Erostratus Unbound: Norway's 22/7 Converging Frames of War

Meret, Susi; Hervik, Peter

Published in:
Nordic Journal of Migration Research

Publication date:
2013

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

VERSITA

Special Issue Editorial • DOI: 10.2478/njmr-2013-0010 NJMR • 3(4) • 2013 • 179-186

Nordic Journal of Migration Research

EROSTRATUS UNBOUND:
Norway's 22/7 converging frames of war

Abstract

The purpose of this introductory article is to set the stage for the theme issue on the 22 July 2011 terror attacks in Oslo and Utøya by mass murderer, Anders Behring Breivik. The article opens up with the historical and literary figure Erostratus to discuss the differences and similarities between this lone wolf character and the acts of terrorist Anders Behring Breivik. It then situates Breivik firmly within an ideological landscape where communities of politicians, pundits and others distance themselves from Breivik's terrorising acts, yet in the end share his basic criticism of "multiculturalism" appearing synonymous with "cultural Marxism" as well as subscribing to what goes under the term of Eurabia conspiracy. In addition, through centring on other catch-all concept of political correctness, the clusters of different anti-migration, anti-feminism and Islamophobic opposition are united together in news articles in a way not unlike the media coverage (and academic analyses) of the Danish Muhammad cartoon affair.

Keywords

Lone-wolf • multiculturalism • Anders Behring Breivik • Muhammad Cartoon affair • grotesque • anger • warfare

Received 9 July 2013; Accepted 2 October 2013

Peter Hervik & Susi Meret

Aalborg University, Denmark

> We are in the very beginning of a very bloody cultural war, a war between nationalism and internationalism and we intend to win it (Berwick 2011: 762).
>
> We maintain (…) war is simply the continuation of political intercourse, with the addition of other means (Carl von Clausewitz 1832).

1 Erostratus

Historical chronicles report of a man by the name of Erostratus, who in 356 BC committed one of the most heinous acts in ancient Greece: he set fire to the Temple of Artemis in Ephesus, one of the World's Seven Wonders. This unprecedented act of devastation was accomplished by Erostratus to render his name forever memorable among the humankind he despised and hated. The burning down of the temple deeply shocked the inhabitants of Ephesus, and at the same time it bewildered them that a member of their community, whose name had hitherto been unknown, could perpetrate such a crime. Erostratus was prosecuted and condemned; his person and name doomed to "*damnatio memoriae*", the eternal oblivion. However, this did not prevent Erostratus from being handed down to posterity and his name, act and story have since passed into modern terminology to define a criminal loner, a lone wolf, perpetrating a criminal strike to bask in the resultant notoriety.

Classic, modern and contemporary literature from Cervantes, to Cechov, to Pessoa, have recounted their version of the ancient Erostratus. Sartre included it in one of the novels of the anthology *Le Mur*, where the main character, Paul Hilbert, embodies the modern Erostratus. Hilbert hates society and humankind. He finds humans weak, vulnerable, emasculated and somehow ridiculous; he observes men "from the above" of his seventh floor apartment balcony. He despises humanity and at the same time he enjoys what he believes is his moral superiority over the men and women walking below on the streets. What this Sartrian Erostratus figure thinks is that:

> You really have to see men from above. I put out the light and went to the window: they never suspected for a moment you could watch them from up there. (…) I leaned on the window sill and began to laugh: where was this wonderful upright stance

* E-mail: hervik@cgs.aau.dk
meret@cgs.aau.dk

> they're so proud of (…) On a seventh floor balcony: that's where I should have spent my whole life. You'll have to prop up moral superiorities with material symbols or else they'll tumble. But exactly what is my superiority over men? Superiority of position, nothing more: I have placed myself above the human within me and I study it (Erostratus in Sartre 1939: 41)

The men and women beneath are for him a disturbing element; they are enemies, traitors of humanity, shadowing his ideals of moral superiority, values and decency. Contrarily from the ancient version, the modern Erostratus, Hilbert, cannot be satisfied by only materially destroying the symbols of humanity. As Sartre tells us, Hilbert feels he must physically eradicate these internal enemies by shooting at that anonymous crowd and the "idea of killing people" takes the lucid form of a plan in his mind, something he must accomplish to be able to "surprise them all" (Erostratus in Sartre 1939: 45).

Several passages of Sartre's Erostratus display some striking, at times almost uncanny similarities with the Norwegian case of Anders Behring Breivik. For modern Erostratus, as for Anders Breivik, the use of violence is seen as an act of duty (see van Buuren 2013, Hervik & Boisen 2013; Titley 2013). They both consider themselves reluctant warriors, preparing for and waging war on their enemies. The killings are propelled and justified by the extraordinary conditions: no other alternative is possible or contemplated and "cruelty, brutality" are considered a "necessary" undertaking. Violence is the necessary extension when other means have failed, or parts of society have already being taken over by the enemy. The attacks also include a spectacular self-performative and self-realisation dimension (see van Buuren 2013) of the fearless and heroic masculine fighter and warrior, wielding guns and weapons. Paul Hilbert buys and carries with him a revolver, which makes him feel strong, powerful, virile and sexually excited. These passages remind of Breivik's emphasis on self-performance and virile behaviour. As described by in the novel: "(…) you feel strong when you assiduously carry on your person something that can explode and make a noise. (…) I put it in my pants and pocket (…) I walked with a certain stiffness, I looked like a man with a hard-on, (…) I slipped my hand and felt the *object* (…)" (Erostratus in Sartre 1939: 42).

Like Breivik, the Sartrian Erostratus does not leave anything to be arbitrary; a warfare strategy is planned into detail, imagined, studied and organised. Before perpetrating his plan, the Hilbert Erostratus sends a letter to more than hundred "selected" French writers and intellectuals, accusing them for what he calls their surplus of humanity and their denial of recognition for those like him, who "do not love men", for in their view of society there is "No entrance, if not a humanist". And Hilbert loves men and women so little that: "soon I am going to kill half a dozen of them: [and] why only half a dozen? Because my revolver only has six cartridges" (Erostratus in Sartre 1939: 48). This will not be an act of fury, as likely described in the newspapers: "there you will see that (…) Paul Hilbert has killed, in a moment of fury, six passers-by on the Boulevard (…). [But] You know better than anyone the value of newspapers prose. You understand (…) I am *not* 'furious'. I am, on the contrary, quite calm".

Significantly, Hilbert's relationship to women is characterised by deep-felt aversion and hatred. He blatantly declares that if he had a relationship with a woman, he would need to find "a cold, pious woman who would give in to me in disgust" (Erostratus in Sartre 1939: 45). Even so he frequently visits prostitutes, only to humiliate them and when planning how to hit women, he thinks he "would have them shot in the kidneys. Or, in the calves, to make them dance" (Erostratus in Sartre 1939: 48). This deep felt hatred Erostratus nourishes for women evokes passages of Breivik's compendium about "killing women on the field of battle", where he argues: "being a Justitiar Knight (…) you must (…) embrace and familiarise yourself with the concept of killing women, even very attractive women" as they "not only comprise the majority of "cultural Marxists", but also 20% of the police force" and if "you are unwilling or incapable of killing women (…) you should (…) steer away completely from the armed resistance movement and should perhaps consider creating yet another right wing blog instead" but "you will face women in battle and they will not hesitate to kill you" (Berwick 2011: 933)

In his compendium, Breivik harshly attacks what he sees as the most nefarious effects on Western society of years of feminism and feminist thinking that with the support of cultural Marxist positions irremediably contributed to weaken, to emasculate heterosexual white men, thereby corrupting the very foundations of traditional Western societies, where "men treated women like ladies, and most ladies devoted their time and effort to making good homes, rearing their children well and helping their communities through volunteer work" (Berwick 2011: 12). For Anders Breivik, here also strongly inspired by the writings of the blogger Peder Are Nøstvold Jensen a.k.a. "Fjordman" (see Walton 2012), the process of feminisation of European culture is planned and under rapid execution and "present-day radical feminist assault through support for mass Muslim immigration has a political parallel to their anti-colonial efforts" that will destroy the "traditional European structures and the very foundation of European culture" (Berwick 2011: 29).

The project of re-centralisation and re-installation of the power of white heterosexual Nordic men within a European context is fuelled by "a gender equality gone too far" and the battle to save the nation (see Keskinen 2013). Breivik is here not left alone; these new forms of political arguments and discursive antagonisms identify clear adversaries in "radical" feminists, supported by the cultural Marxist political and intellectual elites. The political and intellectual elite is thus the internal enemy, who jointly works to promote and perform multiculturalist social experiments that betray the interests of the common people and at the same time complicitly favour the presence and strength of hostile aliens, the Muslims. In his compendium, Anders Breivik also attacks media for promoting a version of "touchy-feely" sub-specimen that totally "bows to the radical feminist agenda". Thus, Breivik arguments are articulated in some of the mainstream discourses that already flourished against multiculturalism, feminism and migration in the Nordic countries, and not only in Norway (Keskinen 2013).

Language and communicative opportunities also play an important role in understanding the differences between the modern lone-wolf Erostratus and the contemporary mass murder Breivik. In his open letter to the 100 French intellectuals, Hilbert articulates his deep frustration for not being able to find own words that can explain his intentions and plans to kill people. His impotence is manifest, he feels unheard, lonely and admits he would wish to have "(…) *my own* words" (Erostratus in Sartre 1939: 49), but he simply cannot find them in himself, nor outside. This point allows us to highlight some crucial differences between Hilbert, the lone wolf and the real Anders Breivik, who in several circumstances insists on describing himself as "part of a broader community of belief" (van Buuren 2013).

The modern, literary Erostratus is isolated, a loner. Like the wolf, which is alone being driven away from the pack, he operates individually. The acts of the human "lone wolf" reflects his hatred over the whole humankind, from which he both excludes himself and feels excluded. The killings represent the last resort to manifest himself and his loathing over humankind and also his attempt to immortalise

his name. But Erostratus remains idiosyncratic, an attempt of personal performance and self-realisation and as such inscribed into his individual and particular relationship to society and humankind, limited by his personal hate against all women and men. Nothing but Erostratus name and act can reach the world outside; significantly Sartre emphasises Erostratus lack of own words to communicate his reasons, as well as his lack of relationships, community and networks. His act remains confined to his individual story and experience of the world: that of the madman in search of negative notoriety.

Yet, what we argue here is that where Hilbert is the loner, he is the recognisable figure, suggesting that the lone wolves make up a *category*, externally defined sharing one or more traits, rather than a *group*, which is "a self-conscious collectivity, rooted in processes of internal definition" thus meaningful to its members and often with some representative (Jenkins 2008: 56).

Unlike wolves, humans go to school and interact with other humans through which they accumulate experiences and create affects. Individuals do not simply operate and act autonomously, they share at the same time their views of the world with others and may influence and be influenced by wider movements, milieus, ideological and discursive landscapes (van Djik 1998). While the ancient and modern Erostratus long for words of their own that they cannot find, Breivik considers himself "just a salesman of ideas developed by others" (Court Transcript 2012-04-19 11:06). Here, the contemporary Erostratus ceases to seek "his own" words, and words are shared to form a common language.

This is also where the differences between Erostratus and Breivik become marked, urging us to reflect on the real nature, forms, connections and affinities that characterised Breivik's world and which prompt us to get beyond what some analyses narrowly reduced to particular digital ecosystem of a few extremist "keyboard warriors". But it is namely at this point that historical and literary analogies come short, as where the ancient and modern Erostratus rested on the destructionist individual ethos, Breivik's preparations and terrorist attacks rest on a formulated ideology, on a desire to carry out his duty of a soldier in an already on-going war. The strategy may be individual but is organised for the group. It takes place within a "framing of war", where a nationalist patriot is called to defend and protect his country from invasion and against self-destruction.

We believe that the contributions of this special issue help revealing that the topography of Breivik's ideological landscape is based on a much larger and complex map of shared visited places, linguistic affinities, common ideological viewpoints. Unlike the case of Erostratus, Brevik's atrocity – summarised as "22/7" – illuminates what is already going on in society.

2 Terrorist Anders Behring Breivik

Anders Behring Breivik's terror attack in Norway's capital Oslo and the killing spree at the Labour party youth camp at Utøya on 22 July 2011 are brutally real. This special theme issue of *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* is an attempt to deal with this reality, as well as with the stories and narratives about it more than 2 years from the facts. How are we to begin conceptualising Breivik's acts that at first sight appear impossible to fathom, these grotesque acts of violence? The grotesque is needed to approach the sudden unpredictable killing of children, youth and adults, who were never warned, nor given a chance to know what killed them, unlike, perhaps, as Philip Gourevitch book-title about the Rwandan genocide tries to posthumously capture it: "We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families: Stories from Rwanda" (Gourevitch 1998). Yet, we cannot consider cruelty in itself a direct measure for insanity. At first, we can only reach for historical individuals and literary figures to attempt to grasp what happened. But doing research on 22/7, we encounter a myriad of stories about the events, which result reflecting positions, connections and associations, concerns and discourses that are – at least not at first – springing out from Breivik's act. The main question that we as editors and the authors faced was: how to see Breivik in relation to these stories? Breivik seems in fact to be part of them, as much as he is messenger and recipient for these stories that existed also prior his attacks and proliferated in different spaces and landscapes. The road to understanding 22/7 is mediated by the pre-understanding, and ideological beliefs from the first attempts were made to grasp what the bombing in Oslo was an expression of.

A white Norwegian middle-class man, until then largely invisible and anonymous, who attributes himself a plurality of identities: he is the Norwegian nationalist conservative, the Christian warrior, the heroic patriot of the nation, the resistance fighter, the reluctant soldier and the Justitiar Knight. Breivik had for years carefully and largely undisturbed planned the attacks in detail, as he emphasises in his compendium, meticulously accounting for the time, the total material costs of the project also calculated in terms of loss of personal income in the years he spent to prepare the attacks. He killed 77 people and admittedly would have killed more, if he had the chance. Like a contemporary Erostratus, Breivik vindicates his terrorist act as a quest of memorable fame, as he claimed at the opening statement on Day 2 of his trial, on 17 April, 2012: "I have conducted the most spectacular attack committed in Europe since WWII. And they want to do everything in their power to prevent this" (Court Statement 2012-04-17, Opening Statement).

Breivik vindicates the extraordinary character of his acts and awaits the deserved notoriety, but differently from the historic and literary character, in 3 years he wrote lucidly and ideologically under the pseudonym Andrew Berwick, producing more than 1500 pages compendium: *2083: A European declaration of independence*. Just before the attacks, Breivik sent it to more than thousand contacts, which he saw to as having a similar "patriotic mindset" – making up a group of like-minded. He asked them to circulate the document among others, to read it, use it and "improve it" if and where necessary and to continue his work there where he left it, "for obvious reasons" (Berwick 2011:9).

Several of the words, concepts and ideas in the compendium are not Breivik's, but directly taken from a motley collection of sources, literature and authors. Breivik's "ideoscapes" clearly project further out than the individual self. He is not alone. His is not an intimate and self-contained revulsion against humans and the world. Breivik has recipients and is himself both participant and receiver of recent decades' of Islam hatred and of a sharp critique addressed against the political and intellectual elite, depicted as hostile, treacherous and conspiratorial against the interests of the nation and its native people. Within this framing, the editors and the contributors to this special issue consider important to point out what seems to have gone silenced or deliberately unheard in the post-22/7 discussions about the attacks to Norwegian democracy, the fact that Breivik focussed on a specific and precise target: the Norwegian social democrats and those "cultural Marxists" considered as main responsible for having opened the country up to massive immigration and in particular to the direct threat represented by Muslims. Breivik's ideological landscape needs to be understood against this particular "frame of war" (Titley 2013), which distillates a "geometry of violence" precisely

triangulating the representation: patriot/alien/traitor. Multiculturalist promoters, Marxists, humanists, libertarians, feminists and globalists are in the front-line in this warfare representation; they are the first legitimate and principal target and their different social backgrounds, positions and activities disappears making them a uniform troop of enemies. Muslims will come next, as Breivik considers them the symptom rather than the source of the problem (see also Seymour 2011). As Breivik argues in his compendium: "We will focus on the Muslims AFTER we have seized political and military control. At that point we will start deportation campaigns" (Berwick 2011: 1254).

2.1 At war and the imagination of being at war

For Breivik, multiculturalists and feminists are Norway's contemporary quislings who collaborate with the invading alien (see also Bawer 2012). The enemy of the people and of the nation in the warfare paradigm is always two-faced: the face of the internal enemy, the disloyal and traitor elites, and of the invading and occupying aliens, the Muslims. The "being in war" state is inscribed in the historical imagery and symbolism of the resistance movement and freedom fighters against the German occupiers under WWII. In his opening statement, Breivik declared: "(…) I stand here as a representative of the Norwegian and European resistance movement. When I speak I speak on the behalf of the many Norwegians who do not want our indigenous rights to be taken from us". The war is thus formulated as an effort of cultural self-defensive, not an offensive one. Hence, it is a "just war", it is legitimate and even a duty.

Patriots and freedom fighters have, therefore, a duty to act also against the internal enemy and to resist, defend and protect the nation against the new contemporary totalitarian ideology, Islam, whose illiberal and undemocratic rule is favoured by irresponsible and compliant elites.

Several of this volume's contributions show (van Buuren 2013; Titley 2013) this discursive domain has a history. Long before 22/7, warfare representations and comparison have thriven undisturbed in conventional media formats and within mainstream politics and in particularly among the parliamentary represented populist radical right, in Norway represented by the well-established Progress Party. Within these images of hostility, Islam is not framed as a religion, but a totalitarian ideology similar to Nazism and Communism, and Islamism the fascist threat of twenty-first century Europe (see Boe & Hervik 2008). When Islam is constructed as a fascist totalitarian ideology, its symbols (the Muslim veil, the mosque and the minaret) become representations of tyranny, slavery and intolerance (Betz & Meret 2009). The fact that Europe is dangerously converting to Islam is the result of the ruling elites, acting as enablers of the Islamic invasion and occupation. To Breivik all this not only made sense, but worked an "eye-opener": "Unfortunately for me (…) I found through the years (…) that everything is connected" (quoted in van Buuren 2013). It is at this point that the various subjects and agents are inscribed into a frame of direct causality and negative intentionality that exacerbates the images of the enemy and legitimises the quest to act, to personally engage in response to the urgency of the societal conditions and extraordinary events. But contrary to the way, it is often portrayed, conspiracy theorising builds upon pre-existing resentments, images of internal and external enemies and imminent threats, but the various elements (subjects, agents and their activities) are combined into an explicit narrative emphasising their conspiratorial operates to achieve a clear goal. The conspiratorial and hostile activities of the involved actors tend then to legitimise the marking of enemy targets of the countering movement and at the same time use the claim as an operational spur. In this sense, radical violence is not possible without victims being marked years earlier as potential, future victims (Balibar 2005).

2.2 The court's verdict

One of the "stories" that the contributions to this special issue contest is the narrative of Breivik as a lone-wolf. On 24th August 2012, the Oslo Magistrate's Court found Breivik guilty, criminally sane and sentenced him to at least 21 years in prison with a possibility of further indefinite detention in prison. The verdict put the debate to rest on Breivik's mental state, when he carried out the twin attacks that killed 77 people and wounded 242.

Besides the legal basis and implications for this ruling, which Breivik decided not to appeal, the post-verdict studies and analyses still revealed a strong tension between idiosyncratic, lone-wolf-type approaches and contextualisations including structures of opportunity created by anti-migration and anti-feminist position, strong anti-establishment feelings, public attacks against intellectuals considered to support dangerous multiculturalist societal projects and so forth.

The Court noted that "The defendant's extremely critical views on immigration are shared by others" adding that "the terror attacks on the USA on 11 September 2001 and the cartoon crisis in Denmark have nourished anti-Islamic tendencies", that "within right-wing extremist groups, there are many who think that a secret conspiracy aimed at Islamising Europe exists", and also that "such conspiracy theories appear to have a certain level of support" (Oslo District Court, Judgment of ABB 2012-08-24).

As already argued at the beginning, Breivik cannot be a lone wolf for at least what we consider as two main reasons. First, Breivik himself frequently emphasises the development of a group identity that refers to a shared sense of belonging to a community, or "we-ness", in opposition to what he considers a degenerating, iniquitous and unacceptable, normality. He translates already travelling discursive frames of war into an operational spur that urges "patriots to take responsibility". Breivik feels part of a community of "Nordic and European heroes" who need "receiving the attention they deserve", "heroic young men", "ideal knights", "foot-soldiers of the conservative revolution" (Berwick 2011). To strengthen the sense of community and belonging, Breivik participated contentious real and virtual "free-spaces"' of trusted and cultural autonomy, voluntarily visited and sometimes removed from direct control (Poletta 1999; Snow & Cross 2011; Simi & Futroll 2010). Here oppositional identities and deeply felt hostility and hatred against the enemies in society proliferate and can be freely articulated. These spaces also provide and reinforce forms of identity and mutual connectivity to other "similars", which allow the participant to overcome isolation (Simi & Futroll 2010: 4). In this manner, for Breivik violence and terror were inscribed into a necessary plan shared by many other "patriots", "heroes" and "freedom fighters" struggling for the national salvation, whose action only would generate the wished social and cultural transformations.

Secondly, with a bow to Michael Bakhtin: words are half one's own and half own by someone else (Bakhtin 1981). In this sense, Breivik's identity is also constantly moving out to the social world and back and his copy–paste compendium of others' thoughts is an example. Breivik frequented websites and chat rooms and found similar in these people that shared his visions, aesthetics of hate, discourses of war and of resistance against the enemy. But he also found his frames of reference in the proliferating discourses

against multiculturalism, against the political and intellectual elite blamed to encourage and support these sociocultural experiments, linking politics to war and talking about this as freely as Clausewitz in his work "On War" (Clausewitz 1984 (orig. 1832)). In this case, Clausewitz's formula is inverted and the military model becomes a way to describe power, or as aptly observed by Foucault:

> it's astonishing to see how easily and self-evidently people talk of warlike relations of power or of class struggle without ever making clear whether some form of war is meant, and if so what form (Foucault in Rabinow 2010: 65).

Nevertheless, the same recipients of these discourses and narratives who were among the first to distance themselves from Breivik's resort to outright violence also promptly dismiss any ideological relationship, affinity or comparison between the use of virulent warfare words and scenarios and the "act of duty" so often declared by Breivik as the logical result of those positions, talks and reflections. As the authors in this volume indicate, already existing "ideoscapes" provide both formulated ideologies and less systematised belief systems (Titley 2013), such as the Eurabia conspiracy theory, that closely reason with and construct their enemies (van Buuren 2013). In this regard, the war ethnographer Carolyn Nordstrom's reminds us that violence is cultural constituted as well. Even if we analytically separate media born discourses from factual, historical event, they are empirically inseparable in the making of cultural meanings. When the grotesque occurs and "the ordinary is suddenly blown away and becomes meaningless, dubious and hostile" (Nordstrom 1997: 156) as it was the case in Norway on 22/7, meaning is still being made and constituted, not least through the streaming of news.

Yet it is still remarkable how the two articles in this volume on the media coverage of the post-22/7 hundred days in Norway and Denmark find that after washing their hands clean in the immediate aftermath of the events, most of the media articles' continued, like Breivik, to focus on the same enemy, which is not or not only Islam, but the catch-all evil enemy going under the various terms of "multiculturalism", or "cultural Marxists" or "political correctness". Breivik is the soldier, who cowardly killed people who could not know what killed them, but whose horrific act captured endless space in the news media, which is part of what defines terrorism, and where people would rehearse their entrenched positions attacking the internal enemies and their doctrines first, and Islam and Muslims secondly (see Hervik & Boisen 2013).

3 Analysis of 22/7 and its stories

One "story" that is intimately related to the 22/7 events and discussed in two articles of this volume (Eide *et al*. 2013; Hervik & Boisen 2013) is anger relating to anti-migration. More specifically, the theme discussed is the representation of Danish and Norwegian peoples' anger towards immigration and immigrants as "natural", unavoidable and therefore justifiable. Eide *et al*. reveal a line of thinking in which there is a risk of an increase and intensification of anti-Breivik reactions that seeks to bar controversial and angry opinions from being expressed publicly; if not expressed (and then debated) – it is argued – the situation will turn explosive, dangerous and uncontrolled. Such thinking is often conceptualised by journalists, pundits and by some political parties through the metaphorical analogy with the "pressure cooker", whose "safety valve" supposedly will take out of a justifiable anger, in this case represented by the threatening presence of migrants with allegedly incompatible cultural values. Those who contain this threat (read: the multiculturalist, the "cultural Marxists" and the "politically correct" intellectuals) only prevent the safety valve to function correctly.

Lakoff and others (Lakoff & Johnson 1980; Lakoff & Kövecses 1987: 195–221; Collins & Gentner 1987) have shown how anger is usually believed to have an effect on the body, which directly associates with the characteristics of heated water in a container. People's anger is metaphorically like a hot liquid and treated like so. When the temperature of the liquid (read: anger in society) in the pressure cooker (read: society) rises, it can explode, unless there is no valve to leave out the steam. This widely employed metaphor generates a powerful counterfactual cognitive association with what would happen if anger *is not* dealt with.

There are at least two crucial problems to deal with here; on the one hand, by using a physical processes to talk about anger – which is both an emotional state and a social construction – anger is naturalised, taken for granted. Anger towards new cultural differences often related to the presence of non-Westerners (Hervik 2011), which is an idea and practice we can trace, leading to pseudo-biological reasoning about instinctive defences of territory (Barker 1991), rights for cultural self-defence (Stolcke 1995; Lentin 2004) inseparable from the mediatisation of society (Hjarvard 2008), including the anti-Muslim pattern of news media coverage (Hervik 2011). In short, anger (towards migrants) is not in and of itself "natural", but "naturalised", and then it is the result of this "naturalisation". Thus, anger and aversion also grew drastically among the Danes in 1997 as a result of intense newspaper campaigning against foreigners in Denmark and the official immigrant policies (Hervik 2011).

On the other hand, when anger is understood as "a physiological response to produce undesirable bodily reactions, to interfere with normal functioning, and to eventuate in total loss of control that can be dangerous to others" (Quinn 1991:62), it effectively removes human agency and social responsibility, including the cognitive effort to locate the actual causes of the anger, i.e. getting angry at migrants rather than angry at those who consistently portray them as dangerous due to their group membership.

"Freedom of speech" at times is emphasised as a safety valve that can let out steam of controversial opinions and angry men, including Islamophobes, like the controversial blogger "Fjordman", quoted by Breivik several times. In this sense, freedom is generated by specific historical circumstances and conditions and it is not the idea now so relentlessly invoked. At present, radical right wing groups and counter-jihad milieus continue to work intensely to remove legislation on racist utterance, arguing that there should be no limits to freedom of speech and freedom of expression, allowing them to speak "the truth", "their truth" about immigration and Islam. And it is also on the behalf of these analogies that, for instance, an author of the Norwegian *Dagsavisen* can argue that to blame for what happened in Norway were not so much those speaking like the terrorist, but rather those opposing his rhetoric (see Eide et al., 2013).

In the Danish media, the "tone of debate" (Hervik & Boisen 2013) is talked about in similar ways. In Denmark, the brutal directness of the debate started long before 9/11 or the Muhammad Cartoon Affair (Hervik 2002), to continue intensifying in the aftermath of 22/7, by further polarising and radicalising, serving as a spur to further violence. Indeed, the most dominant neo-conservative, anti-Islamic, anti-multiculturalist discourse present in the Muhammad Cartoon Affair also dominates the news coverage of 22/7 (Hervik & Boisen 2013).

4 The duty of the knight

In his compendium, Breivik refers to text written by Al-Qaeda leader Al-Zawahiri on the virtues of the knights (see Hervik & Boisen 2013). Notwithstanding ideological difference, we argue that their self-proclaimed duties as knights are very similar.

In relation to another attack, that of 9/11 in New York and Arlington, the scholar Faisal Devji argues perceptively that Al-Qaeda's jihad "have vanished into the immensity of their own global effects. This jihad is global not because it controls people, places and circumstances over vast distances, for Al-Qaeda's control of such things is negligible" (Devji 2005:1–2). The network is poorly organised and its structure fragile and can only offer consultancy for potential suicide bombers and attackers (with same ideology), hence leaving the jihad as globalised, within a landscape of unforeseen events and accidental effects. Instead, for the attackers who wish to accomplish certain ends, the acts become gestures of duty, rather than carrying out specific missions ordered and designed by someone in a higher chain of command. This we see as the link to Breivik. When terrorist attacks no longer operate in a landscape determined by causes and intentions, the Jihad are connected by the contingency of effects, rather than by some common substance. They do not share a psychological profile, nor ideological or mystery uniformity to tie them together. The acts represent, so to speak, nothing beyond themselves. The very nature of the mass media follows this understanding, when they report "effects without causes." We believe Devji's argument make sense also in connection to Breivik's actions, as ethical, in the sense of the "Crusader hero" commitment to "do something", to carry out (a self-defined) gesture of duty as a soldier in war. In this sense, his terrorist acts are comparable with the acts of the 19 suicide killers associated with 9/11 (Hervik & Boisen 2013).

From the perspective of the various individuals, groups and organisations, who are organised anti-migration, anti-multiculturalist, contra-jihad, anti-feminists and Islamophobic ideoscapes using the same ideas as Breivik, it is understandable that they quick distanced themselves from Breivik at the moment of his despicable killings. As for the Norwegian blogger Fjordman, whom Breivik largely "copy–pasted" from (at least 285 pages of his compendium is directly taken from Fjordman), the problem emerged only at the moment of the killings; this obliged him to find ways to sanitise himself, and to be helped by others in his efforts. For all these people, groups, milieus and for the epistemic community they represent, Breivik's 22/7 attack is the uncontrollable, unpredictable and unintended consequence of their shared system of belief. The articles collected in this issue allow us to understand 22/7 against this broader context of relationships, developments and projections that are not, and cannot be exclusively Norwegian.

5 Decisive moment and posthumous reactions

In the absence of tangible causes, the first hours of news media coverage and popular conversations about what occurred gave plenty of speculation about whether the attack was an act of "Islamist terrorism", or Islam-related attacks. These associations with Islam's terrorism were reinforced by references to the Danish Muhammad Cartoon Crisis (Hervik 2011, 2012) and represented the cause as coming from sources outside of Norway.

The historical occurrence of 22/7 is like any event unique. Yet, the event does not exist in a vacuum. The instance of the first explosion interpretations are immediately instantiated to become an outcome of something already going on in society. The dilemma of seeing the events as idiosyncratic versus recognisable comes immediately and manifestly out when news media frames the "decisive moment", "when history is made, a moment like no other, when things come together in a way that they never have before and unlikely to again, a moment thus deeply imbued with historical significance" (Lutz & Collins 1993:59) and at the same time having to deal with the "random moment" "that instant which could be *any* time and, therefore, can by *every* time" (Moeller 1989:409 quoted ibid.).

However, even when the appearance of a white Islamophobe replaced the Islamist terrorist, some associations and comparisons have remained unchanged. This can, for example, be seen in blogger "Fjordman's" new book, bearing the tentative title "Norway Attacks." suggesting – once again – the real cause for Breivik's murderous anxiety rests on the danger from non-native migrants considered culturally and religiously incompatible with Western society. But the anti-migration belief system is still evoked in different ways – as several authors here show – in attacks of "multiculturalism", which serves as a catch-all term for the failures attributed to a liberal opposition to acknowledge and handle the dangers related to incoming culturally diverse migrants.

Upon finishing the theme issue, we understand better that the deeper meaning of the events, like 22/7, to a large extent lies also in the social communication of stories about these events, hence, in the reflection of positions, porous connections and ideological landscapes characterising senders and receiving audience.

Two years and a few months after 22/7, we believe that the issue at stake is still whether Anders Breivik can only be understood within the particular Norwegian context, or whether, as we believe, his action took place in a random moment, but as the outcome of processes, discourses, narratives, rhetoric and positions that have proliferated in both Europe and the US in the past decade.

Peter Hervik is a Professor at the Institute of Global and Cultural Studies at Aalborg University and affiliated the Centre for the Study of Migration and Diversity (COMID). Hervik has conducted research in Mexico, Japan and in Denmark, dealing with issues of identity, categorisation, racism, nationalism, ethnicity, multiculturalism and media. Hervik has worked at the University of Copenhagen, Oslo University, Malmö University and Hitotsubashi University. Among his books: *Social Experience and Anthropological Knowledge* (with Kirsten Hastrup Routledge 1994); *Mayan Lives Within and Beyond Boundaries. Social Categories and Lived Identity in Yucatan* (Harwood Academic Publishers 1999; Routledge 2001), *Den generende forskellighed. Danske svar på den stigende multikulturalisme* (Hans Reitzels Forlag, Copenhagen 1999) and *Mediernes Muslimer. En antropologisk undersøgelse af mediernes dækning af religioner i Danmark* (Copenhagen 2002). In 2011 came *The Annoying Difference. The Emergence of Danish Neonationalism, Neoracism, and Populism in the Post-1989 World* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books) and recently *The Danish Muhammad Cartoon Conflict* (Current Themes in IMER Research 13, MIM, Malmö University 2013).

Susi Meret is an Assistant Professor at the Institute for Culture and Global Studies at Aalborg University and also an academic member of the Centre for the Studies of Migration and Diversity (COMID). She is working in the areas of political sociology, ethnic relations and migration. Her main research interests are contemporary populist radical rightwing parties and voters, populism and populist "othering", anti-immigration, Islamophobia and attitudes towards

ethnic minorities in society. She is project coordinator of the Nordic research network on Nordic Populism (www.nordic-populism.aau.dk) and involved in projects on right-wing populist parties' development in the Nordic countries and on hate speech and populist othering in nine European countries. Among her most recent publications: *Gender, populism and politics of belonging: Discourses of Right-Wing Populist parties in Denmark, Norway and Austria* (with Birte Siim), Palgrave Macmillan, 2013 and *Right-wing populist parties and the working class vote: what have you done for us lately?* (with Hans-Georg Betz), Routledge, 2013.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge their gratitude of a grant from Aalborg University, Department of Global and Culture Studies and from the Nordforsk founded Nordic Populism research network, which allowed us to bring authors together for a one-day seminar at the University of Bergen to discuss pre-circulated drafts of the contributions to this issue.

References

Bakhtin, MM 1981, *The dialogic imagination: four essays by M.M.Bakhtin*, ed. ME Emerson & M Holquest,University of Texas Press, Austin.

Balibar, E 2005, 'Difference, Otherness, Exclusion', *Parallax*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 19–34.

Barker, M 1981, *The New Racism: Conservatives and the Ideology of the Tribe*. Junction Books, London.

Bawer, B 2012, *The new Quislings: how the international left used the Oslo Massacre to silence debate about Islam*, Harper & Collins, London and New York.

Berwick, A 2011, *2083 – A European declaration of independence. De Laude Novae Militiae Pauperes commilitones Christi Templique Solomonici*, London (pseudonym of Anders Behring Breivik).

Betz, H-G & Meret, S 2009,'Revisiting Lepanto: the political mobilisation against Islam in contemporary Western Europe', *Patterns of Prejudice*, vol. 43, no. 3–4, pp. 313–334.

Boe, CS & Hervik P 2008, 'Integration through insult', in *Transnational media events. The Mohammed cartoons and the imagined clash of civilizations*,eds E. Eide, K. Risto &A. Phillips, Nordicom, Gothenburg, pp. 213–234.

Collins, A & Gentner, D 1987,'How people construct mental models', in *Cultural models in language and thought*, eds D Holland & N Quinn, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 242–265.

Clausewitz, C. Von 1984, *On war*, Princeton University Press, Rev ed Princeton, NJ.

Court Statement 2012-04-17 (Open Statement), Available from: <https://sites.google.com/site/breivikreport/documents/anders-breivik-court-statement-2012-04-17>.[lastaccessed 23.09.2013].

Court Transcript 2012-04-19, Available from: <https://sites.google.com/site/breivikreport/transcripts/anders-breivik-court-transcript-2012-04-19-live-report>.[last accessed 23.09.2013].

Devji, F 2005, *Landscapes of the Jihad*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.

Eide, E et al. 2013, 'After the 22 July terror in Norway: media debates on freedom of expression and multiculturalism', *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, vol. 3, no. 4.

Gourevitch, P 1998, *We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families: stories from Rwanda*, Farar, Straus & Giroux, New York.

Hervik, P 2002, *Mediernes muslimer. En antropologisk undersøgelse af mediernes dækning af religioner i Danmark*, The Board for Ethnic Equality, Copenhagen.

Hervik, P 2011, *The annoying difference. The emergence of Danish Neonationalism, Neoracism, and Populism in the post-1989 world*, Berghahn Books, New York and Oxford.

Hervik, P 2012, *The Danish Muhammad cartoon conflict*, Current Themes in IMER Research, vol. 13, Malmö Institute for Studies of Migration, Diversity and Welfare (MIM), Malmö University.

Hervik, P & Boisen, S 2013, 'Danish Media Coverage of 22/7', *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, vol. 3, no. 4.

Hjarvard, S 2008, 'The mediatization of society. A theory of the media as agents of social and cultural change', *Nordicom Review*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 105–134.

Jenkins, R 2008, *Rethinking ethnicity*, 2nd edition, Sage, London.

Keskinen, S 2013, 'Anti-feminism and white identity politics – political antagonisms in radical right-wing populist and anti-immigration rhetoric in Finland', *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, vol. 3, no. 4.

Lakoff, G & Kövecses, Z 1987, 'The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English', in *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, eds Dorothy Holland & Naomi Quinn, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 195–221.

Lakoff, G & Johnson, M 1980, *Metaphors we live by*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Lentin, A 2004, *Racism and anti-racism in Europe*, Pluto Press, London and Ann Arbor.

Lutz, CA & Collins J 1993, *Reading national geographic*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Moeller, S 1989, *Shooting war: photography and the American Experience of Combat*, Basic Books, New York.

Nordstrom, C 1997, *A different kind of war story*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Oslo District Court. Judgement of Anders Behring Breivik 2012-08-24, Available from: https://sites.google.com/site/breivikreport/documents/judgment-of-anders-behring-breivik-2012-08-24 [last accessed 24.09.2013].

Poletta, F 1999, 'Free-spaces in collective action', *Theory and Society*, vol. 28, pp. 1–38.

Quinn, N 1991, 'The cultural basis of metaphor' in *Beyond metaphor. The theory of tropes in anthropology*, ed. JW Fernandez, Stanford University Press, Stanford, pp. 56–93.

Rabinow, P 2010, *The Foucault reader*, Vintage Books Edition, New York.

Sartre, J-P 1939, *Le Mur*, Gallimard, Paris [Translated from French by Alexander, L 1969, *The Wall. intimacy and other stories*, A New Directions Paperbook].

Seymour, R 2011, '2083: 'Breivik's 21st-century fascist manifesto', in *On Utøya: Anders Breivik, Right Terror, Racism and Europe*, eds R Humphrys, E Guy &T Tietze, Elguta Press, e-book.

Simi, P & Futrell, R 2010, *American Swastika: Inside the white power movement's hidden spaces of hate*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Md.

Snow, DA & Cross, R 2011, 'Radicalism within the context of social

movements: processes and types', *Journal of Strategic Security*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 115–130.

Stolcke, V 1995, 'Talking Culture: New Boundaries, New Rhetorics of Exclusion in Europe', *Current Anthropology* vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 1–24.

Titley, G 2013, 'They called a war, and someone came: the communicative politics of Breivik's *ideoscape*', *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, vol. 3, no. 4.

van Djik, T 1998, *Ideology. A multidisciplinary approach*, Sage Publications, London.

van Buuren, J 2013, 'Spur to Violence? Anders Behring Breivik and the Eurabia Conspiracy', *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, vol. 3, no. 4.

Walton JS 2012, 'Anti-feminism and Misogyny in Breivik's "Manifesto"', *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 4–11.