



Navigating troubled waters: collaboration and resistance in state institutions in Nazi-occupied Norway

Ø. Hetland , N. Karcher & K. B. Simonsen

To cite this article: Ø. Hetland , N. Karcher & K. B. Simonsen (2021) Navigating troubled waters: collaboration and resistance in state institutions in Nazi-occupied Norway, Scandinavian Journal of History, 46:1, 84-104, DOI: [10.1080/03468755.2020.1846075](https://doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2020.1846075)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2020.1846075>



© 2020 The Authors. Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group on behalf of the Historical Associations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.



Published online: 17 Nov 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 399



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

ARTICLE



Navigating troubled waters: collaboration and resistance in state institutions in Nazi-occupied Norway

Ø. Hetland^a, N. Karcher^b and K. B. Simonsen^c

^aNorwegian Center for Holocaust and Minority Studies, Oslo, Norway; ^bFaculty of Education, University College of Østfold, Halden, Norway; ^cJewish Museum, Oslo, Norway

ABSTRACT

This article examines and compares the patterns of collaboration and resistance in the school sector, the police, and the ministerial bureaucracy, which experienced very different developments during the German occupation of Norway. While teachers created a powerful resistance movement, the police became a useful tool for the occupier. The development within the ministerial bureaucracy was highly differentiated, where some departments were permeated by a new, National Socialist ethos, and others characterized by a culture of collective resistance. Three main factors led to the disparate responses: the framework established by the German authorities, and their varying interests in different spheres; the internal values, role perceptions, and political views within the three groups; and the social dynamics within given sectors. Leaders' views and influence, the pace and intensity of Nazification, and the ability to mobilize quickly and collectively, were of decisive importance.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 7 July 2020
Revised 29 October 2020
Accepted 30 October 2020

KEYWORDS

National socialism; occupation; Second World War; collaboration; resistance; Norway

Introduction

In July 1941, a speech by Norwegian Minister of Justice Terje Wold, in which he stated how the government in exile wanted public servants back home to behave, was broadcast by the BBC for listeners in German-occupied Norway. Wold declared that 'anyone who helps [the German occupier] helps the enemy'.¹ Still, he also admitted that a Norwegian system of government and administration needed to exist, even during an occupation:

While the enemy holds power in the country, Norwegian public servants must endure a certain connection with the German authorities. But a Norwegian public servant must never let himself be used as a tool by the German regime. [...] As long as Norway is at war, the individual soldier and the individual citizen has a duty to continue the active and passive resistance that is possible.²

Wold's speech thus contained some ambiguities. How could one avoid being 'used as a tool', while at the same time maintaining a 'certain connection' with the occupier? His vagueness was typical of the Norwegian government in exile's attitude throughout the war. Therefore, it was largely up to those working in public institutions to define the

CONTACT N. Karcher  nicola.k.karcher@hiof.no

This article has been republished with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

© 2020 The Authors. Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group on behalf of the Historical Associations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

boundaries between proper and improper interactions with German authorities, and to determine what kind of resistance they considered possible.

In this article, we examine the factors that determined the different patterns of collaboration and resistance that evolved within three sectors in occupied Norway: *the school sector*, *the ministerial bureaucracy*, and *the police*. The teachers created a powerful resistance movement that decisively hampered attempts to turn Norwegian schools into conveyers of Nazi propaganda. Norwegian police officers, however, found it difficult to avoid becoming a useful tool for the occupier. The ministerial bureaucracy fell between these extremes, with examples that resembled the teacher's potent resistance and examples that showed the submissive tendency characterized by the police.

Three main factors need to be considered to understand these differences: the German occupying power's established framework; each group's internal values, role perceptions, and political views; and the social dynamics that developed within given sectors.

Such a comparative approach is relatively rare in studies of Norway during World War II. Academic works have examined the history of the Norwegian police,³ the development within the Norwegian ministerial bureaucracy,⁴ and the situation within the Norwegian school sector⁵ between 1940 and 1945. Still, in most cases these sectors were studied separately or in general descriptions of collaboration and resistance development in Nazi-occupied Norway.⁶ The most important exception is Thomas C. Wyller's pioneering study from 1958 on the emergence of the Norwegian civil resistance movement.⁷ However, Wyller only analysed the dynamics of resistance, not the patterns of collaboration. Thus, we know much about the differences between various sectors of Norwegian society, but still need to examine *why* these came about. The structural, organizational, cultural, and ideological factors prompting different paths of development still need to be examined more carefully and from a comparative angle.

The terms *Nazification*, *collaboration*, and *resistance* are of key importance. Nazification refers to the process of transforming a society's institutions, norms, and values to be in line with National Socialist concepts. It is important to note that National Socialism was frequently a vague ideology, leading to much confusion and struggle about what Nazification in practice implied.⁸ Collaboration involves local institutions, groups, and individuals cooperating with the occupier, albeit conditioned by the asymmetrical power relations between the occupier and the occupied. Ideology, opportunism, pragmatism, or outright coercion all serve as justifications for collaboration.⁹ Resistance comprises actions that undermine or oppose the occupier and his local collaborators. Acts of resistance can be organized or spontaneous, individual or collective, with organized collective resistance being by far the most potent.¹⁰ It is also important to note that we use these terms as analytical tools in this article, not as moral categories.

The occupation regime in Norway

To understand the situation faced by Norwegian public servants, it is necessary to understand what Nazi Germany *wanted* with Norway, and how it chose to administrate the country. Norway was invaded on 9 April 1940, primarily for military strategic reasons. After a successful invasion, the primary objective was to keep the country as a secure German possession, at the lowest possible cost. Consequently, the occupier wanted to keep the

Norwegian economy intact, and leave as much as possible of the daily administration of the country in the hands of Norwegians.¹¹

Some National Socialist leaders, most prominently *Reichsführer SS* Heinrich Himmler, also considered 'Nordic' Norwegians racially equal to Germans, and Norway was therefore a candidate for integration into a future Greater Germanic Reich.¹² Encouraging Norwegians to adopt National Socialism thus became a German objective, and meant that the population was to be treated respectfully.¹³ However, this leniency had its limits, and individuals who actively opposed German interests could expect little mercy.

The initial German plan for a 'peaceful occupation' of Norway with minimal German presence failed. Ultimately, an improvised occupation regime was established on 25 September 1940.¹⁴ Its core institution was the *Reichskommissariat*, led by Josef Terboven. Following an accord between Himmler and Terboven, large German SS and police forces were sent to Norway and put at Terboven's disposal for use against internal security threats.¹⁵ True to the desire to leave as much of the administration as possible in the hands of Norwegians, Terboven appointed commissary Norwegian ministers (*kommisarische Staatsräte*) answering directly to him. The Reichskommissariat subsequently exercised power both independently and through instructions to the Norwegian commissary ministers.¹⁶

Despite his own misgivings, Terboven had to give a role to the Norwegian National Socialist party *Nasjonal Samling* (NS), because Hitler demanded it,¹⁷ despite that the party was highly unpopular in Norway and lacked qualified personnel.¹⁸ Until then, NS had been a marginal party. Established in 1933, it had never won any seats in parliamentary elections.¹⁹ Now, NS activists found themselves with important new tasks and responsibilities. For example, nine of thirteen commissary ministers were party members.²⁰

In general, the more important a sector was from a German point of view, the less leeway was given to Norwegians and NS. Terboven did not take risks with security matters, which were primarily the responsibility of the SS and its police forces, especially the Security Police (*Sicherheitspolizei*, or *Sipo*). Norwegians were given only a limited role, acting primarily as German subordinates. Moreover, because of the politically charged nature of this area, ideological reliability was often a required qualification within the security apparatus, including within the Norwegian police.

In the economic sphere, the occupier had a keen interest in keeping the wheels turning. Given the importance and the less politically sensitive nature of this objective, the occupying power prioritized their Norwegian collaborators' competence over National Socialist sympathies.²¹ In sectors of less critical or more long-term German interest, Terboven was willing to give NS a more independent role, allowing them to test their conceptions of how Norway could become a National Socialist society. One such area was the Norwegian school,²² but this leeway had its limits; at no point could NS' incompetence be allowed to endanger core German interests.

The dual system of Norwegian and German institutions inevitably produced friction. Norwegian actors could never be certain of how and when German authorities would intervene. The occupying power, on its part, was often uncertain about Norwegians' willingness and ability to further German goals.²³ As in Nazi Germany, the power relationships in Norway were characterized by continuous struggles among actors in the regime. Terboven eagerly promoted this free play of forces (*freies Spiel der Kräfte*) and rewarded the best players of this game.²⁴

This system was slightly modified when a 'national government' was established in February 1942. Quisling was made *'Ministerpresident'*, and the former commissary ministers now formally answered to him. This position of NS within the occupation regime was unique. In no other German-occupied country was a local fascist party given such a role. However, while the new ministers gained somewhat greater independence from their German overseers, the basic power relationship between Germans and Norwegians was not altered. Terboven still ultimately called the shots and could overrule Quisling and his ministers at any time.²⁵

Crucially, the regime established on 25 September lacked legal legitimacy. The destruction of the political system was a clear violation of § 43 of the Hague Convention of 1907,²⁶ so the German occupier could now no longer use the convention to justify demands on the population. Most Norwegians and the government in exile considered political participation in this regime as treasonous. From then on, collaboration for them could only be justified for pragmatic reasons. Furthermore, as Tore Gjelsvik, a prominent resistance organizer, stated, Terboven had 'cleared the air', making resistance easy to legitimize.²⁷ The situation thus became much clearer than in other occupied countries in Western Europe such as Belgium, Denmark, France, or the Netherlands, where political collaboration by members of the pre-war administration was, for various reasons, not deemed illegitimate to the same degree.²⁸

A framework defined by the occupier

During the occupation, between 100,000 and 400,000 German soldiers were stationed in Norway, a country of about three million people.²⁹ Consequently, ideas of large-scale partisan warfare or other mass uprisings were rejected by most as being a fool's errand.³⁰ Furthermore, Norwegian dependence on food and fuel from abroad made the population existentially vulnerable. 'No other country in Europe', wrote Alan Milward, 'was so dependent on food imports'.³¹ However, because of Norwegians' supposed racial status and the desire to maintain order, the German occupation power did not let Norwegians starve. Skilled Norwegian negotiators could sometimes use this to secure material benefits for the population.³²

These basic realities had profound effects on how Norwegian public servants evaluated their situation. Fearing devastating retaliation, few dared to directly challenge the occupier, and neither the government in exile nor resistance leaders expected their fellow citizens to openly defy the German authorities. Instead, thwarting NS' attempts to reshape the country in line with their ideas of what National Socialism represented, became the primary objective of Norwegian resistance.³³ For public servants, the nature and intensity of German involvement thus came to play a decisive role in determining the eventual nature of collaboration and resistance in their respective sectors.

Of the three Norwegian public sectors analysed in this article, the German authorities – above all Terboven himself – showed the least interest in the school sector.³⁴ After the proclamation of their new role on 25 September 1940, NS immediately began their attempt to take control of Norwegian schools as part of a wider offensive against Norwegian youth. Their first move was to force the Ministry for Church and Educational Affairs (*Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet*) into line by replacing and influencing its staff. The second initiative was an offensive to gain the teachers' political loyalty. Their

third effort involved proposals to reform Norwegian schools in accordance with National Socialist principles.³⁵

NS leaders did not expect such measures to provoke objections from the German authorities. In fact, their planned Nazification of the Norwegian youth copied the German National Socialist blueprint to a large extent, and was characterized by original Norwegian ideas only to a limited degree.³⁶ As in Germany, youth were to become the spearhead and front-line soldiers to establish a racially pure *Volksgemeinschaft*, based on the supposed Nordic race.³⁷ However, in practice, the vagueness of National Socialist ideology led to disputes, misunderstandings, and power struggles.³⁸

The school Nazification project was not only ideological, but also had an instrumental objective, where the party sought to prove its political prowess and ability to win over Norwegians for National Socialism. NS interpreted their leeway within the school sector as a sign of the occupier's trust, but this was a misunderstanding. In reality, Terboven did not believe that the party could handle much of anything³⁹; his attention was centred on sectors he considered more important, and he was willing to let NS run the show in this 'unimportant' area for some time. Consequently, Norwegian teachers had to deal with NS representatives, both in the Nazified Ministry for Church and Educational Affairs and, more directly, in party institutions. These were far less capable opponents than other civil servants or policemen often faced.

The dominant role of NS in the school sector was indirectly furthered by Alfred Huhnhäuser, the leader of the German school department (*Abteilung Schule und Bildung/Schulabteilung*) in the Reichskommissariat, who seemingly had limited ability to influence developments in the sector – not through lack of interest, but quite the opposite. Huhnhäuser preferred a long-term strategy based on small steps to establish collaboration by prominent and skilled representatives of the Norwegian school sector. Thus, he considered the NS leadership within the Ministry for Church and Educational Affairs, and most other party educationalists, as amateurs who lacked any ability to develop a fruitful school policy. In addition, he deemed NS's aggressive approach counterproductive.⁴⁰

Huhnhäuser's ability to realize his desired policy proved limited. He was politically peripheral within the Reichskommissariat, because Terboven had little time for him or his concerns.⁴¹ His example makes it clear that political influence in the occupation regime depended on gaining Terboven's ear. Even Ragnar Skancke, the Minister for Church and Educational Affairs – a weak leader himself – was unwilling to follow Huhnhäuser's guidelines.⁴² Consequently, Huhnhäuser's views and political position very likely reduced the Nazification pressure on the Norwegian school sector.⁴³

However, when resistance against the NS educational policy threatened public order and stability, Terboven felt compelled to intervene. In February 1942, the new Quisling government went on the offensive towards the school sector by passing two laws: Norway's Union of Teachers (*Norges Lærersamband*) law, which aimed to force all teachers into a National Socialist organization; and the law requiring mandatory service in the NS Youth Organization (*Nasjonal Samlings Ungdomsfylking, NSUF*), a Hitlerjugend-like organization for ten- to eighteen-year-old children.⁴⁴ Together these two laws triggered a nationwide protest, initiated by resistance leaders in the school sector.

In this situation, setting aside both Huhnhäuser and Skancke, about 1,100 teachers were arrested across the country on orders from the German Security Police. The decision to arrest was made during a meeting between Terboven and Quisling.⁴⁵ More than 500 of the

teachers were deported to Northern Norway to carry out forced labour,⁴⁶ making it apparent that teachers, too, were vulnerable to German coercion. Most of them eventually signed a declaration stating that they had formally joined the Union of Teachers, but in practice, this proved an empty gesture: They had demonstrated where their political sympathies lay, and NS more or less gave up trying to make them teach National Socialist ideology to Norwegian pupils.⁴⁷

In contrast to the teachers, the Norwegian police immediately found themselves under heavy German pressure. On 25 October 1940, the head of German police and SS forces in Norway (*Höherer SS- und Polizeiführer*), Wilhelm Rediess, made it clear in a letter to Jonas Lie, commissary Minister of Police, that all future edicts, announcements, and decisions regarding the Norwegian police must be presented to and accepted by him, and that Lie would receive orders from his office.⁴⁸ The Norwegian police thus came under the control of the most ambitious and radical actor in Nazi Germany – the SS – which had dual goals for the Norwegian police: it should serve as a channel for the pan-Germanic ideals of the SS into Norwegian society and aid the SS in their primary task in Norway, which was crushing any opposition to the National Socialist ‘New Order’.⁴⁹ Achieving these goals required filling the ranks with dedicated National Socialists. Furthermore, any signs of police officers’ insubordination or resistance were met with harsh responses; those deemed opponents of the ‘New Order’ were frequently replaced by men with a more ‘positive attitude’.⁵⁰

How far the occupying power was willing to go was dramatically illustrated in 1943. Since the end of 1942, German authorities had received many reports of unreliable police officers, whom they feared would become a fifth column in the event of an Allied invasion. On 16 August they launched *Aktion Polarkreis*, where nearly 500 police officers, or over 10% of the total force, were arrested. The goal was clearly to scare Norwegian policemen into submission. Two-hundred-seventy-one of them were later sent to a failed ‘re-education’ in KZ Stutthof.⁵¹ One of the arrested police officers succinctly summarized the atmosphere surrounding Norwegian police officers: ‘We had, from the very beginning of the occupation, the understanding that if the German masters were superior at anything, it was in their cultivation of *arbitrariness*.’⁵²

For Norwegian police officers, such demonstrations of German power made open insubordination seem futile and self-destructive, strongly contributing to the majority nominally carrying out orders. As one officer, who fled the country in 1944 to avoid arrest, put it:

It would be completely useless for a policeman to refuse to carry out or assist in the arrest of a named person whom the Germans wanted arrested. He would be arrested in any case, if necessary by the Germans themselves, and that would hardly help his case. Moreover, such an act would be dangerous for the policeman in question.⁵³

Tight German control and oversight also made large-scale resistance difficult to organize. The chance of discovery was high. Several resistance groups in the police were destroyed or decimated during the war.⁵⁴

Nevertheless, despite showing great willingness to use force against Norwegian police officers who stepped out of line, the occupier remained interested in retaining a local police force. After all, replacing them with German police would be both inefficient and expensive, and therefore at odds with the desire for a cheap occupation. The punitive measures served to scare Norwegian police officers into compliance, keeping them as tools for the occupying power, while not being so harsh as to risk destroying the force. Symptomatically, several

arrested officers were permitted to return to the force after signing declarations of loyalty or having their loyalty guaranteed by politically reliable colleagues.⁵⁵

Like the Norwegian police, the ministerial bureaucracy was subject to strict supervision by the German occupation authorities.⁵⁶ Nevertheless, mirroring their position in the landscape of German interests, the ideological climate and room for manoeuvring varied widely from ministry to ministry. The German political line could both advance and limit NS pressure against civil servants, and, to a great extent, determined opportunities for developing organized resistance.

The Ministry of the Police (*Politidepartementet*) and the Ministry of Supplies (*Forsyningsdepartementet*), which, in 1943, were merged into a larger Ministry of Economics (*Næringsdepartementet*), further illustrate the occupiers' intent to strictly supervise sectors deemed important to their cause. As in the wider Norwegian police, SS leaders also desired ideological Nazification in the Ministry of the Police. Furthermore, the German Security Police regularly interfered in the daily work of the ministry, often with the aim of removing 'politically unreliable' elements from the Norwegian police force.⁵⁷

The SS also used the ministry as an active instrument to combat perceived enemies. For example, the most important antisemitic measure implemented by the Ministry of the Police, the registration of Norwegian Jews, was initiated and supervised by the Security Police.⁵⁸ As the war progressed and the German occupation policy became more brutal, the pressure on civil servants to participate in the repression policy increased.⁵⁹ Control by the SS also played a major role in hampering organized resistance.

Within the economic ministries, such as the Ministry of Supplies, the situation was very different. The Reichskommissariat, mainly represented by the Department for Economics (*Hauptabteilung Volkswirtschaft*), wanted to keep the economy moving. Its leader, Carlo Otte, was a convinced National Socialist and a member of the SS.⁶⁰ Still, his *modus operandi* was rather pragmatic; he often sought cooperation with non-political actors within business and the economic administration of the Norwegian state. Consequently, conflicts regularly flared between Otte's department and NS representatives.⁶¹

The German line sharply limited NS's power and role within the economic ministries. Between 25 September 1940 and 1 February 1942, these ministries were not even led by NS members, probably because of Terboven's orders.⁶² The Department for Economics also limited attempts by NS to Nazify ministry personnel. In fact, NS opponents among the employees could, at times, counteract party demands with aid from the Reichskommissariat. In the autumn of 1943, the head of the Reichskommissariat's nutrition and agriculture subdepartment actually warned Terboven of the NS attacks against non-party members within the civil service, claiming that political experiments within this field could potentially have disastrous effects.⁶³ Consequently, conditions for creating a common front against NS and its Nazification policy became much more favourable than they were within the Ministry of the Police. Partly because of this, a collective spirit of resistance evolved, inspiring and allowing civil servants, individually and in coordination with others, to regularly hinder the initiatives and demands of the party.

Values, ideology, and interests

The occupier's framework only partially explains the behaviour patterns observed among Norwegian public servants. Differing values, interests, and ideological viewpoints also pushed them in various directions. The sum of an institution's employee views could have a dramatic impact on the character and development of a given institution or even whole sectors of society. An institution staffed by committed National Socialists was, of course, a far more efficient tool for the new regime. Moreover, it was naturally much harder to muster resistance within institutions when significant numbers of staff were eager to root out such activities.

Few cases illustrate this better than the Norwegian police. Police officers had values, conceptions of duty, and interests that made them vulnerable to being used as a tool by the new regime. In the interwar years, the Norwegian police were often accused by the political left of being an instrument of the ruling class.⁶⁴ Their defence was that they were simply agents of the state, bound to enforce even laws they personally opposed. It was not up to the police to challenge the will of the rulers. Indeed, as Ola Kvalsund, Stavanger chief of police put it, police leaders had:

... long underlined and emphasised that the police had to obey any legal government's orders, regardless of whether it ran counter to a policeman's own convictions and sympathies.⁶⁵

The official Norwegian police instructions even underlined that it was not up to any junior officer to evaluate whether an order was legal – this was the responsibility of senior officers.⁶⁶ The struggle to maintain legitimacy also led to warning police officers not to involve themselves with political parties, particularly those deemed 'revolutionary'.⁶⁷ In sum, the message conveyed to Norwegian police officers was that their task was to enforce the laws of the state and maintain peace and order, not to act as independent political or moral individuals.⁶⁸

This did not mean that political views and interests did not exist. A minority of Norwegian police officers had far right political sympathies, and some looked to Germany for ideological and professional inspiration.⁶⁹ Among them was Jonas Lie, who in September 1940 became Minister of the Police. In 1934 he had briefly joined NS.⁷⁰ Lie and others also saw the Norwegian police as being numerically too weak, unprofessional, and 'soft' in its methods.⁷¹ Furthermore, many police officers felt that they were undereducated and to some extent underappreciated.⁷²

During the war, these values and interests had somewhat contradictory effects. A distaste for 'politics' contributed to police being political novices, ill-prepared to mobilize against the new political demands coming from the top. Conversely, the norm of the non-political policeman was at odds with the desire of Norway's new rulers to turn policemen into 'political warriors' for National Socialism. This was tacitly acknowledged by Jonas Lie, who in December 1940 felt the need to emphasize that 'the old view that a policeman ought to be neutral and not be a member of any political party is no longer valid'.⁷³

The idea that it was the task of the police to prevent societal breakdown would prove crucial in the chaotic period following the German invasion. For many police officers, abandoning ship by resigning was simply unthinkable. In June 1940, a leading article in

the junior officer union magazine, *Norsk Politiblad*, asserted: 'When the police therefore accepted the actual situation and everywhere initiated a seamless cooperation with the German authorities it is our opinion that this was the only right thing to do.'⁷⁴

The habit of obeying orders likely made the police more pliable when German authorities demanded they arrest resistance fighters, Jews, and others deemed enemies.⁷⁵ However, a self-image as defenders of law and order also had a moderating effect, leading policemen to react to the increasingly arbitrary way some Norwegian and German National Socialists fought their enemies, including the use of torture and incarceration without trial.⁷⁶ Finally, NS sympathizers in the police would strongly contribute to the chaos and lack of coordination that came to characterize the Norwegian police during the war.

Like the police, the Norwegian ministerial bureaucracy had its own distinct set of norms, traditions, and values, two of which are of particular importance. First, civil servants cherished the ideal of bureaucratic neutrality, espousing a clear separation of administrative and political spheres. Second, the bureaucracy was permeated by a legalistic culture⁷⁷; between 1931 and 1939, 75% of all positions within the ministries were held by jurists.⁷⁸ Consequently, the bureaucratic practice was typically marked by an emphasis on rules, formal procedures, and predictability.⁷⁹

After 25 September 1940, these values and traditions were profoundly challenged when NS, sometimes supported by the German occupation authorities, demanded a pervasive Nazification of Norwegian state administration personnel and practices. Before the German occupation, civil servants employed in the ministerial bureaucracy reflected a combination of strict political neutrality and a legalistic culture that seemed to foster resilience against demands to join NS.⁸⁰ Therefore, an overwhelming proportion of party members within the ministerial bureaucracy were appointed, constituted, or employed *after* 25 September 1940. Their ideological viewpoints and level of radicalism profoundly varied. Still, many of them promoted new ideas, contradicting the old norms of legalism and political neutrality. The new ethos is illustrated in a November 1942 speech by Sverre Riisnæs, NS Minister of Justice, where he stated that civil servants ought to join NS and 'support and work for the party everywhere and with all their ability'.⁸¹

Given that the ministerial bureaucracy was only partly Nazified between 1940 and 1945, the ethos and institutional culture differed markedly from institution to institution. While some departments and offices became deeply permeated by National Socialist values, old bureaucratic traditions and norms survived in others. However, it should be noted that National Socialist civil servants' behaviour could be influenced and moderated by the traditional bureaucratic culture. One case in point involved the Ministry of the Police, where, during the German occupation, nearly all leading positions were filled with party members. Still, throughout the occupation, National Socialist activists complained from the outside that the ministry was far too moderate, legalistic, and formalistic. To an extent, it seems like original bureaucratic norms and traditions were adopted even by committed National Socialists, through a process of institutional socialization.⁸²

In contrast to the police and state administration, the teaching profession had been politically active since the nation-building process of the 19th century. The school sector – more than most other public sectors – was characterized by political consciousness, activism, and participation.⁸³

Several interdependent factors contributed to this development. Teachers played a vital role in the Norwegian process of nation-building and democratization, and through this they also became more confident and conscious members of an increasingly formalized profession.⁸⁴ Particularly after the 1905 dissolution of the union with Sweden, a significant number of teachers participated in politics. Many served as members of parliament, with some even rising to positions as prime ministers.⁸⁵

Through this process, the teaching profession became quite politically homogenous. Their dominant political viewpoint can be described as 'left-wing nationalism', where democracy was deemed an essential Norwegian value. Their work also offered a unique opportunity to distribute these values to new generations. In other words, both in and outside the classroom, teachers acted as political opinion makers, propagating a democratic form of nationalism.⁸⁶

This historical role as campaigners for democracy could easily be recalibrated into new forms of political activism during the German occupation. Unsurprisingly, the attempts to Nazify the Norwegian school immediately prompted protests from teachers.⁸⁷ These strong democratic values within the school sector also meant that the NS decision to encroach on this sector was an obviously bad idea, as it meant challenging a group with very negative opinions regarding the core tenets of National Socialist ideology.

However, the defence of Norwegian democracy was only one of several ideological motives that encouraged resistance. As directives issued by the teacher resistance leadership and articles in the underground press make clear, they had three additional motives: first, the teachers promoted resistance as a moral issue, linked to the overarching ideal of the teaching profession as an independent institution. The teaching profession's self-confidence would not allow any interference in matters of school education by an occupier or their illegitimate local political collaborators. Second, they declared themselves defenders of Norwegian youth, believing that Norwegian children must be protected against Nazism to grow up in freedom. Put differently, teachers emphasized that young Norwegians' right to self-determination was imperilled by National Socialism. Third, teachers stressed the incompatibility between Christian belief and Nazism,⁸⁸ because Christian belief asserted that the relationship between parents and children was a creation of God, which no state institution had the right to intrude upon.⁸⁹ Taken together, these overarching motives – defence of democracy, shielding teachers' independence, protecting Norwegian youth and Christian belief – formed a normative ideology that could mobilize the majority of teachers against Nazification.

However, not all teachers shared this overall perception. Orvar Sæther, a teacher and radical NS member, became leader of the National Socialist Union of Teachers during the war. In 1941 he stated that teachers must act as political soldiers⁹⁰ of the 'Volksgemeinschaft' and claimed that, 'our children must be reared for the battle to ensure the survival of Nordic blood'.⁹¹ But such ideas and values had very little resonance among teachers as a whole.

Social dynamics and collective organization

As important as the context of the occupation and prevalent values and traditions were, they are not sufficient explanations for public servant behaviour in Norway. Why, for example, did the police in some towns choose to collectively join NS, whereas elsewhere few or even none did so? And why did resistance networks develop in some areas or

groups, and not in others? To answer such questions, we must study the social dynamics within each sector.

During the first phase after the German invasion, confusion and doubt were endemic. In this situation, leadership and the ability to organize collectively were crucial for providing direction and strength. As historian Berit Nøkleby put it: 'Unity provided strength, and unity also forced the weak to stay "on the right side"'.⁹²

Three factors should be emphasized, time, pace and degree of Nazification, and leadership. The autumn of 1940 and winter of 1940/1941 were crucial phases.⁹³ At this early stage, repression was lax compared to what it became in later phases of the occupation. Certain – albeit rapidly diminishing – possibilities for open, collective, mobilization still existed. Opponents of National Socialism could still create resistance networks at this stage, which was crucial for their sector's subsequent development. The pace and degree of Nazification was influenced by various factors. In institutions where NS quickly obtained key positions, it became very difficult to develop or maintain open collective resistance. Similarly, in the short term, leaders' positions were often a crucial factor in how their followers or subordinates chose to act. Long-term, as Bernhard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio pointed out, leaders created mechanisms for, 'the reinforcement of norms and behaviors expressed within the boundaries of the culture'.⁹⁴

One example illustrating these factors' effects involved the actions of Kristiansand's chief of police, Christian Rynning-Tønnesen, and his men. In December 1940, Rynning-Tønnesen resigned from his position in response to a demand from the Ministry of the Police that the police should cooperate closely with the NS paramilitary unit, the *Hird*. Inspired by his example, 61 of his 64 men followed suit. The occupiers, along with Jonas Lie, reacted quickly, and removed Rynning-Tønnesen. Leaderless, his men returned to their jobs.⁹⁵

The events in Kristiansand thus provide us with an alternative scenario for the Norwegian police: policemen would risk their livelihoods given inspired leadership and collective support. Furthermore, in 1940 the risks of joining such actions were still relatively small. However, as Rynning-Tønnesen himself pointed out after the war, the Norwegian police, 'did not think, feel and act as a cohesive unit'.⁹⁶ Social, ideological, and geographical divisions and a dire lack of unified anti-Nazi leadership prevented the Norwegian police from collectively mobilizing against Nazification. Symptomatically, the events in Kristiansand did not lead to similar actions elsewhere.

In contrast to the teachers, where opponents of National Socialism quickly went on the offensive and created common positions and groups to coordinate a response, little of a similar character happened among Norwegian policemen. Many of those who could have initiated such a response in fact *joined* NS after encouragement and pressure from superiors and peers, most notably Jonas Lie. In some towns, whole police corps became NS members, and NS sympathizers in the ranks often played crucial roles in facilitating this development. By January 1941, 30% of Norwegian policemen had joined the ranks of the party. Developments in the police were, in the words of resistance organizer Gjelsvik, 'a tragic disaster, caused by poor leadership of the police's organization and lack of countermeasures'.⁹⁷

However, the lack of cohesion meant that the events could play out very differently from town to town. Depending on the views of local leaders and developing dynamics, party membership rates and resistance varied greatly, as did the meaning of NS

membership in the police.⁹⁸ Divided and mostly leaderless on the national level, the police could not organize potent opposition to unacceptable demands, such as collectively threatening to resign. Combined with the previously described effects of German coercion and the influx of National Socialists into the force, the police ended up carrying out ever more radical orders, most notably, arresting Norwegian Jews.

Despite this, even the majority of police officers that were not National Socialists viewed remaining in the force as the 'lesser evil', and this view was tacitly accepted by national leaders. Before he had to flee Oslo on 9 April 1940, Minister of Justice Terje Wold had time to give Oslo chief of police Kristian Welhaven one order: to, 'under all circumstances remain at his post, meet the German forces and defend the interests of the people in the best possible manner'.⁹⁹ In August 1943, resistance members in the police asked the central Norwegian resistance leadership whether it was now better to direct opponents of National Socialism to quit the force, rather than continuing to serve under the prevailing conditions. The answer was a directive stating that such police officers were so valuable for shielding the population and aiding the resistance effort that they should remain at their posts. This acknowledged that they would then carry out illegitimate orders 'up to a certain degree'.¹⁰⁰ The perceived alternative – a police force of National Socialists – was seen as highly detrimental to the Norwegian population.

This view cannot simply be dismissed as cowardice or opportunism. There are many examples of policemen offering resistance, including warning Jews of their coming arrest.¹⁰¹ But such acts by a minority also provided the wider police with an alibi, preventing it from being deemed beyond redemption by resistance leaders or the government in exile. Comforted by this lack of condemnation, many police officers thus continued to dutifully carry out the occupier's orders. The case of the police clearly shows the moral difficulties accompanying the logic of pragmatic collaboration.

As in the police, considerable differences existed within the ministerial bureaucracy. In some departments and offices, a spirit of opposition spread among employees, sometimes leading to organized resistance efforts. In others, the forces opposing NS and the German occupier had little impact, and became isolated to a large extent. Emergence of these various patterns was closely related to the three factors already mentioned – the pace and intensity of Nazification, leadership, and timing of collective engagement.

Developments within the Ministry of Police and the Ministry of Justice clearly show the significance of leadership and timing. Civil servants in the Ministry of Justice managed to formulate an early collective line for 'proper' collaboration during the autumn of 1940. Most civil servants who did not join NS rejected handling so-called political cases, leaving them to party members. An important task was also to prevent colleagues from joining NS, and the 'old' civil servants set a clear example. In fact, none of the director generals leading the ministry's three main departments had joined the party by 25 September 1940.¹⁰²

Within the Ministry of the Police, the situation was quite different; no collective front was established against NS. Indeed, as in the police, several of the original senior civil servants ended up joining NS. Therefore, in contrast to the Ministry of Justice and similar to the police as a whole, no clear borders were established by non-members of NS between necessary, pragmatic, and improper forms of collaboration. To a large extent, resistance thus became limited to isolated individual acts of non-conformity, rather than organized and collective forms. Still, it should be noted that the overall attitude towards the German occupation power turned more negative after the tide of the war turned in early 1943.¹⁰³

Developments within the Ministry of Supplies provides further evidence of the importance of time, pace and intensity of Nazification, and leadership. Øystein Ravner, the commissary minister leading the ministry before 1 February 1942, had little sympathy for NS. In fact, during his trial in 1947, the court concluded that Ravner had actively resisted the party's Nazification efforts.¹⁰⁴ Nearly all of the leading civil servants working under Ravner were also opponents of NS.¹⁰⁵ To no one's surprise, during 1940 and 1941, a collective spirit of opposition against the 'New Order' developed within the ministry. In September 1941, Quisling stated in a letter to Terboven that this institution and the other economic ministries had a nearly 100% anti-German staff.¹⁰⁶

After the ministry became partly Nazified from February 1942 onwards, strong collective resistance only persisted within the departments and offices where the original leaders remained in place. In contrast, in offices and departments with new NS leadership, the collective culture of resistance was considerably weakened. Resistance was reduced to either secret activities or individual acts of non-conforming behaviour, akin to the patterns seen in the Ministry of the Police.¹⁰⁷

Compared to the ministerial bureaucracy and the police, the school sector undoubtedly showed the most comprehensive resistance.¹⁰⁸ As mentioned, attempts to bring the school sector into line started the day the 'New Order' was announced. The Ministry of Church and Educational Affairs and its leader, Ragnar Skancke, were thereafter in permanent conflict with school sector employees.

The first major collision arose from a demand for loyalty sent to every teacher by the ministry in November 1940.¹⁰⁹ Demonstrating their ability to quickly mobilize, the teacher organizations issued a directive calling for teachers to follow their conscience, and huge numbers of teachers refused to declare loyalty to the new regime. This was a major sign of defiance and set the tone for subsequent developments.¹¹⁰ It is also significant because it happened when Nazi Germany remained victorious on all fronts. Even after being forced underground in the summer of 1941, the teacher organizations continued to coordinate resistance.¹¹¹ The contrast to the police, where two police union leaders *aided* Nazification, is stark.

Not to be dissuaded, both the ministry and NS continued their efforts. In addition to constantly pressuring teachers, the ministry launched a text book reform to ensure teaching was in line with the National Socialist worldview.¹¹² However, most teachers sabotaged these attempts, and the ministry lacked the ability to enforce them, rendering the reform largely impotent.¹¹³

The ultimate test of strength between NS and teachers' resistance networks came in February 1942, following the previously mentioned laws regarding Norway's Union of Teachers and service in the NS Youth Organization. In response to these laws, a teacher action committee met and formulated new teacher directives declaring non-cooperation; a majority of Norwegian teachers subsequently refused to participate in a National Socialist education or join Norway's Union of Teachers. These efforts resonated beyond their own sector and gained crucial support from the State Church and tens of thousands of parents.¹¹⁴

What were the reasons behind the teachers' resistance effectiveness? Above all, a combination of prevailing values, potent organizations, and strong leadership made it comparatively easy for them to mobilize. First, as mentioned, most teachers were intrinsically hostile to National Socialist values. Second, they had strong organizations and

leaders, who cooperated closely during the occupation,¹¹⁵ offering moral guidance and concrete directives for how teachers should act.¹¹⁶ Third, the teachers' leadership also established close contacts with the wider resistance movement¹¹⁷; using their communication channels together with its own infrastructure to form a nearly nationwide network through which it could encourage and coordinate protest.¹¹⁸ Finally, the strong cooperation with and support from the Norwegian State Church and Norwegian parents showed teachers that they had overwhelming popular support, which led to even more teachers joining the resistance.¹¹⁹

Nevertheless, we should emphasize that the teachers had an easier task than many other groups. Rather than dealing with strong and radical German authorities, they mostly faced NS, which proved a weak antagonist and exacerbated this weakness by committing numerous political blunders. When Reichskommissar Terboven decided to intervene in the spring of 1942, the teachers' resistance had already achieved important objectives. By autumn 1942, NS had given up most of the radical Nazification attempts they had directed against the schools. For the remaining two and half years of German occupation, the school struggle transformed into a sort of trench warfare.

Conclusion

In autumn 1942, U. S. president Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered a speech during the launch of a new Norwegian Navy vessel, during which he praised the Norwegian civil resistance and its struggle for democracy:

If there is anyone who still wonders why this war is being fought, let him look to Norway. If there is anyone who has any delusions that this war could have been averted, let him look to Norway; and if there is anyone who doubts the democratic will to win, again I say, let him look to Norway.¹²⁰

The Norwegian teachers' struggle was a major inspiration for Roosevelt's speech, and the teachers' efforts and achievements were indeed impressive. Leading figures were clear-eyed about the nature of National Socialism and showed a remarkable ability to organize. Thousands of Norwegian teachers were willing to heed their call for resistance, not knowing what the consequences might be. The contrast to the Norwegian police is particularly stark, where far fewer were willing or able to take similar action.

Nevertheless, it is imperative to underline the relatively favourable conditions the teachers enjoyed. It is hard to envision similar success if the authorities had cracked down on them earlier and more decisively, akin to their reaction to unruly police officers. Ultimately, the character of resistance and collaboration that evolved among Norwegian public servants was decided, to a large extent, by the occupier's framework and resulting policies. As Gerhard Hirschfeld noted, 'a history of collaboration by the populace of a country is always simultaneously a history of the occupying power'.¹²¹

Hirschfeld has also argued against a dichotomous understanding of collaboration and resistance, which he says does not capture the complex relations between occupier and occupied. In fact, he asserted that such boundaries 'are actually quite fluid'.¹²² This point is clearly transferable to the Norwegian case, and in particular to the Norwegian police and ministerial bureaucracy. To stay within these institutions implied collaboration in one form or another, but such collaboration could be combined with acts of resistance and

non-conformity, which, in turn, justified opponents of the 'New Order' remaining in their positions. Furthermore, the form and extent of collaboration varied greatly, often owing to a group's ability to define and enforce boundaries between 'acceptable' and 'improper' forms of collaboration in different contexts and at different stages.

These perspectives have implications beyond the concrete cases discussed in this article. We argue that the three main factors described also represent a fruitful framework for analysing structures and developments elsewhere in Nazi-occupied Europe.

Notes

1. All Norwegian and German quotes translated by the authors of this article.
2. *Dokumenter i offentlig straffesak mot Vidkun Quisling*, 57.
3. See Hetland, "In the Shadow of the SS"; Ringdal, *Mellom barken og veden*; Arnli, "Det norske politiet"; and Johansen, "Rettsoppgjøret med statspolitiet," 47–92.
4. See Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand"; Støen, "Justisdepartementet under okkupasjonen"; Debes, *Sentraladministrasjonens historie*; Kolsrud, *En splintret stat*; Sørensen, *Solkors og solidaritet*, 154–66; and Foss, "Direktoratet for proviantering og rasjonering."
5. Karcher, *Kampen om skolen*; Wyller, *Nyordning og motstand*; Røssum, "Skolepolitikk og lærerstrid"; Kvam, *Skolefronten*; Lien, "En ny ånd i skolen"; Aartun, *Motstandskampen i skolene*; and Birkemo, *Kampen om kateteret*.
6. See Nøkleby, *Nyordning*; Nøkleby, *Holdningskamp*.
7. Wyller, *Nyordning og motstand*.
8. The definition is based on Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand," 20–1.
9. *Ibid.*, 26–7.
10. Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand," 27–8; Støen, "Justisdepartementet under okkupasjonen"; Grimnes, *Norge under okkupasjonen*, 44–5. See also Moland, "Massiv motstand mot nazismen."
11. Debes, *Sentraladministrasjonens historie*, 66–7.
12. See e.g. on German "race research" and its corresponding networks which ran in that direction, Karcher, "Zwischen Nationalsozialismus und nordischer Gesinnung," 55–95. For details on Norway and plans for a future "Greater Germanic Reich", see Emberland and Kott, *Himmlers Norge*.
13. Bohn, *Reichskommissariat Norwegen*, 57.
14. On this, see e.g. Skodvin, *Striden om okkupasjonsstyret*; and Loock, *Quisling, Rosenberg und Terboven*.
15. Emberland and Kott, *Himmlers Norge*, 117–9, 123–4.
16. Bohn, *Reichskommissariat Norwegen*, 57–65; Bohn, "Die Instrumentarien der deutschen Herrschaft," 72–109; and Skodvin, *Striden om okkupasjonsstyret*, 194–209.
17. For a discussion on why, see Dahl, *En fører for fall*, 147, 152–8.
18. Skodvin, *Striden om okkupasjonsstyret*, 194–209; and Loock, *Quisling, Rosenberg und Terboven*, 325–6.
19. Dahl, *En fører blir til*, 417–36; Brevig and de Figueiredo, *Den norske fascismen*, 150–201.
20. Minister of Agriculture Thorstein Fredheim joined NS in 1941. Dahl, *En fører for fall*, 167.
21. Bohn, *Reichskommissariat Norwegen*, 194–216.
22. Karcher, *Kampen om skolen*, 48–52.
23. *Ibid.*, 54–5.
24. This was e.g. described by Huhnhäuser. See *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* (IfZ), Alfred Huhnhäuser, ED 69–1–18 and ED 69–1–31. Skilled players include leader of the Norwegian State Police, Karl Marthinsen, and the Minister of Economics from 1944, Alf Whist. See e.g. Bohn, *Reichskommissariat Norwegen*, 203–11; Hetland, "In the Shadow of the SS," 212.
25. See e.g. Dahl, *En fører for fall*, 275–8.

26. This was the clear conclusion of the Norwegian Supreme Court. See Schelderup, *Fra Norges kamp for retten*, 183–9, 217–9.
27. Gjelsvik, *Hjemmefronten*, 23.
28. For a discussion of this, see Graver, “Jussens helter 11”; Hirschfeld, *Nazi Rule*, 132–81, esp. 133; Jackson, *France: The Dark Years*, 133–6.
29. Dybvig and Korsnes, *Wehrmacht i Norge*.
30. Kraglund and Moland, *Hjemmefront*, 115–8.
31. Milward, *The Fascist Economy*, 35.
32. Simonsen, “Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand,” 138–42.
33. Kraglund and Moland, *Hjemmefront*, 8.
34. Karcher, *Kampen om skolen*, 116.
35. See Wyller, *Nyordning og motstand*, 3–6; Karcher, *Kampen om skolen*, 39–41; and Orvar Sæther, “Lærerne må sette alt inn, hver i sin skole, for å skape Norge fritt og stort,” *Norsk Skuleblad*, October 25, 1941.
36. Karcher, “A National Socialist school,” 1–18. See especially the emphasis on the importance of Christian faith, which was already stressed in the party programme of NS of 1934. Party programme of NS, cited in Irmann-Jacobsen (ed.), *De politiske partiers programmer*, 302; Bakke, *Skolen og tiden*, 34–7; Lien, “En ny ånd i skolen,” 75–6. On National Socialist school education in Germany, see e.g. Karcher, *Kampen om skolen*, e.g. 31–44.
37. See e.g. the works of “race researcher” Halfdan Bryn on this topic such as *Der Nordische Mensch*.
38. An example on this were the conflicts between the nationalist and the pan-germanic fraction within the NSUF. See Kvistad, *Det unge Norges fylking klar til strid*, 457–62.
39. It was e.g. no secret that Terboven considered Quisling as “stupid” and that he would have preferred to get rid of him. See Bohn, *Reichskommissariat Norwegen*, 10; Alfred Huhnhäuser’s testimonies during the treason trials, among others cited in Lødrup, *Læreraksjonens sanne bakgrunn*, 49.
40. Karcher, *Kampen om skolen*, 126–34.
41. See IfZ, Huhnhäuser, ED 69–1–20 until ED 69–1–23, ED 69–1–31.
42. See IfZ, Huhnhäuser, ED 69–1–33 until ED 69–1–42, ED 69–3–80 [back page], Huhnhäuser to high court attorney Bugge, 14 October 1948.
43. See more concretely Karcher, *Kampen om skolen*, 134–7.
44. *Norsk Skuleblad*, February 14, 1942; *Fritt Folk*, February 9, 1942.
45. *Norges Hjemmefrontmuseum* (NHM), 301 Olav Kvalheim, MP 5 Beretning av Skancke under landssvikoppjøret, Quisling to Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 16 March 1942, Quisling to Departementet for Arbeidstjeneste og Idrett, March 16, 1942.
46. See *Riksarkivet Oslo* (RA), L-sak Orvar Sæther, eske 1, mappe dok. 1–23, Avhør av Skancke i Oslo kretsfengsel, October 2, 1945; IfZ, ED 69–6–38; NHM, 59 Lærerstriden, materiale ang. skolen, rundskriv, February 23, 1942; NHM, 222 Ragnar Skancke, beretning av Skancke under landssviksoppjøret [undated, 1948]; SD-rapport BdSudSD Oslo, Meldungen aus Norwegen Nr. 36 vom 14. März 1942, Auszug des [APA] von S. 38, in *Meldungen aus Norwegen*. Vol. 2, 571; Røssum, ‘Skolepolitikk og lærerstrid,’ 81; Wyller, *Nyordning og motstand*, 104, 112–3; and Gjelsvik, *Hjemmefronten*, 68–9.
47. Wyller, *Nyordning og motstand*, 126.
48. Kjeldstadli, *Hjemmestyrkene*, 118.
49. Emberland and Kott, *Himmlers Norge*, 169–70.
50. Hetland, “In the Shadow of the SS,” 90–6.
51. RA, L-sak Christopher Lange, “Die Festnahme von Polizeibeamten am 16. August 1943 – (Polizeiaktion ‘Polarkreis’),” postwar report by Georg Bauer, 4 October 1946.
52. Walle, *Norsk politi bak piggråd*, 20.
53. RA, L-sak Betuel A. Stangeland, letter from Ragnar Paulsen to Betuel A. Stangeland, November 13, 1952.
54. Hetland, “In the Shadow of the SS,” 133, 161, 344.
55. *Ibid.*, 116, 134.

56. Debes, *Sentraladministrasjonens historie*, 66; and Grimnes, "Okkupasjon og politikk," 92–3.
57. For details, see Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand," 166–7.
58. See RA, S–3978, L0032, mappe merket "Jøder", letter from BdS to the Ministry of the Police, 10 October 1942; Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand," 182–3; and Bruland, *Holocaust i Norge*, 183–92.
59. Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand," 186–8.
60. Emberland and Kott, *Himmlers Norge*, 140–1.
61. Bohn, *Reichkommisariat Norwegen*, 264.
62. Dahl, *En fører for fall*, 167.
63. RA, Oslo Politikammer, L-sak Carl Hildisch, henlagt etter bevisets stilling, box 2, note from Karl Blankenagel, October 8, 1943; Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand," 271–2.
64. See e.g. "Retten og plikten," *Norsk Politiblad*, no. 5 (1930).
65. RA, L-sak Ingvald B. Eikeland, Stavanger Politikammer, "'NS' press mot politifolk i Stavanger. Deres brev av 10.8.," letter from Ola Kvalsund to Landssvikavdelingen, 28 August 1945.
66. RA, S–2220–O–Oc, L0029, "Alminnelig instruks for rikets polititjenestemenn."
67. Policeman Thorleif Karlsen claimed that a "policeman ought to be neutral, the servant of everyone. That was the official message." Karlsen, *Lang dag i politiet*, 41.
68. See e.g. *Ibid.*
69. Hetland, "In the Shadow of the SS," 49–51.
70. Nøkleby, *Politigeneral og hirdsjef*, 24.
71. For a discussion of this, see Johansen, *Samfunnets pansrede neve*, 11–5, 72–3, 121–3; Hetland, "In the Shadow of the SS," 44–6, 65; and Roughtvedt, *Med penn og pistol*, 163–8.
72. Hetland, "In the Shadow of the SS," 39–41.
73. RA, S3978–F, L0004, Circular letter from the Ministry of the Police, December 14, 1940.
74. "Politiets tjenestemenn," *Norsk Politiblad*, no. 12 (1940).
75. See Johansen, *Oss selv nærmest*, 168.
76. Hetland, "In the Shadow of the SS," 307; Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand," 182.
77. See e.g. Haaland, "Administrasjon og politikk," 111–46, esp. 117–23, 127–9; Solumsmoen, "Fra byråkrati til teknobyråkrati," 64; and Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand," 36–9.
78. Haaland, "Administrasjon og politikk," 133–4.
79. Mathiesen, "Moderne forvaltning," esp. 396–9.
80. Only 3,5% of the "old" staff joined NS, according to a survey from 1953. See Arctander, "NS-medlemmer og andre i statstjenesten," 356, 359.
81. Sverre Riisnæs, "Din plikt," 5. For similar perspectives, see also Rolf Jørgen Fuglesang, "Parti og stat," 23.
82. For details, see Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand," 157–202.
83. Rune Slagstad, *De nasjonale strateger*, 107, 122–3.
84. Hagemann, *Skolefolk*, 35–62.
85. Slagstad, *De nasjonale strateger*, 122–3.
86. Slagstad, *De nasjonale strateger*, 107, 122–3. See e.g. school education in Germany especially after the establishment of the German Empire in 1871. See among others Wehler, *Nationalismus*, 62–89; Ullrich, *Die nervöse Großmacht*, 343; and Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology*, 150–3.
87. See e.g. Karcher, *Kampen om skolen*, 143–4.
88. *Ibid.*, 166–74.
89. See esp. Hassing, *Church Resistance to Nazism*, 119–29.
90. Orvar Sæther, "Lærerne må sette alt inn, hver i sin skole, for å skape Norge fritt og stort," *Norsk Skuleblad*, October 25, 1941.
91. "Skolemøtet i Oslo, August 17, 1941," *Norsk Skuleblad*, August 23, 1941.
92. Nøkleby, *Holdningskamp*, 250.
93. Wyller, *Nyordning og motstand*, 3–53.
94. Bass and Avolio, "Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture," 113.

95. "Det norske politis motstand mot NS og tyskerne under okkupasjonen, Kristiansandskorpset," *Politiembetsmennenes Blad*, no. 2 (1948).
96. *Ibid.*
97. Gjelsvik, *Hjemmefronten*, 29.
98. See Hetland, "In the Shadow of the SS," 200–1; and Ringdal, *Mellom barken og veden*, 41.
99. Stortinget, *Innstilling fra Undersøkelseskommissjonen*, 127.
100. Gjelsvik, *Hjemmefronten*, 125. For the exact transcript, see RA, L-sak Knut Rød, "Erklæring" by Tage Petterson and Lars L'Abbè-Lund, January 3, 1947.
101. See here Bruland, *Holocaust i Norge*, 402–10; and Ringdal, *Mellom barken og veden*, 266–80.
102. Støen, "Justisdepartementet under okkupasjonen," 31–6; 89–90.
103. Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand," 248; 265–7.
104. See RA, Oslo Politikammer, L-sak Øystein Ravner, eske 2, rettsprotokoll Eidsivating lagmannsrett, March 21, 1947.
105. Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon og motstand," 98.
106. *Straffesak mot Vidkun A.L.J. Quisling*, 123.
107. See particularly Foss, "Direktoratet for proviantering og rasjonering"; and Simonsen, "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand," 259–76.
108. This was not universal, however. See in detail Karcher, *Kampen om skolen*, 79–105.
109. RA, L-sak Ragnar Skancke, eske 1, mappe dok. 1b (2), vedlegg til "Rundskriv til våre lærere fra Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet," November 20, 1940.
110. See Wyller, *Nyordning og motstand*, 15.
111. See e.g. *Ibid.*, 29–36.
112. Birkemo, *Kampen om kateteret*, 55; Lien, "En ny ånd i skolen," 26–7; "Skolen i det nye Norge skal få et fullstendig fagstyre," *Fritt Folk*, November 19, 1940; RA, L-sak Ragnar Skancke, eske 1, mappe dok. 1a (1), Tiltalebeslutning, March 6, 1946.
113. See e.g. Wyller, *Nyordning og motstand*, 29–36.
114. For a concise overview, see Karcher, *Kampen om skolen*, 152–7.
115. See e.g. Kvam, *Skolefronten*, 112–4.
116. See e.g. teacher Einar Høigård, first leader of the school front, who formulated the so-called cardinal points for resistance. NHM, 59 Lærerstrid, resistance circular "Til lærere som ennå ikke har meldt seg ut av sin organisasjon" [undated, 1942]. See also Norum et al. (eds.), *Einar Høigård*; Tveit (ed.), *Minneseminar om Einar Høigård*; and Kvam, *Skolefronten*, 172–88, 258–71.
117. Wyller, *Nyordning og motstand*, 21; Grimnes, *Hjemmefrontens ledelse*, 71, 77, 166; Gjelsvik, *Hjemmefronten*, 60–3; and Birkemo, *Kampen om kateteret*, 123.
118. However, information about the protest did not reach each part of Norway in time. See e.g. Hagemann, *Skolefolk*, 201–2.
119. See e.g. Karcher, *Kampen om skolen*, 154–5.
120. Roosevelt, "Look to Norway."
121. Hirschfeld, *Collaboration and Attentism*, 468.
122. Hirschfeld, *Nazi Rule and Dutch Collaboration*, 5.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Ø. Hetland is a historian and research adviser at the Norwegian Center for Holocaust and Minority Studies. He has been a PhD-candidate and project coordinator at the same institution. Hetland obtained his PhD degree at the University of Oslo in 2020, with a dissertation on the Norwegian police in Nazi-occupied Norway from 1940 to 1945. His research interests include National Socialism, occupation history, and the Holocaust in Norway. Hetland is co-editor of the volume *From Patriotic*

Memory to a Universalistic Narrative? Shifts in Norwegian Memory Culture after 1945 in Comparative Perspective, Essen: Klartext, 2014.

N. Karcher is a historian and associate professor of social science at the University College of Østfold, Norway. She has been a researcher at the Norwegian Center for Holocaust and Minority Studies conducting a project on the school sector in Nazi-occupied Norway. Karcher obtained her PhD degree at the University of Oslo in 2012, with a dissertation on Norwegian-German fascist networks in the interwar period. Her research interests include fascism, far right extremism, and occupation history, particularly with respect to the Nordic countries. In addition to several articles, she authored a monograph on Norwegian Nazification policy and civil resistance (*Kampen om skolen. Nazifisering og lærernes motstand i det okkuperte Norge*, Oslo: Dreyers forlag 2018) and co-edited the volume *Movements and Ideas of the Extreme Right in Europe. Positions and Continuities*, Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang Publishing Group, 2012.

K. B. Simonsen is a historian and researcher at the Jewish Museum in Oslo, Norway. He has been working as a PhD-candidate and research assistant at the Norwegian Center for Holocaust and Minority Studies. Simonsen obtained his PhD degree at the University of Oslo in 2016, with a dissertation on collaboration and resistance in the ministerial bureaucracy in German-occupied Norway from 1940 to 1945. His research interests include antisemitism, conspiracy theories, and occupation history in Norway. Simonsen has published several articles on these topics and co-edited the volume *Historie og moral. Nazismen, jødene og hjemmefronten* (Oslo: Dreyers forlag 2020).

References

- Aartun, Leif Brynjulv, and Sigurd Aartun. *Motstandskampen i skolene 1940–42: Lærerstriden mot nazifiseringen*. Oslo: Orion, 2003.
- Arctander, Signy. "NS-medlemmer og andre i statstjenesten som viste unasjonale holdninger under okkupasjonen." *Statistiske Meldinger. Monthly Bulletin of the Central Bureau of Statistics of Norway*, no. 12 (1953): 351–363.
- Arnli, Jan. "Det norske politi i tida 1938 til våren 1941, med spesielt siktepunkt å belyse etatens relativt store oppslutning Om Nasjonal Samling." MA thesis, University of Oslo, 1976.
- Bakke, Jørgen. *Skolen Og Tiden*. Oslo: Gunnar Stenersens forlag, 1941.
- Bass, Bernhard M., and Bruce J. Avolio. "Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture." *Public Administration Quarterly* 17, no. 1 (1993): 112–121.
- Birkemo, Asbjørn. *Kampen om kateteret: Skolepolitikk og pedagogikk i Norge 1940–1945*. Oslo: Unipub, 2000.
- Bohn, Robert. "Die Instrumentarien der deutschen Herrschaft im Reichskommissariat Norwegen." In *Die deutsche Herrschaft in den "germanischen" Ländern 1940–1945*, edited by Robert Bohn, 71–110. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1997.
- Bohn, Robert. *Reichskommissariat Norwegen: "Nationalsozialistische Neuordnung" und Kriegswirtschaft*. München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2000.
- Brevig, Hans Olaf, and Ivo de Figueiredo. *Den norske fascismen: Nasjonal Samling 1933–1940*. Oslo: Pax, 2002.
- Bruland, Bjarte. *Holocaust i Norge: Registrering. Deportasjon. Tilintetgjørelse*. Oslo: Dreyers forlag, 2017.
- Bryn, Halfdan. *Der Nordische Mensch: Die Merkmale der nordischen Rasse mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der rassistischen Verhältnisse Norwegens*. Munich: Lehmanns Verlag, 1929.
- Dahl, Hans Fredrik. *En fører blir til. Vol. 1 Of Vidkun Quisling*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1991.
- Dahl, Hans Fredrik. *En fører for fall. Vol. 2 Of Vidkun Quisling*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1992.
- Debes, Jan. *1940–1945. Vol. 5 of Sentraladministrasjonens Historie*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1980.
- Dokumenter i offentlig straffesak mot Vidkun Quisling*. Oslo: Oscar Andersens Boktrykkeri, 1945.
- Emberland, Terje, and Matthew Kott. *Himmlers Norge: Nordmenn i det storgermanske prosjekt*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 2012.

- Foss, Joar. "Direktoratet for proviantering og rasjonering under den tyske okkupasjonen: En studie i motstandsvirksomhet innen sentraladministrasjonen." MA thesis, University of Oslo, 1981.
- Fuglesang, Rolf Jørgen. "Parti og stat." In *Norges nyreiseing: Artikler om kulturelle og politiske spørsmål, holdt som foredrag i serien "Norges nyreiseing"*, 19–29. Oslo: Gunnar Stenersens forlag, 1942.
- Gjelsvik, Tore. *Hjemmefronten: Den sivile motstand under okkupasjonen 1940–1945*. Oslo: J.W. Cappelens forlag, 1977.
- Graver, Hans Petter. "Jussens helter 11: Høyesteretts nei." *Juridika*. Accessed September 24, 2020. <https://juridika.no/innsikt/jussens-helter-hoyesterett-i-1940>
- Grimnes, Ole Kristian. *Hjemmefrontens ledelse: Norge og den 2. verdenskrig*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1979.
- Grimnes, Ole Kristian. *Norge under okkupasjonen*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1983.
- Grimnes, Ole Kristian. "Okkupasjon og politikk i Norge." In *Danske tilstander. Norske tilstander*, edited by Hans Fredrik Dahl, Hans Kirchoff, Joachim Lund, and Lars-Erik Vaale, 89–113. Oslo: Forlaget press, 2010.
- Haaland, Torstein. "Administrasjon og politikk i Norges statshistorie 1814–2000." PhD diss., University of Oslo, 2005.
- Hagemann, Gro. *Skolefolk: Lærernes historie i Norge*. Oslo: Gyldendal, 1992.
- Hassing, Arne. *Church Resistance to Nazism in Norway 1940–1945*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2014.
- Hetland, Øystein. "In the Shadow of the SS. Three Norwegian Police Districts 1940–1945." PhD diss., University of Oslo, 2020.
- Hirschfeld, Gerhard. "Collaboration and Attentism in the Netherlands 1940–41." *Journal of Contemporary History* 16, no. 3 (1981): 467–486. doi:10.1177/002200948101600304.
- Hirschfeld, Gerhard. *Nazi Rule and Dutch Collaboration: Netherlands under German Occupation, 1940–45*. Oxford: Berg, 1988.
- Hobson, Rolf. "Weserübung in German and Norwegian Historiography." In *Northern European Overture to War, 1939–1941: From Memel to Barbarossa*, edited by Michael H. Clemmesen and Marcus S. Faulkner, 447–463. Leiden/Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2013.
- Irmann-Jacobsen, Hans, ed. *De politiske partiers programmer ved Stortingsvalget 1927–1936*. Oslo: Statsvitenskapelig institutt, 1961.
- Jackson, Julian. *France: The Dark Years 1940–1944*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Johansen, Per Ole. *Oss selv nærmest: Norge og jødene 1914–1943*. Oslo: Gyldendal, 1984.
- Johansen, Per Ole. "Samfunnets pansrede neve": *Statspoliti og ekstraordinær overvåkning 1918–1941*. Oslo: Gyldendal, 1989.
- Johansen, Per Ole, ed. *På siden av rettsoppjøret*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2006.
- Johansen, Per Ole. "Rettsoppjøret med statspolitiet." In *På siden av rettsoppjøret*, edited by Per Ole Johansen, 47–92. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2006.
- Karcher, Nicola. "Schirmorganisation der Nordischen Bewegung. Der Nordische Ring und seine Repräsentanten in Norwegen 1926–1936." *NordeuropaForum* 1 (2009): 7–35.
- Karcher, Nicola. "Zwischen Nationalsozialismus und nordischer Gesinnung: Eine Studie zu den rechtsgerichteten Verbindungen norwegisch-deutscher Milieus in der Zwischenkriegszeit." PhD diss., University of Oslo, 2012.
- Karcher, Nicola. *Kampen om skolen: Nazifisering og lærernes motstand i det okkuperte Norge*. Oslo: Dreyers forlag, 2018.
- Karcher, Nicola. "A National Socialist School for Norway: Concepts of Nazification during the German Occupation." *Paedagogica Historica* (2019): 1–18. doi:10.1080/00309230.2019.1675728.
- Karlsen, Thorleif. *Lang dag i politiet: Erindringer*. Oslo: Gyldendal, 1979.
- Kjeldstadli, Sverre. *Hjemmestyrene: Hovedtrekkene ved den militære motstanden under okkupasjonen*. Nesøya: Bokstav&Bilde, 1959.
- Kolsrud, Ole. *En splintret stat: Regjeringskontorene 1940–1945*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2004.
- Korsnes, Kjetil, and Olve Dybvig. "Wehrmacht i Norge: Antall tysk personell i Norge fra april 1940 til mai 1945 [Report]." University of Tromsø/Narvik War&Peace Centre, 2018.
- Kraglund, Ivar, and Arnfinn Moland. *Hjemmefront. Vol. 6 of Norge i Krig*. edited by Magne Skodvin. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1987.

- Kvam, Vegard. *Skolefronten: Einar Høigård og norske lærernes kamp mot nazismen*. Oslo: Scandinavian Academic Press, 2013.
- Kvistad, John Mikal. "Det unge Norges fylking klar til slag," PhD diss., University of Oslo, 2011.
- Landssvikavdeling, Eidsivating lagstols, ed. *Straffesak mot Vidkun A.L.J. Quisling*. Oslo: Avdelingen, 1946.
- Larsen, Stein Ugelvik, Beatrice Sandberg, and Volker Dahm, eds. *Meldungen aus Norwegen: 1940–1945. Die geheimen Lageberichte des Befehlshabers der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD in Norwegen*. Vol. 2. Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2008.
- Lien, Andreas Bagås. "En ny ånd i skolen: Nasjonal Samlings skolepolitikk 25.9.1940–31.12.1942." MA thesis, University of Oslo, 2013.
- Lødrup, Hans. *Læreraksjonens sanne bakgrunn: Noen vitneprov*. Kristiansund: self-publishing company, 1948.
- Loock, Hans-Dietrich. *Quisling, Rosenberg und Terboven: Zur Vorgeschichte und Geschichte der nationalsozialistischen Revolution in Norwegen*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1970.
- Mathiesen, Thomas. "Moderne forvaltning fra embets- til bedriftskultur." In *Veien mot rettsstudiet*, edited by Erik Boe, 396–409. Oslo: Tano, 1996.
- Milward, Alan. *The Fascist Economy in Norway*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Moland, Arnfinn. "Massiv motstand mot nazismen." *Aftenposten*. Accessed 17 May 2015. <https://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/kronikk/i/Wk3k/kronikk-massiv-sivil-motstand-mot-nazismen>
- Mosse, Georg L. *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich*. New York: Howard Fertig, 1998.
- Nøkleby, Berit. *Nyordning. Vol. 2 of Norge i krig*. edited by Magne Skodvin. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1985.
- Nøkleby, Berit. *Holdningskamp. Vol. 4 of Norge i krig*. edited by Magne Skodvin. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1986.
- Nøkleby, Berit. *Politigeneral og hirdsjef: Karl A. Marthinsen*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 2011.
- Norum, Kåre, Anne-Margretha Hanssen, and Odd Tyrhjel, eds. *Einar Høigård: Et minneskrift*. Oslo: J. W. Cappelens forlag, 1965.
- Riisnæs, Sverre. *Din plikt i dag som Nordmann og Tjenestemann. Tale av minister Sverre Riisnæs ved politisjefkonferansen i Oslo 10–11 1942*. Oslo: Nasjonal Samlings rikstrykkeri, undated.
- Ringdal, Nils Johan. *Mellom barken og veden*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1987.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. "Look to Norway." Radio speech. Washington DC, September 16, 1942, ed. Norsk kringkasting.
- Røssum, Per Trygve. "Skolepolitikk og lærerstrid 1940–1943." MA thesis, University of Oslo, 1981.
- Roughtvedt, Bernt. *Med penn og pistol. En biografi om politimester Jonas Lie*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm, 2010.
- Schjelderup, Ferdinand. *Fra Norges kamp for retten: 1940 i Høyesterett*. Oslo: Grøndahl, 1945.
- Simonsen, Kjetil Braut. "Nazifisering, kollaborasjon, motstand: En analyse av Politidepartementet og Forsyningsdepartementet (Næringsdepartementet) 25. september 1940–8. mai 1945." PhD diss., University of Oslo, 2016.
- Skodvin, Magne. *Striden om okkupasjonsstyret i Norge*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget, 1956.
- Slagstad, Rune. *De nasjonale strateger*. Oslo: Pax, 2001.
- Solumsmoen, Dag. "Fra byråkrati til teknobyråkrati: Et perspektiv på norsk sentralforvaltnings utvikling." MA thesis, University of Oslo, 1980.
- Sørensen, Øystein. *Solkors og solidaritet: Høyreautoritær samfunnstenkning i Norge ca. 1930–1945*. Oslo: J.W. Cappelens forlag, 1991.
- Støen, Ane. "Justisdepartementet under okkupasjonen." MA thesis, University of Oslo, 2013.
- Stortinget. *Innstilling fra Undersøkelseskommissjonen av 1945. Vol 1 of Undersøkelseskommissjonen av 1945*. Oslo: Arbeidernes Aktietrykkeri, 1946.
- Tveit, Knut, ed. *Minneseminar om Einar Høigård*. University of Oslo: Pedagogisk forskningsinstitutt, 1994.
- Ullrich, Volker. *Die nervöse Großmacht 1871–1918: Aufstieg und Untergang des deutschen Kaiserreichs*. Frankfurt/M: Fischer, 2007.
- Walle, Olaf R. *Norsk politi bak piggråd: Stutthofpolitiets historier*. Kragerø: Naper boktrykkeri, 1947.
- Wehler, Hans-Ulrich. *Nationalismus: Geschichte, Formen, Folgen*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 2007.
- Wyller, Thomas Christian. *Nyordning og motstand: En framstilling og en analyse av organisasjonenes politiske funksjon under den tyske okkupasjonen 25. 9.1940–25.9.1942*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1958.