**Abstract**

 In this thesis, it will be talked about how people are gathering online, merely on Facebook groups, with a common aim and worldview that describes Muslims as being dangerous, and enemies of the western world. The thesis has concentrated on the Facebook group of Stopp Islamiseringen av Norge (SIAN), and it is done observations on this page to be able to describe how the Facebook supporters are using the page as a free space for hate towards Islam. In today’s society, this environment is mainly gathering on the internet and when for example demonstrations is set up people fail to participate, while on Facebook the SIAN group has had over 13.000 supporters. It is therefore this is an important arena for meeting people with similar opinions and sharing one’s own point of views with others. In an instant, your thoughts become shared and validated by hundreds of others.

 Further, the thesis will present the Duplex Theory of Hate and Social Constructivism, as well as talking about extremism and how one can classify someone as extreme. The Duplex Theory of Hate links hate and love, and describes how these to opposite feelings can have certain elements in common, however they manifests itself differently in love than in hate. This thesis will present how the elements in hate are present on the Facebook page. Social Constructivism talks about that there is no universal truths and has been applied to not pass judgment to SIAN, but to give an understanding of that what is presented as their worldview is their truth. The thesis links the rhetoric of the SIAN members with conspiracy theory such as the Eurabia theory. It will be talked about how this theory talks about an ongoing Muslim invasion where the aim is to occupy Europe and how the SIAN supporters uses this type of rhetoric. The theory also talks about how one can never trust a Muslim as they are allowed to lie – called taqiyya. It will also be described how this environment and their rhetoric can be describes as extreme and Islamophobic, while SIAN claim that they have the right to speech their minds.
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**Introduction**

 In this thesis I want to take a closer look at the anti-Islamic environment in Norway. It seems that the racist and/or neo-Nazi organisations no longer draws many members, there are of course still some active in these groups, but these groups are not regarded as accepted in mainstream society. The anti-Islamists on the other hand are portraying themselves as more mainstream and are therefore more appealing to a larger crowd. Over the history there has always been discrimination, and in today’s society in Norway those that are mostly objects of discrimination are the eastern European Roma that come on tourism visa to beg for money and the Muslim minority. I will therefore focus on those that is critical towards Islam and I believe it is important to shed light on the understanding of the Norwegian society that these anti – Islamic groups have. I have therefore chosen the research question:

“What is the worldview within the anti-Islamist environment in Norway, and what role do social media play in this understanding?”

 I have focused my research to the Facebook group of the anti-Islamic organisation Stopp Islamiseringen av Norge (SIAN)[[1]](#footnote-1). I have done observations on the activity amongst the sopporters on this page, but also talked to the official SIAN. These findings will be the basis for how I shed light on their worldview and the role social media plays in this, as well as their sense of community on the social media.

 Further, in this thesis I will talk about concepts such as Eurabia and the fear that some people have of Muslims and how they fear that Muslims will take over the Norwegian and Western society in the future. I will look at their understanding of reality in order to understand why some is so active in these organisations, regardless of the stigma that is attached to it. I will look at social media, in other words the SIAN Facebook group, because it is here the communication is happening. Demonstrations and meeting gather very few people, while the activity on Facebook is much larger. Here people are sharing articles, meanings and commenting on the different groups every day. I will take a closer look at *hate* in a theoretical perspective, to make an understanding of what drives these people to give so much of their time to this anti-Muslim Facebook page. The Duplex Theory of Hate will give this explanation of the passion that can lie behind hate. Social Constructivism is also an important aspect of this thesis. It is important to underline that my agenda has never been to take a stand point, but rather to get an understanding of the motivation of the supporters of SIAN. I will therefore also present the view of SIAN, as well as their critiques, however, it is my own observations on the Facebook page that ultimately will lay the basis for giving an answer to how the worldview within the anti-Islamist environment in Norway is, and what role social media play in this understanding.

**1: Methodology**

 In this chapter, I will present the methods I have used when gathering the data and give an explanation to why I have chosen this data. Firstly, the main method of research has been through a social constructivist point of view.

 Social constructivism talks about how there are no universal truths, but rather several interpretations of a case which serves as different kinds of truths to different people. I have therefore looked at what people are saying as *their* truth, instead of labelling it as right or wrong (more on social constructivism see chapter 2). I believe that to get an understanding of why people have the image of the world that they do, it can been useful not to pass judgement or to disagree, but to rather believe that what they are saying is as fully true to them as my feelings and opinions are on the case. Therefore, the analysis does not include an absolute description of reality, but there is rather a description of SIANs perspectives on social and/or physical phenomena. In other words, I will therefore not present something in my analysis as a universal truth, but describe the perspectives that I have found either from informants or from data collected through articles, books or websites (Pedersen, 2012: 221-222).

**1.1: Interviews**

 When doing interview in a social constructive matter, it is not a method of getting an understanding of the people’s feelings that is central, but how the person one is interviewing or a certain group constructs its “truths” or meanings in interactions with others (Pedersen, 2012: 222). It has been important for me that I have meet those people that I have talked to during this process without prejudice, but rather asked those questions that I have wanted to ask from a “curious point of view”. I have always made it clear that I am not out to judge anyone, but also that I am not writing about this topic as a support towards SIAN. I simply wanted to get a greater understanding of what drives the members and get knowledge about their perception of reality. I have always informed SIAN about this when contacting them.

 For various reasons such as limited time and location as the members of SIAN is living scattered around Norway (I have been situated in Denmark during this period of writing), I have not been able to do proper face-to-face interviews. I have therefor contacted my informants over the internet and all communication has therefor solely been conducted written through e-mail and Facebook mail. Although this allows the informants to think carefully through theirs answers in such matter that they might censor themselves, I would also argue that the informant might think through their answer in such matter that they would not forget certain elements that they might have done in a situation where the informant is put more on the spot. Over e-mail I asked the then leader of SIAN[[2]](#footnote-2), Arne Tumyr, 6 questions. After a couple of days he answered on all the questions and gave full and detailed answers[[3]](#footnote-3). All correspondence was done in Norwegian and I have translated everything into English. The original texts in Norwegian can be found in appendix 1 and 2 together with all the texts translated into English. I was always open about my agenda and what the questions were going to be used for. From the first contact with Tumyr we had a pleasant tone and he was more than willing to answer some questions, and he answered long and informational. I chose to get in contact with Tumyr as he was the leader of SIAN at that time, and I have chosen not to give Tumyr a pseudonym because he spoke on the behalf of SIAN and what he said can be found both on sian.no, and also in various other public interviews.

 I also made contact with the SIAN Facebook moderators, although contact with them did not go as easily as with the official SIAN. The SIAN Facebook page is open for the public to view everything that is posted and written, but to post something one must be a member. It is not enough to press “like”, but one must send a request to become a member and I did not wish to send such a request as I have used my private Facebook account throughout the whole process. I did not want to be perceived as a supporter and that is why I made contact with the moderators instead. As before, I was open about my agenda. I had made a questionnaire about the sense of community of the Facebook page and asked for help with reaching out to the members. I got the answer back that they would discuss this on the next board meeting[[4]](#footnote-4). However, an answer never arrived, so I have therefore not been in contact with any of the Facebook members. Because of this lack of contact, this thesis will merely be based on the observations that I have done on the page. Although one is a member of the Facebook group I will call them supporters in this thesis to not confuse them with the paying members of the official SIAN organisation.

**1.2: Observations**

 Observations is also a method within social constructivism, and is used to give an understanding of how the social world and its meanings are created or constructed with interaction between people (Pedersen, 2012: 223), and it is this interaction that I have wanted to observe. I have not done a classical observation study in this thesis, instead I have observed how people interact with each other on internet. Because most of the interaction between these individuals in the anti-Islamic environment interact with each other on Facebook, I have observed how they use social media to reach others with the same opinions as them. Many of these groups only exists on Facebook, while SIAN has a webpage as well as a Facebook page. During this period of writing I have continually been visiting sian.no and I have been visiting SIANs Facebook page almost every day. There is a high activity on the Facebook page, and I therefore felt it was important to visit this page often so that I would not miss out on anything.

 I have noticed which individual that is most active and I have counted that it is approximately around 10-20 individuals that is frequently commenting and posting, often on a daily basis. The members are of all ages and of both genders. However, my assumptions is that there is slightly more men than women that is active, and that there is slightly more people above the age of 35-40. It is difficult to state such a thing as I have no safe method of measuring this, so it is important to note that that I base this on my own observations. The tone is very informal and many also has misspellings, however I have corrected such errors but at the same time I have tried to keep tone and informality of the original text in Norwegian when I have translated. The SIAN Facebook page is updated every single day by various users. Not all links and comments posted on the page results in debate, but some obtains more than 140 comments such as the debate about allowing Muslims as member on the Facebook group[[5]](#footnote-5). Meanings, thought, blogs, news articles etc. regarding Muslims are shared and circulated on Facebook every day, and a quick look on the SIANs group page indicates the importance of this sharing for the existence of this group. I have looked at what kind of information that is shared, as well as what kind of rhetoric that is used by the supporters of the group. I will further elaborate on this importance of this sharing in chapter “3: Analysis”. I have every day throughout this writing process observed SIANs Facebook page, as well as continuously observing the groups Frihetsforkjemperne (The Fighters for Freedom) and Norwegian Defence League (NDL). I have never participate in any debate that has occurred on these pages, only observed what has been written on these public pages. I have also not “liked” any of these pages, so I have therefore only observed those pages that is open for the public to read. I did not want to infiltrate this group in any way, and as it would never feel right to be part of this group for me personally as I felt it was not appropriate so send such a members request as I discussed previously.

 It is only the leaders of the official SIAN and the moderators of the Facebook group that have been informed about the writings that I have done about SIAN. Therefore, although these groups are completely open for the world to see, I did not feel it was ethically right to write their full name, and I have therefore given all of the SIAN Facebook supporters’ pseudonyms. Since I never have participated in anyways in the discussions, the method I have used is full observation. The observation has also been hidden as it has been over the internet where people post things merely without the thought of someone observing them in such a matter that I have done. However, since the page are public and I have used pseudonyms, I do feel that I have not crossed any ethic boundaries.

**1.3: Document Analysis**

 In this thesis I have used document analysis as a tool to support my findings, as well as a contributor to information about certain matters. It is important to note that in social constructivism one do not see the document as a source to the truth, but as information that is determined by the situation they are written in (Pedersen, 2012: 223). I have therefore used the documents gathered as opinions rather than facts to illustrate different opinions and also to support my empery. For example the Norwegian anthropologist Sindre Bangstad`s work on for example the Eurabia conspiracy theory has given me good insight and information about this concept. Other researchers such as Lars Gule and Kristian Bjørkelo has shed light on extremism, and based on their data I have been able to connect these concepts to the data that I have gathered about SIAN through observations.

 As well as using academic articles to build up my analysis, I have also gathered information from social media, blogs and webpages such as sian.no and vepsen.no (an online media that writes about (and is against) extremism of any sort). I have looked through the Aalborg University library database and google scholar when searching for documents and used keywords such as “Islamophobia”, “extremism”, “hate” etc. when searching. After looking through several of books and academic articles, I chose those that I felt would suit best in answering my research question: “What is the worldview within the anti-Islamist environment in Norway, and what role do social media play in this understanding?”

**1.4: Limitations**

 The main limitation in this thesis is that I had problem getting in contact with the supporters of SIAN on Facebook. I had good contact with the official SIAN and the then leader Arne Tumyr (before the new board), however I had problems on Facebook. The SIAN Facebook page is open, but to write anything on the “wall” one must be a member. As written above, it is not enough to press “like”, but one must request a membership. I did not want to do this as I have used my own private Facebook account throughout this whole process. It would be useful to measure the sense of community that may be on that page and it could have been useful to make a survey in order to measure this. The supporters are not afraid of writing their opinion, but if I could get in contact with some of them I could make more accurate assumptions on what this page mean to these people and what the impressions they get from others on the page has to say for their perception of the world.

 It would also be interesting to do comparative studies to other hate-groups on Facebook, Norwegian and international, but time limited the possibilities to do such research. Therefore, one could argue that this research is rather limited as it is based on one Facebook group, however I will argue that this research can be applied to other similar groups. Many people are for example members of both SIAN and Norwegian Defence League.

 I also had troubles obtaining research from others that have done this on Facebook communities, and what I did find was made on youth. Those active on SIAN is not what I would characterise as youth. I have therefore mentioned the research I found (in chapter “3. Analysis”), however I have not made any conclusions based on this research.

**2: Theory**

 I this chapter, I will talk about the theory that lays the basis for the analysis in this thesis. I will present social constructivism as this thesis is dealing with different objections to what the “truth” is, and illustrate how I understand and grasp the concepts and meanings that informants and others are presenting. In this thesis it will also be important to talk about the concept of hate in a theoretical perspective, and I will therefore take a closer view on the Duplex Theory of Hate, which talks about hate and its link to love. Hate will be an important concept for understanding in this thesis and I believe therefore that it is important to talk about it as a general concept. I will also talk about descriptive extremism and what recognise this type of extremism. However, firstly I will present social constructivism.

**2.1: Social Constructivism**

 I have chosen to focus on the sociological theory Social Constructivism in order to get an understanding of the perception of reality that is presented by anti-Islamist groups and people. It is also important in this thesis to get an understanding of why some people are so engaged in what they call “a fight against Islam” and take a closer look at these peoples worldview. Kirsten Bransholm Pedersen writes in “Videnskapsteori – en indføring”[[6]](#footnote-6) that what we perceive as true and objective is *our* perception of reality, which is constructed through interaction with others. This interaction can be part of how we are brought up, interaction through meetings with different institutions such as educational institutions, or through meeting with different norms, discourses or other perceptions. “Truths” are being constructed and there is no one universal truth, but rather what one perceive as the truth is based on ones perspectives, from the viewpoint the individual has. Some of these constructed truths become the dominant discourse within a society, in other words; a *perception*. Pedersen uses the example on how most people recognise the perception that the environment is under threat as dominant discourse in today’s society. Within a social constructive view it is important to note the knowledge is never seen as objective, not even scientific knowledge (Pedersen, 2012: 188-189).

 The historical roots of social constructivism draws us back to Immanuel Kant (1724 – 1804) and his philosophical heritage. The social constructivists has been inspired of the philosophical view that what is *real for us*, is created in the human consciousness, which means that we can never describe “the real world” objectively. However, our experiences can contribute to how we produce knowledge about realities (an ontological level) (Pedersen, 2012: 191-193). Pedersen further writes that Berger and Luckmann is two important people within the development of social constructivism. In their book “The Social Construction of Reality” (2004)[[7]](#footnote-7) they describe that they want to define “knowledge” and “reality”. They define reality as *“the traits regarding phenomena, which we perceive as exciting independently from our will (we cannot “wish them gone”)”* and knowledge is defined as: *“the certainty, that phenomena is real and has specific characteristics”* (Berger & Luckmann, 2004: 39)*.* Berger and Luckmann writes that sociological science has to relate to what the current “knowledge” in a society is without considering if this “knowledge” is valid or not. Further they explain that all human knowledge transfers, develops and sustains in social situation. Sociology therefore has to try to understand these processes where the “reality” is taken for granted and becomes the form for the “man on the street”. Their view is that the reality is socially constructed, and we all live in a world that is to for us (2004: 39-41).

 When one is talking about social constructivism, it is important to mention *epistemology* and *ontology*. In Pedersen it is written that from the epistemological approach, social constructivism says that it is not possible to achieve objective knowledge about the subject that one is researching. One is therefore not able to do a research about something from an objective point of view. We will always be regarding phenomena, whether they are social or physical, from some kind of perspective, as we will always be under the influence of the discourse of the phenomenon one is situated in.

 From the ontological approach, social constructivism does not accept only one truth, but rather a number of so-called constructed truths based on specific perspectives, values and social and historical contexts. It is necessary to identify the power, the interests and the preconception of the actors that are involved. The way these actors involved perceive the truth creates a ‘reality’ that is made on the basis of their own interpretation and knowledge about this reality. These perceptions become “truths” and in that way create discourses about them that can dominate how people think and feel about these truths (Pedersen, 2012: 190).

 Pedersen illustrates the difference between epistemology and ontology with a figure that explains what it is that becomes constructed:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Epistemology***‘Knowledge of the world’* | **Ontology***‘The world in itself’* |
| **Social phenomena** | 1. Knowledge about social phenomena is socially constructed | 3. Social phenomena are socially constructed |
| **Physical phenomena** | 2. Knowledge about physical phenomena is socially constructed | 4. Physical phenomena are socially constructed |

Figure 1. (Pedersen, 2012: 207).

The epistemological approach says that one can never produce objective knowledge about reality itself. Here it is an assumption that one built knowledge on the basis of certain understandings, all social phenomena are discursive and is interpreted knowledge. Also the second position where all knowledge about physical phenomena is viewed as socially constructed is decided by social factors (Pedersen, 2012: 207-208).

 In the ontological perspective it is the being itself that is constructed, in other words the social and physical phenomena is socially constructed (Pedersen, 2012: 209-212). In this thesis it is the understandings of the world, in other words the knowledge of the socially and physical phenomena (epistemology) and how these are constructed that I will look further into.

 It is with these regards to what I have described above that social construction will be the basis for my analysis, to look at the different views of reality, or rather the different views of the world which people may have. My task will not be to find some kind of “truth”, but to give an understanding of what some groups and individuals are working with as true. I have looked at the worldview and the reality of those active on SIANs Facebook page. According to social constructivism, how they perceive the society is not necessarily wrong, but different from what the mainstream society accept as the norm. Because these opinions expressed on Facebook can be so far apart from what many would view as true, it is also important to also take a critical view of the theory.

**2.1.1: Criticism of Social Constructivism**

 Social constructivism has been under criticism, and I feel therefore that it is important to note these criticsas social constructivism is such an important component for the analysis of this thesis. Pedersen writes that there is three main point for criticism of the theory. The first point talks about the question ofrelativism. Critics asks if all people have their own “truths”, is then all of these truths equally good? It also raises questions regarding science and its role if there are no universal truths. This critique is connected to the issue of validity, how the analysis made is valid to the actual field and the theoretical concepts.

 The other point of criticism talks about the question of existence. This point raises the question if anything of what we observe exists. Pedersen asks questions such as; is there then no obese people? And is death socially constructed? The social constructivists answer that the point is not if things exists or not, but rather if they exists to *us*. A chair might not be considered as something to sit on if one would never had seen a chair before according to Pedersen. She further explains with an example from Jørgensen and Phillips, who says that all though actions and things are real, they are socially constructed. For example “nationalism” can change its meaning and content through certain discussions, events and research, which means that the word can be something else for us now than it used to be. In other words, the concept is not static (Pedersen, 2012: 224-226).

 The last point of criticism noted in Pedersen is about internal contradictions. The criticism talks about how social constructivists cannot claim that there are no such thing as “truths”, but at the same time claim that that is a truth. However, a social constructive theory does not demand to be true, it even acknowledge that constructivism itself is socially constructed. A social constructivist analysis should be used as a source to dialog regarding how something is perceived as real, the right, the good etc.

 Regardless of these critiques, I feel that social constructivism is a valid theory for this thesis is my aim is to describe how some people picture of the world is different from others, and how these anti-Islamist groupings in Norway are seeing certain elements as a truth that others in the society may not share. I believe that for this thesis, my goal is not to look at whether something is true or not, but to rather underline that what is said on SIANs page is true for *them*. This truth is often not compliable to what the view of the world is for the mainstream Norwegian society, and some of might be said would be non-acceptable according to Norwegian law as hateful utterings not is allowed according to the paragraph on racism[[8]](#footnote-8). To conclude, the utterings and rhetoric on SIANs Facebook page may be non-acceptable to the general public in Norway, however, those that has these opinions are having a view of the world where Muslims are enemies of the western world. This is as true for them as it is not true for many others. I will not use this thesis to claim a truth, but rather to present the truth of a certain group in Norway.

 **2.2: Theory of Hate**

 In this chapter I will talk about hate and how hate can be linked to these groups on internet, such as SIAN. I will do so by talking about the Duplex Theory of Hate, which says that hate is actually closely related to love as it is the same kind of passion that is created within the individual. Firstly, I want to present another perception on hate than the one I will focus on. Davis Konstan writes in “Ancient Anger” that Aristotle distinguish between anger and hatred. He claims that while the one that is angry feels pain, the one that hates do not. Further, hatred is described as a response to harmful and vicious actions. Injustice is used as an example as something that can invoke hatred, but not particularly painful (Konstan, 2003: 102). Aristotle also claimed that those that are angry feel some kind of compassion towards their subject, while this is something that those that hate do not generally feel (McKeon, 2008: 67). For Aristotle hate becomes a rather cold feeling, instead of a hot feeling of passion that can be claimed to lie behind anger. I believe that Aristotle has an interesting point that is worth taking into consideration since his views has been important for the understanding of hate. I will later explain how the hate that the people on SIANs Facebook page is not a result of a personal pain as a result of something that personally has happened to them. There is not a personal pain that seems to be the motive behind their participation in the online discussions, however I will argue that there is an aspect of anger in their hate. I will therefore use the Duplex Theory of Hate that illustrate how anger is an element within hate.

 Further, Max Scheler claims that, for the individual-focuses hate to develop into group hate, the element of revenge has to be present. He describes the progress as when *“any person, relation, object, or situation”* (2008: 70) becomes connected to the hatred towards the individual. In other words; one start to generalise (McKeon, 2008: 69-71). It becomes a type of us “versus them” element created. The Muslims become a group as one entity, and are not looked upon as individuals. This generalisation is very present in the Islamophobic environment which I will discuss further in chapter 3. I believe that Scheler‘s point is important to note as the hate that is portrayed on SIANs Facebook page is directed to a whole group and not individuals where *all* Muslims become looked upon in the same matter. A Muslim born and raised in Norway becomes “the same” as one that is active in Taliban. Their common link is that they are born by Muslims parents, but in such a worldview presented online, they are viewed as one entity. I will elaborate more on this later in the thesis.

**2.2.1: The Duplex Theory of Hate**

 I want to look closer at the Duplex Theory of Hate, which links hate to love. I want to do so to get a greater understanding of the mechanisms that drives people that hate. Sternberg writes in “Hate” that Baumeister has defined three or possibly four types of hate where the first one is an ideological belief that one side is good while the other side or group is evil.[[9]](#footnote-9) One hates another group because of a belief in that they are evil (2003: 306). I believe that it is this type of hate that suits this thesis, where the people active on SIANs Facebook page (for example) write hateful things towards the Muslim population truly out of that belief that all Muslims are not good people. A rhetoric based on the good versus evil becomes validated. I will talk more about this in chapter 3.

 Sternberg describes a triangulation of Hate/Love within the Duplex Theory. Here he describes thee compatible components that are present in both love and hate. It is important to note that Sternberg distinguishes between triangulation of feelings and actions with regards to hate and love. The three elements of love and hate are described as negation of intimacy, passion and commitment (Sternberg, 2003: 306). These elements shines through differently in love and hate and the figure below illustrate the elements manifests in hate:



*Figure 2 (Sternberg, 2003: 307).*

Firstly, negation of intimacy becomes linked to disgust when someone hates. In other words, one seek the opposite of intimacy to those one hate. It talks about how one distance oneself towards those we have a hate relationship with, where in a love situation one would seek for closeness. Negative stereotypes, that may be created within a hate-group against the target group for example, then become a reason for distance (Sternberg, 2003: 306). It will later be addressed how people discuss certain implementations to distance themselves to Muslims by describing Muslim values as fundamentally different from western values. In other words, negation of intimacy explains how the people I have observed wants to distance themselves with the Muslim population and even have a view of disgust towards Muslims. One simply do not want those that is object to our hate close to us.

 The second component is described as passion, which in hate becomes anger and/or fear. The target group is viewed as an enemy that is dangerous and a threat, which provokes an anger in some, but also a fear by others. Passion of hate can also be seen between individuals, but it is the hate towards a certain target group that I will be focusing on here (Sternberg, 2003: 307-308). This element is absolutely present as I have observed and will be greatly focused on in chapter 3.

 The third and last component is the one described as commitment, or rather a decision-commitment in hate, which talks about devaluation or diminution through contempt. In other words, the hater is described here by Sternberg as viewing its target group or person as barely human or as a subhuman, and feeling a contempt towards its target. How someone is dressed or speaks can be used as pointing out the differences between the groups as a tool to devaluate the target group (2003: 308-309). These components are all somewhat driven by stereotypes about the target group being a certain way that provokes anger or fear, that makes someone distance themselves from the target group and that creates the target group as devaluated from the hate group (Sternberg, 2003: 310).

 Sternberg described seven types, or rather grades, of hate that is linked to this triangulation described above (2003: 311):

1. Cool hate: Disgust (disgust of negation of intimacy alone)
2. Hot hate: Anger–fear (anger–fear of passion alone)
3. Cold hate: Devaluation–diminution (devaluation–diminution of decision–commitment alone)
4. Boiling hate: Revulsion (disgust of negation of intimacy + anger–fear of passion)
5. Simmering hate: Loathing (disgust of negation of intimacy + devaluation–diminution of decision–commitment)
6. Seething hate: Revilement (anger–fear of passion + devaluation–diminution of decision–commitment)
7. Burning hate: Need for annihilation (disgust of negation of intimacy + anger–fear of passion + devaluation–diminution of decision–commitment)

In what category the people that is active on SIAN and other similar groups Facebook page falls under is difficult to state as the supporters are so various. I believe that many, if not all categories is represented on these type of pages. My observations shows that these people, like any other group, is made up by different individuals with different views. Although they are all supports of SIAN because of a dislike in Muslims, I believe that it is important to know that the Facebook page is not based on a burning hate, but is rather based on supporters within all levels of hate.

 While stories of love tend to have more varied roles, stories of hate has two; the perpetrator and the victim. Propaganda is an example of what can be described as a hate story. Sternberg then writes that the hate is learned; someone has to tell the propaganda and spread it (2003: 314). As written above, what kind of stereotypes and propaganda that is used by the Islamophobic groups in Norway is something I will elaborate on in chapter 3.

 Steve Connor wrote an article in The Independent in 2008 about how scientists had found prof that love and hate are linked in the human brain. The article says that *“scientists studying the physical nature of hate have found that some of the nervous circuits in the brain responsible for it are the same as those that are used during the feeling of romantic love – although love and hate appear to be polar opposites”* (Connor, 2008)*.* The scientists has scanned the brain and found out that the love circuit has something in common with the hate circuit. Professor Semir Zeki from University College London, led the study published in the on-line journal PloS ONE, and claims that this research can illustrate why both hate and love can result in extreme actions. The research had 17 volunteers that they looked at what happened in the brain when the volunteers experienced emotions of love and hate. However, the research did find one element that separate love and hate; the activation of the cerebral cortex. This function, linked to reasoning and judgment, becomes de-activate under love, while during hate emotions the cerebral cortex only becomes de-activated in small areas. In other words, the lover becomes less judgmental towards the person he or she loves (Connor, 2008). One can argue that this article shed lights on the Duplex Theory, and illustrate biologically how one can link hate and love together. It is not only a social scientific theory, but it is also supported neurological science as illustrated here. However, the theory provide benefits such as through narratives one can get a greater understanding of what lays behind the hate.

 The Duplex Theory of Hate also illustrate how there is several degrees of hate; from cool hate to burning hate, which are all present on the Facebook group. I believe that it is important to note this, and in that way not generalise everyone that is a supporter of SIANs Facebook page as people with a burning hate towards Muslims. The theory also tells us that love and hate is not opposites, but related as the three components described above illustrates. Sternberg‘s article also illustrate how hate is linked to for example terrorism. Islamophobic terrorism became a factum 22nd of July when Anders Behring Breivik bombed the government building in Oslo and went on a shooting raid on the Utøya island where the Labour Party had its annual youth camp. His actions showed to be motived by hate; towards Muslims and towards the Labour Party that according to him had allowed Norway to be “Islamised”. Sternberg also link this theory to genocide and massacres. Hate can be manifested through stories that in worst case scenario may lead to horrific events. This is what the Duplex Theory is talking about. However, there are also limitations to the theory such as the point of terrorism, genocide and massacres. There can be many more reasons behind such event, like economic, political and psychological factors. One can for example argue that not all German soldiers in the Second World War where driven by hate, but merely by duty. Sternberg also underline that although the theory seem to fit with several empirical examples, it is not yet properly tested (2003: 322-323). However, I still will argue that Sternberg‘s theory is suitable for what I want to illustrate with my thesis and that the theory can illustrate the motivations behind those that is so active on the internet. I believe that Sternberg‘s theory gives a greater understanding of the drive or motivation behind hate. It also explains what happens when we hate, such as how we seek negation of intimacy, and our passion and commitment. These are important components that I will take into consideration in the analysis. As the name of the theory reveals, duplex theory, I also believe the link with love is interesting. The element of having the same drive with regards to hate as one has when one loves, can be argued as important to understand how someone can be so engaged in this Facebook page. However, as I understand the Duplex Theory of Hate, hate becomes a rather hot feeling which I argue is in contrast to what Aristotle explains hate; as a rather colder feeling. There is also a contrast between the two in regards to the matter of anger. While Aristotle separate hate and anger, Steinberg‘s Duplex theory links anger to hate. Because of the anger that I have observed on the SIAN page, I will argue that Steinberg‘s theory is more applicable as anger and fear of Muslims is present with the regards to the utterings made by SIANs supporters. I believe that Aristotle‘s thoughts are interesting and worthy of having in the back of our heads with the regards of this thesis as one can argue that it can be applied to other cases, however in this case it would imply that the SIAN supporters not have a hate towards Muslims and Islam and that they are merely just angry. Therefore I will be using Steinberg‘s in this thesis as it allows hate and anger to co-exist.

**2.3: Descriptive Extremism**

 It can be difficult to define what extremism actually is although it is a well-known word in most people’s vocabulary, and it can also be difficult to agree on what is extreme. The Norwegian folklorist, Kristian Bjørkelo, that has followed different extreme environments over several years points out that what was radical in its time, may not be looked upon as that now. He exemplifies this by explaining how the French revolution was radical in its time and was implemented through violence and terrorism. Although extreme in its time, the French revolution is now looked up as a fight for equality amongst the different classes in the society. Bjørklo explains extremism as radical (or controversial) ideas and thoughts that is placed far away from the norm in the society. Those who fight for this often feel that the only way of getting these ideas through is by violence and terror (Bjørklo, 2013. URL).

 Another Norwegian researcher on the subject, Lars Gule, also describes extremism as perceptions, objections and/or actions that is situated far away from those perceptions, objections and actions of the general public (Gule, 2012: 15). In the case of this thesis, those perceptions are placed to the right on the political scale and is therefore placed outside the political norm. In other words, extreme ideas are situated outside what the mainstream society finds acceptable.

 Further, Gule describes in “Ekstremismens Kjennetegn” that extremism can be divided into descriptive and normative extremism. The normative extremism describes how something *should* be, and it talks about values. Racism is an example on how different people are given different values, and it is believed that there is racial differences amongst people and this is also how it should be. The descriptive extremism talks about how something *is*, how the world looks like. One has the opinion that the world is looking differently than what most people in the society does. When some describes a present ongoing war with the Muslim world, this is also thoughts that is placed outside what the mainstream society believes (2012: 26). It is the descriptive extremism that will be discussed in this thesis.

 The descriptive extremism talks about an ideological perception of reality that differs from our knowledge about reality. It is important to know that scientific realities are always under development and change. Realities or knowledge are constantly being interpreted and it is therefore these notions might be viewed differently by the different individuals. These different interpretations can then lead to misunderstandings or misrepresentation of actual numbers. The number of immigrants in a country for example can often be looked upon as larger than it actually is. Gule writes that when immigration is described as an invasion or occupation where the Norwegian society as we know it is in danger, this rhetoric becomes extreme. It is therefore that Islamophobia falls under the category of descriptive extremism (Gule, 2012: 29-30, 41, 44), and why also the rhetoric from SIANs Facebook page falls under this.

 Bjørkelo focuses on that violence is an aspect of extremism. The Norwegian Police Security Service (Politiets Sikkerhetstjeneste, PST) says that something is extreme when there is a will to do violent actions to get their political agenda through. Bjørkelo talks about how Fjordman, anti-Muslim blogger that Anders Behring Breivik was inspired of, can be look upon as implicit violent. Although one might not do violent acts oneself, to have a rhetoric that encourage violence is extreme. The anti-Islamic environment expresses that they want to remove Islam from Europe, and Bjørkelo mentions that one cannot remove all Muslims from Europe without being violent (2013. URL). One could argue that most of what the SIANs supporters are expressing is harmless, however the aspect of encouragement to violence such as removal of Muslims is present on their Facebook page, as well as their websites. One can therefore argue that Bjørkelo‘s point of encouragement is an important aspect to take into consideration. When human value is taken away from the target group and they are talked about in abstract terms, such as describes as cockroach or rats, it is describes as extreme rhetoric and can be indication on threats (2013). The target group become associated with negative terms and devaluated.

 Another researcher on the field, Dominic Abrams, writes in the Subject Group Dynamic model (SGD) and describes how this model can explain how members of a group desire a positive group identity. By ensuring a positive group identity, the members believe that their group is correct and have the proper values and norms. Abrams argue that extremism can rise from such norms. Further, he also points out that extremism can be a result of an uncertainty. He also argues that uncertainty and extremism is normal, as people have a view of things that is fundamentally social (2011: 36, 40). In other words, extremism is viewed in terms of its “*shared meaning, value, impact, relevance, purpose, and functions”* (2011: 36)*.* It is therefore it becomes so important to have a positive group identity to legitimize the feeling of belonging to the good side. Further, one can argue that these notions becomes part of the group dynamic where one support each other’s opinions and validate them. However, I will not argue that extremism necessarily is normal, but I will argue that the world view that is expressed on this group is normal to those that is active in the anti-Islamic environment. They do not view themselves as extreme although the mainstream society may do so, but to them their views are completely normal. They view theirs own group as the good, while the target-group are the evil. Or looking at Bjørkelo‘s point of taking away someone’s human values: the target-group become like rats etc.

 I will discuss that the worldview presented by organisations such as SIAN is extreme; the encouragement to violence and ideas that are to the far right of the political mainstream scale is present in the group. However, Abram’s view illustrate how those that are supporters of for example SIAN do not view themselves as extreme. As stated above, descriptive extremism talks about an ideological perception of reality that differs from our knowledge about reality, and how these ideas may encourage violence. For SIANs supporters, their worldview is not anything but normal.

**3: Analysis:**

 Social construction tells us how certain rhetoric and “truths” becomes created through human interaction. This interaction can be part of how we are brought up, interaction through meetings with different institutions such as educational institutions, or through meeting with different norms, discourses or other perceptions (Pedersen, 2012: 188-189). I will take a closer look on how these interactions manifest itself over Facebook in this thesis, and how interaction over social media such as Facebook can contribute to that certain meanings become “truths”. In this chapter, I will discuss how Islamophobia presents itself on the internet and how the different actors on the SIAN Facebook group talk about Muslims.

 First of all, I believe it is useful for look at the number of immigrant in Norway to get an overview of the Norwegian context. Today, 12 per cent of the population in Norway are immigrants or have parents that are immigrants. The largest group comes from Poland, with Swedes as the second largest immigrant group and Somalis third (Statistisk Sentralbyrå, 2013). Numbers from 2010 in Johan Galtung’s article “Muslim diaspora in Europe and the USA” tell that 3 per cent of the Norwegian population are Muslims (2012: 1). However, many sources, including Statistisk Sentralbyrå (SSB), claims that they do not know exactly how many Muslims there is in Norway, because it is difficult to count people according to their beliefs. One is not automatically Christian because ones parents is, or because on is a member of the State Church (which one automatically becomes when being christened in Norway), and vice versa for Muslims. Although, low numbers, several news reports point to the fact that many Norwegians believe that the numbers are higher than it actually is and many discuss that the numbers will raise. This construction of “ethnic Europeans” as at risk of being endangered and as being a future minority is something I will elaborate on in this chapter.

 With that said, studies on the background on surveys by the Norwegian statistical agency Statistisk Sentralbyrå (SSB) show that more and more Norwegians are positive to immigration. Every year, SSB publishes numbers on how the general attitude towards immigrants is in Norway and the positive numbers are increasing. In the 2009 IMDi report about immigrants in the Norwegian media, they use the numbers from SSB from 2002 to 2009 to see in which direction the Norwegian view on immigrants is moving. And the attitudes are moving in a positive direction. In 2002, 63 per cent of the asked said that they felt that immigration had enriched Norway, however in 2009, 70 per cent answered the same. In the conjunction of people being more positive, more Norwegians have contact with immigrants in 2009 than in 2002. It is an important note that Norwegians are more sceptical to Muslim immigrants than towards immigrants of other faiths and like the tendency is in other European countries, Muslims are also more discriminated than other groups. (IMDI, 2009: 17, 19). I believe these numbers are important to keep in mind when reading about the anti-Islamic environment in Norway. Based on these numbers one can draw the conclusion that the anti-Islamic environment does not represent the majority of the Norwegian population, but one can argue that they do represent a reinforced scepticism towards the Muslim minority that is present in the Norwegian population. I will therefore talk about the difference between being sceptical or critical to certain elements within Islam versus Islamophobia. In this chapter I will also take a closer look on the ideology and world view that these people are living by. Firstly, I want to present the organisation behind that Facebook group that I have done my observations on, Stopp Islamiseringen av Norge.

**3.1: Stop the Islamisation of Norway (SIAN)[[10]](#footnote-10)**

 In this thesis I have chosen to focus the observations on SIAN and its Facebook group, which is Norway’s largest anti-Islamic organisation. There are several small groups in Norway that focus on what they call the fight against Islam, such as Norwegian Defence League (NDL); the sister organisation of the more famous English Defence League (EDL). I have observed that on NDLs Facebook page many of those that is active does not have Norwegian clinging names, but more English type of names, and also many of the discussions are in English. As of 22nd of May 2014, NDLs Facebook page had 4988 supporters. With the regards to my observations I will argue that SIANs page is more oriented towards Norwegian supporters and society and I have therefore chosen to focus my observations to SIANs page. SIAN has an informative web page that is often updated, as well as a Facebook page with huge activity. This Facebook page has continuously activity by Norwegians, many well-known within the anti-Islamic environment. My research also tells that most of the active people in the anti-Islamic environment has been members or have been in contact with SIAN in some point[[11]](#footnote-11). As of 22.05.2014 SIAN had 1090 members on its Facebook page, however as I will elaborate on later, SIAN used to have over 13 000 supporters on its page and was Norway’s largest anti-Islam page.

**3.1.1: SIANs Objectives**

 SIAN describes themselves as an organisation that aims to work against, stop and reverse the Islamisation of Norway. They describe Islam as a totalitarian political ideology and movement that is violating the Norwegian constitution and law, as well as international human rights and democracy with their Sharia laws. SIAN, like other anti-Islamists organisations or groups, underline that Islam is not a race and that they therefore not are racists. They state that they distance themselves from such ideology that violates democratic and human ideals. Further they state that they are not against Muslims as human beings and that the Muslims are Islam’s biggest victims. It is the religious-political ideology that they define Islam as, which they want to fight as it is a treat to our peace and freedom (SIAN, URL). I asked the former leader of SIAN[[12]](#footnote-12) some questions about SIAN and their aims, and he told me that they claim that Muhammad was a sex offender, caravan robber and war criminal. Further he underlined that *“the Sharia laws is violating human rights*”, and that *“SIAN want to stop the Islamisation by enlightening and freeing Muslims from the jail that Islam is forcing them to be in. We also believes that Muslim wants this freedom, but we know that Muslims who break out put their own life in danger and inflict themselves and its family fatal hazards- that shows itself in Islam’s inhumane practises”* (Tumyr, 2014. [Personal correspondence]).

 While I wrote this thesis a conflict within SIAN emerged and changed the organisation. It was during the annual general assembly 28th of March 2014 that the leader Arne Tumyr informed that he would resign. With 20 against 18 votes Stig Andersen got elected as the new leader of SIAN, but not without drama. A debate and a division within SIAN about what kind of approach the organisation would have ended in a break within the organisation (SIAN, 2014). Those that broke out of SIAN become described as the Silk Front by SIAN supporters, which want a softer way of dealing with the issues and opens up for that there also are some “moderate Muslims”. They are also against SIANs support to the organisation Folkebevegelsen Mot Innvandring (FMI)[[13]](#footnote-13). The other fraction is, according to Kjersti Opstad that writes for the website Radikal Portal, the “Christian fundamentalists”, which the Silk Front is against. The Christian fundamentalists are focusing on the religion war and is accusing the political left side and immigration for de-christening of Norway. In this fraction there is a strong support to Israel and a resistance towards the Labour Party and the political left Norway.[[14]](#footnote-14) They also support a rhetoric that is calling for a “fight for the cross”. However, Tumyr rejects characteristics such as Christian fundamentalists on SIANs home page. Opstad further writes that it is a known case that the right wing extreme environment is marked by internal disputes, both the more traditional and those hostile to Muslims such as SIAN. SIAN has gathered more “likes” on Facebook than any other Norwegian anti-Muslim page. Radikal Portal estimates that SIAN has somewhat between 200 and 300 paying members and the Facebook page had over 13.000 supporters. She further writes that *“the full scale confrontation resulted in that the about 13.000 followers on Norway’s biggest racist page got deleted”* (Opstad, 2014). It was the people that belonged to the group that broke out that controlled the SIAN Facebook page and they deleted thousands of members and the page eventually got deleted as well. SIAN has now created a new Facebook page but as Opstad writes, it must be a hard blow for SIAN to lose its Facebook group with its 13.000 supporters as this has been such an important channel for them to spread their message, and that it will take time to build up new SIAN as the old one (Opstad, 2014). The so-called Silk Front has also created a new Facebook page and has established the organisation Verdier i Sentrum (VIS) (Values in the Centre). (Tumyr, 2014. URL). The VIS Facebook page has as of 22nd of May 2014 only 172 supporters, while SIANs page has managed to retrieve 1090 supporters as of the same date[[15]](#footnote-15). On the new Facebook group one can read about the break. The discussion is dominated by those who write that the so-called Silk Front is traitors and quislings. Although the debate eventually calmed down, now and then there are still those that mentions the so called traitors in VIS. One significant result of the break is the broader acceptant of what becomes posted. Something that before that would be deleted by the old moderators, may now be allowed to stay. One member asked where the limit of tolerance for the group is placed, and one user called Heidi replies that the appetence is greater now than earlier, and another member, Olav, agrees. They both express content over this fact, but Heidi also states that they do delete racist posts (she is one of the moderators and a central person within SIAN). So although the aims and values of SIAN are the same, the members have a more open space to express themselves.

**3.1.2: Criticism towards SIAN**

 On the other end of the scale, the anti-Racism Centre describes the organisation as one that has an understanding of the world that is built upon conspiracy theories where they claim a negative development in the society and where these negative notions are part of a Muslim plan. Also the Norwegian social anthropologist Sindre Bangstad has harsh criticism towards SIAN and says that *“central members included a Norwegian Nazi and Holocaust denier, a Norwegian apartheid supporter and anti-immigrant activist, and a Norwegian convicted for sending out thousands of racist e-mails about Muslims after September 11, 2001”* (Bangstad, 2013: 383). Further, events become blown up as to something more or different than it actually was about. In the rapport from the Anti-Racism Centre it is described a case from a school in Drammen where they decided to call the annual Christmas party for a winter party. After a lot of commotion it became clear that it was not Muslims that had changed the name, but a Norwegian religious minority that do not celebrate Christmas. However, SIAN article on the case states that *“one can no longer arrange Christian Christmas celebrations in the schools in Oslo where most of the students are Muslims”* (Sultan & Steen, 2012)*.* Further, the article states that multiculturalism demands endings of Christian Christmas celebrations at the schools, one can no longer use the Santa hat and it is forbidden to go to church as a school class (which is a tradition when there are Christian holidays in Norway). Further, I have observed that there is posted links with horrific stories of murder and rape on Christians from various blogs. This is stories that none of the Norwegian newspapers (or international) are writing about, and one could therefore argue that one should be looking at such blogs with scepticism. However, on the SIAN page, all these undocumented stories and blogs become stated as truths, and there is a lack of scepticism to sources that one could argue that one should not unquestionably trust.

 As mentioned above, Vepsen in an online magazine that criticise extremism, whether it is from the political left or right side. In 2012 they published a rapport on the various extreme organisations in Norway. They claim that because of the internal disputes within the Islamophobic environment in Norway bad at organising themselves. They further point to lack of turn ups when organisations such as SIAN and NDL has demo etc. and claim that many of the “internet-activists” may feel that they have done enough when “liking”, commenting and publishing on Facebook. However, Vepsen also claim that the recruitment through internet can contributing to normalise extreme attitudes and writes that it is worrying that so many are openly active with their full name and picture (Vepsen, 2012: 23). In today’s technological society one should not underestimate the power of social media.

**3.2: Eurabia**

 In this section, I want to address the concept of Eurabia and present the meaning behind this conspiracy theory as well as some of the key actors within the theory. I want to do so because this is one of the most important elements within the contra-jihadist movements and is often used as proof to the notion of Islam as a treat towards the European civilisation. It is important to note that SIAN claims that they are not a contra-jihadist organisation, but I believe that there is such elements within SIAN and especially Norwegian Defence League (NDL) that is somewhat linked with SIAN[[16]](#footnote-16), which is influenced by conspiracy theories. The Norwegian blogger Fjordman (Peder Nøstvold Jensen), that was one of the sources of inspiration for the terrorist Anders Behring Breivik`s manifesto, is active in the European contra-jihadist environment and is currently writing for the website Gates of Vienna[[17]](#footnote-17) (which refers to the historical event in 1683 where the Ottoman empire (Muslims) where stopped on their crusade in Europe in Vienna). However, one can struggle to see the difference between counter jihadist groups and Islamophobic groups as although the counter jihadists uses conspiracy theories such as the Eurabia theory more actively than for example SIAN[[18]](#footnote-18), such rhetoric is arguably present on sian.no and its Facebook page. Although SIAN claims otherwise, it is daily it is warned about the danger of Muslim immigration, and words such as “occupation” is often used. This type of rhetoric is consistent with the one that is used in Eurabia and my observations tells that there is elements of the Eurabia theory within the anti-Islamic, and I therefore believe that it is an important concept to elaborate on in this thesis.

 Firstly, the Eurabia theory was first introduced by Bat Ye’Or, and her book “Eurabia: The Euro – Arab Axis” form 2005. She is a Jewish Egyptian - born author with Italian – French parents. Her real name is Gisèle Oreibi, however, after settling down in the UK as a stateless refugee after the Suez War in 1956 she married the historian David G. Littman and took the name Gisèle Littman. Bat Ye’Or is a pseudonym she is using and mostly known through, and it is therefore I will use Bat Ye’Or when talking about her. The Norwegian anthropologist Sindre Bangstad writes in “Eurabia comes to Norway” that Ye’Or is looked upon as a scholar and a qualified historian not only by the Eurabia followers, but also by others. She has been invited to speak at several universities such has Brown, Georgetown and Yale. However, the fact is that all though she has attended both UCL and the University of Geneva, she has no formal degree from either institutions and according to Bangstad she *“is regarded amongst most qualified historians of Islam and the Middle East* [however she is] *failing to meet the basic standards of academic research”* (Bangstad, 2013: 371).

 Bangstad describes Ye’Or‘s version of Eurabia as a conspiracy theory where there allegedly has been a Euro – Arab collaboration since the petroleum crisis in 1973. Ye’Or further claims that this collaboration is directed against Israel and the USA as there is a growing influence by Islam on European policy as the Islamic world is penetrating Europe. However, it is important to note that the expression was first used in a publication by Euro – Arab friendship committee in the 1970s, and it is first in newer times that Eurabia is linked to these notions.

 One important concept in Ye’Or‘s description of Eurabia is the “dhimmitude”. She describes the word as *“[the] obligatory submission [of non-Muslim peoples] by war or surrender to Islamic domination”* (Bangstad, 2013: 372), in other words; the Islamisation of the Christian world. Dhimmitude is a state of mind, something that happens gradually and one can also live in a state of dhimmitude without noticing it. Another key concept to Ye’Or is “taqiyya”. Taqiyya is described as the “concept of the Muslim lies”. Muslims systematically lie to hide their real intentions of taking dominance over the non-Muslims, and one can therefore never thrust a Muslim. While Ye‘Or makes no distinction between Sunni and Shi’a Muslims and taqiyya, it is actually only Shi’a Muslims that has this concept. It is a religious dissimulation that allows a Shi‘a Muslim to conceal its religion when he or she is under treat without it being blasphemy. This concept where taqiyya means that Muslims are allowed to deceive non-Muslims is quoted by several, such as the former leader of the Norwegian the Progressive Party (Fremskritts partiet, FRP), Carl I. Hagen. He said in 2004 that the Qur’an accepts this which *“permits fanatical Islamists to walk around in Western attire, drink alcohol, behave like well integrated immigrants, in short, to conceal their real aims to their surroundings and Western police”* (Bangstad, 2013: 373). On SIANs Facebook group on the 22nd of April a supporter, that I have chosen to call Martin, asked whether or not SIAN should allow Muslims into the group. This was meet with mostly negative comment such as Lilly that said *“[I am] saying no! Remember that they are “allowed” to lie, if it suits their so-called law about taking over “all waters”! Sorry to be negative, but the reality has shown WHERE theirs sympathies lays, when certain things are put to the point!”* (Facebook, 22.04.2014. URL). Another user that I have chosen to call Thor is even more harsh in his statement and says “*Absolutely and categorically NO – cannot take being meet by taqiyya […] every time I am in here on what is supposed to be THE NORWEGIAN RESISTANCE FORCE. Muslims has freely space in ALL other media channels, THIS is a forum for PATRIOTS. Now we have the chance to build up our page in somewhat harmony, and I will not be staying here if the ENEMY will get permission to infest every topic that will be addresses in here”* (Facebook, 22.04.2014. URL)*.* This comment illustrate how he seem to think he is in some kind of war with the Muslims. He highlight words such as “resistance force” and “enemy” which one could strongly argue is a Eurabia type of rhetoric. The tendency on the comments was similar to Lilly‘s and Thor‘s, however some opened up for letting Muslims participate in the discussions because then they could figure out Muslims view on different topics and cases. However, these comments were soon declined with the reason of taqiyya; one can never trust what Muslims say.

 Further, what is described as “the Left” is pointed out as the villains in Ye’Or‘s Eurabia description. The Left is those that is “third worldists, neo-communists and Islamists”. These groups has together created a “powerful jihadist coalition” and is working against the Western democracy. Brice Bower, another Eurabia writer describes this so called “Left” as the “new Quislings” (which is used as a word for traitor and is linked to the second world was and the Norwegian Nazi Vidkun Quisling who was executed for treason after the war ended). On the SIAN Facebook page those who belong to the political left such as socialists and the Labour Party, as well as the “political correct” is often described as enemies and as blind who allows the Islamisation to happens. Those that is the supporters of the Eurabia theory believe that there is a long time struggle from Muslim side to take control over Europe and that this is simply hidden by a powerful elite (Bangstad, 2013:370-374).

 The supporters of SIAN do not mention Eurabia directly, however, it is not difficult to spot that they have what one could call “Eurabia tendencies”, such as the belief that Muslims will slowly take over the Western society and implement Sharia law in Europe. Another thing that is consequently repeated on Facebook is taqiyya. There is very often warnings about Muslim lies and that one cannot trust what Muslims are saying. The stereotype that all Muslims are liars is very present on SIANs Facebook group.

**3.3: Islamophobia**

 When talking about right wing extremism it is important to define what I mean with that and what branch of it that I want to focus on in this thesis. I will use the definitions explained in the rapport on “right-wing extremism” in Norway by Sultan and Steen for Antirasistisk Senter (Anti-Racism Centre). Here they describe three different “trends” that is dominant amongst right-wing groups in current Norway (as it is in several other European countries); “neo-Nazism”, “xenophobia/racism” and “Islamophobia” (2012: 7). It is Islamophobia that I will focus on in this thesis.

 I will use “Islamophobia”[[19]](#footnote-19), or “anti-Islamists”, when talking about hateful utterances towards Muslims and “Islam-critics” when talking about those that has a legitimate critique towards Islam. Lars Gule writes that there is three elements that has to be present for someone to be classified as Islamophobic; non-correct or exaggerating negative preservations towards Muslims and Islam, essentialism and conspiracy thinking. Essentialism is when a phenomena becomes simplified to something static and unchangeable and where this phenomena is describes as being a “certain” way. The concept of taqiyya is a classic example on Islamophobia (Gule, 2012: 50, 56-57). Further, the Anti-Racism Centre emphasises that one can critique elements within Islam, as long as it is not spreading hate and/or fear. They also explain that many are simply calling themselves Islam-critics as it has a better ring to it. It can also be a strategy to use certain rhetoric that will “sell better” to the general public. Anti-Racism Centre also state that “racist” has a certain stigma connected to it, and most anti-Islamists will affirm that they are not racists as Islam is not a race. However, Anti-Racism Centre are pointing out that the definition of “racism” changed already in the 1980s with the change of the society where cultural and religious racism (together with discrimination towards skin colour) became part of the so called “neo-racism”. Another important note is that the anti-Semitism also is not only biological, but also has religious and cultural motives. UN defines racial discrimination as *“any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin ...”* (Sultan & Steen, 2012: 10)*.* However, Anti-Racism Centre argues that some of what is defined in “ethnicity” is culture and religion, together with genetics (2012: 9-10).

 In the Norwegian laws, there is a paragraph, the so called racism paragraph (paragraph § 135a) that is explaining what is looked upon as racism in the Norwegian society:

*“Any person who wilfully or through gross negligence publicly utters a discriminatory or hateful expression shall be punished by a fine or imprisonment up to three years. Just as a public uttering, see § 7, paragraph 2, an uttering is considered when the statement is set up so that it is likely to reach a larger number of people. The usage of symbols is also considered as an uttering. Complicity is punishable in the same manner.
       A discriminatory or hateful expression means threatening or insulting someone, or promote hatred, persecution or contempt for someone because of their
  a) skin color or national or ethnic origin,
  b) religion or belief, or
  c) gays orientation, lifestyle or orientation”* (Antrasistisk Senter, URL).[[20]](#footnote-20)

The Norwegian laws also has a paragraph that talks about discrimination called the discrimination law, and describes discrimination as:

*“Direct and indirect discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, national origin, decent, skin-colour, language, religion or belief is prohibited […]* (Antirasistisk Senter, URL)[[21]](#footnote-21).

 As mentioned, there are many that is “hiding” behind the label of being an Islam-critic as one can argue that it is less stigma attached to it, but what is the difference between the being a critique and Islamophobic? Anti-Racism Centre are re-describing eight steps described in the rapport “Islamophobia: A challenge For Us All” from 1997 published by the anti-discrimination organisation The Runnymede Thrust. These eight steps describes how Islamophobia and Islam-criticism are different from each other (Sultan & Steen, 2012: 16). One could argue that most people would think it is legitimate to criticise certain elements within Islam or within certain Islamic societies. For example in the Scandinavian society one could argue that is it looked upon as legitimate to criticise the Muslim country Saudi Arabia for not allowing women to drive cars. However to generalise and criticise all Muslims in the world for such things is then a step further than Islam-criticism. As the members of SIAN claims to be Islam-critics and not Islamophobic, I want to illustrate the difference between the two with the steps from The Runnymede Trust. The steps are using closed (Islamophobic) and open view (Islam-criticism) of Islam to describe the different attitudes:

1. **Monolithic/diverse:** While the closed view look at Islam as an isolated monolithic block, static and unresponsive to new realities, the open view see Islam as a complex size with internal variations and development.
2. **Separate/interacting:** The closed view look at Islam as separate from other cultures, while the open view sees Islam as interdependent on other faiths and cultures and that they share aims and values.
3. **Inferior/different:** The closed view look at Islam as inferior to the West as it is barbaric, primitive, irrational and sexist. The open view see Islam as different, but equally worthy of respect.
4. **Enemy/partner:** Islam is seen as violent and aggressive by the closed view, as well as supportive towards terror. The open view on the other hand see Islam as an actual or potential partner in cooperation’s and in solutions of shared problems.
5. **Manipulative/sincere:** In the closed view Islam is seen as a political ideology, used for political or military advantages. However, in the open view Islam is seen a sincere religious faith.
6. **Criticism of the West rejected/considered:** While the closed view rejects all criticism towards the West, the open view considers it and debates it.
7. **Discrimination defended/criticised:** The closed view uses hostility to justify discrimination and they would like to exclude Muslims from the mainstream society, while the open view argues that although one debates Islam it does not mean one agrees with discrimination nor segregation.
8. **Islamophobia seen as natural/problematic:** In the closed view anti-Muslim hostility is as accepted as natural, while the open view has a critical look at the critique towards Muslims and Islam (The Runnymede Trust, 1997: 2).

I am using this eight steps not as a theory, but rather as a guidance to help separate criticism and “healthy discussions” from stereotyping and hateful utterings. It is these groups and people that has this closed view on Islam that I have observed under this period, because they view Islam as a threat towards the Norwegian society as they know it, and they fear that Muslims in the future will take over the country. Two of those that is active in this environment is Merete Hodne and Kjersti Margrethe Gilje. They are also somewhat active on SIANs Facebook page[[22]](#footnote-22). In a video interview with Siv Sanvik for NRK they were asked if they fear civil war in Norway. Hodne answered:

*“Oh yes, it is just a matter of time. Maybe not the first 10-20 years but I believe it will happen before we know it. Everything happens so fast, so scary and I would actually wish that I would not have to take this fight. Because it is a fight, it is tough. You get people against you, family against you, but I believe that this is the good; this is something I have to do. We have to do this, at least for my children and for my grandchildren. I have four kids that mean everything to me. I have to fight for their future”* (Sanvik, 2012. URL).

This statement also illustrates the Eurabia theory and how the elements of a belief in a Muslim invasion is present in this environment in Norway. Arne Tumyr wrote to me that Islam is a political ideology and that Muhammad was a paedophile (Tumyr, 2014. [Personal correspondence]). This is not examples of an open view towards Islam. Also when the SIAN supporter, Mia, writes that *“Islam is a mental illness…it involves several characteristics: paedophilia, psychiatry, narcissism, lack of empathy, megalomaniac syndrome, etc. etc.”* (Facebook, 12.05.2014. URL), this is not an example on open view of Islam, but it is a generalisation of Islam and Muslims as one closed entity. One can therefore argue that the SIAN supporters are not Islam-critics, but could be classified as Islamophobic. There is also a great presence of generalisation amongst the utterings of the supporters and they are pointing out the fact that according to them, all Muslims lie. The notion of the hidden agenda is continually presented in the posts and comments. It is important to note that as in the closed view, *all* Muslims are presented as liars. One of the members, Johan, writes that *“it is therefore important that each individual have a thorough understanding of what Islam stands for, to be able to reveal and to put them in place”* (Facebook, 22.04.2015. URL)*,* to a comment of the importance of knowing about the taqiyya, the Muslim lies and deceives. When all Muslims in the world is looked upon as one group that shared the same negative stereotype, a type of us versus them notion becomes created. They are *all* enemies of the Western society. These elements are also typical within the Eurabia conspiracy as well.

 I have wanted to shed light on the link between SIAN and Eurabia. I also have wanted to argue that SIAN is Islamophobic and has a closed view on Islam. As written above, the Anti-Racism Centre argues that the label Islam-critic has a better “ring” to it than Islamophobia, and it might be therefore these groups’ claims to be Islam-critics. Despite what the supporters of SIAN identify themselves as, I argue that there is not difficult to spot hateful utterings towards the Muslim population in Norway and the world, and I will therefore not hesitate to claim the SIAN Facebook page as Islamophobic.

**3.4: Rhetoric and Worldview**

 In this section, I would like to shed lights on how the members and supporters of SIAN talk about Muslims and Islam. Every day ideas and views about the Norwegian society and the danger of losing it to Islam is being published on Facebook. On the SIAN Facebook page, it is not difficult to spot negative and sometimes hateful utterings towards the Muslim population in Norway (and the rest of the world). I have made a link between what is said and published on the page and their worldview, in other words; how people talk about certain things is what I argue is a reflection of their worldview.

 As it is argued above, I have found evidence for what I call a Eurabia rhetoric amongst the members of SIAN. Statements such as that we, as the western world, are in war with the Muslim world and that there is an ongoing Muslim invasion and occupation is weekly, if not daily published on the Facebook page. Looking at Galtung`s article that shows that 3 per cent of the Norwegian population is Muslim (2012), one can argue that the statement of a Muslim invasion is over exaggerated. Such statements reflect a view of Muslims as enemies. Also mentioned earlier, Gule writes that when immigration is described as an invasion or occupation where the Norwegian society as we know it is in danger, this rhetoric becomes Islamophobic. It is as if the number of actual immigrants in Norway become looked upon as larger than it actually is (2012: 41, 44). In an interview with NRK done in 2012, the two active within the anti-Islamic environment in organisations and groups such as Stop Islamisation of Europe (SIOE), Frihetsforkjemperne and SIAN, Kjersti Margrethe Gilje and Merete Hodne answers questions about their fight against Islam. Gilje claims that *“Islam is the devil itself. Islam is evil”* (Sandvik, 2012. URL). Further, she expresses a loss of Christianity in the Norwegian society and claims that Muslims is at fault for this. When the interviewer, Liv Sandvik, claims that there is many who would say that Islam and democracy is compatible and that it is them that have a wrong picture of Islam, but both of the women answers that Islam is not at all compatible with Islam and Hodne claims that Islam is the opposite of Islam, and she says, *“so that is just not possible. It might be Muslims that want democracy, but then they are not good Muslims according to the Quran. But they might good Muslims according to us, good people, good human beings”* (Sandvik, 2012. URL). Gilje then shots in that she still would never let *them* into politics, and Hodne agrees. As written in Chapter “3.3 Islamophobia”, Hodne expresses a concern towards a future civil war as a result of Muslim immigration. She also explains her motivation for fighting against Islam and explains that the reason is that *“[…] have to do this, at least for my children and for my grandchildren. I have four kids that mean everything to me. I have to fight for their future*” (Sandvik, 2012. URL). I will argue that there is not hate itself that drives these women, but their worldview. One can argue that their worldview is based on hate, however, with the regards to social constructivism, their worldview is as true to them as it is not for others. Looking at the video of the interview, I will argue that there is a genuine concern for the Western society that drives these women. However, that does not mean that I do not believe that there are traces of hate within their actions or utterings. Both of them do clearly express Islam as evil and as the enemy, and with over 13.000 supporters of the SIANs Facebook group, one can claim that there are many that share their concern and/or fear of Islam. However, when SIAN or similar groups organise demos and such, there are not many people showing up. This will be discussed further in “3.5: Facebook`s role”. According to vepsen.no, Hodne pointed out under a demo in Oslo in March 2014 that the pork rib (traditional Norwegian Christmas food) is threatened by Islam, despite it having raising sales according to Vepsen (Vepsen, 30.03.2014. URL). It is not difficult to spot the “humour” regarding this by Vepsen, which is continually actively criticises this environment, in this article. One of the main critiques of this environment is exactly the ability amongst these people to make an issue larger than it is or to distort certain elements. As written above, the Anti-Racism Centre claims that such utterings merely whips up the ambience internally in the organisation (Sultan & Steen, 2012: 18-21), and in this way creates more anger and frustration within this environment. Again, here Gule`s claim of a link between exaggerating and Islamophobia becomes applicable (2012: 50, 56-57).

 Despite the critiques claim of SIANs rhetoric being false and merely serves the benefits of promotion within the group, in a social constructivist view these utterings are made because the members truly believe they are true. The SIAN supporters truly believe that all Muslims lie (taqiyya) and they are truly worried about the loss of the western society as we know it. Realities or knowledge is constantly being interpreted and all social phenomena is looked upon as constructed and are viewed differently with regards to the environment a person is grown up in and what a person has experienced in their lives etc. The worldview of those that support SIAN is therefore based on their previous experiences in life. I therefore believe that one could argue that a person that has lived in a small town without the exposure to Muslims and that reads these rather aggressive warnings against Islam will have a greater likeliness to agree with some of what is said on SIAN than a person that is grown up in a multicultural environment. These assumptions is based on numbers from Statistisk Sentralbyrå who æpoints to the fact that the trend over the recent years shows that more and more Norwegians are in contact with immigrants and more and more becomes positive towards immigrants (2013). No matter how legitimate it is for a certain individual to have the opinions that he or she may have, one could argue that much of what is written on the SIAN Facebook page is hateful and gives a very negative image of the Muslim population in Norway.

 It is not only cases regarding Norwegian Muslims that becomes discussed, but also cases from all over the world becomes publish in order to illustrate evil acts done by Muslims. On the 10th of May 2014 on the SIAN Facebook page a video from YouTube got published where a Muslim defends children getting married, saying that according to Islam it is okay if the father of the girl gives consent[[23]](#footnote-23). The active user I have called Jens, commented that:

*“Paedophilia is allowed in Islam. Completely legitimate amongst these nice Muslims. Muhammad did not disappoint Islam in this matter. He found his bride in a 6 year old child. When she was 9, Muhammad raped this little child. What we can see in our days is that Muslims rapes their minor relatives. Cousins etc. Completely after the Qurans teachings…”* (Facebook, 11.05.2014. URL).

There is no doubt that what is presented regarding “child brides” is by western standards not acceptable, and it should be okay to argue that such matters are not acceptable. As the model from The Runnemede Trust illustrates, one can criticise certain elements within Islam, but it is when such elements become generalised as something that *all* Muslims support that one can characterise this as Islamophobic (The Runnymede Trust, 1997: 2). The comments are written in such matter that it seems as all Muslims support young girls getting married to older men. As I also shed light on in “3.3: Islamophobia”, Arne Tumyr told me in an interview that Muhammad was a paedophile and said that *“we claim that the “Prophet” was not – like the Muslims claims – the most high-graded ethical human that ever has lived. We claim that Muhammad was a sex offender, a caravan robber and a war criminal”* (Tumyr, 2014. [Personal correspondence]). Such characteristics that describes Muslims as being paedophiles is often mentioned on various anti-Islamic pages and are often used as a reason for not wanting not allow Islam in Europe.

 To sum up, I want to argue that based in my observation on the SIAN Facebook page, one can assume that the worldview within the SIAN members is based on fear of loss of the western democratic society, a belief that there is an ongoing Muslim invasion to Europe and that those Muslims that claims otherwise is lying (taqiyya). Further, Islam is looked upon as a political ideology rather than a religion that is evil and where human rights are non-existing. Child brides and paedophilia is prevalent. Islam is being described as a threat towards the Norwegian society and is equivalent to Nazism. As the Facebook supporter, Marit describes Islam as *“it is like a poison”* (Facebook, 12.05.2014. URL), a poison that is going to ruin the Norwegian and European society, as we know it. These notions are being treated as truths, as how the society actually is. However, I believe that with these regards one can argue that this type of rhetoric is linked to hate as Muslims are looked upon as a dangerous enemy that one should fear and fight.

**3.4.1: Rhetoric of Hate**

The largest critique against SIAN and similar groups is that their opinions and utterings are hateful. In this section, I want to address some of these hateful utterings and link them to the Duplex Theory of Hate.

 Firstly, I want to present some of the uttering made that can be linked to extremism. As written in “2.3: Descriptive Extremism”, the Norwegian researcher Bjørkelo writes that the Norwegian Police Security Service`s (Politiets Sikkerhetstjeneste, PST) description of extremism is that something become extreme when there is a will to do violent actions to get their political agenda through. He points out that although one might not do violent acts oneself, to have a rhetoric that encourage violence and this then becomes extreme (Bjørkelo, 2013). In an interview with NRK that is mentioned earlier, the interviewer Sandvik asked Hodne (the leader of SIOE and active in SIAN) if she could decide, how many Muslims would there be in Oslo. She answered that if she could decide, Islam would be forbidden in Norway and in the whole world. The interview further asked her how she would implement this and Hodne answered:

“*Yea, it is just that. It will not be easy to do, but here in this way for life, in the democracy Islam does not belong. Islam should not be able to become rooted here in the West, so that is what we can relate to. We can’t do anything with the rest of the world really. We can do something with our country and the West, but it is a tough fight and most people say that we should just give up because it is too late, they are way too much rooted and we can feel that. But what can we do? We cannot let people come here and ruin the future of the children”* (Sandvik, 2012. URL).

One can argue that there is nothing violent in this comment, however, with regards to what Bjørkelo claims one can look at this as an encouragement to violence. One cannot remove all Muslims from Norway and Europe without being violent (Bjørkelo, 2013. URL). Therefore, it can be argued that Hodnes views are extreme and that to wish that someone would not exist could be described as hateful.

 Further, it is not difficult to argue that to celebrate a person’s death can be looked upon as hateful. A student from Iran that studied at NTNU, a university in the Norwegian city Trondheim, attacked another student with scissors, but while his victim survived he died of the injuries that he got inflicted during the attach (Dagbladet, 23.04.2014. URL). The case soon was published on SIANs Facebook pages and when it is decided that the university would hold a memorial for the student, the negative comments from the SIAN members soon came streaming in. One of the members, which I have chosen to call Truls, commented with regards to the student’s death that *“I will be flagging today, this is really happy news”* (Facebook, 23.04.2014. URL)*.* Another member, Mia, wrote “humoristic” that “*all of us should go there to pee on the grave and dance polka. Real trøndersk karsk[[24]](#footnote-24) will be served for free to all participants”* (Facebook, 23.04.2014. URL). Her comment had as of 23.04.2013 gotten 3 so called “likes”, while Truls` comment had 5 “likes”. The debate then turns away from the dead Irani student and the focus become turned towards how devilish Islam is. Both Truls and Mia is active in various debates and can often be observed commenting and publishing on the SIAN Facebook group. There is not difficult to argue that comments such as these present a hate towards Muslims. I must inform that from what I have observed such attacks on an individual are not something that happens every day, nor does it often occur. It is usually Muslims as a group or Islam as a political ideology that is being discussed and generalised.

 The actions of a few Muslims become the action of *all* Muslims. In other words, Muslims living in Norway also becomes guilty of wrongdoings by other Muslims in other parts of the world. One of the members publish on the 12th of May a blog with horrific videos that shows what is described as Muslims cutting up corps[[25]](#footnote-25). A member I have called Marit comment to the post saying:*:)*

*“That is soo horrible that I`m not sure I can watch this!! Islam is like a poison that is flowing about in the world and the governments are sleeping. In Norway they send back the Christian [immigrants] and let the Muslims stay, and they get in everywhere. First eatable so everyone will accept them, but they do not reject the devilry that happens amongst the extreme Muslims. But it is their agenda that Sharia Laws will be implemented in Norway and Europe and? Is that why moderate Muslims are silent or…It is at least something that has to be stopped, urgently…they are so dangerous, not afraid of anything, but Norway supports the gruesomeness several places. Guess they don’t see it, or…but they do not want to see it…as long as they get to kill most possible Christians then everything is okay….”* (Facebook, 12.05.2014. URL).

Here hateful characteristics such as Islam are like poison and that Muslims are dangerous is commented without any reaction from the others. The notion of Muslims having a secret agenda of taking over the western world is again uttered. Comments such as these are being publish every day on this page without any type of negative reactions from the other SIAN supporters.

 Aristotle separates anger and hate. He also claimed that those that are angry feel some kind of compassion towards their subject, while this is something that those that hate do not generally feel (McKeon, 2008: 67). I will argue that some of the supporters of SIAN do not feel a compassion with Muslims and Tumyr told me that his and SIANs aim is to *“liberate Muslims from the jail that Islam is forcing them to be in”* (Tumyr, 2014. [Personal correspondence]). He describes Muslims as one of the biggest victims of Islam. I will argue that some people within SIAN do in fact have some sort of compassions for Muslims as they feel they are trapped into an evil ideology. I have observed that also Hodne has several times differentiated between Muslims that she calls born into Islam but are breaking out and those that still follow Islam. In an interview with NRK, she stated that *“there might be Muslims that want democracy, but then they are not good Muslims according to the Quran. But they might good Muslims according to us, good people, a good person*” (Sanvik, 2012). I will therefore argue that although Aristotle has an interesting aspect, however one can argue that it is not applicable in this situation. I will also strongly argue that there is element of anger amongst the SIAN members. One could argue that these people do not truly hate, however, according to the Duplex Theory of Hate one can for example feel anger towards the target-group that one hates. It is therefore that I believe that this theory is applicable for this thesis.

 The Duplex theory claims that the two elements hate and love has something in common. These elements that are common between the two is described by Sternberg as negation of intimacy, passion and commitment. Firstly, negation of intimacy is described within hate as disgust. With regards to the object for the disgust, one seek opposite of intimacy and one distance oneself towards those we have a hate relationship with, where in a love situation one would seek for closeness. Sternberg describes the creation of negative stereotypes becoming a legitimate reason for distance (2003: 306). As I have described there are several stereotypes that gives a reason for wanting distance with Muslims. One of them are taqiyya, the Muslim right to lie which indicates that one can never trust a Muslim because he or she will say what one wants to hear. All Muslims are described as having a hidden agenda of occupying the western world, and those that denies this are simply just lying. Also stereotypes of Muslim men being barbaric and paedophiles are given as reasons for not wanting Muslims in the Norwegian society. This creates a disgust towards the Muslims, which becomes a reason for wanting distance.

 The second element within hate and love is described as passion and in hate this turns into anger and or fear. The object of hate, Muslims, become dangerous and described as a threat towards the Norwegian society (Sternberg, 2003: 307-308). When Hodne in an interview with NRK expresses that she believes that there will be a civil war within the near future (Sanvik, 2012. URL), Muslim immigration then becomes a threat to the society she lives in and then becomes something she fears. There is also a presence of anger on the SIAN Facebook page. One of the things that is creating a lot of anger is when cases about the Norwegian flag is brought up. On the 17th of May, the Norwegians celebrate their national day, and this is a day where the flag plays a central role and people of all ages and background are out in the streets parading and celebrating. With the regards of this day there was published several cases about immigrants and the Norwegian flag posted on the Facebook page. One of these cases, published on the 16th of May was about Linderud School that was going to be the first school in the children’s parade in Oslo. This is a multi-ethnic school with a majority of immigrant children. One of the members that I have called Lillian wrote that “*I can’t help it, but it provokes me when they are carrying the NORWEGIAN flag”* (Facebook, 16.05.2014. URL)*.* Other members reminded that it is not that immigrant children are in the parade with Norwegian flags that they are against, but the fact that this school has a majority of immigrants. Another case that draw discussion on the Facebook page was a picture of a woman with hijab waving the Norwegian flag (posted on 01.05.2014). Various members made comments such as *“Ugh I lost my appetite”,* *“Holy shit what a provoking picture”*, and *“this is an insult to our flag!”* (Facebook, 01.05.2014. URL). Immigrants, and then in particular Muslims, holding the Norwegian flag provokes so much that it actually can make people angry. Another case regarding the flag was when a Norwegian Muslim politician argued with another Norwegian Muslim politician about the allegiance towards the Norwegian flag as there is no law against burning it[[26]](#footnote-26). One members, Trygve, commented *“Get the bastard out of the country, let them choose to go voluntarily or a neck shot???”* (Facebook, 18.05.2014. URL). Trygve got told to calm down his violent language. Another well-known member commented *“You know I'm delighted that I DO NOT have this guy in front of me now BECAUSE I AM VERY AFRAID THAT I WOULD HAVE ENDE UP IN PRISON. I can literally feel how my blood boils of rage*” (Facebook, 18.05.2014. URL). One can argue that actions by Muslims that in any way is linked to Norwegian symbols are creating anger. During May month I have observed how the flag continually is used as a symbol only regarded for the so called ethnic Norwegian. I will argue that it is when issues regarding the traditional Norwegian society and culture and the possible change or loss of this is causing most rage. As Gilje said in an interview with NRK, she feels that *they* are taking the Christianity out of the country. She also claims that Islam is not compatible with democracy and that Islam is the Devil itself (Sandvik, 2012). It is not difficult to spot the fear of losing the freedom that the Scandinavian countries offer, in other words; so called Norwegian values[[27]](#footnote-27). If a Muslim says that he or she is fronting democracy, freedom of speech, equality between the genders etc., one cannot trust that this is not a lie as according to the worldview presented within SIAN and other similar groups as one can never trust a Muslim to tell the truth (taqiyya –the Muslim lie and deception). This is why they are looked upon as so dangerous. The word “snikislamisering”, “stealth Islamisation”, is also used as proof of the danger behind Islam. It was the leader of the Progressive Party (PP)[[28]](#footnote-28), Siv Jensen, which used to word at the PP general assembly in 2009 (Bangstand, 2013: 384). The word was used in regards to a discussion of allowing hijab in the police or not. Jensen warned that if one will allow certain groups to get special treatment one may end up with a society such as Malmø where there are Sharia zones within the city and where the police is reluctant to enter. She paints a dark picture of the Norwegian society if one allows too much Islamic influence (Dagbladet, 21.02.2009. URL). Siv Jensen is a well-known politician, and PP is now voted into parliament (as of the 2013 election). When such a powerful person warn about Islam in this manner, one can argue that this could make many people fear Muslim immigration. It is important to note that several PP members has later regretted the usage of the word. However, with regards to Eurabia and Islamophobia there is a link to the fear of a Muslim occupation which is expressed as “stealth Islamisation”.

 The third element of the triangulation within the Duplex theory is being described as commitment and within hate this manifests as or rather a decision-commitment in hate, which talks about devaluation or diminution through contempt. In other words, the hater is described here by Sternberg as viewing its target group or person as barely human or as a subhuman, and feeling a contempt towards its target. How someone is dressing or speaking can be used as pointing out the differences between the groups as a tool to devaluate the target group (2003: 308-309). The hijab is often used as a negative notion and a symbol of what one do not want to allow in the Norwegian society. A supporter I have called Petter writes that *“Hijab is a political outfit. So then SS uniform and KKK costume is also okay then??* (Facebook, 20.05.2014. URL). Another supporter, Olav, commented on a picture of some women wearing a burka that “*if the development continues in the wrong direction, all women in this country, will be forced to wear this [burka]”* (Facebook, 24.05.2014. URL)*.* Another supporters expresses, with the regards to the same picture that she is worried for her children and grandchildren (because they might be forced to wear hijab or burka). Hijab is also viewed as a symbol of the suppression of women. Amin-Khan writes about “new-orientalism” and how western media described the Muslim woman as someone who needs to be saved, mostly from being “forced to wear hijab or niqab”. Muslim men are describes as terrorists and Muslim women as someone who needs to be saved from these men (2012: 1595-1606). I have observed that the SIAN group often talks about Muslims as *them* or *they*. The west is the good while the Muslim world is the evil. On the 24th of May 2014 a 2 year old girl got killed by her father in Oslo. The father had gotten his asylum application rejected and should therefore have been sent back to Afghanistan where he come from. Not long after the media started writing about the case, people on SIANs Facebook group started discussing it. The comments generally talked about sympathy for the girl and contempt for the government and police that had not sent the father out as soon as he got the rejection. However, one SIAN supporter wrote that *“small Muslims will become big Muslims”* (Facebook, 24.05.2014. URL). One could interpret that as way of trivialize the dead of the girl as she was a Muslim after all. It can be interesting to note that this comment soon after got removed. The rhetoric implies a fundamental difference between *us* and *them*, and instead of humanising Islam, one demonises it instead. As Gilje told NRK: *“I believe that Islam is the Devil itself”* (Sandvik, 2012. URL).

 In this section, I have wanted to illustrate how the hate that is portrayed on the SIAN Facebook page can be linked to the Duplex Theory of Hate. I have argued how the hate is being displayed as intimacy, passion, and commitment. With regards to this, I will argue that SIAN can be looked upon as a hate-group. The rhetoric and worldview illustrates how the SIAN members are generalising Islam as an evil ideology that is an enemy of the western world. However, some would claim that these people are not driven by hate but simply by the love for their country and people. Can these people be called extremists or are they just simply patriots as they claim to be? That is not the aim of this thesis to conclude on, however, with the regards to the worldview of the SIAN members and supporters one can say they never would call themselves anything but patriots with a love for their country and society. If one look at this in a social constructivist manner, one could not state that how these people perceive themselves and their attitude as being wrong, they are simply just different than many others. With that said, I think it is safe to say that many would disagree with that and say that what is uttered on this Facebook page is wrong, or in other words, not according to what is socially accepted.

**3.5: Facebook‘s Role**

 Firstly, in this section, I want to talk about the role that Facebook plays in the sharing and spreading of ideas within the anti-Islamist environment in Norway. My research indicates that most of the activity between these groups is over internet and social media, in other words over Facebook. I have observed the activity on various Islamophobic Facebook pages, but I have concentrated my research towards SIANs Facebook page as it has the most active and is mainly for Norwegian members[[29]](#footnote-29). Social media is in today’s society a huge part of how people interact and socialise and it is here that Islamophobic ideas become spread all over Europe.

 Every day people post links to blogs, news reports or simply share their own thoughts that again is brought up for discussion, and every day new input is given to the many hundreds of supporters of SIAN. This group is open for anyone to read what is published, therefore anyone, of any age, can be exposed to what can be described as hateful things some of SIANs supporters are writing. As mentioned in “chapter 2: Methodology”, I had problems with getting in contact with the SIAN Facebook supporters and I have therefore not been able to research how social media influences these particular SIAN members. However, other researches indicates that youth are probably influenced the most by social media, as they are the one that are most active, but my observations shows that those that are most active on SIANs Facebook are adults of all ages (mostly above the age of 35-40). SIAN has its own youth page, but this group is a closed group and I have therefore not accessed any information from here. The group has of May 1st 178 members. Further, James Hawdon writes that a recent study done in Japan, United Kingdom, and Spain showed that youth forms strong identifications with online communities, more so than with their families (2012: 42). On the internet, one can find others who share the same opinions as you and in that way get a validation for your opinions. These communications technologies facilitate instant communication and response to what one post on these sites. On SIANs site, some posts do not get much attention while others retrieve huge debate and in an instant, ones ideas are shared with hundreds of others. I will argue that there seems to be a sense of community within the SIAN Facebook page. Some of the supporters are daily on the page and viewing from the conversations it seems that they have a rather informal and friendly tone with each other and it seems to be a bond between some of the members and supporters. After the break within SIAN and the Facebook page with over 13.000 followers were deleted, many have stepped up to build the new Facebook page up again. People chose side in the conflict and from observing from the outside it looks like some bonds has been tightened (while some friendships broke). Many mentioned names on people they felt had betrayed the group, while others expressed a confusion over the situation. It is obvious from conversations that many of those that are most active have meet each other for demos and meetings with the organisation, and has connections outside of Facebook as well. However, as I have argued that most of the activity and connections is happening over Facebook. They are a group that is connected by their ideology and Facebook becomes a free space where people can find their allies in a society where such ideas are not always accepted.

 One example on how communication and organisation is happening over social media I have gathered from Frihetsforkjemperne, a Facebook based group that shares several members with SIAN. On the 29th of March, they had a demo outside the Stortinget (the parliament building situated in central Oslo). The event had for an extensive time been planned and discussed on their Facebook group and it seemed to be a somewhat larger happening. Hodne, the leader of SIOE and a SIAN member, suggested inviting the Swedish Nazi artist Saga and make the event into a larger happening. When another member pointed out Saga`s Nazi links Hodne answered: *“I don’t give a shit if it is… I’m snapping up a little here and a little there. Nazi, racist, you name it, we are that anyway. But others has opinions and I do not decide… But headlines… Attention about the demo is good? Or?”* (Facebook, 08.02.2014. URL)[[30]](#footnote-30). However, Saga did not show up. The anti-extremist online magazine Vepsen, wrote that only 15 people turned up and called the whole thing a fiasco. Frihetskjemperne also had problems with the sound systems and maybe more significantly many of those who were said to speak did not show up. Contrastively, close by it was set up an anti-racist event where around 300 people participated. Vepsen also reports that the police stopped about 40 militant anti-fascists that were headed towards the demo outside the parliament (Vepsen, 30.03.2014. URL). It can be important to note that the relationship between these two groups are very tense after neo-Nazis stormed the Blitz building (a group situated on the far left on the political scale) yelling Nazi slogan such as “sieg heil” and stabbed a 17-year old Blitz member. Other Blitz members then ran after the two men and caught up with them resulting in a fight. Eventually the police came and arrested the two men, and luckily the 17-year old boy survived (Bach, 06.09.2013. URL). Although SIAN and other Islamophobic groups obtain many thousand members on the internet, when they have demos for example they only manage to gather a few of their members. SIAN had put out videos taken from different demos on YouTube[[31]](#footnote-31), and one can see the few SIAN members guarded by police while hordes of critiques gathered around and yell towards the demo. The former leader of SIAN, Tumyr, wrote to me that *“the Norwegian-Iraqi and Islam-critique Walid al-Kubaisi, who has been attempted assassinated, says that to be criticising Islam is linked to danger –also in Norway”* (Tumyr, 2014. [Personal correspondence]). I will argue that Tumyr is right as one can strongly argue that such opinions that he and his SIAN fellows’ expresses are not socially accepted. Although hateful utterings was not accepted before the terror of Anders Behring Breivik on the 22nd of July, and one can speculate that it has not become easier after the attack. Kjersti Margrethe Gilje, a central person in the anti-Islamic environment in Norway and active on SIANs Facebook page, has expressed support to Breivik`s opinions. She has said that she does not support his actions but she calls Breivik sharp and describes his speech in the court as huge, and that he is a visionary (VG, 28.06.2013. URL). Such opinions are not meet with open public support, but on the internet people such as Gilje meet people with similar opinions and can share her thoughts without meeting much condemnation.

 It is important to note that Norwegian law regarding hateful uttering applies to utterings to Facebook as well. The racism paragraph[[32]](#footnote-32) clearly states that hateful utterings is against the law. Slettmeg.no is a Norwegian webpage that informs and help people with their rights on the internet. They state that “*to threaten or mock someone because of race, skin-color, ethnicity, religion, spirituality, sexuality, and way of life or orientation”* (slettmeg.no. URL) is not allowed. This is not followed on Facebook, and one can therefore argue that social media then becomes a kind of free space from is accepted in “the real world”. On these groups hateful and sometimes threatening things are being daily published, despite Norwegian law stating that this not is acceptable.

 In this section, it has been illustrated the importance that Facebook plays in the interaction and spreading of anti-Islamic notions. It is on Facebook that most of the members of SIAN come together and share ideas, and it becomes a free space where people feel that they can freely express their opinions and get support for it.

**3.6: Freedom of speech**

 The notion of freedom of speech has been important to SIAN, and this was one of the major topics that Arne Tumyr talked about when he was the leader of SIAN. On SIANs official website one can read about his and SIANs struggles to get a location where they could hold their meetings. They wanted to use the library in the city Kristiansand to have a lecture they had called “Islam –a threat?”, but it was a politically resistance towards this and the end result was that SIAN was not able to use these locations. Tumyr writes on sian.no that Muslims is allowed to utter themselves, while SIAN and others that has critical voices against Islam has been put to silent. He also writes that he sees a *“tendency amongst Muslims to be violent when someone is “offending Islam” in the public sphere”* (Tumyr, 19.02.2014. URL). When SIAN is holding public stands, they must be protected by a huge amount of police officers, and SIAN sees it as unfear that they are censured in the public debate and sphere while other groups are allowed to utter themselves. They also criticise that their message largely becomes censured in the public space (Tumyr, 19.02.2014).

 Are Tumyr and SIAN not right express themselves? Should they not have the right to utter what they want and where they want and have a voice in the Norwegian society? Some claim that they should not have that right, as what they do express is hateful utterings. Before the break within SIAN in the beginning of April, their Facebook group had more than 13.000 followers and SIAN would claim that these voices are also important to listen to. On the 3rd of May, an article from 2010 by tv2.no was posted on the Facebook page. The article speaks about how the well-known Islamist Mohyeldeen Mohammad warns Norway about what he calls a crusade towards Muslims in Norway[[33]](#footnote-33). One of the supporters of SIAN, Ali, commented “*This man has free rein to hold such speeches…if some of us had said anything like that towards their ideology, we would have been jailed*” (Facebook, 03.05.2014. URL). So what is the society being afraid of? The critiques claim that by allowing these ideas to be spread out openly they could ultimately inspire to hate crimes (such as 22nd of July). As social construction theory describes, the perception of reality that Muslims are a threat towards the western society is how these people view the reality and that this should not be doubted. After observing the Facebook page for a couple months, I have observed that those that is active in this environment truly look upon themselves and their fellow meaning partners as patriots and as someone who care about their country. They are truly worried about Islamic influence and what a future Muslim immigration will do with the Norwegian society, and they argue that they have the freedom to warn about what they perceive as a danger to the Norwegian society and people. Tumyr states that to him the freedom one have in the Norwegian society is important and says that *“we fully work for both Muslims as well as for the Norwegian people to understand that if we want to keep peace and freedom for future generations, the Islamisations has to be stopped”* (Tumyr, 2014. [Personal correspondence]).Hodne also expressed the importance of informing the Norwegian society about the Islamic danger and told NRK that *“you get people against you, family against you, but I believe that this is the good; this is something I have to do. We have to do this, at least for my children and for my grandchildren. I have four kids that mean everything to me. I have to fight for their future”* (Sandvik, 2012. URL). SIAN is simply claiming that they want to inform out of being good. However, critiques claim how they are expressing themselves is hateful. As I have talked about in “3.4.1: Rhetoric of Hate” I will claim that there is hateful uttering on SIAN done by SIAN members. Stereotyping someone as evil, a paedophile, a constant liar and other negative names callings is regarded as hateful.

 One can ask oneself, does freedom of speech mean freedom to hate and where does the line go for what one can say? According to Norwegian law (see “3.3: Islamophobia”) one are not allowed to say hateful things about another group or person. Here the notion of ones honour being infringed becomes applicable, and the law calls it defaming when one utter such hateful things about a group based on for example religion (Bjørkelo, 2013. URL). On the 28th of May a well-known SIAN member published a comment on the Facebook page where he glorifies Anders Behring Breivik because his actions according to him resulted in the removal of the anti-Semitic Labour Party and stopped “fort Utøya” where the Labour Party indoctrinated the youth. He also calls Utøya for the extreme-island. One person asks if since he supports Breivik`s means, should one be scared of him. He answers that *“you don’t need to be worried about me […] I am waiting for orders when a possible war [is coming]”*. Further, he writes that *“I can shoot, and make bombs too”* and *“know dear traitors, when the day comes you will be both shot and hanged”* (Facebook, 28.05.2014. URL)[[34]](#footnote-34). So early after the terror on the 22nd of July, one can strongly believe that many people could feel infringed and defamed by such utterings. One should note that SIAN has officially not stood by Breivik in any way and Tumyr has expressed that *“our compassion with the victims and their relatives was strong and genuine – just as most other people felt”*, and further he said that *“this mass murderer made our work seem pointless”* (Tymyr, 2014. [Personal correspondence]). However, there is voices, both within SIAN and their Facebook page, which expresses sympathy for Breivik. Although we live in a society that appreciate the right to freedom of speech, the “racism paragraph” is supposed to prohibit such statements that members of SIAN and other similar organisations expresses. Daily Islamophobic, stereotypical and generalising comments become uttered and many would claim that it is their right to do so.

 If organisations such as SIAN should be allowed to speech freely in the public open sphere is controversial and debated. I will not make a recommendation to whether or not SIAN should be allowed to express their opinions for an open fora, however I will claim that everyone has the right to speech, whether that person is a SIAN member or not, as long as it is within the Norwegian law[[35]](#footnote-35).

**4. Conclusion:**

 The aim in this thesis has been to shed light on the worldview that is presented on the internet, and then especially on the social media, by the anti-Islamic environment in Norway. This thesis has done so by presenting the activities on the SIAN Facebook page after observing the activities on the page. I wanted to look further into what the worldview within the anti-Islamist environment in Norway is, and what role the social media play in this understanding.

 As social constructivism says, what is looked upon as true to some might not be viewed as true to others, but there is no universal truth, only individual interpretations based on a person’s experiences. One should therefore not claim that the worldview of the SIAN members although one might not agree with them. I have wanted to illustrate that their worldview is their truth.

 This thesis has also wanted to illustrate how the hate is being expressed and why one can argue that what is uttered on SIANs Facebook page, as well as other similar pages, can be looked upon as hateful. The Duplex Theory of Hate has illustrated how both love and hate has tree equal elements that Steinberg describes as negation of intimacy, passion and commitment. However, how these three elements manifests themselves differently within love and hate. In this thesis I have exemplified how the SIAN supporters are seeking the opposite of intimacy with Muslim in negation of intimacy as they wish Islam out of Europe. Passion become described as anger or fear in hate, and there are many examples on the SIAN Facebook page of how people are fearing a Muslim invasion and that the Norwegian society as they know it will vanish when the Muslims are the majority in the future. There is also evidence of anger towards the Muslim population in the western world which shines through in for example issues regarding the Norwegian flag. The third element that is argued to be present on the page is commitment, which in hate is described a viewing the target-group of ones hate as barely human. Instead of being humanised, Islam is being demonised by the Islamophobic environment in Norway (Steinberg, 2003: 306-309).

 In this thesis, I have also discussed why the worldview of the SIAN members and supporters can be argued as extreme. Bjørkelo explain extremism as radical and controversial ideas. He also explains that to want all Muslims out of Europe is implicit violent as one cannot do so without violence, and according to PST something can be regarded as extreme when it encourages violence (2013. URL). This is very much present on the SIAN Facebook page. Islam is described as a poison that they wish to ban from Norway and Europe. Gule also talks about extremism and explains that perceptions that is situated outside of what the mainstream society find acceptable can be regarded as extreme. He talks about descriptive extremism that is describing how something *is.* For example exaggeration of how many immigrants there is in the country is an example on descriptive extremism (2012: 15, 26). Therefore, when the SIAN supporters express that the “ethnic Norwegians” will be a minority in the near future and that the Muslims will take over and implement Sharia laws, this can be argued as extreme.

 One of the main critiques against these groups is that they base their worldview and truths on conspiracy theory. I have observed repentantly traces of Eurabia rhetoric where they expresses a fear of Muslim invasion to the West and that there is an ongoing war between the West and the Arab world. They also continually talk about taqiyya, or the so called Muslim lies. In other words, one can never trust a Muslim to tell the truth. Another element of Eurabia rhetoric is the so-called “Left”. Socialists, the Norwegian Labour Party, political correct etc. become described as allowing Norway to become Islamised.

 To sum up, the Islamophobia environment in Norway has a worldview where Muslims are looked upon as the enemy, they are evil while the western world is good. Islam is not looked upon as a religion, but a political ideology that Muslims are prisoned in. Muhammad is being described as barbaric and a paedophile, and this stereotype is generally used to describe Muslims. When looking at the Runnemed Trust model, this environment has a closed view of Islam where *all* Muslims are described as one unified group (2007: 2). SIAN has been Norways largest anti-Islamic group with over 13.000 supporters on Facebook[[36]](#footnote-36), however although there is a high activity on Facebook, when it comes to actual demonstrations and events there is not many people attending. It is argued that many people are not comfortable about supporting SIAN publicly and Tumyr expressed that it is linked to fear to openly criticise Islam (Tumyr, 2014. [Personal correspondence]). I will therefore argue that Facebook plays an important role in the spreading of their worldviews. Every day people publish, comment and share their views and in an instant it becomes shared with others. There has been a criticism raised towards SIAN for sharing their worldviews, however SIAN claim that they are using their freedom of speech. As I have concluded, we all have the right to use our rights to speak our minds, however as long as it is within the law.

**Bibliography**

Abrams, Dominic. (2011). “Extremism is Normal: The Roles of Deviance and Uncertainty in Shaping Groups and Society” in Hogg, Michael A. Blaylock, Danielle L. (red.) *Extremism and the Psychology of Uncertainty*. USA: Wiley – Blackwell. P.p. 36, 40.

Amin-Khan, T. (2012). “New Orientalism, Securitisation and the Western media's Incendiary Racism”. *Third World Quarterly* (9). P.p. 1595-1606.

Antirasistisk Senter. “Om rasisme”. [Retrieved 10.02.2014] [URL] <http://www.antirasistisk-senter.no/om-rasisme.99429.no.html>

Bach, Thor. (06.09.2013) “Blitzer knivstukket” for vepsen.no. [Retrieved 18.05.2014] [URL <http://www.vepsen.no/2013/09/blitzer-knivstukket/>

Bangstad, Sindre. (2013). “Eurabia Comes to Norway, Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations”. UK: Routlegde. P.p. 370-374, 383

Berger, Peter L. & Luckmann, Thomas. (2004). *Den sociale konstruction af virkeligheden: En vidensociologisk afhandling.* København: Akademisk Forlag. P.p. 39-41.

Bjørkelo, Kristian. (2013). “Hva er ekstremisme?” on nrk.no[Retrieved 12.055.2014] [URL] <http://www.nrk.no/skole/klippdetalj?topic=urn:x-mediadb:19862>

Connor, Steve. (2008). *Scientists prove it really is a thin line between love and hate* in The Independent. [Retrieved 05.05.2014] [URL] <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/science/scientists-prove-it-really-is-a-thin-line-between-love-and-hate-976901.html>

Dagbladet (23.04.2014). “NTNU-student døde av skadene” [Retrieved 18.05.2014] [URL] <http://www.dagbladet.no/2014/04/23/nyheter/vold/drap/innenriks/ntnu/32937179/>

Dagbladet (21.02.2009). “Siv Jensen advarer mot snikislamisering”. [Retrieved 20.05.2014] [URL] <http://www.dagbladet.no/2009/02/21/nyheter/politikk/innenriks/frp/siv_jensen/4966977/>

Facebook. (2014). Stopp Islamiseringen av Norge. [Retrieved throughout the period 01.02.2014 to 31.05.2014] [URL]

Galtung, Johan. (2012) “Muslim diaspora in Europe and the USA” [Retrieved 02.02.2014] [URL] Transcend: <http://www.galtung-institut.de/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/MuslimDiaspora.pdf>

Gule, Lars. (2012). ”Del 1: Ekstremisme” in *Ekstremismens Kjennetegn. Ansvar og motsvar*. Finland: Spartacus Forlag AS. P.p. 15, 26, 29-30, 41-, 50, 56-57.

Hawdon, James. (2012). “Applying differential association theory to online hate groups: a theoretical statement” in *Research on Finnish Society.* Vol. 5. P.p. 42.

IMDi. (2009). *Innvandrere i norske medier: medieskabt islamfrykt og hverdagsliv.* Rapport from Integrerings- og mangfoldsdirektoratet (IMDi). P.p. 17-18.

Konstan, Davis. (2003) “Chapter 4: Aristotle on anger and the emotions: the strategies of status” in Braund, Susanna & Most, Glenn W. (red.) *Ancient Anger*. US: Cambridge University Press. P.p. 102.

McKeon, Richard. (2008) “The Basic Works of Aristotle” in Hadreas, Peter (Red.) *Phenomenology of Love and Hate*. UK: Ashgate Publishing Group. P.p. 67, 69-71.

Opstad,Kjersti. (04.04.2014). “Fullskala krig blant islam-fiender” for Radikal Portal. [Retrieved 04.04.2014] [URL] <http://radikalportal.no/2014/04/04/fullskala-krig-blant-islam-fiender/>

Pedersen, Kirsten B. (2012). “Sosialkonstruktivisme” in Juul, Søren & Pedersen, Kirsten B (red.) *Samfundsvidenskabernes Videnskabsteori: en Indføring.* Latvia: Hans Reitzels Forlag. P.p. 188-193, 207-212, 221-226.

Sanvik, Liv. (2012). *Hevder islam er «djevelens verk*» in NRK [Retrieved 06.05.2014] [URL]. <http://www.nrk.no/norge/hevder-islam-er-_djevelens-verk_-1.10670993>

SIAN (Stopp Islamiseringen av Norge). “Om SIAN: Hvem er vi?” [Retrieved 28.03.2014] [URL] <http://www.sian.no/om-sian>

Slettmeg.no. “Straffbart på internett” [Retrieved 21.05.2014] <https://slettmeg.no/lover-og-rettigheter/straffbart-pa-internett>

Sternberg, Robert J. (2003). “A Duplext Theory of Hate: Development and application to Terrorism, Massacres and Genocide” in *Review of General Psychology* Vol. 7, No. 3. P.p. 303, 306-311, 314, 322-323.

Statistisk Sentralbyrå. (2013). ”Innvandrere og norskfødte med innvandrerforeldre, 1.januar 2013”. [Retrieved 15.02.2014] [URL]. <http://www.ssb.no/befolkning/statistikker/innvbef/aar/2013-04-25#content>

Sultan, Shoaib & Steen, Rune Berglund. (2012) *Høyreekstreminsme i Norge*. Rapport from Antirasistisk Senter. P.p. 7, 9-10, 16, 18-21.

The Runnymede Trust. (2007). “Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All”. [Retrieved 16.02.2014] [URL] P.p. 2. <http://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/islamophobia.pdf>

### Tumyr, Arne (2014). Personal correspondence, 15th of April.

###

Tumyr, Arne. (19.02.2014). “Et ja til SIAN blir også ja til andre biblioteker landet”from sian.no. [Retrieved 02.05.2014] [URL] <http://www.sian.no/artikkel/et-ja-til-til-sian-blir-ja-ogsa-ved-andre-biblioteker-i-landet>

Tumyr, Arne. (04.04.2014). “Går nå amok for å skade SIAN så mye som mulig” from SIAN.no [Retrieved 08.04.2014] [URL] <http://www.sian.no/artikkel/gar-na-amok-for-a-skade-sian-sa-mye-som-mulig>

Vepsen. (2012). “Hatgrupper 2012 –Vepsens årsrapport” [Retrieved 22.04.2014] [URL] <http://zog.no/lastned/rapportscreenversion.pdf>

Vepsen. (30.03.2014). “Frihetsforkjemperne floppet” [Retrieved 01.04.2014] [URL] <http://www.vepsen.no/2014/03/3082/>

VG. (28.06.2013). “Hyllet Breivik –nå vil hun inn på Stortinget”. [Retrieved 21.05.2014] [URL] <http://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/terrorangrepet-22-juli/hyllet-breivik-naa-vil-hun-paa-stortinget/a/10104664/>

1. Stop the Islamisation of Norway. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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4. Appendix 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. I will further shed light on this case in the analysis chapter. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. “Science Theory: an Introduction”. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. I have used the Danish version of the book and the translations is therefore done by myself. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. More on the law in chapter “3.3: Islamophobia”. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The other types of evil is described as revenge, greed and other types of self-interest and the last type is described as sadism. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The Norwegian name for the group is “Stopp Islamiseringen av Norge”. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. It is difficult to find who exactly is current members of SIAN is as the member lists is kept hidden from the general public. The former leader Arne Tumyr told me that there is a fear connected to being an open SIAN member and SIAN is therefore protecting its members by keeping the number of members hidden (Tumyr, 2014 [Personal correspondence]). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Arne Turmyr`s leadership ended in April 2014, in the middle of my writing period. He was therefore the leader when I obtained contact with him. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Can be translated into: “Peoples Movement Against Immigration”. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. One can see in interviews that Margrete Adelheid Gilje uses this type of rhetoric and always have with her an Israeli flag. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. The page has had a rapid growth of supporters and there is no reason and I believe that the numbers will continue to rise continually. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. The NDL leader Rune Hauge is an active commentator on the SIAN Facebook page after the new division of SIAN April 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Fjordmans writings can be found: <http://gatesofvienna.net/authors/fjordman/> [Retrieved 03.04.2014]. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. More on counter jihadism can be found on <http://www.jihadwatch.org/why-jihad-watch> [Retrieved 04.05.2014]. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Many in the anti-Islamist environment does not believe Islamophobia is the right description of them as a phobia is an irrational fear. In their worldview, their fear is not irrational. Lars Gule describes in “Ekstremismens Kjennetegn” (2012) on page 55; “phobia” in this context becomes more a metaphor than a psychiatric diagnosis. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. The original writing in Norwegian:

"Den som forsettlig eller grovt uaktsomt offentlig setter frem en diskriminerende eller hatefull ytring, straffes med bøter eller fengsel inntil 3 år. Likt med en offentlig fremsatt ytring, jf. § 7 nr. 2, regnes en ytring når den er satt frem slik at den er egnet til å nå et større antall personer. Som ytring regnes også bruk av symboler. Medvirkning straffes på samme måte.
     Med diskriminerende eller hatefull ytring menes det å true eller forhåne noen, eller fremme hat, forfølgelse eller ringeakt overfor noen på grunn av deres

hudfarge eller nasjonale eller etniske opprinnelse,

religion eller livssyn, eller

homofile legning, leveform eller orientering." [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. The original writing in Norwegian:

"Direkte og indirekte diskriminering på grunn av etnisitet, nasjonal opprinnelse, avstamning, hudfarge, språk, religion eller livssyn er forbudt […] [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Because I am using pseudonyms on the people on Facebook, I do not want to elaborate more on their role or presence on the SIAN Facebook group. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. The video can be found here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q5t9U9r9Kfs [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. A drink that contains coffee and preferably homebred vodka that is popular drink in the northern half of Norway. In the original Norwegian text Mia spelled karsk as karsjk, but that is not the correct spelling and I have therefore corrected it. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. The blog can be found here: <http://shoebat.com/2014/05/12/muslims-cut-hands-cut-heads-play-corpses-victims/> [Retrieved 13.05.2014]. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. The case can be read on: <http://www.dagbladet.no/2009/06/08/nyheter/politikk/akhtar_chaudhry/abid_raja/statsborgertest/6618635/> [Retrieved 04.05.2014]. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Although much talked about in various debates, it is nowhere stated what Norwegian values are that is different from other country`s values. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Fremskrittspartiet (FRP). [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Norwegian Defence League (NDL) has many, if not mostly, non-Norwegian supporters. My observations points to that many of the supporters are from Britain. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. While all other quotes from internet is collected from the SIAN Facebook group, it is important to note that this quote is gathered from Frihetskjemperne`s Facebook page. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. I have searched “SIAN” and “Stopp islamiseringen av Norge”, and looked at various that SIAN and other members have published. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Look at “3.3: Islamophobia” for the racism paragraph. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. The article in its full can be found: <http://www.tv2.no/a/3135571> [Retrieved 04.04.2014] [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. It is important to note that while other quotes from Facebook is from SIANs Facebook page, this one is taken from one of the members own private Facebook page. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. The racism paragraph on “3.3: Islamophobia”. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Before the break and the Facebook page got deleted in April 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)