

## **Intertextuality in the News: The Spanish Terrorist Attack on March 11**

Natalia Andrea Seghezzi  
Pompeu Fabra University  
natalia.seghezzi@upf.edu

### ABSTRACT

We can define intertextuality as the relationship between one text and other texts. In this paper we analyze intertextuality in news reports focusing upon reporting speech, i.e. the presence of others' words in a text. We argue that when text producers choose to employ reported discourse they pursue a clear objective. Reporters may want, for instance, to detach themselves from what is said or adopt somebody else's words as if they were their own. Thus, intertextuality constitutes a powerful tool at reporters' disposal to suit their own purposes and make texts more persuasive. In the two articles on the Spanish terrorist attack from different newspapers we analyze this is highly significant because after the attack it was not certain who the perpetrators had been. However, authorship was to play a decisive role in the general elections to be held three days later: ETA's hypothesis favoured the political party in power while the fact that Al Qa'ida was behind the attack was beneficial to the opposition. In this paper we show how both newspapers, drawing mainly on the same external voices, succeed in building two different arguments and lead readers towards a biased interpretation of the facts.

*“The reporters use the voices of the people and groups they report on to tell their story as much as a novelist uses characters or a ventriloquist uses dummies”*. (Bazerman 2004: 86)

## 1. Introduction

The term intertextuality appeared in the 1960's and since then it has been widely used across different disciplines. Broadly speaking, we can define intertextuality as the relationship that exists between one text and other texts. In our work we will analyze intertextuality in news reports focusing upon reporting speech, i.e. the presence of others' words in a text. We argue that when text producers choose to employ indirect discourse, direct discourse or scare quotes to reproduce what others have said, they pursue a clear objective. Reporters may want, for instance, to detach themselves from what is said or adopt somebody else's words as if they were their own. Thus, intertextuality constitutes a powerful tool at reporters' disposal to suit their own purposes, make texts more persuasive and lead readers towards a biased interpretation of the facts.

In the two articles on the terrorist attack on Spanish trains in 2004 we will analyze this is highly significant because after the attack, it was not certain whether it had been perpetrated by ETA or Al Qa'ida but authorship was to play a decisive role in the general elections to be held three days later: ETA's hypothesis favoured the political party in power while the fact that Al Qa'ida was behind the attack was beneficial to the opposition.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

For those involved in discourse analysis texts usually offer a rich series of surface (or textual) marks that can be analysed. However, even though the marks found in texts are generally linked and their interrelation may convey interesting insights, it is always useful to dwell on separate aspects at a time to see how a specific topic is exploited in a given text. In our case the focus of analysis will be intertextuality, described as one of the "analytical focuses which seems especially fruitful in discourse analysis" (Fairclough 1992: 74). In general, authors tend to agree on the fact that intertextuality points to the relation existing between one text and other (previous or future) texts. However, the bibliographic review reveals that intertextuality is a truly flexible concept and that it is possible to find as many definitions of the term as authors have written about it.

Many writers have made reference to this fact in their accounts. Meinhof et al.'s *Intertextuality and the Media* (2000), which is a clear example of how approaches to intertextuality can vary as individual authors do different textual analyses on media texts (which range from advertisements to music television) within the common frame of intertextuality, describes intertextuality as "a fuzzy yet powerful term" (2000: 1). Bengoechea and Sola (1997), in their introduction to *Intertextuality/Intertextualidad*, talk about a "chaotic situation" making reference to the fact that many sciences related to knowledge and language have used intertextuality differently. Graham (2000: 2) sees intertextuality as "one of the most commonly used and misused terms in contemporary critical vocabulary". The same author concludes that in order to understand why intertextuality has taken on its current meanings and applications we should study the term's

history.

Such a task can be most useful to grasp why (and how) intertextuality, a term which origins are closely related to the literary field, has been so widely studied in various distant fields of activity such as politics, didactics and the film industry or why hypertext computer systems are the last approach to intertextuality.

This paper does not intend to give a detailed account of the development of the term intertextuality; however, a brief review will provide the general background needed to get familiar with the topic to be dealt with.

Many books on intertextuality point to Bakhtin as the starting point for the theory of intertextuality and acknowledge that the term was coined by Kristeva in 1967 in her account of Bakhtin's works *Rebels and his World* and *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. In coining the term Kristeva meant to address a concept radically different from the traditional romantic conception of the literary work in which the text was autonomous and had one identifiable author. In this sense, as Bengoechea states, intertextuality has to do with "el proceso (necesariamente social) de creación de significado". Bakhtin (1986: 69), within the frame of his dialogical theory of language, argues that there are always preceding utterances with which a given utterance "enters into one kind of relation or another (builds on them, polemicizes with them, or simply presumes that they are already known to the listener). Any utterance is a link in a very complexly organized chain of other utterances". As we can see, intertextuality accentuates the dialogue between the different voices that are present within a text. The idea that texts draw upon other texts is also adhered to by Foucault, who states that "there can be no statement that in one way or another does not reactualize others" (1972: 98). Bengoechea, who defines intertextuality in a wide sense as "la relación habida entre un texto y otros que le preceden", divides the various approaches to intertextuality in two different groups: those who analyse texts in relation to the social structures in which they were produced and those who do not. The author acknowledges, however, that the approaches to intertextuality are potentially infinite.

Among those who focus exclusively on the text we can mention De Beaugrande, who, in his work on text linguistics, takes intertextuality as one of the seven principles that make up the concept of textuality. For him, intertextuality involves the relationships with other texts, specially those coming from the same text type or a similar one (De Beaugrande and Dressler 1981).

Authors like Fairclough and Kress are within the second group of analysts, those who consider not only texts but also their social context of production. Intertextual analysis is for them a valuable tool to understand the conflictive socio-cultural representations found in texts. In *Discourse and Social Change* Fairclough claims that intertextuality constitutes a major focus of analysis because, as Kristeva observes, it implies "the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history". Fairclough explains that by "the insertion of history into a text" Kristeva means that texts are built out of texts from the past and that by "the insertion of a text into history" she is pointing to the fact that texts respond to, reaccentuate and rework past texts. Consequently, texts play a major role in history as well as social and cultural change (Fairclough 1992: 102).

In the same book Fairclough (75-85) develops an analytical framework for text analysis which covers aspects of production and interpretation as well as formal properties of texts. In his view, a comprehensive framework for analysing texts should include: vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, text structure, the 'force' of utterances, the 'coherence' of texts and their 'intertextuality'. The author differentiates between 'manifest intertextuality', the case where specific other texts are overtly drawn upon within a text and 'interdiscursivity', which results in the constitution of texts out of elements and conventions of different discourse types or genres.

In our work we will approach intertextuality concentrating exclusively on what Fairclough calls manifest intertextuality, i.e. features which are manifest on the surface of texts. Within the glossary in *Analysing Discourse* Fairclough (2003: 39) provides the following definition:

The intertextuality of a text is the presence within it of elements of other texts (and therefore potentially other voices than the author's own) which may be related to (dialogued with, assumed, rejected, etc.) in various ways [...] The most common and pervasive form of intertextuality is reported speech (including reported writing and thought), though there are others (including irony). Reported speech may or may not be attributed to specific voices, and speech (writing, thought) can be reported in various forms, including direct (reproduction of actual words used) and indirect report (summary).

Such a definition of intertextuality provides the key elements to analyse texts from an intertextual perspective. According to it, the major focus of analysis should be reported speech (in the form of direct or indirect report). Fairclough suggests, however, that there may be other points or 'forms of intertextuality' worthy of analysis. He considers that irony, presupposition, negation and metadiscourse are all of them forms of manifest intertextuality that can also shed some light onto the intertextual nature of a text.

### **3. Intertextuality in news reports**

Since our focus of analysis is intertextuality in relation to news reports, we may wonder why text producers resort to intertextuality when they write their reports or, in other words, why reporters choose to include what others have said in their own account of the facts.

In relation to this question, Fairclough (1992: 84) expresses that "intertextuality is basically the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts [...] which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo and so forth". This statement suggests that the presence of others' voices in reporters' texts can serve different purposes. Thus, we can conclude that when text producers mention (directly or indirectly) what someone else has said, they do it for some reason. As Bazerman (2004: 94) clearly states:

Intertextuality is not just a matter of which other texts you refer to, but how you use them, what you use them for, and ultimately how you position yourself as a writer to them to make your

own statement. People can develop adeptly complex and subtly skilled ways of building on the words of others. Such complex intertextual performances are so familiar we hardly notice them.

Apparently, the use of intertextuality by reporters is always intentional and they can become experts at manipulating others' words to their aim.

Van Dijk's analyses of news are also very illuminating as regards the presence of intertextuality in news reports. In *La noticia como discurso* (1990: 114) the author examines the journalistic discourse style and concludes that among the limitations news reporters have, due to the fact that they produce institutional discourse, "las citas son una poderosa estrategia para el periodista a fin de evitar las limitaciones sobre la impersonalidad, las opiniones, el punto de vista y la formalidad". His idea also points to the fact that quotations may be used by reporters to suit their own purposes. Van Dijk's studies on news revolve around the structure of news reports as well as the processes of news production and comprehension. He links textual and sociocultural analyses mainly to show how some press practices contribute to the reproduction of racist ideologies. In *Racism and the press* (1991: 151-175) van Dijk devotes a chapter to *quotations and sources*. There the emphasis is on the selection and summarization source statements undergo and the ideological basis the strategies employed in those processes may have. Related to this, van Dijk talks about the functions quotations have. We could say that, basically, quotations may serve one of these five purposes:

1. being newsworthy in their own right
2. making the story more lively
3. enhancing the credibility of the account
4. allowing interpretation of news events
5. allowing the insertion of subjective interpretations and opinions

Bazerman (2004: 86) Morawski (1970) and Plett (1991) also coincide in viewing intertextuality as having specific functions within texts. Bazerman considers that others' statements can be used to background, support or contrast arguments; Morawski speaks about the authoritative, erudite and ornamental functions of quotations and Plett holds that given the authority of the original source, authoritative quotations are used to legitimate statements, being their function fundamentally ideological.

As we can see, quotations (and intertextuality as a whole) play an important role within texts and can therefore be a reporter's powerful strategy to make news reports more persuasive.

#### 4. Terrorism and the media

In the present work we argue that when intertextuality is present within news reports it usually performs a specific function. It is our aim then to analyse the articles we have chosen and find how intertextuality is employed to pass judgement and convey a particular interpretation of the news events reported.

We should mention here that our corpus consists of two news reports on the massive terrorist attack which left near two hundred casualties and more than one thousand injured in Madrid on May 11 2004. The articles appeared on *La Vanguardia* and *El País* the day after the event. The significance of the articles chosen lies in the fact that the terrorist attack took place three days before the Spanish general elections were held. Immediately afterwards, it was not certain whether the attack had been perpetrated by Al Qa'ida or ETA but authorship was to play a decisive role in the election results. The ETA-hypothesis favoured the political party in power (the Popular Party), its candidate for presidency and the Prime Minister, J. M. Aznar. On the other hand, in case the Islamic terrorist group was to blame, the opposition (the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, PSOE) would have had great chances of winning the elections. Eventually the PSOE had a narrow victory which was linked to the prevalence of Al Qa'ida's hypothesis over ETA's. In this context, if we accept that the media has a major role in forming public opinion, the position adopted by the newspapers is to be regarded as highly influential. According to all that has been exposed above, there are good reasons for analysing the intertextuality of a text.

But before we start with the analysis let us first revise some literature on terrorism and the media because the studies done and the experts' opinions can illuminate the analysis of intertextuality in news reports on terrorism.

Most bibliography on terrorism and the media usually revolves around similar topics. Authors (see for instance Aulestia (2005) and Norris et al. (2003)) generally attempt to define terrorism and although their definitions vary, there seems to be wide consensus on terrorism having political causes and political goals (which may be the reason why many people see the media as a mediator between government and terrorists). There is not such agreement, though, as regards the most salient topic, namely, the relationship between the media and terrorism. The nature of the relationship between terrorism and the media is very complex and has led people to take different stances as to whether media coverage on terrorism has positive or negative results.

For some critics terrorists' appearance on the media cannot be negative because the fact that their massacres become news does not mean that reporters support them. Nacos (1994) accepts that the media may benefit terrorists but argues that when they are portrayed negatively or if they are not paid much attention by the media, terrorists become weaker. For authors like Paletz et al. (1992), Rodrigo Alsina (1991) and Soria (1987), however, media coverage of terrorist acts has a negative influence. According to them, terrorists use the media as a means to achieve their goals because the media help them in propagating violence together with the fear, insecurity and chaos they want to transmit. We could say that in their view, without media coverage, there would be no terrorism. M. Thatcher once

insisted on this idea stating that ways should be found “to starve the terrorists and hijackers of the oxygen of publicity on which they depend”<sup>1</sup>. The expert Laqueur also adheres to this posture and goes so far as to state that the media are the terrorists ‘best friend’. Some authors even talk about a symbiosis or a mutual attraction between terrorism and the media pointing to the fact that the media need great news in the same way terrorists need publicity. In other words, for this group the media and terrorism are mutually interdependent. Finally, there are others who think that all publicity, good or bad, benefits terrorists because all they want is to inflict terror.

Another significant topic dealt with in most books on terrorism and the media is the role of the media in forming public opinion. It is mentioned repeatedly that reporters’ work implies selecting and structuring information to present an event into a news form to the public. In this process the media can frame the news in order to guide the audience towards a particular interpretation of the facts presented. This aspect, especially in the press, is very much related to language since it is through the combination of words (though images are important too) how text producers convey their ideas and reflect and reinforce ideologies. Rodrigo Alsina (1991: 19) states that “al analizar [las] estrategias [del discurso periodístico sobre el terrorismo] puede apreciarse lo que pretenden ocultar y lo que desean hacer visible”.

If we link the two main topics we have developed (the relationship between terrorism and the media and role of the latter in shaping public opinion) we can see that not only what is reported but also how it is reported matters. In other words, there is more to terrorism than the mere question about whether the media should cover terrorists attacks or not. And that something else, we believe, can be found in language. Analysing news reports can shed some light on the social uses of intertextuality and allow us to see how reporters select and rearrange what others have said to suit their own purposes.

## 5. Analysis

We have already described our corpus, which consists of two news reports on the bombing in Madrid on March 11 2004. The articles were selected from the Spanish newspapers *El País* and *La Vanguardia* (henceforth referred to as *EP* and *LV*) and it should be noticed that the news item from *EP* is much longer than the one in *LV* (the former contains 37 paragraphs and the latter 17). For the purposes of our work content matters more than length; however, we will point out those cases where findings may have been influenced by this difference.

We will analyse intertextuality in news reports to see how reporters select and manipulate what others have said to suit their own purposes. As we have previously mentioned, the fact that the attack was perpetuated by Spanish or Islamic terrorist groups played an important part in the results of the general elections to be held three days after the attack. Consequently, we want to see whether reporters use others’ speech to support ETA’s or AIQa’ida’s hypothesis about March 11 terrorist attack.

In order to carry out the analysis we will compare and contrast the selected articles concentrating on different aspects. First the use of reported speech as such will be dealt with. Then we will analyse whose voices are reported to see if there exists some link between who speaks, how his/ her original words are reported (whether they are presented as direct or indirect discourse) and the effect reporters pursue. During the analysis we will also focus upon reporting verbs because their choice is generally said to be significant.

## 6. Reported speech

Reported speech, also called *discourse representation* or *intertextual representation*, is considered as “the most common and pervasive form of intertextuality” i.e. the most usual way of incorporating others’ speech into one’s text<sup>2</sup>. There are two main ways to report what others’ have said: we can use either direct or indirect speech. The following examples from one of the news items that make up our corpus (the one in EP) will allow us to point out the main characteristics of each type of reported speech:

- i Pese a todas esas evidencias [desfavorables a la hipótesis de que el atentado era obra de ETA], el ministro del Interior, Ángel Acebes, despejó las dudas en una conferencia de prensa convocada a las 13.00: “ETA ha conseguido su objetivo. El Gobierno no tiene ninguna duda de que ETA esta detrás”.
- ii Interior ha mantenido hasta ahora que la infraestructura de ETA en Madrid era mínima. Además, los criminales no avisaron previamente de sus intenciones mortales, como hace habitualmente ETA en sus atentados.

At first sight we can see that in i. Acebes’ words are explicitly demarcated while in ii. his words (on behalf of the Interior Ministry) are not immediately spotted because they are merged in, i.e. the reporter has incorporated Acebes’ words as if they were his/ hers.

What makes the intertextuality evident in i. is the use of quotation marks, which render explicit the boundary between the voice of the person being reported and that of the reporter. In direct reported speech we assume that the words are the exact ones the speaker used. Besides, the tense and deictics employed (though we do not find instances of the latter in our example) are those of the original version.

On the contrary, when the text producer resorts to indirect speech to retell what someone else has said quotation marks disappear, tense and deictics change to suit the writer’s style and we can never be sure whether the words belong to the original speaker or not. Was *la infraestructura de ETA en Madrid es mínima* Acebes’ original wording or is it the reporter’s choice of words? And the final comment: *Además, los criminales no avisaron previamente de sus intenciones mortales, como hace habitualmente ETA en sus atentados* was also made by the Interior Minister or is it the reporter’s? All these questions aroused by the use of indirect reported speech suggest that the voices presented in the news are not clearly demarcated. In this way indirect speech becomes a powerful device at reporters’



hands to manipulate the content of the reported text at their will.

Another type of reported speech closely linked to direct reportage are *scare quotes* i.e. placing single words or short expressions in quotation marks. We could say that scare quotes share in all the characteristics of direct reported speech in that the outside voice is clearly demarcated and they fulfil van Dijk's functions of quotations set forth earlier. However, there must be some reason why the reporter chooses to include others' complete sentences or mere fragments of what was said. According to Fairclough (1992: 119), scare quotes can be used to distance oneself from the outside voice or use its authority to support one's position.

These two antagonistic uses of scare quotes reinforce the idea that intertextuality can make texts more persuasive because writers can manipulate the content of others' words at their own will to suggest particular interpretations of the facts.

We will analyse now the use of reported speech in each of the chosen articles. Table 1 shows the use of reported speech in the articles from LV and EP and the number of instances of scare quotes, direct discourse and indirect discourse found in each article.

	<b>LA VANGUARDIA</b>	<b>EL PAÍS</b>
<b>Scare quotes</b>	3	8
<b>Direct speech</b>	1	13
<b>Indirect speech</b>	21	16
<b>Total</b>	25	37

**Table 1.** Use of reported speech.

We can see that despite the difference in length mentioned earlier (EP article is longer), both articles present an elevated number of cases of reported discourse. This could be linked to the fact that terrorist attacks are a delicate and controversial topic and that is why it is always relevant and wise to listen to what important people have to say about what happened.

Even though both articles share the considerable amount of reported speech they contain, there exists much less similarity in the forms of reported speech reporters employ. It is interesting to notice that while LV makes use of direct speech only once (in order to retell the King's words), EP resorts to direct speech thirteen times. Similarly, the use of scare quotes is higher in EP. It is pretty clear that the reporter writing for LV is more prone to employ indirect rather than direct discourse and thus reproduce others' words merging their meanings with his/ her own.

A possible explanation for these findings could be sought in the functions direct quotations may serve. We stated earlier that words said by experts and important people give the writing a sense of factuality and veracity because their content comes from sources that can hardly be challenged. Besides, quotations convey liveliness and turn the news more readily credible. The results make sense, thus, if we link the roles quotations play to the considered newspapers' profiles. LV, being a more conservative newspaper, is likely to employ less direct discourse so as to avoid conveying a sensationalist image full of people's

comments. On the contrary, if we see EP as having a socialist profile, it is not surprising that many more people are given a voice in their account of the facts. It is precisely to that aspect, voices, that we turn our attention now.

## 7. Reported voices

We have just seen that although we find numerous instances of reported speech both in LV and EP, the former employs much less direct speech and scare quotes than the latter. The use of indirect speech, however, is pretty similar in both articles though we could argue, recalling that LV article is shorter than the one from EP, that indirect speech seems to be a bit overused by LV reporter.

Let us focus now on the voices included because so far we have studied how reported speech was implemented, i.e. we have compared the use of direct speech vs. indirect speech but we still do not know whose words we are talking about. Therefore, we will look at the people who are quoted in each article and we will see how those people's (or institutions') speech is represented in order to see if there exists a link between whose words are retold and the way it is done (by using indirect speech, direct speech or scare quotes). At the same time we will analyse the reporting verbs employed and the place outside voices are given within news reports because we consider these two elements can also help us interpreting the results. We believe that all these aspects will shed some light on the use of intertextuality in news reports: they will allow us to see if, as we believe, intertextuality is a powerful strategy used by reporters to convey particular meanings and lead readers towards biased interpretations of the facts.

The following table shows the different voices that appear in each of the articles as well as the number of times they are included:

VOICES	LA VANGUARDIA	EL PAÍS
<i>Interior Minister</i>	8	8
<i>The King</i>	3	3
<i>Al Qa'ida</i>	3	4
<i>Batasuna</i>	2	1
<i>Spanish President J. M. Aznar</i>	1	1
<i>Government</i>	1	1
<i>Anonymous</i>	4 (reporter?)	1 (doctors?)
<i>Audiencia Nacional</i>	2	---
<i>Ecuadorian President</i>	1	---
<i>J. L. Rodríguez Zapatero</i>	---	2
<i>M. Rajoy</i>	---	2
<i>Police</i>	---	2
<i>Survivor</i>	---	1

Nurse	---	1
ONU	---	2
Antiterrorists	---	1
Experts	---	1
J. J. Ibarretxe	---	1
G. W. Bush	---	1
G. Llamazares	---	1
J. L. C. Rovira	---	1
The Pope	---	1
Bishops	---	1
Independentists	---	1
	<i>N° of voices: 9</i>	<i>N° of voices: 22</i>

**Table 2.** Voices in news reports

The first striking difference between the two reports lies in the number of people whose voices are incorporated. The fact that the article from EP contains twenty-four voices while LV presents only nine is highly noteworthy. If this finding is related to the ones in the previous section, we can conclude that the higher the number of instances of reported speech, the larger the number of external voices included. Again it seems that EP's profile turns its reporter more willing to draw onto others' voices than LV's.

Let us now look at whose voices we are dealing with to discover who gets quoted in each newspaper. We can see in Table 2 that there are six shared external sources (those marked in italics), i.e. six people or institutions whose voices are present in LV and EP in their account of the terrorist attack: the Interior Minister, the King, Al'Qa'ida, Batasuna, the Prime Minister J. M. Aznar and the government. There is a seventh shared source that we decided to call 'anonymous' (because although the comments are present the source they belong to is not indicated). Regarding anonymous sources we can assume that everything that is not attributed to someone else is the reporter's voice. Another possibility is identifying whose words are being included without mentioning who the original speaker was. In that case we should also analyse their content to see if they play any special role. In Table 2 we can also see which are the two voices that appear in LV but not in EP (Audiencia Nacional and the Ecuatorian president) as well as the other fifteen testimonies present in EP (ranging from Bush's to the Pope's) which are absent in LV.

Now that we have the gist of the intertextual structure of each article, let us analyse more thoroughly those aspects mentioned at the beginning of this section which can help us confirm our hypothesis.

We think it useful to focus on what we consider the main actors in a terrorist attack. In simple terms, when we think about bombing events first we usually think of its consequences, i.e. the damage caused: the number of victims and the destroyed property as well as how, when and where it happened (thus, we think of *experts* such as the police, doctors, etc.). Then we wonder who is to blame for the attack (the *perpetrators*) and finally we expect the *government's* reaction (because we tend to link terrorism to politics). Consequently, we would expect these three sources (experts, perpetrators and the

government) to be present in the account of the facts because they are the main actors we associate with our mental frame of terrorist attacks.

## 8. The experts' voice

Let us start with the experts to see whether they are given a voice to inform us of the disaster with accuracy. Both articles provide the reader with the exact number of casualties and injured people together with a thorough description of the event giving exact places and times. However, it is not until we reach the middle of the article in EP or in the very last paragraphs in LV that reporters mention the sources: *fuentes de la Audiencia Nacional y de la Delegación del Gobierno* in the latter (lines 98-108)<sup>3</sup> and *la policía* and *los expertos* (lines 91-99) in the former<sup>4</sup>. Not only do we find these sources in non-prominent places in the news report, but we also listen to their voices indirectly reported. What is more, in EP the experts' and police statements lead us to believe that it was Al Qa'ida (and not ETA) which was to be held responsible for the attack.

There are other two interesting passages in EP. In the first one, expressions apparently said by an expert appear in the form of scare quotes. Obviously, to say that there were 44 heridos 'en estado crítico' y otros 27 'muy graves' (line 37) entails accuracy and veracity. We wonder, however, if the common reader is able to tell the difference between being 'en estado crítico' or 'muy grave'. The second passage that caught our attention is one where we can listen to the shocking and moving exact words of a survivor and a nurse (lines 106-109). The visual and auditive images they depict: "miré atrás y era como estar en la guerra", "vi cadáveres con los móviles sonando, muchos jóvenes y niños..". make us feel as if we were there and, as van Dijk explains, "make the story more lively".

On the whole we consider that the experts' voices pervade both articles and the reporters draw on their descriptions, statements and explanations to write down their own account. In disasters like this, we believe, the reader assumes that what is written depicts the facts, i.e. readers do not need the reporter to explicitly say "this is what the police said" or "this is the explanation the bombing expert gave" because serious reporting generally report on what those kinds of sources state. However, it is interesting to notice how reporters play upon this 'common knowledge': at times official sources are backgrounded because it is unnecessary to mention them since it is presupposed that what is said springs from them.

Some other times, however, emphasis is put on the fact that certain piece of information comes from an expert so as to convince the reader that what the writer is saying is completely true. In such a game, intertextuality plays an important part and our findings reflect how the use of the different forms of reported speech are manipulated (especially by EP reporter) to convey not only a feeling of veracity and liveliness in his/her account but also a particular reading and interpretation as to whom the attack must be attributed to.

## **9. The terrorists' voice**

We have just analysed the experts' voices treatment in the account of the Spanish March 11 terrorist attack. They were considered first because we believe that experts are the ones in a position to inform us about what happened. We should recall, however, that in this attack two main hypotheses about who the perpetrators had been circulated: some facts indicated it had been ETA while others pointed to Al Qaeda. Thus, the next actors we should consider are the terrorists themselves in order to see if they are given a voice, be it to defend or inculpate themselves.

The two articles coincide in including the terrorists' words. In the case of Al Qaeda (the second most cited voice in both articles -see Table 2), even though both newspapers include their statements in important places (summaries and first paragraphs), the treatment they give is quite different. In LV we can read that Al Qaeda "se atribuye la masacre" y "reivindica los atentados" making reference to an e-mail sent to the British newspaper by the Islamic group but that is all we get of the terrorists' voice. The whole passage (where two instances of intertextuality can be found) conveys a feeling of vagueness due to the hypothetical expressions "habrían consumado" and "se especulaba incluso con la posibilidad". Such findings point to the fact that, according to LV, it was ETA (and not Al Qaeda) who was behind the attacks.

In EP, on the contrary, everything leads us to believe that the perpetrator of the attack was Al Qaeda. In paragraph three we can read the exact words the Islamic terrorist group sent to the British newspaper and how the hypothesis is supported by successive (anti-terrorists' and Interior Minister's) statements.

These results may lead us to think that if LV favours ETA's hypothesis, its article will enhance ETA's voice in the same way it silenced (through vagueness) Al Qaeda's. Surprisingly, when Batasuna (ETA's presumed political wing) appears in the news, not only does it condemn the attack but it also denies ETA's authorship. The strategy employed seems clear: the statements are (shortly and indirectly) quoted as if they had the least importance and they are found in the middle of a passage describing the destruction caused by the attack (lines 46-47). As we interpret it, the reporter writing for LV does not need to say that they support ETA's hypothesis: their strategy lies precisely in not pointing to ETA as the responsible for the attack.

Unlike LV, EP is more explicit. It presents Batasuna's voice (lines 179-182) towards the end of the article and makes it very clear that they think alike. That is, while all the people are debating whether it was ETA or Al Qaeda, Batasuna confirms that ETA is not to blame (thus, pointing to Al Qaeda). Like them, EP does not doubt about ETA's authorship because EP knows ETA was not behind the attack.

## 10. The government's voice

We will focus now on the third actor we consider essential in a report on a terrorist attack: the government. According to what scholars say about terrorism having political causes and goals and in the light of the political context of the Spanish terrorist attack, it is quite undeniable that the government's voice has a major say in the matter.

We have seen in Table 2 that the Interior Minister A. Acebes (and the Interior Ministry) are soundly convinced that it was ETA. However, while LV destroys all arguments that attempt against ETA's hypothesis, EP shows a more doubtful Acebes (in order to suggest it was Al Qa'ida). The writers achieve this through a witty argumentation pattern and the manipulation of reporting verbs and forms of reported speech employed (indirect speech, direct speech or scare quotes).

As regards argumentation, in LV the use of the discourse marker *pero* (line 4) is highly significant because it counterargues what has been said before emphasising what comes afterwards. In lines 22 to 26 there are no connectors after the long indirect speech reportage but the short line (another instance of indirect speech) at the end of the paragraph undermines the previous argument making it clear that there are no reasons to think that Al Qa'ida could be held responsible because, according to Acebes, "el texto no contenía ninguna amenaza". The reporting verbs 'se aseguró' and 'consideró sin titubeos' (lines 22 and 62) emphasise Acebes' words and give stronger support to ETA's hypothesis because they seem unchallengeable.

In EP Acebes' voice also blames ETA, but its deep conviction vanishes as the expressions "expresó algunas dudas", "admitió algunas dudas" and "tampoco confirmó" (lines 29, 55 and 57) used to contextualise his comments cast doubts here and there. In fact the whole passage (lines 44 to 58) reveal how Acebes is shown assertive but not very convincing at the same time as he confirms it was ETA but some hours later (as more evidence is gathered) he cannot be so sure any longer.

In the fifth paragraph it seems logical that EP reporter chose to represent Acebes's words through direct quoting. In this way, the text producer is detaching him/herself from what was said revealing that EP thinks the opposite. This can be contrasted with the use of indirect reported speech made by LV when reporting Acebes's words. We showed earlier how this form of reporting speech implied the merging of voices and this is what LV aims at so as to show that they also support ETA's hypothesis.

Before concluding this section about the government's voice let us recall that the terrorist attack took place three days before the Spanish general elections were held and though it was not certain whether the perpetrators had been Al Qa'ida or ETA, authorship was to play a decisive role in the election results. The reason for this was that if Al Qa'ida was to blame, the Popular Party (PP) would have been doomed to lose the elections because the attack would have been seen as a reprimand for Spain's participation in the war with Iraq. That is why the PP favoured ETA hypothesis while the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (PSOE) pointed to Al Qa'ida in order to persuade people to vote for them promising that they would withdraw the troops and would no longer support the war.

In this context we consider it relevant to consider other political voices present in the articles. The Prime Minister at the time of the attack, J. M. Aznar, is present once in each of the news reports and although he is expected to defend the PP (and its foreign policy) and hold ETA responsible for the attacks, we find that he does not mention this terrorist group. On the contrary, his words are general and include the terms ‘terrorists’ and ‘assassins’. Both newspapers emphasise the fact that he did not mention ETA at all in his speech (line 61 and 68 in LV and line 71 in EP). On the one hand, this fact suits EP (not mentioning ETA in a way supports Al Qa’ida’s hypothesis) and, on the other, helps LV to build their argument: they do not need to say it explicitly because it is all very clear, at least for them, that it was ETA the responsible for the attack. We suggest reading some lines further to see how the interplay of important voices in LV builds the argument in this way.

Other political voices can be found in the candidates for presidency for the PP, M. Rajoy and the PSOE, J. L. Rodríguez Zapatero. While both are absent in LV, we can hear their words in EP. The first time EP writer presents them together (line 6) (as if there were no rivalry between them) asking for the democrats’ unity in an attempt to scorn the terrorists’ intention to confront the Spanish people. Later, Zapatero’s words are quoted verbatim and when repeating his pledge he asks Spaniards to cast their vote “como reacción a ETA” (lines 142-45). It seems surprising that Zapatero himself attributes the massacre to ETA and not to Al Qa’ida (which would be beneficial for him in the elections), but it can be part of his strategy or the mere fact that it was not till March 13 that Al Qa’ida’s hypothesis gained weight. After Zapatero’s statement EP presents three more arguments supporting ETA’s hypothesis: Ibarretxe’s, Llamazares’ and Negroponte’s (lines 154-78), but they occupy unimportant positions in the article and they are quoted either directly or with scare quotes. This, we believe, indicates that the text producer is detaching him/herself from what is said because he/she does not agree with them.

On the whole, we have seen how political voices pervade both reports on the Spanish terrorist attack. The Interior Minister’s voice is not only the most cited one, but also the voice which is mainly used by reporters to build their own argument and persuade the reader that it was ETA or Al Qa’ida the terrorist group to be held responsible for the attack.

## 11. Other voices

So far we have analysed the intertextual treatment of those voices that in our belief were the most related to the terrorist attack. There remain others, however, that should also be mentioned due to their prominent sources. We refer to King Juan Carlos’s and the Pope’s words. The former is a salient voice that appears three times in both articles to strongly condemn the attack. The words taken from his speech are cited in the form of scare quotes or direct quoting in both newspapers as if to show that they completely agree with him and accept his words.

There is one last coincidence: according to EP, King Juan Carlos gave a speech “en el que no citó a la banda terrorista ETA” (line 146) while LV states that “tampoco el Rey la

citó” (line 62). Taking our previous findings into account, we see once again how this reinforces the intertextual pattern employed in each article. While LV is convinced that ETA is the responsible (and therefore, there is no need to mention it), EP implies that if the King does not mention ETA, it should be because it was Al Qa’ida.

The Pope’s testimony (in direct speech) only appears in EP (lines 168-72), a fact which also reinforces this newspaper social side and its willingness to include all those voices that have something to say about what is being reported.

## **12. Conclusion**

In this work we have analysed intertextuality in news reports in order to show how reporters include what others have said to suit their own purposes and suggest biased interpretations of the facts. Reported speech, the most common form of intertextuality, allows text producers to retell others’ words in different forms: indirect speech, direct speech or scare quotes. We have seen that these kinds of reportage have different (and at times opposing) functions because they may allow writers to detach themselves from what is said, support the quoted words or even merge them in as if they were their own. In the articles about the Spanish terrorist attack on March 11 we have analysed we found that intertextuality plays a major role in both in LV and EP and becomes a powerful tool at reporters’ disposal to make their texts more persuasive and lead readers towards biased readings.

Our findings showed that both articles contain a high amount of reported speech but they differ in the form of reported speech that prevails. The article in LV makes extensive use of indirect speech (which allows the original meaning to be reproduced according to the reporter’s intention) while in EP’s account many more instances of direct speech and scare quotes (with various functions) are found.

In both reports we can hear the voices of the three main actors of a terrorist attack: the experts, the government and the terrorists themselves. In all the cases we showed how these sources’ statements are incorporated and manipulated at the text producer’s will to convey particular interpretations. The writers’ pursued effect is achieved through a combination of the form of reported speech and reporting verb chosen together with the prominent or backgrounded place the voices are assigned.

Finally, the argument pattern also plays an important role and helps writers to work on others’ statements and fulfil their aims. In this way both newspapers, drawing mainly on the same external voices, succeed in building two different arguments: while LV puts the blame of the bombing on ETA, EP holds that Al Qa’ida is behind the attack. This suggests that reporting is not always as factual as it seems and that, at least in the context of the articles we dealt with (where general elections were three days ahead), political ideologies play a very important role because, ultimately, they are ‘expressed’ through words. That is why it would be interesting to analyse ideologies in depth and contrast newspapers with marked political orientations so as to see if our findings still hold true.



### Notes

1. This quote was taken from *The New York Times* July 16, 1985 in Paletz et al. (1992: 123).
2. When we use *speech* we refer mainly to somebody's actual words (but it can occasionally point to somebody's writing or thought) as suggested by Fairclough (2003).
3. All the lines and paragraphs mentioned either on LV or EP can be consulted in the appendix, which contains the articles in text format. Here all instances of reported speech are underlined and direct speech as well as scare quotes are highlighted in bold letters so as to have a visual image of the use of intertextuality in each article.
4. In both articles the Interior Minister's voice also gives many details of the facts. However, we consider his a political rather than an expert source because we assume that he is simply transmitting what experts have informed him of.

### References

- Bazerman, Charles (2004): "Intertextuality: 'How texts rely on other texts'". In P. Prior and C. Bazerman, eds., *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 83-96
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1986): "The problem of speech genres". In: *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 60-102
- Bengoechea, Mercedes and Ricardo J. Sola (1997): *Intertextuality/Intertextualidad*. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá.
- De Beaugrande, Robert and Wolfgang Dressler (1981): *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*. Tübingen Max Niemeyer.
- Fairclough, Norman (1992): *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2003): *Analysing discourse. Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel (1992): *Genealogía del racismo*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Piqueta.
- Graham, Allen (2000): *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Kristeva, Julia (1986): "Word, dialogue and novel". In: T. Moi, ed., *The Kristeva Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 24-33.
- Meinhof, Ulrike and Jonathan Smith (eds.)(2000): *Intertextuality and the Media. From Genre to Everyday Life*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Morawski, Stefan (1970): "The Basic Functions of Quotations". In: A. Greimas, ed., *Sign. Language. Culture*. The Hague: Mouton, 690-705.
- Plett, Heinrich (1991): *Intertextuality*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1990): *La noticia como discurso. Comprensión, estructura y producción de la información*. London: Routledge.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1991): *Racism and the press*. Barcelona: Paidós Comunicación.

### References on terrorism and the media

- Aulestia, Kepa (2005): *Historia General del terrorismo*. Madrid: Aguilar.
- Nacos, Brigitte (1994): *Terrorism and the media. From the Iran hostage crisis to the World Trade Center bombing*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Norris, Pippa et al. (eds.)(2003): *Framing Terrorism. The News Media, the Government, and the Public*. New York: Routledge.

Paletz, David and Alex Schmid(eds.)(1992): *Terrorism and the Media*. Newbury Park. California: Sage.

Rodrigo Alsina, Miguel (1991): *Los medios de comunicación ante el terrorismo*. Barcelona: Icaria.

Soria, C. (ed.)(1987): *Prensa, Paz, violencia y terrorismo. La crisis de credibilidad de los informadores*. Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra.

## APPENDIX

### ARTICLES FROM LA VANGUARDIA AND EL PAIS (TEXT FORMAT)

#### LA VANGUARDIA, viernes 12 de marzo de 2004

#### 1 11-M en Madrid

- 2 ● Casi 200 muertos y 1.400 heridos en la mayor matanza terrorista de Europa
- 3 ● Cuatro trenes de cercanías abarrotados estallan a primera hora de la mañana
- 4 ● Al Qaeda se atribuye la masacre pero Interior sigue señalando a ETA
- 5 ● La campaña electoral se cierra dos días antes en señal de duelo

#### 6 Matanza terrorista en Madrid

- 7 ● Diez explosiones en cuatro trenes provocan 192 muertos y un total de 1.430
- 8 heridos

- 9 ● Aunque Interior sospecha de ETA, un grupo islamista reivindica los atentados

- 10 ● Los atentados fueron planificados para causar el mayor número de víctimas

11 Los terroristas colocaron las mochilas con explosivos en cuatro trenes de  
 12 cercanías que cubrían el trayecto entre Guadalajara y Atocha. Las explosiones se iniciaron  
 13 cuando el primero de los cuatro trenes alcanzó el andén de la principal estación ferroviaria de todo  
 14 el país y se sucedieron en solo 5 minutos.

15 IGNACIO DE OROVIO LUIS IZQUIERDO

- 16 1. MADRID. –Un miércoles convertido en domingo. Madrid vacío, sólo roto por decenas de sirenas de  
 17 ambulancia, con un aire de apocalipsis. Un balance de 192 muertos y 1.430 heridos al cierre de esta edición.  
 18 El terrorismo superó ayer todos sus techos de barbarie en España, con diez bombas que explotaron  
 19 sincronizadamente en cuatro trenes de cercanías de Renfe, a primera hora de la mañana, en tres puntos de la  
 20 ciudad (otras dos fueron explosionadas por los artificieros). Es la mayor matanza producida en España y el  
 21 segundo mayor atentado que ha habido nunca en Europa, tras el de Lockerbie (Escocia). Aunque durante todo

22 el día se aseguró desde Interior que ETA era la responsable del atentado, el titular de ese departamento, Ángel  
 23 Acebes, desvelaba anoche que en la tarde de ayer era localizada en Alcalá de Henares una furgoneta con  
 24 temporizadores para explosivos y una cinta con la grabación de versículos de enseñanza del Corán en árabe,  
 25 lo que hizo a Interior “no descartar” ninguna línea de investigación, incluido el terrorismo islámico. El texto no  
 26 contenía ninguna amenaza, según Acebes.

27 1. Conforme avanzaba la noche, la hipótesis de Al Qaeda ganaba peso. Un diario en árabe editado en Londres,  
 28 “Al-Quds al arabi” dijo anoche haber recibido un e-mail de dicha organización terrorista en la que definía la  
 29 masacre de ayer –bautizada como “Operación trenes de la muerte”– como un “ajuste de cuentas” con

30 2. España por ser aliado de Estados Unidos en su guerra en Iraq y que habrían consumado las Brigadas de Abu Hafs  
 31 al-Masri en nombre de Al Qaeda. A última hora se especulaba incluso con la posibilidad de que en algún

32 4. atentado hubiese participado un suicida. De hecho, tras la explosión en Pozo apareció un tórax, sin extremidades,  
 33 en cuya identificación se trabaja. Las pruebas de ADN y las identificaciones serán determinantes para saber si era  
 34 un suicida. De hecho, Interior ha pedido la colaboración de expertos israelíes en la identificación de cadáveres  
 35 víctimas de atentados terroristas.

36 5. Define el horror causado ayer el vacío de la ciudad al mediodía, cuando los madrileños parecieron refugiarse en  
 37 casa. A las dos de la tarde, una pareja de unos cuarenta años caminaba abrazada, llorando, por una acera cerca  
 38 del tren que explotó a un kilómetro de la estación de Atocha. Pero nadie se extrañaba y eso explica también el horror  
 39 que ayer vivió Madrid. El atentado dinamita casi doscientas vidas

40 IDENTIFICACIÓN DE UN TORSO *La policía investiga si un torso humano que apareció en una de las*  
 41 *explosiones es de un suicida*

42 APOYO REAL *Don Juan Carlos se dirigió anoche al país para apoyar a las familias de las*  
 43 *víctimas*

44 y cientos de familias, cuatro trenes, una ciudad, las bolsas y mercados europeos, la campaña electoral –que  
 45 se dio por concluida dos antes de lo previsto– y las elecciones del domingo. Los primeros comicios generales  
 46 sin Batasuna, el brazo político de ETA. Varios de sus dirigentes condenaron, por cierto, ayer el atentado. Su  
 47 líder, Arnaldo Otegi, negó además la autoría de ETA.

48 6. Sólo un par de atisbos de luz en la jornada, bautizada ya como 11-M y señalada por la UE como día  
 49 internacional contra el terrorismo: la solidaridad generosa de miles de madrileños y españoles y la condena  
 50 unánime del planeta. Desde uniones ciclistas de barrio hasta los gobiernos de Estados Unidos, los de toda  
 51 Europa, Bolivia, Colombia o Argelia. Telegramas de solidaridad llegaron de todos los rincones y gobiernos de  
 52 la Tierra.

53 7. El Rey se dirigió anoche al país para mostrar su apoyo a las familias de las víctimas y su “repulsa” y su  
 54 “enérgica condena” por la acción, que causó lo que definió como un “escenario de pesadilla” y afectó a  
 55 personas de toda edad y condición. El Monarca dijo que “siempre estaremos con vosotros”.

- 56 8. La magnitud de la masacre, cuando se considera a ETA como un enfermo moribundo, hizo pensar desde la  
57 mañana que no era ella la autora del atentado. Que tal latigazo no podía ser el estertor de quien agoniza. Que  
58 tenía que ser alguien más fuerte, más capaz de perpetrar una acción tan coordinada e indiscriminada. Toda  
59 la mañana circuló el rumor de que la acción venía firmada por Al Qaeda o algún grupo próximo. Incluso se  
60 especuló con que Interior hubiese recibido la llamada de un grupo islámico asumiendo la acción.
- 61 9. El presidente del Gobierno, José María Aznar, ofreció una declaración institucional al mediodía en que no citó  
62 ni una vez a ETA como posible autora de la matanza. Tampoco el Rey la citó. Acebes sí consideró sin titubeos  
63 que ETA es la causante. Anoche abrió la posibilidad de que fuese terrorismo islámico.
- 64 10. Diez de los artefactos, además, estaban compuestos por unos ocho kilogramos de explosivo. En concreto,  
65 dinamita titadyne y dinamita comprimida de la que también emplea ETA. Los otros dos artefactos contenían  
66 entre once y doce kilos. Así, los terroristas emplearon en total cerca de cien kilos de dinamita.
- 67 11. Otro indicio que sustentaba la tesis de que fue ETA la responsable es que el 24 de diciembre fueron detenidos  
68 SIN REFERENCIAS A ETA *Ni el Rey ni Aznar, aunque sí Acebes, citan a ETA como*  
69 *responsable*
- 70 FURGONETA SOSPECHOSA *La policía detecta un vehículo con detonadores y una cinta en*  
71 *árabe*
- 72 en San Sebastián dos presuntos terroristas con mochilas cargadas de explosivos que pretendían hacer detonar  
73 en la estación también madrileña de Chamartín.
- 74 12. A última hora de ayer, Interior atribuía la acción a nueve personas, seis hombres y tres mujeres, de  
75 entre 24 y 25 años todos ellos. Éstos al parecer habían sido identificados –incluso con fotografías, según  
76 fuentes de Interior– como los terroristas que a primera hora de ayer subieron a los distintos trenes en la estación  
77 de Alcalá de Henares los doce paquetes mortales.
- 78 13. Éstos fueron supuestamente colocados en las papeleras de los vagones. Los cuatro trenes en que explotaron  
79 bombas tienen como punto en común la estación de Alcalá de Henares, donde fue además localizada la  
80 furgoneta. Por ello, la policía considera que los artefactos fueron subidos a los trenes en las paradas, de unos  
81 dos minutos, que se hacen para subir y bajar pasaje.
- 82 14. Esta línea férrea cubre el llamado “corredor del Henares”, a lo largo del cual viven básicamente trabajadores  
83 y personas de extracción humilde. En muchos de los barrios atravesados por estas líneas habita población  
84 inmigrante. Muchos de los heridos son ecuatorianos. El Gobierno de Ecuador convocó a media tarde de ayer  
85 a un minuto de silencio en memoria de las víctimas, entre las que hay nacionales de ese país sudamericano,  
86 que son la primera colonia extranjera en Madrid.
- 87 15. Los artefactos estaban preparados para explotar de manera simultánea hacia las 7.35 horas de la mañana, con  
88 diferencias de entre tres y cuatro minutos. El primero reventó en Atocha.

- 89 16. Dos de ellos explotaron en la estación de Santa Eugenia, donde causaron in situ 15 muertos y alrededor de 25  
90 heridos, cinco de ellos graves. En la estación de El Pozo del Tío Raimundo explotó una bomba a bordo de un  
91 tren y otra fue localizada en las vías, entre el convoy y los raíles. Murieron 69 personas y más de 150 quedaron  
92 heridas, muchas de ellas graves.
- 93 17. La secuencia con más bombas se dio en el convoy 192 de Renfe, a bordo del cual hubo cuatro explosiones  
94 cerca de Atocha, a la altura de la calle Téllez. La primera se produjo en la cabecera del tren, de seis vagones,  
95 y segundos después, en secuencias, se registraron otras tres explosiones. Las de los coches quinto y sexto los  
96 destrozaron y causaron un espectáculo dantesco, con cuerpos mutilados y expulsados de los vagones. Hubo  
97 59 muertos y decenas de heridos. Otra bomba no estalló. En Atocha hubo 30 muertos y numerosos heridos.  
98 Fuentes de la Audiencia Nacional señalaron que la intención de los terroristas era volar la estación de Atocha  
99 –la sede madrileña del AVE–, ya que el convoy que voló a la altura de la calle Téllez llegaba con dos minutos  
100 de retraso.
- 101 18. Dos jueces de la Audiencia Nacional, Ismael Moreno y Juan del Olmo, fueron los encargados del levantamiento  
102 de los cadáveres. Ambos jueces visitaron el pabellón de Ifema habilitado como tanatorio. Unos 70 forenses  
103 colaboraban en la identificación de los cuerpos. Éstas eran de gran complejidad ya que debe comprobarse el  
104 ADN en algunos casos, según las mismas fuentes.
- 105 19. En la dantesca tarea de evacuación de los cadáveres y heridos participaron cientos de personas. Fuentes de  
106 la Delegación del Gobierno detallaron que participaron 1.329 personas de servicios sanitarios, 215 bomberos,  
107 150 miembros o voluntarios de la Cruz Roja con equipos de Catalunya, Castilla, Andalucía, Navarra o  
108 Extremadura.

### El País, viernes 12 de marzo de 2004

1 Infierno terrorista en Madrid: 192 muertos y 1.400 heridos

2 Interior investiga la pista de Al Qaeda sin descartar a ETA

3 ● Diez explosiones en cuatro trenes de cercanías siembran el terror \_

4 ● La policía encuentra detonadores y una cinta con versos del Corán en Alcalá El Rey expresa su  
5 “repulsa e indignación”

6 ● Rajoy y Zapatero piden la unidad de los demócratas

7 ● Los partidos suspenden la campaña electoral y se suman a las manifestaciones convocadas hoy  
8 en toda España

9 Cuatro atentados terroristas sincronizados, en los que estallaron 10 de los 13 artefactos explosivos  
 10 colocados, causaron ayer una matanza en los trenes de cercanías de Madrid. Al menos 190 personas  
 11 fallecieron y más de 1.400 resultaron heridas en el mayor ataque terrorista en la historia de España y uno  
 12 de los más sangrientos de Europa. Las bombas estallaron pasadas las 7.30 en la estación de Atocha y en  
 13 sus cercanías, en la de Santa Eugenia y en el apeadero del Pozo del Tío Raimundo cuando decenas de  
 14 miles de ciudadanos se dirigían a su trabajo. El Ministerio del Interior informó de que su principal línea de  
 15 investigación es ETA, pero no descartó la pista de Al Qaeda tras el hallazgo en Alcalá de una cinta con  
 16 versos del Corán y detonadores en una furgoneta robada.

## 18 Cuatro atentados simultáneos causan una matanza en trenes de 19 Madrid

20 Al menos 192 muertos y más de 1.400 heridos en el peor ataque terrorista sufrido en España  
 21 Interior atribuyó a ETA la masacre aunque después no descartó que pudiera ser

### 22 Al Qaeda

23 JOSÉ MANUEL ROMERO,

- 24 1. Madrid Cuatro atentados simultáneos perpetrados en otros tantos trenes de cercanías que se dirigían ayer  
 25 desde Alcalá de Henares, un municipio de la periferia de Madrid, hasta Atocha, en el centro de la capital,  
 26 dejaron al menos 192 muertos y más de 1.400 heridos. Los terroristas habían colocado 13 bombas en los trenes  
 27 con más de 100 kilos de explosivo. Diez de los artefactos explotaron entre las 7.35 y las 7.45 dejando un  
 28 reguero de muerte en la línea ferroviaria. El Gobierno barajó desde el mediodía la hipótesis de que el atentado  
 29 había sido obra de ETA. A las siete de la tarde, el ministro del Interior, Ángel Acebes, expresó algunas dudas  
 30 tras revelar que habían encontrado en Alcalá de Henares una furgoneta robada con detonadores y cintas con  
 31 versículos del Corán. Sólo unos minutos después, el diario árabe Al Quds Al Arabi comunicó que había recibido  
 32 una carta en la que Al Qaeda reivindicaba el atentado
- 33 2. Los terroristas asesinaron ayer en Madrid al menos a 192 personas e hirieron a más de 1.400, al hacer explotar  
 34 diez de las 13 bombas que ocultaron en mochilas y bolsas de plástico, con entre ocho y 12 kilos de dinamita  
 35 cada una, y colocaron en cuatro trenes de cercanías que cubrían el trayecto entre Alcalá de Henares, municipio  
 36 situado en el sureste de la región, y la estación de Atocha, en el centro de la capital. En los hospitales había  
 37 anoche 44 heridos “en estado crítico” y otros 27 “muy graves”.
- 38 3. La organización terrorista Al Qaeda reivindicó el atentado a través de una carta enviada ayer al diario árabe con  
 39 sede en Londres Al Quds Al Arabi, órgano habitual de los comunicados de Al Qaeda. “Hemos logrado  
 40 infiltrarnos en el corazón de Europa de las cruzadas, y golpear una de las bases de la alianza de las

- 41 cruzadas”, señalaba la misiva firmada por las Brigadas Abu Hafs Al Masri, que anteriormente habían  
42 reivindicado los atentados contra las sinagogas de Turquía y el perpetrado contra la ONU en agosto en Bagdad.  
43 El grupo terrorista denominó a la operación “los trenes de la muerte”.
- 44 4. Desde primeras horas de la mañana, fuentes de la lucha antiterrorista en España consideraban que el atentado  
45 no era “del estilo” de los cometidos por ETA y que tenía que haber sido planificado durante al menos un mes  
46 por un grupo de entre 12 y 30 terroristas. Interior ha mantenido hasta ahora que la infraestructura de ETA en  
47 Madrid era mínima. Además, los criminales no avisaron previamente de sus intenciones mortales, como hace  
48 habitualmente ETA en sus atentados
- 49 5. Pese a todas esas evidencias, el ministro del Interior, Ángel Acebes, despejó las dudas en una conferencia de  
50 prensa convocada a las 13.00: “ETA ha conseguido su objetivo. El Gobierno no tiene ninguna duda de  
51 que ETA esta detrás”. Y añadió: “Es absolutamente intolerable cualquier tipo de intoxicación que vaya  
52 dirigida a desviar el objetivo y los responsables de esta tragedia”, en referencia a las informaciones que  
53 apuntaban a grupos islámicos como autores del atentado.
- 54 6. Sólo siete horas después de esa declaración, el ministro volvió a comparecer ante los medios de comunicación  
55 y entonces admitió algunas dudas tras explicar que la policía había encontrado una furgoneta en Alcalá de  
56 Henares robada en Madrid el 28 de febrero pasado con siete detonadores “y cintas con versículos del  
57 Corán”. El hallazgo del vehículo se había producido a las doce del mediodía. Acebes tampoco confirmó por  
58 la tarde que la dinamita era del tipo usado habitualmente por ETA, como se había informado por la mañana
- 59 7. Todos los partidos políticos suspendieron la campaña electoral como consecuencia de la masacre en Madrid.  
60 El Gobierno del PP acordó con el PSOE convocar a los ciudadanos a una manifestación que tendrá lugar hoy  
61 a las siete de la tarde en toda España bajo el lema *Con las víctimas, con la Constitución, por la derrota del  
62 terrorismo*. En diversos puntos del país se improvisaron concentraciones de condena al atentado. El Rey Juan  
63 Carlos suspendió todos sus actos y visitó a los heridos en los hospitales y a las familias de los muertos. El  
64 Ayuntamiento de Madrid y el Gobierno central decretaron tres días de luto oficial. Todas las comunidades se  
65 sumaron ayer a la convocatoria. Y miles de madrileños se lanzaron a la calle para auxiliar a los afectados por  
66 el atentado y formaron larguísimas colas para donar su sangre con destino a las personas ingresadas en los  
67 hospitales.
- 68 8. El presidente del Gobierno, José María Aznar, compareció ante los periodistas al mediodía tras reunir a su  
69 gabinete de crisis y leyó una declaración institucional: “El 11 de marzo ocupa ya su (Pasa a la página  
70 siguiente) lugar en la historia de la infamia. No hay negociación posible ni deseable con estos asesinos.  
71 No debemos aspirar a nada que no sea la derrota total del terrorismo”. En ningún momento empleó la  
72 palabra ETA.
- 73 9. Al menos nueve terroristas, según las primeras investigaciones del Ministerio del Interior, perpetraron la  
74 matanza indiscriminada de ayer al hacer explotar las bombas entre las 7.35 y las 7.45 de la mañana. Para su

75 acción criminal eligieron uno de los momentos del día en el que los trenes van más cargados de viajeros, hasta  
76 el punto de que muchos vagones rebasan a esas horas su ocupación máxima. Los terroristas fijaron como  
77 objetivo de su matanza un corredor ferroviario —el correspondiente a la línea C-2 entre Guadalajara y Madrid—  
78 utilizado mayoritariamente por trabajadores, muchos de ellos inmigrantes, y universitarios. Interior llegó a  
79 distribuir ayer a media tarde las fotos de nueve supuestos autores de la matanza, todos ellos de ETA.

80 10. Esos terroristas, según la primera hipótesis policial, habrían subido a los cuatro trenes de cercanías para  
81 colocar los explosivos, que iban escondidos en bolsas de plástico y mochilas, y se bajaron antes de que las  
82 máquinas arrancaran desde Alcalá de Henares con destino a la estación de Atocha, en Madrid

### 83 Una línea muy utilizada

84 11. Los cuatro trenes partieron de Alcalá entre las 7.00 (dos de ellos, que deberían llegar a la vez a Atocha) y las  
85 7.15. El temporizador de cada bomba había sido activado para que la explosión se produjera apenas 35  
86 minutos después de colocados los artefactos dentro de cada tren.

87 12. La línea ferroviaria donde atentaron ayer los terroristas es utilizada diariamente por 216.000 pasajeros que  
88 residen mayoritariamente en barrios obreros. En cada convoy viajan en las horas de más afluencia hasta 700  
89 personas, a razón de 100 viajeros por cada vagón. Las explosiones afectaron a dos o tres vagones de cada  
90 convoy. La frecuencia de paso de los trenes en las primeras horas de la mañana es inferior a los tres minutos.

91 13. Entre los argumentos de la policía para atribuir el atentado a ETA figuraba el hecho de que esta organización  
92 terrorista proyectaba desde hace meses un gran atentado en Madrid. Primero lo intentó mediante la colocación  
93 de dos mochilas con 25 kilos de dinamita en el tren Intercity que salía de Irún el día de Nochebuena de 2003  
94 a las 8.15 para llegar a la estación de Chamartín a las 15.25, donde debía explotar el artefacto sólo 30 minutos  
95 después. La policía impidió entonces la matanza, al detener a los dos terroristas que habían preparado el  
96 crimen y desactivar una de las mochilas-bomba que ya había sido colocada en el tren.

97 14. La Guardia Civil evitó más atentados en Madrid cuando interceptó el 29 de febrero pasado en Cañaveras  
98 (Cuenca) a otros dos etarras que trasladaban a la capital más de 500 kilos de explosivo en una furgoneta.

99 15. En ambos casos, sólo dos terroristas prepararon los atentados. En el ayer, hacían falta entre 12 y 30, según  
100 los expertos.

101 16. La masacre de los trenes se convirtió en el atentado más sangriento en la historia de España y uno de los  
102 mayores de Europa. La matanza de ayer equivale en víctimas a los asesinatos de ETA de los últimos 15 años.  
103 La banda terrorista había asesinado desde 1968 hasta ayer a 817 personas.

104 17. La secuencia mortal arrancó a las 7.40 en la estación de Atocha cuando hicieron explosión las tres bombas que  
105 los terroristas habían colocado en el tren estacionado en ese punto y que procedía de Alcalá de Henares. **Miré**  
106 **atrás y era como estar en la guerra**", señaló uno de los supervivientes que viajaban en el convoy. Una  
107 enfermera que acudió en auxilio de las víctimas resumió así su impotencia: "Ví cadáveres con los móviles



- 108 sonando, muchos jóvenes y niños...”. Los servicios sanitarios rescataron del amasijo de hierros a 34  
109 personas sin vida.
- 110 Ochenta forenses trabajaban desde primeras horas de la tarde de ayer en la identificación  
111 de los muertos, algunos de los cuales necesitarán de pruebas de ADN para precisar su identidad
- 112 18. A sólo 500 metros de ese lugar, en otro tren con el mismo destino que circulaba junto a la calle de Téllez, una  
113 zona residencial del distrito de Retiro, explotaron cuatro bombas dentro de las vagones que causaron 64  
114 muertos y escenas dantescas en la vía, donde numerosos viajeros se prestaban auxilio mutuo rodeados de  
115 cadáveres.
- 116 19. El reguero mortal continuó por la estación de Pozo-Entrevias, a poco más de 1.000 metros de la calle de  
117 Téllez, junto a uno de los barrios más humildes de Madrid. Aquí se produjo el atentado más sangriento de la  
118 mañana, con al menos 67 cadáveres. Dos bombas destrozaron el tren que en ese momento circulaba por el  
119 lugar.
- 120 20. A sólo unos cientos de metros, en la estación de Santa Eugenia, los criminales atacaron a un cuarto tren con  
121 otra bomba que causó 16 víctimas mortales. Otros nueve viajeros recuperados con vida en los distintos trenes  
122 murieron en el hospital.
- 123 21. Los 192 cadáveres que dejaron los atentados simultáneos en la línea C-2 fueron trasladados al pabellón  
124 número 8 de los recintos feriales de Madrid, situado en el Campo de las Naciones, un espacio de parques y  
125 edificios de oficinas junto a la carretera de Barcelona. Allí, la esperanza dejó paso al desaliento en cientos de  
126 familiares que acudieron en busca de los suyos.
- 127 22. Ochenta forenses de la administración de Justicia trabajaron en la identificación de los muertos, algunos de los  
128 cuales necesitarán la práctica de pruebas de ADN para precisar su identidad.
- 129 23. La Audiencia Nacional, encargada de la investigación de los hechos, activó el protocolo de grandes catástrofes  
130 que permite evitar la realización de las autop- (Pasa a la página siguiente) sias, preceptivas en toda muerte  
131 violenta, cuando las causas del fallecimiento son evidentes. De los 192 cadáveres trasladados al pabellón 6  
132 de los recintos feriales, sólo habían sido identificados 40 hasta las 19.00 de ayer.
- 133 24. Todos los partidos políticos condenaron el atentado. El secretario general del PP y candidato a presidente,  
134 Mariano Rajoy, consideró “acabada la campaña electoral” como consecuencia del asesinato masivo  
135 perpetrado por los terroristas y reclamó la unidad de todos los partidos: “Es el momento de dejar de lado  
136 todas las diferencias y unir las voluntades de todos los españoles”
- 137 25. Su principal adversario
- 138 El rey Juan Carlos apeló “a la unidad, la firmeza y la serenidad para defender la convivencia  
139 pacífica y democrática que garantiza la Constitución, por encima de las diferencias”  
140 electoral, el socialista José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero, coincidió en esta idea: “Pido a los españoles serenidad y  
141 unidad porque los asesinos quieren que perdamos la calma y enfrentarnos entre nosotros. Yo pediría a todos

- 142 los ciudadanos que el próximo domingo, como reacción a ETA, hubiera una masiva participación en las  
 143 urnas”
- 144 26. El Rey Don Juan Carlos apeló en su discurso televisado, en el que no citó a la banda terrorista ETA, a la  
 145 “unidad, la firmeza y la serenidad” de todos los españoles para “que defiendan la convivencia pacífica  
 146 y democrática que garantiza la Constitución, por encima de las legítimas diferencias de opinión”
- 147 27. En su declaración, el monarca señaló: “La barbarie terrorista ha sumido a España en el más profundo  
 148 dolor, repulsa e indignación. Hombres, mujeres y niños, ciudadanos libres de todas las edades y  
 149 ocupaciones, incluso de otros países, que se acercaban a sus destinos, escuelas y trabajos, se han  
 150 encontrado brutalmente confrontados con la muerte y el sufrimiento. En estos trágicos momentos,  
 151 quiero hacer llegar a las familias de las víctimas mi más profundo afecto y el de toda mi familia”
- 152 28. El lehendakari Juan José Ibarretxe consideró por su parte que los terroristas “están escribiendo su final, sus  
 153 últimas páginas tristes y desgraciadas”. Ibarretxe pidió por la mañana que no se utilice la violencia de ETA  
 154 con fines partidistas. Su Gobierno decidió retirar del orden del día del pleno que celebrará el Parlamento vasco  
 155 el próximo 15 de marzo la discusión del *plan Ibarretxe*. Ese día estaba previsto el debate y votación de las  
 156 enmiendas a la totalidad presentadas contra el plan por PP, PSE y Sozialista Abertzaleak, antes Batasuna, el  
 157 grupo parlamentario que nunca condena los atentados de ETA.
- 158 29. El presidente de Estados Unidos, George W. Bush, trasladó a José María Aznar su condena “en los términos  
 159 más enérgicos” del “horrible atentado” ocurrido en Madrid. El secretario de Estado estadounidense, Colin  
 160 Powell, ofreció al Gobierno español ayuda para encontrar a los responsables de la masacre.
- 161 30. Gaspar Llamazares, coordinador general de IU, reclamó “una imagen común de unidad de todos los  
 162 partidos ante la barbarie nazi que hoy ha cometido ETA”
- 163 31. El líder de Esquerra Republicana de Cataluña, Josep Lluís Carod Rovira, opinó que “no hay ni una sola idea  
 164 política que se pueda defender con la violencia”
- 165 32. Los obispos también comunicaron su rechazo ante el atentado y expresaron que no es moralmente posible el  
 166 trato político con ETA. El Papa también condenó el atentado a través de un telegrama firmado en su nombre  
 167 por el secretario de Estado vaticano, cardenal Angelo Sodano. “Al conocer la triste noticia de los execrables  
 168 atentados, que han causado tantos muertos y numerosísimos heridos, el Santo Padre reitera su firme  
 169 reprobación de tales injustificables actos que violan el fundamental derecho a la vida y socavan la  
 170 pacífica convivencia”.
- 171 Pronunciamiento de la ONU
- 172 33. El Consejo de Seguridad de la ONU, en una iniciativa poco habitual, condenó ayer a ETA por considerarla  
 173 responsable, como el Gobierno español, de los atentados de Madrid. John Negroponte, embajador de Estados  
 174 Unidos ante la ONU, señaló: “Estamos satisfechos de que el Consejo haya actuado tan rápidamente. El

- 175            **Gobierno español considera que la acción tiene el sello de ETA porque habían tenido otras amenazas**  
176            **en las últimas semanas”**
- 177        34. Sólo los portavoces de Batasuna, la formación ilegalizada por su vinculación a la banda terrorista, dudaron  
178            desde primera hora de la mañana de que los autores de la colocación de las bombas pertenecieran a ETA. Los  
179            dirigentes independentistas expresaron su “mas absoluto rechazo” por el asesinato y aclararon que no  
180            contemplaban “la más mínima posibilidad” de que ETA hubiera cometido el atentado
- 181        35. Los atentados de ayer desencadenaron una ola de solidaridad por toda la capital que alcanzó desde los  
182            ciudadanos que residen cerca del lugar de los atentados, que se echaron a la calle para auxiliar a los heridos,  
183            hasta a los madrileños que formaron inmensas colas para donar sangre en las seis unidades de urgencia  
184            repartidas por la ciudad.
- 185        36. La sanidad madrileña puso todos los medios de que disponía para hacer frente a la emergencia. No sólo hubo  
186            que atender a los más de 1.400 heridos sino a miles de personas que, angustiadas, acudieron a las puertas de  
187            los hospitales en busca de las víctimas. Todos los hospitales públicos suspendieron las intervenciones  
188            quirúrgicas programadas para dejar libres los quirófanos ante la avalancha de heridos.
- 189        37. La jornada de hoy estará marcada por las secuelas del atentado. La Conferencia de Rectores de las univer-  
190            sidades públicas de Madrid decidieron ayer suspender las actividades docentes de hoy y de mañana. La  
191            Comunidad de Madrid, sin embargo, mantiene la actividad en los colegios e institutos.