Anders Breivik: On Copying the Obscure
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“This was the moment in any case when ‘man,’ getting a political pounding, was up against the philosophical wall and steadily losing ground.” – Avital Ronell

In the aftermath of the lethal shooting of politically organizing left-wing students and the bombing of Oslo’s political center by the Norwegian Anders Breivik, there has been much discussion about the rationale behind his actions in a general sense, and, more specifically, the implications and explanations of right-wing, nationalist, racist language which is considerably common in several European nations. In many forum threads and blog posts, analyses are given of Breivik’s actions in relation to the current political climate in these environs, which, truth be told, is of an extremely poisonous nature. Ample reflection is given on the 1500+ page manifesto distributed by Breivik, entitled 2083: A European Declaration of Independence; De Laude Novae Militiae Pauperes Commilitones Christi Templique Solomonicici, which appears to have been finished the day before he committed his crimes. This essay aims not so much for a clarification of the content of this manifesto, but attempts to provide a cartography of its rhetorical procedures, hoping to deconstruct some of the discourse that Breivik has managed to create around himself, both before and after his act. It first of all is an attempt to read Breivik as copycat, borrowing left and right, against unstable credit limits and with uncertain debt ceilings, assembling his ideological trust fund from sources as divergent as the Columbine Massacre, American conservative politics, eugenics, post-Luddite ideology, and freemasonry.

The title of his manifesto already gives us the first clues. First, the main title, 2083, a “prophetic” year, is in its form a clear reference to the apoca-

lyptic overtones related to the year 2012 as promulgated in popular culture. A date is a mark of finitude, of a certain inscription in the regime of time. As for the additional connotations of this year me may refer to the Battle of Vienna, which took place on 11 and 12 September 1683, which according to Breivik or any of his presumed sources “broke the advance of the Ottoman Empire into Europe.” In 2083, a similar defeat of Islam might take place, if we would implement the suggestions put forward in his manifesto.

We must rise and claim what is rightfully ours! By September 11th, 2083, the third wave of Jihad will have been repelled and the cultural Marxist/multiculturalist hegemony in Western Europe will be shattered and lying in ruin, exactly 400 years after we won the battle of Vienna on September 11th, 1683. Europe will once again be governed by patriots. (1412-3)

The first subtitle “A European Declaration of Independence” is copied from a blog post by a writer operating under the pseudonym Fjordman with the same title, and integrally copied in Breivik’s manuscript (717–23). The second, Latin subtitle can be translated as “In Praise of the New Knighthood, the poor fellow-soldiers of Christ and of the Temple Solomon” (812; 1335), founded in London, 2002 (832). The first part is taken from a title of text written by Bernard de Clairvaux between 1128 and 1146, entitled Liber ad milites Templi: De laude novae militiae (A Book for the Knights Templar: In Praise of the New Knighthood), the second part Pauperes Commilitones Christi Templique Solomonici, also abbreviated with PCCTS, was according to Breivik the official name of a Christian military order founded in 1119 also known as the Knights Templar (812). The two Latin parts however do not match grammatically. In his manifesto, Breivik referred to himself as “Justiciar Knight Commander for Knights Templar Europe and one of the several leaders of the National and pan-European Patriotic Resistance Movement” (9). It is unclear to what extent the “Knights Templar Europe” organization actually exists. Chapter 3, “A Declaration of Pre-emptive War,” Breivik refers to the “PCCTS, Knights Templar” as a “hypothetical fictional group” (766). As such, the manifesto’s title already indicates the variety of sources mined by Breivik and the effects of their juxtaposition: apocalyptic movies, historical narratives and their return, Islamophobia, and Crusader fictions, placed next to each so as to generate the occasional grammatical mismatch.

It has been argued that in comparison to the texts and manifestos written by Islamist Jihadi, Breivik’s writings have received too much attention. In other words, there would be a certain, perhaps orientalistically motivated, disproportion in our appreciation of his acts. This may moreover, and in a more general sense, be signaled by the troubled relation of the Western

---

3 The blog entry can also be found on the Jihad Watch blog: http://www.islam-watch.org/Fjordman/European-Declaration-Independence.htm. After the Breivik’s attacks Jensen claimed never to write again under the Fjordman pseudonym (Jonas Skybakmoen, “Fjordman avviser nye blogg-rykter,” Aftenposten, August 12, 2011).
media with the word “terrorist,” which somehow doesn’t seem to stick to Breivik’s white-skinned body. Although the accusation of hypocrisy is not entirely unjustified, I think that, if we would provisorily conclude that “terrorism” has become a common shorthand for “terrorism committed by what we perceive as the Muslim other,” the source of the slippery nature of Breivik’s signifier is that his discourse closely resemble the discourse of the Western media, matching its translational and transpositional skills with an equal disregard for a sense of unity, even though his actions seem to suggest otherwise. Breivik’s manifesto provides us with an indication of his “already having failed.” Even though I do not deny that a close reading of Jihadi calls and manifestos is of great importance, such reading would have to rely on an intricate knowledge of the context in which they are produced. Instead, by providing one of many possibly productive readings of Breivik’s manifesto, I hope to incite others to the same with any call to arms that may resound on this planet.

At the same time I will attempt to relate 2083 to the long history of manifestos reaching from the The Foundation and Manifesto of Futurism, Valerie Solanas’s Scum Manifesto, Theodore Kaczynski’s Industrial Society and Its Future, also known as the Unabomber Manifesto, and high school shooter manifestos. However, whereas all the above appeal, to certain extent, to originality and authenticity – in fact, the writing of a manifesto seems in all these cases to be expression of a drive toward uniqueness – Breivik’s manifesto has no such pretenses, he writes: “I have written approximately half of the compendium myself. The rest is a compilation of works from several courageous individuals throughout the world” (5). However, counting the many unattributed passages, the balance might even more drastically toward the side of the “courageous individuals.”

We will take our cues first clues from Valerie Solanas’s Scum Manifesto, which will have provided one of the most apt descriptions of what we will find to constitute the rhetorical procedure of displacement of Breivik’s text, and in general, the so-called debate on Islam as currently articulated in “The West”: “The male ‘rebel is a farce; this is the male’s ‘society,’ made by him to satisfy his needs. He’s never satisfied, because he’s not capable of being satisfied. Ultimately, what the male ‘rebel’ is rebelling against is being male.”

4 Not only because at several points Breivik refers to or praises Muslim Jihadi organizations for the discipline and faith in their cause.

5 Valerie Solanas, Scum Manifesto (London/New York: Verso, 2004), 55. There are many other overlaps between Solanas and Breivik. For example, both had literary aspirations (cf. Ronell, “Deviant Payback,” 2). In his the “Legal Disclaimer” prefacing the third chapter of his manifesto, Breivik states his intention to “create a new type of innovative writing style. By defining, in a horrifically detailed way, a fictional scenario, the reader will be shocked due to the ‘hopefully’ credible and extremely detailed elaborations. It should be noted that the author, as a sci-fi enthusiast, wanted to bring and create a complete new writing style that has the potential to shock the reader with an incredibly credible fictional plot (written in first, second and third person narrative). […] This book is therefore unique in many ways. It is speculated that this type of original approach has the potential to forward and present information in a new and original context. It is therefore no need for concern by any police/state/government prosecutors or intelligence agencies about the content of this book due to its fictional nature. This legal disclaimer was created to remove any doubt whatsoever that the author or anyone choosing [sic] to distribute the book ‘2083’ has any hostile motives or
Breivik did so on many levels, both physical and textual. The steroids that he continued to use until the moment of the massacre,⁶ and the muscled-up discourse that “documents through more than 1000 pages that the fear of Islamisation is all but irrational” (4). Just as he tried to “acquire specialized ‘aggressiveness’ pills on the market” (1464), he acquired his verbal force buy assimilating rhetorical ammo of others. If we may again recall the high school shooters, many of whom used computer games to train themselves for their shooting sprees and to a smaller or larger extent immersed themselves in these environments, we could point at the fact that Breivik consistently used female characters.

I took a year off when I was 25 and played WoW PvE hardcore for a year. Conservatism – Alliance, human female mage – PvE, Server: Silvermoon Conservative – Horde, tauren female resto druid – PvP, Server: Silvermoon (1408)

In his diary entry of October/November 2010, when he is in seclusion preparing for his actions, he writes: “I’m also going to try the new World of Warcraft – Cataclysm when it is released in December. Time to dust of my mage…” (1424), the mage being a “human female.” At the beginning of “the most critical of phases,” the “chemical acquirement phase” for the explosives, he writes:

My concerns and angst relating to this phase impacted my motivation, to a point where I had to initiate specific counter-measures to reverse the loss of morale and motivation. I decided that the correct approach to reversing it was to initiate another DBOL steroid cycle and intensify my strength training. […] In addition; I decided I would allow myself to play the newly launched expansion: World of Warcraft – Cataclysm. (1425)

His steroid use to become more masculine is thus clearly supplemented – “In addition;” – with a female impersonation. This exile to the virtual, as was already suggested by Guy Debord when he stated that “[t]he spectacle is […] intentions. If any legal authority have reservations against this new and innovative form of writing style, they may address or contact the author, any publisher or distributor and share their concerns which will be taken under consideration. Changes will be considered and implemented. As such, the content in its current form will not incriminate anyone, the author or any distributor” (767–8).

⁶ As can be inferred from for example the following passage: “I can’t possibly imagine how my state of mind will be during the time of the operation, though. It will be during a steroid cycle and on top of that; during an ephedrine rush, which will increase my aggressiveness, physical performance and mental focus with at least 50–60% but possibly up to 100%. In addition, I will put my iPod on max volume as a tool to suppress fear if needed. I might just put Lux Aeterna by Clint Mansell on repeat as it is an incredibly powerful song. The combination of these factors (when added on top of intense training, simulation, superior armour and weaponry) basically turns you into an extremely focused and deadly force, a one-man-army” (1344).
– and the perfection of separation within human beings,”7 will however not be sufficient, or, is perhaps already too much. Whereas Ronell argues in her introduction that Solanas, “[when she couldn’t distribute her work, […] went after the metonymies of her declared targets,”8 we will find that Breivik couldn’t distribute his work in the “world beyond,” and mainly had to go after his own signifier. His name “Anders” signifies the “other,” that is, the other sex: the “Brei-vik,” the broad cove, bay, or inlet, the welcoming womb. The contrast with Solanas is therefore one of double negation. Whereas Solanas aimed to destroy the aggressive male figure metonymized by Andy (anthropos) War-hol, Anders – and here we may obviously read a slippage from Andy to Anders10 – Breivik goes after himself, cloaked as a female mage or druid, armed with the powers of transfiguration. It is my intention to show how this is not only visible in the content of Breivik’s manifesto, but also in the very style in which he wrote it. In other – yes, other – words, his signifier spilt over in his language.

On the surface, Breivik’s actions resemble the shooting sprees as perpetrated by what Jonas Staal and I called the high school shooter movement, which comprised, among others, Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold (Columbine High School, 1999), Cho Seung-Hui (Virgina Tech, 2007), Pekka-Eric Auvinen (Jokela High School, 2007) and Matti Juhani Saari (Seinäjoki University, 2008). In all these cases, high school or college students killed a number of their fellow students and teachers before committing suicide. Every single one of them left manifestos, poems, texts, videos, photographs contextualizing their actions and rendering them fully their own. In the text “Follow Us or Die” which accompanied an anthology of their works headed under the same title, we suggested that they “typified the youthful resistance of bodies without a place in a global capitalistic society, and, in the style of this same society, only saw annihilation and self-destruction as possibilities, expressing themselves in home videos, which hardly differ in their rhetoric from those of the militant resistance group al-Qa’ida.”11

All texts and manifestos written by the high school shooters express an existential dilemma: how to perform an act which is fully my own? What is an authentic act? Their violent conclusion must necessarily be self-annihilating, as is becoming once again clear in the aftermath of Breivik’s actions, the context created in the aftermath of such traumatic events spins quickly out of control. As Pekka-Eric Auvinen writes in his “Natural Selector’s Manifesto”: “And remember that this is my war, my ideas, and my plans. Don’t blame anyone else for my actions than myself. Don’t blame my parents or my friends. I told nobody about my plans and I always kept them inside my

9 Cf. ibid., 24.
10 We also note that the English pseudonym under which he wrote his manifesto was Andrew Berwick.
mind only. Don’t blame the movies I see, the music I hear, the games I play or the books I read. No, they had nothing to do with this.”\textsuperscript{12} This type of rhetoric, however, is fully absent in Breivik’s manifesto.

On two other points Breivik’s case diverges considerably from the high school shooters’ one. First of all, he didn’t commit suicide – much too everyone’s surprise. In fact, the media happily relate how he is willing to testify and thus recruit more crusaders in his war against the Islamization of Europe – in uniform, or red Lacoste sweater.\textsuperscript{13} He considers the courtroom to be a stage to perform his persona as a “hero of Europe” (1435).\textsuperscript{14} Moreover, contrary to the high school shooters, Breivik doesn’t seem to aim for an authentic, singular act. Instead, he considers his act only to be the beginning of a pan-European resistance movement against Islam. It is precisely this aspect that strikes anyone who reads 2083. The text is a bricolage of blog posts, other manifestos, diaries, manuals, statistics, and news coverage.

According to Breivik, “The compendium/book presents advanced ideological, practical, tactical, organisational and rhetorical solutions and strategies for all patriotic-minded individuals/movements” (4). It is mainly on the “rhetorical solutions and strategies” that I would like to focus in the present essay, as the other topic seem already to have been covered, though certainly not exhaustively, by the ongoing stream of analyses both on- and offline. In order to bring these solutions and strategies to light, I suggest an approach to the core of his argument concerning his “target”: “Multiculturalism (cultural Marxism/political correctness) […] is the root cause of the ongoing Islamisation of Europe which has resulted in the ongoing Islamic colonisation of Europe through demographic warfare (facilitated by our own leaders)” (9).

It is an impossible task to provide a reading of over 1500 pages of textual bricolage within the space that is alloted to the average review paper. Therefore I will focus in Breivik’s presentation on precisely the two terms that constitute his conception of “multiculturalism,” that is, “political correctness” and “cultural Marxism.”\textsuperscript{15} The pages introducing the concept of political correctness have been copied in their entirety from William S. Lind’s online publication “Political Correctness:” A Short History of an Ideology, without Breivik mentioning him anywhere in his text.\textsuperscript{16} However, he

\textsuperscript{12} Van Gerven Oei, Follow Us or Die, 14.

\textsuperscript{13} His favorite clothing brand (1406).

\textsuperscript{14} He states so explicitly: “A trial is an excellent opportunity and a well suited arena the Justiciar Knight can use to publicly renounce the authority of the EUSSR/USA SSR hegemony and the specific cultural Marxist/multiculturalist regime. […] The accused should use this opportunity to present all available documentation, illustrations and proof included in this compendium (2083 – A European Declaration of Independence) to claim his innocence. […] Furthermore, he must demand that that the national parliament immediately transfers all political powers to this newly established tribunal/cabinet” (1103). Indeed Breivik demanded, among other things, that the Norwegian cabinet resign in exchange for a full confession.

\textsuperscript{15} Breivik defines the concept of multiculturalism as follows: “Multiculturalism (cultural Marxism/political correctness), as you might know, is the root cause of the ongoing Islamisation of Europe which has resulted in the ongoing Islamic colonisation of Europe through demographic warfare (facilitated by our own leaders)” (9).

\textsuperscript{16} Except for in an unrelated section on fourth generation warfare (1480).
has made several alterations which allow us to read how he interpreted the
texts he copied from his online sources. Amendment, supplementation, and
deletion are the textual maneuvers that give us insight into Breivik’s own
theoretical framework; a framework that, as we will see, provides above all
the exact textual equivalent of everything he is agitating against. Whereas
the high school shooters attempted to contextualize a single authentic act
at the cost withdrawing themselves (by means of suicide) from any mediated
context, Breivik attempts to universalize his act of resistance by building on
rhetorical tactics and strategies that are associated with “his enemy”: iter-
ation, duplication, erasure, taking out of context, and reading “too much.”

The entire text of 2083 is marked by displacement. Breivik consistently
alters the topographical markers of every text he quotes in order to fit them
into his context, the context of the European crusade against Islam. Not
all of his source material might prove to be resistant to such a treatment.
Already in the introduction and first chapter of Lind’s book as quoted by
Breivik we can discern a systematic suppression of authorship (for example,
he deletes the opening phrase “As Russel Kirk wrote,” and immediately
starts with “One of conservatism’s most important insights is that all ideolo-
gies are wrong”), and replacement of the continent “America” by “Europe,”
or sometimes, “EUSSR.” For example, the opening sentence of Lind’s first
chapter is as follows: “Most Americans look back on the 1950s as a good
time.” Breivik alter this into “Most Europeans look back on the 1950s as a
good time.”

However, the subsequent paragraphs clearly show the friction caused by
this topographical shift. Not only in discordant phrase like “If a man of the
1950s were suddenly introduced in Western Europe in the 2000s, he would
hardly recognise it as the same country [sic]” (12). Also the picture of “West-
ern Europe” in 1950s that is sketched out in the paragraphs that follow car-
rries little resemblance with the post-war austerity of Western European life:
“In the office, the man might light up a cigarette, drop a reference to the
‘little lady,’ and say he was happy to see the firm employing some coloured
folks in important positions” (12). Even the search/replace of American by
British English orthography cannot the mask the New York office atmosphere
of a “Madmen”-esque scene. In fact, this friction between European and
American contexts is anticipated by Breivik himself when he states that “the
fundamental factors vary too much” and “What works in the US […] will not
work here” (1365). That it will not work will become clear below.

At first glance, there seems to be no apparent reason for Breivik to relo-
cate a conservative analysis of contemporary American society to Western
Europe. However, he has to do so in order to make the introduction of “po-
litical correctness” and “cultural Marxism” relevant for a European audience.
They would otherwise remain strictly within the realm of American cultural
politics: “The ideology that has taken over Western Europe goes most com-
monly by the name of ‘Political Correctness.’ […] Political Correctness in face
cultural Marxism (Cultural Communism) – Marxism translated from economic
into cultural terms” (12–3). Could it be that the alleged translational drive of Marxism, after having infected the economical body spreading the cultural one, has spilt over in Breivik’s discourse, announcing a torrent of translations and transpositions bridging the transcontinental divide?17

Breivik’s own relations with one of the main lairs of political correctness as an expression of cultural Marxism is without a doubt the practice of deconstruction, to which I already referred briefly above, not in the last place by accommodating two authors that could be placed, if they wouldn’t resist, in a deconstructive “canon.” According to Lind, deconstruction, together with critical theory, occupies the mediating position between the discourses of Marx and Freud on one side, and the regime of political correctness on the other. “Deconstruction ‘proves’ that any ‘text,’ past or present, illustrates the oppression of Muslims, women, homosexuals, etc. by reading that meaning into words of the texts (regardless of their actual meaning)” (13). For Breivik, deconstruction is a cultural force, threatening the “nuclear family” (1208), “European ethnic groups” (1157), the “European Church” (1220), “culture, traditions, norms and moral” (1209), in other words “everything we hold dear” (942). He urges the “patriotic/cultural conservative youth” to “Stop the deconstruction of Christianity” and “the European Cultural Genocide and the deconstruction of European identity” (1240). Any militia or paramilitary group – “MAKE ONE!” – “must ensure that it follows all laws to avoid persecution and deconstruction efforts by the government” (1282).

But Breivik becomes more technical in his approach toward the deconstructive forces threatening Europe. The section “Political Correctness: Deconstruction and Literature” is nearly fully copied from the fourth chapter (with the same title) from Lind’s “Political Correctness.” The chapter offers an overview of the history of deconstruction and its reception in America, but what interests us here, again, are the erasures and supplements provided by Breivik in his manifesto, and not any truthfulness that might be implied or implicated. One sentence is highlighted, forming a paragraph on its own, emphasized by the white space of deletion that surrounds it: “The intelligentsia had forgotten its literature in its haste to promote its politics” (28). Let us take our cue from Breivik and continue to another section in which we will attempt to recall our background in terrorist literature, or, as Ronell would put it, “killer texts,” suppressing the politics that we would have liked to promote nonetheless.

The section I would like to consider, “The psychology of cultural Marxists,” is nearly entirely copied and amended from Theodore Kaczynski’s Unabomber Manifesto. As in the case of Lind, Kaczynski’s name is nowhere to be found and the text remains signed by default, by Breivik. But whereas the stealth of the Unabomber’s attacks allowed him to hide in the woods for

17 Such shifts of the signifier are a common trait of the current European discourse on multiculturalism and the influence of Islam in the West. For example, the Dutch extreme right ideologue Martin Bosma consistently writes “(national) socialism” when referring to Hitler’s ideology, thus pasting fascism onto Marxism.
over twenty years, Breivik’s cover was supposed to be blown upon his first attack. His regime of invisibility and untraceability painstakingly describe in the many pages of his diary appended to his manifesto served only to maximally expose himself. And although, again, superficially, there are many relations between Kaczynski’s and Breivik’s tactics, the aims differ widely.

Whereas Kaczynski was aiming against a certain economical-industrial-technological acceleration of society and had no immediate political aims, Breivik’s aim is to overthrow the perceived cultural hegemony of cultural Marxism and the system of political correctiveness – or should we say political correction – that sustains it. And whereas Kaczynski wrote his “psychological analysis” of leftism in order to sketch the general outlines of modern society and its general psyche, Breivik appropriates the same passages as a depiction of a very precise “enemy”: the “cultural Marxist.” Let us start at the beginning of his extensive citation:

6. Almost everyone will agree that we live in a deeply troubled society.
One of the most widespread manifestations of the craziness of our world is leftism, so a discussion of the psychology of leftism can serve as an introduction to the discussion of the problems of modern society in general. [§6]

6. Almost everyone will agree that we live in a deeply troubled society.
One of the most widespread manifestations of the craziness of our world is multiculturalism, so a discussion of the psychology of multiculturalists can serve as an introduction to the discussion of the problems of Western Europe in general. (373)

From this paragraph we can already induce a number of textual strategies deployed by Breivik. First, he has erased Kaczynski’s paragraph numbers throughout. This already provides us an indication of the fact that contrary to the Unabomber’s case, we are not dealing with an organized discourse. We are dealing with a textual bricolage that in its essence rejects the linear order of enumeration.

Second, Breivik again erases the opening sentence: “Almost everyone will agree that we live in a deeply troubled society.” For Breivik is not concerned with society as such, in which industrialization and leftism go hand in hand, but rather with a typology of the ones who threaten an essentially pure, homogeneous, white, West-European community: the “multiculturalists.” Whereas for Kaczynski profiling leftists is a means, it is an end for Breivik. The translation of Kaczynski’s “leftism” to “multiculturalism” is thus a transposition of a general condition of modern society to an external threat.

18 FC (Freedom Club) [Theodore Kaczynski], The Unabomber Manifesto: Industrial Society and its Future (Livermore: WingSpan Press, 2009), 6 [§4].
19 Ibid., 6–11 [§§6–23].
20 In the following citations, the Unabomber Manifesto excerpts (with paragraph numbers between square brackets) always precede Breivik’s altered citation from it.
to it. According to Breivik, modern society is neither “deeply troubled” nor global. It has a very precise location: “Western Europe.” In general Breivik’s discourse transposes its origins – through his erasure of the origins, the first sentences of Lind’s and Kaczynski’s texts – to Europe and again this is marked by a generalized British English orthography. As was the case with his appropriation of Lind’s text, the American continent is replaced by the European one:

Leftists tend to hate anything that has an image of being strong, good and successful. They hate America, they hate Western civilisation, they hate white males, and they hate rationality. […] Thus it is clear that these faults are not the leftist’s real motive for hating America and the West. He hates America and the West because they are strong and successful. (§13)

Cultural Marxists tend to hate anything that has an image of being strong, good and successful. They hate Europe, America, they hate Western civilisation, they hate white males, and they hate rationality. […] Thus it is clear that these faults are not the leftist’s real motive for hating Europe, America and the West. He hates America and the West because they are strong and successful. (374)

Third, Breivik literally confuses ideology with ideologue by replacing “leftism” the first time with “multiculturalism” and the second time with “multiculturalists.” This again points to another feature of Breivik’s actions, namely that he actually acted out his manifesto. As in the case of the high school shooters, there is immediate actualization of his textual drive in reality. The force of this drive can be measured along a chronology proposed by the text itself. On the last day of the diary appended to, or, if you will, included in 2083, Friday July 22, or “Day 82” since he started preparing the explosives for his operation on a remote farm, he writes: “First coming costume party this autumn, dress up as a police officer. Arrive with insignias:-) Will be awesome as people will be very astonished:-)” (1470). In fact, he didn’t wait till August, but had his “costume party” on Day 83, perhaps once again driven by his obsession with this particular number.

Whereas regular extreme nationalists in Western Europe time after time stress the difference between Islam as “ideology of hate” and “ordinary” Muslims, Breivik’s conflation of multiculturalism with multiculturalists and, by extension, Islamism with Muslims allows him immediately to implement his own action plan and massacre 70+ students. But let us not forget that calling for preemptive strikes or embargoes of any sort will make thousands more suffer and die. The next paragraph introduces the necessary shifts to accommodate Kaczynski’s discourse for Lind’s terminology that Breivik appropriated earlier.
7. But what is leftism? During the first half of the 20th century leftism could have been practically identified with socialism. Today the movement is fragmented and it is not clear who can properly be called a leftist. When we speak of leftists in this article we have in mind mainly socialists, collectivists, “politically correct” types, feminists, gay and disability activists, animal rights activists, and the like. But not everyone who is associated with one of these movements is a leftist. What we are trying to get at in discussing leftism is not so much a movement or an ideology as a psychological type, or rather a collection of related types. Thus, what we mean by “leftism” will emerge more clearly in the course of our discussion of leftist psychology (Also, see paragraphs 227-230). [§7]

7. But what is multiculturalism or Cultural Communism? During the first half of the 20th century leftism could have been practically identified with socialism. Today the movement is fragmented and it is not clear who can properly be called a cultural Marxist. When we speak of cultural Marxists in this article we have in mind mainly individuals who support multiculturalism; socialists, collectivists, “politically correct” types, feminists, gay and disability activists, animal rights activists, environmentalists etc. But not everyone who is associated with one of these movements support multiculturalism. What we are trying to get at in discussing cultural Marxists is not so much a movement or an ideology as a psychological type, or rather a collection of related types. Thus, what we mean by “leftism” will emerge more clearly in the course of our discussion of leftist psychology (Also, see paragraphs 227-230). (373)

The first sentence already introduces, by means of a disjunction, the notion of “Cultural Communism” as being identical to “multiculturalism,” together replacing Kaczynski’s “leftism.” But again this can only happen at the cost of an erasure. Whereas in Kaczynski’s §6, Breivik replaced a global perspective with local considerations, this paragraph aims for stasis, not only suppressing the historical aspect of Kaczynski’s discourse (“During the first half…” and “Today,”), but also by erasing the discursive arch of the Unabomber Manifesto in which a definition of “leftism” would “emerge more clearly” in the last paragraphs.

Something similar is at stake when in the next paragraph, his copy of §8 of Kaczynski’s text, where he deletes the sentence “We leave open the question of the extent to which our discussion could be applied to the leftists of the 19th and early 20th century.” For Breivik this question is not open at all, and the break enacted by modernity in Kaczynski’s analysis, which is often signaled by the adjective “modern” preceding “leftist” or “leftism” is actively repressed. Either “leftist” or “modern leftist” is replaced by the eternal “multiculturalist.”

Breivik’s next move is to introduce the figure of the enemy at the gates, which he imports from the orientalist discourse that has been haunting
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America and Europe alike since 9/11, namely the figure of the Muslim (terrorist), whose only aim is to conquer the West, impose the shari’a, and found a new Caliphate. This figure has been productive of an entire vocabulary that if anything expresses his intense influence on certain segments of the occidental mediated subconscious, surfacing in neologisms like dhimmedia. Specifically this insertion into Kaczynski’s manifesto will prove difficult, as the figures that the Muslim is supposed to replace are by no means the “enemies” in the Unabomber text.

13. Many leftists have an intense identification with the problems of groups that have an image of being weak (women), defeated (American Indians), repellent (homosexuals), or otherwise inferior. The leftists themselves feel that these groups are inferior. They would never admit it to themselves that they have such feelings, but it is precisely because they do see these groups as inferior that they identify with their problems. (We do not suggest that women, Indians, etc., ARE inferior; we are only making a point about leftist psychology). [§13]

43. Many cultural Marxists have an intense identification with the problems of groups that have an image of being weak (women), “so called” oppressed minorities, repellent (homosexuals), and other groups in the “victim hierarchy”. The cultural Marxists themselves feel that these groups are inferior. They would never admit it to themselves that they have such feelings, but it is precisely because they do see these groups as inferior that they identify with their problems. (We do not suggest that women, Muslims, etc., ARE inferior; we are only making a point about cultural Marxist psychology). (374)

First we encounter the erasure of the typically American figure of the Indian or Native American, who finds himself replaced by “‘so called’ oppressed minorities.” We should be attentive here to the curious placement of the quote marks. Instead of placed around “oppressed minorities,” as one would expect from the rest of Breivik’s discourse, they are placed on the ironizing speech act itself: “‘so called.’” How many quote marks would have been enough? Or is he pointing out the practice of “calling” them oppressed minorities, thus opening the extensive directory of missed calls and broken connections that have not only haunted the many post-terror situations in recent years but has structured much of philosophical and by extension ideological discourse as such? But not only Indians are called off stage, Blacks are next.

For example, if one believes that affirmative action is good for black people, does it make sense to demand affirmative action in hostile or dogmatic terms? Obviously it would be more productive to take a diplomatic and conciliatory approach that would make at least verbal and
symbolic concessions to white people who think that affirmative action discriminates against them. But leftist activists do not take such an approach because it would not satisfy their emotional needs. Helping black people is not their real goal. Instead, race problems serve as an excuse for them to express their own hostility and frustrated need for power. In doing so they actually harm black people, because the activists’ hostile attitude toward the white majority tends to intensify race hatred. [§21]

For example, if one believes that affirmative action is good for Muslims, does it make sense to demand affirmative action in hostile or dogmatic terms? Obviously it would be more productive to take a diplomatic and conciliatory approach that would make at least verbal and symbolic concessions to non-Muslims who think that affirmative action discriminates against them. But cultural Marxist activists do not take such an approach because it would not satisfy their emotional needs. Helping Muslims is not their real goal. Instead, problems related to Islam serve as an excuse for them to express their own hostility and frustrated need for power. In doing so they actually harm Muslims, because the activists’ hostile attitude toward the non-Muslims tends to intensify the irritation or hatred. (375–6)

The replacement of “race problems” with “problems related to Islam” clearly summarizes ideological shift that is taking place in these sections, moving from race to religion. The emphasis on the critique of religion as replacing race has constituted much of the nationalist and anti-Arab rhetoric in the West, which has always defended itself against the “racism” argument by quickly pointing out that Islam is not a “race” but an “ideology.” But that we are dealing with the same mechanisms of racial exclusion becomes immediately clear upon inspection of Breivik’s adaptation of Kaczynski’s text. Breivik’s “Muslims” are Kaczynski’s “black people” and the former’s “non-Muslims” are the latter’s “white majority.” In spite of much rhetoric against the racism inherent in the “Muslim debate,” Breivik’s textual tactics, and sometimes even his content,²¹ show the contrary.

The final emendation in the paragraph, however, suggest that there is more at stake than a simple replacement. Breivik disposes of Kaczynski’s “race hatred,” and supplements the gap with “the irritation or hatred.” What is this “irritation” that suddenly slips into his discourse? There is no immediately reason for it to appear, neither his own logic nor the text itself

²¹ For example when he meditates his “ideological journey” “from indoctrinated multiculturalist zealot to Conservative Revolutionary”: When I first started on this compendium more than three years ago I had already decided to only cover issues relating to Islamisation and mass-Muslim immigration out of the fear of being labeled as a racist. I have always been terrified of the prospect of being labeled as a racist, to such a degree that I have put significant restrictions on myself, not only verbally but concerning all aspects of my social image. And I know this is the case for a majority of Europeans. I would say I have allowed myself to be paralyzed by this fear. I was inclined not to bring up WW2, the relevance of ethnicity or mention the word race at all. Unfortunately for me, I found out through the years of research and study that everything is connected” (761).
necessitate it. It would have been sufficient just to delete “race.” The rest of his manifesto gives us little clue about this sudden appearance of an ideological itch. All the other four appearances of the root “irritate” are located in fully quoted blog posts.

Perhaps it is an expression, not so much of a tendency in society to be “irritated” by Muslims on the street or the multicultural ideology that he perceives all around him, but of a textual annoyance; the fact that the Kaczynski text doesn’t fully fit his own “Islam-critical” discourse. This textual wardrobe malfunction culminates to the point that Breivik suddenly starts to politically correct anaphors. Whereas Kaczynski throughout his text uses masculine anaphors to refer to any human being in general, Breivik introduces the “he/she” when referring to the cultural Marxist’s “inferiority complex”:

The leftist’s feelings of inferiority run so deep that he cannot tolerate any classification of some things as successful or superior and other things as failed or inferior. [§18]

The cultural Marxist feelings of inferiority run so deep that he/she cannot tolerate any classification of some things as successful or superior and other things as failed or inferior. (375)

This first occurrence is clearly marked, not only because the cultural Marxist is feminized in immediate relation to his/her “inferiority complex,” but also because this feminization is ungrammatical. Breivik refers to “The cultural Marxist feelings” and not “The cultural Marxist’s feelings” as suggested by Kaczynski’s original. In other words the grammaticality of the text starts to break down in Breivik’s attempt to feminize and suppress the cultural Marxist. He wouldn’t be the first to do so, as it has been common in recent years to call multiculturalism and related ideological viewpoints “soft,” or “for pussies,” and opposed to the masculine bombast of reawakened national conscience and ethnic identity. But it would be difficult to find an example so minimal in its displacement, yet so clearly manifesting the textual mechanisms at work. Breivik continues.

The leftist is not typically the kind of person whose feelings of inferiority make him a braggart, an egotist, a bully, a self-promoter, a ruthless competitor. This kind of person has not wholly lost faith in himself. He has a deficit in his sense of power and self-worth, but he can still conceive of himself as having the capacity to be strong, and his efforts to make himself strong produce his unpleasant behavior. [§19]

The cultural Marxist is not typically the kind of person whose feelings of inferiority make him/her a braggart, an egotist, a bully, a self-promoter, a ruthless competitor. This kind of person has not wholly lost faith in himself. He has a deficit in his sense of power and self-worth, but he can still
conceive of himself as having the capacity to be strong, and his efforts to make himself strong produce his unpleasant behaviour. (375)

The tactic of feminization is quite precise here. The first replacement – “The cultural Marxist is not typically the kind of person whose feelings of inferiority make him/her a braggart,….” – is not repeated once we are speaking of the “braggart,” “bully,” or “ruthless competitor.” At this point Breivik returns to the masculine “himself” and “he.”

But the leftist is too far gone for that. His feelings of inferiority are so ingrained that he cannot conceive of himself as individually strong and valuable; hence the collectivism of the leftist. He can feel strong only as a member of a large organization or a mass movement with which he identifies himself. [§19]

But the cultural Marxist is too far gone for that. His feelings of inferiority are so ingrained that he cannot conceive of himself as individually strong and valuable; hence the collectivism of the cultural Marxist. She can feel strong only as a member of a large organisation or a mass movement with which she identifies herself. (375)

In a most literal sense “the cultural Marxist is too far gone for that.” The feelings of inferiority he might have as mere “bully,” which do not rob him from his masculinity (“he,” “himself”) have become “so ingrained” that they start to behave as a collective. At the introduction of this “collectivism” Breivik rapidly drops the masculine pronoun: “She can feel strong only as a member of a large organisation or a mass movement with which she identifies herself.” In the end, the cultural Marxist or multiculturalist, in other words, Breivik’s enemy is woman, the broad-caved mage. Other interpreters of his manuscript have already pointed at his all too apparent misogyny, and it is not my intention to remain on the level of such statement of the obvious. Misogyny appears not to be an aspect of Breivik’s thought, but, as I will argue, one of the main ideological components of the so-called Islam debate.

The signifier “woman” actually allows Breivik to tie back together the various displacements that constitute his text. Let us review them briefly. The key term to the introduction of 2083 is “political correctness,” which arrives with a discourse borrowed from the American William Lind. In order to match Lind’s discourse with his own, American society is displaced to Europe. Once the American issues of “political correctness” as imposed by “cultural Marxists” have been successfully transplanted into the European context, these can be supplemented by Kaczynski’s analysis of “leftism” which is replaced by Lind’s “cultural Marxism” or “multiculturalism,” which has do be cleaned from any linear logic (paragraph numbers), global perspective (the target is “The West”), and the historical framework of modernity. These displacement should finally furnish the stage for the final pièce de résistance of switching
race for religion. All of this is done under the auspices of a feminization of the cultural Marxist – the one who has “feminized European males,” which allows Breivik to fold Kaczynski back onto Lind, connecting their misogynist subtexts. Woman, and by extension the “Feminist movement” are the bearers of political correctness, or the “feminisation of European culture.” (29)

Perhaps no aspect of Political Correctness is more prominent in American life today than feminist ideology. Is feminism, like the rest of Political Correctness, based on the cultural Marxism imported from Germany in the 1930s? While feminism’s history in America certainly extends longer than sixty years, its flowering in recent decades has been interwoven with the unfolding social revolution carried forward by cultural Marxists.22

Perhaps no aspect of Political Correctness is more prominent in Western European life today than feminist ideology. Is feminism, like the rest of Political Correctness, based on the cultural Marxism imported from Germany in the 1930s? While feminism’s history in Western Europe certainly extends longer than sixty years, its flowering in recent decades has been interwoven with the unfolding social revolution carried forward by cultural Marxists. (28)

In this sense, Lind, Kaczynski, nor Breivik escape the condemnation of feminism that was already expressed by the fascistically inclined Futurists, who proclaimed to “glorify war […] militarism, patriotism, the destructive act of the libertarian, beautiful ideas worth dying for, and scorn for women. We wish to destroy museums, libraries, academies of any sort, and fight against moralism, feminism, and every kind of materialistic, self-serving cowardice.”23 Compare this for example with Breivik’s §3.153 “Interview with a Justiciar Knight Commander of the PCCTS, Knights Templar,” an interview with himself:

Approximately 70% of European males support our cause while only 30% of European women. As a consequence, when this is all over we must significantly reduce these women’s influence on political issues relating to national security, social structures, penal policies, border control, immigration, assimilation, certain cultural issues – national cohesion and procreation (birth) policies. This is perhaps the most important lesson we must learn, the betrayal by so many of our own women. It is not really a betrayal as a majority of our women only thinks and acts in accordance with how nature created them – in a suicidal compassionate manner. But it is essential that we prevent our women from propagating their suicidal compassion in “safe and more controlled environments” in the future.

Sure, this is sexist policies but nature itself is sexist and you cannot defy primary natural laws.

Whenever obscure revolutions are proclaimed, scorn for the feminine is never far away. Thus we have tentatively determined the signifier “Anders Breivik” that binds together the multiple displacements enacted in his discourse, albeit not without auto-immune reactions of the texts which he cut into, resulting in occasional ungrammaticality and an invading notion of “irritation”: another word of the obsession of nationalist, racist, or, if you like, “Islam-critical” discourse with the female Muslim body.24

As I suggested above, this properly ideological point emerges not only explicitly in the Breivik’s manifesto, but also manifests itself in the way in which the text juxtaposes its signifiers, their collisions, incidents, and the grammatical debris that is the result of it. Even though he admits, by commenting on himself from the perspective of himself fifteen years ago, to will have been captured by conspiracy theories,25 it seems as if they turn toward him, that his texts, implanted from various strange, external bodies conspire against him and everything he stands for. Breivik’s 2083: A European Declaration of Independence; De Laude Novae Militiae Pauperes Commilitones Christi Templique Solomonici not only exposes itself as complex assemblage of displacements, falling apart at the seams, it also casts in full light on the discourse of the obscure forces in Europe – those who were the first to displace Breivik to the realm of insanity or even the obscurity of Islamic Jihadism. However, their own language, even when in the obscurity of plagiarism, does not fail to emerge in broad, albeit fragmented, daylight.

24 This tendency has already been explicitly established by for example Alain Badiou. In his sardonic essay “Behind the Scarfed Law, There is Fear,” he points to the fact that “everyone” can rally behind such an easily obtainable victory against the spreading of Islam. A first step, so to say, in Breivik’s plan to deport all Muslims from Europe. (See §2.104 of Breivik’s manifesto: “Future deportation of Muslims from Europe” [753].) The control that the French state, as Badiou puts it, intends to exert over the female body by imposing a law banning the headscarf thus in the end comes uncomfortably (or not so uncomfortably) close to Breivik’s own dreams of dominating the female sex.

25 “If I had met myself 12 years ago I would probably think I was an extreme and paranoid nut, who believed in conspiracy theories: ‘Our school institutions are brainwashing us and our media are systematically lying to us you say? Lol, you’re, paranoid! Get a grip’” (761), and: “Q: How would you view your own current political standpoints 15 years ago? A: I would most likely think I was a complete nut job due to the fact that I was ignorant about most issues then” (1382).