

“TERE BIN LADEN”: ‘ISLAMIC TERROR’ REVISED

September 14th, 2001, Jinnah International Airport, Karachi, Pakistan—an inept TV reporter, clutching his flying toupee, declares that all passengers in the first flight taking off from Karachi, Pakistan, to the USA after World Trade Center bombings are Americans, except one, who rushes to the screen with a parodic message, “I love Amreeka,” inscribed on his bag. With repeated announcements about stringent restrictions on carry on items in the background, Ali Hassan, the Pakistani passenger, waits in line to use the toilet as a local man struggles to disentangle the tie of his pajama. As Ali offers him a discarded pair of scissors to cut the knot, the man remarks to an outraged Ali, “Taxi driver *ban ne ja rabe bo* (So, you are going to America to become a taxi driver!)” This scene from *Tere Bin Laden* is a telling commentary on the plight of citizens all over the world who struggle to disentangle the knotty problems created by terrorists while governments indulge in political skullduggery. Ali getting a pair of scissors to cut this knot anticipates the climax of the film, where the protagonist fortuitously provides a comic resolution to the confusion of terrorist violence and political one-upmanship between megalomaniacs belonging to different countries.

Tere Bin Laden, a Hindi film released in 2010, turned out to be a surprise box office success despite lacking top-notch film stars, melodrama, and the song-and-dance routines of a typical Bollywood film. The film projects a dystopic vision of an Islamic society that is adrift in violence that has become endemic to its culture.¹ In a socio-political milieu where religious fanatics openly collaborate with a corrupt ruling class, an ambitious journalist desirous of immigrating to America is advised that the “best bet” or “foolproof” path to reach this hated Islamic enemy-cum-land of dreams is to pretend to be a *mujabideen*² and surrender to the American army in Iraq. But as there is a

likelihood of losing life and limbs in this venture, the protagonist opts for a fake passport, which requires him to pay nearly four million rupees to a human trafficker.³ To make money for this purpose, the reporter decides to create a fake Osama recording to be sold to television channels for exorbitant sums.

In a curiously prescient fashion, the fictional scenario of this film turned out to be partly true. One year after the film's release, Osama bin Laden was actually found to be living a stone's throw away from the military academy in Abbottabad, Pakistan, presumably under the patronage of that country's military establishment and was shot dead by a team of U.S. Marines on May 1st, 2011. Yet regardless of the fears of violent terrorist reprisals, the world continues to flourish 'without' bin Laden (in Hindi and Urdu, *bin* means "without") as the title of the film implies. While the film dealt with the protagonist's version of Osama bin Laden (in Hindi/Urdu *tere* means "your" or "yours");⁴ *tere* can also be used as a plural or respectful form and therefore, hints at multiple versions of the al-Qaeda chief—the heroic martyr of the Islamic imagination juxtaposed with the monster of American popular culture. In this instance, fact definitely turned out to be stranger than fiction. The film concludes in a fantastically glib fashion with the fake bin Laden publicly eschewing violence in accordance with the requirements of the lead character and the American military; in reality, bin Laden seems to have been marginalized and to a large extent incapacitated within his own terror network.

Nonetheless, in spite of its light-hearted treatment of the subject, *Tere Bin Laden* conveys a crucial socio-cultural perspective on religious extremism in a region that is widely regarded as a "hotbed" of "Islamic jihad." The film's outlook projects neither a Western (specifically American), nor strictly "Islamic" world view and therefore, provides insights that go beyond the acrimonious binary polemics that frame any debate about this issue. The

overarching view of this film can be considered to be primarily Indian, a claim that is reinforced by the resolute opposition to the film by the Pakistani establishment, which has been traditionally perceived as holding India and all things Indian as anathema, and many militant Islamic groups located in Pakistan.

Furthermore, *Tere Bin Laden* has an interesting production history. Its reference to Osama bin Laden as “your” bin Laden can be seen as an overt allusion to Pakistani patronage of the fountain-head of “Islamic terror,” who was suspected to be hiding near the Afghanistan—Pakistan border where he enjoyed support of the public as well as governments or quasi-government groups.⁵ And despite its professed location in Karachi, Pakistan and having a Pakistani actor-singer, Ali Zafar, in the starring role, the film’s director, producers, screenplay writer, dialogue writer, music composer, and most of the cast are Indian and mostly non-Muslim. The title *Tere Bin Laden* plays upon the vernacular Hindi/Urdu idiomatic phrase, ‘*tere bin*,’—‘without you Laden,’ as well as ‘your bin Laden.’ It seems to be a clever pun intermixing the Pakistani (‘your’) version of the notorious jihadi mastermind, who continues to be revered in Pakistan and the American version of bin Laden who has been demonized post- 9/11 and was transformed “from Bin Laden the Good fighting the Soviet occupiers of Afghanistan to Bin Laden the Bad toppling the Twin Towers of New York.”⁶ In spite of dealing with this contentious topic, the film is a rollicking comedy: an ambitious small time TV journalist seeks fame and fortune by creating a fake Osama bin Laden video by tricking an unsuspecting bin Laden look-alike.

Along with satirizing the “war on terror” and its various participants, the film attempts to counter the dominant western view of what is known as “Islamic terror,” while simultaneously subverting Pakistan’s barely veiled duplicitous policy of supporting Osama bin Laden and other terrorist outfits,⁷ even as it pretends to play by the American anti-terror script. Post-9/11,

western societies in general, and the U.S. in particular, have been obsessed with the “war on terror.” Due to the belief that the most destructive attack on US soil was planned by al-Qaeda, media attention had been concentrated on its leader, Osama bin Laden, who was perceived as an orthodox Muslim determined to destroy non-Islamic cultures. At this point in time, “when Islam is being projected as the enemy number I [sic] by the west,”⁸ the world is shown as heading towards a clash of civilization—the dominant Christian world at war with a resurgent Islam. Another theorist explains this collision as springing from the fact that “Islam and Christianity have in common a deeply messianic orientation, a sense of mission to civilize the world. Each is convinced that it possesses the sole truth, that the world beyond is a sea of ignorance that needs to be redeemed.”⁹

It is interesting to note that both sides use metaphors deriving from their shared, mutually destructive history to provide legitimacy to their conflict. Equally fascinating is the avoidance of overtly religious terminology by the west, while “Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda; both claim to be waging a jihad, a just war against the enemies of Islam.”¹⁰ The irony is that bin Laden had been nurtured by the US intelligence to promote its interests against the Soviet Union when the Russians had taken control of Afghanistan in the late 1980s. Mahmood Mamdani, professor and political commentator explains, “[t]he CIA looked for, but was unable to find, a Saudi Prince to lead this crusade. It settled for the next best thing, the son of an illustrious family closely connected to the Saudi royal house. We need to remember that Osama bin Laden did not come from a backwater family steeped in premodernity, but from a cosmopolitan family. The bin Laden family is a patron of scholarship: it endows programs at universities like Harvard and Yale. Bin Laden was recruited with U.S. approval....”¹¹ Given such familial credentials, bin Laden’s hatred of all things American seems anomalous. In spite of the fact that the Afghan opposition to Soviet occupation was supported as much by CIA as

Islamic fighters from different parts of the world, bin Laden and his cohorts were almost pathologically hostile to America and held it, along with Israel and the supposedly Hindu India, as their prime enemies.

As against the espousal of militant Islam by Pakistan and Afghanistan, their neighbor, India, has self-consciously positioned itself as a multi-religious, multicultural nation, and has one of the largest Muslim populations in the world. To complicate matters, India also has a well documented history of conflicts between the various religious groups that have called it home. In recent past, there have been vociferous debates between the extremist right-wing Hindu and Muslim factions, which loudly avow their rejection of everything that the other religion represents. However, unlike its theocratic neighbors, India is also a functioning democracy that is self-professedly secular, where diverse voices—religious, ethnic, socially and sexually marginal—can be heard spouting at different ends of the political spectrum, giving this movie a piquancy that may be absent in narratives produced in other socio-political contexts. It is significant to note that the film’s outlook veers dramatically away from the jihadi note heard in countries like Pakistan or “[t]he post-September 11 discussion in the U.S. media, [which is] based on fear of additional terror, [and has shown] an over-whelming preoccupation with nationalistic images and icons. The media’s “us versus them” discourse is based on patriotic motifs (U.S. flags everywhere); human-interest stories about the 9/11 victims that reinforce nationalism; and narratives that demonize “them,” such as reports about Taliban brutality and Palestinian suicide bombers.”¹² The uniqueness of this film’s perspective is a refreshing change from the usual doublespeak of American and Pakistani establishment on issues pertaining to terror.

Accordingly, this Indian film purports to present a satirical perspective not from the “other,” but yet another side, without religious jingoism. Indian political elite’s customary claims regarding terrorism are not blatantly

present, although India has repeatedly claimed to be a victim of Pakistan sponsored terror generated by al-Qaeda, Lashkar-e-Taibiyeba, Jamaat-ud-Dawa et al. Very subtly, this movie highlights the telling socio-cultural and political disparities and similarities between India and Pakistani societies. The collusion of Pakistani establishment and the arrogant Big-Brother attitude of Americans are grist to the film's mill. It presents clichés inherent to the sub-continental discourse, where a burning desire to live the American dream coexists with an almost visceral hatred for America's economic and military imperialism; and America's perceived hostility to Islam and its propagation of the Israeli interests (serious concerns for Pakistan with its self-proclaimed Islamic agenda) are presented in a comic light.

Consequently, it came as no surprise to anyone (at least in India) that the Pakistani government banned this film upon its release, a fact pointedly displayed as a badge of honor on the film's official website. Under the circumstances, it is understandable that its makers highlight the film's suppression in Pakistan, as the film's perspective does not coincide with the notions of the self-professed Islamic states, nor is it a representation of the western outlook regarding the idea of "Islamic terror." Furthermore, the movie voices the widespread sub-continental belief that Islamic terror was the creation of American intelligence. This view is reinforced by a well known defense analyst, Eqbal Ahmed, who "draws our attention to the television image from 1985 of Ronald Reagan inviting a group of turbaned men, all Afghan, all leaders of the mujahideen, to the White House lawn for an introduction to the media. 'These gentlemen are the moral equivalents of America's founding fathers,' said Reagan (Ahmad 2001). This was the moment when the United States tried to harness one version of Islam in a struggle against the Soviet Union."¹³ The self-serving nature of the United States' initial support and later opposition to the jihadists has been debated in the international press, along with the moral ambiguity inherent to the self righteous nature of its proclamations.

Hence, given the skepticism of the people of the Indian sub-continent, both Muslim and non-Muslim, regarding the validity of America's messianic mission against the so-called Islamic terror, this film mocks the American zeal to rid the world of the scourge of Islamic militancy along with a simultaneous realization of the frightening cost of such violence to its own polity. *Tere Bin Laden*, therefore, goes beyond the binaries in which this issue has generally been bogged. It is an ironic commentary on American double standards because the people of the subcontinent commonly believe that "[t]he United States has a habit of not taking responsibility for its own actions. Instead, it habitually looks for a high moral pretext for inaction. The tendency of the United States is to memorialize other peoples' crimes but to forget its own—to seek a high moral ground as a pretext to ignore real issues."¹⁴ But at the same time, this film attempts to comically subvert the powerful message of jihad that bin Laden had given that has so much resonance in the Muslim world. The sheer incongruity of substituting Osama bin Laden, the global instigator of terror, with an innocuous poultry farmer who is proud of his beloved rooster provides a touch of unexpected humor to this otherwise troublesome situation.¹⁵

The film begins with a tongue-in-cheek disavowal of resemblance to any person living or dead and any similarities in the names as being purely incidental, while brazenly using bin Laden's name in the title, as well as playing on the unfortunate resemblance of the bin Laden look-alike. This ironic abjuration is followed by another bland disclaimer rejecting the obscene phonetic echoes in *Kukduk Pencho*, (ostensibly a reference, as the film claims, to the "noted Bulgarian poet Pencho Petkov Slaveykov (27 April 1866–10 June 1912) who was one of the participants in the [M]odernist Misal ("Thought") circle of Bulgaria"¹⁶) which anyone familiar with the north Indian/ Pakistani Punjabi dialects would recognize as an abusive colloquial term. To cap it all, the phrase *Kukduk Pencho* is insouciantly enunciated in

the film by an apparently gay rooster, and is a comic highlight of the farcical *muqabla-e-baang* or “cockopera,” as the English sub-titles describe it, in the course of which Ali, the protagonist, finds the Osama bin Laden look-alike. In Punjabi, *kukduk* is considered to be a part of the sound describing the crowing of a rooster, while *pencho* sounds similar to the Punjabi/Urdu/Hindi term for “sister-fucker.”

The *muqabla-e-baang* or “cockopera” seems to be a parodic account of a rustic sport common in India and Pakistan. This traditional competition involves roosters fighting each other but here, it is presented as a competition to judge the rooster that crows most imposingly. The sheer absurdity of this scene is established by a stage decorated with pictures of roosters in rampantly macho poses, with participants named *Shosha* (a Punjabi corruption of “Show-off”), *Bebaak* (“Outspoken”) who demonstrates the appropriateness of his nomenclature by strolling in limp crowned glory and cooing, “*Kukduk Pencho*,” and *Dubya Pardesi*, loosely translated as “a goner,” or literally, “a foreigner who is sunk or gone,” who hails “from the land of bushes,” presumably an American organic chicken as suggested by the dual references to then President George W. Bush. *Dubya Pardesi* looks impressive but gives an exceptionally poor performance and gets the lowest score. All these birds strut to the stage and crow loudly with masculine bravado, much to the delight of the assembled audience consisting solely of men attired in traditional garb. The contest is, predictably enough, won by a rooster aptly named *Sikander*, the name by which Alexander the Great is known in the sub-continent.

This farcical competition is crucial to the plot of the film, as it not only highlights the inanity of TV reporter Ali’s job for an amateurish television channel called *Danka* TV (*danka* is a part of an idiomatic phrase which means declaration made to the beat of a drum or a loud proclamation). This is also a pun on another Hindi/Urdu word, ‘*dank*’, which means “sting”). It reinforces

the validity of Ali's desire to escape to a better future represented by America. The crowing competition may also be seen as casting comic aspersions on the political message of jihad, where each militant group seeks support from the masses by loudly proclaiming their beliefs; the cleric or hate monger who professes the message loudest, seems to win the battle for popularity and has willing followers. The satirical parallels are obvious as this is the framework in which Ali encounters the bin Laden look-alike, who is the proud owner of the rooster, *Sikander*. The look-alike runs a poultry farm, a metaphorical representation of the commonplace nature of jihadi bands of fighters in this region. Like farmers cultivate and slaughter chickens, warlords openly cultivate their personal armies of militants in Pakistan and Afghanistan and sacrifice them with impunity according to their political convenience. This idea is underscored when Ali's photographer/sidekick, Gul, chortles that as the Americans search for Osama bin Laden in Tora Bora (Afghanistan), "[bin Laden] is cooped up with his chicken [in Pakistan],"¹⁷. The irony lies in the fact that the Osama bin Laden lookalike, known as Noora, is actually is an innocuous, bespectacled eccentric who loves his feathered livestock and wants nothing more than to be surrounded by his birds. His neighbors believe that he is "good hearted but not quite big hearted," while Noora proudly declares that "[P]eople call me king cock."¹⁸ After covering the "cockopera" with his friend, Gul, Ali sees the resemblance between Osama bin Laden and the poultry farmer. His immediate response is to exploit Noora to claim the twenty five million dollar reward for finding Osama bin Laden and use it to fulfill his dreams.

Actor Ali Zafar plays the ambitious, street smart, yet naive anti-hero, who is determined to fulfill his dream of moving to America and become a successful reporter. He is introduced in the film to the tune of an upbeat song that brands him a "good looking jackass," as the English sub-titles explain. Ali adopts numerous disguises while attempting to immigrate to America. But all his efforts fail and he is left with no choice but to work for the worthless *Danka*

TV. The channel has no credibility; its reporters are denied admission to any event that a self-respecting journalist would cover. Consequently, Ali resorts to reporting a politician's news conference by hiding in the air conditioner vent (from where he takes shots of the politician's balding head) and covering rooster crowing competitions in remote villages. Ali and Gul's professional standing is so low that when they realize that the man they had assumed to be Osama bin Laden is merely a lookalike, Gul's plaintive complaint, "Why do we always get copies. How about an original for once?"¹⁹ merely highlights their second class status as reporters. It is at this time that inspiration strikes Ali to make a video of Noora as bin Laden and sell it.

In order to bring his opportunistic plan to fruition, Ali involves many people by bribing them in a Mephistophelian fashion by appealing to their most ardent desires. A disgruntled *Danka* TV employee, Latif, writes the fake Osama bin Laden's speeches and a Radio jockey with left-wing sympathies, Comrade Qureishi, is persuaded to become the voice of bin Laden as it will give him a golden opportunity to spew venom against his ideological enemy, America. To transform Noora into Osama bin Laden, Zoya, a make-up artist who wishes to own a beauty salon, is bribed with a cut of the reward that Ali plans to get for the fake video. It is not a bunch of disaffected Islamic jihadists who plan this coup but ordinary human beings trying to sustain themselves in a politically hostile environment. They sell the tape for one million Pakistani rupees to Majid Khan, the owner of *Danka* TV, who in turn sells the video to an Indian television channel for three million rupees, which promptly broadcasts it as an exclusive. This causes world-wide uproar and the political establishment reacts immediately to this new series of bin Laden's threats by raising security levels all over the world. A top ranking CIA official arrives in Pakistan to deal with this new danger, while Pakistan's feared intelligence agency hypocritically panders to America's worst fears in order to secure much-needed financial support. As America's "Operation Kickass" unfolds (suitably embellished with superhero comic style illustrations), the

condescension of Americans, along with Pakistan's duplicity, is clearly on display. On reviewing the fake bin Laden tape, officials conclude that he must have received a Botox treatment because he looks much younger in the tape than his known age.

In spite of these comic touches, there are serious repercussions of the fake bin Laden video telecasts; there are terror alerts all over the world, while the conspirators blissfully ignore the consequences of their actions and enjoy their ill-gotten gains. However, Ali soon gets his comeuppance. To his horror, he learns that his plans to go to America as an illegal immigrant have come undone as the ironically named '*Lasbkar-e-Amreeka*' (Army of America)—the human trafficking agency through which he planned to go to America—has been forced to shut down because of the high level of surveillance resulting from heightened security. As he sees his dreams of a future in America unravel, Ali feels that he has no choice but to undo the harm he has unthinkingly wrought. Simultaneously, Noora realizes that he has been played for a fool. As a result of Ali's trick, Noora has become a fugitive who is in imminent danger of being arrested for crimes he has not committed. Furious with Ali for endangering his life, Noora angrily demands that this plan must be undone and his life as a poultry farmer restored. Comrade Qureishi also threatens Ali with dire consequences for having implicated him in this crime as the Americans start a large-scale operation to hunt for Osama bin Laden. Ali decides that if one bin Laden video can start a war, another could stop it. In the second video, the fake bin Laden asks President Bush not to use him "as an excuse to go oil hunting"²⁰ and stop the war on terror.

In his worship of all things American, Ali is the antithesis of an Islamic terrorist. He is a charming rogue, who cynically plays the system and succeeds purely by chance. The ambition that drives him is to immigrate to America, become a star journalist, and live the American dream.²¹ In fact, there is a conspicuous absence of religious rhetoric in the film. Ali doesn't indulge

in any feats of heroism in literary, Bollywood, or super hero fashion, or espouse the style of valor common to jihadists or the terrorists/martyrs. One admires his persistence; he is willing to cheat, bribe, create false identities, and be humiliated, to bring his American dream to reality. The end of the film is an ironic fulfillment of the wildest fantasies of the film's audience regarding the return of peace to a war-torn world. In the tradition of a classical Greek comedy, an awful socio-political tragedy is happily resolved in a miraculous fashion.

Using the most egregious and hackneyed devices from suspense thrillers and comedies, the film shows how the Pakistani spy agency tracks down the makers of the Osama bin Laden recording. A missile deployment and spectacular blast later, Ali and his team of inept conspirators are captured and the truth about the video is exposed. When the overambitious American agent sees his twenty five million dollar reward vanishing, he uses Ali's trick to fulfill his aim. Using Noora as fake Osama bin Laden, the American agent creates another false recording with bin Laden espousing the cause of peace; this brings about a cessation of hostilities and peace returns to the world. Also, Ali's fantasy of becoming a famous reporter comes true, as he gets the credit for interviewing Osama bin Laden. Latif, the speech writer, becomes the renowned author of "Osama on Peace;" Zoya and Noora get married and Zoya's beauty salon flourishes, while Comrade Qureishi becomes the founder of a new political party. The only person who loses in this game is Usman, a manipulative Pakistani official, who is consigned to a mental asylum for trying to tell the truth about the bin Laden tape.

The feel good ending of *Tere Bin Laden*, however farcical, attempts to puncture the self-righteous stance of American political elite and snidely shows the Pakistani policy of nurturing terror as insane in the semblance of Usman. Common people like Ali, Latif, Gul, Zoya, Noora and Comrade Qureishi, who are all victims of the contemporary politics of terror, turn out

to be the real winners in this game and are finally able to fulfill their harmless little dreams of having careers, families, and successful futures. The complete absence of an actual terrorist, “violently eradicating a personal, political, social, ethnic, religious, ideological or otherwise radically differentiated foe,”²² in a film that refers to the most notorious terrorist in contemporary history in its title is telling. However, subtle clues about the film’s skepticism regarding the contemporary society’s construction of the terror narrative hint at the existence of multiple versions terrorists and terrorism. The “*Tere*” or “your” version of bin Laden may be of a martyr, but other versions could consist of ordinary citizens and embodiments of evil. *Tere Bin Laden* self-consciously undercuts the existing notions of terror, “Islamic terror” in particular. The film aims to show that associations founded on political convenience are transitory and lacking any moral validity; Osama bin Laden, who was a valued ally of the CIA when he fought the Soviet army in the eighties, became America’s biggest enemy twenty years later. The same man whom contemporary Americans perceive as an incarnation of evil is revered as a freedom fighter and martyr by some followers of Islam. By projecting a stance that interrogates the various versions of Osama bin Laden, the film tries to undercut each of them. It shows that there is a thin line dividing the defenders and destroyers. There seems to be a symbiotic relationship between the two and each is inextricably tied to the other. Under these circumstances, which version has greater credibility depends entirely on the perspective of the audience.

(Endnotes)

1 Rafia Zakaria, “Truth and Terror.” *The Dawn*, May 2nd, 2012: “The conflict between security forces and terrorists has wreaked its own havoc in the enactment of Pakistan’s terror tragedy... According to the South Asia Terrorism Portal, the country (Pakistan) saw 476 major incidents of terrorism (major classified as involving three or more deaths) in 2011.”

2 A fundamentalist Muslim guerrilla fighter.

3 According to a report in popular Indian newspaper *The Hindustan Times*, Saturday July 28th 2012, “Dubbing Pakistan as a ‘global leader’ in visa and passport forgery, Britain’s envoy (to Pakistan) has said that visa fraud is a deep-rooted industry in the country.” P. 18

4 The word ‘tere’ in Hindi/Urdu, spoken as ‘tay-ray,’ is actually closer in meaning to a more familiar ‘thine.’ India and Pakistan share a common culture and history; therefore, there are numerous ethnic, religious, linguistic and cultural commonalities between them.

5 Kate Zernike and Michael Kaufmann, “The Most Wanted Face of Terrorism.” *New York Times*, May 2nd, 2011: “Long before, he had become a hero in much of the Islamic world, as much a myth as a man — what a longtime C.I.A. officer called “the North Star” of global terrorism. He had united disparate militant groups, from Egypt to the Philippines, under the banner of Al Qaeda and his ideal of a borderless brotherhood of radical Islam....” and that the terrorist activity of bin Laden and others “was an affirmation of Muslim power and an opportunity to recreate Islamic political power and topple infidel governments through jihad, or holy war.”

6 James Der Derian, “Imaging Terror: Logos, Pathos, and Ethos. *The Third World Quarterly*: Vol. 26, No. 1 The Politics of Naming: Rebels, Terrorists, Criminals, Bandits, Subversives, p. 23-24

7 “Panetta Declares ‘Undeclared’ War with Pakistan.” ZeeNews.com, June 9th, 2012, quoted American Defense Secretary’s recent statement regarding Pakistani

complicity in terror activities, ““We cannot continue to tolerate a situation where Haqqanis, terrorists on their side of the border, come across, attack our troops, kill our troops, and then return to a safe haven in Pakistan. That’s intolerable,” Panetta said.”

8 Daya Kishan Thussu, “How Media Manipulates Truth about Terrorism.” *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 32, No. 6 (Feb. 8-14, 1997) p. 267

9 Mahmood Mamdani, “Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: A Political Perspective on Culture and Terrorism.” *American Anthropologist* New Series, Vol. 104, No. 3 (Sept.2003) p. 768

10 Mamdani, 768

11 Quoted by Mamdani, p. 770

12 John E. Steinbrink and Jeremy W. Cook, “Media Literacy Skills and the ‘War on Terrorism.’” *The Clearing House*. Vol. 76, No. 6 (July-August 2003) p. 285

13 Mamdani, p. 768

14 Mamdani, p. 773

15 Jeroen Vandaele, “Humor in Film Comedy: Incongruity and Superiority,” *Poetics Today* 23:2 (Summer 2002) p. 29-59

16 *Tere Bin Laden*, directed by Abhishek Sharma (2010; Mumbai, India: Walkwater Media, 2010), DVD.

17 *Tere Bin Laden*

18 *Tere Bin Laden*

19 *Tere Bin Laden*

20 *Tere Bin Laden*

21 “The name’s Ali, yours truly, I love nothing but money/ I chase my dreams[...].”
Jaspreet Singh and Suraj Jagan. “Shor Sharaba.” *Tere Bin Laden* Movie Soundtrack. Pen
Music, 2010. DVD/CD.

22 James Der Derian, p. 23