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I usually introduce this lecture by:

Ò welcome to the country where men are handsome, women sturdy and all citizens are above average.Ò (Garrison Keeler, US)

This humorous and ironic comment indicates Norwegian - Americans` self image. I shall now try to take you through Norwegian mentality as I subjectively see it. I have spent quite a lot of time abroad. It is completely impossible to view Norway critically if one has never spent considerable time outside its borders. I have been lucky to live both in the US, Britain and Poland for several years, and feel qualified in judging Norway from outside. I am well read about Norway`s image abroad, and have found that Norway is popular among the public. The reason is obviously that people rarely hear anything about Norway. One is then likely to jump to the conclusion that ÑNo news is good newsÑ. This conclusion is not at all valid.

This ÑlectureÑ is more like an essay which is meant as a provocative reaction to official Norwegian foreign policy, as it is presented in our foreign department. Our foreign minister, in a speech in spring 2006, goes back 100 years and tries to find supportive arguments to his main thesis: Norway is - and has been - a Ñpeace loving nationÑ.
My mission is to present an alternative view, based on the *seamy* sides of our history. As such, neither the Norwegian foreign minister, Jonas Gar Støre, nor I are objective, in the real sense of the word.

Thanks to Thor Heyerdal, Henrik Ibsen and Gro Harlem Brundtland, we have a popular image abroad. Besides, we have no colonial history, except the one we shared with Denmark while dominated by them for 400 years. At that time Danes were blamed for the atrocities - not us.

Our popularity stems from being small and insignificant in international affairs. On the other hand, Norway has for three consecutive years been nominated by the UN as the best country in the world to live in. This has added to our pride.

Our image is a romantic one, stemming from our pure image that has to do with landscape rather than people. Clean white stretches of snow and ice, scenic mountains and fjords look spotless and innocently blue, white and green. Everything is too spotless and clean to be true - it is an image conjured up by the tourist industry that portrays reindeer, sleigh bells and good natured Santa Clauses and trolls who look ominous, but are really innocent and harmless.

Fortunately, the glossy tourist brochures have not yet published the national Norwegian warning that 35 fjords are too polluted to be used for fishing. I do not envisage that they will ever do so.

But do not get fooled by the romantic image. Famous Norwegian and controversial peace researcher, Johan Galtung, once said that *there is no limit to the international havoc Norwegians could have created if they were 40 instead of 4 million*. A good example of this is when Norway sent gunboats to Greenland in the 1930s to annex East Greenland in a conflict with Denmark. This was admittedly in a very nationalistic period in history, but still Norwegian explorer, Helge Ingstad, was appointed the first governor of the new Norwegian *colony*. Fortunately, however, the Danes brought the conflict before the International Court in the Hague- and Norway lost.
Recently (Aug 2007), the Russians have raised a controversial territorial claim in the North Pole, so has Norway on the continental shelf in the Barents Sea. Norway has even done so in the Antarctica (Queen Maud’s land and Peter 1 Island), but this is not taken seriously by anybody.

Norway is in fact a small and terribly self conscious nation that is caught up in the dilemma of trying to appear moralist in national and international affairs, but finding it more often than not that the most common and viable alternative is to choose a rather pragmatic and opportunistic way out of a problem - but still defending it as the best way.

Model one

1. Moralist
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2. Opportunistic and pragmatic
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3. Third alternative: Best way

To give you a good example, look how our Puritan and Christian Puritanism and teetotaler movement have turned us into moralists.
The *moralist* says that all alcohol is bad for body as well as soul. The *pragmatic* side of this is that in the 1920s the Norwegian authorities found alcoholism to be a serious problem that needed looking into. Norwegians feel guilty when they drink, and they are the only race on earth that hides their bottles underneath the table when they are drinking. They feel they are caught in committing the most abominable sin. But they still drink.

Then the Norwegian government came up with a brilliant and pragmatic idea. Why not establish a wine monopoly that limits the access of alcohol. It gives the government a good conscience - and better still, they are able to put up prices so high that the government even makes money on Norwegians’ bad habits. This is a good illustration of state moralism, and a moralist nation that finds it better to become *pragmatic*, particularly when the government makes a lot of money on it.

This nation has proud traditions through the great humanist and polar explorer Fridjof Nansen who saved thousands of Russian refugees in the 20s exposed to famine in Russia. Also the author Henrik Ibsen was the advocate of political radicalism and stern criticism of capitalist exploitation of natural resources as well as of women in society.

These traditions have made us even stronger in our belief that "we do it the best way" although Ibsen himself was furiously against self pride. Ever since the last century Norwegians have upheld an image as the defender of idealist international goals and ideals. We have even been given the task of awarding the Nobel Peace Prize every year. God knows why the Swede Alfred Nobel gave us this honour. He probably looked around to see which nation was the most moralist and found that Norway was a good candidate. The Danes have always had a reputation for being hedonist and enjoyers of the good life, and were looked upon as totally unqualified. The Swedes themselves were all too engaged in shameless international affairs.

One example to show how concerned Norwegians are about their Peace prize awards is that they study well international reactions in the press every time they pick another candidate. The most
embarrassing example is in 1994 when Nelson Mandela got the price. The Nobel committee was so scared by international reactions to a controversial candidate, that they also chose President De Clerk to share the price with him. This is a good example of Norwegians` fear of being moralistic, and that is why they chose to share the price with the totally insignificant De Clerk. This was another famous example of how pragmatism replaced moralism, for fear of international reactions.

In recent years, we have been famous for brokering the peace accord in the Middle East, called the *Oslo Accord* in 1993. This later became the basis for the Nobel Peace Prize to Arafat and the Israelis in 1994. Although not successful in the end, it helped our reputation as peace negotiators.

When the Nobel Committee in Oslo has sent up their smoke signals to announce their Nobel Peace Prize candidate, very much like they do when choosing a new pope in the Vatican, nobody is more nervous than the committee members themselves. Have they done it the best way, or will they become the laughing stock of all the international media after announcing their candidate? Will the experts fall about in laughter because the candidate is compromising Nobel’s honour? Remember Jante law No 8: ÒYou shall not laugh at usÓ Norwegians do not like to be ridiculed.

The same could be observed with the Nobel Peace Prize award of 1973, when the prize was shared between Henry Kissinger and Le Duc Tho after the ending of the Vietnam war. Norway was too afraid to give the honour to the moral winners of the war, the Vietnamese themselves.

The Peace Prize Award has caused Norway to look at itself as a rather courageous and perseverant defender of human rights. The Nobel prize in literature in Sweden does not have the same international impact by any means. That is why Sweden envies Norway its Òone day fameÓ of the Nobel committee every year. After all, the Swedish Nobel prize in literature does not appeal as much to the international media.
It is dangerous to grant Norway too much attention. President Roosevelt’s words during WWII “Look to Norway” in praise of stubborn military resistance against Hitler’s armies have been forgotten by everybody except Norwegians and this has provided a new dose of self-consciousness that we have exploited ever since.

Today I want to show how this country with its propped up self-image finds it increasingly difficult to appear moralist and right but also that we have a tendency to cling to a choice/to the idea that our alternative was/is the best way after all.

We shall look at history, for example after 1945. I hope to prove this awkward choice both nationally as well as internationally. But everything starts with WWII. That war for the first time gave proof that Norway proved unable to declare itself neutral to international affairs. We had been neutral in WWI and declared the same in 1939 but this time without success. So this period from 1940-1945 proved the first where Norwegians had to face up to realities in foreign affairs.

The Jante Law is the Law of Laws second only to Moses’ laws on the slate. These laws expressed a passion to conform. Deviation from normal behaviour was never tolerated in Norway. This was turned into a philosophy or religion consisting of ten commandments or laws. Typical for Norwegian mentality as seen by a Dane who remembers the same from his own village back home. Sociologists claim it to be more Norwegian than anything else. It has been said also that Norway is the only country in the world where envy is a stronger drive than the sexual drive.

The Jante law is not only a law, it is imbued in every Norwegian from birth and from the way he talks and acts. This is my personal evaluation of this rather unscientific theory and literary “law”. Every little soul strives to convince himself that he is as good as the others and fights for self-recognition yet in the back of his mind he still fears that everybody else might be better/bigger that himself after all. He also has had an unbelievable trust in the Old Testament and Moses who
advocated virtues such as obedience, humility and respect. This is why Norwegians have paid up to 70% tax without questioning it. This testifies to these virtues.

One of our most famous Labour prime ministers, the father figure of our welfare state, in the 50s said that

“There is no limit to how much tax Norwegians could pay as long as they are told often enough and get used to the idea.”

This was a famous aside in a hotel room where the prime minister thought he was alone and only surrounded by trusted party friends. Unfortunately, however, a journalist had overheard his comment, and he splashed it across the first page as a headline in Norway’s largest national paper. This insult to Norwegians nearly toppled the government, and the prime minister had to excuse officially his statement.

By paying heavy taxes Norwegians are kept in control and are led to believe that everybody is equal, *but* on the other hand they believe/fear that everybody else is bigger. They tend to ignore Orwell’s statement that “there are always people who are more equal than others.”

This psychological mechanism has a tremendous effect on this peculiar race. And it is the pillar of society in that it has caused everybody to keep a watchful eye on anybody who tries to climb on the social ladder. This is one of the secrets of the incredibly homogenous characteristics of our society. The Jante Law and those of Moses have resounded between towering mountains for ages here, and their chilling messages have sent shivers down the spines of generations of Norwegians growing up in their villages.

Listen to the words of the Jante Law:

- You shall not think you are something.
- You shall not think *you* are as much as me.
- You shall not think *you* are wiser than us.
- You shall not profess to be better than us.
- You shall not think you know more than us.
- You must not think you are *more* than us.
- You must not allow yourself to believe that you are good for anything.
- You shall not laugh at us.
- You shall not believe that there are people who care about you.
- Last but not least the law of laws
- You must not believe that *you* can teach *us* anything at all.

If these commandments have terrorized Norwegians for generation no wonder we sent so many over to the US - no wonder those who felt a need to achieve something and improve their lot chose to leave.

Norway has never been the land of golden opportunity - it consists of 70% stone and only 4% arable land - yet it has for better or for worse become a country where it has been looked down upon to appear wealthier and better off than everybody else. After all, we are a country of small farmers and crofters, who used to be among the poorest European countries 100 years ago. The psychological and political sanctions against trying to make oneself better than our neighbours have been incredibly strong and have made Norway what it is - the most homogeneous and egalitarian country in Scandinavia and probably in Europe. Today things are changing, and economic and social differences are on the increase.

Still we think we are the best - don’t think you can teach us anything. We do it the best way. Confronted with their own ideals of neutrality and by failing them having to choose the best way.

A nationalist country that had since ages looked upon its own interests as more important than anything else outside suddenly found itself exposed to international issues of critical importance and having to face them. Strategic issues in 1940 forced us to become pragmatic. Why? The answer is that you cannot afford to be *moralist* - and besides - *pragmatism pays*. 
Why Pragmatism

- Geographical position
- Strategic importance
- Narvik for Swedish iron ore
- Kola peninsula for Russian fleet and nuclear submarines
- Norwegian territory of extreme importance whether Norway liked it or not both to Britain, US and USSR.
- Therefore Britain and Germany both prepared invasion in 1940
- Weak Norwegian army and soldiers did not first realize whether they saw German or British ships and planes in the early hours of April 9, 1940.

Once occupied, Norwegian exile government fled to London. They dissolved Parliament. But Quisling installed himself in power with a new government and council when Norwegian king and government escaped to Britain.

Quisling installed new county officials and sacked old ones, and made a new national assembly supported by his party on a basis of a corporative system (trades and professions according to Racist theory). Schools and church/police and biggest papers were nazified, and opposing teachers/ministers sent to prison camps.

Underground resistance army commanded from London

Summed up:

Moralist: sharing the resistance against Hitlerism and heroic performance both in army and merchant marine.

Pragmatic:
- Quisling was able to find support.
- Cooperation with industrial companies. Industry went well.
- Anti - Jewish sentiment was strong, and less attempt here than in Denmark to defend them.
- Police nazified and little sign of boycott of Nazi civilian rule.
- Post - war historians have rationalized this and emphasised the heroic underground military resistance.
Yet:
- Jewish people sent to Germany together with 35,000 Norwegians. Few Jews survived. Denmark succeeded better through an impressive scheme of evacuating them to Sweden.
- Criticism of Police role in rounding up of Jews. They “just followed orders.”
- Children of “German whores” were discriminated and ill-treated.

What do we say in our defence? It was “the best way out, or a compromise. Norway had limited options in the face of a brutalized Nazi terror regime. We have emphasized the heroic contribution of Norwegian forces and the impressive sacrifices of merchant marines sailing convoys for the allies. Yet the fact that we have given the word “Quisling” as a synonym for traitor is played down. The fact is that Quisling could not have reigned without a certain element of Norwegian cooperation. Yet, we claim that in the face of crisis “the best way” was chosen. Quisling had not a great support, but enough to make some Norwegians feel defensive about it.

**Post War reconstruction**
As for the reconstruction period carried through by the Labour Party in particular after 1945, there is no denying that we created a welfare state which was impressive 1 but the reasons for this, I will say something more about in my lecture on the welfare state. The Norwegian welfare state was less impressive, relatively speaking, than the British one.

Of course the Labour Party took credit for these improvements, and the Gerhardsen period from 1945-1963 took pride in an extraordinary improvement of living standard and social security. GNP tripled from 1945 to 1975. Population growth was 30%. Yet, and that is the other side of the coin, arrogance of power caused The Labour Party to function more or less as “a one party state” - very undemocratic with a helpless opposition. Political power was virtually monopolized within party ranks. Nepotism was common.
Increasing incompetence in administrative matters finally toppled the Labour government in 1962 because of severe flaws in industrial administration in Spitsbergen—owned by the government. Government ownership was compromised. Still the Labour Party defended it as the best way: State control in industry.

A socialist historian, D.A. Seip, was so horrified by what his own party had developed into that he wrote a provoking book calling the Post war period in 50ties and early sixties a one party state. Yet, the majority of historians looked upon this period as one where the party in power did everything the best way. In the final analysis the ends justified the means - in spite of everything.

**International cooperation and European Union**

Although Norway has supported international integration and cooperation after WWII and Labour even applied for associate membership in EU in 1962/67 (i.e. half-hearted membership) a national referendum in 1972 swung us back into national isolationism. In political propaganda at the time everything foreign (that is European) was presented as suspicious and negative and a threat to Norwegian lifestyle, culture and independence. The Labour Party supported membership but was badly defeated by the popular opinion 48/52 % in the 1972 referendum and we remained outside while Denmark joined Britain as new members.

In later years this option has been looked upon as the best way for the following reasons.

1. Norway has more influence outside EU than anybody could have foreseen. But his is more due to our oil revenues than to anything else.

2. We also claim that large unemployment and economic recession in EU countries did not reach Norway right away, and foreign labour seemed to create racism and severe confrontation in the rest of Europe.
Yet ï€�� from 1980 till today ï€�� Norway had proved depending on foreign labour. We trade 87% with EU and we had just come out of a recession in 1990 when some Norwegians looked enviously to the European Common Market for help.

3. Racial tension was avoided here, but flourished within the EU - Britain and Germany in particular. Yet racism in Norway today is as severe as in our neighbouring countries. Also oil revenues have not proven only a blessing to Norwegian economy ï€�� our nationalist selfpride has made us behave as ìœBlue eyes Arabsîœ where we have spent wealth on improved living standards, rather than on improving our general traditional industry and investing more in know-how and education. But we still see it as the best way.

**Development aid**

It has to be said, that our foreign aid was idealistic ï€�� which shows our moralist attitudes during the oil boom. Our double standards are easily seen, however, in our cooperation with OPEC on price issues, where the general Norwegian view is to support developing countries controlling their resources ï€�� except in policy where Norwegian self interest is at stake. We do not support OPEC fully on their price initiatives, because we think our North Sea oil deserves a different and better price than theirs, because of its superior quality. Cooperation with our western allies and industrialized countries came first. Even our third world assistance benefits our own economy in terms of expanded markets. We get more back than we give away.

Oil resources give us increased national and international independence so we can afford more development aid. But looking more into our international role, it becomes even clearer how ideals clash with pragmatism. Our development aid has in fact decreased relatively speaking, as part of GNP.

**International affairs ï€œ east-west cooperation**

*Idealism 1945 - 48 Bridge building*

- Interest in keeping east-west cooperation
- Bridge building (Trygve Lie, UN)
- Working against veto in UN
- Trying to be neutral, to avoid conflict and afraid to provoke USSR. Cancelled Churchill’s visit in -46 because he had criticized USSR in Fulton speech (Iron Curtain from Trieste to Stettin).
- Norwegian Labour against Truman doctrine (supporting people who fight to free themselves).
- Greek civil war -46.
- Some neutrals in Norway were sceptical of Marshal Help, but tempted by reconstruction, parliament accepted in the end.
- Difficult to be moralist and neutral when it costs money.
- Norway supported UN, but wanted to keep UN costs down and refused to enter Security Council in fear of conflict involvement.
- Always we have had problems with balancing ideals with pragmatic self interest.
- Finnish-Russian agreement made Norway afraid of similar offer of deal with USSR as Norway was only country without border agreement.
- Russian pressure for an agreement was exercised against Norway in 1948, an in February -49 Norway military was offered USSR agreement, but opposed it and landed on a pro-Nato policy.

Then Norway chose NATO in April 1949 after long pragmatic discussion about what would benefit Norway most.
- Norway declared base principle of non-provocation, as a moralist defence Vis a Vis USSR.
- Confrontation in UN continued. Western majority and propaganda for cold war, resulting in vetoes from USSR.
- UN functioned badly as peace organisation, and Norway looked for other sources for security/peace. Making a decision was hard. The conclusion was to combine a UN with a NATO support as a compromise.
**Political options 1948 - 1949:**

**Idealist I**
- a. Isolated neutralism (*Moralist*)
- b. Neutral Scandinavian defence organization.

**Pragmatic II**
- a. Scandinavian defence organization allied with the West (*Pragmatic*)
- b. Nato-membership.

**Look at options:**

**I:** Neutrality was a negative concept after April 9, 1940. Is neutrality possible in war and peace? Could trade, culture, literature be neutral in a meaningful way?

**II:** Sweden disapproved of Norway’s flirtation with the west.
- Sweden’s policy was to prevent Denmark and Norway to enter Nato.
- Denmark and Sweden wanted a neutral defence, but Norway’s interest was to the west.
- Norway was sceptical of Sweden’s policy of neutrality during WWII, where they allowed transit troop transportation of Germans to Norway. (Sweden was as helpless as Norway in the face of Nazi pressures).
- Norway disliked colonial memories and always admired Britain and US war traditions, trade and history, as well as Britain’s and US’ pragmatic support for Norwegian independence in 1814.

**Norwegian historical background:**

Danish rule (1380-1814). Union with Sweden (1814-1905). Sweden and Norway had a "bloodless war" from July to August as Sweden protested against the Norwegian 1814 constitution, May 17. This shows that Norway has an inferiority complex, as a fairly young nation. That explains its nationalistic thinking. The nation developed more interest in their own affairs, which explains what happened after WWII.
- Norway wanted an improved army in 1945 (linked up with the idea of freedom). US offered material, and even moralists could not resist the temptation.
- Civilian reconstruction offered by Marshal was too tempting.
- Norway's experience with neutrality was bad (1940).
- Norway did not sacrifice anything during the cold war. Ideally we were against cold war but chose NATO for pragmatic reasons.
- Strong US support in Labour. Watergate-like tapes discovered even in Labour party in order to spy on radical communists within own ranks as intelligence it reminds of American Mac Carthyism. The Lund Commission in 1996, opened up secret archives of intelligence against radical politicians. Even I was in those files because of my work in Communist Poland. There was communist witch hunting as early as in the 50s in Norway.

- Soviet propaganda was fiercely anti- Scandinavian after WWII, and wanted neutral defence organization in Scandinavia.
- Norwegians were frightened by this rather aggressive protest against western alliances and joined NATO to avoid Soviet pressure. Joined Nato by 137/13 votes in Parliament. Communism was very strong after the war because USSR pulled out of Finnmark in 1945. They had 20% of votes in Finnmark.
- Norway had chosen side due to a pragmatic argument- and sacrificed a common Scandinavian outlook.

- In 1949, for the first time Scandinavian countries chose different paths in foreign policy. Nordic balance product of cold war. Pattern is repeated now in EU 1994.

Nordic balance what was that in 1949?
- Finland was neutral with Soviet agreement in case of attack.
- Sweden was neutral.
- Norway, Denmark and Iceland were in Nato. Norway's bases were not provocative.
- In case of USSR aggression, Norway/Denmark were pressured to accept US bases, and then USSR would put Finland under severe pressure.
Norwegian NATO membership was a result of "bad conscience" about leaving neutralism, still defending it as the "best way."

1949 - present: Nato period
Appeasement - resistance delicate balance. No exercise east of 24 latitude in fear of provoking the USSR.
- No American bases in peace time.
- No nuclear arms in peace.
- What is the limit?
- U2 plane landed in Bodø before being shot down in - 62.
- Norwegian navigation system to support US nuclear submarines in the Arctic, Loran C. Even the most ignorant moralist could not believe that this system was supposed to guide fishing boats.
- Allied boats never accepted Norwegian claim that nuclear weapons should not be brought to Norwegian waters. (They never said which boats had nuclear weapons.)
- Norwegian support of massive response and flexible response although being against nuclear weapons.
- Anticommunist campaign in Norway in the 50s and military support for nuclear integration.

Norwegian Labour prime minister, Einar Gerhardsen was clearly against and ran an anti-nuclear campaign 1960. The Labour party split in 1961. The radical faction SF, separated because of its nuclear resistance. Intercontinental missiles in 60s stopped debate, because Norwegian territory became less exposed to pressure with long-distance missiles.

Norway showed strong support of US in Vietnam, and in the 60s its government was less critical than US' internal pressures. Inside the US, protest was louder than in Norway. In Sweden, on the other hand, Palme's government dared speak out against it very clearly, whereas Norwegians kept quiet for pragmatic reasons.

- Norway not in favour of non-nuclear free zones suggested by Sweden and Finland because we feared US reactions.
- Supported Nato nuclear modernization plans in Europe -79.
- Norway strongly traditionalist, and the "best behaved pupil" in the Nato class - least critical.
- Afraid to criticize the US.
- In conclusion, a pragmatic policy as the "best way".

**Moralist elements in Norwegian politics**
- Support civilian political emphasis in Nato.
- Strong support for disarmament in UN.
- Nato support of human rights in Greece, Portugal, Turkey 1967-74.

**Moralism in UN and in Development Aid**
- Kerala in the 50s.
- No colonial past except Iceland and other countries during the Viking age.
- Young nation and supportive of decolonization and nationalism.
- First country to reach 1 % GNP in developing aid
- Supportive of New International World Order.
- 50/50 Bilateral/multilateral development aid to the UN
- All gifts, no condition.
- Concentration on help to India/Pakistan/Sri Lanka, (Arap Moi - Kenya), Uganda/Tanzania
- Supportive of the poorest countries.
- Women and children targeted first in development aid.
- Family planning. Best in the world per capita.
- Developing countries decide on what they use our help for -not Norway.

**Pragmatic elements in Norwegian politics**
- Half hearted support for change of Division of Labour and 3rd World industry.
- Weak support for 3rd world shipping. Demands from UN of 40% of trade on 3rd world ships rejected because of Norway’s vested interest in their powerful merchant marine.
- Custom barriers against 3rd world clothing imports still not removed.
- Weak OPEC support, for pragmatic and nationalist reasons.
- Decline in grants in the 80ties and 90ties. Politicians are less idealistic in post modernist society.
- New tendency to support private projects and industries. This is more pragmatic and capitalist than idealist.

Still we think our development aid is an example of the best way.

Current Moralist Issues of Ecology
Our ex- Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland headed the UN Commission on ecological protection, and was the editor of the UN-Manifesto “Our Common Heritage”, 1986. Since 20 years we have professed to hold ecological ideals high, and are generally looked up to for decent environmental concern and behaviour.

Let us not be too highheaded though. It was the Swedish chemist, Svante Arrhenius who pioneered the thought that earth warming is due to carbon dioxide emissions. Already in 1896 he said:

“we are evaporating our coal mines into the air.”

Another comparison with Sweden is equally sobering. Having twice as big an economy and industry as ours, Sweden managed to reduce their CO2 emissions by 13.5% from 1996-2007, whereas Norway increased theirs by 2.7% in the same period. The “ugly” Americans increased theirs by 14% in the same decade. It could be said that our oil exports is a good excuse, but the argument does not hold when comparing to Britain, which also is an oil producing- and exporting nation.
But we still claim to do it best, because we are able to buy CO2 quotas from the Russians, and thereby *making wonders* for global warming.

**Pragmatic Reality**
- Criticised for sealing and whaling for “scientific purpose” and environmental “protection”.
- We had a cod war against Iceland, where we threatened to use force. In the same war against Russia, the tone is more quiet and diplomatic.
- The Norwegian computer system, counting the stock of minke whales has become totally compromised. Luckily this has not yet reached the international media, only in Norway. There is little reason to trust our data on how many whales there are.
- Swedish-Norwegian seal inspector LIndberg was virtually threatened to leave Norway because of his critical report on Norwegian sealing. His family was threatened because we do not like bad publicity in the media.
- Norwegian shipping is making a fortune on sailing garbage and poisonous chemicals to Africa to be dumped – thus contributing to making Africa the biggest garbage dump in the world. African countries accept storage because they make money on it and cannot afford to worry about pollution of own territory.
- Scrapping of old Norwegian boats in India poses a health threat to local workers.
- Norway protests loudly and aggressively against nuclear and coal based energy. Still they produce coal at Spits Bergen for an excellent price, and this coal, in its turn, is used to heat up coal based energy installations in Germany and Denmark. Moralism is costly.

**Racism and treatment of minorities: Ideals**
Strong official support of Anti-Apartheid. Norwegian governments are trying to enforce boycott and criticism of racist incidents everywhere in the world.
**Grim Reality**

ī exceptions are in my town, Sauda, which was granted different treatment in order to continue its profitable metal imports from South Africa during Apartheid.

Our Same/Lappish minority was not allowed to use their own language in school until the 70s and American indigenous population share the complaints of Norwegian Lapps/Same people as regards state discrimination in education. New claims for Same independence was delayed by Norwegian government. The issue of Same Ownership to land was rejected likewise. Also, when building out hydroelectric power in Northern Norway in the 80s, the authorities did not accept ecological protests on the part of Same/Lappish people in protection of their environment. Norway’s national economic interest of profit making in hydroelectric development far outweighed the local Same concern about their land being damaged as valuable reindeer grazing country when building new enormous water reservoirs.

More serious still is a strong element of racism in Norwegian society. Today, that is rather worrying, in comparison to the rest of Scandinavia. Anti-Semitism was relatively strong during WWII, and still Norwegians/Finns/Danes probably stand out as more racist than other Scandinavian countries. Possibly because we have allowed fewer to get in than Sweden.

Among foreign people in Norway, the % of Blacks and Asians is surprisingly small ī 3, 4 % and 20 % respectively. As much as 62 % is from the rest of Europe and North America.

One of the very conservative parties, The Party for Improvement (i.e.in favour of lassez faire economy) uses slightly camouflaged racism in its rhetoric. One of my worries is that so few people seem to discover this.

The irony of this is that Norway, together with Ireland, sent off a higher proportion of immigrants than any other countries into the US.
We have celebrated 150 years anniversary for local emigration to the US, and more people ought to remember this when discussing "harmful immigration." Send them out! Yes, but first we have to bring back the others from Norway who left us.

Since the first 50 people left Stavanger in 1825, we have sent 750,000 Norwegians to the US between 1866 and 1915. In the top year 1882, 30,000 Norwegians left. In contrast, Norway has been much more restrictive than its Scandinavian neighbours in accepting political refugees and foreign workers into the country. When allowing foreigners, however, we used to pursue a strange policy of rounding them up in groups in luxurious mountain hotels far away from any local community to "make their transition easier" as we called it.

This policy has completely failed, and has met a lot of criticism. The hotels have been looked upon as nothing but foreign ghettos. Yet, this policy has been violently defended as the best way because another one might have created even bigger problems. At long last, this policy has been left during the last decade.

The welfare state is secure for generations because we have better prospects for oil and gas incomes in the future than any nation on earth — and last but not least — we can keep our links with the US stronger than before. As an energy producer, we are attractive in every quarters.

In 1994 we had our second fight over the European Union which we rejected for the first time in 1972. I left for the US then, and did the same the second time we rejected the Union with a percentage - 52/48 — very similar to the 1972 results.
When I came to Harvard in August 1995 as a Fulbright professor, I had to explain why Norway said no — as I indeed did when I was a Fulbright scholar in State University of New York at Stony Brook back in 1972-73.

So what are some of the answers I gave?
Norwegian moralism prevented us from joining a union where Catholics are very strong. I do not think this is the most important reason, but religious propaganda was surprisingly vocal. The Biblical rhetoric has been exploited to present Europe as the biblical Beast from Revelation 14. Also the bureaucracy of Brussels is presented as undemocratic and secretive. Norwegian protest has emphasized that we shall lose our open society/democracy and independence.

Some other funny arguments were those that Norwegians saw European standards inferior to ours. Our water quality was seen as better and "Tall Men against the EU Organization" claimed that EU door standards of 70 x 190 cm were not good enough. They also claimed that beds, trousers and shoes would be too small for a nation that claimed to have the highest proportion of people taller than 185 cm in the whole of Europe ignoring that the tallest ones were Dutch and Swedes.

Our moralist outlook seemed to make us believe that Mafioso in Italy, racism in Germany and capitalist and neo-colonialist attitudes in Britain and France will destroy us.

On the other hand, there are very many pragmatic reasons for staying outside EU as well. Farmers and fishermen are afraid of losing subsidies from the Norwegian government. The fear is that heavily subsidized agriculture and fisheries will face massive cuts. According to the anti EU organization, 80% if those employed in agriculture will lose their jobs. Farmers receive 12 bn kr in handouts from the state each year. This sum represents 2% of GNP or twice as much as we give in development aid and guaranties a 180,000 N kr minimum income for everyone employed in agriculture.

Fishermen also want to prevent other countries to enter "our" zones because they have "over fished" stocks for generations. Norwegian Minister for fisheries, who became famous for his nickname "Mr. No-Fish-Olsen" refused any opening for European countries during the EU negotiations. Also after the referendum, Sweden and Denmark are
outraged at Norwegian arrogance in EU – during Norwegian EEA (EØS) negotiations on fishing quotas.

We have chosen in 1994 to isolated ourselves outside other Scandinavians, and how do we rationalize about this?

- but it serves them right to be engaged in the European mess.
- We have always been for international cooperation and integration in the UN and in NATO, but EU is different as it threatens our national independence. Being outside the EU for pragmatic reasons, have made our profits even higher.
- We do not have to send our soldiers as EU European soldiers. Still we have for a long time constituted important elements of UN soldiers both in Bosnia, Africa and the Middle East.
- We can manage on our own, and the terrible warnings by those who supported the EU have not happened. Our economy is still doing better than any other in Europe. We have paid our total foreign debts which is an international sensation. Our pension fund is the largest in the world.

- We thank the Danish foreign minister, Per Hekkerup, who was-according to political rumours- supposedly blissfully drunk during the negotiations about the continental shelf in the 70s. If Hekkerup had kept sober, it is not unlikely that Denmark today would have been the Scandinavian superpower of off-shore energy. As Norwegian moralists, we can only shake our heads in sympathy and blame it all on alcohol.

All above examples of moral dilemmas have illustrated - I hope - how difficult a moralist national outlook is in a world which shows no respect for national borders, and where most political issues that may seem local, or national - in the final analysis have international implications and repercussion whether we like it or not.

Our politicians are gradually waking up to realize that we are all part of a global village where your and my concern is everybody else’s as well. This is particularly true when talking about ecology and the preservation of resources.
May be as things change so dramatically in international politics today, we can all afford to be moralist in outlook — not having to take an opportunistic point of view that favours only national self interest.

The ambitious UN millennium aims of rooting out severe poverty within 2017 are good examples of a whole world asking us to be moralists and do our job. The future deserves international politics to become moralist. But our Norwegian examples show how difficult it is to make it reality.

Let us go back to our original model, as a way of rounding up: Norwegians, deep down, believe in moralism, which is regarded as: the good way.

Reality, however, shows them that opportunism and pragmatism is difficult to avoid, in spite of being: the bad way.

So they rationalise and find arguments to support themselves. They use a well-known psychological mechanism, which is called rationalisation, to defend their actions as: the best way — or the NOR-WAY.

American students have commented during my lectures, that they see close parallels between Norwegian and US mentality — and this is of course true. Any nation struggles with the same dilemma, without admitting it openly.
Norway and the rest of Scandinavia
Norwegians claim that their country is a heaven on earth, particularly after the EU referendum which isolated Norway from the European mess. The night of the EU referendum, no-vote party leader of the Centre Party (former Farmers’ Party) Anne Lahnstein gave an enthusiastic interview to the British paper The Sun and said to the journalist:

“We warmly welcome your readers to visit our beautiful Europe-free zone of Norway.

Norway also claims that Santa Claus comes from Northern Norway but the Finns have convinced more foreigners that he comes from their Lapland.

This conflict never seems to stop. But we Nordics (Scandinavians is a more controversial term as it leaves out the Finns and Icelanders) never tire of reminding the rest of the world that the Nordic nations are just one big, happy family. Blond, prosperous and squeaky clean, we present a united front on the international scene, and like to act as the world’s conscience on such morally worthy issues as the environment and human rights. Who is best?

But now Sweden and Finland have joined Denmark as European Union members leaving Norway and Iceland out in the cold. The differences we Nordics know to exist may now be exposed to the rest of the world.

Like all families we fight among ourselves. Behind the closed doors of the happy Nordic family there are mockery, jealousies and ancient feuds. Sweden, Denmark and Norway see themselves as the “core” Scandinavians sharing an airline (SAS). However Sweden and Finland have strong historical links as do Denmark and Iceland. Norwegians are closer linguistically to Sweden, but genetically to Iceland, as our former Viking colony, and the Greenlanders against the “bigger” countries.
It is getting so complicated that we even have to stop using the term "Scandinavia" in formal discussion. Nor only did it make Iceland feel left out, but purists argue that Finland and Denmark are not part of the Scandinavian peninsula. Now the balance is shifting again with Norway isolated outside the EU.

Swenson the Swede regards himself as the aristocrat of "Norden", as he calls the Nordic block. Danish Hansen is charming of course, and excellent company but hopelessly irresponsible. Ola Nordmann of Norway is just a country boy. Pekka of Finland is a source of cheap labour, and Jon the Icelander is such a funny little fellow. If you want things done properly with efficiency and intelligence, you need a Swede. The Swedes' sense of superiority can irritate his fellow Nordics, who accuse him of being stuck up, boring and pompous. There is no point in telling him a joke because he won't understand it. It will take him ten years to invite you to his house and when he does, he will be so stiff and formal that you never want to go back.

Of course a good deal of these anti-Swedish sentiments are sheer envy. But Norway and Finland have spent centuries under Swedish rule and have historical inferiority complexes. Until the recent recession in Sweden which has rolled back welfare benefits to a stunning degree, the Swedish welfare state has been an amazing success. Now, however, their benefits are inferior to those of Norway.

Swenson the Swede takes a loftily benign view of his fellow Nordics. He does get very sulky about Norway's superior sporting results in the Winter Olympics (not to mention its oil discovered in the 70s) and that the Finns have such a strong international reputation in the field of design. Danish foreign minister P. Hekkerup was drunk during negotiation with Norway on coastal rights on the continental shelf.

Ola the Norwegian is a sturdy fellow, rugged and independent. He is friendlier and more hospitable than his Swedish neighbour, but if he invites you for a stroll or walk beware: this will be no gentle stroll. Ola is a hearty outdoor type, never happier than up a mountain with a backpack. He also has a religious streak. Norway is full of fundamentalists and non-conformist sects. The fierce independence
that lead them to reject the EU twice (1972 and 1994) is partly a result of their new-found autonomy. For centuries Norway was ruled first by Danes and then by Swedes and has been independent only since 1905.

Geographical scales in Norway are vast: The distance between Oslo and the far north of North Cape is the same as between Oslo and Milan in Italy. The fiercely anti EU fishermen and farmers who populate these remote areas are depending on an incredible government subsidy to exist.

Laid back ï happy-go-luck Hansen the Dane is probably everybody’s favourite Nordic ï certainly when it comes to visiting his home. He has the tastiest cuisine, the cheapest drink and the best shopping. Unashamedly hedonistic, he is almost suspiciously free of the hang-ups and dark repressions and guilt feelings that give his fellow Nordics a reputation for gloom. The others feel that he is more part of Europe than Scandinavia, and being a longstanding member of the EU merely adds to his continental glamour. The Finns and the Swedes will almost certainly be looking to their sophisticated Danish relatives to guide them through the corridors of Brussels. Denmark has an impressive reputation for independence within the EU ï and managed to get exceptions for themselves in connection with the Masterrich treaty that other countries could only wish for.

But the Scandinavian welfare state is something all Nordic countries share and are rightly proud of.

Norwegians are scared stiff of Europe ï particularly because they believe that their welfare state will fall apart inside the European Union. I believe, this is totally irrational, but the majority of my fellow Norwegian disagreed with me, and voted me out of the European Union to my dismay ï as they did in 1972.

I believe Europe is too late for Norway now. I envisage us as an exotic natural park left isolated, yet still visited every summer by curious Europeans well into the next century.
The Welfare State:
What is the welfare state? The concept derives from the Socialist movement and its emphasis is on caring for everybody from cradle to grave, thus ensuring a reasonable living standard for everybody. First of all it has to be said that this ideal has little meaning except as a slogan as it indeed was for Norway’s Labour party after World War II. Even more important, is that the concept was used similarly by Socialist governments both in other Scandinavian countries and in Britain and in many other countries to solve the massive social problems arising from the war.

Scandinavian countries have since then been looked upon as ideals and models as they reached a standard hardly imaginable in other countries for three simple reasons namely and this is important:

1. **Size of population**
   That there are so few of us to take care of only between 4 and 8 million in Scandinavian countries or to use a relevant comparison Norway’s population is smaller than that of Long Island, New York and Sweden smaller than that of London.

2. **Homogeneous social structure**
   Secondly, the peoples in Scandinavia are extremely homogeneous not only ethnically and culturally, but also socially and economically. Not until the 70s have majority of Norwegians discovered that it is possible to see and even talk to Blacks and Asians etc. The big influx of people from third World countries since then has left Norwegians numb stricken as they have suddenly realized that people not only look different but are different as well.

The welfare state was at its peak in the 70s when incredible revenues from the booming oil business turned Norway into one of the richest countries in the world. No wonder the welfare state turned Norway into a Paradise on earth as Norwegians had been equal already for generations up to then. Also in comparison with the rest of Scandinavia Norway had had no nobility to create very big social and economic divisions.
between people as they had in Sweden and Denmark even. Norwegians have always been a tribe of fishermen and poor farmers who were colonized by both Swedes and Danes. Sweden was in fact a European superpower while it occupied Poland.

But this has created something good as well in Norway, as for instance a stubborn resistance against social and economic distinctions, and a renowned scepticism of people who try to work themselves upward in society. This stems from belief in two sets of laws that both work to make us equal.

A Norwegian author sums this up in an ingenious way in what he calls The Jante Law. These laws reflect Sandemose’s Danish background and his sarcasm about local Norwegian mentality. Norwegians have never accepted people who stick their necks out. Danes are very different.

Who knows, maybe this social inhibition and tendency to put each other back in place to where they belong has been more efficient in creating equality and welfare for all in Norway than all socialist propaganda since WWII put together.

My point in saying this is actually that the Norwegian welfare state is not a very impressive achievement compared with Sweden’s and Denmark’s, not to say Britain’s, where the class structures historically have been vastly different and with very strong class differences.

In Norway, however, broadly speaking, people have always been fairly equal (“Some were more equal than others” to quote Orwell) in spite of regional differences that were considerable much bigger than in Sweden and Denmark. But these regional differences were more of life style than living standards. You have seen for yourself when visiting the Volk Museum and think of class differences then and compare with other European countries.
If there is a welfare state in Norway, how does that compare with other countries today and what is the meaning of welfare? The World Health Organization has made a definition of health that also Norway has adopted officially.

A state of perfect physical, mental and social wellbeing, and not only lack of illness and physical defects.

By accepting that definition as an official one, there is no welfare state in Norway today as we do indeed have problems that are rather serious and unsolved. Rather than stating the obvious namely that Norwegians are fairly well off that they are well educated that they have nice houses and that regional differences in living standards are fairly small (with the exception of people in the very north), I want to throw light on some of the problems in our welfare state at present:

It may come as a surprise to you, but government spending on health per person here is among the lowest in Europe and much lower than in the US: How does that make sense in a mixed economy where the state sector is roughly 39 % of the GNP?

We have a serious problem of how to fund our welfare state in the future for many reasons:

1. First of all the age structure is such that fewer and fewer people can pay for a rocketing number of people who are senior citizens or pensioners. Year 2000 saw 800,000 above 67 years of age.

2. Secondly, our oil revenues are exposed to price fluctuations that sometimes have removed in a dramatic way incomes that we more or less have taken for granted. In the early 80ties state tax revenues on oil equaled those on tax incomes and interest on state banks put together. (Marginal tax 66 %, average income is 200,000 N kr and 40 % in tax)
As oil incomes increased, luxury taxation, investment in education, high tech and readjustment of traditional industries have suffered from increasing lack of funding.

3. State subsidies too costly
Foreigners coming to Norway refuse to believe that farmers and fishermen can survive in the remote districts in Norway. Fact is they don’t without heavy subsidies from the state. If it wasn’t for that, the most remote districts of Norway would have been depopulated long ago. Some statistics prove important points and they indicate that Norway should not have been fit for human settlements at all. Only 4% of the land mass is agricultural land. We are only in average of 12 persons per sq km compared to 225 in the UK and 273 in Netherlands and 90 in France whereas there are only 1,6 persons per sq km in the very north.

Welfare has been so far to allow people to live at a tremendous cost simply because we have regarded it as a human right to live in tiny communities where one chooses. Imagine in Norway there are 43% of the population who live in communities of 4000 persons or less.

In spite of these problems we are catered for by a state system that reaches out to the remotest island for better or for worse. It may be good when you need unemployment benefits but it may be a pain when you try to build a summer cabin on the waterfront and you trust that local officials will never find out and then they do and you have to remove the cabin for the benefit of general welfare of the public who has the right of free access to beaches and coastline because that is good for their general welfare.

Health care problems
Usually pretty good hospitals are spread throughout the country and they are mostly owned by county or state. Primary health care is
very decentralized and efficient in most regions. Presently, however, this decentralised structure is severely threatened.

If you have an accident at work, you may have sick pay up to two years which almost equals normal pay. However, after that it falls sharply if you are not back to work. You may, however, apply for disability pension which is fairly good, but if you don’t qualify, you have to apply for social help.

The average Norwegian gross income in 2004 was about 200,000 N kr. An unemployed person on welfare with 3 children has 250,000 N kr at his disposal, and this shows that the motivation for work is not always high with this level of welfare benefit.

Costs at hospitals are covered by the state, also most fees for consultations of prescriptions for medicines are subsidized outside hospitals. There is a growing concern though, that private health care has taken over some functions that are poorly and slowly served by the state. Heart operations and hip operations are often hard to provide and competition from private hospitals is being felt more and more.

**Public poverty- and private abundance.**

Municipalities are in financial trouble some have even declared themselves bankrupt before the government in 2005 provided them with extra resources. Especially in rural areas health services are poorer, and the government has for years commanded doctors to serve a certain time in districts where health care is poor. This has met with strong protests from doctors who look upon this as deportation and breach of basic human rights. There is a waiting list of 200,000 patients waiting for treatment in hospitals, in spite of the state guarantee of a maximum of 6 months waiting for patients.

Another problem is the sharp rise in number of elderly people in Norway. Hospitals are filled up with 40% of elderly patients who are not given ample care in open health institutions or in their own homes. Old people prefer to live in their homes, but local municipalities cannot provide enough of home care and send
people off to old age homes where they don’t like to be. In 1984, there was the famous rebellion of the “grey panthers” which resulted in an extra grant of 1 billion N kr from the government, who really panicked because of the aggressive reactions among senior citizens.

Health care in the homes is run by the government and the county, but is not sufficiently developed for everybody. An additional problem is that handicapped youths often find themselves treated in old age homes as treatment for them is too scarce. This violates human rights of handicapped.

**Mental health**
This has undergone dramatic changes of decentralisation and stronger emphasis on open care in the villages and towns rather than in hospital institutions during the last 20 years or so. The ratio staff patient here is 3:1 which is rather good compared to other countries. In hospitals the staff patient ration is 2:1, which is more like in other countries. The open care of mental patients has caused strong reactions on the part of the public who are afraid of dangerous patients being treated in open care. There has admittedly been some cases of killings that have proven them right. On the other hand, this model has also proved successful and serves as a model of success in other countries.

**Alcoholism**
This problem has increased as a result of general improvement in living standards. Here is statistics that compare alcohol consumption in 1987 and 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beer (litres)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirits</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Still there are 150-200,000 alcoholics in a population of 4 million. Drinking habits are very peculiar around heavy binge drinking at weekends. 80% of crime is alcohol and drug related. Suicide rates that used to be the lowest in the world have increased in Norway, particularly among the young. It is now up to the ‘normal’ rates of Sweden and Denmark.

**Child care**
Norway has one of the most generous systems of maternity leave in the world. Parents have a total for 52 weeks full pay during maternity (paternity) leave, and men have to take a minimum of 8 weeks off, or the couple loses their rights. A fully employed woman who bears a child receives a total average of N kr 200,000 in birth support, which has resulted in Norway having one of the highest birth rates in the whole of Europe. Contrary to popular belief, however, Italy has one of the lowest in Europe.

Abortion has been free since 1975, in connection with the aggressive women’s rights movement who stages several changes in legislation. Recently, however, some ministers in state churches have staged an aggressive illegal campaign against women who rightfully take abortion. This reactionary campaign, has met with severe reactions on the part of the government, who has sacked ministers engaged in these campaigns. Due to efficient birth control and family planning, there is a low occurrence of abortion among young women, contrary to the case in Britain and the US. Child support from the government is given up to the age of 18.

**Social care**
Contrary to what people believe, Norway has the highest retiring age in Europe, 70 years. The latest problem now is that because of little or virtually no unemployment, the government is trying to convince people to stay on in working life longer. There is a strong demand of senior citizens in industry and education, and fewer people opt for early retirement at 62, which gives them reasonably
good pensions. The government is now changing rules to make it less profitable to retire early.

This is a sign that the Norwegian welfare state is in need of better financing. In the year 2000, we had 800,000 pensioners, which represent a huge cost for the national government. In the next century, there will be only two working Norwegians for every pensioner, whereas there used to be four in the last century. This is a sign of exploding costs that might erode the quality of the Norwegian welfare state if it was not for our pension fund, and our extremely fortunate position in the world as one of the richest nations on the globe.

Fact is, the Norwegian government makes money on the international stock market by investing its pension fund that already today is worth 200 billion N kr. This is roughly 400,000 N kr per every Norwegian. This fund will triple in three years, when all Norwegians will have 640,000 N kr on their bank accounts. A moderate estimate indicates that in 2017, all Norwegians will have one million N kr on their bank accounts. No reason to worry about financing old age in this country.

If any nation can be rightfully named “God’s chosen people” in terms of their fortunes and privileges - it must be Norway.

By way of conclusion, the question needs to be repeated:

Is this national fortune due to our tendency see Norway as a moralist country that has rightfully deserved its wealth, because Norwegians do everything the “best way”?

Or is it a historical “accident” or “coincidence” totally removed from anything Norwegians have done, and rather a result of historically fortunate geographical, geopolitical and cultural locations?
Readers’ comments:

Dear Ernst,

I have read your lecture and I find it very interesting. You create a structure to explain the behaviour and mindset of Norwegians and their (your) way of living compared to others. It doesn’t in any way interfere with my own opinion but it gives me a wider perspective of explanations. However, I especially respect and admire (as a Swede and as you write) the (winter) sport results performed by Norwegian athletics. This because of the tremendous outcome in every winter World Cup or Olympic winter games. Norway is really a super power when it comes to this. I often wonder why. What makes this come true? It’s also the same in almost all kind of winter sports with a few exceptions. The results are quite good in many other sports as well but they are significant outstanding in winter sports compared to the population. I can also imagine this as factor which strengthen the opinion of being "God’s chosen people". It would be interesting to understand why citizens in a wealthy country as Norway want to expose themselves to such tough training even though the outcome so far has been excellent.

The comparison on page 30 is missing the figures for 2007.

I will send you the paper (from the interview) today.

Regards
Lars Larsson
Executive Recruitment Manager

Accredited Associate of the
Institute for Independent Business

Mobile phone: +46 (0)70 239 98 19

Kjaere Ernst Aage,

foredraget er faanstastisk! Jeg ble saa imponert... jeg har laert en del fra den selv.

Skal vise det til Einar Vannebo (ISS-sjef) og til folk i Polen.

Wojtek

PS. Petimeter som jeg er, og bokforfatter med 4 boeker bak meg, har jeg ikke motstaaet fristelsen og rettet paa et par ting - hovedsakelig det med bindestrek brukt istedenfor tankestrek, apostrofe osv. Og paa side 3-4 mente du vel ikke "price" men "prize"? som i "Nobel Prize"? (Det evige norske problemet med stemte frikativer...). Vedlagt.