TSAS
canadian network for research on
terrorism, security and society

Working Paper Series

No. 14-11

Novermber 2014

Can "Dangerous Speech" be used to explain "Lone-Wolf" Terrorism?

Jesse MacLean

Co-Directors: Daniel Hiebert, University of British Columbia
Lorne Dawson, University of Waterloo

The TSAS Working Paper Series can be found at *library.tsas.ca/tsas-working-papers*

The Canadian Network for Research on Terrorism, Security, and Society

TSAS is supported as a national strategic initiative funded by **SSHRC** and **Public Safety Canada**, along with the following departments of the federal government:

- Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS)
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC)
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP)

TSAS also receives financial support from the University of British Columbia, Simon Fraser University, and the University of Waterloo.

Views expressed in this manuscript are those of the author(s) alone. For more information, contact the Co-directors of the Centre, Daniel Hiebert, Department of Geography, UBC (daniel.hiebert@ubc.ca) and Lorne Dawson, Department of Sociology and Legal Studies, University of Waterloo (ldawson@uwaterloo.ca).

Table of Contents

Section 1 - Introduction 1

1.1. Topic Introduction 1

1.2 Research Question and Paper Structure 2

1.3 Literature Review 4

1.3.1 Perspectives on Lone Wolf Terrorism 4

1.3.2. Meaning of Dangerous Speech 13

Section II - Investigation 19

2.1. Approach of Analysis 19

2.2. Case Study I - Anders Breivik 22

2.2.1 The Incident 22

2.2.2 The Perpetrator 23

2.2.3 The Ideology 26

2.2.4 Speech Consumed 27

2.2.5 Speech Propagated 29

2.2.6 Applicability of Dangerous Speech 31

2.3 Case Study II - David Copeland 36

2.3.1 The Incident 36

2.3.2 The Perpetrator 37

2.3.3 The Ideology 38

2.3.4 Speech Consumed 40

2.3.5 Speech Propagated 43

2.3.6 Applicability of Dangerous Speech 43

Section III - Conclusions and Next Steps 46

Bibliography 52

TSAS

canadian network for research on
terrorism, security and society

Working Paper Series

Can "Dangerous Speech" be used to explain "Lone-Wolf" Terrorism?

Jesse MacLean

Balsillie School of International Affairs, University of Waterloo

Section 1 - Introduction

1.1. Topic Introduction

The term "lone wolf terrorism" has many different perspectives and definitions, but all of them revolve around a common subject: a lone individual committing of a public act of politicized violence, usually against civilian targets, with a theatrical bent. Commonly-given examples of lone wolf terrorism include the 2011 attacks in Norway by a right-wing extremist who killed seventy-seven people as a marketing operation for his manifesto,[1] as well as the 1993 Cave of the Patriarchs massacre in which an Israeli-American doctor shot dead twenty-nine Palestinians at a West Bank mosque.[2] Such attacks are believed to be on the rise in recent years, stemming predominantly from right-wing and jihadist actors. This has brought increased academic and policy focus on lone wolf terrorism, to the point where the American president has spoken of lone wolves as a primary security concern faced by the United States.[3] Indeed, the lone wolf paradigm has emerged as Al-Qaeda's primary strategy for attacking the West since the degradation of the centralized transnational network originally built by Osama Bin Laden.[4]

This evolution calls attention to the question of which acts of violence can be attributed to lone wolves and which are attributed to terrorist networks. Can an attacker carrying out violence in the name of a militant organization be considered an operative or member of that organization? This question is illustrated by the case of a killing spree in France which targeted French soldiers and Jewish civilians. The perpetrator, Mohammad Merah, allegedly operated in the name of Al-Qaeda, which for some scholars "makes Merah's identification as a lone wolf dubious" despite persisting questions about whether he ever underwent formal training and indoctrination overseas.[5]

1 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 26.1: 129-155, pg. 130.

2 Haberman, Clyde. 1994. Hundreds of Jews Gather To Honor Hebron Killer. The New York Times, April 1. Retrieved April 28, 2014 from http://www.nytimes.com/1994/04/01/world/hundreds-of-jews-gather-to-honor-hebron-killer.html

3 McCauley, Clark, and Sophia Moskalenko. 2014. Toward a Profile of Lone Wolf Terrorists: What Moves an Individual From Radical Opinion to Radical Action. *Terrorism and Political Violence* **26.1: 69-85,** pg. 70.

4 Kaplan, Jeffrey, Heléne Lööw, and Leena Malkki. 2014. Introduction to the Special Issue on Lone Wolf and Autonomous Cell Terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 26.1: 1-12, pg. 4.

5 Ibid. pg. 2.

Ambiguities of this nature suffuse the discourse on lone wolf terrorism, including what really constitutes a lone wolf incident and what role extremist communities and communications play in shaping or motivating such attacks. With these issues in mind, it becomes more important than ever to properly identify, understand and explain instances of lone wolf terrorism, for the purposes of preventing and combating such acts of violence. It is particularly important to understand the ways in which propagandists and ideologues can deliberately or unintentionally help convince attackers that their actions are justified and necessary. Clarifying these ambiguities may help predict or even prevent such acts. This paper tests a possible tool which may help to clarify the relationship between speech and violence as related to lone wolf terrorism.

1.2 Research Question and Paper Structure

Precisely how may the acts of violence perpetrated by lone wolves be influenced by speech and media? This question is the primary concern of this project. One answer to this question may be found within "dangerous speech." The aim of this paper is to explore whether the concept of dangerous speech developed by Susan Benesch can be applied toward answering the question above. Since this is the first such attempt at joining dangerous speech to lone wolf terrorism, this exploration does not seek to produce a definitive answer or a series of concrete recommendations for developing future policy or research. The goal is to determine whether a connection *can* be made, not whether it *should* be used as a basis for any particular policy.

Benesch has publicized an analytical framework with guidelines for determining what constitutes dangerous speech. These guidelines have already been tested through implementation in NGO projects, which will be discussed further in this paper's literature review. The guidelines apply to speech acts directed toward a general community for the purpose of inciting *many* members of its audience toward acts of *mass* violence such as genocide, ethnic rioting or large-scale vigilante justice. This paper investigates whether these guidelines can be adapted to analyze speech directed toward fringe actors, inciting violence committed by *individuals*. If the dangerous speech concept can be applied for this purpose, it could be developed as a tool for understanding the relationship between lone wolves and the factors which influence them. Such a tool could in

turn help explain, predict or even prevent the actions of lone wolf terrorists.

This investigation can be contextualized as contributing to a larger academic discussion involving the relationship between speech, ideology, and acts of political violence. A recent article by Jonathan Leader Maynard calls for deeper thought to be given to the relationship between ideology and atrocity.[6] While his writing and most of his sources deal with genocide literature- that is, with large-scale instances of political violence - this investigation may also offer insight by delving into the "micro" side of political violence committed by individuals. Maynard defines atrocity as "all non-accidental acts of large-scale violence against civilians, including but not limited to genocide."[7] Aside from the criteria of *large-scale* violence, this definition could apply to each of the terrorist attacks studied within this paper. The dangerous speech relationship being investigated could shed light on how people become radicalized toward violence against civilians on an individual level, a counterpoint to investigations on mass processes.

Before examining the central research question, this paper provides a two-part review of available literature to ground an understanding of the two key concepts: lone wolf terrorism and dangerous speech. This Literature Review section looks at the many difficulties involved in defining lone wolves versus various other violent actors, in order to clarify why certain incidents were selected for this paper's case studies instead of others. The second part of the Literature Review provides more background on what exactly qualifies as dangerous speech. This part is necessarily limited, as the concept is largely the product of a single writer, Dr. Susan Benesch. This section describes her work developing and implementing the concept in order to contextualize its application to this paper's case studies, while taking note of the differences between dangerous speech applied to mass violence as opposed to lone wolf terrorism.

Within the second section of this paper, the applicability of dangerous speech to lone wolf terrorism will be tested through the examination of case studies. A sub-section describing this methodology in more detail will be provided before the investigation proper is carried out. These case studies will focus on the actions and beliefs of two people who carried out acts of politicized

6 Leader Maynard, Jonathan. 2014. Rethinking the Role of Ideology in Mass Atrocities. *Terrorism and Political Violence* ahead-of-print: 1-21.
7 Ibid pg. 2.

mass violence without verifiable support from a standing militant organization. Both cases will also feature identifiable aspects of speech associated with the perpetrator and their attack, usually a statement, manifesto, or participation in extremist discourse which can be analyzed. The examples used are from Western Europe, as most of the data available on this phenomenon is drawn from acts committed in that region and North America.[8]

The third section of the paper concludes with the findings of the test regarding the applicability of dangerous speech toward understanding lone wolf terrorism. Next steps are suggested regarding future research opportunities and how to broaden understanding of this subject. These next steps are provided with an eye toward the eventual development of concrete policy recommendations or research projects aimed at protecting lives against this form of violence.

1.3 Literature Review

1.3.1 Perspectives on Lone Wolf Terrorism

The classification of what is and is not terrorism has always been contested, due to the highly-politicized nature of the term and its use in delegitimizing any armed actor whom a speaker considers threatening or inconvenient. The classification of lone wolf terrorism is no less ambiguous, and possibly more so due to the absence of defined organizations to be analyzed. To start with, it is worthwhile to consider the *name* of this phenomenon and what it implies. The phrase lone wolf implicitly draws attention to the distinction between this brand of terrorism and ordinary "wolves," namely terrorist groups which can be perceived as unitary actors with shared goals and identities. This term suggests a dangerous predator, an outcast from a usually pack-oriented group, who is antisocial and unpredictable. In discussing definitions of lone wolves, Spaaij makes note of the resonance with "…the biological meaning of the term in their emphasis on those individuals who do not belong to a terrorist group (i.e. to a 'pack')."[9] This further resonates with the fact that lone wolves are often drawn from the ideological fringes of

8 Spaaij, R.F.J. 2012. Understanding lone wolf terrorism: global patterns, motivations and prevention. Dordrecht; New York: Springer, pg. 9.

9 Spaaij, R.F.J. 2012. Understanding lone wolf terrorism: global patterns, motivations and prevention. Dordrecht; New York: Springer, pg. 17.

a society, and rarely carry out their acts in the services of mainstream causes with broad-based popular support.

Before delving further into who or what a lone wolf is, it is prudent to first establish what terrorism is for the purposes of this investigation. This paper will defer to the findings of Schmid and his "Revised Academic Consensus Definition of Terrorism." In brief, this definition states that terrorism is distinguished by "… *a conspiratorial practice of calculated, demonstrative, direct violent action without legal or moral restraints, targeting mainly civilians and non-combatants, performed for its propagandistic and psychological effects on various audiences and conflict parties.*"[10] This sentence and its attached caveats in the full version of the definition seem to cover the key aspects of terrorism: the clandestine nature of most perpetrators, the demonstrative and propagandistic nature of the violence, and especially, the tendency of targeting civilians without conventional legal or moral restraints. Accordingly, lone wolf terrorism in this paper is activity that displays the characteristics described by Schmid as terrorism and which is perpetrated by an agent describable as a lone wolf. What exactly constitutes a lone wolf is a question that will now be explored.

Pantucci has developed one of the only formal typologies of lone wolves, with an exclusive focus on Islamist attackers. This typology distinguishes between lone wolves, lone wolf packs, loners, and lone attackers[11] based on considerations such as command and control links to a larger organization. However, this typology is not adopted by this paper, as it deals solely with Al-Qaedism while none of this project's case studies can be described as Al-Qaeda-affiliated or inspired.

The lone wolf term is often used interchangeably with other phrases, with different or overlapping interpretations depending on the speaker. Terms like isolated dyads,[12] lone attackers[13]

10 Schmid, Alex P. 2012. The Revised Academic Consensus Definition of Terrorism. Perspectives on Terrorism 6: 2, retrieved August 01, 2014 from http://www.terrorismanalysts.com/pt/index.php/pot/article/view/schmid-terrorism-definition/html

11 Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. A typology of lone wolves: preliminary analysis of lone Islamist terrorists. International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Political Violence, pg. 14.

12 Gill, Paul, John Horgan, and Paige Deckert. 2013. Bombing Alone: Tracing the Motivations and Antecedent Behaviors of Lone-Actor Terrorists. Journal of forensic sciences 59.2: 425-435, pg. 426.

13 Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. A typology of lone wolves: preliminary analysis of lone Islamist terrorists. International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Political Violence, pg. 30.

caring-compelled[14] and lone actor terrorism all appear in scholarly efforts classifying particular manifestations of political violence. For example, in one view the term lone wolf applies only to those who are purely self-radicalized, while lone actor includes people socialized towards violence by a community or organization of like-minded extremists. This ambiguity emerges in Bates's definition of lone wolves, which specifies that "Lone wolf terrorism involves violent acts by *self-radicalized* (emphasis added) individuals designed to promote a cause or belief."[15] Considering that instances of true autodidactic self-radicalization toward violence - radicalization in a vacuum, as it were - are rare if not practically impossible, this definition is too limiting to be constructive. Similarly, this paper does not include isolated dyads and lone wolf packs in its view of lone wolf terror, treating the "lone" descriptor as fundamental to the concept.

There are greatly varied criteria within the scholarly literature for which violent incidents and perpetrators are included within the category of lone wolf. Different thinkers emphasize different aspects of the term, such as how "lone" the perpetrator must be to qualify for the label, the presence or absence of political ideology behind their actions, or the intent and scale of the violence carried out. One contribution explicitly notes the lack of consensus in this area, while adopting the stance that lone wolves need not be completely "lone" in their operations:

> As with a number of other terms within the field of terrorism, there is no universally accepted meaning of lone-wolf terrorism… In the context of this paper, it will be maintained that although an UPOI or lone wolf seemingly operates as an individual, they *do in fact function with a degree of influence and/or assistance from like-minded individuals or groups* [emphasis added].[16]

Some scholars include attackers who claim inspiration and direction from a terror group in carrying out their acts, without being members of that group or subordinate to an identifiable chain of command. Under this perspective, acts which are carried out by a principal perpetrator with one or more accomplices may also be counted. This is the definition adopted by thinkers such as George Michael and Raffaello Pantucci, who count Al-Qaeda inspired or directed attack-

14 McCauley, Clark, and Sophia Moskalenko. 2014. Toward a Profile of Lone Wolf Terrorists: What Moves an Individual From Radical Opinion to Radical Action. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 69-85, pg. 69.

15 Bates, Rodger A. 2012. Dancing with Wolves: Today's Lone Wolf Terrorists. The Journal of Public and Professional Sociology 4.1: 1-14, pg. 2.

16 Striegher, Jason-Leigh. 2013. Early detection of the lone wolf: advancement of counter-terrorism investigations with an absence or abundance of information and intelligence. Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism 8.1: 35-53, pg. 37.

ers as examples of lone wolves despite their identification with a transnational terror network. Others insist that for the lone wolf label to apply, the attack must be conceived of, prepared for, and carried out by one person acting completely on their own:

> Thus, in the case where a lone wolf joins an established clique or cell, he or she ceases to be a lone wolf. This criterion also excludes certain high-profile terrorist attacks that are commonly ascribed to lone wolves, most notably the Oklahoma City bombing on 19 April 1995 which claimed 168 lives and wounded more than 500 people.[17]

Spaaij makes this distinction on the grounds that Timothy McVeigh had accomplices who were convicted of facilitating his attack, notably Terry Nichols. By definition this made McVeigh not truly "lone." This would exclude the Oklahoma bombing from being described as a lone wolf attack, despite the fact that its primary perpetrator was not affiliated with any terrorist organization. However, in other literature McVeigh could indeed be counted among the examples of lone wolves. For instance, Weimann insists that lone wolves must not be cooperating with a terrorist group to qualify, but they can be defined as a small group of individuals:

> A lone wolf is an individual or a *small group of individuals* [emphasis added] who uses traditional terrorist tactics – including the targeting of civilians – to achieve explicitly political or ideological goals, but who acts without membership in, or cooperation with, an official or unofficial terrorist organization, cell, or group.[18]

The "lone" boundary of the definition can be further blurred by the killers themselves, who may claim membership within a larger group or organization, absent any evidence to support their claims. The 2011 massacre in Norway is a prime example. The attacker's manifesto claimed that he represented a militant resurrection of the Knights Templar, initiating an apocalyptic confrontation against Muslim immigrants and subversive leftists.[19] Since no credible information is available indicating this organization actually exists, the perpetrator continues to be treated as an example of an unaffiliated killer. This manifesto will be given closer scrutiny later in this piece, as the Norway attack represents one of the most-discussed cases of lone wolf terrorism. Another

17 Spaaij, R.F.J. 2012. Understanding lone wolf terrorism: global patterns, motivations and prevention. Dordrecht; New York: Springer, pg. 18.

18 Weimann, Gabriel. 2012. Lone Wolves in Cyberspace. Journal of Terrorism Research, 3:2: 75-90, pg. 75.

19 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 144.

example is Ted Kaczynski, the so-called Unabomber, who claimed to be the leader of a Freedom Club involved in his decades-long bombing campaign. When the Unabomber was finally apprehended, he was revealed to have been operating with complete independence all along.[20]

There is also a question regarding whether lone wolf terrorism is a recent phenomenon. There is rough consensus that the profile of lone wolves has recently risen relative to terrorist groups. This is commonly attributed to the decline of transnational terror networks like Al-Qaeda and a shift in their tactics toward inspiring attacks by like-minded individuals, which is one of the reasons behind the previously described concerns of authorities and scholars regarding this particular form of terrorism.[21] Many of the lone wolf attacks mentioned in this paper would have been unthinkable in an age before online bomb-making instructions, the prospect of instant media immortality, and access to automatic weapons and body armour. However, this question too does not have a definitive answer. Lone wolves could be seen as carrying on a much older tradition, traceable to the tactics of 19th-century anarchists:

> History is filled with examples of single individuals engaged in assassinations or mass murder and who, though inspired by others, have acted autonomously… The 'propaganda by deed,' committed by a lone wolf terrorist, appears to have been resurrected in the latter half of the 20th century by radical right-wing extremists, Islamic jihadists and others.[22]

The *motivation* for violence also emerges as a point of divergence in lone wolf definitions. The standard separation made between criminality and terrorism is political. Terrorists aspire to make a statement or force societal change in support of a larger cause, while spree or serial killers seek to gratify themselves somehow. According to Spaaij, this distinction excludes violent actions even when they may have enormous political consequences, such as the dramatic and public assassination of an American president:

> …the boundaries of lone wolf terrorism are inevitably fuzzy. Some of the most striking political assassinations and mass murders in history were presumably carried out by lone individuals

20 Spaaij, R.F.J. 2012. Understanding lone wolf terrorism: global patterns, motivations and prevention. Dordrecht; New York: Springer, pg. 18.

21 Kaplan, Jeffrey, Heléne Lööw, and Leena Malkki. 2014. Introduction to the Special Issue on Lone Wolf and Autonomous Cell Terrorism. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 1-12, pg. 4.

22 Bates, Rodger A. 2012. Dancing with Wolves: Today's Lone Wolf Terrorists. The Journal of Public and Professional Sociology 4.1: 1-14, pg. 2.

> rather than groups [46], such as the assassinations of US Presidents James A. Garfield (1881), William McKinley Jr. (1901) and John F. Kennedy (1963). However, should these assassinations be regarded as acts of lone wolf terrorism? As with any act of terrorism, the intent or purpose of the violence is of central import in this consideration. *Violence motivated exclusively by financial gain or personal vengeance does not constitute an act of terrorism because terrorist violence communicates a political message* [emphasis added].[23]

This is by no means the definitive word on the matter. Other scholars count apolitical spree killers or bombers as among the ranks of lone wolves, based on the practical reality that regardless of motive, the purpose and effect of their actions is to terrorize the civilian public. According to this reasoning, the method and effect of a violent act should be the determining factor on whether the terrorist label is attached, not the motive. Jeffery D. Simon adopts this view when classifying John Gilbert Graham as a lone wolf. Graham had financial motives when he committed America's first midair plane bombing, killing forty-four people in an effort to collect on his mother's life insurance policy.[24] Simon is confident in describing this criminal act as terrorism because its effect was largely the same as it would have been with a political motive. Bates also places himself within this camp, using the so-called Mad Bomber of New York as an example:

> Though lone wolf terrorists are self-radicalized, their motivation may not always be political or religious. In some instances, they may be motivated by personal agendas in response to some real or perceived organizational or institutional event. From 1940 to 1957, George Metesky terrorized New York City with 33 pipe bombs, of which 22 detonated, in response to having been injured while working for Consolidated Edison.[25]

Malkki also discusses this issue in her investigation into events described as school shootings which may overlap with events described as terrorist attacks. By definition, school shooters carry out public, theatrical, terrifying acts of mass violence against civilian targeted, often accompanied by public statements, which might well be called terrorism if conducted by a politicized militant organization. Most school shooters are driven by personal grievances, and Malkki also notes mental health as a factor which must be engaged with when evaluating the purpose and

23 Spaaij, R.F.J. 2012. Understanding lone wolf terrorism: global patterns, motivations and prevention. Dordrecht; New York: Springer, pg. 19.

24 Simon, Jeffrey D. 2013. Lone Wolf Terrorism: Understanding the Growing Threat. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, pg. 263.

25 Bates, Rodger A. 2012. Dancing with Wolves: Today's Lone Wolf Terrorists. The Journal of Public and Professional Sociology 4.1: 1-14, pg. 3.

nature of lone attackers. The psychological aspect of lone wolves is a complex and recurring issue worthy of a paper in itself:

> One of the key issues in this debate is how to draw the line between politically motivated lone wolf terrorism and mass murderers acting primarily motivated by personal grievances or mental health problems and how lone wolf terrorism differs from other forms of lone operator violence.[26]

Indeed, both of the case studies included in this paper feature perpetrators with some aspect of mental illness, ranging from Narcissistic Personality Disorder to Paranoid Schizophrenia, and each case has questions about whether their actions were political in nature or driven by an unsound mind. It is interesting to note that this ambiguity is largely unique to lone wolves. While members of terrorist groups are often denounced as maniacs due to their actions and ideology being perceived as deranged by society, mental illness rarely features in terrorist organizations.[27] A professional terrorist usually does not recruit someone who is unstable, for fear they may be a liability to the cause. Since this "screening out" does not exist for lone wolves, psychological factors play a much greater role in their cases:

> My own research supports the conclusion that, in comparison with group-actor terrorism, lone wolves tend to have a greater propensity to suffer mental health issues [18, 26]. Although precision here is difficult, lone wolf terrorists seem relatively likely to suffer from some form of psychological disturbance… lone wolf terrorists often display a degree of social ineffectiveness and social alienation [18] which may also be viewed as symptoms of psychological abnormality.[28]

Another recurring element in the literature on lone wolves is the term "leaderless resistance." The phrase describes a strategy promulgated by American right-wing extremists in the early 1980s after militant organizations repeatedly fell prey to infiltration and arrest by the authorities.[29] Leaderless resistance states that self-directed operators can be more difficult for the government to detect and thwart than an organization. The phrase has become practically synonymous with lone wolves and is actually invoked by one of the manifestos in this paper's case

26 Malkki, Leena. 2014. Political elements in post-Columbine school shootings in Europe and North America. Terrorism and political violence 26.1: 185-210, pg. 186.

27 Crenshaw, Martha. 1981. The Causes of Terrorism. Comparative politics 13.4: 379-399, pg. 390.

28 Spaaij, R.F.J. 2012. Understanding lone wolf terrorism: global patterns, motivations and prevention. Dordrecht; New York: Springer, pg. 50.

29 Michael, George. 2014. Counterinsurgency and Lone Wolf Terrorism. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 45-57, pg. 46.

studies. This means that the history of the leaderless resistance strategy must be at least acknowledged in any definition of lone wolf terrorism. George Michael has written one of the few books focusing exclusively on leaderless resistance and lone wolf terror. He contextualizes both phenomena as military in character. In this view, leaderless resistance is part of the fifth-generation of warfare which will define the twenty-first century, emerging to replace the guerrilla-revolutionary model pioneered by Mao.[30] This paper does not adopt this perspective however, viewing lone wolf terror as a particular form of political crime and not as a new concept in warfare.

Jeffrey D. Simon has written another of the limited selection of books devoted to the topic of lone wolf terrorism. His analysis contextualizes lone wolves with reference to a theory developed by David C. Rapoport, which perceives a succession of "terrorist waves" throughout history since the 1880s.[31] In this view, lone wolves are part of the new Technological Wave of terrorism, which is set to succeed the Religious Wave of terrorism set in motion by the Iranian Revolution and characterized by the activities of organizations like Al-Qaeda. Simon's most illuminating contribution is his focus on the role of technology, especially the Internet, in facilitating radicalization and practical instruction for the potential lone wolf. One of the major themes of the book is the role technology plays for lone wolves, with Simon noting that the Internet allows someone to "…be 'connected' to people, things, and ideas while at the same time being isolated, anonymous and very alone."[32] The fringe elements of society can remain on the margins, distanced both physically and emotionally from the people they resent. While distanced in this way, they are living in an online echo chamber of views which support their own, views which legitimize violence and may explicitly encourage them to carry out violence. The role of this echo chamber in propagating dangerous speech is one of the main subjects under investigation by this paper.

The question of how lone killers may be influenced by the political milieus they frequent is not a new one. More support for this linkage can be seen in other work on the role played by extremist communities in lone wolf indoctrination. Discussing the Norway attacks, Pantucci notes that "Often with Lone Wolves or Lone Actors, it is the Internet that acts as a catalyst or

30 Michael, George. 2012. Lone Wolf Terror and the Rise of Leaderless Resistance. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, pg. 156.

31 Simon, Jeffrey D. 2013. Lone Wolf Terrorism: Understanding the Growing Threat. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, pg. 25.

32 Simon, Jeffrey D. 2013. Lone Wolf Terrorism: Understanding the Growing Threat. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, pg. 34.

plays a supportive role in pushing the individual from radical thought into action… The Internet appears to have been a key tool for Breivik, both in ideological terms and operational terms."[33] In this context, to say that the Internet *acts* in a certain way is to say that it *functions* in that manner; that the Internet as utilized by extremists is a facilitating and enabling factor in the process of ideological radicalization toward violence, as well as enabling the practical processes of researching and planning attacks. While Pantucci focuses on a single instance of terrorism, more broad-based analyses of the lone wolf phenomenon have also noted the role of indoctrination through online or offline extremist discourse. A statistical analysis of 119 lone actor terrorists found that:

> Lone-actor terrorists regularly engaged in a detectable and observable range of activities with a wider pressure group, social movement, or terrorist organization… many lone-actor terrorists regularly interact with wider pressure groups and movements either face-to-face or virtually.[34]

Even lone wolves do not operate and become indoctrinated in a vacuum. However, it should be noted that the dataset behind these conclusions includes terrorists who operated in pairs or had command and control links to a larger organization. This would disqualify them from the lone wolf classification according to the definitions employed in this paper.[35]

This paper does not aim to establish a final definition of what constitutes lone wolf terrorism. That said, it is prudent to take a stance on what it is and what it is not before discussing the selected case studies. Spaaij, author of one of the few scholarly books on this topic, identifies three key features of the lone wolves: "…they (a) operate individually, (b) do not belong to an organized terrorist group or network, and (c) their modi operandi are conceived and directed by the individual without any direct outside command or hierarchy."[36] These three features seem definitive for the concept. It is true that they do not cover the question of what motivations distinguish the terrorist from the apolitical killer, or whether a particular scale of violence separates

33 Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. What Have We Learned about Lone Wolves from Anders Behring Breivik? Perspectives on Terrorism 5.5-6: 27-42, pg. 35-36.

34 Gill, Paul, John Horgan, and Paige Deckert. 2013. Bombing Alone: Tracing the Motivations and Antecedent Behaviors of Lone-Actor Terrorists. Journal of forensic sciences 59.2: 425-435, pg. 434.

35 Gill, Paul, John Horgan, and Paige Deckert. 2013. Bombing Alone: Tracing the Motivations and Antecedent Behaviors of Lone-Actor Terrorists. Journal of forensic sciences 59.2: 425-435, pg. 426.

36 Spaaij, R.F.J. 2012. Understanding lone wolf terrorism: global patterns, motivations and prevention. Dordrecht; New York: Springer, pg. 17.

a criminal from a terrorist. However, they provide a firmer definition of the lone aspect of lone wolf terrorism, which as has been described, creates so much ambiguity. Because of this, all examples and instances of lone wolf terrorism discussed in the remaining parts of this work will be included based on their conformity to these three key features. They will also conform to the academic consensus definition of terrorism developed by Schmid, discussed previously in this review.

1.3.2. Meaning of Dangerous Speech

Dangerous speech is a relatively recent contribution to the discourse on the relationship between speech and violence, mainly advanced by Dr. Susan Benesch. The concept was originally developed with explicit reference to instances of *mass* violence, such as the role of hate radio in inciting the Rwandan genocide, or the part played by media which inflamed communal violence following elections in Kenya. In this view, certain kinds of speech are especially likely to incite violence by convincing an audience that it is necessary and justified. There is already practical precedent for applying the Dangerous Speech guidelines toward links between extremist discourse and violence. The concept has previously been "blooded" in projects aimed at ameliorating societal tensions in Kenya.[37] Benesch's research was used as part of a project called Umati which sought to counter possible election-related violence.[38] During Kenya's 2013 elections, Umati analysts scoured Kenyan social media for instances of inflammatory speech and classified their findings, sorting between the simply angry and the potentially dangerous. These distinctions were established on the basis of Benesch's guidelines, which were employed as an analytical framework in a manner similar to their use in this paper.[39] The purpose was not to police the country's political discussions, but to monitor them for contextual information that was lacking following previous election violence in 2007.[40]

37 Voices That Poison, "Kenya," accessed June 09 2014 at http://voicesthatpoison.org/work-in-kenya/

38 Benesch, Susan. 2014. Countering Dangerous Speech to Prevent Mass Violence During Kenya's 2013 Elections. Dangerous Speech Project, pg. 11.

39 Awori, Kagonya, with Susan Benesch and Angela Crandall. 2013. Umati: Kenyan Online Discourse to Catalyze and Counter Violence. In proceeding of: International Conference on Social Implications of Computers in Developing Countries: 468-475. Retrieved August 04, 2013 from http://www.scribd.com/doc/146349033/Umati-Kenyan-Online-Discourse-to-Catalyze-and-Counter-Violence, pg. 471.

40 Benesch, Susan. 2014. Countering Dangerous Speech to Prevent Mass Violence During Kenya's 2013 Elections. Dangerous Speech Project, pg. 13.

In the dangerous speech concept, there are particular markers or flags that can be identified within a piece of speech and the context in which it is transmitted and received. These flags are what qualify it as speech particularly likely to incite violence. Many of these markers are contextual in nature and do not pertain to the actual content of the speech itself. This is because the effect of a particular piece of speech depends greatly on its context. As Benesch notes in one paper, a man speaking today in Times Square calling for the extermination of the Tutsis would only receive puzzled looks from passersby, while the exact same speech given in 1994 Rwanda could plausibly be expected to incite violence that would cost innocent people their lives.[41] Because of this, the criteria for dangerous speech does not pertain exclusively to the text of the speech. Benesch defines the following characteristics associated with dangerous speech:[42]

1. **The presence of a speaker with a high degree of influence over the audience**
   This influence can take the form of official authority or simple charisma and popularity.
2. **The audience has grievances and fears that the speaker can cultivate**
   A fearful audience suffering from recent economic insecurity is a particular warning sign, especially if the audience has the means to carry out acts of violence against a targeted group.
3. **A speech act that is clearly understood as a call to violence**
   This includes speech which is not *explicit* in advocating violence, but uses poetic language that the audience will understand implicitly. For example, "chop the tall trees" was a common euphemism for butchering Tutsis in Rwanda. Major flags for this guideline include dehumanizing the enemy (as vermin or parasites for example) as well as the "accusation in a mirror" which casts incited violence as self-defence by claiming the audience faces an imminent existential threat from the targeted group.
4. T**here is a social or historical context that is propitious for violence**
   Structural inequalities and discrimination, weak rule of law, pre-existing grievances, and recent outbursts of violence all make it easier for incitement to succeed.
5. **There is a means of dissemination that is influential in itself, for example because it is the sole or primary source of news for the relevant audience**
   Messages that are repeated again and again to the exclusion of other viewpoints are more likely to be accepted as dogma. This is particularly true when the audience is reliant only one source of media, and consumes only one version of political facts.

41 Benesch, Susan. 2007. Vile Crime or Inalienable Right: Defining Incitement to Genocide. Va. J. Int'l L. 48: 485-528, pg. 494.

42 Benesch, Susan. 2013. Dangerous Speech: A Proposal to Prevent Group Violence. Dangerous Speech Project, pg. 2.

There is significant overlap between these features of dangerous speech and the rhetoric employed in extremist communities or by terrorists themselves. Hate groups routinely describe their targets as subhuman and degenerate. Those on the political fringe often shut themselves off from other sources of information, seeing the mainstream media as corrupt and biased, committing themselves to a steady diet of the same extreme messages over and over to the point where radical views become core dogmas. Surrounded by like-minded people, a member of a community can identify themselves as part of a larger voice, no longer perceiving themselves as being part of a fringe minority.[43] Almost by definition, those on the political margins will have grievances to cultivate against larger society, and often fairly or unfairly perceive themselves as targets of vast structural conspiracies which discriminate against them.

It is also worth noting the parallels between this framework and the previously-discussed call by Maynard for deeper thought on the relationship between ideology and atrocity. Maynard cites Benesch in his work, and his "justificatory mechanisms" for atrocity are much like her guidelines for dangerous speech. For example, both authors discuss dehumanisation of the target as a key component of what they are studying, and what Maynard calls Threat-Construction and Guilt-Attribution are similar to Benesch's "accusation in the mirror": the idea that the target of violence is a justified one because of their past, present, and imminent future crimes against the audience.[44]

Despite the overlap, there are also definite distinctions between mass violence and lone wolves which affect how dangerous speech applies to them. First and most obviously, speech inciting mass violence is directed against a large and mostly passive audience of people living in the mainstream context of their society. Large groups of common citizens become convinced of the necessity of violence after being bombarded by messages of hate and fear. As the guidelines for dangerous speech note, these messages become more convincing when they are conveyed through a pervasive and influential medium and perpetuated by a figure recognized as authoritative by the audience. A classic example here is the ordinary Hutu citizens of Rwanda, who

43 Simon, Jeffrey D. 2013. Lone Wolf Terrorism: Understanding the Growing Threat. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, pg. 204.

44 Leader Maynard, Jonathan. 2014. Rethinking the Role of Ideology in Mass Atrocities. Terrorism and Political Violence ahead-of-print: 1-21, pg. 9.

received much of their political news from the radio and who were ultimately susceptible to a message of hatred spread by charismatic demagogues warning them of a Tutsi threat.[45]

The dynamic is different when the audience is an individual or loose association of individuals on the political fringe. The case studies within this paper showed signs of a predisposition toward violence or a mental illness affecting their perceptions, even *before* they began consuming extremist media to form their ideology. Moreover, this consumption was *active* rather than passive. A document such as *The Turner Diaries,* an underground racist novel which influenced the second case study in this paper, cannot be easily stumbled across while listening to everyday radio broadcasts or casually browsing the Web. It must be deliberately sought out with the knowledge of the extremist worldview it contains and an intent to learn from that worldview. Also, in the case of speech consumed by lone wolves, the person propagating the speech is not directing it specifically at that individual. While a speaker aiming to incite mass violence knowingly directs their speech toward a specific community, speakers communicating with fringe actors may never know who ends up influenced by their words. In the example of *The Turner Diaries*, it is highly unlikely that William Pierce had David Copeland's 1999 actions in mind when he wrote the novel in the 1970s. Benesch's own writing on the topic addresses this when discussing the legal questions surrounding incitement to genocide, noting "…surely some length of time would be so long that the speaker could not reasonably be held responsible for the eventual result."[46]

The fourth guideline for dangerous speech, regarding "social or historical context that is propitious for violence," also has particular distinctions between mass violence and lone wolf terrorism. The case studies within this paper took place within relatively prosperous, peaceful, stable liberal democracies, with none of the political instability or ethnic polarization which characterized the contexts of the Rwandan genocide or election violence in Kenya. Most people in these contexts obviously do not respond violently to issues such as immigration. This discrepancy must be addressed while applying the fourth guideline to any of these cases.

It is important to acknowledge that most people in a population do not carry out acts of

45 Benesch, Susan. 2007. Vile Crime or Inalienable Right: Defining Incitement to Genocide. Va. J. Int'l L. 48: 485-528, pg. 523.

46 Benesch, Susan. 2007. Vile Crime or Inalienable Right: Defining Incitement to Genocide. Va. J. Int'l L. 48: 485-528, pg. 497.

violence, even in a mass violence environment saturated with dangerous speech. Propaganda may convince the masses of a threat and of the need for violence, but much of the actual slaughter is carried out by a minority within the population. In the Yugoslav Wars, for instance, "…the effective murderous core of the wars were not hordes composed of ordinary citizens ripped loose from their repression or incited into violence against their neighbors. Rather the politicians found it necessary to recruit thugs and hooligans for the job."47 This observation does not undermine the importance of incitement and dangerous speech in making these atrocities possible, but it establishes an important distinction: mass violence is rarely if ever carried out by most members of a population. Rather, mass violence is likely to be orchestrated by elites and sanctioned by the masses, but actually implemented by a relatively small number of killers. The activities of lone wolves can be seen as representing the extreme extension of this trend. Even the most pervasive speech does not incite an entire population to purge a target, and so the fringe and subcultural speech in the case studies only incites a few individuals toward violence regardless of their environment.

Differences in perception must also be kept in mind. When discussing dangerous speech as relating to mass violence, Benesch's guidelines speak of a context perceived by an entire population, usually shaped by extremists who are manipulating the discourse of mass media. A population incited by dangerous speech has bought into a shared narrative, whereas a lone wolf has come to violently diverge from the accepted societal narrative. Lone wolves often see their environment in a vastly different way from the people around them. What seems tolerable to most people may be a source of apocalyptic fear and rage to a political extremist. A good example of this is anti-abortion violence in the United States. In the worldview of someone like Eric Rudolph, who carried out multiple bombings in service to his far-right views,48 violence is justified by a political context filled with pre-existing grievances, where a weak rule of law (mentioned by Benesch in the fourth guideline) fails to protect the moral and legal rights of the unborn. The fact that the laws of the US and much of the public have made peace with the abortion issue only ren-

47 Mueller, John. 2000. The banality of "ethnic war." International Security 25.1: 42-70, pg. 47.

48 Spaaij, R.F.J. 2012. Understanding lone wolf terrorism: global patterns, motivations and prevention. Dordrecht; New York: Springer, pg. 110.

ders that environment more intolerable for the perpetrator. While dangerous speech as formulated by Benesch instils a vicious conformity within the masses, in the context of lone wolves it may have the opposite effect, helping to split fringe elements of society further from the discourse and institutions of the mainstream.

It should be noted that this paper is not the first effort at applying the analysis of certain types of speech toward efforts to combat lone wolf terrorism. Cohen et al. have previously discussed the possibility of using semi-automated text analysis methods to sift through the Internet in search of linguistic markers: particular phrases which might indicate the precipitation of radical violence. It might be possible to detect these verbal telltales through computer algorithms.[49] In fact, what Cohen et al. describe is similar to the Umati project. Benesch actually describes the possibility of automating Umati's monitoring processes as an opportunity to make the Herculean task of observing Internet discourse more feasible and less expensive, similar to the proposal in the linguistic markers paper.[50] The major difference is that Umati is a non-governmental project aiming at collecting data for research, while the use of computer algorithms to search for linguistic markers has a direct application to law enforcement and counterterrorism. This concept can only be regarded as potentially problematic. In light of what is now known about the excesses cybersecurity services engage in for the sake of combating terrorist *networks*, it seems reasonable to worry about the prospect of similar measures being directed at social communications in the search for terrorist *individuals.* Indeed, the authors make a cautionary note of the privacy implications of such activities in their own piece.[51]

With all these factors in mind, a caveat must be attached to the analysis of dangerous speech: that its role in enabling lone wolf terrorism, if it exists, is almost certainly a lesser one than its role in inciting acts of mass violence such as ethnic conflict. There is a significant difference between fringe actors who may already be leaning toward violence actively seeking out extremist

49 Cohen, Katie, et al. 2014. Detecting Linguistic Markers for Radical Violence in Social Media. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 246-256, pg. 253.

50 Benesch, Susan. 2014. Countering Dangerous Speech to Prevent Mass Violence during Kenya's 2013 Elections. Dangerous Speech Project, pg. 14.

51 Cohen, Katie, et al. 2014. Detecting Linguistic Markers for Radical Violence in Social Media. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 246-256, pg. 254.

literature, versus a passive consumer of extremist media which saturates the mainstream. This caveat extends to the utility of the conclusions arrived at by this investigation. In explaining the usefulness of the dangerous speech concept, Benesch states that:

> First, such speech can serve as a key indicator for early warning, since it is often a precursor - if not also a prerequisite - for mass violence. Second, it may be possible to limit violence by finding ways to limit such speech or its dangerousness. Third, speakers may be held accountable for speech that constitutes crime.[52]

The aim of this paper is to investigate the applicability of dangerous speech to lone wolves primarily for the *first* purpose described above: understanding and prediction. This analysis does not support any proposal to limit speech or hold persons or entities legally accountable for any act of speech. Due to such concerns and the exploratory nature of this research, this paper does not advocate for dangerous speech to be used in any particular security policy even if a link is indeed found to speech associated with lone wolf terrorism.

Section II - Investigation

2.1. Approach of Analysis

In this section two case studies of lone wolf terrorism will be examined in order to test whether dangerous speech can be applied to understanding this form of violence. The case studies used in this project are Anders Breivik, the previously mentioned 2011 Norway attacker, and David Copeland, the so-called 1999 London Nail Bomber. Each of these individuals carried out acts of violence fitting the criteria for lone wolf terrorism, as described in the first section of the literature review. Additionally, each of these cases feature identifiable media consumed or propagated by the perpetrator which relates to their causes, suitable for testing the guidelines of dangerous speech as described in the second section of the literature review.

It must be noted that each of these individuals displayed signs of mental illness. As discussed within the literature review, this raises doubt as to how much their violence was a deliberate political activity and how much it was driven by mental illness. In the cases of Breivik and

52 Benesch, Susan. 2013. Dangerous Speech: A Proposal to Prevent Group Violence. Dangerous Speech Project, pg. 1.

Copeland, this paper defers to the judgement of the courts which found these individuals criminally responsible for their actions, and proceeds from the belief that both men acted deliberately from political belief and were not primarily driven by their psychological conditions. It does so based on the explicit political agendas articulated by each man, and the clear linkages visible between the ideology informing those agendas and the targets selected by these perpetrators. A piece by Becker is useful in reinforcing this distinction, as his study of lone wolf targeting within the United States finds "disconfirming evidence of the idea that lone wolf target selection is a process resulting from mental or psychological problems. The subjects investigated here may well suffer from such problems, but they were, by and large, able to select targets in an instrumentally logical manner if one takes their expressed ideology as a given."[53] While the present paper deals more with the decision to employ violence than the specific targeting process, these findings still lend support to this paper's decision to treat these cases as instances of violence in service to political goals, more than instances of violence driven by psychopathology. The case studies covered by this paper display the same "instrumentally logical manner" described by Becker. Both Breivik and Copeland planned their attacks ahead of time, and chose targets consistent with their stated political goals and (admittedly farfetched) agenda for society. For example, if Copeland's actions had primarily resulted from a psychological disorder, one might have expected less precision in the conception and implementation of a bombing campaign which lasted thirteen days and which exclusively targeted minorities in a manner consistent with the perpetrator's neo-Nazi ideology and goal of provoking racial conflict.

The same format will be used for each case study. First, the terrorist incident in question will be recounted. Second, a brief biography of the perpetrator will be provided. The next subsection will describe the ideology which informed the perpetrator's actions. In this context, ideology will be referred to using the definition of Jonathan Leader Maynard:

> "…an ideology is a distinctive system of normative, semantic and/or reputedly factual ideas typically shared by members of groups or societies, which underpins their understanding of their

53 Becker, Michael. 2014. Explaining Lone Wolf Target Selection in the United States. Studies in Conflict & Terrorism 37: 959–978, pg. 966.

political world and shapes their political behaviour."[54]

Maynard describes how ideology helps shape political violence against civilians. Ideology can generate motives for why violence should be committed while also creating legitimating perceptions and rationalisations for making violence seem permissible, both before and after the act.[55]

The most important part of each case study will revolve around analyzing the "speech" associated with each incident, both speech *consumed* by the perpetrator which could have informed their ideology and their actions, and speech *propagated* by the perpetrator in the form of statements and manifestos in the hopes of influencing others toward their goals and cause. Finally, the guidelines for dangerous speech will be used to test whether or not the speech surrounding these acts of terrorism was dangerous. According to Benesch, the "…ideal type of dangerous speech, would be one for which all five variables are maximized."[56] With this in mind, a case will have to display at least four out of the five guidelines for identifying dangerous speech in order to pass this test. This cut-off is established on the grounds that this paper is not searching for Benesch's ideal type of dangerous speech, but trying to find solid evidence of the *presence* of dangerous speech within these cases.

The speech available for analysis varies between the two case studies. For instance, the case of David Copeland displays ample evidence of speech consumed, but far less for speech *propagated*. On that note, a word of explanation is necessary for the inclusion of speech propagated in these case studies. The question of whether dangerous speech can be linked to lone wolf terror could be answered by simply analyzing the speech *consumed* in these cases. However, this paper takes the position that terrorism itself can be a form of speech that seeks to influence others toward beliefs or policies held by the perpetrator.

The notion that "terrorism is theatre" holds true even when terrorism constitutes a solo performance, as in the case of lone wolves. Terrorists seek to communicate their views through the

54 Leader Maynard, Jonathan. 2014. Rethinking the Role of Ideology in Mass Atrocities. Terrorism and Political Violence ahead-of-print: 1-21, pg. 4.

55 Ibid. pg. 8.

56 Benesch, Susan. 2013. Dangerous Speech: A Proposal to Prevent Group Violence. Dangerous Speech Project, pg. 2.

media toward an audience within both the targeted society and ideological sympathizers, with violence often serving as an attention-generating mechanism. The speech which accompanies this "theatre", in the form of statements and manifestos, helps to convey the terrorist's message. This message often serves a dual purpose: demanding that society capitulate to the terrorist's political demands, and striving to inspire perceived or actual sympathizers to join the terrorist's cause and carry out further acts of violence to advance those objectives. "Terrorism, by using violence against one victim, seeks to coerce and persuade others. The immediate victim is merely instrumental, the skin on a drum beaten to achieve a calculated impact on a wider audience."[57] In other words, if terrorism is seen as an act of communication, accompanied by explicit pieces of speech like the statements analyzed in these case studies, then it can be perceived as an attempt at dangerous speech- speech inciting towards further violence. It is with this in mind that this paper also analyzes speech *propagated* within the case studies, for the sake of thoroughly examining the possible links between speech and violence.

2.2. Case Study I - Anders Breivik

2.2.1 The Incident

The 2011 attack in Norway can be considered one of the classic examples of lone wolf terrorism. It was certainly one of the most effective. With seventy-seven people dead, most of them youths at a summer camp, Anders Breivik caused the deadliest violence Norway had experienced since the country was occupied by Nazi Germany in the Second World War.[58] This crime inflicted more death and destruction than any other lone wolf incident to date, unless the Oklahoma bombing is counted as a lone wolf attack. The fact that it struck Norway, widely regarded as a small, peaceful, progressive country with little history of terrorism, only added to the shock of the violence.

The perpetrator's plan was years in the making. If his own statements can be believed, he

57 Schmid, Alex P. 2004. Frameworks for conceptualising terrorism. Terrorism and Political Violence. 16.2: 197-221, pg. 202.

58 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 129.

first resolved on his course of action in 2002.[59] On July 22, 2011, Breivik left a car bomb in a rental truck outside a government building in Oslo, Norway's capital. The detonation killed eight people and wounded eleven. He then travelled to a summer camp for the Youth League of Norway's Labour Party, located on Utoya Island. Dressed in a police uniform, the perpetrator gathered people at the camp around him, claiming he had news of the bombing in the capital. Then he opened fire with a rifle.[60]

Due to a slow and uncoordinated response by Norwegian police,[61] the perpetrator was able to rampage across the island completely unopposed for over an hour, gunning down everyone he saw. Once the police did arrive, the perpetrator immediately surrendered without any resistance.[62] The final toll of the attacks was seventy-seven dead and hundreds injured. Norwegians were left shocked and grieving by violence which had completely blindsided them, coming from a source no one had expected. Pantucci describes Breivik as "…the archetypal lone wolf attacker of any ideological stripe, and the image he paints (in his manifesto) is undoubtedly the one that most concerns security planners when they are assessing the threat matrix."[63]

2.2.2 The Perpetrator

Since the attacks, much attention has been devoted to the life of Anders Breivik in an attempt to understand who would commit such a crime and why. It's clear that his path to violence was not paved by a background of trauma or deprivation. He grew up in an upscale part of the nation's capital. He attended an elite primary school and a prestigious undergraduate school of economics.[64] Despite the divorce of his parents shortly after his birth, his own writings describe a

59 Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. What Have We Learned about Lone Wolves from Anders Behring Breivik? Perspectives on Terrorism 5.5-6: 27-42, pg. 33.

60 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 129.

61 Norway. July 22 Commission. "Gjørv Report (English Extract)." August 12, 2012. Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no/smk/html/22julikommisjonen/22JULIKOMMISJONEN_NO/EN/REPORT.HTM

62 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 130.

63 Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. What Have We Learned about Lone Wolves from Anders Behring Breivik? Perspectives on Terrorism 5.5-6: 27-42, pg. 32.

64 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 148.

generally good childhood and positive family relationships.[65] His income was comfortably middle class. The perpetrator appears to have invented his own grievances to an extent. He was not subject to recognizable oppression or injustice, but perceived sinister trends destroying Europe around him: multiculturalism, cultural Marxism and especially the immigration of Muslims into Europe. This manifested in reactionary, self-centered rage that drove him toward violence:

> As a white, Christian, heterosexual, middleclass male, Breivik claims that his birthright privileges are threatened by the multiculturalist regime that favors all sorts of minorities, an allegation exemplified in his court testimony by recalling petty squabbles with immigrant youths and a story about a family of asylum seekers that acquired an apartment in the building where he lived through public assistance. That made him angry.[66]

The perpetrator's own account of how his convictions developed focuses heavily on childhood encounters with Muslims. In his manifesto, he describes himself as an active graffiti artist in his teenage years, during which he came into contact with aggressive, criminal Muslim youths.[67] In this narrative, his fixation on Muslim immigration results from witnessing and hearing about crimes and daily harassment emanating from unopposed immigrant gangs:

> He describes how they start as friends, but as they grow older they drift away towards their own cultures and in some cases he describes how his ethnically Norwegian friends got attacked and robbed by gangs of Muslim boys. He describes hearing stories of Norwegian girls being referred to as "whores" by the Muslim community and how one Pakistani he knew was part of a group who gang-raped an ethnically Norwegian girl in the mid-1990s and got away with it…[68]

This pattern apparently continued throughout the perpetrator's life. In his compendium, he claims to have witnessed approximately fifty incidents of violent crime or street harassment against native Norwegians by gangs of Muslim youths, describing such behaviour as endemic in Islamised Europe. The perpetrator also claims to have been personally menaced by Muslim criminals eight times while in Oslo.[69] These accounts cannot be treated as trustworthy for obvious reasons, but they provide insight into the narrative that informed Breivik's actions: a "fallen

65 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 1387.

66 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 148.

67 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 1393.

68 Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. What Have We Learned about Lone Wolves from Anders Behring Breivik? Perspectives on Terrorism 5.5-6: 27-42, pg. 30.

69 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 1393.

Europe" being savaged by hordes of Muslim immigrants, its people betrayed by their weak and corrupt leaders.

If his statements are to be believed, Breivik was committed to what he calls the European Resistance Movement since 2002, almost ten years before his attack. He spent years living a double life while preparing for the attack and writing his compendium. He maintained his relationships with friends and family while fitting seamlessly into the mainstream Norwegian society he planned to assault. His preparations were carried out at a farm very close to one of the largest military bases in the country. In his journal, the perpetrator jokes about wishing he could ask his neighbours for a cup of sugar and some C4, to save him the trouble of making his own bomb.[70] Alibis such as an online gaming addiction and same-sex relationships were used a distraction tactic to deflect anyone questioning his activities.[71]

Breivik's mental state was an important matter at his trial. His acts and ideology were universally seen as deranged, and there were doubts as to whether they were political in nature or the result of a mental illness. The question of his sanity would determine whether he was a terrorist who belonged in jail, or a deeply sick man who needed to be institutionalized and treated. Breivik regarded the prospect of insanity as the "ultimate humiliation," as it would delegitimize him as a political actor, removing the publicity he sought for his cause.[72] Breivik was diagnosed with Narcissistic Personality Disorder, a fitting finding for someone who describes himself as:

> …perhaps the biggest champion of cultural conservatism, Europe has ever witnessed since 1950. I am one of many destroyers of cultural Marxism and as such; a hero of Europe, a savior of our people and of European Christendom – by default. A perfect example which should be copied, applauded and celebrated. The Perfect Knight I have always strived to be.[73]

From his writings, it seems likely that this individual was driven by self-interest first and politics second. A theme of enormous self-absorption runs through the work, while much of

70 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 1455.

71 Ibid. pg. 1382.

72 Spaaij, Ramon and Persaud, Raj, Dr. 2012. Inside the Mind of Anders Breivik - The Norwegian on Trial for Mass Murder. Huffington Post, April 13. Retrieved June 6 2014 from: http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/ram/anders-breivik-psychology-inside-the-mind-of-anders_b_1419343.html

73 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 1435.

the political material is simply plagiarized. However, the court still found the perpetrator sane enough to be held criminally responsible for his attack, due to the extensive planning and preparation which characterized his assault as a deliberate, conscious act. Anders Breivik is currently in prison.

2.2.3 The Ideology

The perpetrator intended the attacks as a marketing operation for his manifesto, entitled "2083: A European Declaration of Independence". The document was years in the making and runs to more than fifteen hundred pages in length. It is styled as an appeal to patriotic Europeans and a declaration of war upon their enemies:

> We, the free indigenous peoples of Europe, hereby declare a pre-emptive war on all cultural Marxism/multiculturalist elites of Western Europe… We know who you are, where you live and we are coming for you. We are in the process of flagging every single multiculturalist traitor in Western Europe. You will be punished for your treasonous acts.[74]

The perpetrator considers his actions to be self-defence against an apocalyptic threat to the existence of European culture and civilization. In his compendium, Breivik describes the clash between Western Europe and Islam as "…perhaps the longest, continuous war in human history. And it's about to be decided within the coming decades. I'm not sure how all of this will play out. What I do know is that it could all be decided on my watch, and I don't want to be the weak link in something my ancestors kept intact for 1300 years."[75]

The perpetrator's ideology as described in Breivik's manifesto is against multiculturalism, immigration, and gender equality. As Gardell puts it, the ultimate goal of this attack was to build support for "…a monocultural, patriarchal Christian Europe without Muslims, Marxists, multiculturalists, or feminists."[76] In analyzing the manifesto, Gardell identifies the key components of the perpetrator's ideology as Islamophobia, reactionary nationalism, antifeminism, tinges of white supremacy, and a form of Crusader Christianity. Breivik's aspiration to ban abortion in

74 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 811.

75 Ibid. pg. 350.

76 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 131.

a "liberated" Europe completes the picture of an overall right-wing extremist.[77] According to Gardell, this lone wolf can be readily classified as a neo-fascist in his political ideology. He desires a nationalist revolution that will transform society according to a rediscovery of core heroic values.[78] Despite the ready applicability of this label, the perpetrator's compendium firmly rejects the legacy of Nazism and all ideologies of white supremacy. Indeed, the symbol of his Knights Templar displays the cross of the Martyrs impaling a skull emblazoned with the symbols of the three "hate ideologies" he despises: an Islamic crescent, a Marxist hammer and sickle, and a Nazi swastika.[79] Throughout his manifesto, Breivik claims that he is no racist and that he opposes fascism, even as he lays out plans for ethnic cleansing and terrorism.[80]

2.2.4 Speech Consumed

The perpetrator's compendium demonstrates that he was enormously and directly influenced by a larger milieu of right-wing discourse. Loosely termed the counter-jihad movement, this worldview is militantly opposed to immigration and multiculturalism in general and to Muslims in particular. Many of the leading members of the movement were directly referenced by the perpetrator in Breivik's manifesto:

> Counter-Jihadis have been particularly active on the Internet, where Breivik came across their message at interconnected anti-Muslim online journals, news-hubs, and blogs, primarily Gates of Vienna, Brussels Journal, Jihad Watch, and Front Page Magazine. Breivik was especially impressed by Robert Spencer, Pamela Geller, Andrew Bostom, Bruce Bawer, Serge Trifkovic, and Baron Bodissey from the U.S., and Geert Wilders, Bat Ye'or, and 'Fjordman' (Peder Nøstvold Jensen) from Europe.[81]

The document's subtitle: A European Declaration of Independence is taken from an essay by a blogger within this movement. The essay lays out one of the main conspiracy theories driving the perpetrator's ideology: the fear that escalating immigration coupled with leftists undermin-

77 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 1183.

78 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 132.

79 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 1100.

80 Ibid. pg. 671

81 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 134.

ing European culture would spawn a new entity known as Eurabia. The essay is the work of:

> …the Norwegian blogger Fjordman (Peder Nøstvold Jensen), who is a main source of inspiration to Breivik and the wider anti-Muslim milieu. In his Declaration of Independence, Fjordman claims that European politicians had betrayed their constituencies by establishing the EU and opening Europe to hostile Muslim immigration with the secret aim of merging Europe with the Arab world to become 'Eurabia,' the land of the un-free.[82]

Members of the counter-jihad movement have invariably distanced themselves from the perpetrator since the attacks on Norway, disavowing any responsibility for his ideology or actions. They claim Breivik is simply a lunatic, an apolitical spree killer. They consider blaming their views for the attacks on Norway as equivalent to blaming the Beatles for the killings of Charles Manson and his cult.[83] As for the most-cited blogger within the manifesto: "Peder 'Fjordman' Jensen was so shocked by it that he gave himself up to the police and gave an interview to a Norwegian paper in which he appeared genuinely bewildered that his predictions of a European civil war should have led anyone to such violence."[84]

Nonetheless, there is evidence of ideological continuity between this community and Breivik. For instance, obvious parallels can be seen between the romanticized Crusader imagery adopted by other anti-Muslim activists and the views expressed by the Justiciar Knight Commander, cell 8 of the new Knights Templar:

> Predating Breivik's compendium, the propaganda videos, web pages, and posters produced by the English Defence League made ample use of Knights Templar and Crusader imagery. 2083 is dotted with illustrations of knights in shining armour, swords in hand, riding, fighting, bursting forth, humbly kneeling, martyring.[85]

This continuity reinforces the conclusion that the ideology and goals of this particular lone wolf are a direct product of the speech he consumed. When the attack came, it was to make a statement in support of the counter-jihad narrative of a Europe betrayed by leftists and under

82 Ibid. pg. 132.

83 Lobe, Jim. 2011. Islamophobes distance themselves from Breivik. Al Jazeera, July 26. Retrieved June 18, 2014 from http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/07/201172611337853373.html.

84 Brown, Andrew. 2011. Anders Breivik's Spider Web of Hate. The Guardian, September 7. Retrieved June 18, 2014 from http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2011/sep/07/anders-breivik-hate-manifesto

85 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 147.

siege by Muslims in service to the perpetrator's own narcissistic desire for infamy and martyrdom.

2.2.5 Speech Propagated

Just as the Internet played a key role in forming the perpetrator's beliefs, so was it the main platform by which he publicized them through his violent marketing operation. He devoted enormous time and effort toward assembling a mailing list of like-minded individuals who would be the first to receive his work, and sent out masses of e-mails containing his manifesto just before the attacks began.

> The Internet not only plays a role in his information collection and fundraising, but also in information dissemination. He uses Facebook as a tool to locate ideological fellow travellers or potential supporters and spends considerable time 'email farming' by 'friending' individuals whom he believes hold views similar to his and then once they have accepted, collecting their email addresses off their profiles. He creates two profiles to do this from and apparently uses up his daily allowance of 50 friend requests regularly in trying to gather this data. Presumably, he also does this through identifying individuals from his regular visits to far right or anti-Muslim websites and forums.[86]

The document sent to these e-mail addresses is strikingly idiosyncratic. Breivik's manifesto is partly the perpetrator's autobiography, partly a compendium of different texts reflecting his worldview, and partly a blueprint for further violence to be carried out by the Knights Templar group that the perpetrator claims to represent. This lengthy document is divided into multiple books whose titles fit the overall theme. The first book is titled "What you need to know, our falsified history and other forms of cultural Marxist/multiculturalist propaganda," and focuses on the "real" history of Islam and its relations with European civilization. The second book is called "Europe Burning," laying out the current state of Western Europe under multiculturalism and Muslim immigration. The third book is "A Declaration of Pre-Emptive War," which lays out the perpetrator's plan for terrorism and revolution, while describing the revived Knights Templar organization he claims to be a part of.

86 Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. What Have We Learned about Lone Wolves from Anders Behring Breivik? Perspectives on Terrorism 5.5-6: 27-42, pg. 36.

The manifesto copies from several sources, reproducing many essays by bloggers like Fjordman. The copying also includes people not on the radical right: three pages are edited excerpts from the Unabomber's manifesto.[87] Breivik's manifesto goes into enormous detail in laying out the perpetrator's worldview, going through an extensive history of Islam and Europe that covers everything from the Battle of Poitiers to seventh-century Bosnia. This narrative makes the case that the history of Islam is defined by conquest, genocide and slavery.[88] Breivik's manifesto devotes particular effort to rehabilitating the image of the Crusades, re-casting the violence as a defensive expedition unmotivated by plunder or territorial aggrandizement; a noble tradition to be rediscovered by the modern-day Knights Templar.[89]

Once the document turns to practical matters, the perpetrator calls for "leaderless resistance" as a tactic for those who must save Europe through a decades-long struggle.[90] The perpetrator describes a fictitious terrorist organization that he claims allegiance to: a resurrected Knights Templar fighting for a monocultural Europe. His compendium includes details on the group's "…ranks, titles, military mission, oaths, initiation rites, ceremonies, heraldry, uniforms, insignia, ornamental cords, medallions, badges, weaponry, military training, burial ceremonies"[91] and more. Advice provided for future resistance fighters includes bomb-making tips,[92] blueprints for homemade armour construction,[93] acquiring weaponry,[94] strategies and tactics,[95] and even music recommendations for boosting morale and resolve before an attack.[96] His vision stretches decades into the future, hence the title of the book: "2083, the year by which Europe will be fully liberated." The perpetrator foresees an eventual continent-wide revolution and civil war

87 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 132.

88 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 2.

89 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 144.

90 Ibid. pg. 143.

91 Ibid. pg. 147.

92 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 1440.

93 Ibid. pg. 882.

94 Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. What Have We Learned about Lone Wolves from Anders Behring Breivik? Perspectives on Terrorism 5.5-6: 27-42, pg. 30.

95 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 837.

96 Ibid. pg. 855.

in the making, spearheaded by the organization he represents.[97]

After this war has been won, a reborn Europe will turn back the clock on degradation and reclaim its pride and heritage under a New Order. The false democracies of the EU will be replaced by stronger, more militaristic systems. Eventually the damage wrought by feminism will be undone and the women of Europe will accept their place as homemakers and mothers.[98] As for the Muslims already living in Europe, their only options will be death, deportation to their countries of origin, or conversion to Christianity.[99]

The perpetrator's autobiography follows, styled in the form of an interview with a questioner who asks Breivik about his life and his motives. The perpetrator shares everything about himself from his defense of terrorism to his favourite football team.[100] The final part of the compendium is a loose diary of his activities from 2002 to 2011 while planning the attack. The document concludes with a photo gallery of the perpetrator dressed or Photoshopped in various costumes of the Knights Templar as well as in plain clothes, posing with weapons, smiling at the camera.

"2083: A European Declaration of Independence" is a compendium of hatred and paranoia which demonstrates that the attacks on Norway were carried out by one man in the service of ideological beliefs shared by many. While it's undeniable that Breivik was psychologically unwell and greatly concerned with gaining notoriety for himself, the clear political agenda laid out in the manifesto still makes him classifiable as a lone wolf terrorist.

2.2.6 Applicability of Dangerous Speech

The perpetrator's description of tactics shows that his attack was as much an act of speech as any blog posting he was inspired by. "The art of asymmetrical warfare is less about inflicting immediate damage but all about the indirect long term psychological and ideological damage. Our shock attacks are theatre and theatre is always performed for an audience."[101] Anders Brei-

97 Ibid. pg. 795.

98 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 140.

99 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 818.

100 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 1407.

101 Ibid. pg. 835.

vik received a message online, then sent another message both in text and in blood to the people of Norway, in service to his ideology and his narcissism. Yet does the framework for identifying the presence of dangerous speech apply to this violence?

The first guideline for dangerous speech is the presence of a speaker with a high degree of influence over the audience. The obvious credence Breivik gave to counter-jihad bloggers demonstrates that these speakers held high influence over the perpetrator's beliefs. In particular, the writings of the blogger known as Fjordman formed core parts of the perpetrator's world-view. Large parts of Breivik's compendium consist of nothing but reprinted essays and postings attributed to Fjordman. These postings rail against all of the groups and individuals who are named by the perpetrator as targets or enemies in the perpetrator's Pre-Emptive Declaration of War to save Europe. Fjordman posits scenarios for the ethnic cleansing of Europe via the expulsion of Muslims, which the perpetrator later advances as part of his long-term plan to save European culture.[102] These quotations easily and readily fit most contemporary definitions of "hate speech," degrading and denigrating the existence of the targeted "other:"

> Muslims have lots of oil and lots of babies and lots of aggression, but that's all they have. Otherwise, they're a spectacular failure. We need them for very little. They need us for virtually everything. Their greatest flaw is their arrogance. Muslims are arrogant losers.[103]

These excerpts demonstrate that Breivik's extremism is a mirror image of what he read and learned online from writers such as Fjordman. In this respect, this lone wolf demonstrates Simon's assertion regarding the importance of online connections to modern lone wolves. He was a part of this extremist subculture, both as observer and participant, and it formed the beliefs that he eventually killed for. Maynard's analysis of ideology is useful here, as he describes how people seek out 'epistemic authorities' to receive political information from. Ordinary and rational people can become complicit in atrocious acts if the justification for those acts comes from a source seen as credible and which speaks in the absence of other points of view.[104] For a political

102 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 740.

103 Ibid. pg. 336.

104 Leader Maynard, Jonathan. 2014. Rethinking the Role of Ideology in Mass Atrocities. Terrorism and Political Violence ahead-of-print: 1-21, pg. 13.

extremist like Breivik, many other viewpoints may be available in their environment, but those sources are not considered credible and authoritative. Mainstream sources are just pawns of the enemy which manipulates the media, while more strident sources of information establish themselves as authoritative by breaking free from commonly accepted narratives. The influence of speakers like Fjordman over the audience in this case demonstrates the presence of the first guideline.

The second guideline is whether the audience has grievances and fears that the speaker can cultivate. Looking at Breivik's manifesto and its fear of the "ongoing genocide" of the Nordic folk[105] shows that this was the case for Breivik, and that his own speech was meant to reach a similar audience: like-minded extremists who would hopefully take up the mantle of the Knights Templar. Breivik's grievances against Cultural Marxist European society extend beyond Muslim immigration and multiculturalism. NATO action against Serbia in 1999 further solidified his narrative of continent-wide treachery, proving to Breivik that the betrayal was not just domestic, but international:

> Serbia plays an important role in Breivik's ideological formation. He stoutly declares that the NATO war on Serbia in 1999 was the 'tipping point' for him to go in the ideological direction he went – though this is somewhat contradicted by the fact that he remained active in mainstream Norwegian politics for a number of years yet; something that suggests that he had not gone completely down the path of violence yet and something of a post-facto determination on his behalf… He sees the wider victimisation of Serbia within Europe as a fundamental part of Europe's surrender to Islam.[106]

Feminism and changes in gender roles also distressed Breivik. The perpetrator displays strong nostalgia for an idealized traditional nuclear family early in his manifesto, describing a romanticized version of the 1950s as a contrast to the supposedly degenerate society of today.[107] This was possibly influenced by his parents divorcing soon after his birth, which denied him the old-fashioned nuclear family he came to perceive as an ideal. The perpetrator shows signs of

105 Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. Terrorism and Political Violence 26.1: 129-155, pg. 142.

106 Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. What Have We Learned about Lone Wolves from Anders Behring Breivik? Perspectives on Terrorism 5.5-6: 27-42, pg. 31.

107 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 19.

revulsion toward his birth mother, viewing her as contaminated and immoral, which possibly informed his hatred of feminism.[108] These hatreds interlock with one another, mutually reinforcing the view of a massive threat to Western civilization. For example, one of the Fjordman posts copied in the manifesto links feminism to the weakening of European institutions against the Muslim foe: "Instead of "having it all," Western women risk losing everything. What are liberal feminists going to do when faced with aggressive gang of Muslim youngsters? Burn their bras and throw the pocket edition of the Vagina Monologues at them?"[109] The grievances being exploited here are not discrete or unrelated, but connected.

The third guideline of dangerous speech is that the speech is understood as a call toward physical violence. This guideline undoubtedly applies to both the speech consumed and the speech propagated in this case. In predicting a European civil war and positing an existential threat to Western civilization in the form of multiculturalism and Islam, the counter-jihad discourse implicitly justifies violence in self-defence. This is the "accusation in a mirror" that Benesch discusses in her framework - the invocation of imminent destruction to justify defensive violence.[110] In terms of speech propagated, the perpetrator compares current European regimes to the Soviet Union and speaks of "an Iron Veil of EU bureaucracy and Eurabian treachery, of Political Correctness, Multicultural media censorship and the ever-present threat of Muslim violence and terrorism that is gradually extinguishing free speech."[111] According to Breivik's manifesto multiculturalism is genocidal treason, facilitated through hordes of savages who cannot even be thought of as human beings:

> Make no mistake. These Muslims must be considered as wild animals. Do not blame the wild animals but rather the multiculturalist category A and B traitors who allowed these animals to enter our lands, and continue to facilitate them. This is nothing less than a genocide aided and abetted by our own elites, primarily Marxist, suicidal humanist and capitalist globalist politicians and journalists. They will eventually pay the ultimate price for their war crimes.[112]

108 Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. What Have We Learned about Lone Wolves from Anders Behring Breivik? Perspectives on Terrorism 5.5-6: 27-42, pg. 28.

109 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 354.

110 Benesch, Susan. 2013. Dangerous Speech: A Proposal to Prevent Group Violence. Dangerous Speech Project, pg. 4.

111 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 304.

112 Ibid. pg. 486.

Breivik's own statements are explicit calls for violence through terrorism, civil war, execution of "multiculturalist traitors," and the cleansing of "animal" Muslims from Europe. All the violence is portrayed as justified and necessitated by the scope and imminence of the threat to civilization. This makes the application of the third guideline very definite.

The time for dialogue is now over. The time for armed resistance has come. *The most basic human right is to defend oneself against deliberate cultural attacks or even an institutionalised cultural genocide of unprecedented historical proportions* [emphasis added]. It's not just a right but a duty for all Europeans to defend oneself against such atrocities through armed struggle.[113]

The final two guidelines for dangerous speech are also evident in this case study. Muslim immigration in Europe has been a controversial topic and cause of societal tensions for many years, underlying controversies over burqa bans, offensive cartoons, and economic disparities. This can be seen as forming a "social or historical context propitious for violence" as described by Benesch, at least as seen by the perpetrator. The vast majority of people in the current European context obviously refrain from violence, yet for someone like Breivik this was an apocalyptic situation, with "recent outbursts of violence" from rampaging Muslim criminals and a "weak rule of law" from treacherous multicultural elites. This conviction that the soul of civilization is in jeopardy is on display in his manifesto:

> There have been several issues that have reaffirmed my beliefs since then. Among them; my governments cowardly handling of the Muhammad Cartoon issue and their decision to award the Nobel peace prize to an Islamic terrorist (Arafat) and appeasers of Islam. There have been tens of other issues. My government and our media capitulated to Islam several years ago, after the Rushdie event. Since then, it has gone downhill. Thousands of Muslims pouring in annually through our Asylum institution, or by family reunification. The situation is just chaotic. These suicidal traitors must be stopped.[114]

The final guideline is whether the medium of dissemination, in this case the Internet, was especially influential and was the primary information source for its audience. Given the "echo chamber" mentality of extremists like Breivik, who shun other viewpoints and distrust main-

113 Ibid. pg. 811.

114 Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published, pg. 1380.

stream discourse, this guideline can be seen to apply. The medium he received and transmitted these messages through was not a passive relationship, but one that he actively engaged in:

> The Internet appears to have been a key tool for Breivik, both in ideological terms and operational terms. In the first instance, it seems clear that his treatise is based mostly upon research he conducted on the Internet, mostly trawling through right-wing and anti-Muslim forums. It has since been reported in the press that he was an active participant in discussions online, though other participants or moderators highlight that he did not particularly distinguish himself as being an extremist.[115]

With all five of its guidelines evident, dangerous speech clearly passes this test for applicability to lone wolf terrorism. This concept can be applied toward understanding the attacks in Norway and the speech surrounding them. There is a relationship in this instance between speech and violence, one which has already been noted by authors such as Pantucci:

> This Lone Wolf case demonstrates the importance of the Internet in disseminating extremist ideology and operational material. But at the same time, it also shows how individuals can become involved in a global ideological battle that they see swirling around themselves and how, with a little effort, they can become quite actively involved in it in a manner that is dangerous to the society in which they are living. Breivik's case shows the danger of the virulent anti-Muslim rhetoric that sometimes pollutes the political discourse in the West… More effort could be expended to confront such ideas and prevent them being mainstreamed.[116]

2.3 Case Study II - David Copeland

2.3.1 The Incident

Over thirteen days in April 1999, three homemade bombs packed with nails were set off in London, England. The spree left three people dead and 139 injured.[117] The first bomb was placed outside a supermarket in an area with a large black population, the second in a street market frequented by Bangladeshi people, and the third in a pub with a predominantly gay clientele. During the spree, confusion was sown by false claims of responsibility for the bombs. The news

115 Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. What Have We Learned about Lone Wolves from Anders Behring Breivik? Perspectives on Terrorism 5.5-6: 27-42, pg. 36.

116 Ibid. pg. 40.

117 Attewill, Fred. 2007. London nail bomber must serve at least 50 years. The Guardian, March 2. Retrieved June 21, 2014 from http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2007/mar/02/ukcrime.thefarright

reported on statements by a group called the White Wolves taking credit for the attack, a group that was later found to be fictitious.[118]

The perpetrator was eventually identified thanks to a CCTV picture taken before the first bombing, which prompted recognition from a co-worker.[119] David Copeland, a twenty-two-year old engineer's assistant, immediately confessed to the bombings when visited by police. His stated goal was to spark a race war in Britain by carrying out provocations against minorities. Police officers found his home filled with Nazi paraphernalia, weaponry, explosives, and hate literature. Despite being diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia, the so-called London Nail Bomber was found criminally responsible for his actions and received six consecutive life sentences. With his appeals repeatedly rejected, David Copeland will remain incarcerated until the year 2049 at the earliest.[120]

The perpetrator was a regional leader in a tiny extremist organization known as the National Socialist Movement (NSM),[121] but all available evidence indicates he planned and carried out his bombing spree completely on his own. The bombing of civilian targets to achieve political ends easily fits Schmid's definition of terrorism, which makes Copeland a clear example of a lone wolf terrorist.

2.3.2 The Perpetrator

The biography of David Copeland offers many clues as to how he became a dedicated neo-Nazi aspiring to start a race war. He told psychiatrists after his arrest that he had been having dreams of sexual sadism since he was twelve years old, some of them involving murdering his classmates or reincarnation as an SS officer.[122] His background involves resentment, crime, drugs, mental illness, and sexual frustration:

118 Ryan, Nick. 2003. Into a World of Hate: A Journey among the Extreme Right. New York, NY: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, pg. 74.

119 BBC News. 2000. Profile: Copeland the Killer. June 30. Retrieved June 19, 2014 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/781755.stm

120 BBC News. 2011. Nail bomber David Copeland loses sentence appeal. June 28. Retrieved June 21, 2014 from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-13946298

121 BBC News. 2000. Profile: Copeland the Killer. June 30. Retrieved June 19, 2014 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/781755.stm

122 Hopkins, Nick and Hall, Sarah. 2000. David Copeland, a quiet introvert obsessed with Hitler and bombs. The Guardian, June 30. Retrieved June 20, 2014 from http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2000/jun/30/uksecurity.sarahhall

> Copeland was brought up in Yately in Hampshire; his father an engineer and mother a part-time helper in a centre for the handicapped. At school he was small for his age and is said to have resented it, gaining the nickname 'Mr. Angry.' He left secondary school with a few low-grade GCSE's and began drinking and taking drugs, including heroin. This was followed by convictions for assault. Copeland never had a girlfriend and it was his great fear that people thought him gay. By 1997 when he moved to London to work on the Jubilee line extension as an engineer's assistant, he had become homophobic and racist. He joined the extremist BNP and became an activist.[123]

According to the BBC, Copeland began reading bomb-making materials on the Internet while part of the xenophobic British National Party (BNP). He learned how to make explosives with fireworks, alarm clocks and nails from information he downloaded online. He also became an avid reader of militant racist literature from right-wing groups in America, notably the novel known as *The Turner Diaries.* The perpetrator eventually became an engineer's assistant, a position which likely provided tools and hands-on experience that proved useful while assembling bombs. Copeland quickly became frustrated with the limitations of the BNP's politics, which did not endorse violence. By the end of 1998, he had gone from BNP activism to a leadership role within the National Socialist Movement. Around this time, he was prescribed anti-depressants by a psychiatrist, who Copeland told he felt like he was "losing his mind." A few weeks after he became a unit head within the NSM, the bombing campaign began.[124]

2.3.3 The Ideology

Upon his arrest, there was no great mystery regarding why Copeland had committed his crimes. His flat was a trove of neo-Nazi paraphernalia, including a large swastika flag hanging on the wall. He had fetishized violence with a collection of photographs showing carnage and atrocities from around the world, including pictures from his own bombings. In addition to explosives, police found knives, a crossbow, and a pistol. The perpetrator was forthright about his motivations and goals, penning a lengthy confession and speaking frankly about his aims:

Despite his right-wing connections, Copeland said he acted alone in his bombing campaign. He

123 BBC News. 2000. Profile: Copeland the Killer. June 30. Retrieved June 19, 2014 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/781755.stm

124 BBC News. 2000. Profile: Copeland the Killer. June 30. Retrieved June 19, 2014 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/781755.stm

> craved fame and notoriety, but in his confession to police he made it clear that his aim was political. 'My main intent was to spread fear, resentment and hatred throughout this country, it was to cause a racial war,' he told detectives. 'There'd be a backlash from the ethnic minorities, I'd just be the spark that would set fire to this country.'[125]

He told the authorities that he was a Nazi, a supporter of the master race, and that he wanted Blacks and Asians out of his country. His statements repeated many key terms and phrases associated with other right-wing extremists, such as the belief that the world was controlled by the ZOG (Zionist Occupation Government).[126] There was also a religious tinge to his racial hatred, as the perpetrator said in a letter that it was "God's law" to bomb his targets.[127] These justifications surfaced during his trial, while lawyers and psychiatrists argued over whether the perpetrator acted out of hatred or mental illness:

Copeland had described how he was 'a prophet' acting out 'his Mission,' claiming his bombings were to be the first of many and would result in the Apocalypse. Believing he was special, he quoted scriptures to justify and explain his actions and claimed divine intervention would sweep him from the courtroom up to heaven.

While multiple psychiatrists agreed that these were the words of a delusional schizophrenic, one Dr. Philip Joseph dissented. He classified Copeland as suffering from a personality disorder and identified his beliefs as being a recitation of teachings from Christian Identity. The Christian Identity is a racist sect in the United States which denigrates the existence of blacks and other "mud people" as the Devil's work, claiming that the white race is intrinsically superior on a spiritual level.[128] Familiar with the Identity, and with the hate literature Copeland had consumed, Dr. Joseph concluded that the perpetrator was not delusional but "was simply repeating what he had read."[129] The other psychiatrists did not know about the Christian Identity and so didn't recognize that Copeland's rants were a product of "rational" white supremacist ideology and not psychopathology.

---

125 Ibid.

126 Ibid.

127 Ibid.

128 Ryan, Nick. 2003. Into a World of Hate: A Journey among the Extreme Right. New York, NY: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, pg. 81.

129 Ibid. pg. 81.

In the mind of the perpetrator, his campaign was not driven by a personal grudge against minorities or homosexuals, but a matter of divinely-sanctioned violence in defence of the White race. His goal was not to kill a few or maim hundreds, but to alter all of British society by fomenting hatred and rage to the point of large-scale violence erupting. The vision of a White society cleansed of undesirables through an apocalyptic race war provoked through terrorism is not new, and David Copeland was not the first person to attempt making it a reality through acts of violence. The strategy and ideology involved in the nail bombing campaign can all be seen in a novel that has been linked to other violent acts of right-wing extremism, a novel avidly read by the perpetrator: *The Turner Diaries.*

2.3.4 Speech Consumed

David Copeland absorbed a great deal of speech other than *The Turner Diaries* which could be called hateful or dangerous for the purposes of this paper. This section could easily deal with the anti-immigrant rhetoric of the British National Party which the perpetrator participated in, or with the communications of the National Socialist Movement. It could also focus on the white supremacist dogmas of the Christian Identity movement, whose website Copeland frequently visited.[130] However, this section will instead focus on *The Turner Diaries.* This is because of the special significance the novel holds, both in the larger milieu of violent right-wing extremism and for the perpetrator's own plans and beliefs.

The Turner Diaries has been called the Bible of the racist right.[131] Part science fiction, part manifesto, and partly a practical guide to conducting a racist terrorist campaign, this novel has been linked to multiple acts of violence since it was originally published in 1978. The novel was sold at gun shows by Oklahoma City bomber Timothy McVeigh, who was inspired by its pro-gun message, and possibly by a sequence in which the protagonists set off a massive fertilizer truck bomb in a government building. A right-wing terrorist group called the Order, which operated in the United States during the 1980s, took its name and its tactics from the book's protago-

130 Ibid. pg. 82.

131 Jackson, Camille. 2004. The Turner Diaries, Other Racist Novels, Inspire Extremist Violence. Intelligence Report 115: retrieved June 21, 2014 from http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-report/browse-all-issues/2004/fall/fightin-words?page=0,0

nists as they robbed armoured cars and murdered a Jewish talk show host. The Order's eventual defeat by the FBI was one of the events which spurred the extreme right into adopting the leaderless resistance strategy which describes many lone wolves today. And of course, there is David Copeland.[132]

Copeland's plan to spark a race war through terrorism may sound farfetched, but in *The Turner Diaries* it is both a legitimate guerrilla strategy and the salvation of the White race. The novel is the work of William Luther Pierce, a former physics professor who left his teaching position to found the National Alliance white-power organization. Pierce wrote the *Diaries* under the pseudonym of Andrew Macdonald. He would later tell a biographer that he wrote novels specifically to teach and to persuade the reader.[133]

The novel depicts the guerrilla war of The Organization against The System: patriotic white Americans against an oppressive political, cultural, and economic system which confiscates their guns, decriminalizes rape in the name of gender equality, and proves inept at providing basic public goods such as electricity and security.[134] The Organization is controlled by a cult-like secret society called The Order. The Order has broader ambitions than liberating America, such as establishing white supremacy over the Earth and exterminating all race enemies, especially the Jews. The struggle is narrated by Earl Turner in the titular Diaries. Starting as a technical expert fixing radios in a small cell, Turner rises in the ranks to become a legendary martyr who wins the war by flying a plane into the Pentagon with a nuclear bomb attached.

The Organization's tactics range from the fanciful (particularly once the protagonists gain nuclear weaponry and begin ethnically cleansing Los Angeles)[135] to practical methods within the reach of a real-life militant organization. Pierce gives many details regarding how his protagonists organize and arm themselves, communicate with other cells, and carry out attacks. One bomb-making sequence provides ample information for the aspiring militant, demonstrating the

132 Ryan, Nick. 2003. Into a World of Hate: A Journey among the Extreme Right. New York, NY: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, pg. 19.

133 Jackson, Camille. 2004. The Turner Diaries, Other Racist Novels, Inspire Extremist Violence. Intelligence Report 115: retrieved June 21, 2014 from http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-report/browse-all-issues/2004/fall/fightin-words?page=0,0

134 Pierce, William Luther. 1978. The Turner Diaries. National Vanguard Books, pg. 35.

135 Ibid. pg. 85.

steps in mixing heating oil in with bags of fertilizer.[136]

The novel's emphasis on provoking racial violence as a tactic against the System is of special significance for the case of David Copeland, as he adopted a similar strategy with his nail bombs. In the novel, The Organization's terrorist attacks provoke the System into deputizing large numbers of black thugs. The deputies oppress and molest white citizens at will, especially women, causing more white resentment against the System and a jump in The Organization's recruiting.[137] This in turn leads to harsher oppression in the form of an anti-racism rally in Chicago which is deliberately fomented into a pogrom against whites.[138] The aftermath of the riot sees a rise in anti-System violence by dissidents not tied to The Organization. The cycle of hatred continues to escalate until whites are flocking to Organization-controlled territory to escape hordes of marauding and sometimes cannibalistic black people.[139] The Organization ultimately triumphs through the use of indiscriminate terrorism to foment racial violence until society simply breaks down.

This content seems to have had a profound effect on the minds of young, angry, insecure white men like David Copeland. The protagonists of *The Turner Diaries* have a sense of purpose and belonging. They are sexually virile. Their cause is just, their world is simple. And they have divine sanction to hurt and kill anyone who is different from them or who disagrees. A BBC documentary on the bombings summarizes the process:

> So now a fatal chemistry was taking place. Copeland, the loner, deeply insecure about his sexuality, nursing a loathing of black people and gays, was feeding on a diet of literature which developed and sharpened his hatred and his anger. From *The Turner Diaries* he'd absorbed the idea of sparking a campaign of terror against the enemies of his race. That idea was fuelled by the writings of the NSM whose literature also provided the internet website address from which Copeland got his instructions in bomb making.[140]

136 Ibid. pg. 25.

137 Ibid. pg. 41.

138 Ibid. pg. 46.

139 Ibid. pg. 90.

140 BBC News Panorama. 2000. The Nail Bomber. July 30. Television. Transcript retrieved June 19, 2014 from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/panorama/archive/811720.stm

2.3.5 Speech Propagated

Unlike other lone wolves, Copeland never posted a manifesto or a list of demands laying out his ideology. What is known of his motivations and goals has emerged through documents such as his police confession, as well as letters to certain journalists. These statements shed little new light on what the perpetrator was trying to accomplish. They largely contain the same neo-Nazi rhetoric that has already been described:

> While on remand in prison and at Broadmoor special hospital, Copeland wrote to BBC correspondent Graeme McLagan. He denied that he was schizophrenic. He also revealed his racist obsessions - writing that what he called 'Zog', the Zionist Occupation Government, was trying to sweep him under the carpet by pumping him full of drugs. "The Jew, devil's disciples and peoples of mud must be driven out of our land," he wrote… "I bomb the blacks, 'pakkies', degenerates… I would have bombed the Jews as well if I'd got a chance."[141]

With this in mind, this case study recognizes that there is little true speech being propagated in this incident. Unlike many other terrorist attacks, the nail bombings were an attempt to affect the public through provocation more than through communication. While the perpetrator undoubtedly sought notoriety and infamy through his act, as demonstrated by his immediate confession once caught, claiming responsibility during the campaign would have undermined his strategy. Other terrorists seek to send a message with their attacks, but the nail bombs were supposed to spark a race war. This objective was more feasible if there was tension and ambiguity over who was planting the bombs and why. What Copeland said was more in the way of explaining and justifying himself than an attempt to influence an audience toward his way of thinking. According to this paper's criteria, speech of this sort cannot be considered dangerous.

2.3.6 Applicability of Dangerous Speech

Despite the lack of any true speech propagated to match the speech consumed, the case of David Copeland and his nail bombs easily meets all of Susan Benesch's guidelines for dangerous speech. The violence and bigotry within *The Turner Diaries*, connected with the context of the perpetrator's isolated and resentful background, mean that all five of the guidelines are in evidence

141 BBC News. 2000. Profile: Copeland the Killer. June 30. Retrieved June 19, 2014 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/781755.stm

here.

The words of William Pierce carried great currency in the communities of right-wing extremism. He has been described as holding an "almost mythical status among white supremacists." [142] This was partly due to his National Alliance organization, and partly due to novels like *The Turner Diaries* and *Hunter*,[143] both of which portray white male heroes fighting against a corrupt American government run by a Jewish conspiracy. *The Turner Diaries* has long been viewed as an especially influential book in the thinking of militant neo-Nazis and white supremacists, one which has been linked to violence by like-minded extremists. Bearing in mind that Copeland had dreamt of Nazism since he was a teenager, this fulfills the first guideline for dangerous speech: the presence of a speaker with great influence over the audience.

The far-right belief that the mainstream media is corrupt and unreliable implies that this message formed the only information that the perpetrator had access to and was willing to treat as credible, which would meet the fifth guideline for dangerous speech. Once again Maynard's concept of epistemic authorities is relevant here, as it helps explain how a person can become reliant on a limited variety of sources for political information in a liberal democratic context: only certain authorities are seen as trustworthy. The fact that Copeland had grievances and fears to be cultivated by such speakers is self-evident from his long-held hatred and resentment toward society, particularly toward the immigrants he blamed for his employment difficulties. The BBC indicates that much of his racism was the result of scapegoating others for his personal and professional failures:

> A string of failed jobs seemed to contribute to his developing racist views. He blamed immigrants for taking the best positions and, mirroring later BNP statements, said local authorities were favouring them with better treatment than 'native' whites.[144]

The lurid hatred and apocalyptic fear mongering of the *Diaries* can hardly be seen as anything other than a call to violence by defenders of the white race, which is evidence of the third

142 Ryan, Nick. 2003. Into a World of Hate: A Journey among the Extreme Right. New York, NY: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, pg. 18.

143 In a reverse case of life imitating art, Hunter is dedicated to the racist serial killer Joseph Paul Franklin, who targeted interracial couples, much like the protagonist of the novel.

144 Ryan, Nick. 2003. Into a World of Hate: A Journey among the Extreme Right. New York, NY: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, pg. 83.

guideline.

Ideological justifications are also provided for the violence, as the protagonists are not immune to pangs of conscience after blowing up hundreds of civilians:

> But there is no way we can destroy the System without hurting many thousands of innocent people-no way. It is a cancer too deeply rooted in our flesh. And if we don't destroy the System before it destroys us-if we don't cut this cancer out of our living flesh-our whole race will die. We have gone over this before, and we are all completely convinced that what we did is justified, but it is still very hard to see our own people suffering so intensely because of our acts. It is because Americans have for so many years been unwilling to make unpleasant decisions that we are forced to make decisions now which are stern indeed.[145]

This reasoning is repeated throughout the novel: indiscriminate violence against civilians is justified and necessary because people have allowed themselves to be blinded to the evil of the System. Americans in this world have lost their rights to be free and safe because they failed to defend their race against its enemies. Later in the book Turner's qualms disappear, and he declares that ordinary people deserve to be targeted for their complacency in the face of the System.[146] The "accusation in the mirror" emerges once more as well: race war is justified because it will thwart the death of the entire white race.

The fourth guideline is more problematic in application. Racial tensions and violence in the United Kingdom are not unprecedented, but can this be considered an environment that is propitious for violence? Could the UK in the year 1999 be described as having structural inequalities and discrimination or a weak rule of law? Perhaps not in an objective sense, but in the worldview of the perpetrator this guideline would absolutely apply. Right-wing extremists like Copeland see the world as a massive conspiracy against white males, with structures built and controlled by sinister enemies and law enforcement meant to suppress rather than protect. This guideline can be seen to apply in the subjective sense then, even if it is not objectively in evidence. The perpetrator *believed* he was in an environment matching this guideline, which may have had the same effect when interpreting dangerous speech as actual conditions propitious for violence would have.

145 Pierce, William Luther. 1978. The Turner Diaries. National Vanguard Books, pg. 26.

146 Ibid. pg. 60.

Based solely on speech consumed, it can be seen that the dangerous speech concept is applicable in understanding the case of David Copeland, the so-called London Nail Bomber. With dangerous speech in mind, it is easier to understand the linkages between the hatred Copeland consumed and the violence he came to visit upon the people of London. Writing on Copeland, journalist Nick Ryan stated that:

> But without the template of the extremists he encountered, perhaps his path would have been different. From Pierce to Griffin, the extremists provide the oxygen that ignites the torments within the Copelands of this world… Sick or not, Copeland was following a stated aim of many neo-Nazi wannabes: to ignite a race war… With Copeland these ideas, put forward by a network spanning continents, had come home to roost.[147]

Section III - Conclusions and Next Steps

This paper has strived to test whether the concept known as dangerous speech can be applied to the analysis of violent incidents which are describable as lone wolf terrorism. This investigation is timely in light of the rising profile of lone wolves as a security threat relative to formal terrorist organizations, and the need to clarify what role speech may play in enabling a person toward radical politics and violence against civilian targets. It also forms a contribution to a larger discussion on clarifying the relationship between ideology, speech, and violence against civilians, called for by Maynard.

This testing has been exploratory in nature, attempting to determine whether a connection can be seen between these two concepts, without aiming to establish a definitive relationship. Beginning with a review of the literature on lone wolf terrorism, this paper has found that there are numerous conflicting perspectives on which violent incidents and which perpetrators are to be classified as lone wolves. Leaning toward the interpretation of Ramon Spaaij while drawing on Schmid's academic consensus definition of terrorism, this paper has proceeded under the criteria that a lone wolf must be a single individual who carries out an act of public, political violence without membership in or operational support from a standing militant organization.

The literature on dangerous speech has also been reviewed. This concept distinguishes

147 Ryan, Nick. 2003. Into a World of Hate: A Journey among the Extreme Right. New York, NY: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, pg. 76.

between ordinary hate speech which degrades or offends versus speech which is likely to incite acts of physical violence from its audience. This examination focused on the concept's practical application toward combating ethnic tensions in Kenya and on Susan Benesch's guidelines for dangerous speech, which are adopted as criteria for the testing undergone in this paper. These guidelines examine features of speech and the context in which it is communicated which could render it dangerous. Both case studies used in the second section of this paper were examined for the presence of the five elements of Benesch's analytical framework:

1. The presence of a speaker with a high degree of influence over the audience
2. An audience with grievances and fear that the speaker can cultivate
3. A speech act that is clearly understood as a call to violence
4. The presence of a social or historical context that is propitious for violence
5. The presence of a means of dissemination that is influential in itself, for example because it is the sole or primary source of news for the relevant audience

Two case studies of lone wolf terrorism were examined using these guidelines: Anders Breivik, a far-right extremist who killed seventy-seven people through bomb and gun attacks in Norway, and David Copeland, the neo-Nazi London Nail Bomber who killed three people and injured over a hundred through three bomb attacks. The same structure was used for each case study, describing in sequence the violent incident, the perpetrator, the ideology behind the incident, speech consumed by the perpetrator while forming their beliefs, and speech propagated by the perpetrator in service to their beliefs. The final part of each case study examined whether the guidelines for dangerous speech could be identified within the speech associated with the ideology and actions of the perpetrators. These guidelines were applied to both the speech consumed and propagated, as well as the *context* of the statements in question. For each case, the presence of at least four out of five guidelines was taken as evidence for the applicability of dangerous speech toward analyzing and understanding lone wolf terrorism.

The results of this test have been largely positive, but display the same ambiguities de-

scribed in the literature review of the two core concepts. Elements of dangerous speech have been identified within both case studies, such as the presence of an audience with exploitable grievances and speech featuring a call to violence. One noteworthy finding regards the first and fifth guidelines, which deal with how much influence the speaker and medium hold over the audience. The same reasoning was used in applying both of these guidelines: an isolated participant on the political fringe will not give credence to mainstream views and sources of information, while being particularly enthusiastic toward speakers who divorce themselves from the discredited mainstream and messages which reinforce their convictions. This has an air of tautology to it: extremist speech is particularly influential in making its audience extremist because the audience is extremist and thus focuses on extremist speech. There is a chicken/egg dilemma implied here that requires deeper thought before dangerous speech is fully embraced as a tool for understanding how lone wolves are radicalized toward violence.

A similar dilemma may be evident in the subjectivity caveat attached to the fourth guideline, regarding an environment propitious for violence. In both case studies, the argument was made that although these perpetrators lived in liberal democratic societies with the rule of law and a high standard of living, they *perceived* their environment as far more unstable and threatening than it actually was, leading to the applicability of the fourth guideline. This reasoning may place too much weight upon the subjective interpretations of a single person whose views significantly diverge from those of the law-abiding mainstream. Thus, while this guideline was found to apply to the cases, it may not stick as securely as the others.

The relationship between dangerous speech and violence is also left unclear by these results. While this paper has demonstrated that hallmarks of dangerous speech are evident in incidences of lone wolf terrorism, it has also found significant differences between how speech operates when inciting mass violence versus lone acts of terrorism. A key difference regards the intent of the audience who was consuming the speech in question. In the context of terrorism, extremist speech is usually propagated underground, not openly projected to a passive consumer. Anders Breivik did not stumble across the counter-jihad movement while checking his e-mail, for instance. These extreme pockets of ideology had to be actively sought out by someone seeking

their political views and impressions. This is a marked departure from conventional images of dangerous speech as described by Benesch, of a public saturated and bombarded by an inescapable flood of propaganda designed by elites to dehumanize a target for genocide.[148] The difference between an active audience versus a passive one shifts the impact of dangerous speech. While Benesch states that incitement is a catalyst if not a *necessity* for ordinary people to perpetrate mass violence,[149] it is easy to imagine someone with Anders Breivik's psychological issues turning to violence even if he had never read a word written by the anti-Muslim blogger Fjordman

The intent of the *speaker* is different as well. When people are accused of incitement to genocide, it is with the understanding that their speech was directed at a specific audience with the intention of creating a specific effect, i.e. mass violence. The relationship is not so clear when extremist speech is consumed by lone wolves. If the writers of the counter-jihad movement are to be believed, none of their warnings against Muslim treachery and Eurabia were ever intended to spark the kind of carnage perpetrated by Anders Breivik. Similarly, while William Pierce was a devoted Nazi who sought to spread his cause through his writings, there's no evidence he wrote *The Turner Diaries* in 1978 America with the intent of causing David Copeland's nail bombings in 1999 Britain. Because of these considerations, this paper concludes that whatever relationship makes dangerous speech applicable to lone wolf terrorism is not as strong or direct as that between dangerous speech and incitement toward mass violence.

The significance of mental health issues in both case studies is also cause for further consideration. Each individual studied in this paper carried out violent acts in service to a stated political cause, but each of them also had their reasoning affected by mental illness. Anders Breivik is a diagnosed narcissist who was driven by a desire for recognition as a Perfect Knight at least as much as by his political views. David Copeland's diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia raised confusion during his trial over whether his talk of apocalyptic race war and divine sanction was the product of psychological delusion, or a demonstration of rational neo-Nazi ideology. This

148 Benesch, Susan. 2007. Vile Crime or Inalienable Right: Defining Incitement to Genocide. Va. J. Int'l L. 48: 485-528, pg. 505.
149 Ibid. pg. 498.

question is central to analysis of lone wolves: distinguishing between rational political violence serving an extremist ideology which may seem deranged to mainstream society and violence driven by personal issues which may include a statement of grievances resembling a political manifesto. These issues indicate a need for further research on this question, as it cuts to the heart of how the terrorist label is applied, and what it signifies.

Despite all of these caveats and questions, there is reason to believe that dangerous speech can assist in understanding lone wolves and extremist ideology. The Umati project in Kenya demonstrates how guidelines for dangerous speech can be employed in examining the relationship between speech and violence. Using this framework, scholars were able to analyze speech on social media during Kenya's elections and sort between statements that were simply angry or part of the political debate, and statements that could be expected to incite flesh-and-blood violence. A similar project, grounded in further research to clarify the relationship between dangerous speech and lone wolf terrorism, could derive valuable research data. An Umati-style project focused on lone wolves would not be a surveillance endeavour aimed at preventing attacks through indiscriminate combing of social media. Rather, it could form a part of the learning process which must take place *after* every terrorist attack for learning from the violence: understanding why this happened, and how it may be countered in the future.

Such a project might employ analysts to examine speech associated with a lone wolf terrorist, such as extremist web forums, to identify which sources played a role in shaping the violence and could incite further violence if unchallenged. Any rubric or method that these hypothetical analysts would use in this future research would have to be carefully calibrated to distinguish between correlation and causation in the speech analyzed and the violence to be prevented. The underlying premise of dangerous speech is that speech can incite violence and that the latter can be prevented by actions toward the former, yet this project's findings do not establish a causal relationship between speech and violence. Any lone wolf Umati-style project based on such a relationship would first have to firmly define it, and then take particular care in methodology. However, this is just one possibility suggested by these findings on the applicability of dangerous speech toward understanding lone wolf terrorism.

Bibliography

Attewill, Fred. 2007. London nail bomber must serve at least 50 years. The Guardian, March 2. Retrieved June 21, 2014 from http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2007/mar/02/ukcrime.thefarright

Awori, Kagonya, with Susan Benesch and Angela Crandall. 2013. Umati: Kenyan Online Discourse to Catalyze and Counter Violence. In proceeding of: *International Conference on Social Implications of Computers in Developing Countries*: 468-475. Retrieved August 04, 2013 from http://www.scribd.com/doc/146349033/Umati-Kenyan-Online-Discourse-to-Catalyze-and-Counter-Violence.

Bakker, Edwin, and Beatrice de Graaf. 2010. Lone Wolves: How to Prevent This Phenomenon? *International Centre for Counter-Terrorism (ICCT).*

Bates, Rodger A. 2012. Dancing with Wolves: Todays Lone Wolf Terrorists. *The Journal of Public and Professional Sociology* 4.1: 1-14.

BBC News Panorama. 2000. The Nail Bomber. July 30. Television. Transcript retrieved June 19, 2014 from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/panorama/archive/811720.stm

BBC News. 2011. Nail bomber David Copeland loses sentence appeal. June 28. Retrieved June 21, 2014 from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-13946298

BBC News. 2000. Nail bomber followed Nazism. June 15. Retrieved June 19, 2014 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/792496.stm

BBC News. 2000. Profile: Copeland the Killer. June 30. Retrieved June 19, 2014 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/781755.stm

BBC News. 2000. Timetable of Terror. June 30. Retrieved June 19, 2014 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/780069.stm

Becker, Michael. 2014. Explaining Lone Wolf Target Selection in the United States. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 37: 959–978.

Benesch, Susan. 2014. Countering Dangerous Speech to Prevent Mass Violence during Kenya's 2013 Elections. *Dangerous Speech Project.*

Benesch, Susan. 2013. Dangerous Speech: A Proposal to Prevent Group Violence. *Dangerous Speech Project.*

Benesch, Susan. 2007. Vile Crime or Inalienable Right: Defining Incitement to Genocide. *Va. J. Int'l L.* 48: 485-528.

Benesch, Susan and Abramowitz, Michael. 2013. A Prelude to Murder: Calling Humans Vermin. Wall Street Journal, December 18. Retrieved June 09 2014 from http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303497804579241983104982434

Benesch, Susan. 2012. Words as Weapons. *World Policy Journal.* Spring: 7-12.

Breivik, Anders Behring. 2011. 2083: A European Declaration of Independence. Self-published.

Brown, Andrew. 2011. Anders Breivik's Spider Web of Hate. The Guardian, September 7. Retrieved June 18, 2014 from http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2011/sep/07/anders-breivik-hate-manifesto

Cohen, Katie, et al. 2014. Detecting Linguistic Markers for Radical Violence in Social Media. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 26.1: 246-256.

Crenshaw, Martha. 1981. The Causes of Terrorism. *Comparative politics* 13.4: 379-399.

Cruickshank, Paul, and Lister, Tim. 2012. How did Mohammed Merah become a jihadist? CNN, March 26. Retrieved June 07 2014 from http://edition.cnn.com/2012/03/26/world/europe/france-shooting-suspect/

Gardell, Mattias. 2014. Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 26.1: 129-155.

Gill, Paul, John Horgan, and Paige Deckert. 2013. Bombing Alone: Tracing the Motivations and Antecedent Behaviors of Lone-Actor Terrorists. *Journal of forensic sciences* 59.2: 425-435.

Haberman, Clyde. 1994. Hundreds of Jews Gather To Honor Hebron Killer. The New York Times, April 1. Retrieved April 28, 2014 from http://www.nytimes.com/1994/04/01/world/hundreds-of-jews-gather-to-honor-hebron-killer.html

Hewitt, Christopher. 2014. Law Enforcement Tactics and Their Effectiveness in Dealing with American Terrorism: Organizations, Autonomous Cells, and Lone Wolves. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 26.1: 58-68.

Hopkins, Nick and Hall, Sarah. 2000. David Copeland, a quiet introvert obsessed with Hitler and bombs. The Guardian, June 30. Retrieved June 20, 2014 from http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2000/jun/30/uksecurity.sarahhall

Jackson, Camille. 2004. The Turner Diaries, Other Racist Novels, Inspire Extremist Violence. *Intelligence Report* 115: retrieved June 21, 2014 from http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-report/browse-all-issues/2004/fall/fightin-words?page=0,0

Kaplan, Jeffrey, Heléne Lööw, and Leena Malkki. 2014. Introduction to the Special Issue on Lone Wolf and Autonomous Cell Terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 26.1: 1-12

Larkin, Ralph W. 2009. The Columbine Legacy: Rampage Shootings as Political Acts. *American Behavioral Scientist* 52.9: 1309-1326.

Leader Maynard, Jonathan. 2014. Rethinking the Role of Ideology in Mass Atrocities. *Terrorism and Political Violence* ahead-of-print: 1-21.

Lobe, Jim. 2011. Islamophobes distance themselves from Breivik. Al Jazeera, July 26. Retrieved June 18, 2014 from http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/07/201172611337853373.html.

The Local: Sweden's News in English. 2007. School shooting suspect remanded in custody. November 13. Retrieved July 23, 2014 from http://www.thelocal.se/20071113/9082

Malkki, Leena. 2014. Political elements in post-Columbine school shootings in Europe and North America. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 26.1: 185-210

McCauley, Clark, and Sophia Moskalenko. 2014. Toward a Profile of Lone Wolf Terrorists: What Moves an Individual From Radical Opinion to Radical Action. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 26.1: 69-85.

Michael, George. 2014. Counterinsurgency and Lone Wolf Terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 26.1: 45-57.

Michael, George. 2012. *Lone Wolf Terror and the Rise of Leaderless Resistance.* Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Mueller, John. 2000. The banality of "ethnic war." *International Security* 25.1: 42-70.

Norway. July 22 Commission. 2012. Gjørv Report (English Extract). Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no/smk/html/22julikommisjonen/22JULIKOMMISJONEN_NO/EN/REPORT.HTM

Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. A typology of lone wolves: preliminary analysis of lone Islamist terrorists. *International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Political Violence.*

Pantucci, Raffaello. 2011. What Have We Learned about Lone Wolves from Anders Behring Breivik? *Perspectives on Terrorism* 5.5-6: 27-42.

Pierce, William Luther. 1978. *The Turner Diaries.* National Vanguard Books.

Ryan, Nick. 2003. *Into a World of Hate: A Journey among the Extreme Right.* New York, NY: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Schmid, Alex P. 2004. Frameworks for conceptualising terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence.* 16.2: 197-221.

Schmid, Alex P. 2012. The Revised Academic Consensus Definition of Terrorism. *Perspectives on Terrorism* 6: 2, retrieved August 01, 2014 from http://www.terrorismanalysts.com/pt/index.php/pot/article/view/schmid-terrorism-definition/html

Simon, Jeffrey D. 2013. *Lone Wolf Terrorism: Understanding the Growing Threat.* Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Spaaij, Ramon and Persaud, Raj, Dr. 2012. Inside the Mind of Anders Breivik - The Norwegian on Trial for Mass Murder. Huffington Post, April 13. Retrieved June 6 2014 from: _http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/ram/anders-breivik-psychology-inside-the-mind-of-anders_b_1419343.html

Spaaij, R.F.J. 2012. *Understanding lone wolf terrorism: global patterns, motivations and prevention.* Dordrecht; New York: Springer.

Striegher, Jason-Leigh. 2013. Early detection of the lone wolf: advancement of counter-terrorism investigations with an absence or abundance of information and intelligence. *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism* 8.1: 35-53.

Voices That Poison. Kenya. Accessed June 09 2014 at http://voicesthatpoison.org/work-in-kenya/

Weimann, Gabriel. 2012. Lone Wolves in Cyberspace. *Journal of Terrorism Research*, 3:2: 75-90.