Discourse on Terrorism: Image of Pakistan in Bollywood film Phantom[1]

Kashan Atif*
Zubair Shafiq**

ABSTRACT

This study examines the discourse on terrorism viz-a-viz contemporary Bollywood cinema and the way it depicts the image of Pakistan. Since their independence in 1947, Pakistan and India have fought a number of wars and the relations between the two countries remained strained. Amidst political conflict, some Bollywood films portray Pakistan in a negative daylight. Mumbai attacks of November 26, 2008 further escalated the tensions when India accused Pakistan. The film Phantom is an example of this scenario. By analyzing this film, this study attempts to understand the propaganda messages and the stereotypical notions associated with Pakistan in the Indian propaganda films. Discourse analysis has been used as research methodology for this study. Main focus was the dialogues used in the film with some minor discussion on the visual elements. The analysis shows that Bollywood has shown Pakistani people as extremists. It also depicted Pakistan's top intelligence agency—ISI (Inter Services Intelligence)—as a horrific

---

organization which not only protects, supports and control the terrorists but is also involved in terrorist activities against India.

Introduction

The rivalry between Pakistan and India is no secret, as they have fought a number of wars, since independence. These wars revolved around several unresolved conflicts which continue to haunt the teeming millions even today. Taking advantage of these conflicts, Indian media always try to distort Pakistan's image, particularly when it comes to Bollywood—world's most popular cinema industry[2]. There is a plenty of evidence to support this claim as films such as *Border (1997), LOC Kargil (2003)* and *Lakshya (2004)* reflected Pakistan as their enemy.[3] *Border* was directed by J. P. Dutta and belongs to the genre of war films. It depicted the real-life events of the Battle of Longewala in 1971 between India and Pakistan. *LOC Kargil* was a war based propaganda film, directed by J. P. Dutta. It was full of hate and bias against Pakistan. They were even mentioned as 'rats' in the film.[4] *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha (2001)* directed by Anil Sharma, was another anti-Pakistan movie which was based on the partition of subcontinent in 1947. This film broke box office records.[5]

---

[2]   Note on Translation: In this study, film dialogues are written in Roman Urdu/Hindi. The translation of these dialogues in English is also presented in brackets along with the actual dialogues.

[3]   A Rasul, *Propaganda Model and Film Industry: Political Economy of the Indian "Soft Power" in the 2lst Century.* Retrieved November 18, 2014, from All Academic, Inc.: *http://citation.allacademic.codmeta~p489390index.html*

[4]   S. Sen, "No Passports, No Visas: The Line of Control between India and Pakistan in Contemporary Bombay Cinema," in Alex Tickell, and Peter Moray, *Alternative Indians: Writing, Nation and Communalism* (Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V, 2005), 197-223.

[5]   J. Desai, "Planet Bollywood: Indian Cinema Abroad," in L. N. Shilpa Dave, *East Main Street: Asian American Popular Culture* (New York: New York University Press, 2005), 55-94. See also N. Mooney, "Of Love, Martyrdom, and Subordination: Sikh Experiences of Partition in the Films Shaheed-e-Mohabbat and Gadar: Ek Prem Katha," in A. G. Roy, & N. Bhatia, *Partitioned Lives: Narratives of Home, Displacement, and Resettlement* (New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd, 2008), 41-44.

There were several other films such as *Lakshya* based on Indo-Pak conflicts which negatively portrayed Pakistan.[6]

It is important to mention that Bollywood cinema is very popular not only in South Asia but also liked all across the world and the messages sent by Hindi movies reach a very wide audience. It has also been observed that generally the media has a very strong position in defining specific connections that represent minority groups.[7] Also the popular culture, especially after 9/11, has played a key role in highlighting Islam, terrorism and the Arab world.

This study, therefore, is an attempt to asses the extent to which Bollywood uses its films for propaganda against Pakistan and how the image of Pakistan is built through films. It is based on the premise that Bollywood presents Muslims as extremist, bad people and portrays Pakistan as a safe heaven for domestic and foreign terrorists. In almost every movie, there lies a connection of Muslims and Pakistan with criminal/terrorism activities or supporting them contrary to the fact that 200 million Muslims live in India as well. Having said that, there are certain movies such as *My Name is Khan, Chak De India,* and *Amir*, where the central characters—being Muslims—try to prove that they are not related to terrorism of any sort and are faithful nationals. However, these movies also give the notion that a Muslim must prove that he or she is not a terrorist but a patriotic nationalist in order to survive. The Bollywood thus forms an excellent case to determine the complexity of relation between politics, culture, patriotism and

---

6   K. Daiya, *Violent Belongings: Partition, Gender and National Culture in Postcolonial India* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008); R. K. Dudrah, *Bollywood Travels: Culture, Diaspora and Border Crossings in Popular Hindi Cinema* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

7   Saied R. Ameili, *et al.*, *British Muslims' Expectations of the Government— The British Media and Muslim Representation: The Ideology of Demonisation* (United Kingdom: Islamic Human Rights Commission, 2007); Ulrich Beck, "Risk Society' and the Media: A Catastrophic View?," *European Journal of Communication* 13, no. 1 (1998): 5-32.

nationalism as disseminated and propagated through movie narratives.[8]

During the early years of partition, the Indian film industry had several Muslim producers, directors, writers and actors. So, the discriminative behaviour, although existent, was not much visible. However, over the period of time, the prejudicial treatment became more visible. Through the widespread reach of entertainment industry, the Indian government aims at achieving its political ends.[9] It was due to the Indian films' propaganda to promote negative image of Muslims and Pakistanis that these movies were banned in Pakistan during 1980s and 90s. Later, the ban was lifted to promote friendly relations between the two countries.[10]

Due to language similarity, Pakistanis prefer watching Indian movies over other cultures. Therefore, the Indian movies have a direct influence upon Pakistani viewers. The gradual transformation of Muslim characters depicted into terrorists also reflects the changing perception of Muslims in Indian society. *Anarkali* (1953), *Mughal-e-Azam* (1960), *Mere Mehboob* (1963), *Bahu Begum* (1967) and *Chaudwien ka Chand* (1960) were the kind of movies that depicted Muslims as leaders and showed their magnificent past. The theme of these movies was favorable from a Muslim point of view. However, from 1970s onwards, portrayal of Muslims began to deteriorate and inclined towards negativity. Movies started portraying Muslims as apathetic and perky Nawabs gambling their money on prostitutes. Examples of these movies presenting Muslims as frivolous and idle include: *Mare Hazoor* (1968), *Pakeezah* (1972), *Umrao Jaan* (1981), *Nikah* (1982) and *Bazaar* (1982) etc.[11] Although, these movies were rich in

---

8   Nadira Khatun, "Indian Muslims, Bollywood and Neo-Nationalism," *Café Dissensus* no. 37 (2016).

9   Shahzad Ali *et al.*, "Portrayal of Muslims Characters in the Indian Movies," *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture 33, no. 1(2012).*

10   Ali *et al.*, "Portrayal of Muslims Characters in the Indian Movies."

11   Ali *et al.*, "Portrayal of Muslims Characters in the Indian Movies."

content yet the scenario presented Muslims in a negative way. The decade of 1980s can be marked as an era of transformation of Muslim characters from heroic individuals to pathetic underworld criminals. Though the presentation of Muslim characters was made ambiguous, one could easily spot a person dressed as a frivolous Arab, holding a briefcase and puffing Cigars.[12] Initially, movies represented the turmoil between Hindus and Muslims at a smaller level, but with the passage of time, the portrayal of Muslims got worse particularly after 9/11.[13] Due to these attacks, the political scenario of the entire world changed. As a result, to this day, Muslims are blamed, doubted, humiliated and demeaned all around the world. Besides, the incident of Mumbai attacks further escalated the enmity between the two neighbouring countries.[14] So, the only character representation left for Muslims was that of criminals, terrorists and extremists.

On academic level, several studies have been devoted on the issue of terrorism in popular culture in general and Hollywood in particular. After 9/11, Kellner has examined several multimedia accounts to investigate the changes caused by the attacks.[15] He focuses especially on the political motivations of cinema and gender changes since the attacks on Twin Towers.[16] While active discussion of media and terrorism is beyond the scope of this work, it would be useful to present a brief summary of the selected research to understand the general trends in media representation. Focusing on various media platforms, it can also direct and position research on Bollywood screens, where the November 26 Mumbai attacks also seem to have influenced the minds of the film-makers.

---

12   Ali *et al.*, "Portrayal of Muslims Characters in the Indian Movies."

13   Ali *et al.*, "Portrayal of Muslims Characters in the Indian Movies."

14   Ali *et al.*, "Portrayal of Muslims Characters in the Indian Movies."

15   D. Kellner, *Cinema Wars: Hollywood Film and Politics in the Bush-Cheney Era* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).

16   Kellner, *Cinema Wars.*

Similarly, O'Loughlin conducted studies on British citizens to show the reality about reporting of July 7 London bombings, stressing the point that media is creating divisions among different religions.[17]

Tom Pollard developed a theory of 'The Spectacle Terrorism' in Hollywood, while trying to understand the dominant discourses on Western cinema after 9/11. Reid has pointed out that, as a result of the attacks, the films have become more violent, darker and negative, inspired by real events instead of comforting the audience.

Shaheen emphasized that it is necessary to analyze the impact of September 11 attacks on American cinema to increase public awareness of the growing use of Arabs as terrorist figures at the expense of the ethnic groups in American society and in the world. The presentations promote a framework in which the American public has misunderstandings and unfair labelling. It thus corroborates the fact that films have an important influence on public opinion and mould perspectives and attitudes, and now have become an integral part of culture. He further argues that if this trend continues, the Arabs will be demonized and the idea of Islam and the Muslims as terrorists, violent and rebellious will ultimately be incorporated in the consciousness of the American public.[18]

Shaheen recognized four stereotype ways that Muslims are portrayed negatively in the Hollywood films, and they include: a) the mythical realms; b) sexual deception; (c) barbarous and rude; and (d) those who like terrorist activities. All these stereotypes serve to propagate the misrepresentation of the Arabs as a group.[19] Shaheen explains that "the Arabs are still the cruellest group in Hollywood history, and the malevolent

---

17   Ben O'Loughlin, Carole Boudeua & Andrew Hoskins "Distancing the Extraordinary: Audience Understandings of Discourses of 'Radicalization,'" *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 25 no. 2 (2011):153-64.

18   J. G. Shaheen, *Guilty: Hollywood's Verdict on Arabs after 9/11* (Massachusetts: Olive Branch Press, 2008).

19   Shaheen, *Guilty: Hollywood's Verdict on Arabs after 9/11*.

stereotypes that link Islam and Arabs to violence have existed for more than a century. The way in which derogatory treatment is carried out can be compared to the attitude of pre-Nazi Germany towards Jews. Shaheen draws the parallel and points out that the Jews were considered dark, with fleeting, perishable and completely different eyes. The same situation is presented today about the Arabs in America.[20]

In Bollywood, the problem of negative portrayal of Muslims lays the same here as well. Thoraval says that Bollywood has recently been criticized for violating India's cultural values and dialogue on controversial issues.[21] It is considered as the most liberal film industry in the Indian language. Regional films are generally modified by Bollywood films (Hindi) because their history and themes are related to the culture of their region of origin, while most Bollywood films are strongly influenced by the Western culture. Bollywood films are watched by a large number of Indian fans. It also enjoys international recognition, particularly in Western countries such as the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Canada and Australia, where large communities of South Asians live.

Goswani says that the younger generation copies the characters in the movies and the typical terms related to drugs are fashionable. Young people try to adopt the characters and think that everything that is shown in movies is modern and fashionable, and if they accept all these things, they will be recognized in society and people will admire them. In this backdrop, glamorizing violence, crimes and negative stereotyping has printed a very negative image on the minds of viewers of Bollywood cinema.

Khan and Bokhari carried a study "Indian Cinema and the Muslim Image" from 2002 to 2008. This research aimed at examining scientifically how and to what extent Indian cinema

---

20   Shaheen, *Guilty: Hollywood's Verdict on Arabs after 9/11*.

21   Y. Thoraval, *The Cinemas of India* (Chennai: Macmillan India, 2001). Retrieved on April 7, 2016 from *http://www.macmillanindia.com/classification.asp?classheaddid=1*

distorted and changed the image of Islam. The study of 50 out of 350 Indian films based on Muslim characters indicates that Indian cinema has twisted the Muslim image and that anti-Muslim propaganda has been carried out.

Sheikh Shiraz has conducted an important study on the representation of Muslims in Bollywood investigating the nature of prejudice against the Muslim community. The study shows that after the September 11 incident, many Muslims are considered as terrorists. The researcher also realized that part of the problem was due to their extremely bad appearance in media, especially in the movies.

In order to study as how Bollywood is creating its narrative of terrorism on screen, researchers draw upon the work of Michel Foucault. In his work on discourse analysis, Foucault focuses on the power relationships which is expressed through languages and practices.[22] In this essay, Foucault's work as theoretical framework is employed in which language is in the form of spoken words, written texts, gestures and also in visual form. Power constitutes meanings in context with social practices and in this case these practices include the rhetoric of 'terrorism' in films that creates a discourse. The following section is an attempt to find out the discourse created by the textual and visual elements in Bollywood film and how did it build the image of Pakistan?

Discourse Analysis

The methodology for discourse analysis contemplates that how does a society shape understandings about any issue through language? It may be in kind of verbal, textual, gestural and symbolic etc. In other words, this method explains that how social world is expressed by communication under influences of social powers. As noted, this paper closely reads and examins the Bollywood movies dealing with Pakistan and depicting terrorism. This approach provides the most direct connection between real world events and their cinematic

---

22　Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage Books, 1970).

depiction. The primary data for this research is developed from a close reading and observation of the film *Phantom* which was relased in 2015. The study intended to examine the content of the film and its wider contribution to the discourse and understanding of onscreen terrorism. Slocum has stated that the close examination of films is an important step in understanding how popular media shapes public perceptions and it also creates knowledge.[23] Our analysis, however, will only focus on the linguistic elements of the film. In the following section, we present a brief summary of the film followed by our analysis of the dialogues in the film and the way its dialogues portray the image of Pakistan.

Film Preview

The *Phantom* is an action packed film and revolves around an Indian agent and his facilitator assigned to kill all those culprits involved in Mumbai attacks in 2008. It was released on August 28, 2015 worldwide except Pakistan where it was banned. It was directed by Kabir Khan and produced by Sajid Nadiadwala and Siddharth Roy Kapur. Saif Ali Khan and Katrina Kaif played lead roles.

The *Phantom* is basically based on the events of Mumbai attacks in which the Indian spy agency RAW plans to kill all those who were allegedly involved in the incident. It hires the services of Jude Rosario (Saif Ali Khan)–an ex-army officer whose real name in the film is Captain Danyal Khan–to kill the perpetrators. Danyal along with his partner Nawaz Mistry (Katrina Kaif) kills Sajid Mir (Mir Sarwar). Danyal then goes to Chicago to kill his second target Daud Gilani/David Coleman Headley (Brandon Hill) who appeared to have visited India where he collected secret information and passed them on to the Lashkar-e-Tayyba (A Pakistan based organization accused of conducting terrorist activities in India). Here Danyal kills Headley with poison given by the RAW. The story continues with few more killings that include death of an ISI (Inter Services Intelligence—Pakistani Intelligence Service)

---

23   D. Slocum, "9/11 Film and Media Scholarship," *Cinema Journal* 51 no. 1 (2011): 181-93.

agent by Danyal Khan that results in the death of Indian ambassador in Jordan. Danyal, despite refusal from the RAW officials, goes to Pakistan to continue his 'mission' and kills Zabeeh ud Deen Umvi and Haris Saeed (Shahnawaz Pradhan). Later, Danyal Khan is shot dead by Pakistani security officers while trying to escape from Pakistani territory whereas his partner Nawaz Mistry is rescued by Indian Navy. The film concludes with the scene where people are gathering at Taj Palace–site of the Mumbai attacks–in order to celebrate the killings of the terrorists involved in Mumbai attacks.

Analysis of *Phantom*

Sr. No.	Dialogue / Scene / Situation	Interpretation
1.	[Phantom starts with a narration that says]: Lashkar-e-Taiba ke train kiye huay 10 terrorists ne Hindustani matti par apna sab se bheyanak hamla bol diya] (Ten Terrorists, trained by Lashkar-e-Taiba, made their most frightening attack on Indian soil).	At the outset, it blames Pakistan's based organization for attacks on Mumbai
2.	[Briefing of RAW officer to his Chief]: "Moosa Hamid, Pakistan ka rehnay wala, 8 sal ki umer main maan mar gai, do sal pehlay bap Afghanistan main maara gaya" (Moosa Hamid is from Pakistan, his mother died when he was eight years old, and his father was killed in Afghanistan two years ago).	Not only it is mentioned that the arrested person is from Pakistan, it also shows the direct connection between Pakistan and the alleged terrorist. Another important interpretation is mentioning of his father's being 'killed' in Afghanistan which means that he may also be involved in such kind of activities. Both of these scenarios lead to an understanding that Pakistani people not only involve in terrorist acts in India but they are also involved in Afghanistan as well.
3.	[Briefing of RAW officer to his Chief]:	Again the name of Lashkar-e-Taiba is directly used here as per

Sr. No.	Dialogue / Scene / Situation	Interpretation
	"Interrogation main us ne bataya hay keh Lashkar-e-Taiba aik aor attack plan kar rahi hay India main. (During interrogation, he told that Lashkar-e-Taiba is planning another attack in India)	India's claims that it is a so-called 'terrorist organization'.
4.	[RAW Chief tries to convince Danyal]: "Woh humaray logon ko maartay rahain gay. Aor woh din door nhi jab dono daishon main jang ho jay gi" (They will keep killing our people, and the day is not far when both countries go to war).	It is indirectly referring to Lashkar again and if they continue their terror activities, it will lead to war between both countries. This apparently is an attempt to justify another act of war in order to prevent the war.
5.	[RAW Chief tries to convince Danyal]: "Hum to chahtay hain keh unhain pata chalay keh is ke peechhay hum hain. Lekin hum par ilzam laganay ke liye un kay pass koi proof nhi ho ga. Dunya ki nazron main woh accidents hon gay. Dekho Danyal hum Pakistan ke logon par attack nhi kar rahay. Hum sirf terrorists ko khatam karna chahtay hain. Pichhlay 10 saalon main 50 hazar se ziyada Pakistani bhi maaray gay hain is say related violence main. Humain 26/11 ka jawab dena paray ga. Aor aik bar agar Lashkar ko samajh main aa jay keh hum par attack karnay ka kya nateeja hota hay to agli bar attack karnay se pehlay woh 10 bar sochain gay.	Not only the name 'Pakistani' is used but also they have given an impression that Pakistani people are suffering from same situation and they separated terrorists to Pakistani nation. However, it also implies that it is the Indian government which is planning to attack on Pakistani soil to help Pakistani people from the terrorists. But in the meantime, it is also stated that they want to let Pakistan know that India is behind all the killings of terrorists.

Sr. No.	Dialogue / Scene / Situation	Interpretation
	(I want them to know that we are behind this. But they would not have any proof to accuse us. For the world, it will be accidents. Look Danyal! We are not attacking the people of Pakistan. We just want to finish terrorists. In the last ten years, more than 50 thousand Pakistanis have died in this kind of violence. We must avenge 26/11. And once Lashkar knows the consequences of attacking us, they will think ten times before attacking us, again.)"	
6.	[Briefing of RAW officer to Danyal]: "Sajid Mir. Lashkar ka top military trainer. Sajid Mir, Sajid Majid, Sajid Bill, Uncle Bill, Abu Barra, Sab issi ke nam hain. 26 passports hain. 26/11 ke sabhi terrorists ko issi ne train kiya. Aor uss rat Karachi se hamaray news channels dekh dekh ke un terrorists ko instructions bhi deen. (Sajid Mir, Lashkar's top military trainer. Sajid Majid, Sajid Bill, Uncle Bill, Abu Baara, they all are his aliases. He has got 26 passports. He has trained all the terrorists of 26/11 attacks. Planned all the operation. And also gave the instructions to terrorists from Karachi, while watching all the thing on our news channels)	Following points can be inferred from these dialogues: (a) Once again name of Lashkar is used, and a person is claimed to be top military trainer of Lashkar. (b) And with the use of name 'Karachi' it gives an impression that terrorists use Pakistani territory against India. (c) In a scene when Sajid Mir pays his thanks to doners in his training camp, the people were dressed up in Pakistan's national dress.

Sr. No.	Dialogue / Scene / Situation	Interpretation
7.	[Danyal calls Pakistani High Commissioner and asks them to ….]: "Bloody fool, tum kya samjhtay ho keh main Lashkar ka mulazim hun. Main Pakistan ka High Commissioner hun, Lashkar ka numainda nahin. Aainda yahan phone mat karna." (Bloody fool. You think, I am Lashkar's servant. I am the High Commissioner of Pakistan, not a representative of Lashkar here. Don't ever call back again)	This is problematic at several levels: (a) Danyal tells that he has information about Sajid Mir and after hearing this receptionist transfers his call to High Commissioner without any other question. (b) It refers that even a receptionist knows the importance of Sajid Mir and hence transfers the call to the Highest Official at Pakistan High Commission. (c) And when Danyal tells about Sajid Mir's assassination by RAW, High Commissioner does not contradict his information that either this person exists or not but he asks about the reason why Danyal was telling this to him. It shows that he is accepting their existence and he asks about what Danyal wants. (d) Then scene changes and a long shot of a building with Pakistani flag on top of it, with a text ' ISI Divisional Station, Pakistan appears on the screen and then some close up shots show working people who immediately start searching information on Danyal Khan on the internet.
8.	[Conversation between Danyal and Nawaz Mistry]: "Pichhlay 6 saal say Pakistani Authorities saari dunya say keh rahi hay keh Sajid Mir jaisa koi aadmi hay	It again refers link with the previous scene in which Pakistani High Commissioner denies any link with Lashkar and explains the situation. Here

Sr. No.	Dialogue / Scene / Situation	Interpretation
	hi nhin, jo koi hay hi nhi ussay koi maaray ga kaisay."	in this dialogue it is tried to show as Pakistan is playing double game; first that Pakistan raises the terrorists against India on the other hand it denies their existence in Pakistan.
9.	[Conversation between Danyal and Nawaz Mistry]: "Syria, Uss jang main to Pakistan say Lashkar ke bhi fighters shamil hain"	It is tried to pose as Lashkar is an international terrorists' organization and its fighters are also involved in other battles like Syria.
10.	[Phone call from ISI officer to Danyal Khan after his contact with Pakistani High Commissioner in London]	The call to high commissioner results in contact from ISI to Danyal.
11.	[When ISI Officer Firoz asks Danyal that what he wants from them, Danyal replies]: "Mujhay Pakistan aa kar Lashkar kay Haris Saeed ya Sabah ud din Umvi se milna hay" (I want to come to Pakistan to meet Lashkar's Chief Haris Saeed or Sabah ud Din Umavi)	In this scene it is tried to establish that Danyal knows the connections between Lashkar and ISI and ISI can arrange his meeting with Lashkar's leadership.
12.	[Danyal suggests the meeting place as Syria by saying]: "*Aik jagah hay Syria, Wahan bhi to Lashkar kay log hain*"	When in his suggestion Danyal once again put an allegation about their presence in Syria, the ISI officer does not deny his statement. In other words, once again he is admitting his allegation.
13.	[ISI station head Haider's conversation with Firoz]: "Sahi jagah hay. Wahan Lashkar kay larkay aor hamaray log bhi hain, Agar sach keh raha hay to Pakistan lay aain gay aor agar jhoot bol raha hay to aik	(a) Once again, it is shown that Lashkar's people are not only involved in terrorism in India but also in other countries like in Syria they are involved in war. (b) It is also tried to establish that Lashkar's people and ISI work together in other

Sr. No.	Dialogue / Scene / Situation	Interpretation
	aor body, Syria main koi notice bhi nhi karay ga" (That is the right place. That place is filled with Lashkar's people as well as ours. If he is speaking truth, we will bring him to Pakistan and if he is telling a lie, he will be another dead body, no one will take notice in Syria)	countries as terrorists or rebels.
14.	[Briefing of RAW officer to Danyal]: "Dunya ki har most wanted terrorists list main is ka nam hay lekin khulay aam ghoomta hay bina kisi dar kay". (His name is on all the most wanted terrorists list of the world. But he roams freely without any fear) "Aik tarf Kalashankov liye Lashkar kay aadmi issay protection day rahay hain to doosri tarf police, of course the ISI" (He is protected by the Lashkar's people armed with Kalashnikovs and the police too and of course the ISI)	(a) It is tried to refer Haris Saeed is the most wanted terrorist in the world. In previous scenes the Lashkar's fighters are shown in Syria fighting against government forces as rebels. So they establish Lashkar as terrorist organization then they call its supreme leader as the most wanted terrorist in the world. (b) And it is also mentioned that even everyone knows where he lives and America has announced ten million Dollars reward for his head but he roams freely without fear because armed Lashkar's people, police and ISI protect him. (c) Again names of 'Lashkar' and 'ISI' have directly used in this scene and also mentioned that ISI protects Haris Saeed.
15.	[Danyal's dialogue]: "Umvi? Kya ussay waqaee Rawalpindi jail main rakha hay? (And Umvi, is he really in Rawalpindi Jail?)"	(a) Again name of Pakistani city is mentioned here, in this dialogue Danyal asks about another prime 'culprit'of Mumbai attacks that he is in Rawalpindi jail.

Sr. No.	Dialogue / Scene / Situation	Interpretation
	[Khalid's reply]: "Jail kahan janab, hotel kahiye hotel, jab se wahan gaya hay do bachay paida kar chuka hay" (Mister, I would rather call it a hotel. Since the time, he has been there, he has fathered two children) [Khalid's dialogue]: "Pakistan Sarkar ko bhi to Amrikion ko dikhana parta hay keh meray bhai Lashkar ko dabanay ke liye hum serious hain, so naam ke liye bhej diya jail main." (Even then, the Pakistan Government has to show the Americans that we are serious about suppressing Lashkar, So they sent him in prison for namesake)	(b) It shows that for Lashkar people jail is not a jail but like a hotel they avail all facilities there so that since the day Umvi is in jail he has fathered of two children. (c) It is tried to reflect as Pakistan is playing game with America too. Only for namesake, Pakistani Government has sent Umvi in jail to show Americans that they are suppressing Lashkar.
16.	[Khalid briefs to Danyal]: "5 din baad aik bohat bari public rally honay wali hay Haris Saeed ki." (Haris Saeed is holding a huge rally in 5 days)	(a) This dialogue shows that Haris Saeed and his organization are freely working and holding rallies in Pakistan.
17.	[Nawaz Mistry Dialogue]: "Yeh sochtay hain keh yeh jannat jain gay. In janwaron ko to jahannum main bhi jagah nhin milay gi" (They think, they will go to Heaven, these rascals would not even get a place in hell)	(a) In this dialogue the philosophy of Jannah and Islamic ideology is discussed disdainfully. (b) Bollywood discusses the ideology of Muslims about Jihad in a negative way and poses them the worst, the ugliest, inhuman, brutal, illiterate, ignorant and wild.

The above examples from the language of film give a clearer idea as how a specific narrative image of Pakistan is created by Indian cinema. This does not limit to the screen play of the film. The following example will also give an indication as how the same discourse of terrorism is shown visually.

In another scene while briefing was going on by the RAW officer in narration, the footage starts in which the people wearing Pakistan's Police uniform are standing with a barrier outside Haris Saeed's residence. Lashkar's armed fighters are also shown in civil dress with Police providing protection to Haris Saeed.

Through these all scenes, Bollywood tried to create an understanding about the ISI that it is more powerful than the Government of Pakistan. They not only protect and support Lashkar but also control and involve in direct acts of terrorism against India. Apart, to strengthen this approach Bollywood shows the scenes where for each mission, the RAW has to seek permission of the Indian Government. While they plan to send a submarine to take Danyal near Pakistani territorial waters, the RAW chief gets permission from the Indian Government by blackmailing and even at the end of the film when the Indian submarine commander orders his officers to return, the RAW officer convinces him by his emotional speech.

Conclusion

It is evident from the aforementioned analysis that the Bollywood constructs its own version of discourse that brackets terrorism and Pakistan together. Foucault argues that discourse not only transfers or disseminates information about the intended meaning of the language, but also about the person speaking the discourse. In this case, not only the intended meaning is obvious from the language used in the film but it also shows the role of Bollywood in the creation of a discourse that is part of the Indian Government policies and has been widely used by the Indian foreign ministry officials on media.

It was also observed that the Bollywood used selective truth in the film. Relying on some real names, it attempted to show as if it was offering true representation of events. The *Phantom* not only attempted to present Pakistan and its agencies negative, but also portraying the India's image as a country following rule of law and more humanitarian than its

neighbours. In that case, cinematic discourse was at play at two levels: first, creating a negative perception of Pakistan and its security forces. Second, it was also portraying India as a true democratic country where rule of law prevails, and thus justifies its stance that it can play a super power role like that of the USA.

Desai has stated that Indian cinema is the world's leading producer of feature films and produces nearly double films in numbers as compared to that of Hollywood. Moreover, the Mumbai based Hindi-language films are not only very popular in India and Pakistan but also have audience in other countries like UK, USA, Canada, Australia and even countries of the Middle East. These countries are the larger market of Bollywood films, where the Indian migrants live in large numbers. Availing this opportunity, Bollywood misses no chance to present a negative image of Pakistan.