

Conclusion

The Jeju people deserve to have this story told. In 2003, former president of the ROK, Roh Moo Hyun, apologized and accepted ROK government responsibility for the wrongful death of many victims. In January 2005, the ROK government officially declared Jeju an “Island of World Peace.” The people of Jeju also deserve an apology and compensation from the US government for its ultimate responsibility for the punishment that Jeju suffered.

The construction of a new naval base appears to many Jeju people as a violation of the designation of Jeju as an Island of World Peace. The naval base will not enhance the chance of Korean unification or peaceful and friendly relations among the nations of Northeast Asia including China. The fight against the naval base construction is reviving the fighting spirit of the Jeju people, and again puts them in the forefront of seeking a united, democratic and peaceful Korea. **PEAR**

The author and Ronda Hauben want to thank the following people who made themselves available on short notice to help them learn the story of the Jeju people: Todd Thacker, Song Jung-hee, Darryl Coote and Kim Soo-yang of the Jeju Weekly; President Jang Jung-eon and Deputy General Secretary Oh Seung-kook of the Jeju April 3 Peace Foundation; Huh Ho-joon journalist with Hankyoreh; Kim Chang-hoo, Head of Jeju 4.3 Research Institute; Yang Jo-hoon, journalist and chief staff member of the Task Force for the Report of the 4.3 Committee, Jessica Koh and Yeong-seon Koh. We also thank Chung Hyun-back for her help.

NORWAY AND THE NEW FACE OF TERROR

Thomas Larsen

Yonsei University,

Graduate School of International Studies

At 3:25 pm on July 22, 2011, the Norwegian capital of Oslo suffered a figurative and literal shock as a huge explosion erupted close to the nation’s parliament building. The first images from the scene showed broken glass, scattered debris and bloody bodies covering the streets. The area hosting many government ministry offices and the prime minister’s personal office was covered in smoke and ash as a car parked close by had exploded. It looked more like a scene from a war-zone than anything one would expect to see in the quiet and peaceful city of Oslo. This would, however, prove to be only the beginning of what would become the most gruesome attack on Norwegian soil since World War II.

Less than two hours later, reports began flooding in about shots being heard on the small island of Utøya, 40-kilometers northwest of Oslo. Still focused on the initial attack in Oslo centrum, people were slow to see any connection with the bombing. As the shooting continued on Utøya, the reality started to slowly sink in. There was a massacre happening on the island at the same time as some 600 people participating in the annual summer camp for the Worker’s Youth League (AUF), the youth wing of the Labor Party. Television viewers would soon see the horrible images of teenagers, some as young as fourteen years old, swimming for their lives and many lying dead in the water surrounding the island. The relative small size of Norway augmented the sense of terror, as “everyone” knew someone on the island. The perpetrator was apprehended about an hour after the first shot had been fired, but unlike other shooting sprees, the terrorist had not attempted to commit suicide. Instead he surrendered quietly with his hands over his head. By that time 69 people had been killed on the island of Utøya. The initial bombing in Oslo had happened on a public holiday and as a result casualties were limited to eight people.¹

¹ “Alt om tragedien” [Everything About the Tragedy], *Aftenposten*, September 21, 2011, <http://www.aftenposten.no/nyheter/iriks/article4181314.ece>. (accessed September 21, 2011).

In the chaos immediately following the explosion, news anchors and terrorist experts were busy speculating on the identity of the perpetrator and possible motivations. Norwegian participation in the war in Afghanistan was frequently cited as a likely reason,² and many international news stations wondered if the known Islamist terrorist Mullah Krekar — currently living as a refugee in Norway — could be involved.³ Television pundits were quick to jump to conclusions and attribute the attack to Al-Qaeda. Many were therefore shocked when the terrorist turned out to be the 32-year-old, blond-haired, blue-eyed Anders Behring Breivik.

Understanding Anders Behring Breivik

What could have caused one man to commit such atrocities? Much could be read from his own personal manifesto, a 1,500 page manuscript he sent out one hour before the attack to over 1,000 people he thought would be sympathetic to his cause.⁴ Drawing on the information available in the manifesto, Breivik has been characterized by many labels in the media; Christian fundamentalist, neo-Nazi, or a lone-wolf killer. However, none of these labels are adequate to explain his worldview and motivations. He makes frequent reference to the Christian crusades in his manifesto, but this seems to primarily serve to create a larger historical context for his “struggle” and as a model for fighting Islam. Indeed, he makes little reference to Christianity elsewhere, and seems to devote much more of his focus to anti-Islamism than expressing any overtly pro-Christian sentiments. He instead prefers to call himself a “cultural Christian.” He does make reference to the Aryan race, and exhibits extreme xenophobia (not just limited to Muslims), but he diverges from traditional Nazism by having pro-Israel views, and claiming that the Jews will be vital for the future battle with Islam. Police reports have confirmed that he indeed carried out this entire operation by himself, and so many commentators have thus categorized him as a lone wolf terrorist reminiscent of Timothy McVeigh or Ted Kaczynski.⁵ Anders

2 Magnus Ranstorp, terrorist expert. Live commentary on the State Broadcasting Channel, NRK, July 22, 2011..

3 He has previously been the subject of a show called “The Wanted” that aired on NBC in July 2009.

4 The entire manuscript entitled “2083 – A Declaration of European Independence” has now been distributed online, I have referenced the full text provided by The Washington Post. Visit their website at www.washingtonpost.com to find the manuscript.

5 Andrew Gumbel, “Terror in Norway,” *LA Times*, July 28, 2011, <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jul/28/opinion/la-oe-gumbel-breivik-mcveigh-20110728> (accessed September 26, 2011).

Breivik copied large parts of his manifesto from the writings of Kaczynski, but the term lone wolf is still something of a misnomer. While he was alone in his actions, he was supported by a community of people on the internet who shared many of his opinions. He did not create his twisted worldview in a vacuum. Websites like *document.no*, Jihad Watch and influential bloggers like Fjordman were important sources of inspiration. In his manifesto he quotes one of the banners from the website *Gates of Vienna* that states, “At the siege of Vienna in 1683 Islam seemed poised to overrun Christian Europe. We are in a new phase of a very old war.”⁶ Much scrutiny has been devoted to the online communities he participated in, and many have been shocked by the violent and racist nature of the debates taking place outside of public view. Still, many of his sources of inspiration are well-known authors and scholars such as Robert Spencer and Bat Ye'or, authors of *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis* and Samuel Huntington, author of *Clash of Civilizations*.

I therefore find it more fitting to describe Anders Breivik as a violent anti-Islamist, with a strong belief in a world-spanning Muslim conspiracy and the inevitable clash between Christianity and Islam. He considered himself a soldier in the global anti-jihad movement, and the July 22 terrorist attack as an act of martyrdom. Some experts have compared his worldview to be quite similar to Al-Qaeda⁷, in that it is a simple black-and-white dichotomy. The Christian and western world is on one side, with Islamists and the liberals in favor of multiculturalism as direct enemies. As such his goal with the Utøya attack was to eliminate the coming generation of politicians from the AUF party, a party he sees as betraying Norway and western culture by allowing Muslim immigrants into the country.

Central to his theory is the thought that Europe is in an unavoidable culture war, a European civil war that will last until 2083. In addition to functioning as a diary and justification for his actions, this manifesto is also meant to serve as a guidebook and call to arms for other Europeans. It is written in English and signed with the Anglicized name Anders Berwick. The detailed explanations give a chilling description of how he prepared for this terrorist action for over nine years. He set up his own farm in order to legally purchase fertilizer that would be used for making bombs, and he joined a gun club in

6 Gates of Vienna webpage, <http://gatesofvienna.blogspot.com/> (accessed September 12, 2011).

7 Niels Ebdrup, “Breivik og al-Qaida i samme kamp” [Breivik and Al-Qaeda Are in the Same Struggle], NRK, September 6, 2011, <http://www.nrk.no/vitenskap-og-teknologi/1.7822613> (accessed September 21, 2011).

order to get a license to purchase weapons. The last entry in his manifesto is dated 12:51 on the day of the terror attack and simply reads, “I think this will be my last entry.”⁸

The Aftermath of the Attacks

Norway is a country that prides itself on its democracy and peacefulness and Oslo is the city where the Nobel Peace Prize is awarded each year. As such, the scenes of July 22 seemed unthinkable to most Norwegians. Some commentators have said that this attack not only cost 77 lives, but that it also cost Norway its innocence. But how much has this terror changed the Norwegian way of life, and what has been Norway's response? In the first speech to the public after the terrorist action, Norwegian Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg made his now infamous quote “The answer to the attacks must be more democracy and more openness. If not, the terrorist will have succeeded with his goals.”⁹ These words seem to contrast sharply with the public response of US President Bush after 9/11 and phrases such as “the United States will hunt down and punish those responsible for these cowardly acts.”¹⁰ Some will point out that the situations were very different, that the 9/11 attacks were acts of politically motivated terrorism from an outside force, as opposed to the actions of one man. However at the time when the prime minister made his speech, it was still not certain how many people were behind the attacks. Indeed, it seemed unlikely that such a comprehensive attack could have been the result of just one man. Moreover, because the target was AUF, it was also clearly a politically motivated action. Many international news organizations reported on “terror bombings in Oslo” when the identity of the perpetrator was unknown, only to change the wording to “killings,” “attacks” or something similar once the identity of Breivik was revealed.¹¹ All major news outlets in Norway have consistently used the term “terrorist.” This was clearly an attack on our social values and way of life.

What does present a challenge though is how to carry these words

into action. Promising to catch those responsible and bring them to justice can be carried out in action, but “more democracy” is vague and without a clear direction. Perhaps the first test of this motto was for Norway to stay true to its democratic values and avoid any knee-jerk reactions. Politicians were quick to come out and promise that this would not lead to new security policies that would infringe on any personal rights. An attack on the scale of what Norway witnessed on the July 22 would normally be a cause for major domestic policy reorientation as a new threat emerges. Such reactionary behavior has not been witnessed in Norway, and the Police Security Service has stated that its national threat assessment remains the same as before the attack. They estimate that the extreme right-wing in Norway is composed of 300-400 people, and that radical Islam is still the greatest threat to Norwegian domestic security.¹²

A few days after the terrorist attack there was an unofficial poll on Facebook asking if people were in favor of reinstating the death penalty for Anders Breivik. While this was an inconsequential poll, it is telling that even as emotionally agitated as the Norwegian people were, over 80 percent of 2000 respondents were against it.¹³ Indeed, there were more people showing support and condolences to the mother of Breivik than people who wanted to see him executed. A recent official poll by CINT has confirmed that Norwegians' attitude toward the death penalty has not changed, and that the percentage of people in favor of it is among the lowest in the world.¹⁴ Social media is playing a growing role in politics around the world, and even in the chaotic hours after the attack, Norwegians were steadfast in their ideals. Indeed, “Our response will be record-breaking election participation” was the fastest growing Norwegian Facebook group. The following memorial service saw 200,000 people take part in the “rose marches.” Police cars, churches and entire street corners were decorated with roses, demand being so great that the tax on rose imports was suspended for a week.¹⁵

8 Neil Sears, “Vlad the Impaler Was A Genius: The Crazy and Hate-Filled Manifesto of the Mass Murderer,” *The Daily Mail*, July 25, 2011, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2018206/Norway-gunman-Anders-Behring-Breiviks-manifesto-Vlad-Impaler-genius.html> (accessed September 25, 2011).

9 “Statsministeren: Svaret er mer åpenhet” [The Prime Minister: The Answer is More Openness], *Dagens Tidene*, July 23, 2011.

10 “September 11: Chronology of Terror,” CNN, September 11, 2011, <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/US/09/11/chronology.attack/index.html>, (accessed September 27, 2011).

11 Tyler Gniewotta, “Terrorist or Fundamentalist?” *Jakarta Post*, July 29, 2011, <http://www.thejakarapost.com/news/2011/07/29/terrorist-or-fundamentalist.html> (accessed September 26, 2011).

12 Police Security Service Rapport, “Trusselvurdering. Ekstremisme i Norge etter terroraksjonene 22. Juli 2011” [Threat Assessment. Extremism in Norway After the Terrorist Attacks of July 22, 2011], July 29, 2011, http://www.pst.politiet.no/Filer/utgivelser/trusselvurderinger/trusselvurdering_2011.doc.pdf, (accessed October 7, 2011).

13 “Bør Anders Breivik få dødsstraff?” [Should Anders Breivik Get the Death Penalty?], Facebook Poll, July 26, 2011..

14 Sindre Granly Meldalen, “Nordmenn vil ikke at Breivik skal henrettes” [Norwegians Do Not Want Breivik to Be Executed], *Dagbladet*, October 8, 2011, http://www.dagbladet.no/2011/10/08/nyheter/innenriks/terror/anders_behring_breivik/dodsstraff/18499197/ (accessed October 9, 2011).

15 “Toll på roser fjernes” [Tariffs on Roses Removed], *Aftenposten*, July 29, 2011, <http://www.aftenposten.no/okonomi/article4187052.ece> (accessed October 8, 2011).

The true meaning of democracy, however, is open dialogue. It is to let the hateful thoughts of people like Breivik come to the surface. The reason the violent anti-Muslim community had a chance to grow in Norway is not only that they hid behind a veil of academia, but also in the fact that they were allowed to exist underground in their own small online communities without being challenged. The best way to deal with extremism is therefore not to silence hate groups, but instead to involve them in the public debate where their views can be disputed and opposed. By going unchallenged, small groups like Stop the Islamization of Norway (SIAN) and Norwegians Against Immigration (NMI) serve as a breeding ground for extreme right-wing opinions. The Police Security Services has labeled people like Anders Breivik as “Lacoste-Nazis,¹⁶” because of their ability to blend into society and operate in normal social settings, unlike traditional skin-heads that could be more easily identified. These groups have been able to grow in strength due to playing up what might otherwise be considered rational concerns regarding the effects of increased immigration. Immigration has been a hot-topic in Norwegian politics in recent years, with parties like the Progress Party (FRP) basing the majority of their election campaigns on reducing immigration and increasing tax cuts. The FRP has been gaining in popularity, and has continuously been the second biggest party in Norway after the Labor Party. While occasionally coming with some inflammatory comments, the FRP is usually considered less radical than many similar parties in the rest of Europe.¹⁷ Anders Breivik was himself a member of the FRP until 2007. He quit because he found the party too soft on immigration.

Norway did have a problem with more violent anti-immigration in the late 1990’s; in the form of the radical group Vigrid. Vigrid utilized symbols from Norse mythology mixed with concepts of Aryan superiority, but chose to downplay traditional Nazi symbols like the swastika and references to the Third Reich. The life of Vigrid provides an interesting example for how to deal with the current radical anti-Islam movement Anders Breivik associates himself with. Existing in the underground, Vigrid managed to consolidate the support of skinheads as well as the more general xenophobic community. Outside of the political specter it could play the role of an alternative to the current political

dialogue, being more extreme in their views than traditional political parties could allow themselves to be. They denied the holocaust and opposed what they called the “Jewish world order,” and urged Norwegians to participate in Aryan resistance against Jews and immigrants.¹⁸ Without explicitly stating it, the reply then was also “more democracy.” The Norwegian Humanist Association invited representatives from Vigrid to give a lecture as a part of the Confirmation education,¹⁹ and they were also allowed to participate in high-school mock elections. Tore Tvedt, the leader of Vigrid, often participated in public debates and got substantial media coverage. The organization apparently mistook this acknowledgment for acceptance, and Vigrid officially ran for parliamentary elections in 2009. The public response was clear. In school debates, high-school students would often turn their back to the invited Vigrid speakers, and their election turnout was a pitiful 179 votes.²⁰ With dwindling number of members, the leader Tore Tvedt resigned and Vigrid were closed down in 2009.²¹ Norwegians have an old saying; “Let the trolls into the sun, and they will turn to stone;” this logic has also guided our public response towards extremists.

The future of Norway

People did indeed answer with more democracy, and municipal elections (originally scheduled for mid-August but pushed to early September) had record-high turnouts, even with 63.6 percent voter turn-out. A new try-out system with selected municipalities giving voting rights to 16 and 17-year-olds showed similar turnout numbers for this demographic. The Labor Party (AP, the mother party of AUF) has always done well, and had a two percent increase from the 2007 elections.²² There were speculations that the AP would get many sympathy votes stemming from the Utøya terror, but this doesn’t seem to have been the case. The Progress Party, known for running on a platform of stricter immigration control, did however suffer a 6.1 percentage point decline from last election. While it is clear that their anti-immigration policies didn’t resonate as

16 The term comes from the fact that Anders Breivik was wearing a Lacoste shirt when he was arrested, and in his manifesto he mentions the brand when he advocates dressing “conservative and professional”. As previously mentioned the term Nazi is however slightly misleading.

17 Gunnar Thorenfeldt and Astrid Medland, “Mener Breivik var en ensom ulv” [Believes Breivik Was a Lone Wolf], *Dagbladet*, August 8, 2011, http://www.dagbladet.no/2011/08/08/nyheter/hoyreekstremisme/internett/behring_breivik/17601726/ (accessed August 8, 2011).

18 Hans O. Torgersen, “Tvedt står ved omstridte utsagn” [Tvedt Stands by Controversial Statements], *Aftenposten*, October 13, 2006.

19 Britt Boyesen and Cecilie Valentine Brekke, “Vigrid underviste konfirmanter” [Vigrid Talked to Confirmands], *NRK*, March 8, 2010, <http://www.nrk.no/nyheter/distrikt/ostafjells/buskerud/1.7028080> (accessed September 28, 2011).

20 Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development, http://www.regjeringen.no/krd/html/valg2009/bs4_6.html (accessed September 25, 2011).

21 SOS Racism, <http://www.sos-rasisme.no/start/13240.html> (accessed September 20, 2011).

22 Valgportalen, www.valg.no (accessed September 25, 2011).

well in the immediate post-July 22 Norway, there are clear indicators that they had lost power even before the Utøya terror. Perhaps more telling is that most parties have seen a sharp increase in membership, and that Jens Stoltenberg currently has the highest approval rating of any prime minister in Norwegian history.²³

The events of July 22 will be with Norway a long time into the future. As the most brutal attack on Norwegian soil since the World War II, it is estimated to have a profound impact on Norwegian society and culture. Many might have been surprised with how quick “daily life” returned. Before the sea of roses left by grieving masses in the capital had decomposed there had been another election and life was going on as usual. Norway is now in the process of deciding who gets to narrate the story of the Utøya terror documentary and other conservative bloggers are putting the blame of Breivik’s extreme action on the left for politically silencing the more moderate anti-Islamists.²⁴ To them, Breivik did not become a killer because he was exposed to right wing hate propaganda, but because of “liberal demonization” of legitimate criticism of immigration policy. The fact that these voices are now being heard in the media is a healthy sign of an open democratic debate.

Since the terror attack there has not only been a growing desire to understand people like Anders Breivik, but also to get a bigger understanding of the Muslim community in Norway. In the memorial service, Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg talked about the “new we,” and the importance of all levels of Norwegian society to be included in the grieving process. A new program by Anti-Racist Center called Tea-Time, where Muslim Norwegians invite strangers into their house for tea and conversation, has gotten a swarm of interest following the attacks,²⁵ with as many as 20,000 new participants. It is almost difficult to find enough Muslims to participate, considering Muslim immigrants make up less than four percent of the total population.²⁶ This initiative gives room for simple, informal conversations about cultural differences, and the participation of the Queen and Crown-princess has helped it garner popularity

and acceptance. The common denominator to Norway’s response to this tragedy seems to be the realization that terror does not have a physical presence, and cannot be fought as such. Terror is not an entity, it has no address or soldiers. The root cause of terror is values and beliefs, and it is through these tools we must fight it.

Experts propose that the reason neo-Nazis have never been able to get a strong presence in Norway is due to Norway’s historical recollection of the atrocities of World War II and the negative association to Quisling and the Nazi regime as traitors.²⁷ Just over the border to the east in Sweden, who was neutral during the war, there is a much stronger neo-Nazi presence. If the democratic, egalitarian public can successfully shape the narrative of Utøya, this terrorist action can be used to spur further public debate, more democracy, and make sure this kind of extremism is met with the same calls of “never again” that helped shape post-war Norway. Now is the time to start asking the hard questions. The democratization of Norway’s public recollection is one that is vital to conserving the social-democratic values of Norwegian society. The last post on Anders Breivik’s twitter account was a quote from the philosopher John Stuart Mill saying: “One person with a belief is equal to the force of 100,000 who have only interests.”²⁸ Breivik might have had his beliefs, but the Norwegian public still holds an unwavering belief in our democratic values. Through this terrible national tragedy Norway have been reminded of what its most important social values are, and what we must strive to uphold and improve. Going forward in rebuilding everyday life in Norway, our new motto has become the quote of one of the terror survivors, Helle Ganestad, who stated, “If one man can create so much hate, think of how much love we can create together.”²⁹ **PEAR**

23 Kirsten Karlsen, “Jens Imponerer” [Jens Impresses], *Dagbladet*, October 4, 2011, http://www.dagbladet.no/2011/10/05/nyheter/ap/innenriks/politikk/jens_stoltenberg/18457977/ (accessed October 4, 2011).

24 Anders Heger, “Kampen om fortellingeng” [The Battle for the Story], *Nyemeningen*, October 1, 2011, http://www.nyemeningen.no/alle_meningen/cat1003/subcat1010/thread189787/?layout=button_count (accessed October 1, 2011).

25 “Økende interesse for å drikke te med muslimer” [Increased Interest for Drinking Tea with Muslims], *GD*, August 4, 2011, <http://www.gd.no/nyheter/article5690672.ece> (accessed August 7, 2011).

26 Stephen M. Walt, “Breivik’s Warped Worldview,” *Foreign Policy*, July 29, 2011, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/07/29/breiviks_warped_world_view (accessed September 28, 2011).

27 SOS Racism.

28 Jørgen M. Gilbrandt, “Anders Behring Breiviks Twitter-konto hacket,” [Anders Behring Breivik’s Twitter Account Hacked], *Dagbladet*, July 31, 2011. The twitter account was later hacked and the quote removed.

29 Uhellet, Twitter Post dated July 23, 2011, <http://twitter.com/#!/uhellet>, (accessed September 23, 2011).