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Note to Educators

The Teaching Beyond September 11th curriculum project seeks to capture the events of the two decades (2001-2021) following 9/11 as a means for youth to understand the post-9/11 global order. Developed by a team of educators from the University of Pennsylvania in collaboration with inter-/national scholars, practitioners, and community activist leaders, each stand-alone module is grounded in at least one of six identified themes and is anchored in an event in a particular year following 9/11. The curriculum does not need to be taught sequentially. Lessons within a module may be taught sequentially or individually unless specified.

The curriculum is ideal for advanced high school and early college students. Educators are encouraged to adapt lessons to meet the needs of their classroom and student academic level. The curriculum framework at the end of this document highlights guiding questions for students to grapple with and enduring understandings that we wish for students to glean from these lessons.
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These materials may be reproduced for educational use with attribution to the original authors and source. The materials contained here may not be reproduced for commercial purposes or in ways that distort the accuracy of the information presented.

Module 11. Right-Wing Extremism

Primary Theme: Democracy and Rights
Secondary Theme: Theme
Year in focus: 2011, 2019
Grades: 11 and 12 and freshman college
Entry points (subject area): Global History, European History, Government & Politics

Module Context
2011 marked the 10-year anniversary of the Global War on Terror and the tenth year the US had been at war with Afghanistan (see Modules 1 & 9). The Iraq war, which had started in 2003, came to an official end in December 2011 (though the US exodus was short-lived and a small number of troops returned to Iraq in 2014 to defeat Daesh [aka ISIS]; See module 3). Several other noteworthy events occurred that year, including the Arab Uprisings that inspired the Occupy Wall Street movement (see Module 10) and also triggered the Syrian War. However, we focus this module on a growing threat since 9/11: right-wing extremism. Specifically, this module focuses on the July 22, 2011 massacre in Oslo and Utøya, Norway, where a lone white right-wing extremist orchestrated a series of events – starting with a bomb blast near the Norwegian Prime Minister’s Office to an hour-long shooting spree targeting youth members of the Labour party. Over 90 people were killed that day. Initial reports suggested the perpetrator was Muslim since the threat from right-wing extremism was very much under-the-radar in Norway. This is partially due to long-standing anti-Muslim sentiments in Europe and partially because there had been several attacks from al-Qaeda affiliated groups in European countries, a result of which terrorism was perceived as synonymous to Muslim extremism. Eventually, it was learned that the perpetrator was attacking young Norwegians, specifically future leaders of the Labour party, as he blamed them for promoting a multicultural society and the Islamization of Europe.

Module Goal
Students will be able to use their independent learning to analyze democratic responses to right-wing extremism and terrorism, while also considering the role of anti-Muslim racism in shaping public perceptions about right-wing attacks.

Module Overview
This module provides students with an understanding of what constitutes right-wing extremism. Using the Utøya and Oslo attacks of 2011 as a focus point, the module showcases how right-wing extremism is a growing issue in many parts of the world.

Lesson 1 – What is Right-Wing Extremism?
This lesson introduces students to key terms and concepts related to right-wing extremism. Students will explore a variety of terms related to right-wing extremism in order to gain a deeper understanding of the term.
Lesson 2 – Responding to Terrorist Attacks: Lessons from Norway
In this two-part lesson, students will learn about the Utøya and Oslo attacks of 2011 through an exploration of real-time tweets, videos and other materials in the aftermath of the event. The focus of the lesson is to see how the country responded to the attacks rather than the attacks themselves.

Lesson 3 – Responding to Terrorist Attacks: A Comparison of Two Leaders
This lesson examines the speeches given by two leaders following right-wing domestic terrorist attacks on their soil in Norway and New Zealand. Students will identify and interpret the message(s) promoted and rhetoric used in the speeches. They will explore how the two leaders express sympathy and solidarity with the directly affected. Students will also reflect on important differences between the focuses of each speech and how the responses of democratic leaders shape our understanding of how to respond to right-wing extremism.

Curriculum Connections
Module 7: What is Islamophobia?
Module 8: Islamophobia and the Oval Office
Module 12: Responding to Hate Violence
Lesson 1. What is Right-Wing Extremism?

Overview, Background Resources and Materials Needed

This lesson introduces students to key terms and concepts related to right-wing extremism. Students will explore a variety of terms related to right-wing extremism in order to gain a deeper understanding of the term.

Background reading for educators before Lesson 1

It would be beneficial for educators to review the following resources. These resources may also be used as a supplementary reading list for students in higher level courses:

1. Compendium – an overview of the Far-Right (Center for Research on Extremism)
   https://www.sv.uio.no/c-rex/english/groups/compendium/index.html

2. Living with Controversy – Teaching Controversial Issues Through Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights (EDC/HRE)”, Activity on page 46: Whose side are you on?

3. Educator Background Resource (provided in supplementary materials)

Key Terms in Lesson 1

- **Alt-Right**: An abbreviation of alternative right, is a loosely connected far-right, white nationalist movement. A largely online phenomenon, the alt-right originated in the United States during the early 2010s before establishing a presence in other countries and declining after 2017. The term is ill-defined, having been used in different ways by alt-right members, media commentators, and academics. Briefly, the alt-right movement espouses a pseudo-scientific form of racism which promotes a form of identity politics in favor of European Americans and white people internationally, to the disfavor of all other groups. Anti-egalitarian, it rejects the liberal democratic basis of U.S. governance and opposes both the conservative and liberal wings of the country’s political mainstream.

- **Authoritarianism**: The principle of blind submission to authority, as opposed to individual freedom of thought and action. In government, authoritarianism denotes any political system that concentrates power in the hands of a leader or a small elite that is not constitutionally responsible to the body of the people.

- **Conspiracy Theory**: A type of explanation that describes the actions of a group of powerful conspirators as the most important cause of an event, a series of events, or a state-of-affairs. Although conspiracy theories are by no means limited to extreme political groups, they are often central to extreme ideologies and may radicalize followers.

- **Extremism**: Extreme perceptions or actions where violence is considered an acceptable means of forcing through dramatic social changes and achieving political, religious or ideological goals.
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- **Far-right**: Far-right politics is characterized by “radical nationalism”, in which groups are excluded on racial, ethnic or cultural grounds. The far-right is a global phenomenon with implications for local, national, and transnational politics. The far-right takes on multiple organizational forms and features different variants of a shared ideological core: the belief that inequalities are natural and therefore some groups are superior to others, which informs their nativist and authoritarian views of society.

- **Hate Crimes**: Defined by the United States Department of Justice: “At the federal level, a crime motivated by bias against race, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or disability.”

- **Islamophobia**: A phobia or exaggerated bias, hatred, or fear of Islam as religion and those who practice Islam, Muslims. Islamophobia extends to other communities and individuals who are perceived to be Muslim as well. Also known as anti-Muslim racism.

- **Nationalism**: An ideology that emphasizes loyalty, devotion, or allegiance to a nation or nation-state and holds that such obligations outweigh other individual or group interests. (Nativist: A policy or perspective of favoring native inhabitants (i.e. those belonging to a particular place by birth) as opposed to immigrants.

- **Radicalization**: The process by which an individual adopts or begins to believe in extreme views.

- **Right-wing radicalization**: A specific ideology characterized by ‘illiberal opposition to equality’. It is associated with radical nationalism, authoritarianism, populism, and xenophobia. Radical right parties have been increasingly successful in recent decades in some of the largest democracies in the world, including the US, Brazil, India, and several European countries.

- **Right-wing extremism**: Right-wing extremism is a very extreme attitude on the political right. It is used for parties, movements, groups, individual activists, and websites. Right-wing extremism is often associated with anti-democratic attitudes, racism, xenophobia, ethnic nationalism, conspiracy theories, authoritarianism - and in some cases political violence.

- **Terrorism (US)**: The United States FBI differentiates between international and domestic terrorism. International terrorism: Violent, criminal acts committed by individuals and/or groups who are inspired by, or associated with, designated foreign terrorist organizations or nations (state-sponsored). Domestic Terrorism: Violent, criminal acts committed by individuals and/or groups to further ideological goals stemming from domestic influences, such as those of a political, religious, social, racial, or environmental nature. (Office of Justice Programs)

- **Terrorism (Norway)**: Acts of terrorism; illegal use of, or threat of use of, force or violence against persons or property, in an attempt to put pressure on the country's authorities or the population or society in general to achieve political, religious or ideological goals.

- **White supremacy**: The belief that white people are a superior race to the exclusion of all other groups. This superiority leads to the belief that white people should have power over others. White supremacy is also considered a system, rooted in history, of oppression by whites over non-white communities.
Teaching Beyond September 11th

Materials Needed for Lesson 1

Lesson 1 Handout: Sources for Key Terms (Educator Resource) and Key Terms Handout (for students).
(1-2 copies of each definition pair for each student group)
- extremism and radicalization
- white supremacy and xenophobia
- nationalism and far-right
- anti-democratic and authoritarianism
- radicalization and conspiracy theories
Lesson 1. What is Right-Wing Extremism?

Learning Plan

Opening – 5 minutes

Open the lesson by asking students to discuss the following question in pairs:
What do you associate with the term right-wing extremism?

In pairs, the students share what they associate with the term right-wing extremism.

After 2 minutes, ask 2-3 pairs to share with the class what they talked about.

Anticipated answers:
- Student might mention specific right-wing extremist organisations/movements or events – current or past
- Terms associated with right-wing extremism: Racism, xenophobia, Islamophobia, antisemitism
- Nazi-Germany, Holocaust, Naming specific politicians
- Students might ask to repeat certain definitions or explain more in-depth (see Compendium resource under Educator Resources).

Possible misunderstandings that may need to be addressed:
- Students might jump to simple conclusions about right-wing extremism. For instance, they might strongly determine that particular right-wing politicians are extreme. This could be an opportunity to go back to the definitions and clarify what is “extremism”. It is important to highlight that the far-right consists of a variety of views on democracy, nationalism and authoritarianism. Right-wing extremism could be understood as the willingness to use violent means to achieve goals.
- Some students might claim that the educator is politically biased and ask why they are not addressing “Islamic extremism” or “left-wing extremism”. In this case, it is important to highlight that the lesson focuses on right-wing extremism as this is a serious, global challenge. Every year there are several right-wing extremist attacks in countries all over the world. For example, in 2019, the US Congress found that white supremacists and other far-right-wing extremists are the most significant domestic terrorism threat facing the United States. (Source: https://www.congress.gov/116/bills/s894/BILLS-116s894is.xml)

Key concepts overview – 10 minutes

Explain to students that to learn more about right-wing extremism, they need to understand some related terms first. Divide class into 5 groups. Each group should receive 2 of 10 key terms handouts (folded so that only the key word is visible)
- extremism and conspiracy theories
- white supremacy and xenophobia
- nationalism and far-right
- anti-democratic and authoritarianism
- radicalization and terrorism
Without unfolding the sheets, direct students to discuss their understanding or associations of their assigned terms for 3 minutes. Next, direct students to unfold the handout and read the definitions provided.

Instruct students to discuss the differing definitions and to come up with a consensus as to which definition makes the most sense to them and why.

Possible prompts:

1. What do you notice about the definitions for each term? Are they similar? Different? Do they say the same thing in different ways?
2. Which definition most aligns with your own understandings of these terms?
3. Were any example associations different from what you expected?
4. Why do you think these definitions were paired together?

The groups should assign one group member to share out and explain the definition to the class and another 1-2 group members to share up to 2 takeaways from their discussion based on the prompts above.

It is important that the educator correct any misunderstandings that may emerge from this discussion (refer to key terms in lesson overview and educator background resource for sources)

Presentation and Discussion – 25 minutes
Each group will have up to three minutes to share their definition and provide 1-2 takeaways for the class.

Once all students have presented their definitions, ask students how these terms might be related to right-wing extremism.

Next, provide a definition of right-wing extremism, which showcases how these words are connected.

Right-wing extremism is often associated with anti-democratic attitudes, racism, xenophobia, ethnic nationalism, conspiracy theories, authoritarianism - and in some cases political violence.

Debrief – 10 minutes
For the last few minutes of class, discuss the definition of right-wing extremism and connect back to the opening activity. What have they learned about right-wing extremism that they did not know before? Did anything surprise them about these definitions?
Lesson 1. What is Right-Wing Extremism?

Student Handouts and Supplementary Teaching Materials

1. Lesson 1 Handout: Sources for Key Terms (Educator Resource) and Key Terms Handout (for students). (1-2 copies of each definition pair for each student group). Key term handout should be folded over so that only key words are visible.
   - extremism and conspiracy theories
   - white supremacy and xenophobia
   - nationalism and far-right
   - anti-democratic and authoritarianism
   - radicalization and terrorism
Sources for Key Terms (Educator Resource) and Key Terms Handout (for students)

The following pages include 5 handouts with pairs of key terms to share with students. Please be sure to fold over the papers so that the definitions are hidden and only the key terms are visible. Distribute the key terms to students (one pair of terms per student group; for larger groups, you may wish to have 2 copies per group).

Note to Educator: Sources for the key terms can be found by clicking on the superscript number after each definition. The definitions come from a range of sources including NGOs, academia, news media, dictionaries, and encyclopedias. As an additional activity, educators may wish to discuss these sources with their students. A full list of the sources for each term can be found below (corresponding to numbered definitions on key terms sheets).

Extremism
1. Norwegian Digital Learning Arena (non-profit)
2. Oxford (dictionary)
3. UK Government (government)

Conspiracy theories
1. Center for Research on Extremism (C-REX)
2. Britannica.com (encyclopedia)
3. Political Psychology (trade magazine)

White supremacy
1. National Institutes of Health (UK government)
2. The Atlantic (US magazine)
3. The Challenging White Supremacy Workshop (NGO)

Xenophobia
1. Teaching Beyond September 11th: Module 12. Responding to Hate Violence (academic)
2. European Commission (government)

Nationalism
1. Britannica.com (encyclopedia)
2. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (encyclopedia)
3. Merriam-Webster (dictionary)

Far-right
1. Center for Research and Extremism (university)
2. Centre for Research and Evidence on Security Threats (CREST) (Independent research org., UK)
3. Merriam-Webster (dictionary)
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**Anti-democratic**
1. Merriam-Webster (dictionary)
2. Newscaster at Rochester.edu (university)
3. The New Yorker (magazine)

**Authoritarianism**
1. Britannica.com (encyclopedia)
2. Iowa Law Review (academic journal)
3. US Legal (private company)

**Radicalization**
1. Frontiers in Psychology (magazine)
2. Frontiers in Psychology (magazine)
3. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UN)

**Terrorism**
1. US Department of Justice (gov’t)
2. Britannica.com (encyclopedia)
3. Global Terrorism Database (university)
## Extremism

1. Extreme perceptions or actions where violence is considered an acceptable means of forcing through dramatic social changes and achieving political, religious, or ideological goals.¹

2. Political, religious, etc. ideas or actions that are extreme and not normal, reasonable or acceptable to most people.²

3. The UK government currently defines extremism as, “vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs.”³

## Conspiracy Theory

1. A type of explanation that describes the actions of a group of powerful conspirators as the most important cause of an event, a series of events, or a state of affairs. Although conspiracy theories are by no means limited to extreme political groups, they are often central to extreme ideologies and may radicalize followers.⁴

2. An attempt to explain harmful or tragic events as the result of the actions of a small powerful group. Such explanations reject the accepted narrative surrounding those events; indeed, the official version may be seen as further proof of the conspiracy.⁵

3. While a conspiracy refers to a true causal chain of events, a conspiracy theory refers to an allegation of conspiracy that may or may not be true.⁶
Module 11: Far-right Extremism
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Key terms (5 pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White Supremacy</th>
<th>Xenophobia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The belief that white people are a superior race to the exclusion of all</td>
<td>1. Comes from the Ancient Greek words xénos, meaning &quot;stranger&quot; or &quot;foreign&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other groups. This superiority leads to the belief that white people should</td>
<td>and phóbos, meaning &quot;fear&quot;. Put together, it means fear or hatred of that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have power over others. White supremacy is also considered a system, rooted</td>
<td>which is perceived to be foreign or strange. In contemporary times, it has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in history, of oppression by whites over non-white communities.⁷</td>
<td>come to mean fear, distrust, prejudice or hatred against people from other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>countries or those &quot;appearing to be foreign&quot; due to race, clothing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>religious identity, language, etc.¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A political, economic, and cultural system in which whites overwhelmingly</td>
<td>2. Attitudes, prejudices and behavior that reject, exclude and often vilify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control power and material resources; conscious and unconscious ideas of</td>
<td>persons, based on the perception that they are outsiders or foreigners to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white superiority and entitlement are widespread; and relations of white</td>
<td>the community, society or national identity.¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominance and non-white subordination are daily reenacted across a broad</td>
<td>3. Fear or hatred of foreigners or strangers; it is embodied in discriminatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>array of institutions and social settings.⁸</td>
<td>attitudes and behavior, and often culminates in violence, abuses of all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>types, and exhibitions of hatred.¹²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. White supremacy is a historically based, institutionally perpetuated system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of exploitation and oppression of continents, nations, and peoples of color</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by white peoples and nations of the European continent, for the purpose of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintaining and defending a system of wealth, power, and privilege.⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Nationalism

1. An ideology that emphasizes loyalty, devotion, or allegiance to a nation or nation-state and holds that such obligations outweigh other individual or group interests.\(^\text{13}\)

2. Generally used to describe two phenomena:
   a. the attitude that the members of a nation have when they care about their national identity, and
   b. the actions that the members of a nation take when seeking to achieve (or sustain) self-determination. \(^\text{14}\)

3. An ideology expressed by people who fervently believe that their nation is superior to all others. These feelings of superiority are often based on shared ethnicity, language, religion, culture, or social values. \(^\text{15}\)

# Far-Right

1. Far-right politics is characterized by “radical nationalism”, in which groups are excluded on racial, ethnic or cultural grounds. The far-right is a global phenomenon with implications for local, national, and transnational politics. The far-right takes on multiple organizational forms and features different variants of a shared ideological core: the belief that inequalities are natural and therefore some groups are superior to others, which informs their nativist and authoritarian views of society. \(^\text{16}\)

2. A narrative of racial and/or cultural threat to a “native” group arising from perceived alien groups within a society. \(^\text{17}\)

3. The group of people whose political views are the most conservative. \(^\text{18}\)

---
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Key terms (5 pages)
### Anti-Democratic

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Opposed or hostile to the theories or policies of democracy, especially through the use of force.(^{19})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Using a combination of “dirty” tactics such as voter suppression and abuse of administrative power to preserve a stronghold.(^{20})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>An opposition to democracy stemming from the belief that it is impossible for the average person, particularly those belonging to groups such as immigrants and lower income classes, to make objective decisions and that power should be entrusted to a certain class or group.(^{21})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Authoritarianism

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The principle of blind submission to authority, as opposed to individual freedom of thought and action. In government, authoritarianism denotes any political system that concentrates power in the hands of a leader or a small elite that is not constitutionally responsible to the body of the people.(^{22})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A legal order in which there is little or no political pluralism and the incumbent party acts via legal or extra-legal means to suppress political opposition with the ruling leader or leaders often lacking an elaborate and guiding ideology and exercising power within ill-defined norms.(^{23})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A governmental or political system, principle, or practice in which individual freedom is held as completely subordinate to the power or authority of the state. In authoritarianism, individual freedom is centered either in one person or a small group that is not constitutionally created.(^{24})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Radicalization

1. The US Department of Homeland Security defines radicalization as embracing extremist beliefs that support violence as a method to affect societal change.\(^\text{25}\)

2. Refers to a change in beliefs, feelings, and behaviors that justify intergroup violence and the demand for sacrifice in defending the own group.\(^\text{26}\)

3. Generally used to convey the idea of a process through which an individual adopts an increasingly extremist set of beliefs and aspirations. This may include, but is not defined by, the willingness to condone, support, facilitate or use violence to further political, ideological, religious or other goals.\(^\text{27}\)

### Terrorism

1. The FBI defines terrorism, domestic or international, as the unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government or civilian population in furtherance of political or social objectives.\(^\text{28}\)

2. Terrorism is the calculated use of violence to create a general climate of fear in a population and thereby to bring about a particular political objective.\(^\text{29}\)

3. The threatened or actual use of illegal force and violence by a non-state actor to attain a political, economic, religious, or social goal through fear, coercion, or intimidation.\(^\text{30}\)
Lesson 2. Responding to Terrorist Attacks: Lessons from Norway

Overview, Background Resources and Materials Needed

In this two-part lesson, students will learn about the Utøya and Oslo attacks of 2011 through an exploration of real-time tweets, videos, and other materials in the aftermath of the event. The focus of the lesson is to see how the country responded to the attacks rather than the attacks themselves.

Background reading for educators before Lesson 2:
It would be beneficial for educators to review the following resources. These resources may also be used as a supplementary reference list for students as per the educator’s discretion.


Key Terms in Lesson 2:

- **Democracy**: Literally, rule by the people. The term is derived from the Greek dēmokratia, which was coined from dēmos (“people”) and kratos (“rule”) in the middle of the 5th century BCE to denote the political systems then existing in some Greek city-states, notably Athens.

- **Extremism**: Extreme perceptions or actions where violence is considered an acceptable means of forcing through dramatic social changes and achieving political, religious or ideological goals.

- **Far-right**: Far-right politics is characterized by “radical nationalism”, in which groups are excluded on racial, ethnic or cultural grounds. The far-right is a global phenomenon with implications for local, national, and transnational politics. The far-right takes on multiple organizational forms and features different variants of a shared ideological core: the belief that inequalities are natural and therefore some groups are superior to others, which informs their nativist and authoritarian views of society.

- **Prime Minister**, also called premier, the head of government in a country with a parliamentary or semipresidential political system. In such systems, the prime minister—literally the “first,” or most important, minister.

- **Terrorism (US)**: The United States FBI differentiates between international and domestic terrorism. International terrorism: Violent, criminal acts committed by individuals and/or groups who are
inspired by, or associated with, designated foreign terrorist organizations or nations (state-sponsored). Domestic Terrorism: Violent, criminal acts committed by individuals and/or groups to further ideological goals stemming from domestic influences, such as those of a political, religious, social, racial, or environmental nature.

- **Terrorism (Norway):** Acts of terrorism; illegal use of, or threat of use of, force or violence against persons or property, in an attempt to put pressure on the country's authorities or the population or society in general to achieve political, religious or ideological goals.

**Materials Needed for Lesson 2**

**Day 1 materials**
2. Lesson 2 Handout 1: Twitter messages from 22 July (1 per student or student pair)

**Day 2 materials**
1. Lesson 2 Slide Deck
2. Note cards, hole puncher, and string, or post-it notes; markers (1 per student)
3. Branches from which notecards can be hung or a giant poster board on which a tree is drawn and post-it notes can be stuck
4. Jens Stoltenberg’s speech from July 2011: Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg’s speech (6 minutes; in Norwegian with English subtitles: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8oPbd9UvZuY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8oPbd9UvZuY) (to be projected)
Lesson 2. Responding to Terrorist Attacks: Lessons from Norway

Learning Plan

Pre-class homework
Assign students this article about the terrorist attacks 22 July 2011 in Norway from the July 22 Center that was established following this event: https://22julisenteret.no/en/the-22nd-of-july-2011/

Day 1

Opening – 15 minutes
Open the lesson by asking students what they learned from the text they read about the terrorist attacks of 22 July 2011 in Norway. Ask the students if they have any questions about what they read.

Anticipated answers/questions:
• Why didn’t anyone stop him?
  o Explain that there has been a debate in Norway if more could be done to prevent the attack and to stop the perpetrator. For example: at the time, security in Norway was quite light and it was possible to park the car with the bomb right next to the office building of the prime minister. Regarding Utøya, no one expected an attack and so it was not possible to prevent it.
• Did he act alone?
  o Yes, the perpetrator was alone in planning and executing the terrorist attack. However, there has been debates about right-wing extremist influences, especially online, where the perpetrator was exposed to right-wing extremism ideology and a sense of community.

Possible misunderstandings that may need to be addressed:
• Students might not realize that the attack took place in both Utøya and Oslo, the state capital, though the perpetrator was the same for both and they occurred on the same day.
• Students often ask if the perpetrator will ever get out of prison (since Norway does not have life sentence). According to Norwegian law, the perpetrator will regularly be evaluated by experts. If it seems likely that he will repeat the crimes, he will not be let out.
• The targets of the attack were not random, but politically motivated. The bomb was targeting the Norwegian Labour government and the attack at Utøya was targeting future Labour/left-wing politicians because the perpetrator believed that their policies were promoting multiculturalism in Norway.
• A common misconception might be that Norway is a homogenous country. Some facts:
  o 15% of the Norwegian population are immigrants. 41% of the immigrant population has background from European countries, mostly from Poland. 44% have a background from Asian and African countries (numbers are from 2021).
The Sami population (an indigenous group) also make up a part of the Norwegian population. Moreover, Norway has five national minorities: Jews, Roma, Romani people/Tater, Kvens, and Forest Finns.

There are no exact numbers of the Muslim population in Norway, but according to the national statistical agency in Norway, close to 4% of the Norwegian population are Muslims.

Application – 20 minutes
Divide students into groups of 4-6 and distribute tweet handout and guiding questions.

1. What can the tweets tell us about what happened in Norway on 22 July 2011?
2. What can the tweets tell us about different responses to the terrorist attacks in Norway on 22 July 2011?
3. Why do you think people who were perceived to be Muslims were harassed in Oslo in the immediate aftermath of the bomb explosion?

Time permitting, address the criticism of using a source like Twitter and ask the students to reflect on tweets as a historical source for understanding historical events, such as the terrorist attack 22 July. What does this source tell us/not tell us?

Debrief – 15 minutes
Ask the students if they have any questions they would like to address.

Ask the students if the Twitter responses from the terrorist attacks in Oslo and Utøya made them think about responses to other terrorist attacks or crises they know of. Is there anything they would like to share with the rest of the class?

If it has not come up in the group discussion, it is relevant to address how Muslims are treated in European countries after 9/11. The initial reactions to the bombing and shootings in Norway was that a member of al Qaeda had been involved and many Muslim individuals and those perceived to be Muslim were harassed in Oslo in the immediate aftermath of the bomb explosion.

A related issue is that the Norwegian security authorities, prior to 2011, focused more on threats from Islamic extremists, rather than the threats from right-wing extremists.

Day 2:

Opening – 10 minutes
Explain that today’s class will build on what the students have learned about the Utøya and Oslo attacks by first watching Prime Minster Jens Stoltenberg’s speech at the memorial service following the attacks and then by analyzing particular quotes from the speech.

Watch the video of Norwegian Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg's speech at the memorial service at Oslo Cathedral on July 23rd (6 minutes)
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Time permitting, watch the entire speech otherwise, watch from 3:46 – 4:36:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8oPbd9UvZuY
(note that the speech is in Norwegian with English subtitles)

Ask students their thoughts and reactions to the video. What stood out for them?

Application – 20 minutes

[Lesson 2 Slide Deck, Slide 2] Present the quote from the speech which calls for responding to terrorism with “more democracy, more humanity, but never naivety”

Direct students for a Think-Pair-Share-Square Activity

THINK: Ask students to individually reflect on what they think the quote could mean in practice. Encourage them to write down their thoughts. (3 mins)

PAIR/SHARE: Next, instruct students to pair up and share their reflections from their individual task. The pairs should work towards find a shared understanding on what the quote means. (5 mins)

SHARE/SQUARE: Two to three pairs meet to create a larger group (square). The pairs present their shared understandings to the quote. They should then discuss how the essence of this quote could be put into practice by them in their everyday lives as citizens of a larger community. (7 mins)

Ask for a few volunteers to share out their thoughts.

- What do you think is the main message or essence of the quote “more democracy, more humanity, but never naivety”?
- What do you think he meant by “never naivety”?
- How could the essence of the quote be put into practice by you in your everyday lives?
- Were there different approaches or any disagreements in the groups on how this could be put into practice?

Debrief – 20 minutes

[Lesson 2 Slide Deck, Slide 3]. For the final 20 minutes of class, introduce students to the “The value tree” at Utøya (optionally pass out handout 2). Invite students to write their own notes reflecting on what is important for them (values, motivations, political causes, etc.). The notes could be used to make their own “value tree” in the classroom. The activity can be done in silence or the students can share what they have written and why and then go up to the tree and add it. Leave the tree in your classroom for some time so that students have a chance to read what others have written in the coming days.

Extension Activities or Homework

Direct students to write an essay discussing the quote “more democracy, more humanity, but never naivety” in the political context of the US after 9/11 or other more recent events, such as the January 6, 2021 insurrection.
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Lesson 2. Responding to Terrorist Attacks: Lessons from Norway

Student Handouts and Supplementary Teaching Materials

1. Lesson 2 Slide deck (please download as a separate file)
2. Lesson 2 Handout 1: Tweets Following Oslo and Utøya Attacks (1 per student or student pair)
3. Lesson 2 Handout 2: Utøya Values Tree (as needed; also presented as a slide)
Responding to Terrorist Attacks: Lessons from Norway

Module 11, Lesson 2

The Utøya “Value Tree”

After the terrorist attack on 22 July 2011, as part of the process of returning to life, young people spontaneously started to write their messages and attached them to the main branches of the large tree near the center of Utøya. The tree has become a symbol of hope, love, and life, and also a symbol of political values they want to fight for.

Today, young people and students participating in the learning activities at Utøya are invited to write their own messages, similar to part of the tree in the learning center, which opened in Utøya in 2012.
Tweets Following Oslo and Utøya Attacks on July 22, 2011

Asterisks after twitter handle denotes original tweet was in Norwegian.

@CiViX* at 15:25: Holy crap. Did Oslo just explode?

@setcounter at 16:10: Al Jazeera reports about Islamist threats against Norwegian govt

@garyboyce at 16:17: Oslo Norway? NORWAY!?! What has Norway ever done to anybody? #OsloExplosion

@esperandom* at 16:52: Not to blame muslims, but could this have anything to do with the book of caricature drawings from Cappelen? #OsloBomb #OsloBlast #oslo #terrorism

@FrkTiril* at 17:41: There is a shooting at Utoya, my little sister is there and called home now!

@ErikVistnes* at 17:58: Bomb in Oslo. Shooting at Utoya. Are we at war?

@gardlm* at 19:03: Police at #utoya going over by boat. Don't they have helicopters???

@hilango at 19:07: According to NRK.no reporter on scene Utoya camp shooter "tall, blonde and with Nordic appearance"

@DavidJonesMP at 20:06: TV stations still speculating Oslo attack is Islamist inspired. Dangerous to do so, given description of Utoya suspect. Exercise caution.

@inkuldra at 22:03: Muslims reportedly harassed in Oslo. This is beneath us, Norway. Do not let this happen. We must stand united. #OsloExpl #Utoya

@uhellet* at 01:56 [July 23]: When one man can create so much hatred - imagine how much love we can create together.
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The Utøya “Value Tree”

After the terrorist attack on 22 July 2011, as part of the process of returning to Utøya, young people spontaneously started to write short messages and attach them to the lower branches of the large pine tree at the centre of the island. There were messages about hope, loss, and love, but also about political causes they wanted to fight for.

Today, young people and students participating in the learning activities at Utøya are invited to write their own messages, either to put on the tree or in the learning centre, which opened in Utøya in 2016.

Photo credit: Above, to the left: CF Salicat. Above, to the right: The European Wergeland Centre. Below: The European Wergeland Centre.
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Lesson 3. Responding to Terrorist Attacks: A Comparison of Two Leaders

Overview, Background Resources and Materials Needed

This lesson examines the speeches given by two leaders following right-wing domestic terrorist attacks on their soil in Norway and New Zealand. Students will identify and interpret the message(s) promoted and rhetoric used in the speeches. They will explore how the two leaders express sympathy and solidarity with the directly affected. Students will also reflect on important differences between the focuses of each speech and how the responses of democratic leaders shape our understanding of how to respond to right-wing extremism.

Background reading for educators before Lesson 3:
It would be beneficial for educators to review the following resources. These resources may also be used as a supplementary reference list for students as per the educator’s discretion.


Key Terms in Lesson 3:
- **Democracy**: Literally, rule by the people. The term is derived from the Greek dēmokratia, which was coined from dēmos (“people”) and kratos (“rule”) in the middle of the 5th century BCE to denote the political systems then existing in some Greek city-states, notably Athens.
- **Terrorism (US)**: The United States FBI differentiates between international and domestic terrorism. International terrorism: Violent, criminal acts committed by individuals and/or groups who are inspired by, or associated with, designated foreign terrorist organizations or nations (state-sponsored). Domestic Terrorism: Violent, criminal acts committed by individuals and/or groups to further ideological goals stemming from domestic influences, such as those of a political, religious, social, racial, or environmental nature.
- **Terrorism (Norway)**: Acts of terrorism; illegal use of, or threat of use of, force or violence against persons or property, in an attempt to put pressure on the country’s authorities or the population or society in general to achieve political, religious or ideological goals.

Materials Needed for Lesson 3:
1. Video to play speeches (optional):
   a. Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg’s speech (6 minutes; in Norwegian with English subtitles) [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8oPbd9UvZuY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8oPbd9UvZuY)
   b. Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern speech (7 minutes; note that beginning is in Māori, the indigenous language of New Zealand) [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NdGq3fF3Ro&t](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NdGq3fF3Ro&t)
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2. Transcript of Address in Oslo Cathedral By Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg (1 per student)
3. Transcript of Speech by New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern at Christchurch Victims’ Memorial Service (1 per student)
4. Responding to Terrorist Attacks: A Comparison of Two Leaders’ Speeches (Graphic Organizer) (1 per student)

Materials for optional extension activity:
5. US President Donald Trump’s Speech following 2019 El Paso, Texas shootings (1 per student)
6. Transcript of French President Francois Hollande’s televised speech following 2015 massacre at the Bataclan and other locations in Paris, France (1 per student)
Lesson 3. Responding to Terrorist Attacks: A Comparison of Two Leaders

Learning Plan

Opening – 10 minutes
Ask students what they know about the attacks in Norway (Utøya and Oslo) (2011) or New Zealand (Christchurch) (2019). Ask if students are aware of how the events are connected.

In case students are unaware of one or both of these incidents, you may wish to highlight some of the following points:

Norway attacks:
- The 2011 Norway attacks, referred to in Norway as 22 July were two sequential domestic terrorist attacks carried out by a lone white right-wing extremist.
- The 32-year-old perpetrator first detonated a bomb in an Oslo street adjacent to the office of the Norwegian Prime Minister. The explosion killed eight people and injured at least 209 people (of which 12 were severely injured).
- He then travelled about 40 kilometers to the small island of Utøya, where the ruling Norwegian Labour Party was holding its annual youth summer camp. He roamed for over an hour dressed as a policeman shooting people on sight. By the end of his rampage, he had killed 77 people, the majority of whom were youth.
- In terms of motivation, the perpetrator wrote a 1,500-page document he refers to as his “compendium,” in which he devoted over 700 pages to attacking Islam. He believed that Muslims were gaining power and dominance over the Christian West and needed to be stopped.
- His reason for targeting Norwegian youth rather than Muslims specifically was he considered these particular youth as “trainee members of the Marxist political elite” that he held responsible for “Islamic colonization.”
- The attack was the deadliest in Norway since World War II. A survey found that one in four Norwegians knew someone affected.

New Zealand attacks:
- Two consecutive mass shootings occurred at two mosques in a terrorist attack in Christchurch, New Zealand, during Friday Prayer on March 15, 2019. The attack was carried out by a single gunman who entered both mosques approximately twelve minutes apart.
- A 28-year-old white Australian man was later arrested as the perpetrator of the attacks. He was described in media reports as a white supremacist and part of the alt-right (i.e a loosely connected largely online group of far-right supporters).
- He had live-streamed the first shooting on Facebook.
- Prior to the attack, he had published a 74-page manifesto, in which he cited inspiration from the Norway attacks, making specific reference to the Norwegian mass murderer as a “partisans/freedom fighters/ethno soldier” who “took a stand against ethnic and cultural genocide.”
- He killed 51 people and injured another 40. He was sentenced to life imprisonment without the possibility of parole – the first such sentence in New Zealand.
Open up for questions before you introduce the main activity.

Application – 30 minutes
Explain to students that you will look at the ways in which leaders of these two countries responded to the terrorist attacks. Divide students into pairs. Hand out the speeches made by Norwegian Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg at the memorial service at Oslo Cathedral in Norway July 2011, and that of New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern at the memorial service at Hagley Park, in New Zealand March 2019 following the attacks on their respective countries.

Ask students to read the speeches in silence; alternatively, ask for student volunteers to read out the speeches or you may play the two speeches for students. This is helpful in relaying the emotions of the leaders.

Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg’s speech (6 minutes; in Norwegian with English subtitles)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8oPbd9UvZuY

Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern speech (7 minutes; note that beginning is in Māori, the indigenous language of New Zealand)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YdGq3frFsRo&t

While students are reading (or listening), pass out the graphic organizer. Direct students to compare and contrast the two speeches.

Go over the graphic organizer and ask students: What stands out in the two speeches? What do the two leaders focus on? What do they leave out? What messages do the two leaders send to their people?
Using the graphic organizer, direct students to focus on the different elements of their speeches and the effects.

Debrief – 10 minutes
Review response from the graphic organizer by asking the following question: What we can learn about these leaders’ reactions to these terrible tragedies?

Anticipated answers:
- Focus was on the victims, not the perpetrator.
- Both speeches express sympathy and solidarity with the directly affected
- Stoltenberg focuses more generally on upholding democracy, humanity and openness
- Arden focuses more directly on the Muslim population targeted and NZ as a multicultural society.
- The use of “our” in Arden’s speech indicates that Muslims belong in New Zealand.
- Students may bring up other speeches they’ve heard from leaders (for example President Biden or Trump) and make references to differences.
Extension activity
As an extension activity, you may wish to bring in the speech that Donald Trump gave following the El Paso, Texas shootings as well as President Hollande’s speech in France following the terrorist attacks at the Bataclan and other locations in Paris. Ask students to compare these speeches with those of Stoltenberg and Ardern. What are the similarities and differences between these speeches? In what ways are the contexts of these speeches different and how does that matter? What are some assumptions inherent in these speeches, particularly about Muslims?

Note to educators: The four contexts of these speeches are vastly different:
- In Norway, the attack was perpetrated by a white far-right extremist and the victims were largely Norwegian youth (some of whom may have been Muslim though they were not the direct target).
- In New Zealand, the attack was also perpetrated by a white far-right extremist, but in this case, the targets were specifically Muslims (the perpetrator was inspired by the Norway massacre).
- In the US, the attacks were again perpetrated by a white far-right extremist who was targeting immigrants, specifically Latine immigrants.
- Only in the Paris shootings were the perpetrators actually far-right Islamists indiscriminately targeting Parisians.
Lesson 3. Responding to Terrorist Attacks: A Comparison of Two Leaders

Student Handouts and Supplementary Teaching Materials

1. Lesson 3, Handout 1: Transcript of Address in Oslo Cathedral By Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg (1 per student)
2. Lesson 3, Handout 2: Transcript of Speech by New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern at Christchurch Victims’ Memorial Service (1 per student)
3. Lesson 3, Handout 3: Responding to Terrorist Attacks: A Comparison of Two Leaders’ Speeches (Graphic Organizer) (1 per student)

Handouts for optional extension activity:
1. Lesson 3, Handout 5: US President Donald Trump’s Speech following 2019 El Paso, Texas shootings (1 per student)
2. Lesson 3, Handout 6: Transcript of French President Francois Hollande’s televised speech following 2015 massacre at the Bataclan and other locations in Paris, France (1 per student)
Your Majesties,  
Dear Eskil,  
Dear all of you,  

It is nearly two days since Norway was hit by the worst atrocity it has seen since the Second World War. On Utøya, and in Oslo.  
It seems like an eternity.  
These have been hours, days and nights filled with shock, despair, anger and weeping.  
Today is a day for mourning.  
Today, we will allow ourselves to pause.  

Remember the dead.  
Mourn those who are no longer with us.  
92 lives have been lost. Several people are still missing.  
Every single death is a tragedy. Together they add up to a national tragedy.  
We are still struggling to take in the scale of this tragedy.  

Many of us know someone who has been lost. Even more know of someone.  
I knew several.  
One of them was Monica. She worked on Utøya for 20 years or so. For many of us she was Utøya. Now she is dead. Shot and killed while providing care and security for young people from all over the country.  
Her husband John and daughters Victoria and Helene are in Drammen Church today.  
It is so unfair. I want you to know that we are weeping with you.  
Another is Tore Eikeland.  
Leader of the Labour Youth League in Hordaland and one of our most talented young politicians.  
I remember him being met with acclaim by the whole Labour national congress when he gave a stirring speech against the EU Postal Directive, and won the debate.  

Now he is dead. Gone forever. It is incomprehensible.  
These are two of those we have lost.  
We have lost many more on Utøya and in the government offices.  
We will soon have their names and pictures. Then the full extent of this evil act will become apparent in all its horror.  
This will be a new ordeal.  
But we will get through this too.
Amidst all this tragedy, I am proud to live in a country that has managed to hold its head up high at a critical time.

I have been impressed by the dignity, compassion and resolve I have met.

We are a small country, but a proud people.

We are still shocked by what has happened, but we will never give up our values.

Our response is more democracy, more openness, and more humanity. But never naivety.

No one has said it better than the Labour Youth League girl who was interviewed by CNN:

“If one man can create that much hate, you can only imagine how much love we as a togetherness can create.”

Finally, I would like to say to the families all over the country who have lost one of their loved ones:

You have my and the whole of Norway’s deepest sympathy for your loss.

Not only that. The whole world shares your sorrow.

I have promised to pass on the condolences of Barack Obama, Vladimir Putin, Frederik Reinfeldt, Angela Merkel, David Cameron, Dimitry Medvedev and many other heads of state and government.

This cannot make good your loss. Nothing can bring your loved ones back.

But we all need support and comfort when life is at its darkest.

Now life is at its darkest for you.

I want you to know that we are there for you.
Christchurch Victims’ Memorial Service at Hagley Park
Speech by New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern

E rau rangatira mā, e ngā reo, e ngā mana. Tēnā koutou katoa.
I acknowledge amongst us today our distinguished leaders, speakers and those who bear authority.

Ngāi Tahu Whānui, tēnā koutou.
My greetings to the whole of Ngāi Tahu.

E papaki tū ana ngā tai o maumahara ki runga o Ōtautahi.
The tides of remembrance flow over Christchurch today.

Haere mai tātou me te aroha, me te rangimārie, ki te whānau nei, e ora mārire ai anō rātāu, e ora mārire ai anō, tātou katoa.
So let us gather with love, in peace, for this family, so that they may truly live again, so that we all may truly live again.

We gather here, 14 days on from our darkest of hours. In the days that have followed the terrorist attack on the 15th of March, we have often found ourselves without words.

What words can adequately express the pain and suffering of 50 men, women and children lost, and so many injured? What words capture the anguish of our Muslim community being the target of hatred and violence? What words express the grief of a city that has already known so much pain?
I thought there were none. And then I came here and was met with this simple greeting. As-salaam Alaikum. Peace be upon you.

They were simple words, repeated by community leaders who witnessed the loss of their friends and loved ones. Simple words, whispered by the injured from their hospital beds. Simple words, spoken by the bereaved and everyone I met who has been affected by this attack.

As-salaam Alaikum. Peace be upon you.

They were words spoken by a community who, in the face of hate and violence, had every right to express anger but instead opened their doors for all of us to grieve with them. And so we say to those who have lost the most, we may not have always had the words.

We may have left flowers, performed the haka, sung songs or simply embraced. But even when we had no words, we still heard yours, and they have left us humbled and they have left us united.

Over the past two weeks we have heard the stories of those impacted by this terrorist attack. They were stories of bravery. They were stories of those who were born here, grew up here, or who had made New Zealand their home. Who had sought refuge, or sought a better life for themselves or their families.

These stories, they now form part of our collective memories. They will remain with us forever. They are us.

But with that memory comes a responsibility. A responsibility to be the place that we wish to be. A place that is diverse, that is welcoming, that is kind and compassionate. Those values represent the very best of us.

But even the ugliest of viruses can exist in places they are not welcome.
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Racism exists, but it is not welcome here.

An assault on the freedom of any one of us who practices their faith or religion, is not welcome here. Violence, and extremism in all its forms, is not welcome here. And over the last two weeks we have shown that, you have shown that, in your actions.

From the thousands at vigils to the 95 year old man who took four buses to attend a rally because he couldn’t sleep from the sadness of seeing the hurt and suffering of others. Our challenge now is to make the very best of us, a daily reality.

Because we are not immune to the viruses of hate, of fear, of other. We never have been. But we can be the nation that discovers the cure.

And so to each of us as we go from here, we have work to do, but do not leave the job of combatting hate to the government alone. We each hold the power, in our words and in our actions, in our daily acts of kindness. Let that be the legacy of the 15th of March. To be the nation we believe ourselves to be.

To the global community who have joined us today, who reached out to embrace New Zealand, and our Muslim community, to all of those who have gathered here today, we say thank you.

And we also ask that the condemnation of violence and terrorism turns now to a collective response. The world has been stuck in a vicious cycle of extremism breeding extremism and it must end.

We cannot confront these issues alone, none of us can. But the answer to them lies in a simple concept that is not bound by domestic borders, that isn’t based on ethnicity, power base or even forms of governance. The answer lies in our humanity.

But for now, we will remember those who have left this place. We will remember the first responders who gave so much of themselves to save others.

We will remember the tears of our nation, and the new resolve we have formed.

And we remember, that ours is a home that does not and cannot claim perfection. But we can strive to be true to the words embedded in our national anthem

Men of every creed and race
Gather here before Thy face
Asking Thee to bless this place
God defend our free land
From dissension, envy, hate
And corruption, guard our state
Make our country good and great
God defend New Zealand

Ko tātou tātou
As-salaam Alaikum (Peace be upon you).
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Transcript of Speech by New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern
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US President Donald Trump’s Speech following 2019 El Paso, Texas shootings

Good morning. My fellow Americans, this morning our nation is overcome with shock, horror, and sorrow. This weekend, more than 80 people were killed or wounded in two evil attacks. On Saturday morning in El Paso, Texas, a wicked man went to a Walmart store where families were shopping with their loved ones. He shot and murdered 20 people and injured 26 others, including precious little children. Then in the early hours of Sunday morning, Dayton, Ohio, another twisted monster opened fire on a crowded downtown street. He murdered nine people, including his own sister, and injured 27 others.

The First Lady and I join all Americans in praying and grieving for the victims, their families, and the survivors. We will stand by their side forever. We will never forget. These barbaric slaughters are an assault upon our communities, an attack upon our nation, and a crime against all of humanity. We are outraged and sickened by this monstrous evil, the cruelty, the hatred, the malice, the bloodshed, and the terror. Our hearts are shattered for every family whose parents, children, husbands, and wives were ripped from their arms and their lives. America weeps for the fallen. We are a loving nation, and our children are entitled to grow up in a just, peaceful, and loving society. Together, we lock arms to shoulder the grief. We ask God in heaven to ease the anguish of those who suffer, and we vow to act with urgent resolve.

I want to thank the many law enforcement personnel who responded to these atrocities with the extraordinary grace and courage of American heroes. I have spoken with Texas governor Greg Abbott and Ohio governor Mike DeWine, as well as Mayor Dee Margo of El Paso, Texas and Mayor Nan Whaley of Dayton, Ohio to express our profound sadness and unfailing support. Today we also send the condolences of our nation to President Obrador of Mexico and all the people of Mexico for the loss of their citizens in the El Paso shooting. Terrible, terrible thing. I have also been in close contact with Attorney General Barr and FBI Director Wray. Federal authorities are on the ground, and I have directed them to provide any and all assistance required, whatever is needed.

The shooter in El Paso posted a manifesto online consumed by racist hate. In one voice, our nation must condemn racism, bigotry, and white supremacy. These sinister ideologies must be defeated. Hate has no place in America. Hatred warps the mind, ravages the heart, and devours the soul. We have asked the FBI to identify all further resources they need to investigate and disrupt hate crimes and domestic terrorism. Whatever they need. We must recognize that the internet has provided a dangerous avenue to radicalize disturbed minds and perform demented acts. We must shine light on the dark recesses of the internet and stop mass murders before they start. The internet likewise is used for human trafficking, illegal drug distribution, and so many other heinous crimes. The perils of the internet and social media cannot be ignored, and they will not be ignored.

In the two decades since Columbine, our nation has watched with rising horror and dread as one mass shooting has followed another, over and over again, decade after decade. We cannot allow ourselves to feel powerless. We can and will stop this evil contagion. In that task, we must honor the sacred memory of those we have lost by acting as one people. Open wounds cannot heal if we are divided. We must seek real bipartisan solutions, we have to do that in a bipartisan manner, that will truly make America safer and better for all.
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First, we must do a better job of identifying and acting on early warning signs. I am directing the Department of Justice to work in partnership with local, state, and federal agencies, as well as social media companies, to develop tools that can detect mass shooters before they strike. As an example, the monster in the Parkland High School in Florida had many red flags against him, and yet nobody took decisive action. Nobody did anything. Why not?

Second, we must stop the glorification of violence in our society. This includes the gruesome and grisly video games that are now commonplace. It is too easy today for troubled youth to surround themselves with a culture that celebrates violence. We must stop or substantially reduce this, and it has to begin immediately. Cultural change is hard, but each of us can choose to build a culture that celebrates the inherent worth and dignity of every human life. That’s what we have to do.

Third, we must reform our mental health laws to better identify mentally disturbed individuals who may commit acts of violence, and make sure those people not only get treatment, but when necessary, involuntary confinement. Mental illness and hatred pulls the trigger, not the gun.

Fourth, we must make sure that those judged to pose a grave risk to public safety do not have access to firearms, and that if they do, those firearms can be taken through rapid due process. That is why I have called for red flag laws, also known as extreme risk protection orders. Today, I’m also directing the Department of Justice to propose legislation ensuring that those who commit hate crimes and mass murders face the death penalty, and that this capital punishment be delivered quickly, decisively, and without years of needless delay.

These are just a few of the areas of cooperation that we can pursue. I am open and ready to listen and discuss all ideas that will actually work and make a very big difference. Republicans and Democrats have proven that we can join together in a bipartisan fashion to address this plague. Last year, we enacted the STOP School Violence and Fix NICS Acts into law, providing grants to improve school safety, and strengthening critical background checks for firearm purchases. At my direction, the Department of Justice banned bump stocks. Last year, we prosecuted a record number of firearms offenses.

But there is so much more that we have to do. Now is the time to set destructive partisanship aside, so destructive, and find the courage to answer hatred with unity, devotion, and love. Our future is in our control. America will rise to the challenge. We will always have, and we always will, win. The choice is ours and ours alone. It is not up to mentally ill monsters. It is up to us. If we are able to pass great legislation after all of these years, we will ensure that those who were attacked will not have died in vain.

May God bless the memory of those who perished in Toledo, and may God protect them. May God protect all of those from Texas to Ohio. May God bless the victims and their families. May God bless America. Thank you very much. Thank you.
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French President Francois Hollande’s televised speech following 2015 massacre at the Bataclan and other locations in Paris, France

My dear compatriots,

As I speak, terrorist attacks on an unprecedented scale are taking place in the Paris area. There are dozens killed, there are many injured. It is a horror.

We have, on my decision, mobilized all forces possible to neutralize the terrorists and make all affected areas safe. I have also asked for military reinforcements. They are currently in the Paris area, to ensure that no new attacks can take place.

I have also called a cabinet meeting that will be held in a few minutes.

Two decisions will be taken: a state of emergency will be declared, which means that some places will be closed, traffic may be banned, and there will also be searches which may be decided throughout greater Paris. The state of emergency will be applied throughout French territory.

The second decision I have made is to seal the borders. We must ensure that no one enters to commit any crimes and that those who have committed the crimes that we have unfortunately seen can be stopped if they try to leave the territory.

This is a terrible ordeal which once again assails us. We know where it comes from, who these criminals are, who these terrorists are.

In these difficult moments, we must — and I’m thinking of the many victims, their families and the injured — show compassion and solidarity. But we must also be united and clear-headed.

Faced with terror, France needs to be strong, it must be great and the state authorities must be firm. We will be. Everyone must be responsible.

What the terrorists want is to scare us and fill us with dread. There is indeed reason to be afraid. There is dread, but in the face of this dread, there is a nation that knows how to defend itself, that knows how to mobilize its forces. And, once again, will defeat the terrorists.

French citizens, we have not completed the operations. There are still some difficult ones we are dealing with. It’s at this moment that the security forces are staging an assault, especially in a place in Paris.

I ask you to place your trust in the security forces’ ability to defend our nation against terrorist.

Vive La Republique et vive la France. (Long live the republic and long live France).
### Responding to Terrorist Attacks: A Comparison of Two Leaders’ Speeches (Graphic Organizer)

**Directions:** After reading the transcripts of the speeches made by Stoltenberg and Ardern, record words and phrases that exemplify sympathy, solidarity, society, and action. Describe the rhetorical effect that the words and phrases evoke. One purpose of a rhetorical effect is to elicit a certain response from an audience. Consider how these speeches would have been received by the audience they were directed to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMPATHY</th>
<th>Evidence from the Transcript</th>
<th>Rhetorical Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stoltenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOLIDARITY</th>
<th>Evidence from the Transcript</th>
<th>Rhetorical Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stoltenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence from the Transcript</td>
<td>Rhetorical Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoltenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION STEPS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence from the Transcript</td>
<td>Rhetorical Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoltenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix to Module 11: Right-Wing Extremism

Curriculum Framework

Goal
Students will be able to use their independent learning to analyze democratic responses to right-wing extremism and terrorism.

Essential questions
1. How can citizens contribute to defending and developing a democratic society?
2. What is right-wing extremism?
3. How does the Norwegian response to the terrorist attacks at Utøya and Oslo 22 July 2011 contribute to our understanding of a democratic society?
4. In what ways do the responses of democratic leaders shape our understanding of how to respond to right-wing extremism?

Understandings
Students will understand that...
1. Right-wing extremism, in its many forms, violates democratic values.
2. Individual and societal responses to extremism and terrorism varies and need to be contextualized.
3. Upholding democracy depends on the participation of citizens as much as it does on the government.

Knowledge
Students will know...
1. The definitions of right-wing extremism and associated terms.
2. How different political leaders reacted to acts of terrorism.
3. The ways which anti-Muslim racism contributed to the treatment of individual Muslims and those perceived to be Muslim following the terrorist attacks in Norway.

Skills
Students will be able to...
1. Consider different definitions of terms related to right-wing extremism and come to consensus on one.
2. Investigate reactions on social media to the terrorist attacks in Norway.
3. Recognize how ant-Muslim racism shaped the harassment of individual Muslims and those perceived to be Muslim in Oslo following the attacks.
4. Reflect on their personal values and the political causes that they want to promote.
5. Compare and contrast two speeches responding to right-wing terrorist attacks.
6. **Analyze** the rhetorical effects of speeches delivered by democratic leaders.

**Summary of Performance Tasks (Assessment)**

1. **Group discussion on how to define right-wing extremism and related terms.** In small groups, students will review three definitions of each key term and come to a consensus about which definition best represents the term.

2. **Analysis of tweets from 22 July.** In small groups, students will read tweets from 22 July and discuss the various responses to the attacks.

3. **Individual reflection:** Students will write their reflections about the quote “more democracy, more humanity, but never naivety” from Norwegian Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg’s speech. Students will discuss their reflections in pairs and as a whole class.

4. **Value tree:** Students will write their values, motivations, and/or political causes that they care about on notecards. Each notecard will be added to the class value tree, based on the value tree at Utøya.

5. **Graphic organizer:** Students will complete a graphic organizer comparing and contrasting the rhetorical effects of speeches delivered by Norwegian Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg and New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern following the terrorist attacks in their respective countries.

6. **Essay (extension activity):** Students will write an individual essay discussing the quote “more democracy, more humanity, but never naivety” in the political context of the US (such as after 9/11 or the January 6, 2021 insurrection)

7. **Text Comparison (extension activity):** Students will compare the speech that Donald Trump gave following the El Paso, Texas shootings as well as Francois Hollande’s speech in France following the terrorist attacks at the Bataclan and other locations in Paris, France with those of Stoltenberg and Ardern.

**Common Core Standards**

**History/Social Studies 11th and 12th Grade**

**Key Ideas and Details:**

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.11-12.1
Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, connecting insights gained from specific details to an understanding of the text as a whole.

**Craft and Structure:**

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.11-12.5
Analyze in detail how a complex primary source is structured, including how key sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text contribute to the whole.
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CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.11-12.6
Evaluate authors’ differing points of view on the same historical event or issue by assessing the authors’ claims, reasoning, and evidence.

Integration of Knowledge and Ideas:

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.11-12.7
Integrate and evaluate multiple sources of information presented in diverse formats and media (e.g., visually, quantitatively, as well as in words) in order to address a question or solve a problem.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.R.9
Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics in order to build knowledge or to compare the approaches the authors take.

Comprehension and Collaboration:

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY 11-12.3
Evaluate a speaker’s point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric, assessing the stance, premise, links among ideas, word choice, points of emphasis, and tone used.
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