

James Madison University

JMU Scholarly Commons

Masters Theses, 2020-current

The Graduate School

5-6-2021

Fascist 'Snakeoils:' A Burkean Rhetorical Criticism of Contemporary Ecofascist Manifestos

Lantz Shifflett

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/masters202029>



Part of the [Critical and Cultural Studies Commons](#), [Environmental Studies Commons](#), [Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Ethnicity in Communication Commons](#), [Journalism Studies Commons](#), [Place and Environment Commons](#), [Politics and Social Change Commons](#), [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), [Rhetoric Commons](#), [Social Influence and Political Communication Commons](#), [Social Justice Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shifflett, Lantz, "Fascist 'Snakeoils:' A Burkean Rhetorical Criticism of Contemporary Ecofascist Manifestos" (2021). *Masters Theses, 2020-current*. 107.
<https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/masters202029/107>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the The Graduate School at JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses, 2020-current by an authorized administrator of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact dc_admin@jmu.edu.

Ecofascist “Snakeoil” and the Imperative of Racializing Environmental Justice for the
21st Century: A Burkean Rhetorical Criticism of Contemporary Ecofascist Manifestos

Lantz Shifflett

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY

In

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the degree of

Master of the Arts

School of Communication Studies

May 2021

FACULTY COMMITTEE:

Committee Chair: Matt Brigham, Ph.D.

Committee Members/Readers:

Alison Bodkin, Ph.D.

Pete Bsumek, Ph.D.

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to thank Matt, Alison, and Pete for all their support and dedication toward guiding me in this project, and for encouraging me to see it through to the end. Together, their work efforts and insights aided me through the hard times of the pandemic, and I could not have gotten this far if it were not for all three of you. I would also like to thank everyone in the School of Communication who supported me in the Communication Advocacy program, including my fellow graduate student cohort. To all my undergraduate educators, advisors, and mentors who influenced me to pursue higher education in general, I cannot thank you all enough!

Finally, I would like to remember Dr. Terry Beitzel who unfortunately passed away earlier this year. He was always the kind and knowledgeable soul who always shared some laughs, and an occasional lighthearted joke if you were willing to lend an ear. He was also a gentle giant who would always find the time to lend an ear back.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	ii
Abstract.....	iv
CHAPTER 1: Introduction	1
CHAPTER 2: The Al Noor Mosque Shootings in Christchurch	17
CHAPTER 3: The Shooting of a Walmart in El Paso	43
CHAPTER 4: Ecofascists in 2083	69
CHAPTER 5: Conclusion.....	92
References.....	103

Abstract

Ecofascism of the 21st century is a revival of centuries-old white nationalist fascism integrated with a concern for environmental issues from the last few decades. Designated by their writers as “manifestos,” three ecofascists have widely disseminated their documents online just before committing acts of racially motivated terrorism in three different countries. Furthermore, these manifestos provide a lens into contemporary ecofascist conspiracies as well as their own concocted “snakeoils” that present their ecofascist agendas in the form of rhetorical “curatives” to environmental issues of pollution. These “cures” are grounded in a new “green nationalism” that attempts to disguise the white supremacist foundations of their conspiracies. Kenneth Burke’s (1939) “Rhetoric of Hitler’s ‘Battle,’” compels rhetorical critics to participate in an anti-fascist “battle” against the distortions of religion and other Nazi-appropriated symbols, forms of commercialization, and Aryan white nationalism. Following suit, this thesis attempts to expose the ecofascist distortions from these three ecofascist manifestos: the Christchurch shooter in 2019, the El Paso, Texas shooter in 2019, and the Oslo bombing and Utøya shooter of 2011. My project includes a focus on revealing these shooters’ “green” tactics and methods of appealing to wider audiences beyond their white nationalist core of followers. Exposing ecofascist rhetorical tactics also presents new challenges to environmental advocacy, and as Yamamoto and Lyman’s (2001) “Racializing Environmental Justice” argues, pushes environmental justice proponents to “examine white racism” in law, policy, and practice.

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

In the last decade alone, mass shootings and hate crimes have been tied to growing contemporary white nationalist movements (Anti-Defamation League, 2021). Specifically, the public shootings in El Paso, Texas, Oslo, Norway, and Christchurch, New Zealand are particularly vivid and violent illustrations of this trend. Each shooter produced and disseminated a manifesto¹ publicly, through digital online message boards, and in certain cases, these manifestos had been sent directly to the e-mail addresses of public government officials. One shooter even uploaded a video message onto his personal YouTube channel, proclaiming his manifesto as “a gift” that was to be shared widely, and just like the others, he had in doing so set a premeditated stage for the horrific murders that would follow. Though appalling in their own right, these manifestos should not be understated, ignored, or forgotten. The rhetorical features used in each manifesto deserve critical scrutiny to understand and address the problems created by contemporary white supremacist movements. To fully account for their vile rhetoric, and ultimately to end or at least limit it, requires a diligent but also critically nuanced criticism.

This thesis project will explore, thoroughly analyze, and critique three ecofascist manifestos²: Patrick Crusius’s *Inconvenient Truth* (2019), Brenton Tarrant’s *The Great Replacement* (2019), and Anders Breivik’s *2083 - A European Declaration of Independence* (2011). A brief review of these manifestos reveals, in Burkean terms, a

¹ The label of “manifesto” will be applied to the texts analyzed in this project, not only because popular discourse has termed them as such, but because the authors themselves understand their work to be that of a manifesto. Through the project, I will conclude with a better sense of the potential and risk of using terms like manifesto (or, as is frequently utilized, “screed”) to describe these artifacts.

² Though this thesis project aims to explore, understand, and problematize the label, the criteria used when designing this project to decide if something ‘counts’ as an ecofascist manifesto are described below, where I provide what I believe to be some of the core tenets of ecofascism.

shared ecofascist orientation that includes, among other aspects, a powerful strain of xenophobic ideology. Thus, a systematic and thorough rhetorical criticism will address various influences, discourses, and rhetorical precursors of each shooter’s worldviews. I aim to pull on these motivational threads that each ecofascist utilizes in their militant and xenophobic rhetoric to consider and address their threats to virtually every scapegoated ethnic minority, and to members of any other identity community that fails to meet the criteria of white, male, and western.

Literature Review

This literature review addresses the significance of key concepts, terms and ideas explored in the thesis. First, I examine the literature on manifestos to explore when, why, and with what significance a decision is made to label something a manifesto. Second, I address those white supremacist ideas connected historically to characteristics of nature and white racial identity formations. Delineating these concepts helps me to ground my thesis project in relation to the broader scholarship regarding both manifestos as well as white supremacist linkages with pro-nature appeals.

Manifestos as a Genre

Manifestos play an important role in resisting social norms and political agendas. Fauteux (2012) notes that “manifestos have been crafted from within various schools of thought” and that “there are various types of and styles of manifestos, spanning centuries, and their meaning can potentially change depending on context” (p. 467).³ Both Fauteux

³ Fauteux’s rhetorical analysis of the liner notes from Refused’s 1998 album *The Shape of Punk to Come* explains that manifestos stem from “revolutionary politics, avant-garde art movements, feminism, civil rights movements of the New Left, and cyberpunk” (p. 467). Juxtaposing these genres of manifesto, I will explicitly examine the opposite end of the spectrum in ecofascist texts, and yet I here acknowledge that manifestos can certainly strive for more humanitarian and progressive social change. In this regard, I stress the value and role of manifestos that seek to problematize institutions of racist, patriarchal, colonial,

(2012) and Cormack (1998) reveal the potential for manifestos to persuade and influence audiences. Fauteux (2012) explores how manifestos can move their audiences toward specific ideas/opinions that are located between “instrumental, goal-orientated texts” and “emotional, sometimes destructive outbursts” (p. 467). Further definitions in Cormack’s work note that “‘Manifesto,’ in its literal sense, means ‘to be struck by a hand.’ A manifesto practices violent and jarring rhetoric, striking readers with short, sharp prose, as well as promoting a program of radical social change” (1998, p. 2).

Considering the significant harm tied to authors of such vile acts of white supremacy, there are other definitions of manifesto that urge caution about texts (self-) designated as “manifestos.” Specifically, Yanoshevsky (2009) articulates that manifestos “are violent acts, spectacular act, a way to sound your voice,” and Lyon (1999) adds that they embody conventions of an “hortatory rhetorical style” (p. 13). As such, the exhortations of manifestos perform and enact a kind of theatrical drama. Yanoshevsky (2009) notes that “the manifesto has a particular performativity” (p. 266), while Puchner (2002) argues that such a manifesto does not “merely describe a history of rupture, but produces such a history, seeking to create this rupture actively through its on intervention” (p. 450).

Furthermore, manifestos are subject to criticism and such criticism determines what qualifies as “manifesto.” Notably, Yanoshevsky (2009) argues that “It would be a mistake to postulate a one-way relationship between the manifesto and criticism... criticism shapes its object – many a manifesto would have not been considered as such

capitalist norms. Such progressive manifesto rhetoric exists in Refused’s lyrics, including “Deadly Rhythm (of the Production Line),” “Worms of the Senses/Faculties of the Skull,” and “Liberation Frequency.”

had it not been for the critics” (p. 275). As a critic, I remain aware of the dangers of legitimizing such works by deeming them worthy of analysis.⁴ Against such risks, I believe that criticizing ecofascist texts plays an important positive function: building direct oppositional resistance through anti(eco)fascism by situating such resistance specifically in reference to the unique and severe threats that ecofascists pose.

White Nationalism and the Environment, Nature, and Identity

Conceptions of white nationalism, on the one hand, and of nature/environment on the other, are linked inextricably through a multitude of historical and rhetorical/symbolic contexts. Feshami (2020) identifies three white nationalist “conceptions” that are common, that “cut across an otherwise diverse milieu.” The first is that white nationalists have embraced some notion of a “unified white race” that can manifest in the use of terms such as “Aryan” and “European” (Feshami, 2020). Feshami (2020) also notes that there is a recurring pattern of a shared racial bond with “a sense of common origins, common enemies, and a common destiny.” Other key unifying principles manifest in references to “our kin” and “our folk” and are, as Feshami (2020) argues, “commonplace in white nationalist discourse, lending a sense of belonging that can provide crucial coherence within an otherwise highly differentiated milieu.” In other words, the cohesiveness of white nationalist rhetoric conforms to a largely singular identity that emerges in opposition to the diverse social environments of their broader societies.

Second, Feshami (2020) argues that white nationalists have “indelible links to specific geographic places or abstract natural spaces,” which help them to form their

⁴ Chapter 5 will exhaustively explore the various ramifications and cautionary considerations when there are themes of racism, terrorism, and other traumatizing rhetoric. Such questions that will be considered and explored thoroughly are a) should we name the ecofascists in question? b) should we quote and reference ecofascists? and c) How can we create a critical discussion around ecofascism and when should we not?

racial identities through connections to a sense of place. Neo-Nazi Richard Spencer expresses this sentiment explicitly when he exclaims that “America belongs to white men,” and in response to being questioned on his views about banning non-European immigrants, responds “because this is our goddamn country” (Mackey, 2016). Another set of key place-based rhetorics used by Neo-Nazi ideologues is found in appeals to “blood and soil” (Feshami 2020) and related nineteenth century German nationalist attitudes that assert that “for each people and each race a countryside... becomes its own peculiar landscape” (George, 1981, p. 17). The power of place for white nationalists is connected to notions of environmental whiteness. Connections between whiteness and nature have earlier precedents, even when such rhetors would not likely have considered themselves white nationalists. For instance, as DeLuca (1999) indicates, the ideas of Muir and Thoreau that helped to create the national park system contained important elements of whiteness.

Ties to place and space manifest in contemporary white nationalist propaganda, which attempts to frame the traumas of the white race as a story of having been environmentally victimized. Feshami (2020) notes that the environment, race, place, are all constructed as “imperiled.” White nationalist exigencies then emerge from the notion that their “race,” including its spiritual impetus that “animates it and ties it to the land,” will be “extinguished” (Feshami, 2020). Additionally, it is in this perceived extermination of the white race and land that “calls for resistance... urging adherent[s] to action” (Feshami, 2020). This action often then is articulated and called forth, sometimes mere moments before “adherents” begin to publicly massacre their supposed “common enemies” that threaten their imperilment and even extinction.

Scholarly Approach/Method

The scholarly approach that I use in criticizing ecofascist manifesto rhetoric begins with a core spirit of Burkean criticism, and specifically the attitude he takes in rhetorically analyzing and evaluating “The Rhetoric of Hitler’s ‘Battle’” (1939). Another critical guiding spirit for my approach comes from the call by Yamamoto and Lyman (2001) to racialize environmental justice. In particular, my invocation of Yamamoto and Lyman (2001) is meant to indicate that, in the 20 years since their essay was written, one of the most important and urgent directions that requires our attention for racializing environmental justice is that we need to seek to address how contemporary environmental justice movements might include exploring and countering threats by white nationalism and ecofascism in their purview of advocacy. Finally, I detail some of the crucial identifying characteristics of ecofascism and ecofascist rhetoric as an important third component that guides this project.

Burkean Perspectives on the Analysis of Fascist Rhetoric

With three main ecofascist texts to criticize and analyze for their different uses of terms, symbols, and motives, the goal of this thesis project is to utilize a Burkean rhetorical criticism as a challenge against ecofascist “distortions” in an attempt to 1) thoroughly explore the significance of white supremacy/fascism as it intersects with ecofascist rationalizations of ecological and environmental collapse as being the cause of white racial suffering and 2) emically draw specific critical tools emerging from each text in order to understand its ecofascist motives, features, and tendencies. Thus, my critical analysis is borne of the spirit of Kenneth Burke’s “Rhetoric of Hitler’s Battle” (1939), without attempting to impose the categories of his essay onto texts emerging in a

different time, place, and context. In this way, I am able to utilize a kind of criticism that introduces the various unification devices and other significant strategic forms of rhetorical demagoguery used in these ecofascist manifestos. Burke emphasized the need for antifascist criticism best: “Our job, then, our anti-Hitler Battle, is to find all available ways of making Hitlerite distortions of religion (and other ‘curative’ unifications) apparent, in order that politicians of *his kind* in America be unable to perform a similar swindle” (1939, pp. 218-219).

Furthermore, Burke noted the important ways in which the critic could do more than merely appeal to our gratification by simply declaring a few “adverse attitudinizing’s and call it a day” and that, in reference to fascist texts, Burke emphasizes that “there are other ways of burning books than on a pyre” (p. 191). In doing so, I aim not to make the mistakes that the “hasty reviewer[s]” made in failing to address the serious and legitimate danger of Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* (Burke, 1939) and my stance, then, must reveal all the key uses of the rhetorical “medicines” and “magic” panaceas that ecofascists present as they appear within the manifestos of Brenton Tarrant, Patrick Crusius, and Anders Breivik. As Burke also commented in critiquing *Mein Kampf*, the rhetoric used in each of the manifestos is exasperating and nauseating, but still warrants a thorough and systematic consideration of their strategies, including their primary rhetorical devices.

Each of the ecofascists that I will study in this thesis project in different ways transforms a set of environmental/ecological rhetorics into one that racially scapegoats and demonizes groups they name and identify, such as Muslims (Tarrant, 2019), “Hispanics” (Crusius, 2019), and leftists (Breivik 2011). In recovering the critical spirit

of Kenneth Burke as it pertains to the analysis of fascist rhetoric, I aim here to conduct a deep textual analysis of the various rhetorical devices and maneuvers and to expose such forms of ethnic and genocidal motivation and the deeper implications for their murders and targeting of ethnic groups. Additionally, Carter (1996) provides an extra layer of depth to Burke’s understanding of victimage (including processes of scapegoating and mortification) that is relevant to understanding the key features of these manifestos.

Whereas Burke catalogued and analyzed specific terms and symbolic themes used throughout Hitler’s rhetoric, following his spirit and example in 2021 means that we must consider the complexity of new social norms, political environments, and other forms of platforming that allow today’s ecofascists a chance to coercively appeal to widespread audiences.

New Directions in Racializing Environmental Justice

Yamamoto and Lyman (2001) argue for the need to address and expand the racialized aspects of environmental justice so that we might include raced perspectives and marginalized communities in the instances where justice systems and law cannot or will not consider race. This thesis project builds on Yamamoto and Lyman’s (2001) call by identifying urgent elements of racializing environmental justice that have emerged in the intervening 20 years. Such an update includes a recognition of the need for environmental justice to branch out to include movements, as they face not only classist, environmental, and ecological justices, but also the sheer terrorism grounded in white nationalist ideologies and acted out in the rhetoric of ecofascist manifestos. The role then in racializing environmental justice in 2021 is to include acts of white terrorism and the ecofascist ideologies that fueled such acts as squarely within the purview of

environmental justice activists, advocates, and scholars. In doing so, the framing of ecofascism as an environmental justice perspective would emphasize the significance of white ultranationalist movements (and acts of terrorism) both from legal and societal perspectives.

My combination of the spirits of Burke and Yamamoto and Lyman (2001) poses the question: What do we do with the fascist magic and the white nationalist medicine? I respond with the same impetus that Yamamoto and Lyman had in the need to racialize environmental justice in order to be attentive to white nationalist (and ecofascist) movements. I draw from the spirit of Burke on resisting fascism, and I aim to critique ecofascist rhetoric as a means of analytical resistance. Thus, I ask how we might engage and prevent white nationalists, white supremacy, and ecofascism from hijacking contemporary policy making and the range of environmental and social movements.

The Characteristics of Ecofascism

Protopapadakis (2014) notes that ecofascism “rests on the backbone of fascism” and finds that its adherents desire the protection of the ecosphere which is the only “bearer of absolute moral value” (p. 589). Protopapadakis writes that ecofascists draw from the following premises:

- [i] Humans propagate without any control, and this seriously threatens natural equilibrium. Therefore, human population should be promptly and drastically reduced, no matter what form this would take; every means to this end is *in principle* just and fair
- [ii] Even the mere presence of humans blemishes and spoils the beauty and purity of the environment. Therefore, humans ought to render large areas entirely human-free
- [iii] Technological progress and urbanization bring high

resource demands and thus have become enduring threats to the environment. Therefore, moral agents ought to reject all cultural and technological achievements to any degree necessary for the reestablishment of a proper environmental equilibrium, even if this would mean that humans might have to live without electricity, communication, transportation etc. [iv] All of what is described above, although necessary and urgent, is unlikely to come to fruition in a liberal democratic state, mainly for two reasons: on the one hand environmental degradation seems to be the systemic aftermath of the emergence and establishment of liberal democratic states; on the other, humans would never willingly consent to measures such as these. (pp. 589-590)

Ecofascism, then, presents a new locus in which ecofascists situate their motives as being in the service of the ecological sphere (“ecosphere”). Other significant ecofascist ideals present in the ecofascist manifestos are their misogynist, patriarchal qualities that are often seen in white nationalist movements. Dyett and Thomas (2019) attend to how ecofascism often features Western capitalist-driven discourses by interlocutors ensconced with sexist and racist overtones. Additionally, they add that ecofascism is “an all-too-common tool of deflection and scapegoating that white environmentalism employs in order to ignore historic power relations” (Dyett & Thomas, 2019).

Chapter Previews

Chapter 2: The Al Noor Mosque Shootings in Christchurch

On March 15th, 2019, Brenton Tarrant launched a murderous assault on the Al Noor Mosque and the Linwood Islamic Centre in New Zealand, all while live-streaming the terrorism on Facebook (“New Zealand Mosque,” 2019). His murderous rampage

resulted in the death fifty-one people and would receive international press coverage (“Still No Date,” 2020). Similar to the Anders Breivik case (examined in chapter 4), Tarrant sent out a series of e-mails to over thirty recipients, including the prime minister of New Zealand, Jacinda Ardern (“PM’s Office Received,” 2019). Tarrant released his manifesto on alt-right message boards 8chan as well as his own twitter page.

In alignment with the theme of ecofascism, Tarrant’s adoption and use of green terms presents a case that reveals white ethnocentrism as revealed in his manifesto, *The Great Replacement*. On initial glance, this manifesto shares some similarities of Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*, but the notable difference lies in the intent of the title of the manifesto itself. Tarrant implies that there is a common enemy from the get-go in the “replacement,” and further emphasizes that “Towards a new society... We march forward” (2019, p. 1). Immediately, the very message of the manifesto beckons to be reviewed by ecofascist adherents and/or an audience that holds white nationalist attitudes, even to the point where Tarrant’s work is cited in the El Paso manifesto as a “source of inspiration.” Lines such as “This is ethnic replacement. This is cultural replacement. This is racial replacement,” bring out his own tactical repurposing of Burke’s discoveries regarding the rhetorical power of repetition. Within this green nationalist propaganda, Tarrant references an inborn dignity similar to that of Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* that acts also as a projection device to unify “those born from our lands” (Burke, 1939). While this manifesto bears some formal and substantive similarities to the work analyzed by Burke, this chapter will, like the two that follow, seek to discern the appropriate tools for textual analysis emically, as they emerge from a close reading of the texts themselves, rather than by superimposing the terms put forth by Burke.

Chapter 3: The Shooting of a Walmart in El Paso

On August 3rd, 2019, Patrick Crusius marched into an El Paso Walmart, killing over 23 people, while specifically targeting members of the Latinx community. Like Tarrant, Crusius, directly before traveling to El Paso, posted a “screed” online via 8chan, a message board website that is home to many (Arango et al., 2019), after which he began his killing spree, targeting specifically “Hispanic” (his label of choice) shoppers at the Cielo Vista Mall (“Texas Walmart Shooting,” 2019). The attack was also motivated by the attacks of Tarrant and would become another case in the growing rise of far-right violence internationally (“Texas Walmart Shooting”).

Crusius provides an explicitly environmental reasoning for his terrorism. Crusius indicates concern about environmental degradation in a paragraph on “race mixing” eugenics as wanting to turn America into a “confederacy of territories with at least 1 territory for each race” (p. 4). The reason for constructing such an abomination of segregated nation states stems from the very same “social unity by granting each race self-determination within their respective territory(s)” (p. 4). Finally, the indelible ties to the environment appear in his critique of the “American lifestyle” that “affords our citizens incredible quality of life” (p. 2). Crusius attempts to pull environmentalists into the conversation by referencing the corporations that “are heading to the destruction of our environment” from “oil drilling operations,” “consumer culture,” and the “trees worth of paper towels,” even citing Dr. Seuss’s *The Lorax* as inspiration (p. 2). Whiteness is under attack, Crusius insists throughout his manifesto, and he seeks to scapegoat the “Hispanic invaders” as the primary culprits.

Chapter 4: Ecofascists in 2083

On July 22nd, 2011, Anders Behring Breivik was responsible for a horrific instance of ecofascist terrorism. Breivik began his murderous spree by detonating a bomb rigged inside a van in downtown Oslo, where he then posed as a police officer and began to shoot members of the Workers Youth League (AUF), killing sixty-nine members of the summer camp of the Labor Party (Lewis & Lyall, 2012). Just ninety minutes before the shootings took place, Breivik sent his manifesto to 250 British contacts and a total of 1003 email addresses (Taylor, 2011). Among the recipients were other anti-Muslim parties such as Vlaams-Belang. Breivik also attached his manifesto to a Youtube video titled “Western Europe patriot” under the handle Anders “Brewick” and wrote “It is a gift to you ... I ask you to distribute it to everyone you know” (Taylor). His actions that followed that same day led to the death of seventy-one people and the injury of over three-hundred others.

Breivik brought up a large number of concerns that parallel white nationalists’ xenophobic, anti-Islam and anti-feminist arguments in this exhaustive 1500-page manifesto. A rhetorical criticism would provide greater depth to understanding his motives, rather than merely observing the terrorist qualities invoked against Muslims, leftists, and feminist activism. Breivik’s manifesto references the “Sex and the City lifestyle, the propagation of sexual immorality (indexed by women's promiscuity), and the ‘erotic capital’ women use to manipulate men” and emphasizes that “the degeneration of our civilization is intimately linked to an epidemic of sexually transmitted disease and ‘emotionalism’” (Jones, 2011). Examining this artifact in particular will allow me to consider how his strain of “environmentalism” and white patriarchal supremacy overlap and intersect with ecofascist patriarchal misogyny.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

This chapter will explore the significance of racializing environmental justice in relation to ecofascist movements as they affect ethnic groups around the world. Furthermore, there will be a discussion on what the implications of this research might mean for future environmental justice movements and antifascism that will allow multiple decentralized movements to advocate against ecofascists who are in positions of hegemonic and governmental power. Lastly, there will be a discussion of future implications on ecofascism studies and potential future trajectories for research in this area, as well as other related findings.

Conclusion

Contemporary ecofascism, as revealed in the texts of the shooters analyzed in this project, presents challenges in analyzing their particular configuration of attitudes, motives, and symbols that are violently white nationalist and supremacist. The power to quash ecofascist rhetorics and their movements in an age ripe with new forms and strains of fascism is imperative to prevent their environmentalism from being made to serve and justify such ideologies and the corresponding sheer threats imposed by the acts of these shootings. This terror caused by ecofascists deserves scrutiny to reveal the underlying motives and symbolic meanings in their texts so that we might formulate strategies of community oppositional resistance and anti-ecofascism. In doing so, we must also expose all of the important symbols, meanings, and various rhetorical devices that are used in each ecofascist manifesto. I seek to understand how we can prevent ecofascism from securing positions of power and political discourse, and to prevent new strains of environmental advocacy that consciously, purposive, or deliberately, or otherwise, are

coercive when employed by ecofascist terrorists to frame immigrants and other marginalized communities as central causes of urgent climactic/environmental change.

In the spirit of Burke, I am to expose and bring to light ecofascists’ terms and “Bastardizations” (Burke, 1939), so that coalitions and advocates for anti-racist action might oppose them in our anti-ecofascist and/or environmental justice advocacy. Where once the Nazis used a variety of tactics to capitalize on their media environment, the new shift in the dynamics of contemporary fascism have interwoven with the fabrics of environmental concerns stemming around overpopulation, emissions, waste, and many other forms of toxic pollutants as reflected in the documents that I will examine. Exposing these derivatives, “bastardizations” of environmentalism, and “Hitlerite” twists to ecological/environmental harm, enables one to challenge and disrupt ecofascist attempts at enacting extreme acts of violence against their scapegoating of targeted ethnic minorities as their solution of choice through these “snakeoil” manifestos (Burke). As such, fighting against ecofascists and their sales pitches ought to prevent them from winning elected offices, from being platformed in mass mediated news, and from perpetrating harm on local communities. The internet itself also can give such freedoms to white supremacists, so we must strive to prevent and counter the ecofascist and the toxic, indeed lethal and anti-democratic, white masculinity they seek to inject into our popular discourses.

Finally, I offer this cautionary disclaimer. There are a great deal of “alt-right” white nationalist attitudes, symbols, and ideas ahead, and reading it was most certainly challenging for me, given the gravity of the terrorism imposed from the ecofascist manifestos. These manifestos contain ideas, thoughts, threatening attitudes that are uncanny

and thoroughly offensive. On that note, I ask that readers to consider the violent racism and xenophobic content of the manifestos that serve as the focal point of my criticism, and therefore keep those who support you close by for your own mental health. Again, I caution that you might feel threatened from the sheer terrorism of the events that occurred on these days, and thus if you go on further, take great care of your own well-being. Please contact a friend, a loved one, and seek support if you should need it. You are not alone, and I say so in solidarity with fellow antiracists, antifascists and antiecofascists!

CHAPTER 2: The Al Noor Mosque Shootings in Christchurch

Introduction

The manifesto examined in this chapter belongs to the mass murderer of the Christchurch shootings at the Al Noor Mosque in New Zealand. There are a significant number of rhetorical devices, attitudes, and motives here to unpack; the reality that we see through the shooter’s rhetoric is grim, and uncannily upsetting. What I aim to explore are the ecofascist components to the manifesto that allow me to observe how it creates various constructions of situations in rhetorical form, but also how they influence future ecofascist murderers. The expressed motives behind such grisly acts reveal much about contemporary aspects of white nationalism, alt-right conspiracy, and far-right ecofascism that are contained within the digital contexts of its pages. This manifesto shapes the grotesque form of violent terrorism against Muslims in the name of protecting a variety of environmental or “eco”-friendly contexts.

Make no mistake, this manifesto subject to my criticism was the last thing a self-titled “ecofascist” circulated across Facebook and the internet before his murders. It contains a violent concoction that is part imperiled victimage through mortification (taken mostly from his travels across Europe), and part extreme, militant, and unapologetic “green” ultranationalism. Among the manifesto’s contents are a combination of ecofascist conspiracies, a prolepsis to those who would challenge him, and the barbarous threats he poses against his “invading” enemy. The hostilities of our subject, Brenton Tarrant, present themselves in environmentally concerned attitudes with a fascist twist; evidence of Tarrant’s ecofascism is abundant and the source of much of his own framing of his motivations for the terrorism he committed after the release of this

manifesto. After reviewing his motives for this unforgivable hate crime, I explore how we might watch for Tarrant’s version of fascist environmentalism through the lens of racializing environmental justice to account for his devious ecological schematics.

Context

On March 15th, 2019, Brenton Tarrant launched a murderous assault on the Al Noor Mosque and the Linwood Islamic Centre in New Zealand, all while live-streaming the terrorism on Facebook (“New Zealand,” 2019). His murderous rampage resulted in the death of fifty-one people, and the shootings would receive international press coverage (“Still No Date,” 2020). Similar to the Anders Breivik case (examined in Chapter 4), Tarrant sent out a series of e-mails to over thirty recipients, including the prime minister of New Zealand, Jacinda Ardern (“PM’s Office,” 2019). Tarrant released his manifesto on alt-right message board 8chan as well as his own Facebook page just before his act of mass violence against his perceived invaders (“Christchurch Shootings,” 2019).

After the horrific slaughter of many members of the Al Noor Mosque, Tarrant was immediately detained and the manifesto that he posted online was banned in Australia and New Zealand. Tarrant appeared on the first day of his trial, and even while in handcuffs, he smirked while signing an OK with his hands for “White Power” (“Okay Hand Gesture,” n.d.). Much of the public controversy around Tarrant’s trial was based on the way he presented himself in court. His often jocular, in-court acts of defiance represented the symbolic counterpart to the presence in his manifesto of a significant

amount of “shitposting”⁵ influenced trolling, which represents an “extreme dark humour [that] is an expression of the hyper-masculinity that fuels extremist groups” (Boseley, 2019). According to Greg Barton, an expert on terrorism from Deakin University, “racist ‘shitposting’ is common across the internet, and is a way for people to connect and gain attention” (Boseley, 2019). Throughout much of the manifesto, Tarrant calls upon this shitposting attitude, revealing much of the aesthetic humor from alt-right/far-right circles. Since then, Tarrant has been sentenced to life without parole in New Zealand, which resulted in the Al Noor Mosque survivors and community members of Christchurch responding against the fear instilled by Tarrant (Menon, 2020).

Literature Review

As explored in Chapter one, the scholarship on ecofascism offers insight into the origins and contemporary philosophy of the ideology. The literature on the Christchurch shootings is scant, and little is written about the manifesto itself. Since the shooting, as of the writing of this thesis, has yet to been covered by academic sources, there are only a handful of works that are relevant for my rhetorical purposes. Feshami (2020) has taken into account Tarrant’s use of environmental white nationalism. In other instances, he addresses the presence of many others who align with Tarrant’s sense of being “imperiled”:

By emphasizing in his manifesto the link between land and race, nation and nature, the Christchurch shooter tapped into the larger current of thought running from German racial nationalists to David Lane and beyond. Indeed, the manifesto

⁵ “Shitposting” is “the act of throwing out huge amounts of content, most of it ironic, low-quality trolling, for the purpose of provoking an emotional reaction in less Internet-savvy viewers. The ultimate goal is to derail productive discussion and distract readers” (*Shitposting, Inspirational Terrorism*, 2019).

itself is a patchwork of references to white nationalism’s intellectual tradition; Mosley, for instance, is cited while the phrase ‘a future for white children’—the closing line of the 14 Words—is repeated in several places throughout the text. To borrow a metaphor from Lane, it is one more link in a long chain stretching from nineteenth-century Germany to today. (Feshami, 2020)

Tarrant draws upon this imperiled form of rhetoric, and in doing so creates an opportunity to interweave white nationalism’s “patchwork intellectualism” into online digital social media platforms (like 8chan, Facebook and Twitter) to situate his stance. The manifesto is a testament to the contemporary ecofascist’s ability to reappropriate old 19th century German traditions while also “shitposting” for new audiences of modern social media communication.

Lavin (2020) references the manifesto regarding religious components to Tarrant’s rhetoric. The exigence of this “invasion” he references is what Lavin (2020) calls “a purported demographic crisis in which white Christians of the West are being outbred, outnumbered, and swallowed up by darker races” (p. 136). Such deliberate racialization also has a call that encourages others of his ecofascist cult to act. In service to fellow readers and far-right extremists under his designation, and as Lavin (2020) also reflects intuitively, Tarrant utilizes forms of “racial responsibility” throughout to motivate white supremacists with “the responsibility of whites to murder anyone perceived to be acting against white racial interest from Angela Merkel to ‘your local drug dealer’” (pp. 136-137).

Klein (2019) explicitly references Tarrant as being part of a larger “ecofascist” movement in her article that addresses the imperative of confronting climate breakdown

and the “intersecting white supremacy and surging xenophobia” (Klein, 2019). Beyond explicitly identifying Tarrant as “ecofascist by nature” and indicating that Tarrant’s argument is that the “environment is being destroyed by over-population” (pp. 15-22), Klein (2019) also emphasizes that his framing that “Continued immigration into Europe is environmental warfare and ultimately destructive to nature itself” is a “twisted kind of environmentalism.” Klein also mentions that Tarrant was:

not driven by environmental concern – his motivation was unadulterated racist hate – but ecological breakdown was one of the forces that seemed to be stoking that hatred, much as we are seeing it act as an accelerant for hatred and violence in armed conflicts around the world.

Klein also cautions “white power ecofascism will emerge with a great frequency, as a ferocious rationalization for refusing to live up to our collective climate responsibilities.” From Klein’s perspective, Tarrant attempts to buy audiences with a very real concern for the environment and through a dehumanizing racialized projection of “invaders.”

Protopapadakis (2014) observes ecofascists’ regard for the value of the “ecosphere” as ultimately revealing itself in the reductive and dehumanizing aspects of its “enlightenment” (p. 586). This includes a demeanor that is “hostile towards individual autonomy and free will” (Protopapadakis, 2014, p. 586). This is evident where Tarrant explicitly opposes democracy and any form of deliberation that might criticize his movement or resist it in any way possible; bigotry is also unsurprisingly a penchant for ecofascism in this way. This then creates a conceptual space where ecofascists establish an “irrefutable moral imperative” for a “flourishing of the natural environment”

(Protopapadakis, p. 588). Tarrant’s rhetorics lead to a construction of his own ideal ecofascist society driven by murder and deterrence through mass shooting terrorism.

Finally, there are other sources that offer insight related to Tarrant, his manifesto, and/or situation. Strategic communication scholarship on conspiracy theories is found in Holbrook (2020), who argues that “Conspiracy theories consist of proposed explanations for events based on secretive plots by powerful agents” (pp. 27-28). Other methods used to analyze Tarrant’s manifesto are most notably seen by Vossen (2020) and Mirzahi (2020). Vossen explores right-wing extremism through framing analysis, and Mirzahi conducts a content analysis for analyzing ideological themes of white supremacy extremism. Ware (2019) explores far-right terrorism of The Atomwaffen Division, a small “neo-Nazi terrorist organization” which has organized and networked all across the U.S. (p. 1). Ware (2020) adds that there is a “rising trend” of far-right extremists using manifestos in general (p. 3). Lastly, scholarship continues to explore the psychology of Tarrant’s transnational terrorism as discussed in Atran (2020), including the historical, social, and political discourses in Karl Johansson (2020). Other studies on Tarrant’s far-right terrorism appear in a report from Quek (2019), and Moses (2019), who noted: “the notion that Europe is being swamped by Third World migrants, and especially by Muslims, is mainstream discourse” (p. 211). As this emerging body of scholarship has revealed, from numerous approaches and scholarly lenses, Tarrant’s manifesto takes every opportunity to racially target Muslims, scapegoating them as responsible as “invaders” for a variety of social ills, including environmental ones. Such framing matches the rhetorical frames of mainstream discourses (Tarrant). That said, there is still

a great amount of research that can be done to analyze Tarrant’s manifesto and its ties to ecofascist agendas.

Introducing the Manifesto

Tarrant’s manifesto “The Great Replacement” is a 74-page document that reveals his plans and motivations for the Christchurch shootings that he is about to commit. Section headers of the manifesto frame his own violent, Islamophobic agenda even before he begins to deliberate about his cause. Before these main sections, the title page contains a “Sonnenrad” (also known as a “sunwheel” or “black sun”) that the Anti-Defamation League indicates represent “ancient European symbols appropriated by the Nazis in their attempt to invent an idealized ‘Aryan/Norse’ heritage” (n.d.). Tarrant’s version features a wheel chart with a variety of categories starting from twelve and going clockwise: “Environmentalism,” “Responsible Markets,” “Addiction-Free Community,” “Law and Order,” “Ethnic Autonomy,” “Protection of Heritage & Culture,” “Worker’s Rights,” and lastly, “Anti-imperialism” (Tarrant, 2019). Sections of Dylan Thomas’s (1952) “Do not go gentle into that good night” follow on the second page, accentuating the last stanza of the poem, “Rage, rage against the dying of the light,” and then transitioning into the main introduction that is roughly three pages long.

The rest of the preliminary section of the manifesto utilizes the rhetorical technique of prolepsis, defined by Lanham (1991) as “Foreseeing and forestalling objections in various ways” (p.120), which for Tarrant involves addressing potential objections in a standard, question-and-answer format. After the prolepsis, Tarrant divides the rest of his manifesto into three sections: 1) “Addresses to various groups,” followed by a poem from Rudyard Kipling’s “The Beginnings,” 2) “General Thoughts and

Potential Strategies” followed by a quotation from the notorious British Union of Fascist leader Oswald Mosely, and 3) an “In conclusion” section, containing more poems and 2 Sonnenrads around pictures recalling the original Sonnenrad on the front page. Subjects within the Q&A pit Tarrant against those he imagines will, after he carries out his mass violence, be his interrogating critic audiences, while also functioning rhetorically to build his ethos explicitly as an “Ethno-nationalist Eco-fascist” with an added “focus on the preservation of nature, and the natural order” (p. 18). The rest of his manifesto reveals further eco-white nationalist attitudes and motives for his killings on the Al-Noor Mosque and questions potential adherents and readers to ponder aiding his desire for “Unity, purpose, trust traditions, nationalism and racial nationalism” that provides a “strength” for ethnic conflicts he sees as central to the larger project (Tarrant, p. 33). This is especially true when he references conflicts of capitalism and the purpose of openly identifying as distinctly “ecofascist” (Klein, 2019).

Audience Analysis

Tarrant concerns himself with and sees his audience as being on the far/alt-right fringes of the political spectrum as well as those who, if not already on board with such views, have at least subscribed to fascism in this environmentally rearticulated form. When questioned on “Who do you represent?” Tarrant replies “Millions of Ethno-nationalist peoples that wish to live in peace amongst their own people,” and also mentions that he was in contact with “reborn Knights Templar for a blessing in support of the attack, which was given” (p. 10). Tarrant is largely concerned with addressing and building a following of ecofascists who adopt the “ethno-nationalist” stance of a green environmental nationalism, as I will explore later in the chapter. What makes Tarrant’s

audience appeals erratic and complex is his back and forth between a couple of identities that on one hand frames him as being a far-right fringe extremist, and on the other, one that frames him as an “Ordinary” Joe of sorts (Tarrant). In doing so, he attempts to expand his image and appeal to larger audiences, but is then left in-between two extremes. At such a juncture, the anti-ecofascist can, by tying those like Tarrant back to their core white eco-nationalist appeals and ideologies, expose these far-right ecofascists or extremists for what they aim to hide. That said, it is important to acknowledge how he might depict himself to unaware audiences and how he uses his scapegoating mechanisms to lead such audiences back to explicit ecofascism.

Causes of the Crisis

Tarrant introduces himself in his prolepsis Q&A as “Just an Ordinary White man, 28 years old. Born in Australia to a working class, low-income family,” and he identifies himself against his interrogators as being a “regular White man” (p. 5). Tarrant describes in detail his cause in ecofascist ethics, linking it with his own frustrations about consumerism and corporate/state “invited immigration,” where “invaders” shall “NEVER conquer our lands and will never replace our people” (pp. 3-5). Three other instances, or “events,” are also described with great anger and vitriol, meriting in response differing murderous degrees of “revenge,” and are as follows: 1) A death of a European girl from an “Islamic invader” in Stockholm in 2017 (I omit this girl’s name out of respect for the family, and the mother who refuted Tarrant’s attacks after he used her death as part of a justification for his mass act of violence) that had managed to “[break] through” Tarrant’s “own jaded cynicism like a sledgehammer;” 2) the results of the 2017 French General election, which resulted in the victory of an “internationalist, globalist, anti-white,

exbanker,” causing Tarrant to lose hope; and 3) Tarrant’s “final push” came from his visit to a cemetery in France where the deaths of “European soldiers” brought him to tears as he sobbed in front of the “forgotten dead” (pp. 7-9). As a result, Tarrant’s justifications for the shootings are ensconced in his own provoked “fight” which he embraces by his manic and Islamophobic frustrations toward immigrants whom he perversely targets as “threats.”

Additionally, Tarrant frames and fixates above all on a “replacement” through a total invasion from Muslim immigration. His use of terms in support for an ecofascist agenda are ensconced with white nationalist attitudes and forceful, threatening, coercive rhetorics about preventing population growth through sheer terror and hubris. The rhetorical repetition found throughout his introduction emphasizes “It’s the Birthrates” three times in a column at the top of the page, and that even deporting all “non-Europeans” would lead to “European” peoples of his white ethnocentrism to the point of “decay” and “eventual death” (Tarrant, p. 3). Tarrant also takes to an extreme degree of prejudice his actions in the shooting he is about to commit, referencing it as a “grand crusade” (p. 56) and even beckons his adherents to extreme and ascetic degrees in a section title “Accept Death, Embrace Infamy” (p. 56). Lavin also reminds us that this is true in a section on “To the Turks” in which Tarrant “revived the medieval notion of a conflict between Christians and ‘Turks’ as the central, civilizational conflict envisioned by contemporary white supremacists” (Lavin, 2020, p. 136). Part of Tarrant’s islamophobia manifests from this link to the Crusades and it too will become of concern as we review Chapter 4’s ecofascist manifesto.

How is this Crisis Framed as Specifically Environmental/Ecological?

In terms of his concern for the “natural environment,” Tarrant concerns himself greatly with “preservation” and “protection,” and indicates how his deep “green nationalist” fascism concerns align with his white nationalist ethics in a section titled: “Green nationalism is the only true nationalism” (p. 38). He also maintains that “mass immigration” sets forth the situation of the “destruction of the natural environment,” where “the protection and preservation of these lands is of the same importance as the protection and preservation of our own ideals and beliefs” (p. 38). These ideals and beliefs are also connected with the need for the “preservation of nature” and the “natural order” in the context of protecting/preserving Europe from “continued immigration” that he exhorts as “environmental warfare and ultimately destructive to nature itself” (p. 38). In framing the environment as imperiled from immigrant “invaders,” he constructs a fascist modification of his exigence to protect his pure nationalistic ties to a White European environmentally warfare society (Bitzer, 1968).

These dramatically pugnacious phrases lead to Tarrant posing himself as if he is in some form of an aggrandized battle, as seen in elements of his militarism and militaristic attitudes. Imbued in the violent language he uses casually are the strikingly undeterred and apathetic visual elements of crusades and conquest reflecting a sense of his own understating of his terrorism as an “attack,” or when he compels his readers to “prepare for war...violence...risk...struggle...” since he only sees it as a “path to Victory [sic]” (p. 59). He uses racial epithets flagrantly to designate “invaders” and through hostile ruminations and derision. Beyond his assault on their dehumanized othering, he envisions that this chaos and crisis will, from his embattled situation, set into motion others to “rise” just as Tarrant did in his environmentally concerned shootings. His

rhetoric galvanizes those to take up arms and follow suit, awarding honors to such ecofascists for their exemplary “paragon” in leadership of his war.

What is His Purpose?

Behind the militant imagery are more layers of his irreverent sense of humor that are entrenched in his attitudes ridden throughout his anti-democratic ultimatums. In a self-indulgent “cheeky” fashion, as Lavin (2020, p. 136) remarks, there are elements of his perfunctory comical attitudinizings strung throughout. Far-right memes appear when he questions himself as being a “shill” or a “patsy,” and other places include his cavalier use of militant frames, and of wanting to cure and provide “antidotes” of “poison sellers and toxin spreaders” of his drug dealing “racial enemies.” In this same section, Tarrant in all caps emphasizes adherents to “kill your local drug dealer” to protect your white people, in order to “remove the poison” (p. 49). Thus, Tarrant starts to project mechanisms of guilt, not only against his non-white enemies but against the nascent masculine adherents to his ecofascist ideology, should they fail in this mission.

Conspiracies and sentiments of a “white replacement” cause Tarrant to call upon concepts of a white death in the supposed replacement processes of mass immigration. Another prominent frame found in the manifesto is mortality and death, expressed in his call for racial violence as resistance to invasion. In doing so, there is often a sense of imperilment he invokes to call upon the significance of this decay and death, and so Tarrant responds with a fascist ethos of coercive rhetorical violence to match the attacks from his shootings; the exigence revolves centrally and emphatically on a “death,” “loss” and cultural “decay.” His rhetorics of violence embrace an experience that is unique to the trades and discourse of soldiers whose sense of “worth” is “not measured by the

length of your life, but your actions during it” (Tarrant, p. 56). His plot to kill Muslim “invaders” is also reflected in a section where he embraces Nazi symbolic imagery through a “lighting march” and a “Blitz to dominant positions” (Tarrant, p. 44).

Rhetorics of Victimage

Blame is placed on “European men” in one section, but only because he argues that “strong men” do not get “ethnically replaced” (p. 30). His blame here categorizes a problem that juxtaposes his masculinist elitism of “strong” vs. “weak” Europeans, in which case he really only blames white men if they allow their “Culture to degrade.” This is made particularly vivid at points such as in the next section when he ties these invaders to the rape of “British women” by “non-white scum” (pp. 30-31). Much of his blame is also framed against those who have endangered “mans (*sic*) natural environment,” wherein Tarrant assumes a more patriarchal and toxic masculinist stance. He presumes that “mans” removal from nature becomes ingrained in his anti-industrial groundworks as seen in his section on the “Radicalization of Western Men” (p. 34). Here Tarrant retreads on his concern for the “birthrates” by calling forth the idyllic picturesque and quintessential “western-men” (p. 35). In doing so, he invokes and centers/situates an entire society of these men who refuse the “decay,” wherein birthrates decline through an envisioned white man’s access to white women’s bodies. Indeed, the “birthrates” which he provokes ecofascist white men to continue in his stead, as part of the mission to become radicalized in full environmental conquest, renders women earthly and imbued with environmental qualities, and ultimately belonging to white society and white men against ethnic invaders.

There is a great poisonous guilt and seething white anger that compels Tarrant to take up terrorist action. Burke (1939) reflects a great deal on the terms defined in Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* to discuss the terms that make up core rhetorical functions of Hitler’s victimage (Burke, 1939). The imperilment of Tarrant’s frustrations from these poisons are not too unlike Hitler’s, where he finds a medicine for “anglo European” white people “in the projective device of the scapegoat, whereby the ‘bad’ features can be allocated to the ‘devil,’ and one can ‘respect himself’ by a distinction between ‘good’ capitalism and a ‘bad’ capitalism” (Burke, 1939, p. 196). In this case, Tarrant embraces a projection device aimed externally at the “invading” Muslim who brings with him his own “healthy” culture (p. 37). We also need to detect another key mechanism in this manifesto: the “internal devil” that is Tarrant’s victimage internalized through his mortified inner self turmoil. He laments of fallen white soldiers of a battlefield in the middle of Europe, his materialized panacea that was Munich for Hitler in his struggle (Burke, p. 192).

Tarrant’s revisions of history become a new construct, a twist to the mangled effigy he has created in the very beginnings of his own victimization and aggrieved imperilment. But to what cost, and more saliently, at whose demise or extermination? Tarrant’s own rhetorical attacks conjure images and fear appeals of a replacement that will be “Invasion on a level never seen before in history” (p. 3). These invaders, in their abstract and racialized immigrant characteristics, call forth the heart of Tarrant’s concocted fascist snake oil: “This crisis of mass immigration and sub-replacement fertility is an assault on the European people that, if not combated, will ultimately result in the complete racial and cultural replacement of the European people” (p. 3). So begins

Tarrant’s diagnosis of his observed conditions brought forth from his own virulent conspiracy, include the need for a medicine to halt against what he ends up repeating ad nauseum: “This is ethnic replacement, this is Cultural replacement. This is racial replacement” and then transitions to the subject of the next section of his manifesto, “White Genocide” (p. 4).

Tarrant’s rhetorical strategies involve a process of victimage among “white nations” through two conceptual approaches: 1) self-mortification through the failures and losses of Anglo European soldiers, and 2) conspiratorial fears surrounding the genocide of white people through scapegoating “mass immigration” and “replacement” in the form of the “birthrates” caused by “invading” Muslim cultures (p. 4). The problem Tarrant depicts as being a “white genocide” embraces an attitudinizing of his own personal aggrievement and thus projects this pain and distress onto the terrorism he eventually causes in the Christchurch mosque on March 15th. “To return to replacement fertility levels is priority number one” and yet, “Due to mass immigration we lack the time scale required to enact the civilizational paradigm shift we need to undertake to return to health and prosperity” (p. 4). Tarrant’s ecofascism ensconces this idea of time being constrained not only to push an exigence that demands a “return to health and prosperity” but also to embrace a baffling list of subjugated terms in which he and his fellow ecofascists are framed as victims.

Among these terms, Tarrant’s review of mass Muslim immigration up to this point presents a continual fear of “replacement” to the point where he seeks to solve his concerns through embodying a white nation. He brings about the eventual event horizon, catastrophizing a point of no return to his white ecofascist adherents: “Mass immigration

will disenfranchise us, subvert our nations, destroy our communities, destroy our ethnic binds, destroy our cultures, destroy our peoples...Long before low fertility levels ever could” (Tarrant, p. 4). Tarrant thus promotes a victimage through scapegoating mechanisms, and also unapologetically projects a means to “crush” immigration (which he attempts to enact in horrific ways after sending out his manifesto) not just for the sake of a white man’s environmental prosperity, but to prevent a supposed white ethnic mixing (and thus a form of destruction) of his ecofascist ethnostate. He places himself in a victimized pose that reflects the frailty and guilt he gradually builds up to the point of terrorist action in manifesto form; so reflects Tarrant’s internalized and frustrated “battle” (Burke, 1939).

Upon viewing the deaths of the final event at the cemetery, Tarrant breaks down in shambles to the point where his despair becomes “shame,” and “shame to guilt... guilt to anger... and anger to rage” (p. 9). Tarrant is utterly mortified and embraces a victimage that enables him to enact distinct fascist motives in his ostensible alienation from his own military experience and political agenda. Shame, guilt, anger, and rage all coalesce into a victimage in opposition directed toward the self through mortification and the other in the form of the scapegoat. Carter (1996) reviews Burke’s (1970) concept of mortification and expands upon it with the notions of existential alienation as a moment where “death comes to be “viewed ‘personally,’ in moralistic terms colored by conditions of governance (moral order)... conceived not just as a natural process, but as a kind of ‘capital punishment’” (p.16). This capital punishment that Tarrant invokes in the form of his “shame” and “guilt” according to the manifesto, is found in the reflection of his

cynicism. Thus, a rebirthing of attitudes is required for his mortification in order to embolden and epideictically envision himself as a victim to the throes of an invasion.

Reflecting on the graveyard scene, Tarrant becomes well aware of the “unfathomable” numbers of crosses he witnessed at the cemetery, and he turns to their symbolic deaths, or “crosses,” in mortified and guilt-driven motivated drama, as he had pulled over to sob in languish. This instance where Tarrant is dramatizing his reflection as guilt bears resemblance to Carter’s (1996) notion that

Death becomes the proper “narrative-dramatic” way of saying “mortification” and is experienced by its narrators as their just dessert, that is, as their dramatically perfect final subjection. (p.17)

And Tarrant, from his “final subjection” in his travels across France, begins to find some degree of redemption in ethnogenocide in the transition from mortified death to victimage. Carter (1996) also recounts Burke in identifying a similar process:

Accordingly, death in the natural order becomes conceived as the fulfillment or completion of mortification in the sociopolitical order, but with the difference that, as with capital punishment in the sentencing of transgression against sovereignty, it is not in itself deemed wholly ‘redemptive,’ since it needs further modifications along the lines of placement in an undying Heavenly Kingdom after death. (p. 17)

The modifications that take place in Tarrant’s manifesto seek “Order, Through Guilt, To Victimage (hence: Cult of the Kill)” (Burke, 1970, pp. 4-5). This ecofascist “cult of the kill” comes from the commitments of mortification that Tarrant faces against in his own guilt and then results in a “cult of the Kill” through victimage.

Tarrant regrets not acting in terrorist ways sooner as he turns inward through his own chagrin. In turn, Tarrant’s mortification enables his corresponding/subsequent complete turn to ethnogenocide as a means to struggle in the fight against “ethnic Invaders.” Such envisioned action becomes a part of his rebirth, from shame into rage, and more portent: white hatred-fueled terrorism. In doing so, his inner struggles and dejection from lamenting lost white soldiers in the form of “white wooden crosses” (p. 9) gives way to a transformation of his inner foe as self to the materializing of an outer foe in the form of racializing Muslimness⁶ as “invader” (Tarrant). This is evident in his numerous other envisioned possible premeditated attacks in the Q&A session, where Tarrant pontificates on attacking other mosques, one in Dunedin, Linwood, and Ashburton, as “bonus objectives” to his ecofascist cause.

Far-right conspiracy also manifests in his themes of white genocide, and is echoed all throughout the entirety of the manifesto itself, in “ensuring” the existence of “our (white and European) people, and a future for white children” (p. 7). Tarrant’s scapegoat mechanism is thus also revealed before us as a means by which Tarrant calls for unification against the common foe, and in this particular case his “replacers” are those specifically of Muslim communities in prayer. Thus, Tarrant responds incorrigibly in his contempt when he questions himself on the “innocence” of those he prepares to slaughter in a horrific and nauseating spectacle through unifying Facebook audiences in broadcasting his shootings, emphasizing that there are “no innocents in an invasion,” referring to his scapegoated victims, and that “all those who colonize other peoples (*sic*)

⁶ See Kundnani’s (2015) definition of “Muslimness” in the racializing environmental justice section. Kundnani (2015) and Lentin & Titley (2011) further defines Muslimness as cultural markers that are associated with “(forms of dress, rituals, languages, etc.) to be turned into racial signifiers” (p. 69).

lands share guilt” (p. 13). His “war” begins when he admits to being “anti-immigration, anti-ethnic replacement, and anticultural replacement,” where his motives in unification admonish that the “white man still lives” and “to show the effect of direct action, lighting a path forward for those that wish to follow” (pp. 5-6). This was not intended to be an isolated incident, and the ecofascist’s concerns for the “natural order” and the “environment” are reflected in Tarrant’s white nationalist ecofascist rhetoric.

Tarrant’s means of “preservation of nature” is also quite fatalistic in his terror scheming. In accepting a death that is “worth” dying, Tarrant attempts to not “shirk” his “racial responsibilities” and thus places the onus on the adherent’s capacity to commit the same atrocities to prevent the death of his white race (pp. 18-56). In doing so, he also compels ecofascists to define their victimage through a variety of mortification tactics: 1) in the form of the monologue he has in the Q&A prolepsis, and/or 2) where Tarrant compels the audience in the fully capitalized commands or attitudes that appear in the second section at the bottom of each headered section. He questions, and asserts judgement about, those from a variety of political backgrounds and seeks to “radicalize” the “Western men” to embrace the same attitudes and causes he has come to in dispelling his inner mortification and transforming it into an impetus that compels fellow ecofascists to follow in his terrorism against Muslims in mosques.

Comparing with Burke’s “Rhetoric of Hitler’s Battle”

Burke’s (1939) “Rhetoric of Hitler’s Battle” accomplishes a great deal as a form of scrutiny against fascism and many of the same unifying devices are present in Tarrant’s manifesto. In his detailed outline of the unification devices, Burke found unification devices similar to those found in this manifesto, such as where Tarrant

beckons readers, and ecofascist adherents, to embrace the religious and humanistic aspects of “assimilation” (p. 37), but not as it is being done now, since its current form results in “decaying” and “deteriorating” white and Christian supremacist culture in order to welcome the “invader” and their “healthy” Muslim cultures. Thus, he suggests fear for his own people’s assimilation to the invading culture and in response to such cultural “failures” of assimilation, he rejects anything other than racial purity of an Aryan-like white society.

Following the grand number of battles and inner struggles with himself, Tarrant reaches a paradigm shift in terms of his conveyed attitude. Immediately stricken by the frustrations of a green fascism intertwined with the ingredients of his own victimized rhetoric, Tarrant begins to place significance on the “eventual death” and the slow decay that “we grow weaker” (Tarrant), and in doing so, begins the formulation of a projection device (Burke, 1939, p. 202). This device extends to other areas of his introduction as well, where Tarrant in his own “struggle” embraces an internalized “racial responsibility” that dates back to historical “crusades” of Christian wars fought in the name of sacrilegious bloodshed against Islam (Tarrant). Many of the religious elements of the manifesto frame Tarrant’s projection devices against Muslims in fully Islamophobic ways, contributing to a wide array of conspiratorial rants and violent rhetorics.

Given the rhetorical dimensions of violence in this manifesto, I argue that any symbolic reference to this manifesto heed cautionary advice from fellow antifascist scholars and researchers who go to great length to expose fascist rhetorics in any instance of life. Tarrant showed no remorse the crimes he committed, and his rhetoric absolutely reflects that; he wishes that he could have murdered more innocent members of the Al-

Noor Mosque (p. 12). As such, there is a real and terrorist motive that underlies his hostilities and intergenerational adaptations of the various *völkisch*, and “Hitlerite” motives for ethnogenocide that became a reality for those who died, and those who were lucky to survive harrowed and traumatized by the attacks of March 15th, 2019. This document, in its violent rhetorical form, beckons others to follow suit, including the next ecofascist subject of my criticism (Crusius, Chapter 3), and as such, I admonish that it will not be the last we see of ecofascist terrorism.

How is His Rhetoric Specifically *Eco-Fascist*?

Qualities of eco-fascism are present where Tarrant defines his far-right agenda within a militant, anti-left, and anti-immigrant rhetoric surrounding the discourses of the “environmentalist movement” (p. 38). He frames the left as being selfish and self-concerned for wanting to “co-opt” the environmental movement, and for their control over the discussion, which has also contributed to the destruction of the environment itself through the “mass immigration” and “uncontrolled urbanization” (p. 38). This is where Tarrant relentlessly reminds us of the need to “protect” and secure our borders, using a brutal logic to attack his scapegoated migrants with a great deal of cruelty, coercion, and ecofascist “environmental warfare” (p. 38). He also frames this warfare against immigrants as an act of green nationalist land preservation for his Eurocentric ecofascist society, and as a means to deter immigrants from crossing the borders safely (Klein, 2019). When he concludes that there is “no Green future,” he reduces the ethics of this crisis to sheerly a matter of environmental concern. In Tarrant’s absolute resolve towards embracing a “Green nationalism,” we begin to see the nuances of fascism in places of “greener” environmentalist concerns that are a process of removing race.

Key components of ecofascism are also present in the manifesto where Tarrant becomes incredibly hostile to any possible notion of a democracy existing in any form other than in a “white nation” and that values such a traditionalism found in environmentalism (p. 57). This also signals Tarrant being within the ecofascist category, but also has him dismissing the idea of a corporate controlled “mob rule” that is now too controlled by enemies, anyone against anything else other than the green nationalism he heralds (Protopapadakis, 2014). His resistance is also to these mob-ruled democratic societies that are industrialized: Tarrant’s Europe of the future is not of concrete and steel, smog and wires, but a place filled with forests, lakes, mountains and meadows (p. 38). This “Green nationalism” is thoroughly tied to the likes of those in the Green forms of environmentalism that capitalizes on the perfectly unpolluted society, one concerned sheerly with a survival of the fittest and most white to rule. Natural purity then becomes a part of a form of racial purity that was valued in the *völkisch* nationalism of Nazi Germany (Feshami, 2020).

Tarrant reads as an ecofascist largely because he embraces it all unapologetically, and his attitudes parallel with other fascist-like figures of the past. Claims of race-mixing and thus scapegoating a racialized Muslim other works to provide a snake-oil panacea for adherents to green nationalist movements centered around white European men. His attitudes are barbarously violent towards anything but his designated fellow ecofascist, and when he weeps for the soldiers he lost in a race war, he projects a genocidal, capital punishment agenda of his white eco-nationalist ethnostate as if it already exists in full parliamentary form. His ethnostate, as he envisions it, becomes segregated from the rest of the Muslims and other “invaders” of his future ecofascist utopia; such a vision is

undemocratic, unyielding, and unapologetic, and if it is threatened, he (and he hopes, his fellow ecofascists) are willing to kill others with mass terrorist bloodshed (even if their own lives are lost in the process).

Contributing to the “Racializing Environmental Justice 2.0” Project

A strategy to counter ecofascist rhetorics should be well aware of how it thematically appears in Tarrant’s rhetoric, and others of his twisted devotion, in arguments for protecting European lands and for “ethnic autonomy” as a means of justifying ethnogenocidal motives. Yamamoto and Lyman (2001) and Yamamoto (1995) offer an approach to “racializing environmental justice” that builds on a critical race theory perspective to interrogate systems and stereotypes of whiteness to explore how “group and subgroup identities, political and socio-economic goals, and ‘available responses’ may sometimes coincide and oftentimes differ” (Yamamoto & Lyman, 2001, p. 342; Yamamoto, 1995, p. 62). In this case, I delineate that the ecofascist white supremacy manifested and promoted by Tarrant is not only quite lethal but also violent in its framings surrounding solutions to environmental climate change and forms of environmental racism that follow.

Important elements of Tarrant’s racializing rhetoric suggest a paradoxical departure from traditional emotionless masculinity seen elsewhere in his manifesto. This is seen in a section “Emotions rule over facts” that oddly juxtaposes sentiments of that seen in far-right commentator Ben Shapiro’s “Facts Don’t Care About your feelings.” This is seemingly a departure from being boring or “placid” like Jeb Bush, as he mentions (p. 47). Here he also compels adherents to “be creative” and to use various seek popular public acclaim through “Painting writing, singing, dancing...poetry” and

“memes” (p. 47). This is also where Tarrant might encourage ecofascists to use the aesthetic forms of art, poetry, and memes to convey a need to incite further Muslim-targeted violence against environmental justice movements that aim to facilitate an ethnically diverse and community coalitional action.

Environmentalism takes a fascist turn in Tarrant’s manifesto through the recognition of his declaration for an Anglo European supremacy. Tarrant’s ecofascist extremism and white nationalist state are comprised of a monolithic grouping of white nationalist colonial attitudes that reference white people as being equal. Yamamoto and Lyman (2001) furthermore emphasize that the racializing environmental justice project’s “aim is to theoretically and practically reframe our understanding of environmental justice to better account for the experiences, needs, and goals of racial and Native communities and to generate more resonant remedial options” (p. 351). In doing so, we must challenge, resist, and reframe environmental concerns as Tarrant constructs them in his monolithic uses of white European ethnocentrism, or Eurocentrism, in the form of his ecofascist superiority complex (as revealed in the form of his ecofascist rhetoric).

When Tarrant uses racializing frames around Muslim immigration, he obsessively remarks on and admires their cultural “healthiness” and argues that his Anglo-European culture is “Decaying” from assimilation (p. 37). The manifesto responds with a need for European supremacy, within an Anglo European/Australian and Christian historic crusade as an attempt to destroy the Minarets, and the mosques of all European lands (Tarrant). This undoubtedly is a reflection of the United States political rhetoric of racializing Muslims during the continued “war on terror,” even after Obama in 2013

declared it was over. The effects of such wars on terror reveal a great deal of ongoing racialization as Lentin & Titley (2011) reflect on, as cited in Kundanai (2015):

The war on terror – with its vast death tolls in Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen, and elsewhere – could not be sustained without the racialized dehumanization of its Muslim victims...But since all racisms are socially and politically constructed rather than reliant on any biological race, it is perfectly possible for cultural markers associate with Muslimness (forms of dress, rituals, languages, etc.) to be turned into racial signifiers (Lentin & Titley 2011, p.69). This Racialization of Muslimness is analogous in important ways to anti-Semitism and inseparable from the longer history of racisms in the US and the UK. (Kundnani 2015, p.11)

In being aware of anti-Muslim and “Muslimness” rhetoric, environmental justice advocates should adopt strategies of antiracist agendas through an understanding of the historicized manifestations of radicalized Muslimness (Kundnani). It is also worth noting, as Kundnani references Sivanandan (2010), that criticism against Islamic beliefs does not necessarily mean it is racially motivated, but it does mean “opposing the social and political processes by which antipathy to Islam is acted out in violent attacks on the street or institutionalized in state structures such as profiling, violations of civil rights, and so on” (Kundnani, p. 11; Sivanandan 2010). For environmental justice group platforms, it is imperative to oust the ecofascists of Tarrant’s design in any form.

Conclusion

Tarrant’s manifesto is an exhaustive review of contemporary ecofascist thought that does not show any remorse for his targets. He is, without a doubt, unapologetic in his

racial terrorism, and does so using popular rhetorical devices of memes and humor. His own situation is one that is frightening and indicative of a fight that knows no immediate end; if given the opportunity, he would no doubt kill again and do so with the same visage of islamophobic inflection revealed within the pages of his manifesto. There is nothing redeemable about his actions or the purposive motion he compels readers to commit in his rhetoric, and the deliberate urge for him is to place any resistance he faces to be stomped under his boot. Furthermore, Tarrant calls into his situational foray fellow ecofascists to join with them in a complex, twisted, and invidious war-like front of militant environmentalism through deliberate threats to Muslim parishioners.

Tarrant’s environment is deeply concerned with the ecological aspects of climate disasters and overpopulation conspiracies. Attitudes of his own utopian ecofascist society beckon a new world that creates with it new challenges imposed by his rhetorical strategies to recreate ecofascism in this form that also aims to catalyze further mass shootings. After reviewing his three causes for inflicting ecofascist terrorism, Tarrant reintroduces new concepts of past white nationalist movements and spins them in full environmental militancy. Splitting his manifesto into three sections allows him to set an imperative to continue this so-called defensive war front against Muslim “invaders” and reflects the real number of ways we might want to consider racializing environmental justice for considering how to account for white nationalists in light of critical race theory and other forms of counter-racist activism. In particular, it is important to understand how islamophobia is reproduced and accompanies arguments in favor of environmental conservation and green nationalist motives.

CHAPTER 3: The Shooting of a Walmart in El Paso

Introduction

Though not even six months after Tarrant’s act of mass violence, the shooter whose rhetoric serves as the focus for this chapter (Patrick Crusius) was outspoken, explicit, and direct in his influence from the Christchurch shooter and much of its contents retain a focus on ecofascist agendas. The formatting and use of terms, attitudes, and motives have changed in subtle ways, and Crusius uses different forms of guilt to construct his battle against “Hispanic invaders” rather than Muslims. The ecofascism present within his manifesto is revealed through a variety of rhetorical forms of victimage, including through a defensive means of guilt, and builds upon the ecofascist rhetoric from the previous manifesto. This particular ecofascist brings to the United States his own set of venomous rhetoric in the form of a manifesto, and gives us a chance to expose and glean the textual significance of the El Paso shooter’s Americanized “battle rhetoric” to justify his deliberate murders.

Throughout, Crusius employs several additional rhetorical tactics, including an abundant use of exaggerated and overstimulated tactics to appeal to the complexities of racial thought in contemporary conservatism in the United States. When ecofascist appeals take form in emotional investments toward the country, or nation, and thus in the symbolic form of American patriotism, they do so from the perspective of our 21-year-old ecofascist, who went to great extremes based on frustrated thoughts that are not too unlike the sentiments of American anti-immigration rhetoric in the popular mass media. To expose our ecofascist in the U.S. requires some perspectivization of this marketplace in which the ecofascist attempts to gain buyers among everyday consumers by appealing

to a reductive, racializing environmentalism. Yet they are also motivationally driven in a cause to protecting sentiments, and rhetorical structures of corporate neoliberalism and the hierarchical manifestation of white supremacy in the process. What ecofascists need is your attention, just a bit of your time, and perhaps a bit of your patriotic sympathy towards their cause. What we must do in response is overturn their carts and their display tables and promote intolerance to their subscriptions to fascist, coercive bargaining, and the opportunity to do as such in resistance to any means in which they advertise their God-given American freedoms. This advert of a manifesto begins a sales pitch to American ecofascism.

Context

On August 3rd, 2019, Patrick Crusius marched into a Walmart in El Paso, Texas, killing 23 Latinx community members. Like Tarrant, Crusius just before his acts of domestic terrorism produced his manifesto in the form of a “screed,” online via 8chan, a message board website that is home to many other digital online message boards of white nationalist extremism (Arango et al., 2019). Crusius would then make his way to El Paso, where he would start his killing spree, targeting specifically Latinx shoppers at the Cielo Vista Mall (“Texas Walmart Shooting,” 2019). Crusius’s attack was also explicitly motivated, in his own words, by the attacks of Tarrant’s terror in Christchurch and would become another case in the growing rise of far-right violence internationally (“Texas Walmart Shooting”). This second case presents a perspective grounded in an extreme form of U.S. anti-immigrant rhetoric that quite terrifyingly shook the foundations of safety by means of white nationalist extremism.

Though it is in overall word and page count much shorter than Tarrant’s (only approximate four pages total) Crusius’s manifesto is no less disturbing. Just like Tarrant, there is an eco-fascist bend to the conversation without which it is impossible to understand Crusius’ presented rationale for the violence he carries out in El Paso. The very title of his manifesto appropriates Al Gore’s climate change documentary *Inconvenient Truth*, and “Highlights the far-right extremists’ budding revival of eco-fascism” (Kaufman, 2019). This aspect of Crusius’s manifesto was but one of the many stories about Crusius, his manifesto, and/or his act of mass violence itself that appeared in popular news outlets such as *Politico* in the hours, days, and weeks after August 3rd. Lenard (2019) adds that Crusius’s manifesto “abounds with Trumpian racist nationalism.” Such rhetorical sentiments are evident in Trump’s framing of migrant refugees as “bad hombres” and his cavalier sloganizing of a “build-a-wall” campaign, that then spurred forth a slew of hate crimes and xenophobic rhetoric against Latinx communities, which also became popularized and made normal in the realm of mainstream politics (Fang, 2017). As discussed in the last section of this chapter, there is a great deal of this mainstream racism that is accepted and scoffed at by ecofascist and white nationalist extremists, who invoke only the most murderous and lethally racist solutions to their dedicated cause for, in Crusius’s case, “preservation.”

Furthermore, Crusius’s manifesto rhetoric exhorts a great deal of white nationalist terrorism, makes use of extreme forms of conspiracies around population overgrowth, race-mixing, resource scarcity, and frames his migrant targets as “polluters” (2019, p. 4). In addition to the many lines of analysis put forth by journalists and pundits alike, as indicated above, there was also a discussion about whether focusing on Crusius gave him

more attention and/or his cause more support. After the shooting at the El Paso Walmart, some journalists noted important attempts to not give Crusius the attention needed to garner more support given the abundance of racialized institutions of the U.S. (as seen in the police, prison systems, ICE concentration camps, and even the organizations of white nationalism in general). However, as Carrasquillo (2019) notes:

the media’s desire to erase the shooter and his ideology ended up erasing his victims and their community, too. While the news media successfully portrayed this shooting as part of a national epidemic of mass killings, we failed to accurately convey how this one was different. The visceral emotions of the Latinos I spoke with should have been—and should still be—front and center.

Carrasquillo (2019) draws into context the importance of such attacks stemming from discourses of political leaders beyond Trump that, in turn, manifest in shootings that are a culmination of anti-immigration rhetoric that has indeed “become only louder, emboldened and unchecked by American leaders” and that the lives that were taken had been “targeted, not by someone pledging themselves to ISIS, but to white supremacy.”

Many of the responses of members of the community were quite upsetting and often gut wrenchingly difficult to read, but there is a raw power in these Latinx community responses that bring forth new perspectives against the hate of the attacks: “there is fear, but people are also resolute that things will get better... they still stand in defiance of those who would instill fear” (Carrasquillo). The survivor’s responses may portend a more hopeful future in community collectivization, attitudinal rejuvenation, and solidarity against white supremacists who terrorize through ecofascist rhetoric. In

accordance, we should all seek to aid groups who may become targets when ecofascist threats are present in our own communities. As someone who has developed particular knowledge and skills in the deployment of advocacy, by means of communication and rhetoric, the best way that I can offer such aid is through the careful and systematic interpretive engagement with texts that require our sustained attention.

Literature Review

Scholarship on Crusius’ manifesto itself is virtually nonexistent in communication studies scholarship. Broadening the search to other disciplines revealed a number of results relating to Crusius and his attack. Quek (2019), writing from an international affairs perspective, reports that “The El Paso attack is the third mass shooting in 2019 within the US, linked to the online forum 8chan and one of several recent attacks committed by individuals to credit the Christchurch attack as an inspiration” (p. 3). Gimse (2020) reviews the identities used by Crusius and other U.S. white nationalist attackers, noting that “Many of the authors are driven by self-entitlement and a sense of white superiority, and their language serves to describe themselves as martyrs and present their victims as the real aggressors” (p. 4). Walton (2020) noted that Crusius’s manifesto “repeats and reinforces language and worldviews present in public discourse, especially in discourse from white nationalists,” and utilizes a meta-narrative of apocalyptic frames (p. 3). Lavin (2020) adds that the ideas of Crusius (and Tarrant) “are drawn straight from decades of national-socialist rhetoric” (p. 200). Crusius carried out his attack months after Tarrant’s Christchurch attack and there are important overlaps in their motives that are worth noting.

In terms of Crusius’s connection to studies on ecofascism, Newton (2020) discusses connections that Crusius has to the theories of Paul Ehrlich’s (1968) *Population Bomb*. Commenting on an interview with Ehrlich, who argued that his book was intended to “make population control ‘acceptable’ as ‘a topic of debate,’” Mann (2018) responds, “But the book did far more than that. It gave a huge jolt to the nascent environmental movement and fueled an anti-population-growth crusade that led to human rights abuses around the world.” Newton (2020) adds that “Crusius’ manifesto is dedicated to theories originally founded by Eirich (*sic*)⁷, discussing demographic shift and overpopulation.” As Newton suggests, regardless of Ehrlich’s intent, figures like Crusius demonstrate that these appeals to eco-scarcity can easily be appropriated to serve deeply violent and dangerous agendas. This focus on overpopulation is utilized with great scapegoating appeal in Crusius’s anti-immigrant rhetoric. The attack against “Hispanics” as Crusius uses the term reaffirms the colonial contexts to which the term racializes Hispanics to the American revisions to Chicanx, Mestizx and Latinx identities.⁸ Using this term appeals to more conservative, or settler colonial-affirming, audiences of the manifesto, and this seems apparent through deeper analysis of Crusius’s manifesto. The ecofascist “invading” frames of rhetoric that Tarrant in the last chapter had utilized appear to have explicitly influenced Crusius to commit to the same frame and the murders in El Paso.

Furthermore, his ecofascist rhetoric “finds its origins in progressive era linking of environmental preservation” (Lenard, 2019), and Tucker (2019) adds that Madison Grant

⁷ The Newton (2020) article misspells “Eirich,” when intending to refer to Paul R. Ehrlich, author of the *Population Bomb*, discussed above.

⁸ I use Latin(x) throughout the chapter, but I also want to recognize the significance of the Chican(x) and Mestiz(x) peoples who also take up anti-European and anti-American colonial stances in their ethnic identity, and who unfortunately may have died in Crusius murderous shootings.

(1865-1937) contributed to a “preservationist outlook on natural resources.” A wide range of pre-existing sentiments are ready-made and available from and for these far-right conservative thinkers. Even more problematic are the international alt-right extremists that appear to be embraced even in France:

Marine Le Pen of France’s far-right National Rally party promised to make the “first ecological civilization” of a “Europe of nations,” claiming that “nomadic” people with “no homeland” do not care about the environment. Neo-Nazi Richard Spencer wrote in a 2017 manifesto, “We have the potential to become nature’s steward or its destroyer.” (Lenard, 2019)

These concepts around nation and place are addressed by Yusoff (2017), who examines how colonial America’s epistemic geologies and geologic order use extractive economies of the past to render enslaved African Americans and indigenous people as laborers through anti-black/indigenous in material histories of the United States. These concepts of antiblack and indigenous histories through America’s grammar of geology created a “racializing of matter” through “the organization and categorization of matter” in black and brown bodies (Yusoff, p. 82). Marx et al. (1867/1990) reflected regarding American slavery that “capital comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt” (Marx et al., 1867/1990, p. 926). Harvey (2007) also reviews the ways in which neoliberalism in the U.S. has reinforced the Protestant work ethic that reinforces a conservative value of labor in Crusius’s manifesto.

How does Crusius Reference Tarrant?

As mentioned earlier, Crusius references Tarrant in his manifesto, and in fact, it is the very first thing he writes about in any substantial way in his “about me” section at the

very beginning (p. 1). Under a section about himself, he “In general” supported the “Christchurch shooter and his manifesto,” since Crusius also sees his invaders as a clear threat requiring a defensive response, and thus as a justification for his vile actions (p. 1). He states bluntly that “Hispanics” “are the instigators, not me,” which serves not only as an homage to Tarrant’s multi-purposed adamant stance for defending his country/climate from “invaders,” but as a means to his ecofascist ends. Crusius is deeply concerned with the environment and “preservation” (p. 4), and this stance is one that is hyper defensive of his white “American” nation and the environment within its borders.

Crusius also symbolically aligns his ecofascist Anglo American views with the genocide of indigenous communities, in a similar way that Tarrant aligns his views with indigenous Europeans being “replaced.” This is evident in Crusius’s manifesto in terms of his attacks on “Cultural racial diversity” (p. 4). But somehow, Crusius argues that, because the Native Americans “didn’t takes the invasion of Europeans seriously,” there is an “invasion” that is worth “attacking” that he defines as “being not at all personal” (p. 1). In this case there is a cooptation of legitimate racial anti-colonial sentiments by Crusius, who subscribes fully to a white ecofascist identity, when he describes himself as facing similar levels of settler colonial ethno-genocide. Not only is this beyond absurd, but this narrative that Crusius (as well as Tarrant and the next chapter’s subject) invokes ultimately reaffirms the conspiracies of their defensive racializing rhetorical schemes and projects outward an extreme, punitive set of logics in the form of the violence that they use in their choice of terms. Tarrant could not entirely form his rationale for ecofascist terror if there was not already a strong perceived militancy from the “invader” in his rhetorical situation (Bitzer, 1968).

This form of classism, including that his is a defensive response to the supposed invasion, is also shaped in a similar form to Tarrant’s ecofascist appeals, especially where Crusius justifies his horrific attacks on Latinx communities and scoffs: “it’s not cowardly to pick low hanging fruit” (in reference to the Latinx community of El Paso and his premeditated murders at Walmart) (p. 4). He sees “invasive Hispanics” as being a problem since there are a great many of them, but he references as low hanging fruit his easy chosen targets as part of a battle for what he might call a longer race war. He knows he cannot kill all Latinx peoples so he settles for tactics of terror, fear, and trauma. He invokes the same attitudes that Tarrant seeks to compel in his audiences: “An ounce of prevention (against replacement) is worth a pound of cure” in psychopathically killing the children of Muslim communities (Tarrant, 2019, p. 53) Crusius also reaffirms Tarrant when he admits that those communities collectively comprising the “ethnic replacement” (p. 1) are to be treated as threats, echoing what many other white nationalists, and neofascist/alt-right supporters, argue, as I will explore further in the last section of this chapter.

Introducing the Manifesto

On first glance, Crusius’ manifesto is seemingly short, simple, and something a normal 21-year-old college student perhaps would have written in terms of length and word structure. His manifesto is also written in a more serious tone, and he drones on at length in his anti-Hispanic agenda with the same repetitive political/economic critique even outside of their respective headered structures. Crusius spends a great deal of time referencing his politics, personal, and economic reasons, but he does not do much to keep these sections from blending into an overall singular rant that contains elements of all

three (plus his ecofascist ideas) throughout the entirety of his manifesto. Crusius’s disorganization seems more like a drafted manuscript in this regard. Spanning roughly four pages, with approximately 2300 words, it also contains sections that vary in length, addressing topics such as his perspectives and the gear he used in the attack. After his initial “about me,” these sections include a variety of stances he takes on specifically “Political” and “Economic Reasons” (Crusius, pp. 1-2). Here, he introduces himself as “defending his country” and begins to transition to his other reasoning.

The rest of the manifesto is also structured with a “Reaction” section where Crusius details what he believes will “incentivize” Hispanic communities and refugees to return home to their countries after his attack (p. 3). The last section, then, is where he details his “Personal Reasons and Thoughts,” and he begins the section by directly contradicting exactly what he had said at the beginning when he stated that he had not carried out his terror for personal reasons. The manifesto is disorganized and the scatterings of his ideas seem to take form in hectic writing styles and spelling errors. Beyond his disorganized and contradictory statements, Crusius creates his own violent agenda to scope out and create his ideal formulative “reasons” to subscribe to ecofascism in the form of Hispanophobia.

What is His Purpose?

As the title of his manifesto suggests, Crusius’ “inconvenience” revolves around a notion that “our leaders... have been failing us for decades” (p. 1). He openly affirms the rhetoric seen in Tarrant’s ecofascist manifesto, and in doing so, spins his own American retelling of the Christchurch manifesto in fully Americanized, nationalistic frames of “patriotism” (p. 4) and of the racially segregated “American Confederacy” (p. 4). He

advocates the latter as a way to prevent what he calls a “rotting from the inside out” of America’s government due to a takeover by way of a multipronged attack of select anti-white corporations that employ “low skilled” wage positions to frame immigration as being “detrimental to the future of America” (p. 1). Crusius enunciates a clear American chauvinist attitude for this politically-oriented rhetoric of concern for the ecofascist state.

His understanding of these aforementioned “jobs” influence how he frames and views “labor” as a salient issue within contemporary American economics. His sentiments are neoconservative and embody a right-wing aesthetic that focuses on labor as it benefits corporations in his white ecofascist-envisioned society. As situated in relation to his ecofascist utopia, he argues that the time for any peaceful means to stop this “invasion” against skilled labor pools has passed. Crusius laments the old conservative fears of “joblessness” (p. 2). He views the growing “automation” of factory jobs and “unskilled labor” as “Jobs that Americans can’t survive on anyway,” so he demands that American corporations “need to keep replenishing the labor pool for both skilled and unskilled jobs to keep wages down” (p. 2). Crusius’ apparent concern for labor is betrayed by his support for a nationalism that is conducive only to an authoritarian class-based system where there is still a strict delineation between unskilled and skilled labor. Such tensions situate his iteration of this American political conversation within the frustrations of his own political embattlement.

Audience Analysis

Crusius largely depends on an audience that is “American” and white. His conspiracies around race mixing and Tarrant’s “replacement” are tied to many variations of alt-right extremism. Since a majority of his manifesto appears to embrace a right-wing

populist agenda on the jobs market, it is arguable that Crusius’s manifesto appeals also to the white blue-collar workers who pledge allegiance to neoconservative attitudes on anti-immigration. These views offer idyllic oversimplifications of neoliberal era reforms, austere work ethics, and political agendas which are combined to suggest that “If conditions among the lower class deteriorated it was because they failed for personal and cultural reasons to enhance their own human capital through education, the acquisition of protestant work ethic, and submission to work discipline and flexibility” (Harvey, 2007, p. 34). Crusius’s own neoliberal framing of corporate needs in the form of “skilled” vs “unskilled labor” works within the popular political frames of private interests and politicians that support this form of austere neoliberal expropriation of labor through “skilled” or “unskilled” value (Harvey, 2007). Crusius’ neoliberal appeals to contemporary conservatism situate his “inconvenient truth,” as he argues that “Hispanic migrants” move to America as “economic immigrants, not for asylum reasons” (p. 3).

Causes of the Crisis

The preceding diagnosis makes the “rotting” of Crusius’s American dream from the inside out all the more evident. In framing Hispanic “migrants” as “invaders” and as “immigrants,” Crusius taps into the widespread political crisis wherein many Republican and Democratic politicians use anti-immigration tactics and rhetorics in order to represent himself as “simply defending my country.” He continues in this way, attempting to make the case all the more evident when he emphasizes “My motives for this attack are not at all personal” (p. 2). This works both as a form of victimage (as I will return to later) and as a response to the crisis of the “Hispanic Invasion of Texas” (p. 1). Other elements from this perceived invasion of society that Crusius responds to is the notion of

“inaction” against which he compels fellow ecofascist adherents to take up arms and follow the crusade that also beckoned Tarrant. The overpopulation conspiracy entails that it is the fault of the Hispanic invader who is somehow responsible for all of the “unnecessary plastic waste” and the “overharvesting” of the corporate/consumer systems they support, going so far as to cite *The Lorax* to build some connection to the environment that only he and his “fellow” ecofascists can share.

How is this Crisis Framed as Specifically Environmental/Ecological?

As noted in the literature review, frames of “preservation” are repeated throughout the manifesto, including that he is preventing an ultimate “collapse” (p. 4). Crusius uses the terms “territory” and “country” to envision the site in which his ecofascist confederacy will take form and situates the “American lifestyle” as being synonymous with the environment of the ecofascist’s “country” (p. 2). He also cares explicitly about “preservation” and the actions to prevent plastic waste and watershed pollution, and to even embrace “recycling” to give some appeals to incorporate environmentally conscious far right preservationists to his cause (p. 2). Finally, the indelible ties to the environment appear in his critique of the “American lifestyle” that “affords our citizens incredible quality of life” (p. 2). Crusius attempts to pull environmentalists into the conversation with the corporations that are heading to the destruction of our environment” from “oil drilling operations,” “consumer culture,” and the “trees worth of paper towels,” even citing Dr. Seuss’s “brilliantly portrayed” environmental criticism of corporate cultures in *The Lorax* as inspiration (p. 2). In citing *The Lorax* himself, who fights the business leading “once-lers” who perpetuate consumer

cultures, Crusius blames corporations to a degree only in that they support his migrant enemies more than the people of his own Anglo-ecofascist society.

Rhetorics of Victimage

Crusius (2019) starts with the scapegoating of Hispanic “invaders” in that he is “simply defending” his “country from cultural and ethnic replacement brought on by an invasion.” By scapegoating “Hispanics” and their “invasion,” Crusius writes himself off from any blame in his stance, and in doing so, the guilt he personalizes within himself here takes a brief form of performative mortification that acts as a defensive mechanism against critics who would attempt to poke holes in his argument. This is evident where he takes not only “faultless” ecofascist stances against the Latinx community members of El Paso, but also can be found where he justifies his murders through rejecting Latinx communities in his anti-“race mixing” conspiracies (Crusius). He then deflects his initial scapegoating mechanism to make out his attacks as being “not at all personal” by the end of the very first paragraph. This becomes a brief form of apologia and victimage through mortification leading up to his more intense, second form of mortification that appears more explicitly, entitled in a section for his own “personal reasons.” Crusius writes quite thoroughly in shades and transitions of mortification that accelerates his castigation, his scapegoating of Latin(x) migrants, first in exclaiming them as “instigators” and then mixing in environmental issues of the physical pollutants which utterly helps him dehumanize his “invaders” in the processes.

Imbricated in-between internalized and externalized features of his victimage, Crusius attempts to open up business for his snake-oil offers. There, he sells us the ideas that there are indeed personal reasons that motivate his cause after all, but these causes

are for “economic” reasons (Crusius, pp. 1-4). He spends a great deal of time writing all about the negative, “wasteful,” and “unwilling” nature of the American people, its government, and the corporations who aid in the destruction of the environment. His platitude and offer for a sale approaches the potential buyers of his ecofascism with a moment of love for them, an appreciation for considering his hate as a possible solution, and then a jarring shift in attitude toward eco-conscious ethnocide (p. 2). Perhaps this was also done strategically to appeal to Trump-supporting neofascist conservatives and/or the everyday “American dream” abiding American workers, as he has referenced in a disorganized manner throughout, and at the very least appeals to the most conservative buyers of the Trump campaign. There is also the erratic structure of the manifesto itself, in the form of his emotional guilt-ridden appeals to people who are quite conflicted, or who might second-guess the lack of content in the ecofascist concoctions they might hold in hand inspecting before they imbibe it. It is a tactic of rhetorical overstimulation that inflates, exaggerates, laments, and adores, and there is only a raucous of thought.

Crusius fluxes in and out of scapegoating and mortification. He attempts to persuade readers and ecofascists to uphold his cause because he alleviates them as being “fellow patriots” on the terms of skin color and race in one moment, and then falls. This volatile victimage takes place between the internalized and externalized framing of his guilt in which he, at the very end, in his final stand, and in his last remarks, before his shootings at El Paso, emphasizes: “I can no longer bear the shame of inaction knowing that our founding fathers have endowed me with the rights needed to save our country from the brink destruction” (Crusius, p. 3). If Crusius is attempting to employ some

persuasive effort to gain the support from even the most patriotic of Americans, then he has to some degree successfully done so in his choice of words and expression for discontent towards migrants. The issues at hand, though, are far more lethal when his volatile mortification becomes an outburst in invoking the “founding fathers,” and in beating immigrant “invaders” with the baton of American chauvinism (or in his case, an AK-47). He uses fear to great degree in this coercive set of threats, both in his own internalized fear of inaction, and in the weaponization of fear that he uses to scapegoat “Hispanics” as a means of control through terror (Crusius). In the process, his attempted form of internalized victimage through mortification had appeared just below the surface in his conveyed motives, and, if only for a brief moment, worked to galvanize and appeal to his fellow ecofascist American patriots. He then alleviates this internal guilt through the violent acts of not only his anti-immigrant terrorism, but also as he describes, and if for a moment escapes in the detail of the “Gear” he used to materialize this terror, in rhetorical form the use of threats through his 2nd amendment “rights needed to save his country” (Crusius).

How is His Rhetoric Specifically *Eco-Fascist*?

Crusius’s ecofascism, as mentioned in Newton (2020), takes form in the conspiracy of overpopulation, and there is indeed an overwhelming ambience of his concerns for the physical, ecological environment as being the primary motive for his murders in El Paso. He envisions a war that is required to “repel the millions of invaders” that “plaque” (*sic*) (plague?) his fellow white nationalist European “comrades” (pp. 3-4). Economically speaking, Crusius’ concern for the “environment” repetitively invokes an argument that favors environmental “preservation” through the corporate

sympathetic means of capitalism. He seeks to distinguish between two types of corporate interests and thus calls out the corporations that “also like immigration because more people mean a bigger market for their products” (p. 2). Thus, Crusius begins to explain his transition into the greener side of whites-only corporate America, accomplished through racial segregation and spontaneous acts of coercion through racial terrorism. Like previous appeals to less extreme audiences, Crusius invokes Dr. Seuss’s *The Lorax* as another reference to environmental concerns on “Water sheds around the country, especially agricultural areas” and the pollution of fresh water from “oil drilling operations” (p. 2). His ecofascist agenda incorporates one of America’s memorable children storywriters of the 20th century.

Invoking Dr. Seuss gives him some connective artifact that broader audiences can relate to when Crusius gathers his rhetorical description of environmental pollution (in the form of electronics and plastics as Crusius mentions). His reference to the Lorax’s protests takes into consideration what Crusius discusses in his views of the lifestyles of Once-ler-like businessmen from the “urban sprawl” and “Inefficient cities” that he expresses in shared grievances with other ecofascist Americans (or fellow Lorax) as being “inconvenienced” by “Hispanic” plague and their supposed economic Once-lerisms (Crusius). Crusius remarks: “I just want to say that I love the (white) people of this country, but god damn most of y’all are just too stubborn to change your lifestyle,” and in his deep-seated exasperation, he comes full circle, back to his ecofascist agenda: “So the next logical step is to decrease the number of people in America using resources. If we can get rid of enough people, then our way of life can become more sustainable” (p. 2). Crusius demands the bloodshed of his ethnic “Hispanic invaders” as imperative to

achieving climate sustainability and the preservation of natural resources in order to prevent the destruction of the country. Thus, he wrote his *Inconvenient Truth*, and instead of defending the trees, he defended his white nationalist ecofascist needs.

Comparing with Burke’s “Rhetoric of Hitler’s Battle”

Crusius states an explicit environmental reasoning for his own terrorism, which to a degree affirms Burke’s “noneconomic interpretation of a phenomenon economically engendered” category of argument (1939). However, Crusius’s struggle is rhetorically built up in the “Personal Reason and Thoughts” section, where he starts out with “My whole life I have been preparing for a future that doesn’t exist,” where he catastrophizes the “invasion” as the reason that “the job of my dreams will likely be automated. Hispanics will take control of local and state government of my beloved Texas, changing policy to better suit their needs” (Crusius, p.3). Thus their “control” over Texas creates an exigences where he urges every reader to “remember this: INACTION IS A CHOICE,” once again emphasizing of imperilment of white people and “our European comrades” (pp. 3-4). Lastly, there is the tie to nationalism and the environment, as he describes America being destroyed from the “inside out,” and he immunizes his actions of terrorism as “faultless... Because this isn’t an act of imperialism but an act of preservation” (p. 4). His use of apologia indicates that he wants the readers to take use of the snake oils in a tonic that steels his fellow ecofascist into battle and in sacrifice.

Other incidents of Crusius’s concern for environmental degradation appear in a paragraph on “race mixing” eugenics of wanting to turn America into a “confederacy of territories with at least 1 territory for each race” (Crusius, p. 4). The reason for constructing such an abomination of segregated nation states stems from the very same

desire for a “social unity by granting each race self-determination within their respective territory(s)” (p. 4). Hitler’s desire for social unity is applied to the damage that would bring about a eugenic paradise to stop the perceived “alienation” of the white race by “invading cultures” that “overtake weaker and/or undesirable ones” (Crusius, p. 4). Here Crusius compels us to create a “unity” that, as Burke also argues, functions as the “worldview” of ecofascist confederacy that relies on the “basic Nazi trick” of the “‘curative’ unifications by a fictitious devil-function” (1939, pp. 218- 219).

Crusius argues that the “Hispanic invasion” of Texas results from Hispanics being the “instigators” to frame a common enemy through his own projection device, in order to own his irrational ideation of an “Hispanic invasion of Texas” (Crusius, 2019). This rhetoric of the invading, and as he presents, voiceless enemy is an extreme view of xenophobia that places anyone outside of the American white patriot as being part of the larger “inconvenient truth” of “the takeover of the United States government by unchecked corporations” (p. 1). Make no mistake, Crusius is no Marxist, or anti-capitalist; he struggles with the “invaders” and finds some form of symbolic rebirth in ecofascist white supremacy as he “fights for America and Europe” (p. 5). Burke (1939) found that there was a “lure” that derived from the “bad filling of a good need,” and this concept should not be undermined in the very intentional threats that white nationalist supremacy poses with a “good need” that only applies to Anglo-European whites (p. 218).

Contributing to the “Racializing Environmental Justice 2.0 Project”

Crusius’s case presents a frustrated and monotonous approach to a more serious-toned concern around the environment. Crusius scapegoats “Hispanics” as once again

“invaders” in a way that links the work of the previous ecofascist (Tarrant) to United States White-Anglo-American extremism. This is an “American” form of extremism given how he loves “the people of this country,” and that to him in regard to ecofascist action, “the next logical step is to decrease the number of people in America using resources” (Crusius, 2019, p. 2). He then comes to the conclusion and judgement that his scapegoated “Hispanics” come to the U.S. as “economic immigrants, not for asylum reasons” (p. 3). This reflects much of the extremism that was brought into focus during the Trump presidency, as Lavin (2020) finds:

Trump’s extremist rhetoric, embrace of violence, and propensity to engage in public racism... led white supremacists to hope for the first time in most of their lifetimes, that they might see a government ready to purge the country of nonwhite people and create the white ethnostate they dreamed of. (p. 58).

Crusius links these extremist dedications to the cause of white ethnic environmental “preservation” because he situates his own actions as “faultless” in the process of relieving himself of the internal victimage and projecting it outward toward his victims (p. 4).

The ties between far-right and alt-right extremism in the case of decentralized ecofascist movements seems to stem from a wide array of these casual xenophobic and everyday remarks of conservative politicians. Such was the case in the 2018 midterm elections where “the specter of ‘caravan’ of migrant snaking its way up from Central America was the chief subject on which he [Trump] campaigned” (Lavin, 2020, p. 3). In Crusius’s manifesto, anti-immigrant frames are found constantly throughout his conspiratorial rantings, reflecting the far-right’s frustration with more “moderate” forms

of right-wing conservatism in the U.S. Crusius seems to espouse his frustrations with GOP Republicans in a manner similar to that found in the sentiments of Brad Griffin, self-identifying white nationalist and member of the League of the South, who argued in a blog that the “GOP under Trump is somehow . . . campaigning on White Nationalism but governing on mainstream conservatism.” These far-right extremists are not willing to settle for anything outside of their ethnostate, be it for environmental reasons or otherwise.

Other sentiments of the normalization of mainstream far-right rhetoric appear in other studies. The control of co-opted ideas from the national stage perhaps then should help us grasp the significance of Crusius and the extremists who would follow the actions of Tarrant and Crusius. Quek (2019), reporting on Crusius, reflects as such:

Over the last decade, the far-right movement has increasingly shifted from the periphery and adopted a transnational identity primarily based on racial and nationalistic ideals. The movement has also succeeded to some extent in co-opting debates around immigration and globalisation [sic] that dominate current mainstream political discourse. (p. 4)

These developments will have pernicious effects on societies, emboldening those who subscribe to extremist views, while desensitizing the general public to hate speech and the violent acts that ensue from such rhetoric:

This has led to a normalisation of far-right language and political lexicons, wherein far right ideas widely rejected as repugnant in the past, have dominated mainstream. discussions on issues such as immigration and societal culture. These developments will have pernicious effects on societies, emboldening those who

subscribe to extremist views, while desensitising the general public to hate speech and the violent acts that ensue from such rhetoric (Quek, 2019, p.4).

This is where Crusius also anticipates his own mainstream media coverage, and makes the argument that his ideology and opinions “predate Trump and his campaign for president” (p. 4). This normalization of the far/alt-right presents another challenge to addressing ecofascists in the everyday political lexicon.

To add to the severity of these threats, ecofascists attempt to transform the appeals of their rhetoric to a more western fascist version of national socialism.

Unconventionally, Crusius seeks to blame certain sectors of neoliberal capitalism that produce needs for unskilled labor and, as Tarrant argues, “climb as far up the power hierarchy as possible” (p. 44). Where Crusius seems to embrace this form of austerity is by supporting the claimed need to “decrease the number of people in America using resources,” and in doing so, make “our (white, American and Europeans) way of life become more sustainable” (p. 2). Essentially, Crusius seeks a contradictory goal: White unification through the destruction of corporations, and a consumer culture of “Aryan Love” as Burke discovers it in Hitler’s nationalism (1939, p. 199). After all, Crusius could not bring himself to kill his “fellow Americans,” despite their own contributions to the reduction in availability of skilled jobs and the destruction of the environment (p. 4).

Like Tarrant, Crusius is adamantly defensive of the American/European ethno-state citizens who would comprise his envisioned ecofascist ethnic-autonomous society, as if the origins of current American capitalism were largely unaffected by centuries of chattel enslaved laborers from the Trans-Atlantic slave trade. Yusoff (2017) remarks on this legacy of slave plantation developments in the geographies of America’s settler

colonialism: “the financial benefits of ending slavery reshaped the world to provide the material preconditions for the Industrial revolution and the metamorphosis of capitalist forms” and the “racial circumscription of slavery predates and prepares the material ground for Europe and the Americas in terms of both nation and empire building-and continues to sustain it” (pp. 42-43). In depicting this empire that Crusius would have us patriotically aid, he offers a revised history of America’s colonial past, framing his terrorist actions not as an “act of imperialism” but instead as a form of environmental and nationalist “preservation” (p. 4). Crusius insists that readers (and ecofascist followers) are under attack, but seeks to scapegoat the “Hispanic invaders” in order to re-situate a whole new white settler colonial capitalist state.

Environmental justice groups, then, must be aware of the significant mainstream use of anti-immigration rhetoric which frustrates Crusius and leads him to politically attack both Democrats and Republicans as being not committed enough, and in doing so, frames them as being responsible for the “rotting from the inside out” of America (p. 1). It was only as early in the late 1990s, according to Yamamoto & Lyman (2001), that an African American staff attorney of the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund (LDF), Veronica Eady, had charged the group with “not putting enough emphasis on the environmental problems of minority communities” (p. 349). The Sierra Club also problematically considered a proposal in to reduce U.S. immigration from 900,000 a year to around 200,000, pitting environmental platforms against immigrants as being at fault for environmental issues. Specifically, advocates for this proposal within the Sierra Club had focused on the same issue that served as a perpetual source of Crusius’s ecofascist fixation (population growth), and these advocates maintained that such a vote against

immigration would prevent “population growth” as being the “source of environmental problems in America...”—that is, their solution was to “[c]ut off the immigrants,” many of whom were Latinx and Asian American (Yamamoto & Lyman, 2001). Ultimately, when this proposal was voted on by the full Sierra Club membership, it was rejected, and similar attempts from within the organization have since been defeated (Hopkins, 2018).

In terms of academic influence in the United States regarding ecofascism, in the mid 20th century, University of California Garrett Hardin was a prominent scholar of political science. As Mildenerger (2019) notes, Hardin continues to be cited widely across a large number of academic studies (with over 40,000 citations) and is still being published, and adds:

People who revisit Hardin’s original essay are in for a surprise. Its six pages are filled with fear-mongering. Subheadings proclaim that “freedom to breed is intolerable.” It opines at length about the benefits if “children of improvident parents starve to death.” A few paragraphs later Hardin writes: “If we love the truth we must openly deny the validity of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” Hardin practically calls for a fascist state to snuff out unwanted gene pools.

Furthermore, Hardin’s advocacy may have served as part of the foundation for sentiments of anti-immigration terrorism in the United States, as rhetorically used by the last president:

Or build a wall to keep immigrants out. Hardin was a virulent nativist whose ideas inspired some of today’s ugliest anti-immigrant sentiment. He believed that only racially homogenous societies could survive. He was also involved with the

Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), a hate group that now cheers President Trump’s racist policies. Today, American neo-Nazis cite Hardin’s theories to justify racial violence. (Mildenberger, 2019)

The extent to which Hardin sows fear in terms of ecofascist and nativist sentiments will be explored further in chapter 5, but he was among the most prominent of ecofascist thinkers in higher education. Environmental justice groups, then, must be wary of experts who may form organizations that carry the legacies of Hardin’s rhetoric.

Conclusion

Crusius presents himself as defiant and stoically willing to carry out ecofascist terrorism with an unyielding, coercive application of racial terror in the form of extremist attacks. Like Tarrant in New Zealand, Crusius see himself as an Atlas who holds the entirety of ecological well-being of white American capitalism upon his shoulders. He carries the burdens with him to lead the ecofascist adherents to a new “confederacy of territories” (p. 4) to fight and defend against race-mixing and to collectively recreate borders for an ecofascist (White Anglo-American only) society. Environmental justice movements in the United States should be wary of any apparently pro-environmental advocacy that utilizes or depends upon threats that manifest against Latinx communities (as well as communities that are deemed Other by the Crusiuses of the world). Tarrant went extremely far out of his way to murder his victims, and the spontaneity of hate crimes like his against unsuspecting communities seems jarring, but environmental justice groups need to be aware of the more subtle ways in which ecofascism frames environmental appeals, rather than focusing only on those most visceral, visible final acts

of terrorism. Being attentive in this way allows us to expose anti-immigration rhetorics in any setting or platform.

CHAPTER 4: Ecofascists in 2083

Introduction

Ecofascism as explored in this thesis has thus far encompassed a variety of rhetorical tactics to envision and attempt to achieve a form of ecofascist collectivization. This form of collectivization, however, is made quite difficult given the way that communication across digital platforms allows for decentralized movements, such as the ecofascists in question, that posit themselves as embarking on some higher purpose aimed at protecting their land, country, children, and families from those who are neither white Anglo Americans nor white Europeans. This cause for terrorism has been perpetuated by these ecofascist motivated-extremists. These ecofascists situate themselves as resisting such “replacement” and “invasion” and draw upon contemporary influences from extremism in alt-right/ far-right circles of conspiracy. There is no doubt this ecofascist ideology played a substantial role in influencing the manifestos in the previous two chapters, and this chapter’s manifesto also aims to create adherents to an ecologically-concerned fascism.

This chapter explores the works of an ecofascist who went to extreme lengths to target readers/audiences who sharply opposed ecofascism and deeply rooted white nationalist attitudes. These included progressive politicians and labor party members of the left, “cultural Marxists,” political correctness, and multiculturalism. His actions led to one of the most significant acts of domestic terrorism in Norway’s history, and with this terror, he compelled many of his accomplices to follow his lead into an idyllic and ecofascist vision of 2083. He creates a “compendium” to organize a wide array of instructions (both in terms of rhetorical strategy and in guiding supports toward their own

acts of premeditated shootings in the future) that took the lives of many in Norway. In analyzing the various interlocking components of his ecofascist victimage, which collectively situate and frame his cause for enacting his extremist terror, I aim to expose the final ecofascist in question for his use of rhetorical strategies to further sell his ecofascist concoctions.

Context

On July 22nd, 2011, Anders Behring Breivik was responsible for two horrific instances of ecofascist terrorism. Breivik began his murderous spree by detonating a fertilizer bomb rigged inside a van in downtown Oslo, where he then hours later posed as a police officer and began to shoot members of the Workers Youth League (AUF), killing sixty-nine members of the summer camp of the Labor Party in Utøya (Lewis & Lyall, 2012). Just ninety minutes before the shootings took place, Breivik sent his manifesto to two-hundred and fifty British contacts and a total of 1003 email addresses (Taylor, 2011). Among the recipients were other anti-Muslim parties such as Vlaams-Belang. Breivik also attached his manifesto to a Youtube video titled “Western Europe patriot” under the handle Anders “Brewick” and wrote “It is a gift to you ... I ask you to distribute it to everyone you know” (Taylor). His actions that followed that same day led to the death of seventy-one people and the injury of over three-hundred others.

The media coverage of Breivik’s attacks that day were also quick to shore up the situation by way of their own racial biases. Press release statements covering the event immediately afterward responded to the attacks before Breivik’s identity had been released, and Kundnani (2015) found that statements from the *Wall Street Journal* in response to Breivik’s initial attack had framed Muslims as being responsible:

the *Wall Street Journal* went on press while the identity of the perpetrator was still unknown. On the presumption that only a Muslim could be responsible, the newspapers editorial claimed that Norway had been targeted because it is “a liberal nation committed to freedom of speech and conscience, equality between the sexes, representative democracy and every other freedom that still defines the West.” (pp. 257-258)

Breivik’s views, not too unlike the editorials of the *Wall Street Journal*, “Believed that Norway’s values were under threat from radical Islam” (Kundnani, p.258). Far-right blogger and Breitbart news contributor Pamella Geller was referenced in Breivik’s manifesto, and two weeks after the attack she responded with, as Kundnani terms it, “gusto”:

Breivik was targeting the future leaders of the party responsible for flooding Norway with Muslims who refuse to assimilate, who commit major violence against Norwegian natives, including violent gang rapes, with impunity, and who live on the dole... all done without the consent of the Norwegians. (Geller, 2011, as cited in Kundnani, 2015)

With popular media already having been foregrounding conspiracies of Muslim “invaders,” their immediacy was bolstered by these attacks, and their views paralleled Breivik’s own far-right extremist attitudes in major news media. Breivik was also known to tap into other popularized mediums of communication even while imprisoned. He even went as far as to set up a “Conservative Revolutionary Movement” with many other correspondents, while also writing three books in the process (Berglund, 2012). In 2013, he was moved to another prison, and many of those letters were vetted. He eventually

participated in a civil trial against the Norway government in 2016. During court proceedings in both 2012 and 2016, Breivik stretched his arm out in a Nazi salute to the members of the court and the galley of participant viewers when was freed from his cuffs (“Breivik Gives,” 2016).

Recordings of these events were themselves quite controversial, and journalists have added to the discussion around the permitted imagery and recording of Breivik’s Nazi salute. Frey (2013) writes in response to Breivik’s court hearings:

When deciding what to publish or not from a man who is sorry he did not kill more people, the salute becomes a posing detail. It is indeed a significant token showing that the terrorist did not regret his criminal act of terror.

Others comment on how “headlines, photographs, and even news leads at the trial opening made the gesture the memorable image, reused throughout the testimony and sentencing” (Whitehouse, 2013). This massively disseminated imagery and use of Nazi symbolism, in many ways, conveys the prevalence of platformed and normalized hate speech across an international, wide-spread viewing of Breivik’s relentless and hateful communicated visuals. Such mainstream coverage might have, prior to publication/circulation, considered the power of the Nazi salute as a symbol still used in many far-right/alt-right acts of extremism.

Since Breivik’s murders in 2011, there have been even more unfortunate incidents of white nationalist attacks that took place internationally (Anti-Defamation League, n.d.). Outside of the other manifestos analyzed in this thesis, Dylann Roof, John Earnest, and Robert Bowers are just some of the other murderers that spread hate through a wide variety of digital platforms, including an online forum known as Gab, before their

premeditated attacks (“Gab and 8chan,” n.d.). Breivik draws upon a number of Anti-Muslim writers throughout his manifesto, “quoting from the writings of European and American anti-Muslim writers, including Robert Spencer and Pamela Geller, who promote a conspiratorial anti-Muslim agenda under the pretext of fighting radical Islam” (Anti-Defamation League, 2011). Far-right writers have conveyed such anti-Muslim attitudes of other popular far/alt-right wing figures that in turn, become a weaponizing logic for contemporary white nationalists’ scapegoating rhetorics. Tarrant, following Breivik’s lead, made use of these Islamophobic and anti-Muslim attitudes throughout his manifesto.

Literature Review

Significant scholarship attends to the public controversies that Breivik’s manifesto raised. His manifesto was subject to a great deal of scrutiny from a wide variety of perspectives outside of communication. Tietze (2015) and Humphrys et al. (2011) reviewed, right after the attack, the public debate around Breivik’s motivations, and found that such public discussions depoliticized his motivations despite the “intensely political” declarations of his manifesto being “one most accurately characterized as a modern variant of fascism” (Tietze, 2015). With regards to the tactics used in Breivik’s manifesto, Kundnani (2015) adds that it contains a set of deliberate instructions for fellow alt-right followers, and that the manifesto was written in English to “attract British and American readers” (p. 258). Feshami (2018) noted regarding this manifesto “how attitudes regarding racial imperilment, often articulated in terms of a ‘white genocide,’ foreclose on any possibility of incorporating white nationalist voices into democratic societies” (Feshami, 2018). Vysotsky (2020) and Berbrier (1998) also

contribute to a critical perspective of framing processes used in this white nationalist rhetoric.

Other questions of audience raised by Breivik’s manifesto are found in its use of many symbols stemming from his supposed underground paramilitary group known as the Knights Templar. Wollenberg (2014) adds that Breivik “devotes a significant portion of his manifesto to the Crusades, representing them as the chief precursor and analog of contemporary Europe’s dilemma.” Others, like Jamin (2014), discuss the conspiratorial aspects of “Cultural Marxism” and its use by extreme right activists from Pat Buchanan to Breivik himself. While this scholarship explores the wide set of conspiracies and far-right extremist dynamics involved, as well as the various media discourses that ensued after the terrorism in Oslo and Utøya, there are still ecological and environmental rhetorics to be considered in the rhetoric of Breivik himself. Van Gerven Oei (2020) adds that we need to explore “Breivik as copycat, borrowing left and right, against unstable credit limits and with uncertain debt ceilings, assembling his ideological trust fund from sources as divergent as the Columbine Massacre, American conservative politics, eugenics, post-Luddite ideology, and freemasonry.”

Lastly, the sources available from within media studies and mass communication scholarship continue to question the roles of audiences and their narratives. Yusha’u (2015) reviews the YouTube comments of *CNN*, the *BBC*, *NBC*, and *PJTV* and uses critical discourse analysis to observe how user-generated comments contribute to the Islamophobia in the West. Sayimer and Rabenda Derman (2017) also explore how hate speech in YouTube comments radicalized and used threatening terms of “dangerous speech” and “fear speech” against Syrian refugees and also called for violence while

offering praise for Breivik’s terrorism. Other mass media studies around media coverage of Breivik in Israel and Norway can be seen in Samuel-Azran et al. (2014). While communication studies reveals much about the mass media response to the shootings, more scholarship is needed that specifically examines, utilizing an anti-ecofascist mode of criticism, Breivik’s manifesto as its primary source.

Introducing the Manifesto

Breivik’s manifesto is a textbook-sized manifesto that spans roughly 1,518 pages. Titled “2083 A European Declaration of independence,” the manifesto’s cover page depicts a large red iron cross that was also used by the Nazis on various war machines and uniforms, and underneath it reads an inscription in Latin that has no real discernable meaning. As previously mentioned, Breivik credits himself as “Andrew Brewick,” likely to identify himself with his Aryan German influences that are scattered throughout. The next pages provide a preface wherein he describes his motives for writing the manifesto in a letter-style format. In this preface, and after a few blank pages, he posts Youtube links (alongside those of another video streaming platform, Veoh) that serve as a presentation of his compendium and describe the processes for determining how to circulate his manifesto.

According to his summations, his manifesto covers five “main topics” : 1) “The rise of cultural Marxism/multiculturalism in Western Europe,” 2) “Why the Islamic colonization and Islamisation of Western Europe began,” 3) “The current state of Western European Resistance Movements (anti-Marxist/anti-Jihad movements),” 4) “Solutions for Western Europe and how we, the resistance, should move forward in the coming decades,” and 5) “+ Covering all, highly relevant topics including solutions and

strategies for all of the 8 different political fronts” (Breivik, p. 4). He also notes that, while he has written half of this compendium himself, the rest comes from other “courageous individuals around the world” (p. 5), including the works of the Unabomber (Theodore Kaczynski) and many others (van Gerven Oei, 2020). What follows is Breivik’s supposed 9-year effort to compile extremist plagiarized texts into a fragmented array of disjointed white Anglo European supremacy conspiracies that became a source of anti-Muslim and Islamophobic rhetorics. As a result, the manifesto itself can be read as a compendium for ecofascist knowledge that stems from white nationalist ideologies and conspiracies.

What is His Purpose?

Since Breivik often frames his manifesto as being a compendium, it attempts to inform and persuade European “patriots” and nationalists alike regarding “anti-muslim” subjects and islamaphobic conspiracies. There are times where he also references the text as a “book” (Breivik, p. 5) that he asks his readers to consume and to sell to other subscribers of his extremist conspiracies. Breivik, in this list of contents, places an emphasis on the manifesto’s “advanced ideological, practical tactical, organizational and rhetorical solutions and strategies for all patriotic individuals and movements” (p. 4). Far-right ultranationalist attitudes, ideologies, and conspiracies are ubiquitous and abundant in his rhetoric throughout his manifesto. Breivik adds that his purpose and motive for creating such a compendium is to be circulated, revised, edited, and translated to other audiences across Europe and the Americas. He “highly recommends” that a “French, German and Spanish Patriot” take responsibility for translating and distributing the text.

Circulation would appear to be the initial act in which Breivik’s “patriots” would begin to find people who could carry out his ecofascist program.

Beyond these directives for circulation, Breivik attempts to sell his ecofascist concerns for the environment through “Cultural conservative/nationalist rhetorical strategies” (p. 661). Here, Breivik provides a list of terms that should not be used in “modern debates with adversaries,” given that they will cause such adversaries to “label you as a bigot” (p. 661). This gives Breivik a means to stymie arguments that counter his own ecofascist-inflected notions of preservation by appealing to what “Modern politicians tend to use.” He offers examples of these “safer” terms such as “Non-Muslims, conservatives, cultural conservatives, Christian Europeans,” to name a few (p. 664). This strategic use of argumentation and rejection of certain terms encourages Breivik’s adherents to utilize more “inclusive” terms to debates so that they might “appeal/reach out to all specters of the right wing including the Christian Movement in addition to free market liberals” (p. 664). Hence, Breivik not only wants to create a fringe populist fascism, but one that could swindle many people until it is perhaps too late, either through an election of the next Hitler, or through continued white nationalist terrorism by way of mass shootings. Breivik introduces his toxically rebranded set of tactics, or “strategies,” to use both to enlarge the community of those who might partake in his agenda and as advice for those who have come to support his vision.

Audience Analysis

Breivik’s appeals to these “rhetorical strategies” are aimed at mainstream audiences to conform to and codify their ultranationalist attitudes in a way that appears to de-radicalize their otherwise accelerationist and violent motives against Muslims. In

doing so, Breivik creates a means to appeal to “patriots” through a more extreme and chauvinistic advocacy for those who no doubt fear the same conspiracies around an Muslim invasion as he does. There are a great deal of pensive informative strategies to counter the agendas of his opponents. Hence, crafting his manifesto in the form and function of a compendium acts as guide for those who have subscribed to extreme anti-immigrant views as well as mainstream political conservatives who share a general aversion to a “multiculturalist stance” (Breivik). Like the previous manifestos, Breivik is motivated to reach these far-right audiences with a cause that they see as the “saving of the country” (p. 666). There are a number of tropes and idyllic symbols he uses to do so.

For instance, Breivik refers to his followers as “Justiciar Knights and “European resistance fighters” (p.1104) whose work is essential to address the growing threats of “islamisation” (such a framing would no doubt go on to influence Tarrant to write his manifesto on “Replacement” in 2019). Imagery of the crusades appeals to a small set of zealous cultish far-right extremists, and those who affirm a strong approval of their historical significance. As such, the extreme white ultranationalists are willing to go to extreme lengths to prevent this conspiratorial ethnic invasion from the get-go and this is evident towards the final pages of the manifesto where Breivik details his means of ecofascist terrorism. His use of destructive bomb-making and impersonating police is something that his most loyal and zealous followers would also likely commit in murderous and psychopathic form. He outright rejects that any form of moderate conservatism could offer a solution that would prevent this multiculturalism given that, as he comments in section of rhetorical strategies for the far right, he is highly critical of anything even slightly to the left of his political stance.

Breivik reproduces these violent conspiracies and even goes to great lengths to encourage others to take the information he has compiled and to do the same for many “conservative/nationalist” readers (p. 4). The very fragmented and Unabomber-plagiarized abomination that is this manifesto is a marathon for ecofascist adherents to follow. He compels others to take up his cause for “resistance” against his rhetorical and ideological enemies. These enemies of his support political correctness, are a part of the “islamisation” of Western Europe, and are cultural “relativist[s],” which he deems as equivalent to “cultural Marxism” (Breivik, pp. 4-5). Breivik also wants his readers to spread this ecofascist manifesto to “everyone you know,” given that the distribution of its contents is perhaps certifiably illegal in places in Europe. He thinks that his readers can sidestep potential legal punishment for doing so by adding a “legal disclaimer” that he provides in “Book 3” for violating these laws. He also wants translations of his compendium to exist in multiple languages (French, German, and Spanish), and asks those with such translating abilities to serve as “patriots” by doing so as a way to take up arms as part of his so-called “European resistance” and/or “Justicar Knights” (Breivik).

Causes of the Crisis

Breivik compels his “knights” to a “Conservative Revolution – the only Solution for free Europeans” which he follows with a quote from the father of conservatism himself, Edmund Burke: “The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing” (p. 768). Thus, if readers have somehow made it seven hundred pages up to this point in the manifesto, he attempts to gain their support through a rebranding of his ecofascism as “conservatism” or through a “Conservative Revolution.” This revolution aims to criminalize most of society and in doing so reveals how Breivik

delineates boundaries for his ecofascist concerns about the environment given that these crimes, as Breivik adds, are of an “Individual criminal responsibility” (p. 770). He also has created a category for people who “allow mass Muslim immigration,” resulting in a form of “extinction,” which serves as a form of projecting his victimage upon this enormous category of people (Breivik).

The category in question is designated by Breivik as “The accused,” and he encourages his followers to target those who aid in the “allowance” and “high treason” of “1a. Aiding and abetting to cultural genocide against the indigenous peoples of Europe” (p. 771). Cultural Marxists, multiculturalists, feminists, Muslims all actively participate in and contribute to the extinction of Anglo Europe’s “indigenous (white) peoples from exercising the right to self-determination” (p. 773). Another section, titled “Crimes against the indigenous peoples of Western Europe – 1960-2010,” reflects his white nationalist efforts at historical revision, including by means of utilizing distorted appropriations of anti-colonial advocacy. Breivik inverts traditional anti-colonial histories by situating white Anglo Europeans as the defensive victims in the manifesto and thus serving as the ideological foundation for the compendium’s overarching motives for ecofascist mass murders (p. 773), in what Berbrier (1998, p.488-489, as cited in Vysotsky, 2020, p. 32) calls an “ethnic claims making.” I will explore this notion further in Chapter 5.

Breivik’s framing processes for coopting rhetorics around indigenous rights movements acts as an embattlement and cause for a “defensive” ethos permeating the many immigration conspiracies found throughout the manifesto. Breivik also claims that the guilty cultural Marxists, multiculturalists, feminists and Muslims who challenge

Breivik’s ecofascist platform are “individuals from various professional groups,” which includes “journalists, editors, teachers, lectures, university professors, various school/university board members, publicists, radio commentators, writers of fiction...” (p. 771). Breivik reveals a long list of his so-called accused “cultural Marxist/multiculturalist/suicidal humanist/capitalist globalist politicians,” who are “primarily from the alliance of European political parties known as ‘the MA 100’ and EU parliamentarians” (p. 771). These scapegoated parties and entities are thus far nothing really new in relation to the ideas and writings of other white nationalists, but are nonetheless concerning given that he has targeted his accused for his shootings at the AUF party in Utøya.

After detailing this exhaustive list of these targets, he blames these accused of their “guilty” qualities, and further “charge[s]” them through his own codified ecofascist policy in an aesthetic form reminiscent of a legal document. He even goes as far to indict those in section 5 for any “Participation of indirect atrocities against Europeans” and those who commit “Crimes against the indigenous peoples of Western Europe” (p. 773). Breivik’s law is punitive and unforgiving, unless you abide by the Western attributes of his code or are born of Anglo American/European/Saxon western societies. In full occidental chauvinism, Breivik also uses this part of his manifesto to compel his Knights to take up arms to fight in a crusade dedicated to “saving the country” against these “multiculturalist” and “Marxists elites” who will cause the “Islamisation” and thus the “elimination” of the freedoms of he and his fellow ecofascists, if not their full “extinction” (p. 772). He deems such activity as “treason” and “demographic warfare,” or even a “colonization of Europe” involving a task of somehow “demoting” 40,000 cultural

conservatives who have taken similar causes to the cultural Marxists and multiculturalists (Breivik, p. 772). A second list also appears to include “institutions” that these accused (specifically framed here as “Marxist/multiculturalist”) have “criticized/ridiculed/opposed/undermined/weakened/partly dismantled” (p. 778). Breivik considers his fellow ecofascist cultists as being wronged by an agenda from these accused institutions, and in response he advocates for a white nationalist occidental place-based environmentalism.

How is this Crisis Framed as Specifically Environmental/Ecological?

Breivik then attends specifically to the more environmental concerns that are interwoven throughout his compendium-manifesto, particularly in a section titled “Green is the new Red – Stop the Enviro-Communism!” (p. 646). Following the explicit anti-communist/Marxist rhetorics strewn throughout the previous six hundred pages of his manifesto, Breivik argues that there is a “neo-communist agenda” that “uses politicised [*sic*] science to propagate the global warming scam in order to implement their true agenda; global Marxism” (p. 646). He also takes these anti-Marxist concerns and bitterly argues that the Climate Change Conference of 2009 had a Marxist agenda: to be a forum to negotiate a “totalitarian ideas of World Government,” and a “transfer” of wealth from Western countries to “3rd world countries” that he lambasts for not sharing the blame for contribution to the CO2 emissions (“because allegedly western countries have been burning CO2 and 3rd world countries haven’t!” [p. 648]).

Breivik frames an ecofascist crisis of “islamisation” and his other anti-Muslim rhetoric as being a defense against Muslims from “polluted” and “developing countries” (p. 648). Framing Muslims as polluted 3rd world others assists in his creation of

environmental crisis as being directly tied to an impending “Islamic invasion,” and in doing so, frames Marxists for wanting to “scam” the environmental conservation of his Anglo-Eurocentric/occidental supremacist people. Such is the case when he targets the AUF party in Utøya, developing a comprehensive compendium, or perhaps series of legal codes in this case, that set the precedent for Breivik’s justifications for targeting oil rigs and to “Identify high priority off shore targets” in France, UK, Germany, Norway, Sweden, and Spain for future ecofascists (“Justiciar Knights”) to evaluate as potential sites for inflicting terror after his own murders (p. 968). Breivik does not want his fellow ecofascists to stand by passively in relation to his cause; there are great environmental consequences to his chauvinistic knights being “scammed” (Breivik).

Rhetorics of Victimage

As White European or American men, who Breivik frames as being scammed by the “emotionalists,” Breivik’s scapegoating mechanism appears to be provoked by various “feminist assaults” against his toxic masculinity who also support his feared “Mass Muslim immigration” (Breivik, p. 29) This assault, as he perceives it, also creates a “feminization of European culture” that begins to shape the rhetorics of his victimage, as he also frames “radical feminists” as committing an “assault” against European men but also against the last “bastion of male domination” (p. 29). Breivik carries out his terrorist acts and the bombings of Oslo disguised as a police officer, and quite symbolically, embodies a police officer in carrying out his defensive resistance of the bastion in full domestic terror against AUF camp members of the shootings that would follow in Utøya. The supposed assault that feminists, in Breivik’s imagination, are

perpetrating on masculinity in Europe reflect a scapegoated need to target feminists and their radical Marxist collaborators.

The language Breivik uses in deeming individuals as “accused” contains a projection device to also define them as “guilty” of significant crimes against the defensive imperilment that Breivik creates visually in order to indict anyone who he deems treasonous in their actions against his designated “indigenous” Europeans. This guilt is a form in which Breivik condemns critical stances against his ecofascism by scapegoating the criminals who aid in the destruction of the Anglo European centrist state. These “criminals” as he states are essential to perpetuating the cause of many who oppose his ecofascism and aid the enemies. This scapegoating is then made clear in the concept he devises as “The Conservative Revolution – The only Solution for free Europeans” (Breivik, p. 768). This “solution” presents the need for his law section, which describes as a crime any “Aiding and abetting to cultural genocide against the indigenous peoples of Europe” (p .771). There is a situated land to which Breivik would legislate his ecofascist law across all of Europe, and in the process, control and coerce through terror his political opposition, Muslims, feminists, Marxists, and other non-Anglo-Europeans.

Breivik’s section titled “Morally Justifiable?” also emanates his rhetorical forms of victimage through questions of his ecofascist ethics. He compels his ecofascist Justiciar Knights to “pragmatically” make “evaluations” without resorting to hate, as if to normalize that there is some sound and ethical reason to vomit terroristic acts of targeting his scapegoated Muslims, feminists, multiculturalists, and Marxists alike. He posits the ideas that no doubt influenced Tarrant’s own Islamophobic sentiments when he asks, “how many of or sisters have and will be raped by Muslims?” and “How many (Anglo-

European) patriotic oriented individuals will be ridiculed and persecuted by our multiculturalist oppressors?” (pp. 1025-1026). He puts forth his own metrics and calculations to quantify his call to ecofascist terrorism: “In fact, from a pragmatical viewpoint, it would be inhuman not to act in a cruel manner when the alternative is much worse” (pp. 1025-1026). His scapegoating logics thus aim to establish an exigence that defines why it is morally justifiable to use domestic terror and racial terrorism as a defensive stance in the name of his own imperiled mortification and ecofascist-driven ethics. Breivik’s conceptual ecosphere is mendaciously hostile and life-threatening to all non-white Anglo-European/American/Saxon people. Make no mistake, Breivik’s ecofascist Knights are ethnogenocidal crusaders, and will attempt to kill you if you stand in their way.

How is His Rhetoric Specifically *Eco-Fascist*?

Breivik’s “European Declaration of Independence” requires a set of land to uphold his ecofascist Euro-centric society. This is indicated by his use frames centered around taking a “resistance” to “multiculturalism,” as it is supported by leftwing political stances in socialism and labor parties such as the AUF that was targeted the day of the shootings. The constant scapegoating of Marxist and Multiculturalism indeed are another dead giveaway, given the way he accuses them for their support for the “Muslim invasion,” which he frames as being an issue about which these Marxists promote a “biased coverage” of “Environmentalism – obsession with global warming instead of focusing on birth/overpopulation (no calls for birth/population control in the developing world)” (p. 778). This is where Tarrant’s own ecofascism is shaped, as concern about “birthrates” being the cause of “overpopulation” becomes a critical justification for a

“replacement” or an “inconvenient truth” or a need for a “European Declaration of Independence” to prevent this apocalyptic “extinction” of Anglo occidental men and their environment for capital control and conservation of the environment.

Comparing with Burke’s “Rhetoric of Hitler’s Battle”

Breivik’s rhetoric is incredibly potent, given the vast and dizzying number of texts collected in his manifesto. The makeup of the document itself exceeds the definition of a manifesto, and serves as a “crossroads” for ultranationalist conspiracy to occur, especially since he explicitly mentions in the introduction that he wants audiences of all politically conservative alignments to circulate and improve the document (Breivik). The material and virtual capacity for the manifesto as a digital artifact, a text that aims to inform strategic tactics of eco-terrorism, then takes on a whole world of potential interpretations. It appeals generally to those who have become the most dedicated in pursuit of alt-right (and far-right) positions of ultranationalism and are devoted buyers of ecofascist narratives. Just as important as the ingredients of the ecofascist snakeoils are the causes for the “curatives” that Breivik’s compendium creates in response to his resistance to the green Marxism he is diametrically opposed to in every instance (Breivik). His manifesto thus operates in situ as a crossroads of sorts in compendium form, a locus for ecofascist inquiry and the conspiracies of the far right. Breivik’s manifesto, as a compendium, offers a lingua franca to all other white nationalist hate groups who then can borrow, take, and utilize each ecofascist text for their own organizational acts of racial terrorism.

Breivik invites these groups of “Anti-Marxists” and “Anti-multiculturalists” to engage in a counter “political correctness” that conveys fact over “feelings”-based

attitudes, but not to the point where he abandons emotion as a persuasive rhetorical strategy. This was most definitely evident in Tarrant’s manifesto, and appears once ecofascists use a form of their investment into their violent murderous ideologies. Such a tendency takes form in the object of the white ethnocentric state that they wish to establish, even if that means domestic terrorism against any non-white culture that supposedly replaces their own racial dominant position in their society. Breivik’s victimage harnesses the idea that he is a victim of a supposed Muslim colonialism. This also entails a set of instructions in the form of law-like drafting of documents in the manifesto-compendium but also in his push for what he calls a “Movement for Academic Reform” (Breivik, p. 25). He frames this as a growing demand for college education reform, to position parents as being “consumers” that can act as a “force” for reform when they demand accountability from universities (Breivik, p. 25).

Here, he invests significant energy into exposing university donors through conservative student newspaper reporting, military recruitment on campuses, and the need to intensify vocal opposition to political correctness (Breivik, p. 26). He situates the university system as powerfully opposed to the ideas of Breivik and his fellow ecofascist adherents, detailing a variety of manipulative forms of media control that university structures use to control campuses and prevent dissent from the outside. Breivik ensures that readers up to this point in his manifesto understand what the feminists and cultural Marxists do to ascend in popular sites of media consumption through television, and certain power figures of these feminist Marxist movements culturally resist the deeply authoritarian patriarchy of Breivik’s own agenda. In doing so, he constructs his own “perfect enemy” that is resilient and capable of forming self-preservation against the

tactics of their resilience (Burke, p. 209). This is also true of “the accused” and the “muslim Invaders” who form the central collective of enemies to his ecofascism.

Lastly, there are a number of ways in which Breivik seeks to create his own ecofascist cult through the use of religious imagery from a Christian fundamentalist like-resistance to his perfect enemies. As Burke (1939) also notes regarding the “religious bastardization” of fascist rhetorics, there is an “anti-Hitlerite Battle” to “find all available ways of making the Hitlerite distortions of religion apparent” (p. 219). The distortions and use of the iron cross, and the “crusades” of Breivik’s “knights,” take on a mythical revisionism of medieval history and offer building blocks for the various “unification steps” that lead to new crusades in the name of ecofascist protections of the environment against “Islamisation” and the vast array of the “accused” category of sinners in the manifesto (Burke, 1939). Breivik condemns these individuals for conspiring against his own ecofascist religious zealots, the “knights Justiciar,” who are themselves a cult of Islamophobic, toxic masculinist, and European “indigeneity” (Breivik). Breivik creates a panacea through his violent acts of domestic terror, as revealed in the logging of the months that led up to his attacks and his murders under the alias of a fertilizing company owner.

Contributing to the “Racializing Environmental Justice 2.0” Project

Breivik’s scapegoating mechanisms contain a whole variety of instances of far-right and alt-right extremism associated with the fascist roots of influence found throughout his manifesto, including connecting their efforts with the Crusades and providing a compendium-like set of rhetorical tactics. Yamamoto and Lyman (2001) observe that “conservative groups paid nearly \$1 million to support the [anti-immigrant]

proposal” put forth for consideration by the Sierra Club members (p. 350). Groups Yamamoto and Lyman mentioned like the Pioneer fund, “which has long supported white supremacist views,” became “emboldened by the Sierra Club proposal” and “have turned immigrants from society’s toxin to toxic waste itself” (Guillermo, 1998). Though the Sierra Club membership had rejected the anti-immigrant proposal, and though not all environmentalists are all at fault, ecofascists are now using online digital means of information to swing people under its wake (Burke, 1939). Breivik includes a great deal of consideration into how he might make his ecofascist society happen, and to what lengths he wanted others who share his ecofascist agenda to take up arms after his attack.

Given the complexity of the manifesto, and its exhaustive gathering of white nationalist conspiracies, Breivik doesn’t want any end to the radical “conservatism.” He would compel adherents to strategically utilize a softened ecofascist rhetoric in a new visual format to appeal to the medieval visuals of his ecofascist symbolism. In rhetorical form, this appears in Christian medieval themes as adherents being “knights” throughout the manifesto itself. This appropriation of medieval imagery is reflected in the cover page and the symbolic use of the term of his ecofascist adherents as “knights” (Breivik). His selected imagery bolsters an austerity of fascist hypermasculinity, which blames radical feminism, multiculturalism, cultural Marxists, and others to stop such femininity from reaching his ecofascist patriarchal resettlements. On top of accusing these groups of crimes from his codified laws, Breivik commits to blaming “professional groups” of educators, artists, writers, executive leading positions in academia and other forms of “globalist” societies who dismantle his desire for patriarchy. This ideally is recognized as conspiracy, but it unfortunately would also buy those who were open to anti-politically

correct and anti-Marxist spheres of influence. Politically reactionary attitudes pave the way for a great deal of Breivik’s own hypermasculine frames.

Lastly, there is value to assessing the implications of using a compendium-like structure that does more than incite ecofascist shootings; it also informs and is designed to be circulated. Yamamoto and Lyman (2001) argue that the understanding of racial histories involved in law and adjudications of racial issues around the environment “shapes how we view the ‘environmental’ problem, the rights claims, and the possible ‘justice’ remedies” (p. 358). The legal document style that Breivik invokes deflects any idea of European settler colonialism in favor of a new “resettlement” that violently opposes the multiculturalist society (p. 1027). Yamamoto and Lyman (2001) revealed that “Courts usually forgo meaningful analysis of racial or cultural discrimination in considering environmental justice issues” (p. 323). Ecofascists inspired by Breivik’s “ethnic claims-making,” then, already have advantages in relation to actual ethnic indigenous communities, wherein courts do not consider cultural or economic connections to the environment (p. 324).

Exposing the ecofascist snakeoils in full Anglo-ecofascist sentiments is imperative. Breivik’s resettlement of colonial law that revises or reinforces white Anglo-European settler colonialism gives ecofascist nationalism a new homeland. Environmental justice movements might consider how they handle racial environmental justice issues within the “courts of the conqueror” in terms of the legacy of settler colonial relations to law that built justice systems in other countries internationally (Williams, 1994, p.194). In combatting these ecofascist calls to an Anglo-European/American ecofascist supremacy, we should challenge pre-existing codified

laws that already reinscribe such supremacy in routine court procedural functions.

Ecofascists’ defensive stances on “preservation” and “conservation” only value the rights of Anglo-European “indigenous peoples” to lands, property, and the quality of their white nationalist claims to environment (Breivik).

Conclusion

In acknowledging far-right extremism, and the ecological/environmental strain that compels adherents take action through mass shootings in the form of ecofascist rhetorics, it is important to recognize that adherents to these ideologies continue to reproduce and rebrand themselves throughout history just as Europeans have written it. Their violent and bigoted fascist tactics of communication still incorporate a variety of rhetorical techniques that continue to popularize aesthetics of ecofascism, in this case in the form of a compendium to conservatives internationally. Furthermore, Breivik seemingly is a part of a wider decentralized collective of white nationalism. Anders Breivik was a significant influence for a lot of the recent mass shootings that were driven by environmental and ecofascist motives. This chapter aims to expose the underlying methods and strategies that comprise this egregious compendium, and many of these are similar to the mechanisms we have seen thus far in the previous manifestos. It is important to continue to attend to such rhetoric, examining with caution and attention the motives of every-day fascisms.

CHAPTER 5: Conclusion

Introduction

Ecofascism is a brutal reflection of white nationalist thought combined with environmental extremist ethics stemming from a wide variety of rhetorical framings of contemporary climate disaster-based initiatives, which often revolve around immigration as being one of the primary causes. Tarrant, who followed in Breivik’s footsteps, frames his own victimage rhetorics based on his own deep hostilities against the Muslims and members of the Al-Noor Mosque. Crusius who scapegoats Latinx communities for his American ecofascist cause, draws a great deal from Tarrant and poses an immigrant invasion from Latinx communities in his rhetoric. All the Manifestos together present a horrific degree of premeditated terrorism and seething vitriolic violence toward multiracial communities that stand against them, or who pose any threat to their racially segregated white ethnostate. Following the legacy of fascism from pre-World War II, ecofascism from the three manifestos all utilize environmental initiatives that are driven by archaic white nationalist conspiracies, that aim to use the threat of terrorism coercively through a fascist austerity agenda.

Furthermore, the need to unpack whiteness, and white supremacy from everyday institutions and social systems are also imperative. Yamamoto and Lyman (1995) and Yamamoto (1995) have contributed a greater understanding of social and historical dimensions to racism, colonialism, and the powerful role played by the courts in these processes. In arguing for the need to racialize environmental justice, Yamamoto and Lyman (2001) offer a key sight about how scholars can situate an advocacy for racialization “in light of” rather than “in spite” of complex and historical racial group

interactions (p. 35). This sentiment is also recognized in Feshami (2020) as he relates it to his own research on white nationalist connections to the environment and the forest:

This concern for the environment and the wellbeing of our world should also reframe how we think of white nationalism. While we rightly understand it in terms of hate—hate for others, hate for difference, and so on—we also need to understand this sort of racialism in terms of love. There is no reason to assume that white nationalists are disingenuous about their love of the environment or the natural world represented by the forest. As such, we should be asking how such love motivates them, stirs them to activism and to resistance, and helps them to mobilize others to their point of view. If we are to meaningfully address the ongoing challenge of white nationalism in our societies, a better understanding of this love is essential.

Environmental justice must enlarge its scope to take on whole new considerations of the harms caused by ecofascist agendas and their various snakeoils, by way of popular rhetorical appeals. This of course isn't to say we should abandon all caution or the possibility of defensive antifascist action against ecofascist advocates and their platforms when necessary. Rather, rhetorical critics should attempt to racialize environmental justice in a way that prevents future ecofascists from taking up arms for destructive and racist purposes in the name of their conspiratorial overpopulation beliefs. Ecofascist rhetoric must be confronted in order to prevent such ideas from being further circulated, reproduced, and rearticulated since ecofascists use white nationalist populism to gain power from the platforms in which they speak.

I argue that future rhetorical critics need to continue to “do more than burn the books” of white nationalist publications, but we should also caution about platforming them in our writing. Given that Breivik’s manifesto was seen as a “compendium” and widely disseminated in a media environment conducive to spreading the demagogic rhetoric of the Trump presidency, as well as many other far right politicians, scholars should expose the ecofascist “bastardizations,” but also consider the harm of their accessibility and commercialism on online digital network mediums (Burke, 1939). There is a very real danger that is present if such ideas are moved into the mainstream, as Vystotsky and Madfis (2014) argue that:

(white) supremacist involvement in anti-immigration political activity has distinct and significant functions for their members. It allows them to engage in mainstream political conversations where they would otherwise be stigmatized and excluded. This enables them to adopt an image as political advocates rather than merely racial agitators, violent criminals, or domestic terrorists. Their participation in the larger anti-immigration movement pulls the acceptable discourse and goals of that movement further to the right and towards more extreme and bigoted positions. (p. 140)

White supremacists rhetorics found in the ecofascist manifestos, have the capacity to take center stage and undoubtedly move it further to the right. Such white supremacist individuals and groups are emboldened by this mainstreaming and “the events of January 6 offer them martyrs and a revanchist narrative that will serve them for years to come, providing an internal mythos for recruitment and a justification whenever they need to

use force” (“January 6”, n.d.). We should treat cautiously then, the very same revanchism of ecofascism.

Issues of Ecofascist Circulation

Given the various rhetorical devices and mechanisms used by Tarrant, there remains the question of what to do about an anti-ecofascist approach. I believe Klein (2019) frames a “confrontation” as being necessary, and I would also add that there is a value for some form of direct oppositional resistance both in discursive and, if need be, counter fascist measures as seen by the tactics often utilized by antifascists internationally (Bray, 2017). This resistance has rhetorical dimensions, especially given the diffuse and complex circulation of far-right and fascist texts, memes, and manifestos, via internet digital message boards (and social media, etc.). Stanovsky (2017) reviews the ways in which contemporary fascist movements have become popularized in intergenerational contexts of “Fascist repetition”:

It’s (alt-right) 4chan’s “Politically Incorrect” /pol/ board. Such sites have served as a forcing house for the creation of right-wing memes that aim to repackage and popularize well-worn racist, sexist, anti-Semitic, homophobic, transphobic, and xenophobic rhetoric for a new generation. (p. 134)

Fascist rhetorics of repetition create a discursive and racialized white space and, as Lavin (2020) adds: “Tarrant’s manifesto is a remarkable appeal to whiteness that draws on texts and authors from across centuries” (p. 136) through his use of various poems from Rudyard Kipling, Dylan Thomas, and the British Union of Fascist leader, Oswald Mosely. The circulation of alt-right and far-right memes on digital social media platforms poses another troubling aspect to understanding the complexity ecofascist rhetorics.

Further studies should continue to research how extremists broadcasting terrorism via Facebook (and other platforms for Crusius and Breivik) might also empower other white nationalist extremists within the same medium in which it is being shared and reproduced. Discerning them from the antifascists, activists, and advocates who counter them is also crucial since they contribute to exposing ecofascist rhetorical tactics emboldened in new forms in digital media.

“Accelerationism” in Ecofascist Agendas

One way we might learn from Burke while finding a more appropriate means of countering ecofascist rhetoric is to step back and analyze and take in account all of the previous terrorism that white nationalist rhetoric has perpetuated and indeed normalized up to this historical moment. Echoed from the violent and unapologetic rhetoric of the Charlottesville “Unite the Right Rally,” fascist threats re-appeared from previous years of white supremacist movements. Christopher Cantwell (also known as “the Crying Nazi”) states in the *Charlottesville: Race and Terror* feature by *Vice*: “I’m not even saying we’re (white nationalists) non-violent, I’m fuckin saying that we didn’t aggress, we did not initiate force against any-body. We’re not non-violent, we’ll fuckin’ kill these people if we have to”) (“Watch vice news tonight’s,” 2017). The polemics of these threats attempt to situate Neo Nazi rhetoric as if they are upstanding everyday normal American citizens. Make no mistake, these statements have resulted in the many racially motivated hate crimes and even death for multiracial communities, and individuals outside of El Paso and Christchurch. It is imperative to not forget the lethality behind the rhetoric that far/alt-right white nationalists, and now ecofascists, use in their lexicons.

Arsenal Terror of Ecofascists

Ecofascist manifestos, which serve as rhetorical and symbolic constructions that lionize anti-immigration sentiments to the point of outright acts involving terrorist shootings, should continue to be studied to prevent such act from killing hundreds every year and stoking fear among communities of color. Tarrant, Crusius, and Breivik each go to great lengths to describe the arsenal of AK-47s, AR-15s, assault rifles, and self-made explosive devices they used in their killings. Thus, it is necessary to understand that the intent of the writers of each manifesto I analyzed was, from the get-go, only ever terrorism. The same should be considered and applied to all forms of bigoted ultranationalist, anti-immigration rhetoric in mainstream news, given that extremist-related murders in 2019 were “overwhelming (90%) linked to rightwing extremism” (Anti-Defamation League, 2020).

Direct Oppositional Resistance and Anti-Ecofascism

Based on the preceding reflections, there is a need to identify where and how the normalization and mainstreaming of many xenophobic, anti-Muslim sentiments occurs, given their appearance in day to day narratives and records from political leaders in recent decades. The “everyday fascists” are ardent supporters of Trump (and other mainstream conservatives) who often like to:

‘tell it like it is’ by actively trying to dismantle the taboos against feminists, black liberation, queer liberation, and others have given actual blood sweat, and tears to establish as admittedly shoddy, and far too easily manipulatable, bulwarks against outright fascism. These social norms are constantly contested and are unfortunately subject to resignification in oppressive directions, such as when

George W. Bush sold the war in Afghanistan as a crusade for women’s rights.

(Bray, 2017, p. 204)

Hence, the need to observe this resignification comes with a need to recognize the complexity of the shifting forms of ecofascist environmentalism through mainstream forms of modern conservatism. Breivik requires some base of support that agrees with (or at least isn’t fully opposed to) the anti-feminist and politically incorrect attitudes comprising the conspiracies he resurfaces.

Countering such extremist forms of fascism must involve a critical assessment of everyday political and social policy regarding immigration and other forms of racial hierarchy. Where Breivik sought to reaffirm a “conservative revolution” through the Nazi scapegoating mechanisms of blaming communists, not too unlike the strategic planning behind the events of the Nazi police burning of the Reichstag, there is a need to directly confront, and address the severity of rhetoric that facilitates Breivik’s ecofascist-driven acts of ecofascist shootings. As Bray (2017) reflected:

Many protesters associated the (Donald Trump’s) Muslim ban with Nazi anti-Semitism and therefore sought to put the wisdom of Martin Niemöller’s classic ‘First they came for the communists...’ quote into practice by standing up for the first to be persecuted. ‘Not This Time Motherf***ers!’ is exactly the right kind of response to the persecution of any group, and Niemöller famous statement deserves credit for inspiring many to take a stand. (p. 207)

The role in which we understand a racializing environmental justice stance must also then take into account the last hundred years of ecofascism that has plagued not only Germany but countries all over the world. This is a struggle where anti-ecofascism is imperative in

countering the demagogic scapegoating and ecofascist snakeoils that will continue to be concocted throughout these times and beyond.

Rhetorical critics can learn a great deal from the scholarship that has already exposed dominant frames of fascist agendas. Berbrier (1998, as cited in Vysotsky, 2020, p. 32) adds that “ethnic claims-making” consists of an

effort to portray white supremacist ideology as representing that of an ethnic group, arguing... that if according to the values of “cultural pluralism” and “diversity,” ethnic or racial pride is legitimate for (other) ethnic or racial minority groups ... then it is also legitimate for whites. (Berbrier, 1998, p.498-499)

White supremacy as it is introduced into the ecofascist use of ethnic claims-making should be scrutinized, challenged, and revealed through critical analysis of the ecofascist’s claims to land rights, and their “indigenous” claims to what Tarrant might call “ethnic autonomy” (2019) or Breivik might see as a “conservative revolution” for free Europeans (2011). Crusius (2019) also makes use of this framing process in his arguments for a “confederacy of territories.”

Discussion

Rhetorical critics choosing to take up the Burkean spirit to expose “Hitlerlite distortions,” benefit greatly from scholars who have gone to great lengths to define and interpret the dimensions of white nationalism. As Renton (1999, cited in Bray, 2017) adds: “one cannot be balanced when writing about fascism, there is nothing positive to be said about it,” so we must not forget the need for resisting such forms of giving platforms to ecofascist rhetorics (Renton, 1999; p.18). As such, ecofascism demands a similar level of examination and criticism that does not take lightly the source texts, and rhetorics of

extreme forms of white nationalism and the idea that, as Bray (2017) argues, “antifascism has always been just one facet of a larger struggle against white supremacy and authoritarianism” (p. xvii). Antifascism has contributed to more direct actions of disrupting racist and or fascist movements, and the potential for doing so allows them to challenge fascists without risking the real terrorizing harm behind platforming their rhetoric in any form. In regard to the ecofascist manifestos that are the subject of this thesis, there is a very real threat that each text incites as a legitimate cause to uptake an ultranationalist struggle for a defensive, environmental nationalism for all white-Anglo identifying people.

Furthermore, this green nationalism for all three ecofascists includes tactics to reach audiences who might not be aware of what white nationalist attitudes, symbols, conspiracies and ideas might be entailed. A set of anti-ecofascist rhetoric is also necessary to work with anti-fascist movements that have, for over a century, attacked, quashed, and stifled forms of bigoted reactionary movements that scapegoat multiracial and nonwhite ethnic communities. Antifascism is not just a “single issue movement” and it understands the need for “a rejection of the classical liberal phrase incorrectly ascribed to Voltaire that ‘I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it’” (pp. xv-xvi). Any sentiment of ecofascism should also be rejected in this way in order to reject and acknowledge the history of white supremacy in all its manifestations through state, colonial, capitalist, and political formations. Ecofascists are no less armed violently now, as evident in their rhetorics, to attack any ethnic group not of their white nationalist claims/conservation/conquest to land and the environment. As such, exposing their rhetorics that attempt to appeal to broader audiences around environmental

concerns, and their own distortions of Anglo-environmental “justice,” are necessary as we approach legitimate issues around climate change, and other issues around the slow violence of pollution (Nixon, 2011).

Conclusion

Ecofascist manifestos present a wide variety of rhetorics that distort and undergird a white nationalist extremism and their manifestos. The texts I have analyzed in this project, were self-described as manifestos by each shooter, and the rhetoric enclosed within their pages reveals a sinister and evil appropriation of environmental justice concerns. Therefore, preventing ecofascists, and ecofascism broadly, is important, as is the need to oust their conspiracies and popular use of internet-based rhetorics around memes, “shitposting,” and other dastardly persuasive selling of white nationalism in the form of an environmental defensiveness. In the case of Chapter 2, Tarrant sought to create an ecofascist rhetoric through selling conspiracies of an impending “Muslim invasion” responsible for the overpopulation and environmental collapse seen in already pre-existing far-right “Eurabia” conspiracies (Tarrant). Chapter 3 explores how Crusius used tactics of victimage to ensconce an economic, political, and personal cause from American neoconservative attitudes, while also repurposing Dr. Seuss to suit his anti-immigration frames, and engineered a particular rhetorical ethics for justifying racial terrorism against his scapegoated “Hispanic invaders.” Finally, Chapter 4 explores the ways in which Breivik used his manifesto to create an ecofascist law through an ecofascist code and in the process, produced a “compendium” to act as a collective work for other white occidental, European, American, and Anglo-Saxon ecofascists that

enabled them to reproduce and circulate ecofascist rhetoric for their own terrorist purposes.

All three ecofascists provoke and sell a snakeoil rhetoric through their manifestos, framed with a label of environmental concern for “preservation” and/or “conservation,” but the contents of each vial are quite toxic, hateful, racist, and xenophobic, capitalizing upon pre-existing anti-immigration political rhetoric. Their defense for such bitter, angry, and accelerationist attitudes toward ethnic claims-making is contained within already abundant white nationalist and far-right attitudes towards society. Burke’s (1939) contributions to analyzing and exposing “The Rhetoric of Hitler’s Battle” reveals much about Nazi “Hitlerite” distortions of popular commercialized values of fascist rhetorics. Ecofascism has now presented to us, by way of the unfortunate shootings committed subsequent to the writing and publishing of each of the manifestos covered in this thesis, a new challenge: How do we not only talk about the ecofascist talk, but also counter their rhetorics when they begin to craft and plan acts of mass shooting and terror? Ecofascist advocates offer no quarter for those who resist them after all.

References

- Anti-Defamation League. (n.d.). *Sonnenrad*. Retrieved February 18, 2021, from <https://www.adl.org/education/references/hate-symbols/sonnenrad>
- Anti-Defamation League. (2011, July 25). *ADL: Norwegian terrorist motivated by rowing extremist ideology in Europe and the U.S.* Retrieved April 21, 2021, from <https://www.adl.org/news/press-releases/adl-norwegian-terrorist-motivated-by-growing-extremist-ideology-in-europe-and>
- Anti-Defamation League. (2020). *Murder and Extremism in the United States in 2019* (p. 34). Anti-Defamation League; Center for Extremism.
<https://www.adl.org/media/14107/download>
- Anti-Defamation League. (2021, March). *Gun violence and mass shootings*. Retrieved April 21, 2021, from <https://www.adl.org/education/resources/tools-and-strategies/table-talk/gun-violence-mass-shootings>
- Arango, T., Bogel-Burroughs, N., & Benner, K. (2019, August 4). *Minutes before el paso killing, hate-filled manifesto appears online* (Published 2019). The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/03/us/patrick-crusius-el-paso-shooter-manifesto.html>
- Atran, S. (2021). Psychology of Transnational Terrorism and Extreme Political Conflict. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72(1), 471–501. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010419-050800>.
- Berbrier, M. (1998). White supremacists and the (Pan-)ethnic imperative: On “european-americans” and “white student unions.” *Sociological Inquiry*, 68(4), 498–516.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1998.tb00482.x>

Berglund, N. (2012, July 26). *Breivik sets up conservative network*. News In English. No.

<https://www.newsinenglish.no/2012/07/26/breivik-sets-up-conservative-network/>

Bitzer, L. F. (1968). The Rhetorical Situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 1(1), 1–14.

Boseley, M. (2019, March 17). *Inside the “shitposting” subculture the alleged*

Christchurch shooter belonged to. The Sydney Morning Herald.

[https://www.smh.com.au/national/inside-the-shit-posting-subculture-the-](https://www.smh.com.au/national/inside-the-shit-posting-subculture-the-christchurch-shooter-belonged-to-20190317-p514xt.html)

[christchurch-shooter-belonged-to-20190317-p514xt.html](https://www.smh.com.au/national/inside-the-shit-posting-subculture-the-christchurch-shooter-belonged-to-20190317-p514xt.html)

Bray, M. (2017). *Antifa: The anti-fascist handbook*. Melville House.

Breivik, A. (2011). *2083: A European Declaration of Independence*.

Breivik gives Nazi salute in court return to challenge jail isolation. (2016, March 15).

BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-35807961>

Burke, K. (1939). Rhetoric of Hitler’s “Battle.” In *The Philosophy of Literary Form* (3rd Edition). University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1970). *The rhetoric of religion: Studies in logology*. University of California Press.

Carrasquillo, A. (2019, August 10). *This is what latinos think everyone got wrong about el paso*. POLITICO Magazine. <https://politi.co/2yRMOoG>

Carter, C. A. (1996). *Kenneth Burke and the scapegoat process*. University of Oklahoma Press.

Charlottesville: Race and terror – vice news tonight on hbo. (2017, August 14).

https://video.vice.com/en_us/video/charlottesville-race-and-terror-vice-news-tonight-on-hbo/59921b1d2f8d32d808bddfbc

Christchurch shootings: Social media races to stop attack footage. (2019, March 16).

BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-47583393>

Cormack, P. (1998). *Manifestos and declarations of the twentieth century.* Garamond Press.

Crusius, P. (2019, August 3). *Inconvenient Truth.*

Dyett, J., & Thomas, C. (2019). Overpopulation Discourse: Patriarchy, racism, and the specter of ecofascism. *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*, 18(1–2), 205–224. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15691497-12341514>.

Ehrlich, P. R. (1968). *Population bomb.* Ballantine Books.

Fang, L. (2017, September 15). *Trump adviser spent a decade using street gang ms-13 to justify anti-immigrant agenda. Now it’s happening.* The Intercept.

<https://theintercept.com/2017/09/15/trump-adviser-spent-a-decade-using-street-gang-ms-13-to-justify-anti-immigrant-agenda-now-its-happening/>.

Fauteux, B. (2012). “New noise” versus the old sound: Manifestos and the shape of punk to come. *Popular Music and Society*, 35(4), 465–482.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03007766.2011.578523>.

Feshami, K. A. (2018). Voices of White Resistance: Democratic theory and the task of contending with white nationalist voice. *Open Library of Humanities*, 4(2).

<https://doi.org/10.16995/olh.370>

Feshami, K. (2020). *A mighty forest is our race: Race, nature, and environmentalism in white nationalist thought | drain magazine.* <http://drainmag.com/a-mighty-forest-is-our-race-race-nature-and-environmentalism-in-white-nationalist-thought/>

Frey, E. (2013). Norway’s Media Coverage: The salute of a man who does not regret.

Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 28(1), 59–61.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/08900523.2013.755078>

Gab and 8chan: Home to terrorist plots hiding in plain sight. (n.d.). *Anti-Defamation League*. Retrieved March 6, 2021, from

<https://www.adl.org/resources/reports/gab-and-8chan-home-to-terrorist-plots-hiding-in-plain-sight>

Geller, P. (2011, July 31). *Summer camp? Antisemitic indoctrination training center*.

Geller Report News. <https://gellerreport.com/2011/07/summer-camp-indoctrination-training-center.html/>

Gimse, A. (2020) *The Language of Lone Wolf Terrorists An in-depth study of the use of personal pronouns and identity terms in lone wolf terrorist manifestos* [Master’s thesis, University of Agder].

Guillermo, E. (April 30, 1998). *Sierra Club Settles Immigration-for Now*, *AsianWeek*.

Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610, 22–44.

Holbrook, D. (2020). The challenge of conspiracy theories for strategic communications.

The RUSI Journal, 165(1), 26–36.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03071847.2020.1734384>.

Hopkins, H. (2018, November 2). How the Sierra Club’s history with immigrant rights is shaping our future. *Sierra Club*. Retrieved from

<https://www.sierraclub.org/articles/2018/11/how-sierra-club-s-history-immigrant-rights-shaping-our-future>

- Jamin, J. (2014). Cultural marxism and the radical right. In P. Jackson & A. Shekhovtsov (Eds.), *The Post-War Anglo-American Far Right: A Special Relationship of Hate* (pp. 84–103). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137396211_4
- January 6: A mass base for fascism?: Meanwhile, as the republicans fracture, a new political center emerges—Further to the right.* (n.d.). CrimethInc. Retrieved April 19, 2021, from <https://crimethinc.com/2021/01/07/january-6-the-debut-of-a-mass-base-for-fascism>
- Jones, J. C. (2011, July 27). *Anders Breivik’s chilling anti-feminism*. The Guardian. <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2011/jul/27/breivik-anti-feminism>
- Karl Johansson, P.-A. (2020). *Bringing the War Home A Psycho-Historical Exploration of How Right- Wing, Lone Wolf Terrorist’s Construct Group Identities in the 21st Century*. Linnæus University.
- Kaufman, A. C. (2019, August 4). *El paso terrorism suspect’s alleged manifesto highlights eco-fascism’s revival*. HuffPost. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/el-paso-shooting-manifesto_n_5d470564e4b0aca3411f60e6.
- Klein, N. (2019, September 10). *Only a green new deal can douse the fires of eco-fascism*. The Intercept. <https://theintercept.com/2019/09/16/climate-change-immigration-mass-shootings/>
- Kundnani, A. (2014). *The Muslims are coming! Islamophobia, extremism, and the domestic war on terror*. Verso.
- Lanham, R. A. (1991). *A handlist of rhetorical terms* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.

Lavin, T. (2020). *Culture warlords: My journey into the dark web of white supremacy*.

Hachette Books.

Lentin, A., & Titley, G. (2011). *The crises of multiculturalism: Racism in a neoliberal*

age. Zed Books.

Lewis, M., & Lyall, S. (2012, August 24). Norway mass killer gets the maximum: 21 years. *The New York Times*.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/25/world/europe/anders-behring-breivik-murder-trial.html>

Lyon, J. (1999). *Manifestoes: Provocations of the modern*. Cornell University Press.

Mackey, R. (2016). “America belongs to white men,” alt-right founder says. *The Intercept*.

<https://theintercept.com/2016/12/07/america-belongs-white-men-alt-right-founder-says/>.

Mann, C. C. (2018). *The book that incited a worldwide fear of overpopulation*.

Smithsonian Magazine. <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/innovation/book-incited-worldwide-fear-overpopulation-180967499/>.

Marx, K., Engels, F., Mandel, E., Fowkes, B., & Fernbach, D. (1990). *Capital Volume 1: A critique of political economy*. (Original work published 1867).

Mildenberger, M. (2019, April 23). *The tragedy of the tragedy of the commons*. Scientific American Blog Network. <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/voices/the-tragedy-of-the-tragedy-of-the-commons/>

Mirzahi, S. (2020). “I took action for my race”: Right-wing extremism as a transnational social movement. <https://doi.org/10.7939/R3-R4WP-A844>

- Menon, P. (2020, August 27). New Zealand mosque shooter given life in prison for “wicked” crimes. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-newzealand-shooting-idUSKBN25M2QF>.
- Moses, A. D. (2019). “White genocide” and the ethics of public analysis. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 21(2), 201–213.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14623528.2019.1599493>.
- New Zealand mosque shooting: What is known about the suspect?* (2019, March 18). BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-47579243>.
- Newton, D. (2020, April 15). *The dark side of environmentalism: Ecofascism and covid-19*. Office of Sustainability - Student Blog.
<https://usfblogs.usfca.edu/sustainability/2020/04/15/the-dark-side-of-environmentalism-ecofascism-and-covid-19/>.
- Nixon, R. (2011). *Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor*. Harvard University Press.
- Okay hand gesture. (n.d.). Anti-Defamation League. Retrieved March 24, 2021, from <https://www.adl.org/education/references/hate-symbols/okay-hand-gesture>.
- PM’s office received shooter’s manifesto minutes before attack*. (2019, March 17). <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-03-17/jacinda-ardern-christchurch-shooter-manifesto-email/10909874>.
- Protopapadakis, E. D. (2014). Environmental ethics and linkola’s ecofascism: An ethics beyond humanism. *Frontiers of Philosophy in China*, 9(4), 586–601.
<https://doi.org/10.3868/s030-003-014-0048-3>
- Puchner, M. (2002). Manifesto = theatre. *Theatre Journal*, 54(3), 449–465.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/tj.2002.0095>.

Quek, N. (2019). *El-paso shootings: Growing threat of white supremacists*.

<https://dr.ntu.edu.sg/handle/10356/92267>

Quek, N. (2020, March 19). *Bloodbath in christchurch: The rise of far-right terrorism / rsis*. S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies. <https://www.rsis.edu.sg/rsis-publication/icpvtr/bloodbath-in-christchurch-the-rise-of-far-right-terrorism/>.

Renton, D. (1999). *Fascism: Theory and practice*. Pluto Press.

Samuel-Azran, T., Lavie-Dinur, A., & Karniel, Y. (2014). Narratives used to portray in-group terrorists: A comparative analysis of Israeli and Norwegian Press. *Global Media Journal: Australian Edition*, 8(1), 1–12.

Sayimer, İ., & Rabenda Derman, M. (2017). Syrian refugees as victims of fear and danger discourse in social media: A youtube analysis. *Global Media Journal*, 8(15), 384–403.

Shitposting, inspirational terrorism, and the christchurch mosque massacre. (2019, March 15). Bellingcat. <https://www.bellingcat.com/news/rest-of-world/2019/03/15/shitposting-inspirational-terrorism-and-the-christchurch-mosque-massacre/>.

Sivanandan, A. (2010, March 15). Fighting anti-Muslim racism: An interview with A. Sivanandan. *Institute of Race Relations*. <https://irr.org.uk/article/fighting-anti-muslim-racism-an-interview-with-a-sivanandan/>.

Stanovsky, D. (2017). Remix racism: The visual politics of the “alt-right.” *Journal of Contemporary Rhetoric*, 7(2/3), 130–138.

Still no date for mosque attack gunman’s sentencing. (2020, April 30). RNZ.

<https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/415504/still-no-date-for-mosque-attack-gunman-s-sentencing>.

Tarrant, B. (2019, March 15). *The Great Replacement*.

Taylor, M. (2011, July 26). *Breivik sent “manifesto” to 250 UK contacts hours before Norway killings*. The Guardian.

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/jul/26/breivik-manifesto-email-uk-contacts>

Texas Walmart shooting: El Paso attack “domestic terrorism.” (2019, August 5). BBC

News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-49226573>.

Tietze, T. (2015). Anders breivik, fascism and the neoliberal inheritance. In R. Leeson

(Ed.), *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography: Part VI Good Dictators, Sovereign Producers and Hayek’s ‘Ruthless Consistency’* (pp. 281–291). Palgrave

Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137479259_8

Tucker, J. (2019). *The founding father of eco-fascism*. AIER.

<https://www.aier.org/article/the-founding-father-of-eco-fascism/>.

van Gerven Oei, V. W. J. (2020, July 16). *Anders breivik: On copying the obscure /*

continent. <https://web.archive.org/web/20200716125213/http://www.continentcontinent.cc/index.php/continent/article/view/56>

Vossen, M. A. (2020). Assessment of the extent to which white supremacy extremist

attackers’ manifestos indicate shifts in the white supremacy ideology [Master’s thesis, Johns Hopkins University]. [https://dspace-](https://dspace-prod.mse.jhu.edu/handle/1774.2/63284)

[prod.mse.jhu.edu/handle/1774.2/63284](https://dspace-prod.mse.jhu.edu/handle/1774.2/63284).

Vysotsky, S. (2020). *American antifa: The tactics, culture, and practice of militant antifascism*. Routledge.

Vysotsky, S., & Madfis, E. (2014). White supremacist stigma management and legitimization via anti-immigration activism: The case of the keystone state skinheads. In A. Ackerman & R. Furman (Eds.), *The Criminalization of Immigration: Contexts and Consequences* (pp. 129-146). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

Walton, M. (2020). Defending white america: The apocalyptic meta-narrative of white nationalist rhetoric. *Theses and Dissertations*.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/8491>

Ware, J. (2019, July). Siege: The Atomwaffen Division and rising far-right terrorism in the united states - international centre for counter-terrorism.

Ware, J. (2020). Testament to murder: The violent far-right’s increasing use of terrorist manifestos. International Centre for Counter-Terrorism.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep23577>.

Williams, R. (1994). Large binocular telescopes, red squirrel pinatas, and apache sacred mountains: Decolonizing environmental law in a multicultural world. *West Virginia Law Review*, 96(4).

<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr/vol96/iss4/16>

Wollenberg, D. (2014). The new knighthood: Terrorism and the medieval. *Postmedieval: A Journal of Medieval Cultural Studies*, 5(1), 21–33.

<https://doi.org/10.1057/pmed.2014.1>

Yamamoto, E. K. (1995). Rethinking alliances: Agency, responsibility and interracial justice. *UCLA Asian Pacific American Law Journal*, 3, 33.

Yamamoto, E. K., & Lyman, J.-L. W. (2001). *Racializing environmental justice*.

<http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/35333>

Yanoshevsky, G. (2009). Three decades of writing on manifesto: The making of a genre.

Poetics Today, 30(2), 257–286.

Yusha’u, M. J. (2015). Extremism or terrorism: Communicating islamophobia on youtube in the norwegian attacks. *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research*, 8(2), 171–191. https://doi.org/10.1386/jammr.8.2.171_1