The Justification of Terrorism

Morten Alexander Mossin

Master's thesis in History

Department of Archaeology, Conservation, and History (IAKH)

University of Oslo

Spring 2014

Abstract

In this dissertation I have taken use of comparative research in order to compare three different terrorist organisations, and their justification of terrorism. The groups subjected to study in this paper are Rote Armee Fraktion, Al-Qaeda, and Anders Behring Breivik. The idea of using justification to legitimate violent attacks is a shared trait in most terrorist groups. The concept of justification is explained, and each group is examined to determine how they justify their violence. This analysis reveals that justification, even spanning cultural borders and ethnicities, is comparable and recognizable. The ideological basis for justification is conformable. Reflections made in the process include the importance for more social scientific research on the subject of justification, as well as the daunting realisation that terrorism will most likely never be overcome.

Preface

I have Finally completed the biggest project of my life. The journey was tough, but oh so rewarding. I would never have dreamed of finding the justification aspect of terrorism so interesting and gratifying. I have learnt a great deal, and grown in the presence of great minds, both around me and materialised in the books I've read. The ordeal has been tiresome, however I've always found comfort in the attentive and caring compassion of those close to me.

First of all I want to thank my thesis counsellor – Professor Øystein Sørensen. For his guidance, words of wisdom, and expert opinion on my thesis. I would like to thank my family, for being so understanding and supporting in my academic pursuit. The staff at UiO have been exemplary, always there if (when) I needed them. Nik Brandal, Ragnar Holst Larsen and Helena Neumann especially, thank you.

I would also like to thank my fellow students, both in Oslo and at Cambridge. Professor Paul Russell at Cambridge University for his commitment. And a special thanks to Aleksander Kristensen for his second opinion and invaluable feedback on my final draft.

My two-year journey has come to an end, may the next one be as inspirational as the one I have had.

Morten Alexander Mossin

Cambridge, 14th of May, 2014

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1. Introduction

1.1 Starting Point

"Allahu akbar. Allahu akbar."[1]. Those were the last words ever heard by several passengers trying to break into the cockpit of Flight 93, September 11th 2001. Allahu akbar is Arabic, and best translated as "God is the greatest", but how could these Muslim terrorists justify and legitimize their actions in the name of God? There had been several terrorist attacks on Western society prior to this one, although previous operations could not compare to this latest one in forms of planning and the enormous loss of life. The Bush administration called for a 'Global War on Terrorism'[2], and described the terrorist attack as cowardly. Western society would experience several more terrorist attacks across several countries in the years that followed.[3] And all seemed to culminate in the most recent one, the dreadful attack on Arbeidernes ungdomsfylking's (AUF) summer camp at Utøya and the bombing of Regjeringskvartalet by Norwegian right-wing extremist Anders Behring Breivik on the 22nd of July, 2011. This project will try to examine how terrorist groups with different ideological standpoints justify their actions. Do they use justification in similar patterns, or is their justification of violence based on their own, unique ideological traits? Political violence, with an emphasis on religious and nationalistic terrorism will be the main focus for this paper. Terrorism is an old phenomena, but has in recent years become an international symbol of fear and hatred. Many contribute this 'growth' to globalisation, and some even say the worst is still ahead.

---

1 http://911research.wtc7.net/planes/evidence/flight93cvr.html
2 President George W. Bush Speach to the Nation, 21. September, 2001
3 David Rapoport, Modern terror, The Four Waves, in Audrey K. Cronin and James M. Ludes Attacking Terrorism, Elements of a Grand Strategy. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

1.1.1   Politically motivated terrorism

Terrorism often comes as a result of escalating political violence, and this will certainly be the case in at least one of the three target groups. The one group who without doubts spurred up due to political differences was the Rote Armee Fraktion (Red Army Faction). This is the first group in this dissertation, and was chosen for being a left-wing, anti-imperialist, anti-capitalistic and anti-fascistic oriented militant group. They did not like the progression of the West German republic, and would exhibit this disfavour by using brutal methods of violence.

1.1.2   Religious extremist terrorism

Religious extremist terrorism grants a wide range of perpetrators, but the last couple of decades one group has made more impact than most, namely *Al-Qaeda.* Their ferocity as well as the ability to maintain and grow self-sustaining branches within their organisation still makes them one of the biggest threats to Western society. As the threat assessment report of Spring 2013 from Politiets Sikkerhetstjeneste (PST) in Norway described: *"Extreme Islamism continues to represent the most serious terrorist threat in Norway, and we expect this to be the case also in 2013. Several extreme Islamist informal groupings of different sizes exist in Norway."*[4] Therefore Al-Qaeda is a natural selection when justification of terrorism is to be examined.

1.1.3   Nationalistic terrorism

Nationalistic terrorism often presents itself when a country being invaded, governed in a way which nationalists perceive as detrimental to their culture, or occupied, e.g. the establishment of Al-Qaeda as a response to the Soviet military campaign in Afghanistan. There are also other infamous nationalistic groups such as the Irish Republican Army (IRA) and the Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA), among others, which all struggle for the liberation and unification of a perceived beleaguered nation.

---

4   PST Annual threat assessment, 9th of April 2013

In other words; the primary ideologically oriented types of terrorism, and the case studies which will be compared are widely recognized terrorists that matches best with the methodology this paper will be using. These three types of terrorism alongside three types of organisations/individuals will be the major part of this dissertation. It is important to note however, that these definitions are not distinctive, nor do they explicit or inhibit the different terrorist groups within each category. Terrorist groups/individuals are highly dynamic, therefore they can have obtained ideological premises with foundations in all of the above and more. Norwegian historian Brynjar Lia, author of *Architect of Global Jihad*, subdivides terrorism into four categories: Socio-revolutionary terrorism (left wing and right wing), separatist terrorism (usually by ethnic-minority groups seeking autonomy or independence), single-issue terrorism (anti-abortion activists, environmental militants, animal-rights defendants etc.) and religious terrorism.[5] This dissertation will take use of Lia and his summarization over the root causes of terrorism. The justifications made by the three case studies will be cross-examined with Lia's theory of causes as displayed in his publications 'Causes of Terrorism: An Updated and Expanded Review of the Literature' and 'Globalisation and the Future of Terrorism'.

A clear cut definition of what constitutes as terrorism has proven to be a daunting challenge, and several definitions have been made, e.g. UN Security Council, 2004; European Union, 2002; United Kingdom, 2000. In the United States they even have several different definitions within their own country, e.g. US national security strategy, USA Patriot Act, US National Counterterrorism Center. Nevertheless, this dissertation will use the definition fronted by the United Nations Security Council in 2004, which defines terrorism as:

---

5 Brynjar Lia, Globalisation and the Future of Terrorism, p. 11

"Criminal acts, including against civilians, committed with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury, or taking of hostages, with the purpose to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, intimidate a population or compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act, which constitute offences within the scope of and as defined in the international conventions and protocols relating to terrorism, are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature "[6].

(United Nations Security Council, 2004)

The increasing research on terrorism has tried to achieve a greater understanding of the phenomena, and has focused on almost all aspects and ranges within terrorism. Characteristics such as motivation, justification, origin, types of attacks, organisation and social structures in terrorist cells etc. has been thoroughly examined. However, many feel that the fundamental societal understanding of what terrorism actually is has been clouded by an underlying disdain and preconception of why it happens and how to respond to it[7]. An unintentionally subjective approach, chiefly driven by a desire for revenge, has in turn managed to almost completely overlook issues that are important in the quest to truly understand why terrorists carry out their attacks. This paper will try to gain a broader understanding as to how terrorists justify their actions, in an attempt to enhance a collective understanding towards the field of terrorism. How do they justify and legitimize their dreadful acts? Can the chilling images of 9/11 and 22/7 really be justified?

---

6 United Nations Security Council Resolution 1566, 2004
7 Martin C. Gus, Understanding terrorism:, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues.

Sociological theories concerning this subject have projected their focus primarily on terrorist groups and how they operate, or on 'lone wolf' individuals like the Unabomber.[8][9][10] The literature on these groups and/or subjects is extensive, however additional elements of a comparative nature should be accomplished, in hopes of further advancing societies understanding of what drives people to such extremes. Comparing different terrorist groups/individuals and the ways in which they justify their attacks may help develop improved methods of prevention, as well as prohibiting growth and escalation in current and future terrorist groups.

1.2 Current theory

While searching for researchers who had indulged themselves in any kind of variety within comparative studies of terrorism, a study made by the International Center for the Study of Terrorism surfaced with the title 'Comparing Role-Specific Terrorist Profiles[11]. In this paper the researchers do not focus so much on the ideological aspects, and how terrorists justify their actions, instead they present a more comprehensive understanding of which age groups, ethnicities and so on are more likely to become terrorists. They have also acutely used a statistical technique known as the 'Logistic Regression Model'' to reveal which factors influence the probability of becoming a suicide bomber versus a terrorist[12]. It is intriguing to examine their study, however it does not affect the proposal for this paper, as none of their studies focus directly on comparing different terrorist organisations/individuals and in which ways they warrant their actions.

---

8 Alston Chase, Harvard and the making of the Unabomber, 2000
9 Jeff Halverson, ASU study on Al-Qaeda's motives, 2012
10 Anthea Bell, Baader-Meinhof, The Inside Story of the R.A.F, 2009
11 International Center of the study of Terrorism. Pennsylvania State University., Paul Gill & Joseph K. Young, Comparing Role-Specific Terrorist Profiles, 2011
12 The definition terrorist could very well be a potential suicide bomber, however Gill and Young have just based their comparison between known suicide bombers, and terrorists who have been apprehended by the FBI's Counterterrorism Program between 1980-2002, and the subsequent court transcripts that came from both federal and local levels. Paul Gill & Joseph K. Young, Comparing Role-Specific Terrorist Profiles, 2011, p. 19

John Hargon, Director of the International Center for the Study of Terrorism was contacted with an enquiry as to his knowledge of similar studies of a comparative nature, to which he recommended examining the latest issue of the journal Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict, edited by Allison Smith. Contact was established with Allison Smith, and the acquisition of two research papers which she had edited and published in the issue ensued. The two articles were only respectively 7 and 18 pages long, and the subject addressed in these articles was 'The terrorist rhetorical style and its consequences for understanding terrorist violence'[13]. Her study was more a research project to determine whether or not terrorist groups became more active in engaging chatter, and other clear antecedental activities before attacks occurred They seem to have proven a viable connection between an increase in communication and threat projection in terrorist groups when attacks were close at hand[14]. This is interesting research without a doubt, however this does not either relate much to what this dissertation will be exploring. An important aspect of this paper is to transcend the instinctive fear and anger in regards to terrorism, in order to achieve an objective and valid understanding of its origin and roots in modern day society.

---

13 Lucian Gideon Conway III* and Kathrene R. Conway, The terrorist rhetorical style and its consequences for understanding terrorist violence, The University of Montana, Missoula, 2011
14 Lucian Gideon Conway III* and Kathrene R. Conway, The terrorist rhetorical style and its consequences for understanding terrorist violence, The University of Montana, Missoula, MT, USA, 2011. p. 13-15

1.3 **Main Theses**

The primary focus of this paper will be to examine the justification behind terrorism. Differences in justification, and the relationship between different groups/individuals will be explored. On this basis, there will be three teses for this dissertation;

- Terrorists legitimize the use of violence in order to accomplish their ideological goals

- Different terrorist groups use contrasting methods of justification

- There are extensive diversities within justification of terrorism

1.4   Restriction of the project

This subject is an extensive one, however it should prove to be manageable by employing specific and precise contemporary theories and empiric evidence. There will be paid meticulous detail in regard to the different terrorist organisations/terrorists justification, however the specific terrorist actions will be compactly described, and unnecessary and exceeding elaboration on attacks bearing no correlation to the topic at hand will be left out. The main purpose of this dissertation is to disclose the legitimizing reasons between different kinds of terrorists and ideological point of views.

This paper will try to focus principally on how specific and various types of terrorist organisations legitimize their self proclaimed prerogatives to cause panic and death. The timespan for this research will stretch from around the foundation of the Rote Armee Fraktion in 1968 and conclude with the terrorist attacks on Utøya and Regjeringskvartalet on the 22nd of July 2011. In that sense this project will address modern- and contemporary terrorist history, as well as focusing on a the aspect of justification. There have been many terrorist attacks by the three subject groups within this time span, however the focus will be narrowed down to which attacks they themselves have largely explained/justified. Publications and other direct sources from the terrorists will be the focus point in this study.

1.5 Sources

Most of the sources required for this dissertation will be based on research papers, as well as books and other literature written on the subject of terrorism. The main bulk of sources for this dissertation will however be highly influenced by these publications:

Brynjar Lia – Globalisation and the future of Terrorism

Bruce Hoffman – Inside Terrorism

Roger Griffin – Terrorist's Creed

Isabelle Duyvesteyn – How new is the new terrorism?

Jean Rosenfeld – Terrorism, Identity and Legitimacy: The Four Waves theory and political violence

Magnus Ranstorp – Mapping Terrorism Research: State of the Art, Gaps and Future Direction

Øystein Sørensen – Drømmen om det fullkomne samfunn

Richard Jackson – Contemporary Debates on Terrorism

Jeffrey B. Cozzens – The Culture of Global Jihad

James Hoge, Gideon Rose – How did this happen

Noel O'Sullivan – Terrorism, Ideology and Revolution

Alongside these, primary sources such as Anders Behring Breivik's manifest '2083 – A European Declaration of Independence' alongside Rote Armee Fraktion`s 'Über den bewaffneten Kampf in Westeuropa', 'Daz Konzept Stadtguerilla' and 'Die Auflösungserklärung' will be thoroughly examined. Bin Laden`s Fatwa, Declaration of Jihad, and interviews will form the basis for Al-Qaeda's justification.

2. New terrorism and its significance

2.1 Four wave theory

Most people consider terrorism as a new phenomena, a means for the few to be heard by the many. Terrorism has actually a rich history, ans has existed for centuries as an instrument of delivering one's own ideological, and often radical, ideas and notions to a predetermined audience. The first acts of terrorism came about with the assassinations of Roman soldiers occupying the holy lands of Judea by Israelite freedom fighters, and are by some considered to be *old* terrorism. In this dissertation however, *old* terrorism will be classified as ancient instead. Henceforth when the term *old* terrorism is used, in contrast to *new* or *modern* terrorism, it will be defined as terrorism stretching from the anarchistic groups which formed around 1870 – 1910s up to what has become the fourth wave of terrorism, namely the religious wave spurring up in the 1970s. These religious groupings and their potential successors are hereby to be regarded as *new* terrorism. The reasons for this classification, and a further explanation of the different waves of terrorism will be addressed, as well as the origins of terrorism and the historical value of studying it.

David C. Rapoport, one of the leading experts on the study of terrorism has revolutionized how terrorism, as well as its respective contemporary periods, are viewed. His concept of four different waves of terrorism is in short terms remarkable, and offers not only a thorough explanation on how different types of terrorism has emerged and dissipated, but also functions as a possible tool to predict and prevent future generations/waves of terrorism. His theory is becoming increasingly more important with the outbreak and emergence of 'lone wolf' terrorism. Rapoport depicts his four wave theory as follows:

Figure X - David Rapoport, Four Wave Theory

Focus	Primary Strategy	Target Identity	Precipitant	Special Characteristics
Anarchists 1870-1910s	Elite assassinations, bank robberies	Primarily European states	Failure/slowness of political reform	Developed Basic terrorism strategies and rationales
Nationalist 1920s-1960s	Guerilla attacks on police and military	European empires	Post-1919 delegitimization of empire	Increased international support (UN and diasporas)
New Left/Marxist 1960s-1990s	Hijacking, kidnapping, assassination	Government in general; increasing focus on U.S.	Viet Cong successes	Increased international training/cooperation/sponsorship
Religious 1970s-2020s	Suicide bombings	U.S., Israel, and secular regimes with Muslim populations	Iranian Revolution, Soviet invasion of Afghanistan	Casualty escalation, Decline in the number of terrorist groups

The mere suggestion that terrorism might be more dynamic and in flux as opposed to sporadic acts of either political, nationalistic, anarchistic or religious violence throughout time may not only offer insight into what has transpired, but also as to what might take shape in the future. Scientific studies of the wave theory continue to show how different terrorist groups yield momentum and national/international significance to its successor.[15] Even though each wave consists primarily of terrorist acts within its respective time period, hiccups as well as premature, prognostic episodes may occur. Incidents which may provide further understanding into out of date strategies, or an ominous foreshadowing of what may lie ahead. With each wave lasting around 40 years, it seems like the dreams of our parental generation might become undesirable and unappealing to the next generation, however this observation would be better suited as a hypothesis for social sciences with a more psychological disposition.

Rapoport defines the different waves with three characteristics: "*(1) a cycle of activities characterized by expansion and contraction phases, (2) covering multiple nations, and (3) driven by a common predominant energy that shapes the participating groups' characteristics and mutual*

---

15 Karen Rasler and William R. Thompson, Terrorism, Identity and Legitimacy, Looking for waves of terrorism, p. 25-26

relationships"[16].

Even though the different waves expand and contract, there may still be traces of various terrorists acting outside of their respective waves. Just as you might observe some non-contemporary fashioned girl walking down the street wearing khaki pants which went out of style 40 years ago, terrorism may reoccur outside its era of "fashion", it does not imply the fact that either khaki pants or the type of terrorism are to re-emerge again under a definition of typicality. The study of Rapoport's different wave theory and the possible correlation and similarity between different definitions/waves should be of highest priority, due to the importance to further advance the understanding on the causality of terrorism and the prospect of anticipating and preparing for a potential fifth wave. This paper will as previously mentioned focus on the three subjects; Rote Armee Fraktion (RAF), Al-Qaeda and Anders Behring Breivik. It will be intriguing to discover how groups of different ideological points of view, as well as being categorized in different 'waves' will correlate when it comes to justification. With such a wide variation in aspects such as foundation, organizational composition, ideology, actions and objectives it is only natural to think they would differ in justification as well.

2.2   Developing different approaches to terrorism

With these 4 decade long waves of terrorism, consisting of assorted terrorist groups within each wave, curiosity arises as to why and how they achieve support and are able to obtain new individuals to join their cause. However, just as new policies, parties, leaders and governments gain support, terrorist groups do too. The longing for each of us to 'belong' with people who are like-minded and share the same sets of values and beliefs give us motivation. The importance of kinship and friendship in the recruitment phase are perhaps the most dominating factors, as with all other organizations.[17] The globalisation process has effectively shrunk the world in both a political, nationalistic and religious sense and therefore made us more susceptible to discover our own differences, as well as bringing those with similar thoughts together. New ideas and global

---

16 David Rapoport, Four Waves of Terrorism, 2005
17 John Horgan, The psychology of Terrorism, 2005

trends occur all the time, and there will always be individual reflection and perception on what is good or bad, right or wrong. Technological advances in communication, especially the utilization of the internet is a innovative and modern catalyst for the recruitment arena.[18] Previously centralized groups came together in an endeavour to change or reverse the status quo, whereas new terrorism encompasses groups and members on a global scale, which in turn leads to various challenges for modern day society to keep track of archaic and obsolete constructs on how terrorism used to be. Changing the status quo refers especially to terrorist groups who wants to re-establish a previously existing order of society. Examples of these are the Israelite freedom fighters who wanted to drive out the occupying Roman force in Judea, religious extremists who desperately tries to fight for the preservation and conservation of their old traditions and way of life. Even the Norwegian Heimevernet who sabotaged German instalments in Norway during World War II were by the occupiers regarded as terrorists.

After the allied forces won the second World War people did not consider Heimevernet to be terroristic, instead they are regarded as freedom fighters, fighting for equality against the suppressing tyranny of Nazi-Germany – The umbilical cord between the definition of freedom fighters and terrorists is often severed by the ruling force in society, and what some may consider to be terrorist acts today might in the future be regarded as heroic acts in a desperate fight against oppression.

The struggle to change the status quo back to 'normal', or to the traditional way of living has not excluded other, more ambitious, endeavours for power. Terrorism expert Roger Griffin writes about the concept of *nomos,* which he means is the very essence as to why people engage in terrorism. It is everybody's constructed concepts on what society should look like, be governed, who should populate it, and what rules and regulations it should apply etc. These concepts, or nomos if you will, is what make up the definition on what kind of world people want to live in, and for most these are values worth fighting for to achieve[19]. Griffin states how terrorism is being used to protect what he defines as a 'beleaguered nation', which implies that terrorism may be used as

---

18   Alejandra Bolanos, Contemporary Debates on Terrorism, Is there a "new terrorism" in existence today?, p. 34-35
19   Roger Griffin, Terrorist's Creed, p. 24-46

a defensive method for the preservation of the nomos.[20] According to Slovene philosopher Slavoj Zizek, some countries experience a greater need for defending their nomos due to a cultural shock-effect instead of a gradual surge which was the case in Europe:

"*In Europe, where modernisation took place over several centuries, there was time to adjust to this break, to soften its shattering impact, through Kulturarbeit, the work of culture. New social narratives and myths slowly came into being. Some other societies – notably the Muslim ones – were exposed to this impact directly, without a protective screen or temporal delay, so their symbolic universe was perturbed much more brutally. They lost their (symbolic) ground with no time left to establish a new (symbolic) balance. No wonder then, that the only way for some of these societies to avoid total breakdown was to erect in panic the shield of 'fundamentalism', that the psychotic-delirious-incestuous reassertion of religion as direct insight into the divine Real, with all the terrifying consequences that such a reassertion entails, and including the return with a vengeance of the obscene superego divinity demanding sacrifices.*"[21]

The importance of having a nomos, and maintaining it is essential for human beings, or as English political philosopher John Gray writes:

"*By providing a view of reality as stable, orderly, meaningful, and permanent, cultural world-views allow us to deny that we are merely transient material organisms, clinging to a clump of dirt in a purposeless universe fated only to die and decay. Instead, we live out our time on earth believing we are eternally significant contributors to a meaningful reality.*"[22]

The protection of ones own nomos can lead to acts of terrorism, and as previously experienced in the past, it may lead to extreme ideologies such as Nazi-Germany's utopian pursuit. Even though some of the Nazi views on society sought inspiration from a romanticized view on Roman history most of it was newly crafted for the Reich. This approach to society and the *new* ideological beliefs

---

20 Ibid, p. 30
21 Slavoj Zizek, Violence, Six Sideways Reflections, p. 70
22 John Gray, Enlightenment's Wake, Politics and Culture at the Close of the Modern Age, p. 17

and views that entangle happens when a new nomos is created. The repercussions for mankind when such a change takes place can have devastating consequences for the very essence of modern day morality. The construct of their own nomos, or 'world order' as the Germans phrased it, led to the slaughter of millions and encompassed every aspect of daily life for the regimes inhabitants. Hannah Arendt, famous for the post-war publication *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951) defines the phenomena as 'Total terror', effectively stripping citizens of their basic human rights and introducing a cruel combination of propaganda and subterfuge as a tool for radicalization.[23]

Nazi-Germany's pursuit for a new world order was based on the idea of creating their unique and new traditional conceptualizations on how society should, and could, be shaped. Griffin describes this process as 'Programmatic modernism'.[24] These two foundations of terrorism, i.e. the nomos-defending one vs. the nomos-creating one offer different types of terror, alongside their respective justifications of it. Griffin states: "*On closer examination modernist, nomos-creating forms of terrorism exhibit entirely different metapolitical dynamics from the nomos-defending ones...".[25]* However, a clear similarity between the two is the careless disposition they display for human lives and moral safeguards. Apparently any measure, regardless of force and effect, is permitted in their pursuit for ideological fulfilment

If the three subject matters in this study display different reasons for existing and causing turmoil, it will be this papers objective to highlight them. Jacobinism is also a concept that relate well with the definition of nomos. Shmuel Eisenstadt, an Israeli sociologist states that Jacobinism occurs when anti-pluralists commit themselves to eradicate any form of 'heterodoxy' or variation/deviation from what they consider to be the one true norm. These activists will go to any measure in order to impose their new social order free from ambivalence and doubt. This notion stems from totalitarianism, which derives from Italy's most prominent fascistic philosopher in the early 20th century, Giovanni Gentile. 'Totalitario' was a word he would use to describe the new structure and ambitions of the newborn Italian state. It was his ambition and dream that the state

---

23 Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitarianism, 1973
24 Roger Griffin, Terrorist's Creed, p. 55-56
25 Ibid, p. 56

would become the absolute and 'total representation of the nation', and that it should provide 'total' answers regarding all nationalistic objectives and questions. This idea of a 'total utopia' has persevered, and can still be seen as a way of justifying ones own actions even to this day. Eisenstadt carefully defines this occurrence in his book *Fundamentalism, Sectarianism, and Revolution: The Jacobin Dimension of Modernity:*

"The strong predisposition to develop not only a totalistic world-view, but also overarching, totalitarian, all-encompassing ideologies, which emphasize a total reconstruction of the social and political order and which espouse a strong, even if not always universalistic, missionary zeal."[26]

2.3   Challenges to a comparative approach

By examining three different terrorist groups/individuals many impediments for comparability spring up. The world is perpetually dynamic, and alongside it the ever changing moral compass, virtues and values for human kind. When comparing RAF, which was inspired by a leftist point of view as well as being a post-war generation, to Anders Behring Breivik who grew up in the suburbs of Oslo in a stable and affluent country, the assumption that different ideological views and beliefs could have been formed by society is not far stretched. Focusing on Al-Qaeda, Muslim extremists mostly deriving from underdeveloped countries such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Somalia, Yemen etc., it is not hard to understand that different cultural and sociological needs and desires has been formed between the three subjects of study.

As well as comparing groups of different cultural backgrounds, sociological point of views and in different time periods, the different languages and connotations may prove challenging. An example of how this may apply even between neighbouring countries such as France and Germany can be seen in an experiment performed by Stanford linguist Lera Boroditsky. The French word for bridge is 'le pont' which has a masculine gender, while the German word for bridge is 'die Brücke' and is of feminine gender. When asked to define the word bridge, the French attributed it with words like 'immense' and a 'concrete giant', while Germans described it as 'elegant', 'light' and 'breathtakingly beautiful'. Boroditsky believes the difference in gender changes the way

---

26 Shmuel Eisenstadt, Fundamentalism, Sectarianism, and Revolution, The Jacobin Dimension of Modernity, p. 72-73

objects and words in general are conveyed to an audience. This connotation barrier can lead to a more moderate realization of the term 'lost in translation'. However, disregarding the linguistical challenges, the cultural barriers in both geography and time might also be rewarding. Because of them the justification made by the three different groups will be examined across these cultural and geographical borders, providing additional insight into the history of justification.

2.4 *New* Terrorism

Dipak Gupta, professor in political science at San Diego University states that in historical examples societies which provide incentives for creative activities and free considerations usually develop new ideas and entrepreneurs. While those who develop institutional restrictions on freedom of thought and speech tend to produce unproductive and destructive personalities. He continues: *"We can extend this logic to see that in the Arab/Islamic nations where the expression of even moderate dissent or frustration can take place only within the confines of religious discourse, the expression of ideas is limited. Thus these societies have channelled their frustration, anger, and a perception of humiliation through religious fundamentalism."*[27].

This theory of why religious fundamentalism occur may offer not only additional insight as to why the fourth religious wave came to be, but also as a clear reminder on the importance of commitment in encouraging both free will and speech. After the attacks on 22nd of July, Norwegian Prime minister Jens Stoltenberg reiterated this in a speech where he emphasised the need for 'more democracy' and 'more openness'. Improving the democratization process, even in pre-established democracies, may prevent future turmoil and uprising. Brynjar Lia suggests there should be a clear focus on developing non-aggressive channels for the dissenting few to fume their disagreement in. The problems concerning states which are currently undergoing a process of democratization are many. They have the tendency to become spawning pools for new radicals because of the instability and transition from the known to the unknown.[28]

---

27 Dipak Gupta, Terrorism, Identity and Legitimacy, Waves of international terrorism, p. 35
28 Brynjar Lia, Globalization and the Future of Terrorism, p. 16

Tracing back to the definition of *new* terrorism, Rapoport's first wave of terrorism was populated by anarchists, with methods like assassination, regicide, and other clear cut methods for achieving their goals. The second wave encompasses the diaspora, the Jewish struggle to return to their homeland. They regarded regicide and assassination of prominent political figures to be counter-productive, and decided to use systematic assassinations of the police, in an attempt to force military units to replace them. The idea was that military units, with their training for war-time crisis, would prove to be unfit to 'govern' society during peace time and therefore act more ruthless and atrocious than necessary against the rebellious Zionists. This treatment could generate sympathy to the cause by the populous. Third wave political activists and terrorists, where radicalism meet nationalism, used hijackings to a large extent. Hijackings was a measure to procure a negotiating chip for either the release of fellow political activists, or in an attempt to change political avenues and decisions.[29]

With the growth of a new, religious wave of terrorism, there is a change in experience concerning both the fundamental style of terrorism, which is a normal transition between each wave, and the escalation of casualties in each attack. This change is very a-typical, but with every wave-transition some changes should be expected, so why is this fourth wave considered to be worthy of the term '*new* terrorism'?

The major factor behind this new classification is primarily due to the increase in casualties which accompanies the fourth wave. Traditional terrorists would try to keep the killing of innocent people to a minimum, as not to attract ill fame from society, or to scare of potential new followers from joining their organization. The removal of this concern being voided mute has several reasons. First of all the technological changes in society must be considered, especially the emergence of the internet age which has provided new tools for recruitment as well as new methods for spreading ideological beliefs worldwide with only the click of a button. As terrorists become even more internationalized, people became saturated with news on terrorist attacks as they were 'normalized' through mass media and the internet. The shock effect of terrorism slowly receded, combined with the effort to acquire headlines and the media's attention on their struggle, terrorists had to change their tactics.

---

29 Jean E. Rosenfeld, Terrorism, Identity and Legitimacy, The Four Waves theory and Political Violence, p. 16-17

New terrorists, from 1970 and beyond, are described as indiscriminate, with their victims picked at random.[30] While RAF, regarded as a third wave terrorist group, tried to gain societies sympathy by only killing people they regarded as 'responsible', Al-Qaeda, a fourth wave terrorist group do not seem to have the same degree of concern. Breivik knew he would be despised for his actions, and in that sense should be regarded as a fourth wave terrorist, or maybe as an entirely new fifth wave individualist.[31] . Breivik had deliberately targeted Norway's largest political youth organization, in direct affiliation to the Norwegian Labour Party. As well as planning to execute former Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland, which would have been a political assassination, Breivik shows an adeptness to incorporate several key factors from Rapoport's chart on terrorism. Since he also introduces new methods of 'warfare' in his manifest, attacks designed for lone operators, the notion of Breivik as a fifth wave terrorist, a technological fresh 'lone wolf', is compelling.[32]

2.5   Historical approach

Norwegian historian and terrorist expert Brynjar Lia presents us with the 'Causes of terrorism' in his Contemporary Security Studies. This dissertation will focus on how justification of terrorism is explained, along with any differences and similarities across the three different groups. Using Lia's theories of causality the objective will be to discover how justification and causality go together, and see if the history of terrorism, and its justification, has changed over time.

The importance of studying terrorism in a historical approach is essential. Psychological studies of both the mindset of terrorists as well as other sociological studies is certainly valuable in understanding the many aspects of terrorism. Doing a historical approach however may provide insightful in discovering similarities across time, as well as prospecting for signs of recurrence. As terrorist expert Jeffrey Simon states: "*In today's instant access and information overload society, we are inundated with analyses of current affairs but pay scant attention to what we may learn*

---

30 Isabelle Duyvesteyn, Mapping Terrorism Research, The Role of History and Continuity in Terrorism Research, p. 65
31 Anders Behring Breivik, 2083 – A European Declaration of Independence,p. 1352.
32 Anders Behring Breivik, 2083 - A European Declaration of Independence, p. 894-909

from what has transpired in the past".[33] As Rapoport claims that terrorism is as much a changing entity as all other aspects of life, it would be unwise to disregard the potential of historical repetition. Or to paraphrase the German philosopher Immanuel Kant regarding the importance of history and sociology intertwined: *"History without sociology is blind and sociology without history is void".[34]*

---

33 Jeffrey D. Simon, Terrorism, Identity and Legitimacy, Technological and lone operator terrorism, p. 44
34   Immanuel Kant, German Philosopher, Quote.

3. Ideological Justifications

3.1 The power of ideological justification

The difference in ideologies world wide have fuelled hatred and ignited wars for centuries. The most horrific crimes against humanity have been justified behind a belief in a 'true way' of living. Probably the best example in history of such a conviction is the German Nazism. The belief and self entitlement of being a *Herrenrasse* (Master race) were predominant in Nazi-Germany, and still exists to this day. Eugenics played a huge role in the formation of Nazi ideology, as the notion of a 'clean' Aryan race became a leading reason for ethnic cleansing. Traditional warfare where raw materials, goods and the acquisition of land had been the driving force were being replaced by a much more powerful and sinister rationalization i.e. ideology. Field Marshal Keitel, Chief of the German High Command, noted in his memoirs a speech made by Hitler in March 1941, where the Führer expressed his belief in the inevitability of conflict between *"diametrically opposed ideologies"* and that *"the war was a fight for survival and that they dispense with their outdated and traditional ideas about chivalry and the generally accepted rules of warfare."*.[35] This just shows how ideological justification is able to grant both aggressors and defenders a moral Carte Blanche in a fight for survival.

This warrant of moral suspension in conjunction with the *nomos* principle constitutes a strong defence for terrorists when justifying their actions, both internally and externally. Since ideologies are ever changing, constantly adopting new ideas and ridding itself of passé ones, there will always be room for interpretation and discussion regarding which ideologies are the 'correct' ones. From a historical point of view there are distinct possibilities in which present day ruling ideologies will be seen as archaic, and perhaps illegitimate. A cautious approach should be taken before premature judgement is cast upon someone pertaining a different mind-set or ideological affiliation. The human capacity for defending and preserving their ideological beliefs has through history proven immense. Understandably by its affecting powers there have been, and will most

---

35 Walter Goerlitz, The Memoirs of Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, Chief of the German High Command 1938-1945

likely continue to be, episodes where ideology is being played as an extenuating excuse for atrocities such as terrorism.

3.2 Political violence

Political violence is often an escalation of political activism, and occurs when political groups and individuals no longer feel that they can communicate properly with the authorities using political dialogue, demonstrations and civil disobedience in order to achieve their goals.[36] When this escalation takes place weaker states experience large militias, and region-wide insurrections. While in stronger states where militant formation is harder to accomplish, the outbreak of small militant opposition groups, often characterized as guerrilla based resistance, may develop. These uprisings consist of people who regards themselves as 'freedom fighters' in a war against oppression, and not as terrorists.[37] Violent political action can be divided into four categories: terrorism, vigilantism, lynching and rioting. The political violence that is terrorism is what this paper focuses on, and it separates itself from the three other groups by having characteristics such as a high organizational factor, and a collective liability for their actions.[38] Political violence that qualifies as terrorism is more than not properly planned, carefully executed, and seeks to create a shock effect in the population. Being collectively liable means all members can he held responsible for actions performed by the group. Being collectively responsible for their actions often drives the terrorists into a mindset of 'us' against 'them'.

Terrorism is subdivided into groups, based on the political conviction of the group. State terrorism, religious terrorism, left wing terrorism and separatist terrorism are some of these. Right- and left wing terrorism will be addressed as 'nationalistic' terrorism in the next paragraph. This is to encompass both Breivik, who is a right wing terrorist, and the RAF, which are left wing terrorists. Breivik will be more closely examined in Chapter 3, as he does not possess the typical qualities of a nationalistic terrorist. His disposition is rather of an internationalist, seeking to bring about a grandiose European continent. Much of the effort in previous years to stop and prevent political

---

36 Brynjar Lia, Globalisation and the Future of Terrorism, p. 12
37 Ibid, p. 13
38 Roberta Senechal de la Roche, Towards a Scientific Theory of Terrorism, p. 2

violence has proved futile. Political violence, and especially terrorism, seems to have a correlation with the continued globalization of the world. And even though terrorism has been around for thousands of years, its impact and ferocity has increased staggeringly over the last couple of decades. Raising awareness of the topic has been of great concern for the international community as the continued battle for understanding and prevention rolls on. As former Director General of MI5 said: "You cannot guarantee security, however many resources, however clever you are, however much you work with other people. You will not stop all terror and it's a delusion to think you will."[39]

3.3   Religious and nationalistic justification

In Rapoport's four wave theory religious terrorism is the fourth and last one depicted. Religious terrorism has become the major contributor to terrorist acts in society, with a seemingly constant flow of new terrorists willing to contribute in campaigns like holy Jihad, with many willing to sacrifice their own lives for the cause. Religious terrorism is however, a vague and unclear definition, which can through simplification and misconception lead to misunderstanding and obscure convictions. Yet again the problem revolving the hazy and unclear definition of terrorism makes it hard to distinguish between a 'just' war, and terrorism. The trouble with defining religious justifications of terrorist acts also poses problems within sociological theory. Religion has throughout the ages been permitted to permeate, and define our societies. Values, symbols and physical entities which may have been rooted in religious scripture or folklore have increasingly become symbolic representations of a specific people, and in doing so transcended its roots into a more traditional, nationalistic and tangible substance, superseding religious connotation. This increasing ambiguity, where religion, tradition and nationalistic symbolism are concocted together makes it nearly impossible to differentiate them. Griffin defines religious terrorism as:

---

39 Richard Jackson and Samuel Justin Sinclair, Contemporary Debates on Terrorism, p. 193

"A totalizing cosmology, generally formulated within an extended, and constantly evolving, scriptural and ritual tradition and admitting many variant sectarian interpretations, postulating a suprahuman [sic], metahistorical order which is manifest in atemporal laws or metaphysical patterns, and which endows human life with a narrative shape, ethical values, and ultimate meaning conceived as independent of human agency or will"[40]

What Griffin is trying to convey with his definition is the fact that much of what has been deemed religious terrorism is in fact 'communal-nationalist-religious', which offers a broader understanding of terrorist acts committed in the name of religion. Anders Behring Breivik in his manifesto compares Christianity and Islam, in an attempt to demonize Muslims and the 'ugly and unknown' truths about their religion. Breivik is clear throughout his entire work that Islam serves as a threat for traditional and Christian values in Europe. This argumentation may be regarded as religious, but also includes a perplexed and romanticized traditionalistic view of a utopian world.

The border between religious and nationalistic justification is a vague one. Religious legitimization of terrorism normally transcends the basic principles needed for religious preservation, and may instead be a fundamentalistic interpretation of scripture. This might be because the border between religious and nationalistic political violence or terrorism is unclear, undistinguishable, or as with most cases, complexly interweaven with one another. As Kumar Ramakrishna, one of the leading experts on religious terrorism, writes:

"Religious violence is less about religion per se than about the underlying social psychological and, in particular, mimetic dynamics driving it. As noted, the religious cause merely provides a legitimation for the violence the warring parties already feel compelled to commit."[41]

Ramakrishna's statement has a more narrow conclusion when it comes to the importance of religiously driven justification. His conclusion completely removes the significance of religious

---

40 Roger Griffin, Terrorist's Creed, p. 160
41 Kumar Ramakrishna, Religion and Conflict in South East Asia, 2007

terrorism as an independent entity for justification. Although this might be the case, the religious rooting in modern societies help shape peoples definition of self, and should therefore not be subdued to a hollow casing for other ideological justification. With the fear of losing ones nomos, a primitive and basic sense of survivalism kicks in. Many will then find meaning and inspiration in their religion, and use this as the basis for what they perceive as justifiable retaliatory actions.

Religious terrorism is often considered to be the legitimizing explanation in regards to movements like Islam's globalizing religious war on the West, as well as secular terrorism. Although secular terrorism is easy to confuse with religious terrorism, there is a clear difference according to Bruce Hoffman. Violence for a religious terrorist is primarily a *"sacramental act"*, or a *"divine duty executed in direct response to some theological demand or imperative"*[42]. In other words, religious terrorism transcends the political, moral and practical constraints that may affect other terrorists, effectively leaving the terrorists unconstrained by ways of targeting, size and capacity.

As previously mentioned in chapter two, the continuous development of terrorism into what can only be regarded as *new terrorism* seems to display a progressive build up in both casualties and size of terrorist attacks. The restrictions which Hoffman debates are exclusive for religious terrorists might however be less valid in an increasingly digital era. The difficulties facing new terrorists in their quest for recognition and acknowledgement are not only to induce an increase in the loss of life and destruction, but in order to do so they would also have to rid themselves of the political, moral and practical constraints which they were previously obliged to uphold. Other issues which have separated religious terrorism from other ideologies is the notion of 'total war'. The religious terrorists do not appeal to any other constituents than themselves, their holy leaders, and deities. This effectively removes the restraints that normally are imposed on other terrorists who desire to appeal to a supportive or uncommitted group of people. The absence of a crowd-pleasing mentality allows religious terrorists to commit almost limitless violence against a huge variety of people, which are not members of the terrorists' religion or religious sect.

---

42 Bruce Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, p. 89

4. Anders Behring Breivik

"You will forever be celebrated by your people as a martyr for your country, protecting your culture and fighting for your kin and for Christendom. You will be remembered as a Conservative revolutionary pioneer, one of the brave European Crusader heroes who said; enough is enough, it is time to take back our countries before our multiculturalist traitor elites actually manages to finalize their agenda and sell us all into Muslim slavery. Your sacrifice will be a great source of inspiration for generations of Europeans to come."

(Anders Behring Breivik)

4.1 Background

Anders Behring Breivik was born in Oslo on the 13th of February 1979. He grew up with his mother in the west end parts of Oslo, in what can be described as a troublesome upbringing. Breivik had a modern upbringing consisting of separated parents, where his mother retained custody. In the early stages of his life, concerns were made regarding his mental health. One psychologist reported that Breivik's distinctive smile was not due to his emotions, rather that it was a deliberate response to his environment. The same psychologist also stated that his mother "sexualised" him, and that he was the victim of her primitive aggressive behavior.[43] In Breivik's testimony during his trial, he spent some time depicting his childhood, and how he came to ultimately regard Muslims as "animals". Bruce Hoffman explains this phenomena as 'propagandist rhetoric', and the use of it very common in terrorism, describing other human beings in denigrating and dehumanizing terms such as 'infidels', 'dogs' or 'animals'.[44] One of the journalists covering the trial, Harald Stanghelle, political editor of Aftenposten, commented:

"If you are able to outdefine humans as animals, you are able to do anything towards these

---

43 Richard Orange, "Anders Behring Breivik's mother 'sexualised' him when he was four". The Telegraph, 2012
44 Ibid, p. 89-90

people"[45].

Breivik explains his childhood as filled with incidents which led him on a path to where he ended up, a path filled with injustice and inappropriate behavior stemming from the Muslim community in Oslo.

By his 18th year, Breivik had seemingly been a victim in several cases of abuse and discrimination. According to his statement a Muslim man, the father of one of his friends, broke his bicycle when he was only seven years old. The reasoning behind destroying the bike was that Breivik had play fought with his son, which was a sign of disrespect within the Muslim society. In later years of his adolescence Breivik ended up in several altercations with other teenagers, predominantly Muslim ones. He was slapped, beaten with a pool stick, chased by a gang and finally at the age of 20 he claims he had his nose was broken as a result of being attacked by a gang. He also states that women he knew were raped by Muslims, and that all these transgressions, combined with school policy of portraying Islam as a peaceful religion, made him increasingly politically motivated for his cause. According to Breivik's testimony incidents similar to what he experienced happens all the time, however people don't speak of them, and the few who do are quickly labeled as right extremists.[46]

4.2   Ideological justification and methodology

Defining and chartering Breivik's ideological affiliation has proven to be a difficult task. In the aftermath of the attacks 22nd of July the media did not hesitate to label Breivik's political engagement. Neo-fascist, neo-nazist, nationalist- and Christian extremist are just some of the categories he fell into. Exploring his manifesto as well as some of his statements during trial does not encourage an easy understanding of his political compass. Breivik uses neologism to a great degree, some examples being national-darwinist, suicidal-marxist, suicidal-humanism, knight-justitiarius and knight-justitiarius commander to mention a few. The use of neologism in a way to explain his endeavor may suggest that his political allegiance could also be in the grey area of the

---

45 Breivik Trial. 16 April – 22 June, 2012. Oslo.
46 http://www.dagbladet.no/2012/06/04/nyheter/breivik/innenriks/terrorangrepet/rettssak/21915319/

scale, not as black and white as others are. There are statements made however which clarifies a couple of these affiliations. One of these is how Breivik regards himself as Christian, but not in the all-encompassing theological sense, instead in a pragmatic, cultural and conceptual way:

"*If you have a personal relationship with Jesus Christ and God then you are a religious Christian. Myself and many more like me do not necessarily have a personal relationship with Jesus Christ and God. We do however believe in Christianity as a cultural, social, identity and moral platform. This makes us Christian.*"[47]

There are also clear statements in his manifesto disapproving Nazism, stating *"If there is one historical figure and past Germanic leader I hate it is Adolf Hitler"*[48]. In fact Breivik regards the efforts of the Third Reich as one of the greatest sins, effectively enabling a post-war climate where multiculturalism could thrive. The genocide of the Jewish population made racism a taboo, a construct that still is the norm. As well as facilitating multiculturalism the *"holocaust religion"*, i.e the pacifist legacy the holocaust has embedded in European society, is according to Breivik preventing nationalistic doctrines from emerging. And without nationalistic doctrines, Europe will *"wither and die"*[49]. These opinions connected with his pro-Israel views makes it difficult to regard Breivik as a neo-nazi, at least in a traditional definition of the movement.

Even though Breivik expresses concerns about the decrease of *"Nordic genotypes",* he seems more interested in aspects like culture, politics and ideology, not racial discrimination. It is also problematic to regard him as a nationalist, as his primary concern and self identification revolves around Europe – European culture, history and civilization. His cultural embrace encompasses neo-pagan Odinism more than Norwegian characteristics and values.[50] Breivik regards himself as a militant nationalist, and the best category to place him in would be that of a very broad and generic, neo-fascist. Controversial topics like Israel and Freemasonry are subjects he and his potential followers might have to compromise/disagree on.

---

47 Anders Behring Breivik, 2083 - A European Declaration of Independence, p. 1162
48 Ibid, p. 940
49 Ibid, p. 1366
50 Øystein Sørensen, Ideologi og Galskap, Anders Behring Breiviks Totalitære Mentalitet, p. 15

Breivik feels the society he lives in is threatened by both external and internal powers. He is strongly committed to what he regards as the preservation of Europe and its culture. In many ways 'we', i.e non-Muslim Europeans, have lost our way, and require guidance to [re]create a grand Europe, powerful and influential. Breivik wants to help create a strong and interconnected European federation, immensely stronger and more influential than its present model, not resembling the *"mushy, ungovernable forms of the present European Union, which is a powerless Medusa"*.[51] His prospect for the future includes a strong and monocultural federation: *"We need to imagine a grand monocultural Europe, based on the cultural and economic cooperation of independent countries."[52]* To accomplish this set goal Breivik needs to *"make sure the current system implodes"[53]*. The attacks which were being planned would help create a movement which eventually will lead to an armed revolution, a *Conservative Revolution*. This type of argumentation for revolutionary terrorism is, according to professor Øystein Sørensen, the same kind that were being employed by revolutionary terrorism groups and single perpetrators in Europe and North America between 1860 and 1914.[54]

The need for a new and improved European union comes not only from a impending islamification, but also to save us from ourselves. The European population is slowly but surely being influenced in a negative manner. Breivik writes:

"US cultural domination of Europe is unacceptable... We will defeat the cultural Marxist/multiculturalists because they seek to wipe our everything European... So for God's sake; please join in our pre-emptive war against the US cultural tyranny"[55].

This is one of his prime arguments for the dissolvement of NATO and the creation of a new European military alliance. The cultural tyranny Europeans are suffering is slowly eroding away at our way of life, particularly the encouragement of feminism and promiscuity. Christian values are

---

51 Anders Behring Breivik, 2083 - A European Declaration of Independence, p. 1308
52 Ibid, p. 1308
53 Ibid, p. 836
54 Alex Butterworth, The World That Never Was, A True Story of Dreamers, Schemers, Anarchists and Secret Agents, 2010
55 Anders Behring Breivik, 2083 - A European Declaration of Independence, p. 1125-1235, 1164, 1312

being attacked by TV-series like *Sex and the City,* a TV show running from 1998-2004 where protagonist Carrie Bradshaw freely explore modern social issues like sexuality, safe sex, promiscuity and femininity. The impact of what Breivik defines as 'Excessive sexuality' hinders one's spiritual development, as well as creating room for promiscuous behavior in society. This lifestyle is further enforced by the media, and does not apply to a healthy society focused on bringing up children with high moral standards. The illusion of love must be stopped, and instead couples should engage in a pact of mutual respect, cooperation, friendship and proper communication in order to forge a lasting institution for the raising of children.[56] He further explains that sexual desire can cause people to place primitive instinct ahead of intellect.

Breivik wants the new social structure to be hierarchical, patriarchal, and authoritarian. He wants to revive the *patriarchal model*, and the core family must assert dominance over *"the creation and rise of the matriarchal systems which are now dominating Western European countries".[57]* The fertility rate needs to rise, so abortion should not be allowed, with the exception of rape, endangering the life of the mother, or if the child is proven to have mental or physical disabilities. Women should not be encouraged to educate themselves beyond a bachelor's degree, and it would be preferable if they only engaged themselves in part time jobs. The European population should discourage women from engaging in *"Sex and the city/Madonna lifestyles"*, and the media's task is to portray women`s new role as *"actively illustrated and glorified through series, movies and commercials...",* he continues, *"this will involve significant restrictions in media freedoms and rights".[58]*

After some of the domestic issues concerning morality and cultural behavior have been resolved, the new and improved Europe needs to remove the plague that has been ravaging our lands for too long, namely the Muslim population and the multiculturalists. The multiculturalistic government and the journalists are according to Breivik *criminals* and *traitors*, and they have already allowed more than 25 million w inside the European gates, a offense that should be punished by execution. The process will take roughly 70 years, but Breivik is confident in its

---

56 Anders Behring Breivik, 2083 - A European Declaration of Independence, p. 1402
57 Ibid, p. 1177
58 Ibid, p. 1181

accomplishment.[59] As for the Muslims residing in Europe, they should all be deported to ensure stability and to establish a *secure* country.[60]

To prevent civil war between the new ruling power, i.e the cultural conservative party & the Knights Templar, and the liberals in society Breivik coins a plan. He wants to "create inner city zones where extreme liberals will be offered to live and work. These zones should have regulated/controlled entry points. Everyone leaving and entering will be registered to avoid excessive cultural contamination."[61] Breivik champions numerous notions to create a new, and in his perception, utopian Europe. His totalitarian goal is to establish a premier world power, self-sufficient, independent and grand monocultural Europe. A federation joined together in economic, cultural and militaristic partnership, cleansed of multiculturalism, and where the liberalists are neatly tucked away in their own cities of decadence and moral depravity.

Breivik seems determined to prevent what he sees as the ongoing genocide of Europeans. His apprehension of the future is discouraging at best, and he feels this inevitable process, the Muslim invasion, has gone too far, and action needs to be taken to prevent further escalation. There is little evidence to support the claim of an ongoing genocide, so what Breivik is dreading might more correctly be regarded as nomocide. Breivik's concept of his ideal world, as well as his entire belief system, is according to him endangered by the Muslim invaders. The dangers of feeling culturally and religiously threatened are remarkable, or as Robert Robins and Jerrold Post wrote in their psychological study 'political paranoia':

"Their actions were defensive aggression against the enemy without. Strong beliefs may serve as protection against psychological stress [anomy], especially for the fanatical believer, whose sense of self rests upon the integrity of his belief system... For the passionate believer, it is not the beliefs that generate the passion. To the contrary, the rigid beliefs provide a sense-making container for powerful feelings. Because attacks upon those beliefs threaten the believer's control and risk his

---

59 Ibid, p. 1262
60 Ibid, p. 1302
61 Anders Behring Breivik, 2083 - A European Declaration of Independence, p. 1306

being overwhelmed by the feelings, such attacks provoke a passionate, even violent response."[62]

Considering the differing consensus regarding Breivik's mental health during his trial, no form of deduction concerning it will be made in this paper. It is however intriguing to imagine what Breivik felt, and how devastatingly tangible and urgent he must have perceived the Islamic threat.

When Breivik is talking about the conceived threat of multiculturalism and the loss of our European identity, he addresses two groups. The first group is the general audience, the everyday person going about his or her business, blissfully ignorant to the looming dangers of multiculturalism. In his manifesto he avidly uses the pronoun 'we', probably to be inclusive, as well as creating a segregation between 'us' and the liberals, multiculturalists and the Muslim population. When he is talking about his ideological journey, he writes directly to the reader:

"We cannot ignore the relevancy of these doctrines and we are forced to reflect on these issues if we are to have a meaningful discussion. We are forced to bring up all the taboos and reassess all the current 'accepted truths'."

He wants us, the readers, to understand his way of thinking, and comprehend the notion that 'we' are all in this together, whether 'we' want to believe it or not.[63] He also introduces a demand on behalf of Norwegian right wing blogger Peder Are Nøstvold Jensen, also known as Fjordman, including it in his manifesto. In this demand, which is 'on behalf of the indigenous peoples of Europe' it says: *"We, the citizens of the United Kingdom, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, Switzerland, Austria, Iceland, Malta and Ireland demand that ..."[64]* Clearly Breivik is not deterred in encompassing the entire 'indigenous peoples of Europe' in his appeals.

The second group he addresses are other militant nationalists, both during trial and in his manifesto. When his court verdict was concluded, he directed his retort to all militant nationalists,

---

62 Robert Robins and Jerrold Post, Political Paranoia, The Psychopolitics of Hatred, 1997, p. 144
63 Anders Behring Breivik, 2083 - A European Declaration of Independence, p. 761-767
64 Declaration made by Peder Are Nøstvold Jensen, aka Fjordman, published in 2083 - A European Declaration of Independence, p. 770

apologizing to them for not killing more than he did. In his manifesto he consistently uses the 'we' and 'us' form to include this grouping. Examples are:

"The truth needs to come out. We are in the very beginning of a very bloody cultural war, a war between nationalism and internationalism and we intend to win it.", "Yes! This is the hero, the man who will defend us...", "to defend us from Islamic criminals".[65]

The importance for Breivik to achieve his goals is paramount. As stated in his manifesto, he is preparing himself for martyrdom, the ultimate achievement for a militant nationalist. This is to him a matter of existentialism, and not only in the physical term of it, but also the existentialism of everything European. The threat of multiculturalism is invading our countries, slowly eroding away our way of life. Breivik exhibits no clear limits in how far he is willing to go, no moral boundaries, no action too excessive: "*Multiculturalism is an anti-European hate-ideology designed to deconstruct European cultures and traditions, European identities, European Christendom and even European nation states. And, as such, it is an evil genocidal ideology created for the sole purpose of annihilating everything European.*"[66]

Even killers have limits, and most would have moral issues against killing children, however Breivik entirely removes this aspect, declaring it as self-defense or acting in a preemptive manner to ensure survival: *"In many ways, morality has lost its meaning in our struggle. The question of good and evil is reduced to one simple choice. For every free patriotic European, only one choice remains: Survive or perish.*"[67]

Roger Griffin commends the handling of the Breivik case in court, calling it a triumph of liberal democracy. However, he suggests that most 'experts' fail to understand the powerful potential of nomic despair [sic], identity crisis, and fanatical hatred. This is made perfectly clear by Breivik, as most could not even have imagined a terrorist attack directed against children.[68]

---

65 Anders Behring Breivik, 2083 - A European Declaration of Independence, p. 240, 478, 762
66 Ibid, p. 1227
67 Ibid, p. 837
68 Roger Griffin, Terrorist's Creed, p. 211

The use of terrorism is legitimate in Breivik's eyes, and in addition to terrorism guerrilla warfare and sabotage will also be used. The intention he states is to ultimately change the current regime, as well as attempt to radicalize Muslims to escalate conflicts:

"PCCTS's will use guerrilla warfare against MA100 political parties and individuals who directly or indirectly support the "cultural Marxist/Multiculturalist Alliance". Our method of choice is sabotage operations or the use of shock attacks against concentrations of category A and B traitors throughout phase 1 and 2. Our objectives also include the aim of radicalising Muslims through strategic attacks on their communities. This will contribute to escalate the conflicts and create increased polarisation which will serve our interests."[69]

Breivik states that in the beginning the intention is to "wake" the masses, as he lists examples on different attacks made to create shock and awe. He gives examples like dressing up as either police or firefighters, and the use of flamethrowers against political activists. He arguments for the use of terror as an instrument to create and spread fear among the populus:

"A severely burned category A or B traitor will in reality become a living symbol of what awaits individuals guilty of trying to sell their own people into Islamic slavery. They will act as a deterrent and contribute to spread fear in the hearts of the rest of the traitors and will thus cause more ideological damage than that of a dead body. He or she will become a living testament to what will happen to any and all category A and B traitors and everyone will learn that high treason is not without risks."[70]

The use of anthrax and other biological weapons has a profound 'shock effect', and thus will create massive media coverage.[71] In addition to shock the public, forcing them to become aware of the threats of multiculturalism, Breivik also explains why economically targeted attacks may be favourable. It's his firm opinion that these sorts of attacks will accelerate the process of governmental collapse, granting the cultural conservatives power.[72]

---

69   Anders Behring Breivik, 2083 - A European Declaration of Independence, p. 825
70   Ibid, p. 944
71   Ibid, p. 961-964
72   Ibid, p. 968

Breivik writes about the inevitability of violence in his manifesto:

"It may be relatively peaceful until "something" triggers a confrontation. This "something" can be a combination of an economic depression resulting in massive unemployment, riots getting out of hand, an assassination or a terrorist attack by an Islamist group or Anti-Jihad group. The confrontation has a cascade effect which results in a similar scenario as that of Lebanon. The rebellion will eventually develop into a civil war. Para-military organisations will be created on both sides (Muslims + cultural Marxists vs. the cultural conservatives/nationalists). The conservatives of that specific Western European country are screaming for "a strong leader or group" who can "approach and solve" this problem (70% of men, 30% of women will support this – a total of 25% of the people or 50% of all non-Muslims). By studying all available data, we know that once the Muslims reach approximately 50% of the population there will be a conflict which is likely to result in enormous human suffering. At that point, morality will lose its meaning. The question of good and evil will be reduced to one simple choice for us; Survive or perish. The "strongman" is what we are headed for. He's not what we want; he's just the inevitable endgame."[73]

The eruption of social disorder, violence and killings are inevitable as the revolution is coming. Breivik says: *"we are using brutal means because we have tried absolutely everything else... we are left no choice."*[74]

In other words the use of violence is justifiable in the sense of it being self defensive and proactive. The defence from genocide is not something Breivik will excuse, and as he has both stated and proven, he has no moral reservations against it whatsoever.[75] The greater good that comes from this revolution will be worth the lives lost in its cause. He arguments that if you could proactively save 1000 individuals by sacrificing 100, most people would make that decision. While 70% of women, and 30% of men would not – indicating the fault with the current maternal society that he resides in, as well as the liberalistic attitude 30% of men has adopted.[76]

---

73 Ibid, p. 651
74 Ibid, p. 1383
75 Ibid, p. 1357
76 Ibid, p. 1291

In Breivik's dire view of the future if action is not taken, he measures how many victims multiculturalism will create:

"*Expected Muslim atrocity report for the next 10 years (…):*

- 1 million+ of our sisters raped.

- 3-4 million+ of our brothers and sisters ravaged, robbed, beaten, terrorised

- 30 000-40 000+ murdered directly/indirectly (suicide due to atrocities)"[77]

So in order to prevent this future scenario action must be taken, action similar to the one he would commit on July 22nd 2011. Even when discussing the possibility to procure nuclear weapons, and use them against targets inside Europe, Breivik proclaims *"It is your duty to use any and all means necessary to prevent the mass extermination of our cultures, identities and the ongoing genocide of the free peoples of Europe."*[78]

Breivik also includes the thoughts of Locke, Thoreau and Gandhi when he defends his legitimate use of terrorism: *"Like Locke and Thoreau, Gandhi believed that the quest for freedom incurs an obligation to oppose an oppressive government, which he called the 'duty of disloyalty', when the state fails to represent the people's interests and needs: 'Disobedience of the law of an evil state is therefore a duty'"*[79] According to Ingeborg Kjos, in her dissertation 'Anders Behring Breivik's manifest, En Idèanalyse' (concept analysis) these thoughts experience great resolve throughout the world, especially the idea that regimes responsible for genocide should be overthrown. And what this proves is Breivik's notion of European states being part of the definition of these genocidal-regimes.[80] And thus force against them in an attempt to overthrow them is legitimate. Breivik also justifies his right to instigate revolution by referring to the American Declaration of Independence which states:

---

77 Ibid, p. 1026
78 Ibid, p. 958
79 Ibid, p. 1121
80 Ingeborg Kjos, Anders Behring Breiviks manifest, En Idèanalyse, Universitetet i Oslo, 2013, p. 79

"(…) That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these Ends, it

is in the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new Government, laying its

Foundation on such Principles, and organising its Powers in such Form, as to them shall

seem most likely to affect their Safety and Happiness."[81]

In part 3.23 of his manifesto, 'The cruel nature of our operations', Breivik starts the paragraph of with the quote; *"We do not want to do this, but we are left no choice".* The task of enlightening the European people, and killing those responsible for multiculturalism is not something Breivik wants to do. He feels it is his responsibility, not only as a fellow European, but also as a Justiciar Knight: *"As a Justiciar Knight you are operating as a jury, judge and executioner on behalf of all free Europeans. Never forget that it is not only your right to act against the tyranny of the cultural Marxist/multiculturalist elites of Europe, it is your duty to do so.".[82]*

Breivik has come to the realization that the world he is living in is endangered, and he needs to 'awaken' the masses from the slumber of indoctrination. He understands the task is significant, and that the reactions he will face after the attacks will be those of terror and dread. He seems self-aware when facing his own objectiveness; *"If I had met myself 12 years ago I would probably think I was an extreme and paranoid nut, who believed in conspiracy theories"[83],* not a typical feature of a deranged person.

 Breivik believes the carnage he is about to consummate is a necessary evil, a means to an end; *"There are situations in which cruelty is necessary, and refusing to apply necessary cruelty is a betrayal of the people whom you wish to protect."[84]* Breivik exhibits not only an overzealous empathy for the indigenous population of Europe, he seems to have grown sympathies for the cultural conservatives after World War II. They were, and still are, victims, unable to rise again after the War. It is not unreasonable to conclude that Breivik portrays himself as a protagonist, fighting a just cause for the ideological casualties in the aftermath of war, more precisely the decline of National Socialism and Fascism. The concept of 'political correctness' and the socialist

---

81 Anders Behring Breivik, 2083 - A European Declaration of Independence, p. 1120
82 Ibid, p. 837
83 Ibid, p. 761
84 Ibid, p. 837

indoctrination through multiculturalistic journalist and mass media renders most people incapacitated to make a change, therefore his contribution, his wake-up call, is in Breivik's opinion of imperative importance.

4.3   Impact and restrictions

Even though Breivik's pre-set goals seem immense, he feels some limitations must be made, so as not to hinder or even thwart their efforts. He writes: *"If we however fail to compromise and instead contribute to ram a puritan and deeply conservative way of life down the throat of everyone we will only defeat ourselves. Unwillingness to reason with the individualists/liberalists will only be counter-productive and will prevent us from ever seizing political power."*[85]

Breivik is totalitarian in the full extent of the word, but seem to fathom that his plans for Europe won't be uncontested. Whether or not Breivik's cries for attention will make an impact or not is for the future to decide. He himself is confident in the outcome, and believes in his prospect for Europe wholeheartedly.

To achieve his goals Breivik used three different types of arenas to convey his message to the world. The first arena was the internet, which he used to spread his manifesto, as well as uploading a video to YouTube The second arena was the actual attacks, granting him incredibly high national and international attention. And finally he tried to, with limited effect, use the court proceedings as his own personal scene for justification and addressing like-minded individuals. Breivik was, according to his manifesto prepared for martyrdom, however the public platform the trial would provide probably seemed a better choice. The attacks he carried out are still close to memory for most, and the bomb at Regjeringskvartalet and the shooting at Utøya left a total of 77 dead, and injured over 300 others. His rampage left both a nation and the international community in a state of shock. There is no doubt that this cruel act of terrorism at least accomplished the goal of being recognized, whether it will contribute to an increase in 'national

---

85 Ibid, p. 1165

conservatives' or eventually spark a 'cultural revolution' is yet to be determined. The problem of terrorists ″competing″ for media attention is evident, the more victims, the more horrendous the act, the more attention to the cause. A terrifying reality.

5. Al-Qaeda

"Every Muslim, from the moment they realize the distinction in their hearts, hates Americans,
hates Jews and hates Christians. For as long as I can remember, I have felt tormented and at war,
and have felt hatred and animosity for Americans."

(Osama Bin Laden)

5.1 Background

Al-Qaeda has over the last decades become one of the most notorious terrorist organization the world has ever seen. Their relentless and indiscriminate killing of civilians has changed the very nature of what terrorism connotes. They are most renowned for the September 11th attacks, which claimed the lives of 2,977 victims. In more recent years Al-Qaeda has branched out into many segments and direct affiliates, like Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghred, Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula among others. This paper however will focus on the 'original' Al-Qaeda organization, founded by Osama Bin Laden in the late 1980's. The establishment was as a direct result of the Soviet War in Afghanistan, protection against the Russian invaders was considered to be a holy task, a jihad, and so the present terrorist organization was originally considered a nationalistic anti-communistic establishment. Bin Laden, son of billionaire Mohammed Bin Laden went to Afghanistan to fight the Soviet invasion in 1979, funnelling money, arms and fighters from the Arab world and into Afghanistan.

After the Soviet occupation Bin Laden's hatred against America started growing. He felt that the American troops stationed in the 'Holy Land', i.e Saudi Arabia was a sacrilege, and demanded that all *kafirs*[86], i.e. non-Muslims, must leave the land of the two mosques[87]. Bin Laden is a Sunni-Muslim, and his interpretation of the Qur'an is exceedingly confined, adopting the controversial Sharia law. Al-Qaeda has been conducting attacks and operations extensively, usually employing

---

86 Arabic term used in an Islamic doctrinal sense, usually translated as 'unbeliever', 'disbeliever', or 'infidel'
87 Al-Masjid al-Haram in Mecca and Al-Masjid al-Nabawi in Medina

suicide attacks and simultaneous bombings of different targets. The truck bomb explosion at the World Trade Center in 1993 would remain as an ominous foreshadowing of events to come, while the bombing at Riyadh and Khobar, killing 47 people, were considered 'successful' by Bin Laden. The primary target being American soldiers stationed in Saudi Arabia.

5.2   Ideological justification and methodology

Bin Laden and Al-Qaeda feels the killing of *kafirs* is a necessary and just cause, and based on America's reaction to the battle of Mogadishu, more commonly referred to as Black Hawk Down, led Bin Laden to believe that the American spirit was weak and easily broken.[88] Bin Laden often mentioned the 'American Zionist movement', which he considered responsible for the death of millions of Muslims He regarded this movement as a powerful force which needed to be stopped from killing more Muslim children, and continuing its oppressive behaviour against all Muslims The collaboration of Americans and Jews needs to be stopped, so that the word of Allah becomes dominant, and the word of the disbelievers becomes abased. Fending off the Israeli-American alliance, occupying the *"land of the two holy mosques and the land of the ascension of the Prophet"*, i.e Saudi Arabia, is the most primary concern, and Bin Laden claims there is no greater duty for the Muslim community.[89]

The 'occupation' that is being used as a premise for jihad is not a hostile one, it is simply the stationing of American troops in its allied country, used for deployment in nearby conflict zones. The overzealous view of not permitting non-Muslims in Saudi Arabia is how Bin Laden has interpreted the Qur'an, and therefore deems it a legitimate argument for his actions. The petition to banish the kafirs from the holy lands, as well as the request to release jihadists from imprisonment is made clear in Bin Laden's vow to jihad: *"we pledge to God Almighty to do all we can to support our religion, to establish the shari'ah of Islam in the land of Islam, to expel the Jews and the Christians from the sacred places, and to endeavour to release our ulema from the United States, from Egypt, from Riyadh, and from all Muslim lands."[90]*

---

88 Interview held with Osama Bin Laden on 21 Oct 2001, Alluni
89 Osama Bin Laden's Declaration of Jihad against the Americans, London Al-Islah original in Arabic, 2 Sep 1996
90 Doha Al-Jazeera Satellite Channel Television in Arabic, 21 Sep 2000

In addition to the expulsion of non-believers, i.e the kafirs, from the holy lands, as well as the release of fellow jihadists Bin Laden had a utopian aspiration to create a global Islamic state. The goal of uniting all the Muslims in the world was expressed through a letter to a Pakistani newspaper, Bin Laden wrote:

"Today, every member of the Muslim world agrees that all the Muslim countries of the world having geographical boundaries on the basis of nationality, geography, religious discord, colour and race, should be merged into one Muslim state, where men do not rule men."[91].

This plan to merge all Muslim countries into one gigantous state was, to say the least, revolutionary. It is an expressed desire to make Islam dominant over all other worldly religions. Where men do not rule men is Bin Laden's way of saying that the only legislature which should be used is the Qur'an. This kind of grandiose intention may sound exaggerated and unlikely, however the Islamic scholar, theologian and philosopher Abul Ala Maududi described the innate ambition of Islam in a similar way:

"In reality Islam is a revolutionary ideology and programme which seeks to alter the social order of 'the whole world' and rebuild it in conformity with its own tenets and ideals. 'Muslim' is the title of that International Revolutionary Party organized by Islam to carry into effect its revolutionary programme. And 'jihad' refers to that 'revolutionary struggle' and utmost exertion which the Islamic Party brings into play to achieve this objective." [92]

Sayyid Qutb, the leading theoretician of the Muslim Brotherhood and Al-Qaeda, and also mentor for both Bin Laden and Ayman Al-Zawahiri had other more radical interpretations of jihad. Qutb wanted to raise awareness of the ongoing battle between *jihad* and *jahiliyya;* which he defined as *"state of ignorance of the guidance of God"[93].* He insisted that *jahiliyya* is the fundamental characteristic of contemporary society, and that it continues to prevail wherever and whenever Islam is either rejected or ignored.[94] Qutb meant that all nations and individuals which do not

---

91 Rawalpindi Nawa-i-Waqt in Urdu - Pakistan's second largest circulation's daily
92 Maududi, Jihad in Islam, p. 5
93 Sayyid Qutb, Milestones, p. 19
94 Gilles Kepel, Muslim Extremism in Egypt, p. 13

accept Islam as the sovereign ruler of all human beings should fall into the category of *jahiliyya*. The attempt to try to seek govern themselves without the divine guidance of of Allah is a profound rebellion against God's will. According to Qutb, the non-believers use technology and science to nurture it's objectives against God, which is against God's will.[95] He explained how the only legitimate rulers are the ones who carry out the will of Allah, as expressed in Sharia. And that all other political legitimacy are null and void, rejecting all claims to legitimacy in the entire civilization of secular, democratic modernity, even the Muslim countries were targets in his words of delegitimization. Qutb writes in his book Milestones:

"Islam, then, is the only Divine way of life which brings out the noblest human belief characteristics, developing and using them for a human society. Islam has remained unique in this respect to this day. Those who deviate from this system…. are truly enemies of mankind"[96]

By defining all non-believers of Islam as enemies, true Muslims have no other choice than to declare *jihad* against the modern culture of *jahiliyya*. The replacement of God's sovereignity should never befall to a single man or woman, and action must be taken to restore God's will. Qutb goes on to speak about the world alliance of *jahiliyya*, with the spearhead consisting of Christian imperialism and Zionism. An aggressive force aimed at nothing less than the total annihilation of

Islam altogether.[97] Qutb continues his book by stating the ultimate goal for jihad, and the true meaning of Islam:

"Islam is not the name of a mere "Religion", nor is Muslim the title of a "Nation". The truth is that Islam is a revolutionary ideology which seeks to alter the social order of the entire world and rebuild it in conformity with its own tenets and ideals. "Muslims" is the title of that "International Revolutionary Party" organized by Islam to carry out its revolutionary programme. "Jihad" refers to that revolutionary struggle and utmost exertion which the Islamic Nation/Party brings into play

---

95 William Shepard, Sayyid Qutb's Doctrine of Jahiliyyah, p. 527
96 Sayyid Qutb, Milestones, p. 51
97 Hendrik Hanzen and Peter Kainz, Radical Islamism and Totalitarian Ideology

in order to achieve this objective."[98].

Qutb also rejects the idea that jihad is used a protection of Islam in a defensive manner, and argues that if Islam had not employed aggressive force in the time of Muhammed it would never have achieved the worldwide influence that it did, this is also an argument voiced by Bin Laden.[99] Qutb believed that the physical destruction of *jahiliyya* was the only righteous path for jihadists, as he also argued for the destruction as being 'ethically justifiable'. The non-believers were ipso facto in opposition to God, and therefore in an act of rebellion against those striving to create a world obedient to His will. Since the *jahili* unbelievers do not follow Islam, and the Sharia law, they are by the process of elimination set on destroying the religion, and therefore violent acts against these people can be seen as justifiable.

The mentality of 'them' against 'us' is apparent, and the choice for radical Muslims is easy; join the cause, or be excluded. The same rhetoric used by president Bush in the aftermath of 9/11, Benito Mussolini in speeches across fascist Italy, Jesus of Nazareth in the Bible, and also by Shredder in Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles saying *"those who are not with me are against me, and I crush anyone who stands against me!"* . Unquestionably an international theme for the justification of violence.

Qutb also uses propagandic rhetoric by referring to the unbelievers as sub-humans, which in turn meant the destruction of them would not violate any ethical or moral principles. Rather the opposite, the killing of unbelievers, regardless of methods, would be a forthcoming and desired outcome, as it would have a positive influence on the restoration of the world to its intended configuration. The very notion that killing unbelievers was morally wrong is according to Qutb a misconception. He meant that the mortal life alongside fear and death are expressions of materialism, and as such *jahiliyya*. And as Hanzen and Kainz, two researchers on radical Islamism and totalitarian ideology concluded in an article on Qutb: *"In sum, Qutb's interpretation of the world contains all elements necessary to justify any kind of mass murder in the name of 'faith'. Moreover, Qutb's ascription of a paranthropoid identity to non-believers exactly parallels National*

---

98 Sayyid Qutb, Milestones, p. 63
99 Ibid, p. 62-63

Socialism's characterization of those targeted for destruction as Untermenschen (sub-humans). Denial of full humanity to such a group is a major step on the road to their guilt-free extermination."[100]

Further exploring Qutb's view of two world orders, *jihadists* and *jahiliyyas* he summarizes his distinction between the two by stating that: *"There are two parties in all the world: the Party of Allah and the Party of Satan –the Party of Allah, which stands under the banner of Allah and bears his insignia, and the Party of Satan, which includes every community, group, race and individual that does not stand under the banner of Allah."*[101] It does not get much clearer than that. Everything not regarded as being a member of the 'party of Allah' is the enemy, and must be killed.

Bin Laden's ideas are certainly influenced by Qutb, and he can be seen as an aggressive instigator of jihad, in a struggle which to him preferably ends in Islamic world domination. Whether Bin Laden's Al-Qaeda considers the American-Israeli alliance, the trespassing of kafirs in the Muslim holy lands, or the demand to release fellow jihadists as the most legitimate cause of their battle is not known. Regardless of drive, there should be given ample room to take Maududi and Bin Laden's words gravely. The gradual contamination of Western thoughts like materialism, democracy, humanism, communism, secular science and loose sexual morals into the Muslim world may give some traditionalists reason enough for creative destruction, designed to rebirth humanity into a new world order of Islam.

In global terms Bin Laden addresses all Muslims to join his cause. As well as speaking to the Muslim communities in the world, he also allowed foreign reporters to interview him prior to 9/11. He wanted to share his views on the true nature of America and their Zionist allies. In most of his pleas he is vague and imprecise in who he refers to, however it is more than reasonable to think that his intended audience in most cases are Muslims whom he might convince to join his movement: *"Every effort concentrated on the Americans and the Zionists will bring good, direct, and positive results. Therefore, if someone can kill an American soldier, it is better than wasting his*

---

100 Hanzen and Kainz, Radical Islamism and Totalitarian Ideology, p. 61
101 Sayyid Qutb, Hadha al-Din, Cairo, Dar Al-Qalam, 1962, p. 85

energy on other matters."[102] This intention to convey his messages to the Muslim population is seen more clearly in other statements; *"I appeal to the Muslims all over the world to support and assist the Taliban... The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies - civilians and military - is an individual duty for every Muslim" [103][104]*, and a more sinister one;

"We -- with God's help -- call on every Muslim who believes in God and wishes to be rewarded to comply with God's order to kill the Americans and plunder their money wherever and whenever they find it." [105]

This call for power seems to focus primarily on warriors who are willing to physically fight for the just cause of jihad by killing and robbing the Americans of their money. However, after the attacks on 9/11 Bin Laden seems to redirect some of his focus towards the Muslim scholars and clergymen. Even though he regards it as a great 'humiliation' and a lack of true 'manliness' not to pick up a sword and kill Americans, he wants them to use their words in order to forge the glories of their nation.[106]

The fanatical nature of Al-Qaeda and Bin Laden is empowered by the notion of eternal paradise for those who can gain God's grace. Paradise has been prepared for those who covet it, which in turn illustrates how devoted some jihad soldiers can be.[107] There does not seem to be room for hesitation for the fatwa issued by Bin Laden, and he implores his people to *"adopt every tactic to throw the Americans out of Saudi territory."[108]*. When linked with terrorism, Bin Laden retorts:

"Terrorism, if it is against criminals, thieves, and bandits, is a legitimate thing adopted by all states in all ages. The blameworthy terrorism is the kind committed by thieves against nations."[109]

Clearly he does not consider himself a terrorist, at least not in the true definition of the word. The interpretation and connotation of the word terrorist is more fitting for American leaders of state such as Clinton and Bush according to Bin Laden, whom he says are responsible for the countless

---

102 London Channel 4 Television Network in English, Gwyn Robert, 20 Feb 1997
103 Interview with Osama Bin Laden by Hamid Mir, in Jalalabad, 18 Mar 1997
104 Bin Laden's Fatwa, London Al-Quds al-'Arabi in Arabic, 23 Feb 1998
105 Ibid.
106 Bin Laden on tape, Doha Al-Jazirah Satellite Channel Television in Arabic, 18 Apr 2002
107 Bin Laden on tape, Doha Al-Jazirah Satellite Channel Television in Arabic, 18 Apr 2002
108 Interview with Osama Bin Laden by Hamid Mir, in Jalalabad, 18 Mar 1997
109 Osama Bin Laden on Jihad against US, London AL-QUDS AL-'ARABI in Arabic, 27 Nov 1996

deaths of Muslim people.[110] [111] The presence of American troops in Muslim lands, as well as their support to Israel leaves Bin Laden and his Al-Qaeda with no other choice than to fight. He believes fighting to be a natural part of the Islamic religion and the Sharia law. Jihad is every Muslims religious duty, and *"those who love God and his Prophet and this religion cannot deny that"*[112], and *"the nation cannot dispense with it* [in its fight] *against its enemies."*[113]

In addition to the religious duty to wage war, Bin Laden declared three main arguments for justification for engaging in a holy war with the Americans. The fatwa urging for jihad starts of by quoting a controversial verse in the Qur'an, namely 9:5 'the verse of the sword':

"But when the forbidden months are past, then fight and slay the Pagans wherever ye find them, and seize them, beleaguer them, and lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war)"[114]

And here it ends. Although it is important to note that in the original verse of the Qur'an it continues: *"...but if they repent, and establish regular prayers and practise regular charity, then open the way for them: for Allah is Oft-forgiving, Most Merciful. If one amongst the Pagans ask thee for asylum, grant it to him, so that he may hear the word of Allah. and then escort him to where he can be secure."*[115]

The last segments of the verse does, to some extent, negate the powerful message of the first lines. Whether this seclusion was intentional is not something this dissertation will explore, but should rather be a individual assessment. The fatwa continues by presenting three arguments as justification for jihad:

1. *First, for over seven years the United States has been occupying the lands of Islam in the holiest of places, the Arabian Peninsula, plundering its riches, dictating to its rulers, humiliating its people,*

---

110 Text of Bin Laden's Letter 'to the Pakistani people', 24 Sep 2011
111 Interview with Bin Laden on 11 Sep Attacks in the US, Karachi Ummat in Urdu 28 Sep 2001, Al-Jazirah, Bin Laden on US Strikes, Doha Al-Jazirah Satellite Channel Television in Arabic, 07 Oct 2001, Osama Bin Laden's Declaration of Jihad against the Americans, London Al-Islah original in Arabic, 2 Sep 1996
112 Time Magazine Interview With Bin Laden, 11 Jan 1999
113 Osama Bin Laden on Jihad against US, London AL-QUDS AL-'ARABI in Arabic, 27 Nov 1996
114 Qur'an, verse 9:5, commonly referred to as 'the verse of the sword'
115 Ibid.

terrorizing its neighbours, and turning its bases in the Peninsula into a spearhead through which to fight the neighbouring Muslim peoples.

2. *Second, despite the great devastation inflicted on the Iraqi people by the crusader-Zionist alliance, and despite the huge number of those killed, which has exceeded 1 million... despite all this, the Americans are once against trying to repeat the horrific massacres, as though they are not content with the protracted blockade imposed after the ferocious war or the fragmentation and devastation. So here they come to annihilate what is left of this people and to humiliate their Muslim neighbours.*

3. *Third, if the Americans' aims behind these wars are religious and economic, the aim is also to serve the Jews' petty state and divert attention from its occupation of Jerusalem and murder of Muslims there. The best proof of this is their eagerness to destroy Iraq, the strongest neighbouring Arab state, and their endeavour to fragment all the states of the region such as Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Sudan into paper statelets and through their disunion and weakness to guarantee Israel's survival and the continuation of the brutal crusade occupation of the Peninsula.[116]*

Obviously Bin Laden regards himself, as well as the entire Muslim community as victims, being stepped on by a coalition of crusaders, referring to the Holy Crusades from the middle ages, and the Zionists. A coalition with objectives such as the killing of innocent Muslims, the fragmentation and devastation of Muslim lands and its peoples, the continued occupation of Jerusalem, and to retain the guarantee of Israel's survival. Based on the interpretations of Imam Brain-damaged concerning jihad, Bin Laden declares it a necessity for every individual to defend sanctity and religion where it is threatened. Failing to comply with the fatwa issued by Bin Laden will according to him have dire consequences. As written:

---

116 Bin Laden's Fatwa; London Al-Quds al-'Arabi in Arabic, 23 Feb 1998

"Unless ye go forth, He will punish you with a grievous penalty, and put others in your place."[117]. This appears to be a ultimatum of either complying with the fatwa to kill Americans and Zionists, or expect to be replaced, which could mean not being given a place in Heaven or simply rendered worthless in society. In conclusion, it's a choice between eternal salvation against disgrace and condemnation.

The questions of collateral damage in Al-Qaeda attacks have been a big issue, many scholars of Islam consider the attacks to be an offence to the religion as they do not distinguish between believers and non-believers, often killing many innocent Muslims in their assaults. In Time Magazine's interview with Bin Laden in January of 1999 he replies to these allegations: *"When it becomes apparent that it would be impossible to repel these Americans without assaulting them, even if this involved the killing of Muslims, this is permissible under Islam."[118]* What is interesting to note is how he later in the interview was asked to comment on the recent attempts made by US forces to kill him, to which he replied:

"The American bombardment had only shown that the world is governed by the law of the jungle. That brutal, treacherous attack killed a number of civilian Muslims."[119]

The jihadists are apparently sanctioned to include killing Muslim civilians in their efforts to repel the Americans, while the American [unintentional] killing of civilian Muslims when trying to liquidate Bin Laden is a barbaric recession to to jungle law. This might at first glance look like a classic case of contradictive argumentation and double standards, however it goes deeper than the initial reaction. Bin Laden regards the Qur'an, and the laws of Islam, more precisely the Sharia, to be the only legitimate ruling. The fatwa he issued is in fact his personal ruling on a point of Islamic law. He considers the word of God to trump any man made constitution, and therefore his cause will always be regarded as more lawful. This ethic superiority incessantly fuels Bin Laden's conceived notion that all Americans are ignorant, infidels and cowardly.[120] In a later interview he confirms this disregard for civilian life by saying; *"We do not differentiate between those dressed in military uniforms and civilians; they are all targets in this fatwa."* [121]

---

117 Ibid.
118 Time Magazine, Interview With Bin Laden, 11 Jan 1999
119 Ibid.
120 Interview with Osama Bin Laden by Hamid Mir, in Jalalabad, 18 Mar 1997
121 Esquire Interview With Bin Laden, Esquire, Feb 1999

Bin Laden's arguments for the expulsion of American troops from Muslim lands is to him self-explanatory. He asks one of his interviewers what they would do if a robber broke into their house, to which the interviewer replied that if he [the interviewer] had a gun, he would shoot the perpetrator. Bin Laden seemed content and congratulated him on a correct answer, and further said that this is the right method to throw America out of the Gulf.[122] In all essence the main priority of Bin Laden and the very grounds for the foundation of Al-Qaeda is to reclaim the holy land, and 'purifying' them from Western culture. An influence which he views as corrupting and non compliant with his interpretation of the Qur'an.

5.3   Impact and restrictions

Al-Qaeda implements very few, if any, restrictions on themselves to achieve victory against the American and Zionist alliance. The ambitious goals they have declared a holy cause has not been fulfilled yet, and the process is still ongoing. Al-Qaeda is still going strong, even after Bin Laden was killed by American special forces. The organization seems to have developed from a hierarchical one, where the top leaders were directly involved in the planning and funding of attacks. The present modi operandi among Al-Qaeda operatives is consisted primarily of secluded cells and lone wolves. Whether their achievements will gratify the late Bin Laden is for the future to decide.

The organization utilizes various methods to accomplish their goals. In addition to their actual terrorist attacks they have reached out to international press, as seen with the interviews with Bin Laden. They have published articles on topics such as the declaration of jihad against Americans as well as the religious fatwa, in addition to public statements urging jihad against US and Israel. Bin Laden's letter to the Pakistan daily newspaper, calling for a 'Global Islamic State' also shows his dedication in accessing the public mass. There is little doubt that the actual attacks, especially those on 9/11 are the ones that has made the biggest impact on the World. They were, and still are, unparalleled in the trepidation it left behind. The scenes from that September morning have been seared into the global consciousness of how horrendous acts of terror can be, but also how

---

122 Interview with Osama Bin Laden by Hamid Mir, in Jalalabad, 18 Mar 1997

effective they can be to gain attention.

It is difficult to determine how many attacks Al-Qaeda are responsible for, the reason is their tendency to either claim responsibility for acts committed by others, or by refusing to take responsibility for attacks to which they are culpable. There have been numerous attacks that have been confirmed as committed by Al-Qaeda, these are:

1993 Feb 26: Bombing of World Trade Center; six killed, more than 1,000 people injured.
1996 Jun 25: Khobar Towers bombings in Saudi Arabia; 19 U.S. servicemen killed, hundreds of others wounded.
1998 Aug 7: U.S. Embassy bombings in East Africa; 224 killed and about 4,000 injured.
2000 Oct 12: USS Cole bombing in Yemen; 17 U.S. soldiers killed.
2001 Sep 11: Hijackers crash two jets into World Trade Center; a jet is flown into the Pentagon, and another plane crashes in a Pa. field. Total dead and missing: 2,992.
2001 Dec 22: Richard Reid attempts to blow up American Airlines flight from Paris to Miami.
2002 Apr 11: A truck carrying natural gas explodes outside a Tunisian synagogue, killing 19.
2002 Oct 12: Bomb explodes in a resort area on the Indonesian island of Bali. More than 200 people die.
2003 May 16: Thirty-three killed and almost 100 injured in five suicide bombing attacks in Casablanca, Morocco.
2003 Nov 15&20: Four truck bombs detonated in Istanbul, killing 57 people.
2004 Mar 11: Ten bombs explode on Madrid trains, killing 190 people and injuring nearly 1,400.
2005 Jul 7 : London subway and bus bombings; 52 people killed.
2005 Nov 9: Coordinated bombing attacks on three hotels in Amman, Jordan, killing 60 people.
2007 Apr 11: Two suicide bombers detonate in Algiers, killing 33 people.
2008 Sep 20: Truck bomb explodes outside the Marriott Hotel in Islamabad, Pakistan, killing more than 50 and injuring more than 200.
2009 Dec 25: Attempted bombing of Northwest Airlines Flight 253.
2010 Oct 29: Package bombs found on U.S.-bound cargo planes in England and Dubai.[123]

Including these attacks, Bin Laden laid claimed to the Mogadishu attacks in 1993, where he is quoted to have said: *"One day our men shot down an American helicopter. The pilot got out. We caught him, tied his legs and dragged him through the streets. After that 28,000 US soldiers fled Somalia. The Americans are cowards. We made it clear to the world that we will not let America's*

---

123 Washington Post, Major Al-Qaeda Attacks, 2 May 2011

new world order work."[124] These attacks do not include the extensive attacks in Iraq after the American occupation, with casualties scaling in the thousands. Chilling words were used from Bin Laden after the attacks on the U.S Embassies in East Africa on August 7, 1998: *"The battle has not yet started and that the answer is what you see, not what you hear."[125]* One can only speculate whether this in fact was a reference to the attacks that would happen 3 years later.

Bin Laden`s hatred towards the West and Israel is according to Afghanistan expert Richard Rubin not so arbitrary as people might think. He claims the constant wars raging in Afghanistan during the past 20 years has devastated everything of value in the country. Rubin defines the acts that has transpired in Afghanistan as criminal activities culminating in the destruction of world heritage. Afghanistan has been in ruins the last decade, which ultimately has led to a huge downfall for the Afghan people, leaving them with little hope of education, work and self-fulfillment All this chaos he says can be traced back to rockets and weaponry which *"we paid for"*, i.e. the American people. He is talking about the weapons that America supplied into Afghanistan during their war against Russia. This might shed some light on how Bin Laden and Al-Qaeda are able to justify targeting American civilians, i.e the tax payers, which in their eyes are liable for the destruction of Muslim lands.[126]

A debate regarding the governing of Afghanistan is not a common one, even though some might claim that the Taliban was doing a good job in disarming the people, as well as closing down the enormous opium production that was taking place. For Bin Laden and Al-Qaeda the mission is clear, they will *"fight them until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in God."[127]* History has already shown that here should be no doubt as to the commitment of individuals connected to the Al-Qaeda network. Their cause is just, and most of them will prefer death over succumbing to what they often describe as the American-Zionist Crusader alliance.

---

124 Interview with Osama Bin Laden by Hamid Mir, in Jalalabad, 18 Mar 1997
125 Bin Laden Warns Clinton 'Battle Has Not Yet Started', London Al-Quds Al-'Arabi in Arabic, 22-23 Aug 1998
126 Fox interview with Taliban and Afghanistan expert Barnett Rubin, prior to 9/11. No date given, television broadcast initially cancelled.
127 Bin Laden's Fatwa; London Al-Quds al-'Arabi in Arabic, 23 Feb 1998

6. Rote Armee Fraktion

"*Violence... is an instrument we shall neither categorically reject nor use arbitrarily, one whose effectiveness and revolutionary legitimacy we need to learn to understand in a process of theoretical reflection and practical use.*"

(Ulrike Meinhof)

6.1 Background

The Rote Armee Fraktion, commonly known as the Baader-Meinhof gang/group, was a West German terrorist organization. The RAF was originally founded by Andreas Baader, Horst Mahler, Gudrun Ensslin and Ulrike Meinhof in 1970 as opposition to the capitalistic and imperialistic country they felt they were living in. Besides being in opposition to fascism, they regarded themselves as communistic, and the ideas of Mao Zedong, Ho Chi Minh, Che Guevara and other Marxist critiques were predominant in their ideology. The Faction would be operational from 1970 to 1998, where it became responsible for numerous attacks during this period. The group is said to have had three different generations. The "first" generation consisted of the founders, i.e Baader, Mahler, Ensslin and Meinhof. The "second" generation operated in the mid of 1970's until the "third" generation superseded it and existed from 1980's until the dissolvement of the group in 1998.

Andreas Baader, born in Munich 6 May 1943, was the first leader of the organization. He is described as being a charismatic individual, strongly devoted to what he considered the injustice against the proletariat in West Germany. Growing up in a post-war atmosphere in Germany resulted in many questions from a generation that became increasingly aware of the crimes committed by their parents. The main concern was the recurrence of the authoritarian regimes and fascist ideologies of pre-war Germany. Many young left-wing students believed this was the case in West-Germany, that it had not managed to rid itself of its past, and the fear of additional crimes like the Holocaust was a deep concern. An increase in left-wing extremism came after a

student was shot during a protest against the Shah of Iran. The police officer who shot Benno Ohnesong was later acquitted, fuelling the political left-wing student movement, partly radicalising it.

From the beginning of the radicalization of left-wing during the 1960's to the dissolvement of the RAF in 1998, there would be a time period filled with kidnapping, killing, bombing and hijacking, all in the name of justice. In RAF's final letter, faxed to the Reuters news agency on the 20th of April 1998, the group stated: *"Almost 28 years ago, on May 14, 1970, the RAF was a rescue operation: Today we end this project. The urban guerrilla in the shape of the RAF is now history"*[128] Their struggle, or Guerilla Warfare as they called it, captivated an entire country. The population were split between condemning them and sympathizing with the movement. Their struggle would also leave the national stage as they would criticize the American imperialistic system, as well as condemning Israel.

6.2   Ideological justification and methodology

The RAF are considered to have been anti-fascist, left-wing extremists. They were against capitalism and often regarded themselves as communists. They went to the West Bank and Gaza to train with the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) guerillas. And they considered the Palestinian cause to be a source of inspiration and guidance.[129] After returning from the training camps the group became more militarized as they started robbing banks, killing 'justifiable' targets, bombing against U.S facilities, as well as kidnapping. The reasons behind these attacks were explicit. The group wanted an end to the American imperialists who kept on supplying weapons into Israel, to effectively put a stop the American exploitation of the Third World. They wanted an end to the Vietnam War, as well as the fascistic development in their own back yard. The group believed that speech without action was wrong, and hoped that by standing up to the reasons behind injustice people would rally to their cause. The target audience were primarily, but not exclusively, the West-German population.

---

128 Rote Armee Fraktion, Auflösungserklärung, Reuters, 20th Apr 1998
129 Charles Townshend, Terrorism, A Very Short Introduction, 2002, p. 70

Being revolutionaries in the true spirit of Che Guevara they regarded their cause as surpassing to existentialism.

"Victory means to accept the principle that life is not the most precious thing for a revolutionary" .[130] and *"The duty of the revolutionary is to always struggle, in spite of everything to struggle, to struggle until death."* are just two statements made by the RAF to clarify their dedication. Their revolutionary struggle transcends the importance of life, there is no greater outcome than the successful outcome of their ideological themes.

RAF provided much argumentation on how they were able to use violent actions to front their cause. The precursors to physical conflict were apparent several years prior to the attacks. Ulrike Meinhof, being a prevalent journalist in West-Germany, before she became radicalized, was often alleged of using demagogically rhetoric to promote her beliefs. Examples of this type of argumentation is clear in her comparisons, where she often compared Auschwitz with Vietnam, Nazi-Germany with the present Federal Republic, and the German police with the Nazi regimes SS. She regarded herself and other activists as the *"New Jews"*, being persecuted by the Federal Republic for their views. As Stefan Aust wrote in his highly acclaimed book 'Der Baader Meinhof Komplex' World War II had happened only twenty years earlier, and many of the people who were in charge of the police, the schools, the government and other offices had been in charge under Nazism. Even the Chancellor, Kurt Georg Kiesinger, had been a Nazi. People started discussing this as early in the 60's. They were the first generation since the war, and they were asking their parents questions. Aust says the RAF saw their country as a continuation of the fascist state it had once been, and when that happened they gave themselves permission to do almost anything they could do to prevent further escalation. They saw their actions as the resistance their parents did not put up.[131]

This might have been a oversimplification by the parts of the generation, regardless it helped them establish a mental state of revolt. They did not want to be a part of something they felt was authoritarian and fascist. Their parents had stood idly by, but this generation would not stay

---

130 Rote Armee Fraktion, Auflösungserklärung, Reuters, 20th Apr 1998
131 Stefan Aust, Der Baader Meinhof Komplex, p. 17

passive and submissive, they wanted to fight what they conceived as oppression and wrongdoing. Their analogical arguments were by many regarded as a huge offence for the true victims of World War II, and considered Meinhof's statements as unsympathetic and violative. However, there were people who recognized the statements, and regarded action as a way out of the downspin they were in. Experiencing a new age of authoritarian rule had to be stopped at any cost. This feeling of emergency combined with Meinhof's emphasis that *"Peace is the driving factor for political action"* mobilized the people. The statement is probably adopted from Max Weber's 'Politics as vocation' which he published in 1919. Weber also meant political action was an important method in obtaining peace.[132] Terrorism expert Marc Sageman also describes the importance of a collective identity, or sense of solidarity, in an individual's decision to embrace violent extremism. A culture that is embedded with a history of protest, and a population that supports certain aspects of an ideology, is more likely to breed violent extremists.[133]

Starting with political demonstrations escalating into kidnapping and murder seem like a barrier most people would not overcome, this was however not the case with the RAF. When they returned from the training camps in Palestine they robbed several banks, after which they published a statement showing the reasons behind it. In 'Daz Konzept Stadtgurilla', translated to The Concept of Townguerilla, they justify the use of violence as a test to see whether or not it's possible to organize armed resistance for the cause:

"*The Red Army Faction asserts the primacy of practice. Whether it is right to organize armed resistance now, depends on whether it is possible, and whether it is possible can only be determined in practice.*"[134] In this guerilla-statement the group evidently wants to disclose the possibility of a future armed resistance. The organization of this alleged armed resistance will be used against the oppressors of the proletariat in West-Germany, as well as revert the growth of imperialistic tendencies in society. This notion of 'testing' violence and its impacts was a theme brought up three years prior to the publication of Daz Konzept Stadtgurilla. The Berlin Editor's Collective writes in Konkret, where Meinhof was an employee:

132 Max Weber, Politics as vocation, Free Students Union of Munich University, 1919
133 Marc Sageman, Understanding Terror Networks, p. 147
134 Rote Armee Fraktion, Daz Konzept Stadtgurilla, 1971

"Violence... is an instrument we shall neither categorically reject nor use arbitrarily, one whose effectiveness and revolutionary legitimacy we need to learn to understand in a process of theoretical reflection and practical use."[135]

What is interesting to point out is how the use of the word 'we' gives the impression that these are the thoughts of many, even granting the reader a feeling of belonging to this 'we' group. It is also worth mentioning that one year after this publication was made Meinhof quit her job at Konkret. The reason behind her resignation was her concept of the media having been infested by capitalism. The readers demand for stories of interest made the relationship between publisher and buyer became a supply&demand relationship. Non violent action was useless to the point of being counter-revolutionary, and words alone are toothless she claimed. Meinhof continued by stating that:

"Violence is the only language the system understands because capitalism relies on violent oppression for its continued existence; violence is the language of capitalism. In that context, any violence we engage in is a justified response. Not only that: because force or violence is the only language the system understands, counter-violence is actually virtuous in that it instigates communication. Only since we have started using violence ourselves has a realistic dialogue begun to develop, as the system is having to pull back its veil and speak."[136][137]

Obviously Meinhof meant there were two primary reasons for justifying violence as a force to change the status quo. The first argument is that the 'system' uses violence rigorously itself, therefore any retaliation with violence is a direct response to the system. In other words she does not regard the 'system' as it is defined, as a group of interacting, interrelated or interdependent elements forming a whole, but instead she views it as a self-sufficient entity in which all actions should meet an equal legitimate reaction. The concept of 'us against them' comes to mind, and would probably have been a prominent instigator and driving force for radicalization. Secondly she arguments how the system's language is violence, and therefore to engage in dialogue one would need to adopt violence as a tool for communication. It is also interesting to note how she never mentions the word state, country, government or political ideology, but instead uses the word

---

135 Berlin Editor's Collective, *Konkret*, 1968
136 Sarah Colvin, Ulrike Meinhof and West German Terrorism Language, Violence, and Identity, p. 37
137 Ulrike Meinhof, Die Sprache Des Systems

'system'. The use of the word 'system' is probably an effort to alienate herself and the reader from the state policies she so resolutely opposed. This along with their consistent use of 'schwein' (pig) to describe police officers are additional examples in the use of propagandic rhetoric for the purpose of debasing the antagonistic opponent, in this case the state.

The frustration felt by the group, which was primarily a feeling of injustice, may according to Berkeley professor Neil Smelser lead to violent radicalization. His 'strain theory' discusses how a population's frustration over cultural, political, racial, or economic issues can lead to such extremes of resentment and dissatisfaction which ultimately may spur violent activities.[138] There is little doubt that the frustration these members felt towards society, combined with the grievance of the monstrously unjust actions of their predecessors, would contain the right ingredients to stimulate an uprising. This notion is further enhanced by Wiktorowicz in his 'Social Movement Theory Approach' discusses this phenomena: *"When susceptible, politically involved individuals experience something that causes a dramatic shift in their ideology, such as a personal or national crisis, it is a prime opportunity for radicalization to occur.* "[139]

Ulrike Meinhof realized that protest would never be sufficient to win the struggle against the corrupt, capitalist West German state. She argued that *"... broken windows will be replaced by insurance companies; new trucks will be brought in for the ones that were burnt; the number of police water cannons will remain constant; and there will always be enough rubber truncheons"*, effectively thwarting any protests focused on changing the system. She decided it was out of necessity that they had to start considering violence and counter-violence.[140] Meinhof continued on sharing her ideas in "Vom Protest zum Widerstand" (From Protest To Resistance). Further emphasizing the importance to surpass the idea of protest in benefit of physical and "effective" resistance.

In RAF's 'Daz Konzept Stadtgurilla' they summarized the reasons for creating the group. It reads: *"Under the existing conditions in the Federal Republic and West Berlin, we doubt it will be possible to create a strategy to unify the working class or to create an organization that could*

---

138 Neil Smelser, The Faces of Terrorism, Social and Psychological Dimensions, p. 90-119
139 Quintan Wiktorowicz, Islamic Activism, A Social Movement Theory Approach
140 Sarah Colvin, Ulrike Meinhof and West German Terrorism Language, Violence, and Identity, p. 241

simultaneously express and initiate the necessary unifying process. We doubt that the unity of the socialist intelligentsia and the proletariat can be "moulded out of" the political programs or the declarations coming from the proletarian organizations."[141]

In this section they disregard normal political strategies for unification of the proletariat, deeming them improbable. The unity they were seeking required something else, a concrete battle plan

"We believe that without a revolutionary initiative, without the practical revolutionary intervention of the vanguard, the socialist workers and intellectuals, and without concrete anti-imperialist struggle, there will be no unifying process. Unity can only be created through the common struggle of the conscious section of the working class and the intellectuals, one which they do not stage-manage, but which they model, or else it will not happen at all."[142]

The group felt they had to create a revolutionary initiative in order to gather both the working class and intellectuals in their common struggle. The unifying process also required a concrete anti-imperialist struggle. Basically in order to ensemble a revolutionary enterprise they needed to create RAF. By having created a revolutionary group they would be able to challenge the 'system' by implementing violent actions against it. When it comes to the legality question of their attacks they become adamant in that their struggle goes beyond the socialist project which is the justice system. The argument is that they have experienced illegal imprisonment, terroristic sentences, police harassment, blackmail and coercion. If the state does not follow their own justice system, why would they have any desire to abide by it? As RAF concluded in their final letter to Reuters:

"With the Constitution in hand, they intend to neutralize contradictions and leave left-wing criticism dead in the water and empty of content."[143]

Legality they argued was a question of power - power which the fascist state held. Any attempts to have a political struggle within the confines of 'legality' would be a futile one, leaving their cause to fall on deaf ears. The group wanted to create such a revolutionary force that it had to be taken seriously. *"If one person throws one stone, it's considered a criminal act. If one hundred people throw one hundred stones it's considered a political action."*

---

141 Rote Armee Fraktion, Daz Konzept Stadtgurilla, 1971
142 Ibid.
143 Rote Armee Fraktion, Auflösungserklärung, Reuters, 20th Apr 1998

After the publication of Daz Konzept Stadtgurilla, the RAF followed up with another publication, *Über den bewaffneten Kampf in Westeuropa* contained further and more specific legitimization for the use of terror against the ruling apparatus. They start by claiming the necessity of armed struggle in order to demoralize the working masses, which in turn will lead to less and less mobilization from the state.[144] The label as terrorists does not connote something bad for the RAF, instead they feel honoured by it, rhetorically asking *"Is not 'individual terror' the bane of all revolutionary movements?"* while referring to Lenin's struggle against the populists.[145] Anyone who screams out 'terror' is only startled by the movement force of the revolutionary party, and should be reminded that Lenin "Das Grossen Meister" (the great master) pointed out the importance of revolutionary thinking.[146] Using Lenin as a basis for argumentation permeates the publication, especially in how he legitimises terrorism as a method of achieving revolutionary victory.

"The terror has to melt itself together with the mass movement... may the fusion between revolutionary terrorism and the mass movement gain strength and grow, and may the masses as soon as possible come equipped with terrorist weapons to ensure the plan."[147]

The call for armed struggle is also something Lenin champions in his publication on Guerilla Warfare. Lenin says that the armed struggle pursues two objectives, firstly the killing of individuals, superiors and subordinates in the police and army service. Secondly the seizure of funds both in government and among private individuals in society is permitted, and the funds taken should go to the revolutionary party. Some should be used to procure additional weaponry, and the rest should be used for the maintenance of those involved in the revolutionary movement.[148] These ideas were absolutely implemented by the RAF as most of their victims were members of police enforcement, as well as robbing banks for the 'cause'. Lenin resolutely pointed out that *"A Marxist bases himself on the class struggle, and not social peace"[149]*

---

144 RAF, Über den bewaffneten Kampf in Westeuropa, p. 6
145 Ibid.
146 Ibid.
147 Ibid.
148 Vladimir Lenin, Guerilla Warfare, Sep 30, 1906, p. 2
149 Ibid. p. 3

In contrast to putchism, terrorism is not a quick process, and requires more time to be efficient. The revolutionary insurgents need to function as a political vanguard for the organization, this is crucial for armed struggle. Über den bewaffneten Kampf in Westeuropa state that effective protection of the interests and actions of the masses by armed groups is a necessity for the formation and consolidation of new forms of political organization of the masses. Or in the words of former chairman of the Communist Party in China, Mao Zedong:

"Every Communist must grasp the truth: the political power comes from the barrel of a gun and our principle is:., The Party commands the gun, and must never admit that the guns command the party. If you have the guns, you can create so much more than party organizations... then you can also create cadres, build schools, and create a culture that call mass movements to life." [150]

The need for guns is clear in Mao's words, only with them can you really create change, and form a culture which benefits all parts of society. RAF argues that if they possess enough guns they can stop the suppression of the enemy, and finally overcome them. By rallying enough people to the cause, the power of the enemy will be severely limited, as they rely on employers to fight their cause. In this publication the group consistently talks about *Volkskrieg*[151], people's war, and how efficient this is as an instigator to revolution. When ordinary people suddenly start taking up arms, and fights against oppression, i.e the capitalistic and fascistic government, true victory will be achieved.

"The officer of officers will not know which of his neighbours is in connection with the guerillas, when and under what circumstances the strike against him is taking place."

This uncertainty renders any retaliatory attacks from the state impossible, instilling fear in people hired to protect governmental institutions and organizations.[152] To discover how many people were willing to join the Red Army in their revolutionary struggle, they needed to reveal just how many people would be supportive of their armed struggle. That argument called for the use of violence, as an incitement for additional followers of the revolution. This is what Meinhof meant with her quote concerning the *"practical use"* of violence. The use of terrorism was not only a

---

150 RAF, Über den bewaffneten Kampf in Westeuropa, p. 7
151 Ibid.
152 Ibid.

method of communicating and retaliating against the 'system', but was also an experiment of the future acquisition of support/new members. They argument that violence against a corrupt system is justified by enlisting new followers to the revolutionary struggle, as well as striking the enemy with crippling blows. The full potential of armed struggle was still unclear, and the *"means of armed struggle is convenient to discover."[153]*

After the first generation of the RAF, Baader, Meinhof, Ensslin, Möller and Raspe, were arrested and put on trial, they requested data on the Vietnam War. They called several witnesses to the court, including American politician and former president, Richard Nixon. This was their attempt at showcasing how the U.S and the Federal Republic were responsible for war crimes in Vietnam, and had therefore breached international law. The group wanted to be treated as prisoners of war, as well as point out that the U.S military bases which they had attacked were justifiable targets of international retaliation. The attack on American installations in West-Germany was regarded by the group as necessary. They wanted to both explore the effects of their physical violence, as well as checking to see if it was true that the American imperialism was like a paper tiger. If so was the case it meant that, in the final analysis, American imperialism could be defeated.[154]

6.3 Impact and restrictions

The group imposed very few limitations on themselves and the guidelines for their operations. They killed several police officers during bank robberies or in escape attempts. Besides killing members of police, the individuals they killed were carefully selected. The victims were predominantly foreign soldiers, usually American, as well as high ranking individuals in companies within the Federal Republic of Germany. Th group actually harnessed a decent amount of support during their struggle. A poll in the early 1970's showed that over a quarter of West Germans under forty felt sympathy for the group, and one tenth said they would hide a gang member from the police. Several prominent intellectuals championed the group's legitimacy, and as the surviving members state in their final letter: *"We stand by our story. The RAF was the revolutionary attempt*

---

153 Ibid.
154 RAF, Auflösungserklärung, Reuters, 20th Apr 1998

by a minority, against the tendency of society to contribute to the transformation of capitalist relations. We are glad to have been part of this experiment...... [we] *took the fight against a State which, after the liberation from Nazi Fascism, had not broken with its Nazi past.* "[155] Even after RAF's dissolution they remained uncompromising in what they had been fighting for. Unyielding in its assertive justification of 'crimes' committed. In historical terms the approach the RAF took, being in between terrorists and freedom fighters could have been what made them 'acceptable' for so many Germans. The state's monopoly for violence, as previously stated by the RAF, is what made the groups objectives unobtainable. The absolute, non-negotiable demands made by terrorists, as well as the use of violence, creates a close to impossible scenario for a resolving political process. The RAF also state that as long as there is domination and oppression instead of freedom, emancipation and dignity in the world, one is allowed to question the system. This permission to question the system, which also probably means to attack it, was and is legitimate as long as the oppression consists. They group thinks it was a strategic mistake not to build up a political and social organization in addition to the illegal armed.[156]

The type of actions used by the RAF mainly consisted of either bombs or assaults with small arms fire. They used target killings, kidnapping, and was also indirectly involved in the hijacking of a Lufthansa airliner. They combined these physical attacks with a lot of written work. They attempted to justify their actions with political publications like 'Daz Konzept Stadtgurilla', 'Über den bewaffneten Kampf in Westeuropa' and the 'Auflösungserklärung'. During the trial they also tried to reach out and explain how their attacks were legitimate and necessary. Their only regret is not forming a political party, which is understandable considering the vast amount of support they once obtained in the public eyes. They considered violence to be a pivotal part in the fulfilment of their grandiose idea of prevent the growth of fascism, imperialism and capitalism. Some of their more prevalent attacks include the bombing outside of an Officers Club and the Army Security Agency where three Americans were killed, the siege of the West German embassy in Stockholm, the assassination of the federal prosecutor-general Siegfried Buback, the kidnapping and killing of the German Employer's Association's chairman Hanns-Martin Schleyer. All the attacks, with the

---

155 Ibid.
156 Ibid.

exception of the Stockholm attack, the murder of Arie Kranenburg in the Netherlands, and the attempted assassination of NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Alexander Haig in Belgium, were committed inside the border of present day Germany. Regardless of this the magnitude of their attacks gave them widespread international media coverage, and their cause gained support even in America with groups like the violent leftists Weather Underground. By the end of their almost 30 year of existence the group had killed 34 people. They concluded their attempt at revolution in just 3 lines:

<div style="text-align:center">

I was

I am

I will be.

</div>

7. Comparative method

"History is nothing but a procession of false Absolutes, a series of temples raised to pretexts, a degradation of the mind before the Improbable. Even when he turns from religion, man remains subject to it; depleting himself to create fake umphs over evidence and absurdity alike. His power to adore is responsible for all his crimes; a man who loves a god unduly forces other men to love his god, eager to exterminate them if they refuse. There is no form of intolerance, of proselytism, or ideological intransigence which fails to reveal the bestial substratum of enthusiasm... We kill only in the name of a god or his counterfeits."

(Èmile Cloran)

7.1   Root causes and connections

Examining these groups more closely will reveal similarities in both their methods of attack, as well as their legitimization of said attacks. There are a wide variety of approaches in how these terrorists justify their actions. To understand the way terrorists justify their attacks, the root causes of terrorism needs to be addressed. The process of justifying and legitimizing acts unimaginable by most people derive from a preconceived cause. This causality of terrorism is covered extensively by Norwegian historian and professor Brynjar Lia in his book 'Globalisation and the future of terrorism'. The causes of terrorism and the justification for it go together in an intertwined relationship, as one is unequivocally dependant upon the other. Lia's summarization of the most important causal relationships focuses on factors on both the societal/national as well as the international/world levels. His account of the prime causality of terrorism is broad and comprehensive, and more importantly it is both cross continental and does not discriminate between events which happened 50 years ago and those still occurring in the more contemporary setting. This width is needed when examining the acts of justification by subjects such as the

1970's Rote Armee Fraktion against the more present-day Anders Behring Breivik. When disclosing the reciprocal causality for the justification of terrorism, similarities among the three subjects legitimization be exposed by the implementation of a comparative approach. Lia argues that all processes of causality and justification can be partitioned into his summarization of the root causes behind them.[157]

The first cause that encompasses justification from the subject groups in this paper is the cause of *Relative deprivation and inequality.* Defined as widespread perceptions of deprivation and inequality, especially among culturally defined groups, which as the basic condition for participation in collective civil violence.[158] The initial thoughts as to how people were able to give themselves in to terrorism, and become murderers for a 'just' cause were many. Galtung, a Norwegian sociologist believes that situations most likely to provoke aggressive and violent behaviour occur when people are in a state of disequilibrium along various socio-political dimensions of status.[159] Continuing on the thoughts of this papers second chapter, relative deprivation is a leading cause of terrorism. When rising expectations by various social groups are met by governmental resistance in the form of sustained political repression, low ranking socio-economic or political status, or lack of educational opportunities, groups may turn to political violence.[160] The gap between expectations and satisfaction becomes too expanded, resulting in acts of terrorism.

But how does this apply for the three subjects of this paper? One of Al-Qaeda's most prevalent argument for justifying their attacks is just that. They feel deprived of their holy lands, the occupation of foreign troops and non-believers is in direct conflict with their expectations. The Qur'an is interpreted in such a way that violence is justified to decrease the gap between expectation and satisfaction. With Breivik the same pattern of justification is seen for his attacks on Utøya and Regjeringskvartalet. His notion of a utopian society is not fulfilling, and so it is his duty to alter the path of societal development by 'revealing' the sinister plan the multiculturalists

---

157 Brynjar Lia, The Causes of Terrorism, 2005
158 Brynjar Lia, Globalisation and the Future of Terrorism, p. 15
159 Johan Galtung, A Structural Theory of Aggression, Journal of Peace Research 1, p. 95-119
160 Joshua Sinai, New Trends in Terrorism Studies, p. 36-38

have devised. There is a huge discrepancy between his expectations of society, and how it actually is, giving him a sense of deprivation. The political inequality which minority groups experience may be a direct factor to terrorism. And the greater this political inequality of minority groups within a state, the more terrorism a state is likely to face.[161]

There is no doubt that all the three subject groups operate in a sphere of political inequality. Not possessing the opportunity to win political ground with their argumentation opens a gap for other methods. As RAF explains, violence is a method that needs to be categorically tested. As well as the argument that violence is 'the language of the state', so in order to communicate with it the adoption of violence is instrumental. Breivik used to be a member of the Norwegian Progress Party, but left the immigration restrictive party (FrP) in 2004 after deeming it too liberal. The political inferiority he felt, as well as the lack of conviction by society, was a driving factor for Breivik's justification for his acts. He needed to perform an act of violence to draw public attention to the righteous cause he was campaigning for.

Terrorism and mass media is another aspect that combines the three subjects of this paper. Paradigmatic shifts in modern mass media appear to influence patterns of terrorism, by enhancing its agenda-setting function, increasing its lethality and expanding its transnational character.[162] The possibility to reach out worldwide is a powerful tool, one which has had dire consequences for the civilian population. Terrorism attacks created for shock and awe make the best headlines, and therefore the most attention. This interrelation between terrorism and mass media was evident already in the 1970's, where it was noted that *"informational flows, thus seem to benefit militants or discontented individuals or groups in today's international system."*[163] As society over time adapted itself to violence being displayed on the evening news the threshold has been heightened. Terrorist attacks were becoming mundane and regular.

The attacks like 9/11 and the Utøya massacre are not in any way justified for achieving a higher media coverage, however the increased attention and international reportage does help to intrigue the masses. The question of how someone could orchestrate such horrendous attacks

---

161 Brian Lai, Explaining Terrorism Using the Framework of Opportunity and Willingness, 2007
162 Brynjar Lia, Globalisation and the Future of Terrorism, p. 15
163 Amy Redlick, The Transnational Flow of Information as a Cause of Terrorism, p. 91

either consciously or unconsciously directs attention towards the attackers cause. This exploitation of the continuing globalization and media awareness makes it easier to both share the ground concepts of ones ideological conviction, and subsequently draws attention to the cause. Attention which most likely creates disgust in most people, but undoubtedly comprehension for some. The justification process that Al-Qaeda, RAF and Breivik underwent was portrayed in manifestos, official declarations, interviews, articles and newsletters. These cries for attention, in particular the ones made by RAF, did not prove efficient in gaining political equality, and thus other options were considered. The obvious problem is that most people who have beliefs that do not cohere with the grand beliefs of society might use the media to be heard. The contest between national/international recognition and attention leads to more brutal methods for showcasing their convictions.

Lia explains that *Rapid modernisation* makes societies more exposed to ideological terrorism. Societal changes associated with modernisation create new and unprecedented conditions for terrorism such as a multitude of targets, mobility, communications, anonymity and audiences. Socially disruptive modernisation may also produce propitious conditions for terrorism, especially when it relies heavily on natural-resources export, causes widespread social inequality and environmental damage and creates mixed market-clientalist societies.[164] Europe's immigration policies, the deployment of American troops in the Middle East, and the (re)growth of fascism and capitalism are for the three subject groups considered to be socially disruptive.

These events, that might be attributed to globalisation, modernisation and the creation of new ideologies, are seen as hostile and nomos-threatening. RAF finds justification in past events, not wanting to have a recurrence of their parent generations crimes against humanity. They regarded the modernisation process that took place in West Germany as a failure, not able to remove the fascist ideology that ruled during World War II. Al-Qaeda finds it socially disruptive in accordance to their ideological beliefs in Islam that foreign troops, i.e *kafirs*, occupy lands where only Muslims should be allowed. The exploitation of the natural-resources in the area, namely oil, is according

---

164 Brynjar Lia, Globalisation and the Future of Terrorism, p. 15

to Al-Qaeda an act performed by bandits.[165] This modernist, nomos-defending justification for terrorism is according to Roger Griffin not the same as Breivik's nomos-creating one. He argues that Breivik does not try to defend a 'beleaguered' nation, but instead desires to create a new one. Breivik feels that modernisation comes at a cost, and that this cost will eventually be the downfall of all that is European. The ideal outcome for Breivik is creating, or 'programming' as Griffin defines it, a new setting where multiculturalism seizes to exist.[166]

Political regime and legitimacy is a root cause arguing that terrorism is closely linked to a set of core legitimacy problems. Lack of continuity of the political system and a lack of integration of political fringes tend to encourage ideological terrorism. Ethnic diversity increased the potential for ethnic terrorism.[167] Breivik and RAF are both aware of belonging to the outer part of the political fringes. The RAF kidnapped and assassinated people they believed were responsible for political repression in order to attract publicity and promote a Marxist-Leninist revolution[168], while Breivik in his own opinion did the same. According to Breivik his killing of the members in the Workers' Youth League (AUF) was legitimate, based on his argument that it was their political party that allowed multiculturalism to flourish in Norway. The connection between RAF and Breivik is apparent, and their legitimacy for killing political targets seem to coincide. Both groups are interested in changing the political climate, and violence directed against the alleged facilitators of the current system are fair game. Their concept of the state as the antagonist weakens the legitimacy of the state, and ultimately promote the use of political violence against it.

Hegemony in the international system is defined as an international state system characterised by strong hegemonic power(s), and is according to Lia more exposed to international terrorism than a more multi-polar system. High levels of bipolar conflict in world politics invite the use of state-sponsored terrorism as a means of war by proxy. A strongly unipolar world order or a world empire system, on the other hand, will experience high levels of transnational anti-systemic 'anti-

---

165 Peter Arnett, Bin Laden interview, Mar 1997
166 Roger Griffin, Terrorist's Creed, p. 56, 210 - 212
167 Brynjar Lia, Globalisation and the Future of Terrorism, p. 15
168 Bruce Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, p. 230

colonial' terrorism.[169] America's role in the ideological beliefs of RAF, Al-Qaeda and Breivik play an instrumental part in their legitimization for the use of violence. Al-Qaeda argues that America (and its Zionist ally) are responsible for the murder of millions of Muslims. Their foreign policy causes unrest and seeks to anchor Israel's position of power in the Middle East.

This relates directly to the cause of *ongoing and past* wars. While terrorism in some cases is an armed conflict in its own right, terrorist motivations are often rooted in ongoing or past wars in one way or another. Armed conflicts also have various facilitating influences on transnational terrorism. The ongoing presence of American troops in Muslim countries, and their constant supply of weapons into the area is distressing, and the only method to stop this 'invasion' is violence. The RAF on the other hand believed the Americans were a part of the fascist movement, or the continuation of Nazism as Meinhof argumented. The war in Vietnam worked as in a unifying manner as RAF compared it with Auschwitz. After the bomb attack on the headquarters of the U.S Army on the 24th of May, 1972 they justified their attack saying: "*The U.S. Air Force has dropped more bombs Vietnam in the last 7 weeks than they did in second world war on Germany and Japan combined. This is genocide, genocide, that would be the "final solution" that is Auschwitz. We demand an end to the bombing of Vietnam!*"[170] Breivik also employs what can be defined as 'anti-colonial' terrorism, at least in his opinion. He feels the Muslim population is overpopulating the European continent, slowly eroding away the 'indigenous' inhabitants. According to Breivik this new method of warfare is a contrived plot to establish Muslim supremacy in the world. He perceives himself as a cultural defender who by the use of violence is enlightening Europe of what is conspiring against us. The common denominator between the three factions is the conviction of facing a colonizing adversary. They justify the use of violence, and regard it as necessary to stop the current situation from progressing further.

Economic and cultural globalisation is also a root cause which encompasses all three groups, and their justification. Economic globalisation is said to have mixed impacts on transnational terrorism, depending on how globalisation is measured. Cultural globalisation, measured in the rate of

---

169 Brynjar Lia, Globalisation and the Future of Terrorism, p. 15
170 RAF, Declaration of May 25, 1972

international non-governmental organisations (INGOs), tends to cause higher levels of transnational terrorism, especially against US targets.[171] Cultural globalisation also attributes as the spread of cultural ideas and behaviour. American capitalism is a trigger point both for the RAF and Al-Qaeda. Meinhof quit her job and pointed out that violence is the only language the capitalistic society understands. And since violence was the language of capitalism, any violent action that was to be used by the RAF was for communicative reasons, and therefore legitimate.[172][173] Hoffman also states that the RAF may also be considered to be altruist in their socialistic attempt to create a greater good for a wider constituency.[174] Bin Laden spoke about the hegemony of capitalism, and how it must be stopped in order to liberate the American people from the slavery of the corporations.

While these groups condemn capitalism as an evil that needs to be stopped, Breivik argues for the protection of capitalism, and the inherent position it has in Western society. Although being a firm believer in capitalism, Breivik and Al-Qaeda share the same argumentation when it comes to defeating their enemy. They both feel that economically targeted attacks may shorten the time it takes for the system to collapse. The attacks on 9/11 were directed at what Bin Laden refers to as the economic heart of America. Breivik's request for sabotage and terrorism against economically viable targets, such as oil platforms, are in similar contrast to Al-Qaeda's presumptions of the core strategy for success. Breivik even commends the attacks on 9/11 stating they are good examples on attacks which struck the economy hard.[175] There are a variety of other root causes for terrorism, however these do not showcase the groups correlation in how they justify their actions. Causes that are left out include *Democratisation, The ecology of terrorism, terrorism by spoilers, the contagion theory, poverty, weak states and insurgencies.*[176]

---

171 Brynjar Lia, Globalisation and the Future of Terrorism, p. 15
172 Sarah Colvin, Ulrike Meinhof and West German Terrorism Language, Violence, and Identity, p. 37
173 Ulrike Meinhof, Die Sprache Des Systems
174 Bruce Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, p. 43
175 Anders Behring Breivik, 2083 - A European Declaration of Independence, p. 968
176 Brynjar Lia , Globalisation and the Future of Terrorism, p. 15-16

7.2 Culture and Religion

The cultural aspect behind the justification is in these cases rooted in American culture. RAF wanted to stop American imperialism, and most did not want to engage in the *"boring bourgeois life"* that West Germany had adopted from America. For Breivik and Al-Qaeda the biggest problem for the spread of American culture is promiscuity and the maternal values that comes with it. Breivik argues for more conservative values, and wants to restore a public and domestic patriarchal order.[177] Al-Qaeda demands Sharia law to be implemented, and the contamination of Western culture into Muslim countries makes it harder to do so. When addressing similarities in the justification of terrorism, religion is usually a key aspect. This is also the case for two of this papers subjects, namely Al-Qaeda and Breivik. They both rely on religion as a primary cause for legitimizing their acts. While Al-Qaeda is using a very theological understanding of the religious texts for their basis, Breivik adopts a more conservative and historical approach. He regards himself as Christian, but more of a cultural Christian, not worshipping the God but instead the doctrines of Christianity.

Religion has always been closely connected with terrorism, and from the zealots of ancient Rome to the assassins that fought to repel the Christian crusaders between A.D 1090 and 1272. The word assassin is literally translated as "hashish eater", a reference to the ritual intoxication that, as legend has it, the Assassins undertook before embarking on their missions of murder.[178] Violence for these assassins was a sacramental act, a divine duty, commanded by religious texts and communicated by clerical authorities. There is little doubt that these early assassins carry a chilling resemblance with Al-Qaeda, Bin Laden, and other religious fanatics. Rapoport points out that this 'holy terror' provide justification for itself by the terrorists engaging in it.[179] Hoffman agrees, and defines the justification process of religious terrorism as:

"*Religion, conveyed by sacred text and imparted via clerical authorities claiming to speak for the divine—therefore critically serves as a means to explain contemporary events and, in turn, as a legitimating force justifying violence. This explains why clerical sanction is so important to religious terrorists and why religious figures are often required to "bless" (i.e., approve or sanction) terrorist*

---

177 Michael S. Kimmel, Globalization and its mal(e) contents, p. 603-620
178 Bruce Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, p. 84
179 Rapoport, Fear and Trembling, p. 659

operations before they are executed."[180]

While the RAF, being secular terrorists regard violence either as a way of instigating the correction of a flaw in a system that they regard as basically good, or as a means to foment the creation of a new system, religious terrorists *"see themselves not as components of a system worth preserving but as "outsiders" seeking fundamental changes in the existing order. This sense of alienation also enables the religious terrorist to contemplate far more destructive and deadly types of terrorist operations than secular terrorists, indeed to embrace a far more open-ended category of"enemies" for attack—that is, anyone who is not a member of the terrorists' religion or religious sect."*[181]

Although Breivik considers himself as a self-proclaimed Christian, he falls much more in with the secular terrorists, especially in the desire to foment the creation of a new system. His utopian plans for Europe include Christianity, but more as a cultural blanket to protect his conservative values and the Christian concept of right and wrong. Instead the Muslim Al-Qaeda seeks a more totalizing and despotic rule, based on Muslim values, more precisely Sharia law. The execution of terrorism is often in direct response to theological demands or imperatives, including the elimination of a broadly defined category of enemies, undeterred by the politically counter-productive potential of indiscriminate killing. Finally, and also critical, they are not attempting to appeal to any other constituency than themselves.[182] Rapoport believes the justification for religious violence comes in two categories, the first is 'fanaticism', which to him is the capacity of religious belief to inspire commitment, and its resistance to compromise. The second is messianism, the expectation of imminent transformation of the world.[183] The jihad networks, such as Al-Qaeda, springing up in both Western democracies as well as in the Middle East are counter-culture communities not set on compromise. And one could argue that Breivik fits the bill for messianism, or at least its secular counterpart (shadow).

---

180 Bruce Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, p. 89
181 Ibid.
182 Charles Townsend, Terrorism, A Very Short Introduction, p. 98
183 Ibid.

7.3   The need for identity and propagandic rhetoric

The creation of a unique identity is important for all terrorists. Their altruist objective is what distinguishes them from common criminals only looking to promote personal gain. The collective identity created in groups like the RAF and Al-Qaeda grants a sense of belonging, and establishes an 'us' against 'them' mentality. The feeling of superiority over other parts of society comes with argumentation for their cause. Breivik stresses the importance of maintaining the collective identity of Europe. He believes Europe's shared name, descendants, historical memories and elements of a common culture is something that should be protected. Social identity becomes most important, and therefore politicized, when it is threatened by forces of domination and/or assimilation (like colonialism and globalization).[184]

As mentioned previously the root cause of *Rapid modernisation* makes the process of contemplating one's own tradition and identity more intensive with the increasing phenomena of globalization. Even though some argue that these nationalistic and identity creeds justifying revolutions are personal impulses, most agree that the inherent need for belonging trumps these impulses.[185][186] Hoffman again underlines the importance of propagandic rhetoric in the notion of 'us' against 'them'. This type of rhetoric is used for portraying the terrorists' victims are either subhuman or unworthy of living. As previously mentioned, some of these words are, *"infidels, dogs, children of Satan, and mud people."*[187] The RAF and Al-Qaeda consistently uses the word 'pig' to describe their adversaries, and there is little doubt that this sub humanizing way of addressing your opponent helps condone and justify their violence.

---

184 Myron Aronoff, The Politics of Collective Identity, p. 2
185 Richard English, Terrorism, How to Respond, p. 30
186 Joseph Conrad, The Secret Agent, p. 121
187 Bruce Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, p. 89

7.4 Guerilla warfare

Guerilla warfare is a theme that connects all three groups. The belief that guerilla tactics will change the fight in their struggle, and ultimately help them claim ideological victory is shared by the RAF, Al-Qaeda as well as Breivik. The RAF stated in their publication 'Über den bewaffneten Kampf in Westeuropa' that *"Urban guerrilla warfare is the correct revolutionary method for intervention in the metropolises."*[188] The tactic is clear in the fact that

"the city is also a massing of attack targets. If the rural guerrilla manages to threaten multiple single targets, the enemy in the big city will be vulnerable on all flanks. Thus never knowing which object is under attack. Since all objects are accessible to the partisans within the city, the enemy must protect all of them. His desire to be everywhere has the same result, he will not be strong enough everywhere. Few fighters can bind powerful forces of the enemy."[189]

Clearly the RAF view the metropolis as prime targets for guerilla warfare, a method used to instil fear in the population and drain the resources of the state. Breivik also arguments for the use of guerilla warfare against people who support the cultural Marxist/Multiculturalistic Alliance, in order to create a shock and awe effect demoralising the enemy. Breivik and the RAF have the same idea of "waking" the masses, as if they are in an ideological slumber, blissfully unaware of the dangers they are in. The tactics of guerilla warfare is also evident in Al-Qaeda, or "jihadi strategies" as Norwegian scholars Brynjar Lia and Thomas Hegghammer coined the phenomena.

Mao's often-cited analogy that guerilla warfare is like the attack of a weak flea against a powerful dog. The flea can't match the dog in conventional warfare, so it bites the dog multiple times, and other fleas join in. This leads to the dog attacking itself in a frenzy, but aren't able to kill the fleas, instead it weakens and eventually dies.[190] The idea that something as insignificant as a flea can kill a strong dog is revolutionary thinking, and the adoption of this mindset is notable for all three groups. Mao believed that the development of guerilla warfare was a path to revolution, using terror as a means to reach the goal of defeating your enemy. The stage of creating guerilla forces was the initial stage, which ultimately would lead to such an amount of followers that

---

188 RAF, Über den bewaffneten Kampf in Westeuropa, p. 5
189 Ibid.
190 Mao Zedong, Analogy, Cited in Robert Taber's book, War of the Flea, The Classic Study of Guerilla Warfare, Aug 2002

conventional armies, capable of destroying the governmental ones, would emerge and be triumphant.[191] Whether ideological, nationalistic, or religious, all guerilla insurgencies use similar tactics to advance their cause, tactics described by both Mao Zedong and Vladimir Lenin. There is a sense of comfort in the fact that even though you feel weak and insignificant, and that your opinions aren't heard, you can still be able to continue the fight and win. Or as the American historian Walter Laqueur wrote: "*Guerilla warfare aids the wretched, consoles the afflicted, and helps those who have been mislead to find the right way. Thus as the powerful opposed and kings discomforted .*"[192]

---

191 Noel O'Sullivan, Terrorism, Ideology & Revolution, p. 36-37
192 Walter Laqueur, The Guerilla reader, p. 68-70

8. Conclusion

"The foundation of morality should not be made dependent on myth nor tied to any authority lest doubt about the myth or about the legitimacy of the authority imperil the foundation of sound judgement and action. "

(Albert Einstein)

As Winston Churchill said 'History is written by the victors' the same principle goes for legitimacy. The ruling power has the ability to define what is and what is not legitimate in society. In earlier times the state achieved legitimacy through its monarch, ruler or religion.[193] In more contemporary societies the embodiment and the expression of the nation is what legitimises action. If the largest community of people in a nation stand together, they are able to decide their own future. People with a shared cultural and historical background tend to agree and regard the world in the same way. Sometimes ripples are created in society, with the establishment of groups, sects or lone individuals, with strong ideological beliefs. Their decision to both use violence, as well as appealing for others to do the same, is based on how they perceive the world, and more often than not the violence they are committing is in their eyes defensive measures in order to secure their cultural heritage - their nomos.

These uprisings come as a result of many different root causes, and the justifications used by terrorists are often explained within these causes. The terrorists use violence as a way of fighting the system, raising awareness of their cause, as well as promoting themselves. They are experiencing a state of war, and want others to realize the importance of the current conflict they are fighting for. The altruistic basis for their actions are in most cases an essential justifying factor for their violence, enlightenment and ideological conviction trumps human lives. The decision to employ terrorism is ideologically grounded in revolutionary theories in which political violence plays an essential role in sparking off a mass uprising and a popular revolution. The Red Army Faction, for example, believed that their 'armed struggle' would sooner or later inspire mass

---

193 Rupert Emerson, From Empire to Nation, p. 95-96

support[194]. The same hope is still alive in Al-Qaeda and Breivik to this day. They want people to join their revolutionary cause, to create utopian societies. A new European superpower or a single Muslim state, the ambitions are there. Whether defensive or not, these grand notions for the protection of ones culture is something people can relate to. A peoples cultural heritage is important, even though today's society has a tendency to seem post-nationalistic, the regular citizen is usually protective of his own country. The cultural legacy bestowed upon us is sacred, and its preservation is most important and dear. With an increasing globalisation of the world, some people feel their identity is being attacked, regardless of this being true or not, the basic human instinct is to try and control what they perceive as a threatening situation.

When undertaking this master thesis, the expectation was to discover three totally different types of terrorists. One who based their action on religious scripture, one who based his violence on nationalistic interest, and the last one out of political agendas. Based on the diversity in both culture, geography and with all the years separating them, to discover the amount of similarities in how these three, some would say 'totally different', groups justify violence is astonishing. It goes to show that terrorism, and the justification of it, really is a global phenomena, interconnected in all forms. Even across Rapoport's different waves of terrorism it seems evident that justification ultimately comes from a feeling of preservation.

Compared to the sheer population numbers, there are very few who actually become radicalised enough to resort to terrorism. For these few individuals their struggle seem to transcend sociological concepts and ideas, as well as the value of human lives. The resolution and dedication they experience for their 'cause' supplants all other norms and moral values. Their struggle seem to be an existential one, where survival is dependant on getting others to follow their cause.

People who turn to terrorism seem to have a feeling of deprivation or fear. They have obviously not been able to fit in to society like others. Globalisation and post-modernity has implemented so many changes to society. Colonialism, imperialism, capitalism, communism, fascism, increasing impiety and a post-nationalistic society are just some examples of impacts that may be perceived as threatening to ones identity. Different cultures and peoples are being increasingly confined in a constantly shrinking world due to technological advances. This unavoidable interconnectivity with

---

194 David J. Whittaker, The Terrorism Reader, 2001, p. 190

others can feel strangling for some, and the importance for future generations is to increase our awareness that these feelings exist. The need for more forthrightness and acceptance towards these dissidents is crucial in order to prevent their built-up frustration from turning violent. Democracy and freedom of speech are key words in this struggle.

Marc Sageman argues that terrorism, when it reveals itself, should not be indiscriminatingly repressed, instead there should be a focus on the actual perpetrators of terroristic acts.[195] The most effective strategy to combat terrorism is, according to Sageman, to let the organizations fade away due to internal decay. Efforts to stop them may only prolong the ordeal, and inadvertently delay their demise. While this may be true, not fighting what a majority of the population regards as gross injustice is morally objectionable. If (when) terrorism arises, there should follow a strong and resilient reply, not passive inactivity. Regardless of ideological beliefs and religious conviction the use of violence should always be the last resort. This is especially true in Western societies where the democratic establishment allows everyone to both have their own opinions, and the freedom to express them.

For the future study of terrorism, the emphasis on pro-active research can not be stressed enough. The process from being a well-functioning member of society to a state of radicalization is a usually a long one. The social sciences focusing on terrorism should focus primarily on this process, as it will provide the most value for society. Another interesting aspect of study would be one that measured the impact of terrorists justifications. How many has read Anders Behring Breivik's manifesto, and agreed with it to such an extent that they are willing to join his cause? How many jihadists did Bin Laden`s fatwa result in? These issues are hard to measure, but if it could be done, the real impact of terrorism would reveal itself not only in the attacks, but also in the ideological contagion that ensues.

---

195 Marc Sageman, Leaderless Jihad, Quoted in Jean Rosenfeld, Terrorism, Identity and Legitimacy, p. 92

Bibliography

Noel O'Sullivan, Terrorism Ideology & Revolution, Harvester Press, 1986

Charles Townsend, Terrorism, A very Short Introduction, The other place press, 2002

Brynjar Lia – Globalisation and the Future of Terrorism, Patterns and Predictions, Routledge, 2005

Jean E. Rosenfeld, Terrorism, Identity and Legitimacy, The four Waves theory and political violence, Routledge, 2011.

Rasler and Thompson, Looking for waves of terrorism, Routledge, 2009

Dipak K. Gupta, Waves of international terrorism, an explanation of the process by which ideas flood the world, San Diego State University, 2010

Jeffrey D. Simon – Technological and lone operator terrorism: prospects for a Fifth Wave of global terrorism, president of Political Risk Assessment Company Inc, 2013

Jeffrey Kaplan, David Rapoport and the study of religiously motivated terrorism, University of Wisconsin, 2010

Marc Sageman, Ripples in the waves: fantasies and fashions, Senior Fellow of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, 2010

Michael Barkun, The fourth terrorism wave: is there any religious exception?, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, 2010

Pedahzur and Perliger, The Fourth Wave, comparison of Jewish and other manifestations of religious terrorism, 2010

John Muller, Action, reaction and overreaction: assessing the impact of terrorism upon states, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University, October 7, 2005

Weinberg and Eubank, Backlash: reactions against terrorism studies, 2010

David Rapoport, Before the bombs there were mobs: American experiences with terror, Routledge, 2008

Myron Aronoff, The politics of collective identity: contested Israeli nationalisms, Routledge, 2010

Richard Jackson and Samuel Justin Sinclair, Contemporary Debates on Terrorism, Routledge, 2012

Magnus Ranstorp, Mapping Terrorism Research, State of the art, gaps and future direction, Routledge, 2007

Joshua Sinai, New trends in terrorism studies: strengths and weaknesses, Program Manager for Counterterrorism Studies at The Analysis Corporation, 2008

Isabelle Duyvesteyn, The role of history and continuity in terrorism research, senior lecturer-researcher (associate professor) at the Institute of Political Science, Leiden University, 2006

John Horgan, Understanding terrorist motivation: a socio-psychological perspective, Routledge, 2005

Jeffrey B. Cozzens, Approaching Al-Qaeda's warfare: function, culture and grand strategy,

Routledge, 2007

Paul Wilkinson, Research into terrorism studies: achievements and failures, Routledge, 2005

Richard English, Terrorism, How to Respond, The other place press, 2009

President George W. Bush Speach to the Nation, 21. September, 2001.

Rapoport, D.C (2004) "Modern terror: the Four Waves," in Audrey K. Cronin and James M. Ludes Attacking Terrorism: Elements of a Grand Strategy. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University
     Press.

Rex A. Hudson, Who becomes a terrorist and why. Barry Scheider & Jim Davis, Avoiding the abyss: progress, shortfalls and the way ahead in combating the WMD threat. Phillip P. Purpura, Terrorism and homeland security: An introduction with applications.

Martin C. Gus, Understanding terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues. Jacqueline M. Gray, Understanding the 'War on Terrorism': Responses to 11 September 2001

Paul Gill & Joseph K. Young, Comparing Role-Specific Terrorist Profiles, International Center of the study of Terrorism. Pennsylvania State University, 2011

Slavoj Zizek, Violence: Six Sideways Reflections, Profile books, 2009

John Gray, Enlightenment's Wake: Politics and Culture at the Close of the Modern Age, Routledge, 1995

Ted Robert Gurr, Why Men Rebel, Princeton NJ, Princeton University Press, 1970

Goerlitz, Walter. The Memoirs of Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel: Chief of the German High Command 1938-1945. Translated by David Irving. Cooper Square Press 2000

Orange, Richard. "Anders Behring Breivik's mother 'sexualised' him when he was four". The Telegraph.

Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitarianism, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich 1973

Shmuel Eisenstadt, Fundamentalism, Sectarianism, and Revolution: The Jacobin Dimension of Modernity, Cambridge, Polity 1999, p. 72-73.

Roger Griffin, Terrorist's Creed, Fanatical Violence and the Human Need for Meaning, Palgrave Macmillan, October 2012

Bruce Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, Columbia University Press, August 1998

Øystein Sørensen, Drømmen om det Fullkomne Samfunn, Aschehoug, 2011

Noel O'Sullivan, Terrorism, Ideology and Revolution, Brighton Wheatsheaf, 1986

Anders Behring Breivik, A European Declaration of Independence, 2011

Øystein Sørensen, Ideologi og Galskap, Anders Behring Breiviks Totalitære Mentalitet, Dreyer Forlag, 2005

Alex Butterworth, The World That Never Was, A True Story of Dreamers, Schemers, Anarchists and Secret Agents, Vintage 2011.

Robert Robins and Jerrold Post, Political Paranoia, The Psychopolitics of Hatred, Yale University Press, 1997

Ingeborg Kjos, Anders Behring Breiviks manifest, En Idèanalyse, University of Oslo, 2013

Sayyid Qutb, Milestones, Islamic Book Service, 1964

Gilles Kepel, Muslim Extremism in Egypt, University of California Press, 2003

Hendrik Hanzen and Peter Kainz, Radical Islamism and Totalitarian Ideology, University of Passau, 2007

Bin Laden's Fatwa, Declaration of War against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places, 1996, later Al Quds Al Arabi in Arabic, 1998

Washington Post, Major Al-Qaeda Attacks, 2 May 2011

Rote Armee Fraktion, Auflösungserklärung, Reuters, 20th Apr 1998

Stefan Aust, Der Baader Meinhof Komplex, Verlagsgruppe Random House, 2008

Max Weber, Politics as vocation. Free Students Union of Munich University, 1919

Rote Armee Fraktion, Daz Konzept Stadtgurilla, 1971

Berlin Editor's Collective, *Konkret*, 1968

Sarah Colvin, Ulrike Meinhof and West German Terrorism Language, Violence, and Identity, Camden House, 2009

Neil Smelser, The Faces of Terrorism, Social and Psychological Dimensions, Princeton University Press, 2010

Quintan Wiktorowicz, Islamic Activism, A Social Movement Theory Approach, Indiana University Press, 2003

Rote Armee Fraktion, Über den bewaffneten Kampf in Westeuropa, 1971

Vladimir Lenin – Guerilla Warfare, 1906

Johan Galtung, A Structural Theory of Aggression, Journal of Peace Research, Journal of Peace Research, June 1964

Amy Redlick, The Transnational Flow of Information as a Cause of Terrorism, Westview Press, 1979

Michael S. Kimmel, Globalization and its mal(e) contents, SAGE Publications, 2012

Rapoport, Fear and Trembling, American Political Science Association, 1984

Joseph Conrad, The Secret Agent, HarperCollins, 2013

Mao Zedong, Analogy. Cited in Robert Taber's book, War of the Flea, The Classic Study of Guerilla Warfare. Aug 2002

Walter Laqueur, The Guerilla reader, Wildwood House, 1978

Ted Kaczynski, Industrial Society and its Future, 1995

David J. Whittaker, The Terrorism Reader, Routledge, 2003

Rupert Emerson, From Empire to Nation, 1969

Roberta Senechal de la Roche – Towards a Scientific Theory of Terrorism, Online article, 2004

Lucian Gideon Conway III* and Kathrene R. Conway, The terrorist rhetorical style and

its consequences for understanding terrorist violence, The University of Montana,

Missoula, MT, USA, 2011

Rex A. Hudson, Who becomes a terrorist and why, The lyons press, 2002

Barry Scheider & Jim Davis, Avoiding the abyss: progress, shortfalls and the way ahead in combating the WMD threat, Praeger, 2006

Phillip P. Purpura, Terrorism and homeland security: An introduction with applications, Butterworth-Heinemann, 2006

Martin C. Gus, Understanding terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues, SAGE publications, 2012

Jacqueline M. Gray, Understanding the 'War on Terrorism': Responses to 11 September 2001, Department of Psychology, University of Surrey, 2006

Alston Chase, Harvard and the making of the Unabomber, W.W Norton & Company, 2003

Jeff Halverson, ASU study on Al-Qaeda's motives, 2012.

Anthea Bell, Baader-Meinhof: The Inside Story of the R.A.F, The other place press, 2009

http://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/terrorism-2002-2005

http://www.dagbladet.no/2012/06/04/nyheter/breivik/innenriks/terrorangrepet/rettssak/2191531 9/

http://www.dagbladet.no/2012/10/24/nyheter/terror/innsamling/islamister/pst/24009751/

http://911research.wtc7.net/planes/evidence/flight93cvr.html

http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/jun/17/humanities.internationaleducationnews

http://www.niu.edu/phil/~kapitan/pdf/CanTerrorismbeJustified.pdf

http://911research.wtc7.net/planes/evidence/flight93cvr.html

http://www.globalpolitician.com/22194-islamism

http://www.vg.no/nyheter/meninger/artikkel.php?artid=10057636

http://www.vg.no/nyheter/meninger/artikkel.php?artid=10057622

http://nymag.com/daily/intel/2011/07/anders_breivik_unabomber.html

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YMiqEUBux3o

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1782008

American Department of Justice, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 0.85, 2002-2005