

The Tales of Two Terrorists

A comparative case study of the manifestos of Anders Breivik and Brenton Tarrant

Bauke Rommert Stellingwerf

b.r.stellingwerf@gmail.com

S2737949

Leiden University

Assessor: Prof. Dr. Isabelle Duyvesteyn

MA International Relations: Global Conflict in the Modern Era

Wordcount: 14304

18-06-2021

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Picking, Choosing and Overlooking	3-5
Methodology	5-7
Tackling Symptoms (Brenton Tarrant)	7-12
Diagnostic Framing.....	7-10
Western Society.....	6-8
Immigration.....	8-9
Islam.....	9
Environmentalism.....	9
Time.....	9-10
Prognostic Framing.....	10-12
Immigration.....	10
Environmentalism.....	10-11
Western Society.....	11
Islamization.....	11
Time.....	11-12
Cultural Marxists and Eurabia (Anders Breivik)	12-32
Diagnostic Framing.....	13-25
Cultural Marxism.....	13-20
Islam.....	20-22
Western Society.....	22-23
Time.....	23-25
Prognostic Framing.....	25-31
Cultural Marxism.....	25-27
Islam.....	27-28
Western Society.....	28-32
Conclusion	32-33
Bibliography	34-38

Introduction

On the 22nd of July 2011, Anders Breivik detonated a bomb next to a government building in Oslo and committed a mass shooting on the island of Utøya. The bomb, which killed 8, was targeted at the H-building where, among others, the Labour party's prime minister's office was located. On Utøya, Breivik killed 69 attendants of a Labour party youth camp (Hemmingby and Bjørgo 166). Eight years later, on March 15th, 2019, Brenton Tarrant committed the deadliest shooting in New Zealand's history when he killed 51 and wounded 40 more in his attacks on a mosque and an Islamic centre in Christchurch (Royal Commission of Inquiry 10). In his manifesto Tarrant states that he was strongly inspired by Breivik in planning and committing his attack (Veilleux-Lepage et al. 557-558). If Tarrant was really as inspired by Breivik as he claimed, how can we explain the difference in target selection? In the prior instance Breivik targeted the Norwegian labour party, whilst in the latter a politically marginal group were targeted by Tarrant. On first instinct it may be tempting to justify the discrepancy in target selection by arguing that both Muslims and the Labour party are both vaguely left-wing targets, but Breivik's plea to "NOT for the love of god aim your rage and frustration at Muslims" does suggest that there is a more substantive difference in their target selection (Breivik 1254-1255).

The purpose of this thesis is to understand why the target selection of Tarrant differs from Breivik's. This will be achieved by comparing the diagnostic and prognostic framing in the manifestoes of both terrorists. Comparing these frames will give an insight in what specific problems the two perceived (the diagnostic framing) and what solutions they believed to be appropriate to solve these problems (the prognostic framing).

Picking, Choosing, and Overlooking

Much of the research on Tarrant and Breivik can be found in the lone wolf terrorism literature. Much of this research has been quantitative in nature and there has been a strong focus on secondary sources. According to Spaaij and Hamm, this has inhibited the in-depth analysis of the rationale of these terrorists (Spaaij and Hamm 174-175). Beydoun (1213) argues that there is also a double standard in the literature concerning lone wolves which has led to Muslims being branded as lone wolf terrorists, whilst non-Muslim perpetrators are not branded as such. Simi (251-252) makes a similar argument when he contends that in the post-9/11 world, the academic focus on Islamic fundamentalist terror has led to a gap in knowledge

concerning other types of terror such as white terror. Furthermore, the understanding of lone wolf terrorists as insane has also inhibited academic understanding of the ideologies of perpetrators (Stohl 7). Moses (201) notes that this has also happened in the case of Tarrant's attack when politicians have consistently portrayed his attack as senseless, thereby taking it out of the realm of discussion. By critically engaging with the ideas of two far-right lone wolf terrorists, this thesis will hopefully give more insight into their ideology and, as such, will help address some of the aforementioned problems.

When considering research done into Breivik specifically, there are a few noticeable trends in the literature. One of the largest bodies of literature concerns Breivik's psychopathology. This literature explores Breivik's possible insanity and role of autism in his eventual attack. There is also substantial amount of literature which primarily treats Breivik as a case study for studying lone wolf terrorism. Besides these two larger groups of literature, there is also literature which relates specifically to themes such as Christianity, Islamophobia, radicalization, target selection, and the role of the internet.¹ Although Cultural Marxism is arguably the single most pressing issue identified by Breivik, there is barely any academic literature which analyses its role in his manifesto. Considering how Breivik's attack targeted left-wing political targets, this seems like an area of study which is ripe for further exploration.

Compared to Breivik, very little research has been done into the Tarrant case. One obvious reason for this is that Tarrant's attack is more recent. The final government report on the matter, "Ko tō tātou kāinga tēnei" was only released at the end of December 2020. Literature which predates this report has run the risk of taking inaccuracies as fact, such as happened to Calasso (344) who states in his article that Tarrant had deleted a longer version of his manifesto shortly before the attack. Later questioning by Tarrant's psychiatrist shows, however, that there had been no longer version of the manifesto (Royal Commission of Inquiry 217-224). The sparse literature which does exist on Tarrant largely follows the same trend as the literature on Breivik, namely that it generally follows one specific theme as it relates to his attack.² Although these works are valuable in their own right, the following will present the ideologies of both terrorists as a whole rather than focussing on individual themes or subjects.

¹ For literature regarding Breivik concerning Christianity see for example Strømme (2017), for Islamophobia see Önerfors (2017) and Titley (2013), for lone wolf/lone actor terrorism see Feldman (2013), Bakker and de Graaf (2011) and Pantucci (2011), for radicalization see Holt et al. (2018) and Winter (2019), for target selection see Hemmingby and Bjørge (2018) and Gill (2016), for psychopathology see Wessely (2012) and Faccini (2016), and for the role of the internet see Bergstrom et al. (2016)

² For example, Moses (2019) considers the manifesto in the context of white genocide narratives in public discourse, Baele et al. (2020) and Scrivens et al. (2021) consider the role of the internet in the manifesto, Bjork-

The following, to the best of the author's knowledge, is the first comparative study of Breivik and Tarrant's manifestoes and the first work that has applied framing theory to Tarrant's work. Furthermore, there is seemingly no existing academic literature which scrutinizes Tarrant's target selection in any serious sense. As such, this thesis should provide a valuable addition to the sparse qualitative analysis of far-right terrorist ideology that is available in the academic literature.

Methodology

The aim of this paper is to understand the target selection of Tarrant compared to Breivik through a qualitative analysis of their manifestos. This requires a theoretical framework which allows for the analysis of the ideologies of both men, whilst also considering how their eventual acts relate to these ideologies. For this purpose, framing theory will be used. As noted by Simi (257), political violence is rooted in social movements. As such, it is important to attempt to understand Breivik and Tarrant as parts of a larger social phenomenon. Berntzen and Sandberg (772-773) argue that, although Breivik operated alone, it is important to understand his ideas as being reflected in, and partially resultant of, a wider anti-Islamic social movement. Social movement theory has already been used for understanding terrorism, but it is rarely used for understanding lone wolf terrorists. By comparing the ideas of Breivik and Tarrant, the theory can illuminate developments in their ideology. As Benford and Snow (628) state, collective action frames are constantly changing through being constituted, contested, reproduced, and transformed. Furthermore, As argued by Hemmingby and Bjørgo (165), ideologies provide terrorists with the information of who the enemy is and why they are the enemy. As such, understanding the ideologies through the lens of framing theory provides an insight into who both men view as their enemy, which will help understand the target selection of both terrorists.

Framing theory concerns itself with the ways in which people interpret events or occurrences through so-called collective action frames. These frames simplify reality into interpretable narratives which places events within a comprehensible context. This allows for the creation of social movement organizations (SMOs) around which collective action can be mobilized (Snow et al. 464). As such, collective action frames organize events in such a way

James (2020) contemplates the manifesto from a Feminist perspective, Roach (2021) takes a counterterrorism perspective, and Roose (2019) explores islamophobia in the manifesto.

that the adherents of the frame have a shared understanding of certain events, often interpreted as problems, around which groups organize and mobilize in order to change the perceived problem. Collective action frames have three constituent parts, the prognostic framing, the diagnostic framing, and the motivational framing. In the diagnostic framing a SMO establishes what event or occurrence it defines as a problem, in the prognostic framing it establishes what can be done to solve the problem, and the motivational framing is how a social movement mobilizes its adherents to execute the proposals in the prognostic frame. For an SMO to be viable, it is important that there is a fit between these three so-called framing tasks. For example, a solution proposed in the prognostic frame must provide a solution to the portrayed problem in the diagnostic frame (Benford and Snow 614-620). For the purposes of this paper, only the diagnostic and prognostic framing of Tarrant and Breivik will be compared as their target selections- which are a part of their prognostic frames which themselves are resultant of their diagnostic frames, are the primary concern. In order to compare the diagnostic frames of Breivik and Tarrant, the problems they identified will be noted and categorized based on which factor caused these problems. This ensures that an identified problem is understood within its proper context. Islamization, for example, is identified as a problem by both, but Tarrant sees it as a consequence of the high birth-rates of Muslims, whilst Breivik sees it as a conspiracy of Cultural Marxist elites. This difference in the diagnostic frame will influence which solutions are appropriate in the prognostic framing. As such, it is important that the constituent parts of the diagnostic frame are carefully contextualized and categorized in order for the comparison to be accurate. The solutions proposed in the prognostic frame will also be compared and their differences will be analysed. The differences that will be shown through the comparisons will provide an answer regarding why Tarrant's target selection differed from Breivik's.

As the thesis does not concern itself with how Breivik and Tarrant attempt to mobilize others to take action, the motivational frames of both men will not be analysed. Berntzen and Sandberg (2014) have also compared the collective action frames as found in Breivik's manifesto to the frames found in more mainstream anti-Islamic groups. They were able to place Anders Breivik as an actor within a broader social context whose actions can be understood more completely when considered in this context. For the purposes of this thesis, framing theory will also be used in order to make a comparison. In the following, however, it is not the similarities which are of interest, but rather the differences and how these may clarify the difference in target selection. As Berntzen and Sandberg (Berntzen and Sandberg 760-761) argue, framing theory can provide valuable insights when applied to terrorists. Here, close

qualitative analysis of the diagnostic and prognostic frames of two terrorists will be used in order to show how a different perception of problems influenced the target selection of Brenton Tarrant and Anders Breivik.

Tackling Symptoms

In this chapter the diagnostic and prognostic framing in Brenton Tarrant's manifesto will be analysed. Tarrant's diagnostic framing can be categorized into five categories: Western Societal issues, issues stemming from immigration, issues stemming from Islam, issues stemming from environmental degradation, and finally the timescale at which events are progressing. This chapter will take each of these categories into consideration and will then explore how Tarrant proposes to solve the issues through his prognostic framing.

The primary concern regarding Western society that Tarrant identifies is the "hedonistic, nihilistic, Individualism" which has led to falling birth-rates in Western society (Tarrant 6). Near the end of his manifesto Tarrant states that "Even if all invaders are deported tomorrow and all traitors are dealt with as they truly deserve, we are still living on borrowed time. Whether it takes ten years or a thousand years, whilst we are facing birth rates at sub-replacement levels, then our people are dying" (Tarrant 68). He believes that the decreasing birth-rates, which are the result of the aforementioned ideological shifts, will lead to there being no future for "our white children" (Tarrant 9). What Tarrant ideally wants is a world in which he can live peacefully among his own people, living on their own land, practising their own religion, and deciding on their own future (Tarrant 13). For Tarrant, decreasing birth-rates are the most fundamental challenge with which the white race is faced.

Tarrant is also worried about his perceived disfunction of democracy. Tarrant describes democracy as mob rule, and he believes the mob is ruled by the enemies of the people. Namely, the global and corporate run press, the Marxist controlled education system, and the state-run anti-white media machine (Tarrant 27-28). There is clearly a broad group of actors which are able to pervert democracy. More so than democracy, Tarrant is very critical of capitalism. He believes capitalists are a danger to white society due to their import of labour from low wage-cost countries which he perceives as threatening white populations in the West (Tarrant 34). This critique of capitalism is one of the most well-developed and elaborated ideas in Tarrant's manifesto. Comparatively he spends little time critiquing, for example, Cultural Marxist elites or government policy whilst spending far more time railing against corporate

elites. This can also be seen towards the end of the manifesto where Tarrant states “make no mistake, the major impetus for the mass importation of non-European into Europe is the call and want for cheap labour. Nothing drives the invasion more and nothing needs to be defeated more than the greed that demands cheap labour” (Tarrant 80). Besides the problem of the importation of cheap labour, Tarrant also believes that the capitalists sole concern for profit maximization has led to them ignoring the values and interests of the white race. (Tarrant 34). What these values are exactly remains unspecified, but Tarrant clearly views capitalists as an important enemy.

The final societal problem Tarrant identifies is the state of European manhood. He believes that weak European men are at the core of why the great replacement is possible. The great replacement, which is also the title of Tarrant’s manifesto, is a conspiracy theory which states that white European populations are deliberately replaced at an ethnic and cultural level through migration and growth by ethnic communities (Davey and Ebner, 7-8). Concerning Western men’s role in the great replacement, Tarrant states that “the people who are to blame the most are ourselves, European men. Strong men do not get ethnically replaced, strong men do not allow their culture to degrade, strong men do not allow their people to die. Weak men have created this situation and strong men are needed to fix it” (Tarrant 39).

The second category of problems within Tarrant’s diagnostic framing are problems stemming from immigration. Although he believes low-birth rates are what makes contemporary white civilization unsustainable in the long-run, mass immigration is the greatest threat in the short-run (Tarrant 6). In his manifesto he explicitly states that one of his reasons for carrying out his attack is to reduce immigration rates by intimidating and physically removing so-called “invaders” (Tarrant 7-9). It is interesting to note that Tarrant views immigration as a hostile military takeover. In justifying his attack, he states that no one taking part in an “invasion” is innocent (Tarrant 17). When considering the relationship between ideas and actions, it is important to consider that these militarized terms may also lead to militarized solutions. As mentioned above, for a collective action frame to be effective, there must be a fit between the framing tasks. As such, when immigration is portrayed as a militarized problem, the solutions also run the risk of becoming militarized. As Davey and Ebner (18) note in contemporary political (far-) right it has become commonplace for refugees to be referred to as invaders. This shows a worrying similarity to language used by extremists such as Breivik and Tarrant. It is important that when considering political language, the consequences of that

language are also considered. Framing theory, with its analysis of both ideas and action is a suitable tool for this purpose.

Besides the problem of immigration generally, Tarrant also identifies problems which are specific to Islam. Although Tarrant states that he holds no ill will towards Muslims in particular, he does hate Muslims who are living on “his land” who aim to replace white people (Tarrant 17-18). Furthermore, it is not any particular Islamic tenant of faith which bothers him, but rather the fertility rates of Muslims. Tarrant, a self-described racist, believes that race and fertility rates are inherently connected and as such, he is especially worried about the presence of high-fertility minority communities in white civilizations (Tarrant 19-20). When justifying his target selection Tarrant states that he targeted Muslims because of “Historical, societal and statistical reasons. They are the most despised group of invaders in the West, attacking them receives the greatest level of support. They are also one of the strongest groups, with high fertility, high in group preference and a will to conquer” (Tarrant 29). Although Tarrant finds all non-white immigration to be problematic, he finds Muslims to be particularly troublesome which is why in his prognosis they became the designated target. Considering birth-rates are the fundamental issue facing the white race in Tarrant’s mind, him targeting Muslims due to their birth-rates is understandable.

The fourth problem Tarrant identifies are, interestingly, environmental concerns. Tarrant believes that true Conservatism must be Green Conservatism. He believes this is the case because a group of people are shaped by the natural environment from which they originate. The environmental issue is also a connected to birth-rates when he states that “[t]here is no green future with never ending population growth, the ideal green world cannot exist in a World of 100 billion 50 billion or even 10 billion people. Continued immigration into Europe is environmental warfare and ultimately destructive to nature itself” (Tarrant 48). Note that Tarrant here once again uses militarized language when thinking about environmental challenges. Another peculiar aspect to Tarrant’s thinking is that, although he is normally described as a far-right extremist, some of the themes he is worried about are normally considered more left-wing issues. This is the case for both his environmental concerns and his strong dislike of capitalism.

The final category which is contained in Tarrant’s diagnostic framing is the timeframe within which he expects white civilization to be doomed. Tarrant argues that widespread resistance to Islamization must have start before 2028 as this is when the “boomer” generation

will start to pass away. Once this has happened, the ethnic composition of the West will have changed so far that resistance will be futile (Tarrant 74). Considering the manifesto was released in 2019, this only left Tarrant with nine years to act before white civilization would fall. Tarrant states that “[i]f we wait until the majority of the boomers begin to pass (between 2028-2038 depending on individual nations and life expectancies) than it will be too little, too late. As by this time the invaders and occupiers of lands, non-Europeans, numbers will swollen [SIC] to a staggering size, due to both mass immigration and the differing birth-rates [SIC] between the native European people and these invaders. (...) We attack as soon as possible, we attack with force and we achieve stability and play defense as the boomers pass, not during their passing, not after” (Tarrant 74).

Now that the problems which together comprise Tarrant’s diagnostic framing have been analysed, the prognostic framing of Tarrant will be considered. Tarrant acknowledges that low birth-rates in white communities are the fundamental problem which endangers the white race. Importantly however, he also believes that immigration will destroy the white race far earlier than decreasing birth-rates. As such, he believes that killing “invaders” and deporting immigrants should take priority (Tarrant 6). In his manifesto, Tarrant justifies his tackling of a secondary problem as follows:

“ ‘Why attack immigrants when “X” are the issue?’ because the “x” groups can be dealt with in time, but the high fertility immigrants will destroy us now, soon it is a matter of survival we destroy them first” (Tarrant 29).

Here Tarrant acknowledges that there are more fundamental problems which he could address, but that tackling these problems would be futile if high fertility immigrants are not dealt with first. The specific strategy Tarrant proposes, his prognostic frame, is to reduce immigration rates by intimidating and killing “invaders” (Tarrant 7-9). This is also what Tarrant eventually did when committing his attacks in Christchurch.

Tarrant’s prognostic framing so far addresses the problems concerning Islam and immigration. To Tarrant, however, it also addresses the problems stemming from environmental degradation. He states the following:

“Why focus on immigration and birth rates when climate change is such a huge issue? Because they are the same issues, the environment is being destroyed by over population, we Europeans are on the groups that are not over populating [SIC] the world. The invaders are the ones over populating [SIC] the world. Kill

the invaders, kill the overpopulation and by doing so save the environment”
(Tarrant 29).

Tarrant believes climate change and the presence of immigrants are so closely interrelated that both problems can be solved through killing “invaders”. Although Brenton Tarrant has not been researched as such, he provides an interesting example of a terrorist whose ideology could be described as eco-fascist.

Tarrant’s prognostic framing concerning societal problems is noticeably less specific compared to his prognostic framing concerning Islam, immigration, and environmental change. Considering Tarrant’s belief that declining birth-rates are a fundamental threat to the white race, it is troublesome for Tarrant that he does not have solutions to this problem. He does hypothesize that a broad societal shift is necessary where there is a larger emphasis on family values, gender, social norms, the importance of nature, culture, and race, but he never establishes how this should happen (Tarrant 68). Furthermore, besides his call to call to “KILL YOUR LOCAL ANTI-WHITE CEO” Tarrant also does not appear to have a deep understanding of how to tackle capitalism (Tarrant 58). Compare this to the relative depth of his considerations on why to target Muslims (kill members of a high fertility population, disincentivise immigration, environmental benefits) and the shallowness of Tarrant’s prognostic framing concerning societal issues becomes evident.

As stated in the diagnostic framing, Tarrant believes that resistance against Islamization must have started before 2028. For Tarrant, this practically means that terror attacks against “invaders” must have increased to such an extent that immigration from non-whites has substantially decreased and remigration has greatly increased, both of which decreases the number of invaders in white society (Tarrant 74). Furthermore, Tarrant also believes that by 2044 likeminded individuals need to have risen to the top of political, military, judicial, educational, and economic institutions. He states that “[w]e do not have the luxury of time like the left had, we must be ready to act, and act soon. That means those that can, or have the ability should look to ingrain themselves into these institutions and climb as far up the power hierarchy as possible, in the shortest time possible. When the time comes you must be ready to act. BLITZ TO DOMINANT POSTITIONS” (Tarrant 54). Tarrant’s prognostic framing for the short term is fairly clear and concise; commit terror acts to decrease the number of high fertility immigrants. His prognostic framing in the longer term, however, is more ambiguous. It is clear he wants the readers of his manifesto to infiltrate power structures, but how this

should be done or how it alleviates the problems presented in his diagnostic framing remains unclear.

Tarrant's prognosis only provides solutions to three of the five issue areas identified in his diagnostic framing. His most concrete prognosis, to terrorize Muslims as much as possible before 2028, is intended to make immigration to white societies less appealing and to kill members of high fertility minority groups. This addresses the problems concerning Islam and immigration. Furthermore, as Tarrant believes that "the invaders" are the ones overpopulating the world and not Westerners, killing immigrants also provides a solution for environmental challenges (Tarrant 29). The fundamental problems of Western society, which he does acknowledge as being the most threatening ultimately, are not adequately addressed in Tarrant's prognoses. He does pose that his readers must infiltrate political power structures by 2044, but it is never made clear how this addresses the issues he identifies in Western society or what the result should be of this infiltration. What allows Tarrant to leave these questions unanswered is the short timescale which is left to tackle the problem of mass migration. Tarrant believes that if migration is not tackled before 2028, solutions to the fundamental problem of low Western birth-rates will have become irrelevant. As such, the short timeframe in Tarrant's diagnosis allows the prognosis to neglect more difficult and fundamental questions, preferring to tackle the simpler problem of mass immigration through attacks and intimidation. As such, Tarrant's view of the impending doom of the white race allows him to not address more difficult ideological and cultural questions.

Cultural Marxists and Eurabia

In this chapter the diagnostic and prognostic framing of Breivik will be analysed and compared to Tarrant's. Due to the length of Breivik's manifesto, it is not possible to fully analyse all of the prognostic framing and all of the diagnostic framing in the manifesto. Because the aim of this paper is to understand Tarrant's differing target selection as compared to Breivik, it is not necessary to fully analyse all parts of Tarrant's framing. For example, Breivik spends parts of his manifesto railing against the negative influence of the European Union (EU) on European society. Although Breivik identifies many problems which are resultant of the EU, a full analysis of these problems is not necessary as Tarrant never mentions the EU in his manifesto. Therefore, a full exploration of the diagnostic and prognostic framing concerning the EU is not valuable to the purposes of this thesis. This chapter will first consider Breivik's

diagnostic framing concerning Cultural Marxism, Islam, Western civilization, and the timeframe left before the fall of Western civilization. Then, the prognostic framing for these same issues will also be considered. Throughout the chapter comparisons will be made to how the diagnostic and prognostic framing of Breivik compares to Tarrant. The findings of these comparisons will then be summarized in the conclusion of the thesis.

The most prominent issue in Breivik's diagnostic framing is the influence of Cultural Marxism on Western society. Breivik believes that Cultural Marxism is the dominant ideology of Western elites. In his understanding, Cultural Marxism is the transformation of Marxism from an economic theory to a cultural theory. Whereas he understands Classical Marxism as forcefully making everybody's income equal, Cultural Marxism propagates the idea that all cultures are equal. In Breivik's mind, the entire contemporary European political spectrum has been subjected by a Cultural Marxist, politically correct agenda (Breivik 19-21). Reconquista, one of the authors quoted in the manifesto, states the following concerning Cultural Marxists and their worldview:

“The core principle of liberals and multiculturalists is that everybody is equal. In the fluffy bunny la-la land of these vain zealots, the sexes are equal; all ethnic groups are equal; all sexuality is equal; all children are equal and children are equal to adults; animals are equal to humans; all cultures are equal and all religions are equal. For anybody to discriminate against anybody else and assert superiority is to establish inequality and inequality simply must not- indeed will not- be tolerated” (Breivik 398).

Cultural Marxism is presented as a form of extreme egalitarianism which represses the differences between different groups. This is a problem as he is convinced that cultures are inherently unequal (Breivik 408). Breivik describes the beliefs and goals of Cultural Marxists as follows:

“We believe the typical European Christian man and woman, Christendom and European nationalism is [SIC] the cancer of the world so we have decided to exterminate it. We will do this through multiculturalism. The next decades we will deconstruct European identity, European traditions, European culture, European Christendom and European nation states. This is a long term project that will involve new waves of colonisation of Europe by the Islamic world” (Breivik 801).”

Multiculturalism, thus, is an insidious weapon used by Cultural Marxist elites in order to destroy Western culture.

Breivik imagines Cultural Marxists to be the evillest ideological group that has ever existed, concerning which he states the following:

“The only thing that separates Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot with today’s cultural Marxists (...) is that the tyrants of today are all directly responsible for the extermination of THEIR OWN people and intend to sell the rest into Islamic slavery. Never in the history of man has an ideology revolved around the concept of exterminating its own people. As such, multiculturalism is truly unique in human history.” (Breivik 814)

Clearly the threat of Cultural Marxists is considered incredibly serious, and potentially even the greatest threat any civilization has ever encountered. What is interesting about Breivik’s understanding of Cultural Marxism is that the destruction of the European culture and identity is essentially the purpose of the ideology, stating “[m]ulticulturalism is an anti-European hate ideology which has been designed to exterminate European culture, traditions, our identity and even our nation state” (Breivik 1111) and “[t]he thing is that many of our political and cultural elites (...) know exactly what they are doing. They know that they are contributing to a process of indirect cultural and demographical genocide” (Breivik 771). Considering the severity of the threat perceived by Breivik, acts of resistance such as mass killings are more likely to become a part of the following prognostic framing.

The language of genocide, similarly to the militarized language in Tarrant’s manifesto, allows for the radicalization of solutions. In his prognostic framing Tarrant is also worried about genocide. It is important to note however that Tarrant puts the blame for this genocide mostly on capitalists who import cheap labour, whilst Breivik blames Cultural Marxists (Tarrant 34). Although the consequences are similar between both terrorists, namely genocide, in Tarrant’s diagnosis the cause of the threat is found in capitalists, whilst Breivik looks to the Cultural Marxist elites who have infiltrated Western governments. As such, it is logical that Breivik would choose a political target for his attacks.³

³ A critical note here is that, as Calasso (2020) notes, Tarrant did address his manifesto to New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern and he also calls for the assassination of Angela Merkel in his manifesto. The point still stands however, that over the length of his manifesto Breivik never critically engages, or even mentions, governments or their policy as a substantial contributor to his diagnostic frame.

To understand why Breivik takes the problem of Cultural Marxism so seriously, it is also important to have a general understanding of who the Cultural Marxists are. In his manifesto Breivik becomes quite specific with regards to which groups he considers to be a part of the Cultural Marxist elite. Breivik creates a categorization between three different types of traitors: category A, B, and C traitors. Category A traitors are the political elites in national governments and in the EU, Category B traitors are journalists, publicists, lecturers, university professors, school and university board members, publicists, radio commentators, fiction writers, cartoonists, artists, technicians, scientists, doctors, liberal church leaders, and investors who fund Cultural Marxist endeavours, and category C traitors are socialists, feminists, gay and disability activists, animal rights activists, and environmentalists (Breivik 780). In Breivik's diagnostic framing category, A, B, and C traitors are held responsible for the cultural genocide of the indigenous European population by aiding a foreign invasion through immigration. Furthermore, the traitors are preventing Europeans from resisting the invasion through harassing cultural conservatives.⁴ Moreover, they are blamed for decreasing birth-rates through enforcing Marxist social structures. Examples of these social structures are the facilitation of contraceptives to women and the legalization of abortion which Breivik views as genocidal policies considering the birth-rates of "indigenous Europeans" is already below replacement level (Breivik 781-782). In line with the great replacement conspiracy, both Tarrant and Breivik are concerned about birth-rates. Birth-rates do, however, play a more central role in Tarrant's manifesto. Importantly, however, in Tarrant's diagnostic framing birth-rates are a problem of Western society itself, it is never blamed on any group other than Western men. Contrast this with Breivik's belief that the low birth-rates are the result of an insidious elite actively pursuing white genocide. For Breivik, there is a specific group that can be targeted for an attack for their role in white genocide, whilst Tarrant's understanding of the problem of low-birth rates does not provide a clear target.

Another concern with Cultural Marxism is its alleged purposeful deconstruction of European identity and tradition in the name of their humanistic, multicultural ideology (Breivik 12). The roots of Cultural Marxism and its undermining of Western culture and identity lies in the philosophical tradition of the Frankfurt School and Critical theory. The purpose of Critical Theory, according to Breivik, is understood as disrupting and challenging existing social structures (Breivik 23). Critical Theory is, for example, blamed for the rise of feminism and

⁴ Cultural Conservatives is the term Breivik gives to those who are ideologically likeminded to himself.

the perceived breakdown of gender roles in 20th century Europe (Breivik 20-25). Breivik states the following with regards to the role of the Frankfurt school's ideology in Europe's downfall:

““Cultural Marxism,” as preached by the Frankfurt School has thus spurred the widely popular and destructive concepts of “affirmative action,” “multiculturalism” and “diversity”. One can't escape these terms today. These concepts have destroyed every defensive structure of European society which has laid the foundation for the Islamisation of Europe” (Breivik 37).

Cultural Marxism, thus, is held responsible for a wide range of ideological developments that Breivik disagrees with. In Tarrant's worry about similar ideological developments is also present. The key difference is that Tarrant does not recognize one particular group as having caused these developments. Considering Tarrant also does not provide a more comprehensive understanding of why ideologies have shifted, it follows that he also does not know how to address the problem.

Another part of Breivik's diagnostic framing concerning Cultural Marxism is that, to make the mass migration of Muslims more palatable for the native European population, Cultural Marxist academics have attempted to hide the history of Islamic colonization of the West (Breivik 12). Breivik's manifesto goes to great lengths to construct a broad historical narrative in which Muslims have attempted to take over Europe, starting in the 8th century with the presence of Muslims in Southern Spain and spanning all the way to the early 20th century with the Ottoman presence in the Balkans. Breivik gives a broad account of different atrocities and battles in which Muslims have been involved over the last 1300 years in order to create a grand narrative in which European civilization has been in a struggle for dominance with the Islamic world. From this particular view, the Crusades are even imagined as an essentially defensive struggle (Breivik 144). This view of the Crusades being essentially defensive acts in protection of the Christian world is a view which can be encountered more generally in contemporary right-wing and far-right discourse.⁵ The view of Islamic civilization and European-Christian civilization being in some sort of eternal struggle fulfils a similar role to the concept of genocide in Tarrant's writing; namely to frame the actions of the Breivik as being defensive (Moses 202-203).

⁵ See for example Steven Crowder's video “DEBUNKED: “The Crusades” Myths” which 14 million YouTube views on YouTube at the time of writing where it is argued that the Crusades were defensive in much the same way it is argued by Breivik.

In Breivik's diagnostic framing Cultural Marxist elites are also blamed for having brainwashed the indigenous peoples of Europe more generally with their 'multiculturalist propaganda'. One of the examples given is the attack on institutions like the church which are understood as playing an important role in upholding traditional European norms and values (Breivik 786-787). The importance of the undermining of European values and Christendom can be gathered from the following quote:

“The biggest threat to Europe is the cultural Marxist/multiculturalist political doctrine of “extreme egalitarian emotionalism”. This type of political stance involves destroying Christendom, the Church, our European Cultures and identities and opening up our borders to Islamic colonisation. The Islamisation of Europe is merely a “secondary infection”. Western Europe has grown weak and decadent and will be completely annihilated culturally unless we succeed to implement a second European renaissance and reverse the damage done” (Breivik 1353).

The perversion of Christendom is given more substance earlier in the manifesto when it is stated that “[o]ur illiterate, lazy culture has spilled over to many professing Christians who have embraced the ways of the pacifist egalitarian. They are willing to read a modified, pacifist, gender neutral Bible, missing what God says so that they can continue to ignore their duties in regards to the ongoing Crusade (self defence). Our modern Bible was written by men using dynamic equivalence. In other words, they are telling you their interpretation and their doctrine, NOT what the manuscripts really say. This can be confirmed by reviewing how the modern Church is using pacifist, fanatically egalitarian and gender inclusive language. Fanatical egalitarianism, gender inclusivity and pacifism wasn't in the original texts, in the original Bible. It is a modern, feminist and cultural relativist concept born from the Marxist revolution” (Breivik 1140). It is not only the perceived destruction of the Church by the state which is a problem, but Christianity and its most holy scripture itself have been corrupted by Cultural Marxist influences. Breivik finds Christianity, or at least its cultural aspects, to be quite important. However, contemporary Christian practices and perspectives are widely disagreed with. When compared to Breivik's manifesto, Christianity does not play much of a role for Tarrant. Although stories of Christian persecution by Muslims are used at points to illustrate why Muslims are dangerous, it never plays a more substantial role in his prognostic or diagnostic framing.

Cultural Marxism, in Breivik's thinking, also lies at the root of the Islamization of Europe (Breivik 16). In his manifesto it is stated that Western governments have created false representations of both their own and Islamic civilizations in order to make them appear equal. As Önnersfors (163-165) argues, Breivik believes that Cultural Marxists have entered into an alliance with elites from the Islamic world in order to destroy and Islamize Europe. The conspiracy theory which propagates this idea is called the Eurabia thesis, and it was introduced by the author Bat Ye'or. According to the Eurabia thesis the political leaders of Europe are part of a grand conspiracy to turn Europe into an Islamic colony (Strømmen 556-561; Berntzen and Sandberg 762). Here, once again, the understanding of Islamization by Breivik allows him to view his actions in a defensive frame where he and his compatriots are defending Europe against insidious Cultural Marxist and Islamist elites (Titley, 219). In this imagining, Islam is presented as a political ideology which, in cooperation with Cultural Marxist elites, poses an existential threat (Berntzen and Sandberg 763-764).

Breivik believes resistance to Islamization has been made impossible by Cultural Marxists due to a strict regime of political correctness. This has made it impossible for European patriots to resist their own impending doom (Breivik 632). One interesting leap in logic Breivik makes in his manifesto is that Cultural Marxists are held responsible for all crimes which have been committed by Muslims in Europe (Breivik 783). The thinking being that without the Eurabia project, Muslims would not exist in Europe and as such would not commit crimes. This raises the interesting question of to what degree Breivik holds Muslims themselves accountable, and to what degree he believes they have agency in their own right. This question becomes more pressing when considering that Breivik also holds Cultural Marxists accountable for crimes perpetrated by Muslims against non-Muslims outside of Europe (Breivik 793). At this point, Cultural Marxists are not only responsible for all Muslim crimes committed against non-Muslims in Europe, but they are also held responsible for Muslim perpetrated atrocities around the world. Besides indicating the lack of agency Breivik ascribes to Muslims, this also shows the incredibly large extent to which Breivik holds Cultural Marxists responsible, in some way, for all the wrongs he notes in his diagnostic framing. In Breivik's manifesto the influence of Cultural Marxists is ever-present when discussing problems. As such, Cultural Marxism binds together the large number of problems which he identifies in his diagnostic framing.

Not only is Cultural Marxism held responsible for the perceived wrongdoings of Islam, it is also held responsible for the success of feminism in the 20th and 21st centuries (Breivik 35-

36). Fjordmann, one of the quoted authors in the manifesto, argues that feminism has weakened Western civilization and demography through the establishment of political correctness and through weakening the family structure (Breivik 358-359). The causal relationship is presented by Fjordman as follows:

“The West has skyrocketing divorce rates and plummeting birth rates, leading to a cultural and demographic vacuum that makes us vulnerable to take-over by...Islam” (Breivik 361).

Interestingly, Tarrant never mentions Feminism or feminists in his manifesto at all. His diagnostic framing does include some of the same problems, such as declining birth-rates, but he recognizes these problems as stemming from individualism and the deterioration of manhood in the West, rather than as the result of genocidal Cultural Marxist policies (Tarrant 39).

In Breivik’s diagnostic framing, Cultural Marxists are also in control of the press (Breivik 390). They use this control to purposefully misrepresent and underreport the occurrence of Muslim perpetrated crimes in the West (Breivik 806-807). Furthermore, the Cultural Marxist press is thought to promote multiculturalism whilst actively propagating against nationalism and traditional values. This is thought to “actively contribute to the annihilation of European identities, cultures and national sovereignty” (Breivik 803). Although Tarrant is also worried about the state of the press, he only ever mentions the press in the context of the press being controlled by capitalists, and the consequences of this control are not expanded upon in his manifesto.

Although Breivik does not consider himself to be a racist, he does blame Cultural Marxism for the problems of interracial relationships and race mixing. He believes that the Cultural Marxist mainstream media propagates interracial relationships which contributes to his perceived Nordic genocide (Breivik 1160). Race mixing is a problem because he believes that “[r]ace mixing leads to suicidal children with severe mental health problems” and that “[a] majority of Europeans see ethnic, blood-bonds as the most essential cultural factor and consider their ethnic tribe to be their extended family. This issue is extremely politically incorrect to discuss, due to the current cultural Marxist regimes but it is not a secret that ethnicity remains and will remain as the most important uniting cultural factor” (Breivik 1162). In the same vein as Breivik, Tarrant is also worried about the racial make-up of the Western world, although he does not connect the downfall of the white race to Cultural Marxism in his diagnostic framing.

Another difference between the two manifestos is that Breivik goes to great lengths to avoid being called a racist, generally speaking in terms of ‘Western culture’ rather than race and reiterating at different points that he is not a racist, whilst Tarrant explicitly talks about saving the white race and states that “I am a racist” (Tarrant 19).

In a similar vein to the issue of sexual promiscuity, Cultural Marxism is also blamed for the deaths which have resulted from drug epidemics in Breivik’s diagnostic framing. According to Breivik, Cultural Marxism has undermined the authority of the church and has thereby taken away the moral inhibitions of Westerners regarding drug use. Somewhat similar to how Cultural Marxists are held responsible for all crimes committed by Muslims, Cultural Marxists are also held responsible for the damage drugs have done to Western society (Breivik 1222). Tarrant also views drug use as a problem, but he does not provide an explanation as to why the problem of drug use exists. He believes that drug dealers are racial enemies of the white race, but he does not place these drug dealers within a broader framework as Breivik does when blaming the proliferation of drug abuse on Cultural Marxism (Tarrant 59).

The final problem in Breivik’s prognostic framing concerning Cultural Marxism is the emergence of environmentalism. Environmentalism is mentioned sparsely in Breivik’s manifesto, but due to the grave contrast with Tarrant’s perception of environmentalism it is worth taking into consideration. Breivik believes environmentalism is a Marxist plot created by the United Nations (UN) to redistribute resources from wealthy Western countries to poor third world countries. Environmentalism, thus, is a veiled attempt at global Marxist redistribution of wealth (Breivik 656). Tarrant’s position on environmentalism is nearly as contradictory to Breivik’s as one could imagine. In his chapter “Green nationalism is the only true nationalism” Tarrant states that true Conservatism, or Traditionalism as he sometimes calls it, is not possible without protecting the nature from which the culture sprung forth (Tarrant 48). Furthermore, Tarrant even frames his decision to kill non-whites in an environmental frame as he believes they are responsible for overpopulation and its consequences for the environment (Tarrant 29).

Besides diverging views on the nature of environmentalism, Tarrant and Breivik diverge a surprising amount on the problem of Cultural Marxism more generally. For Breivik, Cultural Marxism is at the very core of his problem diagnosis and all constituent areas of his problem diagnosis in some way is connected to its influence. Compare this to Tarrant, who only mentions Cultural Marxists as a problem in the context of their role in the educational

system (Tarrant 27-28). Whilst it is difficult to gauge how seriously Tarrant takes the issue of Cultural Marxism, he certainly takes it far less seriously than Breivik, whose entire problem diagnosis essentially boils down to the influence of this one subversive elite group.

Now that all issues in Breivik's diagnostic framing concerning Cultural Marxism have been examined, it is important to consider the role of Cultural Marxism as a whole in his ideology. For Breivik, Cultural Marxist elites play a role, and are responsible for, an incredibly broad set of problems. There are not many problems which are not in some way related to the pervasive influence of Cultural Marxism. As such, the role of Cultural Marxism in Breivik's thinking shows some resemblance to the role of the Jewish world conspiracy in Nazi propaganda as explained by Hannah Arendt (463-476). In both cases the ideologies point to an insidious, elitist force that has been operating to the detriment of wider society (society meaning the Aryan race in the case of Nazism or white Western society in the case of Breivik). This sort of all-encompassing evil conspiracy is absent from Tarrant's manifesto, and therefore there is not one adversarial other who Tarrant can blame for the problems in his diagnostic framing. Breivik is able to blame Cultural Marxists for most issues in his diagnostic framing which allows for Breivik to tackle fundamental problems through targeting Cultural Marxist targets such as the Norwegian Labour party. In Tarrant's case, the diagnostic framing is far more dispersed. He identifies many different problems, but there is not one central conspiracy which underlies them. Through killing Muslims, he does tackle some of the problems of his diagnostic framing, but he is not able to tackle the fundamental problems facing Western society.

Now that Breivik's diagnostic framing regarding Cultural Marxism has been explored, the thesis will now turn to his diagnostic framing concerning Islam. Although, as mentioned above, Islamization is caused by Cultural Marxist elites, there are still problems specific to Islam independent of Cultural Marxism.

There are many reasons why Breivik considers Islam to be dangerous, but according to Breivik it is especially dangerous now due to the increasing Islamic technological parity to the West. Islam, which is portrayed as always having been a warlike religion, for the first time in centuries possesses the technology to pose a serious threat to Western dominance (Breivik 2011, 78). Furthermore, Islam is also believed to be fundamentally incompatible with democracy as in Islam, believers and unbelievers are believed to be inherently unequal (Breivik 559). Breivik views Islam as a political ideology which, in time, will be the end of freedom in

the west (Breivik 1110). He expects this to happen somewhere between 2070 and 2080 as that is when Muslims will have become the majority population in Europe- at which point democratic institutions will be used to institute an Islamic Europe (Breivik 660). Breivik believes that Muslims in the West take orders from their Islamic spiritual leaders to promote the geopolitical goals of Islam (turning the entire world into the Dar al-Islam) (Breivik 564).

Another problem in Breivik's diagnostic framing are the birth-rates of Muslims. Breivik believes that "[t]he growth of the Islamic population is explosive. According to some, one out of three babies born in France is a Muslim. Hundreds of Muslim ghettos already de facto follow sharia, not French law. Some believe France will quietly become a Muslim country, while others are predicting a civil war in the near future" (Breivik 293-294). Breivik even goes as far as to describe the difference between Western and Muslim birth-rates as demographic jihad. As mentioned above, the eventual goal of "out-breeding" westerners is to eventually turn democratic institutions against them. Proof for this theory is seen in the Shariatic disapproval of birth control and Islamic marriage laws which stimulate Muslim population growth (Breivik 491-492). Breivik fears in the long term that the growing proportion of Muslims in Western societies will lead to civil war which, if Islam wins, will lead to the transformation of Western society into an Islamic dictatorship in which non-Muslims are enslaved and slaughtered (Breivik 496-498). Tarrant's problem diagnosis concerning Muslim fertility rates never go into as much detail as Breivik's, but fertility rates are the primary reason why Tarrant opposes the Muslims presence in white civilization (Tarrant 17-20).

Now that Breivik's diagnostic framing concerning Islam has been analysed, it is important to note that not all parts of his diagnostic framing are equally problematic. As Breivik notes "[j]ust as Islam isn't the cause of Europe's current weakness, but rather a secondary infection, it could have unforeseen and ironic effect of saving Europe from herself. By quite literally putting a dagger at Europe's throat, the Islamic world will force Europeans to renew themselves or die. Europe will go through a turbulent period of painful, but necessary revival, and will arrive chastened at the other side" (Breivik 741). Although Breivik does believe that Islam poses serious problems for Western civilization, it is not the most fundamental problem. Breivik even predicts that the presence of Islam may be positive as it will lead to a final confrontation between Cultural Conservatives and Cultural Marxists to decide the fate of Europe (Breivik 660-661).

The third subject in Breivik's diagnostic framing which will be considered are problems of Western society. Firstly, Breivik believes that conservative values such as religious belief and devotion to one's nation have been replaced by secular hedonism. This is a problem because he does not believe that individuals are willing to sacrifice for these values and that these values are void of meaning. Breivik furthermore believes that without these great truths, Europeans will not stand a chance in a battle against Islam (Breivik 652). Tarrant has a similar grievance in his diagnostic framing regarding hedonism and individualism, but he considers these ideological issues to be problematic for entirely different reasons. According to Tarrant, hedonism and individualism is the leading cause of the declining birth-rates which, in the long run, will destroy the white race (Tarrant 6). He makes no mention of hedonism or individualism decreasing the capacity of Western society to resist Islam.

Another problem Breivik recognizes with Western culture is unlimited free market capitalism. More specifically, he is worried about the disregard of Asian countries for intellectual property laws which Breivik wants to mitigate by European countries and countries with European heritage creating protectionist trade zones (Breivik 1198). Although capitalism is a small part of Breivik's diagnostic framing, it is not nearly as central as it is in Tarrant's diagnosis. He believes that the capitalist's need for cheap labour has led them to betray their race through the importation of workers. As such, capitalists are taking part in his perceived genocide on the white race (Tarrant 34).

Breivik is also highly critical of Western governments and their inability to protect their citizens. He states that "[c]itizens in Western European countries pay high taxes to a state that is totally incapable of protecting our most basic rights, and is frequently unwilling to even try. With hate speech laws we are deprived of the right to protest against being swamped by immigration that will eventually render us minorities in our own countries. The law is used to punish the law-abiding citizen while the criminals rule the streets" (Breivik 730). Clearly, Breivik is not convinced that Western governments are putting forward their best effort to protect their citizens. An interesting contrast in both manifestoes is that Tarrant never blames governments for anything in his diagnostic framing. Tarrant may be worried about issues like immigration and changing social norms and values, yet the role of the government concerning these problems is never considered. Considering Tarrant does not recognize governments or their policy as problematic in his diagnostic framing, it follows that it also does feature in his prognostic framing and that he would not select a government-related or political target for his attack.

Now that the issues of Western society in Breivik's diagnostic framing have been taken into consideration, the role of time will now be analysed. The problem of time running out before the downfall of Western civilization is less prominent in Breivik's manifesto than in Tarrant's. Due to its importance in Tarrant's manifesto, however, it is important to analyse Breivik's framing concerning time for comparative purposes. Both Breivik and Tarrant's manifestoes have a certain ticking timebomb quality to due to their fairly precise predictions concerning before what time action needs to be taken. At the start of his manifesto, Breivik states that "[t]ime is of the essence. We have only a few decades to consolidate a sufficient resistance before our major cities are completely demographically overwhelmed by Muslims" (Breivik 16). Later in the manifesto, being demographically overwhelmed by "the hordes of Islam" is estimated to take place in the next 20 to 70 years (Breivik 1140). The 20-to-70-year timescale is most likely the result of his belief that in 2030 Muslims will reach a critical mass of 20% of the total population in Europe, whilst he expects their share of the population to be over 50% in the 2070 to 2080 period. The consequences of the critical mass reached by 2030 is that European intelligence agencies will no longer be able to stop all terror attacks that Muslims commit which will undermine the legitimacy of European governments. From 2070 to 2080 Breivik expects Muslims to become a majority of the population in Europe, at which point he expects a grand European civil war of Marxists and Muslims battling against Cultural Conservatives in a final showdown over who gets to decide the future of Europe. This civil war will be triggered by the inability of democracies to deal with an anti-democratic majority of Muslims (Breivik 660-661).

When compared to Breivik's manifesto, the urgency in Tarrant's is far greater. Tarrant, like Breivik, has two points in time which are crucial. For Tarrant, the first is 2028, when the boomer generation will have mostly passed away which will radically change the ethnic makeup of Western countries. Although chronologically being close to Breivik's 2030 prediction, the consequences of 2028 are far more dire. Tarrant believes that, if large scale attacks by white nationalists on non-Western populations have not started by 2028, further resistance is futile, and the white race will be doomed (Tarrant 74). Compared to Breivik's analysis, where the amount of terror attacks will have only increased beyond a manageable amount for security agencies, the consequences for Tarrant are far more urgent. Breivik believes that the final battle which will decide the fate of Western society will take place somewhere between 2070 and 2080, which leaves him far more time to act and prepare for the apocalyptic showdown between Cultural Marxists and Cultural Conservatives. Tarrant had

nine years at the time of writing to inspire other potential terrorists before white civilization is lost, whilst Breivik imagined there were still 61 to 71 years left until the final struggle between the Cultural Marxists and against the Cultural Conservatives would take place. Because Tarrant believed he only had nine years to act before white civilization was doomed due to high Muslim birth-rates, he decided to attack two mosques rather than a target which may have been more appropriate for tackling the fundamental issue of low white birth-rates.⁶ Breivik, on the other hand, understood Cultural Marxism as the most fundamental problem in his problem diagnosis, and he also believed that there was sufficient time to solve it. Breivik eventually tackled his fundamental problem through bombing a Cultural Marxist centre of political power and through committing a mass shooting on a labour-party youth camp. The time left in the diagnostic framing of the two terrorists informed which targets were attacked through informing the attackers of whether addressing a fundamental problem or a secondary problem should take precedent.

Although in this thesis it has been attempted to neatly categorize the problems which are included in Tarrant and Breivik's diagnostic frames, there are some problems which are mentioned which do not easily fit into any of the aforementioned categories. This is true specifically for Breivik's manifesto which, despite its structured presentation in the foregoing, meanders from problem to problem and at many points is difficult to follow. The problem in Breivik's diagnostic framing which must be considered in order to compare it to Tarrant's is that of overpopulation. Breivik states that it is the fault of the third world and that future conservative governments must stop food aid in order to alleviate the problem (Breivik 1203-1204). Both Breivik and Tarrant agree on overpopulation as a problem, but Tarrant places overpopulation in the context of a more complex diagnosis. For Tarrant, overpopulation is problematic due to its harmful consequences to the environment, and he believes that non-white races are the cause of overpopulation due to their high birth-rates (Tarrant 29). As such, there is a more well-defined picture of why overpopulation exists as a problem and what its consequences are. In Breivik's diagnostic framing, the problem of overpopulation never develops beyond being a rhetorical device for condemning third world countries.

Now that the diagnostic framing in Breivik's manifesto has been analysed, the prognostic framing concerning Cultural Marxism will be considered. When keeping the extreme acts Breivik undertook in his struggle against Cultural Marxism in mind, it is

⁶ Think for example about an abortion clinic or a pharmaceutical company which produces anticonception.

interesting to note that the first call to action in his manifesto is rather innocuous. Breivik calls on his readers to defy Cultural Marxism by proclaiming non-PC (politically correct) opinions on subjects such as homosexuality, the role of women in society and family life, and the misfit between Sharia law and Western culture (Breivik, 21-22). Compared to Tarrant, Breivik actually provides his readers with acts of resistance that have a low barrier of entry.

The first more substantial prognosis in Breivik's manifesto is found in a text written by D.L. Adams. He believes that multiculturalism needs to be destroyed to avoid the destruction of Western civilization. Although it is a call to action, what specifically needs to be done in order to destroy multiculturalism is not further specified by Adams (Breivik 408). The manifesto does get more specific when it starts prescribing which locations and persons to target in terror attacks. Breivik gives a long list of targets consisting mostly of the category A and B traitors. Breivik specifically advises his readers to attack large meetings of Cultural Marxist political parties, media conferences, EU headquarters, government buildings, mainstream media channels, and universities. Islamic targets are also mentioned, but only large cultural events with more than 2000 Muslims present can be considered (Breivik 929-930). The purpose of the attacks on Muslims, unlike in Tarrant's case, is not the killing of Muslims in and of itself, but rather the incitement of a violent reaction from Muslim communities in the West. These reactions are thought to increase tensions between ethnic groups which will increase polarization and accelerate the breakdown of Cultural Marxist-controlled society (Breivik 1082-1084). An interesting point to consider when looking at Tarrant's attack from the perspective of Breivik's prognostic framing is that Breivik argues against the use of violence against Muslims until at least 2030 (Breivik 1255). According to Breivik's prognostic frame, Tarrant's attack was executed far too early and far too small in scale to achieve the desired results of a breakdown of the multiculturalist social order. Regarding attacks on Muslims Breivik states the following:

“DO NOT for the love of god aim your rage and frustration at Muslims. Muslim or Paki bashing is a sure way to hurt our cause as this is what the cultural Marxist elites WANT you to do. They want you to waste your efforts on fighting Muslims and they will do anything to prevent you from aiming your efforts at them. They want the indigenous Europeans to busy fighting Muslims as that will guarantee their positions. We will never have a chance at overthrowing the cultural Marxists if we waste our efforts fighting the Muslims (...) When the pipe in your bathroom springs a leak and the water is flooding the room, what do you

do? (...) You go for the source of the problem, the leak itself! You DON'T mop up until after you have fixed the actual leak. Needless to say, our regime is the leak (all category A, B and C traitors), the Muslims are the water. As such, ALL our efforts must be aimed at category A and B traitors with very few exceptions. The ONLY exception should sabotage attacks (...) and effectuate certain strategic attacks during the Muslim Eid celebration – later in phase 1 and 2, in order to radicalise and manipulate Muslim forces. The Muslim husbands, uncles, brothers and nephews will go absolutely nuts which will result in devastating Jihadi frenzies, substantially contributing to weaken our regimes further and at the same time create more recruits for our resistance movements. Muslims are our absolute best recruitment tools” (Breivik 1254-1255).

From the foregoing it is clear that Breivik actively argues against the type of attack that Tarrant committed.

Returning to Breivik's prognosis for a large-scale attack, he instructs his readers to attack a large-scale convention or gathering of the reader's local socialist or social democrat party (Breivik, 950). This is largely congruent with the final target of his attack, namely a Norwegian labour party summer camp and government building. Furthermore, Breivik also notes that art exhibitions and other cultural outings may have large gatherings of category A and B traitors and thus provide a good target for attack (Breivik 952-953). Tarrant never mentions the concept of category A and B traitors which is in line with his more general lack of engagement with Cultural Marxism in his manifesto.

In his prognostic framing concerning Cultural Marxism Breivik also recognizes some strange bedfellows which may help Cultural Conservatives in destroying the Marxist social order. He states that anarchists could be useful allies for the assassination of category A and B targets (Breivik 1254). Furthermore, Breivik also believes that jihadi groups in the Middle East could be potential allies in order to obtain chemical weapons and weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) which could be used against Cultural Marxist elites (Breivik 959-966).

Breivik also provides sabotage attacks as a potential weapon against Cultural Marxists. These attacks should be on high-value economic targets such as the gas and oil industry (Breivik 985). Furthermore, he also believes it is justified to undertake attacks on nuclear plants to create multiple Chernobyl-like disasters in Europe. Breivik believes this will bring Western governments to their knees due to the incredible economic damage such sabotage operations

would cause (Breivik 1030-1031). Besides bringing Western governments to their knees through large scale sabotage attacks, Breivik also believes that cultural conservatives need to take control of political and military power in their countries. This should be done through spreading awareness of the problems facing European societies which, in turn, will attract cultural conservatives who are willing to join the resistance (Breivik 771). Tarrant similarly believes that Western governments must be infiltrated by 2044 in order for white civilization to prevail, but he never specifies how exactly this should be done (Tarrant 54). Once again, the relative poverty of Tarrant's prognostic framing and understanding of problems as compared to Breivik is shown.

An interesting difference concerning in the prognostic framing of both terrorists is the order in which they believe problems from their diagnostic framing need to be tackled. Breivik states that the more fundamental war within the West, between Cultural Marxism and Cultural Conservatism, needs to be won before the question of Muslim migration can be addressed (Breivik 709). Tarrant, on the other hand, states that Muslims will have destroyed Western culture due to their high fertility before the issue of low white fertility destroys Western culture (Tarrant 29). Here, differences in the diagnostic framing of the two terrorists can be seen to influence the target selection. Tarrant spends most of his diagnostic framing worried about birth-rates among whites on the one hand and Muslims on the other. This, however, never turns into a larger discussion on why white birth-rates have declined and how this can be stopped. Because of this, Tarrant is forced to tackle minority birth-rates first as this is the only problem for which he has a solution. Here, the issue of time plays an important role for Tarrant. In Tarrant's mind white society will be doomed due to demographic changes by 2028. This only leaves him nine years to act which he views as far too short to find solutions for low white birth-rates. The only effective plan of action in Tarrant's mind is to first deal with the problem of high-fertility minorities, after which the white race has plenty of time to reconsider its ideological failings (Tarrant 29). For Breivik, however, there are 60 to 70 years left before the final showdown between Cultural Conservatives and the Cultural Marxist-Islamic alliance (Breivik 660). This leaves Breivik with plenty of time to provide solutions in his prognostic framing for defeating Cultural Marxism.

Now that Breivik's prognostic framing concerning Cultural Marxism has been addressed, the prognoses regarding Islam will be considered. Breivik's first proposal to deal with Islam is to make Western countries more inhospitable to Islam and to deport and revoke the citizenship of Muslims who hold sympathies towards Sharia law (Breivik 534).

Furthermore, any Muslim who does not believe in the equality of genders or the equality between Muslims and non-Muslims must also be deported to their “country of origin” (Breivik 710). Breivik’s prognostic framing here is fairly similar to Tarrant’s concerning Muslims as he also views deporting Muslims and making life inhospitable as important ways of saving society from their presence (Tarrant 6-9). Furthermore, to counteract Islamic influence, right-wing parties in the West will need to become more relevant in the Western political scene, according to Breivik (Breivik 499). He also recognizes, however, that the demographic changes in Western society will make resistance against Islam increasingly difficult. Thus, armed resistance will need to be established eventually to save Western civilization. (Breivik 801-802)

Breivik’s manifesto also provides direction for what should be done with Islamic countries once Cultural Conservatives have taken control in the West from Cultural Marxists. Firstly, Breivik believes large-scale military intervention in the Middle East may be necessary in order to avoid the Islamic countries from obtaining nuclear weapons (Breivik 712). Furthermore, he poses that Western powers must intervene in the Middle East in order to protect Christian minorities. Breivik even proposes creating new states in the Middle East in which Middle Eastern Christians can live in peace (Breivik 1317). Although some of the proposals in Breivik’s prognostic framing are rather fantastical, there is a broad range of prognoses on how to deal with the perceived problem of Islam, especially when compared to Tarrant’s prognostic framing which does not expand much beyond terrorizing Muslims.

Breivik’s prognostic framing also contains a range of solutions concerning Western society. These are mostly reforms aimed at strengthening the West in its struggle against Cultural Marxism. Primary among these is saving democracy through overthrowing the elites by way of a coup (Breivik 733). After Cultural Conservatives have taken control, the constitution will be suspended and democracy as it functions now will not return. Rather, Western states will be transformed to a system of “administered democracy” which is more similar to Russia’s system of governance according to Breivik (Breivik 1354-1355). These long-term goals can only be achieved, however, if Cultural Conservatives are able to garner broad public support in the short term. Breivik believes that without spreading support for Cultural Conservatism, the civil war between Marxism and Conservatism will be lost, at which point the West is doomed (Breivik 771). Breivik believes that a Cultural Conservative consensus of 20-35% of the European population is necessary to create viable political resistance to Cultural Marxism. The core tenants of this Cultural Conservative movement

should include monoculturalism, the nuclear family, the free market, morality, support for Israel and non-European Christians, law and order, and Christianity (Breivik 659-660). Breivik believes that to win the coming civil war, Cultural Conservatism must be set up as “a daring and controversial counterculture that offers an original and rebellious alternative to the prevailing set of cultural Marxist/multiculturalist assumptions. (...) Our status as a mass movement begins and ends with our ability to inspire the masses to share our worldview. Promoting that worldview is the only goal that matters; and every action we take should be aimed at moving us toward that outcome. When the epistemology is widely accepted, implementing our policies will proceed easily and naturally, with minimal opposition” (Breivik 662-663). Breivik believes that, in the short term, the primary battle is an ideological one in which Cultural Conservatives and Cultural Marxists oppose each other in a struggle for the hearts and minds of the European people. As Berntzen and Sandberg (768-771) note, Breivik is very concerned with making his movement palatable and presentable to a broad audience rather than merely to the far-right. Breivik put a fair amount of thought into the success of the social movement he addresses and attempts to guide through his manifesto. This is very different from Tarrant who, although he does give directions to his readers, never puts much thought into how his ideas can gain more traction in society. Combined with both Breivik’s diagnostic and prognostic frames being far more thought-through, it creates the impression that Breivik was more concerned with his role as a potentially leading ideologue of cultural conservatives, whereas these ambitions are absent in Tarrant’s manifesto.

It is interesting to note that Breivik considers widespread conservatism to be a central component of the West’s chance of survival whilst Tarrant makes very clear in his writing that he is not a conservative and he describes conservatism as corporatism in disguise. (Tarrant 20) This is yet another idiosyncrasy between Tarrant and Breivik, as Breivik believes that free trade between Western countries is quite useful and can even be used to support non-Western Christian populations (Breivik 659-660). Tarrant, meanwhile, sees Capitalism as one of the greatest threats to ethnic autonomy as he believes that an ethnically conscious society will never be able to compete with global markets. As such, free market dynamics are to be avoided at all costs. (Tarrant 79)

Besides reforms to democracy and the spread of Cultural Conservatism, Breivik’s prognostic framing also offers advice in case Western society breaks down completely. Breivik states that the Cultural Conservatives must be ready, both physically and mentally, to face the challenges and opportunities that come with the breakdown of society. Breivik believes

Cultural Conservatives must start thinking about their goals and how to achieve them actively before society has broken down, so they rise up as the dominant force after the civil war (Breivik 713-714).

Breivik's prognostic frame also contains answers for how to deal with the problems of decreasing birth-rates. As Pantucci (28) notes, Breivik believes that patriarchal structures must be reinstated in order to increase birth-rates and strengthen the nuclear family. Ideologies such as individualism, secularism, and feminism have all undermined the rates of reproduction in Western society and as such must be replaced by more traditional values (Breivik 1147-1148). Breivik proposes to limit the availability of contraceptives, to reform sex education, criminalize abortion, discourage women from pursuing full-time careers, also discouraging them from achieving anything higher than a bachelor's degree, and generally discouraging liberal lifestyle choices for women (Breivik 1183). Here, Breivik's prognostic framing provides solutions for the most fundamental problem identified in Tarrant's manifesto; the declining birth-rates among whites. Considering the supreme importance of this issue for Tarrant and his admitted inspiration by Breivik, it is surprising that Tarrant did not simply copy these prognostic frames in his own manifesto. Furthermore, the plentiful idiosyncrasies between Tarrant's beliefs and Breivik's which have come to light throughout this thesis could be believed to question the validity of a comparative study between the two terrorists. It is important to note however that idiosyncrasies in thinking are not a bug, but rather a feature of the contemporary far-right. As Önnersfors (160-164) argues, ideological fuzziness is characteristic of both Breivik and contemporary European political parties such as PEGIDA who he considers to be part of the European Counter Jihad Movement. In his paper Önnersfors describes both Breivik and PEGIDA as examples of the third generation of the far-right. The rhetoric of this new generation is not preoccupied with providing coherent worldviews. Rather, the combination of its ambiguity and the decentralized nature of the social movement allow for ideologically diverse people to engage with the far-right based on little more than a shared enemy (Önnersfors 168-175). As such, the idiosyncrasies between Breivik and Tarrant are characteristic of the rhetoric of the social movement of which they are both a part, rather than indicating that they are not part of a social movement.

Concludingly, Breivik also provides a solution for the problem of overpopulation in his prognostic framing. Similarly, to Tarrant, Breivik determines that overpopulation is caused by the third world and their high fertility rates. Under a Cultural Conservative government, Breivik proposes that all food aid to third world countries be stopped to halt population growth. Breivik

also recommends that Western countries enforce one child policies in the third world to curb overpopulation (Breivik 1203-1204). Tarrant viewed the problem of overpopulation through the lens of it being an environmental challenge in his diagnostic framing, and his prognoses were, besides stopping aid to the third world, to also kill “invaders” to cull the population. What is most interesting about this comparison is that despite their different diagnostic framing, the solutions provided in both prognostic framings are largely similar.

Conclusion

When comparing Tarrant and Breivik’s manifesto it becomes clear that many of their ideas and beliefs differ quite significantly. Both are worried about the genocide of their people, but who is held responsible, and therefore how the problem can be addressed, is different. In his diagnostic framing, Tarrant believes that Capitalists that imported high fertility minorities into white societies are to blame, whilst Breivik believes that Cultural Marxist elites actively attempt to destroy Western society (Tarrant 34; Breivik 711). For Tarrant, the fundamental problem facing the white race are the sub-replacement level fertility-rates which, in the long-run, will mean its downfall (Tarrant 68). A problem for Tarrant is, however, that he does not know how to tackle the problem. Although he acknowledges the problem in his diagnostic framing, there is no proposed solution in his prognostic framing. Breivik also acknowledges that declining birth-rates are a problem, but Breivik believes it is caused by Cultural Marxists. As such, Breivik can tackle the problem through targeting Cultural Marxists. Tarrant is not able to find a solution to his fundamental problem of low white birth-rates, therefore his prognostic framing focusses mostly on Islam and immigration. These then, are also the problems which Tarrant addressed through his attacks.

Differences in diagnostic framing continue when considering Islam. Both terrorists understand Islam as a problematic, but the exact nature of the problem once again differs. For Breivik, Islamization is the result of a conspiracy between Cultural Marxists and Islamic elites who intend to turn Europe into an Islamic colony (Strømme 556-561; Berntzen and Sandberg 762). As such, Breivik is able to tackle the problem of Islam through targeting Cultural Marxists in his attack. Tarrant disagrees on the fundamental problem causing Islamization as he believes Capitalists are to blame, but his prognostic framing does not provide a solution for this problem (Tarrant 34). As such, Tarrant’s target selection was focussed on the secondary problem of an Islamic presence in white society. More generally, this thesis has shown that

Tarrant's diagnostic and prognostic frames are far less well defined than Breivik's which leaves him unable to tackle fundamental problems. For Breivik, nearly all of his diagnostic and prognostic framing in some way traces back to a conspiracy of Cultural Marxist elites who want nothing more than to destroy Europeans. As Cultural Marxists control the political structures in the West, targeting a left-wing political party is logical. The fact that Cultural Marxism is woven through all issues in his prognostic framing, provides for a clear target for addressing the issues which he identifies. As Tarrant does not have such a convenient scapegoat which is responsible for all his perceived ills, he resorts to tackling the secondary problem of high-fertility Muslims. Another factor which enables Tarrant's targets selection besides his shallow diagnostic framing, is his understanding of how much time white society has left before its downfall if it fails to act. Tarrant believes he only has until 2028 before demographics have changed to such an extent that the white race is doomed due to high-fertility Muslims having demographically overtaken them (Tarrant 74). Thus, for Tarrant, the urgency of high Muslim fertility allows for him to tackle a symptom, rather than the root cause of the problem which he has failed to identify. Breivik, on the other hand, believed that Cultural Conservatives have until at least 2070 to prepare themselves for the final cataclysmic showdown with Cultural Marxists (Breivik 660). This leaves Breivik with plenty of time to address the fundamental problem of Cultural Marxism, rather than tackling the problems they have caused. Tarrant's understanding of time, or lack thereof, has allowed Tarrant to solely focus on addressing issues for which the solution is to kill Muslims as these are the only issues he comprehends.

Bibliography

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. London: Penguin Random House UK, originally published in 1951, republished in 2017.

Baele, Stephane J., Lewys Brace, and Travis G. Coan. "The 'Tarrant Effect': What Impact did Far-Right Attacks have on the 8chan Forum?," *Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression*, (December 22, 2020): 1-23. Accessed June 1, 2021, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19434472.2020.1862274>.

Bakker, Edwin, and Beatrice de Graaf. "Preventing Lone Wolf Terrorism: Some CT Approaches Addressed." *Perspectives on Terrorism*, vol. 5 no. 5-6 (December 2011): 43-50. Accessed June 1, 2020. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26298538?pq-origsite=summon>.

Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 26 no. 1 (January 2000): 611-639. Accessed June 2, 2020. <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611>.

Bergstrom, Kelly, Stephanie Fisher, and Jennifer Jenson. "Disavowing 'That Guy': Identity Construction and Massively Multiplayer Online Game Players." *Convergence* vol. 22 no. 3 (June 2016): 233-249. Accessed June 3, 2021. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1354856514560314>.

Berntzen, Lars Erik., and Sveinung Sandberg. "The Collective Nature of Lone Wolf Terrorism: Anders Behring Breivik and the Anti-Islamic Social Movement." *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 26 no. 5 (February 2014): 759-779. Accessed June 2, 2020. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09546553.2013.767245>.

Beydoun, Khaled A. "Lone Wolf Terrorism: Types, Stripes, and Double Standards." *Northwestern University Law Review*, vol. 112 no. 5 (March 2018): 1213-1242. Accessed April 13, 2020. <http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=a9a95d16-21f9-468a-9b87-499148a8b24e%40sessionmgr4008&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=128834834&db=aph>.

Bjork-James, Sophie. "Racializing misogyny: Sexuality and Gender in the new Online White Nationalism." *Feminist Anthropology*, vol. 1 no. 2 (November 2020): 176-183. Accessed June 1, 2021. https://catalogue.leidenuniv.nl/prime-explore/search?query=any,contains,%22Brenton%20Tarrant%22%20bjork-james&tab=all_content&search_scope=All_Content&vid=UBL_V1&lang=en_US&offset=0.

Breivik, Anders B. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. London: self-published, 2011. <https://publicintelligence.net/anders-behring-breiviks-complete-manifesto-2083-a-european-declaration-of-independence/>.

Calasso, Roberto. "Confessions of a Child of the Century." *RES* 71/72, no.1 (June 2019): 344-348. Accessed December 3, 2020, <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/706986>

Davey, Jacob, and Julia Ebner. 'The Great Replacement': The Violent Consequences of Mainstreamed Extremism. London: Institute for Strategic Dialogue, 2019. <https://www.isdglobal.org/isd-publications/the-great-replacement-the-violent-consequences-of-mainstreamed-extremism/>.

Faccini, L., and C.S. Allely. "Mass Violence in Individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder and Narcissistic Personality Disorder: A Case Analysis of Anders Breivik using the "Path to Intended and Terroristic Violence" Model." *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, vol. 31 (November 2016): 229-236. Accessed June 3, 2021. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1359178916301550>.

Feldman, Matthew. "Comparative Lone Wolf Terrorism: Toward a Heuristic Definition." *Democracy and Security*, vol 9, no.3 (July 2013): 270-286. Accessed May 31, 2020, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17419166.2013.792252>.

Gill, Paul, and Emily Corner. "Lone-Actor Terrorist Target Choice." *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, vol. 34, no. 5 (September 2016): 693-705. Accessed June 3, 2021. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/bsl.2268>.

Hemmingby, Cato, and Tore Bjørgo. "Terrorist Target Selection: the Case of Anders Behring Breivik." *Perspectives on Terrorism* 12, no. 6 (December 2018): 164-176. Accessed December 22, 2020, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26544650>.

Holt, Thomas J., Joshua D. Freilich, Steven M. Chermak, Colleen Mills, Jason Silva. "Loners, Colleagues, or Peers? Assessing the Social Organization of Radicalization." *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 44 no. 1 (April 2018): 83-105. Accessed June 3, 2020. <https://rd.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12103-018-9439-5>.

Moses, A. Dirk. "“White Genocide” and the Ethics of Public Analysis." *Journal of Genocide Research*, vol. 21 no. 2 (April 2019): 201-213. Accessed May 29, 2020, <https://www-tandfonline-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/doi/full/10.1080/14623528.2019.1599493>.

Önnerfors, Andreas. "Between Breivik and PEGIDA: The Absence of Ideologues and Leaders on the Contemporary European Far Right". *Patterns of Prejudice*, vol. 51 no. 2 (March 2017): 159-175. Accessed May 30, 2020, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0031322X.2017.1302642>.

Roach, Kent. "Counterterrorism and the Challenges of Terrorism from the Far Right." *Common Law World Review*, vol. 50 no. 1 (March 2021): 3-20. Accessed June 1, 2021, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1473779520975121>.

Roose, Joshua M., and Bryan S. Turner. "Islamophobia, Science, and the Advocacy Concept." *Society*, vol. 56 no. 3 (June 2019): 210-221. Accessed June 1, 2021. <https://rd.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12115-019-00357-6>.

Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Terrorist attack on Christchurch Masjidain on March 15 2019 volumes 1-4. Ko tō tātou kāinga tēnei. Wellington: Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. <https://christchurchattack.royalcommission.nz/>.

Pantucci, Raffaello. "What Have We Learned about Lone Wolves from Anders Behring Breivik?" *Perspectives on Terrorism*, vol. 5 no. 5-6 (December 2011): 27-42. Accessed June 1, 2020. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26298537?pq-origsite=summon&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents.

Scrivens, Ryan, Thomas W. Wojciechowski, Joshua D. Freilich, Steven M. Chermak, Richard Frank. "Comparing the Online Posting Behaviour of Violent and Non-Violent Right-Wing Extremists." *Terrorism and Political Violence*, (March 2021): 1-18. Accessed May 31, 2021. <https://www-tandfonline-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/doi/full/10.1080/09546553.2021.1891893>.

Simi, Pete. "Why Study White Supremacist Terror? A Research Note." *Deviant Behaviour*, vol. 31 no. 3 (February 2010): 251-273. Accessed May 29, 2020. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01639620903004572/>

Snow, David A. and E. Burke Rochford, Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. "Frame Alignment and Micromobilization and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review*, vol. 41, no. 4 (August 1986): 464-481. Accessed June 3, 2020. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2095581?sid=primo&origin=crossref&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents.

Spaaij, Ramón, and Mark S. Hamm. "Key Issues and Research Agendas in Lone Wolf Terrorism." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, vol. 38, no. 3 (December 2014): 167-178. Accessed April 14, 2020, <https://www-tandfonline-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2443/doi/full/10.1080/1057610X.2014.986979>.

Stohl, Michael. "Old Myths, new Fantasies and the Enduring Realities of Terrorism." *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, vol. 1 no. 1 (March 2008): 5-16. Accessed April 13, 2020, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17539150701846443>.

Strømmen, Hannah. "Biblical Blood-Lines: From Foundational Corpus to the Far Right Bible." *Biblical Interpretation*, vol. 25 no. 3-5 (November 2017): 555-573. Accessed April 13, 2020, https://brill.com/view/journals/bi/25/4-5/article-p555_6.xml?language=en.

Tarrant, Brenton H. *The Great Replacement*. Self-published, 2019. https://img-prod.ilfoglio.it/userUpload/The_Great_Replacementconvertito.pdf.

Titely, Gavan. "They Called a War, and Someone Came: The Communicative Politics of Breivik's Ideospace." *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, vol. 3 no. 4 (December 2013): 216-224. Accessed May 30, 2020, <https://journal-njmr.org/articles/abstract/10.2478/njmr-2013-0014/>.

Veilleux-Lepage, Yannick, Chelsea Daymon, and Amarnath Amarasingam. *The Christchurch Attack Report: Key Takeaways on Tarrant's Radicalization and Attack Planning*. The Hague: International Centre for Counter-Terrorism, 2020. Accessed January 3, 2021. <https://icct.nl/publication/the-christchurch-attack-report-key-takeaways-on-tarrants-radicalization-and-attack-planning/>.

Wessely, Simon. "Anders Breivik, the Public, and Psychiatry." *The Lancet (British Edition)*, vol. 379, No. 9826 (April 2012): 1563-1564. Accessed June 3, 2021.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140673612606552>.

Winter, David A., and Guillem Feixas. "Toward a Constructivist Model of Radicalization and Deradicalization: A Conceptual and Methodological Proposal." *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 10 (March 2019): 412. Accessed June 2, 2021.

<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00412/full>.