

Notice of Decision under Section 38(1)

TO: Chief Censor

Title of publication: 2083: A European Declaration of Independence

Other known title: Oslo Manifesto

OFLC ref: 2100168.000

Medium: Text File

Author: Anders Behring Breivik

Country of origin: Norway

Language: English

| | |
|------------------------|----------------|
| Classification: | Objectionable. |
|------------------------|----------------|

Excisions: None

Descriptive Note: None

Display conditions: None

Reasons for the Decision

The Office of Film and Literature Classification (Classification Office) examined the publication and recorded the contents in an examination transcript. A written consideration of the legal criteria was undertaken. This document provides the reasons for the decision.

Submission procedure:

The Chief Censor called in the publication and submitted it for classification on 28 April 2021 under s13(3) of the Films, Videos, and Publications Classification Act 1993 (FVPC Act).

The Secretary for Internal Affairs was notified of the submission on 6 May 2021. As a person with an interest in the classification they were informed of their right to make written submissions on the classification. The closing date for written submissions was 26 May 2021.

Under s23(1) of the FVPC Act the Classification Office is required to examine and classify the publication.

Under s23(2) of the FVPC Act the Classification Office must determine whether the publication is to be classified as unrestricted, objectionable, or objectionable except in particular circumstances.

Section 23(3) permits the Classification Office to restrict a publication that would otherwise be classified as objectionable so that it can be made available to particular persons or classes of persons for educational, professional, scientific, literary, artistic, or technical purposes.

Synopsis of written submission(s):

No written submissions were received.

Description of the publication:

The *Oslo Manifesto* (titled *2083: A European Declaration of Independence*) is the 1500+¹ page document released by Anders Behring Breivik (now Fjotolf Hansen²) just before he conducted two terrorist attacks in Norway on 22 July 2011.

Breivik killed eight people by bomb blast in the government quarter of Oslo and then gunned down a further 69, mainly teenagers and young adults, at the Workers' Youth League (AUF) summer camp in Utoya.³ He surrendered without resistance when the authorities finally arrived on Utoya. Breivik was found guilty of terrorism and premeditated murder at his trial in 2012 and was sentenced to 21 years in prison – the maximum allowed under Norwegian law.

The cover contains an image of a red St. George's cross on a white background along with the title and a subscript in Latin. The document is credited to Andrew Berwick, an anglicised translation of Anders Breivik.

The publication is a compendium of Breivik's own writing and a collection of essays, blogposts and other texts from individuals who are prominent in the anti-Islam and counter-jihadi⁴ milieus of North America and Europe. It contains an introduction and then is divided into three sections (or books, according to Breivik):

1. What you need to know, our falsified history and other forms of cultural Marxist/multiculturalist propaganda (Book 1) [pages 45-286]
2. Europe Burning (Book 2) [pages 287-775]
3. A Declaration of pre-emptive War (Book 3) [pages 776-1515]

¹ The *Oslo Manifesto* appears to be available as a 1515 or 1518 page document. The page references in this decision refer to the 1515 page document.

² Breivik legally changed his name to Fjotolf Hansen in 2017. However, we will refer to him as Breivik in this document as he is more commonly known by this name.

³ The bombing in Oslo and the attack in Utoya will collectively be referred to as the Oslo attacks.

⁴ The counter-jihadi movement is a collection of bloggers, activists, think tanks, lobbyists and pundits across the US and Western Europe, all united by the shared belief, to varying degrees, that Islam is at war with the 'West'.

The first half (Books 1 and 2) of the publication presents Breivik's conspiratorial far-right world view through the writings of his favoured counter-jihadists and anti-Islamists. He believes Europe is facing an existential threat due to the influx of Muslims. He includes selective accounts of history and a variety of misrepresented statistics to lend credibility to the claims made in the document. The key components of Breivik's extremist ideology can be summarised as Islamophobia, far-right nationalism, antifeminism and militant Christianity.

The third book, which represents half the document, is largely concerned with Breivik's proposed solution – a violent conservative revolution that plays itself out in three phases. It begins with a lengthy disclaimer, which Breivik states is included as security so the reader can distribute the document without fear of prosecution. The section includes a wide range of tactical, strategic, and practical advice for anyone who wants to follow Breivik's example.

Breivik also outlines his visions for the future in a collection of musings that amount to over 100 pages. He imagines a conservative, patriarchal, mono-cultural Europe that practices a version of militant Christianity focused on societal cohesion rather than religious doctrine or devotion. His view is that everyone living in Europe will have to conform to these ideals or be forcibly deported elsewhere.

A number of chapters towards the end of Book 3 are incomplete and marked with statements such as "Under Construction", "Rough Draft", and "Not Edited". Breivik viewed the publication as a work in progress that others could add to and improve on.

A loose diary/personal log and a lengthy Q&A section complete Book 3. The Q&A material is a rehash of Breivik's ideology, conviction, and visions for the future presented as if he were an aspirational leader being unveiled to an adoring public. Insights into his personal history appear to be fabricated, exaggerated and misrepresented to cast him in a highly flattering light.

The document ends with a collection of 'professional' photo-shopped glamour photographs, which Breivik hoped would inspire his intended audience and be used by media and the authorities.

Consultations and written submissions:

There are many publications freely available on the internet and elsewhere written by terrorists and mass murderers seeking to glorify themselves and their actions. The Classification Office has not sought to proactively classify such documents for many reasons including not wanting to bring undue attention to them and because they are not directly linked to New Zealand in any significant way. The *Oslo Manifesto* represented one such publication until the events of 15 March 2019. The Royal Commission Report into the Christchurch mosque attacks refers extensively to the *Oslo Manifesto*, and the influential role it played in the terrorist's actions. This prompted us to conduct a formal classification.

Dealing with historic publications, like the *Oslo Manifesto*, in a digital world is complex and difficult. We currently operate within a 30-year-old legislative framework that was designed to deal with the world of physical media. This world no longer exists. The potentially high criminal penalties that apply to those intentionally creating and distributing content can now, theoretically, apply to those sharing a web page (thereby distributing the

publication). The creators, hosts and digital distributors of harmful content are often in other countries, making enforcement against them, in some cases, difficult or impossible.

The 'classification paradox':

The Classification Office often faces a 'classification paradox' in dealing with this type of material: what obligations of public information/transparency apply alongside a classification decision that renders the sharing or simple possession of such material a criminal act?

In the case of the material related to the Christchurch mosque attacks, the Classification Office highlighted the decisions in a very public way. We recognise that, without this clear public messaging, many members of the public would be at risk of continuing to possess and distribute the material with little or no understanding that what they were doing was a criminal act.

Subsequent decisions on promotional livestreams and associated documents (such as in the case of the attacks in Halle, Germany in 2019) were also made very rapidly, and with public announcements. In some other cases, however, a decision has been made not to 'call in', classify, and publicise the material – because an assessment was made that there was little public awareness of, and low levels of interest in, the videos, images or documents in question. In calling in, classifying, and announcing decisions around some of this material, the publicity itself could draw attention to, and effectively increase the potential audience for, the publications.

It is possible to classify publications without publicity, but this places innocent members of public at risk of unwittingly possessing an objectionable publication. The Classification Office is not responsible for enforcement but we take into account the possible impacts of decisions we make under s 3(4) of the FVPC Act, particularly where decisions may have the effect of criminalising possession of material that New Zealanders may believe is lawful.

A balancing act:

This type of publication raises complex freedom of expression and harm issues. The public may legitimately be interested in understanding a perpetrator's rationale, but we also know that many of these publications are intended to provide inspiration and guidance for supporters to follow.

We decided to carry out a series of consultations to better inform this classification and the difficult balancing exercise it presents. We consulted minority and religious groups and sought the views of organisations in the tech sector and those in online environments, where we know this document will continue to exist regardless of any formal classification in New Zealand. We also wanted to gain some insight in how we should deal with this type of material in the future.

The consultation was targeted due to the sensitive nature of the topic and to minimise amplifying the content or encouraging people to seek out it out. We consulted with members of the Muslim, Jewish and Christian faiths, the National Council of Women of NZ (NCWNZ), academics, the tech sector, a survivor of the Oslo attacks and a group of young people. We also received written submissions from NCWNZ and the New Zealand Catholic Bishops Conference.

Our written submission form contained 10 questions that provided an opportunity to respond to all aspects of the consultation. Our consultation workshops took place between July and September 2021. They followed the same 10-question framework, but frequently broadened to discuss matters of specific interest to those present. We have briefly summarised the consensus view of our consultees and submitters below. A more thorough analysis of their responses is in our consultation report.

1. *Awareness – did you already know about this publication?*

All those who took part in the consultations knew of the publication but to varying degrees. Some had been aware of it following the Oslo attacks and others became aware of it as a result of the Royal Commission Report into the Christchurch mosque attacks.

2. *Who do you think is the intended audience and are they likely to be influenced by it?*

There was a general consensus that the publication is aimed at disaffected men who believe in extreme far right ideologies.

3. *Do you think the availability of this publication in Aotearoa New Zealand is harmful or dangerous?*

Most believed there was clear evidence that the publication has already caused harm in Aotearoa New Zealand. Some talked specifically about the role that the publication played in the Christchurch mosque attacks (as outlined in the Royal Commission Report) as evidence of the harmful and dangerous impact it has had.

4. *Availability – is there any value or importance in this document being publicly available?*

There were two general points of view in response to this question. Some thought it should remain in the public domain (as it has done for the last 10 years) so that the issues can be debated and discussed. Others thought it should be made objectionable but exemptions need to be available if the publication was required for research purposes.

5. *What would be the impact on your community if it were banned?*

As documented in the answer to the previous question many felt strongly that publication needed to be made available for legitimate research and reporting purposes if it were made objectionable. Young people were particularly concerned about the availability of extremist material like the *Oslo Manifesto* on social media platforms. They felt making this type of material objectionable would be a positive step in preventing young people from being radicalised.

6. *What about if it were to be age restricted e.g. R18?*

There was little appetite from responders to age restricting this publication. Most felt that the intended audience and the majority of those likely to act and perpetrate the violence expressed within it were over the age of 18. A number of responders felt there should be a range of tailored classifications between R18 and objectionable.

7. *Banning or age-restricting this publication would limit freedom of expression – when could this be justified?*

A common theme expressed by those responding to the consultation was that freedom of speech or expression comes with responsibilities and trade-offs. Many

voiced the opinion that freedom of expression could justifiably be restricted if it were used to intentionally harm others. A few expressed the opinion that all forms of hateful ideologies should be out in the open so that they can be defeated through debate. Several consultees also noted the risk that making publications objectionable could have the opposite effect of making them more desirable to certain people.

8. *What are your views about the positives and negatives overall of either banning, age restricting or leaving this publication unrestricted?*

Responders generally felt that there were more positives to classifying this document as 'objectionable' than there were to age-restricting or leaving the publication unrestricted, although a small number did favour an age restriction classification. Either way, there were some concerns about what restricting access to the document could mean (whether that be through an age restriction or through exemptions under an objectionable classification).

9. *The publication is one of many written by violent extremists, some have been banned and some have not, is it useful to classify these types of publications?*

There was acknowledgment that the sheer volume of these types of publications that are available makes it difficult to understand where something goes from being a hateful publication to a publication that will cause real harm and is unlawful in the New Zealand context. And that the act of classifying documents can lead to drawing attention to otherwise unknown publications.

10. *Are there any risks or downsides to the classification of these types of publications?*

Similar responses were made to those for classifying the *Oslo Manifesto*, including drawing attention or amplifying such documents, the practicalities of doing this with the thousands of documents in existence, and the risk of making them seem more attractive.

New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990:

Section 14 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (NZBORA) states that everyone has "the right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and opinions of any kind in any form". Under s5 of the NZBORA, this freedom is subject "only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society". Section 6 of the NZBORA states that "Wherever an enactment can be given a meaning that is consistent with the rights and freedoms contained in this Bill of Rights, that meaning shall be preferred to any other meaning".

The meaning of "objectionable":

Section 3(1) of the FVPC Act sets out the meaning of the word "objectionable". The section states that a publication is objectionable if it:

describes, depicts, expresses, or otherwise deals with matters such as sex, horror, crime, cruelty, or violence in such a manner that the availability of the publication is likely to be injurious to the public good.

The Court of Appeal's interpretation of the words "matters such as sex, horror, crime, cruelty or violence" in s3(1), as set out in *Living Word Distributors v Human Rights Action Group (Wellington)*, must also be taken into account in the classification of any publication:

[27] The words "matters such as" in context are both expanding and limiting. They expand the qualifying content beyond a bare focus on one of the five categories specified. But the expression "such as" is narrower than "includes", which was the term used in defining "indecent" in the repealed Indecent Publications Act 1963. Given the similarity of the content description in the successive statutes, "such as" was a deliberate departure from the unrestricting "includes".

[28] The words used in s3 limit the qualifying publications to those that can fairly be described as dealing with matters of the kinds listed. In that regard, too, the collocation of words "sex, horror, crime, cruelty or violence", as the matters dealt with, tends to point to activity rather than to the expression of opinion or attitude.

[29] That, in our view, is the scope of the subject matter gateway.⁵

The content of the publication must bring it within the "subject matter gateway". In classifying the publication therefore, the main question is whether or not it deals with any s3(1) matters in such a manner that the availability of the publication is likely to be injurious to the public good.

Matters such as crime, cruelty and violence

The *Oslo Manifesto* deals extensively with crime, cruelty and violence. It presents the rationale and justification for the Oslo attacks and urges the reader to carry out similar acts of violence in support of the extremist ideology and revolutionary agenda it promotes.

Certain publications are "deemed to be objectionable":

Under s3(2) of the FVPC Act, a publication is deemed to be objectionable if it promotes or supports, or tends to promote or support, certain activities listed in that subsection.

In *Moonen v Film and Literature Board of Review (Moonen I)*, the Court of Appeal stated that the words "promotes or supports" must be given "such available meaning as impinges as little as possible on the freedom of expression"⁶ in order to be consistent with the Bill of Rights. The Court then set out how a publication may come within a definition of "promotes or supports" in s3(2) that impinges as little as possible on the freedom of expression:

Description and depiction ... of a prohibited activity do not of themselves necessarily amount to promotion of or support for that activity. There must be something about the way the prohibited activity is described, depicted or otherwise dealt with, which can fairly be said to have the effect of promoting or supporting that activity.⁷

Mere depiction or description of any of the s3(2) matters will generally not be enough to deem a publication to be objectionable under s3(2). When used in conjunction with an activity, the Classification Office defines "promote" to mean the advancement or encouragement of that activity. The Classification Office interprets the word "support" to mean the upholding and strengthening of something so that it is more likely to endure. A publication must therefore advance, encourage, uphold or strengthen, rather than merely

⁵ *Living Word Distributors v Human Rights Action Group (Wellington)* [2000] 3 NZLR 570 at paras 27-29.

⁶ *Moonen v Film and Literature Board of Review* [2000] 2 NZLR 9 at para 27.

⁷ Above n2 at para 29.

depict, describe or deal with, one of the matters listed in s3(2) for it to be deemed to be objectionable under that provision.

The Classification Office has considered all of the matters in s3(2). The relevant matter is:

s3(2)(f) *acts of torture or the infliction of extreme violence or extreme cruelty.*

The Classification Office has carefully considered whether the publication promotes or supports or tends to promote or support acts of torture or the infliction of extreme violence or extreme cruelty.

Some may argue that the *Oslo Manifesto* cannot be separated from the Oslo attacks, which resulted in the death of 77 individuals and serious injury of many others. The attack on Utoya undoubtedly involved countless acts of extreme violence and cruelty.

While the document justifies the Oslo attacks and calls for further acts of violence that may well result in similar death and destruction, there are no detailed descriptions or depictions of these acts. The violence that the *Oslo Manifesto* promotes is set within the wider promotion of crime and terroristic violence in support of an extremist agenda. Full consideration of these contextual factors requires application of both ss3(3) and 3(4) of the FVPC Act and is not possible with the application of s3(2) alone.

Accordingly, the Classification Office has not deemed the publication objectionable under s3(2) of the FVPC Act.

Matters to be given particular weight:

Section 3(3) of the FVPC Act deals with the matters that the Classification Office must give particular weight to in determining whether or not any publication (other than a publication to which subsection (2) of this section applies) is objectionable or must, in accordance with section 23(2), be given a classification other than objectionable.

The Classification Office has considered all the matters in s3(3). The matters relevant to the publication are:

s3(3)(d) *the extent and degree to which, and the manner in which, the publication promotes or encourages criminal acts or acts of terrorism.*

Breivik sets out the purpose of the publication in his introduction:

The compendium/book presents advanced ideological, practical, tactical, organisational and rhetorical solutions and strategies for all patriotic-minded individuals/movements. The book will be of great interest to you whether you are a moderate or a more dedicated cultural conservative/nationalist.

[About the compendium – 2083: page 11]

He adds:

I am 100% certain that the distribution of this compendium to a large portion of European patriots will contribute to ensure our victory in the end. Because within these three books lies

the tools required to win the ongoing Western European cultural war.

[About the compendium – 2083: page 12]

The first half of the publication presents the justification for the Oslo attacks and establishes Breivik's conspiratorial far-right nationalist worldview.

The crux of Breivik's ideology is a deep aversion to Islam, which is framed as a totalitarian hate ideology defined by conquest, slavery, and genocide. Islam and Europe have supposedly been engaged in a grand civilisational struggle that has been going on for centuries:

Islamic scholarship divides the world into two spheres of influence, the House of Islam (dar al-Islam) and the House of War (dar al-harb). Islam means submission, and so the House of Islam includes those nations that have submitted to Islamic rule, which is to say those nations ruled by Sharia law. The rest of the world, which has not accepted Sharia law and so is not in a state of submission, exists in a state of rebellion or war with the will of Allah. It is incumbent on dar al-Islam to make war upon dar al-harb until such time that all nations submit to the will of Allah and accept Sharia law.

[1.4 Review 1: Religion of Peace? Islam's war against the world – Islam 101: page 78]

The modern migration of Muslims to Europe is classified as the "third wave of jihad". Breivik claims that Muslims are stealthily waging "demographic warfare" and will inevitably supplant indigenous White Christian populations and their culture. Violent jihad and the "dhimmitude" (subjugation) of non-Muslims is presented as central to Islam:

The doctrine of Islam is clear on these points as are the adherents of the so-called "religion of peace". Jihad is a responsibility for all Muslims. It is the command of both Allah and Mohammed. Muslims [sic] who do Jihad are "good" Muslims because they follow the commands of Allah and Mohammed; those who do not do jihad are "extremists" because they reject the commands of the doctrine of Islam. Those who reject jihad are perfect fodder for jihadists because they are not "good" Muslims. This concept must be understood clearly. Our conceptions of good/evil, right/wrong do not apply in the Islamic worldview.

[2.24 Ignorance and Multiculturalism must be destroyed: page 408]

Revisionist accounts of historical conflicts and modern day violence are misrepresented as acts of militant jihadism and all part of a grand plan to convert the world to Islam. The Crusades are recast as heroic defensive expeditions that successfully repelled the Muslim invaders.

The grandiose presentation of history as a Manichean clash of religious ideologies is a well-established tactic adopted by other terrorist publications – *Dabiq* and *Inspire* present the same theme from an Islamic terrorism perspective. The official title of the *Oslo Manifesto* references the 400th anniversary of the Battle of Vienna – a victory that is celebrated within the counter-jihadi movement. Christian armies ended the siege of Vienna in 1683 and stopped the Ottomans from marching into central Europe (the second wave of jihad). Breivik foresees a similar victory in 2083 for the revolution he seeks to inspire. The *Oslo Manifesto* effectively presents Breivik's ideology and the violence he advocates as the latest chapter in a righteous, ongoing struggle.

Breivik is convinced that Europe will succumb to Islam when Muslim populations exceed 50-60% of the total population. Population statistics are unscientifically and erroneously

extrapolated as credible evidence. He calculates the 50% threshold will be reached in the latter half of 21st century without the intervention of patriotic individuals like himself.

The concept of White populations being replaced by the influx of migrants (specifically Muslims, recently) has been an established narrative within White extremist circles for decades. The unsubstantiated White genocide or 'Great Replacement' narrative has bled into mainstream conservative media and political discourse recently.^{8,9} This theme is likely to resonate with disaffected White individuals, especially those who already share Breivik's worldview.

While the publication clearly identifies Islam and Muslims as the enemy of the West, Breivik's primary indignation is aimed at so-called 'cultural Marxists' or 'Multiculturalists' – the domestic groups he considers directly or indirectly responsible for the "Islamic invasion".

Multiculturalists/cultural Marxists usually operate under the guise of humanism. A majority are anti-nationalists and want to deconstruct European identity, traditions, culture and even nation states.

[About the compendium – 2083: page 12]

Cultural Marxism is a far-right conspiracy theory that claims a small group of critical theorists who fled Nazi Germany conspired to destroy conservative White culture by introducing 'Marxist' principles such as equality and political correctness into educational and political institutions. The conspiracy carries deep anti-Semitic connotations given that many of the critical theorists were Jewish.

Breivik insists that the European political majority, educationalists, journalists, feminists and global capitalists are all cultural Marxists who have intentionally indoctrinated the public. He identifies these groups as traitorous as they have promoted immigration and championed multiculturalism. The Eurabia conspiracy theory is presented as evidence of collusion between the European political elite and the Arab world to facilitate the replacement of White Christians with Muslims:

Multiculturalism is wrong because not all cultures are equal. However, it is also championed by groups with a hidden agenda. Multiculturalism serves as a tool for ruling elites to fool people, to keep them from knowing that they have lost, or deliberately vacated, control over national borders. Leftists who dislike Western civilisation use multiculturalism to undermine it, a hate ideology disguised as tolerance. Multiculturalism equals the unilateral destruction of Western culture, the only unilateral action the West is allowed to take, according to some.

[2.5 Boycott the United Nations! page 339]

The first half of the publication ends with Breivik explaining his ideological journey in an effort to connect with the reader. He alludes to being 'red-pilled', a concept that is likely to appeal to those who are vulnerable to radicalisation.

All patriots sometimes feel like that guy in the Matrix who wants to go back into his pod, and pretend he never learned the truth. It would be better wouldn't it? At least for a short while,

⁸ Jacob Davey, Julia Ebner. 2019 *The Great Replacement: the violent consequences of mainstreamed extremism*. Institute for Strategic Dialogue. <https://www.isdglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/The-Great-Replacement-The-Violent-Consequences-of-Mainstreamed-Extremism-by-ISD.pdf>

⁹ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/09/27/how-republicans-learned-stop-worrying-embrace-replacement-theory-by-name/>

but then again, my children would have hated me for my cowardice a few decades down the road as THEY would have been forced to suffer due to my cowardice.

[2.106 The Ideological journey – from indoctrinated multiculturalist zealot to Conservative Revolutionary: page 771]

The publication frames cultural conservatives and ethno-nationalists, such as Breivik, and indigenous White Europeans as victims. The threat of occupation, subjugation, discrimination, emasculation and annihilation are repeatedly employed to create a sense of impending doom and urgency. The hegemony of the cultural Marxists means a political solution is not possible. Therefore, violent resistance and revolution is not only justifiable but necessary:

The cultural Marxists have for more than 50 years disregarded the will of the majority of Europeans. 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. It's not just a right but a duty for all Europeans to defend oneself against such atrocities through armed struggle. We call upon you, fellow Europeans. Stop complaining and instead fight by our side.

We, the patriotic Europeans, will continue to effectively revolt against the "Nazis of our time"; the cultural Marxist/multiculturalist elites, who are leading us to the cultural slaughterhouse by selling us into Muslim slavery.

[3.5 A new era has come – the time for dialogue is now over: page 811]

The second half (Book 3) of the publication describes a future in which patriots like Breivik fight back. Breivik predicts the revolution he is about to inspire will play out in three phases over the next decades.

Spearheading this resistance is a reborn Knights Templar order – a heroic modern day crusader force of leaderless patriotic men willing to sacrifice themselves for the greater good. Breivik claims to be a founding member of the secretive group. The creation of an imaginary Knights Templar order provides Breivik with a religious and moral mandate for his murderous actions. It also serves to inspire the dormant warrior instincts inside those who may want to follow his example. The document is dotted with romanticised imagery of knights in shining armour, swords in hand, kneeling, riding, fighting, bursting forth, martyring.¹⁰

The call for violence and mass murder is unambiguous. It is repeated throughout the second half of the publication:

There have already been thousands of pre-emptive strikes from brave Europeans all over Europe. However, the majority of attacks have been impotent "poop in mailbox" operations with zero to little ideological effect. In order to successfully penetrate the cultural Marxist/multiculturalist media censorship we are forced to employ significantly more brutal and breath taking [sic] operations which will result in casualties. In order for the attack to gain an influential effect, assassinations and the use of weapons of mass destruction must be embraced. When employing such methods the Justiciar Knight becomes a force multiplier, he becomes a one-man army. The continuation of these "humiliating strikes" on

¹⁰ Gardell, Mattias. 2014 Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 26.1: 129-155.

the Multiculturalist system will contribute to destroy the cultural Marxist hegemony in Europe.

[3.16 PCCTS – Purpose and objectives of re-founding: page 833]

Cultural Marxists are usefully categorised in an A to D traitor classification system. They are charged with a variety of imaginary offences such as being responsible for cultural genocide; abetting the foreign invasion of Europe; and being responsible for the institutionalised persecution of those who attempt to resist. Those in the A and B categories are stated to have been sentenced to death by the Knights Templar. A variety of possible targets and methods of attack are discussed and suggested as options for those who wish to join the cause.

Breivik seems undecided on the immediate fate of Muslims in the West. On the one hand killing Muslims is seen as a distraction from targeting cultural Marxists. But, on the other hand, one of the key objectives of the Knights Templar is the radicalisation of Muslims through strategic attacks on their communities. Attacks on Muslim women are suggested as a 'pragmatic' way of inciting retaliatory violence that will reveal the true face of Islam.

The publication contains hundreds of pages of practical advice for any aspirational terrorist who wants to follow Breivik's example. Topics covered in detail include:

- Bomb-making instructions.
- Blueprints for homemade armour and defensive weapons.
- Tips for acquiring firearms and creating chemical bullets.
- Consideration of biological weapons.
- Planning an operation/attack.
- Combat strategies and tactics.
- Recommendations for training and physical conditioning including the use of steroids and stimulants.

Breivik addresses the cruel nature of the operations he proposes. He justifies using terror as a means of waking up the masses even though the people may initially hate you for it:

As a Justiciar Knight you are operating as a jury, judge and executioner on behalf of all free Europeans. Never forget that it is not only your right to act against the tyranny of the cultural Marxist/multiculturalist elites of Europe, it is your duty to do so.

There are situations in which cruelty is necessary, and refusing to apply necessary cruelty is a betrayal of the people whom you wish to protect.

Once you decide to strike, it is better to kill too many than not enough, or you risk reducing the desired ideological impact of the strike. Explain what you have done (in an announcement distributed prior to operation) and make certain that everyone understands that we, the free peoples of Europe, are going to strike again and again. Do not apologise, make excuses or express regret for you are acting in self-defence or in a pre-emptive manner. In many ways, morality has lost its meaning in our struggle. The question of good and evil is reduced to one simple choice. For every free patriotic European, only one choice remains: Survive or perish. Some innocent will die in our operations as they are simply at the wrong place at the wrong time. Get used to the idea (sic). The needs of the many will always surpass the needs of the few.

[3.23 The cruel nature of our operations: page 846]

The discussion of certain topics, such as an attack on a nuclear power plant, provides a sense of Breivik's grand ambition but is incredibly fanciful in tone. Notwithstanding some of the more outlandish operations he suggests, the core instructional advice contained in the publication remains highly credible given his own example and the actions of the Christchurch Mosque attacker.

The *Oslo Manifesto* promotes and encourages acts of crime and terrorism to a high extent and degree, and in a manner that is likely to be injurious to the public good. The publication is quite clearly a call to arms and an incitement to terroristic violence. It contains several elements that are common in works of terrorist propaganda:

- Establishes an in-group (Cultural conservatives, native Europeans and the reborn Knights Templar) and an outgroup (Cultural Marxists, feminists and Islam).
- Presents the out-group as an existential threat to the in-group.
- Justifies violent action against the out-group by demonising them.
- Misrepresents terroristic violence as a righteous historical struggle.
- Argues those who join the cause are heroic and selfless.
- Creates a false sense of urgency to spur others into action.
- Includes unambiguous calls for terroristic violence.
- Insists violence is the only solution.
- Includes detailed instructional guidance.

*S3(3)(e) The extent and degree to which, and the manner in which, the publication represents (whether directly or by implication) that members of any particular class of the public are inherently inferior to other members of the public by reason of any characteristic of members of that class, being a characteristic that is a prohibited ground of discrimination specified in section 21(1) of the Human Rights Act 1993.*¹¹

The conceptualisation of Islam in the publication frames Muslims as inherently destructive because of their beliefs. They are labelled as “animals” at one point but this is not a reference that is used repeatedly. Muslims, especially those already living in the West, are portrayed as duplicitous and intent on destabilising the West to institute Sharia law. Highly selective examples of Quranic scripture and hadith (sayings of the prophet Muhammad) are misrepresented as evidence of Islamic doctrine that places this obligation on Muslims.

Misogyny is a key element of the *Oslo Manifesto*. Radical feminism is presented as a movement that is contrary to nature. It has heralded a social revolution that has resulted in the loss of traditional patriarchal norms and gendered responsibilities. Feminists have neglected their reproductive duties and by implication are responsible for the declining birthrates. The European man has been emasculated by the empowerment of women and this has left him weak and unable to fend off the onslaught of the Muslim masses. Feminists (as adherents of cultural Marxism) are viewed as crucial supporters of immigration and the Islamic invasion.

The ideology contained in the *Oslo Manifesto* represents the modern far right, which has shifted away from arguments about genetics and race to the preservation of White culture. Islam, feminism, equality, globalism, and the liberal left have been identified as existential threats to White culture and the traditional status of the White, cis-gendered man. Breivik distances himself from the overt racism of traditional far-right groups by framing his

¹¹ The grounds of discrimination prohibited by s21(1) of the Human Rights Act 1993 are sex, marital status, religious belief, ethical belief, colour, race, ethnic or national origins, disability, age, political opinion, employment status, family status and sexual orientation.

discourse as a critique of Islam, rather than of any race or people. He urges his supporters and far-right activists to avoid the use of words such as 'White supremacy' and 'race' to appeal to as many people as possible.

Despite the clear discriminatory and misogynistic basis for the document, it cannot fairly be said to convincingly promote the notion that members of any race, religion, or ethnic group are inferior. Nor does it convincingly promote the notion that women are inferior. The document demonises Islam and feminism in an obvious, unsubtle effort to present them as credible and convincing threats. Only those who already share Breivik's worldview and those who are vulnerable to radicalisation are likely to find the pronouncements contained in the *Oslo Manifesto* convincing.

Additional matters to be considered:

S3(4)(a) The dominant effect of the publication as a whole.

The *Oslo Manifesto* is a bloated, dense, and lengthy document that is partly a compendium of pseudo-intellectual texts that reflect a conspiratorial far-right worldview, partly a narcissistic, aggrandised autobiography, partly a tool for radicalisation, partly an instructional manual for terroristic violence, and partly a declaration of war.

The publication sets out Breivik's justification for the Oslo attacks as an act of self-defence against an existential threat facing his people and culture, and strives to inspire others to follow his example. It goes far beyond the expression of hateful, but protected political speech, and into the sphere of promotional terrorist propaganda that has already been shown to be inspirational and influential.

The document demands a high level of engagement and effort from the reader that will be beyond most people. However, the engagement and effort required can also work to enhance the uptake of the publication's message by creating a level of investment by the reader. Alternatively, an invested reader can choose to direct their attention to specific sections, such as the instructional material, and disregard the rest of the document.

S3(4)(b) The impact of the medium in which the publication is presented

S3(4)(d) The persons, classes of persons, or age groups of the persons to whom the publication is intended or is likely to be made available
and

S3(4)(e) The purpose for which the publication is intended to be used

Breivik viewed the Oslo attacks as a "marketing operation" and a "book launch" for the *Oslo Manifesto*. He believed the distribution of the document "was one of the most important motives for the operation" and asked for it to be distributed widely amongst "patriots". Breivik claims the publication "currently offers the most comprehensive database of solution oriented subjects" and made this appeal to his audience – "please help us and help yourself, your family and friends by contributing to spread the tools which will ensure our victory: for the truth must be known."

Whilst it is always difficult to ascertain the level of influence a document may have had on the actions of an individual, the Royal Commission Report makes it clear that the

perpetrator of the Christchurch mosque attacks followed the instructional advice provided in the *Oslo Manifesto* to a significant degree. Similarly, Christopher Hansson, a US Coast Guard Lieutenant pleaded guilty to federal weapons and drugs charges in the US in October 2019. The evidence against him indicated that the strategic, tactical, and instructional advice contained in the *Oslo Manifesto* was highly influential in his terroristic plot to exact retribution on minorities and those he considered traitors.

While the publication is unlikely to be persuasive or harmful to most adult readers, there is a high risk of it persuading some disaffected individuals who are susceptible to the way it promotes terroristic violence. The very real possibility that even a small number of individuals may be persuaded to act on Breivik's message, as has already happened, creates a real level of risk to the safety and security of all New Zealanders.

The publication has been freely available on the internet as a PDF document since it was emailed to approximately 1000 contacts by Breivik on 22 July 2011. A pledge by the major tech companies in 2021 to reduce the availability of far-right manifestos on their platforms means the document is less likely to be available on mainstream sites in the future.

S3(4)(c) The character of the publication, including any merit, value, or importance it has in relation to literary, artistic, social, cultural, educational, scientific, or other matters

The publication contains the stated justification for the Oslo attacks. It forms an integral part of the atrocities that were committed on 22 July 2011 and provides vital contextual information in relation to them. The document is likely to be of ongoing interest to academic researchers, analysts, and journalists seeking to inform the public. These parties will still have access to the publication in New Zealand through the s44 exemption process if the publication is classified objectionable.

With regards to the merit, value, or importance to the general public, the publication has not been constructed in a way that provides a useful reference for ordinary New Zealanders seeking to understand the circumstances of the Oslo attacks or far-right extremism in general. Moreover, the document is neither a genuine political treatise nor a significant historical document, such as *Mein Kampf*, that has value in being available in the public domain despite expressing views that most will find abhorrent.

Some of our consultees expressed an opinion that having hateful, offensive and potentially harmful ideas and documents available for the public to debate and discredit was possibly more desirable than making them objectionable. By making documents objectionable we could effectively inflate their status, make them more desirable, and therefore likely to have worse effects. Countering this position another of our consultees stated that it is easier for hatred to spread than it is for it to be challenged in our increasingly polarised communities. This is especially true on social media platforms and the closed insular forums that exist on the internet. Many said it was important to take a stand, especially with material that exhorted the reader to carry out acts of violence against vulnerable minority communities.

Our consultations also raised an interesting perspective on the differential treatment of terroristic propaganda produced by the far right compared with material produced by Islamic extremists. The implication being there is a tendency to favour free speech arguments for material produced by far-right extremists compared with material produced by Islamic terrorists. We note that a number of Islamic terrorist publications, such as *Dabiq* and *Inspire*, which have been banned for many years are functionally very

difficult to distinguish from the *Oslo Manifesto* in terms of their harmful, terrorist promotional effects.

The document is undoubtedly a piece of modern terrorist propaganda that has been written for an audience susceptible to far-right radicalisation with the specific intent of inciting the reader into committing acts of terroristic violence. Members of the public are better served accessing the countless media articles and academic reports produced in the aftermath that appropriately contextualise the *Oslo Manifesto* and the events of 22 July 2011. Furthermore, anyone who has had a legitimate interest in the publication has been able to access it for over 10 years.

Conclusion:

The *Oslo Manifesto* is classified as objectionable.

The extent, degree and manner in which the *Oslo Manifesto* promotes acts of crime and terrorism, and presents those engaging in such acts as selfless and heroic creates a high probability of significant injuries to the public good. Specifically:

- Those who share Breivik's worldview or are susceptible to far-right radicalisation may well be encouraged or emboldened to follow in his example given the justifications presented and the promotional nature of the publication. This creates a risk of further terroristic violence (at worst) and (at least) a risk that racist hatred will be further spread.
- There are detailed elements in the publication that give potential attackers suggestions on targets and instructional guidance on the means to perpetrate large-scale violence and mass murder.
- The continued sharing of the publication provides Breivik with notoriety and recognition, thereby establishing him as an example for those who may seek similar notoriety and recognition through violent action.

In making this decision, we considered:

- the right to freedom of expression, that is to seek, receive, and impart information and opinions protected under s14 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (NZBORA), and
- s5 of the NZBORA that states this freedom is subject "only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society".

The Classification Office has had extensive and careful regard to the NZBORA and the need to ensure that freedom of expression continues to be preserved in New Zealand. The *Oslo Manifesto* is not classified objectionable because it is an example of 'hate speech', (although it is evidently a discriminatory tract that most New Zealanders would find repugnant), nor is it banned because of the extreme political views that it espouses.

The unrestricted availability of the *Oslo Manifesto* has already led to real harms in New Zealand through the actions of the Christchurch mosque attacker as outlined in the Royal Commission Report. The document contains repeated and specific calls on followers to carry out further murderous attacks, and instructional details about how to carry out those attacks. As a result, an objectionable classification for the *Oslo Manifesto* is a demonstrably justified limit on the right to freedom of expression due to the high likelihood of further

significant injuries to the public good arising directly from the publication's continued availability.

The Classification Office considered imposing a tailored restriction to allow researchers, analysts and journalists access to the publication. However a restricted classification is inconsistent with the classification of, and degree of harm associated with, similar promotional material from other known terrorist sources. Furthermore, a tailored restriction could introduce uncertainty and may reduce the effectiveness of the classification as a protective measure for the New Zealand public.

Those who believe they have a legitimate interest in possessing the publication may lodge an application with the Chief Censor for an exemption under s44 of the FVPC Act.

Date: No notice of decision has been issued

For the Classification Office (signed):
Tested

Note:

You may apply to have this publication reviewed under s47 of the FVPC Act if you are dissatisfied with the Classification Office's decision.

Copyright Office of Film and Literature Classification. This document may not be reproduced in whole or in part by any means in any form without written permission except for brief quotations embodied in articles, reports or reviews.