

Clive Archer

Norway Then and Now

A Comparison of Norwegian Society in the Late 1960s and Today

ABSTRACT

Political, economic and social change in Norway from the late 1960s to the early 2010s has been substantial, though key elements of the politics and society have endured. Change is mapped using seven areas of interest, including economic growth, change in the country's societal composition and in its relations to the rest of the world. In particular, the developments in social movements and the continuation of Norway as an "organisational society" are examined. It seems that, while Norway's organisations went into decline at the end of the last century, they have made something of a come-back. This may be in response to outside challenges in areas such as the environment but also may reflect an upsurge in youth activity. The country is now involved in European and world events as never before. Norway is becoming like many other West European societies, only it is better organised and richer.

Introduction

During the forty or so years from the late 1960s to the 2010s, Norwegian society, in common with those throughout Europe, has changed greatly. Those visiting Norway in the late 1960s would remember a country that was still greatly affected by its war-time experiences, that was regionally diverse but socially and politically quite unified and had a society underpinned by social movements, often attached to economic activity. Norway of the 2010s still has its regional differences and social movements, though now with more related to environmental issues, but the economic basis of the country has changed, as have some basic social elements.

This article will examine the main features of Norwegian society at the end of the 1960s and will note the major changes in the forty years since. In particular it will concentrate on seven elements:

- the Norwegian economy has developed with the transition from primary and secondary industry to the services, and the exploitation of oil and gas has left Norway and its inhabitants very rich;
- the role of women in Norway has progressed;
- it remains a country of low crime;
- Norway has become a country of immigration;
- its politics are less dominated by the labour movement;
- it is more integrated into the European economy and politics;
- and it has become more active on the world stage.

Some of the consequences of these changes will be seen in social movements, broadly defined. First, the domination of Norwegian society by the labour movement, including the Labour Party and the central trade union organisations, has weakened, though it still remains important. Secondly, Norway has become a less collectivist, more diverse, consumerist and individualistic country. However, elements of social solidarity remain. Finally, the very nature of social movements has changed with a greater emphasis on environmentalism and specific issues.

First, it is worth considering the nature of social movements that have both reflected and guided social change in Norway.

Social Movements

A social movement is “an association or set of associations organised around a common interest that seeks to influence collective outcomes without obtaining authoritative offices of government.”¹ Social movements in the latter part of the twentieth century concerned themselves, *inter alia*, with peace, women’s rights, animal rights, national separatism and environmentalism. They often debated whether to become political parties and engage the electorate more directly, and they had a variety of relationships with the state and its government. A state can either restrict access to itself to a small number of players, thus being exclusive, or open up access to many others, being inclusive. It can be active and concern itself with a wide range of interests in civil society, whereas a passive state will do little to advance the standing of particular social movements. Using such descriptions, Norway can be defined as an “active inclusive” state that has “expansive corporatism” where there is “tripartite concertation under which policy is made by agreement between

1 John Dryzek/David Downes/Christian Hunold/David Schlosberg/Hans-Kristian Hernes: *Green States and Social Movements. Environmentalism in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany and Norway*, Oxford 2003, p. 2.

the executive branch of government and peak business and labour federations”, but that an expansive interpretation allows the inclusion of groups beyond business and labour.²

A number of “new social movements” in western countries were less class-based than their more traditional companions and covered environmentalism and feminism in particular.³ This article will also refer to some of the main developments in social movements, especially environmental ones, in Norway from the late 1960s to the early 2010s.

The Late 1960s

The Economy

A generation after the end of the Second World War, Norway had recovered economically from the damage done by Nazi occupation, mainly because the Labour-led governments after 1945 restricted private consumption and channelled investment into rebuilding industry. Cars remained rationed until 1960.⁴ Although exports had reached pre-war levels by 1950, controls were maintained on capital, and labour costs were managed by industry-trade union agreements.⁵ The 1960s became “the first decade of prosperity” and a period of optimism.⁶ Indeed it was an era of full employment compared with the hard times of the 1930s. By the start of the 1970s households were acquiring the facilities associated with modern living: 73 per cent had a bath, 70 per cent an indoor toilet, 90 per cent hot water. The working Norwegian could expect four weeks’ holiday as of right and his or her working week was 42.5 hours in 1968, with a five-day week for most occupations being introduced in 1970.⁷

The workforce in Norway had developed a strong industrial base in the immediate post-war period, mainly to produce goods for the home market. By the start of the 1970s, the number of industrial labourers had reached 400,000, compared with under 200,000 for most of the 1930s.⁸ However, the real growth in employment was in the service sector, standing at 750,000, or half of the workforce, at the start of the 1970s. The expansion was

2 Dryzek et al., pp. 6–8.

3 Claus Offe: *New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics*, in: *Social Research* 52:4 (1985), pp. 817–868.

4 Tore Grønlie: *The Years since 1945*, in: Rolf Danielsen/Ståle Dyrvik/Tore Grønlie/Knut Helle/Edgar Hovland (eds.): *Norway: A History from the Vikings to our own Times*, Oslo, Copenhagen and Stockholm 1995, pp. 357–453, p. 361.

5 Natalie Ramsøy: Preface, in: Natalie Ramsøy (ed.): *Norwegian Society*, Oslo 1974, pp. 7–9, p. 8.

6 Grønlie, p. 361.

7 *Ibid.*, pp. 367–368.

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 368–369.

notable in areas where women predominated: the health service, education and retailing.⁹ “The number of teachers rose from 40,000 to 70,000 between 1960 and 1970” and half of those were women.¹⁰ Norway was also becoming a more urbanised society with one million out of the 3.9 million inhabitants in 1970 living in urban areas, the rural regions having lost 250,000 compared with 1945.¹¹

Women’s Role

The role of women in Norwegian society started to change in the 1960s. During that decade the share of women in the non-agricultural work-force saw a slight increase from the 30 per cent level where it had been since 1945. The largest jump happened between 1970 to 1975, by which time it had reached almost 40 per cent. By 1970 the hourly pay of women in industry was 75 per cent of that of men, a 15 per cent rise on the 1945 figure.¹² Meanwhile the proportion of women elected to municipal councils and parliament started to move up from below 10 per cent to over 15 per cent, but women were still vastly under-represented in political parties, public bodies and trade unions by the end of the 1960s.¹³

Internal Peace

After the turbulence of the Second World War, Norway had become a peaceful society. Not only did the state not face warfare or terrorism, but it was a land of low crime rates. A leading jurist could write about Norway’s crime record for 1965 that the transgressions were “first and foremost the result of our coveting our neighbour’s goods” but that “attacks on life and limb provide comparatively few cases for the courts in Norway – in strong contrast to conditions prevailing in many other countries.”¹⁴ The same author opined that “Criminality, while not unknown, is very far from being the average citizen’s way of life”,¹⁵ a statement valid for most European states then and since.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 371.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 390, p. 371.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 372; Statistics Norway: Population statistics, at: http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/02/02/folkendrhist_en/tables/tab/00.html (accessed on 17 January 2013).

12 Grønlie, p. 386.

13 Elina Haavio-Mannila: *The Position of Women*, in: Folmer Wisti (ed.): *Nordic Democracy*, Copenhagen 1981, pp. 558–588.

14 Nils Christie: *The Administration of Justice and its Clients*, in: *ibid.*, pp. 348–384, p. 351.

15 Christie, p. 369.

Immigration

Norway was certainly not a country of mass immigration in the 1960s, and very few of those who came to the country were from the developing nations. From 1961 to 1970, net immigration to Norway was only 442¹⁶ compared to Denmark's 18,671 and Sweden's 197,812 (both for 1960–9).¹⁷ Most net immigration to Norway was from the United States (576 for 1966–70), Finland (113 for the same period) and Yugoslavia (191).¹⁸ The US figure may have reflected a number of Norwegian emigrants to North America returning to their native land in their old age, but also included those with a business interest in Norway, especially in the newly-discovered offshore oil and gas.

Political Power

Norway's political structure was showing some change by the late 1960s. Already in the summer of 1963, the Labour Party – in power since 1945 – had handed over to a centre-right coalition for 28 days after a vote of no confidence. It lost power to a similar coalition in the 1965 election with its vote sinking to 43 per cent of the total.¹⁹ In 1961, a group had broken away from the party over foreign and defence issues and formed the Socialist People's Party (SF), which entered the *Storting* (parliament) in that year and was also represented in 1965.²⁰ However, it lost its parliamentary representation in 1969 with Labour clawing back its 1961 share of the vote (46 per cent) and winning power again.²¹ It seemed that Labour was regaining its hegemony over Norwegian politics.

Nevertheless, the 1961 breakaway and the later loss of power represented a change in politics that seemed to weaken the domination of Labour. It also reflected a trend in society: the post-war population bulge was becoming politically engaged, frequently on the left, and was often rebelling against the war-time generation. By 1970 there were 30,000 university students, six times the pre-war figure, and new universities were created in Trondheim and Tromsø in 1968, with Kristiansand, Molde and Stavanger hosting the first of the new regional colleges of higher education the following year. By 1970 women accounted for 35 per cent of all new university students.²² This growth was fertile ground

16 Statistics Norway: Befolkning, Tabell 3.31 immigration and emigration, by country, at: <http://www.ssb.no/histstat/tabeller/3-3-31.t.txt> (accessed on 17 January 2013).

17 Mary Hilson: *The Nordic Model*, London 2008, p. 191.

18 Statistics Norway: Befolkning, Tabell 3.31 immigration and emigration, by country, at: <http://www.ssb.no/histstat/tabeller/3-3-31.t.txt> (accessed on 17 January 2013).

19 Ivar Buch Østbø: *Stortinget. "All makt i denne sal"*, Oslo 1995, pp. 78–80.

20 Ottar Julsrud/Morten Malmø (eds.): *Politisk Årbok 2002*, Oslo 2002, pp. 37–38.

21 *Ibid.*, pp. 10 and 38.

22 Grønlie, pp. 390–392.

for new social movements that emerged in the 1960s and one of these can be seen in Nature and Youth (*Natur og ungdom*), established in 1967 by those involved in the study of biology. This also reflected the growth in environmental movements internationally. Nature and Youth joined the International Youth Federation for Environmental Studies and Conservation (IYF) in 1973.²³

Europe

Another important political grass-roots movements that grew up in the 1960s and reached its height in 1972 was *Folkebevegelsen mot norsk medlemskap i Fellesmarkedet* (the People's Movement against Norwegian membership of the Common Market). This and its predecessors had an important and active youth element that helped it to victory in the September 1972 referendum on Norwegian membership of the European Community (EC).²⁴ The European issue was also one that emphasised the social division in the country between town and country, centre and periphery, though this was ameliorated by the support given to the “no to the EC” side by urban opponents of EC membership, especially in Oslo.²⁵

Nevertheless, the referendum campaign and its result helped to emphasise the split between the political elite – which was almost entirely in favour of EC membership – and the sizeable part of the population that opposed it. It created cleavages within existing political parties such as the Liberals and Labour, and separated Norway from its close allies, Denmark and the United Kingdom, in European policy. As in other countries, the European issue entered politics in the 1960s and has never really left.

The World

An element in the decade-long discussion on Norwegian membership of the EC was the special nature of Norway. Opponents characterised the EC as “the Other” and contrasted continental European ways, both social and political, to those in Norway, which were to be preferred.²⁶ Norway was by the 1960s a remarkably stable society despite growing urbanisation and a burgeoning youth cohort. Those who were sailors or missionaries saw the world, but otherwise there was little interaction across borders beyond Scandinavia and, to a lesser extent, the United Kingdom and the United States. In 1960 Norway was one of the last European countries to introduce television, that window on the world.

23 *Natur og ungdom*: Historien år for år, at: <http://nu.no/historie/category148.html> (accessed on 17 January 2013).

24 Tor Bjørklund: *Mot strømmen. Kampen mot EF 1961–1972*, Oslo 1982, pp. 113–114, 125–136.

25 *Ibid.*, pp. 329–330.

26 Iver Neumann: *Norge – en kritikk*, Oslo 2001, pp. 123–145.

Even by 1974 only 160,000 Norwegians went on holiday by charter plane. In contrast many went to their family holiday cottages within Norway. By 1970 there were 190,000 of these, one for every seven houses.²⁷

Nevertheless, at the official level Norway had a particular view of the world. By the late 1960s, Norway's role on the world stage was played out through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which was seen as essential to bind the US and the United Kingdom to the defence of Norway, and through the United Nations (UN). Norway had provided the first Secretary General of the UN (Trygve Lie) and was an active participant in UN peacekeeping operations. Norway also had an active *Idealpolitik* reflecting "Norwegian values of peace, democracy and human rights" in foreign affairs, and this led it to criticise US policy in Vietnam and right-wing governments in Spain, Portugal and Greece. This policy was a mixture of the Norwegian Christian missionary tradition and social democrat ideals of international solidarity.²⁸

Organisations in the Late 1960s

By the late 1960s Norway was a country of organisations. In a survey in the early 1970s, 28 per cent of respondents were not members of a political party, occupational organisation or any other organisation, leaving 72 per cent who were members.²⁹ This includes youth and sports clubs but still represents an overwhelming part of the Norwegian population. Compared with the other Nordic states, this figure was similar to that in Denmark, lower than the 80 per cent reported for Sweden but ten points ahead of Finland.³⁰ Almost 200,000 were either individually or collectively affiliated to the Norwegian Labour Party, about five per cent of the population. There was an incentive to join a trade union as wage negotiations were conducted between the Employers' Confederation and the LO, the main trade union confederation.³¹ Union membership as a percentage of the labour force was 55.6 per cent in the 1970, below the figures for Denmark and Sweden but still some 15 percentage points above the average for eight "northern" states, including the four Nordic states (without Iceland) and Austria, Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands.³² Norway's low position in the Nordic table was attributed to the failure of unions to organise in the new service industries and among women, though it is also the case

27 Grønlie, pp. 367–368.

28 Olav Riste: *Norway's Foreign Relations – A History*, Oslo 2001, pp. 256–262.

29 Willy Martinussen: *The Distant Democracy*, London 1977, p. 184.

30 Kjell Eliassen: *Political and Public Participation*, in: Folmer Wisti (ed.): *Nordic Democracy*, Copenhagen 1981, pp. 126–137, p. 134.

31 Nils Elvander: *State Intervention and Economic Freedom*, in: *ibid.*, pp. 279–307, p. 295.

32 Hilson, p. 190.

that, unlike in Norway, unions in Denmark and Sweden have traditionally administered unemployment benefit.³³

By the end of the 1960s, new social movements were making their mark in Norway. In the environmental field, Norway had well-established, nature-based mass-membership organisations in the Norwegian Mountain Touring Association, established in 1868 (now the Norwegian Trekking Association, *Den Norske Turistforening*), and the Norwegian Society for the Conservation of Nature (*Norges Naturvernforbund*, set up in 1914 under a different name) which was more of a campaigning organisation. Nature and Youth (later *Norges Naturvernforbund's* youth organisation) was formed in 1967 and represented “radical environmentalism”.³⁴ By the early 1970s the government was co-opting elements of the environmental movement into the policy-making process.³⁵

Feminist movements were formed in Norway in the early 1970s, but tended to be small and fissionable.³⁶ Nevertheless, the more general women’s rights movement had its effect on the political system with what Helga Hernes called “state feminism” – including the incorporation of women as participants in public life – and the increase in female representation in the *Storting*.³⁷

An important element in the range of organisations seen in Norway was their role in the democratic process and even nation-building.³⁸ Throughout much of the twentieth century, active membership was the basis of voluntary organisations in Norway which “compared with other countries, recruited members from an unusually broad social range” thus making voluntary organisations “important actors in the democratic system”.³⁹ By the late 1960s, a change in Norway’s organisational society was noted: that of the growth in the numbers of specialised organisations that sprang out of the “leisure society” that was emerging as people had more free time. These groups were still mem-

33 Walter Korpi: Labor Movements and Industrial Relations, in: Folmer Wisti (ed.): Nordic Democracy, Copenhagen 1981, pp. 308–323, p. 314.

34 Ørnulf Seippel: From Mobilization to Institutionalization? The Case of Norwegian Environmentalism, in: *Acta Sociologica* 44:2 (2001), pp. 123–137, p. 129.

35 Liv Astrid Sverdrup: Norway’s institutional response to sustainable development, in: *Comparative Politics* 6:1 (1997), pp. 54–82.

36 Francis Sejersted: *The Age of Social Democracy*, Princeton and Oxford 2011, p. 452.

37 Helga Hernes: Statsfeminisme – et personlig tilbakeblikk, in: *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift* 3–4 (2004), pp. 288–294.

38 Stein Rokkan: *Citizens, Elections, Parties*, Oslo 1970.

39 Per Selle/Kristin Strømsnes: Membership and democracy: Should we take passive support seriously?, Department of Comparative Politics, University of Bergen 1998, at: http://c.ym-cdn.com/sites/www.istr.org/resource/resmgr/working_papers_geneva/Selle.pdf, p. 5. (accessed on 6 June 2013).

bership-based with a “democratic organisational form” and were thus re-enforcing the general nature of the voluntary sector.⁴⁰

Organisations such as SF, Nature and Youth, feminist groups and *Folkebevegelsen* got wind in their sails from a combination of social change in Norway – the growth in the number of young people and the number of students – and external factors such as NATO’s nuclear policy, the US war in Vietnam, international concern for the environment leading to the 1972 UN Conference on the Human Environment and the extension of EC membership.

In summary, by 1970 Norway had passed through a post-war period of austerity and had advanced economically throughout the 1960s. That decade had also seen social and political change as the post-war generation came to adulthood and the grip of the Labour Party faltered. The welfare state was recognisable and advancing, and the country was well organised, not least through membership of trade unions and the Labour Party. Nevertheless, it was not a country open to the world, with few immigrants or visitors. Oslo was a northern city more like the dour Edinburgh than the modernist Stockholm or sybaritic Copenhagen. Nevertheless, the outside world, in the form of the European Community, was about to impinge on Norwegian politics and also deepen social and geographical rifts within the country.

Norway in the 2010s

The Economy

Norway at the start of the 2010s is, per capita, one of the richest countries in the world. The average per capita income of its citizens was 58,090 US dollars (at purchasing power parity) in 2011, fourth globally and behind only Luxembourg in Europe.⁴¹ Its relatively small population, reaching five million in 2012, had benefitted from some forty years of extraction of oil and gas from its large offshore domain. Over this period, petroleum production has added more than 9,000 billion Norwegian kroner (1,640 billion US dollars at 2013 rates) to the country’s economy and its value creation is double that of onshore industry.⁴² Though the oil and gas business employs only about two per cent of the Norwegian workforce directly, it continues to be of great importance, even if oil production has peaked. By 2010 oil and gas extraction provided 21 per cent of Norway’s Gross

40 Ibid., pp. 5–6.

41 Clive Archer: Norway, Economy, in: Europa Publications (ed.): Europa World Year Book 2012, at: <http://www.europaworld.com> (accessed on 17 January 2013).

42 Norwegian Petroleum Directorate: The petroleum sector – Norway’s largest industry, at: <http://www.npd.no/en/Publications/Facts/Facts-2012/Chapter-3/> (accessed on 17 January 2013).

Domestic Product and the country was the world's seventh largest oil exporter (for 2011) and second largest gas exporter (2010).⁴³ This domination by the oil industry meant that, over the years, the domestic industry sector was squeezed even more than in other western states, with manufacturing employing nine per cent of the workforce in 2010 compared with 22 per cent in 1970. However, the service side of the economy continued to grow, employing 75 per cent of the workforce in 2011 as against 62 per cent in 1969, while agriculture only accounted for 2.2 per cent of the labour force in 2011 compared with 12 per cent in 1970.⁴⁴

One of the strengths of Norwegian society has been its capability to keep people in work, though the nature of that work has changed over time. From 1970 to 2009 employment in the service sector increased by 13 per cent, with that in health and social services going up fourfold and that in education doubling. During the same period, the number employed in manufacturing fell by a third and that in the primary industries by just under two-thirds.⁴⁵ The pie-chart of occupations in 2010 showed a quarter of those employed being designated as "technicians and associate professionals", 24 per cent as "service workers and market sales workers", 13 per cent as "professionals", then 10 per cent as "craft and related trade workers". Those in agriculture, forestry and fisheries provided just over two per cent of the workforce, in manufacturing 17.4 per cent and in the service sector some three-quarters of those working.⁴⁶ By the end of 2012, Norway had just over 2.6 million people in work, an employment rate of 69.3 per cent with only 3.2 per cent unemployed, a substantially better figure than other industrialised countries, including Norway's Nordic neighbours.⁴⁷

While the welfare state continued to grow in Norway during the 1970s with easier sick pay, a lower pension age and tighter laws on work conditions, "it can be argued that the development of the welfare society peaked in the course of the 1970s."⁴⁸ In fact, the welfare state was further entrenched in the late 1990s and 2000s with the pension age being lowered again and with government attempts to control sick pay being rebuffed by the trade unions.

Since 1995 the state's net earnings from petroleum activities have been poured into the "Government Pension Fund-Global", making it one of the world's top sovereign wealth

43 Ibid.

44 Hilson, p. 189. Statistics Norway: Manufacturing, at: http://www.ssb.no/industri_en/ (accessed on 17 January 2013).

45 Statistics Norway: Labour, at: http://www.ssb.no/arbeid_en/ (accessed on 17 January 2013).

46 Ibid.

47 Statistics Norway: Growth in employment, at: http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/06/01/akumnd_en/ (accessed on 17 January 2013).

48 Grønlie, p. 447.

funds, worth 122 per cent of Norway's Gross Domestic product by the end of 2011.⁴⁹ Norway's wealth can be seen in its public buildings, such as the airport at Gardermoen outside Oslo and the new opera house in Oslo, and in its population. Life expectancy in 2010 was 83 for women and 79 for men, compared with 75 and 63, respectively, across the northern border in Russia, and 81 and 76 in the US (both for 2009).⁵⁰ The consumption of wine has increased tenfold during the four decades from 1970; nine out of ten households have a television set, a 25 per cent growth since 1973, and three-quarters have a dishwasher, a 72 per cent growth since 1973.⁵¹ There was a summer house or cabin for almost one in twelve of the population, a decline from 1970, and, on average, 12.5 per cent of annual expenditure per household in 2009 was spent on culture and leisure.⁵² Norway had between 2005 and 2009 one of the lowest levels in Europe of people at risk of poverty or social exclusion, some 16 per cent or 10 per cent lower than the EU average.⁵³ The average Norwegian could expect to work a 37.5 hour week in 2012.⁵⁴

Women's Role

The role of women has developed over the period under review. In women's employment, as in the provision of public child care and parental leave, Norway was ahead of most states, though behind Sweden. However, using the UN's Gender Empowerment Measure, which examined the role of women in public positions, Norway had overtaken Sweden to take first place globally by 2001, after having been in second place to their neighbours from 1970.⁵⁵

By 2011, women made up 47 per cent of the labour force,⁵⁶ 74 per cent of females in Norway were in the labour force, some 15 per cent higher than the average EU figure and

49 Ibid.

50 Statistics Norway: Demographics, health and crime, at: http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/00/minifakta_en/en/ (accessed on 17 January 2013).

51 Statistics Norway: Household Consumption, at: http://www.ssb.no/forbruk_en/ (accessed on 17 January 2013).

52 Statistics Norway: Living conditions and consumption, at: http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/00/minifakta_en/en/ (accessed on 17 January 2013).

53 Eurostat: Key figures on Europe 2012, Social Inclusion, at: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-EI-12-001/EN/KS-EI-12-001-EN.PDF, p. 85 (accessed on 17 January 2013).

54 Statistics Norway: Labour force survey, Q3 2012, at: http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/06/01/aku_en/ (accessed on 17 January 2013).

55 Statistics Norway: As different as two drops of water?, at: <http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/00/histstat/> (accessed on 17 January 2013).

56 Statistics Norway: Population aged 15–74 by labour force status (LFS) and sex, at: http://www.ssb.no/aku_en/tab-2012-10-31-01-en.html (accessed on 17 January 2013).

beaten only by Iceland in Europe. Unemployment among women was lower than that among men (3.1 per cent compared with 3.5 per cent), less than a third than that suffered in the EU and the lowest in Europe.⁵⁷ The average basic monthly salary for women was 86.6 per cent of that for men in 2011.⁵⁸ Women are playing a full role in public life. From 2001, women have made up 35 to 40 per cent of representatives in municipal councils and the parliament. In the Stoltenberg government returned to office in September 2009, there were ten women in a cabinet of 19. A law mandated that 40 per cent of board membership of publicly listed firms must be women by 2008. This increased presence has, according to Norwegian scholars, led “to more focused and strategic decision-making, increased communication, and decreased conflict” in these firms.⁵⁹ It seemed that Norway was fast fulfilling its role of a “haven for gender equality” as outlined by the UN Committee on Elimination of Discrimination against Women.⁶⁰ However, while 40 per cent of board members in public companies were women in 2011, the figure for private limited companies was 17 per cent.⁶¹ Furthermore, in 2009, men had 80 per cent of all stock dividends paid to individuals and contributed near 70 per cent of all capital tax revenue.⁶² The road to economic gender equality is a long and difficult one, even in Norway.

- 57 Statistics Norway: population aged 15–74 by labour force status (LFS) and sex. Per cent, at: www.ssb.no/a/english/kortnavn/aku_en/tab-2012-10-31-01-en.html (accessed on 19 August 2013), and Eurostat: Key figures on Europe 2012, Employment, at: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-EI-12-001/EN/KS-EI-12-001-EN.PDF, pp. 73 and 75 (accessed on 17 January 2013).
- 58 Statistics Norway: Average monthly earnings and basic monthly salary for full-time equivalents, by sector, sex and working hours per 3rd quarter 2010 and 2011, at: http://www.ssb.no/lonnansatt_en/tab-2012-03-28-01-en.html (accessed on 17 January 2013).
- 59 Anne Sweigart: Women on Board for Change: The Norway model of Boardroom Quotas as a Tool for progress in the United States and Canada, in: *Northwestern Journal of International Law and Business* 32:4 (2012), pp. 81A-105A, pp. 83A-84A.
- 60 UN Committee on Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Norway called „Haven for gender equality“, as Women’s Anti-discrimination Committee Examines Report on Compliance with Convention, in: Press Release WOM/1377, 20/01/2003, at: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2003/wom1377.doc.htm> (accessed on 17 January 2013).
- 61 Statistics Norway: Gender equality, at: www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/as-different-as-two-drops-of-water (accessed on 19 August 2013).
- 62 Norwegian Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion: Equality 2014 – the Norwegian Government’s gender equality action plan, Oslo 2011, p. 38.

Internal Peace

At the start of the 2010s, Norway could also be seen as a peaceful society, albeit one that was to receive a rude awakening in 2011. Entering the 2010s, Norway was not a society where crime was a major issue and, as in the late 1960s, criminality was far from being the average citizen's way of life. In 2008, the crimes recorded by the police totalled 264,000 compared with 477,000 in Denmark and 377,000 in Scotland, both with slightly larger populations. The country was also lightly policed with 7,505 police officer units in 2008, compared with 10,743 and 17,048 for Denmark and Scotland respectively. Also Norway, in line with other Nordic states, tended not to lock up so many criminals: its prison population was 3,420 in 2008 compared with Denmark's 3,530 and Scotland's 7,835.⁶³

On 22 July 2011, a right-wing extremist carried out two acts of mass murder in the government quarter of Oslo and on the island of Utøya, where a Labour Party summer youth camp was being held. This slaughter of 77 people went against all that had been experienced in Norwegian society since the Second World War and was treated as the action of one unhinged individual. The response of Norwegian society was to demonstrate across the land in favour of the values of toleration and solidarity, and against the intolerance and hate seen in the ramblings of the perpetrator. Over 200,000 people attended a service in the weekend following the attacks.⁶⁴ In many ways, the behaviour of a sizeable section of the Norwegian people, their non-governmental organisations and those governing the country showed what Norway had become. It was reflective, conscious of its professed values of solidarity and tolerance, and scarcely vengeful. The subsequent trial of the perpetrator brought an international reaction that varied from admiration of Norway to an inability to understand aspects of the Norwegian criminal system and the Norwegian response.⁶⁵ In many ways, the series of events on and after 22 July 2011 showed both the vulnerability of Norwegian society, even to the actions of one person with very modest resources, its lack of preparedness for such violence, and also its maturity when compared with many other countries in Europe, let alone other parts of the world. This is not to claim that Norwegians are superior to those in other

63 Eurostat: Key figures on Europe 2012, Crime, at: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-EI-12-001/EN/KS-EI-12-001-EN.PDF, p. 93 (accessed on 17 January 2013).

64 Norges offentlige utredninger: Rapport fra 22. juli-kommisjonen, Oslo 2012, pp. 35–37.

65 For example, see Max Fisher: A Different Justice: Why Anders Breivik Only Got 21 Years for Killing 77 people, in: *The Atlantic*, 24 August 2012, at: <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/08/a-different-justice-why-anders-breivik-only-got-21-years-for-killing-77-people/261532/>. Andeas R. Graven: Gransker massivt mediekjør, 23 April 2012, at <http://www.forskning.no/artikler/2012/april/319601> (both accessed on 17 January 2013).

cultures, only that their society has developed certain ways of behaviour and structures that allowed it to react in a particular way to such an attack.

Immigration

Oslo has become a more typical European capital city with the sort of varied population seen elsewhere in the continent. Indeed, Norway has changed from being a country of emigration – which it still was for some years in the 1960s – to being a place of immigration.

While the excess of births over deaths fell from the 1960s to the mid-1980s, there was a small annual immigration. However, this became an average of over 10,000 a year during the 1990s and rose in particular from 2006 to over 40,000 a year with an all-time high of 48,600 being reached in 2012.⁶⁶ In 1970, the number of immigrants in Norway was about 50,000, about 1.25 per cent of the population, whereas the number of immigrants in 2012 was 11 per cent and those born to immigrant families two per cent of the population. Of the 655,000 immigrants and those with an immigrant background, 294,000 were of European origin, 163,000 had an Asian background, 60,000 African and 11,000 from Oceania and North America. Of the 471,000 non-Nordic persons granted residence in Norway from 1990 to 2010, 22 per cent were refugees, 28 per cent were economic migrants and 23 per cent came as part of family reunification.⁶⁷ The largest groups of immigrants in 2012 were from Poland (72,103), Sweden (36,578), Pakistan (32,737), Somalia, Iraq, Germany, Lithuania and Vietnam.⁶⁸ Swedes, Danes, Germans, Poles and Lithuanians represented 44 per cent of all foreign citizens in Norway in 2011. Thus the nature of immigration changed from the 1990s onwards. While there has always been a Nordic element, immigration came much more from Asia, Africa and Latin America than before, and latterly has had a more East European element. The greatest concentration of immigrants – almost 100,000 – is to be seen in Oslo and next-door Akershus.⁶⁹ Moslems make up an estimated 2.6 per cent of the population, though this figure is hard

66 Statistics Norway: Record population growth continues in 2012, at: http://www.ssb.no/folkber_en/ (accessed on 17 January 2013).

67 Statistics Norway: Immigration and immigrants, at: <http://www.ssb.no/en/innvgrunn> (accessed on 19 August 2013).

68 Statistics Norway: Population 1 January 2011 and 2012 and changes in 2011, by immigration category and country background. Absolute numbers, at: www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/statistikker/innvutv (accessed on 17 January 2013).

69 Ibid.

to verify.⁷⁰ Many of these are concentrated in the eastern part of Oslo. Thus Norwegian society changed as immigrants stayed and their families were brought up in Norway.

In 2011 there was a record number of emigrants from Norway. Of the 22,900 foreign citizens who emigrated, the largest groups were Swedes and Poles, followed by Germans and Filipinos,⁷¹ with most of these representing persons who had come to Norway to work and intended to return home after a given period.

This pattern of migration helped explain Norway's population growth, as well as Norway achieving a surplus of males for the first time.⁷² Furthermore, internal migration has continued apace. By the start of 2012, almost 80 per cent of Norway's inhabitants were in urban settlements with 90 per cent of the growth in population having taken place in urban areas in 2011.⁷³ Again a strong element in this urban growth was the rise in immigration to the six main urban centres. Certainly in these areas, the population no longer has the homogenous ethnicity of the late 1960s.

Though the unemployment rate was higher among immigrant groups (7.7 per cent) than the rest of the population (3.4 per cent), this distinction narrowed for Norwegian-born individuals of immigrant parentage (5.1 per cent). This seems to show an integration of "new Norwegians" into the work-force. Nevertheless, immigrants from Africa suffered a 14.2 per cent unemployment level, while the rate for West Europeans was 2.8 per cent, demonstrating a statistically significant gap of some size.⁷⁴ A number of factors could explain the difference: the West Europeans are more likely to be in Norway in pursuit of a particular job, while those from Africa may well be refugees who have to find jobs after arriving in Norway. They may also find a greater cultural difference than the West Europeans, providing barriers to work resulting from their own outlooks, those of others or both.

70 Clive Archer: Norway, History, in: Europa Publications (ed.): Europa World Year Book 2012, at: <http://europaworld.com> (accessed on 17 January 2013).

71 Statistics Norway: Another immigration record in 2011, at: http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/02/02/20/innvutv_en/ (accessed on 17 January 2013).

72 Statistics Norway: Immigration main reason for male surplus, at: http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/02/01/10/folkemengde_en/ (accessed on 17 January 2013).

73 Statistics Norway: 4 million inhabitants in urban settlements, at: http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/02/01/10/befteftt_en/ (accessed on 17 January 2013).

74 Statistics Norway: Low unemployment for male immigrants, at: http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/06/03/innvarbl_en/ (accessed on 17 January 2013).

Political Power

In Norway's political sphere, the Labour Party was still in power in early 2013, though in a coalition and no longer with the dominance that it had even in the late 1960s. It still has close ties to the trade union movement, especially the central union confederation, LO, though its parliamentary make-up is more middle class and female than forty years ago.⁷⁵ The major change from that period in Norwegian politics has been the growth of the Progress Party. The forerunner of this party made its mark in the 1973 election. It had its ups and downs until the early 1990s, but since the 1997 election it has attracted over 14 per cent of the popular vote in general elections and became the second largest party in the *Storting* in the 1997, 2005 and 2009 general elections. It is a populist party that has concentrated on the issues of lowering taxation, reducing government bureaucracy and cutting immigration. It has bitten into the Labour vote as well as that of more centre-right parties that traditionally pick up the first two topics.

Partly as a result of the rise of the Progress Party, and the continued existence of the Socialist Left Party (SV, formerly SF), Norwegian party politics have been more fragmented since the 1960s. There are two parliamentary parties to the left, two to the right and three in the centre, though in reality this neat positioning along a political spectrum hides a good deal of overlap and some changes in position on particular issues. As was already happening in the late 1960s, centre-right coalitions have come to power, with the main alternative being that of minority Labour governments. It seemed that, at least until the mid-2000s, the electorate had less party loyalty than previously and was increasingly treating political choices as consumers might, hopping from one product, or party, to another. However, since 2005, an old pattern has re-emerged, that of a right-left split, albeit ameliorated by small centrist parties. At both the 2005 and 2009 general elections, a majority centre-left government was returned and the centre-right parties were in opposition.

This move back to a clearer choice in Norwegian politics – left or right and a majority government that has a programme to implement – was also a response to what had become an increasing criticism of the way that it had been drifting since the late 1960s. A national study of Norwegian democracy published in 2003 outlined some of the problems that had developed in the governing of Norway especially in the decade or so beforehand.⁷⁶ In particular, it noted how the growth of a variety of organisations within Norwegian society came to a halt at the start of the 1990s and went into reverse. Instead of the traditional organisations, there had been a rise of “‘here-and-now-organisation’,

75 Arbeiderpartiet: Arbeiderpartiets stortingsrepresentanter fra 1945 og framover, at: <http://arbeiderpartiet.no/Om-AP/Aps-historie/Arbeiderpartiets-stortingsrepresentanter-fra-1945-og-framover> (accessed on 17 January 2013).

76 Øivind Østerud/Fredrik Engelstad/Per Selle: *Makten og demokratiet*, Oslo 2003.

in often small, nonmembership-based, professional, single-issue, action groups.”⁷⁷ The Norwegian study of democracy found membership of most political parties to be falling and voter participation to be dropping in both local and national elections.⁷⁸ The connection between what the parties promised, what the elector voted for and what was delivered needed to be re-established, with a clearer alternative to be given to the voters. This is partly what has happened since the publication of the report in 2003: the Norwegian electorate has been faced with a broadly left-right choice, though with further choices within each camp.

Europe

An area where democracy has been seen to falter is that of European policy. This has been recognised both in the democracy study and in a later one on Norway and the European Economic Area agreement. In an academic report on the working of Norway’s relationship with the EU, the “most problematic aspect” was identified as being that “Norway in reality has bound itself to take on policies and rules from the EU over a very broad field without being a member and without voting rights.”⁷⁹ Having to transpose EU legislation into Norwegian laws without the *Storting* being able to alter a comma was seen as being part of a “democratic deficit” that resulted from Norway being part of the European integration process without being a member of the organisation driving the process. The agreement is seen as part of the Norwegian political compromise between democracy and other values and interests that a broad political majority thought available through European integration. A commentator on Norway and European integration may see the current situation being similar to that in the late 1960s with Norway being only a reluctant European, holding the integration process at arm’s length. In reality, Norway has taken on a large slice of the European project and has seen a Europeanisation of its policies and a section of its administration.⁸⁰ So Norway is part of the mainstream concerning this major development in European politics since the 1960s.

77 Stein Ringen: Democracy in Norway, in: Taiwan Journal of Democracy 6:2 (2010), pp. 43–55, p. 51.

78 Østerud/Engelstad/Selle: Makten.

79 Norges offentlige utredninger: Utenfor og innenfor Norges avtaler med EU. Utredning fra utvalg oppnevnt av Utenriksdepartementet 7. januar 2010 (Europautredningen) Avgitt til Utenriksdepartementet 17. januar 2012, Oslo 2012, p. 19 (my translation).

80 Ibid.

The World

World events after the end of the Cold War have affected Norway's current role in the world, though perhaps not always as might be expected. Norway did not react as swiftly to the end of the Soviet Union as, for example, Denmark which very quickly changed its defence and security posture. One Norwegian writer considered that "[t]hroughout the 1990s, Norway remained one of the most conservative members of NATO"⁸¹ and Russia was being identified as the main security threat to Norway even in 1993. However, Norway did involve itself in some of the main western peace operations (some led by the European Union) in the Balkans – stepping its toe outside the NATO area in a mode different from traditional UN peacekeeping. Even this was begrudged by military leaders, fearing that it would detract from the main role of the armed forces to protect Norway.⁸² The terrorist attacks on the US on 11 September 2001 helped to change this approach. Since then Norway has contributed fully to the NATO operation in Afghanistan and it was there that its air force bombed opponents for the first time since 1945. While Norway's contribution to the Iraq war was minimal, mainly because of the lack of a UN resolution to back the action, Norway was one of the most active participants in the international NATO-led action against the Khaddafi regime in Libya in 2011. Again Norwegian aircraft were used to bomb ground targets. In early 2013, the Norwegian government was also considering contributing to an EU military training operation in Mali.⁸³

These last two events happened when SV, the Socialist Left Party, was in government. They have had to accept not just Norway being part of EU and NATO military operations, but also Norwegian armed forces taking hostile actions against Arabs, Asians and Africans. This would seem unthinkable to the Labour Party of the late 1960s, let alone to SV's predecessor, SF. While Norway's *Idealpolitik* is still alive in other areas such as trying to bring peace to a number of world hot-spots and in environmental policy, the reality of the international effects of global terrorism and unstable regimes has been brought home to Norway as to other European states. It seems that the opportunity for idealism and special pleading in such cases has become limited.

81 Pernille Rieker: *Europeanisation of Nordic security*, Oslo 2003, p. 222.

82 Ibid.

83 Tore Arne Andreassen: *Barth Eide åpner for norsk militær innsats i Nord-Afrika*, *Aftenposten*, 21 January 2013, at: <http://www.aftenposten.no/nyheter/uriks/Barth-Eide-apner-for-norsk-militar-innsats-i-Nord-Afrika-7097953.html> (accessed on 23 January 2013).

Norway – an “Organisational Society”?⁸⁴

A study of governance in the OECD placed Norway second in the class, describing it in the following terms:

Norway is a typical consensus-driven democracy able to adapt smoothly to a changing global environment. The country's economic and social policies are exemplary in cross-national comparison and help ensure a high quality of life for Norwegian citizens.⁸⁵

Looking at the role of interest organisations in decision-making, the authors of the OECD study wrote:

The government and the opposition parties listen carefully to the opinions expressed by business, farmers and union leaders. Intellectuals and academics also receive attention. Environmental groups have a substantial influence on environmental policy. The large organizations are professional in communicating their messages to politicians and to the public, and are sometimes able to set the political agenda. In addition, there are numerous formal arenas for routine consultation between governments and various kinds of interest organizations. In many areas, such consultations are formalized and have become a routine mode of policy formulation.⁸⁶

This would suggest a continued involvement of such organisations in the governmental process and one that has become embedded in the Norwegian political system over time. It would also reflect the expansive, inclusive nature of the state in Norway whereby corporatism has been extended beyond just the main trade union and employer organisations to bring in others such as environmental groups. In this area, even the Bellona Foundation, that broke away from the mainstream Nature and Youth organisation in the mid-1980s, has not been a mass-membership group, but has relied on high-profile activities, scientific work and, over time, an increased connection with government.⁸⁷ It

84 Selle/Strømsnes: *Membership and democracy*: p. 5.

85 Bertelsmann Stiftung: *Sustainable Governance Indicators 2011, Norway*, at: http://www.sgi-network.org/index.php?page=countries_keyfindings&country=NOR (accessed on 17 January 2013).

86 Stein Ringen/Ulf Sverdrup/Detlef Jahn: *Sustainable Governance Indicators 2011. Norway Report*, at: http://www.sgi-network.org/pdf/SGI11_Norway.pdf, p. 35 (accessed on 24 January 2013).

87 See the major study on environmental groups in the mid-1990s, Kristin Strømsnes, Gunnar Grendstad and Per Selle: *Miljøvernundersøkelsen 1995. Dokumentasjonsrapport*, Bergen 1996.

has accepted government project work and “receives much of its money from trade and industry”.⁸⁸ Though Bellona has remained a critic of many aspects of official policy, it works within the political system and demonstrates the inclusive nature of that system.

This trend in the environmental movements reflected a broader one noted at the end of the twentieth century. By the 1980s Norway was starting to see the rise of non-membership-based, centralised and professionalised voluntary organisations and a decline in the membership-based, democratically structured organisations.⁸⁹ This seems to have had an adverse effect on the political capital of the country, as suggested in the democracy study cited above. It meant that, though Norway continues to be an “organisational society”, its nature was changing with the membership of the organisations apparently shrinking and their nature becoming more specialist.

However, there is some indication that Norwegian political society is no longer in decline. First, the switch from a mass-based structure of voluntary organisations to a more professional one may not be bad for democracy. The old model may be romanticised while a more professional approach may help to provide real alternatives in decision-making.⁹⁰ There is every indication that environmental movements’ involvement in Norwegian politics has shown a “breadth, depth and range” of participation in the political process.⁹¹ Secondly, there is some evidence that the membership decline may have been reversed into the twenty-first century. A comparative study of western countries showed Norway not only as one of the leaders in the share of its population involved in voluntary work, but also indicated that this share had increased from 52 per cent to 58 per cent between 1997 to 2004.⁹² This placed Norway first in this category, ahead of Sweden at 51 per cent and Denmark at 35 per cent.⁹³ Admittedly, some 54 per cent of the voluntary time devoted by Norwegian was to cultural, sports and hobby organisations, and only 10 per cent went on political, humanitarian and environmental organisations, but perhaps that is to be expected in modern “free time” life. A traditional “free time” organisation such as the Norwegian Trekking Association was able to boast breaking the 200,000 members mark in 2003 with 241,000 in 2011.⁹⁴

88 Dryzek et al., p. 27.

89 Selle/Strømsnes: *Membership and Democracy*: p. 6.

90 *Ibid.*, pp. 20–21.

91 Ørnulf Seippel: *Environmentalism, Democracy and Political Opportunity structures: The Case of Norwegian Environmental Movements*, in: *Environmental Politics* 8:3 (1999), pp. 49–76.

92 Karl Henrik Sivesind: *Frivillig sektor i Norge 1997–2004. Frivillig arbeid, medlemskap, systemsetting og økonomi*, Oslo 2007, at: <http://www.samfunnsforskning.no/Publikasjoner/Rapporter/2007/2007-010>, p. 12 (accessed on 17 January 2013).

93 *Ibid.*, p. 14.

94 Den Norske Turistforening: *DNTS historie*, at: <http://www.turistforeningen.no/historikk/> (accessed on 6 June 2013).

An even more encouraging sign was that in 2007 a report from the Norwegian Youth Council could report that “93% of children and youth growing up in Norway take part in voluntary organised activities... This makes Norway exceptional when it comes to voluntary activities, and one can say that Norway is an organisation society.”⁹⁵ This was not just a reflection of more young people playing sports: in 2011 the Labour Party’s youth organisation in Norway reported a historically high membership figure of 13,900 at a time when political parties were generally seen to be losing members. This increase partly reflected a reaction to the tragic events of 22 July 2011 in which a number of Labour youth members were killed or injured, but even the 2010 figure of 9,600 compares favourably with 6,500 in 2003.⁹⁶ The Young Conservatives in Norway reported their record year for membership in 2012: almost 5,000 members, 500 up from their previous record in 2011 and showing increases every year since 2007.⁹⁷ It seems that political membership organisations are far from moribund in Norway.

The nature of Norway as an organisational society has changed since the late 1960s. Generally, the mass organisations have been less well patronised, though there are signs in some of a return to higher figures over the last decade. Corporatism is still dominant in Norwegian political life, but the range of participants is perhaps wider than forty years back, including a number of environmental organisations in particular. The voluntary sector seems to be more professional and thus less democratic than before, and this can be seen in the environmental movements, though the extent to which this matters is disputed.⁹⁸ Compared with many other developed countries, Norway is still an “organisational society”.

Conclusions

Norway today is a vastly richer society than in the 1960s. It is also more varied and more individualistic. Some of the old socio-economic social movements have fallen away and new ones have arisen. However, there are still elements of the old values of solidarity, even if they are constantly being challenged. The socio-economic changes have affected the social movements in Norway, though perhaps not as strongly as in other states.

But is this much different from the changes experienced by many north European states since the late 1960s and early 1970s? The main difference is that Norway is richer

95 Norwegian Youth Council: Who? Why? How?, Oslo 2007, at: <http://www.un.org/esa/soc-dev/nyin/documents/wpaysubmissions/norway.pdf>, p. 1 (accessed on 06 June 2013).

96 AUF: Historisk tall, at: http://auf.no/-/bulletin/show/713840_auf-med-historisk-medlemstall?ref=checkpoint (accessed on 17 January 2013).

97 Unge høyre: Unge høyre øker mest!, at: <http://ungehoeyre.no/politikken/nyheter/article/unge-hoeyre-oeker-mest.html> (accessed on 17 January 2013).

98 Seippel: From Mobilization to Institutionalization, pp. 132–136.

than its neighbours, which is due to the flow of oil and gas through the Norwegian coffers and to the judicious management of this wealth by successive governments in Oslo. This seems to be in line with the previous approaches of Norwegian governments towards the use of wealth as noted by international commentators: “The nation has invested heavily in both infrastructure and production facilities over the years in question, in fact, ever since the end of WWII. Spending annually some 20% of its GDP on such investments [...]”⁹⁹

This approach has been accepted by the majority of Norwegian voters who have not in the main supported parties that wanted to spend more of the oil money, and by the country’s consumers who, again on the whole, have not been beguiled by conspicuous consumption as have the citizens of other oil-rich states.

It does seem that Norway has been ahead of other European states in the areas of women’s rights, the environment and in settling immigrants. It is a country of organisations and these are experiencing something of a renaissance in the 2010s. It has, despite one individual action, remained a peaceful society and one that is included in the mainstream European integration process. It is a vanguard state in environmental matters but still gains its wealth from selling hydrocarbons. Furthermore, it has in recent years joined other NATO states in taking forthright military action against those seen to threaten Western interests. Perhaps in the 2010s Norway is slightly less special than it could claim to be in the late 1960s, still a lot better organised than others and certainly much richer.

Clive Archer was until 2009 director of the Manchester European Research Institute, Manchester Metropolitan University. From 2009 to 2012 he was emeritus professor at MMU and an individual research member of the Oslo-based Geopolitics of the High North research group. He has written and edited numerous books, including *The European Union* (2008), *Norway Outside the European Union* (2005) and *International Organizations* (3rd edition 2001) which were published by Routledge. He has been honoured by the King of Norway and the President of Finland.

99 Forum Oeconomicum: Norway – A European Economic Exception?, at: <http://www.forumoecon.com/forumoecon/parchives/international/Norway/norway2011.pdf>, p. 13 (accessed on 17 January 2013).