Exam 5th of December Autumn 2014

The Norwegian Society SOS2501 in general:
This is a one semester 15 points course. The students are mainly exchange students from foreign universities visiting Norway for a shorter period of time. They have had several lecturers during this course and the curriculum covers a wide field (both sociology and political science with a focus on Norway). During the course each student has written two papers (with the potion between topics from political science and sociology). The students are to answer to their best ability with the readings and lectures in mind.

Define 6 out of 8 terms (Counts 50% of the exam)
The students are expected to write maximum half a page.

Political cleavages:
The idea of the model is that individuals' behaviour is decided by the participation in different social categories. Either social classes, cultural or regional community. Each cleavage reflect a social base or conflict dimension with a collective identity. The exact cleavages varies from country to country, but in Norway these cleavages can be divided into territorial-cultural and economic-functional dimensions. Such cleavages may then give rise to political parties, and in so doing, be a major contributor to the party system found in any given country. Rokkan used the idea of political cleavages to explain Norway’s party system among others. The student should be able to mention the seven cleavages Rokkan and Valen used to explain the structuring of the party system and the alignment of the electorate in Norway:
Center (cities) vs. Periphery & districts, part of the territorial dimension.
Linguistic cleavage of Riksmål vs. New Norwegian
Moral cleavage of alcohol control vs. non-control – cultural dimension.
Religion: active church vs. secularization - cultural dimension.
Urban and rural conflict of producers vs. Consumers - part of the economic-functional dimension.
Rural class-struggle of smallholders vs. farmers controlling the land - part of the economic-functional dimension.
Industrial class struggle of owners/employers vs. Workers - part of the economic-functional dimension.

Integration:
In the social science literature the concept refers to the maintenance of a distinctive cultural identity while simultaneously participating as equals in greater society. Integration has been the goals of
successive Norwegian governments, but is not easy to achieve. If the student can give a distinction between integration, assimilation and segregation, this should give a full score.

The resource curse:

In the reading by Mehlum et al. also called the curse of institutions. Natural resources have in many cases been a curse rather than a blessing, as the economic performance of the resource rich countries have struggled to handle this. In countries with good institutions, such as good protection of property rights and little corruption, natural resources seem to contribute to growth. Where this is not the case, where there are dysfunctional institutions, more natural resources may stimulate predation, rent-seeking and other destructive or non-productive activities, in turn creating negative externalities for the rest of the economy. If the students are able to mention specific reasons for how Norway avoided the resource curse, they should be awarded: early industrialization with a long and stable democratic rule, and a late oil discovery.

The Sami Assembly:

The assembly first gathered in 1989. It does not have a lot of power, but its symbolic and political meaning is of great importance, especially when one considers the bad treatment of the Sami people and other ethnic groups by the Norwegian state. There are 39 representatives in the Assembly, and it is led by a board and a president elected by the assembly. The assembly does not have the power to make any decisions binding Norwegian citizens or authorities, it can only advice matters it considers relevant to the Sami population. The election of the of the assembly takes place jointly with parliamentary elections, and the voters must be registered in a Sami census compiled on a self-reported ethnic basis. If the student can mention debates/struggles that contributed to raising the “Sami question” and therefore initiating the Sami assembly, should be awarded.

The Norwegian Constitution:

The Constitution plays little role in real day-to-day politics. This has several reasons: first, the introduction of enabling acts has delegated much discretionary power over the economy to the government and the central bureaucracy, and secondly, the Norwegian system of corporatism has developed by itself without any constitutional change. Because of a Norwegian tradition of "constitutional conservatism" there has been made few efforts to revise The Constitution so that it reflects the current practices. However, The Constitution contains some “hard elements”, which include basic human rights, such as that new laws cannot be applied to past events, public expropriation of private property must be compensated, freedom of expression, etc. A main point about these hard elements is that they cannot be changed by a mere majority in parliament, but only after a special procedure requiring 2/3 of the vote. This point reflects well the principle of division of power between generations: i.e., the principle that the parliament which founded the constitution is allowed to guide later parliaments

The Labor Party (Ap):

The Labor Party, Arbeiderpartiet, was founded by the trade unions in 1887, and did not get a breakthrough until 1903 -- but grew after the introduction of universal male suffrage in 1898, and after the introduction of proportional representation. Today a mildly left-of-centre party and has been the largest political party in Norway since 1927. With the reformist course in the 1950s and 1960s the party built the welfare state of Norway. The EU-question split the party's leaders and members..The
party spent 37 years in office after 1945, and historically the longest sitting coalition government in Norwegian history. If the student can say which cleavage this party erupted from (Industrial class struggle of owners vs. workers), this gives a full score.

**NATO:**

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Here we are looking particularly for Norway’s role. NATO was founded in 1949, with Norway as one of the founding members. The core of NATO is article 5 of the North Atlantic treaty, requiring member states to come to the aid of any member state subject to an armed attack. The standard explanations for this foreign policy of Norway were geography and geopolitics: Norway’s coastline, and the distance to the other major political centers of Europe. It also served as a huge advantage during the Cold War and the close proximity to military buildup in the Soviet. The United States and the United Kingdom considered Norway’s membership loyal. While the Norway itself considered it as a “reluctant ally”. This was mainly because Norway refused to let nuclear arms be place on Norwegian soil in peacetime. This was to avoid giving offense to the Soviet Union. Other points should be awarded.

**The Nordic Healthcare systems:**

The Nordic healthcare model builds on two main principles: universality and participation. The principle of universality means that all inhabitants shall have the same access to public health services regardless of age, gender, social status or geographic location. Geographical equity is a concern due to the number of low-density rural areas in the Nordic countries, while social equity reflects the long history of social democratic thinking. The second important health policy goal in the Nordic countries is public participation. A key important aspect of participation is the institutionalisation of arenas for democratic decision-making at local, regional, and national levels. The Nordic countries belong to the family of tax-funded integrated single-payer hospital systems, with publicly owned hospitals (state, county or municipalities). The strong emphasis on political governance through locally elected political bodies distinguishes the Nordic countries from the more centralised tax-based system of the UK. Although differences exist between the Nordic countries with respect to the structural and institutional layout, the similarities are of a magnitude that makes it possible to talk about a distinct Nordic model of health care. Thus, we can summarize the Nordic model of health care as characterised by:

- Funding predominantly by taxes
- Decentralized public governance structure (except Norway from 2002)
- Elected local governments that can tax
- Public ownership (or control) of delivery structure
- Equity driven – with focus on geographical and social equity
- Public participation

Choose one of the following three essays questions:

(Counts 50% of the exam)

1. **Norway as a sport nation:** Outline some characteristics of Norway as a sport nation (the participation pattern in physical activity and sports and the ideal types of sports) and discuss
some potentials and challenges related to the Norwegian sport model to fulfill the aim of ‘sport for all’.

1) Some central characteristics of Norway as a sport nation: (see lecture)
   a) the best sport nation in the world relative to the population (Olympic medals, wc, wc)
   b) has one umbrella organization for all voluntary organized sport (the NIF).
      This organization receive directly and indirectly most of the state support (from lottery money) to sporting activities in Norway
   c) The Norwegian population do more sport and exercise than ever before (ca 80% exercise one time a week or more, but the everyday physical activities have, however, during the last fifty years decreased
   d) Outdoor self-organized activities like walking, hiking and ski trips are the most common practiced activities among the Norwegians. Only 9 % of the population play football, and among these mostly children and youth

2) Ideal types of sports (Skille 2007) 1) self-organized sport, 2) Organized sport, 3) commercialized sport. Here it is essential to describe the participation patterns within these different ideal types of sport.
   A discussion of the Norwegian Model demands a description of the organization model. The discussion should highlight the underlying tension in the model between elite sport (voiced by the sport federations) and sport for all (voiced by the regional federations) and further a discussions of the myths regarding the ideological statement within NIF, that elite sport creates sport for all and vice versa (Helle-Valle, 2008).

2. Different approaches in culture & political culture: Using studies of resources and opportunity structures for explaining why some succeed and others do not is not enough to explain different approaches in culture. Norms, values and discourses have to be used as well, and symbols and meanings from movements can also be helpful to understand collective actions.
   So; why do some movements succeed and others do not? This a major focus in sociology and political science.
   Keeping the article on Commercial Whaling in mind, discuss how international anti-whaling movements and Norwegian environmental organizations have different approaches. Explain how they differ in results regarding framing their issues towards public opinion and resource-management/government in the international community, and towards nations that still do whaling and those who fight against it.

The student might start by reviewing the issue at hand, although the question as written does not require this.

The International Whaling Commission (IWC) adopted the moratorium on commercial whaling in 1982, which went into effect in 1986. This was styled as a moratorium rather than an outright ban, and seemed to leave open the possibility that whaling might resume once scientific evidence might support such a move had been collected and analyzed. At the time, Norway had a relatively small whaling industry at that time (1982 – it was fairly small scale). Norway along with some USSR, Japan, and Peru voted against the moratorium, and official objected to it. Scientific and aboriginal whaling was not affected by the moratorium. In 1993 Norway resumed commercial whaling after having voluntarily suspended commercial whaling in 1987. (Norway carried out research whaling during this interval). It was the only country that could openly do so without violating international law.
The article by Bailey (2009) compared Anglo-American and Norwegian organizations suing the concept of framing. A frame has 4 tasks: to provide a diagnosis of the problem, to offer a prognosis, provides an us-them dichotomy, and provides motivation, at “call to arms”. The student might discuss the positions of the various organizations using that approach.

The student should recognize that key members of Norway’s environmental movement support Norwegian whaling; Norwegian commercial has been opposed by a broad array of organizations, many of which were based in the US and the UK. The Bailey article focused on these (i.e, the US & UK groups) and discussed them with respect to framing. US/UK organizations linked to the broad pro-moratorium coalition do frame the issue differently than do Norwegian environmental organizations. Culture has much to say: animal-centric organizations were always a part of the pro-moratorium movement in the US & the UK. However, framing by the different groups also reflected their origins in different democratic political systems (political culture). Bailey used the work by Lijphart which distinguishes between the “Westminister” (often “pluralist”) versus the “majoritarian” (often with corporatist features) systems that produce “adversarial” versus “consensual” political cultures. As a part of the cluster of values associated with each, views of the state differ, with the Westminster-adversarial cluster holding the state at a distance and the majoritarian-consensual cluster much more receptive to a closer relationship with the state. These two broad differences made it difficult for the groups of Anglo-American origin to appeal to Norwegian environmental groups (or to the broad public). The US-UK are considered examples of adversarial culture; Norway of the consensual political cultures.

Here are examples of the clash in culture and political culture:

views on animals differed, an important point because the pro-moratorium coalition contained many animal groups and made arguments based on the characteristics of whales.

Anglo-American orgs viewed whalers (and Norway) with suspicion, in part linked to state involvement – also Norwegian science was suspect for the same reason

Funding sources fueled suspicion, with Norwegians more suspicious of organization that solicited funding via public campaigns and Americans more suspicious of organizations that receive money from the state (as a broad rule, there were exceptions)

Norwegians viewed US organizations as anti-democratic, rather than as a legitimate lobby groups; they highlighted their own democratic credentials (point here is that organizations are organized differently in the two systems, and have different characteristics);

The two groups differed in the degree to which they thought the international regulation of whaling was really possible

The pro-moratorium groups (or antiwhaling) were much more inclined to use tactics and strategy that groups that were a product of a more consensual culture would find offensive (such as going outside the IWC, forcing the decision, using extra-legal means, etc.).

3. Foreign Policy: Define foreign policy and explain how Foreign Policy Analysis may shed light on foreign policy phenomena. Illustrate with examples.

Watch out for intellectual life that revolves around the following essentials:

Watch out for intellectual life that revolves around the following essentials:

In lecture and curriculum foreign policy has been defined as “the externally-directed and purpose-oriented enterprise of the territorial state, where strategies are chosen and instruments are applied in the light of the state's collective self-understanding, foreign policy goals, capabilities, and the specific challenge that face the state in question.”

Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) is a framework of analysis, a model, and a broad-ranging menu of both complementary and competing frameworks of interpretation (approaches, theories) that allow
decision-makers, observers, students and knowledge producers to think systematically, and with precision and coherence on foreign and security policy phenomena. More precisely, FPA “is the study of the process, effects, causes or outputs of foreign policy decision-making in either a comparative or case-specific manner” (Foreign Policy Analysis 2013).

If this definition gives the impression that FPA is about studying and tracing foreign policy decision-making and implementing processes, this is correct and one of two main characteristics of FPA (process-tracing case-study).

The other main attribute of FPA is the multi-level approach to explain a state's (i) space for manoeuvre, (ii) preferences (goals), (iii) choice of policy-instruments (means) and (iv) actual behaviour towards the global environment and other states in particular. Note that (i) through (iv) are the links in the decision-making and implementing chain that is the process under study.

Four levels of analysis/explanation are identified. A state’s foreign policy may be explained by a mix of influences related to attributes of (a) the state governmental apparatus; (b) decision-makers; (c) the society from which the state emanates; and (d) the global environment towards which the state's foreign policy is directed.

The latter (d), are labelled “outside-in”-explanations; and (e) “inside-out”-explanations. (a) and (b) relates to foreign policy decision-making body itself which job it is to work out what political space for manoeuvre is available subsequent to the influence of global and external environments, and how this space is to be utilize in the best interest of the country.

Possible example: Explain US foreign policy towards ISIL. How has the mix of US threat perception, US Middle East interests, and domestic politics put their mark on the policy? And how may institutional inertia in the US foreign policy decision-making apparatus form the policy?