

PRAXIS & ANALYSE

NVE: CONCEPTS, DYNAMICS AND OPEN QUESTIONS

Background Paper accompanying
the EU Knowledge Hub Conclusion
Paper

Fabian Wichmann

NIHILISTIC VIOLENT EXTREMISM: CONCEPTS, DYNAMICS AND OPEN QUESTIONS

Background Paper accompanying the EU
Knowledge Hub Conclusion Paper

Fabian Wichmann (Research Assistant / Grüner Vogel e.V.)

Berlin, June 2026



CONTENT

1

Prologue: Scale, Visibility
and the Limits of Attribution

3

Conceptualising NVE:
Between Extremism, Violence
and Digital Subculture

5

How NVE Works: Violence,
Recognition and Escalation

7

Conclusion: Understanding
Without Overfitting

2

Introduction: Emerging
Violence Beyond Familiar
Categories

4

Origins, Ecosystems and
Vocabulary: Understanding
the Environment

6

Implications for Prevention,
Intervention and Multi-
Agency Response



ABSTRACT

This background paper provides an analytical introduction to Nihilistic Violent Extremism (NVE) as an increasingly visible form of digitally mediated violence. It argues that NVE is best understood not as a coherent ideology or fixed organisational form, but as a digitally mediated violence ecosystem in which recognition, coercion, fragmented ideological references and psychosocial vulnerability interact. The paper complements the EU Knowledge Hub [Conclusion Paper](#) by offering conceptual orientation for prevention, policy and multi-agency responses, drawing on the EU Knowledge Hub process and recent research by the Center for Monitoring, Analysis, and Strategy (CeMAS).



PROLOGUE

SCALE, VISIBILITY AND THE LIMITS OF ATTRIBUTION

Developments since 2024 have made the practical and operational relevance of NVE increasingly visible and help explain why recent EU and Europol threat assessments address the phenomenon more prominently. In Sweden, several serious knife attacks involving 14-year-old perpetrators were reported in 2024 and 2025; some were filmed, disseminated via Telegram or livestreamed, and in at least one case the perpetrator referred to pressure and threats originating from online networks. In Italy, a 15-year-old was arrested in 2025 on charges including terrorism-related offences, weapons and explosives procurement, and possession and dissemination of child sexual abuse material. According to reporting, allegedly planned a murder to gain status within an online community and stored violent material, including school shooting and terrorist propaganda, on his smartphone. In Finland, a 16-year-old injured several people at a school in 2025 and staged both the attack and related messaging through widely used applications. The documented motivation was not political but a desire to do “something significant and exciting”.

In Germany, the case of “White Tiger” drew particular attention after a 20-year-old suspect was arrested in 2025 and reportedly faced 123 charges, including murder, attempted murder, serious child sexual abuse and rape. According to investigative reporting and security assessments by European institutions, the case involved allegations of online coercion, extreme

violence, manipulation of minors and the alleged encouragement of a 13-year-old in the United States to take his own life during a livestream. CeMAS has also documented a short series of offline offences in Germany and Austria in April 2026, including arson attacks and property damage attributed to a nihilistic accelerationist group. Although these cases differ in their concrete circumstances, they point to a common challenge: online recognition dynamics, group pressure and performative violence can translate into real-world harm, while motives often remain hybrid, fragmented or not primarily political.

Taken together, these developments indicate that the phenomenon cannot be reduced narrowly defined to “online extremism”. Europol describes parts of these ecosystems as exhibiting cult-like dynamics: vulnerable minors are approached in digital spaces where they feel socially embedded, including gaming and social media platforms, before seemingly benign contact can shift into dependency, coercion and abuse through practices such as love bombing, information harvesting and blackmail. Extreme content, ranging from gore and animal cruelty to depictions of sexual violence against children, can contribute to desensitisation and the erosion of social norms. Violence is normalised, internalised as a group code and increasingly staged in performative ways. Over time, certain groups illustrate how closely sexual exploitation, performative violence and fragmented ideological elements

may become intertwined.

Yet despite growing visibility, the actual scale of the problem remains difficult to assess. Available figures from Europol, CeMAS and investigative reporting point to highly networked transnational environments, extensive online activity and significant involvement of minors. However, such numbers remain methodologically fragile.

NVE-related spaces are fluid, multilingual and platform-based. English frequently functions as a common language, while users may operate multiple accounts, conceal locations, use aliases, migrate across platforms or participate anonymously. Distinguishing between authentic

individuals, duplicate profiles, fake accounts and passive observers is therefore extremely difficult.

As a result, no reliable estimate can currently be made of how many individuals in specific countries can be meaningfully linked to NVE-related networks or environments. What can be assessed more confidently are recurring patterns: transnational connectivity, escalating forms of coercion, the social value assigned to violence, the search for status and recognition, the prominent involvement of minors and the transition from digital interaction to real-world harm. Hence, this paper focuses less on quantifying the phenomenon and more on understanding the dynamics relevant to prevention, policy and multi-agency responses.



INTRODUCTION

EMERGING VIOLENCE BEYOND FAMILIAR CATEGORIES

The cases outlined above point to a broader analytical challenge: how should violence be understood when it is shaped by extremist references, digital recognition dynamics, coercion and vulnerability, but does not consistently follow a coherent ideological or political logic?

This question matters because NVE sits at the intersection of several fields that are often treated separately: violent extremism, serious youth violence, online harm, cyber-enabled coercion, sexual exploitation of children, self-

harm dynamics and psychosocial vulnerability. No single framework fully captures the phenomenon. A purely ideological lens risks overstating coherence and political intent. A purely criminal justice lens may miss the symbolic, social and community-related functions of violence. A purely psychological lens risks individualising or pathologising dynamics that are also shaped by digital environments and group processes.

This paper treats NVE as an analytical entry point into these intersecting dynamics.

NVE

It does not assume that all cases associated with NVE meet conventional definitions of extremism or terrorism. Instead, it explores how violence, online ecosystems, fragmented ideological references and social dynamics of recognition interact in ways that challenge familiar prevention and policy frameworks.

The terminology surrounding this phenomenon remains fluid. Alongside Nihilistic Violent Extremism, related terms such as Nihilistic Violence, Nihilistic Extremist Violence, Post-Ideological Violence, Violent Misanthropy, or terms referring to ideologically fragmented violence are used in different research, policy and law-enforcement contexts. These terms set different analytical priorities: some foreground violence and transgression, others misanthropy, weak ideological coherence or hybrid overlaps between extremist narratives, online subcultures,

cybercrime, sexual exploitation and offline harm. This variety reflects both conceptual uncertainty and the multi-dimensional nature of the phenomenon. Its relevance for violent extremism prevention lies not in assuming ideological coherence, but in recognising how violence-legitimising narratives, extremist symbolic repertoires and networked mobilisation may create pathways from online socialisation to real-world harm.

This paper aims to strengthen understanding rather than to provide a definitive classification. It offers orientation on key concepts, ecosystems, internal vocabulary, escalation dynamics and implications for prevention, policy and multi-agency responses. In doing so, it complements the EU Knowledge Hub Conclusion Paper by providing additional background on the phenomenon and the conceptual tensions it raises.



CONCEPTUALISING NVE BETWEEN EXTREMISM, VIOLENCE AND DIGITAL SUBCULTURE

Throughout this paper, the term Nihilistic Violent Extremism (NVE) is used as a provisional analytical term rather than a settled category. Its use does not imply that all observed cases fulfil conventional definitions of extremism. Rather, the term reflects the observation that many cases display overlap with extremist narratives, symbolic repertoires and violence-oriented communities while often lacking co-

herent ideological orientation or strategic political objectives.

As a working concept, NVE helps capture forms of violence that are highly destructive and anti-social in orientation, though only partially structured by coherent ideology. The term “nihilistic” is not used here in a strict philosophical sense. It refers to a violence logic in which destruction, transgression, domination

and emotional detachment become central organising elements. Drawing on the CeMAS 2026 definition, NVE can be understood as the interaction of three elements: nihilistic and misanthropic beliefs, community dynamics of recognition, pressure or coercion, and the acceptance of extreme violence as a meaningful, legitimate or necessary form of action. This perspective shifts attention away from ideology alone and towards the interplay between worldview, social reinforcement and escalation.

This also explains why the “E” in NVE remains contested. Traditional understandings of violent extremism usually link violence to broader political, ideological or religious objectives. In many NVE-related cases, however, violence appears less directed toward political transformation than toward visibility, recognition, dominance, belonging or self-efficacy within digital environments. Extremist references may appear but are often fragmented, hybridised and situationally adopted. This does not mean that all forms of nihilistic violence should be understood as

extremism. A useful distinction can be made between Nihilistic Violence (NV) and Nihilistic Violent Extremism (NVE). NV refers more broadly to destructive forms of violence characterised by emotional detachment, transgression and the absence of coherent political or instrumental objectives. NVE describes situations in which such violence becomes embedded in broader ecosystems of meaning, social reinforcement, extremist references or collective recognition.

This distinction also helps avoid two common mistakes: reducing all severe violence to ideology or reducing emerging violence dynamics to individual pathology. The notion by P. Neumann (2026) of a “grey zone” is useful here: NVE-related cases often sit between clearly political violence and forms of harm shaped by fragmented ideology, digital socialisation, psychosocial vulnerability and personal grievances. NVE is best understood as an analytical lens that helps identify how violence, digital environments, social recognition and ideological fragments interact in contemporary forms of harm.



4 ORIGINS, ECOSYSTEMS AND VOCABULARY

UNDERSTANDING THE ENVIRONMENT

Understanding NVE requires moving beyond the assumption that contemporary violence emerges primarily through ideology or formal group membership. Many dynamics associated with NVE develop in digital environments where belonging, recognition and status are produced through fluid participation, shared aesthetics and rapidly changing symbolic references rather than stable organisations or coherent programmes. Parts of the phenomenon became increasingly visible from around 2017 onwards across imageboards, encrypted communication platforms, gaming environments and social media ecosystems (CeMAS 2026; Argentino 2025).

Repeated exposure to transgression, provocation and social reward can change how harmful behaviour is perceived. A recurring term for this broader cultural environment is the Edgesphere: loosely connected online spaces organised around boundary testing, anti-normative humour, irony, shock value and aestheticised violence. Most participants never engage in serious violence, but such environments can contribute to normalisation processes in which increasingly extreme content becomes socially acceptable or symbolically valuable.

What begins as irony, shock culture or performative transgression can, in some cases, evolve into coercion, humiliation or real-world harm. Several labels have become relevant in public debate, research and law-enforcement reporting, including The Com, 764, CVLT and No

Lives Matter. These should not be understood as coherent organisations in the traditional sense, but as decentralised, overlapping and often unstable network environments. Their relevance lies less in formal structure than in how they signal belonging, recognition and orientation within wider NVE-related ecosystems (CeMAS 2026; Europol 2026; EU CTC 2025; Argentino 2025).

A highly coded language is central to these environments because it signals belonging, status and escalation. Terms such as clout describe recognition gained through visibility, provocation or increasingly extreme behaviour. Gore refers to explicit depictions of severe violence and often functions as a mechanism of desensitisation and identity formation. Practices such as raids, swatting or cut shows describe different forms of coordinated targeting, coercion or performative harm. Such terminology should not be treated as standalone evidence of radicalisation. Its relevance depends on context: frequency, behavioural change, social reinforcement, coercive dynamics and movement into closed or more harmful spaces. Digital platforms are not merely channels through which NVE circulates; they shape how communities emerge, how recognition is distributed and how harmful behaviour becomes visible, valued and normalised. This explains why the Knowledge Hub Conclusion Paper places strong emphasis on digital ecosystems, platform governance and early detection beyond ideological content alone.

KEY TERMS AND REFERENCES IN NVE-RELATED ENVIRONMENTS

Term / reference	Orientation
Edgesphere	Loosely connected online environments organised around transgression, irony, shock value and boundary testing rather than coherent ideology.
The Com	Broad decentralised online ecosystem associated with harassment, coercion, exploitation and harmful content; better understood as a networked environment than a formal organisation.
764	A widely discussed label associated with online coercion, grooming, sextortion and violence-related offences. It has become a key reference point in debates on NVE-related network dynamics.
CVLT	Label associated with closed violent communities, loyalty practices, coercive self-harm and anti-social aesthetics; illustrates how belonging, exclusivity and violence may become intertwined through ritualised or performative practices.
No Lives Matter (NLM)	Label and networked reference point associated with nihilistic, violent and anti-social positioning; may signal belonging, hostility towards social norms and orientation towards violence rather than coherent ideology.
O9A (Order of Nine Angles)	References to O9A may appear in some NVE-related contexts, particularly where occult, satanic, transgressive or accelerationist symbolism is used to intensify shock value and anti-social identity. Such references should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of organisational affiliation or coherent ideological commitment.
Accelerationism	Strategic concept, found across different ideological environments, that existing systems should be destabilised or accelerated toward collapse. In NVE contexts, references often appear fragmented or aestheticised.
Clout	Social recognition, status or influence gained through visibility and attention; in NVE-related environments, increasingly transgressive behaviour may generate clout.
Gore	Graphic depictions of severe injury, abuse or violence that may contribute to desensitisation, identity formation and normalisation.
Raid	Coordinated targeting, harassment or disruption of individuals or communities in digital spaces.
Swatting	Deliberate triggering of emergency service responses through false reporting in order to intimidate, disrupt or endanger targets.
Cut shows	Live-streamed or recorded acts of self-harm, coercion or humiliation staged for attention, recognition or social reinforcement.

These labels and terms should not be interpreted as standalone indicators of radicalisation. Their relevance depends on context, behavioural patterns, escalation dynamics and broader social environments.





HOW NVE WORKS

VIOLENCE, RECOGNITION AND ESCALATION

If NVE cannot be sufficiently explained through ideology alone, the key question is what drives participation and escalation. In many observed cases, violence appears to follow a logic different from conventional extremist mobilisation. Rather than serving primarily as a means to achieve political objectives, violence can generate social value within these environments. It produces attention, recognition, status, belonging, control and perceived self-efficacy. Violence can become socially and symbolically rewarding. Extreme content can signal commitment, emotional detachment, dominance or authenticity. Acts of violence are not only carried out; they are documented, circulated, interpreted and reinforced. In environments shaped by visibility and competition, escalation can become part of the social logic: what initially attracts attention may quickly lose value, requiring more extreme forms of transgression to maintain recognition. This is why CeMAS describes escalation less as an individual deviation than as a system: community pressure, recognition and the demand to demonstrate commitment can turn violence into a recurring requirement for belonging.

This matters because violence in these spaces is not only an act; it becomes content, performance and communication. Visibility and recognition may be linked to the ability to provoke stronger reactions, demonstrate emotional detachment or cross boundaries. Furthermore, violence-related content does not

merely document harm. It can itself become part of the communicative infrastructure of NVE-related environments. Videos of enacted violence, livestreamed humiliation, gore material or violent content circulating in adjacent online spaces, including parts of true-crime-related communities, can contribute to desensitisation and help establish violence as a shared code. This dynamic is not only spontaneous or subcultural but can also be structured and deliberate. Documented NVE-related materials indicate that manuals circulate within these environments, some of them lengthy, providing detailed guidance on how victims can be selected, approached, manipulated, blackmailed and pushed into dependency, fear or despair. Such materials may include scenarios, scripts and suggested text modules. Their existence underlines that coercion and escalation are not always improvised, but can be learned, systematised and transmitted within the network.

The function of violence thus often shifts from political transformation to domination, humiliation, emotional intensity and control. This is particularly visible in cases involving coercion, exploitation, grooming, sexualised violence or performative cruelty. Harm becomes relational and communicative: it targets victims while also addressing an audience.

At the same time, NVE should not be reduced to individual pathology. It is not a psychiatric category. However, psychosocial vulnerability may shape susceptibility to these environments.

Isolation, trauma exposure, identity instability, emotional dysregulation or experiences of humiliation can interact with digital ecosystems that offer belonging, intensity, certainty and status.

NVE is therefore better understood as an escalation process than as a fixed identity. Exposure, participation, recognition and re-

inforcement interact dynamically; roles can shift, and boundaries between observer, participant, victim and perpetrator may become blurred. This directly supports the Conclusion Paper's emphasis on minors as both victims and perpetrators, the need for safeguarding approaches and the importance of identifying behavioural patterns rather than relying on ideological indicators alone.



IMPLICATIONS FOR PRE-VENTION, INTERVENTION AND MULTI-AGENCY RESPONSE

The dynamics described above explain why NVE cuts across established professional and institutional boundaries. It may involve elements of violent extremism, cybercrime, child sexual exploitation, coercive control, self-harm, offline violence and psychosocial vulnerability at the same time. As a result, no single sector is likely to hold the full picture. Individual signals may seem limited or ambiguous but gain meaning when understood in context and connected across systems (EUKH Conclusion Paper 2026; Rousseau et al. 2025; CeMAS 2026). Relevant indicators may not appear primarily as ideological statements, but through behavioural shifts, aesthetic preferences, language, platform migration, fascination with violence, admiration of perpetrators, coercive interactions or deeper involvement in closed online communities. None of these signals should be treated as proof of radicalisation in isolation. However, when several appear to-

gether—especially alongside vulnerability, isolation, desensitisation to violence or evidence of coercion—they may indicate escalation risks that require careful assessment.

This why responses must avoid both underreaction and over-securitisation. Dismissing violent aesthetics, gore fascination or 'edgy' behaviour as mere provocation can lead to missed opportunities for early support. At the same time, framing adolescents primarily as security threats can increase stigma, reduce trust and make disclosure less likely. This is particularly important because young people in NVE-related environments may occupy ambiguous positions: they can be victims of grooming, coercion or exploitation while also participating in harmful behaviour toward others.

Existing approaches from tertiary prevention, disengagement work, youth support and safe-

guarding remain relevant, but they require adaptation.

Case management, relationship-based counselling, risk and needs assessment, stabilisation work and social reintegration can provide important foundations. However, where NVE lacks stable ideological commitment, intervention may need to focus less on challenging a coherent worldview and more on reducing attachment to violent communities, interrupting recognition dynamics, addressing coercion, rebuilding offline relationships and creating alternative sources of belonging, agency and self-worth.

Therapeutic and psychosocial interfaces are especially relevant, without turning therapy into deradicalisation or medicalising ideology. Psychotherapy does not 'treat' extremism. Yet therapeutic professionals may be essential where trauma, self-harm, emotional dysregulation, depression, anxiety, problematic or excessive online engagement, suicidal ideation or severe relational dependency are present. Effective cooperation requires clear roles: prevention actors address social, ideological and community-related dynamics; therapeutic services address clinical and psychosocial needs; law enforcement assesses immediate risk and criminal harm (Wichmann 2026).

The key challenge is less to build entirely new systems than to improve transfer, coordination and role clarity between existing ones. NVE should not be assigned to one institutional domain. The task is to build interfaces that allow relevant signals, risks and support needs to be assessed together.

Beyond role clarity, prevention responses also need to consider access pathways. Since

NVE-related environments are mostly digital, support and intervention offers must become visible and reachable in the same spaces where vulnerable individuals seek belonging, recognition or guidance. This may include redirection approaches, low-threshold digital counselling and pathways that guide at-risk individuals towards specialised support before escalation becomes entrenched.

Where coercion, vulnerability, ideological fragments and violence-related behaviour intersect, referral pathways should connect criminal justice and security assessments with specialised tertiary prevention structures that have proven effective in other areas of extremism prevention.

At the same time, cases that become visible through law enforcement, judicial proceedings or other formal systems require context-sensitive assessment. Given the uncertain scale of the phenomenon, but also its qualitative relevance in cases involving coercion, minors, sexualised violence or real-world harm, structured referral into existing counselling and support systems should be ensured. Not every case will primarily call for a security response, just as not every case can be addressed through counselling alone. Where coercion, vulnerability, ideological fragments and violence-related behaviour intersect, referral pathways should connect criminal justice and security assessments with specialised tertiary prevention structures that have proven effective in other areas of extremism prevention. These should be linked, where necessary, to therapeutic and psychosocial support. The aim

is not to transfer existing models mechanically, but to adapt tested case-management, stabilisation and disengagement approaches to the specific dynamics of NVE.

Building on these considerations, policy and practice responses should focus less on creating a separate NVE-specific system and more on strengthening the interfaces, assessment tools and counselling capacities that allow existing structures to respond to NVE-related dynamics.

Policy and practice implications

Building on these considerations, policy and practice responses should focus less on creating a separate NVE-specific system and more on strengthening the interfaces, assessment tools and counselling capacities that allow existing structures to respond to NVE-related dynamics. Five implications are particularly relevant.

1. Develop shared assessment and referral frameworks

NVE-related cases should not be assessed through single indicators or isolated labels. Violent aesthetics, perpetrator admiration, platform migration, nihilistic language or references to specific groups may be relevant, but only when interpreted in context. Assessment should therefore focus on patterns, trajectories and combinations of signals, including behavioural change, online community involvement, coercion, vulnerability, fascination with violence, group pressure and indications of real-world harm. Policy responses should support the development of shared assessment frameworks across law enforcement, youth services, schools, mental health services, child

protection and specialised prevention providers. In practice, these frameworks should help professionals decide when a case requires safeguarding, psychosocial support, specialised tertiary prevention, criminal justice assessment, or a combination of these responses.

2. Organise multi-agency interfaces more clearly

NVE-related cases often cut across institutional boundaries. They may involve violent extremism, cybercrime, child sexual exploitation, coercive control, self-harm, psychosocial vulnerability and offline violence at the same time. No single institution is likely to hold the full picture.

Policy should therefore strengthen formal multi-agency interfaces rather than assign NVE to one institutional domain. This includes clear contact points, data protection guidance, referral pathways, joint case discussions and role clarity between security actors, child protection, youth services, schools, mental health professionals and civil society prevention providers. In practice, relevant signals, risks and support needs should be assessed together before cases escalate or fall between systems.

3. Adapt tertiary prevention to NVE-specific dynamics

Existing approaches from tertiary prevention, disengagement work, youth support and safeguarding remain relevant, but they need adaptation. Where NVE lacks stable ideological commitment, intervention may need to focus less on challenging a coherent worldview and more on reducing attachment to violent online communities, interrupting recognition and clout dynamics, addressing coercion, rebuilding offline relationships and creating alternative

sources of belonging, agency and self-worth. Policy should recognise specialised tertiary prevention providers as both casework partners and sources of expert consultation for regular services. In practice, this requires long-term case management, digital case assessment, family and environment work, stabilisation, relationship-based counselling and support for disengagement from harmful online communities.

4. Strengthen needs-oriented, guilt- and shame-sensitive counselling

NVE-related online environments may fulfil important functions for individuals, including belonging, recognition, status, protection, control, intensity or perceived self-efficacy. Effective intervention therefore needs to address not only problematic narratives or violent aesthetics, but also the needs that these communities appear to meet.

Practice should integrate needs-oriented, systemic and resource-based counselling approaches. This includes building alternative forms of belonging, stability and self-worth outside violent communities. At the same time, guilt and shame should be treated as central counselling dimensions. Shame may prevent disclosure, reinforce withdrawal or maintain dependency on harmful online relationships, especially in cases involving sexual exploitation, humiliation, coercion or self-harm. Guilt may be complex where individuals are both victims of coercion and involved in harmful or criminal behaviour. Counselling should therefore be shame-sensitive, trauma-informed and responsibility-oriented, combining protection, stabilisation and accountability.

5. Address digital dynamics and de-amplification

NVE-related harm is shaped by digital visibility, peer recognition and audience effects. Violence may function not only as an act, but also as content, performance and communication. Bystanders, consumers and online audiences can reinforce escalation through attention, interaction, sharing or validation.

Policy and practice responses should therefore include digital case competence and de-amplification principles. Professionals need to understand platform migration, closed online spaces, coercive communication, social engineering, sextortion, raids, swatting, cut shows, gore content and perpetrator admiration. At the same time, public and institutional communication should avoid unnecessarily reproducing group labels, symbols, violent imagery or perpetrator narratives in ways that may generate status or imitation. The aim should be to reduce harmful visibility while making support, reporting and counselling pathways more accessible.



7 CONCLUSION:

UNDERSTANDING WITHOUT OVERFITTING

The emergence of NVE raises important questions for prevention, policy and research, but it does not require immediate agreement on classification. The current debate illustrates a broader challenge: contemporary forms of violence increasingly cut across categories that have traditionally been treated as distinct, including extremism, serious violence, online harm and psychosocial vulnerability. There are valid reasons to retain connections to violent extremism frameworks: many cases include extremist narratives, symbolic overlap with established milieus or accelerationist references. At the same time, violence often fulfils social functions that are at least as important as political intent, including recognition, belonging, status and control.

The challenge, then, is not merely replacing existing concepts but determining whether current frameworks allow sufficient differentiation. Cases may differ considerably in their degree of ideological involvement, digital participation, coercive dynamics, psychological vulnerability and pathways into escalation. Responses should follow these observed dynamics rather than labels alone. Given the uncertain scale but clear qualitative relevance of NVE-related cases, this also means ensuring structured pathways into existing counselling, tertiary prevention and psychosocial support systems, rather than waiting for conceptual closure before building practical interfaces. Nihilistic Violent Extremisms may ultimately

remain a transitional term, evolve into a more precise category or become part of a broader rethinking of contemporary violence. Regardless of how the debate develops, one conclusion is clear: the task is not to settle the label, but to understand the interaction between violence, recognition, vulnerability and digital environments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argentino, Marc-André. "Chasing Clout: How Com Networks Turn Violence into Social Currency." *From the Depths*, October 25, 2024.

Argentino, Marc-André. "Nihilistic Violent Extremism (NVE): An Analytical Framework." *From the Depths*, April 17, 2025.

CeMAS. *Gewalteskalation als System: Nihilistic Violent Extremism in Deutschland*. Berlin: Center für Monitoring, Analyse und Strategie, 2026.

EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator. *Nihilistic extremist violence: An emerging threat (15477/25, LIMITE)*. Internal document, 2025.

EU Knowledge Hub on Prevention of Radicalisation. *Nihilistic Extremism in the Digital Age: Conclusion Paper*. Thematic Panel 1 and Thematic Panel 3. Brussels: EU Knowledge Hub on Prevention of Radicalisation, 2026.

Europol. *Intelligence Notification: The Rise of Online Cult Communities Dedicated to Extremely Violent Child Abuse*. The Hague: Europol Operations Directorate, 2025.

Europol. *Project Compass: First Operational Results against The Com Network*. The Hague: European Counter Terrorism Centre, 2026.

Institute for Strategic Dialogue. *Beyond Extremism: Platform Responses to Online Subcultures of Nihilistic Violence*. London: Global Network on Extremism and Technology, 2026.

Neumann, Felix. *Terrorismus ohne Ziel? Die Entwicklung nihilistischer Gewalt*. Berlin: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, 2026.

Neumann, Peter R. "The New Grey Zone: How Terrorism in Europe Has Changed." *Perspectives on Terrorism* 20, no. 1 (2026): 108-120.

Rousseau, Cécile, Diana Miconi, C. Ngov, and Ghayda Hassan. "Ideological and Nihilistic Violence in Adolescents Referred to a Specialized Clinic for Violent Extremism." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 67, no. 2 (2025): 30-48.

Sivignon, Pierre. "Escape the Void: Responding to Youth-Led Nihilistic Violence." *Global Network on Extremism and Technology*, February 2, 2026.

Wichmann, Fabian. "Rechtsextremismus zwischen Ideologie und Pathologie: Herausforderungen für Ausstiegsarbeit und Psychotherapie." In *Zwischen Beratung und Therapie: Schnittstellen in der Deradikalisierungsarbeit gestalten*. Tagungsdokumentation. Berlin: Grüner Vogel e. V., 2026.

FABIAN WICHMANN

has been working in the field of right-wing extremism prevention since 2006. Through this years of practical work in the field of extremism prevention, he had gained experience in the field of radicalisation and deradicalisation processes, especially in the areas of analysis, intervention, family counselling and exit counselling.

He implemented several successful and internationally recognised campaigns, published articles on the subject of right-wing extremism. In addition, he was co-chair of the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) working group Communication & Narratives and RAN Ambassador for over four years. Currently he is working as a research assistant at Grüner Vogel e.V. and is the Co-Leader of the Thematic Panel on Ideologies and Conspiracy Narratives within the EU Knowledge Hub on the Prevention of Radicalisation.

IMPRINT

Suggested citation:

Fabian Wichmann (2026) NVE: Concepts, Dynamics and Open Questions. Background Paper accompanying the EU Knowledge Hub Conclusion Paper In: Analyse & Praxis. Grüner Vogel e.V., Berlin.



Gefördert durch:



Author:

Fabian Wichmann

Editorial:

Hanno Schedler

Date of publication:

June 2026

Layout:

©2026 Grüner Vogel e.V.

Illustrations:

Fabian Wichmann

Publisher:

Grüner Vogel e.V.

Swinemünder Str. 2

10435 Berlin

Tel: +49 30 3390 8159

info@gruenervogel.de

www.gruenervogel.de



Grüner Vogel e.V.

— BERATUNGSSTELLE —



Grüner Vogel e.V. | www.gruenervogel.de