

Archived Content

Information identified as archived on the Web is for reference, research or record-keeping purposes. It has not been altered or updated after the date of archiving. Web pages that are archived on the Web are not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards.

As per the [Communications Policy of the Government of Canada](#), you can request alternate formats on the "[Contact Us](#)" page.

Information archivée dans le Web

Information archivée dans le Web à des fins de consultation, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Cette dernière n'a aucunement été modifiée ni mise à jour depuis sa date de mise en archive. Les pages archivées dans le Web ne sont pas assujetties aux normes qui s'appliquent aux sites Web du gouvernement du Canada.

Conformément à la [Politique de communication du gouvernement du Canada](#), vous pouvez demander de recevoir cette information dans tout autre format de rechange à la page « [Contactez-nous](#) ».

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE / COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
CSC 30 / CCEM 30

MDS RESEARCH PROJECT / PROJET DE RECHERCHE DE LA MED

NORWAY IN NATO

“A CONTRIBUTOR OR JUST A RECIPIENT COUNTRY”

By / par Maj Roy Tvetter – Royal Norwegian Air Force

This paper was written by a student attending the Canadian Forces College in fulfilment of one of the requirements of the Course of Studies. The paper is a scholastic document, and thus contains facts and opinions which the author alone considered appropriate and correct for the subject. It does not necessarily reflect the policy or the opinion of any agency, including the Government of Canada and the Canadian Department of National Defence. This paper may not be released, quoted or copied except with the express permission of the Canadian Department of National Defence.

La présente étude a été rédigée par un stagiaire du Collège des Forces canadiennes pour satisfaire à l'une des exigences du cours. L'étude est un document qui se rapporte au cours et contient donc des faits et des opinions que seul l'auteur considère appropriés et convenables au sujet. Elle ne reflète pas nécessairement la politique ou l'opinion d'un organisme quelconque, y compris le gouvernement du Canada et le ministère de la Défense nationale du Canada. Il est défendu de diffuser, de citer ou de reproduire cette étude sans la permission expresse du ministère de la Défense nationale.

Abstract

Norway joined NATO in 1949 to receive guarantees of reinforcements in case of a conflict, and to procure military equipment at favourable terms. The policy of non-alignment failed to keep the country out of the Second World War, and when a possible Nordic Alliance could not fulfill Norway's requirements for security measures, it turned towards the only country capable of providing them: the US, the lead member of the NATO Alliance.

For the first fifteen years of being a NATO member, Norway received approximately CAD 10 billion in military aid from the US. The country also received NATO infrastructure funds to rebuild parts of its military infrastructure throughout the country. In return, Norway provided the US and NATO with intelligence information and early warning of Russian forces in the high north.

Prior to the Second World War, the very rugged topography of Norway was of great importance to the country in ensuring unrestricted access to Sea Lines of Communication and its natural resources in the oceans surrounding Norway. During the Second World War, Germany invaded Norway to gain unrestricted access to the SLOC of the allied countries. Russia also considered the physical features and the geographic location of Norway to be of significant military importance. It was not until the mid 70's that the rest of the Alliance realised the importance of the strategic location of Norway. However, with the deterioration of the Soviet Union in the 90's the importance of Norway's location to the NATO Alliance diminished.

The decline in Norway's defence budgets in the 90's has forced the country to reduce and transform its defence forces in order to provide NATO with combat-

capable niche forces. By doing this, Norway will help contain security threats where they originate, and this will help reduce the danger to Norway's sovereignty.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	5
Presentation	5
Outline	9
NORWAY PRIOR TO NATO	10
Pre Second World War.....	10
The Second World War	11
The road to NATO	12
Conclusion.....	17
NORWAY AND THE COLD WAR.....	19
Military assistance	19
Norwegian contribution.....	25
Conclusion.....	31
NORWAY POST COLD WAR.....	32
The Gulf conflict 1991 (Desert Shield/Desert Storm).....	33
The Kosovo conflict (Allied Force) 1999.....	34
Afghanistan (Operation Enduring Freedom) 2001	35
The Gulf conflict 2003	36
Conclusion.....	36
NORWEGIAN TRANSITION TO TRANSFORMATION	38
Norwegian Air Force at present.....	38
Doctrine	43
Technology	46
CONCLUSION.....	50
Bibliography.....	55

INTRODUCTION

Explore your strong capabilities and focus on these. This is how you can play with the big boys, even if you are small.

Ms. Kristin Krohn Devold, Minister of Defence, Norway¹

Presentation

Norway has a long and rugged coastline, which has provided the country with reliable SLOC (Sea Lines of Communication). The country has always viewed its SLOC, coastline, offshore resources, and its economic prosperity to be of vital importance in the shaping of its foreign and defence policy.² The fact that Norway has 196 kilometres of common border with Russia has at times influenced the shaping of the country's foreign and defence policy. This policy and its geography have and will always play an important part when the country chooses friends and Allies. Its neighbouring countries and Allies have had a strategic view of the country that has changed with time and changing military threats. The Norwegian strategic view is more stable since natural resources are the basis for economic prosperity and the military threat to a country will always change over time.

Throughout the years, several countries have made attempts to gain control of parts or the whole Norwegian coastline. Most of these attempts have been made to gain a military advantage in the region. Germany made the last successful attempt during the Second World War (the Second World War), when it invaded Norway and gained unrestricted access to the North Atlantic Ocean, and the

¹ Erling Svela, International Press Commends the Norwegian Armed Forces, Forsvarets Forum, no 17, September 2003, 9

² The size of the Norwegian Economic Zone, the Fishery Zone surrounding Jan Mayen and the Fishery Protection Zone surrounding Svalbard consist of 2.2 million square kilometres of ocean or seven times the size of the Norwegian mainland.

capability to interdict the Allied SLOC with its Navy and Air Force. Towards the end of the Second World War, the Soviets unsuccessfully proposed split sovereignty over Svalbard, and after the war they proposed that they be allowed to take control of Bear Island. Arguably, the reasons for these proposals were founded on the American strategic long-range bomber capability that had emerged during the war.

The communist threat after the Second World War made it clear that Norway could not remain non-aligned. It left the country with no option but to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949. This membership, together with Norway's strong historic transatlantic ties with the UK and the US, played an important part in shaping the country's foreign policy, rebuilding its society, improving economic growth, and the development of its military forces after the war.

Most countries in Europe were struggling to rebuild their societies after the war; such was the case with Norway. Economic and military aids were necessary to keep the country focused towards the west; the alternative was to have a neutral Nordic Alliance with limited capability to rebuild. This was not enough for Norway, who in addition wanted guarantees of reinforcements in case of war. The only countries that could provide such guarantees were the US and the other members of NATO.

The aid Norway received during the first twenty years as a NATO member improved the military structure and also raised the standard of living. For the first twenty years after NATO was formed, this aid consisted of substantial amounts of military equipment as well as financial aid. From 1970 onwards, aid was confined to infrastructure items. Due to the nature of the aid it is difficult to show in dollars

how much was received. However, this paper will show that until the late 1980's Norway received more than it contributed to NATO.

The aid received was much needed since the war had drained the country of its resources. Norway, with its mountains and fjords is a difficult country to defend. The country only has 4.5 million inhabitants, with half the population in the central eastern part and only half a million in the northern part of the country. The coastline with its great array of long fjords measures thousands of kilometres. Not only does this provide unrestricted access to SLOC, but it also provides great potential for the use of Sea Power. Despite the drastic change in the security situation in the world during the last few years, and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the coastline remains important because of SLOC, the oil, the gas, and the fish industry.

Because of its small population that is sparsely distributed in the rugged areas, Norway has based its national defence plans on conscription and the total defence concept. If the country is attacked, total mobilization will occur, and the armed forces will have complete access to all resources available in the country. Conscription provides the general population with a broad knowledge of its military. Approximately 70% of the population supports Norway's participation in NATO.³ Also most Norwegians were satisfied when Norway became a member of the United Nations (UN).

Since the formation of the UN in 1945, Norway has used the organisation actively to promote its values of democracy, peace, human rights and confidence

³ MOD, Norwegian Defence Facts and Figures, (Oslo: The Royal Norwegian Ministry of Defence, 2003), 64.

building among the superpowers. It has had observers and peacekeeping forces engaged in different countries continuously since the foundation of UN. More than 55,000 Norwegians have taken part in more than 30 international operations around the world since 1947.⁴ The organization became a vehicle for the government to promote Norwegian values internationally. More importantly, however, NATO was the organization to ensure collective defence and military reinforcements in case of war. The country's contribution to NATO and the US has mainly consisted of early warning and intelligence collection. However, it was not until the 1991 Gulf War that the country contributed internationally with combat supporting forces, and later with war fighting forces.

A decline in the defence budget for the last twenty years has forced the country to reduce its forces. The country is now decisively transforming its forces to shaped niche capabilities that NATO has identified as a priority requirement. Norway does not possess the luxury of having a multi-purpose force with global reach, and must develop and maintain a highly advanced and credible niche force in order to be viewed as an international contributor. A successful transformation together with a carefully balanced capital equipment programme is crucial for the future success of the Norwegian armed forces as a contributor to NATO. The aid Norway has received from the US and NATO, together with the current military restructuring and modernization programmes, has made her capable of being an important niche contributor to NATO.

⁴ MOD, Norwegian Defence Facts and Figures..., 33.

Outline

US aid to Norway was established during the Second World War, when Norway participated in the “lend-lease” program, and the country was able to lend or lease war equipment at a reasonable rate. At the end of the war, US forces together with other Allies liberated Norway. After the war the US provided large loans to the European countries, including Norway. After Norway joined NATO, the US assisted the country with war materiel over a fifteen-year period, valued at more than CAD 10 billion (1995 value).⁵ For the last thirty years, NATO has financed parts of the country’s infrastructure. As Norway grew stronger the aid programme was gradually reduced.

To effectively explain how Norway has been able to change from being just a receiving country to becoming an important niche contributor to NATO, this paper is divided into four distinct parts. The first part covers the history and background of the country until it became a member of NATO in 1949. The second part shows how the aid received prior to the cold war shaped its defence forces, and how it contributed valuable information to NATO in this time period. The third part covers the cold war and the time between the two Gulf wars. Finally, the paper examines the transformation of the Norwegian Armed Forces to meet national and NATO requirements, with particular emphasis on the role of the Air Force. For the purpose of this paper, aid received from the US and NATO is viewed as one.

⁵ Paul V. Wiker, “*United States Defence Aid to Norway 1949-1953*,” IFS Info 1/1997. (Oslo: Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies, 1997), 3,4.

NORWAY PRIOR TO NATO

Pre Second World War

Norway adopted its first constitution in 1814, while still in double monarchy with Denmark. Napoleon suffered a heavy defeat at the Battle of Leipzig in 1813, and this caused Denmark to cut the links with Napoleon and hand Norway over to Sweden. Sweden was part of the allied force that defeated Napoleon, but it lost Finland to the Czardom (Russia). Sweden viewed Norway as one of the spoils of the war, but had to invade the country to secure a union that lasted to 1905.⁶

Just after its independence in 1905, Norway elected to become a monarchy. In November 1905, the Storting (Parliament) chose the Danish Prince Carl as King of Norway, who took the name Haakon VII.⁷ Prime Minister Christian Michelsen led the first government. Despite being a “new nation” it was easy for the government to apply its new foreign policy. History dating back a thousand years to the Vikings had shown that Norway was a shipping nation, relying on the sea as the lines of communication to enhance fishing and commerce. The British blockades during the Napoleonic war had shown Norway that it was more important to maintain good relations with the west rather than with the rebellious and war fighting-nations in central Europe.⁸

Despite limited resources, the government had to establish a department of foreign affairs in Oslo, as well as a network of embassies and consulates. The guidelines from the government stressed that Norway should remain non-aligned in

⁶ Tor Dagne, “The History of Norway,” *Department of Foreign Affairs*; available from [<http://odin.dep.no/odin/engelsk/norway/history/032005-990454/index-dok000-b-n-a.html>]; Internet accessed 4 Mars 2004.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Olav Riste, *Norwegian Security Policy from Isolationism to Atlantic Integration*, IFS Info 2/1996. (Oslo: Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies, 1996), 4.

peace aimed at neutrality in war. The policy of non-alignment had broad support from the people. The non-alignment policy did not restrict the government from taking an active role in promoting international arbitration agreements.⁹

The policy of staying non-aligned and the fact that there was no land warfare near its borders, kept Norway out of the First World War. Its merchant fleet was significant and suffered heavy losses during the war. 2000 sailors lost their lives as a result of submarine attacks and the use of mines. The war brought significant financial gains to the country; however, the depression struck in 1920 and caused economic hardships to the population. The economic recovery that started in 1932 continued until the outbreak of the Second World War. Despite this economic upswing, the government failed to provide additional funding to strengthen the defence of the country. In 1939, Norway once again proclaimed its neutrality.¹⁰

The Second World War

Notwithstanding Norway's policy of strict non-alignment, Germany invaded the country on 9 April 1940. Despite an active Milorg (resistance movement), the country remained occupied for the duration of the war. When the Germans seized Oslo, the King, the Prime Minister and the members of the Government successfully escaped to England via Sweden. After arriving in England, they quickly established an interim Government that coordinated international and defence issues on behalf of Norway. The King frequently addressed the Milorg and the Norwegian people via radio to help maintain morale and situational awareness. These messages were available to Norwegians residing in other countries as well.

⁹ Tor Dagne, "The History of Norway,"...

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

Thousands of Norwegians were engaged in the effort to defeat the Germans and to restore peace and prosperity. Norway had more than 1000 ships and 38,000 men in the merchant fleet that were loyal to the country. These ships continued to support the war effort throughout the war, and the income was used to finance training at various places in the western hemisphere. Prime Minister Winston Churchill once stated, "The Norwegian merchant navy was worth an army of one million men from 1940 till 1945." Approximately 90,000 Norwegians fought domestically in the resistance forces or Milorg to make the life of German soldiers miserable. In total, approximately 10,000 Norwegian lost their lives during the war. Of these almost 4,800 were in the merchant navy, 1,500 were resistance fighters, 1,350 were in the armed forces and 1,350 were civilians serving abroad. After the war, a total of 90,000 men and women were arrested for collaboration with the Germans; 46,000 of these were eventually convicted for wartime offences.¹¹

The road to NATO

Norway was liberated on 8 May 1945 and its military units soon returned from England. Four air squadrons returned to Norway, and one was split into a fifth squadron. These squadrons were involved in Maritime Air and Defensive Counter Air Operations. Soon after their return a sixth squadron was formed to perform transport missions. This last squadron was responsible for all domestic transport

¹¹ Per Conradi Hansen, "History of The Royal Norwegian Air Force in Canada 1940-1945," (Toronto, Unpublished, 1985), Introductory remarks.

missions, as well as international missions.¹² When the men and their aircraft returned to their homeland after the war, they faced new roles and challenges.

One of the primary aims of the defence policy was to maintain air superiority (Defensive Counter Air) in Norwegian airspace, long enough to receive allied reinforcements.¹³ Other roles were Offensive Counter Air, Maritime Reconnaissance and Surveillance, Support Air Operations, Search and Rescue and International Operations. After the war, it was not only the military that got new roles: Norwegian politicians had learned a lesson in foreign policy when the Germans invaded in 1940, and strict non-alignment policy for Norway was not an option after the war.

The United Nation (UN) was established in 1945 by 50 states. Most of the nations had great hopes for the organization, but it soon became apparent that membership in the UN did not solve many of their national defence problems. The Norwegian government took full advantage of Norway's membership in the UN. They wanted Norway to be viewed as the "bridge builder" between east and west.¹⁴ Arguably, it is more correct to state that Norway stayed neutral in matters concerning the great powers. In the US, Norwegian foreign policy was viewed as follows; "Norway has adopted a foreign policy which may be described as being pro USA and

¹² Marius Fredriksen, "1945 From Airpower to Air Force" *Royal Norwegian Air Force*; available from [<http://www.mil.no/luft/start/omlf/historikk/article.jhtml?articleID=7027>]; Internet accessed 4 Mars 2004.

¹³ Nils Naastad, "The History of the Air Force" *Royal Norwegian Air Force*; available from [<http://www.mil.no/luft/start/omlf/historikk/>]; Internet accessed 4 Mars 2004.

¹⁴ Kjetil Skogrand, "Cash and Cannons; Norway, Denmark and the US Aid Programmes", IFS Info 2/1998. (Oslo: Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies, 1998), 6.

UK to the greatest extent it dares, pro Soviet to the extent it must, and pro UN to the greatest extent it can.”¹⁵

In 1945 there were few indications that the US viewed the northern part of Norway as strategically important, despite the fact that the Germans had established bases there to interdict the Sea Lines of Communications (SLOC) to Murmansk. The US became surprised when the Soviets withdrew their forces out of Norway after they had forced the German forces out of the northern part of Norway following the war. The US was probably willing to let the Soviets get access to ice free harbours out of Kirkenes, and they did not protest when the Soviets proposed split sovereignty between Norway and the Soviet Union over Svalbard, and full Soviet control over Bear Island.¹⁶ The explanation could be:

1. A positive gesture to Stalin, for withdrawing his forces out of northern Norway.
2. The US viewed the area of little strategic interest at that time.
3. The US viewed its bases in Greenland and Iceland as far more important.¹⁷

The Soviet Union withdrew its forces from northern Norway after the war; however, in 1945 it annexed the Baltic States, parts of Finland, North East Germany and parts of the Czech Republic. After the war it used its communistic influence to overthrow the democratic governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Romania,

¹⁵ Wayne S Cole. *Norway and the United States 1905-1955, Two Democracies in Peace and War*, (Iowa State University Press/Ames, 1989), 120-121.

¹⁶ Olav Riste, *Norwegian Security Policy from Isolationism to Atlantic Integration*, 7.

¹⁷ Rolf Tamnes, *The United States and the Cold War in the High North*, (Hants, UK: Dartmouth Publishing Company, 1991), 33-34.

East Germany, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. This overthrowing created fear among many of the western nations.¹⁸

As a result, the US introduced the "containment theory", designed by George Kennan. The theory aimed to prevent the Soviet Union from further expanding its communistic influence. Other aid programmes were introduced by the US to strengthen nations to enable them to better resist communist aggression, like the Marshall Plan and the Truman doctrine. The Marshall Plan was a US post Second World War recovery program designed to provide financial and equipment aid to most European countries, while the Truman doctrine was designed to give aid to all nations that were willing to and demonstrated ability to fight external pressure. Together, these three programs were aimed at avoiding the spread of communism into western European countries. The Soviet Union refused an offer to join the Marshall plan.¹⁹

The European countries tried different programs themselves, and in 1948 France, the United Kingdom and the Benelux countries formed the Western Union. The aim of the organization was to enhance economic, social and cultural cooperation, together with a collective self-defence program. The biggest weakness of the organization was the lack of US support.²⁰ Norway was not invited to join the Western European Union, and this suggested that the central European countries did not view Norway as important. There was also an attempt to form a Nordic Defence Alliance between Denmark, Sweden and Norway. Norway rejected such an Alliance when it became clear that Sweden would not accept US military

¹⁸ The North Atlantic Treaty Organization. *Facts and Figures*, (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1984), 14

¹⁹ Erling Bjøll, *The Duel that does not seem to end*, (Oslo: Grimberg/Cappelen, 1984), 97.

²⁰ Per Riste, *The road to NATO*, (Oslo: Den Norske Atlanterhavskomite, 1984), 4.

aid, and the US would not support a Nordic Alliance that would stay neutral in case of crisis or war. This suggests that it was Norway that was trying to convince the US of the strategic importance of the north and not vice versa.²¹

When the negotiations regarding a Nordic Alliance could not be fulfilled, Norway decided to join NATO in 1949. For Norway it was essential to join NATO to firstly; ensure military guaranties in case of a crisis or war, secondly; ensure reinforcements in case of a crisis and to secure SLOC (Sea Line of Communications), and thirdly; gain access to affordable military equipment.

For Norway it was important to maintain a conciliatory attitude toward the Soviet Union and the strategy was to declare it's base-policy of 1949. This policy denied permanent stationing of allied troops in Norway during peacetime. Later, it was amended to include geographic restrictions on exercises conducted on Norwegian territory. For the Norwegians it was important to indicate a restrictive base-policy towards the Soviet and at the same time explain the possibilities in case of war for the US.²² Norway wanted to pave the way for the country to be a bridge-builder between east and west. Also it wanted to signal that Norway was a peaceful country that did not pose a threat to the Soviet Union, even as a member of NATO. For the US it was important to include Norway in NATO to:

1. Include Norway in its containment policy.
2. Stop the spread of communism.
3. Maintain South Norway as a northern flank to NATO.

²¹ Rolf Tamnes, *The United States and the Cold War in the High North...* 59.

²² Cabinet minister Hauge, From his statement to the Parliament 21 February 1951, Parliament negotiations 1951, part 7, p 286.

The base-policy imposed limitations that the US viewed as sufficient to realize its goals.

Non-alignment proved to be effective for Norway during the First World War, due to the limited geographical spread of the land warfare. However, under the greatly increased land, sea, and air activities of the Second World War, non-alignment could not keep Norway out of the conflict. Germany invaded the country to gain access to its harbours and airfields. These were used extensively to interdict Allied SLOC, both from the air, as well as from the sea. During the last part of the war, the Soviets tried to gain access to harbours at Svalbard and Bear Island. This fact, together with the failed Scandinavian initiative to form an Alliance, forced Norway to join NATO. Membership in the Alliance ensured that Norway would receive reinforcements in case of an emerging crisis, and be able to procure military equipment at a favourable price.

Conclusion

The non-alignment policy Norway adopted after its independence in 1905, proved to be effective until the Second World War. It must be stated that it was the lack of geographic spreading of the First World War that kept the country out of it and not its non-alignment policy. For Norway it has always been of outmost importance to maintain unrestricted access to the SLOC and our trading partners. Free access to the fishing ground surrounding waters was also important. Free trade and fish have always been the basis for wealth and economic prosperity. From a military perspective, the country did not play a vital role at that time. However, it was important to have a good relationship with its British neighbours,

who had a capable, sea-going fleet. History had proved that Central Europe was partly unstable because of all conflicts that originated there. With the invasion of Norway during the Second World War, the Germans proved that the country had gained a new geo-strategic role with its long coastline that provided free access to the North Atlantic Ocean. The Germans exploited this advantage to interdict the SLOC between the US, Europe and the Soviet Union. Towards the end of the war, the Soviets also expressed military interest for the high north. This interest together with a failed Scandinavian initiative, poor British economy, US guarantees of reinforcements in case of war, and the prospects of procuring military equipment at favourable prices, caused Norway to join NATO in 1949. After the war, Norway was suddenly a small power between two superpowers; with a common border to the one threatening its sovereignty. This fact turned out to have great influence on the shaping of its foreign policy for years to come.

NORWAY AND THE COLD WAR

Military assistance

In 1940 Norway was alone when the Germans invaded the country. The country did not possess sufficient military equipment to mount an effective defence posture; such was the case immediately following the war. The country feared that it would be involved in an emerging conflict between two former Allies: the US and the Soviet Union.

Norway agreed to contribute with one brigade to support British forces in Europe. In return, Norway was hoping that the British would agree to provide reinforcements and military equipment at favourable terms when the sovereignty of the country was threatened. In 1947, it was revealed that the British were not able or willing to accept such a proposal due to economic constraints.²³ It became apparent that such guarantees had to come from elsewhere.

The Norwegian foreign policy changed in 1948 from neutrality towards a more western orientation as it became clear that the US was the only country that could provide Norway with the necessary military support. The US had provided Norway with military equipment under the "lend - lease" program during the war. Immediately after the war, several European countries, among them Norway, received US financial loans. The US continued to assist the European countries with the introduction of the Marshall-plan. Notwithstanding the new western orientation

²³ Paul V. Wiker, *United States Defence Aid to Norway 1949-1953*, IFS Info 1/1997. (Oslo: Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies, 1997), 3

in Norway's foreign policy, it took some time before the country agreed to join the plan. One can argue that the Marshall-plan resulted in the establishment of permanent transatlantic ties and it was this that caused Norway to drop its non-alignment policy. Ultimately, Norway became one of the first twelve NATO members when it was created in 1949.²⁴

As a member of NATO, the country was guaranteed military reinforcements if an invasion should occur. The aim of Norway's national defence policy was to build and maintain a force with sufficient strength to resist an invading force for a minimum of two weeks until reinforcements from other NATO countries could arrive.²⁵ There was some uncertainty regarding the time factor, but for Norway the provision of additional military equipment was just as important as reinforcements. The Military Aid Program (MAP) between the US and Norway was signed in 1950, and included material, raw material, machinery, and advisors at no cost for Norway. MAP also required Norway to increase its defence budget considerably. Norway, on the other hand, approved the transfer of raw material and semi-raw material to the US, even after the termination of the Marshall plan.²⁶

The US wanted 50 advisors, belonging to the Military Assistance Advisory Group (MAAG) to help the Norwegians organize and operate the military equipment, because without proper handling the equipment would be rendered useless. The Norwegian government found this number to be too high and argued that it contradicted the "base-policy". They also suggested that 22 military advisers

²⁴ NATO, *NATO Handbook*, (Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 2001), 30.

²⁵ Paul V. Wiker, *The American Military Assistance to Norway 1949-1953...*, 7

²⁶ *Ibid*, 8.

would be easier to sell to the left wing opposition party. A secret deal was made that included 22 military advisers and some extra personnel that of “covert purposes” that belonged to the American Embassy. It soon became apparent that the Norwegian forces were of less quality compared to the other Allied forces, and in the shadow of the war in Korea, the number of personnel attached to MAAG in 1953 was increased to 73 people.²⁷

The Korean War resulted in increased fear of spreading communism, and in two years the Norwegian defence budget more than quadrupled. This was more than any other country in the Alliance. Increasing budgets and US pressure also resulted in organizational reforms and the doubling of the personnel in the forces to 16,000.²⁸

The reorganization of the forces, increasing in size, and large amounts of military equipment, brought expanded capabilities to the country. In the 50’s, Norway received several types of air defence weapons; including fighters and surface to air missiles. The Norwegians turned down several weapon types since they were viewed to be too expensive to operate. The navy received submarines, destroyer escorts and fast patrol boats and the cost was shared equally between the US and Norway. These naval assets were employed in Anti Submarine Warfare, coastal defence, and escort duties. In essence, these capabilities enhanced the ability to defend Norwegian airspace and ensure the SLOC between North and South. The capabilities were further expanded in the 60’s with the introduction of

²⁷ Paul V. Wiker, *The American Military Assistance to Norway 1949-1953...*, 14.

²⁸ *Ibid*, 19.

Offensive Counter Air assets. The Allied exercises activity was also increased to show presence and the resolve of the Alliance in adjacent waters.²⁹

It was also important to strengthen the Hemispheric Defence, and without early warning these forces could not react; not only under and on the ocean, but in the skies as well. In 1953, Norway got its first early warning installation, and in 1956 Norway possessed a chain of coastal radars that was expanded into a chain of early warning radars. The early plans were to extend the Distant Early Warning Line (DEW-Line) from the American continent, all the way to Europe. This turned out to be impossible, and some years later, the Norwegian radars were incorporated into the NATO Air Defence Ground Environment (NADGE). NADGE consisted of a line of early warning radars, similar to the DEW-Line, which stretched from Norway to Turkey.³⁰ Together with a well-established intelligence community, this was the backbone of Norway's early warning capability.

It was not until 1996 that the US weapon aid arrangement, parts of the MAP, was terminated. Most of the equipment delivered was becoming old and obsolete, and it was in both countries interest to terminate the program. All of the equipment delivered to Norway remained the property of the US. Upon termination, Norway bought the rest of the equipment for US \$ 1.8 million. From the beginning of the 50's to the 70's, Norway received in total 7,763 military vehicles, 479 artillery pieces, 171,068 rifles and 624 aircraft and helicopters. In addition to this program, there was the naval aid program, also part of the MAP. In

²⁹ Rolf Tamnes, *The United States and the Cold War in the High North...* 152-153, 203.

³⁰ Rolf Tamnes, *The United States and the Cold War in the High North...* 120, 210.

this program, Norway and the US equally shared the financing of 50 naval vessels.³¹

The table shows the US allocations to Norway during the weapons aid program for the timeframe 1950-1965. The Norwegian Ministry of Defence made a calculation in 1965 that indicated that aid received from the US and Canada by 1962 equalled approximately CAD 8 Billion. In total, the US provided aid equivalent to approximately CAD 10 billion 1995-dollars. All prices are believed to be laid down-cost prices, which are considerably lower than a commercial buy would have been. The table does not cover the naval aid program of 1960 or the NATO infrastructure aid.³² The weapon aid program came to an end in 1967, but because of the delay in the delivery of the equipment, shipments ended in 70-71. All the delivered equipment belonged to the US and as mentioned, it was not until 1996 that the program was officially terminated.³³

Table 1:
Weapon aid to Norway as approved by Congress

<i>Fiscal year</i>	<i>US Aid in mill. 1995-kroner*</i>	<i>NO Defence budget in mill. 1995-kroner*</i>
07.49/06.50	Approx. 393	Approx. 4083
1950/51	Approx. 3451	Approx. 4488
1951/52	Approx. 3654	Approx. 9628
1952/53	Approx. 8668	Approx. 12756
1953/54	Approx. 6839	Approx. 10729
1954/55	Approx. 3282	Approx. 9079
1955/56	Approx. 5751	Approx. 7947
1956/57	Approx. 2765	Approx. 7866
1957/58	Approx. 3469	Approx. 7691
1958/59	Approx. 2348	Approx. 8270

³¹ MOD, Historic end to the US Military Assistance Program, MOD Press release No. 051/96: available from [<http://odin.dep.no/odinarkiv/norsk/dep/fd/1996/pressem/010005-070068/index-dok000-n-n-a.html>]; Internet accessed 11 April 2004.

³² Paul V. Wiker, *United States Defence Aid to Norway 1949-1953...*, 32.

³³ MOD, Historic end to the US Military Assistance Program, MOD Press release No. 051/96

1959/60	Approx. 1989	Approx. 9845
1960/61	Approx. 746	
1961/62	Approx. 1342	
1962/63	Approx. 1205	
1963/64	Approx. 2121	
1964/65	Approx. 1002	
1965/66	?	
1966/67	Total: 49027 = CAD 10Billions	

* One Canadian dollar equals five Norwegian kroner.

The table does not include all the aid the country has received from NATO. NATO's infrastructure program financed the improvements and constructions of its deep-sea harbours throughout the country. Neither does it include the cost of building aircraft shelters, the hardening of vital facilities, underground fuel storages, retractable silo radars and much more.

In addition to all this aid, the US and NATO made several arrangements to reinforce the country's defence forces in case of a crisis. One of these initiatives was the Collocated Operating Bases (COB) Program that was signed in 1974. This program consisted of providing selected airfields with Minimum Essential Facilities (MEF) to allow Allied aircraft to operate from them. MEF included parking space, fuel, ammunition, spares and later hardened shelters. Other agreements were made, like the Norway Air landed Marine Expeditionary Brigade (NAL MEB) in the beginning of the 80's, aimed at reinforcing the land and air forces.³⁴ The Canadian Air Sea Transportable (CAST) Brigade was another example of the planned reinforcement units. This particular Brigade was reassigned in 1989 to the Central-European theatre.³⁵ The last example was the establishment of the Forward

³⁴ Tamnes, *The United States and the Cold War in the High North...* 287.

³⁵ *Ibid*, 288.

Operating Location of NATO Airborne Early Warning installation at Ørland Air Station.

During the cold war, Norway received large amounts of military equipment from the US. The aid was not limited to only equipment, but consisted also of guarantees for reinforcements in case of a crisis. Some facts and figures have been provided; however, some of the figures are estimates and it is difficult to locate exact figures. This is especially true about the investments NATO has funded in Norway. The facts presented should be sufficient to prove that Norway greatly benefited from all the aid it received.

Norwegian contribution

In the first few years after Norway became a member of NATO, its government worked hard to convince the UK and The US how important Norway was from a military/political viewpoint. The UK lacked the financial resources to commit forces to defend North Norway in case of a crisis. The US at the time, did not view North Norway to be of strategic importance; however, there were some friends of Norway in the US that lobbied its case. NATO and the US viewed South Norway to be the northern buffer for the defence of Central Europe. Between the Northern Fleet and the Black Sea Fleet, it was the Baltic Fleet that was regarded as the biggest threat to NATO. At that time, the military installations on the Kola Peninsula were not regarded as a threat to Europe.³⁶

Despite this view, the US decided to contribute to the defence of the northern region. Primarily the US wanted cooperation on areas covering

³⁶ Rolf Tamnes, *The United States and the Cold War in the High North...* 55.

intelligence gathering, information on the Soviet nuclear capability, information on new weapon systems, and early warning in general. It was the US Air Force (USAF) that was most interested in the northern region.³⁷ This suggests that the USAF was developing plans to fly their nuclear-armed long-range bombers across the northern region to reach targets in the Northern part of Russia. The US also believed that Norway had a positive influence on its closest neighbours in the area.³⁸ The Norwegian Ministry of Defence has stated that Norway will share such information with Allies who demonstrate their willingness and ability to reinforce Norway in case of a crisis or war.³⁹ This type of information is special in the nature of gathering, processing, interpretation and dissemination, and close cooperation is of mutual interest.

During the Second World War there was cooperation between the Norwegian Intelligence service, MI6 (UK military intelligence), and OSS (Office of Strategic Services - former CIA). These ties were strengthened after the war; however, the ties with OSS were of a more sporadic nature. In the years after the war, the UK and the US launched several operations with the aim of gathering photographic information of military installations in the Soviet Union. In 1948, Norway conducted photoreconnaissance over Svalbard (demilitarized zone) to confirm or deny Soviet activity on the island group. The US also had plans for Norway to conduct such missions over the Kola Peninsula as well.⁴⁰ In the book "The Secret Norway" (Det Hemmelige Norge), Colonel L. Fletcher Prouty was

³⁷ *Ibid.* 5.

³⁸ *Ibid.* 148.

³⁹ Nils Morten Udgaard, War preparations may be discovered, Aftenposten 21 Sep 79.

⁴⁰ Rolf Tamnes, *The United States and the Cold War in the High North...* 49-52.

referenced, describing a flight with a civilian unmarked aircraft that staged through an unnamed airport in Northern Norway. The flight continued to the Kola Peninsula to covertly drop off CIA personnel who planned to gather intelligence in the region.⁴¹ With the available information it is reasonable to speculate that Norway joined the UK and the US in conducting flights over the Kola Peninsula to gather intelligence information.

In the beginning of the 50's, Norway organized intelligence operations through Finland. Personnel with a distinct anti-communist background were recruited and sent to Finland. Upon arrival Norwegian instructors, who were funded by the CIA, and then inserted into the Soviet Union, trained them. Balloons were released and materiel and equipment were also inserted into the Soviet Union. The aims of the operations were to gather signal, electronic, and human intelligence.⁴² Again, there are strong indications that Norway was involved in intelligence gathering operations in the Northern Region in the years after the Second World War.

Other facilities were also used to collect intelligence in the High North. Norway has always used the oceans for trade and fishing, and the shipping assets are capable of being used for other tasks as well. They are perfect for intelligence collection at sea or in the ports they visit. In 1956, Norway got its own shipping company, Egerfangst that operated the vessel Eger.⁴³ Eger was probably not the first in a series of vessels operated by the Norwegian Intelligence services. Later these vessels were named Marjatta. Eger was equipped by the Americans and was

⁴¹ Christian Christensen, *The Secret Norway*, (Oslo: Forlaget Atheneum, 1983), 195-198

⁴² Christian Christensen, *The Secret Norway*,... 200.

⁴³ Rolf Tamnes, *The United States and the Cold War in the High North*... 120.

used to collect Signal Intelligence (SIGINT) and Communication Intelligence (COMINT) in the Barents Sea. Its main objective was to gather intelligence on radio transmissions and other electromagnetic transmissions. Other vessels were also used to gather intelligence information. Later, these vessels also gathered data when the Soviets conducted missile firing in the Barents Sea. From an intelligence perspective, these vessels were a revolution in the field.⁴⁴ It is fair to suggest that the main reason for Norway's cooperation with the US on these intelligence operations was to strengthen their Trans-Atlantic ties, improve Norway's national defence forces, and to enhance the prospects of gaining access to reasonably priced war material.

The relationship was put to a test in 1960, when a U-2 aircraft was shot down over the Soviet Union. The aircraft was en-route from Pakistan to Bodø Air Station in Northern Norway. During the late 50's, the US Air Force conducted some 15 flights with U-2 out of Bodø.⁴⁵ It has not been confirmed that any of these penetrated Soviet airspace. The fatal flight was a photoreconnaissance flight aimed at taking photos of missile bases, defence installations, and naval facilities. Just after the U-2 incident, a RB-47 was shot down in international waters while on a reconnaissance mission over the Barents Sea. The RB-47 flight was never intended to stage through any Norwegian base.⁴⁶ After both of these incidents the Soviets made formal complaints and warned Norway that there would be military actions against Bodø and other Norwegian airfield used by the Americans conducting spy missions. The answer stated that Norway was being misled by the US, and that

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 121.

⁴⁵ *Ibid*, 132.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 123.

none of these incidents contradicted its base-policy.⁴⁷ Norwegian politicians insisted on a stricter enforcement of the self imposed base-policy towards the US, and most Americans permanently stationed on Norwegian soil were asked to leave the country after they had trained Norwegian personnel to operate their equipment.

After these incidents, the Norwegians remained tense for a long time, but the cooperation between the US and Norway continued. However, the self-imposed base-policy continued to be strictly enforced. The options forwarded to Norway at the end of the 60's, on the possibility of procuring reasonably priced P-3 Orion's and Kobben class submarines, were received with great pleasure. The Royal Norwegian Air Force operated Albatross aircraft; which did not have the desired Anti Submarine Warfare (ASW) Capability that the Alliance needed in the High North. With the procurement of the new aircraft came the agreement to divide the North Atlantic between Norway, Canada, the US and the UK, known as the NORCANUSUK agreement.⁴⁸ Norway became responsible for the northeastern part, or the Barents Sea. It is reasonable to suggest that this agreement gave the Norwegians a better capability to conduct several types of surveillance in the Barents Sea, and to monitor allied movements in the area as well. This was an excellent opportunity for the Norwegian government to demonstrate low-tension policy towards the Soviets. The Government also decided to put both assets under the control of the Commander in Chief North Atlantic (CINCNORTH) in case of war, instead of the

⁴⁷ Jahn Otto Johansen, *Norway, the Soviet Union and the Northern Areas*, DNAK no. 10/88. (Oslo: The Norwegian Atlantic Committee), 11.

⁴⁸ Rolf Tamnes, *The United States and the Cold War in the High North...* 216.

Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR).⁴⁹ This decision could arguably be proof of how important the Norwegians viewed the Trans Atlantic ties.

The introduction of the P-3 Orion was not the only capability that was introduced to enhance the ASW-capability in the High North. In the beginning of the 60's, Norway got its first Sonar Surveillance System (SOSUS), located at Andøya. The system was modernized in 1968 and relocated to the Air Base situated on the island.⁵⁰ The SOSUS system consisted of a long cable on the ocean bottom with hydrophones attached to it, which was laid out pointing northwards. The system was designed to provide early warning and identification of surface and subsurface vessels moving in and out of the Barents Sea. In the 70's, a second system was established on the North tip of Norway. The aim of this second system was to try to monitor Soviet naval movements North East of Norway.⁵¹ The effectiveness of this effort has never been documented.

These assets became an important tool to monitor the build-up of Soviet forces at the Kola Peninsula. In 1939, there were 13 submarines based at the North Fleet, while there were 62 based at the Baltic Fleet, and the Soviets possessed a total of 175 subs.⁵² In 1950, the North Fleet had increased to 30, while the total Soviet inventory had risen to 330.⁵³ To further demonstrate the military build-up in the northern area, this numbers had increased to 175 in the Northern Fleet, 35 in the Baltic Fleet, and 340 in the Soviet inventory by 1975. The significance of the build-up was that 50% of the submarines were based at the Kola

⁴⁹ Ibid, 213.

⁵⁰ Ibid, 212.

⁵¹ Ibid, 212.

⁵² David D. Lewis, *The Fight for the Sea*, (New York: Collier Books, 1961), 219.

⁵³ Anders C. Sjaastad and John Kristen Skogan, *Policy and Security in the Area of the Norwegian Sea*, (London: Dreyer, 1975), 54-55.

Peninsula, and they constituted for 50% of the nuclear powered submarines as well. These submarines housed two thirds of the submarine based nuclear weapon potential of the Soviets.⁵⁴ The surface force of the Northern Fleet had a similar development; however, it was the largest and most capable ships that were based there. Compared to the other fleets, the Northern Fleet had fewer Minelayers, Mine hunters, Corvettes, and landing ships.⁵⁵ This picture suggests that the Northern Fleet was equipped to retaliate a nuclear attack and to interdict SLOC, while the other fleets were tasked to conduct an amphibious landing in case of war.

Early warning, surveillance, exercise facilities, and intelligence collection have been the Norwegian contribution to the Alliance. Being a member of the Alliance would not automatically mean that a country got access to collected material. The collected information was carefully screened and traded to partners who could provide Norway with much needed guarantees of reinforcements in case of war, and the possibility of procuring military equipment at a favourable price, suitable for the defence of Norway and the Alliance.

Conclusion

During the Cold War, the military strategic significance of the High North changed compared to the pre-war area. SAC showed interest for the area in order to use their strategic bombers to reach the Soviet Union. It was also a fear that the Soviet should take control of the northern part of the country, either to use it for their ocean-going vessels or to deny the Alliance access to the same area. For

⁵⁴ International Institute for Strategic Studies, *"The Military Balance"*, (London: IISS, 1974-1976), 160.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, 166.

Norway, this meant that it was situated in the middle of two superpowers. The rest of the Allies did not view the High North as an area of importance.

Despite the interest from SAC, it was not until the mid 70's that the strategic significance became clear for the Alliance. With the expansion of the Northern Fleet, its strategic ballistic submarines, its strategic bombers, and the build-up of the Soviet Navy in the north, that the area gained a significant military interest. The geo-strategic location of Norway had gotten a completely new meaning. This situation endured throughout the Cold War.

NORWAY POST COLD WAR

Norway entered the post cold war period with a peacetime strength of approximately 24,000 persons in its military forces. The defence expenditure was approximately 3% of GNP, about the average of the other members of the NATO Alliance, and it had remained almost unchanged for the previous 20 years.⁵⁶ Between the beginning of the 90's and 2001 the annual defence expenditure decreased to approximately 1.8% of GNP.⁵⁷ Despite changing Governments, the defence policy remained, by and large, constant. Together with the deterrence and aid provided by its Allies, it turned out to be a successful period for the security of Norway.

In the mid 80's, it became apparent that some of the equipment Norway had received needed to be replaced because of age and fatigue. The Defence Headquarters concluded in its White Paper of 1985 that a yearly growth of 7% in the defence budget was necessary to maintain current defence capabilities.

⁵⁶ Finn Molvig, *Norwegian Defence Policy in the 70's and the 80's*, ... 1.

⁵⁷ NATO, "Nato Handbook 2001" available from [<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb090804.htm>]; Internet accessed 08 April 2004.

Experience suggests that a 3 % yearly growth would have been more realistic. However, neither the Defence HQ, nor the Ministry of Defence took adequate action, and did not start the necessary transformation of the Forces.⁵⁸ Norway had a large Force in relation to its population, compared to other members of the Alliance. With steady and even declining budgets, that had been prepared and approved to cover only operating and maintenance costs, it became impossible to make provision for the purchase of essential capital equipment. In the mid 90's it was finally realized that a major transformation was needed if a credible defence capability was to be maintained.

The Gulf conflict 1991 (Desert Shield/Desert Storm)

The Iran/Iraq war ended in 1988, but it did not take long before Iraq, with Saddam Hussein at its helm, attracted world attention again. In 1990, Iraq invaded Kuwait to seize its natural resources, which according to Saddam Hussein belonged to Iraq. It is reasonable to assume that the Iran/Iraq war had been costly and that Saddam Hussein wanted Kuwait's resources to rebuild Iraq. Most of the world's nations did not agree with the invasion, and in December 1990, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 678, demanding that Iraq withdrew all its forces from Kuwait by January 1991.⁵⁹

Iraq refused to comply with Resolution 678, and the Coalition, lead by the US, launched an air attack on 17 January 1991. The objectives of the campaign were to obtain the unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait and to

⁵⁸ Finn Molvig, *Norwegian Defence Policy in the 70's and the 80's*, 6.

⁵⁹ NATO, *NATO Handbook*, (Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 2001), 442

reduce Iraq's military capabilities to such an extent that they could not longer pose a threat to the other countries in the region.⁶⁰ After 38 days of a massive air attacks, the ground war began. The ground war lasted from 24 to 28 February, and Kuwait was liberated. The Iraqi withdrew from Kuwait and unconditionally accepted all 12 UN resolutions that were in effect.⁶¹ The war was a true military revolution in technology; the first of its kind in history.⁶²

Norway participated in the coalition with a field hospital that includes 232 persons, and it was stationed in Saudi Arabia. The country also provided a Coast Guard ship to support a Danish frigate that operated in the Gulf.⁶³ These deployments suggest that Norway at this time was prepared to support international operations with supporting forces but not combat forces.

The Kosovo conflict (Allied Force) 1999

Serbian military actions and infringement towards the civilian population in Kosovo, created a serious situation in the fall of 1998. According to the UN, there was at that time 250,000 refugees in Kosovo. UN security resolution 1199 of September 1998 stated that the situation in Kosovo constituted a threat against peace and security in the region. This resolution demanded an immediate cease-fire, which the Serbs ignored.⁶⁴ Several peace talks between the Serbs and the

⁶⁰ John A. Warden III, *The Air Campaign*, (New York: iUniverse.com, Inc., 2000), 145.

⁶¹ NATO, *NATO Handbook*... 443.

⁶² John A. Warden III, *The Air Campaign*... 160.

⁶³ MOD, From the Minister of defence statement to the Parliament 18 January 2001: available from [<http://odin.dep.no/fd/norsk/aktuelt/nyheter/010011-210030/index-dok000-b-n-a.html>]; Internet accessed 27 April 2004.

⁶⁴ Knut Vollebaek, "The new NATO and consequences for Norway," Security Policy Library no 7 – 1999, The Norwegian Atlantic Committee, available from [<http://www.atlanterhavskomiteen.no/publikasjoner/sp/99/7-99.htm>]; Internet accessed 27 April 2004

Kosovo Albanians failed, and on 22 March the North Atlantic Council authorized a broad range of air operations to end the repression in Kosovo.⁶⁵ Two days later, NATO commenced air operations against military targets in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in order to prevent violence, the spread of instability in the region, and to avoid human suffering. After 78 days, the air operations were suspended when President Slobodan Milosevic withdrew his troops from Kosovo.⁶⁶

During the Kosovo conflict the Norwegian Air Force participated with 6 F-16 fighter aircraft. These aircraft were stationed in Italy and conducted defensive counter air operations during daytime. Norway also provided personnel to NATO's Airborne Early Warning Force, stationed in Germany. Norwegian C-130 aircraft conducted several humanitarian flights during the conflict. Norway also supported the operation with helicopters and Army personnel.

Afghanistan (Operation Enduring Freedom) 2001

As a result of the terror attack 11 September, the US invoked NATO article V (collective self defence), and later they launched an offensive against terrorists and their training camps in Afghanistan. UN Security Resolution 1368 confirmed that the terror attack against the US authorized self-defence.⁶⁷

Norway participated with several different units in support of OEF. The RNoAF had one C-130 stationed in Kyrgyzstan for six months that conducted tactical air transport of personnel and equipment into the joint operation area.

⁶⁵ NATO, *NATO Handbook*... 495.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, 498

⁶⁷ Gunnar Heloe, Norwegian participation in International military Operations: Why, Where and How, (Speech to the Defence College 21 November 2003), available from [<http://odin.dep.no/fd/norsk/aktuelt/taler/010011-090090/index-dok000-b-n-a.html>]: Internet accessed 27 April 2004.

When the C-130 returned to Norway after it successfully completed its commitment, the country sent 6 F-16 aircraft, to Kyrgyzstan for six months. In OEF these aircraft conducted offensive counter air operations, now with precision guided munitions, in support of coalition ground troops in Afghanistan. In total, the Norwegian aircraft dropped 8 precision-guided bombs; the first bombs dropped by a Norwegian aircraft in combat since the Second World War.

The Gulf conflict 2003

Norway did not support the US led war in Iraq. The reason was that neither the UN nor NATO supported the war. On 22 May 2003, the UN Security Council issued resolution 1483, which was supported by Norway. Norway has sent a small Army unit in support of the multinational stabilization force that is designed to increase security and stability in Iraq.⁶⁸

Conclusion

In the beginning of the 90's, Norway's military struggled with a declining defence budget, and participation in international operations quickly showed that its forces did not meet the standards maintained by the rest of the Alliance. Just after the end of the cold war, the country participated in NATO operations with supporting forces only. Later involvement in international operations has showed that Norwegian forces were improving and that they were capable of participating in combat operations also. Norway has stated that it is willing to participate in combat operations against security threats that occur outside the traditional NATO

⁶⁸ Gunnar Heloe, Norwegian participation in International military Operations...

area. The rationale being that it is better to handle the threat where it originates, before it spreads to the borders of Norway.

NORWEGIAN TRANSITION TO TRANSFORMATION

"... we are committed to the need for change and transformation, and we will contribute fully."

Mr. Kjell Magne Bondevik, Prime Minister of Norway.⁶⁹

Norwegian Air Force at present

Today, Norway is going through its largest transformation since the Second World War with the aim of establishing a highly combat-capable niche force that can be effectively incorporated into other NATO or coalition forces. The peacetime strength of the military is 21,750, while wartime authorized strength is 157,750. Of these there are 2,100 officers and civilians and 1,100 conscripts in the Air Force. Between 2002 and 2005 the peacetime strength will be reduced by approximately 5,000 servicemen, and the savings of approximately 400 million CAD will be used for new equipment and operations. The current defence budget is approximately CAD 6 billion, and it is estimated that it will remain constant for the next two years. The ongoing activities include a significant modernization of the forces.⁷⁰

CAD 3.8 billions of the budget is allocated to operating costs, and CAD 1.8 billions is allocated to the Capital Equipment programme. The Capital Equipment allocation comprises CAD 1.4 billions for materiel and CAD 400 millions for defence properties, buildings and installations. The defence budget for 2004 represents

⁶⁹ Kjell M. Bondevik, Statement during the Prague Summit 21-22 November 2002, *NATO*; available from [<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s021121o.htm>]; Internet accessed 05 March 2004.

⁷⁰ MOD, Norwegian Defence Facts and Figures, (Oslo: The Royal Norwegian Ministry of Defence, 2003), 36.

1.87% of national GDP and 4.87% of the overall national budget.⁷¹ Defence expenditure per capita of the population in Norway for 2003 was CAD 1200, the second highest in NATO, while Canada in comparison spent CAD 400 per capita.

Defence expenditure is of course a central issue during the reorganization of the Armed Forces. In August 2003, Norway reorganized its Defence Headquarters. The country now has a Ministry of Defence with the Defence Staff fully integrated. The Minister of Defence is responsible to the Norwegian Parliament for all military matters, while the Chief of Defence (CHOD) assisted by his three environmental (Army, Navy and Air Force) Chiefs of Staff (COS) is responsible for the control and administration of the Norwegian military forces. The new Integrated Defence HQ is responsible for most administrative matters, while the Joint Operational HQ is responsible for all matters concerning the operation of the forces. The Joint Operational HQ is collocated with the new Joint Warfare Center (JWC), which is organized as part of NATO's new Allied Transformation Command (ATC).

CHOD Norway has full command of all national forces, while Joint Operational HQ has operational command of the same forces. The respective component commanders execute operational control of their forces. Regional Command South and North execute tactical command over assigned forces, while Air Operation Center (south) and the Combined Air Operation Center (north) execute tactical control over assigned air forces. Local Wing Commanders have been delegated

⁷¹ MOD, "Norwegian Defence 2004," *Ministry of Defence*; available from [<http://odin.dep.no/fd/engelsk/publ/veiledninger/010011-120075/index-dok000-b-n-a.html>]; Internet accessed 10 March 2004.

tactical control of assigned forces to carry out annual training programmes and weather reconnaissance flights. Norway has eight types of aircraft in its inventory, including 5 Saab Safari trainers, which are used for pilot selection.

The Norwegian Air Force has 57 F-16 fighter aircraft at its disposition. These aircraft are capable of conducting all-weather, day and night Defensive Counter Air Operations. Precision Offensive Counter Air Operations can only be conducted during visual flight conditions since GPS guided munitions are not yet operational. The F-16 aircraft force is also equipped and trained to conduct tactical air support of maritime operation (TASMO). All aircraft have been through mid life update (MLU), and they are presently being fitted with helmet mounted sight, Link-16, and the capability to use GPS guided munitions (JDAM). The number of aircraft will be gradually reduced to 48, which is the target number for the new aircraft procurement programme planned for introduction in 2015.

In order to conduct maritime air operation, Norway has 6 P-3 Orion aircraft. Four of these are newly updated P-3C aircraft, capable of reconnaissance/surveillance, anti surface warfare (the aircraft does not have anti-shiping missiles), and antisubmarine warfare operations. The aircraft have a limited air to ground surveillance capability with its sophisticated radar. A planned upgrade of its infrared camera in 2008 will enhance this capability. The two older P-3N aircraft have limited capabilities and are used to support the Coast Guard and for training. All P-3 aircraft can be used for Search and Rescue (SAR), and are fitted with the Canadian built SAR Kit Air Droppable (SKAD) to enhance this capability.

Tactical Air Transport is conducted with 6 aging C-130 aircraft. These aircraft are now 35 years old, and have not been extensively modernized since they were procured in 1969. Norway is presently investigating the possibility of leasing an interim replacement for these aircraft pending the introduction of new tactical transport aircraft in 2012.

To ensure adequate Electronic Warfare (EW) training for Norwegian and NATO units, Norway operates two EW equipped DA-20 aircraft. These aircraft are also used to collect EW information, in order to update EW equipment for all national assets to meet the constantly changing EW threats. Norway also operates one DA-20 that is equipped to calibrate air navigation aids. It is also used as a VIP aircraft.

A fleet of 18 Bell 412 Helicopters have until recently been used in the Tactical Aviation role, to support the Norwegian Army. 12 aircraft are stationed in North Norway and will continue to support the Army (Brigade North), while the other 6 aircraft are stationed in South Norway, and will be dedicated to support Special Operation Forces.

The national SAR commitment is carried out by a fleet of 12 Sea King helicopters, detached at five locations throughout the country. From these locations they can reach the mainland and anywhere in the economic zone in 2-3 hours. The aircraft are growing old, and a replacement programme of new NH-90 helicopters is now being investigated.

Norway has ordered 14 new NH-90 helicopters to be delivered by 2008. The first 8 of these will replace the aging Lynx helicopters now operated by the Coast

Guard. The last 6 will be used as dedicated frigate helicopters for the 5 new frigates that are now being built for the Royal Norwegian Navy.

For ground-based air defence, Norway has 6 batteries of Norwegian Adapted Surface to Air Missile Systems (NASAMS). NASAMS consist of Air Launched Medium Range Air to Air Missile (AMRAM) missiles and a Norwegian developed fire control system. The plan is to reduce the number of batteries to two; one will be available for operations and the other will be held in reserve.⁷²

Norway is forming a Base Support Unit that will be operational on 1 August 2004. The unit consists of approximately 200 personnel and non-system specific support, and the unit is designed to support other Norwegian Air Force units that participate in international operations. The Base Support Unit is designed to be capable of supporting one large detachment, i.e. either an F-16 unit (4-12 aircraft with support) or a NASAMS battery. Instead of supporting a large unit, the unit can support two smaller detachments consisting of a helicopter unit (4-8 aircraft with support), a transport unit (1-2 C-130 aircraft with support), a maritime patrol unit (1 P-3C aircraft with support), or an EW unit (1 DA-20 aircraft with support).⁷³ Due to limited resources available to the country, these forces constitute the air units Norway can contribute to an international operation. If a NATO Article V should occur domestically, Norway will rely on its total defence concept and all units will be mobilized and used in the defence of the country.

⁷² Defence Headquarter, "Defence study 2003," available from [\[http://www.mil.no/multimedia/archive/00032/The_new_defence_pdf_32767a.pdf\]](http://www.mil.no/multimedia/archive/00032/The_new_defence_pdf_32767a.pdf); Internet accessed 28 April 2004

⁷³ RNoAF, "High Readiness Forces," *Air Warfare Center*; available from [\[http://www.mil.no/luft/liit/start/bidrag/article.jhtml?sourceID=175592&source=ftd\]](http://www.mil.no/luft/liit/start/bidrag/article.jhtml?sourceID=175592&source=ftd); Internet accessed 28 April 2004.

Table 2:
RNoAF aircraft inventory at present, short term and long term plans.⁷⁴

Type and roles	Present	2005 - 2008	2008 - Future
F-16 (OCA/DCA/TASMO)	57 F-16	48 (+9)	48 new aircraft
P-3C Orion (MPA)	4	4	4
P-3N Orion (Coast Guard)	2	2	2
DA-20 (EW/VIP)	3	3	3
Bell 412 (Tactical Transport)	18	12	12
Bell 412 (SOF-support)		6	6
C-130 (Tactical Air Transport)	6	4-6 New/Lease?	New/Lease?
Sea King (SAR)	12	8-12 New aircraft	8-12 New aircraft
Saab Safari (Training)	5	5	5
Lynx (Coast Guard)	6		
NH-90 (Coast Guard)		8	8
NH-90 (Maritime)		6	6
Base Support Unit	1	1	1
NASAMS (SAM)	6	1 (+1 mob)	1 (+1 mob)
ASR (Air Surveillance Radar)	2	2	2
UAV		Introduce	Operational
Strategic Airlift		NATO cooperation?	NATO cooperation?
Air to Air Refuelling		NATO cooperation?	NATO cooperation?

Doctrine

It is important for a nation to have a published military doctrine that is accessible to all involved personnel. Military doctrine is where theory, common practice, technology, and visions for the future are documented. Doctrine should reflect lessons learned to preserve critical knowledge. Principles of war, together with tenets, present and future capabilities are also important ingredients of doctrine. Additionally, all military personnel should have access to and be trained

⁷⁴ MOD, "Stortingsproposisjon no. 42 2003-2004(Government bill), Continued modernization of the Armed Forces in the period 2005-2008," Table 5.4 Air Force Operational Capabilities; available from [<http://www.odin.dep.no/fd/norsk/publ/stprp/010001-030030/index-hov005-b-n-a.html>]; Internet accessed 18 March 2004.

on doctrine. There are three levels of doctrine. Basic doctrine covers the strategic level of war, reflects the vision and is normally not updated as often. Operational level doctrine covers the operational level, and tactical level procedures, which cover the detailed level of operation of system specific procedures.⁷⁵ Operational and tactical procedures are normally tied to their respective environments. Operational and tactical level of doctrine must be updated regularly to reflect changes in technology and organization. It is important for all personnel in the Forces to know, debate, and perfect these ideas for future use. Norway has enhanced their doctrine in recent years, but there is still more which needs to be accomplished.

In the past, Norway had inadequate doctrine, which did not reflect present and future capabilities. The Chief of Defence (CHOD) Norway tasked the military power section of the Defence Staff College (FSTS), to rewrite the doctrine in order to reflect current capabilities. Between 2000 and 2002, the military power section rewrote all existing doctrine, and has been directed by the CHOD to keep them current. Today, Norway has modern basic doctrine consisting of two manuals, one covering operations, and the other covering national defence in general.⁷⁶ The next three manuals cover their respective environments in general and are considered operational.⁷⁷ At the detailed tactical level, system specific manuals cover operating procedures and tactics for each respective weapon system.

⁷⁵ Canadian Forces, *Out of the Sun*, Department of National Defence, (Winnipeg: Craig Kelman & Associates Ltd, 1997), 3.

⁷⁶ Defence Headquarter, Norway, *National Defence Joint Operations Doctrine* (FFOD part 1 – General & FFOD part 2 – Operations), (Oslo: Defence Headquarter, 2000), Introduction.

⁷⁷ Defence Headquarter, Norway, *National Defence Aerospace Doctrine*, (Oslo: Defence Headquarter, 2002), Introduction.

All Norwegian doctrine is compatible with the new or updated NATO doctrine. These new NATO doctrine consist of between 30 and 40 manuals that are included in the new Allied Joint Publication (AJP) series, and covers all levels of warfare.⁷⁸ CHOD Norway has clearly stated that where the Norwegian doctrine is inadequate, NATO doctrine will be used to fill the gaps.

In general, Norwegian doctrine is sound and reflects the capabilities of the military and its plans for the future, but improvements are still needed. Law of Armed Conflict and Rules of Engagement are briefly mentioned and explained while in the current doctrine, moral and ethical issues are not discussed. CHOD Norway has issued a flyer to all members of the armed forces where moral and ethic is explained from a civilian company's perspective.⁷⁹ Such an important issue should be a part of national doctrine. The civilian society expects members of the armed forces to demonstrate good ethic understanding and live by strong moral values. After all, during conflict, militia may be required to kill. This demands a good understanding and adherence to these values.

These values are especially important for officers who are members of national defence forces of countries that rely on conscripts. Often, these conscripts have 12 months available for military education and training. Armed forces of western countries operate highly sophisticated equipment and are using well-trained professionals to operate this equipment. If a country experiences a total war, it should utilize all available resources, and it is acceptable to engage limited trained conscripts in combat. Is it morally acceptable to send a conscript with

⁷⁸ NATO, *Allied Joint Doctrine AJP 01 (B)*, (Brussels: North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, 2002), Preface ix.

⁷⁹ Chief of Defence, *National Defence Foundation for Values*, (Oslo: Defence Headquarter, 1998), 5.

limited experience to fight a war against a distant enemy outside own territory? It must be up to the reader to take a stands to this question.

Technology

“Transformation is not a term; it is a philosophy – a predisposition to exploring adaptations of existing and new systems, doctrines, and organizations. It has been part of the Air Force for decades. Transformation is not outlining new programs or things to buy. Rather, it is an approach to developing capabilities and exploring new concepts of operation that allow us to be truly relevant in the era in which we find ourselves, and for years to come.”

-Dr. James Roche, Secretary of the US Air Force⁸⁰

The Norwegian government recognizes that military transformation is a strategic process and that future threats are difficult to determine. Due to a constant changing security situation, it is important to transform military forces to quickly adapt to new threats. Norway is transforming its forces by removing outdated capabilities, introducing new capabilities, further developing existing capabilities, updating its doctrine, and introducing new concepts of operations. Military capabilities must have the possibility to integrate into other Alliance or coalition forces in order to make them relevant. Transformation of military forces is an ongoing process that integrates new technology and capabilities, but also requires training and experimentation. A military organization is large and complex to change, however; to change the mindset of the people is one of the most

⁸⁰ USAF, “The U.S. Air Force Transformation Flight Plan,” available from [http://www.af.mil/library/posture/AF_TRANS_FLIGHT_PLAN-2003.pdf]; Internet accessed 28 April 2004.

important challenges.⁸¹ This is important for Norway, since the age constellations in medium ranks are higher than most other countries.

As mentioned earlier, updated doctrine is important because it gives the broad direction of how to develop and use military forces. Doctrine must reflect theory, lessons learned, organization of forces, and proven operating practice. Doctrine is fundamental to how military forces are trained and employed, and must also reflect new technology.

Technology development is an important aspect of military transformation. New technology will influence how military forces are lead, organized, concepts of operation, and the requirements for training. The ability to effectively enhance existing and new technology is and will be important for Norway.⁸² Norway also considers cooperation with national companies capable of developing new technology for the armed forces for successful transformation.

Training and experimentation is important to develop new concepts, and must be a part of transformation. Adequate training will prepare forces to be relevant both nationally, as well as internationally. Together with the implementation of NATO's new ACT, Norway has been made responsible to house the new NATO Joint Warfare Centre (JWC). Norway is taking advantage of these last NATO changes and has established a Center for Military Experience, responsible for the systematic collection lessons learned, who will then pass these over to the Staff College responsible for incorporating these into existing doctrine.⁸³

⁸¹ MOD, "Stortingsproposisjon no. 42 2003-2004,"...para 5.3

⁸² MOD, "Stortingsproposisjon no. 42 2003-2004,"...para 5.1

⁸³ MOD, "Stortingsproposisjon no. 42 2003-2004,"...Para 5.3.2

Norwegian Defence Research Establishment (NDRE) is an institution that is doing research and development for the armed forces and is responsible for providing advice to the military and political leadership in matters that may have influence on national defence planning.⁸⁴ The institution has also been tasked to assist the military in matters that can enhance the transformation of the armed forces.⁸⁵

Norwegian Battle Lab & Experimentation (NOBLE) was established in the late 90's as a battle laboratory. NOBLE is tasked to conduct joint operational experimentation with new technology and tactics. The aim of these experiments is to steer concept development toward joint operational and multinational direction. The laboratory is heavily involved in the transformation of the Norwegian armed forces.⁸⁶

Another task given to NOBLE is to experiment and develop new Network Centric Warfare (NCW) concepts to the Norwegian armed forces.⁸⁷ NCW is defined as "...no less than the embodiment of an information age transformation of the DoD. It involves a new way of thinking about how we accomplish our missions, how we organize and interrelate, and how we acquire and field the systems that support us."⁸⁸

During the Second World War, the gasoline engine was considered to be a technological innovation and was available to both sides. However, the Germans

⁸⁴ Norwegian Defence Research Establishment, "Homepage"; available from [<http://www.mil.no/felles/ffi/start/English/>]; Internet accessed 28 April 2004.

⁸⁵ MOD, "Stortingsproposisjon no. 42 2003-2004,"...para 6.7.7

⁸⁶ MOD, "Stortingsproposisjon no. 42 2003-2004,"...para 5.3.2

⁸⁷ Øystein Johansen, "NOBLE Symposium 2002," *Officers Bladet*, No. 1 (February 2003), 34

⁸⁸ Department of Defence, "Network Centric Warfare, Department of Defence Report to Congress"; available from [<http://www.defenselink.mil/nii/NCW/>]; Internet accessed 28 April 2004

integrated this innovation with creative procedures and completely changed the method of conducting warfare. They used this innovation to create the favourable “Blitzkrieg-concept” that nobody could encounter.⁸⁹ NCW deals with the same situation, but now it is all about how to employ information to gain a military advantage. It is about getting inside the information loop of your adversary and gain information dominance. The ultimate goal is to reduce the “fog of war” by utilizing a network to link communications and real time sensor information to the “shooter”. The commander can then make a quick decision of which platform will deliver the desired effect on target, before the adversary can make his move.⁹⁰

There are obvious advantages with NCW, like protection of own sensor and “shooter” platforms and enhanced situational awareness since all have the same common operational picture. Disadvantages are information overload and security. Security can be exploited against the enemy as well by penetrating the network of an adversary and inserting disinformation.

Norway is enhancing its NCW capability by modernizing selected platforms with improved communication equipment like link-16. New procurements are screened to see how these can best be equipped to meet the future of NCW and make them compatible with Alliance partners. Norway still has a way to go before NCW is fully implemented in its military force.⁹¹

⁸⁹ Sverre Diesen (L Gen), “*NCW – What is it really?*” Luftled No. 1/2004, 4.

⁹⁰ Elinor C. Sloan, *The Revolution in Military Affairs*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2002), 8.

⁹¹ Øyvind Johnsen, “*Realization of NCW in the Norwegian Forces*,” Luftled No. 1/2004, 7.

CONCLUSION

"You can play with the big boys even if you are small."

Ms. Kristin Krohn Devold, Minister of Defence, Norway⁹²

Norwegian politicians argued that being non-aligned in peace and staying neutral in war was the reason the country never got involved in The First World War; however, it is more correct to suggest that the limited geographic spread of The First World War land operations kept Norway out of the conflict. The Second World War demonstrated that being non-aligned was not enough to avoid invasion by Germany. During the Second World War, Germany saw the strategic importance of using bases on the Norwegian coastline to gain unrestricted access to the North Atlantic. These bases gave them the ability to interdict allied SLOC. It is reasonable to assume that Russia had the same view, since they tried to get split sovereignty over Svalbard at the end of the war, and control of Bear Island just after the war.

It was politically important for the Allies to have Norway as a member. Most Allies viewed central Europe as being of greater military importance than the northern flank. It was clear that the Alliance viewed Norway as a northern buffer against the spread of communism. From an Allied military perspective, the Baltic fleet was viewed as a bigger threat than the Northern Fleet, and Southern Norway

⁹² National Post, "A smarter military," *National Post*; available from [<http://www.nationalpost.com/utilities/story.html?id=FDEA4AE2-21C7-4DC5-BD2A-B09BE5...>]; Internet accessed 02 September 2003.

became the northern flank of the Alliance. Norwegian politicians worked hard to try to convince the rest of the Alliance that the entire country was strategically important. They had to wait many years before they were heard.

The US had the same perspective as most of the Allies, and saw their bases in Greenland and Iceland as sufficient to maintain the right level of national security. As an ally, this view did not restrict Norway from participating in the massive aid program that the US launched towards the European countries after the war. From 1950 to 1965 Norway received the equivalent of 10 billion Canadian dollars (1995 value). After 1965, the aid declined and the Alliance members became more prepared to take part in the defence of their own countries. The US on the other hand, became more involved in the Vietnam conflict, and reduced their involvement in Europe in the late 60's and the beginning of the 70's.

Despite their reduced engagement in Europe, the US maintained an interest in gaining intelligence from the Northern Region. For the US and the members of the Alliance, it was important to gain information about the Soviet nuclear weapons program, the development of new weapon systems, the build-up of forces at Kola Peninsula and receive early warning of military activity. A well-developed intelligence collection system, together with advanced US equipment, made Norway capable of contributing intelligence data to selected members of the Alliance. Norway traded intelligence information for guarantees of military reinforcements in case of a conflict and the provision of military equipment on favourable terms.

In the mid 70's, the Norwegian government succeeded in convincing the Allies of the massive Soviet build-up at Kola, and its strategic importance. Norway continued to feed the Allies with intelligence information in exchange for continued

guarantees of reinforcements and NATO investments in Norway's infrastructure. Frequent exercises in the north showed that the Alliance had the will and the capability to operate in this area in case of a conflict. Norway viewed these exercises as comforting, since it demonstrated presence and cohesion among the Alliance. This situation changed dramatically in 1989 with the fall of the Soviet Union and the disappearance of the military threat in the north.

After the fall of the Soviet Empire and the diminishing threat of communism, it became difficult to argue for defence funds, and the defence budget started to decline. With declining budgets, it was difficult to maintain a relatively large and capable defence force. Norwegians viewed themselves as a "peace-loving" people and did not hesitate to support the UN with peacekeeping forces when required. However, participation in a limited war with combat forces was not considered normal behaviour for Norway. This was proven during the Persian Gulf War in 1991, when the country sent a Coast Guard ship to the Gulf to be a stand-by and a hospital ship for a Danish Frigate. Also in 1999, Norway sent a fighter detachment to conduct Defensive Counter Air operations in support of the Kosovo conflict, even though the detachment was not capable of conducting night operations. It became clear that an improvement in the capabilities of Norway's armed forces was necessary if the country was to be regarded as a serious Alliance partner.

In 1999, the Norwegian Armed Forces started the largest transformation since the Second World War. The aim of the transformation was to develop a capable national defence force that was able to provide highly combat-capable niche forces that were much needed in NATO. A small country with limited resources is not capable of contributing large forces, and must shape its forces in accordance with the

needs of the Alliance. Contributing credible niche forces when requested increases the possibility that NATO will come to Norway's assistance if a national crisis should occur. The security threats of today are worldwide, and the Norwegian government with a mandate from the UN, NATO or a legally elected government, will fight the threat internationally to avoid the spread to Norwegian soil.

The transformation now underway in Norway's military forces is replacing capabilities that are no longer needed with new capabilities that are necessary to maintain a robust and effective national defence force. Inadequate doctrine has been rewritten and shaped toward the future, and is in harmony with the new NATO doctrine currently being implemented. The administrative side of the military organization was too large, and it is being reshaped to more effectively serve the combat forces as a force multiplier. All new procurements are being screened toward Network Centric Warfare, to better meet the information domain of the future. Most personnel in the Armed Forces believe the transformation will end in a few years; however, it is fair to argue that there will be continuous transformation for many years. The advances in technology will occur so quickly that it will be necessary to have continuous transformation to be able to maintain a highly sophisticated, combat-capable and relevant force.

The aim of the transformation of the Norwegian Forces is to reduce operating costs, and to use the savings to procure equipment that will provide new and enhanced capabilities. The aid Norway received as a new NATO member consisted of large amounts of military equipment. Early on, the country spent most of its military budget on maintaining and operating this equipment. Later, it was necessary to supplement the equipment. However, it is currently necessary to

reinvest in new capabilities shaped for the future. Norway has limited funds available for investments, but the Capital Equipment programme appears healthy. It is therefore critical that the government maintain a steady and predictable course to ensure success. With limited funds available, one faulty major procurement could completely destroy the ongoing transformation effort. The aid Norway has received from the US and NATO, together with the current military restructuring and modernization programmes, has made her capable of being an important niche contributor to NATO.

Bibliography

Documents

Canadian Forces, *Out of the Sun*, Department of National Defence, Winnipeg, Craig Kelman & Associates Ltd, 1997.

Defence Headquarter, Norway, *National Defence Joint Operations Doctrine*. (FFOD part 1 – General & FFOD part 2 – Operations), Oslo, Defence Headquarter, 2000.

Defence Headquarter, Norway, *National Defence Aerospace Doctrine*, Oslo, Defence Headquarter, 2002.

Hauge (Cabinet minister), From his statement to the Parliament 21 February 1951, Parliament negotiations 1951.

Hansen, Per Conradi, *History of the Royal Norwegian Air Force in Canada 1940-1945*, Toronto, Unpublished, 1985. (Lt. Hansen was trained in Little Norway, Canada in 1942)

NATO, *Allied Joint Doctrine AJP 01 (B)*, (Allied Joint Publication), Brussels, North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, 2002.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, *Facts and Figures*, Brussels, NATO Information Service, 1984.

Books

Bjøll, Erling, *The Duel that does not seem to end*, Oslo, Grimberg/Cappelen, 1984.

Christensen, Christian. *The Secret Norway*, Oslo, Forlaget Atheneum, 1988.

Cole, Wayne S. *Norway and the United States 1905-1955, Two Democracies in Peace and War*, Iowa State University Press/Ames, 1989.

Henriksen, Vera. *History of the Air Force*, Vol I & II, Oslo, Aschehoug & Co, 1994.

Lewis, David D. *The Fight for the Sea*, New York, Collier Books, 1961.

Sjaastad, Anders C. and Skogan, John Kristen, *Policy and Security in the Area of the Norwegian Sea*, London, Dreyer, 1975.

Sloan, Elinor C. *The Revolution in Military Affairs*, Montreal, McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.

Tamnes, Rolf. *The United States and the Cold War in the High North*, Hants, UK, Dartmouth Publishing Company, 1991.

Warden III, John A. *The Air Campaign*, New York, iUniverse.com, Inc., 2000.

Periodicals

Diesen Sverre (L Gen), "NCW – *What is it really?*" Luftled No. 1/2004.

International Institute for Strategic Studies, "*The Military Balance*," London, IISS, 1974-1976.

Johansen, Jahn Otto, "*Norway, the Soviet Union and the Northern Areas*," DNAK no. 10/88. Oslo, The Norwegian Atlantic Committee

Johansen, Øystein. "*NOBLE Symposium 2002*," Offisers Bladet, No. 1, February 2003.

Molvig, Finn. "*Norwegian Defence Policy in the 70's and the 80's*," IFS Info 4/1994. Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies

Riste, Olav. "*Norwegian Security Policy from Isolationism to Atlantic Integration*," IFS Info 2/1996. Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies

Riste, Per. "*The road to NATO*," DNAK, 1984. Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies

Skogrand, Kjetil. "Cash and Cannons; Norway, Denmark and the US Aid Programmes", IFS Info 2/1998. Oslo, Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies, 1998.

Svela, Erling. "*International Press Commends the Norwegian Armed Forces*," Forsvarets Forum, no 17, September 2003

Udgaard, Nils Morten. "*War preparations may be discovered*," Aftenposten 21 Sep 79.

Wiker, Paul V. "*United States Defence Aid to Norway 1949-1953*," IFS Info 1/1997. Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies

World Wide Web

Bondevik, Kjell Magne. "Statement during the Prague Summit 21-22 November 2002," *NATO*; available from [<http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s021121o.htm>]; Internet accessed March 2004.

Dagre, Tor. "The History of Norway," *Department of Foreign Affairs*; available from [<http://odin.dep.no/odin/engelsk/norway/history/032005-990454/index-dok000-b-n-a.html>]; Internet accessed March 2004.

Defence Headquarter, "Defence study 2003," available from [http://www.mil.no/multimedia/archive/00032/The_new_defence_pdf_32767a.pdf]; Internet accessed April 2004

Department of Defence, "Network Centric Warfare, Department of Defence Report to Congress"; available from [<http://www.defenselink.mil/nii/NCW/>]; Internet accessed April 2004

Heloe, Gunnar. "Norwegian participation in International military Operations," Why, Where and How, (Speech to the Defence College 21 November 2003); available from [<http://odin.dep.no/fd/norsk/aktuelt/taler/010011-090090/index-dok000-b-n-a.html>]; Internet accessed April 2004.

MOD, "From the Minister of defence statement to the Parliament 18 January 2001"; available from [<http://odin.dep.no/fd/norsk/aktuelt/nyheter/010011-210030/index-dok000-b-n-a.html>]; Internet accessed April 2004.

MOD, "Historic end to the US Military Assistance Program," MOD Press release No. 051/96; available from [<http://odin.dep.no/odinarkiv/norsk/dep/fd/1996/presse/010005-070068/index-dok000-n-n-a.html>]; Internet accessed April 2004.

MOD, "Stortingsproposisjon no. 42 2003-2004, Continued modernization of the Armed Forces in the period 2005-2008," *Ministry of Defence*; available from [<http://www.odin.dep.no/fd/norsk/publ/stprp/010001-030030/index-hov005-b-n-a.html>]; Internet accessed March 2004.

MOD, "Norwegian Defence 2004," *Ministry of Defence*; available from [<http://odin.dep.no/fd/engelsk/publ/veiledninger/010011-120075/index-dok000-b-n-a.html>]; Internet accessed March 2004.

Naastad, Nils. "The History of the Air Force" *Royal Norwegian Air Force*; available from [<http://www.mil.no/luft/start/omlf/historikk/>]; Internet accessed March 2004.

National Post, "A smarter military," *National Post*; available from [<http://www.nationalpost.com/utilities/story.html?id=FDEA4AE2-21C7-4DC5-BD2A-B09BE5...>]; Internet accessed September 2003.

NATO, "Nato Handbook 2001" available from [<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb090804.htm>]; Internet accessed April 2004.

Norwegian Defence Research Establishment, "Homepage"; available from [<http://www.mil.no/felles/ffi/start/English/>]; Internet accessed April 2004.

RNoAF, "High Readiness Forces," *Air Warfare Center*; available from [<http://www.mil.no/luft/liit/start/bidrag/article.jhtml?sourceID=175592&source=ftd>]; Internet accessed April 2004.

Several authors, "The History of the Royal Norwegian Air Force." *RNoAF*; available from [<http://www.mil.no/luft/start/omlf/historikk/article.jhtml?articleID=14832>]; Internet accessed March 2004.

USAF, "The U.S. Air Force Transformation Flight Plan," available from [http://www.af.mil/library/posture/AF_TRANS_FLIGHT_PLAN-2003.pdf]; Internet accessed April 2004.

Vollebaek Knut, "The new NATO and consequences for Norway," Security Policy Library no 7 – 1999, *The Norwegian Atlantic Committee*; available from [<http://www.atlanterhavskomiteen.no/publikasjoner/sp/99/7-99.htm>]; Internet accessed April 2004