

WATCHING TERROR ABROAD: DISCURSIVELY ANALYZING INDIAN NEWS
COVERAGE OF THE 2008 MUMBAI ATTACKS

by

BRIAN CREECH

(Under the Direction of Jay Hamilton)

ABSTRACT

With the November 2008 attacks on Mumbai, we see a new trend in the way in which terror operates within urban spaces, with cities becoming battlefields and the state and military discourses moving to re-territorialize more fluid civilian spaces. This paper looks Indian newspaper coverage of the 2008 attacks on Mumbai as a case study in how the values of global capitalism discursively construct the context of the attack and how the capitalism's discursive practices place local values and identities inside a structure that constructs Mumbai as a typical site within a new type of global terror whose threat is insidious and can be stemmed only through constant militarism. By critically understanding the popular discourses surrounding the attacks, we can start to search for and create alternative discourses about terrorism that do not lock countries and citizens within a logic of perpetual militarism and victimhood.

INDEX WORDS: Terrorism, Globalization, Post-colonialism, Media, Discourse Analysis, Mumbai, Foucault

WATCHING TERROR ABROAD: DISCURSIVELY ANALYZING INDIAN NEWS
COVERAGE OF THE 2008 MUMBAI ATTACKS

by

BRIAN CREECH

B.A., Davidson College, 2005

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2010

© 2010

Brian Creech

All Rights Reserved

WATCHING TERROR ABROAD: DISCURSIVELY ANALYZING INDIAN NEWS
COVERAGE OF THE 2008 MUMBAI ATTACKS

by

BRIAN CREECH

Major Professor: Jay Hamilton

Committee: Nate Kohn
Andy Kavoori

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2010

DEDICATION

Dedicated to my father, Joel Creech, for years of endless support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis began with an idle conversation with my dear friend Viral Vikram Mehta, and I would like to thank him for his unique insight into Indian politics and culture. This thesis would have never started had it not been for his passionate love for the city of Mumbai.

There have been many different sign posts and tour guides along the way, and my thanks goes to Dr. Carolina Acosta-Alzuru for listening to these ideas in their protean form and for her honest feedback when this was just a budding idea.

Thank you to Professors Kavoori and Kohn for their thoughtful readings.

And my most sincere thanks to Dr. Hamilton for his careful guidance in creating the finished product. Sections of this paper undoubtedly echo his influence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | v |
| CHAPTER | |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2 LITERATURE REVIEW | 6 |
| Through the Post-Colonial Lens..... | 7 |
| Terrorism as Post-Colonial Resistance..... | 9 |
| Identities of Resistance..... | 11 |
| Media(ted) Terrorism | 13 |
| The Post-Colonial Battlefield..... | 18 |
| Conclusion..... | 23 |
| 3 THEORY | 24 |
| Theorizing Terrorism’s Place Within (Post) Colonial Discourse | 24 |
| 4 METHODS | 38 |
| Introduction to Discourse Analysis | 38 |
| Elements of Discourse Analysis..... | 41 |
| Gathering Specific Texts | 42 |
| Research Questions | 44 |
| Conclusion..... | 45 |

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|----|
| 5 | ANALYSIS..... | 46 |
| | The Character of Mumbai | 47 |
| | “Six Foreigners Among 101 Dead” | 53 |
| | Exploring Alternatives | 61 |
| 6 | CONCLUSION..... | 67 |
| | Prospects for Future Research | 70 |
| | REFERENCES | 72 |
| | APPENDIX: Articles Analyzed..... | 78 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

On November 26, 2008, several gunmen swarmed India's financial capital Mumbai and killed more than 160 people. They held the city and the world's attention hostage for three days until the police and military swarmed the hotel in which the terrorists besieged themselves, breaking the siege and killing all but one of the gunmen. In the months that followed, it was revealed that these terrorists were part of Lashkar-e-Taiba, an anti-India terrorist group based in Pakistan. These attacks and their aftermath drew attention and sympathy from across the world.

The stories of these attacks rely upon the existing material culture and boundaries within a city that is already ripe with post-colonial ethnic boundaries and conflict. In them, a certain image of Mumbai emerges and circulates, one that will echo these attacks while offering a depiction that places the terrorists and victims within a larger narrative framework. During the subsequent weeks as more articles delved into the nature of the attacks, Mumbai and its citizens embodied a process of what could be called "narrative colonization," in which the words written about the attacks helped transpose American conflicts onto it, thus placing Mumbai and its citizens into a framework signified by the phrase "Global War on Terror."

While many studies examine ways in which international news constructs a sense of the Other, this research project will analyze news of this particular attack in order to explore how it plays into or subverts discourses about decades old post-colonial ideologies (Bailey, 2005; Agnew & Litvack, 2006). Mumbai, as India's financial center, is a consistent subject of Western influence embodied in the flows of finance and capital that move through the city. At the same

time, it is a city in which the material culture is infused with identity politics of Hindu nationalism, particularly in opposition to the Muslim communities and the poor shanty towns that act as markers of class difference within the prosperous Mumbai. Even the change of the city's name from Bombay to the more Hindu-centric Mumbai reflects an exclusionary change meant to build upon notions of the more mainstream Hindu-identity (Appadurai 2000, 627). As a national trading center, the city is dependent upon the image it presents to the moneyed interests of Europe and the United States, and so the image that plays throughout Indian media is one groomed at home, but set for consumption among the western world.

This study will focus on terrorism as a discursive act, because, as Baudrillard (2001) states, "Terrorism, like virus, is everywhere. Immersed globally, terrorism, like the shadow of any system of domination, is ready everywhere to emerge as a double agent. There is no boundary to define it; it is in the very core of this culture that fights it" (accessed electronically).

Understanding terrorism as a discursive act requires a framework that casts power as an imminent force filtering its way through a culture via discourses. Power works through discursive means, and as Foucault (1981) states, "it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together. And for this very reason we must conceive discourse as a series of discontinuous segments whose tactical function is neither uniform nor stable" (p. 101). By constituting knowledge discursively, dominant power structures assert a social reality that reinforces their dominance. Media representations are where we can witness the embodiment of discourse as these waves and fluctuations of power play out.

It is in the workings of discourse that power is provisionally achieved, however. There is no external, privileged position that has absolute control over the discourse. Instead, discourse is fluid, and certain discursive methods lend agency to certain groups in certain contexts. Referring

to post-colonial subjects in particular, Bhabha (1998) states, “to dwell ‘in the beyond’ is also...to be part of a revisionary time, a return to the present to re-describe our cultural contemporaneity; to reinscribe our human, historic commonality; to touch the future on its hither side” (938). Marginalized cultures thus often become the stand-ins for other interests, being the signs that signify and constitute the homogenizing interest of global capitalism. But, power within discourse is never a static thing, and changing global conditions and discursive methods such as appropriation and hybridity give once subservient groups the potential to subvert dominant discourses, or at least change the local identity enough to resemble the dominant.

Terrorism though is a particular kind of political resistance, one that undermines more common diplomatic and militaristic methods of resistance to achieve political goals. Terrorism uses modern technology to introduce a military threat into everyday life and to disrupt the daily patterns of citizens and present a threat whose power is imperceptible and always present. In the Mumbai attacks, the terrorists operated in a coordinated manner assisted by seemingly benign technologies like smart phones and GPS systems, exploiting the violent potential built into the tools of everyday movement and commerce. Terrorist attacks like these exploit the violent potential built into everyday discourse, and it is the purpose of this study to look at how discourses constitute this violence.

Terrorist attacks can be seen as discursive acts that undermine the security promised within the discourses of nationalism and global capitalism. As these systems grow and expand beyond national boundaries, terrorism crops up as a symptom. Baudrillard (2001) crystallizes the critical perspective necessary to understand the way that terrorism operates post-9/11:

Though it is (this superpower) that has, through its unbearable power, engendered all that violence brewing around the world, and therefore this terrorist imagination which -- unknowingly -- inhabits us all.

That we have dreamed of this event, that everybody without exception has dreamt of it, because everybody must dream of the destruction of any power hegemonic to that degree, - this is unacceptable for Western moral conscience, but it is still a fact, and one which is justly measured by the pathetic violence of all those discourses which attempt to erase it (accessed electronically).

That is to say, threats to the hegemonic discourses are sewn discursively, and that as the discourse grows in power, attacks on that power reverberate much more loudly. In searching for ways to understand the terrorists place within the discourse, Baudrillard proposes “a system whose excess of power creates an unsolvable challenge, [and] terrorists respond by a definitive act that is also unanswerable. Terrorism is an act that reintroduces an irreducible singularity in a generalized exchange system.” To stay stable, the discourse must change to resolve this singularity.

Looking at newspapers in particular, this thesis will trace the intersections of nationalist and globalized discourses across three Indian newspapers, tracking how these discourses play out across mainstream media. This study will read articles and stories about the Mumbai attacks, and will examine how the language of the stories reproduces rules and roles by which international and Indian readers can engage with the concepts of terrorism, global capitalism, and national identity. Mumbai, as an economic center and point of cultural exchange, contains a multiplicity of discursive operations and provides the fodder for the insightful unpacking of layers of divergent and competing operations. In points of exchange and trade like Mumbai, the narrative identity of “the subject splits and the signifier fades,” allowing for multiple uses and interests to be placed upon a single subject (Bhabha 1990, p 304). In reading these articles, I will identify and interpret commonly repeated discursive constructions, looking for the ways these constructions create a sense of social reality surrounding the attacks.

It should be noted that the language and discursive acts that create a social reality have a material consequence. They become the antecedent acts that create the ontological viewpoints through which military and political action is considered, taken, and justified. To discuss terrorism and the ways that it and its victims are constructed allows us to understand the way discursive boundaries and avenues are created, thus creating an entry point into the systems in which these attacks are constructed and reacted to. In this framework, material violence and discourse are connected as the destruction of human bodies portend the destructive potential rooted within certain discourses.

Generally speaking, this study will look at terrorism as a discursive practice, and how it acts as a means of destructive resistance within post-colonial discourse. In the case of the Mumbai attacks, the city itself becomes a site of necessary reconstruction in the discourse, and that along with the reverberating destruction brought on by the attacks, the dominant strains within the discourse simultaneously pushed to resolve this destruction through media institutions.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Various strains of scholarship comprise the background of this work. In order to develop a foundation on which to build an analysis, this literature review will look at the role of discourse within post-colonial scholarship, media's relationship with terror, discourse and terror within India, and the relationship between terrorism and discourse creation. This literature review acknowledges the interdisciplinary nature of studying such a phenomenon while focusing on the literatures that help focus the aperture more directly on this incident, thus grounding the study within a specific context that borrows from media studies, anthropology, international policy, religious studies, cultural studies, and discourse analysis.

The studies reviewed here all give varied and detailed pictures of media practice in the post-colonial world as well as of the relationship between terrorism and the media, but they have yet to address more completely how terrorism functions within post-colonial media.

They show that various discourses construct social realities, and that various elements are expressed differently based upon the discourses and power structures within which they are situated. A post-colonial context such as India is a place where various discourses struggle for primacy and, given certain instabilities, either perpetuate the presence of state or international power, or point to flaws within the structure offered by those in power. The diversity of these studies shows that no element has a fixed meaning, but that certain concepts, such as terrorism, are so loaded that they can be used to justify power, disrupt power structures, or act as a last

grasp at agency within a system that has disabled other options. Terrorism gains its power from an elusive meaning, and it is in the display destructive potential that it exerts within discourse.

Through the Post-Colonial Lens

This thesis works within a larger post-colonial context by looking at how the West constitutes discourses of the East. Scholars argue that Western power structures operate under an apparent historical imperative to influence the rest of the world, beginning when the Bretton Woods agreement of 1944 set monetary policy for Western nations. The general on monetary policy established a precedent of financial colonization and political influence abroad that has justified a continued process cultural colonization through discursive practices (Deis 2004, p. 361). As the spread of open global markets and trade led to a cultural exchange influenced by the capitalist values of Western nations, the influence of the dominant became more subtle as the military and legislative practices of colonization were replaced by the less overt practices of cultural, political, and financial exchange (p. 368). Tracking the influences that one culture can have on another via international relations, Appudurai (1996) notes the relationship between East and West are filtered through the lens of cultural exchange, as the subtle and barely noticeable exchange of ideas, products, and people constitute life in either country. Through a system of domination that reflects an agile subtlety among Western powers, these cultural flows facilitate the infiltration of a system of dominance that serves a capitalist interest and subverts local sovereignty (p. 25), while at the same time refracting back upon the dominant West in often unpredictable ways.

One specific way that scholars describe the post-colonial relationship is in terms of dominance and resistance. For example, Barber (1996) describes a variety of conflicted and irreconcilable interests at the core of the discourse between the East and West, specifically in

regards to globalized capitalism and local interests within the Arab world (p. 12-16). Barber argues that Islamic fundamentalism's resistance to global capitalism indicates a general conflict between localized interests everywhere and the flattening imperative of market-driven capitalism (p. 35). Pluralism and multiculturalism emerge as discursive methods by which dominant nations continue to push the status quo within post-colonial discourse, remaining dominant through the guise of accepting and appropriating forms of local culture (pp. 42-45). Other scholars concur, arguing that as global capitalism expands, discourses about pluralism and multiculturalism serve American and Euro-centric profit motives by replacing notions of cultural sovereignty with the superior sovereignty of capital across the globe (Brown 2008, Schoolman 2008).

These power conflicts reproduce and propagate through the culture via discourse, and post-colonial scholars looking at emerging discourses about war, geopolitics, and the public sphere provide a context for understanding how these colonizing discourses work. Spivak (1998) describes how the language of colonization inscribes a certain set of roles into a post-colonial society while tradition and convention ascribe an alternative and equally limiting set of roles, thus trapping certain voices between the strictures of colonial bureaucracy and local custom, in this case the voices and bodies of Indian widows torn between traditional obligations and colonial prohibitions against self-immolation (p. 281). Debrix (2008) looks at terrorism as a discursive act and notes that the need to make meaning allows discourse to take the place of irrational despair after a terrorist attack (p.72). Citing Kristeva's theory of abjection, Debrix also notes that cultures experiencing terror spawn a dominant ideology that creates a discourse constituted by an us/them dichotomy that reinforces the valor of the victim's culture and the evil of the terrorist's culture (p. 81). This binary offers an enemy and a place to which to exorcise anxieties about the security of the victim's culture in the modern world. As this discourse about

terrorism perpetuates, the West reads its own anxieties in the stories of other nations, providing a precondition for continued violence and retaliation while treating other nations as surrogate victims for Western values (90).

Discourses should be understood as the means through which power continually exerts dominance and influence by creating the logics through which we come to understand and debate the world. Using Foucault's (1981) notion of discourse as a starting point, we can read cultural objects, like newspapers and media reports, as sites of constantly competing power because, "there can exist different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy; they can, on the contrary, circulate without changing their form from one strategy to another, opposing strategy" (102). As the agenda-setting bearers of popular discourse, newspapers reflect mainly the dominant discourse, but within this dominant discourse there exists strains of resistance. In the post-colonial world, these texts are a hybrid combination of the colonizers ideology laced through with the language of the colonized (p. 45).

Terrorism as post-colonial resistance

Infused with the discourses of dominance in the post-colonial world are the strains of resistance. Thinking of terrorism as a form of discursive resistance suggests how these attacks work to disrupt the flows of dominant discursive practices. Several political scholars look at terrorism as a symptom of modern capitalism's global expansion, thus indicating a decline in capitalism's hegemony as competing ideologies bristle against the encroaching presence of capitalism with more power and more violence (Robinson, Crenshaw, and Jenkins 2006). Still, as a phenomenon, the motives for terrorism remain elusive. Robinson, Crenshaw, and Jenkins do note that the majority of terrorism happens in states that face social disorganization or upheaval, and that a country lacking a coherent power structure and incapable of providing for the security

of its citizens is one in which terrorism thrives. Whether the disorder is social, political, or material, terrorism remains a tool used by marginalized groups to gain power in the face of increasing disorder.

Understanding terror as resistance though does not account for how the term itself gets used discursively to propel the interests of Western nations. Bhatia (2007) strikes at the typical difficulties often encountered by those who try to define terrorism, noting that it is an elusive sociopolitical concept to define, but one whose elusive definition is especially useful in international discourse and diplomacy. Looking at the types of rhetorical constructions used in media and political discourses that relate to terrorism, Bhatia acknowledges the material violence inherent in the attacks, but finds that terrorist attacks often provide an event for national leaders to galvanize nationalist rhetoric around, particular amid an international audience. He notes that within international discourse, “no agreed definition of terrorism [exists] because the word is frequently attributed with subjective meaning, used to excuse one’s own behavior and condemn others,” pointing out that in the reality after the attack the use of the word “terror” becomes imbued with politically charged meanings that can be used to legitimize certain states, leaders, and courses of action, and can especially be used to demonize resistance against all of these (p. 281). Bhatia, along with other scholars that look at how the discourses surrounding terrorism help form national and international policy (c.f. Wardlaw, 1989; Collins, 2002; De Silva, 2003, Whitbeck 2004), indicate that the discourses that arise after attacks have more affects on the social and political reality than the attacks themselves because it is through these discourses that courses of action at once considered too extreme or unjustified gain widespread justification in the midst of a nationalist rhetoric that galvanizes public opinion into justifying retaliatory violence as the subtle spread of nationalist values. Hess and Justus (2008) note that the struggle

for control of the discourse is evident through a changing vocabulary of international relations, one that brings new words and new meanings to old words in order to contain the damage that terrorist attacks and other acts of resistance can have on the social landscape and that authorities seeking to fight terror must encounter within the realm of discourse. This scholarship maps the acknowledged connection between discursive violence and material violence within policy discourse related to media words and images, confirming the fear that terrorist attacks pose an undefendable threat against the image and perception of states' dominance and security.

Identities of Resistance

Islam forms a specter amid the discourses about international terror, especially in stories about terrorism following the end of the Cold War, with several scholars noting how Islamic fundamentalism is often placed in conflict against the spread of western capitalism (eg., Shaw 1996, Bergesen and Lizardo 2004, Snow 2007, Klein 2009). Islamic fundamentalism is often portrayed as an antagonistic ideology, threatening not just the spread of capitalism but also national sovereignty, human rights, technological progress, egalitarian virtues, democratic processes, and general global security. In the media stories, it exists as a specter that opposes the state's value, though the virtues that the state espouses can also be as fluid as the notion of evil that terrorism, and by extension Islam, come to inhabit (Shaw 1996). In an international discourse mostly led by American rhetoric in the wake of 9/11, Islamic fundamentalism comes to inhabit an increasing set of ideological dichotomies that ties ideas about "right and wrong" to constructions of the power and the weakness, with dominant ideologies often using the presence of terror, and their ability to fight it, to legitimate their own sense of right within the global stage (Bhatia 2008, p. 287). Heated rhetoric and good/evil dichotomies are not limited to Western rhetoric, as the state controlled media in Iran and other Arab nations push an agenda that uses an

“anti-Western filter” to contextualize Arab states and Islamic political movements as being opposed to the damaging potential of the Western agendas (Klein 2009, p. 390). These discourses offer a framework for locating the enemy, and thus controlling the impact that their discursive activities may have within the culture.

A fluid definition of the evil, coupled with a loose definition of terrorism, helps create a discourse of fear that justifies policy and rhetoric that leads to further use of violence and domination in international affairs (Stocchetti 2008). This lays bare a rhetorical and material choice presented by state and the forces that oppose terrorism to their would-be allies and enemies: to comply or to face destruction. Stocchetti notes that the constructions of the terrorist identity used in media and in policy rhetoric all limit the potential to analyze these phenomena critically while also creating “mutually destructive identities” where each actor relies upon a certain construction of the other actor that polarizes cultural differences and creates “arbitrary representations of history and religion for the effective mobilization of the masses against in the fight opponents” while demonizing dissent within the culture (p. 237). For Asad (2007), modern terrorism (particularly suicide bombings) committed by fundamentalist Islamic groups is a series of simplifications, beginning with the simplification of human life to serve the ideological means of a larger group. The biological impulse to preserve one’s life gets subverted to the needs of a group to express a political ideology, and it is through a complex blend of group psychology, religious devotion, and rhetoric that terrorist recruits are pushed to become suicide bombers. Asad points out that among many of the young men who become terrorists also have few other options. The state has failed them, and the swelling wave of global capitalism leaves them little room to express their agency. Terrorist cells offer a stability that they cannot find elsewhere, and it is through acting as a part of this group that the young men find an identity. And so, stepping

into this identity, they also step into a swirl of competing discourses, where their actions become discursive acts that threaten the hegemony of the dominant discourse and display the power of a minority scrambling to find their agency on a global stage.

The terms used to define and talk about terror filter into the language of popular opinion as the terms become more homogenous, leading to an overkill of fear within the discourse as the particular image of a constantly lurking terror becomes ubiquitous across media outlets (Snow 2007). Media's constraints and form create a limited picture of terror, and in repeatedly consuming the same flawed and limited images of terrorists, publics come to rely on these stereotypes and this compels collective action and political will in a way that is at its best misguided and uniformed (p. 21). These limited understandings of all the factors serve those in power most of all because the majority of the public lacks the information or the access to information to effectively protest any policy that locks the society into a system of violence. As an externalized threat, terrorists are necessarily mysterious and driven by myriad cultural and political forces more complex than what is typically found on the evening news, where 80 percent of Americans get their information about the world (p. 22). In such a homogenized media network, "terrorist," "terror," and "terrorism" becomes buzzwords used to trigger emotion and build sympathy for militaristic nationalist agendas under the guise of "security," "safety," and "democracy." These simplifications are utilitarian and ignore a centuries old tradition of cultural exchange between religions that is as filled with cooperation as it is fraught with conflict (Asad 2007).

Media(ted) Terrorism

Because more often than not, terrorists achieve their goals of creating nation-wide terror through the machinations of mass media and popular press, scholars looking at terrorism and

media offer particular insight into how mediated terrorism, and the victim's mediated response to it, discursively operates within a context of power and resistance. Martin (2003) specifically details the relationship between terrorism and the media, noting that terrorist groups seeking to disseminate their message and political viewpoints often manipulate news values to gain coverage by creating media events that help ensure the propagation of their message. Noting a "contagion effect," Martin points out that the successful attempts to gain media attention beget other groups who use terrorist tactics to gain a voice in the international press and continue to press their own agendas (p. 295). Media institutions have shown an awareness of the power that terrorism held over audiences, with reporters, editors and broadcasters clinging to the word ever since the 1970's in order to bolster news drama and increase audiences (c.f. Zulaika and Douglass, 1996). But, as governments and media institutions began noticing terrorists' manipulation of news values to build sympathy, they attempt to stem the sympathy and take control of the message using the same news outlets. As new media create a more dispersed mediascape, it becomes even more difficult for states to maintain hegemony through regulation, ethics, and common practices, as the internet and other forms of unrestrained media communicate the goals of terrorism and begin to influence the public discourse surrounding terror.

Concerns about the threats that violent resistance, particularly terrorism, place against countries leads to a power structure perpetuated by the presence of terrorism and the ever-present fear of violence. In the years leading up to 9/11, terrorist violence had claimed only several dozen American lives, and Zulaika and Douglass (1998) point out that over one thousand books on terrorism were published between 1989 and 1996, indicating that the threat of terrorism gained its power and impact more within the popular imagination than within the realm of

international diplomacy. The two also note that as more books, articles, and television shows investigate terrorism as a subject, this new focus and understanding of terror builds a perceived sympathy among media producers and audiences towards those that engage in acts of political violence.

In the realm of media representation, the threat of the terrorist impinges upon the simulacrum of military security that spans across media stories and events. It is within the representations that the “terrorist” becomes an archetypical character and gains the power to threaten the peace and security offered by the state as well as the military systems that protect the state’s interests. Terrorism relies upon a media outlet to filter fear and violence beyond the site of the attack, turning television images into a “medium of terror” as depictions of violence filter their way into the popular consciousness (Hertz 2006, p. 54). Citing images of the USS Cole, the smoldering wreckage of the World Trade Center after 9/11, and the destroyed trains and public panic after the London train bombings, Nacos (2002) notes that stories and images of destruction deconstruct ideals of national strength while also introducing the terrorists as agents in the popular discourse and opening the door for discussions about their ideologies, motives, and grievances to appear in the popular media (p. 8).

Following 9/11, terror and American global interests become increasingly intertwined as discursive constructions of the terrorist begin to infiltrate American media and rhetoric and compel international violence to protect national interests. Manjani (2002) lays bare the ideological lines that compel the US version of the terror narrative, specifically separating other cultures into classifications of “good foreigner/bad foreigner” (p. 45). But, because no culture is homogenous, conflicts are externalized into the ways other cultures and their conflicts are talked about, thus preserving rhetorical peace and stability within the dominant paradigm (p. 47). The

effectiveness of terrorism as a rhetorical construction is built around the perpetuation of visual markers of the attack within television audiences. Adroit use of the mass media changes the mediascape into a relentless barrage of images of terrorist attacks that constantly remind citizens that their safety is precarious as the military structures that keep order and security are shown falling apart (p. 55). Using media technology to engage in a war of ideas, terrorists propel their own ideologies, thus acknowledging media's ability to act as the means by which various discourses swirl and compete (Corman and Schiefelbein, 2008). Scholars point out that the efforts to combat terrorism are waged as effectively within media as within the borders of the countries that terrorists operate within. Violent terrorist attacks legitimize the presence of foreign military forces that materially propagate ideology and intimidate competing interests (p. 67). By engaging in a "war for minds" with terrorists, modern capitalism take the war of ideologies into the media, tacitly acknowledge the material affects that discourses can have on a country (97).

Images, narratives, and stories of terroristic violence threaten the hegemony and dominance of Western nations whose colonizing imperative relies upon an ability to provide material and economic security internationally. Thussu (2006) looks at how television distills images of Islam and Islamic leaders into easily consumed villains that energize the American imagination and create a discursive impulse furthering the goals of American policy and security abroad (p. 10). These depictions also locate terrorism within a good-versus-evil dichotomy that existentially valorizes Western interests abroad that elevates the terrorist narrative at the expense of cross-cultural exchange and subtle understanding of the cultural and economic factors that lead to terrorist attacks (p. 18). As discourse on terrorism begins to filter into policy decisions, political campaigns, nationalist rhetoric, media coverage of these discussions sustain the

terrorists' presence within the discourse, thus prolonging the intent of the initial attacks (Nacos 2002, p. 10).

As the means for widely facilitating the spread of discourse, media act as a tool to propel both the mission of terrorism as well as the interests of the capitalist state. Operating through the plethora of means such as journalistic storytelling conventions, speech conventions, or even a tendency to build news content around key words like “fear” and “threat” in order to ensure that the story resonates with a sense of impending threat, both terror and anti-terror interests use media to their advantage (Nacos 2002). Exploring the relationship between media outlets and the audience, Nacos also analyzes the relationship between the media outlet and the state, questioning whether or not there exists an impetus to protect the image of the state from the threat of terroristic discourse either through self-censorship or outright state censorship. Nacos acknowledges that media have an innate inability to capture the gruesome reality of any attack, and in doing so admits the presence of a constructed social reality that structures the possible discourses and popular responses to terrorist attacks, particularly attacks against Western interests (p. 174). Within the structure of media, journalists and producers act as an uncontrollable variable whose allegiances tend to follow the dramatic developments of “the story,” though this development is nearly impossible to specify. Over time though, conventions develop which structure reporting and discussion of terrorism. As they filter from the western media models into international outlets, the writing, reporting, and language of terrorism stories becomes homogenized across national boundaries in discursive forms already established by Western interests (Stenvall, 2007, p. 209).

Through journalistic and storytelling conventions, media create a “hyperreal sphere that blur[s] the line between public and private interests,” thus enabling a war between varied

interests (some with and some without political sovereignty, others with commercial imperatives) that fight in language instead of with bullets (Lewis, 2005, p. 154). Within this sphere, evil becomes more ubiquitous and menacing, freed from political and geographic boundaries and threatening potential attacks anywhere on the globe, against any interest. The label “evil” also becomes more fluid, moving from group to group based upon context. Using terms like “good” and “evil” transports news stories about terrorism and the context surrounding them into a discursive realm where the desired resolution to conflict is the vanquishing of this mysterious “evil.” All policy must have as its focus the destruction of this “evil.” However, the term “evil” fails to encapsulate all of the ways that terrorists are presented within media texts, because using the term assumes that discrete policy and diplomatic questions about cultural conflict can be solved by vanquishing some form of empirically observable “evil.” Media perpetuate this simplified notion by causing disputes to follow an archetypical structure that aligns various global interests along an axis of “good” and “evil” that does not reflect the sustained realities of dealing with cultural conflict and its consequences. At the same time, is a bit too simple to blame media story-forms for reducing complex global political events into common narratives. Nacos (2002) points out that audiences react and expect these narratives to fit within certain discourse models, though audiences rarely follow the presented narrative structures along prescriptive lines. Even when terrorists and their ideologies are presented as conventionally evil, since they are also presented as characters, which may build sympathy amid audiences.

The Post-Colonial Battlefield

The Mumbai attacks provide a singular modern moment for understanding terror, where discourses surrounding post-colonialism, globalization, and violence form a critical locus from

which to launch a variety of analyses. To understand how the Mumbai attacks play into threads within Indian discourse, scholars giving an insight into the unique media and political landscapes of the Indian sub-continent offer a framework for understanding how Indian media work within, post-colonial, nationalist, and globalized discourses. About Mumbai in particular, Appadurai argues that ethnic conflicts play out in public spaces encoded with the hybrid politics of national identity made to fit within the global market, and that attacks against these spaces are direct attacks against dominating discourse. Yet, external gazes tend to create a simplified and false homogeneity amid other cultures. Lankala (2006) argues that nationalistic responses to 'Islamic Terror' in India are in part driven by the presence and expectations of India's Western partners (p. 87). India's strengthened discursive relationship to US interests is also exemplified by the national presence of English-language newspapers, primarily because English is not associated with regional identity or conflicts (p. 91).

Understanding the Indian political climate offers insight into the rhetoric and ideologies that create discourses within the country and determine the contexts of how national crises are dealt with in the popular press. Van der Veer (1994) discusses the importance of religious divisions in the country, given the rise of Hindu nationalism and the use of an idealized Hindu identity to exercise political power throughout the country. In the case of Mumbai, its very name invokes a return to traditional Hindi ethnic identity. The post-colonial national press has been a key institution in the spread of national identity. An identity based in Hinduism has come to dominate the national identity, thus marginalizing Muslims alongside other ethnic groups within a political system that assimilates along a hierarchical line while caring little for political pluralism (pp. 78-84).

Prior to the Mumbai attacks, Indian discourse about terror worked within a Hindu nationalist framework, with conventional political and power structures necessarily taking on a religious and ethnic bent. Arab identity and Muslim identities are often elided within the context of terrorism to create an image of the terrorist that escapes strict definitions of identity of either context, while retaining the rhetorical flexibility to become a threatening specter that haunts the context of terrorist attacks (Stoltz 2007).

The Mumbai attacks are a critical lynchpin for scholars studying global terror, as the methods, motives and coverage of the attacks marked widespread changes of how international terrorism was conceived and fought in the popular imagination. Recent scholarship tackling the Mumbai attacks as a social phenomenon examines the consequences of these attacks for the way we critically understand cities as ideological and material battle sites, how international violence is dealt with in the media, how rhetoric is employed at the behest of policy, and how American politicians use the language of 9/11 as a reference point to direct reactions to terrorist attacks in other countries. For many scholars, these attacks and ways they are talked about suggest how ideological violence is built into the modern condition, and that this type of violence and its reverberations affects the social realities of not only India, but also global capitalist networks.

Implicit within the Mumbai attacks is a redefinition of the modern city as an ideological and military target. Discussing how constructing Mumbai as a target undermines centuries of history, Bishop and Ray (2009) interpret the Mumbai violence as a metonym for the global city-as-target situated within a discourse that of globalization-as-urbanization (p. 263). Along with additional examples, theoretical perspectives that conceptualize and analyze interactions within urban space offer a fruitful basis from which to understand the attacks, especially competing discourses about capitalism, nationalism, ethnic identity, and globalization. The city as a multi-

layered physical manifestation of diverse ideologies, religious practices, security policies, ethnic identities, and development practices forms the frame of reference for understanding how terrorist attacks and modern reactions to them turn civilian spaces into a new type of military target (c.f. Graham, 2009 and Coaffee, 2009). By understanding the landscape, mediascape, financial structure, and historical and cultural make-up of the city, we can develop a critical framework for analyzing how the cultural impacts of a terrorist attack ripple through the various cultural strands found within the city as well as how colonizing powers recontextualize these structures in the face of resistance.

Reflecting on the prevalence of daily violence in the third world, Pieterse (2009) analyzes how the Mumbai attacks fit within a media system that focuses on a unique incident in Mumbai while simultaneously ignoring the daily and systemic violence in Africa and poorer parts of India. Looking at violence across the global south, Pieterse (2009) takes the generalized media ambivalence towards killings and executions across Africa to mean that media interests tend to find meaning when an international story has elements that mimic Western consciousness and anxieties. Extending this insight to Mumbai, one can interpret it as an intersection of global commerce and culture, which acts as a symbolic target of the Western way of life. News stories and accounts of violence in more impoverished regions of the world becomes a means of survival, part of the daily fabric that further accentuates the differences between the developed and undeveloped world. Pieterse argues that the routinized violence inherent within African urban life attacks a fragile social infrastructure built upon fluid power relations. Whereas as the Mumbai attacks show how susceptible urban infrastructures are to an attack, there is little room in the media to comprehend the more systematic forms of social violence plaguing the so-called third world. There is a potential within Pieterse's reasoning to look at how media critically

engage violence in the third world, to understand how the discursive relations surrounding violence tend to create a bias built around western-centric anxieties.

When global media picked up on a John McCain soundbyte calling the Mumbai attacks “India’s 9/11,” the discourse surrounding Mumbai attacks was quickly reterritorialized within an America-centric idiom imbued with the interests of global capital (Roy 2009). Reading the attacks this way illuminates a fundamental indifference to identity, as the city and these attacks are part of a more globalized narrative about the threats the “9/11 style attacks” present to modern cities and leaders while also giving credence to the idea that there is global threat against capitalism. Roy’s argument acknowledges that the language following the attacks reflect an adherence to the United States military-political-economic imperialism in the South Asia, at least among the English speaking media, with Indian leaders and commentators calling for the same types of strategic military responses that the United States engaged in after 9/11. Looking at how the 9/11 cliché has diffused and changed the way terrorism is viewed, Roy concludes that these types of attacks are performances that destroy a “symbolic order” in which the city becomes a dramatized player in system of global atrocities. It is a language spoken in violence, where local identities and conflicts devolve into destructive spectacles meant to show the both the instability and the power of the state.

Bratton (2009) offers a way to understand how commercially available technology contains the potential to map and imagine the world as a potential site for ideological domination. Advances in technology change the ways in which individuals interact with the physical world, thus changing the meaning of physical spaces as technologies like GPS and satellite phones give groups more connectivity and mobility. Looking specifically at how the Mumbai terrorists used consumer GPS systems, satellite phones, and Google Earth to plot and execute their attacks,

Bratton argues that the Mumbai attacks demonstrate the destructive potential of seemingly benign technologies used to help individuals conceive of and navigate the world. He links the use of these technologies to a fundamentalist Islamic desire to turn the world into a caliphate, noting that these technologies, free from moral values, can be handled by their users in a quest to realize certain ideologies. Implicit in this argument is a technological determinism that ties the potential for increased destruction and domination to the potentials built within machines.

Kaplan (2009), on the other hand, offers a view of technology's potential to increase understanding and offer more information to people while leaving their agency intact. Technologies such as social media, smart phones, micro-blogging, and text messaging helped citizens and officials learn more about the attacks as they happened, but the influx of unregulated and unverified information led to an a murky understanding of the attacks as rumors and partial observations mixed with eyewitness reports. Kaplan's analysis of social media reports after the attacks shows that improved technologies and increased access to information do not necessarily mean an increased potential for nefarious uses, as disparate strands of information and intentions coalesce into a muddled and almost inoperable version of the reality.

Conclusion

This thesis will explore how terrorism operates within overlapping discourses and how media narratives about terror lay bear the mechanic at work. It should be noted that discourse is elusive and ever-changing, and that what may seem to be hegemonic and fixed also fractures, while what seems to be resistant and threatening may also become an element that support dominant groups and discourses. These conflicts and shifting meanings constitute discursivity, and in analyzing these shifts in conflicts, one can see the way discursivity exerts a material and social presence.

CHAPTER 3

THEORY

The purpose of this chapter is to more fully develop a theoretical perspective and strategy of analysis suitable to the intentions of this study.

On the surface, acts of global terrorism appear to be political and cultural anomalies, occurring without antecedent and disrupting the movement and discourses of everyday life. Localized and often initially fueled by irreparably divisive ethnic and political differences, these acts of terror play out in front of a global audience thanks to communications networks and institutions that span continents. By doing so, terrorist attacks and the resistance they represent gain a discursive footing within a communication system perpetuated by the same forces these attacks are thought to resist. Because terrorism works within a discursive frame similar to dominant ideology, we should consider how these power structures operate in order to understand how terrorism acts as an active mode of discursive resistance. Starting from a post-colonial perspective, this chapter will explore ways to imagine how terror resists from within the discursive order found within media texts.

Theorizing Terrorism's Place Within (Post)colonial Discourse

In thinking about terrorism as an act of resistance, it is important to keep in perspective the destruction and violence that comes with terror attacks. While resistance to repressive forces is often seen as a positive thing in cultural studies, it is important to remember that certain modes of resistance are fraught with their own shortcomings. As Deleuze and Guattari (1981) warn, the language and philosophy of revolution and change has the potential to lead to a far more

restrictive and destructive reality than the system it resists. As a form of resistance, terrorism then becomes a destructive line of flight that leads out of a restrictive system and into oblivion.

Traditional colonial systems rely on the exploitation and use of people and resources based upon a series of formalized relationships reinforced by legal and violent means that reinforce the degradation of the subjugated group. This innate subjugation is the pretext of the historical and cultural flows that extend from these systems even after political liberation. This model of subjugation and exploitation as conceived of by Fanon (1963) holds true for the more insidious forms of capitalism's spread, and is through Fanon's argument that we can understand the unique position that the subjugated group occupies, because it is from this position that resistance is launched. Inherent in the colonial system is a basis of oppression and dehumanizing violence that is traditionally channeled into the act of cultural production, but as resistance mounts, the violence turns outward, creating new means of external resistance (pp. 44-46). Though his arguments have often been used to encourage bloody revolutions, Fanon talks of violence not only as a physical act but also as a bloodless cultural and political act that also strips subjects of their humanity. He reminds readers that inherent within the use of violence is the exertion of control and the limiting of human possibility, whether materially, culturally, or psychologically.

When talking about terrorism, one cannot escape the reality of violence and destruction, so Fanon serves as a grounding point, reminding us about the dangers of violent resistance. Since violence is so intrinsically a part of colonizing systems and the colonizing logic, then reactive terror becomes a dangerous symptom of that system as the oppressed seek ways to escape the constantly encroaching limitations of colonial and (post)colonial systems. Fanon points out that political revolutions within former colonies may shake the formal political and military bonds,

but the psychic bonds linger, and I would like to posit that these deep psychic bonds extend beyond the boundaries of the mind and into the culture at large, where they are influenced by systems of economic and cultural exchange that privilege and reinforce the patterns of dominance. The fact that structures of inequality are so hard to escape perpetuates the irrational and destructive use of terror to disrupt these systems. In this light, terror can be seen as reactive consequence to the violent impulse located within capitalism's colonizing tendencies. Capitalism and domination must locate this violence outside of themselves, and so at a certain level, terrorism serves the function of externalizing the violence within a threat that is essentially not of the system it chooses to resist.

Since discourse (as Foucault (1981) argued) fundamentally creates the intellectual model of the world through which groups operate, in order to understand terrorism we need to develop a sense of what discourse is and what it means to operate discursively. While it could be said that discourse comprises everything, it is more accurate to say that discourse is a system, like language, that actors operate within (Gee 1999). The system itself is free from ideological values, but actors within the system dictate how power, knowledge, and agency are distributed and spread. Language tends to be seen as the primary component of a discursive system because it is through a system of language that most power and knowledge are freely communicated. The pervasiveness of its logic of discourses persists everywhere, but discursive structures also constantly changing as groups with competing interests use a variety of discursive methods to change understood notions of cultural knowledge, thus causing identities, power, and agency to change within a given framework (p. 12).

To understand how terrorist attacks operate discursively, we most locate them within a system of colonial discourse that preserves patterns of dominance lodged within the

machinations of culture and history. To begin asking questions about how terrorism acts as a form of resistance, or even if it is a even an effective form of resistance at all, one must first develop a coherent understanding of (post)colonial discourse and how new institutions work to maintain patterns of structure and dominance in a world where colonizing powers and administrations have been deposed and replaced by less symbolic and formal forces like global capitalism and forms of grass-root nationalism. Though there are formal means of resistance to nationalism and global capitalism, for the most part they exist in the aftermath of the revolution, building up from the destruction. As a means of resistance and change, terrorism is constructed as an external force capable of destroying the security and order offered by modern colonizing forces. Terrorism's disruption introduces a fundamental chaos to the order that power structures must reorganize around to accommodate for.

In thinking about terrorism then, media outlets form a discursive framework based in a system of language and images, and since most modern shared cultural knowledge is transmitted via media outlets, the media are the most prevalent means for reproducing discourse and knowledge. Traditional media outlets have proliferated in many developing nations at the behest of global commercial expansion and the colonizing imperatives of Western nations, creating a mediascape whose rules for access have been established and controlled by Western businesses, governments, and their local allies. This control is effectuated by a series of cultural flows intertwined among financial systems, technological shifts, and media networks because these institutions allow cultural material to flow freely across national boundaries and perpetuate ideologies that reinforce colonial power structures and control the available paths of resistance (Appudurai 1990, pp 20-21). Within these structures and networks, traditional rules of colonial exchange meet with modern technological changes and social demands, creating an ideological

landscape rife with structures that privilege certain types of discursive practices and cause others to slip from the mediascape as bits of outmoded antiquities. Local forms and means begin to become global and must fit into the discourse in order to continue to spread along their machinations.

Thus, resistance must come from within, turning communication and language systems into sites of continually conflict, where fluid meanings and identities have the privileged reality of continually changing to adapt within a system whose rules are constantly adapting in order to deal with threats to the order. Guattari (1991) points out that media images reinforce normative practices that help maintain social order for the purpose of perpetuating a consistent order, sublimating human meaning and desire into a capitalist system of perpetual production. Communication and media networks form the mechanism that push the ideology, and Guattari theorizes that in order to for resistance to be successful, it must be launched via the same networks of communication and culture production. By putting the means and technology of communication into the hands of those who choose to resist, potentialities are opened that allow mass media to “problematize what is at stake in its full amplitude” and “bring individuals out of themselves, to disengage themselves from their immediate preoccupations, in order to reflect upon the future and order of the world” (263). Implicit in this argument is the use of technology beyond simple ideological determinism, one that instead reflects upon technology as a tool and mechanism for change, although the possibilities offered by the changes in technology as groups use technology to further interact with the discourse, infusing the discourse with new ideologies that rarely get expressed. Guattari’s thesis represents an alternative mode for dominance, one that theorizes communication networks as something independent of commercial systems and commoditization. For Guattari, effective resistance is human driven and represents potential

driven by a unified sense of humanity that crosses national boundaries. The ideology of capitalism becomes a social reality that is inescapable, similar to Fanon's assertion that the colonization can never be fully erased from the psyche of the colonized. Instead, Guattari illuminates the potential of living in a new reality. Following Guattari, Hardt and Negri (2000) point out that power (or in their terms, Empire) is immanent and total through the spread of economic inequality, but resistance can only be manifest within the terms of this domination. Therefore, resistance, whether violent or non-violent, must be global, and communication networks offer the most readily available path for this resistance.

At this point it should be noted that violence and appropriation exist within colonial discourse precisely because colonization and de-colonization are not simply monolithic and overwhelming processes. Inherent contradictions and subtle interplay mark the colonization process with a murky set of relationships that at once reinforce old power structures and identities while offering new means for resistance through the creation of new identities capable of navigating the murky process. Speaking primarily about political, military, and religious colonizing interests, Comaroff (1989) notes "the colonizing process is characterized by occasional conflict, as well as common interest, among its perpetrators -- be they administrators or industrialists, merchants or militia, the crown or the cloth. To be sure, its contradictions everywhere run far deeper than are suggested by the tensions visible on the surface plane of empire" (p. 165). These contradictions and tensions run deep within the colonizing logic and continue to persist, so analysts must "treat as problematic the making of both colonizers and colonized in order to better understand the forces that, over time, have drawn them into an extraordinarily intricate web of relations" (p. 165). New discourses that can navigate this

historical and cultural complexity then gain privilege and offer a keen set of new options to those seeking to resist and those seeking to gain new power.

Thanks to the commercial and cultural exchange system of global capitalism, hegemony within a society is no longer sustained only by state apparatuses and laws. The dominance of global capitalism and its discourses are spread beyond these means via communication networks that can continue to reinforce dominance without an arm of the state clearly-delineated along trade lines, military lines, or political boundaries. Bollywood, as an institution of cultural production, serves as a macro-case study here in the link between media and post-colonial discourse entrenched in capitalist systems. As Kavoori and Punathembekar (2004) point out, Bollywood's once localized economy of shady practices and patrons connected to organized crime fell into a more stabilized and reliable financial system that were more in tune with Western business practices, thus allowing Bollywood cinema to fit within a larger global commercial system (p. 18). With this commercial legitimization came an impulse to center Bollywood films within a global Indian diaspora integrating itself within a larger global context. These distribution and marketing forces begin to influence the content of Bollywood films and begin to control the discourses surrounding minority groups like Muslims, women, children, as well as creating a discourse for what it "means" to be of modern India within the global context. For international audiences, Bollywood films package a sense of what it means to be Indian, thereby creating the rules that will dictate how outside cultures are to read and understand what it means to be Indian in this sense. Granted, there are hints of colonial expectations as Indian identities become subservient to what will play across a broader (and wealthier) international audience and unsavory cultural elements are sanitized from the screen. But instead of the military power of Britain deliberately subjugating the bodies and institutions of India to its own

ends, Indian institutions subjugate themselves to the perceived expectations of the western gaze in order to meet the desires of the capitalist tendencies and cultural expectations left behind by the British. As the Bollywood example shows, understanding all the ways that post-capitalism's complex residual effect on the cultural practices and the modes by which discourse gets created is nearly impossible because the nature of these changes is imperceptible and linked to an indiscernible variety of influences. There is a discrete and complex historical-cultural causality structure in place, and as Appudurai (1990) states, "Can we speak of some of these flows as being, for a priori structural or historical reasons, always prior to and formative of other flows?...The relationship of these various flows to one another, as they constellate into particular events and social forms will be radically context dependent" (337).

Partly through the increasingly pervasive presence of communication technologies, and partly through the increased access to production technologies, communication networks and materials increasingly become the material through which discourse passes. In rethinking how power works in a world without clear bodies of dominance, Lash (2007), points out that communication networks fundamentally change the way power operates, saying, "The global information society is an order of not dualism, but monism, immanence. Now domination is through communication. The communication is not above us, even as disciplinary power is. It is instead among us. We swim in its ether" (p.66). This type of domination through communication fundamentally changes the way in which we think of power working as it exerts its influence upon the public sphere at one point thought to be the independent means for evaluating the machinations of power and influence. Yet by undermining the independent nature of communication systems, power structures infiltrate the systems by which discourses are created and spread and help groups and citizens make sense of the world. Communication networks offer

a variety of methods for both escaping and reinforcing dominance through cultural codes, access to information, and the creation of shared nationalistic identity, history, and culture. In the case of terrorism, destructive and catastrophic acts call into question the stability of dominant groups by disrupting security. Disasters, particularly terrorist attacks, call into question the dominant power structure's ability to maintain order and protect human life. As Hobbes (1651) noted, the most fundamental and tacit understandings that allows a people to be dominated is the promise that the dominating system will at the very least protect the lives of the people from physical harm. Random acts of violence destabilize the myth of security, poking holes in the tacit agreement between people and the power at large. When this fundamental operating principle is threatened, so too is the legitimacy of the dominant structure tacitly charged with maintaining that dominance.

Because local communication networks are a mixture of national culture and (post)colonizing traditions, discursive methods within (post)colonial cultures create hybrid identities and modes of communicating, and it is partially through this hybridity that power is continually perpetuated. As Bhabha (1997) states, "Mimicry is, thus, the sign of double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation, and discipline which 'appropriates' the Other as it visualizes power" (p. 153) This line of thought hints at a problematic multiculturalism that elides real difference and simplifies identities into an innocuous melting pot where identity becomes a grey anonymity. Mimicry (and hybridity as Bhabha theorizes it) involves the adoption of local forms of discourse in order to co-opt them into the perpetuation of certain power forms. Mimicry and hybridity work both ways though, and local groups can achieve resistance and power by moving through the chains of dominant discourse. Dominant culture too, through a process of appropriation, adopt the same modes of discourse stemming from resistant colonized

groups. This type of appropriation allows dominant power structures to infiltrate local cultures and maintain subtle dominance, making hybridity an intimate part of how power maintains dominance, but also how local groups move within power and change the modes of discourse. In a (post) colonial world so intricately laced through with historic patterns of dominance, Lash offers a framework for understanding how power perpetuates itself when the formal structures of dominance have been removed, informal methods persist. Without the formal trappings of dominance like armies and administrators, the discursive logic of dominance becomes pervasive and acts of resistance begin to seem more irrational. It is a dominant logic that is also capable of re-contextualizing and re-presenting resistant positions and actions into this logic precisely because there is no privileged space outside of communication and language from which to launch a form of discursive resistance.

After the smoke clears and the bodies begin to pile up, news coverage of these attacks propagates, and it is within the development and construction of these narratives after the attacks that power propagates and moves to maintain its dominance. In the immediate aftermath following terrorist attacks, there is an opportunity to control and create the burgeoning narrative, thus creating a discourse that reasserts national identity and resolve shown in sharp contrast to a physical crisis. Jones (2006) notes that violent discourses are rare moments that fully disrupt the flows of national discourse. It is within this vacuum that audiences and citizens are confronted with an immanent chaos that threatens not only their existence but their fundamental pillars of the collective identity as well. This chaos is fleeting though, as narratives fill the void by reasserting fundamental ideologies that allows power to remain dominant. Jones (2006) describes how narratives work after a disaster, stating that these stories perform a range of ideological functions, most often that of reasserting power, and constructing myths [that] can be mobilized to

serve political ends,” and “work[ing] to shape social memory and ideological positionings” (p. 34). In the case of terrorist attacks, nationalist discourse becomes more pervasive as reminders of previous terrorist attacks and the need for physical violence to justify the mission of the colonizing state. Cooperation from the populace becomes easier to gain as not just nationalistic, but also falsely pluralistic international rhetoric promises to protect uninvolved citizens and potential victims ever more fervently from an externalized threat. Though terrorism may have as one of its prime purposes the destabilization of power structures, the reinforcement it invites through its very threat serves to solidify the center of the discourse. As an act of direct resistance, terrorism galvanizes the fundamental nationalist and militarized ideologies swirling within the discourse.

The violence of these attacks inscribes the conflict of ideology within the body politic onto the bodies of citizens and victims. After terrorist attacks, images of the victimized bodies and destroyed buildings become imbued with visceral emotion and become the raw material for discourse. At first, bodies serve as targets for terrorist attacks and take on the nationalist ideologies, while later standing in as a place holder for the much more elusive and harder to attack abstract notions like capitalism, ethnocentric nationalism, and inherently unequal class structures. After an attack, bodies maintain their function as a physical stand-in for the dominant discourse, but through repeated glorification within narratives of the attack, they gain a special status whereupon their destruction reinforces the need for power structures to defend the ideologies that had been attacked. Appudurai (2000) points out how in modern Mumbai, physical spaces become imbued with shared historical and cultural narratives that echo the validity of Hindu nationalism. Buildings in Mumbai already filled with a certain ideology created by years of cultural flows and continued commercial uses, so they easily slip into a discursive system of

meanings where they and the people associated with these spaces become targets. Within the logic of terrorist attacks, the physical targets are constructed to contain certain meanings and ideologies, and in an act that destroys the target, the meanings and ideologies imposed on these targets are also attacked. In the aftermath though, terrorists also lose their own identity and meaning, as dominating power structures use the word “terrorist” as a shaded and veiled signifier that comes to be defined by increasingly vague phrases like “threat,” “radical,” and “fundamentalist.” As Chomsky (2002) suggests, it is in the best interest of the state and dominating power structures to adhere to a necessarily loose definition of terrorist so that the ideological imperative for the cultural, commercial, and political colonization of less powerful can be justified under the banner of protecting the world from a threat that is existentially dark and menacing. These constructions of terrorism and terrorists also obscure from critical inquiry the relationship between the spread of global capitalism and the increasingly violent means that various groups are using to resist this spread. These constructions of terrorism erase the geopolitical content surrounding terrorist attacks and recast these conflicts as erroneous and essentialized struggles between an intrinsic force for good against an intrinsic force for evil.

Even in a post-9/11 context though, meaning continues to be inscribed on targets in increasingly subversive ways that begin to chip at the security of dominant discourses. By looking at how Daniel Pearl’s body becomes inscribed with US ideology in a Middle Eastern context, Grindstaff and DeLuca (2004) note how the use of Pearl’s body, voice, and face personalize the threat in a way that is not readily re-appropriated by the dominant ideology. The ideologies of the kidnapers are forced to be uttered through Pearl’s mouth, reinforcing a personalized and psychic subjugation before his body is violently rent asunder. In this context, the terrorists are identified as a group unified under a common belief system and that maintains

secrecy and anonymity. Their ideologies become de-localized from any physical body, speaking instead through Pearl, illustrating that the threat is located within ideology, not just within the bodies that carry out that ideology, and that said ideology can personally threaten any single body within the opposing discourse. It is through this grotesque violence that every body loses its human quality. To recall Fanon, this dehumanization illustrates how the systems that stem from colonial frameworks are sewn with a logic that privileges conflict over human life, thus leaving violence as far too often the most logical, yet fundamentally compromised means of resistance.

Because terrorism happens at the intersection between nationalism and a leveling capitalism, it can be seen as a disruptive and anomalous force that changes discursive flows. Concerned primarily with the materiality of terrorism's representation, we can look at the various ways that discursive practices act to repair the disruption caused by terrorism. With violence at its core, terrorism is a lurching threat to the security of certain discursive structures, but it also threatens the legitimacy of resistance rooted within the discursive practices of the mass media. From a discursive standpoint that constructs terrorism as a threat external to the logic of dominance, dominant power structures reinforce the need for their existence while also obscuring the logic of violence that is fundamental to the process of colonization.

To summarize, from a discursive perspective, terrorism as a method of resistance functions as a violent act of last resort, one that acknowledges the limits of rational discursive methods to resist capital domination, and in an act of destruction reinforces the importance and power centered within the target. These attacks promote a politics of fear that reinforce patterns of domination, and as terrorist attacks more frequently become events mediated through communication networks, their disruptive power continues to propel an oppressive politics of fear that galvanizes a certain nationalistic identity and rewards groups and individuals that align

with that identity while further removing foreign identities from that discourse. In nations that are increasingly brought together through shared communication networks, national identity and discourse is continually reinforced and carried through the discursive modes of these networks.

CHAPTER 4

METHODS

This chapter explains discourse analysis as a research method and specifically lays out how it will be used to gain insight into the logics surrounding the Mumbai attacks. A discourse analysis must acknowledge the preexisting contexts that discursive acts enter into. In the case of this analysis, global capitalism, with India acting as a complicit partner in the system, foregrounds the analysis, but there are also several other discourses at play. There is the context of Hindu nationalism in India, which dominates the political rhetoric for the past fifteen years. Within these two contexts, there is also the discourse surrounding terrorist violence as well as the place fundamental Islam occupies in relation to these discourses. On the obvious level, the discourses surrounding a terrorist attack represent a series of cultural and values based conflicts, but the purpose of the analysis is to ground these conflicts amid a socially constructed reality that creates the context around the attacks themselves. By understanding the system on knowledge and discourses surrounding the attacks, we can come to understand how the attacks are synthesized and made part of a national storyline.

Introduction to Discourse Analysis

This thesis uses a discourse analysis of the stories about the attacks to find patterns of larger global discourses about terrorism and power, looking at how terrorists, police, victims, western tourists, international diplomats, buildings, and audiences are symptomatic of as well as help constitute a larger, dominant context. To put it simply, discourses make up our entire social existence. It is tempting to say that discourses reflect a fixed reality, but various discourses

working independently, in competition, and in cooperation to actively create the social reality that we call “culture” (Gee, 2005). Discourses can be thought of as systems that create meaning, though these meanings are rarely fixed, often changing with every announcement within a particular discourse.

The analysis will focus on articles and stories about the Mumbai attacks. It will examine how the language of the stories creates the rules and roles by which we engage the concepts of terrorism and global capitalism. Mumbai, as an economic center and point of cultural exchange, contains a multiplicity of discursive operations and provides the fodder for unpacking layers of divergent and competing operations. In centers of exchange and trade such as Mumbai, the narrative identity of “the subject splits and the signifier fades,” allowing for multiple uses and interests to be placed upon a single subject (Bhabha 1990, p 304). In reading these articles, I will identify commonly repeated linguistic constructions, looking for the ways these constructions limit and channel subjects’ identity within these competing contexts of global capitalism and terrorism.

Discourse analysis pushes beyond textual analysis by studying the intertextual nature of texts in order to locate the texts within patterns of power (Johnstone 2002, p. 24). By analyzing the structure and usage of language across multiple texts, discourse analysis helps lay bare the myriad parts that coalesce into the construction of knowledge (p. 4). As an outgrowth of linguistics, discourse analysis explores the possibilities permitted by the function of language, noting how the structures of the systems that we communicate within limit the ways subjects can be conceived (p. 34).

As an example of the type of analysis proposed for this study, Acland (1991) uses discourse analysis to deconstruct the ideological structures of sexuality within the story of a

particularly grisly violent crime, showing how dominant ideology of social control and the danger of deviance gets inscribed upon the narrative across multiple stories and media outlets, even when traditional sexual roles of the actors involved are inverted within the narrative. The language of feminine sexuality, class, and sexual violence coalesces around the crime to create new discourses about gender, violence, and sexuality that create in turn a subject that privileges the maleness of the attacker and criticizes the female victim for an aggressive sexuality. Both of these subjects are situated within discourses about sexual morality among elites, but Acland traces the narrative across multiple news outlets and stories, tracking emerging patterns within the discourse and highlighting these patterns as a marked change within the relevant discourses surrounding the crime.

Acland's analysis highlights an important facet of discourses: that they are not entirely reflective of the cultural context they are situated within, but that they have material effects and create new strands and contexts within the culture (Gee, 2005). While discursive practices to a certain extent reflect and adhere to certain rules of expression within the culture, competing discourses introduce new rules and means of expression as well as previously unarticulated subject positions. While it is tempting to think of discourses as ineffable forces creating social reality, it is perhaps more useful to think of discourses as a series of forces with varied interests creating a system with diverse subject-positions and various methods for expression within the system. Activities, identities, relationships, politics, connections, and systems of knowledge constitute a quasi-fixed system that allows for a diversity of expressions and a flux of social values. When these elements come together, they form a series of knowledge systems that give people the means to interact with one another, organize information, and make decisions based upon those decisions.

In relation to this thesis, discourses about Indian Hindu identity and nationalism, global capitalism, Islamic fundamentalism, and terrorism all collide and collude to form a social reality within which to ground these attacks. A discourse analysis looks at how the language and expressions surrounding the attacks create a social reality and re-imagine existing discourses to accommodate and reflect the attacks. Looking at the material consequences of the attacks and the discourses surrounding the attacks, an analysis of the attacks must acknowledge the power of language and ideology to change not just the social reality, but also the material reality that these attacks are situated within.

Elements of Discourse Analysis

This thesis uses a model for critical discourse analysis originally put forward by Gee (2005), who was influenced by Fairclough (1989) and Foucault. This model analyzes discourses as a system that creates and expresses ideology through a series of practices that, although not homogenous, can be analyzed to provide deeper insights into the sociopolitical and cultural contexts that underscore discursive practices. The object of study is not a text with limited boundaries, but instead a series of patterns that cut across a variety of texts. The method also provides a perspective to deal with the intertextual nature of sociopolitical and international relations, allowing the analysis to account for phenomena that occur across genres, institutions, and media (Kristeva 1986).

To analyze various elements that constitute and exemplify the discourse, one begins by asking questions specific to each element of the discourse, looking at grammatical constructions, word choice, imagery, figurative language, and rhetorical devices as the linguistic methods for constructing and reproducing identities and relationships, with the hope of gaining insights into the politics and systems of knowledge generative these constructions. Since social realities are

brought into being by a multitude of utterances and written constructions, the analysis will consider in detail the type of reality that these discursive actions create. As elements are repeated, they create a pattern, and it is through these repetitions and resulting patterns that the cultural fabric surrounding a story or event is created, as these social realities lay forth the possibilities and boundaries for constructing new material realities. Since several different discourses can be identified across a wide body of texts, these multiple discourses also need to be identified and culled together. Different modes of expression for similar discursive elements illustrate conflicting power structures that are rooted in competing sociopolitical contexts and cultural values.

Gathering Specific Texts

The texts to be analyzed for this project are news articles published from November 26-December 2, 2008 within three different major Indian newspapers. As the colonizing language, English is Indian media's link into the global media world as well as the discursive system wherein the ideology of global capitalism has the cultural heft to dominate.

The Indian publications to be analyzed include *The Daily News and Analysis India*, *The Indian Express*, and *The Times of India*. Each text will be read for coverage that happened over the course of the attack as well as for any explanatory journalism, commentary, graphics, and historical contextualization. Each element contributes to the discourse in a particular way, and by noting the details of each element, a comprehensive analysis can be built that purposefully generalizes across a variety of media outlets and communication forms.

I chose to analyze each of these publications because they offer different editorial decisions, demographic audiences, publishing schedules, international and local perspectives, writing style, and tradition. *The Daily News and Analysis India* has a dominant presence within

the city of Mumbai by functioning as a cosmopolitan publication available to Mumbai's international audience. *The Indian Express* is a national publication aimed at India's Hindu majority, but is often critical of government policies and practices. *The Times of India* aspires to unbiased journalism and functions as both the agenda-setting paper for India as well as the main source of news about India for the global world. It carried the most articles about the attacks and attempted to document how the attacks affected a variety of groups in Mumbai. Stories in each of these papers exhibit an awareness of internet audiences and present an image of India curated for the West's consumption. Each publication communicates with overlapping audiences and borrows content from not only Indian news agencies, but also from international wire services. By analyzing a variety of stories from these papers, I hope to document the processes by which identities and power relationships are reproduced discursively within different story contexts.

These papers represent a view of India that is presented to the rest of the world while providing a clear image of life in India for Indians living or born abroad who are looking to reconnect to the Diaspora through a shared image of home. Whether constructed through a sense of collective nostalgia or through a concentrated desire to present a certain image of the world for global consumption, the India that serves as the setting for these attacks is one constructed in language and in image, privileging the aspects of Indian culture that easily translate across cultural boundaries and provide a sense of universal "Indianness" that compels a sense of unity and sympathy for Indian culture amid the attacks. The sense of India that foregrounds the stories of the attacks is one that is seen as a valuable and amiable ally in the West and as an idealized homeland to those Indians living abroad. Within the context of an ideal India, these attacks are framed with a clear villain perpetuating a threat against an idealized homeland.

Since the news reports were originally printed in English and are distributed internationally, certain discursive practices and value assumptions that are inherent in the language must be addressed prior to an analysis. When a media institution prints in English, they are using the language of international business and engaging in a form of discourse that closely adheres to the values of global capitalism (Gilbert 2008). Acknowledging an international audience also places the “India” encountered in the stories as a character among a global stage operating amid transnational economic and political forces. In this context, globalization and capitalism are constructed as positive forces and the terrorist attacks threaten these forces. Value judgments aside, these contexts frame complex local issues into a flattened “us versus them” scenario that allows for readers to identify with a clear sense of good and evil. A critical discourse analysis acknowledges the construction and assumptions inherent within this context and uses the tools of interpretation to divulge how discursive operations work to reproduce the power relationships preceding the attacks.

Research Questions

- 1) How is the city of Mumbai discursively constructed immediately after the attacks, and what does this construction say about the types of power relationships that are being reproduced in the discourse?
- 2) How does the discourse surrounding the Mumbai attacks reproduce a global conflict between capitalist values and terrorists?
- 3) What are the underlying cultural values that are reproduced within the discourses surrounding the attacks?
- 4) What alternative identities or actions are presented within the discourse?

Conclusion

By reading newspaper stories as discursive texts, we can come to understand how various discourses constitute themselves into social realities. It should be noted that these stories do not compromise the entirety of any discourse. Instead, they offer glimpses into the constituent parts and logics at work within Indian culture during the immediate aftermath of the attacks. By coming to understand how different logics work discursively, we can come to understand the knowledge, language, and logic that drive policy action, thus revealing the material consequences behind the language at work. The monolithic mirage of a discourse at work can be effectively debunked when various and competing discourses are identified, revealing the potential for operative alternatives to actions and language once thought inescapable.

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS

This chapter will closely analyze news reports immediately following the Mumbai attacks to trace how discursive practices worked to establish an order amid the chaos. In order to develop a coherent narrative following the attacks, news stories display a formulaic reliance on official outlets and eyewitness accounts of the violence, all of which cohere to form a social reality informed by a larger global narrative about terrorism that pits the values of global capitalism against the interests of local terrorist groups.

This analysis of news coverage in *The Times of India*, *The Indian Express*, and *The Daily News and Analysis* will reveal the discourses that seek to reconstruct a global capitalist logic disrupted by the terroristic violence. In the first section, we will look at how Mumbai becomes a city whose only value is as a financial center luxurious playground for wealthy Westerners located within a logic that is completely secularized. In the second section, we look at how the post-colonial tenor of the newspaper coverage uses rhetoric and tropes from American foreign policy and 9/11 to contextualize the Mumbai attacks within a concept of global terror that has as its ultimate target the machinations of capitalism's spread. By diminishing the presence of local concerns about the attacks and constantly comparing India's reaction to terror to America's reaction to 9/11, the discourses surrounding the attacks use Mumbai, the city and its citizens, as the stand-ins for Western anxieties about terror and its threat to capitalism.

In the third and final section of this analysis, we will look at alternative strains within the story of the attacks, as local identities and interests offer ways of contextualizing and

constructing the attacks that do not lock the country and its citizens into discourses about terrorism that do not rely upon a logic of perpetual militarism and submission to capitalist development as the only alternative to victimhood.

Discourses are hardly monolithic. Instead, strains of different discourses produce knowledge and social realities through an obscure process that contains multitudes of interests and interpretations. By focusing on select elements within the discourse, we can see how the various discursive machinations of power operate.

The Character of Mumbai

In order to understand the relationship between Mumbai, the terrorists, and the West, we must first understand how Mumbai is discursively constructed. By understanding the various identities that Mumbai discursively inhabits, we can come to understand how it functions as a victim, source of nationalist pride, and surrogate for capitalist anxieties. Constructions of Mumbai move between general categories of victim and battle site. At certain points the city is anthropomorphized to contain the well of human suffering associated with the attacks, at other times the name of the city is invoked to represent the material luxury of the city as well as the material destruction of its buildings. These distinctions between the human and the physical are important because they are rarely delineated and often overlap, causing the physical destruction of the city to take on a more human nature amid the discourse, thus emphasizing the drama of the attacks while creating an identity for the city that humanizes the values of global capitalism.

Understanding prevailing identities and constructions within Mumbai provide the context for understanding how discourses directly following the attacks reproduced or changed existing relationships or identities. For Appadurai (2000), a rise in Hindu identity amid anxieties about Islamic fundamentalism and aspirations towards Western affluence among Mumbai's middle and

upper classes are the two most prevalent ideologies constructed onto Mumbai's physical space (p. 640). The poor of the city move between noticeable and abject shanty towns, thus transforming themselves into the relatively anonymous members of the working class, and it is on their backs that Mumbai's Western aspirations rest. When it was called Bombay, Mumbai was seen as a more cosmopolitan city, acting as a portal between India and the rest of the world, but as Appadurai states, "the transformation of Bombay into Mumbai is part of a contradictory utopia in which an ethnically cleansed city is still the gateway to the world (644)." Falzon (2004) explores the increase of gated communities in Mumbai as residential segregation increase along ethnic lines, creating "residential enclaves" that mimic the politics of exclusion throughout the city (145).

Throughout the news articles, the word "Mumbai" takes on a on various metonymical uses, at certain points representing every person and building that fell victim to the physical violence, while at others standing in for India as a whole, and yet at other times representing a type of materialist capitalism threatened by the attacks. This allows the city to take on a rhetorical and symbolic shorthand that unites the people, buildings, and institutions of the city with the capitalist values that the terrorists targeted. For example, one headline from November 29 reads "Mumbai falls prey to rumors" (Times of India) In the construction of this sentence and throughout the story, Mumbai is presented as an entity with a psychological vulnerability, one that is built with specific elements from individual lives, such as a shopkeeper hearing gunshots and other citizens staying home out of fear of falling victim to roaming terrorists in the street. Within Mumbai these type of totalizing constructions allow terror to become manifest anywhere within the entire space of Mumbai. If the city itself is vulnerable, then anyone or anywhere within the scope of the city is also vulnerable.

Anyone, that is, who fits within a certain economic class within Mumbai. As Appudurai (2001) points out, the swelling population of the poor and working class within Mumbai fill substantial physical space, but are often overlooked and silent, moving between the slums and their jobs and only gaining value as pieces within Mumbai's luxury economy. Unmentioned and unseen throughout the coverage of the attacks, Mumbai's impoverished and poor only gain value and identification as a victim through their role in Mumbai's economy, as part of the luxury hotels and restaurants frequented by wealthy foreigners. Individual Indian identities that surface in the coverage of the attacks are either as employees of the Oberoi or Taj Hotels, high-end restaurants in the city, or in connection with wealthy foreigners. The validity of these identities are tied to global capitalist flows that originate in the West, indicating remnants of post-colonial logic that constructs Mumbai's value through a lens that is thoroughly tinted with a Western-centered bias. The everyday violence that accompanies persistent poverty is made invisible because it has become routine, whereas the violence of terror is unique because it disrupts flows and forces the state and capitalist order to reorganize itself (Pieterse 2009). That these identities are constructed within Indian newspapers represents a deeply localized deference to the logic of Western superiority, but we'll go into further detail on this point in the next section.

Coverage of the attacks on Mumbai spends much time dwelling within the walls of the hotels Oberoi and Taj Mahal, Mumbai's two largest luxury hotels. The terror that is recounted in the stories happens within the walls of the hotels, with witnesses, victims, army and government officials, and police recounting the movement of terrorists through the building, conducting a type of decontextualized violence against the unsuspecting customers. It is the type of decontextualized violence, moved from the battlefield and into the civilian hotel space, that allows for the hotels to stand as symbols of Mumbai's financial luxury. The hotels, wealthy

guests, and foreign dignitaries become symbols of the global capitalism that the terrorists targeted. In the text of the stories, these spaces become battlefields, and the individuals whose stories are related become ad-hoc soldiers, ill-prepared for the fighting, as detailed in the following passage, a lede from a story that ran as the attacks began to slow down and the Indian National Security Guard began to restore order:

When faced with a volley of gunshots, while sipping coffee at the Oberoi Hotel on Wednesday night, Ali Arpacioğlu, a Turkish citizen on a business trip to Mumbai, chose to escape through the hotel kitchen and down a flight of stairs that opened onto the road outside. This was probably one of the best decisions he took. On the other hand, his business partner, Meltem Muezzinoglu, and her husband, Seyfi, both Turks, when faced with the same situation, decided to dash out of the restaurant and head upstairs instead. When terrorists laid siege to the hotel, the Muezzinoglus were held hostage (Lewis and Mukherji, Times of India, Nov. 28, 2008).

In this passage, savvy civilian survival is framed as a bit of serendipity, as the context of the hotel quickly shifts from leisurely coffee drinking to battle ground. The violence is mainly ideological as the terrorist attacks change the use and context of the hotel, as “the vaulted alabaster ceilings, onyx columns, beautiful archways, hand-woven silk carpets, crystal chandeliers, an eclectic collection of furniture, and a dramatic cantilever stairway,” all disappear amid flames and gunfire, erasing the material markers of wealth and capital as the context changes and citizens dramatically find themselves in new reality. The news reports highlight what has been destroyed, and by characterizing the setting of these attacks as hotels and “restaurants patronized by who's who of the corporate world,” that no longer exist, the reports discursively glorify this type of luxury by establishing it as an apolitical and unjustified target of terrorism. The focus on the surface signs of luxury overlooks the deeper ideological implications of class as the news reports glorify the victim's status as wealthy consumers whose money fuel capitalist flows throughout Mumbai.

This shift in the city's context is alluded to in phrases such as "Generally, at this time the area is full of people and traffic jams are common. But this morning, it is very calm. It does not look like Mumbai," which refer to Mumbai's atmosphere of business and trade, with scenes of people going to work, bustling to do their jobs, with filled streets and bought things the sign of standard activity in Mumbai (PTI, Times of India, November 27, 2008). But as this productivity is slowed then stopped, it is a clear and pervasive marker of something wrong. As Graham (2009) points out, the abrupt change in Mumbai's atmosphere denotes a distinct change in the context of urban space, as the city becomes a battle site, where military action becomes part of the fluid space of urban routine.

Mumbai citizens throughout the text are ill-prepared for this sudden shift from city to battlefield, with even hundreds of Mumbai police outgunned and outmatched by twenty terrorists. "They were wielding AK-47s while our cops were facing them with self-loaded rifles (SLRs). Our men fired 40 rounds in retaliation, it's not as if they did not try their best," reads one account, displaying a focus on firepower that indicates that Mumbai's vulnerability was intrinsic. (Das Gupta, Times of India, November 27, 2008). The terrorist threat is constructed as being more powerful than Mumbai is capable of dealing with. In this context, terrorists exploit a destructive potential found within the walls of the luxury hotels and restaurants of Mumbai, as the rooms of the Oberoi and Trident hotels become a refuge and hiding place for hostages and a tactical position for the terrorists, giving cover against the firepower of the state while also serving as a stage on which terrorists kill wealthy locals and foreign nationals. By recalling in detail gruesome acts of violence within the hotel walls, the news coverage also performs the subtle task of affirming that the presence of the terrorists pushed a type of violence within the discourse that Mumbai and its citizens were unequipped to deal with. What is most telling is that

officers and government officials quoted throughout the coverage candidly reveal that Mumbai is unprepared, admitting to a weakness in the way not only that the city conceives of itself, but in the way it operates within a world where terroristic violence is an imminent threat.

News reports about firepower, grenades, automatic rifles, and gunshots may give the initial indication that the city's weaknesses are material, but other elements in the text lead one to believe that Mumbai's weaknesses are tactical and the terrorists engaged the everyday and mundane in a way that exploits a violent potential within that space. The news reports construct the commercial products like GPS units, satellite phones, a hijacked fishing trawler, and common city maps as tools used to convert the city into a battle space. The following newspaper description of the abandoned fishing ship used to transport the terrorists into India from Pakistan attests to an ability of the terrorists to slip within the social fabric of Mumbai without being noticed: "A nondescript, 25-metre-long fishing vessel bearing the name 'Kuber' in the Gujarati script and a Gujarat registration number would have barely raised an eyebrow in a region dotted with numerous such boats. To complete the appearance, it carried nearly 50 kg of marinated fish, rice and lentils." (Naik, Times of India, November 28, 2008). Within the news reports, Mumbai's weakness and vulnerability stems from not engaging or being aware of the violent potential found in the city's social fabric. It is a logic of violence where commonplace items can become weapons, and when these items become weapons, cities and citizens become casualties.

Mumbai though is no stranger to terror. Bombings and assassinations fill the city's history, but the news reports detail how these attacks are different. The difference though is not in the types of violence encountered, it is in how the attacks are informed by global politics. The discourses that create the narrative surrounding these attacks stem from a post-9/11 logic where two commercial airplanes were deterred from their common uses to become weapons in an

attack that was defined as a spectacle that challenged to cultural hegemony of capitalist values by attacking the symbols of those capitalist values in the nation that sends those values across the world. The phrase “India’s 9/11” and even documenting the attack’s as “26/11” imparts an idiom that explicitly defers to a global war on terror, invoking recent American political history to define the import and context of these attacks (TNN, Times of India, “Tributes, Slogans at Ground Zero, December, 1, 2008).

Ultimately though, Mumbai is constructed as geographically and culturally vulnerable to these types of terror attacks. India is constructed similarly as weak and incapable of protecting against these types of attacks. "This is an impotent nation and we do not have the power to hit back. Less than a dozen men brought the city to its knees for two days. We will continue to be a soft state," states one citizen, vocalizing a sentiment that runs throughout the coverage (Bharuca, N. Times of India. December 1, 2008, “We Do Not Have the Power to Hit Back”). By admitting impotence in the direct aftermath of these attacks, Indian officials quoted within the discourse admit a dependence upon stronger nations to actively combat this type of terror. The overriding sentiment is that with these attacks, India has been thrust into a conflict it cannot fight, thus pushing the nation to adopt and become reliant on Western nations to fight the conflict.

“Six foreigners among 101 dead.”

“Terror attacks in Mumbai; six foreigners among 101 dead,” read the front page of the Times of India the morning after Lashkar-e-Taiba operatives attacked hotels, hospitals, and train stations in Mumbai. This sentence is the first time any dead bodies are mentioned in the Mumbai attacks, and it is telling that the first indication to any dead bodies are those of foreigners (Times of India, November 27, 2008, Page A1). Since the first bodies drawn out for exclusion are foreign bodies there is a discursive tendency at work that privileges these bodies, allowing the

domestic victims to remain in a nameless pile. These bodies indicate that the attacks sought international attention as the battle site of a greater war between ideologies and not an active agent in the conflict.

The significance of the hotels Oberoi and Taj are also determined by their proximity to Western celebrities. In an expository description telling readers about the hotel, known as “a landmark of the Mumbai skyline,” readers are given the following list of dignitaries: “rockstar Mick Jagger, former French President Jacques Chirac, Prince Charles, The Beatles, Bill Clinton and the rock and roll star Elvis Presley among others” (Times of India, Nov 27, 2008). By determining the landmark’s value via the presence of many Western celebrities, the article undercuts the cultural and historical tradition detailed in the article by associating the hotel’s value with the service it was able to provide celebrities and leaders from the West. The context in play before the attacks already assumed a reliance upon the West to determine the value, but following the attacks, these Western interests set the tone for how India should deal with this new terror.

To humanize the attacks, the Times of India ran a series of articles that detailed the perspective of individuals caught within the violence. Many of these articles feature Turkish, British, or American businessmen in Mumbai for commercial reasons, but one article in particular focuses on an American couple caught in the middle of the attacks while on a romantic holiday. “We didn’t see the terrorists, but we felt their rage,” reads the headline, displaying an explicit admission that the emotional and damaging spirit of the attack would be filtered through American sensibilities informed by 9/11 (pti, 11, 28, 2008). These two Americans become stand-ins for their entire country, judging the experience but also making the assertion that “despite their brush with terror, the couple is eager to ‘keep coming back’ to India which is a ‘magical

country.’’ The couple’s experience of the attacks and of the city are emotional in their tenor, and they lack any tactical information about the terrorism, because, as the headline indicates, they never saw the terrorists. Another article depicts a “Tourists night out” turning into a night sleeping on the streets in a simulated refugee experience that describes the danger of and violence of the attack, but in a vague way that lacks any type of material duress or personal danger that places the subject within the realm of the attack. The lack of detail and the vague emotional reactions of the American and European tourists reduce Mumbai to an essentialized position and implicitly skews the perception of the attack towards an American-centric post-9/11 understanding of global terror. These Americans join a plethora of other foreign nationals quoted throughout the coverage as witnesses to the terror. It gives the violence a more global character by purporting that the ideology behind the violence matters more than the geographic space that the violence occurs in.

In other cases, the spectacle of violence becomes part of an unexpected tourist experience, where the violence and the attendant anxiety are safely constructed as an exciting detour on their vacation, “They came from different parts of the world -- businessmen and women, couples on a holiday -- and, if someone told them hours earlier that they would be spending Thursday night on Mumbai’s asphalt streets, they would have laughed it off,” begins one story that leaves tourists taking shelter under “Mumbai’s starry skies” (Thomas, TNN, November 28, 2008). Sleeping on the streets is constructed here as a safe and interesting tourist experience and not as part of a violent terrorist attack, at once centering the importance of the attack away from the violence as the attack is also constructed as a visual spectacle with starry skies where tourists narrowly escaped becoming hostages and then “walked over to the Gateway of India, trying to capture shots of a burning Taj Mahal Hotel on their mobile phones” (Ibid.).

These attacks become reduced to details from a personal travelogue, such as in one instance in which a “British youth...borrowed a piece of paper from a local journalist and called his father back home to negotiate with UK-based publications for a blow-by-blow account of the attack” (Ibid.). By turning the attacks and destruction into an object subjected to the gaze of the tourist, the human impact the attack is distanced from the act of observing the attack. Immediately after explosions and gunshots begin, the process of objectification begins to turn Mumbai into a site filled with artifacts of the attacks, where the material consequences are removed visual markers of ideological violence. Though these tourists are physically among the violence and terror, the retelling discursively removes them from it, as if the act of recounting the violence serves the purpose of removing the tourists from the violence but allows them to deliver the story of the violence. Through the retelling, the violence becomes re-territorialized into part of a larger global context, where these collective retellings essentialize the attacks into a story about the observable evils of terrorism.

Moving beyond the detailed language of observers and to the language of policy and security, the news reports contain various examples of language that indicate the same rhetoric adopted by American officials in the wake of the war on terror. Because the terrorism and violence fits within a global context defined by Western interests, the news coverage of India’s reaction to the attack looks to the West for the policy language and postures to take. “In a first...India seems to have joined countries like US, Israel, Russia and some from Europe in refusing to negotiate with terrorists on hostages,” reads the beginning of a Times of India story that adopts a phrase that had been used throughout the American presidential elections to summarize an approach to dealing with terror: “refuse to negotiate” (Times of India, TNN, November 28, 2008). Not only does this phrase indicate an aggressive approach to dealing with

terrorism, it shows that this aggression has been borrowed from the Western officials conducting the war on terror. Negotiation is linked with failure, and in the same article the tactic seems to have led to another major symbolic terror event when the same article discloses that the terrorist who killed journalist Daniel Pearl had been release from an Indian prison at the behest of other terrorists negotiating for hostages. This slyly recited fact implicates India's former policies for imperiling American journalists by not conducting its security policy in a way that effectively prevents the production of terror. In the way the language is structured, there is the positive connotation to India's decision to not negotiate with terrorists, as if the government made a decision that allowed access to an elite group of nations more readily prepared to deal with terror in a way that propels a shared interest, which in this case is global capitalism.

To further construct the global nature of the attacks, several articles immediately following the attacks pushed a connection between Al Qaeda and the attacks, often explicitly drawing references between 9/11 and deferring to intelligence officials and counter-terrorism experts from other countries to point out the connection between Al Qaeda and the attacks. In a strategically vague analysis, a British terrorism expert is quoted as saying, "Al Qaeda set the blueprint for terrorist operations and now we see different people, different groups in different parts of the world, copying it," and figuratively constructing the main enemy of global capitalism since 9/11 across the globe, artfully colonizing terrorist violence across the globe as a singular enemy against the same capitalist values that al Qaeda attacked on 9/11 (PTI, Daily News and Analysis, November 28, 2008). Foreign terrorism experts quoted in news coverage of the attacks characterize the terror tactics as seemingly random and impossible to follow, because al Qaeda "created the 'modus operandi' of attacking vulnerable civilian targets with no warning, long-term plans or demands," thus creating a type of illogical social chaos, whose adoption by

terrorist groups like Lakshar-e-Taiba marks "a new, horrific milestone in the global jihad" (Ibid.). With Western experts controlling the interpretation of the attacks by citing privileged intelligence, these articles exclude Indian officials from determining the nature of the attacks, as well as from having a say in how these attacks relate to Indian culture, politics and history. The language also suggests that al Qaeda's ideology is subtly colonizing other groups, and that the only way to combat the insidious spread is for countries experiencing terror to adhere to a uniform way of determining the terror. Western officials giving analysis of the attacks also provide facile agency to India's police to determine on their own which group is to blame for the attacks, while also limiting the scope of the investigation by preemptively naming al Qaeda as ideologically responsible, regardless of what type of material influence they may have had in the attacks. With discursive link between al Qaeda and the attacks established, the discourses colonize Mumbai into a context that has at its core a conflict between global capitalism and a network of ideologically linked terrorists.

Within discourses that link the more personal language of direct witnesses with the policy language of law enforcement and intelligence agencies, American officials claim legal jurisdiction over the attacks by declaring that when Americans die in terrorist attacks abroad, the FBI has the responsibility to investigate these attacks, regardless of national sovereignty. Within the discourse, the deaths of these bodies justify the presence of American officials as they take control of investigating the attack, parsing out information, quoted as saying "That is not something we can comment on at this time," as they are quoted speculating at the root of the attack. The presence of these officials is not as important as the discursive value of their words, with news stories determining the superior credibility of "U.S. intelligence" based upon America's experience with terrorism, despite the fact that Mumbai has experienced three

destructive attacks from Islamic militants since 1993 (Daily News and Analysis, IANS, December 4, 2008). The news articles constantly cite the presence of six dead American bodies amid the almost 200 victims whenever quoting U.S. officials, thus justifying an American-centric contextualization of the attacks.

Within the discourses surrounding the attacks, India interests passively acquiesce to the interests of global capitalism, ironically dismissing a history or conveniently eliding a history of terrorism within Mumbai. Indian interests within the discourses surrounding the attacks line up with the interests of global capital, revealing a city that is symbolically linked to others that have experienced terrorist attacks since 9/11, each constructed as a victim of a type of ideology that actively and violently resists the impending hegemony of global trade and capitalism. This deferral to American- and Anglo-centric international affairs parallels post-colonial relationships where Indian identities and interests remain subservient to interests of global capitalist powers that use the discourses of impending and insidious violence to push the ideal of global capital without having to actively militarize or re-colonize the city. As shown in the previous section, discourses surrounding Mumbai already operate within a prevailing capitalist logic that defers to Western interests, making it no surprise that in the aftermath of the attacks, the discourses surrounding the attacks would also construct India within a further deferential relationship to Western interests. Such a reaction to the attacks relies upon the type of Western militarism that is used to protect such ideological and hegemonic values like “democracy” and “capitalism.”

The notion that Indian police and security forces were ill-prepared in the face of terrorism continue as the news reports recount an overwhelming amount of ammunition, confirming a destructive potential left unrealized. Some experts estimate that the terrorists had enough ammunition and tactical prowess to kill over 5,000 people ((Times of India, PTI, November 29,

2008, Terrorists planned to kill 5,000 people: Patil). The focus on the sheer number of bullets, bombs, GPS units, cell phones, and general tactical superiority of the terrorists lends credence to the image of India as weak and unprepared for the attack. In the face of such potential destruction, the United State's superior military, financial and intelligence resources juxtapose against the established weakness of the Indian military and government. India is further construed as a bystander caught in a conflict between two powers.

The theme of India's weakness and unpreparedness continues to be extorted as news articles cite terrorism experts from across India whose knowledge of terrorism creates a context around the attacks that acknowledges a change among global terror towards a more immanent, destructive, insidious, and random type of terror that recontextualizes cities into military spaces caught in the middle of "urban jihad" (Times of India, TNN, November 30, 2008, "experts, media had warned of 'Urban Jihad' long back). The Mumbai attacks are constructed as part of an "upgraded jihad...a step up from training camps, terror cells and targeting with bombs attacks. Terror has been upscaled" and has become a more overt type of violence that can turn the entire cityscape into a battlefield (Ibid.). The use of the phrase "urban jihad" alongside subsequent references to al Qaeda training camps and US counter-terrorism tactics and intelligence deepens the construction of Mumbai as a surrogate target/battle site in the global war between terrorists and global capitalism, as defined by American interests. As "security experts who had viewed tapes of training of terrorists in Afghanistan...conclude that al Qaeda was providing skills for attacking cities in the West," Mumbai stands in for all other cities.

In the greater context of global terror, the social reality informed by culture, history and politics wanes in importance to the material reality where violence draws attention to the logistics of attacking a city. As the tactics of terrorism change the streets, buildings, and

commercial flows of the city become factors in a military strategy. Implicit within the discourse is the assumption that as the plans of terrorists began to evolve, so too must the techniques used to combat them, and so the city must be divorced from its cultural significance and reconceptualized as a wild space filled with the potential threats that can only be controlled by preemptive government militarization. The discourse constructs Western interests as more capable than Indian officials, as the news articles show a reliance on “US intelligence agencies [that] have been tracking the phones and SIM cards recovered by Indian authorities from the terrorists involved in Mumbai attacks, leading to a ‘treasure trove’ of leads in Pakistan and several possible connections to groups in the US” (India Express, December 2, 2008, “US Warned India Twice about Sea attack: Report”). When Indian officials come to rely upon US resources, they are discursively composed as subject to US superiority and reliant upon US technology and intelligence, thus showing that these attacks fit within a context of terror attacks that is determined by interests ultimately outside of India.

Exploring Alternatives

Discourses are not monolithic structures, and competing powers and interests can be traced by looking at alternative strains throughout the discourse. In the case of the Mumbai attacks, one should look for moments when Indian identities are reasserted and the attacks are framed within a context that does not take as its touchstone the conflict between ideological terror and Western capitalism as defined in the aftermath of 9/11. Competing power structures operate in discourses that construct Mumbai as something other than a city targeted because of its luxury and appeal to Western capital. This is not to say that alternative discourses are morally superior or more enlightened than the dominant discourses. As an alternative to the ideological surge of global capitalism in the wake of the attacks, we also see a strong sense of Indian and

Hindu nationalism that essentializes Muslim identities and constructs Pakistan as a chaotic territory whose government is incapable or unwilling to control, demonstrating a discursive tendency to assert one's own agency by subverting the agency of another group.

Looking at how Mumbai and India are constructed in relation to Pakistan offers the most obvious point of conflict for tracking an alternative construction of India that is informed by a context with specific historical and cultural conflicts that are not influenced by any Western interests. The following passage on India's conflict with Pakistan contains several different discourses, affirming the agency of India's agency while also asserting a similarity between Indian and American public opinion:

India didn't retaliate after the deadly bombing of the Indian embassy in Kabul July 7. But many Indians view the Mumbai attacks the same way Americans viewed the September 11, 2001 attacks, and the Indian government is under enormous pressure to retaliate, perhaps by bombing training camps in Pakistan. Seven years ago, the attack on India's Parliament led to an intense crisis between the two nations. Since then, the Indian government has been more restrained. But you can't expect that restraint to dissolve were a firm link between the Mumbai attack and Pakistan's intelligence service to emerge (Indian Express, December 8, 2008).

The article, which was reprinted in *Indian express* from the *New York Times*, places the Mumbai attacks in a historical context that acknowledges the conflict with Pakistan and public opinion in India. Even though public opinion is likened to the American reaction to 9/11, there is the tacit implication that the Indian government has the ability to react to the attacks with the same type of "restraint," that it has shown in the face of other attacks a restraint that is decidedly different than an American-style response. Before celebrating restraint too much though, one should consider that in this context the use of restraint is an implicit reference to the nuclear arsenal of both India and Pakistan. By showing restraint, India helps maintain a sense of stability in southern Asia, thus allowing Western political, commercial, and cultural interests to continue to propagate throughout the region.

Though restraint on the one hand illustrates India's ability to react to the attacks in a way that is different from the escalated militarism of discourses within the U.S. after 9/11, the use of restraint also cedes to the U.S. the use of force in the region with the assumption that Western countries can conduct military action in the region in a way that does not disrupt the capitalist interests in the region. Dissension and disagreement about Prime Minister Singh's terror policy and reaction to the attack reveals the presence of several different interests actively seeking to determine the best route for dealing with the attacks. In a particularly scathing editorial about the Prime Minister's stance on terror, the Prime Minister's consistent "assertion that Pakistan too, like India, was a victim of terrorism" becomes a "macabre irony" that undercuts a bitter historical conflict that "plays itself out in a ghastly re-run with every terror strike (PM's stand on terror comes back to haunt him, Times of India, November 29, 2008, PTI). The criticism tries to discursively link the terrorist attacks with the Pakistani government while condemning the Indian government for hanging onto a political context that does not protect India's security. What is important about these examples is how they refuse the discursive processes that overtly push the interests of global capitalism. Instead, this debate embodies a discursive process of self-determination, as various voices within the Indian press consider the best route for India to take as it attempts a reaction to the attacks that is both culturally and historically specific to the conflict between the two nations. We can see debate as a marker of potential and possibility within the discourse, a process where "disbelief wrestle[s] with incredulity" and the multitude of utterances of various groups within India's public sphere create the discourses that will inform how the nation reacts (Ibid.).

References to India's sovereignty and pleas to protect emerge often throughout the discourse, especially those attributed to the minority Muslim and Urdu press, thus creating a

fundamental respect necessary to restore the agency of the Indian government in connection to the attacks. Lamenting the attacks as an assault on India's sovereignty, editorial writers co-opt the language used after 9/11, stating "Unless we are united, the evil forces of terrorism cannot be defeated" and attacking politicians "trying to win brownie points at a time when they should sink their differences and stop doing politics over the deaths of innocents," the Urdu press distances Muslims from these attacks and leads the call for unified response to the attacks (Wajihuddin, M. Times of India. December 1, 2008, Terror strike an attack on sovereignty: Urdu Press). These articles encourage a type of nationalism that also empowers a generalized idea of "India" in the face of these attacks while creating a plurality, independent of religious or ethnic identity, that defies the aims of terrorism. The appeal to plurality and national pride regardless of ethnic background embodied in statements like "Many Urdu commentators have used the opportunity to remind Muslims of their sacrifices in liberating India and their duty to protect its unity and integrity" places India at the center of the conflict, aware of itself within an international context. Within this logic, Indians are no longer simply victims to a terrorist attack; instead, they are part of an international community, capable of choosing how to employ its resources and allies in determining a reaction to the attack. Though the language still maintains a subtly aggressive militarism, this is an aggression pushed from within the country and not imposed by a grander narrative of the attacks controlled by the powers of global capitalism. As a victim, the country is united, but within the discourse gains the agency to face "an unprecedented challenge. Its commercial capital, Mumbai, is a constant target. Muslims must rise to the occasion and prove they are next to none when it comes to offer sacrifices for the country," thus showing that an Indian identity empowered by nationalism and not reliant upon outside sources to determine the conflict (Ibid.).

Within the role of terrorist and anti-terrorist alike is the imperative to discursively display power through highly visible and publicized acts of violence. Though the materiality of these acts cannot be ignored, they also become discursive acts. Over time, as the discourse of violence begets more violence, the line between what is material and what is discursive becomes blurred, and the rhetoric of fear gains a power that is closely tied to demonstrations of material violence. When the word “terrorist” begins to appear, it acts as catalyst for this mental act of blurring the material and the discursive. By manipulating this word and the potential for random violence it signifies, discursive logics begin to create an environment of fear that helps propel the impetus of the state.

Finally, attempting to shake any post-colonial intentions from the discourse, a single nameless Indian official asserts India’s authority in defining the attacks, stating simply, "This is a domestic issue. This is not India's 9/11" (TNN, Times of India, Terror Strike Captures Global Media Attention). Sweeping narratives that give a global or even national context to the attacks are shed as the attacks are constructed as a single political attack with the specific purpose to “disrupt any overtures to Pakistan and to ignite a backlash against Indian Muslims” (Ibid.). By limiting the scope of the attacks to a specific political conflict, the nameless official attempts to work against other discursive practices that have imbued the attacks with the same significance of 9/11. Implicitly, the line states that 9/11 and the conflict between terrorism and global capitalism is not India’s conflict. With direct and simple rhetoric, the official distills the attacks to a specific to a historical and cultural context surrounding the conflict between India and Pakistan. The simple statement does not essentialize either side of the conflict nor does it align either nation with a certain ideological framework. Within this particular discursive system, terrorism loses a bit of its power to perpetuate conflict within a system of deeper ideological

conflict, as the motives behind the attack are discursively linked to the disruption of specific international policy goal.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Conflict is a constant part of international relations, and the discourses surrounding conflict allow for certain types of policy actions and subsequent material consequences. These discourses create a structure of relationships that allows governments and their agents to move through the world and interact with various groups. These relationships and the implicit power among them are fluid, but there is an order that governs how the flows of international information move.

In a post-colonial world so intricately laced through with historic patterns of dominance, Lash offers a framework for understanding how power perpetuates itself when the formal structures of dominance have been removed and informal methods persist. Without the formal trappings of dominance like armies and administrators, the discursive logic of dominance becomes pervasive and acts of resistance begin to seem more irrational. It is a dominant logic that is also capable of re-contextualizing and re-presenting resistant positions and actions into this logic precisely because there is no privileged space outside of communication and language from which to launch a form of discursive resistance.

Terrorism disrupts these relationships and acts as the catalyst of resistance to any sense of established order or discursive flow. The attack creates a void, and various powers flood in to determine the narrative of the attacks by turning to previously established narratives of terrorism and conflict to define the strength of the attackers, the weakness of the victims, and the overall importance of the attacks. Especially after 9/11, the tendency exists to recontextualize terrorist

attacks within countries that have a history of terror as an attack on global capitalist interests. In this case the attacked nation is constructed as a victim caught in the middle of the conflict and incapable of understanding how to fight or protect itself from terror. This type of discourse subverts the connection between violence as a political act located within a discrete cultural context and reconstructs that violence as a random, yet inevitable act. Critics of globalization argue that terrorism is a symptom of global expansion, but it is more accurate to say that terrorist attacks act as the catalyst justifying the economic and military security promised by Western capitalism.

Amid the discourses surrounding the Mumbai attacks, the focus on luxury as well as the material violence excludes any criticism of the imperial nature of capitalism from overtly entering into the discourse, with the phrase “terrorists seemed to be targeting British and American citizens” becoming a euphemistic way of noting that at their core, the attacks are an act of resistance against the cultural imperialism of Western-style capitalism. Though India may be constructed as a complicit partner in this imperialism, the nation can also be seen as a bystander in the conflict, with the nameless local bodies piling up as terrorists sought to kill a handful of wealthy Westerners. The destruction and death become a grotesque signifier of a type of violence that is the byproduct of capitalist expansion. The thread of Indian non-violence and “restraint” towards Pakistan that runs throughout the discourse that appears at first to be a lack of agency is also an act of passive resistance in choosing not to engage in the same type of colonizing militarism that perpetuates the post-9/11 discourses about terrorism.

As Nelson (2003) has said, “Human conflict begins and ends via talk and text,” and it is in the direct aftermath of the Mumbai attacks that various discourses compete to construct what a response to the attack (449). By looking at how the language surrounding the aftermath of the

attacks was used to create a sense of the attacks, we come to understand that through discursive practices, power structures construct sociopolitical experience and go about “defining the identities that shape actions and interactions on a global scale” (Hodges 2009, p. 84). In the aftermath of these attacks, global powers worked to limit India’s role in the discourse to that of a surrogate victim and ideological stand-in for the powers of global capitalism.

Terrorist attacks conducted by extremists present a difficult obstacle for modern globalism, as their increase in frequency and threaten the lives of citizens as well as a nation’s sovereignty and security. Since 9/11 though, the global discourse surrounding terrorism has created a system of unrestricted violence that perpetuates the goals of global capitalism. The simplistic and reductive rhetoric on either side of the “war on terror” creates a self-perpetuating system of violence where the continually expanding machinations of global capitalism need the continued presence of extremist terrorism in order to justify their existence, and vice versa. Terrorism, its motivations, its victims, and targets are wrapped in a discourse of reduction and abstraction that allows the attacks to have the potential to occur anywhere at any time, thus validating the need for a unified global means of “counter-terrorism.” As Stocchetti (2007) notes, the system of terrorism and counter-terrorism creates an endless loop where groups begin to lose their agency to act within this hyper-militarized logic (p. 238). Said (1997) crystallized media’s role in the process when he tracked how Western Media control the flow of information about Islam and highlight the religion as a source of violence. Within this logic, Western media create the political will behind the notion that the only way to deal with the continued threat of Islamic violence is to acquiesce to the logic of violence.

Alternatives to this militarized discourse can interrupt this cycle by lessening the abstract and immanent nature of terrorist attacks and root the motivations behind terrorism within a

specific historical, political, ethnic, religious, or cultural contexts. Simplified appeals to good and evil, as well as the victims and security forces leads to a simplified and polarized narrative that casts nations like India as powerless victims caught within a more existential conflict between the values of Western capitalism and the terrorists that choose to resist it. This, at worst, overtly ignores cultural and political factors specific to the region that lead terrorism, or, at best, casts these factors as the elements and variables to account for within the larger conflict. This context limits the options available to Indian officials as the discursive elements already align the country alongside the allies of global capitalism.

Yet discourses are constantly in flux and are open to alternatives and change. Recent events have shown that diplomacy has prevailed in India as the country did not launch military attacks inside Pakistan, despite heated rhetoric to do so, and has sought instead to work alongside Pakistan to apprehend the terrorists, despite rhetoric accusing the country of withholding information from US and Indian forces. These policy realities indicate that tensions and options outside of the post-9/11 narrative existed within the discourses surrounding the Mumbai attacks. Though these kinds of attacks threaten the security of citizens and the sovereignty of individual nations, the swirl of discourses within the immediate aftermath of the attacks offers alternatives to a system of perpetual violence and victimization. Activists, politicians, journalists, and citizens seeking to perpetuate an alternative to the violence seize these discourses amid the aftermath, thus helping to create a social reality not determined by the militaristic tenor and colonizing goals of global capitalism.

Prospects for future research

This thesis primarily looked at the how discourses began to constitute the social reality immediately following a terrorist attack and major international disaster. In order to more fully

comprehend the machinations of discourse, one might examine how these discourses create social reality over a longer period of time across multiple media. Though newspapers act as the agenda setting institutions of discursive topics, discursive practices extend and reproduce conflicts and identities across all communication modes. Research investigating journalists' and media producers' intention and awareness can reveal how pervasive discursive operations can influence the creation of news and the spread of information.

In order to critically understand how discourse influences modern social reality, one might also look at how media practitioners go about creating the stories and narratives of major crises and catastrophes. More work also needs to be done analyzing how audiences and citizens react to these types of stories, including investigations into whether or not audiences are aware of the types of discursive practices at work within the media.

Furthermore, more critical work exploring terrorism as an act of discursive resistance can offer a lens through which to view the reproduction of discourses in the aftermath of disasters. By understanding this phenomenon, we can also come to understand how democratic states and power structures are able to gain the popular political will to react violently to terrorist attacks. We can also gain a better understanding of how Western intervention into crises in the Third World perpetuates systematic dependence upon the machinations of Western power to protect the commercial and political interests abroad. By moving toward a more concrete understanding of the cultural, socioeconomic, and geopolitical causes of terror, we can come to fashion alternative means of dealing with terror attacks that do not lock nations and their citizens into a system of continued militarized action, thus propelling a type of perpetual violence that ensures the need for thriving capitalist logics.

REFERENCES

- Acland, C. (1991). "Tall, Dark, and Lethal:" The Discourses of Sexual Transgression in the Preppy Murder. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*. 15(2). Pp. 140-158.
- Agnew, E. & Litvack L. (2006). The Subcontinent as Spectator Sport. *History of Photography*. 30(4). pp. 348-358.
- Appadurai A. (1996) "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy," in *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (pp. 27-47). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . (2000) Spectral Housing and Urban Cleansing: Notes on Millennial Mumbai. *Public Culture* 12(3). pp. 627-651.
- Asad, T. (2007). *On Suicide Bombing*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bailey, O. (2005). Journalism and the Politics of Naming the Other. *Conference Papers – International Communication Association, 2005 Annual Meeting, New York, NY*, p1-14.
- Barber, B. (1996). *McWorld Versus Jihad: How Globalism and Tribalism are Reshaping the World*. New York: Ballantine.
- Baudrillard, J. (2001). The Spirit of Terrorism. Retrieved April 24, 2009 from www.egs.edu/faculty/ baudrillard/ baudrillard-the-spirit-of-terrorism.html
- BhaBha, H. (1998) The Location of Culture. In J. Rivkin and M. Ryan (Eds.), *Literary Theory: An Anthology* (pp. 936-944). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- . (1990). *Nation and Narration*. New York: Routledge.
- Bhatia, A. (2009) The discourses of terrorism. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 49(1). pp. 279-289.
- Bishop, R. and Roy, T. (2009) Mumbai: City as target introduction. *Theory, Culture & Society*.

- 26(8). pp. 263-277.
- Bergesen, A. & Lizardo, O. (2004). International terrorism and the world system. *Sociological Theory*. 22(1). pp. 38-52.
- Borradori, G. (2003). *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bratton, B. H. (2009). On Geoscapes and the Google Caliphate: Reflections on the Mumbai Attacks. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 26(8). pp. 329-342.
- Brown, W. (2008). Sovereignty and the Return of the Repressed. In D. Campbell and M. Schoolman (Eds.) *The New Pluralism*. pp. 250-272. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2002). 9-11. New York: Seven Stories.
- Coaffe, J. (2009). Protecting the urban: The dangers of planning for terrorism. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 26(8). pp. 343-355.
- Collins, J. (2002). Terrorism. In J. Collins and R. Glover (Eds.) *Collateral Language*. New York: New York University Press. (pp. 155-174).
- Comaroff, J. and Comaroff, J. (1997). *Of Revelation and Revolution, Volume II: The Dialectics of Modernity on a South African Frontier*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Corman, S. & Schiefelbein, J. (2008). Communication and Media Strategy in the Islamist War of Ideas. In: Corman, S & A. Trethenwey & H.L. Goodall, Jr. (Eds): *Weapons of Mass Persuasion: Strategic Communication to Combat Violent Extremism*. New York: Peter Lang. (pp. 73-96).
- Deis, M. (2004). Asian and Latin American Money Managers look at Free Trade. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. 16(3), pp. 360-370.
- Debrix, F. (2008). *Tabloid Terror*. New York: Routledge.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1981). *One Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. (B.

- Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- De Silva, Eugene, 2003. Intelligence and Policy in Combating Terrorism. In: Gunaratna, R. (Ed.), *Terrorism in the Asia-Pacific: Threat and Response*. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press. (pp. 108–132).
- Falzon, M. (2004) Paragons of Lifestyle: Gated Communities and the Politics of Space in Bombay. *City and Society* 16(2). pp. 145-167.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *The Wretched of the Earth*. (C. Farrington, Trans.). New York: Grove Press.
- Foucault, M. (1981). *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume 1*. Victoria: Penguin Books.
- Gee, J. (2005) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis Theory and Method* (2nd Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Gilbert, J. (2008). *Anticapitalism and Culture: Radical Theory and Popular Politics*. New York: Berg.
- Graham, S. (2009). The urban battlespace. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 26(8). pp. 278-288.
- Grindstaff, D. and DeLuca, K. (2004) "The corpus of Daniel Pearl." *Critical Studies in Media Communication*; 21(4). pp 305-324.
- Guattari, F. (1996). Remaking Social Practice. In G. Genosko (Ed.) *The Guattari Reader*. (pp. 262-272). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hammond, P. (2007). *Media, War, and Postmodernity*. New York: Routledge.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A (2000). *Empire*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Herz, M. (2006) Prime Time Terror: The Case of *La Jete* and *12 Monkeys*. In A. Kavoori and T. Fraley (Eds.), *Media, Terrorism, and Theory: A Reader* (pp. 53-68). New York: Rowan And Littlefield.

- Hess, A. & Justus Z. (2008) Re-defining the long war: Toward a new vocabulary of international terrorism. In S. Corman, A. Trethewey, & H.L. Goodall, Jr. (Eds.) *Weapons of Mass Persuasion*. (pp. 129-149). New York: Peter Lang.
- Hobbes, T. (1651). *Leviathan, or The matter, form, and power of a common-wealth, ecclesiastical and civil*. London: Andrew Crooke. Accessed via Early English Books Online, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>.
- Hodges, A. (2007). The narrative construction of identity: The adequation of Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden in the "war on terror." In A. Hodges & C. Nilep (eds.) *Discourse, War, and Terrorism*. (pp. 67-88). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jones, B. (2006). "Remembering the Catastrophe: Ideology and Social Memory in Disaster Documentaries" *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Dresden International Congress Centre, Dresden, Germany*. Retrieved 2009-05-25 from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p92961_index.html
- Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse Analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Kaplan, C. (2009). The biopolitics of technoculture in the Mumbai attacks. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 26(8). pp. 301-313.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). Revolution in Poetic Language. In T. Moi (Ed.) *The Kristeva Reader*. (pp.89- 135). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Lankala, S. (2006) Mediated Nationalisms and 'Islamic Terror: The Articulation of Religious and Postcolonial Secular Nationalisms in India. *Westminster Papers in Communication & Culture*. 3(2), 86-102.
- Lewis, J. *Language Wars: The Role of Media and Culture in Global Terror and Political*

- Violence*. Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto.
- Mamdani, M. (2002). Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: a Political Perspective on Culture and Terrorism. In E. Hershberg and K. Moore (Eds.), *Critical Views of September 11* (pp. 44-60). New York: New Press.
- Martin, G. (2003). *Understanding Terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. London: Sage.
- Nacos, B. (2007). *Mass Mediated Terrorism: the Central Role of the Media in Terrorism And Counterterrorism*. New York: Rowan and Littlefield.
- Nelson, D.N. (2003). Conclusion: Word Peace. In M.N. Deidaic and D.N. Nelson (Eds) *At War With Words* (pp. 449-468). New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Parmeswaran, R. (2006). Military Metaphors, Masculine Modes, and Critical Commentary: Deconstructing Journalists Inner Tales of September 11. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*. 30(1). pp. 42-64.
- Pieterse, E. (2009). African reverberations of the Mumbai attacks. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 26(8). pp. 289-300.
- Punathembekar, A. and Kavoori, A. (2004). Introduction: Global Bollywood. In A. Kavoor and A. Punathembekar (Eds.) *Global Bollywood* (pp. 1-16). New York: NYU Press.
- Ray, T. (2009). "India's 9/11:" Accidents of a moveable metaphor. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 26(8). pp. 314-328.
- Qutb, S. (2000). *Social Justice in Islam*. (J.B. Hardie and H. Algar, Trans.) New York: Islamic Publications International (Original worked published 1954).
- Robinson, K., Crenshaw, E., & Jenkins, J. (2006) Ideologies of violence: The social origins of Islamist and leftist transnational terror. *Social Forces* 84(4). pp. 2009-2026.

- Said, E. (1997). *Covering Islam: How the Media and Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. New York: Doubleday.
- Schoolman, M. (2008) A Pluralist Mind: Agonistic Respect and the Problem of Violence Towards Difference. In D. Campbell and M. Schoolman (Eds.) *The New Pluralism*. pp. 17-61. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Shaw, M. (1996). *Civil Society and Media in Global Crises: Representing distant Violence*. New York: Pinter.
- Snow, N. (2007) Media, terrorism, and the politics of fear. *Media Development* 3(1) pp. 17-22.
- Spivak, G. (1988) Can the Subaltern Speak? In C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (Eds.) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. pp. 273-311. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.
- Stenvall, M. (2008). "Fear of Terror Attack Persists;" Constructing fear in reports on terrorism by international news agencies. In A. Hodges & C. Nilep (eds.) *Discourse, War, and Terrorism*. (pp. 205-222). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Stocchetti, M. (2008). The politics of fear: a critical inquiry into the role of violence in 21st century politics. In A. Hodges & C. Nilep (eds.) *Discourse, War, and Terrorism*. (pp. 223-240). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- van der Veer, P. (1994). *Religious Nationalism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Volcic, Z. and Erjavec, K. (2008). Discourses of war and terrorism in Serbia. In A. Hodges & C. Nilep (eds.) *Discourse, War, and Terrorism*. (pp. 185-204). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wardlaw, G. (1989). *Political Terrorism: Theory, Tactics and Counter-measures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zulaika, J. & Douglass, W. (1996). *Terror and Taboo*. New York: Routledge.

APPENDIX:ARTICLES ANALYZED

Daily News and Analysis:

ANI (10 December 2008). Mumbai Attacks – No right thinking Muslim should do that: Amla.

Daily News and Analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

IANS. (4 December 2008) FBI helping India gather evidence in Mumbai attacks. *Daily News*

and Analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

PTI. (28 November 2008). Mumbai Attacks follow Al Qaeda blueprint. *Daily News and*

Analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

---. (28 November 2008). LeT members learned Hindi before Mumbai attacks! *Daily News and*

Analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

---. (2 December 2008). Evidence of Pak link to Mumbai attacks should be shared. *Daily News*

and Analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

---. (2 December 2008). Israel prepares to bury Jewish victims of Mumbai attacks. *Daily News*

and Analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

---. (4 December 2008). Mumbai attacks: Malaysian police awaiting feedback. *Daily*

News and Analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

---. (5 December 2008) 5 terrorists involved in Mumbai Attacks may still be at large: Report.

Daily News and Analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

---. (8 December 2008) Pak territory used for attack, says US. *Daily News and Analysis*.

Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

---. (10 December 2008). “VOIP connection used in Mumbai attacks paid for from Karachi.”

Daily News and Analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

---. (11 December 2008). Mumbai Attacks are war on India: Rahul Ghandi. *Daily News and Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

---. (11 December 2008). PM apologizes for Mumbai attacks. *Daily News and Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

Sinha, M. (13 December 2008). Seeing the Mumbai attacks through social media. *Daily News and Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai>.

Indian Express

Associated Press. (28 November 2008). Mumbai attacks: Timeline of terror strike. *Indian Express*. Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

Express News Service. (30 November 2008). Mumbai attacks: Surat-based yarn merchant's son among those killed. *Indian Express*. Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

---. (8 December 2008). India's response Mumbai attack aftermath lauded. *Indian Express*. Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

Indian Express Agencies (27 November 2008). 125 dead, 327 injured in Mumbai attacks. *Indian Express*. Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

---. (27 November 2008). Cabinet reviews security scenario post Mumbai attacks. *Indian Express*. Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

---. (27 November 2008). Mumbai attacks: Hospitalswitness horror stories. *Indian Express*. Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

---. (29 November 2008). Dawoodprovided logistics to militants in Mumbai. *Indian Express*. Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

---. (29 November 2008). Mumbai attack may trigger Indian military response. *Indian Express*. Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

---. (29 November 2008). Unnoticed heroes in Mumbai attacks: Fire fighters. *Indian express*.

Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

---. (2 December 2008). US warned India twice about sea attack: Report. *Indian Express*.

Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

New York Times. (8 December 2008). Analyst points out domino effect of Mumbai attack.

Indian Express. Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

Pathan, B. (2 December 2008). Mumbai attacks rob Rann Utsav of its color. *Indian Express*.

Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

Reuters. (27 November 2008). World leaders condemn Mumbai attacks. *Indian Express*.

Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

---. (1 December 2008). “We took Mumbai attack orders from Pakistan.” *Indian Express*.

Retrieved from www.indianexpress.com.

Talwar, R. (29 November 2008). Mumbai attacks. *Indian Express*. Retrieved from

www.indianexpress.com.

Times of India

AFP (27 November 2008). India’s “Mujahideen” groups: a home grown militancy?. *Times of*

India. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

AFP (27 November 2008). Terrified guests recount night of horror in hotel. *Times of India*.

Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Ali, S. A. (30 November 2008). Mumbai locals helped us, terrorists tell cops. *Times of India*.

Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Associated Press (27 November 2008). “There were gunfire and explosions, it was terrifying.”

Times of India. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Bagchi, I. (30 November 2008) 26 foreigners killed. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Bharucha, N. (1 December 2008). "We don't have the power to hit back." *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Choksi, M. (1 December 2008). God has been very kind to us: victim. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Dasgupta, D. (28 November 2008). 3-hour killing spree from CST to Chowpatty. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com

--,-- (30 November 2008). Gunmen had not checked in as guests: Oberoi. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Deshpande, S. (30 November 2008). Operation Cyclone successful. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Dubey, B. and Viju, B. (1 December 2008). Blogs Godsend in terror times. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Gupta, S. (27 November 2008). Mumbai terror attack: Urban voters react angrily. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Hafeez, M. (29 November 2008). 10 terrorists had entered Mubai: Police. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Kartikeya, T. (1 December 2008). Many dial their ex, some after years. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Lewis, C. and Mukherji, A. (28 November 2008) Turkish couple left off by terrorists for being Muslims. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com

Naik, Y. (28 November 2008). Mumbai Attack: Satellite phone vital clue to solve mystery.

Times of India. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Naryan, V. and Chomski, M. (1 December 2008). Defian Leopold opens its doors to customers. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

PTI (27 November 2008). Attackers were looking for British, Americans, says witness. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

PTI (27 November 2008). Hotel Taj witnesses India's bloodiest rage. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

PTI (2 Number 2008). Mumbai gunmen were like "young boys," says eye witness. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

PTI (27 November 2008). Outside Group behind Mumbai Attacks: PM. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com

PTI (27 November 2008). Seven foreigners among 200 taken hostage at Mumbai Taj. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com

PTI (27 November 2008). Terror Strike hits life in fast-paced Mumbai. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

PTI (27 November 2008). US, UK, Australia advise nationals against travel to Mumbai. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

PTI (28 November 2008). Initial information suggests Pak hand in Mumbai attack: Pranab. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (28 November 2008). "We didn't see the terrorists but we felt their rage." *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (29 November 2008). At least 13 Foreigners killed in Mumbai: MHA. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

- . (29 November 2008). Pak may relocate 100,000 army men to border. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (29 November 2008). Terrorists planned to kill 5,000: Patil. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (30 November 2008). Security and hospitality can't go together, says Oberoi. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- Raighatta, C. (30 December 2008). Mumbai will continue to be center of prosperity: Bush. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- Reuters. (28 November 2008). Three Pakistani Militants held in Mumbai: Reports. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- Sanger, V. (27 November 2008). Report recommended guarding of seashores, attack could have been prevented. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- Sahni, A. (28 November 2008). Cops can't wait for special forces. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- Siddiqui, P. I. (29 November 2009). Mumbai cops ignored LeT terrorists' confessions. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- Singh, V. V. (28 November 2008). End of the road for terrorists at Chowpatty. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- Thomas, S. (27 November 2008). People were running out screaming "blast blast." *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- ,---. (28 November 2008). Tourists' night out on Mumbai streets. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- ,---. (1 December 2008). Sermons keep faithful going in city. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Times News Agencies (27 November 2008). Final operation on at Taj hotel, hostages rescued.

Times of India. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Times News Agencies (27 November 2008). We want all Muhjahideen released: Terrorists inside Oberoi. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Times News Network and Agencies (27 November 2008). Terror attacks in Mumbai; six foreigners among 101 dead. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (28 November 2008). Hundreds of cops vs. two terrorists. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (28 November 2008). In a first, India refuses to negotiate with terrorists. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (28 November 2008). Nariman House Secured, 5 hostages taken. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (28 November 2008) Pak may be pushing hardened jihadis. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (28 November 2008). Terror strike captures global media attention. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (29 November 2008). Indian boats could be used for attack. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (29 November 2008). Mumbai's famed spirit bruised. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (29 November 2009). Mumbai falls prey to rumors. *Times of India*. Retrieved from

- www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (29 November 2009). NSG end reign of terror at Nariman. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (29 November 2009). PMs terror stand comes back to haunt him. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (29 November 2008). Shadow of terror over Mumbai's marriage season. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (29 November 2008) UK "Curry King" survives terror. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (30 November 2008). Experts, media had warned of "urban jihad" long back. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (30 November 2008). He died for nation, says Unni's father. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (30 November 2008). India has tell-tale evidence of Pak connection, says agencies. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (30 November 2008). Jihadis used "anonymous" service to send e-mail. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (30 November 2008) Land, air and sea – India vulnerable from all sides. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (30 November 2008). Muslims speak out against terror online. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
- . (30 November 2008). Survivors of Oberoi Standoff recount tales of horror. *Times of India*. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (30 November 2008). We rebuild what has been destroyed, says Tata. *Times of India*.

Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (1 December 2008). Citizens set out their agenda against terror. *Times of India*. Retrieved

from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

---. (1 December 2008) Tributes, slogans at ground zero. *Times of India*. Retrieved from

www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.

Wajihuddin, M. (1 December 2008). Terror strike an attack on sovereignty: Urdu Press. *Times of*

India. Retrieved from www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com.