
The Case of Anders Behring Breivik – Language of a Lone Terrorist[§]

Cecilia H. Leonard, M.D.^{*}, George D. Annas, M.D., M.P.H.[†],
James L. Knoll IV, M.D.[†] and Terje Tørrissen, M.D.[‡]

Anders Behring Breivik carried out a massacre in Norway on July 22, 2011, killing a total 77 persons and leaving 42 others severely wounded. He detonated a bomb in Oslo and then drove to the island of Utøya, where he shot and killed youngsters gathered at a youth camp. The authors performed an analysis of Breivik’s writing style in his extensive manifesto which he published hours before the attacks, and also referred to the two psychiatrists’ reports. The first report concluded that he suffered from paranoid schizophrenia. The authors concurred with the second report. Breivik seemed to be a person with narcissistic personality disorder, whose grandiosity might have caused him to be regarded initially as mentally deranged; however, closer examination revealed his deliberate attempt to methodically indoctrinate and deceive potential readers, to alarm potential targets and to terrorize a nation. Copyright © 2014 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

The case of Anders Behring Breivik, who carried out a dreadful massacre in Norway on July 22, 2011, immediately received overwhelming media coverage and stirred much debate. Breivik set off a bomb at the government offices in Oslo, the capital city of Norway, killing eight persons. As a result of the bombing, nine other persons were severely wounded. He then used an escape vehicle, which he had parked a few blocks away, to drive to a ferry that took him to the island of Utøya, where he shot and killed 69 youngsters. (He killed 67 and two died from escape injuries, without gunshot wounds – one fell off a cliff and the other drowned.) Of the 564 persons at Utøya, 33 were also severely wounded.

The authors include one of the forensic psychiatrists who examined Breivik for over 37 hours, in addition to reviewing over 10,000 pages of documents, and over 230 hours of interrogation audio and video materials.

This work includes a discussion of the debate regarding the link between extreme political fanaticism and madness, and an analysis of Breivik’s “manifesto,” concluding with an overall impression of his state of mind, based on all of the above.

^{*}Correspondence to: Cecilia H. Leonard, SUNY Upstate Medical University, 750 E. Adams Street, Syracuse, NY 13210. E-mail: Cecilia.leonard@verizon.net

[†]SUNY Upstate Medical University

[‡]Specialist in Psychiatry, Ottestad, Norway

[§]Similar material to this article was presented at the 44th Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law (AAPL) on October 25, 2013 in San Diego, CA.

ANALYSIS OF MASS MURDER

Hempel, Meloy and Richards (1999) were the first to write about how mass murderers seem compelled to “convey their central motivation in a psychological abstract” (p. 213). Since then, the writings of many mass murderers have been analyzed and shown to reflect strong themes of persecution, alienation, envy, and vengefulness (Knoll, 2012; Dutton, White, & Fogarty, 2013). The analysis of mass murderers’ communications begins with the assumption that the perpetrator would not have bothered to craft and/or communicate a manifesto unless it had great personal meaning. Indeed, many seem to make special efforts to ensure that their final communications will be transmitted to and read by others.

Because revenge is often a central motive for mass murderers, it has been hypothesized that these individuals desperately need an “audience” to recognize their struggle (Neuman, 2012). In this sense, there is a theatrical aspect to their vengeance, which requires witnessing by the other. These messages, or symbolic stories of injustice and oppression, may be written, videotaped or posted on the Internet (Aitken, Oosthuizen, Emsley, & Seedat, 2008). The messages are rich sources of forensic psychiatric data, providing a deeper understanding of the perpetrator’s motive, mental state and psychological disturbances.

Acts of extreme violence invariably have symbolic meaning, and have been noted to serve a homeostatic function for a fragile ego (Yakeley & Meloy, 2012). Thus, the communications of such individuals may be expected to reflect the more primitive defense mechanisms, such as projection, externalization and projective identification. While paranoia and persecution are strong themes found in the communications of mass murderers, it is important to keep in mind that some individuals on the paranoid spectrum may perceive their mistreatment as having been substantially greater than that which occurred in reality (Dutton et al., 2013). Thus, one should not prematurely conclude that a perpetrator suffered from paranoid schizophrenia or that the extent of mistreatment he describes was necessarily in accord with reality.

THE MASSACRE AND AFTERMATH OF 07/22/2011

There were several aspects of Breivik’s attacks that resulted in so much attention. First of all Breivik conducted two attacks within hours of each other that fit into two categories of mass murder. The attack in Oslo fell into the category of a “hit and run” attack, while the Utøya attack bore all the characteristics of the “pseudocommando” category (Dietz, 1986). Dietz described “pseudocommandos” as “collectors of injustice” who hold on to perceived insults, amassing “evidence” that they have been grossly mistreated. To sustain the revenge “romance,” they must collect the unwanted, hated or feared aspects of themselves. This collection is then reassembled into the form of an “enemy” who “deserves” to be the target of a merciless, incendiary rage. Thus, the pseudocommando maintains object relations that are based heavily upon envy and splitting.

The pseudocommando is a type of mass murderer who has been preoccupied with paramilitary themes and firearms. He usually commits his assault in broad daylight while well armed and has no plans to evade capture. The killings at Utøya were also

reminiscent of school shootings, in that the youngsters had gathered at an established Camp of the Workers' Youth League.

Another aspect of the attack inviting more attention than usual was what many refer to as his "manifesto" of over 1,500 pages, which he disseminated as a pdf e-mail file about three hours prior to committing mass murder. The text is entitled, *2083 A European Declaration of Independence*, and is written under the pseudonym "Andrew Berwick," (hereinafter, "the compendium," Berwick, 2011). It contains an introduction followed by three books. The first outlines the case against what he refers to as multiculturalism and cultural Marxism (hereinafter, MC/CM) in Europe: "What you need to know, our falsified history and other forms of cultural Marxist/multiculturalist propaganda." The second book describes the supposed current dire circumstance Europe is in, as a result of pro-MC/CM policies: "Europe Burning." The third book, entitled "A Declaration of Pre-emptive War," contains a collection of detailed plans for retaliation against MC/CM, detailed instructions on how one can train and execute acts of violence supporting his cause, as well as a self "Q&A," and a detailed journal chronicling his own experience as he prepared for his "mission." A pervasive theme was his call for the deportation of all Muslims from Norway, in particular, and from Europe in general (Berwick, 2011).

Mass murderers tend to leave some final communication, often sent to the media, which suggests that they want to convey their deep personal feelings in the event that they die. These documents provide useful information for the forensic psychiatrist to analyze, as they are "rich sources of data about their motives and psychopathology" (Knoll, 2010).

Breivik's trial provided a platform for many debates about the insanity defense and the question as to whether or not fanaticism can be called madness (King's College, London, 2012). According to Professor Simon Wessely (2012) of the Institute of Psychiatry at King's College, London: "When people struggle to comprehend what lies behind the mass murder of adolescents gathered for a weekend of discussions and campfires, the simplest response is that the killer 'must be mad' " (p.1563). Professor Wessely had been asked by the Norwegian government to join an International Advisory Council tasked with reviewing the emergency response, both medical and psychosocial, to the dreadful events of July 22, 2011 (King's College, London, 2012). Breivik's meticulous preparation, intensive research and almost flawless execution of his plan perplexed many who found it difficult to reconcile such high intelligence with a capacity for such heinous action.

Others suggested that, because Breivik's fanaticism was of such a degree that no extremist group endorsed his position, this in itself was indicative of his psychosis and delusional thinking (Taylor, 2012). It is intuitive to suggest that a mass murderer working within a group collective would be unlikely to suffer from a psychotic illness, for who would be likely to follow or easily cooperate with such a person? One also notes that a group of similarly minded individuals would be unlikely to execute a realistic plan. However, the simple fact that one is a "lone actor" does not, in itself, preclude the person from being sane. Breivik exhibited many instances of significant efforts to avoid detection, suggesting he may have been hesitant to attempt to involve others for fear of risk of discovery. In Book 3, he notes the importance of working alone and not trusting anyone (p. 841). One also notes that his claims of being part of a "network" are less than sound. Such claims likely serve as a boost to his sense of self, but the extent to which they represent delusional beliefs is in question as the latter aspects of this article will show.

Under the scrutiny of the media, and in a specially constructed courtroom, the trial of Anders Breivik began. Two court-appointed psychiatrists were called upon to determine whether or not Breivik was insane at the time of the massacre and whether or not he might still be suffering from a psychotic illness. This first team, consisting of Dr. Torgeir Husby and Dr. Synne Sørheim, concluded that he suffered from paranoid schizophrenia and that he was insane at the time of the massacre (Husby & Sørheim, 2011). In a mystery yet to be unraveled, their report (hereinafter referred to as the first report) was leaked to the media before the court could rule on the case.

FOCUS OF THE FIRST REPORT

The first team of psychiatrists considered the compendium an important source of information; however, when they learned of his ability and willingness to cooperate, they decided it would be “far more useful to ask the subject [Breivik] to comment on the various topics...directly” (Husby & Sørheim, 2011, p. 26). They considered the compendium as consisting of a “historical” part and an “operational” part. They decided not to make the historical part “the subject of further discussion with the subject” (section 2.8.1, Husby & Sørheim, 2011 p. 27). They relied on his prior explanation of the historical significance of that portion and stated he “has assured the committee about his extensive study of the topic.” The first team also referred to the “operational part” of the compendium as that “in which the subject describes the preparation of the impugned acts.”

With regard to Breivik’s political views, the first team essentially isolated these from his actions and the context of his tedious preparation for his attack. They wrote in section 2.8.2 (Husby & Sørheim, 2011, p. 27):

The experts stress that they have not taken a position on the subject’s political message or point of view. This is obviously beyond the experts’ mandate. Likewise, the experts have no qualifications to assess the compendium’s literary quality or the quality of the materials he has quoted, or otherwise produced.

For the experts it has been the egocentric bias in the compendium that has been of importance and interest, i.e. the subject’s own perceived importance given both directly derived from historical events and his subsequent self-given, future importance for Europe and the world.

At the same time, the first team noted that Breivik’s opinions with regard to Europe and the state of Norway were shared by many in Europe and Norway, and acknowledged that he did “cut and paste from various websites and historical sources”(section 2.8.4.2, Husby & Sørheim, 2011 p. 29).

The first team focused on the discordance between Breivik’s intelligence and his failure to accurately assess how the outside world would experience and understand his “product,” the compendium. They attributed this to “his general cognitive and intellectual decline” which occurred “from some point between 2000 and 2006.” They considered the compendium as a whole, and in its individual parts, to be “pathetically self-centered” and including “the most banal level” of “detail about his thoughts and activities almost from birth to date.” For these reasons, they concluded that Breivik had basic and underlying delusions of grandeur.

The themes of the Knights Templar, martyrdom, and Breivik’s interview with himself were all considered by the first team as part of his grandiosity, which they attribute to

delusion. They recognized “general enemy concept, paranoia and grandeur” in “the intensity of the subject’s war terminology and his experience and description of being in a war.”

The first team was convinced that what they saw was the result of paranoid psychosis with delusions of grandeur, and concluded that Breivik suffered from schizophrenia, paranoid type. They wrote in section 2.8.42 (Husby & Sørheim, 2011 p.29):

The experts can ascertain, both in the compendium and through contacts with him in our conversations and in the course of questioning, that he actually both emotionally and in reality has the perception of war, destruction and his own task of salvation.

The subject describes himself as in a situation with only two outcomes; destruction of his own culture and existence or the salvation by his martyrdom and long-term victory, with the final victory in year 2083.

OPPOSING VIEWS

The authors recognize here that the first team interviewed Breivik within two to four weeks after the massacre, whereas the second team met him in 2012. One might consider a preliminary assessment dated August 18, 2011 and provided by Randi Rosenqvist, psychiatrist, and senior adviser. Dr. Rosenqvist relied on the reports provided by the staff members at Ila Prison and Detention Institution. She noted (Rosenqvist, 2011, pp. 1–2):

His functioning here in prison is characterized that the courtesy and acceptance of the framework that officials and health workers are working under. It seems as if the first ten days were relatively "high on adrenaline and action"... The health care professionals ... have not found reason to consider him as in need of treatment or suicidal.”

Risk Assessment and Management Measures:

I assume that he will continue, as he has hitherto done, to come with different requirements that neither the court or prosecuting authority can comply. I assume that he "must" do this in order to maintain his self-esteem, he is probably most interested in the noise around such claims than they actually result in changes. ... For the time being, I think it’s good for the security that he feels like a VIP prisoner, which he is, actually. I believe that prison will have the least problems with him as long as he can maintain his facade, his megalomaniac self and steady activity.

Dr. Rosenqvist’s insights support the opinion that the second team finally reached, namely that Breivik was acting as a person with a malignant narcissistic personality disorder who in the initial days and weeks of his incarceration tried to maintain a sense of grandeur and importance, an effort especially notable at his trial.

The nation of Norway was mostly appalled, as most believed that a finding of insanity would mean that Breivik would “get away with murder.” Seemingly coherent, goal-directed statements by the defendant and flawless execution of his plan rallied those in favor of a guilty verdict.

Although most lawyers, judges, the State Prosecutor and government attorney, i.e., the Attorney General, believed that a second report would not make a difference as to the result, namely an insanity verdict, the Oslo District court relied on the following paragraph in the law to appoint a second team: “A criminal case should be enlightened

in all possible ways, and if the court rules that it would be ‘good’ to have a second opinion and enlighten the case, they can appoint a second team.”

Under pressure from several sources, a second team of psychiatrists was appointed by the court, opposed by the State Attorney, General Attorney and the defense lawyers and their client.

Before discussing the opinion of the second team, it would be prudent to review the statute that is used in Norway to assess sanity and possible reasons for penalty reduction. First, under Penal Code § 44, the psychiatrists are required to assess whether or not the defendant was “psychotic, unconscious or mentally retarded to a high degree (IQ < 55) at the time of the criminal acts.” If the experts conclude that none of those conditions apply to the defendant, then they must consider Penal Code § 56c: whether at the time of the criminal acts the defendant “had a serious mental disorder with a significantly impaired ability to realistically assess his relationship with the outside world, though not being psychotic, or was mildly mentally retarded (IQ 56-75), or acted under a strong consciousness disturbance” (Norwegian Penal Code § 44 and § 56c).

The second team, Dr. Terje Tørrissen and Dr. Agnar Aspaas, opined that Breivik did not suffer from psychosis during the attacks or during the evaluation (Tørrissen & Aspaas, 2012). They diagnosed him primarily with narcissistic personality disorder, and with an antisocial personality disorder. They also noted that he met some of the criteria for paranoid personality disorder. Supporting the diagnosis of narcissistic personality disorder were several themes in his compendium.

Breivik wrote extensively about what he called “Cultural Marxism” and Europe’s history of welcoming persons of the Muslim faith. He proposed that in order to eradicate Islam from Europe the “Knights Templar” should start by getting rid of “category A traitors.” He identified those as 12 persons within the government, politicians who were responsible for laws that made it legal for Muslims to become citizens, to receive benefits, and live comfortably in Norway (Berwick, 2011; Tørrissen & Aspaas, 2012).

He told police officers during interrogation on July 22, 2011 that there are 4500 “category B” traitors in Norway who would be better targets for immediate attack, since “category A” targets usually have a lot of security around them (Tørrissen & Aspaas, 2012). He identified “category B” traitors as intellectuals who indoctrinate MC/CM into society. He declared in his compendium that Justiciar Knights have been “given the mandate to execute category A and B traitors by the war crimes tribunal known as PCCTS, Knights Templar” (Berwick, 2011). He repeated this mandate during the interrogation, further revealing that category B traitors would include persons in the media, whereas he had no mandate to kill the 85,000 “category C” traitors (less culpable individuals who nevertheless promote the MC/CM agenda; Berwick, 2011). He lamented that the downside of what happened on July 22, 2011 was that he had killed mostly category C traitors at the camp (Tørrissen & Aspaas, 2012).

The Eurabia-Code is a term that Breivik adopted from Peder Are Nøstvold Jensen, better known as “Fjordman,” a far-right Norwegian blogger who frequently writes about the supposed dangers of Islam in Europe. Jensen, in turn, had co-opted the word “Eurabia” from Gisèle Littman’s book, *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis* (written under the pseudonym “Bat Ye’or”), (Littman, 2005). Jensen states that he used the term “...alluding to author Dan Brown’s massive bestseller *The Da Vinci Code*.” (Berwick, 2011, p. 56; Jensen, 2006, p. 1). This tendency for Breivik to affiliate himself with those he considers successful persons in several disciplines is a recurring theme in the

compendium. Along with this is his scorn for others who might not have his intelligence or his perceived virtue.

METHOD

The focus of our examination is on Breivik's style of writing (semantics, syntax), with less of an emphasis on his themes. We provide evidence that Breivik's writing, including how he chose to form his arguments (rhetorical style) and his level of attention to, and understanding of, his audience/reader (Gricean Inference, Theory of Mind), suggest an author who is deliberate, capable of complex and abstract thinking, as well as even eloquence at times. Throughout the many examples in his compendium, Breivik presented himself as someone who in all reasonable likelihood was not someone who suffered from a schizophrenic spectrum illness or other chronic psychotic disorder during its creation, which he purported began in 2006 (p. 1424) and evolved into its current draft sometime in 2011.

For this analysis, we used the method of examining the compendium for a "Gestalt" to determine what was suggested about Breivik from the "voice" he used. We recognized limitations in regard to the bias that can arise when one attempts to make a judgment about what someone is intending through his writings. No actuarial/statistical measures were used to analyze the writings. Analysis involved an evaluation of the semantics, syntax, and temperament of the writings from a forensic psychiatry viewpoint. Further, the method was also informed by psychodynamic theory, which may be helpful in understanding important psychological themes present in linguistic evidence (Knoll & Meloy, *in press*). In the case of mass murderers, certain psychological patterns have been suggested to occur with some frequency, such as resentment, narcissism, media-related modeling, and obsessive traits (Cantor, Mullen, & Alpers, 2000). On a manifest level, data can be analyzed for thought disorder, non-linear thinking or other evidence of psychopathology. On an abstract level, data can be analyzed for the identification of defense mechanisms, psychological themes, and psychic conflict. Both levels are analyzed in the present study.

A CLOSER LOOK AT THE COMPENDIUM

While it would be insufficient and inadequate to form a diagnosis of an individual based on his writing alone, one can still glean important information from this domain. What follows is an examination of Breivik's compendium and what it may tell us about the mind behind the words.

Vital to forming an opinion on the mental state of the author is examination of the original unaltered text. However, Breivik's compendium produced many road blocks to this analysis. Chief among these is the question of which passages in the compendium were authored by him and which were lifted from other sources. A quick run-through of the compendium revealed that a significant portion contains works by other authors. For example, there were over 35 passages written by the blogger "Fjordman"/Jensen. Breivik included many other authors as well, such as the similarly politically leaning "Bat Ye'Or"/Littman, Serge Trifkovic, and Robert Spencer.

However, author-credited passages such as these were not the only ones where he included works from others.

If Breivik was consistent in his attributions, then it would be a simple task to isolate and begin to analyze the passages that he actually wrote. However, Breivik's adoption of other writings were often more liberal. Occasionally he included a passage with no author attributed, and where a reader would reasonably assume it was authored by Breivik, but which in fact turned out to be taken verbatim from another author. In these instances he often followed the passage with a "source" followed by a website link (e.g., the passage 1.17, on pp. 159–164), which could be easily mistaken as a fact citation rather than the attribution of the entire text. Yet, Breivik frequently moved beyond this liberal style and into unbridled plagiarism.

Because Breivik is not shy about giving credit to a number of other writers, the reader is naturally left to wonder why he chose to plagiarize some authors but not others. When data were confounded in such a manner, it makes the interpretation more challenging. Yet, there is value in determining from whom and in what manner one decides to plagiarize.

The primary reason that one might choose to plagiarize is simply to attempt to make him/herself appear more credible. The first passage that Breivik plagiarized appeared to be an attempt to do just that (i.e., make himself seem to be what he considered to be scholarly). On pages 11–34, Breivik plagiarized an essay entitled "'Political Correctness: a short history of an ideology'" (Lind, 2004), making minor changes to the text to suit his needs. This work is one in which minorities were painted as "bogeymen" in the United States. Yet, Breivik was writing a compendium about Europe and making Islam his own bogeyman, and therefore some adjustments were required. For example, Breivik wrote: "Glorification of homosexuality should be shunned. Jurors should not accept *Islam* as an excuse for murder" (p. 14, italics added).

The original text is as follows: "Open homosexuality should be shunned. Jurors should not accept *race* as an excuse for murder" (Lind, 2004, p. 7; italics added)

Breivik wrote: "...violent crime is disproportionately committed by *Muslims*" (p. 14, italics added). The original text stated: "...violent crime is disproportionately committed by *blacks*" (Lind, 2004, p. 7; italics added).

As many have noted, soon after the compendium was "published," Breivik copied passages from another famous essay, "Industrial Society and Its Future," more commonly referred to as the "Unabomber Manifesto" of Theodore Kaczynski. For example, Breivik wrote: "One of the most widespread manifestations of the craziness of our world is *multiculturalism*, so a discussion of the psychology of *multiculturalists* can serve as an introduction to the discussion of the problems of *Western Europe* in general" (p. 373, italics added).

Kaczynski wrote: "One of the most widespread manifestations of the craziness of our world is *leftism*, so a discussion of the psychology of *leftism* can serve as an introduction to the discussion of the problems of *modern society* in general." (Kaczynski, 1995; italics added)

Instead of quoting and citing Kaczynski, Breivik selected part of it, substituted "leftist" with "cultural Marxist" and attributed the writing to himself. There are several possible rational reasons why he might have chosen to do this. One possibility is that it allowed him to use the same arguments, while perhaps avoiding the perceived loss of credibility of putting his ideas in line with those of a convicted murderer (despite the fact that Breivik was about to become one himself). Another is that, if he had decided

to quote Kaczynski directly, he would have had to reconcile an anti-industry, pro-environment stance with his own ideology, which would place environmental activists in the same category as “cultural Marxists.” (See 2.72, p. 646: “Green is the new red – Stop Enviro-Communism!”) An additional possible motive (and potentially the most important one) is that this allowed him to keep a distance from Kaczynski, whom many believe has a severe mental illness.

Despite the numerous examples of plagiarism, Breivik’s own “voice” appears throughout parts of Books 1 and 2, and most prominently in Book 3. Due to English not being his primary language, one notes subtle grammatical errors in many parts of his writing. Despite this, Breivik showed that he was capable of writing intelligently, eloquently, and many times humorously.

CAPACITY FOR FLEXIBLE THINKING, AMID RIGID BELIEFS

Throughout the compendium, Breivik showed himself capable of anticipating potential arguments against his views and statements. The examples that follow show his capability of structuring his sentences accordingly:

We shouldn’t necessarily [adopt] an anti-sexual stance but at least an anti-promiscuous stance (3.88, p. 1175).

I’ll be the first to admit that there are many sensible feminist policies (3.89, p. 1177).

While compassion is not always a negative thing it can severely cripple fields/committees who rely on a minimum degree of cynicism... (3.89, p.1178).

With sentences such as these, Breivik provided evidence that he realized his reader might be skeptical of what he was saying. By conceding some points in the beginning of the statements, he showed an understanding of what his reader might be thinking and reacting to in the moment. In fact, Breivik appeared to demonstrate that this awareness went beyond simple rhetorical strategy designed to improve credibility, and further into an understanding of the potential emotions his reader would be feeling. For example, in the introduction, he anticipated the shock that his reader might experience while navigating through the compendium, and attempted to pre-emptively add reassurance:

Don’t let the topics discussed in the books startle you too much. Many of the topics may seem completely absurd or too radical today, but in a couple of decades, you will start to understand its relevancy to our struggle (p. 8).

NARCISSISTIC FANTASY OR DELUSION

One could easily dismiss the illogical political/social arguments Breivik makes, as well as note the intelligence and capacity for complex thinking he demonstrated, and yet still have some valid questions about his beliefs and whether or not they could be considered delusions. Throughout his compendium, Breivik referred to being a

“Justiciar Knight,” from the Knight’s Templar, and part of a secret network of resistance fighters against MC/CM. The second team considered delusional disorder in the differential diagnosis, due to his high level of functioning amid odd beliefs. However, Breivik appeared to provide examples in the compendium that showed he was aware that his claims are at least exaggerated, if not complete fantasy. Additionally the second team reported that he was able to rationalize and explain his beliefs about the Knights Templar and was correctable and refined his statements (Tørrissen & Aspaas, 2012). Such findings suggested that Breivik did not have false, fixed beliefs that could not be modified.

In the introductory pages of the compendium, Breivik wrote that he would include a “legal disclaimer” in the beginning of Book 3. He wrote that the purpose of the disclaimer was to allow others to redistribute the compendium without fear of legal ramifications (such as being accused of promoting violence). Breivik wrote:

By including the ‘legal disclaimer’ in ‘Book 3’; will allow everyone to distribute the content without violating any European laws. If you are still in doubt feel free to delete or change the wording in certain chapters before distribution (p. 6).

However, when one arrives at Book 3, which is called “A Declaration of Pre-Emptive War,” one finds a quite casually written disclaimer, in which Breivik claimed the book was “a hypothetical response” to the perceived threat of cultural Marxism. He then proceeded with a rambling description of why this fictional plot should alert European governments about what could happen. However, soon afterward, he gave clear, painstakingly detailed instructions for readers on how they should patiently and methodically prepare for actual attacks on government officials. The disclaimer itself was a single spaced paragraph spanning the length of about a page and a half. One might view this passage as evidence of a disorganized thought process; however, another explanation could be the casual nature with which he often wrote, as well as the fact that he stated that the compendium is to be considered “a first edition draft,” (p. 9). In addition, although not specifically noted at the beginning of Book 3, some of the sections in the compendium are noted to be “under construction” (for example, p. 1219).

In the disclaimer, Breivik described Book 3 of his compendium as fiction – even implying that what was to follow was actually a new type of “novel.” Breivik wrote:

It should be noted that the author, as a sci-fi enthusiast, wanted to bring and create a complete new writing style that has the potential to shock the reader with an incredibly credible fictional plot (written in first, second and third person narrative). The author or distributor does not condone or agree with any of the descriptions or methods used in this book and the related chapters (p. 767).

His casual manner shows his level of comfort when stating that his assertions are all false. This occurs to such a degree that it makes one skeptical that his disclaimer is entirely an “act” meant to protect others from liability, and could possibly be a sign that he may not be certain in his beliefs.

Breivik referred to himself as the Justiciar Knight of the Norwegian branch of the Knights Templar, which he described as an organization of true European persons who were exquisitely intelligent and who were conspiring to bring about the deportation of all Muslims from Europe. At the time of his writing, he claimed that he was just one of about 22 persons who had reached a similar level in the

organization for which he also provided a proper Latin name: *Pauperes Commilitones Christi Templique Solominici* (PCCTS).

Breivik saw himself as advisor to many like-minded persons who would eventually read his compendium, and attain his rank in the PCCTS. He went to great lengths to describe how they should conduct themselves in public to avoid scrutiny by the authorities while in the process of acquiring ammunition. He gave lengthy instructions on how a bulletproof uniform could be hand-sewn at home, and in fact he created the one he wore on the day of the massacre. He mocked the feminist movement that caused boys to have to learn about home economics in school with subjects such as cookery and sewing, because he was now able to use that knowledge to make what he called “Loki’s Armour.” He also provided a detailed description of how the bomb was made, as well as his personal reflections on every step and misstep along the way.

Many pseudocommando mass murderers place the blame for their actions on their intended victims. Breivik wrote: “Until the day you decide to act, we the free people of Europe will have no choice but to take matters into our own hands and act accordingly” (p. 808). Breivik knew that his actions would be cruel, even naming section 3.23 “The cruel nature of our operations.” Nonetheless he often expressed ambivalence within his writings, and demonstrated some indecision in his actions. He wrote: “We do not want to do this but we are left no choice.” After his capture he stated to police officers on July 22, 2011, during interrogation that it was the worst day of his life and that he had dreaded this day for two years (Tørrissen & Aspaas, 2012).

Breivik documented a clear understanding that there was a risk of apprehension, dedicating a section (3.47) to “Avoiding apprehension/arrest and death.” He exhorted potential recruits that they must be prepared to martyr themselves, while warning them not to be too eager to die, as that would result in a lack of patience needed for their mission to succeed. He went on to provide the description of a mindset that can only be akin to one of a suicide bomber:

The core strength of a Justiciar Knight is that we accept the fact that we’re already dead. In a way, this makes us partly immortal. How can we die when we are already dead? The sooner you accept that, the sooner you will be able to function as a soldier is supposed to function: without mercy, without hesitation, without compassion and without remorse. All war depends upon it. Fear is poison in combat, something everyone feels but try to suppress. If you allow fear to paralyze you, you will fail. You cannot allow this as it is destructive and even contagious. Have no doubt about it; you will get caught or you will die. Just get used to that... Accepting your duties, embracing your destiny as a Justiciar Knight (p. 935).

The lack of remorse, the clear calculation with intent to do harm, and his clearly stated intent to act “without mercy” all support evidence for the diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder. However, there are problems with this diagnosis, as outlined in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV). These include the lack of evidence for overt conduct disorder as a youth (other than some instances of graffiti/“tagging”), as well as there being little evidence of pervasive antisocial acts throughout his adult life.

ABB’s knowledge of wrongfulness, the several steps he took to avoid detection and to mislead others in order to gain access to the Youth Camp, would be in keeping with a standard of sanity in most courts in the United States. The knowledge of wrongfulness is not addressed in the Norwegian Penal Code § 44 and § 56c, because the legislature in Norway use a medical principle (a dichotomy: sick or not sick) not the psychological principle used in most countries.

In addition to Breivik's suggestion that he was aware of his exaggeration of his own "movement" and supposed accomplishments, he also appeared to have anticipated arguments against this and to put forth protections against this happening. For example, Breivik referred to his online computer simulation *World of Warcraft* (*WoW*) activities as a partial cover story (i.e., what he told people what he was up to, while in fact secretly planning his mission; p.1382). However, he also noted that he did indeed play *WoW* "hardcore" for about a year (p. 1408). This could show, on the one hand, that he did not want to be discredited as a "loser" who had spent so much time playing an online game and, on the other, his need to boast about how well he played it. An example of the latter is found on page 1408, where he wrote about his *WoW* activities and noted that his was "one of the most progressed guilds in the world at one time."

Some have alluded to this isolative period of playing *WoW* as potentially being his "first break" of psychosis in his progression to supposed paranoid schizophrenia. However, one may reasonably question how common it is for someone with this illness to both feel the need to explain his first break with reality to others and to be able to do so with such plausibility. In addition, others familiar with *WoW* have stated that getting to the level of "world class," as Breivik did, requires an organized focused mind of the type would be unlikely for someone suffering from acute psychosis, and that this was more in keeping with his tedious preparation for the attacks.

Most troubling in Breivik's compendium is a subsection on page 949 with the title, "Authentication process when acquiring nuclear/biological/chemical weapons from the enemies of our enemies." He declared that the PCCTS would eventually work with enemies of what he calls the "EU/US hegemony" "such as Iran ... al-Qaeda and al-Shabaab" if intelligence agencies manage to intercept or neutralize "our long term efforts to liberate our countries."

Breivik also showed ambivalence with regard to the type of violence he wanted to perpetrate and the types of persons he wanted to be affiliated with. For example, while he initially exalted himself above any gang or violent reactionary group, he later wrote: "We will launch information campaigns and create awareness by using any means necessary, including distribution of our messages by using lethal shock attacks against concentrations of category A and B traitors in a pan-European context." While in this sentence he seemed to acknowledge his need for assistance from others to accomplish his goal, he then wrote: "When employing such methods the Justiciar Knight becomes a force multiplier, he becomes a one-man army." At the same time he shifted his audience from current Justiciar Knights and potential knights, all of whom would be of similar superior intelligence, to any "person who fights the cultural Marxist/Multiculturalist alliance with weapons using unconventional methods." Those methods he identified as including assassinations, weapons of mass destruction and guerrilla warfare.

Interestingly, Breivik made references to the police forces in his compendium and said that he would not harm them. He saw himself and members of the Knights Templar as doing that which the police would like to do but were not allowed to do or were too feeble to carry out. Yet, on Utøya, the first person he killed was, in fact, a police officer. Although he still had ammunition when the arresting team arrived, he surrendered. During interrogation he revealed that he would have fought with them if they had arrived before his mission was completed. Such a statement is in keeping with sentiment he expressed in his compendium:

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 preemptive manner. In many ways, morality has lost its meaning in our struggle (p. 837).

While he railed against Islam and expressed fear that due to the high birth rate the numbers would grow to the point that *Sharia* law might take over Europe, he wanted to point out that his aim was not to kill Muslims. He wrote “We do not wish to destroy Islam but simply to isolate it primarily outside Europe” (p. 960).

NARCISSISM OR GRANDIOSITY

While there are numerous examples of Breivik providing evidence of his having a personality disorder, he was also quite self-reflective when directly addressing aspects of his own personality. In the “Q&A,” he addressed the question, “Can you describe your strengths and flaws as an individual?” Breivik wrote:

I sound quite self righteous at times and I don’t like admitting it when I’m wrong, although I usually do. I still have a relatively inflated ego, with a constant need to feed on an intellectual level. This is a quite common flaw and I try to suppress it although I know I fail as most people do. Also, over the years I’ve generally been perceived as quite arrogant (even downright unpleasant at times, the last few years) (p. 1401).

Breivik went on to rationalize why some of these parts of his personality existed:

This is likely due to the fact that I do not care as much as I did for creating or preserving social relationships due to my life choice. I guess it is also due the way I choose my rhetorical approaches, which is to a certain degree only an indirect defensive mechanism. I, as most people, like to think I have a superb self confidence. But people who show signs of arrogance usually often use deliberate defensive manifestation to camouflage intellectual or social insecurity or perhaps they just don’t care. I guess the root to a majority of human flaws is linked to man[']s fundamentally flawed nature (p. 1401).

Breivik went on to explain why he had shunned the practice of honing his social skills:

Social skills is an art form that requires continuous practice, and many of the people I know are masters at it. I know I could be as well but it would require a different lifestyle. I do not accept or acknowledge many of the established “social rules” as I view it as irrelevant noise which takes us away from what is needed of us at this point in time (p. 1401).

Breivik also explained why he had not attained a higher socioeconomic status:

I used to be a relatively self centered, arrogant individual who didn’t care much for anyone except my closest friends and family. I used to have pretty shallow ambitions where the goal of personal acquisition of wealth, gaining admiration from other shallow individuals and the attempt of gaining unlimited access to sex and parties was the driving force behind my existence. Pretty pathetic when you think about it really, but it’s as we know quite common in a society in complete moral decay... (p. 1401).

In the preceding sections, Breivik demonstrated an ability to examine aspects of his own personality, in addition to denying his own current arrogance, while dismissing social skills and economic advancement as morally beneath him. In this way, he was able to rationalize why he had not been more successful, as well as belittle those who have attained what some consider a higher social status.

NARCISSISM ON DISPLAY

Breivik's narcissism and arrogance became evident several times during his trial, which was held in Oslo District court from April 16, 2012 to June 22, 2012. For instance, he lectured a testifying professor in toxicology about the effects of ephedrine, acetylic acid, anabolic steroids, and dehydration, stating that the professor might not have been aware of these facts or read the proper international literature. Breivik showed that he did not always understand what he had read, for instance he stated that he behaved under the "flight and fear" reaction during the attack at Utøya. When corrected and told that his victims did act under "flight and fear" (not Breivik) he stated that Norwegian psychiatrists probably did not know about the amygdala and its functions.

Breivik also drew parallels to Vidkun Quisling and himself. Quisling betrayed Norway during the Second World War and joined Hitler. Breivik said after the terrorist act that he would be hated as much as Quisling. This statement might be true, but the comparison of himself to a historical figure was done with a certain pride. Breivik knew quite a lot about some subjects that interested him, but also showed that he had only superficial knowledge of many topics about which he claimed to possess a deep knowledge of. When lack of in-depth knowledge was exposed, he would respond by saying that the matter was not important.

When a reconstruction video of the bomb was played in court, Breivik smiled, satisfied, as the military bomb expert told the court about the complexity of the bomb. Even if Breivik recognized that he might be arrogant, and even had reasonably good insight about this, that indeed shows a dynamic personality (more normal than expected). The foregoing examples show that he unveiled his narcissism and arrogance when "forgetting" about his reflections and expressions.

CONCLUSION

On the surface, Breivik's writings and actions suggest that he is a man with delusional bizarre beliefs about being part of a secret society of knights who will save Europe. This, coupled with a devastating act of mass murder, suggests a seriously troubled mind. The authors recognize that as more time elapses and more data are gathered, one may have a significant advantage in attempts to properly diagnose and assess a person's baseline mental state. The authors also concede that Breivik may indeed have presented himself differently during the period of time soon after his arrest than later on. At the same time, the first team's failure to consider the range of violent acts that non-psychotic persons have perpetrated in the name of nationalist, political, religious, or other agendas caused them to rely only on a narrow interpretation of behavior, namely one rooted in major mental illness, such as schizophrenia.

Even for a forensic psychiatrist, it can be difficult to reconcile the possibility that a person could carry out such a massacre without some form of mental incapacity. However, when one begins to look below the surface and dig a little more deeply into Breivik's compendium, as well as his statements since the attack, a different picture begins to emerge, of a man who possessed the capacity for complex thought and a well-developed understanding of human nature and emotions. A man whose words and actions – including how carefully he chose the people whose writings he would plagiarize and his anticipation of the reactions of his readers – demonstrate a mind significantly more rational and reality-based than one might presume at first glance.

REFERENCES

- Aitken, L., Oosthuizen, P., Emsley, R., & Seedat, S. (2008). Mass murders: implications for mental health professionals. *The International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine*, 38(3), 261–9.
- Berwick, A. (2011). 2083 – A European Declaration of Independence. Accessed on 2/26/2014 Available at <http://publicintelligence.net/anders-behring-breiviks-complete-manifesto-2083-a-european-declaration-of-independence/>.
- Cantor, C., Mullen, P., & Alpers, P. (2000). Mass homicide: The civil massacre. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 28, 55–63.
- Dietz, P. (1986) Mass, serial and sensational homicides. *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 62(5), 477–491.
- Dutton, D., White, K., & Fogarty, D. (2013) Paranoid thinking in mass shooters. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 18, 548–553.
- Hempel, A., Meloy, J., Richards, T. (1999). Offender and offense characteristics of a nonrandom sample of mass murderers. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 27(2), 13–225.
- Husby, T., Sorheim S. (2011). Court Psychiatric Report of Anders Breivik by Dr. Torgeir Husby and Dr. Synne Sorheim (English Translation). Accessed on 2/26/2014. Available at <https://sites.google.com/site/breivikreport/documents/anders-breivik-psychiatric-report-of-2011>.
- Jensen, PAN (writing under “Fjordman”) (2006). The Eurabia Code. Accessed 2/26/2014. Available at <http://gatesofvienna.net/2006/10/the-eurabia-code/>.
- Kaczynski, T.D. (1995). “Industrial Society and Its Future.” Accessed on 2/26/2014. Available at <http://editions-hache.com/essais/pdf/kaczynski2.pdf>
- King's College, London. (2012). The case of Anders Breivik, posted 27/04/2012, accessed on 12/12/2012 at <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/iop/news/records/2012/April/The-case-of-Anders-Breivik.aspx>.
- King's College, London. (nd). The 45th Maudsley Debate, at King's College, London, UK - 2012: Do cases like that of Anders Breivik show that fanaticism is a form of madness?
- Knoll, J. (2010). The “pseudocommando” mass murderer: part II, the language of revenge. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 38(2), 263–72.
- Knoll, J. (2012). Mass murder: causes, classification, and prevention. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 35, 757–780.
- Knoll, J., & Meloy, R. (nd). Mass Murder & the Violent Paranoid Spectrum. *Psychiatric Annals*, in press.
- Lind, W.S. (Ed.) (2004) “Political correctness:” A short history of an ideology. A Product of the Free Congress Foundation. Accessed 2/26/2014. Available at http://www.lifesitenews.com/ldn/2005_docs/PC1.pdf.
- Littman, G. (writing under “Bat Ye’Or”) (2005). Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis. Cranbury NJ, USA: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Neuman, Y. (2012) On revenge. *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society*, 17(1), 1–15.
- Norwegian Penal Code § 44 and § 56c. (nd). Norges Lov 1687-2012, Fagbokforlaget, 15.03.13, ISBN 978-82-450-1415-0. Straffeloven 1902-strl. 1902, § 44 and § 56 c. Translation: “Penal Code § 44 and Penal Code § 56c”
- Rosenqvist, R. (2011). Psychiatric Report 2011-08-18 (English Translation). Accessed on 2/26/2014. Available at <https://sites.google.com/site/breivikreport/documents/rosenqvist-psychiatric-report-2011-08-18>
- Taylor, M. (2012) Do cases like that of Anders Breivik show that fanaticism is a form of madness? Yes. *British Medical Journal*, 345, e4612 doi: 10.1136/bmj.e4612.
- Tørrissen, T., Aspaas, A. (2012). Court Psychiatric Report by Dr. Terje Tørrissen and Dr. Agnar Aspaas (English Translation). Accessed on 2/26/2014. Available at <https://sites.google.com/site/breivikreport/documents/anders-breivik-psychiatric-report-2012-04-10>.
- Wessely, S. (2012). Anders Breivik, the public, and psychiatry. *The Lancet*, 379, 1563–1564.
- Yakeley, J., Meloy, J. (2012). Understanding violence: Does psychoanalytic thinking matter? *Aggression And Violent Behavior*, 17, 229–239.