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Abstract

Through a process of ‘re-en-framing’ events advocated by Žižek, S. (2014), this paper exposes ‘rogue’ representations of Chechen identity and lycanthropy. In first framing the ‘official’ narrative of the Boston Bombers, the paper proceeds from a critique of claims made in the Rolling Stone coverage of the event. The representations of Chechen identity that emerge from the magazine’s article are then re-framed through fin de siècle ‘Caucasaphobia’ and mytho-medievalising of the Chechen subject. In then returning to the Boston Bombing event it is through a critique of counter-insurgency/radicalisation theory that the biopolitical consequences of the event are set alongside the ‘werewolf trial’ of the surviving perpetrator.
DEATH OR FREEDOM

(THE CHECHEN “NATIONAL ANTHEM”)

We were born at night, when the she-wolf whelped.
In the morning, as lions howl, we were given our names.
    In eagles nests, our Mothers nursed us.
    To tame a stallion, our Fathers taught us.
We were devoted to our Mothers, to people and the Native land
And if they will need us – we’ll respond courageously.
We grew up free, together with the mountain eagles.
Difficulties and obstacles we overcame with dignity.

Granite rocks will sooner fuse like lead.
    Than we lose our Nobility in life and struggle.
The Earth will sooner be breached in boiling sun.
    Than we appear before the world; losing our honour

Never will we appear submissive before anyone.
Death or Freedom – we can choose only one way.
    Our sisters cure our wounds by their songs.
The eyes of the beloved arouse us to the feat of arms.

If hunger gets us down – we’ll gnaw the roots.
    If thirst harasses us – we’ll drink the grass dew.
We were born at night, when the she-wolf whelped.
    God, Nation and Native land –
We devote ourselves only to their service.

Usmanov (1999)
Three Chechen Flags

‘Separatist’ flag of the Chechen Republic of Ichkeria (from 1991 to exile on Dec 31, 1999)

‘Sovereign’ flag of the Russian Federal Republic of Chechnya (since 2004)

‘Wahhabi’ flag of the Caucasus Emirate (proclaimed Oct 31, 2007)
I must admit my heart skipped a few beats when I saw that Rolling Stone cover again that you included with your abstract. I remember first receiving that magazine in the mail and the shock I felt when I realized who that face belonged to. I read that article a few times before throwing it out because I couldn't have that kid haunting my apartment – Laura Schlein.

From the digital cover of Rolling Stone Issue 1130, its subject, “that kid” stares back from the screen. The text announces the dramatisation of the subject that is pursued within; ‘The Bomber – How a Popular, Promising Student Was Failed By His Family, Fell Into Radical Islam and Became A Monster’. From the relative confines of the bottom right hand corner of the page, this ‘flash fiction’ bleeds into the Armani Exchange top worn by ‘that kid’, ‘The Bomber’, ‘a Monster’ that stares back from the page. Without any sense of urgency, his adolescent gaze into the camera lopes through the glamour and dead cool sheen of the Rolling Stone cover. It is through an effortlessly provocative, and almost singular-eyed seeing through tussled hair, that this gaze shoots straight past other texts from sidelined stories; the ‘pretty fly for a white guy’ of his ‘popularity’, ‘the reluctant hero’ as his ‘promise’, the ‘climate change’ of his alleged ‘radicalization’, his cool ‘melting’, his ‘stumble’, his ‘frontlines’ his ‘failure’ and his ‘fall’. The cover-star has displaced Willie Nelson, Jay-Z, Gary Clarke Jnr. and Robin Thicke in a story that has also pushed the Arctic Ice-Melt and questions of sustainable global ecology to the margins.

Whilst immediate comparison of the cover-subject might be made to Jim Morrison in an echoing of the iconography performed by the images from Brodsky’s ‘young lion’ photo-shoot of The Doors front-man in 1967; it is by virtue of the sepia-tones and shadow-play that is afforded consideration for the cover’s aesthetic as a kind of marriage of the wolf (le mariage du loup), also known as a sun-shower. The play of asymmetry within the cover’s composition is accentuated by the subject’s hair shielding the shadowed side of his face: terror is twinned with entertainment, celebrity coupled with infamy, long dead dreams from iconographic mythic pasts are united with ‘combined and uneven’ (Calder-Williams, 2011: 150) currencies of contemporary cataclysm. Within a ‘state of exception’, (Agamben 2005: 3) such as is arguably announced in the Rolling Stone cover, The Bomber is suspended in a zone of bare indiscern-ability, a rock ‘n’ roll rogue who is further (bio)politically performed by promise of a life to be stripped bare in the magazine’s feature article.

Janet Reitman’s extensive 11238-word Rolling Stone’s article entitled Jahar’s World was published four months after the bombings at the Boston Marathon on April 15th 2013. At the time of publication in August 2013, ‘Jahar’, notably another naming of the Rolling Stone’s subject after ‘The Bomber/Monster’, was incarcerated, awaiting a trial at which he would be indicted on 30 federal charges for his role in both the bombing and subsequent crimes that occurred before his arrest. In the article’s second naming of the cover subject, before his monstrous metamorphosis into The Bomber, Jahar is employed as an Anglophonic mediation for the subject’s ‘Chechen’ name, Dzhokhar and emphasised as ““Jahar” to his friends’ (Reitman 2013: 45).

Reitman’s process of subjectification inherits aspects of the Jahar/Dzhokhar linguistic differentiation within broader questions of split loyalties in community, citizenship, civilianship, culture, and ethics of nationhood. The Jahar/Dzhokhar naming of the divided subject is evocative of Robert Louis Stevenson’s Strange Case of Dr
*Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886) from Booker’s archetypal exemplar of the *hero overcome by monster* plot. It is argued here that the *divided subject* of Reitman’s account forms a narrative ground to ‘make monstrous’ any legitimate foundations for any question of the *ethico-political ‘divided sensibility’* (Eagleton, 2009: 275) that might critically emerge later. A ‘combined and uneven’ (Calder-Williams, 2011) currency is then proposed as an *Americanization of Jahar*, with a frequency of 336 mentions of this name in the article, and a monstrous *Chechenization of Dzhokhar*, with frequency of 20 mentions. This ‘uneven’ dichotomy is accentuated through privileging distinction of ‘combined’ U.S. cultural values belonging to Jahar with an eschewing of Dzhokhar’s ‘uneven’ Caucasian bonds as a ‘barbaric other’. An untenable, or unsustainable cultural co-existence is argued as espoused by the article through a reading of its cultural attributions to its Chechen subjects as, at best myopic and at worst *Caucasophobic*. The provisionally ‘cultural clash’ critique of the article can be further read within the newly nuanced narrative ushered in by the article’s second sub-header, where it is declared that ‘he was a charming kid with a bright future. But no one saw the pain he was hiding or the monster he would become’ (ibid).

It is with reference to the ‘other’ brother, the ‘othered’ bomber, Tamerlan, that the figure of co-cultural impossibility finds its mark. First mentioned on the third page of the article with 318 uses of Tamerlan, a singular usage of ‘Tim’ and two citations of ‘Timmy’ from friends within the article, this imbalanced frequency of naming this subject is indicative of the dominant representation for a cultural ‘monster inside’ that is presented by Reitman. Declared as the second of ‘*Five Revelations*’, in an online *teaser* which notably features the cover-image as part of its digital ‘splash’, the *Rolling Stone* website more overtly projects a *medievalising* onto Tamerlan’s narrative:

> Around 2008, Jahar’s older brother Tamerlan confided to his mother that he felt like "two people" were inside him. She confided this to a close friend who felt he might need a psychiatrist, but Zubeidat believed that religion would be the cure for her son’s inner demons and growing mental instability, and pushed him deeper into Islam. (Online)

A feature in the first of the online ‘*Five Revelations*’, sets the scene in which to stage the article’s psychodrama of the brothers’ inner US-Chechen conflict, namely, within the co-cultural shared values of a wrestling ring. The plea of Jahar’s former wrestling coach, Peter Payak, is cited by Reitman’s article as ‘a name from the past – and the memory of that past – both of which were invoked during the standoff, that convinced Jahar to ultimately give up’ (Reitman, 2013: 48). Payak’s role in the naming of the subject by ‘replacing the nearly impossible-to-decipher Dzhokhar with a simpler and cooler-sounding rendering’ (ibid.) elevates this wrestling school coach to figure of creation (without responsibility) and whose act of redemption is more oriented in salvaging a life and heroically bringing the ‘monster’ back alive.

The family place for Jahar “‘like a son’” (ibid.) and Payak’s surrogate patriarchy, as some compensation for the ‘failure’ of Dzhokhar’s family, quickly re-establishes the detail of inferences from the cover narrative as *idee fixe* of the article. But it is the asserted normative ‘unproblematic’ aspects of *Jahar’s* cultural engagements that are foregrounded: ‘[h]e was also “just a normal American kid” as friends described him, who liked soccer,
hip-hop, girls; obsessed over *The Walking Dead* and *Game Of Thrones* and smoked copious amounts of weed’ (ibid). Reitman continues the cultural conflict between ‘Americanized’ *Jahar* and ‘Chechenized’ *Dzhokhar*, insisting that all doubt of loyalty finds its *smoking gun* in the *‘jihadist screed’* (ibid) that was scrawled onto the walls of a Watertown resident’s boat whilst Dzhokhar hid there. For Reitman, such turmoil of loyalty is sealed in Dzhokhar’s signing-off as “*Fuck America*”. The article then presents a short but heavily emotive litany of 21st Century terror-acts on America, proceeding from 9/11 and through a chain of other *homespun plots*. A core distinction is made that ‘*Jahar*’ and ‘*Tim*’ were neither members of al-Qaeda, nor, were they affiliated with an Islamicist group. Dzhokhar and Tamerlan were lone wolves, rogues, with further claim that ‘*[t]hey were Muslim, yes, but they were also American – especially Jahar who had become a naturalized U.S. Citizens on September 11th, 2012*’ (ibid: 48).

Notably, Reitman’s article does not explicitly afford status to the Tsarnaevs as a normative *Muslim American*, or even Muslim *and* American, but in *exceptional* terms, ‘Muslim, yes, *but... also American*. Arguably, it is an incommensurability of a Muslim American subject that is posited throughout article and which extends from the implicit Judeo-Christian ‘framing’ of the protagonist’s conflict in his ‘fall’ from the cover’s grand-narrative. As the *rogue solitary survivor* of the shoot-out with the authorities, Dzhokhar is inferred as *non-naturalized* whilst the article efforts opportunity to infuse wild rock to a life, where there is only seeming normal *domestic roll*. Subsequently it is Tamerlan’s ‘failed dream’, with all its ideological weight, that is ushered in as the shadow falling over a cover-star’s sepia-toned fairy-tale fate and as the big bad brother weighing in to ‘throw’ his brother-wolf’s *jihad*.

Lobbying for critical ‘exception’ to be taken toward the magazine as seemingly affording glamour to *The Bomber* resulted in the magazine issues removal from sale in selected retailers such as CVS in the USA. Whilst this lobbying faction might have felt vindicated by the ‘unshelving’, it is argued that the magazine actually serves both neoconservative and neoliberal ideological agendas regarding Islamicism and potential uses or abuses of Radicalization Theory. The Bomber issue controversy generated an echo-chamber in multiple platforms of media coverage which seemingly only served to fan the flames of feared fandom for Dzhokhar on social media channels. According to Sneed (2013) *Rolling Stone* generated doubled sales for *The Bomber* issue.

The moral outcry also served to afford a ‘might is right’ editorial assertion of *Rolling Stone*’s values, traditions and the politically engaged youth demographic of its readership within an online declaration. The further transparency of these self-substantiated virtues with appeal to extending the magazine’s declared demographic, was further enacted with online publication of the article in its entirety some two-weeks before distribution of the hard copy. Circulation and sales of the magazine, as the material controversy-commodity, were then doubled, despite the ‘whole story’ as ‘substance’ of the article, being freely available online.

The capital success of the cover’s controversy can be argued as a kind of *lyconomy*, not just as a portmanteau to describe a kind of ‘wolf’s economy’, but in the assertion of ethico-juridical terms - for which we might read *Law* - amounting to the positing of a ‘might through right’ (notably the core subject of Derrida’s seminar on
The Beast & The Sovereign and essay on Rogues). The determination of ‘good intentions’ in the article is sealed by the asserted virtuous traditions, what Žižek terms the ‘fragile symbolic fiction’ (2009: 127) stamped by the ‘special stuff’ of the Rolling Stone establishment, that is, through an absence of ‘given ethical substance’ (ibid.). It is for such exemplars as the Rolling Stone’s style of self-sovereignty that Derrida employs the term, lyconomy, as means of understanding how ‘Law (nomos) is always determined from the place of some wolf’ (2009: 140).

Within the inner-wrestling of the ‘divided sensibility’ (Eagleton, 2009: 275) and the jihad of Dzhokhar (Chechnya)/Jahar (USA), Reitman’s article abounds in a mytho-medievalising of the North Caucasus. The predominating of Dzhokhar’s diasporic ‘inheritance’, after his ‘naturalization’ has been affirmed in the ‘normative’ cultural engagements where he ‘assimilated best’ (Reitman, 2013: 50), is employed to cast the subject into ethical doubt, questions are conjured with regard to ‘true allegiances’ playing a role within the subsequent ‘fall’. The strength of Dzhokhar’s Chechen ‘bond’ is introduced through his shared-namesake; ‘Chechnya’s first president, Dzhokhar Dudayev’ (ibid.) with Reitman further noting that Jahar ‘had similar “Chechen pride”. He embraced the national Chechen symbol, the wolf; learned traditional dances; and could even speak Chechen as well as Russian’ (ibid – emphasis. my own). Starkly put, how might Dzhokhar Tsarnaev’s ‘embracing of the wolf’ be read and understood through Biopolitics 2.0?
II Erasing Tracks: Reframing Re-enchantment: *Lycanthropy (Werewolf)*

*Lupus est homo homini, non homo, quom qualis sit non novit.*
One man to another is a wolf, not a man, when he doesn’t know what sort he is.
- Plautus.

In his chapter entitled *Of Wolves and Werewolves*, Russell (2007) details the role of demonisation in the Russo-Chechen conflicts and reflects on how the ‘Chechen wolf’ theme had so caught the public imagination in the first war, that it was quite easy for the media to resurrect it when fighting broke out again in 1999’ (2008: 63). Unlike the ‘wolf years’ and campaign against Yeltsin’s Russia, Vladimir Putin’s swift ascendency to presidency in 1999 was twinned with this mutation of the Chechen in *werewolf* identity. In lieu of the devastating casualties and humiliating retreat of Russia’s troops from Chechnya in 1996, Putin’s *siloviki* (‘people of force’) policy of *Chechenisation* as a regional ‘domestication’ was unleashed at the dawn of a millennium. This was achieved firstly in the *airstrike-led* ‘urbicidal’ destruction of Grozny with armed occupation of the remains, then, in *zachistka* through the outlaying and ‘oulawed’ settlements and finally in the Kadyrovsky *peace-building* project to achieve ‘No More Traces Of War’ (Gilligan, 2010: 2011).

Russell (2007) makes notes of performative currencies of rhetoric and shift from the ‘crusading’ to the ‘criminal and crazy’ attributions for the 21st Century Chechen subject. The naming of the military operation seeking to eliminate key *insurgents* as a ‘Wolf Hunt’ and counter-terror ‘crack squad’ known as the ‘wolfhounds’ (Russell, 2007: 63) further highlights a *‘genelycology’* (Derrida, 2009: 57) in the Chechen conflicts. The long traditions of ‘Caucasophobia’, itself generative of a body of fictional archetypes in Russian literature and lore, might be read not in opposition to, but instead alongside the supra-stoicism and ‘dark imaginings’ of the traditional Nokchii spoken mythos. The historical legacy of Chechen subjection and resistance to genocide; within 18th & 19th Century Tsarist Imperialism, 20th Century Sovietisation and the deportation of the entire populous under Stalin, found its postmodern equivalence within millennial *siloviki*-styled Russian democracy in Politkovskaya’s ‘small corner of hell’ (2003) and Russell’s ‘black hole of lawlessness’ (2007: 7) in *fin de siècle* Chechnya.

In his audio letter of December 4, 2000, nearly a year into the Russian ‘Wolfhunt’ Counter-Terror Operations in Chechnya and some months before the 9/11 attacks in the USA, Aslan Maskhadov, the outlawed president of the separatist Chechen Republic of Ichkeria, reflected on the state of his nation in an audio letter:

> At the moment, we shouldn’t get very upset. We should expect the worst: that we are a small nation, our state has not been recognized, we were presented to the world as barbarians, terrorists. We contributed to that impression. Today we cannot pretend that everything is 100 percent normal here. So, we should take into consideration that we are what we are, and there is a huge state, with a huge territory, huge natural resources, with dirty politics, barbarian politics... Nobody is going to defend the interests of small nations. And today Russia’s army is not an army but a hungry horde. (Akhmadov & Danilof 2013: 56)

It was alongside expression of deep condolences to the US that following 9/11, Maskhadov also identified the potential for ‘Chechnya as a tool for blackmailing Russia... with aims of pulling off their own interests’ (ibid). The extent to which Russia sought to capitalise on 9/11 as leverage to its stakes within the Caucasus region,
is emphasised in Maskhadov’s audio communiqué of December 5, 2001 in which he states that ‘this [9/11 attack] really untied their hands, even with some degree of malicious joy and behaviour, when that situation there exploded. “We told you so!”’ (ibid: 187).

‘At 9.15 p.m. on Wednesday, 23 October 2002, Wolves struck’ (2006: 179), Murphy’s opening line in his rendering of the Dubrovka Theatre Siege event examples, with bare disclaimer, an academic case through which Chechen identity is represented as a ‘Wolf of Islam’. Murphy’s attributions can be read to subvert Chechen totemic identification for a Westernised perspective of Chechen over-identification with the much-maligned animal archetype. Murphy’s metaphor acts within a consciousness of human ‘genelycology or... politic-eco-lycology’ (Derrida, 2009: 206) and through appeal to the zoophobic or ‘speciocidal’ (Mazis, 2011) impulses towards the wolf. The rapacious, cunning and cruel attributes of the wolf are no less evident in Derrida’s Werewolf as Sovereign and Beast, than in Murphy’s wild mythologies of the Chechen as a fantastical and fanatical beast.

[T]he wolf is the proud national symbol of the[ir] Chechen homeland. Wolves are small in number, but their terror victims count into the thousands. At least 164 men, women, children, and terrorists died at Dubrovka. During the first war with Russia, Wolves took more than three thousand hostages in two Russian hospitals... The deadly bombs that Wolves have put on buses, trams, and in busy markets, trains and subway stations have killed hundreds more. Other Wolves and Chechen criminals have kidnapped men, women and children – Russians and Westerners – for sale into slavery, cutting off their victims’ fingers and hands, or worse, executing them or selling the severed heads of captives to Osama bin Laden for millions of dollars. (Murphy, 2006: 3)

Where 9/11 endorsed Putin’s claim for an ‘archipelago of terror’ and the potential threat of radical Islam in Chechnya, the ‘terror spectaculars’ orchestrated by Shamil Basayev in the Moscow theatre and Beslan school siege in September 2004, further perpetuated ‘the Chechen’ as a shapeshifting subject. The image economy of armed, chappour-clad, female body-bombers commonly termed ‘Black Widows’, acts as strange coupling to the ‘werewolf’ male whilst retaining Caucasophobic inference in translation.

Tuman’s (2010) account of the Dubrovka Theatre Siege arrives at a flawed ‘collective psyche’ (105) in the Chechen with a stigmatised legacy of historical genocide underlying a cause ‘fuelled by hatred’ (ibid). Such explanation is offered with little regard to what was taking (a) place contemporaneously and within the immediacy of the post-1999 counter-terror operations in Chechnya. Tuman’s character profile of the Chechen presents a kind of ‘ticking bomb’ or ‘crack’ in the historical subject and – with deeply Caucasophobic connotation here – that a Chechen’s ‘life-deemed-unqualified’ might leak through such an everyday flaw in national identity.

In his penultimate correspondence of January 30, 2003 and with increasingly despairing tones for what began with little hope, Maskhadov makes repeated analysis of international ‘divided sensibility’ towards the Chechen People’s Republic of Ichkeria; ‘Americans do not call us international terrorists because it is not to their advantage, nor do they term what the Russians are doing [in Chechnya] to be genocide. They are
steering a middle course’. (Akhmadov & Daniloff, 2013: 229). This ‘steering a middle course’ is almost immediately reiterated before an exasperated declaration:

That is, politics at large in this world, as soon as you begin to get the hang of it, it is a nightmare. A real nightmare... Everything that is done by everyone, everywhere, is hypocrisy. Hypocrisy. There are no rights anywhere, and it is unlikely that there will ever be. There are interests, that’s it! Interests of states, interests of parties, leadership and so on... the West proposed something else, we run there, kneel down, only if this [war] is stopped. Well what next? There are lots of examples where many states stopped wars like this, but these people were not really given more freedom, the more so, if they are Muslims. (ibid: 233)

The killing of Maskhadov in March 2005 heralded a schism in the remaining Chechen resistance. With a government in exile for the exhausted Chechen Ichkeria project, the wolf coat-of-arms that had represented separatist struggle from the former Soviet Union was erased from the Federal Republic flag. In October 2007, association from the exiled Chechen-Ichkeria government was severed and a new flag was raised in declaration of a Caucasus Emirate under leadership of its emir, Doku Umarov. By June 2015, following a period of ‘fitna’ in the wake of Umarov’s death, the Caucasus Emirate was integrated as Vilayet Kavkaz into the ‘rogue’ Islamic State with a relatively self-declared leadership pledging fealty to Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi in announcements posted on YouTube.

Throughout the shifts of aims from separatism to shari’a and schism from hope in state independence to a retro-activated dream of a pan-Caucasian emirate that was first conceived in Sheik Mansur’s uprisings of 1785, the mytho-medievalising representations of contemporary Chechen mujahideen have been coupled with savant employment of digital technologies and developments of online propaganda in asymmetric conflict. Moore (2010) identifies how:

Chechnya has a unique position in the development of information war, the ‘cottage-industry’ of producing, copying and distributing DVDs and CDs representing elements of Chechen resistance, the use of web-feeds and web-pages which link Chechen cause with other conflicts and the way that transnational networks have employed such tools for recruitment of foreign fighters. (79)

Techniques employed from the quarter decade conflict in Chechnya provided precursors to the 2.0 ‘virtual caliphate’ of IS.

Williams (2015) argues that the conflated role of Chechens in both the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts from 2001-2014 are not matched by evidence of real presence and only ‘spectral’ claims to actual impact. Despite the prevalence suggested from Google hits returned for ‘Chechens in Afghanistan’, Williams identifies that:

...testosterone-laced, boilerplate rhetoric accounts of Chechen “nightmares/fanatics” with “fire in their bellies who never ate and needed to die” of course lack any specific details... The lack of any prisoners at the massive US prisons... and complete lack of even a substantiated Chechen passport or corpse seems to mitigate against the existence of a Chechen fighting presence of any size in Afghanistan. (221)
In contrast to this, Williams recognizes how the civil war in Syria since 2011 has reanimated the reputation and value of Chechen veterans as a particularly prized asset to fighting units with Chechens represented in various groups across sectarian divisions eg: the Al Qaeda-affiliated Nusra Front, the Free Syrian Army and IS, as well as those numbered within the Assad government-allied Russian troops.

Within materials presented as evidence for Dzhokhar Tsarnaev’s self-radicalisation, pre-ISIS videos of Chechen fighters on the new front of anti-Russian resistance and jihad in Syria are set alongside the pragmatic role of an article that details how to “Make A Bomb In The Kitchen Of Your Mom”, from the first issue of Al-Qaeda’s digital-download magazine ‘Inspire’. Issue 11 of the Inspire magazine (May 2013), circulated a month after the bombings, appropriated a social-media circulated phrase ‘Inspired by Inspire’ within its dedicated coverage of the Tsarnaev brothers. The D-I-Y model of ‘Open-Source jihad’ and lone wolf terror-acting methods that were advocated by Al-Qaeda following bin-Laden’s death, have since become a mainstay strategy for Islamic State’s campaign to effect ‘states of emergency’ in Europe and the USA.
III Feigning Feign Tracks: Enframing Disenchantment: *Lycanthropology* (*Homo Homini Lupus*)

*If you bleat, the wolf will carry you away; if you keep quiet, the shepherd will cut your throat. Damned if you do, and damned if you don’t* – Chechen Proverb (Jamoukha, 2005: 244)

In returning to the Boston Marathon Bombing event it is through a critique of the post-1999 Russian counter-terror operations conducted in Chechnya as ‘sufficiently counterproductive so as to question whether the ends really have justified the means’ (Russell, 2007: 87). Through promulgating an everyday theatre for terror, for example, in inflammatory rhetoric predominating ‘so-called disseminators’ as ‘playing the role of cheerleaders’ (ICSR, 2014: 1, Radicalization Theory furthers *shortest schema* metaphoric modelling of event dramatisation to produce extraordinarily connotative narratives for individual acts and behaviours. In turn, counter-terror measures, as the political legacy of terror-acts, can be read to further radicalise the public sphere. It is through the consolatory actions and counter-terror consequence of events, that terror-acts effectively achieve what Crenshaw (2011) argues as ‘a reasonable way of pursuing extreme interests in the political field’ (122).

The Behavior Recognition System (BRS) *AISight* provides a post-bombing upgrade to Boston’s existent integrated camera network and makes boast of recognising ‘suspicious behaviours’ through vigilant digital *eyesight* with all the promise of *Artificial Intelligence*. The technology is represented as a kind of contemporary equal to the claim of Robespierre’s ability to detect counter-revolutionary guilt through the ‘terrorist culpability’ in a fear of guilt detectable within the eye. *AISight* is presented in notably gleeful terms in heralding a precognitive future-crime prevention capability to ‘recognise a precursor pattern that could be associated with crime before it happens’ (Cooper, 2014). The consequence of human-led profiling is succinctly analysed by Hall (2015) where she identifies that;

> The biopolitical project of terrorism prevention is not only concerned with reflexive governance, or a suspect’s capacity to perform transparency... Terrorism prevention increasingly involves policing involuntary behavior, or the expert’s ability to read a suspect’s incapacity to control communicative signals emitted by her body and face. (155/156)

Where BRS Lab’s technology might be viewed as the leviathan’s eye of counter-terror, the failures of both FBI monitoring of Tamerlan Tsarnaev and counterinsurgency continuum policies as *modus operandi* of Massachusetts State Police to prevent the bombings, are absent from orientations of the event such as those presented by Reitman. The FBI digital circulation of the brothers’ images on April 18th 2013;

> ...sparked what officials describe as a chaotic and deadly series of events: the murder of a police officer at MIT, a carjacking, and ultimately a shoot-out in a quiet residential neighborhood in Watertown. The entire metropolitan region was shuttered for a day while police hunted for the remaining suspects. Militarized police turned the town into a temporary war zone. It was a traumatic night and day for everyone in the city. (Ellis, K. 2014)
Where the voice of his coach operated as a lure for live capture in Reitman’s account, the behemoth of law occupation in six districts around the Watertown area more overtly presented a rapacious counter-terror ‘wolf-hunt’ for Tamerlan and Dzhokhar Tsarnaev in a militarized ‘state of exception’.

Through the post-political performativity of *Homo jihadi* and *hostis* of Radical Islam, Kundnani (2014) makes an exemplar of the Boston Marathon Bombing “official” narrative and (white) mythologising of radicalisation such as that represented by Reitman’s article. In dismissal of counterinsurgency culture claims as means of normalising the ‘state of exception’, Kundnani revises Reitman’s groundwork claims:

...the real problem with the article was its attempt to present the brothers’ alleged actions as solely the product of a psychological “disintegration” brought about by a series of individual misfortunes... This deployment of a psychological radicalization model – supported, of course, with quotes from the terrorism-expert industry – enabled the writer to avoid a political analysis of such violence that placed it within the context of the global war on terror and its vast civilian toll. (2014: 19)

Kundnani further examines the extent to which Reitman’s article’s framing of the event-narrative is supported only by the sleight of an ideological misdirection away from the Tsarnaevs’ political disaffection and finds ‘parallels with their experiences as refugees from Russia’s brutal war of counterinsurgency in the Caucasus’ (ibid: 288). Kundnani then radically re-enframes the Tsarnaev brothers as failed by *rogue ideology* and political alienation, rather than Reitman’s account of their individual emotional-psychological ‘meltdown’ or co-cultural incompatibilities in meeting the ‘good life’ expectations of neoliberal values. In proposing that it is only after the ‘wolfhunt’ that Dzokhar’s biopolitical status is fully exposed as lupine within his incarceration and lycanthropic within his trial, the last lyco-pathology of this examination seeks to exhaust the flawed fictive remains of *The Bomber Issue*.

Few images of Dzhokhar Tsarnaev were released during his time awaiting trial. The day after prosecution presented a short video-clip of him to the sentencing jury, it was released to media channels in a censored form. The 30-seconds filmed by camera surveillance of his cell, present the prisoner first stepping onto a fixed-metal bench to use the reflective surface of the lens to adjust his hair. He then gestures his middle finger into the lens, steps back down and sits, looking back up to the camera. Within the censored version the finger is heavily pixelated to blur the gesture. As prosecuting evidence, the footage presents the ‘lone wolf’ in captivity as unremorseful and without penitence for his crimes. The digital distortion applied to the gesture is then circulated without the offending substance.

According to Chermers (2012) the association between lycanthropy and law extends from the shared etymology of wolf as ‘thief’ within Sanskrit origins. As in Agamben’s (1998) treatment of ‘The Ban and The Wolf’, Chermers notes the wolf as ‘outlaw’ and extends on the lyco-legislative status within account of court trials, noting that;

Real living individuals were convicted of transforming into wolves; records exist of such cases as early as 1428, when a series of witch trials in Valais included testimonies of werewolfism, and as late
as 1765, when a series of vicious attacks on peasants in Gévaudan prompted a national werewolf hunt. (5)

Whilst rejected by the court, the defence’s motion to have Dhokhar’s trial moved out of Boston provides data to support the argument that the trial operated as a contemporary werewolf trial. In both the ‘monstrous’ nature of the crime and the trial remaining local to where the crime had impact, two foundational characteristics of the werewolf trial are evident. The extent to which a jury bias was stacked towards predetermination of guilt is not a factor in the trial of a werewolf where;

In terms of performance, the werewolf’s existence at trial comes into being when the accused shapeshifter confesses. It seems that, according to the trial records, accused werewolves almost always confess, sooner or later... [L]ycanthropy was a crimen exceptum which stripped all due process from the accused, opening the door for evidence to be submitted by known liars, felons, little children, and the accused’s own defense attorneys (who could be compelled to testify); in the cases of witches, ugliness could be considered evidence enough to begin prosecution, while for werewolves it seems that belligerence could be enough. (10/11)

The defence’s switched plea to full admittance of guilt at the first session of Tsarnaev’s trial, performs alongside the video-clip as evidence of ‘belligerence’ within the sentencing. Confession of culpability at trial is coupled with 30 seconds of the subject’s ‘caged’ behaviour from a 2-year duration in captivity.

In ‘re-en-framing’ the Boston Marathon Bombings through ‘rogue’ representations of lycanthropic Chechen identity there are vertiginous aspects returned to the event in a Biopolitics 2.0 that does not dispense with archaic inheritance amidst dizzying disorientations of the digital. The profile and publicity surrounding ‘medieval’ werewolf trials, as Chermers observes, provided ‘a multifariously useful tool for social control; for the populace, it granted a focus for the rage and fear of the populace, an antidote to the feeling of helplessness such times engender’ (7). Such trials occurred after austere times, traumatic events or civil war and the legal status of werewolves would eventually dwindle as medical definition of lycanthropy changed. The mytho-medievalising and monster-making representations of identity that extends from Caucasophobic folklore, both permeate and permutate in contemporary global currencies of digital circulation. In these terms, Reitman’s Rolling Stone article arguably acts as a kind of prejudicial programme to the Tsarnaev ‘werewolf’ trial that proceeded.
The meteorological phenomenon of a ‘sunshower’ i.e., when both rain is falling and sun is shining. The French metaphor is by no means exclusive, a commonality of tricksters and comic couplings are evident within the global themed-variations of folkloric expression. For example: ‘the foxes wedding’, ‘the leopard is taking her daughter to be married’, ‘jackal marries the wolf’s wife’, ‘the monkey’s birthday’, etc. See Vaux’s (1998) ‘crowd-sourced’ request: http://linguistlist.org/issues/9/9-1795.html

Within the paper I employ the term ‘combined and uneven’ after Calder-Wilkins (2011);...as a revision and pun off of the Marxist theory of combined and uneven development, a theory that gives shape to my analysis not just of geographical displacement but a general structure of overlapping timescales, speculative timescales out of joint, and all those knotty passages from abstraction to the barest shapes of the concrete. (150-151)

As Agamben (2005) observes:
The immediate biopolitical significance of the state of exception as the original structure in which law encompasses living beings by means of its own suspension emerges clearly in the “military order issued by the president of the United States on November 13, 2001, which authorized the “indefinite” detention” and trial by “military commissions”...What is new about President Bush’s order is that it radically erases any legal status of the individual, thus producing a legally unnamable and unclassifiable being. (3)

Agamben then further asserts that; ‘The state of exception is not a special kind of law (like the law of war); rather, in so far as it is a suspension of the juridical order itself, it defines law’s threshold or limit concept’. (4)

Eagleton (2009) writes:
One might portray this divided sensibility as a form of libertarian pessimism, in which the emancipatory impulse has by no means been laid to rest – in which the vision of 1968 can still be felt living and breathing – but which now, in the disenchanted aftermath of that epoch, must confess the naivety of dreaming that desire could ever be free from law or the subject innocent of power... You must not give up on your delirious dreams of pure difference, free libidinal flows, the kingdom of justice, or a realm of love beyond the law; but you must not try to bring them about either, for that way lie psychosis, totalitarianism or some other ghastly graveyard of the spirit (275).

Here we might examine the editorial declaration and clearing of the ‘ethical ground’ with text that appears on the online version - text-version of the article but not in the magazine’s material:
Our hearts go out to the victims of the Boston Marathon bombing, and our thoughts are always with them and their families. The cover story we are publishing this week falls within the traditions of journalism and Rolling Stone’s long-standing commitment to serious and thoughtful coverage of the most important political and cultural issues of our day. The fact that Dzhokhar Tsarnaev is young, and in the same age group as many of our readers, makes it all the more important for us to examine the complexities of this issue and gain a more complete understanding of how a tragedy like this happens. –THE EDITORS (Rolling stone website – ‘Five Revelations In The Bomber Article’).

Nokhchii – Chechen term of self-reference for the indigenous people from that region of the North Caucasus.
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