

Norwegian Memorial Work after July 22, 2011

by Jone Salomonsen

Abstract

Following the twin terror attacks of July 22, 2011, two public memorials will be built, one in Oslo, another close to Utøya. Furthermore, since the Labour Youth (AUF) experienced the massacre in their summer-paradise Utøya, AUF decided to reclaim the island by building their own private memorials to mourn the dead and teach democracy. The concept of “memorial” was endorsed by both agencies and the decisions were grounded in the engaged public spirit that had followed the massacres. Huge flower oceans were built in Oslo and the acts were interpreted as popular expressions of “love, solidarity and grief,” and as vivid messages to Breivik: “not your people.” Yet, some of the locals in Utøya’s vicinity did not want to re-engage with the trauma of the massacre, and refused memorials close to their home. Why does AUF welcome memorial sites open to ritual performance and inter-active memory work but the local people do not? The article explores this antagonism as expression of different forms of symbolic communication, performativity and ritual, and as result of political disagreements. To separate the political from the social, the political protest from social condolence, the author uses analytical distinctions developed by H. Arendt and C. Mouffe.

Keywords: memorial, Norway, paganism, performance, ritual, terrorism, Utøya

Introduction

How should a democratic nation commemorate a terrorist attack? What is the main purpose – to honor the individuals who died, or defend democratic ideals and ways of life of the democratic citizens who were attacked and killed? Should we also remember the bereaved and the love and care given to them by co-citizens in the period after the attack? The answers to these questions are not self-evident. Following Anders Behring Breivik’s twin attacks in Oslo and Utøya on July 22, 2011, the Norwegian Government decided early on to establish two national memorials. One at the bombed-out government building in Oslo and one on the mainland across from ‘Utøya Island.’ Utøya is owned by the Norwegian Labor Party’s Youth League, AUF, and every summer, AUF Utøya hosts a week-long political summer camp for teens and young adults. In 2011, 564 young people camped when Breivik arrived and shot 69 face to face, or as they were hiding, running or swimming away. Therefore, AUF wanted to build two private memorials at Utøya – a meditative place to remember the dead and a democratic learning center. All in all, four memorials were under consideration.[1]

The government’s template for the national memorials was largely grounded in the engaged public spirit that followed the massacres. People’s immediate responses to the attacks were non-stop gatherings in the streets of Oslo. A huge “ocean of roses” emerged in front of major institutions of power. Acts of condolences to the bereaved, and flowers, letters, and other personal objects placed on the ground for the dead, were quickly interpreted as popular expressions of grief, solidarity, and love, but also as explicit messages to Breivik: “We are not your people”. It made sense to embody aspects of this public spirit and its aesthetics when envisioning private and public memorials. In 2013, the official *Artistic Plan for Memorials after July 22* (KORO) had even surveyed people and asked what words they associated with the street assemblies following July 22 and what words they hoped future memorials would be able to evoke. A majority of the respondents reported that the words “love,” “solidarity,” “grief,” “reflection,” “hope,” and “peace” best captured their post-July 22 experience.[2]

The survey confirmed the legendary naming of the “spirit in the streets” as “love.” The street gestures also embraced the dead, reaching out for them and their families. In the language of “love”, it proclaimed that the beloved dead had not lived in vain – even though they died young. However, the primary purpose of a national commemoration after a terrorist attack cannot simply be to remember the loving, gentle acts of the survivors or their unique post-terrorism experiences with each other. Love is not the emblem of democracy, but pluralism,

argument, negotiation. Therefore, the aim of KORO's survey was confusing, not least since Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg had launched a more sober counter-expression. On July 24, 2011, in his speech at the combined memorial service and high mass in Oslo's Cathedral, he had already helped Norwegians articulate a thoughtful and symbolic stanza to go with the act: *More Democracy, More Openness, More Humanity. But Never Naivety.* [3]

To further complicate the picture, not all citizens agreed with KORO's interpretations of the sentiment and norm "love." Some of the locals in Utøya's vicinity (in the municipality of Hole) disagreed both on the purpose, aesthetics and location for the proposed public memorial and argued that any memorial close to people homes would transform their neighborhood into a permanent stage for "terror tourism." This led to a significant political conflict that blocked further progress for this important national memorial until 2020. Initially Utøya also faced disagreements and uncertainties, but in the end they found common ground. The meditative memorial "The Clearing" was dedicated at Utøya in 2015 and the democratic learning center "The Hedge-house" in 2016.

In this process, both agencies (AUF Utøya and KORO) consulted professionals, including leading scholars of memory studies after massive acts of terrorism. In the USA, scholars who had been involved in the memory politics for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial (1982), the Oklahoma City National Memorial & Museum (1995) as well as the National September 11 Memorial & Museum in New York (2001) were consulted. In Norway, historian Tor Einar Fagerland is a leading theorist in this tradition, and two of his international colleagues are James Young and Ed Linenthal. Fagerland played an important role early on as a consultant to the memorial process at Utøya and helped invite to Norway both Linenthal and Young and the director of the September 11 Museum, Alice M. Greenwald. All of them advised AUF on reaching circumspect decisions, both in terms of the overall rehabilitation of Utøya and concerning open and inclusive memorial designs.[4]

According to their line of thought, the concept of a classical monument is passé. Rather than embodying memory, a monument tends to displace it altogether, supplanting a community's possible memory work with its material form. The alternative concept to "monument," says Young, is the "memorial," which may be defined as a counter monument – a construction "in which the artist has attempted to create a performative piece that may initiate a dynamic relationship between artist, work, and visitors." [5] A memorial, therefore, is perceived as an egalitarian idea that attempts not only to commemorate the historical impulse that led to the murders or to commemorate only those killed, but to facilitate an 'enactment' in which the hierarchical relationships between object and its interlocutors are breaking down. One could add that such 'enactments' can be experienced both as multidirectional and as incentive to new social or political engagement. Multidirectional means in this context that the 'enacted' remembrance of a specific event in the present may recall painful losses from the past. It may re-enact trauma or it may be experienced as healing. Either way, to visit a memorial and be engaged with it should be more than "a visit".[6]

Since Norwegian professionals quickly agreed to endorse the concept of the "memorial," rather than opting for a "monument," the door to a plurality of *subjective* interpretations and enactments between visitor and artwork is deliberately left wide open. From the perspective of the "memorial," the result of KORO's survey is no longer confusing. It is rather the opposite, namely perfectly fitting. All the sentiments that the Norwegians had described in the survey and said they wanted a memorial to evoke, are all of a sudden very relevant. The question is rather, should the Norwegian state and AUF Utøya design memorials that both meet and prioritize among these criteria and the expectations embedded with these?

In the following, this article seeks to explore the essential considerations which guided the Government/KORO and AUF Utøya as they felt obliged to remember the massacre and to call on renowned artists and architects to design worthy memorial sites. The article also explores why a memorial open to inter-active memory work was welcomed by AUF Utøya, but not by some of the local people on the mainland opposite Utøya, and how this conflict finally was solved. However, to help explore the meaning and aimed-at-effect of inter-active and ritualized memory work, the author will introduce some analytical tools of ritual performance as theorized by ritual studies scholars. This will help us to analyze the first significant public ritual after Breivik's mass murder, the Ocean of Roses, as an instance both of condolence *and* of non-violent protest, and as the giving and receiv-

ing of gestures of love.

However, the rituals of the street are of two kinds: 1) rituals of death and mourning belong by convention to the private, the family, the social; 2) rituals of non-violent protest belong by convention to the public, the political. To make the social versus the political a preliminary, yet viable, analytical distinction, we borrow from Hannah Arendt's differentiation between the social and the political. This also helps us grasp what is uniquely new about democracy, and hence, about the kind of society Breivik attacked. Next Chantal Mouffe's re-reading of Arendt is introduced as she bends the concept of the political into a pop-up conflictual discourse that can surface anywhere. The political is related to issues that people often disagree on but that still need to be resolved, and may include contestation of norms and traditions. In the final summary, the article explores whether the discourse of "remembering the beloved dead" has prevailed over the discourse of "defending democratic argument against terrorist authoritarianism" in Norway's national memorial labor. It will be argued that the answer depends on how we understand the hegemonic relationship between the social and the political, and their interdependence.

Analytical Approaches

The Social and the Political

According to Arendt, the problem with attacking "democracy" is that it represents a genuine political space of continuous talking and listening, of oppositions and confrontations, of open debates and tough negotiations. This space is in principle different from the socially constituted and ordered "houses" of society, be it the family, religion, the church, or the welfare institutions of the state. According to the history of the sociology of religion, the domestic, the religious, and the social are co-constituted.[7] These spaces are "from the beginning" generated from the principles of lineage, ancestry, kinship and the domestic sphere. A desire to undo the political and return to the purely social may therefore equal a desire to return to the inherited hierarchical orders of the house, including the ghosts of the *pater familias* (authoritarian family father) and the possible use of violence in order to discipline family members. Arendt's point is that politics as such cannot be built on family grounds, on *ethnos*, since politics is by and of itself a constitution of *demos*.

Chantal Mouffe builds on Arendt's distinctions between the political/public and the social/private but recasts the spatial limits of the political when she argues that "the political" is the potential antagonistic inherent in all social relations – in the parliament as well as at the dinner table. It operates in public and private spaces and manifests itself in strong disagreements when decisions have to be made. Democracy, she argues, is a way of organizing human co-existence from within a context that is always conflictual – precisely because of this ever-present "political." The aim of democratic politics is thus to create the institutions through which this potential antagonism (hostility and strife) can be transformed into agonism (a community of disagreeing citizens) and enable pragmatic decisions to be made on matters of common concern.[8]

However, Mouffe warns that if we want democracy actually to work, citizens must also pay allegiance to two basic norms: (1) all humans have equal worth, and (2) all human rights are universal rights since they are in-born and not relative to a specific culture. Furthermore, Mouffe urges citizens to experiment with new forms of association in which a plurality of views can flourish and where ethical capacities for democratic decision-making can be practiced and enhanced. She defines such enhancement as belonging to the "pre-political," which is distinct from "the political" (the work of "the political" is to transform antagonism into agonism and facilitate acceptable decision-making). But the two are also related since a viable democracy implies a viable pre-political space as its necessary premise.

Mouffe's concept of the pre-political is meant to help us think about something as outside of democratic politics, and to be conscious of democracy's precondition. But one can disagree with Mouffe when it comes to the question whether or not the pre-political is limited to certain experimentations or exercises of rights within the social.[9] If Mouffe is correct in thinking that democracy begins with a new, constructed assembly (*demos*), founded on shared allegiances to certain ethical norms, the human capacity to pay allegiance to such norms,

and in due manner submit to them, begins not with experimentation but with ritualizing life in pre-political social domains. In this article, ritual will be approached as a creative cultural tool with which it is possible to discover, practice and enhance the ‘cultivation’ of skills, and through skills, establish new norms.

Ritual Theory and the Performative Register

Contemporary memory studies often analyze acts of terrorism as well as acts of remembrance as symbolic, performative communication and approach the indexicality of the performative with reference to J.L. Austin and his linguistic ideas about “performative utterances.”[10] Austin’s concept means that some words, spoken in a certain context, are able to evoke and materialize its reference: a word can create and make real that which it refers to or implicates. The marriage vow “yes” is a famous example. In his study of Breivik’s manifesto, Matias Gardell (2014) used the concept of the performative to explain in what sense Breivik’s “military authority” exists, when writing:

“Breivik’s account of the Knights Templar should not be seen as a description of a preexisting military organization but as a *performative* narrative, a proposition designed to *create that which it refers to*: a vanguard of heroic crusaders paving the way for a nationalist revolution.”[11]

Another interpretation of the power of the symbolic, used within a performative register, is the power of repetition. Ritualized practices entail repetition, and in their performance they both form “sensibilities” and enhance “skills.”

In a new study on symbolic meanings attached to both terrorist attacks and their response (in Bali and Norway), Anne-Marie Balbi (2019) explores how policy-makers can learn from “local resilience to terrorism” and how collective narratives emerge “organically as part of the engagements by local stakeholders” in connection to sites of terrorist attacks. She argues that governments are not the ideal vehicles for creating counter-narrative messages. Instead, local resilience in the form of new communal “trust” with each other may be produced from the counter-terrorist symbolic, which implies a performative effect. Thus, “trust” may produce new local engagement which again may contribute to social change.[12]

This is a significant finding which confirms that sentiments of trust can develop in local and engaged (repeated) symbolic responses to acts of terrorism. This article will build on this insight but also take a step beyond the ‘production of symbolic meanings’ and focus on *embodied* ritualized acts that draw the ritualist into more transformative practices. To analyze embodied memorial *acts*, we will briefly introduce ritual studies and also propose a distinction between the ritual (transformative) and the ceremonial (performative).[13]

In the late 1970s, ritual studies scholar Roland A. Delattre proposed that rituals are one of the constitutive activities by which human beings *articulate* themselves. This is different from *expressing* oneself (which draws on a separation between content and form). Articulation brings into being something that otherwise would not be. It is a process by which a living impulse works itself out. Delattre further defines ritual as those carefully rehearsed symbolic motions and gestures which we regularly perform. Through them, we articulate humanity’s felt shape and rhythm and reality as we experience it. The main accomplishment of ritual is the “articulation of feeling” (i.e. love) and a “disciplined rehearsal of right attitude” (i.e. solidarity). The ritual process yields social anchorage, orientation and a sense of the real (for a short while), but not lasting feelings of social unity. That is a reason why it will be repeated again and again.[14]

Furthermore, ritual engages us with the rhythms of a broader reality than our own humanity, such as the natural environment we are dependent on. However, according to Delattre, a ritual is not a ‘magical power’; it does not achieve “change” or “the new” by itself. Ritual is rather the context for a “coming together” that makes some of the desired achievements possible. Thus, ritual enables and participates in bringing our humanity into being. This generative dimension of ritual refers to what is commonly called its subjunctive mode, its “what if” mode of creativity. It also refers to a ritual’s ability to invent or bring new possibilities into being through its inner potentialities and subversive dynamics.[15]

To help scholars distinguish better between two very different forms of appearing together in the social, anthropologist Victor Turner split the category of ritual into “ceremony” (the actual) and “ritual” (the possible). [16] While a ceremony might be about *social* cohesion and about harnessing the *political* powers to rule, a ritual can facilitate the enactment and articulation of collective *aspirations* aimed at transformation and change. The secret tool of ritual is to achieve “change” is its interstitial and processual character, its framing and sequencing processes. Through the ritual process, a person or a group is transported from structure to a liminal space and back to structure – a process which in itself can create major “before” and “after” experiences. Thus, the liminal is essential and critical to this definition of ritual. According to Turner, it is, in fact, only liminality that can constitute (time-limited) zones of creativity, subjunctivity, and *communitas*. [17]

In line with the performative embodiment practices of a ritual, Judith Butler has argued that when bodies come together “in alliance in the street,” the act produces more and other than what mere conversation does. It enables people to create a physical memory *in each other* by acting together, both by being physically close and vulnerable individuals. Based on experiences with the Arabic Spring and several Occupy movements in 2011 and 2012, Butler analyzed cases of non-violent actions, which both assumes and elaborates on living and sustainable social bonds. What typifies these bonds? According to Butler, they express in a general way that *social interdependency characterizes life*. Accepting this, we can “proceed to account for violence as an attack on that interdependency.” [18] An act of terrorism is an attack on persons and material things, but just as fundamentally, it is an attack on “bonds.” Since sustainable social bonds are a prerequisite both for society to exist and for democracy to express itself, an act of terrorism affects the foundations of normal life.

The Terrorist Attacks and the First Ritualized Responses

Breivik's Symbolic Framing of his Acts and Mission

On Friday, July 22, 2011, Norway experienced its biggest attack since WWII. Seventy-seven people were killed – 8 in Oslo and 69 at Utøya – and more than 150 others were wounded. Anders Behring Breivik saw himself as a leading protagonist in an imagined upcoming war in which Europe will expel all Muslims and be reborn as a patriarchal, mono-cultural, and non-democratic society. Like Hitler, Breivik believes in the existence of an inherent aristocratic and sexist principle in nature, which he prophesizes will manifest itself in its fullest form as patriarchy and authoritarianism in a new, ideal state. He primarily acquired the ideological pieces for his rhetoric from the new counter-jihadists, but also from the much older white power/white nationalism movements in Europe and the USA, which ideologically go back to the early 1900s. Assisted by the internet, Breivik became knowledgeable about their ideology and strategies. [19]

Breivik's vision is to destroy the political and return to the purely social, which in its simplest form should be based on the patriarchal householder and his indigenous, white, ancestral lineage. He framed his act in religious terms and communicated his goals with carefully chosen symbols. Breivik is not a religious person, but as a nationalist he believes religion is necessary to build a new society. Breivik also used ritual language and legitimized his deadly acts as religious self-sacrifice: his willingness to risk dying (while he killed others) for a greater cosmic good was termed “sacrifice” in his manifesto, whereas those Norwegians he intended to kill were not categorized as “sacrifices” but as enemies to be “taken out.” Six hours before the bomb blast in Oslo, Breivik posted a ten-minute video of himself on YouTube, urging radical nationalists in Europe and the USA to “embrace martyrdom” and join him in “the war.” The video shows him dressed as a Knight Templar, wielding a large sword, using text blurbs to call for a return to the zeal of the early Christian crusades – armies within the medieval political realm called Christendom. In the video, he also poses with a semi-automatic gun and a pistol, which he later would use at Utøya. About ninety minutes before the bomb blast, Breivik distributed a 1500-page manifesto titled “2083 – A European Declaration of Independence” via email, with a big red Christian Maltese Cross printed on top. With this text, Breivik sought to explain his mission and called on more ‘soldiers’ to help destroy the present-day European political system and return to the patriarchal mansions of old. [20]

However, during his trial – beginning in April 2012 – we learned that he also identifies with pre-Christian Odinism. Breivik explained to the judge that he called his pistol “Mjølner,” after Tor’s magic hammer in Norse mythology, and his gun “Gugne,” which is Odin’s magical spear of eternal return. These names were carved onto his gun and pistol with Rune letters to enhance their performative (or even “magical”) powers. The same holds for the car used to transport “Mjølner” and “Gugne” to Utøya. Breivik named his vehicle “Sleipner,” which is the Old Norse label for Tor’s wagon as he roars across the sky, throws Mjølner at random, and creates thunderstorms and fears of “Ragnarok” – the final cosmic battle and the end of life as we know it.[21]

For the sake of persuasion and effective recruitment, Breivik portrayed himself strategically as a person from the past, coming forward with the acclaimed values of a pre-modern, medieval Christendom on the one hand and with the imagined norms of a pre-Christian Odinst warrior-cult of Germanic and Scandinavian origin on the other hand. The tactic of embracing two seemingly opposed politico-religious traditions to wage war against modernity and liberal democracy is not unique. It is a typical feature of the new, neo-fascist tactic that has been spreading in Europe and the USA for a long time.[22] However, when Breivik resurfaced briefly in public in 2016 (to accuse the state of Norway of having imposed inhumane prison conditions on him), he had resolved this apparent religious knot by purifying his thinking and taking sides. He is no longer considering himself a Christian but opted for Odinism only.[23]

Ocean of Roses: Ritualized Counter-response to Breivik’s Massacre and Ideology

The immediate counter-response to Breivik’s massacre was a small condolence ritual that began in the early morning of July 23 but quickly evolved into a strong mobilization of togetherness, solidarity, and protest. Some explained their participation as springing from a need “to come together,” others that they felt a need “to act”: “I had to do something” (*jeg måtte gjøre noe*).[24] The act of leaving one’s home and “coming together” with other Norwegians one did not know in an unprotected space in downtown Oslo included other more minor acts such as picking or buying flowers, writing a personal condolence letter, bringing chocolate or an old teddy bear, or asking the children or the neighbors to join in. All the objects were placed in the streets. Some of them were intended for the dead, some “for my little country” (Norway), while others were more political, attempting to diagnose the situation. From an analytical point of view, this mass of people constituted a preliminary new social, a new “house,” in the middle of the public square.[25]

On Monday, July 25, almost half of the capital’s population (more than 200,000) attended this silent condolence ritual, and the flowers and other objects they brought grew into what Norwegians called an “ocean of roses.” The event was co-initiated by a plurality of public and private actors [26] and attended by the royal family as well as prime-minister Jens Stoltenberg, who – in his speech – proclaimed that “What we see tonight may be the most important “march” that the Norwegian people has made since WWII.” He encouraged the crowd to dress up the whole city with their flowers as a protective shield and as an expression of “love.”[27] The “ocean of roses” spread out, and its dense materiality flowed into more streets, squares and parks. It touched buildings associated with Parliament, the Norwegian Labor Party, and Labor Union, and – as if a coordinated body in motion – it peaked at Oslo Cathedral.

Picture 1: The Ocean of Roses, Oslo Cathedral

Photo Credit: Odd Andersen NTB Scanpix

Oslo Cathedral opened its doors to the “push of the ocean” in a way that has never been seen before. The streets continued materially into the middle passage of the church, and people circulated in and out for weeks. This building (which ordinarily only holds ‘the church’) constituted – for a little while and un-ordinarily – a new social, a new “house,” helping to symbolize Norwegians as one big “family.”

On the town square bordering the Cathedral, the gathering grew. Its density stood in contrast with the quiet atmosphere that reigned. People behaved as if at a funeral or as if in church. They greeted newcomers with a nod, perhaps a smile and whisper, giving each other space, but there was no loud talking. These simple gestures were enough to create a sense of “love” and “solidarity” – befitting a family, a clan, a tribe – experienced and attested to by thousands of people, and the red rose became its symbol. At the same time, these actions were also symbolic expressions of something else. They were, in themselves, *embodiments of peace with unknown others*, expressing great trust and, therefore, also significant vulnerability. People stood side by side with others they did not know and were not afraid of being stabbed within the new boundaries of a new symbolic, that of a common home.[28]

Analysis 1 of the Ocean of Roses: Modes of Rituality

Two modes of rituality – ceremony and ritual – were present in people’s response in the streets of Oslo, each leading to the other. The more political aspect of the gathering, the ceremonial, obviously signaled back to Breivik and the world, “we are not your people.” It did so through the gesture of forming a large ritually structured “body” that positioned “itself” respectfully in front of significant political and ecclesial institutions. In doing so, it confirmed Norway’s democratic constitution and its Christian-humanistic heritage. At the same time, this structured body was transformed into a *communitas* (a liminal form of togetherness) when it turned inward on itself, processing people’s fear and grief at having lost fellow humans and their own sense of security. The ritual was, in this case, contemplative, opening up space for a new experience of togetherness, love, and solidarity, primarily characterized by an attentive collectiveness. The silence was privileged; so were material, individual

expression, and movement. In this mode, rituals are not the performances of the “as is” of democratic society or the perfection of business as usual, but enactments of collective aspirations of “what if,” for example “what if we were to think (for a little while) of ourselves as living in, or occupying, the same home”?

The July 22 protesters’ massive presence at the edge of Oslo Cathedral was part of their bodily (and strategic) statement against Breivik, not a sign of suddenly becoming “more religious.”[29] People also gathered in and around the Cathedral because the church formally represents an extension of the family, a well-known space of sanctuary and safety, because the church is where people marry, baptize their children, and say farewell to their dead. In fact, this unusual close interaction between church and people should even be perceived as an invitation from the church “to be received” or “to be held,” which refers to primary acts of hospitality, love, and healing expected from kindreds. We do not know precisely how people interpreted the invitation of an open Cathedral, but we know that at least a thousand people every day accepted it and walked in, lit candles, wrote prayers, touched things, looked at the art, listened to music, often joined in the singing, walked out and came back in. Generative ritual is not primarily about belief but about participation in what it creates and being willing to experience it.[30]

Drawing on both Delattre and Butler, we should ask: what was being rehearsed and expressed in the streets of Oslo? A possible answer was: letting the other press her or his living, bodily ‘image’ onto me, into my personal space, and tolerating their unique existence with me. In this take on ritual, it has become a context and an articulation of common humanity. It confirms sociality and interdependence. To accept the image of the other in my personal space, without pushing away or trying to eradicate it, may be interpreted as a non-violent and peaceful act of love, of neighborly or filial love.

Analysis 2 of the Ocean of Roses: Assessment with Young Adults

Inspired by global social (street) movements and by Judith Butler’s work, our research team staged a workshop in October 2014 to learn more about how young adults experienced July 22, 2011. We invited people aged 18-30 to participate in open conversations and discussions with each other and with us in the rented venue DogA in Oslo.[31] For several of these young people, assembling in front of the Cathedral and in the streets of Oslo after July 22 were radically new experiences. Specifically, they were amazed at being part of *creating* something new. Although individuals were free to express what they felt on paper and on other materials placed on the ground, there was no preaching. Nor were there leaders or instructors, although silence was the tacitly obeyed rule. The assembly had no stable borders, ebbing and flowing with the changing number of people present, its flow structured by streets and walls. It was devoid of explicit religious or political symbols except for the red rose, representing love and an ethical passion for justice.

As already narrated, a majority of the Norwegians who responded to the 2013 KORO survey reported that the words “love,” “solidarity,” “grief,” “reflection,” “hope,” and “peace” best captured their post-22 July experience. [32] The conversations in our workshop did not contradict this, but more emphasis was placed on inclusion, community, safety, contemplation, and space for individual needs.

The experience in the streets seemed to have created in and of itself a form of ritual resourcefulness, both to express resistance and to form a new type of floating community. Discussions revealed a need in young people for contemplation, with opportunities both for silence and for individual processing, while at the same time being part of a social group, a community. When in the streets, they had felt that they “gave” love and solidarity to strangers and that they “received” a sense of belonging in return. For a few days, they experienced a transformed city where it was safe to stand close to strangers. All of them were certain that love and solidarity are the glue of society, although many were aware of fear lurking just beneath the surface. They were afraid of racism and xenophobia, of Breivik’s ideology, of what might happen if trust is undermined and fear encouraged, and if people started collaborating on the basis of fear and not community sentiment.

It also became evident that young people lacked venues where they could talk about July 22. They felt that both high school and college/university had failed to deal critically with Breivik’s ideology in class. Neither their fear

of extremist ideology nor their experience of showing “love and solidarity” to strangers was ever discussed in connection with democracy or freedom of speech. Nor did teachers reflect with them on the nature of the acts in the streets of Oslo and elsewhere, or what it means to live in a democracy. Educational research had already documented that Breivik’s ideology was not sufficiently discussed in Norwegian schools and that more education in “democracy” was needed.[33] But no research had yet documented the need of young adults to be able to understand the *nature of the acts* in the streets of Oslo, which implies knowing how to discern grief and condolence from memory work, and also the social from the political. And finally, there were no established memorial sites to re-visit this experience (after the Ocean of Roses was cleaned up from the streets) – places where they could continue to remember and pay respect.

National Memorials and Local Protests Close to Utøya

After the twin terrorist attacks in Oslo and on the island of Utøya, the Norwegian Government decided to establish two public memorial sites, one in Oslo and the other in the municipality of Hole, close to Utøya. It was decided that the two anticipated memorial projects could not be monumental or authoritarian but had to be contemplative, educational, interactive, and open-to-ceremony. Both memorials should encourage participation, including in rituals. People’s response to terrorism in 2011 was interpreted as popular expressions of love, solidarity, and grief. Therefore, the memorial sites should be open to re-enact such rituals or create new ones by having prepared “ceremonial grounds.” The memorials should honor those who were killed, the survivors, relief workers, and volunteers, and the names of the dead should be inscribed at the sites.

The Canceled Memorial: Memory Wound

After an open competition, Swedish visual artist and architect Jonas Dahlberg was in February 2015 chosen as art designer for the two national, inter-linked memorials. His model, “Memory Wound,” was to cut a permanent wound in nature and thus recreate the physical sensation of brutal loss. By cutting out a large section of a cliff at Sørbråten, a small peninsula across from Utøya, a deep rift would go through the waters and make a barrier. Visitors would walk through a contemplative landscape and suddenly be prevented from reaching the cliff, and the longed-for view of the beloved lost to Breivik’s killing spree. On the other side of the cut, inside the Wound, the names of the dead would be carved. People would see but not be able to touch the inscriptions and never reach the “other side.” This art experience was expected to force people never to forget and help them reflect and relive how brutally death came to Utøya and Oslo. The rock mass carved out at Utøya would be used to create a submerged amphitheater memorial in Oslo. It would be placed in front of the bombed government building and take the embodied image and form of a democratic assembly.[34]

Nevertheless, would this memorial assembly also have the power to evoke feelings of love and solidarity, or spur engagement? Would it help us rehearse the social precondition to democracy? If so, what are the sentiments, powers or gestures that may help July 22 never to happen again?

Local Protests against National Memorials

Some of Utøya’s neighbors, especially those with properties and houses close to Sørbråten, strongly opposed Jonas Dahlberg’s memorial design. They protested via the media, arranged public meetings, argued with the state, announced that they might go to court. Their most important argument was that the drastic cut in nature that Dahlberg’s artwork entailed would be a non-stop reminder of the killings on Utøya in addition to being an actual ‘murder’ of living nature. They believed it would be impossible not to register the cliffs’ wounds daily and – taken all together – it would be traumatic. The residents presented medical proof that they had already suffered significant health damage due to Breivik’s terrorist attacks on Utøya. The dispute continued until June 2017, when the Government officially canceled Jonas Dahlberg’s “Memory Wound” as proposed national memorial in Utøya’s municipality Hole.

Picture 2: Cancelled Memorial: Memory Wound

Photo Credit: @ Jonas Dahlberg Studio

In February 2017, historian Tor Einar Fagerland, leader of the National Support Group for July 22, Lisbeth Røynealand, and AUF leader, Mani Hussaini, had already written a column for the Norwegian newspaper *Aftenposten* where they strongly recommend that the Government entirely dropped “Memory Wound” and instead chose Utøya quay as a site for a new, national memorial in Hole.[35] Their argument was typical of the new understanding of memorial sites: Memorials have a unique power when they are designed to remember *what* happened *where* it happened. Utøya quay on the landside is such a site. It had an essential function during everything that happened on July 22, 2011, including the rescue work. From here, Breivik took the ferry MS Thorbjørn and pretended to be a policeman before he began to shoot. Young people who swam from Breivik’s bullets were rescued and put in safety on the Utøya quay by locals. For campers or members of the AUF Youth League, it would be easy to connect their own experiences with the inherent power of this particular place.

Furthermore, by establishing a national memorial on the mainland, at the embarkation point of the passage to Utøya, the connecting line between the terrorist attacks on Utøya and Oslo would be emphasized. Thus, a “memorial and a learning” axis could be extended from the July 22 center and the Government quarter in Oslo to the Hedge-house learning center and the Clearing memorial site, both at Utøya. By completing all memory constructions related to Utøya with a national memorial at the Utøya quay, former conflicts with locals in Hole might also stop. The fact that the quay is Utøya’s property even gave the proposal the flair of a gift. Their recommendations were eventually accepted.

Yet, sixteen individuals tried to prevent the announced decision to go ahead with the construction on the same grounds as before: they would be traumatized by the constant flow of “terror tourism.” In the fall of 2020, the residents went to court to present evidence that they already had suffered significant mental health harm as a result of the terrorist attack and that the memorial site would worsen it. However, they did not win the case. On February 8, 2021, the court finally considered the health aspect for these 16 individuals to be subordinate to society’s need for a national memorial and the need to complete the memorial process before the 10th anniversary of the terrorist attack on Utøya in July 2021.[36]

In his new book *Ingen mann er en øy* (No Man is an Island) the manager to AUF Utøya, Jørgen Watne Frydnes, provided a detailed narrative and explained what seems to be a rather complicated situation. According to

Frydnes, Utøya has three kinds of neighbors: A large majority is called “the boat people,” including those who helped rescue the swimmers from the waters on July 22, 2011. They are supportive of Utøya and recognize the national obligation to build a memorial site in Utøya’s vicinity. A small minority finds it hard to live with a blatantly visible memorial of the ‘Utøya massacre’ close to home. This is the group that in the end went to court to stop it. An even smaller minority of political adversaries has for a long time resented that the Norwegian Labor Party’s Youth League (AUF) owns Utøya. They disagree strongly with the Labor Party’s version of social-democratic politics and have, according to Frydnes, used the incident of the terrorist attack to plead for the final lockdown of Utøya. This group is also against building any visible memorial in their neighborhood.[37]

This description of three stakeholders is probably a fair sketch of how many other small, local communities in Norway would have divided into 2 or 3 antagonistic groups after a local catastrophe, depending on what kind of national political response they approved of. The tragedy, in this case, is that the conflict is still not resolved. The community lacks “experimental tools” to acknowledge the strife and show a willingness or capacity to start negotiations to find common ground befitting neighbors. The government has not interfered or engaged professionals to help people find an acceptable solution to the conflict. From an analytical perspective, both minority positions may, in this case, be regarded as examples of the anti-political, of denying the existence of “the political” in the midst of their vicinity, insisting instead on “the social/private” as the only legitimate human sphere. To refuse the political is in Norway the same as to refuse to do democracy. As is evident in this case, to refuse the political also implies a refusal to practice and enhance (in the social sphere) one’s ethical capacities for democratic decision-making. The result is continued strife, which is the opposite of resilience.

The National Memorial: Utøya Quay

The proposed new memorial to be built at Utøya quay is simply called the “National Memorial Utøya Quay.” It was designed on commission by the architectural firm *Manthey Kula*. [38] The architects intend to invite to a commemoration victims and survivors of the dual terror attacks, both in Oslo and on Utøya July 22, 2011, but also of their rescuers. The memorial is in the process of being built on the dock area on the landside of Utøya. This is where the ferry leaves and also where many survivors were taken care of after the attack.

The memorial has been immediately supported by professionals, survivors, and AUF, and therefore also by the government. However, the government has switched the management of the project from KORO (Art in Public Spaces) to Statsbygg (Public Building). This move might mean that the memorial is perceived more as an architectural assignment than an art assignment. The actual memorial site will consist of 77 bronze columns, which represent both the 69 killed on Utøya and the eight who died in the government building in Oslo. Each column alludes to a high-rise, vague contour of a prolonged human body. Together the 77 columns will form a wave motion along the quayside. The wave is coordinated with the sun’s movements as the tragedy in Oslo and on Utøya unfolded. Given the size of the place, it will have a smaller potential for collective meditation and reflection from a large assembly, but at the same time, it invites – in a straightforward way – people to sit down between the columns and “lean towards” the memory of a specific “person.”

Picture 3: National Memorial Utøya Quay

Photo Credit: Statsbygg/ Manthey Kula

Whether the National Memorial Utøya Quay becomes a memorial, as defined in this article, or rather turns out to be more of a monument that individuals look at but do not engage with, nor communicate with, remains to be seen.

Utøya's Memorials: The Clearing and the Hedge House

The Clearing

The firm *3RW Architects* were commissioned to design the private memorial for the dead at Utøya.[39] They started the process by choosing a site where nobody was killed. When working out the plan, they took inspiration from the simplest form of human sociability we know, the circle. They also took knowledge from the many archeological remains of circular campfires found at the campsites of the first migrants to the landmass called Norway thousands of years ago.[40] A small flock could easily be imagined to have gathered around the fire for protection, warmth, and community. Inspired by this pattern, a unifying, heavy steel ring was carved at Utøya and attached between four tall pine trees. It sits 1,5 m above the ground and moves with the wind. The names of the dead are carved into the steel, and the memorial itself is called *The Clearing* (in the woods). Bordering the uneven circle is a garden of bushes, flowers, and herbs. It is meant to attract life from the surrounding environment, including butterflies, not least the species named Mourning Cloak. Life lost is to be remembered with the smell and vision of new life. However, the fact that the names of the dead break the ring makes all the difference. The circle is full but broken by instances of human loss.

According to the architects, their design tries to address the duality of Utøya as both a unique natural site and the scene of a horrific crime. In this duality, nature represents hope. The memorial clears a space in nature to establish community and give shelter and protection from the elements, and from any possible traces of Breivik's killing spree – which still may be visible in other areas of the island. It is also meant to highlight the presumed fact that nature has no memory of Breivik's killing and is already healing from the scars and wounds of July 22, 2011. When a big tree in the forest dies, we know an organic process named a clearing begins. The memorial copies the form of this cleared spot, supposedly free from violence and free from history.

The “Memorial Committee” at Utøya that chose this design regards it to be both sophisticated and unpretentious: “No matter what social, cultural or religious affiliation, you can feel welcome here.”[41] Thus, the memorial is intended to be both non-religious and trans-religious. It was constructed with voluntary work from survivors, parents, siblings and friends and was dedicated on July 22, 2015. Many families who had lost their children to Breivik’s massacre were present at the time of the opening, primarily adults. All carried flowers. The prime minister said a few words. Then silence. No music, no talking, no singing. People strolled around the steel ring. Some stuck flowers into the carved-out name in the ring. Some put down flowers on the ground, under the name of their lost child, sibling, or friend. The flowers formed a new ring under the metal ring. The slope above the ring is occupied by benches and seats. It invites mourners to rest in contemplation with memories and views of the sea, the trees and flowers, and the memorial site itself. The same ritualized patterns that unfolded in the streets of Oslo are repeated here: silence, whispering, kindness, togetherness, roses, small movements, circles, contemplation, crying.

Utøya is a campsite on a small island and is in many ways already a liminal space. However, within it, different modes of rituality have been put in place. From the 3RW architects’ point of view, it was essential to build the memorial in a place where nobody was killed and which materially and symbolically could harvest all the riches of nature for its design. However, it is just as important to be aware that the old gathering site for political speech and discussion, concerts, and rallies, “Bakken,” is only a three-minute walk from the “Clearing.” These two places are connected by a border of trees and flowers that demarcate two different modes of rituality: on the one hand, the political, ceremonial meeting grounds for a political assembly, that can instantly shift into a loud, singing crowd that creates a deep sense of bonding and social community; and on the other, a personal, spiritual memorial site inviting individual and collective commemoration, and open to ritual.

It was crucial for AUF to ‘reclaim’ Utøya as a living campsite for political meetings and social gatherings, and not let terrorism win. However, as pointed out already, this was perceived as controversial, including by some survivors and mourners.[42] The 3RW architects nevertheless captured this ‘reclaiming.’ The presence of a memorial site for young political activists killed by a terrorist is a constant reminder that democracy is not a given but must be defended and its supportive social institutions need to be strengthened. The two sites, the one linked with the political, the other with the social, are complementary.[43] However, it is important not to confuse them. It is ritual, as a time-limited tool of the social, which may support democratic politics, not the other way around. Rituals rehearse our common humanity while politics contains our wildest disagreements but offers civilized tools to come to terms, despite conflicts.

Picture 4: The Clearing Memorial at Utøya

Photo Credit: 3RW Architects

Utøya Learning Center: the Hedgehouse

The Hedge-house is designed by *Blakstad Haffner Architects* and is the project on Utøya that has received most attention.[44] AUF Utøya, in collaboration with survivors, relatives, young people, activists and professionals, had to decide what to do with the old café building where 13 young people were killed and many injured.

In the process of accepting this immense task, the young leaders and managers of AUF Utøya focused on connecting with a certain group of professionals and advisers, such as the earlier mentioned historian Tor Einar Fagerland. Supported by his and other people's advice, they travelled the country and conducted in-depth conversations with all survivors and all families that had lost a child to Breivik's massacre. Furthermore, Fagerland advised AUF not only to involve everyone affected by the terrorist killings at Utøya but also to contact the professionals who developed the memorial site Ground Zero after September 11, 2001, in New York.[45]

The main memorial design at Ground Zero consists of a structure of two deep, square waterfalls, placed in the footprints of each of the twin towers. Water constantly flows downwards, along the inner walls, into an abyss. The water begins its flow just under the names of all those killed. Names are grouped according to who sat or died close to each other physically, inside the building and on the planes, or who worked together in rescue teams on the ground and died while saving others. Visitors can see and touch the name inscriptions with their hands and leave flowers and other greetings. But the feeling of a never-ending death as the waters keep falling down into the abyss is palpable. The site also lacks a place, or practices, to spur new engagement.

A park is planted around the memorial, with oak trees blooming in the spring. They indicate new life across all forms of death and break some of the "darkness" of the abysses associated with the memorial itself. In addition, a Museum is established midway between the two abysses. It includes a learning center that respectfully portrays all the dead and which may educate the entire population on what happened on 9/11. It has also been essential to preserve some damaged objects – parts from distorted buildings or vehicles – and include these as tactile tracks in the museum. The Ground Zero Memorial used ten years to materialize and was dedicated on September 11, 2011.[46]

The first Director of the 9/11 Memorial & Museum in New York, Alice Greenwald, carefully advised AUF Utøya

not to tear down all traces of death, to leave something for posterity, but perhaps frame it in a new way. She also helped them find a way to balance personal losses with national grief. These challenges were quite similar in New York after 9/11 and in Norway after 22/07. Thus, *The 22nd July 2011 Learning Center*, first located in the destroyed government building in Oslo, is inspired by the museum at Ground Zero. The exhibition in the Oslo Learning Center was dedicated on July 22, 2015.[47]

Utøya's old cafe building has been transformed by being cropped and then incorporated into a new framing/building, designed by architect Erlend Blakstad Haffner. He found inspiration in old Norwegian building customs and a certain notion of "hegn" (hedge) in Herman Wildenvey's poem "A Summer Day". Haffner developed the idea of a hedged house that could "hang" and "surround" a part of the cafe building to protect and preserve it. He suggested that 69 inner, thick wooden pillars could support the roof and represent those killed at Utøya. The thinner, free-standing wooden pillars placed around the buildings outside to shield it would represent the 495 who survived.

The design is inspired by the old Norwegian longhouse associated with the Viking era, where free-standing earth-dug pillars carried the house's roof, which was separate from the pillars used to carry the walls. According to Haffner, we can see the same principle in the first stave churches, where the space between the two rows of pillars would be known as the "cool passage." The same effect has been achieved at Utøya.[48] Together, both the dead and the survivors symbolically hedge off and protect a new generation of young people who come to Utøya to learn about democracy and social-democratic politics and who meet for history lessons or democracy seminars in the learning center, the Hedge House. The building has become so successful that in 2016 it was announced by the British newspaper *The Guardian* as one of the world's ten most significant buildings that year.

Concluding Remarks: Implications for Memory Work

How should a democratic nation commemorate a terrorist attack? What is the primary purpose – to honor the individuals who died or defend democratic ideals and the ways of life of the democratic citizens attacked and killed? Should we also remember the bereaved and the love and care given to them by co-citizens?

This article has discussed these questions by presenting how the Norwegian Government and the AUF Youth League at Utøya recognized their obligation to remember the effects of the July 22 massacre and called on renowned artists and architects to design worthy memorial sites. It has discussed the conceptual implications of the different memorial designs, and to a certain extent compared the Norwegian process to New York's Ground Zero. It has shown that the ritualized discourse of "love and grief" has prevailed over the discourse of "defending democracy" as expressive of public preference in our national memorial practices and debates. However, AUF Utøya has managed to balance "remembering the beloved dead" with "rehearsing democratic attitudes" in its own memorial work. They have recognized and separated the two practices visually and spatially by giving each of them hegemony at one particular memorial site: "love" at the Clearing, "democracy" at the Hedgehouse, thus linking them together. This is a didactic ploy copied from experiences made at Ground Zero. It works, and it would be a good idea for the Norwegian Government to also copy this experience when finalizing its plans for the Governmental quarter in Oslo. Learning from Utøya, it should prepare to consciously split the place-based memorialization of the beloved dead from debating what a robust democracy is, why democracy was attacked by Breivik, and why young people presently are being recruited to groups aimed at returning society to premodern lifeforms by acts of violence. Sequencing memory politics, the beloved dead must come first, although we as a collective only remember them once every year. Democracy must be practiced daily, although we know it does not exist without a deep and egalitarian respect for every single individual life and what we hold to be inborn human rights.

Picture 5: The Hedge House

Photo Credit: Are Carlsen

When the Norwegians answered KORO's survey in 2013, they were crystal clear that they hoped future memorials would be able to evoke both the relational sentiments we name "love," "solidarity," "grief," "reflection," "hope," and "peace," and the memory of why exactly these sentiments are connected to so many people's post-July 22 experience. Furthermore, since the concept of "memorial" includes an intention "to facilitate" enactment between the human visitor and the memorial itself, the visitor has a standing invitation to re-enter the historical moment of the event, or of another event, and dwell on anything that comes to mind or touches the heart. Although memory to one generation is history to the next, to re-enter the memory of time and its entanglement with the self is a way forward to actually remember Breivik's attack and the realities of death that took the life of specific, named persons. Thus, we may assume that remembering July 22, 2011 by visiting a memorial, most likely will (and should) *begin* as a remembrance of the facts of life and death of real people, not the facts of democracy.[49]

Memorial work is hard work. The Norwegian Government should therefore begin to remind itself and its people why public memorials after July 22, 2011, must be built, visited and engaged – collectively. To strengthen and protect the short history of democracy in our country, we must be reminded to never forget Breivik's revolting and hideous acts. We must be reminded that all Norwegians co-constitute "the democratic citizens" together with those who were killed. We must also be reminded to continue to honor the dead, care for survivors and defend the next generation by improving democracy now. To be reminded is to remember. More democracy and more humanity, as an intentional unifying practice, have not been called back to the streets of Oslo since 2011.[50]

As argued in this article, it is useful to draw on the analytical and spatial distinction between the social (private) and the political (public) to understand memorial work – first as stated by Hannah Arendt and later refined by Chantal Mouffe. It helps us grasp what is uniquely new about democracy, and hence what Breivik attacked. It also clarifies how an instant community of feeling and care can form and last in public space, enabled through the tools of social ritual, a practice associated with the domains of family, neighborhood, home. The social can also co-exist with the political rituals of non-violent protest, or with debate. This is supported by Mouffe's bending of the concept of the political, away from denoting a physical space to denoting a pop-up conflictual discourse, related to major issues or to contestations of norms and customs. Thus, the political may surface

anywhere. Therefore, we must not conflate politics with morality but accept the dimension of antagonism as “ineradicable in politics.”[51] On the other hand, if we are willing to practice and enhance our ethical sensibilities in pre-political fields, Mouffe is certain that democratic cultures and debates can be improved and become more robust. As indicated in this article, the architects who designed the “Clearing” probably aimed at inducing a certain dormant memory in the mourners: a sense of a pre-existing interrelatedness, larger than death. Thus, to enter a specific memorial space might in fact also be an invitation to rehearse a specific ethical sensibility, productive to democracy.

Implied in Mouffe’s argument is of course a deep critique of hate speech as not-belonging to either agonistic democracy nor to democratic “free-speech” since it is a performative practice aimed at killing trust, destabilize social bonds, and destroy the spirit and confidence to dare to speak up for the weak and do the right thing.

This article has approached ritual as a creative cultural tool with which it is possible both to discover, practice and enhance a certain ‘cultivation’ of social skills, and through skills, norms. Egalitarian ritual plays an important role in cultivating democratic dispositions. Ritual is not an organization but a *tool* with which people gather into a particular ritualized mode, for a particular reason and for a limited time. Neither is ritual democratic per se. It becomes part of democratic culture through its particular enactment in place, through how it is constructed and done.

However, part of the skill of performing ritual in a democratic society is to make sure that ritual ends and to be aware of this fact. Otherwise, ritual can become a totalitarian way of life and impose utopian or nativist norms onto politics, or become a battlefield for never-resting antagonistic forces. This demand for ritual closure necessarily means that an experience of “togetherness” ends when ritual ends. For an experience to take hold and be “crafted” onto the body as sentiment, disposition, knowledge or memory, ritual must be repeated again and again. Thus, ritual *in this take* is a primary cultivating tool of “bodies in alliance” in a plurality of places. If successful, it imprints a physical memory of close and peaceful inter-action and may pull the participating individual to deeply accept another person’s humanity and rights, as well as being aware of their joint social interdependence.

The ritual process may be prescribed or improvised. It nevertheless takes people into places and processes where they may be forced to see the other, often including those who do not belong to their own in-group. Ritual intends to build or confirm social community and, therefore, society. That is why it also needs to end. For if our social life becomes a single ritual event, society may turn into a version of Breivik’s authoritarian dream.

About the Author: **Jone Salomonsen** is Professor of Theology & Interdisciplinary Gender Studies at the Faculty of Theology, University of Oslo. She is trained both as theologian and as anthropologist, and has extensive ethnographic field work experience from the United States, South Africa and Norway. Main research fields are Feminist Theology, Gender and Religion, Ritual Studies, Ecological Neopagan NRM, Democracy and Religion. In 2013-2017 she was lead Principal Investigator (PI) and project manager for “REDO: Reassembling Democracy. Ritual as Cultural Resource,” funded by the Norwegian Research Council’s SAMKUL program, <https://www.tf.uio.no/english/research/projects/redo>.

Notes

- [1] The empirical research for this article was funded by the Norwegian Research Council's SAMKUL program through the REDO project (2013-2017), *Reassembling Democracy. Ritual as Cultural Resource*. URL: <https://www.tf.uio.no/english/research/projects/redo/>.
- [2] Cf. *Artistic Plan for Memorials after July 22* (KORO)'s 2013 Quest Back Survey and the word cloud that was figuring the dimensions of people's associations with July 22, p 47. URL: <https://koro.no/content/uploads/2015/12/Minnesteder-Kunstplan.pdf>.
- [3] Stoltenberg's Speech July 24, 2011. URL: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumentarkiv/stoltenberg-ii/smk/taler-og-artikler/2011/tale-ved-statsminister-jens-stoltenberg-/id651789/>.
- [4] Cf. Fagerland, Tor Einar (2013), «22 juli som minnested: ny bruk av offentlig rom». *Kunstplan for minnesteder etter 22. juli*, published by KORO 11.06.2013; Fagerland, Tor Einar (2016) «Følgeforskning og minneprosesser på Utøya 2013–2014», *De berørte etter 22 juli. Forskningsetiske perspektiver*, (Ed.) Vidar Enerbakk et al., Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk, pp. 85-106; Linenthal, Edward T. (2001), *The Unfinished Bombing. Oklahoma City in American Memory*, New York: Oxford University Press; Young, James E. (1993), *The Texture of Memory – Holocaust Memorial and Meaning*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press. Other important scholarship in the field that also has influenced the Norwegian memorial work includes Margry, Peter Jan & Christina Sanchez-Carretero (2011), *Grassroot Memorials. The Politics of Memorializing Tragic Deaths*, New York: Berghahn Books; Santino, Jack (2004), Performative Commemoratives, the Personal, and the Public: Spontaneous Shrines, Emergent Ritual, and the Field of Folklore, *The Journal of American Folklore*, 117 (266), pp. 363-372.
- [5] Young, James E. (1992), "The Counter-Monument. Memory against Itself in Germany Today," *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 18, No. 2. (Winter, 1992), pp. 267-296.
- [6] Rothberg, Michael (2009), *Multidirectional Memory. Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*, Stanford: Stanford University Press; URL: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780804783333>.
- [7] Arendt, Hannah (1998) [1958]. *The Human Condition*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Arendt's thesis is supported by classical sociology. Cf. Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. (1945), Religion and Society, *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. 75, No 1-2, pp.33-43; Nisbet, Robert A. (1952), "Conservatism and Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology*, Sep, 1952, Vol. 58, No. 2, pp. 167- 175; URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2772188>; Durkheim, Emil 2008 [1912], *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, New York: Dover
- [8] Mouffe, Chantal (2002), "Which Public Sphere for a Democratic Society?" *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, (1), June 2002, pp. 55-65; Mouffe, Chantal (2005), *On the Political*, London: Routledge.
- [9] Mouffe (2002), p. 64
- [10] Cf. Juergensmeyer, Mark (2017). *Terror in the Mind of God. The Global Rise of Religious Violence*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; De Graaf, Beatrice (2011). *Evaluating Counterterrorism Performance. A Comparative Study*, London: Routledge; J. L. Austin (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [11] Gardell, Mattias (2014). "Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for Monocultural Europe," *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 26:129-155, p. 147. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2014.849930>.
- [12] Balbi, Anne-Marie (2019) *Constructing Counter-Narratives to Terrorism: A Comparative Analysis of Collective Resistance in the Aftermath of Terror Attacks in Bali and Norway*, Ph.D. Thesis, Curtin University. Australia, May 2019, <https://espace.curtin.edu.au/handle/20.500.11937/78145>.
- [13] Cf. Turner, Victor (1974) *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors. Symbolic Action in Human Society*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press; Schechner, Richard (1988) *Performance Theory*, London: Routledge.
- [14] Delattre, Ronald A. (1978), "Ritual Resourcefulness and Cultural Pluralism." *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, Vol. 61, No 3 (Fall 1978), pp. 281-301.
- [15] Cf. Handelman, Don (2005), "Epilogue. Toing and Froing the Social," *Ritual in Its Own Right: Exploring the Dynamics of Transformation*, (Eds.) Don Handelman and Galina Lindquist, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 213-222; Grimes, Ronald L. (2020). "Improvising Ritual," in: *Reassembling Democracy*, (Eds.) Graham Harvey, Michael Houseman, Sarah Pike, Jone Salomonsen, London: Bloomington, pp.17-36.
- [16] Turner, Victor (1979). "Frame, Flow, and Reflection: Ritual and Drama as Public Liminality," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, Vol 6. No 4 (Dec. 1979), pp. 465-499.
- [17] Turner (1979), p. 469.
- [18] Butler, Judith (2020) *The Force of Non-Violence. An Ethico-Political Bind*, London: Verso, p 16. See also Butler, Judith

- (2015). *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- [19] Cf. Berntzen, Lars Erik & Sveinung Sandberg (2014). "The Collective Nature of Lone Wolf Terrorism: Anders Behring Breivik and the Anti-Islamic Social Movement," *Terrorism and Politics Violence*, Vol 26, 2014-Issue 5, pp 759-779; URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2013.767245>; Ravndal, Jacob Aasland (2012). "A Post-Trial Profile of Anders Behring Breivik," *CTC Sentinel*, Vol 5, Issue 104, pp16-19; URL: <https://ctc.usma.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/CTCSentinel-Vol5Iss104.pdf>; Gardell, Mattias (2003). *Gods of the Blood: The Pagan Revival and White Separatism*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- [20] Breivik, Anders Behring (2011). *2083 – A European Declaration of Independence*, published on the internet on 22 July 2011. US White supremacist and ultranationalist Greg Johnson discovered and endorsed Breivik during his trial. Cf. Johnson's representation of his own extreme/radical right philosophy in Greg Johnson. *The New Right vs. Old Right & Other Essays*. San Francisco: Counter Currents publishing, 2013. Salomonsen offers an analysis of Johnson's ideology in Salomonsen, Jone (2021). "Towards a new 1933? The Fascist Labor of the Extreme and the Radical Right," *Dialog. A Journal of Theology*, 2021, pp 1-8; URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/dial.12652>.
- [21] For more on Breivik's Christian-Pagan rhetoric, cf. Salomonsen, Jone (2015). "Graced Life After All? Terrorism and Theology on July 22, 2011." *Dialog. A Journal of Theology*, Vol 54, Issue 3, Sept 2015, pp 249–259; URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/dial.12186>; and, Salomonsen, Jone (2017). "Det som Gud skapte mest likt sitt bilde. Totalitær livstolkning og teologisk respons," *Ska-pelsesnåde. Festskrift til Svein Aage Christoffersen*, (Eds.) Stine Holte, Roger Jensen og Marius Timmann Mjaaland, Oslo: Novus Forlag, pp.185-212.
- [22] Cf. Wilkinson, Paul (1981), *The New Fascists*. London: Grant McIntyre University Press.
- [23] Breivik's utterances to journalists during his case against the Norwegian state, V.G. March 16, 2016, which he lost. URL: <http://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/anders-behring-breivik-soeksmaalet/breivik-hevder-han-er-gaatt-fra-vold-til-politisk-aktivisme/a/23639646/>.
- [24] Salomonsen, Jone (2020), "The Ritual Powers of the Weak. Democracy and Public Responses to the July 22, 2011, Terrorist Attacks on Norway"; in: *Reassembling Democracy*, Graham Harvey, Michael Houseman, Sarah Pike, Jone Salomonsen (Eds.), London: Bloomington, pp.143-161; DOI [10.5040/9781350123045.ch-008](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350123045.ch-008).
- [25] Cf. Døving, Cora Alexa (2018). "Homeland ritualized: an analysis of written messages placed at temporary memorials after the terrorist attacks on July 22, 2011 in Norway," *Mortality. Promoting the Interdisciplinary Study of Death and Dying*, Volume 23 (3), pp. 231-246; Høeg, Ida Marie (2015). "Silent actions – emotion and mass mourning rituals after the terrorist attacks in Norway on July 22, 2011," *Mortality. Promoting the Interdisciplinary Study of Death and Dying*, Volume 20 (3), pp. 197-214.
- [26] The language of love was initiated on Twitter on the night of July 23 by an 18 years old girl named Hanne Gannestad, who tweeted, "When a man can cause so much pain – think how much love we can create together (Når en mann kan forårsake så mye ondt – tenk hvor mye kjærlighet vi kan skape sammen)." When a young AUF politician and survivor from Utøya, Stine Renate Håheim, was interviewed by CNN some hours later, and they asked her: «How do you tell the youth of Norway that revenge is not an option?» she answered with Gannestad's words. The saying went viral and spread rapidly, and not just in Norway. Cf. Kverndokk, Kyrre (2017) Sosiale medier og kjærlighetsfortellingen om 22. juli; URL: <https://22juliseret.no/ressurs/sosiale-medier-og-kjaerlighetsfortellingen-om-22-juli>.
- [27] Cf. Jens Stoltenberg July 25, 2011, who also said: "Det vi ser i kveld kan være den største og den viktigste marsjen det norske folk har lagt ut på siden den 2. Verdenskrig"; URL: <https://www.arbeiderpartiet.no/om/historien-om-arbeiderpartiet/22-juli/jens-stoltenbergs-tale-pa-minnemarkeringen-25-juli-2011/>.
- [28] People used plural terms to describe the gatherings in the streets of Oslo. They were called *Rosehav* (*Ocean of Roses*), *Blomsterhav* (*Ocean of Flowers*), and *Rosetog* (*Rose March*). The Norwegian *Artistic Plan for Memorials after July 22* ("Kunstplan for Minnesteder etter 22 juli" (KORO) used *Blomsterhav* for the experience in Oslo, URL: <https://koro.no/content/uploads/2015/12/Minnesteder-Kunstplan.pdf>. Tellingly, on September 28, 2019, a national memorial named *Iron Roses Memorial* was unveiled outside Oslo Cathedral. URL: <https://mdh.no/project/the-rose-monument/>.
- [29] As of 2017, almost 71% of the population is affiliated with the majority church, the Church of Norway, even though less than 4 % attended Sunday worship weekly. In 88% of all registered funerals, the bereaved chose ceremonies under the auspices of the Church of Norway, Cf. Ida Marie Høeg (2020). "The flower actions: Interreligious funerals after the Utøya Massacre"; in: *Reassembling Democracy*, Graham Harvey, Michael Houseman, Sarah Pike, Jone Salomonsen (Eds.) London: Bloomington, p.165.
- [30] Seligman, A. B. (2009), "Ritual, the Self, and Sincerity," *Social Research*, 76 (4). *The Religious-Secular Divide: The US Case* (Winter 2009) concludes that generative rituals are not focused on belief and are inherently non-discursive. Ritual does, of course, create its world of meaning, but whatever its semantic contents turn out to be, it is still far secondary to its subjunctive creation, p.1077.
- [31] We offered a 3-hour multi-workshop 3 days in a row. Altogether thirty people participated in the conversations. A majority

were female college students. Some of them were recruited through the University of Oslo and also assisted us in setting up the event. The event was hosted by the REDO project and took place in Oslo in October 2014. It was organized by Ida Marie Høeg, Cora Alexa Døving, Mari Lilleslåtten and the author of this article.

- [32] Cf. Koro's 2013 Quest Back Survey and the word cloud that figured the dimensions of people's associations with July 22; URL: <https://koro.no/content/uploads/2015/12/Minnesteder-Kunstplan.pdf>
- [33] Cf. Anker, Trine and Marie von der Lippe (2015), Når terror ties i hjel: en diskusjon om 22. juli og demokratisk medborgerskap i skolen. *Norsk pedagogisk tidsskrift*, Vol 99.(2) pp. 85-96. The main results of Anker & Lippe's research in Norwegian schools were already known at this point. Regarding the importance of "education in democracy" beyond learning *about* it, see also Bies-ta, Gert J. J. (2006) *Education and the Democratic Person. Beyond Learning. Democratic Education for a Human Future*, Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, pp.117-145;
- [34] Cf. Hjort, Ingeborg (2019), "Memory Wound: Minnsted mellom virkelighet og virtualitet," *Norsk Medietidsskrift* 26 (03), pp. 1-19.
- [35] February 8, 2017; URL: <https://www.nrk.no/kultur/foreslar-nytt-sted-for-22.-juli-minnesmerke-1.13368614>.
- [36] The neighbors lost the lawsuit about Utøyakaia, 8 February 2021; URL: <https://www.aftenposten.no/kultur/i/Kyji35/naboene-tapte-soeksmal-om-utoeyakaia>; National Memorial at Utøyakaia, Statsbygg & Manthey Kula Architects (2021); URL: <https://www.statsbygg.no/prosjekter-og-eiendommer/utoyakaia> and <https://www.mantheykula.no/national-memorial-at-utyakaia>.
- [37] Frydnes, Jørgen Watne (2021). *Ingen mann er en øy*, Oslo: Res Publica, p. 157. For an account of the contemporary radical right in Norwegian social media, cf. Haanshuus, Birgitte P. & Anders Ravik Jupskås (2017) "Høyreklikk! En analyse av ytre høyre på sosiale medier i Norge," *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning*, 2017, Vol.58 (2), p.145-165. For an account of how a re-articulation of Norwegian (ethno-) nationalism started to be visible on social media pre-Breivik, from about the early 2000s onwards, see Gullestad, Marianne (2006). "Imagined Kinship. The Role of Descent in the Re-articulation of Norwegian Ethno-nationalism"; in: *Neo-Nationalism in Europe and Beyond. Perspectives from Social Anthropology*, Andre Gingrich & Marcus Banks (Eds.) . Oxford: Berghahn, pp. 69-91. Due to the absence of significant critical public debates about Breivik's ideas and in light of a new growth in support of (ethno-) nationalist ideas, AUF has recently suggested that they require a new July 22 Committee to report on the situation and to examine why the government has not helped raise a public debate about the danger of Breivik's ideology. Cf. Rønning, Mats (2021) "AUF vil ha ny 22. Juli kommisjon," *NRK 2* April 2021; URL: <https://www.nrk.no/norge/auf-vil-ha-ny-22.-juli-kommisjon-1.15431159>
- [38] Cf. URL: <https://www.mantheykula.no/projects/nationalmemorialutoyakaia>. The long-term plan is to also build a memorial in the Governmental quarter. So far, a very successful 22 July 2011 Learning Center opened in 2015, and a temporary 22 July memorial was built in 2018. Cf. URL: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/midlertidig-minnsted-i-regjeringskvartalet-apnet/id2607490/>
- [39] The 3RW Architects; URL: <https://www.archdaily.com/770709/the-clearing-memorial-at-utoya-3rw-arkitekter>. The architects cooperated with ecologist Christian Mong and researcher Joseph Chipperfield at Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA) to plan and develop the memorial site.
- [40] Interview with 3RW architect Sixten Rahlff, January 21, 2021.
- [41] Cf. Vegard Grøslie Wennesland; URL: <https://archinect.com/news/article/132497273/the-clearing-memorial-to-norway-s-july-22-attacks-opens-on-the-tragedy-s-fourth-anniversary>. Cf. also this link to the memorial: URL: <http://www.utoya.no/minnsted>.
- [42] Frydnes 2021, pp. 59-114, narrates the conflicting views that also emerged among the bereaved: reclaim and restore Utøya to new life, or let it become an abandoned place, a museum over the destructions effectuated by the biggest violent attack on Norway since WWII.
- [43] Cf. also Anne-Marie Balbi (2019) and her detailed account of the Norwegian memorials after July 22, 2011, in particular the communicative resources at Utøya, and how the result is rebuilt trust and renewed community, and therefore resilience.
- [44] URL: <https://www.b-h-a.no/>
- [45] The terrorist attacks on the U.S. in 2001 were staged by 19 men who hijacked 4 planes and used them as weapons against American targets. Two planes crashed into the twin towers that made up the World Trade Center in lower Manhattan. The third plane crashed into the Pentagon building, and the fourth crashed in the countryside of Pennsylvania before reaching its destination (probably the Congress in Washington DC). The total number of dead was close to 3,000, with 2606 of them being killed in New York. The committee responsible for developing a memorial at Ground Zero spent several years understanding what the city, the country, and the bereaved needed and what it was possible to achieve on the site.
- [46] Sturken, Marita (2002), Memorializing Absence, *Understanding September 11*; in: Craig Calhoun, Paul Price, Ashley Timmer

(Eds.). New York: W.W. Norton, pp. 374-384; Miller, Eric D. (2011), "Finding Meaning at Ground Zero for Future Generations: Some Reflections a Decade after 9/11," *International Social Science Review*, Vol. 86, nos. 3 & 4, pp. 113-133. The pavilion above the underground museum at Ground Zero has been designed by the Norwegian architectural firm Snøhetta.

[47] Decisions made at Utøya were informed by experiences both from the Oklahoma City Memorial (4/25, 1995) as well as from New York's Ground Zero (9/11, 2001). Cf. also Vogel, Wendy (2016). "The Story of Norway's Multiple July 22 Memorials," *Hyperallergic*, published November 21, 2016. URL: <https://hyperallergic.com/339320/the-story-of-norways-multiple-july-22-memorials/>.

[48] Interview with architect Erlend Blakstad Haffner, January 21, 2021.

[49] Talsnes, Anne (2018), "Det som er minner for en generasjon er historie for den neste." URL: <https://22julisenteret.no/nyhet-sarkiv/det-som-er-minner-for-en-generasjon-er-historie-for-den-neste>, published Sept 7, 2018.

[50] Talsnes, Anne (2020) "Minnesteder og debatt, 22. juli senteret," published June 2020; URL: <https://nettsteder.regjeringen.no/22juli/files/2020/07/Minnesteder-og-debatt.pdf>; Wiggen, Mette (2018), Norway has Failed to Combat a Climate of Hate, *Centre for the Analysis Of Radical Right*, published August 2, 2018; URL: <https://www.radicalrightanalysis.com/2018/08/02/norway-has-failed-to-combat-a-climate-of-hate>.

[51] Mouffe (2002), p. 59.