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Marte Fevang Smith describes when she first saw Behring Breivik “I look up and I see him standing there, 5-6 meters away, on the campground. He looks around, looks to the side, looks toward me, he says “where the hell is he.” He walks toward us. He begins shooting at us, one by one.”

“He says “have you seen him? I'm from the police. The perpetrator is still free. We have a rescue boat, come with me” Several walk toward him. “Can you prove that you are from the police?” That's when he begins to shoot.”

“Then I was shoot in the hands, jaw and chest. That is when I realized he was standing over us. I get up and run.” - Ina Lidbak

“He shouted 'yes', 'hooray' and 'bull’s-eye', when he shot people” - Tonje Brenna

One of the survivors on Utøya describes the scenario: "The floor became a pool of blood. I laid in it. In the beginning the blood was warm. After a while it became cool. I was very cold."

Another one tells: “I pulled the bullet out of my leg, threw it on the ground and continued running.”

“Look at the sky, look up at the sky” - A girl tells in court about how she tried to distract another girl from seeing the dead bodies which lay strewn.

---

3 Østli, Kjetil. “”Nei, vi går ikke fra han”.” Aftenposten, 05 19, 2012.
5 Østli, Kjetil. “”Nei, vi går ikke fra han”.” Aftenposten, 05 19, 2012.
6 Ibid.
7 Østli, Kjetil. “”Nei, vi går ikke fra han”.” Aftenposten, 05 19, 2012.
Introduction

On July 22nd, 2011 Anders Behring Breivik's terrorist attacks in Oslo and Utøya shocked the entire Norwegian nation as well as the international community. Behring Breivik placed and detonated a bomb in the governmental quarter in Oslo then attacked the Labor Party youth camp on the Utøya island. The attacks on July 22nd killed 77 people and left several hundred injured. These attacks were the first terrorist acts on Norwegian soil since the German occupation during World War II.

The attacks came as a shock both in Norwegian society as well as other countries throughout the world since they were unexpected in what was considered a peaceful 'model' society. Media both in Norway and in countries abroad asked the question 'how could this happen here?' Norway is known internationally as a small, wealthy and peaceful Scandinavian country. In a study conducted for the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Innovation Norway, in 2008 Norway's reputation internationally was described using the following characteristics; “beautiful and versatile nature, energy resources and technology, high standard of living, egalitarian welfare society, ethical, non-corrupt and likable.” In addition, Norway is recognized for its work for human rights and peace. Further, it is well known for its wealth from petroleum reserves which is used to ensure a high standard of living for its citizens. In 2011, Norway was the highest ranking country on the United Nation's human development index. Until July 22nd, 2011 these were the characteristics Norway had been associated with.

Theodor Enerstvedt (2012), professor in sociology at the University of Oslo, has examined and analyzed Behring Breivik's manifesto. Enerstvedt directs criticism toward

8 See Figure 1 and Figure 2 in Appendix
the society for failing to be reflective about why these attacks took place in Norway. He argues that unless the Norwegian society is self-critical in order to reveal its responsibility for the attacks, it will miss an important lesson. He believes that if the society fails to conduct such self-examination, there is a real possibility that a similar event will take place in the future. Therefore the topic for this thesis is to examine how aspects of Norwegian society may have contributed to the development of extreme right-wing and fascist ideology which resulted in Anders Behring Breivik's attacks in Oslo and on Utøya on July 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2011.

In this thesis, I will be analyzing possible explanations of why Behring Breivik developed his extreme ideology and how the Norwegian society may have contributed to this development. The areas relevant to study how the Norwegian society may have influenced Behring Breivik's development are: the history of immigration in Norway, Behring Breivik's political background and extreme right-wing ideology and Behring Breivik’s specific extreme ideology. Focusing on these three areas will allow me to focus on specific characteristics of his ideology, its development and foundation in Norwegian society. As studying aspects of the society which may have contributed to Behring Breivik's attacks is a broad and abstract topic, I will focus on content analysis of newspaper articles. I will examine how debate in media relates Behring Breivik's attacks to the Norwegian society. This will allow me to understand how the public relates the effect of unique characteristics of the Norwegian society to the emergence extreme fascist or right-wing ideology, which led to Behring Breivik's attacks on July 22\textsuperscript{nd} 2011. More than simply focusing on Anders Behring Breivik's acts, I hope to be able to direct attention to characteristics about the Norwegian society which may provide a breeding ground for fascist and extreme right-wing sentiments and ideology. Øyvind Strømmen (2007) states that he considers the emergence of groups and political parties with clear fascist
tendencies to pose a large threat to Western democracy, which emphasizes the importance of examining the presence of such aspects in society.

**Behring Breivik, Immigration and Xenophobia in Norway: an overview**

Behring Breivik's political background and extreme ideology can be related to his antipathy toward immigrants, particularly from Muslim countries. I therefore consider it important to include a brief historical review of Norway's immigration patterns in order to better understand the setting in which reactionary anti-immigration sentiments developed. This review will show that anti-immigration sentiments, especially those directed toward Muslims, have partly developed based on an insufficient understanding of the number of immigrants as well as an exaggerated perception of problems caused by immigration. Further, the review will show that the leading right-wing party in Norway, the Progress Party, has exploited developments in immigration and taken issue ownership over it. Throughout the history of immigration, which began in the 1960's, it has developed from being portrayed as an economic problem to a cultural one.

**Behring Breivik's political background**

The political tradition which Behring Breivik is included in is fascism and right-wing extremism. Both of these affiliations are denied by Behring Breivik himself, but become apparent through his manifesto and his statements in interrogations and during the trial. Øyvind Strømmen (2007) states that fascism arises when there is a perceived (or actual) national crisis or period of recession. In order to restore the nation to its optimal state, fascism considers the solution to be a resurrection and renewal of the national to that which historically (pre-industrialism, pre-capitalism) has characterized the nation. The nation is to be united through the leadership of a strong and authoritarian leader.
According to Gunnar Skribekk (1972), fascism has historically been in opposition to liberal political ideology, democracy, communism and socialism. Further, Skribekk describes it as a panic-like reaction to the perceived situation of the nation. Another central aspect of fascism is extreme nationalism and a wish to shape the nation, through a “political, social and ethical revolution” (Strømmen 2012: 1) in order to establish a national unity. Strømmen (2007) states that, contrary to popular belief, fascism did not end with the fall of Nazi Germany. He identifies the presence and continuous development of fascism in Europe; Eurofascism.

When defining right-wing extremism, one can refer to right wing-populism to identify what type of ideals it advocates. Strømmen (2012) refers to Hans-Georg Betz who lists opposition to western democratic values, cultural and ethnic homogeneity, xenophobia, anti-feminism and traditional family values as characteristics of right-wing populist parties. Such characteristics are in alignment with those of right-wing extremism and fascism. However, what differentiates right-wing populist parties from right-wing extremists is that the former operates within the boundaries of democracy. Right-wing extremists on the other hand, while sharing similar ideology and ideals, openly promote anti-democratic values as well as the use of violence as a necessary means to promote their cause.

Considering the clear fascist rhetoric used by Behring Breivik in his manifesto, a focus on the history of fascism and the extreme right is important in order to understand what tradition Breivik is a part of and where he has received inspiration from. The tradition these ideologies have in Norway will give an understanding of the legacy such ideology has and of the strength and support it has had historically. The political legacy Behring Breivik is a part of provides a background or foundation for his beliefs which allows some understanding where his ideology developed from.
Right-wing populism is an important part of the history of Behring Breivik's political activity. Between the years of 1999 and 2004 Behring Breivik was a part of the Progress Party (FrP), a valid right-wing party in Norwegian politics. Right-wing populism is characterized by exclusive nationalism, authoritarian values and anti-elitism which are also apparent in Behring Breivik's ideological beliefs. Right-wing populist's express antipathy against the political elite, mainstream media and those who exploit the social welfare system, who are considered traitors. Such views are shared by Behring Breivik and like-minded. Behring Breivik left the party in 2004 and states in his manifesto the reason being that the Progress Party was too moderate regarding certain issues. In addition, he had lost belief in being able to achieve a change through democratic means.

It is essential to note that when comparing Norway to other European countries, it has not had any strong and successful fascist parties. Due to this, fascist viewpoints have never been officially represented in politics. In addition, the public debate in Norway is known to be concerned with being politically correct, which makes it difficult to express certain opinions, such as concerns regarding immigration or integration. This has been pointed out by Behring Breivik and likeminded and is used by conspiracy theorists to strengthen their argument. Ketil Raknes (2012) provides statistical evidence suggesting that the Danish people consider their democracy strengthened by the debates held, which have included quite extreme right-wing populist party Dansk Folkeparti. Most European countries have quite radical right-wing populist parties and Raknes along with Strømmen (2007) emphasize that compared to other right-wing populist parties in Europe, the Progress Party is very moderate. This raises a question of why a country with such a relatively moderate right-wing, experienced an attack by a right-wing extremist. One could assume that a country with extreme/radical right-wing populist parties would be more probable to experience an act of extremism.
**Extreme right-wing ideology**

When searching for an answer to the question of which characteristics of the Norwegian society may have contributed to Behring Breivik's attacks, it is relevant to examine his development from a conventional political stance to an extreme one. It is important to understand what the societal factors which contributed to Behring Breivik leaving a democratic path and develop extreme ideology, which legitimates violence and considers it necessary.

According to Lars Gule (2012), a definition of what is 'extreme' requires a definition of what is considered 'normal'. Behring Breivik's ideology is considered extreme since it is not widely acknowledged and is based on beliefs which are not founded in reality; it cannot be verified by providing scientific evidence. This is according to Gule, a descriptive type of extremism. Behring Breivik believes in counter-jihadism, based on Bat Ye'or's (2005) theory about Eurabia, a theory which argues that Islamic leaders and political leaders of Europe have made a pact where Europe is in the process of becoming colonized by Muslims in order to turn Europe into a Muslim region. A Muslim 'occupation' of Europe is advancing and Behring Breivik considers Europe currently to be in a state of war. Additionally, Gule emphasizes that extremism is revealed through the means considered fit to meet an end. The use of violence is generally considered extreme.

Theorists who have contributed to the developed counter-jihadist ideology, such as Bat Ye’or (2005) and Oriana Fallaci, have applied an essentialist, also known as categorical, approach in order to give the illusion of evidence in support of the theory, to add to its credibility. An essentialist or categorical approach selects certain characteristics of an object, phenomenon or individual and applies these to describe all other similar objects, phenomenon or individuals. According to Gule (2012) the essence of the subject to be explained is considered permanent and static. The essence identified is considered
the primary characteristic of what is being described and internal variance within a group is ignored. In her book *Insurgent Identities: Conflict and the Politics of Difference in Darfur* Dr. Anne Bartlett (2013) identifies essentialism as “a key component in the process of political and social scape-goating and sets up a dangerous set of stereotypes for the purpose of othering.” (Bartlett 2013: 45). This function of essentialism becomes blatantly apparent in counter-jihadism. Although central theorists behind the ideology offer ‘evidence’ in support of it, these are highly circumstantial and completely detached from their origin. However, Behring Breivik is convinced his beliefs are justified and have a foundation in reality.

Behring Breivik's extreme ideology has both been related to both fascism and Nazism. Fascism is an ideology which arose in the 20th century (Heywood 1992). Heywood (1992) describes fascism as an ideology where traditional values were “transformed or turned upside down” where “freedom came to mean complete submission, ‘democracy’ was equated with dictatorship, and progress implied constant struggle and war” (Heywood 1992: 174). The ideology is highly authoritarian, totalitarian, patriarchal and elitist and opposes traditional Western values such as: “progress, freedom and democracy” (Heywood 2002: 60). The totalitarian character of fascism becomes evident through its support of a single party system and rejection of parliamentarism. Heywood (1992) identifies the values which are held sacred in fascist society as: “loyalty, duty obedience and sacrifice.” (Heywood 1992: 177). In addition unity among one’s own, which may be identified by race or nation, is central. Fascism strives to unite the people by any means necessary, particularly in time of crisis, under the rule of a 'supreme leader'. A strong and authoritarian leader is considered to be able to unite the nation in a time of crisis. This leader will have complete power which extends to all societal spheres and guide the people who are seeking “guidance and direction” (Heywood 1992: 178).
Another important characteristic of fascism is militant nationalism where “the 'new' man, a hero, motivated by duty and honour and self-sacrifice, prepared to dedicate his life to the glory of his nation or race, and to give unquestioning obedience to a supreme leader.” (Heywood 2002: 60). Further, evolution has a central role in fascism as it considers weakness as an evil which must be eliminated in order for the strong to prevail, in accordance with Charles Darwin's theory of natural selection. In addition Heywood (1992) emphasizes that in fascism sacrificing the weak is considered justified as it serves the common good. This is descriptive of the key role the group has in fascism, as opposed to the individual.

Nazism is a race-focused sub-ideology of fascism. Nazism emerged from the combination of “racial anti-Semitism and social Darwinism” (Heywood 1992: 186). Nazism can be characterized by totalitarianism, Aryanism, racial anti-Semitism and the idea of domination by the superior race. Heywood (1992) emphasizes that anti-Semitism is not a Nazi invention. Rather, it can be traced back to the Christian era when idea developed since Jews were believed to have killed Christ in addition to refusing to convert to Christianity. Racial anti-Semitism was developed in Germany through the use of Count Gobineau's work “Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races” in order to develop the idea of the superiority of the Aryan race. H.S. Chamberlain developed Count Gobineau's idea of Aryanism further, which became combined with fascism by Hitler. Chamberlain's definition of the superior Aryan race primarily including Germans laid the foundation for “Nazi race theory which portrayed the Jews as universal scapegoat for all German misfortunes.” (Heywood 1992: 187). Heywood states that Count Gobineau's racial anti-Semitism became appropriated by Adolf Hitler who combined it with “the science of races” (Heywood 1992: 186). This is led to Jews becoming considered “as race rather than a religious, economic or cultural group.” (Heywood 1992: 186) who Hitler saw as the
primary threat to the existence of Germany.

The contemporary phenomenon 'islamophobia' is a less extreme but more socially widespread form of extreme right-wing ideology opposing Islam, which shares characteristics of descriptive extremism. Counter-jihadist ideology also exhibits clear signs of islamophobic rhetoric. According to Mattias Gardell (2011) islamophobia is an extreme fear or skepticism to Islam seen both in politics and public opinion. Gardell argues that contemporary islamophobia has been influenced by and spread considerably following al-Qaeda's September 11th attacks on the United States in 2001. These were used by right-wing parties to fire up under anti-immigration rhetoric. Islam is seen as the antithesis to Western freedom and democracy. Gardell argues that Islam has replaced the threat conceived by communism during the cold war. The rhetoric used in islamophobia is clearly essentialist as certain characteristics of Islam are chosen to describe all Muslims.

Gardell (2011) sees the July 22nd attacks as a direct consequence of islamophobic rhetoric and that Behring Breivik's acts were based on islamophobic logic. As a result he emphasizes the importance of examining islamophobic rhetoric and tendencies in society in order to prevent similar events from occurring in the future. He considers it worrisome that little attention has been paid to understanding Behring Breivik's political conviction and that his acts were not immediately recognized as politically motivated attacks. It will be essential to study to what extent islamophobic rhetoric exists in Norwegian society in addition to what foundation it finds in Norwegian society. This will allow me to determine if Behring Breivik's viewpoints are widespread in the Norwegian society and if he was influenced by this.
Behring Breivik's extreme ideology – counter-jihadism

A final part of understanding if and how Norwegian society may have contributed to Behring Breivik's attacks is related to examining his specific extreme ideology and what ground this has in Norwegian society. Behring Breivik's counter-jihadist ideology is founded in the Eurabia theory. The ideology's primary theorist is Gisele Littman, who goes by the pseudonym Bat Ye’or. Littman's primary argument in *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis* (2005) is that Europe is in the process of becoming colonized by Islam in order to turn it into Muslim region. This is the result of a conspiracy formed between Muslim and European leaders following an oil crisis during the Egyptian-Syrian war against Israel in 1973. Øyvind Strømmen (2011) argues that Ye'or's book has contributed to the idea of Eurabia developing from an eccentric theory to a social reality. He also states that Eurabia has been an “essential innovation” (Strømmen 2011: 11) for contemporary right-wing extremism since it has contributed to make Islam the new target for their animosity after WWII and the Cold War.

Behring Breivik received support and inspiration for his extreme viewpoints on counter-jihadist on-line discussion forums and blogs. Øyvind Strømmen (2011) has studied the online activity of counter-jihadists and states that considering the violent rhetoric used in such milieus the attacks on July 22\textsuperscript{nd} did not come as a surprise to him. Strømmen argues that the current phase of right-wing extremism, primarily dominated by counter-jihadism, has to a large extent developed on and through online discussion forums. Strømmen considers Behring Breivik's internet activity to be an important factor in his radicalization. However, it is difficult to determine how much his internet activity influenced Behring Breivik. Nevertheless, the fact that Behring Breivik discussed his ideology with likeminded counter-jihadists on the internet suggests that his extreme ideological beliefs are shared by others.
Øyvind Strømmen (2011) labels the image the Eurabia literature creates of Islam a 'puzzle-version', where those pieces of the puzzle that fit the image it wants to create of Islam are chosen as examples to portray Islam and Muslims. An example of this is selecting 'fitting' phrases out of the Quran to prove a point. These are completely detached from their original context and are not necessarily meant to be taken literary. Another example is how aspects of traditions of Islam become detached in order to 'prove a point'. 'Taqiyya' for instance is a practice which allows Muslims persecuted due to their religion to lie about their religious affiliation. This has especially applied to Shia Muslims who have been historically prosecuted in several Islamic countries. Counter-jihadists refer to the practice of taqiyya as proof of dishonesty being a characteristic which applies to all Muslim.

Some central characteristics of counter-jihadist ideology are perceived hostility from European countries toward Israel, which often becomes explained by referring to anti-Semitic attitudes. Ye’or (2005) argues that challenging America's position as a superpower was a reason behind the supposed coalition formed between European and Muslim leaders. In addition, the European Union is seen as an important enabler for the 'colonization' of Europe by Muslim's. In sum, Ye'or describes the European “jihadist coalition” (Ye'or 2005: 12) to be characterized by anti-Western, -Christian, -American and Judeophobic sentiments. In order to understand why Behring Breivik adopted such an extreme ideology as counter-jihadism, one must consider how he found grounds for the primary characteristics of the ideology in Norwegian society.

Through the trial against Anders Behring Breivik his mental state has been a major focus. There have been completed two forensic psychiatric evaluations of Behring Breivik. The first psychiatrists found him to have been psychotic during the July 22nd
attacks, the second deemed him sane when carrying out his crimes. On the 24\textsuperscript{th} of August, Anders Behring Breivik was sentenced to 21 years imprisonment along with preventive detention, which allows the extension of his sentence as long as he is considered a danger to society. The verdict is based on the assumption of Behring Breivik having been aware of the consequences of his acts on July 22\textsuperscript{nd} and therefore fully responsible for the deaths of 77 people. My objective is to provide an evaluation of the effect of societal factors on Anders Behring Breivik's attacks on July 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2011.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central characters</th>
<th>Fascism</th>
<th>Nazism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Benito Mussolini who was the leader of the first fascist state and advocated state centered fascism.</td>
<td>-H.S. Chamberlain who defined Aryanism to include primarily the German people thereby creating “the ground for Nazi race theory which portrayed the Jews as a universal scapegoat for all of Germany’s misfortunes.” (Heywood 1998, p. 187).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adolf Hitler who used Mussolini’s fascism to developed race centered fascism.</td>
<td>- This was developed further by Adolf Hitler who “suggested that the Jews were responsible for an international conspiracy of capitalists and communists, whose objective was to weaken and overthrow the German nation.” (Heywood 1998, p. 187).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main concepts</th>
<th>- Authoritarianism, totalitarianism and elitism</th>
<th>- A fascist sub-ideology which is centered around:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- National unity under a charismatic leader</td>
<td>1. Aryanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The community’s interests are superior to those of the individual.</td>
<td>3. Domination by the superior race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is related to strong and militant nationalism called “integral nationalism” (Heywood 1998, p. 180)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central ideas</th>
<th>- In opposition to traditional Western values such as “progress, freedom and democracy” (Heywood 2002, p. 60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Highly focused on the power of unity, which is why national unity much be achieved through any means necessary. Unity of the nation can be achieved under the rule of a ‘supreme leader’. Political power extends to all parts of societal spheres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “The fascist ideal is that of the ‘new man’, a hero, motivated by duty, honor and self-sacrifice, prepared to dedicate his life to the glory of his nation or race, and to give unqu{-}uestioning obedience to a supreme leader” (Heywood 2002, p. 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Closely related to times of crises and struggle, which democracies are considered to be unable to handle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In a fascist regime freedom is considered complete submission, democracy is viewed as dictatorship and progress is achieved through struggle and war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The idea of Evolution has a central position in fascism since the struggle is considered to lead to progress. Social Darwinism has also impacted fascism as weakness is considered an evil which must be eliminated. According to fascism the weak: “must be sacrificed for the common good, just as the survival of a species is more important than the life of any single member.” (p. 176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The ideal fascist society is led by a supreme leader. Under the leader there is a male elite characterized by “heroism, vision and capacity for self-sacrifice” (p. 178). The rest of the society consists of the masses who seek “guidance and direction” (p. 178). In this ideal fascist society “the allegiances of race or nation” (p. 180) are considered stronger than the allegiance to social class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Does not believe in equality between nations or races but rather a continuous “struggle for dominance” (p. 180) through “expansivism, war and imperialism.” (p.180).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target of animosity</th>
<th>- Communism, democracy, individualism, ‘inferior races’, capitalism, liberalism, equality, feminism, rationalism, Marxism, Bolshevism, socialism</th>
<th>- Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals, non-Aryans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vienna School/Counterjihadism</td>
<td>Frankfurt School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Director of the anti-Islamic website Jihad watch, Robert Spencer</td>
<td>-György Lukács</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Norwegian counterjihadist blogger Peder Nøstvold Jensen</td>
<td>-Theodor Adorno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Writer Giselle Littmann/Bat Ye’or</td>
<td>-Max Horkheimer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Late Italian journalist Oriana Fallaci</td>
<td>-Herbert Marcuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Anti-Islamic blogger Pamela Geller</td>
<td>-'critical theory' – critique of society in order to raise awareness of oppression and thereby resist it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Cultural conservatism and support of monocularism which is seen to secure national unity.</td>
<td>-Theodor Adorno's theory of ‘the authoritarian personality’ which attempted to explain why some people strive to dominate others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Highly pro-Israel and pro-USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The Vienna School of Thought has it's name from the Battle of Vienna in 1683 where Polish-Austrian-German forces prevented the Islamic Ottoman empire from invading Europe. Behring Breivik (2011) characterizes the ideology as a hybrid: “of several conservative and traditionalist directions.” (p. 1235).</td>
<td>-Working to free people from “unnecessary domination” (Turner 1998, p. 553) and introduce less oppressive options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Is characterized by Behring Breivik (2011) as: “a new conservatism/nationalism” (p. 1235).</td>
<td>-Focus on encouraging individuals awareness and consciousness in order for them to resist oppression and domination. This is achieved “through a detailed, historical analysis of reification.” (Turner 1998, p. 554)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The ideology is according to Behring Breivik an ideology under development which has as it's objective to 'preserve European culture and traditions and to consolidate Europe's anti-Marxist forces.</td>
<td>-Reveal “historical forces that dominate human freedom” (Turner 1998, p. 554) in addition to the “ideological justifications” (Turner 1998, p. 554) for forces which limit this freedom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Bat Ye’or's (2005) work “Eurabia: A Euro-Arab Axis” is a canonical work for The Vienna School/Counterjihadism. It outlines an ongoing takeover of Europe by Muslims. This is the result of a pact, the Eurabia project, made between the political leaders of Europe and the Muslim world.</td>
<td>-Primary goal is to free people from “class domination” (Turner 1998, p. 554)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the pact Europe has become increasingly anti-Western, anti-Christian, anti-American and judephobic according to Ye’or (2005).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-As a result of the Islamization a civil war will break out in Europe between those support the Eurabia project and those who oppose it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Advocates authority and traditional values related to the family, religion and nation and these must be restored.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Behring Breivik's strives for a future political arrangement of Norway to be an administered democracy, which will be led by a Guardian Council who will have the power to overrule any decision made by the government. The Council’s primary functions will be to prevent cultural Marxists from infiltrating central institutions of society and to assure that monocultural and culture conservative practices are maintained. He also consider it necessary that one seat in parliament is to be reserved for an individual who's task is to control cultural and scientific institutions in order to they adhere to culture conservative ideals. Behring Breivik believes that this political structure will be: “immune to future Marxist infiltration of schools, universities and media.” (Ernstvedt 2012, p. 67).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Behring Breivik advocates international politics which lays out new national boarders in order to assure the prevalence of the Nordic genotype.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Shares characteristics with Neo-conservatism where multicultural and multireligious societies are considered as problematic, since they are “conflict-ridden and inherently unstable” (Heywood 2002, p. 50). Social stability is an ideal which can be reached through sharing a common culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Pro-Nationalism, Pro-pan-nationalism (pro-Europeanism), Pro-Christian identity, Pro-cultural conservatism, Pro-monoculturalism (pro cultural unity), Pro-patriarchy, Pro-Israel” (Behring Breivik 2011, p. 1235)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;cultural unity), -patriarchy, -Israel”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Behring Breivik 2011, p. 1235)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Islam, Marxism, Frankfurt School, communism founders of cultural Marxism Antonio Gramsci and György Lukács, 'political correctness' which is defined by Marxists, main stream media who are considered as biased political activists promoting the Eurabia project, sociology, pan-nationalism, - Anti-globalism/internationalism, Anti-multiculturalism, Anti-Jihadism, Anti-Islam(isation), Anti-imperialistic, Anti-feminism, Anti-pacifism, Anti-EU(SSR), Anti-matriarchy, Anti-racist, Anti-fascist, Anti-Nazi, Anti-totalitarian” (Behring Breivik 2011, p. 1236)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of fascist and counter-jihadist ideology

When comparing fascist ideology and counter-jihadism, the two have a number of similarities. Both ideologies are highly totalitarian and authoritarian of nature. These characteristics of counter-jihadism become apparent through Behring Breivik’s (2011) advocacy of a Guardian Council in the political arrangement of future Europe. This council is to have the power to override any political decision made by the government which it considers cultural Marxist and multicultural of nature. It will also have full power over military and police forces. In addition, Behring Breivik argues for a temporary suspension of the constitution: “until we have had the opportunity to implement at least some of our principles.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 1354). He states: “All coups involve the temporary suspension of the constitution.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 1354). Such characteristics have a highly dictatorship-like character. Further, Behring Breivik advocates for monitoring cultural and scientific institutions to assure that these adhere to cultural conservative values. In addition, Behring Breivik believes that those supporting the multicultural society should be tried and sentenced. Further, both ideologies hold unity of the nation as essential. In fascism unity has traditionally been important either within the nation or the 'race'. Counter-jihadism, on the other hand, strives for national unity between those who share the same culture. Promoting and ensuring common culture is seen as a way through which a national unity can be achieved.

As emphasized by Andrew Heywood (1992), fascist states have historically developed in a time of national crisis. When reading Behring Breivik’s (2011) manifesto it becomes apparent that he considers a fascist monocultural society as a solution to the current crisis Europe is in. This crisis is according to Behring Breivik characterized by the islamisation of Europe which is facilitated by multicultural political leaders. Behring
Breivik describes the current state of crisis in the following terms: “Multiculturalism (cultural Marxism/political correctness), as you might know, is the root cause of the ongoing Islamisation of Europe which has resulted in the ongoing Islamic colonization of Europe through demographic warfare (facilitated by our own leaders).” (Behring Breivik 2011: 16).

In addition the central position of heroism and sacrifice is important in both traditional fascism and counter-jihadism. The fascist ideal is described by Heywood (2002) as: "that of the 'new man', a hero, motivated by duty, honor and self-sacrifice, prepared to dedicate his life to the glory of his nation or race, and to give unquestioning obedience to a supreme leader” (Heywood 2002: 60). Behring Breivik (2011) describes his own role in the “battle for Europe” as “Justiciar Knight Commander for Knights Templar Europe and one of several leaders of the National and pan-European Patriotic Resistance Movement” (Behring Breivik 2011: 16). These types of military ranking and orders have a highly heroic character to it. In an interview Behring Breivik conducts with himself toward the end of his manifesto he portrays his life as not having been what most would consider as 'normal' due to his dedication to his role as Justiciar Knight and the responsibility which comes with this. These characteristics are telling of the sacrificial nature of his ideology. Behring Breivik has stated that he considers his attacks on 22nd of July, 2011 as: “horrible, but necessary”10 However, he believed it had to be done in order to secure the future of Norwegian and European culture. He considers himself a martyr in the battle against Eurabia and that he will be considered a hero in the future, which aligns with fascist the fascist ideals of “loyalty, duty, obedience and self-sacrifice” (Heywood 1992: 177). Further, Behring Breivik describes the future 'battle for Europe' in the

---

following terms: “Innocent people will die, in the thousands. But it is still better than the alternative; millions of dead Europeans” (Behring Breivik 2011: 1360). This further testifies to the sacrificial nature both fascism and counter-jihadism share.

Further, Heywood (1992) emphasizes the nationalistic character of fascism. This nationalism is related to heroic and sacrificial aspect of fascism, where the individual is expected to sacrifice his life for his nation. Behring Breivik (2011) emphasizes the nationalistic character of counter-jihadist ideology in the introduction to his manifesto: “It is not only our right but also our duty to contribute to preserve our identity, our culture and our national sovereignty by preventing the ongoing Islamisation.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 15). The central role of nationalism in counter-jihadist ideology is further exhibited in an essay by Peder Nøstvold Jensen (Fjordman) in Behring Breivik's manifesto: “I would suggest that one thing we should fight for is national sovereignty and the right to preserve our culture and pass it on to future generations.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 709). This aligns with Heywood's (1992) description of fascist nationalism which is highly militant and has no concern for other nations and different cultures but rather strives to assert dominance and superiority over other nations and races.

Further, the perception of traditional democracy as a dictatorship is prominent in counter-jihadism. Behring Breivik (2011) does not consider Norway a democracy but rather sees it as a multicultural dictatorship. This emphasizes a contradiction in counter-jihadist ideology where dictatorship and democracy are defined as the polar opposite of its traditional meaning. It becomes apparent through Behring Breivik's manifesto that the current political arrangement in Norway is considered a dictatorship while the political arrangement suggested by him is considered democratic. Theodor Enerstvedt (2012) notes that Behring Breivik advocates for a society that he considers democratic but which for
most others is considered a terroristic dictatorship. This aligns with the way fascism considers complete submission as true freedom. In fascist ideology evolution has an important role as struggle is seen as a way in which the strong survive and the weak are eliminated. Counter-jihadism considers Islam as an immoral and savage culture which is incompatible with the developed Western European countries. Islam is considered underdeveloped and that its presence will reverse European development.

Heywood (1992) identifies that fascism opposes: “human reason and intellectual life in general.” (Heywood 1992: 175). This characteristic is also found in counter-jihadism as Behring Breivik (2011) dedicates a part of his manifesto to argue why the Frankfurt School of Thought must be rejected. Behring Breivik explains why he opposes the Frankfurt school:

The Frankfurt School blended Marx with Freud, and later influences (some Fascist as well as Marxist) added linguistics to create “Critical Theory” and “deconstruction.” These in turn greatly influenced education theory, and through institutions of higher education gave birth to what we now call “Political Correctness.” The lineage is clear, and it is traceable right back to Karl Marx.”

(Behring Breivik 2011: 20).

Further, he argues that the field of sociology must be removed altogether. He justifies this in the following terms: “Any and all faculties of sociology in the European world (US/Europe) are therefore in many ways Marxist indoctrination camps where the students learn how to infiltrate public institutions and covertly contribute to change the character of society by presenting falsified reports and statistics.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 378).

In addition, there are a number of parallels in who both ideologies consider as foes. Both ideologies oppose communism, feminism, Marxism, liberalism, egalitarianism and
liberalism. However, where fascism opposes different races, counter-jihadism opposes those with different culture. However, Behring Breivik (2011) characterization of the Vienna school as: “Anti-racist, Anti-fascist, Anti-Nazi, Anti-totalitarian” (Behring Breivik 2011: 1236) seems highly contradictory due to the clear parallels it has with fascism.

It becomes apparent that counter-jihadism has a strong fascist character. In the first fascist state, Mussolini's Italy, fascism was not centered on race, but rather on the state. However, Adolf Hitler combined Count Gobineau's theory of the scientific difference between races and H.S. Chamberlain's theory about Aryanism with fascism. This gave fascism a strong racist character. Hitler appropriated race science and Aryanism to direct animosity toward the Jewish. Regardless, of the non-racist foundation of fascism, it seems highly contradictory that a number of the central characters in counter-jihadist ideology are Jews and have laid the foundation for the contemporary fascist Eurabia theory. As Nazism is a race centered sub-ideology of fascism, counter-jihadism may be characterized as a fascist sub-ideology focused on culture. Although counter-jihadism is not directly racist or Nazi, it appears as surprising that members of a people who has been historically oppressed and prosecuted have a central role in the oppression and prosecution of another people. Further, it appears contradictory that a people which has been prosecuted by a fascist regime, would support similar ideology in order to target others.

Counter-jihadism expresses highly pro-Israel sentiments which may provide some explanation as to why Jews such as Bat Ye'or and Pamela Geller support the ideology. Counter-jihadist's are highly condemning of European states' critique of Israel and support of Palestine. When reading Ye'or's (2005) book the central position of the Palestine-Israel issue for the counter-jihadist ideology becomes apparent. She argues that one of the Eurabia projects primary objectives is for European Marxist's to challenge the powerful
Theodor Enerstvedt (2012) has addressed and debated many of the contradictions found in the Vienna School of Thought/counter-jihadism. First he has addressed Behring Breivik (2011) claim of being an anti-racist and anti-Nazi. Enerstvedt argues that Behring Breivik intentionally tries to distance himself from racism and Nazism, by avoiding discussing whether he thinks the Germanic or Nordic race is superior to others. In his manifesto Behring Breivik (2011) states: “Creating a pro-indigenous and/or pro-ethnic movement does not make it a “white supremacy” movement but rather an Indigenous rights movement or even a civil rights movement. Anyone who calls you a racist due to these reasons proves very clearly that HE is the real racist, as he obviously ONLY attacks European rights movements.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 1157). In other words, Behring Breivik attempts to emphasize that his focus is not on the racial difference of Muslims and native Europeans, but rather in the different rights between the two. Enerstvedt argues that Behring Breivik purposely trying to distance himself from racism and Nazism, may suggests that he has racist or Naziist opinions which he tries to disguise.

Enerstvedt (2012) states that a clear similarity between Behring Breivik (2011) and Nazi ideology is the intense hate toward Communism. Enerstvedt argues that the anti-Communist character of Nazism was a primary reason for why Jews became the main target for Hitler, since most communists were Jews. Enerstvedt characterizes this as hate
toward culture (Communism) which becomes associated with a group of people and thereby becomes turned into racial hate. In conclusion, Enerstvedt states that he acknowledges that Behring Breivik attempts to differentiate himself from Nazism and racism. However, this is according to Enerstvedt not convincing partly since using efforts to distance himself from such ideologies may be strategic and since many of those who support Behring Breivik's views belong to groups which show clear racist and neo-Nazi tendencies.

Behring Breivik (2011) claims to be an anti-fascist since he does not support a single party political arrangement. In addition, Behring Breivik denies being a fascist since he only supports a temporary suspension of the constitution. In debating Behring Breivik's claim of being an anti-fascist Enerstvedt (2012) also indicates that Behring Breivik distances himself from the idea of an authoritarian leader, which is central in fascism. Behring Breivik advocates for a future Norwegian society with a constitutional monarchy combined with a multiparty system, not a dictatorship. However, Enerstvedt emphasizes that Behring Breivik does advocate for fascist ideals as he supports a highly centralized political power which controls most aspects of society. Behring Breivik’s vision of the future political arrangement of Norway is an administered democracy, like that in Russia. In addition, Enerstvedt emphasizes that the Vienna School Behring Breivik identifies with has fascist characteristics as it advocates for the use of martial law in the future political arrangement of Norway and Europe. Further, Behring Breivik’s understanding of democracy does not align with the general definition of democracy.

A way in which one can try to make sense of the contradictory nature of counter-jihadism is by considering Ketil Raknes’ (2012) main thesis in Høyrepopulismens hemmeligheter. He argues that right-wing populist parties are reinventing their politics in
order to increase its voter base which will increase support for such parties and provide them with a greater political impact. This is done through including aspects in its politics, such as support of the welfare state and greater focus on women's and gay rights, which have previously been excluded or ignored. Considering the similarities found between fascist and counter-jihadist ideology in addition to the contradictions in counter-jihadism, it may seem as this new fascist sub-ideology is working to reinvent its content and appearance in order to appeal to a larger audience. Through defining the ideology as: “Anti-racist, Anti-fascist, Anti-Nazi, Anti-totalitarian” (Behring Breivik 2011: 1236) counter-jihadism attempts to distance itself from these ideologies, although it has clear ties to these. The process of distancing itself from these is done by giving racism, fascism, Nazism and totalitarianism a different definition than their traditional definition is. It seems like counter-jihadist ideology is an attempt to reinvent fascist ideology in order to allow for greater part-taking in the political sphere and thereby having a greater impact on society. This idea is supported by Øyvind Strømmen (2011) who argues that the Eurabia theory has been an “essential innovation” (Strømmen 2011: 11) for right-wing extremism and allowed it to address and meet the concerns of a large group of people who are skeptical to or in opposition the multicultural society.
Anders Behring Breivik's manifesto – 2083. - A European Declaration of Independence

An hour before Anders Behring set out to bomb the government quarter in Oslo, after which he attacked the Norwegian Labor Party's youth camp on Utøya, he sent a document to a number of people. This document was Behring Breivik's manifesto which he claims to have worked on for nine years prior to the attacks. In the introduction Behring Breivik (2011) introduces the topics which will be elaborated in the main part of the manifesto. The 1550-page manifesto begins with Book 1 where Behring Breivik, using the author name Andrew Brewick, examines the history of Europe in order to emphasize how it has been falsified by cultural Marxist’s11 and multiculturalists. This revision of history spans from the middle ages until today. In Book 2, “Europe Burning”, Behring Breivik reviews and analyzes the current state of Europe and suggests changes which can improve the crisis Europe is currently in. In this part Behring Breivik describes the Eurabia ideology and provides 'evidence' for the progress of Eurabia in Europe. Further, Book 3, “A declaration of pre-emptive war”, outlines the European civil war which according to Behring Breivik began in 1999 and will conclude in 2083. In this part of the manifesto Behring Breivik also includes a diary-like description of his preparations for the July 22nd attacks both ideologically and practically, in order to make it feasible for other culture conservatives to carry out attacks.

11 The term cultural Marxist is frequently used by Behring Breivik about the current European political leadership. He condemns Marxism since it has been used by the neo-Marxist Frankfurt school to define the politically correct stance of multiculturalism and thereby dismiss other platforms, including the Right-wing. Behring Breivik (2011) considers the multiculturalism having developed from the Marxist ideal of the 'classless society' and considers this problematic since it: “contradicts human nature – because people are different, they end up unequal, regardless of the starting point – society will not accord with it unless forced” (Behring Breivik 2011: 20).
As pointed out by a number of people such as Øyvind Strømmen (2012b), Bjørn Stærk (2012), Matias Gardell (2011) and Theodor Enerstvedt (2012), Behring Breivik's (2011) manifesto is far from original. Strømmen labels Behring Breivik a “copy/paste extremist” (Morgenbladet 2012) as the majority of his manifesto is copied from other authors. Both Strømmen and Stærk identify writings by well-known counter-jihadists Robert Spencer and Gregory Davis, the Unabomber Ted Kaczynski and counter-jihadist blogger Peder Nøstvold Jensen, also known as Fjordman. Strømmen argues that Behring Breivik's introduction to the manifesto is plagiarized from William S. Lind's, former director of Center of Cultural Conservatism, pamphlet “Political Correctness: A Short History of Ideology”. He characterizes Lind as an “ultra conservative member of the think-tank, Free Congress” (Morgenbladet 2012). The second part of the manifesto is according to Strømmen (2012b) composed of essays written by Peder Nøstvold Jensen (Fjordman) and other counter-jihadist bloggers. In addition Strømmen (2012b) has identified essays by British Eurosceptic journalist John Laughland, the Hindu nationalist Shrinandan Vyas, Lucio Mascarenhas, Serbian nationalists and Islam critic Daniel Pipes.

Through the manifesto Behring Breivik (2011) explains the significance of year 2083 in the title. The year 2083 will be the 400-year anniversary for the battle of Vienna which took place in 1683. For Behring Breivik this battle is the most significant one in European history as the Ottoman empire was prevented from conquering Western Europe. In addition, Behring Breivik predicts 2083 to be the year by which European cultural Marxist/multicultural regimes will fall. Following this: “Europe will once again be governed by patriots” (Behring Breivik 2011: 1413). Ideologically Behring Breivik identifies with the Vienna School of Thought which he characterizes as: “a new

---

conservatism/nationalism” (Behring Breivik 2011: 1235). Behring Breivik describes the Vienna School of Thought in the following terms:

The ideological platform advocates a strict anti-Jihad/Islamic stance which indirectly establishes a default friendly stance and support to Israel as an integral part of its fundament. The Vienna School of Thought is a right wing, Western European equivalent and reaction to the Marxist - Frankfurt school (ideological caricature). The purpose of the platform is to ensure a consolidation of anti-Marxist forces before Europe is overwhelmed demographically by Muslims.

(Behring Breivik 2011: 1235)

In the introduction to his manifesto Behring Breivik (2011) states: “Much of the information presented in this compendium (3 books) has been deliberately kept away from the European peoples by our governments and the politically correct mainstream media (MSM)” (Behring Breivik 2011: 11). Behring Breivik goes on to outline the main issues which he will discuss further in the document. The primary focus areas are: “the development of cultural Marxism/multiculturalism in Europe, the background of the Islamic colonization and islamification of Europe, the current state of those opposing this colonization (Western European Resistance Movements)” (Behring Breivik 2011: 11), the solution to end Islamic colonization of Europe and how the resistance movement must proceed in order to make this happen.

Behring Breivik (2011) defines cultural Marxism as “Marxism translated from economic into cultural terms” (Behring Breivik 2011: 20) and outlines major developments of the ideology in Europe. He states that cultural Marxism is synonymous with that which is 'politically correct', which has led to other views being dismissed. Behring Breivik argues that the Frankfurt-school is to blame for the development and spread of cultural Marxism. He describes the objective of cultural Marxism:
Cultural Marxism, or Political Correctness, shares with classical Marxism the vision of a “classless society”, i.e., a society not merely of equal opportunity, but equal condition. Since that vision contradicts human nature – because people are different, they end up unequal regardless of the starting point – society will not accord unless it is forced.

(Behring Breivik 2011: 20)

Further, he argues that Marxism must be resisted as it is a totalitarian ideology.

In Book 1, Behring Breivik (2011) thoroughly describes the Marxist, communist and multicultural falsification of history. According to Behring Breivik this falsification has taken place in order to justify the building of society on Marxist School of Thought. Behring Breivik also presents considerable critique of Islam. His critique extends over several hundred pages where he reviews the Quran, the Sunnah, Sharia legislation and the practice of Jihad. Behring Breivik describes the Prophet Mohammad in the following terms: “Because Muhammad is himself the measuring stick of morality, his actions are not judged according to an independent moral standard but rather establish what the standard for Muslims properly is” (Behring Breivik 2011: 69). Further, he goes on to present quotes from the Quran which suggest that Muhammad's wife Aisha was six when they married and nine when he consummated the marriage along with other quotes suggesting the immorality of the Prophet and Muslim's in general. He goes on to describe the Islamic religion as: “less a personal faith than a political ideology that exists in a fundamental and permanent state of war with non-Islamic civilizations, cultures and individuals” (Behring Breivik 2011: 103).

Behring Breivik outlines characteristics of Islam which the West needs to be aware of. Here he refers directly to the writings of Islam-critics such as Bat Ye'or, Serge Trifkovik, Robert Spencer and Walid Shoebat. He has also copied texts directly from Norwegian counter-jihadist blogger Peder Nøstvold Jensen. Further, as part of Behring
Breivik's immense criticism of Islam, he goes on to identify genocides which he believes Islam has been responsible for, in order to emphasize the violent nature of Islam. Toward the end of Book 1 Behring Breivik discusses Bosnia, as he sees this as a European country infiltrated by Muslims as a consequence of Turkish conquest in 1463. As a result of this conquest, Behring Breivik argues that the Christian Serb’s become suppressed by the Muslim Bosniak’s. He describes the current situation in the following terms “Today, the Muslims, with backing of the Western powers, want to usurp the right for the entire Bosnia - even though they are MINORITY there. Muslims want to usurp the right for themselves to be the only people called Bosnians. In other words they want to be the only ones to rule the entire Bosnia.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 264).

In Book 2, Behring Breivik (2011) outlines the current problems faced in Europe and suggests solutions to these. In this part one can clearly see the clear influence by Bat Ye’or's (2005) Eurabia literature and, as identified by Strømmen (2012b) , this part of the manifesto is dominated by texts borrowed from counter-jihadist blogger Peder Nøstvold Jensen. Book 2 describes the role played by the European Union (EU) and other European institutions in the Islamic take-over of Europe and suggests that these must be destroyed. Further, Behring Breivik identifies the 'evil' forces of “cultural Marxism, multiculturalism, globalism, feminism, emotionalism suicidal humanism and egalitarianism – a recipe for disaster” (Behring Breivik 2011: 350). Behring Breivik argues that sociology must be removed from academia. He explains this by stating that:
Students of sociology are taught how the public apparatus may be used (by deliberately manipulating statistics, and rejecting all aspects of biology) to portray and propagate a Marxist world view. Any and all faculties of sociology in the European world (US/Europe) are therefore in many ways Marxist indoctrination camps where the students learn how to infiltrate public institutions and covertly contribute to change the character of society by presenting falsified reports and statistics.

(Behring Breivik 2011: 377-378)

Behring Breivik (2011) presents yet another essay by Nøstvold Jensen criticizing the biased mass media which censors all opinions which do not belong to the 'politically correct' cultural Marxist stance. He argues that this makes Norway, along with numerous other European countries undemocratic and totalitarian. In conclusion the counter-jihadist blogger states:

The differences, particularly on issues related to Jihad and immigration, between the information reported in blogs and independent websites[5] and the information presented to us by the established media are so great that it shocks many ordinary citizens once it dawns upon them just how much censored propaganda we are spoon-fed every day. This experience has shattered the myth of free, critical and independent Western media, at least for some.

(Behring Breivik 2011: 386)

Behring Breivik (2011) goes on to draw parallels between the governance of the EU and the United States and that of the Soviet Union. Hence, he refers to the EU as the EUSSR and the United States as the USASSR. Further, he outlines the responsibility he believes multinational corporations, and thereby capitalism, have in immigration and multiculturalism. He believes multinationals are the primary driving force behind liberal immigration politics.

Behring Breivik (2011) describes his perception of a current state of Jihad in Europe. He includes an article by Robert Spencer, founder of the islamophobic website
Jihad Watch, who argues that the primary objective of Jihad is persecution of Christians. Behring Breivik argues that Sharia laws are in the process of becoming implemented in European countries, that Islamic terrorism is on a rise and that those with opposing views are becoming prosecuted. He argues that: “Muslims want autonomous territory, not better integration” (Behring Breivik 2011: 486). Behring Breivik presents demographical and statistic 'evidence' of an ongoing islamification of Europe. For example, he presents the table “Muslim atrocities committed against Western Europeans 1960-2010” (Behring Breivik 2011: 488). The table also predicts crimes by Muslims against non-Muslims until the year 2020. The numbers in this table have been checked by Theodor Enerstvedt (2012) against reliable statistics from Statistics Norway. Not surprisingly, he finds that Behring Breivik's figures are exaggerated. He also finds that the numbers presented for future crimes are highly unlikely. Behring Breivik predicts that in 2050 20 percent of the population in Norway will be Muslim. However, the researcher at Statistics Norway Enerstvedt's has conferred with predicts the percentage of Muslim's in Norway will be 7 percent in 2060, which suggests that Behring Breivik's predictions are highly exaggerated.

Behring Breivik describes cultural Marxist's conscious strategy of Islamisation:

The constant process of the Islamisation of a country sets forward from small issues and the specific demands/requirements develop and increase progressively with the increase of Muslims percentage wise in a country... When the politically correct (cultural Marxists/multiculturalists) agree to 'the reasonable' Muslim demands for their 'religious rights,' they also get the other components under the table.

(Behring Breivik 2011: 500)

He outlines why there is no use in the differentiating between 'moderate' and extreme Muslims, since: “In many cases, a moderate Muslim evidently has the same goals as the terrorists but refuses to fight for them with a weapon in his hand and sacrifice himself in
battle (until jihad has been legally proclaimed). But that is no reason to make a sharp
differentiation between a moderate and an extreme Muslim religion. The final goals may
be very similar, or even the same.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 525). Behring Breivik
describes why Islam is incompatible with democracy: “If the meaning of “democracy”
expands to include constitutional government, secular jurisprudence, the rule of law and
equality before the law, and above all freedom of speech, then no - constitutional
democracy cannot be reconciled with Islam. It is a waste of time and money to make the
attempt.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 571).

Further, Behring Breivik (2011) emphasizes that European culture conservatives
must unite in order to resist and prevent Islam's colonization of Europe. In order to do so,
he argues that the culture conservative wing must come to an agreement regarding what
their ideological stance is, what issues they are facing and how these are to be solved. He
promotes:

A cultural conservative approach where monoculturalism, moral, the
nuclear family, a free market, support for Israel and our Christian cousins
of the east, law and order and Christendom itself must be central aspects
(unlike now). Islam must be re-classified as a political ideology and the
Quran and the Hadith banned as the genocidal political tools they are.
(Behring Breivik 2011: 659)

Behring Breivik believes that culture conservatives must unite and form a resistance
group, the Knight Templar, in order to prevent Islamic take-over of Europe. He describes
the objective of the Knights Templar in the following terms:

PCCTS, Knights Templar on behalf of the free peoples of Europe, hereby
declare a pre-emptive war against the cultural Marxist/ multiculturalist
regimes of Western Europe. We acknowledge that Europe has been in a
technical state of civil war since 1999 when European and US cultural
Marxists/multiculturalists, through NATO, decided to attack Christian Serb forces and thus disallowing them their right to repel Islam from their ancestral lands.

(Behring Breivik 2011: 825)

Book 2 includes a number of essays by Peder Nøstvold Jensen, the most important being his draft of “A European Declaration of Independence”. In this essay, Nøstvold Jensen presents a long list of incidences which justify a European declaration of independence after which he outlines the specific demands of the culture conservative wing. Further, Behring Breivik (2011) predicts the European civil war which will stand between “cultural conservatives and cultural Marxists (nationalism vs. Internationalism).” (Behring Breivik 2011: 1197). He states: “Just as WW1 was caused by Imperialism, WW2 by Fascism and the Cold War by Communism, this one will be caused by multiculturalism.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 737). In other words, the forthcoming war is a cultural one. Behring Breivik outlines the phases through which the inevitable civil war, the Battle of Europe, will proceed: “The never ending flood of Muslim demands is calculated to break the budget, jam the bureaucratic gears into gridlock, and bring the system crashing down. Fear, turmoil, violence and economic collapse would accompany such a breakdown providing perfect conditions for fostering radical change.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 660). He claims that Muslims have already infiltrated Europe and are prepared with forces ready to fight in the forthcoming war. He uses Kosovo as an example of Muslim forces within Europe. Toward the end of Book 2 Behring Breivik argues for deportation of Muslim populations in Europe. He outlines the history of deportation of Muslims from Greece and Israel in order to present this as a feasible strategy.

Book 3, “A Declaration of pre-emptive War”, begins by Behring Breivik (2011) describing a fictive future scenario where resistance becomes carried out against the
increasing number of Muslims in Europe. He outlines a number of hypothetical responses
to “cultural Marxist/multiculturalist atrocities and the threat of Islamisation” (Behring
Breivik 2011: 776). He emphasizes that the responses described to supposed threat are not
actual plans, but rather of fictional nature. In addition, he stresses that he does not
advocate the use of the type of violence described in the responses to a threat. He states:
“The author or distributor does not condone or agree with any of the descriptions or
methods used in this book and the related chapters.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 776).

Behring Breivik (2011) goes on to identifying the end of the phase of dialogue
between the native European people and the multicultural establishment. According to
Behring Breivik the phase of dialogue began when the EU’s Eurabia project was
established in 1955 and came to an end when NATO bombed Serbia in 1999. He
emphasizes that the every cultural conservative attempt to start dialogue has resulted in
them becoming “rejected, ignored or ridiculed” (Behring Breivik 2011: 778) by
multiculturalists. Behring Breivik proceeds to outline who he considers traitors of the
native European people after which he lists the charges against these. These range from
war crimes (especially relating to the NATO bombing of Serbia in 1999) to biased news
coverage and anti-Western propaganda taught in schools. Behring Breivik refers to
Nøstvold Jensen’s writings where he argues that the only possibility of freedom for native
Europeans is armed resistance.

Behring Breivik (2011) describes three phases of the European civil war which
will be carried out by the reemerged European resistance group, the Knights Templar.
Phase 1 extends from 1999 to 2030 which is characterized by “Better communication and
cooperation among cultural conservative groups” (Behring Breivik 2011: 662) and
includes terrorist attacks and sabotage by cultural conservative resistance groups. Behring
Breivik debates different strategies which could promote cultural conservatives in Europe to unite, such as the church and Christianity. The second phase includes the military battle for Europe, extending from 2030 to 2070. Further, this phase includes more advanced resistance groups and “Preparation for pan-European coup d’états” Behring Breivik 2011: 812). The final, third phase will be a full civil war which will end with a coup d’état. Following the coup, the phase will include instating cultural conservative rule in Europe, execution of traitors and deportation of Muslims. The civil war is according to Behring Breivik to be carried out through all means possible; ideologically, economically, politically and military.

Behring Breivik (2011) discusses how to practically carry out resistance against the multicultural establishment including ways in which one can avoid being detected by National Intelligence Agencies, how to avoid family and friends becoming suspicious and how to maintain motivation during long-term planning. He identifies supplies needed for different operations, where to acquire supplies from and physical training methods. He outlines which countries are more appropriate to carry out attacks in due to their high Muslim populations in addition to listing political parties which support multiculturalism in these countries. Behring Breivik goes on to categorize traitors of the native European people into an A, B, and C-category with the intention: “to easier identify priority targets and will also serve as the foundation for the future “Nuremberg trials” once the European cultural conservatives reassert political and military control of any given country.” Behring Breivik 2011: 938). After having outlined a considerable number of ways in which attacks may be carried out in the most destructive way possible Behring Breivik discusses the 'responsibility' which comes with being a European resistance fighter. He states that one major task is to advertise the ideology and convert more followers and
recognizes a trial after a 'successful operation' as an excellent opportunity to advertise the resistance battle and gain support for the movement.

Book 3 includes a detailed diary-like description of Behring Breivik's (2011) preparation for his own attacks on July 22nd, in addition to suggested alternative strategies which may be used. A detail worth noting is that Behring Breivik describes the preparation of the bombing of the government quarter but does not mention preparations for the Utøya shooting. Behring Breivik suggests a future political arrangement of Europe, after the battle for Europe has concluded. He believes the European church needs to be converted from a “labour church” to a “traditional church” (Behring Breivik 2011: 1133). He argues that Catholicism is more suitable for the future monocultural Europe than Protestantism and argues for a patriarchal social structure to be re-instated in Europe. He discusses the future political structure of monocultural Europe and the need of a Guardian Council, which will be the superior decision making organ. He advocates for the need of a Guardian Council in order to prevent “future Marxist attempts of infiltration” (Behring Breivik 2011: 1190). He describes his vision of the future political structure of Europe in the following terms:

At least one parliament seat should be reserved for a "Cultural and Scientific Overseer" which will have the right to veto any new bills presented by parliament which violates the nations primary doctrines (preferably only used in extremely rare cases and only when the primary values are threatened). We must avoid a one-party-state system as this is not desirable in the long run. As long as we have implemented permanent mechanics in relation to cultural areas (culture, procreation, defence-security, immigration) we can afford to continue to guarantee balanced political representation on a majority of other areas.

(Behring Breivik 2011: 1190)
The manifesto concludes with Behring Breivik’s (2011) discussion about the Christian justification of his attacks. He argues that the Pope legitimizes rightful crusades and that the Bible permits acts of self-defense, which is how Behring Breivik perceives his battle. In addition, he emphasizes the important position Christianity will have in the monocultural Europe: “It is essential that we preserve and even strengthen the Church and European Christendom in general (by awarding it more political influence on certain areas), when it comes to the moral, cultural and social aspects of society.” (Behring Breivik 2011: 1308). He argues for creating an economic, cultural and military European Federation. The final part of the manifesto consists of an interview Behring Breivik has conducted with himself, definition of important terms and images of Behring Breivik wearing different uniforms which the cultural conservative resistance group is to wear.
Literature review

In this review of literature I will outline the central literature regarding Norwegian right-wing extremism and its historical background in Norway. There have been a number of studies of far right politics and right-wing extremism in Norway. However, such studies have had a limited focus on how such politics and extremism is unique to the Norwegian context. My aim is to understand how right-wing extremism, specifically the type of violent and devastating extremism experienced Norway experienced recently, has developed in the unique Norwegian context and how specific characteristics of the Norwegian society has facilitated this development.

I have divided the literary contributions into the four following categories; the history of immigration in Norway, political background, extreme right-wing ideology and Behring Breivik's extreme ideology. I will begin by outlining the history of immigration in Norway in order to provide a background for the development of right-wing politics. Norway's leading far right party, the Progress Party, is primarily known for their opposition to immigration. The second part of my review of literature will describe the political background to the acts of political violence carried out by Anders Behring Breivik on July 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2012. I consider this necessary as Behring Breivik was active in the political scene before he radicalized and developed extreme ideology. The politics he was involved in can by no means be blamed for Behring Breivik's acts of terrorism, but as Øyvind Strømmen (2011) argues, it would be naive to believe that (political) rhetoric does not come with its prize. The political background Behring Breivik identified with before becoming extreme is relevant in order to understand the background from which his extremism developed. I will start chronologically by discussing Per Bangsund's (1984)
book *Arvtakerne* which addresses the history of Nazism and fascism in Norway from end of the German occupation of Norway during World War II until 1984. In addition, I will use Øyvind Strømmen's account of the development of the far right in Norway from his 2012 article “Utviklingstrekk i Norsk Høgreekstremisme” for the 22\textsuperscript{nd} of July commission. I will go on to address more contemporary right-wing politics in Europe and Norway by discussing Ketil Raknes' book *Høyrepopulismens hemmeligheter* (2012). Raknes outlines how right-wing populism has developed to become a supported political stance in a number of European countries. Finally, I will discuss Øyvind Strømmen's book *Eurofascism* (2007) where he outlines the history and current position of fascist politics in Europe and the challenges this creates and may lead to in the future.

The third part of the review of literature will shift focus to look at extreme right-wing ideology. This is relevant as Theodor Enerstvedt (2012) argues that Breivik enters into an international tradition of “right-wing extremists, nationalists, neo-Nazis and neo-fascists” (Enerstvedt 2012: 12). I consider the development from a political ideology into an extreme one important as this is the reason why Breivik resorted to violence. As long as one acts within the boundaries of democracy, violence does not appear as a justified means to an end. However, when ideology becomes extreme, the use of violence becomes considered legitimate. In addition, the literature I have examined focuses specifically on extremism which considers Islam the primary enemy. I will begin by outlining the history of the extreme right wing in Norway. Øyvind Strømmen (2012) outlines major developments in Norwegian right-wing extremism from 1927 until 2012 in the article “Utviklingstrekk i Norsk Høgreekstremisme” for the 22\textsuperscript{nd} of July commission, an independent commission which was appointed to go through and evaluate how different government agencies handled their task under and after the attacks. In the book *Terror*
From the Extreme Right gathered by Tore Bjørø (1995), he discusses the reasons for emergence of the extreme right wing in Norway in addition to characteristics specific to the Norwegian radical right. Further, I will discuss the concept of extremism in addition to extremism focused specifically on Islam. Lars Gule's Ekstremismens kjennetegn (2012) deals with what constitutes as extremism is and discusses the justifications for extremism. Gule discusses both a descriptive and normative foundation for extremism and discusses how Behring Breivik relates to these. Finally, I will address Mattias Gardell's Islamofobi (2011) which examines what islamphobia is and how and why it has developed. In this edition, published after the July 22nd attacks, Gardell discusses Behring Breivik in the context of islamophobia. Gardell considers the July 22nd attacks a consequence of islamophobic rhetoric found both in politics and the general public.

The final part of the review will focus on Anders Behring Breivik's specific ideology which can be traced back to counter-jihadist ideology. I will outline Bat Ye'or's (2005) theory about Eurabia. This conspiracy theory has according to Strømmen (2011), Gardell (2011) and Enerstvedt (2012) been central in the development counter-jihadist ideology adopted by Behring Breivik and like-minded. Further, I will address two sources of literature which specifically discuss Behring Breivik's ideological conviction. In Øyvind Strømmen's Det mørke nettet (2011), the author focuses on the type of emerging right-wing extremism shared and developed on blogs and online discussion forums. Strømmen traces the emergence of such discussion forums and blogs back to European right-wing populist parties, who share similar views as those expressed anonymously on the internet. He considers the spread of the ideology worrisome as its rhetoric holds an extreme potential for violence. Finally, I will discuss Theodor Enerstvedt's (2012) analysis of Anders Behring Breivik's ideology through his examination of Behring Breivik's
manifesto in the book *Massemorderen som kom fra ingenting*. Enerstvedt places Behring Breivik in a political and ideological tradition and outlines the background for his extreme thoughts. In addition, Enestvedt discusses the reasons to why Behring Breivik left the path of legitimate politics and resorted to terrorism.

**Setting the scene - History of immigration in Norway**

Today, Norway is known as having a liberal immigration policy, along with countries such as Sweden, Germany and Austria, where approximately 12 percent of the population are immigrants\(^\text{14}\). However, large scale immigration, such that seen in other European countries like France, Sweden and the Netherlands, began relatively in Norway. Due to an increase in the need of labor force larger scale labor immigration began in the 1960's with immigrants from Pakistan and India. In the 1970's additional labor immigrants arrived from Turkey, Morocco and Yugoslavia (Moore 2010). Anniken Hagelund (2003) argues that around this time immigration became to be considered a “political problem” (Hagelund 2003: 49). In 1975, the government began limiting labor immigration by introducing a “‘full stop’ in the immigration of non-Nordic workers” (Hagelund 2003: 49), only allowing “temporary migrant workers, those with needed expertise (such as the petroleum industry) and limited number of refugees” (Moore 2010: 359).

In the 1980's, Norway opened for the arrival of refugees, primarily from countries such as Vietnam, Iraq, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Somalia and Afghanistan. Tom Christensen and Per Lægreid (2008) point to a first “wave” of refugees in the 1980's. Further, they state that the numbers fell in the 1990's until reaching a peak again in 2002, as a result of

---

the more liberal policies implemented. Although Norway is not a member of the European Union (EU), it became a member of the European Economic Area (EEA) in 1994.\textsuperscript{15} This implies that Norway must adhere to certain legislation and policies of the EU, which include liberal policies regarding immigration within the EU. Following this, Norway has also received a considerable number of immigrants from countries such as Poland and Lithuania. In addition, Norway became a part of the Schengen agreement in 2001, which allowed greater immigration to Norway from other member countries of Schengen and vice versa.

Currently, the countries from Norway has the greatest number of immigrants from are Poland (10 percent), Sweden (5 percent), Pakistan (5 percent), Iraq/Kurdistan and Somalia. Through immigration, the Norwegian society has also been introduced to new religious communities. Today there are religious communities including Islamic, Buddhist, Hindu, Sikh, Jewish and Orthodox present, amongst others. Although the presence of Islam often becomes emphasized and exaggerated, Statistics Norway\textsuperscript{16} emphasizes that out of all the religions represented by immigrants in 2008, 88.2 percent were not followers of Islam.

Immigration to Norway is administered by Norwegian Directory of Immigration established by the government in 1988. Norwegian immigration policy divides those entering the country in the following three categories: “those seeking refuge, those entering the country to reunite with their families and those immigrating in order to work” (Christensen et al. 2008: 163). According to Christensen and Lægreid (2008) Norwegian immigration policy has largely been 'consensus driven' between the major political parties, 


with the exception of the right wing Progress Party.

According to Harald Moore (2010), the rise in immigration in the 1960's gave a boost to the development of the Norwegian far right party the Progress Party (FrP), today well known for its antipathy toward immigrants. He argues that skepticism regarding immigration was caused by immigrants taking “lower-tier economic positions” (Moore 2010: 358) in the labor market. In addition, Moore states that when labor immigrants became replaced by refugees in the 1980's the anti-immigrant sentiments strengthened further. Hagelund (2003) confirms this development by referring to statistics which show the considerable increase in refugees from maximum 300 per year in the 1970's and 1980's to 8 600 in 1987. This development was appropriated by the Progress Party, who began directing focus on immigration, setting it on the political agenda, after the peak in the number of refugees in 1987. They expressed skepticism regarding the privileged treatment of refugees as opposed to Norwegian citizens. Today, Hagelund argues that the Progress Party has received “issue ownership” (Hagelund 2003: 51) over immigration politics. Hagelund states that from the establishment of the Progress Party in 1973 its approach to immigration has developed from considering it an economic problem to a cultural one. Further, she argues that this development can also be seen in public opinion in general.

**Political background**

In 1927 the first Norwegian fascist party, Nationale Legion, stood for election. However, the party only received 1,2 percent of the votes and later dissolved (Øyvind Strømmen 2012a). Central figures of the party later moved on to other parties, which had resemblance to the German Nazi party NSDAP, such as Norges Nasjonalsocialistiske Arbeiderparti and Nasjonal Samling. Through this, members from Nationale Legion
contributed to the further development of radical nationalist parties and groupings in Norway after the German occupation came to an end in 1945. Per Bangsund (1984) argues that the early Norwegian fascist parties did not support Hitler or the German occupation, but rather had as a primary cause to fight communism and limit state bureaucracy.

Immediately after the end of the German occupation the far right milieu was primarily concerned with the treason settlement of those who had sided with the Germans under the occupation. According to Strømmen (2012a), until new far right parties were established to carry on the radical right-wing tradition in Norway politically, individuals identifying with such groups published right-wing oriented journals, such as 8. Mai and Folk og Land. These journals served an important function as it kept fascists in Norway updated on the development of neo-fascist movements around Europe. It published articles by central figures in neo-fascist movements such as Per Engdal and Oswald Mosley. In addition, the journals allowed information to be shared about meetings and events within the milieu.

The next organized fascist party in Norway did not develop until the 1960's. According to an interview with Norwegian politician and journalist Finn Sjue (NRK 2012) right-wing extremism in Norway underwent a hiatus from the end of German occupation in 1945 until 1968. Bangsund (1984) also argues that the far right movement in Norway underwent an important development during the 1950's-60's. Rather than simply copying foreign right-wing ideology, it developed its own far right politics founded on the situation in Norway after World War II. Bangsund suggests that a 'new nationalism' was formed through this development and that it required a party which could reach out to voters and receive support.

In 1968, Nasjonal Ungdomsfylkning (NUF) was founded which represented a new
development for fascist tradition in Norway. Bangsund (1984) states that NUF did not only represent skepticism to race mixing and development aid but also opposition to communism, liberalism and democracy. In addition, the party was highly critical to Norway's 1949 NATO-membership. They considered NATO defense cooperation to protect the interests primarily of the powerful 'elite countries' such as the United States, the United Kingdom, German and France. They would rather have Norway forming defense cooperation with other Nordic countries. According to Bangsund, NUP did not strive to introduce national socialism similar that seen in Germany under Hitler’s rule. Rather, they aimed to modernize the ideology and develop a unique Norwegian nationalism. However, after a relatively successful period, NUP dissolved due to internal conflicts.

In 1974 NUP developed into Norsk Front which had as its primary goal to fight the supposed decay of Norwegian society after World War II. Strømmen (2012a) states that previous NUP member, Olav Hoaas was responsible for introducing opposition to immigration into Norwegian right-wing politics. However, Norsk Front also dissolved after a violent episode related to right-wing radical groups. The first episode involved a bomb being thrown toward a May Day celebration in Oslo in 1979. Norsk Front became replaced by Nasjonalt Folkeparti, which welcomed the members of the late Norsk Front. Nasjonalt Folkeparti also dissolved after being associated with the bombing of a Mosque in Oslo in 1985. These were the first violent attacks related to right-wing extremism in Norway after the German occupation. Finn Sjue (NRK 2012) argues that until the 1970's the Norwegian right-wing milieu largely consisted of amateurs and was rather unorganized. In 1977, Carl I. Hagen formed the most successful far Right party in Norwegian history, the Progress Party (FrP).
Through Øyvind Strømmen's (2012a) article contributing to the 22\textsuperscript{nd} of July commission and Per Bangsund's *Arvtakerne* (1984) the early development of right-wing populist and fascist parties in Norway from 1945 until 1984 is sketched. These parties are the precursor to the Progress Party, which Anders Behring Breivik was a member of from 1999 until 2004. The political legacy of the early right-wing parties is important as these later developed into the Progress Party, who are known for their focus on immigration and specifically immigration from Muslim countries. The development of these parties and the political legacy of extreme right-parties and organizations are important to understand the history background of Breivik’s political ideology. Since the timeline provided by Strømmen and Bangsund only extend up until the mid-1980, further inquiry into the more contemporary history of the extreme right is required.

In *Høyrepopulismens hemmeligheter* journalist and political advisor Ketil Raknes (2012) discusses how right-wing populism, which he describes as right-wing extremism kept inside the boundaries of democracy, has become an increasingly valid and supported political stance in several European countries. He argues that although right-wing populism is different from right-wing extremism the two share similar ideals such as exclusive nationalism, authoritarian values and anti-elitism. However, what separates the two is their view of democracy. Right-wing populist parties consider democracy to provide the opportunity for them to promote and gain support for their ideology. Right-wing extremists, on the other hand, consider democracy a primary obstacle to their ideology; their ideology is fundamentally incompatible with democracy. This makes violence a legitimate way in which to meet opposition.

The support of authoritarian values in right-wing populism becomes evident through advocating longer prison sentences, more discipline in schools and traditional
(Christian) moral values. Raknes (2012) identifies that a common focus for such parties in Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands and Norway, is skepticism to immigration. In addition, the ideology finds threats to the homogeneity of the nation both within and outside the boarders of the country. Those who pose a threat to the country from within are the elite, media and those who exploit social welfare. This group is considered to have failed the national community and to be traitors of the country. In addition, immigrants and ethnic minorities who have entered the country pose a threat from within. Raknes, along with Strømmen (2011), Gardell (2011) and Hylland Eriksen (2012), argues that after the September 11th attacks on the United States, Islam has become considered the primary enemy to homogenous nations. After this development where religion became central in defining the enemy, right-wing populists have included traditional Christian values into their ideology. Although right-wing populists have traditionally had a conservative approach to the family, homosexuals and the role of women they have become more liberal regarding such issues. Those who are considered a threat to the country from outside are the European Union as a symbol of the elite, intellectuals, the United Nations, neighboring states and Jews in the financial sphere.

Raknes (2012) finds that by taking a left-wing approach to economic issues, particularly the support of the welfare state in Scandinavian countries, combined with a traditional right-wing approach to values based issues such as culture and immigration, right-wing populist parties cater to the needs and wishes of an expanded group of voters who have not felt that their wishes and needs have been sufficiently covered by other parties. In addition, the more liberal approach to gay and women's rights may have increased support for such parties. He argues that right-wing populist parties have found a void in the political sphere which they have filled.
Raknes (2012) describes the developments of the right-wing Progress Party (FrP) in Norway and how it has managed to adapt to current issues. Although, the party is critical to immigration, Raknes suggests that this is not the primary reason why they have gained support. Raknes argues that after the Parliamentary election in 2009 the party became the new labor party in Norway since 36 percent of the Norwegian labor force voted for it in comparison to the Labor Party's (Arbeiderpartiet, Ap) 33 percent. He believes this can be explained by the fact that the party has applied a more leftist approach to economic issues, expanding their electorate. Raknes emphasizes that although the Progress Party is considered a right-wing populist party (the only one in Norway), it is still considerably more moderate compared to similar parties in Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands. He also argues that the party has had a long history in Norwegian politics since their views are more moderate and therefore considered valid and legitimate.

In conclusion, Raknes (2012) believes that those who support right-wing populist parties may have valid reasons to do so, and may not primarily vote for such parties due to having racist attitudes. The right-wing populist parties he has focused on have developed their ideology in a way which includes aspects other than primarily hostility toward immigration, such as taxation and welfare issues. He also argues that due to democratic tradition in the countries he has focused on, people with views that by most might appear as 'radical' or 'alternative' must be allowed a place and voice in politics, granted they stay within the boundaries of democracy. Raknes also suggests that allowing such parties a legitimate place in politics will strengthen democracy since it allows controversial and tough issues to be addressed, discussed and debated. Raknes refers to a study conducted in Denmark showing that the Danish people consider their democracy strengthened through the debates held which have included the quite extreme right-wing populist party Dansk
Raknes (2012) offers an alternative way of viewing right-wing populist parties. He argues that such parties have been strategic and successful in including a traditional left-wing stance when coming to economic issues. Through this shift of focus, right-wing populist parties have expanded their electorate and managed to receive greater support. He offers a credible explanation as to why such parties have emerged, developed and collected votes. Rather than referring more racist attitudes in society being the reason to this, Raknes suggests that a more liberal approach to women's and gay rights and a more leftist approach to economy have expanded their voter base. Raknes provides a nuanced view of right-wing populism by highlighting the variety of issues advocated by such parties.

Raknes' (2012) account of right-wing populism is relevant when considering right-wing extremism and fascist tendencies. Although there are important major differences between right-wing populism and right-wing extremism and fascism, Raknes emphasizes that there are important common characteristics between the two. Anders Behring Breivik was a member of the Progress Party from 1999 to 2004, but left the party since their approach to immigration was too moderate. The fascist and extreme right views of Behring Breivik are considerably more radical than those advocated by right-wing populist parties. However, such politics are a part of the same political tradition as right-wing extremism and fascism are founded on and have developed out of. As stated by Øyvind Strømmen (2011), the Progress Party cannot be held accountable for Behring Breivik's acts but it would be naive to believe that he was not affected by the political rhetoric it uses. For instance, the current leader of the Progress Party, Siv Jensen, became highly criticized after introducing the term 'islamification by stealth' when discussing the
effects of the Muslim population on the Norwegian society. This view of Islam has clear parallels to counter-jihadist ideology. It is essential to examine the political stance Behring Breivik had, until he radicalized and left the path of achieving change through peaceful democratic means.

Raknes (2012) points to an important issue in his conclusion when stating that those with controversial views must also be allowed to part-take in the political sphere. In his manifesto Behring Breivik (2011) argues that the media and political elite supporting multiculturalism have completely excluded him and those with similar ideological beliefs from politics and public debate. This has added fuel the idea about a conspiracy where the current political leadership is involved in promoting the rights of certain people as opposed to others.

Journalist and author Øyvind Strømmen's *Eurofascism* (2007) focuses on fascist tradition in Europe after World War II. He argues that this is an important topic as it is essential to note that “Fascism did not start with Hitler. It did not end with Hitler either” (Strømmen 2007: 7). He considers this necessary as Europe is seeing the emergence of political parties with clear fascist tendencies which Strømmen argues poses a much larger threat to Western democracy than Islamist terrorism. It is this ideological trend having emerged after WWII, which he labels ‘Eurofascism’. He critiques the attention and efforts being focused on Islamist terrorism, while ignoring the development of fascist extreme ideology within Europe.

Strømmen (2007) argues that modern neo-fascists are both capable and willing to refer to violence and terrorism and therefore should be considered a serious threat. In addition, he expresses concern regarding the “increased political importance of neo-fascist parties” (Strømmen 2007: 12) seen in several European countries. Strømmen outlines
some central characteristics of neo-fascism. For instance, Eurofascists deny being fascist and racist. They rather claim to be merely 'race-conscious' or 'nationalist'. Another central characteristic is viewing Islam and Muslim immigrants as 'invaders' and those who are in support of immigration as 'traitors of their country'. Further, fascists often perceive that they, along with the native people of the country, are being discriminated against by the political leaders currently in power. Strømmen argues that Eurofascists have moved away from anti-Semitism and often express highly pro-Israel views. In addition, Eurofascists tend to romanticize the nation’s past and consider a collected European nation, different from that of the European Union, an ideal. They consider their goal; a nationalist and authoritarian state, a better solution than a totalitarian multicultural state. Strømmen outlines the primary enemies of Eurofascists as follows: ‘leftist media, Marxist scholars, 'political correctness', 'the established parties', multiculturalism, Muslim immigrants in general and Islamic radicalism in particular’ (Strømmen 2007: 11).

Strømmen (2007) argues that through adopting a more 'housebroken' rhetoric and appearance Eurofascism has succeeded to appeal to people who do not consider themselves fascist. He particularly identifies the fascist think tank Nouvelle Droite's member Alain de Benoist as a central figure in making fascist politics more 'clean' and 'acceptable'. de Benois introduced the idea of 'ethnopluralism', according to which “in order to preserve the unique national characters of different peoples, they have to be kept separated; mixing different ethnicities only leads to cultural extinction.” (Rydgren 2008: 745). Ethnopluralism has, according to Strømmen, been used by neo-fascists in order to develop a more respectable image, which has allowed fascist ideas to seep its way into mainstream politics.

Strømmen (2007) outlines the history of fascist organizations and parties in a
number of European countries and identifies central characters in the Eurofascist scene, where Bat Ye'or (2005) and Oriana Fallaci are considered decisive. Strømmen emphasizes that the Norwegian right-wing Progress Party is much more moderate in its ideology than other European right-wing populist parties with clear ties to fascism. He states that although some of its party members have drawn inspiration from Eurofascist parties, it would be a mistake to label the Progress Party fascist. Instead, Strømmen argues that the party has become an umbrella organization for a spectrum of different people who share “nationalist, populist and xenophobic” (Strømmen 2007: 125) tendencies.

Finally, Strømmen (2007) emphasizes that none of the Eurofascist political parties discussed have gained major popular support or political power. Regardless, he considers fascist political forces to pose a threat to democracy in numerous European countries. He draws a history of politically motivated violence and terrorism from Eurofascists and argues that it also poses a real threat in the future. Although he doubts Eurofascist parties could come to power, he argues that the presence of the totalitarian and authoritarian ideals it supports do pose a threat, at least on a national scale. In particular, Strømmen states that he finds it worrisome how Eurofascism shortens the distance between liberal ideas and fascist and highly nationalistic ideas since it appeals to a wide range of people. In addition, Strømmen finds the reluctance in society “to identify fascism for what it is” (Strømmen 2007: 164) alarming. He also addresses the 'monopoly' afforded to parties with Eurofascist tendencies to address certain issues, such as problems related to immigration. He argues that this monopoly makes it hard to create legitimate political debate around certain topics, without risking being labeled a racist or fascist; “Through the fear of being seen as racist we have invited those who truly are racist to the stage” (Strømmen 2007: 165).
Strømmen (2007) provides a clear account of the development of fascism in Europe after WWII. His description provides good justification for his concerns regarding the threat posed Eurofascists. In addition, his concerns appear realistic, since he explicitly acknowledges that most probably fascists will not come to political power in any European country in the foreseeable future. However, he considers the ideals and values which it advocates alone to be dangerous enough that the mere presence of these pose a possible threat to democracy. The threat Strømmen argues Eurofascism could pose in the future seems even more justified after Behring Breivik's attacks. As stated by Strømmen, the Norwegian Progress party may not be labeled Eurofascist and therefore this might not have been where Behring Breivik developed his extreme ideology. However, the flow and exchange of information allowed by social media, the internet and other forces globalization, have enabled Behring Breivik to debate, develop and receive support for his extreme ideology.

Strømmen (2007) emphasizes important issues regarding fascism which are worth noting. Strømmen argues that people may disregard the presence of fascism today since some assume that fascism dissolved after Hitler’s fall. He also emphasizes the ‘monopoly’ Eurofascist parties have on certain issues as worrisome. This is important, as having monopoly on certain issues enables them to collect a larger number of votes. Strømmen states that in a democratic political sphere, issues should be open for public debate, without limiting the voices of those with controversial or socially unaccepted opinions.

Øyvind Strømmen's *Eurofascism* (2007) is highly relevant when considering the type political extremism exhibited by Behring Breivik and placing him in the correct political and ideological category. In Strømmen's review of the characteristics of Eurofascism, most of these are also suitable when describing Behring Breivik. Strømmen's
concern regarding the reluctance to identify fascism in society seems justified. I have followed the media coverage of the investigations and trial and I have not found much discussion about Behring Breivik's fascist affiliation. However, since Behring Breivik exhibits apparent fascist views it is important to examine the origin and development of fascism. In addition, examining the history of fascism in Norway is important in order to investigate which characteristics unique to the Norwegian society may have affected the development of Behring Breivik's ideology.

Strømmen (2007) identifies Bat Ye'or (2005) and Oriana Fallaci as theorists who have had a decisive effect on the development of Eurofascism. The inspiration Ye'or has been for Behring Breivik (2011) can clearly be seen in his manifesto and when considering the central position counter-jihadist ideology has had for him. Those Strømmen identifies as the enemies of Eurofascism, coincide perfectly with those Behring Breivik consider a threat to his 'ideal' society. In his manifesto, Behring Breivik (2011) denies being racist and explicitly disassociates himself from Hitler's racist ideology. In addition, Behring Breivik's view of immigrants and especially those who support immigration is in alignment with that of Eurofascists. Strømmen emphasizes that the Norwegian Progress Party should not be considered a Eurofascist party since its politics is considerably more moderate than its British, French and Belgian counterparts. This may be a reason to why Behring Breivik left the Progress party in 2004. He explains this in his manifesto by stating that the party’s politics was too moderate for him and therefore he did not receive the desired response to his views.

In conclusion, the literature examined in this section all deal with the history of the political stance Behring Breivik's extreme ideology has developed from. Per Bangsund (1984) and Øyvind Strømmen (2012) have outlined the development of right-wing politics
and organizations in Norway from 1945 to 1984. Ketil Raknes (2012) has sketched the development of right-wing populism and argued for how such parties have received a valid position in politics in several European countries. In addition Raknes has suggested what such parties offer to voters and how they may be primarily receiving votes based on their politics economic politics, rather than immigration politics. Øyvind Strømmen (2007) has focused on the fascist tradition in Europe after World War II both looking at political parties, central ideological figures and organizations.

A recurrent theme in the literature examined so far is the labeling of the Progress Party as a relatively moderate far right party in comparison to its European counterparts. In addition, the authors seem to agree on the Progress Party being the first and most successful far right party in Norway historically. Raknes (2012) and Strømmen (2007) identify a tendency in Norway of excluding those with radical rightist views, especially regarding immigration. They consider it worrisome and problematic to exclude those with certain views from public debate and politics. In addition Hagelund (2003) and Strømmen argue that this has given far right parties 'monopoly' on certain issues, such as concerns regarding immigration.

However, Raknes (2012) and Strømmen (2007) differ in the way they consider radical right-wing politics. Both outline very similar characteristics of such parties but apply different terms to it. While Raknes uses the term right-wing populist parties, Strømmen labels them Eurofascist parties. Strømmen's term 'Eurofascism' expresses the severity of the ideals advocated by such parties, to a larger extent than Raknes' term 'right-wing populist parties'. In addition, Raknes' failure to identify the right-wing populist parties as fascist may be an example of Strømmen's criticism regarding the refusal of society to identify fascism in society. Raknes places greater emphasis on trying to
neutralize far right parties and explaining their rhetoric. Strømmen, on the other hand, focuses on warning about the possible outcomes of such rhetoric and the consequences of such parties obtaining political power of such parties. Raknes' account of the politics of such parties seems more impartial than Strømmen's.

**Extreme right-wing ideology**

According to Strømmen (2012a) following the end of the occupation in 1945 until the 1980's individuals with extreme right-wing ideology generally joined and found unity in the established parties and organizations outlined by Per Bangsund (1984). According to Strømmen (2007) such organizations and parties have historically been weak since they have served as a gathering place/hub for individuals with a wide specter of right-wing ideology, varying from those who have moderate viewpoints to those who have extreme ideological beliefs. He characterizes most of the far right organizations and parties from 1945 to the 1980's to have had strong neo-Nazi tendencies, partly due to this.

Another branch of extreme right-wing groups in Norway identified by Strømmen (2012a) is primarily characterized by extreme opposition toward immigration, where the major group Folkebevegelsen Mot Innvandring (FMI) was established in 1987. Politician and journalist Finn Sjue (NRK 2012) argues in an interview that in the 1980's, especially after the increase in immigration in 1987, Norwegian right-wing milieus began focusing on opposition to Islam and multiculturalism. In other words, the focus shifted from race to culture. This is a development in Norway which has also been identified by others, such as professor in Social Anthropology Thomas Hylland Eriksen (2012). FMI's rhetoric is clearly influenced by the Eurabia literature where Europe is currently in a state of civil war, between culture conservatives and culture liberals. In addition, FMI has showed
tendencies to advocate for the use of violence in order to promote their political ideology. In 1989, three members of the group were arrested for having planned terrorist attacks against a refugee reception center. Strømmen (2012a) describes the 1990's as being primarily characterized by these two branches of right-wing ideology; neo-Nazism and extreme opposition to immigration.

In the 2000's Strømmen (2012a) argues that the focus shifted to counter-jihadism due to terrorist attacks by Islamist groups and the riots following the editorial cartoons depicting the prophet Mohammad, published in several European newspapers. Strømmen states that counter-jihadist views are strongly characterized by conspiracy theories and hateful rhetoric. In addition, he believes that counter-jihadism has greatly benefited from social media and the internet. He identifies Peder Nøstvold Jensen (Fjordman) as a central and influential character in the Norwegian, as well as international, counter-jihadist movement. His rhetoric, based on the Eurabia literature, exhibits clear fascist tendencies and he indirectly encourages actions which closely resembles genocide. In conclusion, Strømmen states that anti-Muslim right-wing extremism currently has the strongest and most influential presence from the extreme right in Norway today.

Strømmen's (2012a) account of the history of right-wing extremism in Norway coincides with the developments sketched out previously of the history of immigration and right-wing politics in Norway. The extreme right wing shares a number of similar ideas as far right politics. However, the extreme right wing considers the limits set by democracy as an obstacle for their ideology and for what they consider to be an ideal society. Next, I will outline literature which discusses right-wing extremism in more detail focusing on developmental stages and characteristics of such extremism, particularly in the Norwegian context.
In the collection *Terror from the Extreme Right* several authors discuss the different processes of radicalization into right-wing extremism in the context of different countries. In his introduction, editor of the volume, Tore Bjørgo (1995) discusses the problems related to the term 'extreme right-wing'. He argues that the term has become an umbrella category which covers a wide variety of orientations, ranging from politically and ideologically motivated groups to youth gangs primarily inspired by white-power music. Bjørgo offers the following definition of right-wing extremist terrorism: “the systematic use (or threat) of violence to intimidate categories of people for political purposes” (Bjørgo 1995: 6). In order to illuminate what the 'basic element' of right-wing extremism is Bjørgo refers to Willem Heitmyer who emphasizes a perceived nature-given inequality between people as an essential characteristic. In addition, Heitmyer stresses to the use of violence as an accepted way of acting (Bjørgo 1995: 3).

Bjørgo (1995) argues that a useful way to understand such extremism is viewing it as a reaction “to threatening changes at work in society” (Bjørgo 1995: 3). However, the way the extreme right-wing perceives society tends to be affected by conspiracy theories about the state of affairs. Bjørgo states that accepting the idea of conspiracies allows every event to be incorporated into the ideology and all criticism or evidence of the contrary to be rejected. However, in order for violence to be considered a legitimate means, the individual or group must go through a radicalization process through which the 'enemy' becomes “delegitimized and demonized” (Bjørgo 1995: 4). Bjørgo emphasizes that although extreme right-wing groups are particularistic in their goals and values they are internationalist when it comes to inspiration and organization. In addition, Bjørgo argues that the imagined threat posed by immigration serves as one of the few issues where such groups can receive popular support in politics.
In Tore Bjørgo's (1995) chapter “Extreme Nationalism and Violent Discourses in Scandinavia: 'The Resistance', 'Traitors' and 'Foreign Invaders' ”, he discusses and compares the rhetoric used by the extreme right wing in the Scandinavian countries. He states that Norway, Denmark and Sweden have different histories of right-wing extremism, since the countries historical background, especially relating to World War II, is different. Similarly to Strømmen (2012a), Bjørgo argues that the Norwegian extreme right is divided between neo-Nazis and anti-immigration groups. The extreme right in Norway and Denmark are similar and through their discourse they attempt to legitimize their ideology by drawing parallels between their opposition to immigration and the resistance to German occupation during WWII. The extreme right-wing attempts to justify their stance by arguing that current opposition to immigration is as legitimate as resistance against the German occupation was and that immigration should be fought with similar force as the resistance forces fought the German's during the occupation.

The Norwegian and Danish extreme right has attempted to create an image of themselves as 'the new resistance movement' thereby distancing themselves from Nazism (Bjørgo 1995: 188). The groups do this by trying to adopt symbols from World War II of positive nationalism and patriotism, which were mostly anti-Nazism. Due to the anti-Nazi character of such symbols they become 'suitable' for groups opposing immigration, since such groups deny any affiliation to Nazism and racism. Rather, they are merely 'culture conservatives'. According to Bjørgo (1995), the connection made between contemporary anti-immigration groups and the WWII resistance movement is used to acquire legitimacy for their stance. According to Raknes (2012), the Norway's history during WWII has also been an advantage to the progress of far right politics in Norway. A central aspect of anti-immigration groups is the idea of current political leadership, in addition to those who
support immigration, being traitors. This is also a key aspect in Behring Breivik's (2011) ideology. In addition, anti-immigration groups and Behring Breivik share the idea that those who should be the target for antipathy and violence are not immigrants, but rather those who allow and promote immigration.

Bjørgo (1995) emphasizes that regardless of the different ideological basis between anti-immigration groups and neo-Nazis “the content of their rhetoric is strikingly similar” (Bjørgo 1995: 204). He emphasizes the primary argumentation and conclusions to be similar. However, characteristic where the two differ is the source of the legitimacy of their stance. Anti-immigration groups refer to the resistance to the German occupation to legitimate their ideology. Neo-Nazis, on the other hand, use Hitler's National Socialism to justify their stance. Bjørgo points to the complete absence of anti-Semitic views as a relatively unique character of anti-immigration ideology in Norway and Denmark. He explains this by referring to the history both countries have had with Nazism, which has acted as a deterrent to such views. In addition, Bjørgo denies that the contemporary right-wing's focus on Islam, is a substitute to that on Judaism. He argues that conspiracy theories regarding Islam are far from as elaborate as those of Jews and Judaism. However, Bjørgo stresses that Islamic conspiracy theories will develop and become “more elaborated and appealing” (Bjørgo 1995: 209).

When seeking explanations to the violence exhibited by right-wing extremists Bjørgo (1995) emphasizes such groups being denied an "outlet for their views through ordinary channels of the political system" (Bjørgo 1995: 202) to be a common explanatory factor. He states that this might lead to “the pressure cooker effect” (Bjørgo 1995: 202), where tension and frustration regarding being denied participation in public debate builds up and is released through acts of violence. Bjørgo argues that this is may be an
explanatory factor to a certain extent, but that it would be too simplistic to regard the effect of this as the sole explanation to right-wing violence. He argues that right-wing extremists do have sufficient channels through which they are able to express their views and that being denied such channels is to an exaggerated extent referred to by extremists themselves in order to justify violence. In conclusion, Bjørgo states that the extreme right-wing use historic traditions in order justify ideology and actions based on their ideology. He argues that factors which are particularly important to such groups are: “notions of conspiracies and impending threats of national and racial disaster, and the triangular relation between domestic traitors serving foreign forces of invasion/occupation and the resistance movement of true patriots fighting both categories of enemies.” (Bjørgo 1995: 211).

Bjørgo (1995) provides an interesting account of the foundation of Norwegian right-extremism specifically. His description of the extreme right is credible as he outlines a historical foundation for the unique type of right-wing extremism found in Norway and Denmark, which distances itself from Nazism. Bjørgo even argues that distancing themselves from the Nazi legacy of Nazism works in the groups’ advantage, adding to their legitimacy. Even though such groups attempt to disassociate themselves from Nazism, Bjørgo highlights that they share similar rhetoric to Nazism. It adds to the credibility of Bjørgo’s account of right-wing extremism focused on immigration and Islam that he predicts anti-immigration right-wing extremism to develop to become as elaborate as the anti-Semitic stance. This development has taken place since Bjørgo's 1995 volume. Today, Bat Ye’or’s (2005) Eurabia is defined by a number of researchers as the leading theorist behind counter-jihadism. In addition, Bjørgo offers an explanation to violence by extreme right but at the same time acknowledges that these explanations are too simplistic
to fully explain this. Next, I will discuss literature dealing with the concept of extremism in order to understand how a stance becomes considered extreme and how individuals with an extreme stance legitimize it.

In Norwegian philosopher Lars Gules (2012) book *Ekstremismens kjennetegn* he discusses extremism and its descriptive and normative foundations. Gule defines extremism as views, opinions, expressions and actions which deviate from what is considered as 'normal'. Thus, an understanding of what is 'normal' is required in order to determine what is extreme. This makes extremism a relative concept, since opinions regarding what extremism is fluctuate with changes in what is considered normal. The relative character of extremism is a weakness, since this allows some views to be discarded and other accepted depending on the current climate. Determining what extremism is also includes the means one is willing to use to reach an end. Accepting the use of violent means is generally considered as extreme.

Gule (2012) states that in order for an understanding of reality to be socially acknowledged as a valid position, it must be justifiable with scientific evidence. Gule (2012) defines descriptive extremism as extremism with a theoretical or ideological foundation based on an understanding of reality which deviates from the general understanding of reality, which lacks a scientific foundation. In other words, it is an understanding of reality which is not and cannot be verified by science. Those whose stance is based on descriptive extremism, often justify it by combining selected facts with analogies to predict a future outcome of a situation. All objectives to their stance are rejected by any rhetorical means. According to Gule, ruthless rejection of objections and refusal to reevaluate a stance reveals descriptive extremism. He argues that a new development in descriptive extremism is to justify a stance by combining it with some sort
of conspiracy theory. In addition, Gule recognizes using essentialism to define a phenomenon a characteristic of descriptive extremism. In *Islamofobi* Gardell (2011) identifies essentialism as a key characteristic of islamophobia. Essentialism involves defining something based on a very simplified basis, in order to understand it. The essence which is defined is considered as a permanent and unchangeable characteristic. Gule identifies anti-Semitism and islamophobia as classic examples of essentialism. He defines islamophobia as an unfounded fear of or fear founded on wrong premises, toward Muslims and Islam, which is a central characteristic in counter-jihadism and the Eurabia literature. For instance, counter-jihadism and the conspiracy theories about Eurabia are by most people considered a type of descriptive extremism, with little to no foundation in reality. However, for individuals such as Anders Behring Breivik, his world view is a based on reality. Gule also emphasizes the importance of not dismissing all 'strange' perceptions of reality as insanity.

Normative extremism is according to Gule (2012) an extreme perception of reality which deviates from established and generally accepted ethical, moral and political norms of most societies. Such universal norms are those of human rights, democracy and rule of law. An example of normative extremism would be a political stance, where murdering those in opposition is considered acceptable. In the case of Anders Behring Breivik, he would most likely consider himself a normative rather than descriptive extremist since he considers his view as based on a reality created in the Eurabia literature, but which deviates from generally accepted norms.

Gule (2012) offers a thorough and nuanced account of the concept of extremism. He emphasizes the position general society has in determining what constitutes as extremism and how it is a dynamic concept which changes. When viewing Gule's
discussion about descriptive extremism in conjunction with Behring Breivik's ideological background in counter-jihadist ideology the two coincide perfectly. When studying counter-jihadist ideology one can identify most of the characteristics Gule outlines of descriptive extremism.

Gule (2012) makes an important point stressing that eccentric and extreme views should not instantly be dismissed as insanity. This dismissal can provoke and agitate people with such perceptions. This may lead to radicalization of 'extreme' ideology. Further, simply dismissing what one does not understand may result in loss of important information and prevents one from understanding and dealing with such views in an appropriate way.

In addition, considering Behring Breivik in the context of both descriptive and normative extremism brings out interesting sides of his extreme stance. Behring Breivik would most likely not agree with being categorized as a descriptive extremist. However, I believe he would agree that he is a normative extremist; his extremism is based on the fact that he does not share society's general norms and values. In his manifesto, Behring Breivik (2011) discusses the deterioration of Norwegian society and argues for the need to reinstate 'traditional' norms and values to the society. Behring Breivik resorted to extreme means in order to stop the current development and assure the future of a monocultural Norwegian society. In interrogations and during the trial Behring Breivik has expressed that he understands that his actions are considered extreme. However, in his frame of understanding the acts were: "horrific, but necessary."

Gardell wrote the book *Islamofobi* where he examines the history behind the appearance of 'islamophobic tendencies' both in politics and in public opinion, primarily focusing on Sweden. He traces a fear and skepticism to Islam as far back as the middle ages, but as several others, he identifies the September 11th, 2001 attacks of al-Qaeda as a turning point for 'contemporary' islamophobia. The fear these attacks generated became directly related to Islam and the skepticism toward Islam and Muslims reached a strength and span unseen before. Both according to Raknes (2012) and Gardell (2011), right-wing parties have used the attacks to fire up under their anti-immigration rhetoric. In addition, the parties could now identify their primary enemy which supposedly threatened Europe's democracy and freedom – Islam. According to Gardell, Islam has replaced the threat previously posed by communism, during the Cold War.

The essence of islamophobia is according to Gardell (2011) the direct link between Islam as a religion and the idea of the static way 'all Muslims are'. Islamophobic ideas completely exclude the possibility that Islam as a religion varies between societies and individuals. The concept entails that all Muslims are alike and there is no such thing as a moderate Muslim. All Muslims are judged based on the acts of a minority of radical Islamists. Those who claim to know Islam often provide 'proof' of the threat posed by Islam and Muslims by reproducing random and detached quotes from the Quran. Gardell also criticizes the false image portrayed by Islam through outdated and misinformed literature in schools, medias exaggerated focus on the supposed threat posed by Islam and conclusions drawn about Islam based on a Christian interpretation of the Quran.

An updated version of *Islamofobi* was published after Anders Behring Breivik attacks on July 22nd, 2011 with an epilogue where Gardell (2011) discusses the events of July 22nd specifically. According to Gardell, the instant link made between the attacks and
Islamic terrorism is a clear consequence of islamophobic rhetoric. He criticizes the fact that when it became known that the terrorist was in fact a blond and blue-eyed native Norwegian man, his acts became dismissed as merely a rare incident carried out by an insane loner. This way, attention became diverted away from Behring Breivik's political conviction and inspiration, which is disturbingly widespread. Gardell believes this is irrational, as the history of right-wing extremism in Norway shows that after World War II this group has been responsible for violent attacks. Further, Gardell strongly disagrees with dismissing Behring Breivik as insane. He believes the attacks to have been calculated, political murders and he argues that the attacks were based on a logic which can and must explained in order to prevent similar events from occurring in the future.

Having studied Behring Breivik’s manifesto Gardell (2011) identifies four primary sources of influence; islamophobic rhetoric, culture conservative ideas, some elements from white supremacist ideology and anti-feminism. The primary source of influence comes from Bat Ye'or's (2005) islamophobic Eurabia literature according to which World War III has begun, where Islam is taking over Europe, through demographic warfare. This demographic take-over has been made possible through a conspiracy formed between western politicians, scientists, professors, CEO's and media and Islamic leaders.

Another source of influence for Behring Breivik has been white supremacist ideology. This influence is however an ambiguous one, as Behring Breivik states in his manifesto that he completely rejects the Nazis hate toward Jews. According to Gardell (2011), Behring Breivik has an ambivalent stance to race as he does not consider himself a racist. He supports the race centered Norse mythology Odinism in its criticism of culture-Marxism promoted by the church. However, Behring Breivik believes Christianity has a better potential than Odinism to reconcile Europe in its battle against Islam. Gardell
argues that Behring Breivik's influence from white supremacists primarily affected the organization and planning of his attacks. Gardell finds similarities in Behring Breivik's attacks and the development seen in the United States in the 1970's-80's where American racists directed their antipathy toward state leaders who afforded blacks equal rights, rather than Afro-Americans themselves. In addition, Gardell identifies the trend seen in the United States among Arian supremacists and politically motivated terrorists to resort to a 'lone-wolf' strategy to avoid detection by the authorities.

Gardell's (2011) account of islamophobia, especially related to Behring Breivik, introduces interesting arguments regarding the influence islamophobic sentiments in society may have had on Behring Breivik. Gardell states that he considers the July 22nd attacks a direct consequence of islamophobic rhetoric. In the Norwegian society I consider far right parties, such as the Progress Party, being primarily responsible for voicing such rhetoric publicly. This might challenge Strømmen's (2011) argument regarding the responsibility Norwegian far right party, the Progress Party had in the development of Behring Breivik's ideology. Although Strømmen acknowledges that it would be naive to believe that the rhetoric used by far right parties do not have consequences, Gardell's account might make a case for placing a greater responsibility with parties expressing hateful rhetoric.

Both Strømmen (2007, 2012a) and Bjørgø (1995) argue that the extreme right wing in Norway has historically accommodated a wide specter of ideologies, which according to Bangsund (1984) has historically been a weakness of the Norwegian far right. In addition, they both agree on anti-immigration being the primary type of right-wing extremism in Norway at the moment. This becomes further re-verified by Gardell's (2011) literature regarding islamophobic sentiments in society. Bjørgø aligns with Gardell, as
both discuss Norwegian anti-immigration extremists denying their affiliation with Nazism and racism in general. I find Gardell's discussion of the influence Behring Breivik has had from neo-Nazism interesting as it seems like this has been quite ambiguous. This ambiguity reveals further similarity in rhetoric between 'culture conservatives' and 'racial conservatives' discussed by Bjørgo and reveals the difficulty in separating the two.

Gule (2012) and Gardell (2011) both bring up an important point when emphasizing the importance of not dismissing those with extreme views as insane. Behring Breivik's mental state was a major focus during his trial and was a decisive factor in the type of sentence he would receive. In 'expert testimonies' during the trial Bjørgo, Strømmen, Gardell and Gule all emphasized the political aspect of Behring Breivik's ideology and extremism and stressed the importance of sentencing him according to this. During his testimony¹⁸ Gardell stated that Behring Breivik is a product of a political milieu. In addition, he argued that if all of those with similar ideology to Behring Breivik's are to be considered insane, the Norwegian state must be prepared to build a large mental institution in order to house them all. The testimonies of Bjørgo, Strømmen, Gardell and Gule serve as support for Behring Breivik entering into a tradition of political extremism and that such views are unfortunately widespread in society.

Gardell (2011) identifies islamophobia as a decisive influence on Behring Breivik's development of extreme ideology. In his article, “Xenophobic Exclusion and the New Right in Norway”, Thomas Hylland Eriksen (2012) discusses islamophobic sentiments in the Norwegian society. He states that considering the minimal contact Norway has had historically with the Ottoman Empire, there is little foundation for such sentiments. Regardless of this, he identifies an increased tendency in the Norwegian
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¹⁸ Bakke Foss, Andreas. "-Behring Breivik er et produkt av et politisk miljø." Aftenposten, 06 05, 2012.
society of considering Islam and Muslims “as a social problem” (Hylland Eriksen 2012: 207). Hylland Eriksen argues that through comparing Norwegian and Islamic culture, Islam becomes depicted as the direct opposite of Norway and goes as far as arguing that Muslims have become the primary 'Other' for “Norwegian self understanding” (Hylland Eriksen 2012: 207). Hylland Eriksen echoes Gardell and states that islamophobic sentiments advertised through Bat Ye’or’s (2005) *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis* is the “discursive universe” (p. 208) in which Behring Breivik “came of age ideologically” (Hylland Eriksen 2012: 208). The final part of this review of literature will discuss specifically Behring Breivik’s ideology.

**Anders Behring Breivik's extreme ideology – counter-jihadism**

Ideologically Breivik represents counter-jihadism. A canonical work for counter-jihadism is *Eurabia: a Euro-Arab Axis* by Jewish-Egyptian Gisele Littman (2005), using the pseudonym Bat Ye’or. In her work, Ye'or outlines highly questionable and speculative evidence suggesting that Europe is undergoing a takeover by Islam. She suggests that Europe has and is currently undergoing an evolution from a Christian civilization to and increasingly Islamic one. This is the result of a conspiracy formed between European liberal political leaders and leaders of the Muslim world. Ye'or argues that Islam has throughout history “subjugated and in some cases extinguished once powerful Judeo-Christian, Hindu and Buddhist civilizations” (Ye'or 2005: 9). According to Ye'or this take over has been under development for decades without the awareness of the population of Europe. However, as a result of the al-Qaeda attacks in the United States on September 11th, 2001 and in Madrid on March 11th, 2004 Ye'or argues that the population of Europe is becoming increasingly aware of Islam's 'colonization' of Europe.
She labels the new Europe “a civilization of dhimmitude” (Ye'or 2005: 9). By the Arabic term ‘dhimmi’ she refers to “subjugated, non-subordination to an ascendant Islamic power to avoid enslavement or death” (Ye'or 2005: 9). She argues that previously Europe has resisted the repression by Islam but following the establishment of the European Union (EU), Europe has accepted Islamic colonization. This is according to Ye'or a result of the conspiracy liberal European leaders have formed with Islamic leaders as a result of the oil crisis in context of the Egyptian-Syrian war against Israel in 1973. During the war Arab oil producing countries reduced oil production, increased the price of oil and placed an embargo on oil. In order to resolve the crisis the Euro-Arab Dialogue (EAD) was formed. According to Øyvind Strømmen (2007) Ye'or's book has changed the status of the Eurabia theory from a questionable theory to a social reality. Strømmen argues that both Ye'or's and Oriana Fallacis literature regarding Eurabia have greatly contributes to the “mythos of Eurofascism” (Strømmen 2007: 56). In addition, in his 2012 article Strømmen describes the Eurabia theory as an “essential innovation” (Strømmen 2012a: 11) for right-wing extremism.

When describing the events leading to the collaboration, Ye'or (2005) refers to previous French Prime Minister, Charles de Gaulle, working to restore France's position in Europe as a major driving force behind forming the EAD. She argues that de Gaulle wished to create a European-Arabic alliance in order to challenge American power and hegemony. Ye'or claims France has had a central part in the cooperation and labels France an “Islamic Empire” (Ye'or 2005: 40) due to its colonial history. She considers the Treaty of Paris in 1951 and the treaties of Rome in 1957 all precursors to enabling the establishment of the EAD. In order to secure oil resources to Europe, political leaders of Europe enter into a cooperation with Arabic countries in order to establish and regulate
current and future “political, cultural and economic cooperation” (Ye'or 2005: 54). Ye'or argues that the two major reasons for the establishment of the EAD were Europe's rivalry with the United States and “the Arab stranglehold on Europe” (Ye'or 2005: 111) due to the oil crisis.

In the years immediately following the Egyptian-Syrian war against Israel the cooperation largely focused on the relationship between Israel and Palestine. However, Bat Ye'or (2005) states that overall “The Euro-Arab Dialogue established the conditions for a genuine Euro-Arab symbiosis” (Ye'or 2005: 57). The Arabic representatives in EAD made sure to eventually include criteria into the cooperation which ensured labor immigration from Arabic countries to Europe. Further, the representatives required that the immigrant population must be allowed to practice their native culture and religion and that the European host countries were to facilitate this. When Ye'or describes the way the Arabic representatives increase the demands to the European counterparts she makes it appear as if the European representatives are victims of the Arab representative’s cynical demands and exploitation. She goes as far as claiming that the European Community has been used as “an instrument of Arab Policy” (Ye'or 2005: 70). She outlines the main objectives of the EAD for the Arab countries to be transfer of technology (particularly military and nuclear technology), “implanting Europe with a large Muslim population” (Ye'or 2005: 75) and influencing Europe through religious, political and cultural practices.

As a result of this “jihadist coalition” (Ye'or 2005: 12) Europe has become increasingly anti-Western, anti-Christian, anti-American and judephobic according to Ye'or (2005). She claims that due to immigrants from previous French colonies in Islamic countries, French Jews cannot express their religion without risking lynching. Further, she argues that such attitudes have even been incorporated into policies developed by the EAD.
and become implemented by the political, religious and media elite and that these can be interpreted as “an extension of jihad” (Ye'or 2005: 127). She states that European countries have adopted the elimination of Israel as first priority through cooperation with the Arab world. Primarily she directs critique against European leaders who gave in to 'Arab threats' in 1973.

Additionally, Ye'or (2005) interprets all critique of the United States and Israel as support for Islam and jihad. She believes Arab states would have been powerless without Western technology. By providing such technology through the EAD, European leaders have enabled Arab states to acquire more international power and influence. Ye'or believes that Islam has historically used jihad to subdue Christian populations and granted dhimmi-status to non-Muslim populations. Further, she argues that Muslim populations in Europe consider international and national legislation secondary to Shari'a law and states that Muslims require Shari’a law to be incorporated into European civil law. She argues that there is an increasing tension building between Europeans and Eurabians due to the incompatibility between political, social, cultural and religious beliefs and values. Ye'or believes that the majority of the European population is unaware of the EAD agreements, but that they are becoming increasingly aware of “the unrelenting mutation of their societies” (Ye'or 2005: 129).

Ye'or (2005) offers arguments which seem purely based on unverified ideas. Amongst other things, she argues that European Jews are experiencing increasing anti-Semitic violence, due to an increase in the number of Muslims residing in European countries and increase in general 'judeophobic' sentiments. Ye'or states that this has been ignored by authorities in order to protect the political and economic cooperation with the Muslim world. In addition, she argues that European countries have ignored and
diminished the threat posed by Islamic terror. I cannot see any traces of this in Norway where the majority of research on terrorism has been focused on Islamic terror and which has led to the incorporation of the Council of Europe's convention regarding terrorist acts into Norwegian legislation in 2011\(^19\). In addition, Gardell (2011) argues that islamophobic sentiments can be seen in the media as well as military research and training in Sweden, where a disproportionately large focus is directed at Islamist terror, as opposed to domestic terror. I consider it reasonable to assume the same trend applies for Norway.

Further, one of the primary reasons Ye'or gives for the establishment of the EAD, a “jihadist coalition” (Ye'or 2005: 12), was Europe's need for oil which was embargoed by Arab countries during the Egyptian-Syrian war against Israel. In other words, she argues that Europe has agreed to Muslim colonization in exchange for petroleum resources. However, as pointed out by Thomas Hylland Eriksen (2012), this theory does not seem applicable for the Norwegian context, as it is a major exporter of petroleum.

Ye'or's (2005) arguments about the conspiracy and collaboration between the EU and the Muslim world appear weak. On one hand, she argues that most European political leaders have a close and amiable cooperation with Muslim leaders and on the other she states that following the September 11\(^{th}\) attacks on the United States, the EU increased its financial support to Palestine due to fear of similar attacks on European soil. She also argues that European countries have condemned the United States authorities for the invasion of Iraq. However, NATO forces contributed in both Iraq and Afghanistan. Out of the current 130 000 NATO military in Afghanistan, the vast majority are American, but the majority of the remaining military personnel are from European countries.\(^20\)

---


Ye'or (2005) refers to conspiracy theories such as the US authorities being responsible for the September 11th attacks in order to ridicule and weaken the arguments of those with opposing views to hers. This appears odd when considering that her own ideology is also based on a quite controversial conspiracy theory. Additionally, she is uses numerous examples of terrorist attacks carried out by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in order to illuminate the violent nature of Islam. Simultaneously she expresses pro-Israel and pro-American views with no critique of terrorism carried out by Israel or the United States. Ye'or offers trivial evidence to support her idea of a conspiracy including claiming that Islamic history and art exhibitions are proof of an ongoing conspiracy. In addition, through describing the history and practice of dhimmitude or taqiyyya, she portrays Islamic religion in general as a hateful, vicious religion, which has as its only goal to conquer and destroy. This is an extremely generalizing, one-sided and faulty portrayal of a religion and all its followers. In conclusion Ye'or's arguments appear overall as unreflected and weak.

While conducting research for his book Det mørke nettet journalist Øyvind Strømmen (2011) monitored the counter-jihadist milieu on blogs and online discussion forums for years. He has investigated such milieus in several European countries, but focused specifically on Norway. During his research Strømmen has read comments posted by Anders Behring Breivik in addition to having had debated with him along with one of his major inspirations, Peder Nøstvold Jensen (‘Fjordman’) on counter-jihadist online forums. After the attacks on July 22nd Strømmen stated that these unfortunately did not come as a surprise to him. Strømmen argues that considering the violent rhetoric used in these milieus it would be naive to believe that this would not have major violent real-life consequences.
In *Det mørke nettet* Strømmen (2011) uses examples from online debate to place Anders Behring Breivik and his ideology in a larger context, where similar views are shared by a number of others, both in Norway and Europe in general. Strømmen identifies three primary historical phases in right-wing extremism in Norway after the 1970's. The first phase was primarily dominated by neo-Nazi groups. Further, the second phase was characterized by what Strømmen calls extreme form of 'everyday racism'. This phase was not dominated by neo-Nazism but included individuals who had been a part of the resistance-movement during World War II with an extreme skepticism directed toward Islam.

The current phase is marked by extreme critique of Islam combined with conspiracy theories. This phase has largely been developed on and through online debate forums, but has its foundation in the Eurabia literature and counter-jihadist ideology. Although the current state of right-wing extremism has weaknesses due to poor structure and organization, Strømmen states that such characteristics provide certain advantages for those involved. The internet allows sharing socially 'unaccepted' views anonymously and allows involvement in radical ideology to be combined with 'normal' activities such as an ordinary job and a family. Strømmen (2011) states that Behring Breivik is ideologically a member of a group but in his terrorist acts he was alone. Strømmen argues that the factor which separates Behring Breivik from like-minded, are the violent means which he is willing to use. In estimating how large the counter-jihadist milieu is in Norway, sharing similar views as Breivik, Strømmen regards the online milieu to be considerably larger than any organized groups.

In addition to online debate and loose groupings, Strømmen (2011) outlines far right political parties in Europe that share and promote a similar rhetoric regarding Islam.
as Behring Breivik. This is where Strømmen believes that the largest threat from counter-jihadist milieus lies. He considers it worrisome that a group with such extreme and potentially violent ideology as counter-jihadist's are allowed a legitimate position in politics. Strømmen regards the following far right parties in Europe especially worrying; the Norwegian Progress Party (FrP), the Austrian Freiheitspartei (FPÖ), the British National Party, Sweden's Sverigedemokraterna and Hungary's Jobbik. According to Strømmen, these parties represent an anti-globalization, anti-politics and anti-EU stance. In addition, they share a xenophobic tendencies and extreme skepticism toward Islam. Strømmen argues that previous anti-Semitic views have largely been replaced by counter-jihadism.

Strømmen (2011) has conducted extensive and thorough research of extreme right wing milieus in Norway, specifically focusing on counter-jihadism. I find it essential to note that Strømmen, due to his knowledge about the milieu Behring Breivik was a part of, did not find the attacks surprising. This suggests that had the Norwegian secret service had a greater focus on and thereby knowledge about domestic terrorism, as opposed to solely Islamic terrorism, the July 22nd attacks could have been averted.

Further, Strømmen (2011) places Behring Breivik and his ideology in a larger, national and international context. This further supports the idea of Behring Breivik not being a product of a psychiatric disorder but rather of an international milieu. I find it both interesting and worrisome that Strømmen believes the largest threat to European democracies is posed by organized groups, rather than extreme violent individuals such as Behring Breivik. This suggests that such groups possess characteristics which make them a larger potential threat than Behring Breivik. In addition, Strømmen expressing more concern regarding such groups than solitary violent individuals, conveys that he considers
it possible that such groups may be able to have an influence in society.

Professor in sociology at the University of Oslo, Theodor Enerstvedt (2012) has written the book *Massemorderen som kom fra ingenting*. The title of the book translates to 'The mass murderer who came from nothing' and is worth noting as it refers to the way the author considers the Norwegian society to have reacted to Anders Behring Breivik's attacks. He criticizes the society for being reluctant to be reflective about why these attacks took place in Norway. Enestvedt conducts a thorough analysis of Anders Behring Breivik's ideology through his manifesto in order to understand 'where' Behring Breivik came from and place his attacks on July 22\textsuperscript{nd} in a societal context. Enerstvedt describes his intention with the book as placing Behring Breivik in a national and international historic tradition in order to show that the attacks did not appear out of 'nothing'. He states that such understanding is essential as Behring Breivik is a part of a larger development seen internationally of extreme right-wing, nationalistic, neo-Nazi and neo-fascist sentiments.

Enerstvedt (2012) specifically criticizes the political sphere in Norway for failing (or avoiding) to focus on and discuss the economic, political and ideological explanation Behring Breivik (2011) has provided for his attacks both through is manifesto, interrogation and trial. This is, according to Enerstvedt, supported by mass media that sensationalize and dramatize the attacks in order to divert focus away from Behring Breivik's reasoning. He argues that this contributes to cover up the foundation of the attacks and to cover up forces which he considers are threatening the democracy in Norway, along with that of other European countries. Unless an understanding of why there is a development in Europe, also identified by Raknes (2012) and Strømmen (2011), where right-wing populist parties are receiving greater support and strong nationalist sentiments are developing, Enerstvedt fears that the Norwegian society will 'miss the
point' and thereby be unable to prevent such attacks in the future.

Enestvedt (2012) primarily describes Behring Breivik as an anti-Marxist and anti-communist since large parts of his manifesto are dedicated to emphasizing the way he considers Marxism has deteriorated and destroyed the society and how such forces should be resisted and fought. Behring Breivik (2011) considers Marxism, communism and multiculturalism as the primary 'enemies' which has paved the way for Islam's presence in Europe. In particular, he considers political leaders, NGO's, mass media, cultural leaders and major corporations to be 'Category A traitors'. The target for Behring Breivik's attacks was primarily the multiculturalism supporting Norwegian Labor party (Ap) who he blames for the presence of Islam in Norway.

In his manifesto, Behring Breivik (2011) provides immense criticism of Islam, but explicitly states on numerous occasions that Muslim's are not his primary target. Further, Behring Breivik outlines demographic 'evidence' to illustrate that Eurabia theory is becoming fulfilled. However, the demographics he refers to are highly exaggerated. This is the primary empiric foundation of his theories and acts. Behring Breivik's ideal society is characterized by monoculturalism, traditional moral values, the nuclear family, free market economy, support of Israel and traditional Christian values. He considers the current situation to be a battle between the culture conservative and culture liberal and between the national and the international. Further, he believes that this will escalate into a full scale European civil war in the years to come.

Enestvedt (2012) goes on to explore explanations as to why Behring Breivik left the political path, within the legal and non-violent bounds of democracy and decided resort to terrorism. Enestvedt emphasizes that in his manifesto Behring Breivik (2011) identifies NATO's bombing of Yugoslavia in 1999 as an important turning point in his
radicalization. In the manifesto Behring Breivik conducts an interview with himself where he identifies the unconstitutional NATO-bombing of Yugoslavia in 1999, where the Norwegian forces participated, as the turning point. Behring Breivik considered this bombing campaign as further evidence of the Eurabia theory, where the native Serbian population was attacked in order to protect the Muslim Kosovo-Albanian population. After this he considered a terrorist attack justified. More generally, Behring Breivik considers cultural liberals to have been responsible for wars, terror, murder and genocide toward the native European population in the European civil war which according to Behring Breivik began in 1999 with the NATO bombing of Serbia and will conclude in 2083. During Behring Breivik's testimony he stated that the attacks were necessary since: “I see my people being victim to genocide.” (Aftenposten 2012).21 He considers Europe to currently be undemocratic, since one cannot be considered a democrat unless one is a multiculturalist. Øyvind Strømmen (2011) also verifies that for counter-jihadists there is no democracy unless their views are heard and shared.

In his manifesto, Behring Breivik (2011) describes a strategy through which the cultural conservative wing can win the battle for Europe. He goes on to outline a political arrangement which should be instated in Norway after the end of the European civil war in 2083. Behring Breivik states that politically he does not identify as Fascist since he does not support a single party system. Rather he believes in an 'administrative democracy', such as that seen in Russia. His ideal is a constitutional monarchy with a monocultural and democratic multi-party system. However, he considers it necessary to instate a Guardian Council which would be ranked above the government and which would have the power to veto any laws and bills. This suggests that Behring Breivik's

ideal society is characterized by authoritarian values. Ideologically, he claims to distances himself from what he calls “hate-ideologies” (Behring Breivik 2011: 752) such as national Socialism/Nazism, Islam, communism and multiculturalism. He justifies this by arguing that racism directed at native Europeans, from Islam and multiculturalists toward culture conservatives, cannot be fought with racism. He is highly critical of those criticizing Islam or multiculturalism being dismissed as mere Fascists, racists or Nazis.

Behring Breivik characterizes himself as an anti-Marxist, anti-communist, anti-Islamist, anti-cultural Marxist, anti-multiculturalist and anti-imperialist. These characteristics most people would agree are suitable to describe Behring Breivik. Further, he claims to be an anti-Nazist, anti-Fascist and anti-racist. The truthfulness of these characteristics is debatable. Having examined Behring Breivik’s manifesto Enerstvedt (2012) argues that Breivik is not a racist as he does not focus on race when criticizing Islam, but rather on culture. He claims that instead of on focusing on racial differences between Europeans and Muslims, he is interested in the rights of Europeans as opposed to those of Muslims. However, Enerstvedt believes this is rather a tactical claim from Breivik, trying to avoid being associated with neo-Nazism. Further, Enerstvedt characterizes Behring Breivik as a conspiracy theorist and as an anti-totalitarian. The ideologies he opposes; Islam, Nazism and communism are all totalitarian according to Behring Breivik. He also considers Norway a totalitarian and undemocratic society characterized by conformism in order to provide a sense of security.

I agree with Enerstvedt’s (2012) criticism regarding the Norwegian society avoiding to direct focus on the explanations Behring Breivik has given to his acts. Rather than examining and illustrating the political meaning behind Behring Breivik’s attacks Enerstvedt argues that both the political sphere and media in Norway have focused on
concealing and direct focus away from his reasoning. During the preparations for and particularly during the 10-week trial the greatest focus was directed at speculations about Behring Breivik's psyche. While this is an essential aspect, I assume that the public speculating in and debating his mental state has very limited relevance. Unlike most other criminal cases, Behring Breivik has offered considerable documentation providing background and explanations to his attacks. However, this has been afforded relatively little attention. Behring Breivik began working on his extensive manifesto in 2006. The five years he spent on the manifesto, provides thorough documentation of his development in practical preparations, ideology and radicalization. Considering the extent of documentation which is available, little focus has been directed at this.

Considering the focus Enerstvedt (2012) directs at characterizing Behring Breivik as an anti-communist and anti-Marxist it appears as if his antipathy is primarily directed at these rather than Islam. This illuminates an important characteristic about the contemporary extreme right-wing, inspired by counter-jihadist ideology. Although it directs antipathy toward immigrants, primarily Muslims, the political leadership who are considered responsible for the presence of Islam in Europe is considered the 'primary enemy' who carry the blame. This is a characteristic about the contemporary extreme right-wing also identified by Ye'or (2005). In a commentary in Morgenbladet, Strømmen (2012b) outlines “hate toward Muslim's, contempt of the left-wing and conspiracy theories of Eurabia” (italics mine) as key characteristics about the contemporary right-wing; counter-jihadism.

The emphasis Behring Breivik place on NATO's 1999 bombing of Yugoslavia

---

suggests that Behring Breivik's ideological conviction may have a greater foundation in reality than what is acknowledged by many. The lack of acknowledging Behring Breivik as a rational individual with reasoning behind his acts, may be a result of what Enerstvedt (2012) considers as lack of attention focused on examining the political, economic and ideological explanations to Behring Breivik's acts by the political milieu and media. Strømmen (2012b) also identifies a lack of attention paid to Behring Breivik's political ideology in a commentary in Morgenbladet\textsuperscript{24}. However, Behring Breivik's focus on the NATO bombing campaign also supports Gule's (2012) account of the characteristics of descriptive extremism, where events and characteristics are understood in specific terms in order to incorporate it into the ideology and thereby 'make sense' of it.

Strømmen (2011) confirms what becomes evident through Bat Ye'or's (2005) book, that Eurabia is an extremely hateful and violent ideology. Although Ye'or's theory seems highly questionable to most, Strømmen's research confirms that it is a widespread ideology with followers both in the general public as well as political parties. Strømmen identifies that the important role the internet has played for the development and spread of the ideology. He argues that since the views expressed by the ideology are very controversial the internet has allowed supporters to acquire information, debate and develop their ideology anonymously.

Bat Ye'or (2005) and Enerstvedt (2012) identify those who by the followers of the ideology are considered responsible for the Islamic takeover of Europe. However, as stated by Strømmen (2011) and Hylland Eriksen (2012) these have very limited relevance in the Norwegian context. In Enerstvedt's account of Behring Breivik's manifesto one can

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.
clearly identify the influence of the Ye'or's Eurabia ideology. In addition, Strømmen's book identifies influences and opinions from Eurabia literature to be widespread in online milieus. Behring Breivik and Ye'or share the use of speculative demographic 'evidence' of Muslim colonization of Europe and cultural liberal European leaders being primarily responsible of the presence of Islam in Europe. In addition, the idea of an ongoing war between native Europeans and Eurabians is a perception shared by both. However, Behring Breivik has further elaborated Ye'or's theory and outlined a strategy for native Europeans to persist and win the battle for Europe.
Methodology

The methodology I have employed in this research project is qualitative content analysis. Content analysis is an interpretive approach to data which allows for human activity to be analyzed through looking at text. Satu Elo and Helvi Kyngäs (2007) define the objective of the method in the following terms: “The aim is to attain condensed and broad description of the phenomenon, and the outcome of the analysis is concepts or categories describing the phenomenon.” (Elo et al. 2007: 108). I am focusing on which societal factors may have influenced Bering Breivik's development of counter-jihadist ideology. Content analysis is a suitable methodology to research my topic of right wing extremism as such views are socially unacceptable subculture, which may be hard to study through other means, such as observation or interviews. Further, researching the foundation of this type of ideology in the Norwegian society is a topic too extensive to research through other means given the timeframe I have. Additionally, content analysis allows research to be carried out in an unobtrusive and nonreactive manner.

Furthermore, I consider content analysis an appropriate methodology as it allows me to examine printed media in order to acquire an understanding of how the society perceives Behring Breivik's attacks on 22nd of July. Further this allows insight into how right wing extremism is perceived to relate to the Norwegian society. Based on this I am able to draw conclusion about which societal factors have contributed to the events on July 22nd 2011. Content analysis is suitable as this is a topic of research which is tough to document through alternative qualitative or quantitative means as it is a broad topic with many abstract aspects.
Data

My data consists of 33 newspaper articles from the timeframe of when the trial against Anders Behring Breivik took place, beginning on April 16th, 2012 and concluding on June 22nd. I chose newspaper articles due to their documentation of the case and debate around it in addition to the easy availability. Further, I chose to focus on articles from this particular 10-week period as I expected that there would be a considerable focus on the case and trial in the media. Considering that this is the trial of the first Norwegian terrorist, I anticipated the trial to generate interesting and relevant public debate around the case. I have selected some articles after the end of the trial on June 22nd as the court deliberated for six weeks and announced the verdict on August 24th.

The 33 articles selected include traditional news articles, interviews, chronicles and highly detailed reports of the trial. I decided not to focus on articles published right after the attacks as this was a period when the entire nation was in a state of shock and consequently the media coverage of this period was affected by this. I anticipated articles published during the trial would have a more objective view of the events as well as being based on more reliable information.

Data collection

When collecting data I primarily used the Norwegian newspaper Aftenposten as a source since it is a major newspaper known to be a respected and reliable source which is published each day of the week. Aftenposten was also known to include a detailed daily report of the trial. Additionally, I have collected articles I considered
relevant from additional major national newspapers such as Verdens Gang, Morgenbladet and Dagbladet. Using major national newspapers in selection of data for content analysis is supported by Professor and Director at the Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration Gerlinde Mautner (2008) who states: “If you are interested in dominant discourses, rather than dissident or idiosyncratic voices, the major dailies and weeklies are obvious sources to turn to.” (Mautner 2008: 32).

Additionally, Mautner emphasizes the influence major newspapers have as a reason for selecting it as a source. Further, she supports the use of print newspapers, in contrast to online news articles, as a source as it reaches out to a large masses and thereby “shape widely shared constructions of reality.” (Mautner 2008: 32).

When carrying out data collection I went through each daily printed copy of Aftenposten and Verdens Gang over the trials 10-week period. The additional articles from Morgenbladet and Dagbladet were more sporadically selected. When going through the newspapers I selected all articles which were related to the following categories: Anders Behring Breivik (7 articles), the trial (8 articles), public debate regarding the attacks on July 22nd (15 articles) or about the extreme right wing in Norway (3 articles). I chose to focus on these four categories when collecting data as I considered this would give me a variety of relevant articles. After having collected these articles, I re-read them and narrowed the number down to those which were most relevant. In determining relevance of articles I focused on articles that had societal relevance, which did not only focus on sensationalizing the case. I also considered it important to collect articles about the trial where the individuals making statements had certain knowledge about the issues they were commenting on.

I have opted out articles with limited newsworthiness which has little
relevance due to their limited reliability and relevance for the topic of my research. For instance, I chose a considerably smaller number of articles from Verdens Gang (VG) than I did from Aftenposten as VG, being a tabloid newspaper, has been criticized by the Norwegian Press Association on a number of occasions. Considering the fact that Behring Breivik's attacks were the first terrorist attacks on Norwegian soil after World War II, combined with an extensive 10-week trial, there were a considerable portion of articles which were based on mere speculation and which were highly sensationalized.

**Data analysis**

Having collected articles I systemized the data by writing short summaries of each article in order to trace the major themes in the articles and categorize them accordingly. As mentioned previously, I chose to collect data from four categories; articles regarding Behring Breivik, those regarding the trial, the societal debate following the attacks and trial and articles dealing with the far right in Norway. These categories make up the framework of my content analysis. I found this categorization appropriate as it starts with a narrow focus on Behring Breivik and his acts and expands the focus to include how the Norwegian society views the attacks in the societal context. I expected that using these categories when collecting data would give me a variety of different articles.

The 33 articles I have selected from this framework make up my sample of data and were obtained through relevance sampling. Klaus Kirpenderff (2012) characterizes relevance sampling in the following terms: “aims at selecting all textual
units that contribute to answering given research questions.” (Krippendorff 2012: 120).

This is done by conducting a surface analysis of the considered data in order to evaluate its relevance. Kirpendorff states: “The resulting units of text are not meant to be representative of a population of texts; rather, they are the population of relevant texts, excluding the textual units that do not possess relevant information.” (Krippendorff 2012: 120).

According to Bruce L. Berg (2001) one must decide whether to analyze manifest content or latent content of data when conducting an analysis. In my analysis I will focus on manifest content, the “surface structure” (Berg 2001: 242), since I consider the overt content of the data I have collected as the most informative and relevant for the focus of my research. The focus of my research is which societal factors may have influenced Bering Breivik's development of counter-jihadist ideology. Therefore I consider it more appropriate to focus on the actual content of the articles rather than interpreting underlying content. In addition, I fear that by focusing on latent content of the data I might misinterpret statements and thereby give different meaning to peoples statements than what they originally intended.

Further, Berg (2001) states that when analyzing data a research must decide the level at which the data will be analyzed. He identifies that the level may be: “words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs, sections, chapters, books, writers, ideological stance, subject topic, or similar elements relevant to the context.” (Berg 2001: 244). I will analyze the articles based on the relevant themes and key concepts I have identified in them. Berg states the first step in content analysis to identify such themes in the data collected. This can either be carried out through induction, deduction or a combination of these. Identifying themes through inductive means implies the
researcher: “‘immersing’ themselves in to the document” (Berg 2001: 245) and thereby identifying relevant themes. “Immersing” oneself into the data, refers to reading the text a number of times in order to become familiar with the data and independently identifying relevant themes. In a deductive approach, on the other hand, the researcher uses themes identified in a theoretical perspective used by the researcher as a framework.

I will employ an inductive approach where I identify themes myself, after having studied the data sufficiently. These themes will be used as my units of analysis which Charles P. Smith (2000) defines as the “basis of comparison of one text with another” (Smith 2002: 320). I will use the previous research I have conducted on the topic of my research, particularly related to the review of literature, in order to determine the most relevant themes. Kirpendorff (2012) refers to this as the theoretical construct of a content analysis. Through analyzing the primary themes of the articles, I will study how the Norwegian society has perceived and interpreted how Anders Behring Breivik’s attacks relate to the Norwegian society. I will focus on to what extent the attacks are perceived to have originated from dynamics in the Norwegian society and which aspects of the society are perceived to have contributed to the attacks.

Further, I will carry out organizing of the data through coding. Smith (2000) emphasizes the importance of data coding as: “It specifies the information to be obtained from the material to be analyzed.” (Smith 2000: 320). Berg (2012) refers to Strauss (1987) who argues open coding is carried out through four steps while going through the text: “(1) ask the data a specific and consistent set of questions, (2) analyze the data minutely, (3) frequently interrupt coding to write a theoretical note,
(4) never assume the analytic relevance of any traditional variable such as age, sex, social class and so forth until the data shows it to be relevant.” (p. 251). Step number 1 involves keeping in mind what the objective of the research is and thereby keeping focus on what is relevant in order to shed light on the research topic. Berg emphasizes that this does not encourage data to be “modeled to that study” (Berg 2012: 251) but rather to be open to discover new issues that are relevant for the research. Further, he refers to Strauss who defines the process of open coding as a detailed examination of data in order to identify “concepts and categories that fit the data” (p. 255).

When coding my data I first identified key concepts and themes in the summaries written about each article. Further, I re-read each article to identify any additional relevant data identifying how Behring Breivik’s attacks are related to the context of the Norwegian society. After having thoroughly processed the data a second time I created a list of all the concepts and themes found in the data. Elo and Kyngäs (2007) state that after having conducted the coding procedure the “lists of categories are grouped under higher order headings” (Elo et al. 2007: 111). This allows merging of similar categories into higher order groupings. Based on the list of themes, I merged the key concepts which were related into new ‘higher order’ categories. I consider these new categories to be the prominent ways the July 22nd attacks are related to the societal context of Norway. This phase, abstraction, is by Elo and Kyngäs labeled as the final phase of inductive content analysis. This refers to grouping sub-categories under generic categories and further grouping these under main categories “as far as it is reasonable and possible” (Elo et al. 2007: 111). The result will be: “a general description of the research topic through generating categories” (Elo et al. 2007: 111).
**Data**

It becomes apparent through Behring Breivik’s manifesto and reports from the trial that he is highly critical of the current Norwegian society. He considers it a multicultural society which accepts Muslims and rejects him along with likeminded. He views his attacks as a way to defend the cultural and ethnic rights of his people and necessary as the multicultural political establishment did not fulfill this task. He hopes his acts on July 22nd will spark a European civil war through which Europe will be 'cleansed' of cultural Marxists and Muslim invaders and which will lead to a return to a traditional society where “monoculturalism, moral, the nuclear family” (Behring Breivik 2011: 659) are held sacred. My data illuminates this perception of the extreme right-wing of being superseded by the political leadership and general society. The data also brings up an experience Behring Breivik along with other members of the extreme right wing have of being subjected to political censorship by the current political leadership as well as the media. Further, the most debated issue during the trial, which also is prominent in my data, was discussion regarding Behring Breivik’s psychological state. This was a primary focus as there were two forensic psychiatric evaluations of Behring Breivik, which reached opposite conclusion. In addition, his mental state was decisive for the outcome of the trial. Finally, the trial has revealed that there are a considerable number of people in Norwegian society who, while condemning his use of violence, share Behring Breivik’s ideological beliefs.
Rejection by society

The experience, described by Behring Breivik on the opening day of the trial, of right-wing being rejected by the Norwegian society, at the expense of Muslim immigrants and the politically correct stance, is a major theme in my data. Behring Breivik sees the Norwegian society as rejecting the right-wing stance and has identified this as central for his radicalization which led to the attacks on July 22\textsuperscript{nd}. In Aftenposten's\textsuperscript{25} report of the opening day of the trial, April 17\textsuperscript{th}, Behring Breivik stated that he considers Norway in process of becoming “asphyxiated by conformism”.\textsuperscript{26} He continues: “Our [cultureconservatives] opinions are considered inferior and as people we are seen as secondary citizens.”\textsuperscript{27} According to Behring Breivik, this is revealed through acceptance of that which is 'politically correct', defined by the multicultural establishment, and dismissal of the right wing. He argues that after World War II, cultural Marxism became the only accepted stance which led to nationalists becoming excluded from participating in the democracy. This makes Behring Breivik consider Norway a dictatorship. Behring Breivik directs immense critique toward the supposedly independent media in Norway and Europe and accuses these of being political activists promoting multiculturalism, rather than independent journalists. Behring Breivik explains the background for his attacks:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Slike ulevelige urettferdigheter skapte meg...man har misforstått ondskap og brutalitet. Det jeg gjorde var godhet, ikke ondskap. Og ja, jeg ville gjort det...}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{26} Ibid. 7

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid. 7
“The unlivable injustice created me...they have mistaken evil and brutality. What I did was out of kindness, not evil.”\(^{28}\) This testifies to the perception Behring Breivik has of Norwegian society where him and likeminded are rejected by the political establishment through dehumanization and ridicule. He sees the political leadership in Norway as protecting the Muslim immigrant population and their rights at the expense of those of its own citizens.

In journalist Kjetil Østli's article in Aftenposten\(^ {29}\) he discusses the concept of 'truth' in the trial against Anders Behring Breivik. He describes Behring Breivik's truth in the following terms:

**Kortversion:** Marxister har makten, og gjør Norge om til et multiøtnisk helvete. Såne som ham sensu-reres, folket tøres bak lyset og hjernevaskes av eliter. Snart er etniske nordmenn en minoritet, og dette komplottet må bekjempes. Islamisering og jihad på-går, og eliten hyller det.

“Short version: Marxist's are in power and have turned Norway into a multiethnic hell. People like him are censored, the people is deceived and brainwashed by the elite. Soon native Norwegians will be a minority, and this conspiracy must be fought. There is an ongoing islamisation and Jihad which the elite applaud.”\(^ {30}\) Behring Breivik perceives the political leadership in Norway to protect the rights of its immigrant population over its own citizens. The perception of Norway's political leadership facilitating for immigrants, at the expense of its own citizens rights, is also

\(^{30}\) Ibid.
identified in Harald Stanghelle's commentary on the trial in Aftenposten. Stanghelle outlines the incidences which Behring Breivik has described led to his radicalization such as his bicycle being broken by an immigrant, rumors about a girl at his high school being raped and a fight that broke out at a house party. Stanghelle characterizes the incidences described by Behring Breivik as the result of ordinary tensions found and to be expected in most multicultural societies. In addition, Stanghelle emphasizes that these are experiences which can be recognized by others, but have not led to their loss of faith in democracy.

In an interview with Swedish journalist and author Mustafa Can in Aftenposten, Can criticizes Scandinavian countries for having a very narrowly defined national identity, both in political and social life. He argues that this tendency almost seems totalitarian at times. This may be seen in relation to the tendency in Norwegian society to accept and welcome only the 'right' political opinions, and ignoring those which vary from this. Further, Can criticizes Scandinavian societies for being reluctant to engage in debate about controversial and tough issues, such as conflicts which, according to Can, occur naturally in a multicultural society. He states that this reluctance stems from an attempt to prove how tolerant we are. Can addresses a shortcoming in Norwegian society by stating:

"Wir brauchen Akzeptanz für Unterschiede, für Konflikte, die auftreten." ([33])

He

33 Ibid.
emphasizes that conflicts are a natural part of development and if conflicts are not
dealt with they will become greater in the future. This can be related to rejecting
concerns related to immigration brought up by the right wing. Issues regarding
immigration are often difficult, but non-the-less a real concerns for parts of the
population. The issues and concerns will not disappear if ignored, rather they will
escalate into greater problems. In conclusion, Can emphasizes the importance
conflicts have in development by stating:

"If one cannot accept conflict as a part of development, one is ignorant of the fact that
civilization always arises from conflicts". 34

Witnesses from the extreme right were called in to testify in the trial in order
to provide an understanding of the milieu Behring Breivik belongs to. This
emphasized that he is included in a political tradition and that his ideas cannot be
dismissed as signs of insanity. In political commentator Harald Stanghelle’s chronicle
in Aftenposten he describes the testimonies of members of the counter-jihadist milieu:

34 Ibid.
“The outsiders on the stand told the same story. About persecution and harassment. About an existence at the outskirts of society. They are all very different but share a feeling of being persecuted, unwanted and misunderstood.”

Further, Stanghelle reports that these witnesses support Behring Breivik's worldview (however, not his acts of violence). He also identifies the relatively widespread perception of those with 'unaccepted' political views being denied participation in Norwegian politics. In the right-wing milieus being denied equal political participation, Norway is characterized as a “terror state” and as a "consensus dictatorship". Stanghelle describes the right-wing milieu in Norway:

Den formes av mennesker som mener seg forfulgt av den norske eliten - og som definerer seg som dissidenter i et norsk konsensusdiktatur. For Norge er en «terrorstat» der den hvite rasen er «i ferd med å bli utryddet av den norske makteliten», fortalte Vigrids Tore Tvedt retten.

“It consists of people who consider themselves persecuted by the Norwegian elite – and who define themselves as dissidents in a Norwegian 'consensus dictatorship'. For Norway is a 'terror state' where the white race is “in the process of becoming extinct because of the Norwegian power elite”, explains Vigrid's Tore Tvedt in court.”

Tvedt's testimony further indicates the experience of being excluded from society, expressed by numerous representatives from the extreme right.

36 Vigrid is a Norwegian neo-Nazi group founded by Tore Tvedt in 1999.
37 Stanghelle, Harald. "Politisk krattskog." Aftenposten, 06 06, 2012. 6
When testifying in the trial the representatives from the extreme right wing experienced differently treatment than the witnesses who did not identify with Behring Breivik's ideology. Political commentator Anders Giaever directs harsh criticism against the court for the unequal treatment of the different categories of witnesses (those who condemn and those who support Behring Breivik's ideology) in his commentary in Verdens Gang. Attorney Morten Kinander's chronicle in Verdens Gang echoes Giaever's criticism of the exclusionary treatment of representatives from the extreme Right in the trial. Kinander's title states:

"Practices political censorship. Many have ridiculed the extreme right-wing's claims of censorship. Now the Right wing's favorite complaint has become reality in Oslo District Court". Kinander argues that if the extreme right had not experienced political censorship previously, they have now, through the trial. He states that this differential treatment of witnesses should have been addressed and explained sufficiently by the court. This differential treatment may have provoked the sense of rejection and exclusion by society further. Finally, Kinander indicates that unfortunately this allows suspicion regarding political censorship to arise.
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Jørgen Svartstad's article in Aftenposten\textsuperscript{41} addresses counter-jihadist blogger Peder Nøstvold Jensen's, using the pseudonym Fjordman, experience of being considered public enemy number one. This is a result of being labeled as Anders Behring Breivik's mentor and primary inspiration. Nøstvold Jensen rejects this affiliation with Behring Breivik and argues that attempting to hold him responsible for Behring Breivik's acts is an attempt to further smear his reputation as well as that of counter-jihadism. Further, Nøstvold Jensen argues that he is being used as a scapegoat for Behring Breivik's action. This may be considered as an example of how those with extreme right-wing views being pushed to the outskirts of society due to their unaccepted political views.

In an article in Aftenposten\textsuperscript{42} Øyvind Lefdal Eidsvik reports that central characters in the counter-jihadist milieu, such as Pamela Geller are claiming that Behring Breivik's trial is used as yet another tool to taint counter-jihadist’s reputation. Lefdal Eidsvik refers to Pamella Geller's blog Atlas Shrugs where she states:

\begin{quote}
“Again we see the dogs in media doing the dirty work of the OIC (Organization of Islamic Cooperation).”\textsuperscript{43}
\end{quote}

Geller's statement on her blog emphasizes the common

\begin{flushright}
\textit{"...ser vi at de lo-grende hundene i media gjør det forferdelig skir-ne arbeidet til OIC (Orga-nisation of Islamic Co-op-eration), skriver hun."
}\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
43 Ibid. 12
\end{flushright}
theme claims of the political establishment and medias conscious effort to discredit
the counter-jihadist stance has in the milieu. In addition, it demonstrates how the
members of the ideology reject criticism by referring to the political establishment
attempting to reject the counter-jihadist stance.

In Jan Kjærstad's chronicle in Aftenposten⁴⁴ he debates whether the
Norwegian society has gained enough insight regarding Behring Breivik's attack to
prevent similar events in the future. Kjærstad emphasizes that although Behring
Breivik's ideology has been tied to fascism and right-wing extremism there has been
lacking attention paid to these ideological foundations. This suggests that there is a
tendency to dismiss extreme right-wing ideology even in a case where it has been
identified and has a prominent role. He argues that the society has attempted to de-
demonize Behring Breivik, in order to reduce fear of similar events in the future.

In Aftenposten's⁴⁵ report of the trial on June 21st, the day before the trial
against Anders Behring Breivik concluded, district attorney Inga Bejer Engh stated in
her concluding remarks that through the trial Behring Breivik has become portrayed
as “a tragic image of someone who wanted to become something”. Further, she
ascertains that a growing sense of defeat in the society was a central factor in turning
Behring Breivik into a terrorist. These statements support the perception those with
extreme Right-wing ideology have of being rejected by society, in addition to this
being a decisive factor in Behring Breivik's radicalization.

Political censorship of right wing

Behring Breivik has both in his manifesto and during his trial claimed that he and likeminded 'patriots' have been denied participation in the Norwegian democracy through being subjected to censorship both by the political establishment and media. Behring Breivik identifies this as a major factor in his radicalization which led him to lose hope in achieving change through democratic means. The censorship of the right-wing in Norway has been another recurrent theme in my data.

Kjetil Østli’s article in Aftenposten\textsuperscript{46} debates the role of fear in Anders Behring Breivik's acts. He refers to Behring Breivik's statements about censorship from the trial:

\begin{quote}
"From 2007 on, I have had daily contact with ideological individuals. We follow mainstream media in order to note what they are NOT writing, to test if you ideology is correct."\textsuperscript{47} Behring Breivik continues:
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{46} Østli, Kjetil. "Hva er din største frykt?." \textit{Aftenposten}, 06 09, 2012.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid. 32
"The most important reason why I am sitting here today. Becoming censored... Gang violence from Muslims is ignored by media. Resistance is labeled as right-wing extremist/Nazist. Their violence is seen as a result of our intolerance and that is very provocative."  

These statements testify to Behring Breivik's experience, shared by a number of members of the extreme Right wing, of being subjected to political censorship by the society. Behring Breivik describes leaving the democratic path since he was not taken seriously - he felt invisible and ignored. Østli identifies Behring Breivik's concern about not being taken seriously is as an expression for his fear of not being acknowledged in society.

Several articles reported that they witnessed signs of censorship of the extreme right wing during the trial. In Morten Giæver's commentary on the trial in Verdens Gang he criticizes the clear censorship of those who witnesses who belong to the same ideological stance as Behring Breivik. Giæver argues that this differential treatment of witnesses will agitate those who believe in the conspiratorial Eurabia theory and those who consider themselves being subjected to political censorship. Attorney Morten Kinander's chronicle in Verdens Gang also directs harsh criticism toward the inconsistency in the way witnesses are dealt with in the trial. He states that the extreme right's claim of political censorship has been dismissed and ridiculed, but through the trial these claims have become reality. Kinander argues that allowing national broadcasting of the testimonies of those who condemn Behring Breivik's ideology and not of those who share his ideological viewpoints is an obvious case of censorship and is extremely problematic. He states that this aspect of the trial has

---
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supported the claims made by Behring Breivik about him and likeminded being subjected to political censorship. Finally, he states that he considers the court allowing broadcasting of one group of witnesses and not another as a sign of the court taking on the controversial role of ‘policing opinions’.

In an article for Magasinet\(^\text{51}\), Rønnaug Jarlsbo and Heidi Molstad Andersen have interviewed members of different extreme right-wing groups in Norway, where several members echo Behring Breivik's claims of being subjected to political censorship. Stop Islamisation of Norway's leader Arne Tumyr states he has recognizes the political censorship Behring Breivik claims the Right-wing is subjected to. Leader of the anti-immigration group Norsk Folkeparti, Oddbjørn Jonstad interprets Behring Breivik's attacks as a cry for freedom of speech. Further, Jonstad states: “We have no real democracy in Norway.”\(^\text{52}\) The article includes an interview with researcher of right-wing extremism Tore Bjørøg who argues that after July 22\(^{\text{nd}}\) freedom of speech has been limited further. Bjørøg states:

\[\text{Det er en styrke ved demokratiet at det er plass til de radikale og ikke-voldelige debattantene. De skal ha samme rett til å ytre seg som andre. Mitt inntrykk er at 22. juli har gjort det vanskeligere å diskutere innvandringsmotstand, fordi flere ord og uttrykk ikke lenger er akseptable, sier Bjørøg, som minner om at det var et av 22. juli-terroristens strategiske mål at sensuren av de moderate anti-islamistene skulle forsterkes.}\]

“It is a strength of democracy that there is space for radical and non-violent debates. They are to have the same right to express themselves as others. My impression is that

\(^{52}\) Ibid. 29
after July 22nd it has become more difficult to discuss opposition to immigration, since a greater variety of expressions and words are no longer acceptable." Bjørgo's statement both attests to limitations to freedom of speech prior to Behring Breivik's attacks, as well as to the further limitations after the attack which is a problematic aspect about the Norwegian society.

A number of articles reported the purpose acts of terrorism serve for the terrorist and emphasize the effect censorship has on the perpetrator. In his article in Morgenbladet Gudmund Skjeldal discusses how acts of terrorism are a way for the terrorist to communicate and advertise his ideology. Terrorism researcher Lars Erslev, interviewed by Skjeldal, states that the only logical aspect he has found in Behring Breivik's statements in court are the claims of the attacks leading to further political censorship of culture conservatives and nationalists. Behring Breivik hopes increased censorship after the attacks will lead to the radicalization of like-minded, which will finally spark a European civil war. Further, Erslev states that Behring Breivik's experience of being censored may have had a considerable effect on his radicalization. The combination of the experience of being censored and lashing out violently in order to spread a message, suggests that the experience of being censored plays a decisive part in provoking violent attacks. The central role conveying a message has for terrorists is supported by Per Olav Reinton's chronicle in Aftenposten dealing with the history of terrorism from the extreme right. He states that an essential factor for terrorists is raising awareness about their cause through receiving media coverage for their attacks. According to Reinton the worst punishment a terrorist can get is not
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being heard and taken seriously. Finally, Reinton states that being heard and acknowledged is what Behring Breivik is fighting for in trial. The focus on being acknowledged and heard further suggests the decisive effect censorship has on those with extreme viewpoints and indicates that censorship may provoke a person with extreme views to carry out a violent attack.

The most recent development in the debate about freedom of speech in Norway in the aftermath of Behring Breivik's attacks is reported by author Knut Lindh in his chronicle in Aftenposten\(^56\). Lindh outlines a proposal made by Norwegian Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud, Sunniva Ørstadvik, calling for further legal restriction of debate with hateful content. He considers this problematic as it builds on an assumption of freedom of speech breeding violence. Lindh argues that there is no evidence suggesting that freedom of speech will lead to violence and hence that restricting it will prevent violence from occurring. Additionally, Lindh expresses great concern regarding restricting open public debate which is a pillar of democratic society. He presents the following quote by the editor of the Danish Newspaper Jyllandsposten who published cartoons of the Prophet Muhammad in 2005, Flemming Rose: “Violence begins where words end. When you are no longer allowed to express your anger through words, violence becomes the only thing left.” (p. 5). Lindh states that cases where freedom of speech has been limited has functioned as a 'pressure cooker effect', intensifying hate and anger. He considers Behring Breivik's attacks as an example of the consequences of limiting freedom of speech. Lindh states:

\(^{56}\) Lindh, Knut. "Der ordene slutter." Aftenposten, 08 03, 2012.
"We do not need to go further than to Anders Behring Breivik who numerous times claimed that a significant reason for the terrorist attacks was that he was denied expressing his opinion through/in media." In other words, Lindh sees a clear correlation between denying Behring Breivik's participation in public debate and his attacks in Oslo and on Utøya on July 22nd.

**Behring Breivik dismissed as insane**

A very central aspect in the trial, which has been decisive for its outcome, is the question of whether Anders Behring Breivik was criminally insane on July 22nd and therefore unaccountable for his attacks. According to Norwegian legislation, a person who was psychotic while carrying out a crime is to be considered unaccountable for his actions and cannot be given a prison sentence. This is due to the fact that a person who is psychotic fails to understand reality and therefore cannot be held accountable for his/her acts. Rather, the perpetrator is to be sentenced to compulsory psychiatric care. In order to be deemed unaccountable a person must exhibit symptoms of a psychosis which include of hallucinations, delusions or thought disorders.
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The first forensic psychiatric report, mapping out Behring Breivik's mental state, was carried out by psychiatrists Torgeir Husby and Synne Sørheim who concluded that Anders Behring Breivik suffers from paranoid schizophrenia. They conclude that Behring Breivik is detached from reality and suffers from delusions. These symptoms make up a psychosis which makes Behring Breivik unaccountable for his acts on July 22nd, 2011. The first forensic psychiatric report was subject to immense critique from numerous experts on the field. The two forensic psychiatrists have according to several experts on terrorism, such as Tore Bjørgo, Øyvind Strømmen and Mattias Gardell, misinterpreted Behring Breivik's worldview as insanity, rather than political conviction. Professor at the Oslo Police academy Tore Bjørgo, has raised concern stating that some aspects of Behring Breivik's worldview have been interpreted as signs of insanity. However, such beliefs are normal in extreme right-wing and counter-jihadist milieus. This suggests that the forensic psychiatrists’ conclusion is based on false premises. Due to the considerable level of doubt raised through the criticism directed at the first report, the court appointed a new forensic report to be conducted by psychiatrists Terje Tørrisen and Agnar Aspaas.

The second forensic psychiatric report found Behring Breivik to be a narcissist and as suffering from dissocial personality disorder. These mental disorders are not serious enough to lead to psychosis and thereby grant unaccountability for the actions. Anders Behring Breivik himself wishes to be held fully accountable for his actions and sentenced accordingly. He believes that considering him criminally insane is a way for the society to pathologize him and thereby dismiss his political ideology.

On the 24th of August, 2012 the Oslo district court deemed Anders Behring Breivik sane and sentenced him to maximum sentence according to Norwegian law,
21 years of imprisonment. The sentence includes preventive detention which allows the sentence to be prolonged as long as he is considered a danger to society. The courts verdict acknowledges that Behring Breivik's attacks were primarily politically motivated. In addition, it indicates that the first forensic psychiatric report, deeming Behring Breivik insane, was discarded by the judges. A number of articles expressed concern regarding the considerable efforts made to dismiss Behring Breivik's attacks as insanity. Concern regarding the attempt to reject Behring Breivik's political ideology and ignoring its foundation in the Norwegian society, was a debated theme in my data.

In his commentary in Aftenposten\textsuperscript{58}, Harald Stanghelle outlines some of the criticism which has been directed at the first forensic psychiatric report which found Behring Breivik to be a paranoid schizophrenic and that the was psychotic when carrying out the attacks on July 22\textsuperscript{nd} 2011. The functioning level they Synne Sørheim and Torgeir Husby considered Behring Breivik to have is impaired to the extent where he would require a caretaker. However, he was able to spend years planning the attacks as well as following through with them. Further, the psychiatrists conducting the first report have been criticized for being unwilling to consider Behring Breivik's acts through an alternative lens. Stanghelle describes Sørheim's and Husby's approach:

\textsuperscript{58} Stanghelle, Harald. "Med diagnosen som forstørrelsesglass." \textit{Aftenposten}, 06 16, 2012
They have given their diagnosis – and they refuse to accept that the phenomenon they have identified could be explained in alternative ways than through psychiatry.”\textsuperscript{59}

Alternative explanations have been sought and brought up due to the immense criticism the first report has been subjected to. The unwillingness to consider alternative explanations may be interpreted as an example of the lengths to which the psychiatrists were willing to go in order to ignore Behring Breivik's political conviction and dismiss him as insane.

Andreas Bakke Foss' article in Aftenposten\textsuperscript{60} about how Behring Breivik is described by those who interrogated him, tells a very different story. One of the interrogators, Geir Egil Løken characterizes Behring Breivik as patient, empathetic, coherent, polite and analytical. Further, Løken states that he was unable to detect any sign of psychosis after conducting over 70 hours of interrogations of Behring Breivik. Løken also described Behring Breivik as highly convinced of his ideology and as being able to portray it in a convincing manner. Further, Bakke Foss has interviewed Terje Emberland, a researcher at the Center for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities in Oslo. Emberland states that Behring Breivik's ideology is clearly fascist

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{60} Bakke Foss, Andreas. "Slik Blir Behring Breivik beskrevet av avhørene." Aftenposten, 06 01, 2012.
and that although his ideology appears as bizarre, the ideas exhibited by Behring Breivik are characteristic of fascism. Further, in an article in Verdens Gang (2012) three psychiatrists are interviewed about how they perceive Anders Behring Breivik's mental state. The psychiatrists interviewed have followed the trial in the courtroom but have not had individual conversations with Behring Breivik. All three state that they cannot see clear signs of Behring Breivik being psychotic, as claimed by the first forensic psychiatric report.

Behring Breivik being driven by political ideology is echoed by Anders Giæver in Verdens Gang. He outlines the testimony of Tore Bjørgo, researcher of right-wing extremism, who stated that there are numerous reasons to believe that the conclusion reached by the first forensic psychiatric report was reached on wrong premises. He specifies that the conclusion in the first report was reached with lacking knowledge of the characteristics of the subculture Behring Breivik is part of. Anders Bakke Foss report in Aftenposten on the trial on April 4th adds to the perception of Behring Breivik as a political extremist, as opposed to an insane individual. The article focuses on the testimony of the well-known Swedish scholar of comparative religion, Mattias Gardell. The purpose of Behring Breivik's defense attorneys calling in Gardell to testify was to 'normalize' Behring Breivik's ideology to confirm that he is a political extremist. Gardell stated that: “Breivik is no mystery. He is the product of a political milieu, with a long tradition”.

61  "Nøkkelspørsmalet." Verdens Gang, 06 12, 2012
63  Bakke Foss, Andreas. "-Behring Breivik er et produkt av et politisk miljø." Aftenposten, 06 05, 2012.
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In his article in Morgenbladet\textsuperscript{65}, Øyvind Strømmen outlines sources which Behring Breivik has copied into his manifesto and argues that considering the counter-jihadist sub-culture which Behring Breivik stems from, he cannot be dismissed as insane. He finds it surprising that the first report deemed Behring Breivik insane as the psychiatrists who conducted it have acknowledged that he has been inspired by existing political ideologies. Strømmen supports this and states that Behring Breivik's ideology is shared by a considerable number of people both in Norway and Europe.

In immigration critic, Bjørn Stærk's chronicle in Aftenposten\textsuperscript{66} he acknowledges Behring Breivik as a political extremist, rather than a mentally unstable individual. Further, he states:

\textbf{Mange nordmenn deler skepsisen mot innvandring. Noen av dem ser muslimer som en spesielt stor trussel mot Europa.}

“Many Norwegians share the skepticism toward immigration. Some consider Muslims a particularly large threat to Europe”\textsuperscript{67} However, Stærk emphasizes that in order for his attacks to be politically relevant, Behring Breivik must represent a larger political movement. Stærk argues that this is not the case and therefore the Norwegian society does not have reason to fear similar future attacks. He states that although there is a considerable number of people in the Norwegian society who do believe in the conscious islamisation of Norway and Europe, these do not according to Stærk support the violence used by Behring Breivik. In conclusion, Stærk states:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{65} Strømmen, Øyvind. "Klipp-og-lim-ekstremismen." \textit{Morgenbladet}, 05 04-10, 2012. \\
\textsuperscript{66} Stærk, Bjørn. "Han representerer ingen." \textit{Aftenposten}, 05 03, 2012. \\
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid. 4
\end{flushright}
“I think much of the confusion regarding who Behring Breivik represents is related to the lack of knowledge about the immigration critical right wing.”68. This statement suggests that the views expressed by Behring Breivik are shared by a number of people in Norway. However, according to Stærk these do not need to be feared since they are not organized in a political movement.

In Kjetil Østli’s article in Aftenposten69 he debates the different roles fear has in the trial against Anders Behring Breivik. He identifies Behring Breivik's greatest fear as not being taken seriously and therefore being dismissed as insane. In the Norwegian legal system, a perpetrator who is considered to have been psychotic when carrying out the crime cannot be held legally accountable for his acts. Instead of being sentenced to a prison sentence, the perpetrator will be sentenced to compulsory psychiatric care. Østli identifies Behring Breivik's primary objective in the trial to be convincing the court of that he was well aware of his acts when carrying out the attacks.

The conscious effort Behring Breivik is making in order to be considered sane is also addressed in Harald Stanghelle's chronicle in Aftenposten.70 Stanghelle argues that Behring Breivik does this through denigrating his manifesto. Although,
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Stanghelle acknowledges that Behring Breivik's ideology is violent and dangerous he states that it was correct to allow Behring Breivik his 73 minute talk about the ideological motives for his attacks. Many were skeptical to this, but Stanghelle emphasizes that in order to assure legal protection, this was necessary. In his chronicle in Aftenposten, Lars Gule outlines immense criticism toward Norwegian Board of Forensic Medicine and argues that the current Board has shown, through Anders Behring Breivik's trial, that it is incompetent in conducting forensic psychiatric evaluations, which have decisive consequences of defendants. In conclusion, he states that the Board's methods and practices must be revised; otherwise defendants’ legal protection may be jeopardized.

Harald Stanghelle's chronicle in Aftenposten also discusses the central role the psychiatry has had in the trial against Anders Behring Breivik. In addition he emphasizes the power the forensic psychiatrists have in determining the outcome of the trial. More importantly, Stanghelle emphasizes an important point: had the terrorist been an Islamic terrorist we would have not spent the majority of the trial debating whether the perpetrator could be held criminally accountable for his acts. Rather, Stanghelle argues, we would have eagerly searched for signs of fanatic extremism.

Xenophobic and anti-Islam sentiments prominent in Norwegian society

A final prominent theme in my data is that skepticism to immigration, particularly from Muslim countries, is prominent in Norwegian society. This is an 'ugly' aspect of the Norwegian society which has been brought to light through Behring Breivik's attacks and the trial against him. As seen in the discussion of the previous theme, considerable efforts have been made to dismiss Behring Breivik's acts as merely the acts of an insane individual. However, as many of the articles I have examined state, Behring Breivik's extreme ideology is shared by many others. As Mattias Gardell stated during his testimony:

"If all of the like-minded are to be sentenced to compulsory psychiatric care, you must build a large institution."

Behring Breivik has firmly argued all along that he has comrades who share his ideology. This is described in an article by Andreas Bakke Foss, Tone T. Strøm-Gundersen and Per Andersen Johansen in Aftenposten which outlines Behring Breivik's introductory speech where he describes the ideological motive of his attacks. In his this speech Behring Breivik states:

---
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\[ \text{Jeg står her i dag som en representant for den norske og europeiske antikommunistiske og antifeministiske motstandsbevegelse og som representant for Knights Templar-nettverket, startet han.} \]

“I stand here today as a representative of the Norwegian and European anti-communist and anti-feminist resistance movement and as a representative of the Knight Templar network.”\(^{75}\) Further, he claims to be speaking on the behalf of a number of Norwegian, Scandinavian and European like-minded. In Aftenposten's\(^{76}\) the report of the trial on 04/19/2012, Behring Breivik describes the objective for his attacks and states that the biased Norwegian and European media who function as political activists rather than impartial journalists. District attorney, Inga Bejer Engh suggests that Behring Breivik carried out the attacks in order to create a platform for his ideology. This is denied by Behring Breivik who states that he has comrades internationally who share his ideological beliefs and therefore does not need to create a platform for the ideology. The emphasis of the fear of Muslim immigration being relatively widespread in Norwegian society was used by Behring Breivik's defense attorneys in order to show that his attacks stemmed from political conviction and ideology shared by others, rather than psychosis. Behring Breivik has claimed all along that he is a member of a larger political movement which receives support from other sources/stances.

---
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In Kjetil Østli’s article\(^{77}\) debating the role of fear in the trial against Anders Behring Breivik. Østli argues that Behring Breivik created a worldview where he has identified an enemy which is to blame for problems he identifies in his society. The fear Behring Breivik expresses relating to the effects immigration (particularly from Muslim countries) has on the Norwegian society, is according to Østli shared by a considerable number of people in the Norwegian society. Østli describes: “It is not the fear of Muslims. Not of feminists or radicals. Not the 'nuthouse'. The defendants’ real fear seems deeper and it is shared by me and you.”\(^{78}\)

In Harald Stanghelle's chronicle in Aftenposten\(^{79}\) he addresses the efforts Behring Breivik has made during the trial, in order to be considered sane and deemed a prison sentence. Behring Breivik's strategy includes admitting having exaggerated certain parts of his manifesto, such as the Knights Templar which according to Behring Breivik took place in London in 2002. Behring Breivik has explained the exaggerated description of the meeting by stating that he wanted to portray Knights Templar in a more flattering way, in order to add to his credibility. Stanghelle concludes by arguing that regardless of Behring Breivik's exaggerations, his unconventional worldview is unfortunately not something he has made up, but is shared by many others. Stanghelle refers to immigration skeptic blogger, Bjørn Stærk's characterization of Behring Breivik's ideology: “For many the insight into Anders Behring Breivik's thoughts must have been a frightening insight into a foreign world. For me it was frightening to see how familiar it was.”\(^{80}\)

\(^{77}\) Østli, Kjetil. "Hva er din største frykt?." Aftenposten, 06 09, 2012.
\(^{78}\) Ibid. 32
\(^{80}\) Ibid. 2
Per Fuggeli, Professor in Public Health at the University of Oslo, criticizes the medias dramatization of Behring Breivik and the attacks in a chronicle in Aftenposten.\textsuperscript{81} He argues that this has allowed focus to be directed away from debating and investigating what about 'us', the Norwegian society, contributed to the attacks. Fugelli states:

\begin{quote}
A human, its thoughts, values and actions do not occur in a vacuum. I am made up out of genes, close objects and people and of societal forces and era in which I was born. Not to exempt Behring Breivik of his responsibility, but in order to prevent that the future will hold similar events we must examine what about 'us' may have contributed to Behring Breivik's insanity.\textsuperscript{82}
\end{quote}

Fugelli's statement brings up the important concept of societal influence on individuals, which seems to have been largely ignored as an explanatory factor during the trial. Further, Fugelli argues that Behring Breivik fell short in the Norwegian achievement society and therefore searched for belonging elsewhere. Fugelli contends that through the skepticism and antipathy to immigration, particularly to Muslims, which has become normalized in

\textsuperscript{81} Fugelli, Per. "En sosialmedisinsk diagnose." \textit{Aftenposten}, 05 09, 2012.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid. 4
Norwegian society, Behring Breivik developed his “racist paranoia.”\footnote{Ibid. 4}

Finally, an article by Rønnaug Jarlsbo and Heidi Molstad Andersen in \cite{84} offers interviews with a number of members of different Norwegian racist and counter-jihadist groups. These groups have in common that they share Behring Breivik’s ideology but condemn his use of violence. Both the leader of Stop Islamisation of Norway, Arne Tumyr, and leader of Norwegian Defence League, Ronny Atle, claim that the number of members have increased after the July 22\textsuperscript{nd} attacks. Also the leader of the anti-immigration group Norsk Folkeparti believes that recruiting new members will be easier after July 22\textsuperscript{nd}. The article also includes an interview with analytical leader at the Norwegian Police Security Service, Jon Fitje, who states that although the major threat of terrorism is perceived to come from extreme Islamists, he considers it likely that counter-jihadist groups in Norway will become more violent. He considers this probable as such groups are in major opposition of immigration, which is unlikely to decline. Further, he states that such groups are generally not focused on 'normal' debate regarding immigration but rather on debate which glorifies and encourages violence. This is refuted by Ronny Atle, member of Norwegian Defence League (NDL) who states: ”After July 22\textsuperscript{nd} the media has portrayed us all as extreme and violent. That is not right. Neither I nor NDL is against immigration. We are against islamisation of the West and want to bring the debate out in the open.”\footnote{Ibid. 24} The article also includes an interview with Lars Gule where he estimates there to be around 15,000 individuals in Norway who have as extreme and islamophobic views as Behring Breivik, but who do not approve of his use of

\footnote{Jarlsbo, Rønnaug, and Heidi Molstad Andersen. “Fryktens budbringere.” \textit{Magasinet}, 05 05, 2012.}
violence. Further, he believes on a European scale this number is several hundred thousands of like-minded.
Discussion

The two primary themes found in my data are the tendency to dismiss and exclude those with extreme right-wing views and pervasive anti-Muslim sentiments found in the Norwegian society. Rejecting the extreme right is done through excluding them from participating in democratic practices, political censorship of their opinions and by referring to individual pathology. These practices have become identified and reported by media in association with the trial of Anders Behring Breivik, as well as labeled concerning and problematic. Further, the presence of anti-Muslim sentiments in Norway became apparent through the testimonies of Behring Breivik's comrades and of experts who have studied the presence of such views both in extreme milieus and the society in general.

The first category of data identifies the rejection of individuals with extreme right-wing ideology through ridicule and harassment due to their political views. These experiences were reported by Behring Breivik, members of various extreme right-wing groups who were called in to witness in the trial as well as additional central characters in the counter-jihadist milieu such as counter-jihadist blogger Peder Nøstvold Jensen. Some articles reported of differential treatment of witnesses in the trial based on whether they supported or rejected Behring Breivik's ideology. This differential treatment became apparent through nationally broadcasting the witnesses who condemn Behring Breivik's ideological beliefs and refusing to broadcast those who share his ideology. In an interview with Swedish author Mustafa Can, he identifies reluctance in Scandinavian countries to address problems and conflicts which naturally occur in multicultural societies. Can believes this relates to an attempt
to portray the societies as tolerant. However, this becomes somewhat misguided as conflicts occur naturally in a diverse society. Can emphasizes that unless these conflicts are addressed and dealt with they will escalate into greater issues in the future.

The next category of data assesses the way the extreme right-wing is dismissed by the society through practices resembling political censorship. Concerns of being subjected to political censorship has been raised by a number of members of the extreme right, including Behring Breivik, witnesses from the far right and members of extreme right-wing groups such as Stop Islamisation of Norway and Norsk Folkeparti. Further, a number of articles emphasized the role conveying a message and advertising an ideology has for terrorists. Claims of censorship in conjunction with the need for a terrorist to carry out an attack in order to spread his ideology, indicates that being denied voicing his opinions may have had a decisive effect on Behring Breivik's development into a terrorist. Finally, a number of articles identified a concerning development where efforts are made to restrict open public debate further.

Further, my data shows that there has been a clear attempt from Norwegian society to dismiss Behring Breivik and his acts by referring individual pathology. Several articles report the considerable efforts made to define Behring Breivik as insane and the consequent reluctance to consider alternative explanations to Behring Breivik's attacks, such as political ideology. A number of articles indicate that referring to individual pathology is an insufficient explanation and that societal factors must be considered. In an interview with interrogators who spend over 70 hours interrogating Behring Breivik, they report being unable to see signs of
psychosis in Behring Breivik's behavior. In addition, characteristics about Behring Breivik which forensic psychiatrists have interpreted as signs of psychosis has by a number of experts\textsuperscript{86} of political ideology and counter-jihadist milieus, been identified as distinctive of fascist ideology and normal in counter-jihadist milieus. In a chronicle by immigration skeptic blogger Bjørn Stærk who is familiar with counter-jihadists milieus, Stærk identifies Behring Breivik worldview as normal in such circles. Finally, the insufficiency of insanity as an explanation for Behring Breivik attacks is emphasized by the court convicting him as a sane individual convinced by political ideology. This infers that the court has discarded the conclusion reached by the first forensic psychiatric report deeming Behring Breivik psychotic on July 22\textsuperscript{nd}.

Lastly, a recurrent theme found in my data is the presence of similar views to those of Behring Breivik in Norwegian society. Several of articles reported that there is a generally widespread skepticism to immigrants, especially from Muslim countries, in Norway. Behring Breivik has, ever since he was apprehended on Utøya, has claimed that he is a member of a larger counter-jihadist movement, Knights Templar which he refers to as a: “National and pan-European Patriotic Resistance Movement” (Behring Breivik 2011: 16). Further, the presence of similar attitudes as those of Behring Breivik is identified by members of the extreme right as relatively widespread. However, they emphasize that although they share large parts of Behring Breivik's ideology they condemn his use of violence. In addition, researchers of extreme right-wing milieus state that Behring Breivik's views are widespread in such sub-cultures. Further, a number of journalists and public debaters have identified

\textsuperscript{86} Researcher at The Center for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities Terje Emberland, Professor at Norwegian Police University College Tore Bjørø, Professor of comparative religion at the University of Uppsala Mattias Gardell, journalist and author Øyvind Strømmen
Behring Breivik’s immigration skeptic views as present in the general Norwegian society. In a chronicle by Professor in Public Health Per Fuggeli, he states that a person does not develop in a vacuum but is affected by the environment in which it develops. He calls for a reflective examination of the Norwegian society in order to illuminate how the Norwegian society has influenced Behring Breivik's development into a terrorist. Fuggeli states considering the presence of xenophobic and anti-Muslim sentiments in Norwegian society, it is reasonable to assume that Behring Breivik has been influenced by this, in the development of “his racist paranoia” (Aftenposten 2012: 4).

My data suggests a number of distinctive ways in which dynamics of the Norwegian society may have influenced Anders Behring Breivik to carry out his attacks on July 22nd. First, my data proposes that there is a trend in Norwegian society to dismiss the extreme Right through denying participation in democratic practices, political censorship or by, in the case of Behring Breivik, referring to individual pathology. This tendency has also been identified by Øyvind Strømmen (2007) and Ketil Raknes (2012) in their works on extreme right wing politics. Secondly, xenophobic sentiments seem to be more pervasive in the society than previously known.

The Norwegian society has had a role in Behring Breivik's radicalization through dismissing his views and denying him an outlet for his opinions. These aspects may have further agitated Behring Breivik's beliefs the political establishment conspiring against him and like-minded. The way in which the Norwegian society has dealt with Behring Breivik, testifies to the failure to acknowledge and deal with problematic societal aspects.
Issues related to restricting extreme views have also been addressed in previous literature. Ketil Raknes concludes his book about right-wing populist parties by emphasizing the importance to allow all opinions to be stated and heard in politics. Raknes states although the views of right-wing populist parties are considered quite extreme, it is essential to allow them participation in politics. In his earlier research of right wing extremism in Scandinavia, Tore Bjørgo (1995) has identified that denying the extreme right an outlet for their views may cause a 'pressure cooker effect'. This implies that through not having ones opinions heard and taken seriously frustrations grow and result in the individuals lashing out violently. Bjørgo identifies this as a key explanatory factor to violence from the extreme right. This effect has also been identified in Knut Lindh's chronicle as decisive for Behring Breivik's attacks. In Lars Gule's book about extremism he emphasizes that dismissing extreme stances may have serious consequences, as it may provoke radicalization of an individual with extreme views. Tore Bjørgo (Magasinet 2012)\textsuperscript{87} has also emphasized that a key aspect in a democracy is allowing also radical yet non-violent opinions to be expressed.

Strømmen (2007) addresses the tendency to ignore extreme ideology in one’s own society. He criticizes European countries for failing to direct focus on parties and groups with highly fascist characteristics. He emphasizes that focus is rather directed at the threat of Islamic extremism. In his later research of the counter-jihadist milieu, Øyvind Strømmen (2011) identifies the tendency in Norwegian society to deny the presence of views similar to those of Behring Breivik. Strømmen states that it would

\textsuperscript{87} Jarlsbo, Rønnaug, and Heidi Molstad Andersen. “Fryktens budbringere.” Magasinet, 05 05, 2012.
be naive to assume that the type of violent rhetoric used in such milieus would not have violent consequences. Thereby, had the society acknowledged the presence of counter-jihadist ideology and views in society, it may have been more appropriately prepared for such an attack or may even have been able to prevent it.

This trend suggests that there is a social closure in Norwegian society where some topics and opinions are excluded from public debate; rather than welcoming, addressing and dealing with concerns raised, the issues are ignored. There are a number of previously unfamiliar issues which arise when a population which has previously been highly homogenous, such as Norway, becomes increasingly heterogeneous.\textsuperscript{88} Further, issues related to immigration are unarguably tough and complex. However, refusing to allow concerns to be raised regarding it and denying participation public debate is very problematic. Due to the complexity of the issue of immigration there are well-founded concerns regarding it among the population. These issues are real concerns for parts of the population, which must be acknowledged not dismissed.

Mustafa Can, interviewed by Solveig Grødem Sandelson in Aftenposten (08-06-2012), proposes an explanation to the tendency to avoid public debate of tough issues in Scandinavian societies. Can contends that avoiding to debate difficult issues is an attempt to prove how tolerant the society is. Avoiding to address tough issues may give an image of a tolerant ideal society, but contrarily it results in the society becoming more intolerant. According to Merriam-Webster dictionary tolerance is defined as “2 a : sympathy or indulgence for beliefs or practices differing from or

\textsuperscript{88} Wollebæk, Dag, and Signe Bock Sedgaard. \textit{Sosial Kapital i Norge.} Oslo: Cappelen Damm, 2011.
conflicting with one's own.” This definition emphasizes that tolerance does not entail only accepting certain people and views. Rather, tolerance implies welcoming people and opinions which are different from one’s own.

As a result of the trial of Behring Breivik a number of individuals have expressed concern of the Norwegian society becoming less open and tolerant, following Behring Breivik’s attacks. Tore Bjørø states in an interview that he has an impression of that expressing extreme views has become tougher after the July 22nd attacks. In addition, Norwegian Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud, Sunniva Ørstadvik has called for further legal restriction of hateful speech. These developments are concerning and should be addressed and dealt with by the Norwegian government if Prime Minister, Jens Stoltenberg's call for “More democracy, more transparency and more humanity” is to be accomplished.

In addition, considerable efforts have been made to dismiss Behring Breivik's political conviction as the reason for the attacks. The testimonies of Tore Bjørø, Øyvind Strømmen, Mattias Gardell and Lars Gule during the trial serve as support for Behring Breivik entering into a tradition of political extremism. Further, they confirm that such views are unfortunately pervasive in society. A number of individuals involved in the investigations after July 22nd have emphasized that Behring Breivik's case is a rare one, as he has provided an extensive material where he outlines the motive and background for his attacks. Theodor Enerstvedt (2012) criticizes the Norwegian society for not having sufficiently focused on the justification Behring

---

Breivik has provided for his attacks in his manifesto. Rather, efforts have been directed at forcing Behring Breivik's acts into a psychiatric explanatory model. Mattias Gardell (2011), on the other hand, directs criticism toward first assuming that the attacks were carried out by an Islamic extremist. Further, Gardell criticizes the attempts to dismiss Behring Breivik as insane once it became evident that the terrorist was a native Norwegian. According to Gardell this insanity was introduced as an explanation to Behring Breivik's attacks in order to divert attention away from his political ideology. Finally, Gardell argues that dismissing the attacks as stemming from insanity rather than extreme right-wing political conviction is completely irrational. He emphasizes that Norway has a history of violent attacks from the extreme right wing and therefore Behring Breivik's attacks should be considered in the context of this. The failure to acknowledge and deal with a problematic side of society in an appropriate way has had immense consequences in Norway as it has contributed to Behring Breivik's attacks which cost the lives of 77 people.

Finally, my data indicates that there are generally pervasive xenophobic sentiments, particularly against Muslims, in Norwegian society. Mattias Gardell (2011) considers Behring Breivik's attacks as a direct consequence of islamophobic rhetoric, which is more common in Norwegian society than previously known. This is a characteristic also identified by Thomas Hylland Eriksen (2012) in his article regarding islamophobic sentiments in Norwegian society. Hylland Eriksen argues that Muslims have become the primary 'Other' in Norwegian society. It seems like this previously enclosed and 'ugly' aspect of the society has become revealed through Behring Breivik's trial. It appears as Behring has expressed and highlighted (although in an extreme manner) thoughts that are shared by a disturbingly large number of
people in the Norwegian society. Through this, Behring Breivik has become resembling of the embodiment of the 'ugly' side of Norwegian society and forced the society to acknowledge this aspect of it.

The dismissal of extreme views and presence of xenophobic sentiments suggest that there are factors in Norwegian society which have contributed to Behring Breivik's development into a terrorist. Although, I consider it reasonable to assume that these factors have had an influence on Behring Breivik's radicalization, it is hard to determine to what extent they have had an influence. Both the tendency to exclude the extreme right and xenophobic sentiments present in the general population can and should be addressed and dealt with by the society. Following Behring Breivik's attacks prime minister Jens Stoltenberg called for “More democracy, more transparency and more humanity”91. However, considering current developments addressed by Lindh (2012) and Bjørgo (2012) it seems like rather than Norway becoming more democratic and transparent, freedom of expression is becoming limited further. By acknowledging the practice of excluding the right wing and by addressing the current negative development, conscious efforts can be made toward including a variety of views in public debate, which is a cornerstone of democracy.

More challenging will be to deal with the prevalence of xenophobic sentiments, particularly directed toward Muslims, in Norwegian society. However, acknowledging this problematic aspect of society would be a step in the right direction. To do so, further research on the issue as well as awareness campaigns could be implemented. The work of NGO's, such as Norwegian Center against

Racism, is extremely valuable and important in order to change negative development in attitudes against immigrants. Considering the pervasive negative sentiments against Muslims which have been uncovered, the work of such organizations as Norwegian Center against Racism has become even more crucial.
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Figure 1: Anders Berhring Breivik's route when driving the truck which contained a bomb from his mothers apartment to the governmental quarter in the city center of Oslo.

Figure 2: Anders Behring Breivik's route from Oslo city center to Utøya.
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