



## Articles

### A Case Study of Anders B. Breivik's Intergroup Conceptualisation

by Mathias Holmen Johnsen



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/).

#### Abstract

*This paper undertakes summative content analytical case study of Anders Behring Breivik's political manifesto, analysing Breivik's conceptualisations of social ingroup and outgroup, and how these concepts interact. Findings indicate that Breivik conceptualises his ingroup on a three-level scale, ranging from specific to general. The outgroup is conceptualised as twofold, seen as either originating inside Breivik's ingroup society or outside. A basic interaction pattern between the two group-conceptualisations was found, suggesting mutual reinforcement and a self-replicating pattern of radicalization and entrenched group-conceptualisation. Ingroup categories appeared to exist as hierarchical subsets, while outgroup categories were clearly differentiated as separate entities.*

**Keywords:** Lone-wolf terrorism; Social Identity Theory; Radicalisation; Social Psychology; Case Study; Breivik

#### Introduction

When Anders Behring Breivik opened fire at Utøya near Oslo on July 22<sup>nd</sup> 2011, it can be said with confidence that he no longer considered the Labour Party youths he had chosen to attack as worthy of the sympathy or protection typically granted to one's social ingroup. Even though Breivik's victims were primarily fellow Norwegian citizens who shared his ethnicity and socio-economic background, Breivik had somehow developed a mental conceptualisation of this group of individuals as not only an outgroup, but existing in such stark opposition to him and his ingroup that he found it necessary to take personal, violent action to see their destruction.

It has not been difficult to obtain access to Breivik's own statements relating to how he viewed his targets: Both his publicly available manifesto and statements made in court refer to labels such as, but certainly not limited to 'traitors', 'elites' and 'Cultural Marxists', clearly articulated derisive outgroup-terms. Breivik's perceived ingroup has been similarly clearly articulated: 'The Knights Templar', 'Cultural Conservatives' and 'Ethnic Europeans' are only some of the labels openly and frequently employed.

However, with the insight given by Breivik himself regarding his ingroup/outgroup conceptualisations no significant effort has so far been made to thoroughly analyse how these were developed. This paper will attempt to expand on our understanding of Breivik's thoughts and motives by exploring his intergroup conceptualisation through the lens of psychological theory, specifically that of Social Identity Theory. Through looking in-depth at Breivik's Manifesto '2083 – A European Declaration of Independence', this paper will explore how Breivik articulates and conceptualises his social ingroup and outgroup, as well as exploring the extent to which these two groups are related on a conceptual level.



## *Literature Review*

This section will provide a brief overview of Social Identity Theory, as well as the form of terrorism perpetrated by Anders Breivik; so-called lone-wolf terrorism. These two areas will provide the majority of the theoretical-grounding for the subsequent analysis of Breivik's manifesto.

### *Social Identity Theory and Intergroup Relations*

Social Identity Theory assumes that social group membership and intergroup relations is based in the individual's self-categorization, constructed of ingroup defining properties (Hogg & Vaughan, 2011). 'Intergroup relations' can be understood as referring to interactions between individuals conducted "*in terms of their group identification*" (Sherif, 1966, p. 192). As such, one can understand Breivik's interaction with his victims as an example of *intergroup* interaction. Social Identity Theory can be used to understand how this intergroup conceptualisation was formulated by Breivik's construction of his own group-identity. Turner et al. (Turner et al., 1987) commented, "*ethnocentricity and group cohesiveness are... two sides of the same coin*"<sup>1</sup> (p. 62), suggesting that the closer one identifies with one's ingroup, the more one's behaviour will be affected by the relevant intergroup conceptualisation. From this, we can gather that even the most radical and complex intergroup actions can be traced back to the individual's conceptualisation of intergroup identity.

Henri Tajfel (1970) has presented evidence for the viability of such a claim with what become known as the Minimal Group Paradigm (Tajfel et al. 1971). He demonstrated that when individuals were divided into arbitrary groups and given a task that involved allocating insignificant but scarce resources between an arbitrarily assigned ingroup and outgroup, participants would consistently act "*in a manner that discriminates against the outgroup and favors the ingroup*" (1970, pp. 98-99). This illustrates how social group distinctions are formed very easily. Tajfel and Turner et al.'s ideas combine to suggest that action-patterns based on intergroup conceptualisation are formed just as easily as the concepts themselves.

### *Lone-Wolf Terrorism*

Breivik claims that he is part of a small organization of equally devoted political activists. However, no evidence has been found to prove this claim. As such, it would be presumptive to analyse Breivik's acts on the basis of conventional terrorism studies, as this field tends to "*focus predominantly on group dynamics and collective socialization to explain individual pathways into terrorism*" (Spaaij, 2010, p. 855), driving factors which might not be equally prominent in the case of lone actors. This case was further emphasised by The Dutch COT Institute for Safety, Security, and Conflict Management and their 2007 report on lone-wolf terrorism which including a basic definition underlining the way in which such acts varied from group-based phenomenon.<sup>2</sup> One cannot reasonably expect that an actor distanced from any explicit group context will follow the same patterns of social group identification as an individual who is located firmly within such a social group.

Moskalenko and McCauley (2011), identifies some important elements vital to the formation of driving factors of extremism in lone-actor terrorists. It is entirely plausible, they argue, for individuals to identify with a group that "*extends far beyond those near and similar to ourselves*" (p. 122), suggesting that explicit social exposure to the group is not necessary to conceptualise it as an ingroup. They further stress how even for lone-wolf actors it is possible for "*concern for the welfare of others [to go] beyond any economic value to the*



*self* (ibid). They suggest that lone-wolf actors take it on themselves to punish individuals or groups they see as breaking the norms of the ingroup, so as to protect it. The authors suggest that this drive can be so strong as to transcend the need for explicit group interaction (p. 120).

## **Methodology**

The exploration of Breivik's intergroup conceptualisations will be based on a basic content analysis of his manifesto. This paper will apply a very simple classification-scheme to the text, taking note of, and analysing text that displays Breivik's conceptualisation of 1) the Ingroup, and 2) the Outgroup. The variation of content analysis that will be utilized in this study is labelled by Hsieh & Shannon (2005) as 'Summative', an approach which "*attempt[s] not to infer meaning but, rather, explore usage*" and which "*focus is on discovering underlying meanings of the words or the content*" (pp. 1283-1284). This format fits together very well with the exploratory approach of this paper, relying on the meanings and usage found during analysis to assemble a theoretical construct useful in answering the research-question.

Anders Breivik's Manifesto is by his own admission only in part his own work. He claims to have written approximately half of the volume himself, with the remainder being copied from the work of other authors (Breivik, 2011, p. 5). Although he states simultaneously that the relevant authors will be credited when their text is used, making sure that this statement is true would take extensive cross-referencing of the entire manifesto with the relevant texts, a task beyond the scope of this paper. As such, this paper will base itself on two assumptions; that Breivik has either written the text being analysed himself *or* he is copying without citing, but in which case he is still adding content to his manifesto that *share his views*. As such, one can assume that the content of the manifesto reflects Breivik's attitudes and conceptualisations, even in the case where he has not written the text himself. Further, the attitudes expressed in Breivik's manifesto appear to be accurately mirrored in his own statements during his trial (Aftenposten.no, 2012).<sup>3</sup>

As Breivik's group-conceptualisations are explored, they will be classified and grouped in the manner that appears most consistent with the text. It is here important to remember that these classifications will not necessarily refer to genuine social groups, but rather the social environment as observed by Breivik. As such, the findings of this paper should be examined with an eye to whether or not they accurately illustrate Breivik's personal conceptions, rather than conceptualisations that can be objectively observed in the relevant social environments.

## **Analysis**

### **The Ingroup**

#### **Organisational–Knights Templar**

The most explicit of Breivik's ingroup conceptualisations is that of the Knights Templar. On the front Page of his manifesto is clearly printed a stylised St George's Cross, and a Latin inscription that translates as

*"In Praise of the New Knighthood*

*The Poor Fellow-Soldiers of Christ and of the Temple of Solomon"*

The second line is the original name of the Knights Templar order, while the first is taken from the title of a



book written in praise of the newly formed Templar Order by Saint Bernard of Clairvaux sometime in the 12<sup>th</sup> Century (Barber, 1994, p. 44). Writing under his anglicised pseudonym Andrew Berwick, Breivik styles himself “*Justiciar Knight Commander for Knights Templar Europe*” (Breivik, 2011, p. 9), and states that the purpose of the reborn order is “*servicing the interests of the free indigenous peoples of Europe and to fight against the ongoing European Jihad*” (p. 817).

Breivik comments on how he believes that Western schools have been subject to the falsification of information by the outgroup, resulting among other things in “[f]alsified information about the Crusades (it was a defensive campaign not offensive)” (p. 41). As such, one can observe that Breivik conceptualises his closest ingroup as defensive militaristic unit, reacting to the aggression of the outgroup in order to defend the wider ingroup.

Interestingly, a list of Templars is printed in the manifesto, taking note of those allegedly present during the re-funding of the organization (p. 817), including information on nationality and religion. Paradoxically, members listed as ‘atheist’ are *also* labelled ‘Christian’. This detail provides some preliminary insight into what values and ideals make up the fundamentals for Breivik’s perceived ingroup members and as a consequence the wider ingroup as a whole.

### **Political–Cultural Conservatives**

In terms of a political ingroup, Breivik utilizes the label of ‘cultural conservative’, which might be most accurately understood as fundamental conservatism. Breivik provides little specific detail about this label and its related values, but certain allusions are made, such as the statement “[m]ost Europeans look back on the 1950s as a good time” (p. 12), as well as an account focusing on how the typical societal ideals and traditions of that era were morally and objectively better for Europe and European citizens. What is clear, is that Breivik perceives his political ingroup as underrepresented, and at worst actively persecuted by the outgroup. For example, regarding journalist and media-attention to the ingroup, Breivik states that “[a]s cultural conservatives and anti-multiculturalists we are by default perceived as enemies” (p. 389), further commenting that “[n]eedless to say; the growing numbers of nationalists in W. Europe are systematically being ridiculed, silenced and persecuted by [the outgroup]” (p. 5). He further holds that active political participation of the ingroup is made impossible by the outgroup, stating that “[a]mong so called Western European ”conservative” parties the actual cultural conservatives are shown the door” (2011, p. 14).

While Breivik might conceptualise his outgroup as a political entity in terms of having a general political orientation, he is very clear about it not being an ideology, stating rather that “all ideologies are wrong” (p. 11), going on to claim that ideology adheres to a specific set of political principles independently of reality. This suggests that he considers the ‘political’ aspects of his ingroup as signifying a set of principles that are political only insofar as they are addressed in a *political setting*. This idea is interesting in that one can see parallels to Clausewitz’ idea that “theory should be study, not doctrine” (1976, p. 141). This is to say, Breivik appears to be entirely confident that his perspective is objective ‘theory’, and that as such it is not to be considered ‘doctrine’ but truth. Conversely, those who deny what Breivik observes as truth must be the victim of doctrine, ideology, which subverts and alters the truth that Breivik perceives as absolute.



## *Ethnic/Demographic–Native Europeans*

Breivik makes it very clear already from the first page that Europe and Europeans make up his wider ingroup. When he states that the outgroup “[DOES] NOT have the permission of the European peoples” to wield power (2011, p. 4), he sweepingly includes the European people in general as being in opposition to the outgroup. Indeed, Breivik states that the Manifesto is a “personal gift and contribution to all Europeans” (p. 5), and continues to refer to ‘all Europe’ or ‘all Europeans’ throughout the Manifesto as being victims of the outgroup. More exactly, the so named ‘jurisdiction’ of the Knights Templar is stated as including specifically Western Europe and the Balkans (p. 817), and Breivik appears to make a point to specify *ethnic or native* Europeans as belonging to the ingroup. It can be observed that he appears to limit his conceptualisation to a primarily European ingroup, although it seems likely that individuals from the other ‘Western’ nations fitting his ingroup criteria would be welcomed as a member of this ingroup.

One can observe a clear difference between types of ingroup Breivik Conceptualises: The ‘European’ ingroup is different from the ‘Culturally Conservative’ ingroup, insofar as the former is an ingroup on whose behalf Breivik is fighting, whereas the latter is the ingroup which is doing the fighting. He appears to conceptualise the wider ingroup as innocent bystanders in a war perpetrated by the outgroup. The repeated use of terms such as ‘genocide’ and ‘massacre’ to describe the behaviour of the outgroup towards the ingroup enforces this impression.

## *The Outgroup*

### *Cultural Marxists and Islam*

The main conceptualisation of Breivik’s outgroup is twofold, a division existing along the lines of whether the group is inside or outside Breivik’s wider ingroup society. Multiculturalists, labelled by Breivik as Cultural Marxists, are ‘inside’ European society, and so are conceptualised as a group made up of individuals who *should* be part of the ingroup, but who for one reason or another has chosen to oppose it. As he states “*You cannot defeat Islamisation or halt/reverse the Islamic colonization of Western Europe without first removing the political doctrines manifested through multiculturalism/cultural Marxism*” (p. 5). This statement presents the other outgroup section, Islam, an entity that Breivik sees as ‘outside’ European society, and seeking its destruction.

Looking first to the ‘inside’ outgroup, Cultural Marxism is conceptualised as a western ideology that has sabotaged and undermined the European system and identity in the name of ‘political correctness’, and as a result has left European society vulnerable to an ongoing “*Islamic Colonisation of Europe through demographic warfare*” (Breivik, 2011, p. 9). According to Breivik Cultural Marxists are responsible for historical falsification in pursuit of rewriting history to suit their ideological outlook. The concept of ‘political correctness’ is perceived as the main tool employed by the Cultural Marxists when it comes to changing society. Breivik holds that the term is one used by Marxists to denote “*the General Line of the Party*” (p. 11), and which is employed by the outgroup to condemn any undesirable action or statement made by the ingroup, making it impossible for it to express its views.<sup>4</sup> One can see the extent to which Breivik finds political correctness a threat when he laments “[p]olitical Correctness now looms over Western European society like a colossus. It has taken over both political wings, left and right” (p. 14).

In further detail, Breivik quite systematically labels politicians and journalists and academics of the outgroup



establishment as “*traitors*” of “*category A and B*” (p. 931) respectively, claiming that there are in Europe approximately 400,000 such individuals (p. 932). There are also ‘traitors’ in classes C and D, which are conceptualised as individuals who have in the past or are at present actively enabling categories A and B. According to Breivik, A and B traitors are the most hostile of the ‘inside’ outgroup, going so far as to label the class A individuals as war-criminals, liable to be ‘punished’ by death under the authority of the Knights Templar (p. 1407).

When it comes to the ‘outside’ outgroup, Breivik’s conceptualisation of Islam paints it as a more lethal entity than the ‘inside’ outgroup. He perceives the ‘Islamisation’ of Europe as part of an ongoing “*1400 year Islamic Jihad against non-Muslims and Europe*” (p. 38). Rather than distinguish between several sub-categories of this outgroup, Breivik states sweepingly that “[w]herever there is a presence of Muslims, Islamisation occurs” (p. 478), and that Muslims “*must be considered as wild animals*” (ibid). The further conceptualisation of this ‘outside’ outgroup similarly lacks nuance, positing Islam simply as inherently destructive and belligerent towards Europe and Europeans. Interestingly, this one-sided perspective is contrasted by a quite detailed, if skewed, retelling of the history of Islam, demonstrating that Breivik has spent some considerable time researching the outgroup.

An interesting distinction that Breivik makes when it comes to the question of outgroup *blame* can be seen when he states that one should “*not blame the wild animals but rather the multiculturalist category A and B traitors*” (ibid). As such, Breivik seems to have conceptualised the ‘outside’ outgroup as entirely incorrigible, having no interest in negotiation or any greater political or strategic goal than the annihilation of the ingroup. He appears to suggest that this group has no true agency beyond their inherent, destructive, nature, and so the blame falls rather to the ‘inside’-outgroup who has both agency and understanding, intentionally working to the detriment of Breivik’s ingroup when they should know better. This conceptualisation further adds to distancing the ‘outside’ outgroup from Breivik’s ingroup on a fundamental level.

### ***European Political Establishment***

Breivik appears to perceive the ‘inside’ outgroup as having a firm hold on the political system of Europe. He holds that throughout Europe there are 100 major political parties which “*indirectly or directly support the Islamisation of Europe through their support for European multiculturalism*” (p. 924). Further, Breivik conceptualises the European Union as an “*actively hostile entity run by a corrupt class of abject traitors*” (p. 313). One can see, then, that the outgroup is perceived as having obtained significant control over the political system, reiterating the point that was seen earlier that the ingroup has no hope of engaging in political discourse due to active exclusion. When Breivik’s does not conceptualise his political ingroup as a conventional political party-entity, one should ask if this is due to the perceived exclusive nature of the present European political system. The ingroup is conceptualised as consisting of the majority of European citizens, and so it follows that the only reason it is unable to engage in ‘legitimate’ political activity is that the outgroup denies it. Here again one can see how blame is attributed to the outgroup: Unacceptable actions committed by the ingroup is the fault and responsibility of the outgroup for excluding the ingroup from conventional political engagement.

The hold of the ‘inside’ outgroup on the ‘establishment’ is not only political, Breivik finds, but also by extension judicial. Speaking on the European Court of Human Rights he states that “*court rulings and principles are very often “ordered” by cultural Marxists to either be used against cultural conservatives directly or to systematically and gradually destroy European culture, traditions, our identities and to limit the sovereignty*



*of nation states*" (p. 338). Further, Breivik holds that "150,000 cultural conservatives or others" have been incarcerated by the outgroup "for "resistance" and/or "defence" related acts" (p. 772). Again we can see how Breivik has conceptualised the outgroup as persecuting the ingroup with means they have turned to their own purposes. The ingroup commits acts of "resistance" and "defence", which are morally justifiable reactions to the existential threat posed by the 'outside' outgroup, but the 'inside' outgroup persecutes these acts because the ingroup "doesn't support the cultural Marxist/multiculturalist stance" (ibid).

As social identity theory points out, a social system that is perceived as illegitimate and unstable but conceivably open to change through interaction will foster social competition, ranging from activism to terrorism (Hogg & Vaughan, 2011, pp. 418-419). It is quite clear that Breivik conceives of the European establishment as such, and when he then takes the most violent approach to social competition it is a further sign of how deeply ingrained his oppositional intergroup conceptualisations have become.

### ***Existential, Genocidal Threat***

Breivik is very clear in his conceptualisation of the outgroup as an existential threat to the ingroup. With regards to Islam, he holds that it has historically been the perpetrator of "countless genocides of more than 300 million people" (p. 41). He further claims that "what is happening to the indigenous peoples of Western Europe and our cultures—amounts to a merciless and bloody genocide" and that it is one "in which many members of the native Europeans [sic] are playing a willing and active part" (p. 390). This is a recurring theme through the manifesto, conceptualising the 'outside' outgroup as presenting an existential, genocidal, threat to the ingroup, while the 'inside' outgroup is actively working to promote and assist this threat by attempting to eliminate traditional European values and identities as seen above. As suggested by the Terror Management Theory, making one group out as an existential threat will further enhance the intergroup bias (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999, p. 9), feeding back into the intergroup rivalry-spiral suggested by Social Identity Theory and providing another potential explanation as to how Breivik's intergroup conceptualisations have come to be so oppositional.

### ***Discussion***

Breivik's conceptualisations of ingroup and outgroup can be coherently summarised as follows: The ingroup in the widest sense consists of the majority of Ethnic Europeans actively adhering or desiring a return to conservative societal values, distained and persecuted by a small but powerful minority.

Where the ingroup is one cohesive social unit, the outgroup is twofold and seemingly unified only by their antagonistic attitude to the ingroup. Islam is perceived as inherently violent and its adherents as dehumanized barbarians, while Cultural Marxists are perceived as intolerant and hysterical ultra-liberals who intentionally suppress factual truths in pursuit of ideological ends. The former desires the violent death of the ingroup, while the latter desires the eradication of the ingroup's ideals and values.

A clear pattern that can further be seen in Breivik's conceptualisations is the sub-categorisation of each group. Within the ingroup there appears to be three: Ethnic, political and personal (the Knights Templar). The outgroup is as mentioned split in two, depending on whether or not they belong within Breivik's perceived ingroup society.

Further, within both ingroup and outgroup, a distinction is made between active and passive members. Passive members of the ingroup includes all those who are perceived to share Breivik's ideals but do not



actively advocate or fight for them. The passive *outgroup* members refer to those 'inside' European society who are perceived as passively accepting the detrimental actions of the 'active' outgroup.

The conceptualisations portrayed by Breivik correspond to the patterns proposed by Social Identity theory initially, with the added theoretical extensions introduced by his Lone-wolf status. One can see that, as suggested by Moskalenko & McCauley (2011), Breivik most certainly identifies with an ingroup that extends far beyond those near to himself, albeit not so much beyond those similar to himself. This provides an example of the Minimal Group Paradigm translated through the perspective of a lone-wolf individual: an ingroup is conceptualised based on basic identifying factors. As the individual is solitary, the group identification logically extends to all who appear to fit the group-defining properties, limited by outwards appearance rather than personal familiarity or knowledge. Here one can see here how SIT requires some modulation when applied to a lone-wolf individual, but retains its overall validity and usefulness.

The prime concern one might have with the SIT's validity rests on its social grounding, given the asocial nature of Breivik's process of conceptualisation. However, while Breivik exists in a space of political activism comparatively unpopulated by explicit group conditions, he still conceives of himself as existing in a social world, a *social context*. As pointed out by Arena & Arrigo (2006) identity is central to any terrorist, and there is no doubt that Breivik *identifies* as existing in a social context, which returns one to the introductory point made about how the essential unit of analysis is how Breivik himself perceives reality, not the objective truth of it. This is a fact extended to the use of SIT in this context, and as such, utilizing a *socially-based* theory to understand Breivik's intergroup conceptualisations should be seen as a highly instructive framework for understanding the formations of intergroup identity within a lone-wolf individual.

## Conclusion

In summarizing the findings of Breivik's Ingroup/Outgroup conceptualisation, answering the first part of the research-question, we can order it as seen in Table 1 below.

	Ingroup	Outgroup
Personal	Knights Templar	
Political	Cultural Conservatives	Cultural Marxists
General/Ethnic	Ethnic Europeans	Islam

From what has been explored in the analysis-section, it is clear that these conceptualisations are sophisticated and well defined. Even 'Islam', which is conceptualised as lacking complexity of motivation, is given a detailed, if selective, historical background. According to SIT, such complexity of conceptualisation corresponds to the perceived extreme intergroup conflict. The way in which the ingroup and outgroup are so thoroughly conceptualised might be understood as a necessary step in the process of creating a comprehensive concept of the outgroup and ingroup, lacking any fellow individuals sharing his particular intergroup perspective. The more detail Breivik collected on either group, the greater the detail with which he could formulate the intergroup conflict. According to Riketta (2005), this would result in an even stronger identification with the ingroup, feeding back into the conceptualisation of the outgroup.





The fact that no outgroup entity falls into the ‘personal’ category of conceptualisation is a fact that fits into a typical pattern of terrorist polarizing rhetoric. According to Jerrold Post, ‘the other’ tends to represent “*the establishment*” (2005, pp. 54-55), the terrorist actor self-conceptualising as counter-establishment. Accordingly, Breivik’s conceptualisation of the outgroups as exclusively establishment entities<sup>5</sup> is entirely concordant with the pattern, as does the emphasis that his ingroup is *not* part of an ideological establishment.

What we can conclude from this paper, is that Breivik’s ingroup and outgroup conceptualisation function as mutually reinforcing concepts, each defining and being defined by the other. This provides us with a very interesting perspective into how lone-wolf individuals might come to radicalize to the point of violent action. Being subject to a self-directed process of deeper and deeper intergroup conceptualisation which, if uninterrupted and given the right conditions persists to the point of extremism. At this point, the conceptions of the ingroup’s superiority over the outgroup becomes a conscious, articulated belief rather than an underlying psychological attitude, symbolising a change in the individual from radicalizing to radical.

The patterns uncovered in this paper demonstrates the feasibility of applying Social Identity Theory to the case of lone-wolf terrorist individuals. When an understanding of lone-wolf terrorists is coupled with the insight into intergroup conceptualisation provided by the SIT the resulting theoretical framework has proven to offer compelling and valid data.

This paper provides several avenues of approach for future research, the most prominent of which might be to more thoroughly explore the exact process of the formation of intergroup conceptualisation in lone-wolf violent actors, working on the basis of the process used in this paper. Further, future research should also endeavour to collate case-studies of several lone-wolf individuals, so as to enable analysis of data from several sources rather than rely on one case alone.

This paper has provided a preliminary content-analysis case-study focused on the social intergroup conceptualisation of Anders Breivik, a psychological phenomenon that has only been superficially explored thus far in Breivik’s specific case and in lone-wolf terrorism generally. A pattern of intergroup conceptualisation has been uncovered, which suggests great potential for future research on this topic.

**About the author:** *Mathias Holmen Johnsen is enrolled as a student in the University of St Andrews’ Handa Center for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence, undertaking a Master of Letters degree in Terrorism Studies. Norwegian by birth, he graduated with a Master of Arts in International Relations and Psychology from the University of St Andrews in 2013, with a special focus on lone-actor terrorism and the psychology of terrorism.*

## Notes

1. Ethnocentricity as a pattern of behaviour indicates that the (ethnic) ingroup being favoured over a specific outgroup, necessitating explicit conceptualisation of both ingroup and outgroup.

2. “In the case of lone-wolf terrorism, such acts are committed by persons

(a) who operate individually; (b) who do not belong to an organized terrorist group or network; (c) who act without the direct influence of a leader or hierarchy; (d) whose tactics and methods are conceived and directed by the individual without any direct outside command or direction” (p. 6)

3. A translation of these proceedings can be found at

<https://sites.google.com/site/breivikreport/transcripts/anders-breivik-court-transcript-2012-04-17-live-report> (Author and date of publication unknown, accessed on February 7<sup>th</sup> 2014). The origin of this translation is unknown, but the translation is accurate.

4. “But what happens today to Europeans who suggest that there are differences among ethnic groups, or that the traditional social roles of men and women reflect their different natures, or that homosexuality is morally wrong? If they are public figures, they must grovel in the dirt in endless, canting apologies. If they are



university students, they face star chamber courts and possible expulsion. If they are employees of private corporations, they may face loss of their jobs. What was their crime? Contradicting the new EUSSR ideology of "Political Correctness." (Breivik, 2011, p. 11)

5. Islam constituting an establishment in and of itself.

## References

- Aftenposten.no. (2012, April 17). *Dette sa Breivik—ord for ord*. Retrieved February 07, 2014, from Aftenposten: [http://www.aftenposten.no/nyheter/iriks/22juli/article6807324.ece#.UvTOHvl\\_tI8](http://www.aftenposten.no/nyheter/iriks/22juli/article6807324.ece#.UvTOHvl_tI8)
- Arena, M. P., & Arrigo, B. A. (2006). *The Terrorist Identity: Explaining the Terrorist Threat*. New York: New York University Press.
- Barber, M. (1994). *The New Knighthood: A History of the Order of the Temple*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Breivik, A. B. (2011). *2083: A European Declaration of Independence*. Retrieved December 6, 2013, from The Washington Post: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/r/2010-2019/WashingtonPost/2011/07/24/National-Politics/Graphics/2083+-+A+European+Declaration+of+Independence.pdf>
- Clausewitz, C. v. (1976). *On War*. (M. Howard, & P. Paret, Eds.) Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- COT, Instituut voor Veiligheids- en Crisismanagement [Institute for Safety, Security, and Conflict Management]. (2007, July 6). *Lone Wolf Terrorism*. Retrieved 10 2, 2012, from Transnational Terrorism, Security & the Rule of Law: <http://www.transnationalterrorism.eu/tekst/publications/Lone-Wolf%20Terrorism.pdf>
- Hogg, M. A., & Vaughan, G. M. (2011). *Social Psychology* (6th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277-1288.
- Moskalenko, S., & McCauley, C. (2011). The Psychology of Lone-Wolf Terrorism. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 24*(2), 115-126.
- Post, J. M. (2005). The socio-cultural underpinnings of terrorist psychology. In T. Bjørgo, *Root Causes of Terrorism* (pp. 54-69). London: Routledge.
- Riketta, M. (2005). Cognitive differentiation between self, ingroup, and outgroup: The roles of identification and perceived intergroup conflict. *European journal of Social Psychology, 35*(1), 91-106.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *In Common Predicament: Social psychology of Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spaaij, R. (2010). The Enigma of Lone Wolf Terrorism: An Assessment. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 33*(9), 854-870.
- Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in Intergroup Discrimination. *Scientific American, 223*(5), 96-102.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Psychology, 1*(2), 149-178.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Penelope, O. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social*



The Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence

# Journal of Terrorism Research



*group: A self-categorization theory.* Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.