LOVE AS POLITICAL CONCEPT

A short genealogy elucidating the background of Anders Breivik's *Manifesto*

Published in in: *Philosophy, Culture, & Traditions,* vol. 9, 2013, p. 89-104.

Marc De Kesel

> Although I do admit that I am disgusted by the current development, I would rather say I'm driven by my love for Europe, European culture and all Europeans.
> […]
> I have prepared mentally for a very long time and I will gladly sacrifice my life for the benefit of my European brothers and sisters. My love for them exceeds my own self-serving interests.
>
> Anders Breivik[1]

> *Omnia vincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori.*
> Vergilius[2]

"Greater love hath no man than this, than to lay down his life for his friends." It is a well-known sentence from the gospel of John (15:13). Anders Breivik quotes it in his *2083*, a megalomaniac "Compendium" of more than 1500 pages, in which he legitimizes the bloodbath he caused on the isle Utøya on the 22th of July 2011. The context of the quote discusses a few misunderstandings concerning the medieval crusaders (p. 139). It is true they were out for loot and plunder, Breivik admits, but their deepest motive was nonetheless a willingness to follow the example of Christ and to take up their cross. Out of love for the Lord or, what amounts to the same thing, for truth and justice. Elsewhere in the manifesto, Breivik puts himself forward as a confessional Christian[3] and in his eyes, the crusades did what all today's Europeans now should do and what he, as one of the few, is really willing to do: to defend Europa against the Islam, even

[1] Thus Breivik in the "Interview with a Justiciar Knight Commander van de PCCTS, Knights Templar", one of the last chapters in his *2083: A European Declaration of Independence*, the document that he put on the internet the day his bomb attack in Oslo killed 8, and his massacre a few hours later on the isle of Utoya 69 persons. For the meaning of PCCTS, see further in this essay, paragraph 6. Quotations from that document are from the internet pdf-file (https://sites.google.com/site/knightstemplareurope/2083). For the quotes here, see p. 1382 and 1403.
[2] "Love conquers all; let us all yield to love!" Vergil, *Eclogues* X 69.
[3] "My parents, being rather secular wanted to give me the choice in regards to religion. At the age of 15 I chose to be baptised and confirmed in the Norwegian State Church. I consider myself to be 100% Christian. However, I strongly object to the current suicidal path of the Catholic Church but especially the Protestant Church. I support a Church that believes in self-defense and who are willing to fight for its principles and values, at least resist the efforts put forth to exterminate it gradually. The Catholic and Protestant Church are both cheering their own annihilation considering the fact that they embrace the ongoing inter-faith dialogue and the appeasement of Islam." A few lines further, he is much less affirmative concerning his religious identity: "Regarding my personal relationship with God, I guess I'm not an excessively religious man. I am first and foremost a man of logic. However, I am a supporter of a mono-cultural Christian Europe."(p. 1403-1404)

if this is at the dispense of his own life.[4] Yet, according to him, non-Christian Europeans too could recognize themselves in Christ's word and follow the example of the crusaders. Facing the threat of islamization as well as the decadent deterioration of left-winked, multicultural politics (of which current islamization of Europe is but a symptom), we Europeans must put aside our personal interest and, if necessary, give our life for the preservation and restoration of Europe.

For Breivik, it is first of all a matter of reasonableness.[5] But it is a matter of emotional attachment, of love for Europe as well. He does not quote from the gospel of Saint John because of Christ, but because of the love he appeals to: "Greater love hath no man than this, than to lay down his life for his friends." That, because of that love, he has sacrificed the youth – and the future – of leftist Norway, is only one thing. He has sacrificed himself as well, aware as he was of the juridical sentence that awaited him. It is his way to show how great his love for Europe is.

In spite of its length, Breivik's manifesto is nothing more than a pamphlet: a patchwork of divergent arguments that cannot stand any reality test. His world is a delusion which, on that particular day in 2011, has come to a '*passage à l'acte*'. But just like any other delusion, his too is composed out of ideas gathered from the more or less normal world. This goes not only for the content of his discourse, for the racist plea in favor of the European identity, for instance. It goes for the emotional, libidinal side of his engagement as well. For his *love*.

This paper presents some reflections upon the use of the term 'love' in Breivik's manifesto. First, I examine love in general, and how it has obtained a place within the political discourse of the West. Only then, I focus on Breivik's love for Europe and discuss its pathological character.

1. Europa, a Palestinian girl

Who was the first to love Europe? It is an uncertain and complicated story, which is no surprise, since it happened in immemorial times when the gods lived among the humans and love was simply love: eros, nothing more, nothing less. Zeus was the first to love Europe, i.e. a non-European beauty, seduced on a non-European shore and kidnaped to a European island in order to be raped there – as by times still happens today to stranded refugees. Robert Graves tells the story as follows:

---

[4] Breivik spend seven pages on convincing his Christian reader that violent self-defense is without doubt a Biblical virtue(p. 1327-333).

[5] "It's essential that we don't allow the passion to control us. It's critical that we are cool and act rationally with a long term perspective. Our day will come, have no doubt about it. Just act rationally in the mean time and don't sell your life cheaply. Make sure you have many children or fight for the armed resistance movement. You may fight with the pen or with the sword, every effort counts!" (p. 1403)

> Agenor, Libya's son by Poseidon and twin to Belus, left Egypt to settle in the Land of Canaan, where he married Telephassa, otherwise called Argiope, who bore him Cadmus, Phoenix, Cilix, Thasus and Phineus, and one daughter, Europe.
>
> Zeus, falling in love with Europe, sent Hermes to drive Agenors cattle down to the seashore at Tyre, where she and her companions used to walk. He himself joined the herd, disguised as a snow-white bull with great dew-laps and small, gem-like horns, between which ran a single black streak. Europe was struck by his beauty and, on finding him gentle as a lamb, mastered her fear and began to play with him putting flowers in his mouth and hanging garlands on his horns; in the end, she climbed upon his shoulders, and let him amble down with her to the edge of the sea. Suddenly he swam away, while she looked back in terror at the receding shore; one of her hands dung to his right horn, the other still held a flower-basket.
>
> Wading ashore near Cretan Gortyna, Zeus became an eagle and ravished Europe in a willow-thicket beside a spring; or, some say, under an evergreen pine-tree. She bore him three sons: Minos, Rhadamanthys, and Sarpedon. [6]

Europa is originally from Tyrus in Canaan. In other words, she is Palestinian, Philistine or, yet another synonym, Phoenician. And on the side of her father, Agenor, her origin is Egyptian. Zeus abducted her to Crete, where she stays, becomes a goddess after her death, and after a while leans her name to a territory. According to some, Europa is etymologically the 'land of the West, of the sun going down (in opposition to Asia that originates from the Akkadian word 'asu'– to rise up – and signifies the East).[7]

In the light of opinions like Breivik's defending the European identity in its historical dimension, it is good to remember this first, complex and hybrid meaning of the name 'Europe'. From a European perspective, Europa is of foreign origin, and the first one who declares his love to her does not exactly give us an example to follow.[8] The fact that the girl Europe could give her name to a continent is due to a divine but not less condemnable seduction followed by rape. If love is at the base of Europe, then, it is certainly not the sacrifical love Breivik refers to in his quote from the gospel of Saint John. Europa is not the result of a heroic founding act, but of merely erotic love, a love that transgresses

---

[6] Robert Graves, *Greek Myths* 58 a-c.

[7] De etymologie die Europa terugvoert op het Semitische 'erebu', 'zonsondergang' of het Fenicische 'ehreb', 'avond', is niet onomstreden. De gangbare etymologie leest in het woord een samenstelling van 'eurys' (breed) en 'ops' (gezicht): 'breedgezicht'. Graves vermeldt die etymologie, alsook nog een andere die er een samenstelling in zien van 'eu' (goed) en 'rope' (wilg): 'goed voor de wilgen', 'goed bewaterd' (Graves 2000: 193). Een aantal versies van de mythe vermelden dat de affaire of, zoals Graves aangeeft, de verkrachting van Europa plaatsvond onder een wilg.

[8] Voor ons die door het monotheïsme getekend zijn is dat moeilijk om begrijpen, maar voor de antieke Grieke fungeerden de goden niet als modellen voor menselijk ethisch gedrag, wel integendeel.

the ruling laws. That this amorous transgression passes territorial limits as well, is an extra issue for reflection here.

The transgressing and hybrid background that resonates in the name 'Europe' is confirmed by the rest of the mythological story. Her father, Agenor, does not let it go at that.[9] He wants his daughter back at any cost and ordered his four sons to go searching her, adding that it is not allowed to return without her. They swarm out over the world in all directions and give their names to the tribes they conquer or create, but none of them succeeds in the mission his father ordered.

Cadmos is the only one operating on the land of the Greek. When, in the Delphian Oracle, he asks where he can find his sister, "the Pythoness advises him to give up his search and, instead, follow a cow and build a city wherever she should sink down for weariness".[10] This town is Thebe, a city that will be the victim of a series of transgressions, all of them in the line of the one committed on Europa. There is, among the many, the story of Laios, offspring of Cadmos who, before becoming king of Thebe, was raised secretly outside the city, with Pelops, whose little son (Chrysippos) he seduced and, thus, introduced pederasty in Antique Greece.[11] The curse Pelops put on him and his posterity results in one of the most well-known myths of Antique Greece: the myth of Oedipus killing his father and generating with his own mother his own brothers and sisters. Both his sons/brothers will kill one another and thus make an and tot the house of Cadmus.

Thebe is a town founded by a stranger and it bears its strangeness as its fate. That kind of Thebe is a valid emblem for the essentially hybrid Europe, both for the beautiful girl of Tyrus who was already marked by such fate, and for the kind of Europe to which that girl has given her name.

Sophocles wrote *Oedipus Tyrannos* for an Athenian audience. It is not a mere coincidence that the mirror in which Athens was looking was Thebian. And similar is the mirror in which today's Europe is looking at itself. But, in that mirror, Breivik had obviously not looked at all.

2. Europa Romana

The idea that Thebe can be seen as Europe's mirror does not imply that Europe is originally a Greek project. As political project it is rather Roman. Although the Romans did not use the term Europe to refer to their empire. That empire was a matter of '*urbs* and *orbis'*, of the city (Rome) and the surrounding world. There was no reference to the frontier dividing the East and the West, Asia and

---

[9] Voor een grondige studie van het al of niet Fenicische identiteit van Kadmos en van zijn relatie met het Griekes Thebes, zie onder meer: Ruth E Edwards (1979), Kadmos the Phoenician: A Studie in Greek Legends and the Mycenaean Age, Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.

[10] Graves *, Greek Myths* 58 e.

[11] Jean-Pierre Vernant, « Le tyran boiteux : D'Œdipe à Périandre », in : Vernant & Vidal-Naquet, *Œdipe et ses mythe*, Bruxelles: Editions Complexe, 1988, p. 60.

Europa. Rome's surrounding world is the area of the Mediterranean See, in the broad sense of the word: from the north of England and the mouth of the Rine up to the Euphrates and Tigris and the bends in the Nile deep down in Nubia.

Is it *love* that binds the Roman – the Italian, Gallic, Jewish, Egyptian, African … Roman – to Rome and its empire? Is his political binding a matter of *amor*? Of course he loves his country, but he calls his patriotism not in reference to 'love'. Patriotism is for the Roman part of what he calls *pietas*, which we translate with piety. A misleading translation, because it names an attitude that, although religious too, occupies the entire life of a Roman, including his attitude with regard to the republic or the empire. To us, piety is linked to religious ascetism, i.e. with a religiosity distracting from the world and orienting towards the world 'beyond'. Ascetism is unknown to antique religiosity, including Roman religion. In the eyes of the Romans, too, gods are immortal and have access to the domain of the 'beyond', but their *religio* supposes the gods to be *here*, and that it is matter to make them feel good here, among the mortals. Prayers, processions, sacrifices, feasts are supposed to satisfy the gods here and now. 'Religio' (a word that has not equivalent in the any other language in Antiquity) means literally something like 'acting scrupulously', 'doing the rituals without making any mistake'. For the Romans, this is the sole way to propitiate the gods here.

'Here', this is first of all in Rome, and the gods there are not exclusively Roman gods, but also those of the other people in the empire. Before waging war against the mortals of a people, Rome had already 'fought' against their immortals. The ritual of the *evocatio* – to mention just that one single example – was a way to seduce foreign gods and to invite to come to Rome, where a 'house' was built for them.[12] No wonder the *urbs* was full of temples. Only with their gods on your side, only when they feel home with you, you can venture a war against a people in order to make that, too, feel home with you in your empire. Thus Rome's imperial attitude towards other people.

Not love, but *pietas* binds a Roman to his country. In politics, 'love' means nothing to him. Just as the word 'Europe' is without sense for him. Yet, the project 'Europe', and even the 'love' for Europe have both a Roman signature.

The project emerged in the wake of the declining empire. From the third and the fourth century onwards, the empire could less and less stand the pressure of the entering tribes and collapsed at the end of the fifth century. At that time, the old Greek 'caesura' had already re-appeared. Its first shape was the caesura between the West- and the East-Roman empire and was situated on the line between Italy and Greece. When after the fall of the West-Roman empire, the East-Roman empire progressively diminished (under the pressure of the Arabian

---

[12] Eric M. Orlin (), *Foreign Cults in Rome: Creating a Roman Empire*, Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press, p. 26, 38. Clifford Ando (2008), *The Matter of the Gods,* Berkeley / Los Angeles: The University of California Press, p. 130.

conquest), this area too (actual Greece and West-Turkey) became part of the Occident, distinct from the East, the Levant, naming the Middle-East and Egypt. The Occident has always been (and is still) full of nostalgia for the Roman empire. The impact of that nostalgia on the history of Europe is difficult to overestimate.

More than anywhere else, the political nostalgia for Antique Rome had been cherished in the bosom of the *ecclesia christiana*. From the fourth and the fifth century onwards, the Church had strongly promoted herself as the new – this time *true – religio romana*. She has remained thoroughly Roman up till now. It is not a coincidence that the Pope's benediction on Christmas and Eastern is called 'urbi et orbi' (for the city – Rome – and for the surrounding, i.e. the world). Here, the idea uniting love to politics has its origin. For Christianity, *love* does have a political connotation. That connotation is genuinely Christian and has been reinforced when the Christianity replaced (and became) the *religio romana*.

3. Love & Body

'Love' is a core concept in Christianity. But the first Christians, whose language was Greek, did not use the then common word for love, which was *eros*: the blind, unsatifiable hunger for love which is able to destabilize even the upper god, as is illustrated in the adventures of the Palestinian girl called Europe. The Christians used the word '*agapè*', the Greek word for non-erotic love, for love naming a state of satisfaction, a state in which the lack that moves *eros* has been filled up: the state that makes people live together in peace, as 'brothers and sisters'. While *eros* is the name for unsatisfied and unsatisfiable desire, *agapè* is the one for desire's satisfaction.

Not specifically the satisfaction of *sexual* desire. Christian *agapè* refers to a desire which occupies a much larger field and even the entire universe. Originated in the bosom of the Jewish religion, Christianity defines itself as the fulfillment of a desire that constitutes the core of that religion. Though originally pure, God's creation has been spoiled by man's sin. In order to help overcoming that condition of 'sin and death', God had given his people the Law – the Thora. If they obeyed its commandments, that people would again be 'in line' with God, which means as well that they should realize a 'just' society in which "the infant will play near the cobra's den, and the young child will put its hand into the viper's nest" – images used by Isaiah (11, 8) to say that in God's 'Promised Land' social justice will reign, since there, justice will be done even to those who are without rights.

Yet, that Promised Land failed to become real, and in the second and first century BC, the religious imagination put forward a new basic idea. Because man did not succeed in delivering the world from its state of sin and death, God himself would intervene in order to realize that deliverance. Creature as it was

now would come to an end ('eschaton'), God would make himself entirely clear ('apocalypse'), and God's own messenger – the Messiah – would come to launch both *eschaton* and *apocalypse* and, thus, introduce a new world without sin, death or any other kind of lack.

While the Jewish religion of the first century lived waiting for the Messiah to come, a small group began to believe that this hope was redeemed by Christ. By his resurrection, he had overcome death and definitely introduced the 'Kingdom of God', i.e. the new Creature without any lack, the realm of Eternal Life. Certainly when that message found its way to non-Jews (and in this, Saint Paul was decisive), the base was prepared for a properly new religion: Christianity.

A central point in Paul's letters (the oldest Christian sources) states that the Christian lives in love, in *agapè*. It becomes the fixed term to express the state in which people live claiming that Jesus is the Christ/Messiah, a state which for that reason is no longer marked by sin and death – a state as well, so they immediately add, which is still not fully realized, but soon will be. 'Soon' means: when Christ, who in his 'ascension' has gone to the Father for a while, will be back in order to 'judge the living and the death' – the deceased who will have stood up out of their graves and the living who, without ever having died, will enter directly into the Eternal Life of the Second Creation. *Agapè*, love, is the Christian term for the fulfillment of that messianic expectation, i.e. of the divine promise that was at the basis of the Jewish religion. This is why the *First Letter of Saint-John* (4:16) put forward *agapè* as the proper name of God.[13]

But what has all this to do with politics? Is Christian love not a pious, merely religious matter? Yet, do we not forget, then, that in Antiquity, religion was an inherently political matter. This goes not only for Roman religion, but also for Judaism and, thus, for Christianity. The *eschaton* would mean the end of all that exists, including the entire existing political order; and the messianic area would bring 'God's Kingdom', a term with an obvious political connotation. It is true that in the beginning, the young Church stayed away from politics ("So give back to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's", Matthew 22, 21), but already the way in which that young community organizes itself, anticipates to a universal 'empire' in which the *agapè* will reign over all.

In that context, an image is used which will play an immense role in the politics of the West: the image of society as a body. Christ is "the head of the body which is the Church", we read in Paul's *Letter to the Colossians* (1:18). The Christian community lives "in Christ" and what binds that community is love: not the dividing and lack-producing *eros*, but *agapè*, that is beyond

[13] "Dear friends, since God so loved us, we also ought to love one another. No one has ever seen God; but if we love one another, God lives in us and his love is made complete in us. This is how we know that we live in him and he in us: He has given us of his Spirit. And we have seen and testify that the Father has sent his Son to be the Savior of the world. If anyone acknowledges that Jesus is the Son of God, God lives in them and they in God. And so we know and rely on the love God has for us. God is love. Whoever lives in love lives in God, and God in them." (1 John 4:11-16)

division. Hence the idea of a community as being one body, with Christ as its head. That image is not only applied to the Church but to the worldly political sphere as well. For more than one and a halve millennium, the image of an undivided love community was a major concept in all kinds of political discourses in the West.

What binds people to one another, is supposed to be their common love for Christ as the head of the body they all together constitute – a head that has its earthly representation in the king, the pope or other local authorities on lower levels. This, however, does not mean that this image simply mirrors reality. It is first of all a 'weapon' in the fight for conquering or beholding political power. Even on the highest level. Remember the never ending fight in the Middle Ages between the pope and the German emperor about who of both is the real head of the *Holy Roman Empire*.

The love that binds people to the body of their community, is mediated by Christ. This brings in a second metaphor in the Christian political discourse. If Christ is the head of the human love community, he is that because he has sacrificed himself for that community.[14] "Greater love hath no man than this, than to lay down his life for his friends", we read in the gospel of Saint John as quoted by Breivik in his *Compendium*. And 'friends' is not an exclusive term here. All humans are Christ's friends. That passage in the *Letter to the Colossians* is very clear:

> And he is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning and the firstborn from among the dead, so that in everything he might have the supremacy. For God was pleased to have all his fullness dwell in him, and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether things on earth or things in heaven, by making peace through his blood, shed on the cross. (Col 1:18-20)

What makes a community, what makes a multitude of individuals one body, is the love of Christ, a love that shows its true nature in the "blood, shed on the cross". What people binds to a community is the love for Christ, a love that recognizes the one on the cross as the example to follow and, thus, includes the possibility (or even the imperative) of self-sacrifice in favor of the community.

4. Patriotic love

Although Breivik's criminal act on the isle of Utøya might at first sight look eschatological and apocalyptic, a closer look reveals it on the contrary as a denial of what is crucial in the idea of *eschaton* and *apocalypse*, for it is essential to notice that these still *have to* happen and that, therefore, everything

[14] And not only for the members of the Christian community, but for the entire human community (and even for the universe) as well.

as it is now, is to be put under ‘ ‘apocalyptic reserve’. The uncertainty about the current situation is an essential dimension of Christian self-understanding, and is definitely absent in both Breivik’s *Compendium* and his massacre.

Historically, the decline of medieval thought changed that uncertainty into certainty, a certainty which was no longer founded in God (and which consequently was uncertain for us humans), but in man himself: in his Cartesian *cogito*, doubting about everything in order to discover in that very doubt its self-assured ‘self ‘ – its ‘subject’. This subject will be as well the base on which modernity ascribes a similar certainty to the things outside, to the ‘objects’ of knowledge. This is the way Descartes gave modern science its new foundation.

The political equivalent of that new paradigm can be noticed in the formation of the European *states*. The medieval kingdoms had not such a solid base of certainty as the modern states supposed to have, if only because they were divided both internally and among one another by the hornets’ nest of contradictory feudal requests – a hornets’ nest which was redoubled by a second one of religious signature which was equally structured in a feudal – and thus dividing - way. The one binding all together was a God who, despite his promise of unity, in the facts sustained the unstable character of the feudal system. During the sixteenth century Reformation, God was definitely attacked as factor of cultural and political unity. A century and a half of religious wars changed God even into the major devising element of his time.

At the beginning of modernity in the seventeenth century, God loses definitely his binding and founding function - also in politics, where that function is now left to the human *cogito*, the modern *self* or subject. Unlike the medieval feudal kingdoms, the states, which (only) now emerge, define themselves as sovereign. From now onwards, they legitimize themselves *only apparently* by referring to God. In fact, they situate their legitimate ground merely in themselves. They suppose their identity to be the point of certainty beyond doubt from where they relate to the surrounding world in absolute freedom. Of course, also modern free community is prone to negative affections, but these are not supposed to affect its identity, and the state allows itself everything to avoid such things. This implies that the sovereign identity of the state becomes the ultimate reason why war can be waged. The Cartesian *cogito* has its political equivalent in the sovereignty of the modern nation-state.

It is within this context that the Christian metaphor of ‘love and body’ re-emerges. For the identity of the state cannot defend ‘itself’: only its citizens – its subjects – can do that. This is why it is necessary that these subjects are emotionally related to the identity of their state, in other words, that they *love* their country. To be what it is, to secure its own identity, the state is dependent on the passion of its citizens. Only the love of each of them individually allows the state to be the united sovereign body it pretends to be.

Because each one of the citizens has to guarantee the identity of their state, each of them must be willing to prefer the love for his country to the love

for himself. This is why the citizen's love for the state – his patriotism – implies his willingness to sacrifice himself for it. The state's identity lives by the love of its citizens who, if necessary, are ready to give their life for it. Here, we see how the old link between love and politics, originating in the earliest age of Christianity, is far from being absent in modernity. It is still fully operational in modern patriotism in all its variations.

5. Modern identity

In the age of modernity, identity is an abysmal political problem, if only because it is fundamentally related to freedom. Pre-modern man understood himself as being created by God, as a gift of the Creator and, consequently, as being mutually given to – and dependent from – one another. Since modernity, we do no longer understand ourselves as given and dependent, but as autonomous and free. We relates to reality proceeding from the certainty of a sovereign self. This is why we understand ourselves precisely as 'identity': not as image of God, like in medieval times, but as identical to ourselves, as beings basically coinciding with themselves. This identity is our ground, our foundation, and in this, we are identical to each of our fellows, to the collective of identities constituting our society.

In its turn, however, also the society understand itself as free, i.e. as an entity having its ground in the point in which it sovereignly coincides with itself. The society, too, defines itself as a, autonomous subject and a free identity.

Yet, the identity of the individual and the one of society are not really reconcilable with one another. On the one hand, a freedom based society founds itself in the possibility of each of its members to take the freedom to turn his back to that society, and so enables its own dissolution. This is why, on the other hand, a freedom based society is inclined to sacrifice the liberty of the individual citizens to its own interest and to sustain itself by the virtual sacrifice of the citizens in favor of its own (collective) freedom.

Modern politics fluctuates between two models. One model opts for the freedom of the individual and gives as less as possible free space to the collectivity. De seventeenth century Dutch Republic listened to that paradigm – as, in our time, does neoliberalism. The other model gives full room to the liberty of the collectivity, which unavoidably is at the cost of the individual's freedom. Remember early modernity's absolutism (the regime of Louis XIV, for instance), or the Marxist regimes of last century who all were infected by totalitarian logic.

In the model embracing the primacy of the collective freedom over the one of the individual, the old metaphor of 'love and body' strongly persists. There, the love for the fatherland is not a hollow concept, because the individual

is supposed to read his own identity for a larger part from the identity of the collectivity and, if necessary, to sacrifice his individual freedom in favor of it.[15]

In the first model, where the individual liberty has a primacy over the collective one, the metaphor of 'love and body' is persisting less. There, society *as such* is almost disappearing underneath the requirements of its particular individuals. A reference to sacrificial love does not make great chance to be heard there.

Is this to say that, in this political model, love is merely absent? Not exactly. Love is only left unused for political purposes. But it does give room to love: not the sacrificial love – *agapè* – that unites us in one body, but *eros*, the kind of love that puts people (and, as we saw, even gods) against each other in a never-ending 'love battle'. Politically, that kind of *eros* can be translated in democracy, since this is based upon dissensus and encourages opposition instead of discouraging it (as is the case in the other model). In a democracy, citizens are supposed to have different opinions about what the identity – and even the 'body' – of the society is and that dissensus is supposed to be the best guarantee for a freedom based society.

The other model that puts the freedom of the collectivity above that of the individuals, describes the kind of love present in its counter-model as 'selfish', and ascribes the anomalies of that model to this kind of asocial, egoistic love. By succumbing to it, the citizens subvert the collective identity and endangers its survival.

6. PCCTS

The last lines could be read as a summary of Breivik's *Compendium*. The mass murderer of Utøya is indeed an extreme advocate of the model preferring the collective identity over the individual one. He is certainly 'extreme' concerning the concrete consequences of his political choice. Reading his *Compendium*, it is difficult not to notice how thoroughly out of touch with reality he is. Yet, not without ground, some commentators remark that "the bizarre thing is that his ideas, as Islamophobic as they are, are almost mainstream in many European countries".[16]

After all, Breivik's message is quite simple. In the name of a wrongly understood freedom, Europa has neglected his identity in such a way that it is now on the verge of getting lost forever. Responsible for this are the ideas of

---

[15] Think of the place love has in the political thoughts of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The citizen must be taught a love for his '*patrie*', so that his individual will is in perfect conformity with the general will ('volonté générale'). Love of the fatherland, he writes, is a "gentle and lively sentiment which combines the force of *amour proper* with all the beauty of virtue, endows it with an energy which, without disfiguring, makes it into the most heroic of all the passions"; Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*, ed. V. Gourevitch, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 16. For a comment, see: Simon Critchley, *The Faith of the Faithless: Experiments in Political Theology*, London / New York: Verso, 2012, p. 44.

[16] Aldus William Maclean and Catherine Hornby in: http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/08/26/us-norway-breivik-europe-idUSBRE87P01N20120826 (eigen vertaling, MDK).

'left' modernity, which has now taken the shape of *political correctness* dominated by multiculturalism and "cultural Marxism", which according to Breivik amount to the same thing. Europe's hospitality with regard to immigrants, and more specifically the generosity that gives room to the Islam has made the continent blind for the "demographic Jihad", i.e. for the fact that within the time of only a few generations, the Muslim population will obtain the majority in Europa, which definitely will ruin its identity.[17] And it is a fact, Breivik adds, that it is simply too late to look for a political solution. Before all governments of Europe will have passed the necessary measures through their parliaments, the continent will already have collapsed and irreversibly islamized.

The *Compendium* therefore opts for a violent solution: a "European civil war" in three phases.[18] The first Phase, 1999-2030, when the Muslim population in Europe is still under the 30%, has to concentrate on the "European Resistance Movement", more precisely on the PCCTS, the new "*Pauperes Commilitiones Christi Temlique Solomonici*", the new "*Order of the Knights of Christ and the Temple of Salomon*", in other words, the modern version of the medieval Knights Templar. This is also the phase in which the public opinion must be pushed in the right direction by means of 'shock-actions'. In a second phase (2030-2070, when the Muslim population reaches peaks of 40%), the amount of such actions has to increase, as well as both the number and the strength of PCCTS-cels. In the meanwhile, coups d'état must be prepared everywhere in Europe. In the third phase, 2070-2083, these coups d'état take place and the "cultural conservative agenda" is implemented. In that same phase, a start is made of both the execution of the leftist leaders ("cultural Marxists", "multiculturalists"), and the deportation of Muslims.

In 2083, for the third time in history, Europa will stop the invasion of Muslims, so Breivik prophesizes. This happened a first time in 732, when Charles Martel defeated the Saracen's army penetrating Europe from Spain and the south of France. By forcing them back to Narbonne and further, Charles Martel enabled the emergence of a proper, Christian Europe. A second turning point was the battle of Vienna in 1683, when, after a siege of two months to the city, the Osman empire was on the verge of obtaining access to Middle- and West-Europe. Nowadays, the Islam is waging a third war against Europe, this time with "demographic" means, and again, it is high time to join forces. This is the hope of Breivik, who puts forward 2083 as the year in which Europe will turn the tide (p. 1098). Having this year as title, the *Compendium*, together with

---

[17] In the introduction to his *Compendium*, Breivik writes: "Time is of the essence. We have only a few decades to consolidate a sufficient level of resistance before our major cities are completely demographically overwhelmed by Muslims. Ensuring the successful distribution of this compendium to as many Europeans as humanly possible will significantly contribute to our success. It may be the only way to avoid our present and future dhimmitude (enslavement) under Islamic majority rule in our own countries." ('Dhimmitude' is derived from 'dhimmi', the Arabic term for non-Muslim people under Muslim government.)

[18] See: p. 803 e.v.; 822 e.v., p. 1257 e.v.

the new *Knights Temlar*, intends to prepare Europe for the ultimate battle against the Saracen.

On Utøya, Breivik did not kill Muslims but young Norwegians, all of them members of the Labor Party whose political agenda is multiculturalism and other left, socialist ideas. Following the logic of his phased plan, he first wanted to strike 'Europe', i.e. the future left avant-garde by which the continent will be lead in the coming century, not in order to start their extermination, but to warn them with a strong signal in order to put them back on the right track. He also wanted to strike the false idea of 'Europe': 'false', because it is cosmopolitan and, consequently, suicidal. In the name of that idea, they have delivered Europe to foreigners and neglected what, out of love for Europe, they should have done the most: cherishing its identity. Allowing the non-European Islam into its bosom – which is to say: allowing the *Christian* identity to be raped – they have given up both the idea and the reality of Europe.

Especially the increasing fastness of the Islam's "demographic warfare" urges Europe to immediate and resolute action (p. 807 ff.). Notice that Breivik's himself declares his own action on Utøya *not* to be such action. It was nothing but a extra support accompanying the launching of his *Compendium*, which is intended to be a call for action to others. His own individual act is but a way to shake awake the other cells of the PCCTS. Breivik mentions himself to be a member of this new Knights Templar Order, which was created in April 2002 in London as an international movement organizing a new crusade against the Islamic Jihad (p. 817). He declares to be the Norwegian 'one man cell' of that movement.

This new order of fighters is named after a alleged medieval, Christian predecessor, and it looks as if Breivik has in mind a new religious, Christian Europe. Yet, this is not exactly the case. He explicitly turns against what he calls a "Christian European theocracy". What he has in mind is a "a secular European society based upon our Christian cultural heritage".[19] Christianity has been a constitutive element in the formation of Europa's identity. Breivik's fight concerns the European identity, not Christianity as such.

7. Love / Hate

Breivik's *Compendium* is thoroughly penetrated by hatred against all what is supposed to be politically correct, multi-cultural, social minded, cultural-marxist, leftist , et cetera. Yet, the *Compendium* nowhere explicitly calls for

---

[19] "It is therefore essential to understand the difference between a "Christian fundamentalist theocracy" (everything we **do not** want) and a secular European society based on our Christian cultural heritage (what we **do** want). So no, you don't need to have a personal relationship with God or Jesus to fight for our Christian cultural heritage. It is enough that you are a Christian-agnostic or a Christian atheist (an atheist who wants to preserve at least the basics of the European Christian cultural legacy (Christian holidays, Christmas and Easter)). The PCCTS, Knights Templar is therefore not a religious organisation but rather a Christian "culturalist" military order." (p. 1361; bold by Breivik)

hatred. Breivik turns things upside down here. What Europe has to hate, is precisely hatred, he repeats again and again in his manifesto. For precisely the contemporary ideologies of that continent are all dominated by hatred, hatred against Europe. According to Breivik, the PCCTS fights against the "hate-ideologies" of the last century: communism, Islam, cultural Marxism and Nazism (p 818).[20] Perfidiously, they have impregnated today's common sense with hatred. Indeed 'perfidiously', because everybody present Europe as preaching a mission of love, love for the other, the foreigner, the refugee, the cosmopolitan, et cetera, while all this is but a veil for destructive self-hate. Since its modernity, Europa has become too slack to be interested in its own identity and, therefore, has created a kind of hate against itself. And it is up to the PCCTS to fight that hidden hatred – for the moment still in a kind of avant-garde position, but soon in open *pole position*.

The basic grammar of Breivik's thought is the one of love and hate. He loves Europa, which is why he hates the hate for Europe. His love is hating hatred. This is at least how he would like things to be: dialectical – as a negation which, once negated itself, turns in its positive reverse.

But this is not how things work. If only because the object of both this hatred and this love is not what he supposes it is, i.e. something with a fixed identity. There is not *first* an kind of natural identity called Europe which, secondly, is hurt in its identity by hatred, in order, finally, to find its love for itself in hating that hatred.

In a way, Europa emerges in the commitment of its citizens, in their very love for Europe. This is at the same time Europe's weakness, delivered as it is to the whimsicality of its citizens' love. What is more, being the ground upon which Europe rests, this love itself inclines to deny this, i.e. to deny that Europe has no proper ground in itself, that it is what it is because it is what we *want* what it is – because we love something that for a larger part exists precisely thanks to that love of ours.

Some say that Love is the 'ground' of all what is. Even if they are right, love is itself inclined to deny this, because this implies that, since love itself is without ground, then *nothing* has any ground. In order to be what it is, love has to deny this. That denial is the reason one can say that love, basically, does not love itself. Is this not what a modern poet tries to say when he sings that 'Love is not loving'?[21] Love cannot love itself, since it has no 'self', no ground of other point where it is able to appropriate itself. And this is precisely what love cannot but 'hate'. It cannot but hate its own groundlessness.

---

[20] Breivik considers Nazism not as an ally or a predecessor. Like Islam, Nazism has no respect for bounderies, we read in his *Compendium* (p. 122). After all, it is a national socialism and, thus, a socialism; and, so he writes, "It is striking to notice that these writers were inspired by a Marxist worldview and consistently refused to see the heavy Socialist influences on the Nazi ideology anyway" (p. 639). On the next page, he cites Winston Churchill (one of his 'favorites'), who wrote in his diaries concerning Hitler's *Mein Kampf*: "Here was the new Koran of faith and war: turgid, verbose, shapeless, but pregnant with its message.". (p. 640).

[21] David Bowie, in 'Soul love' (*The Rise and the Fall of Ziggi Stardust and the Spiders from Mars*, 1972).

So, what Breivik's love for Europe hates, is the idea that it might not have a ground in itself, in its own fixed identity. He hates that Europe's ground might be nothing but the groundless love of the 'multi-cultural' multitude of its citizens. At the end of the day, he cannot stand that only the love felt for Europe is Europe's 'ground'. He wants his love to be anchored, grounded in Europe or, what amounts to the same thing, he wants a love that loves itself, that start from a 'self', a 'ground' it can appropriate as the ultimate guarantee of its identity.

Bartolomeo Manfredi, Cupido gekastijd door Mars, ca 1605, Charles and Mary Worcester Collection, The Art Institute of Chicago.

Here, both Breivik and the ideas he defends, miss the core of modernity's self-understanding. If modernity stands for the idea that we do no longer relate to reality proceeding from reality itself, i.e. proceeding from the link that binds us ontologically to reality, then, Breivik's manifesto can be read as one of the many attempts to turn the shift of modernity back and to restore the ontological, 'essential' relation with reality which we supposed we had in pre-modern times . His claim is that Europe *itself*, the community *itself*, identity *itself* make us loving it. This is the old, metaphysical foundation of 'political love', as it was practiced in Antiquity and in Christian Middle Ages: love as grounded in the fullness it desires – an *agapè* based *eros*.

In the first years of the seventeenth century, Bartolomeo Manfredi, an artist in the line of Carravagio, painted a scene in which Mars furiously wipes Eros, while Venus tries to protect her little son against the beating of her lover.

The interpretation of that painting is uncertain, if only because of a lack of references to concrete mythological stories in Antiquity.[22] But it may not entirely be thoughtless to say that, here, Mars's fury turns against the whimsicality of Eros, against the unreasonableness and the groundlessness of the way he shoots his arrows, both the golden ones making someone falling in love and the blind ones making someone hate his partner or lover. Breivik's position is maybe similar to the one of Mars. He, too, hates that kind of love and declares the war against it.

8. Christian love and democracy

What, if the kind of love Breivik declares the war to, is the love underlying today's democratic culture? For, if it is love that binds us to democracy, it is certainly that whimsical, groundless kind of love Mars is wiping on Manfredi's painting – a love not anchored in any given, fixed 'self' or identity, neither in our own identity nor in the one of the community's 'body'. The love underlying a freedom based society is itself to be defined as free, i.e. as having no ground neither in its subject nor in its object. It is love as desire, unfulfilled and unfulfillable desire.

It is one of the hallmarks of democracy to give a central place to that kind of open desire. Parliamentary work, public debates, free press, and lots of other democratic procedure never stops encouraging the citizens to change again and again the actual state of their society but does not provide any prescription concerning the content of those changes. All this requires a commitment and an active engagement of the citizens. They have to invest their desire and, so to say, love their society. Yet, *what* precisely they have to love is not known in advance and depends finally on the whimsicality of their wishes and desires. It depends on their groundless love for democracy. That love is democracy's abysmal base.

This kind of democratic love is much closer to the paradigm more *eros* than the one of *agapè*. If it is to be associated with a god, then, it is Venus' little son who cannot stand neither sacrifices not altars, as we can read in Euripides.[23]

So, is then Christianity and its *agape* paradigm incompatible with modern democracy? Not exactly. Of course, Christianity is responsible for the idea of the society united as a body, as it has been the 'regulative idea' for more than a millennium of western politics. And that idea, indeed, originates in *agapè*, in love thought from (an as) satisfaction – love thought from (and as) the shore of eternal truth it longs for. But Christian love is not solely *agapè*, it has incorporated Greek *eros* as well. And *eros* fits with one of the core concepts of Christian doctrine, more precisely with the apocalyptic and eschatological condition we humans are in. More exactly does it fit with one of the dimensions

---

[22] For the reference to antique and barok painting, see: Alfred Moir, "An Examination of Bartolomeo Manfredi's *Cupid Chasticed*, in: *Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies*, 11 (1985) 2: 156-167.
[23] *Hyppolytus,* verse 544.

implied in these concepts. They claim that we live in the fulfillment of time and, thus, in the satisfied condition of *agapè*. Yet, at the same time, these concepts say that the *eschaton* and the *apocalypse* are still to come and that the world as it is now – including its political system – is under reserve; that nobody knows the truth the Messiah will reveal at the end of time.

Here, *eros* clearly appears as a paradigm underlying Christian tradition as well. Here enters love in its quality of still unsatisfied desire, of unfulfilled messianic expectation. It is not a minor line in the Christian tradition. Despite its strong line of ascetism, Christianity has at the same time a genuinely 'erotic' dimension, living love as groundless desire.

Remember its rich mystical tradition. Mystics lost themselves in Christ who however, even in that very moment, remained the impossible and unreachable object of their desire – an impossibility they embrace precisely with love. This is the 'nada' John of the Cross attends at the top of the Mount Carmel.[24] This is the God Simone Weil experiences as the one who, while satisfying her desire, stimulates it even more.[25] It is the God who brings Teresa of Avila in a state in which she 'dies of not dying': satisfied, though at the same time suffering of not disappearing in that very satisfaction and, thus, of keeping desiring.[26]

This is a strong line in Christian tradition, and it has both roots in antiquity and representatives in modernity. If Christianity is able to connect with modernity and, especially, with its political, democratic culture, this is one of the possible lines. The fact that Christian love is eschatological and apocalyptical does not only mean that we can assume to lay down upon the shore of truth. It means also that no shore in our entire universe is yet the shore of truth, for the truth is still to come.

Here, Christianity meets its modern mission. Democracy requires a culture of desire, of unsatisfied and unsatisfiable desire, and Christian tradition has an expertise in this. Not exactly a political expertise, it is true. But reconsidering its tradition, it can see how its own theory, acknowledging the apocalyptic openness of desire, fits with the openness of today's democratic culture. And it can add to the formal openness of today's democratic desire a hope that is more content oriented. Longing for a community of love united as a body, it can at the same time acknowledge and privilege that longing as what has to be lived by the sake of that longing as such. Christianity is able to acknowledge the metaphysical situation beyond finitude and human condition, but it can at the same time keep people longing for it, acknowledging desire – unsatisfiable desire – as what in Christian culture too is at stake.

---

[24] John of the Cross (1987), *Selected Writings,* translated from the Spanish by the editor, Mahwah (New Jersey): Paulist Press, p 19.

[25] Simone Weil (2003), *Gravity and Grace*, with an introduction and postscript by Gustave Thibon, translated by Emma Crawford and Mario von der Ruhr, London / New York: Routledge, p. 10-15.

[26] Teresa of Avila (2000), *The Way of Perfection*, Text prepared by Kieran Kavanaugh, OCD, Washington: ICS Publications, p. 215.

Referring to elements from the Christian tradition, Breivik's love for Europe has denied the dimension of desire inherent to genuine love. It is up to Christianity now to correct the Breiviks in Europe and to show that its tradition can help us to build up a modern, free democracy.