

Why does Norway give emergency aid?



(The Humanitarian aid project, 2016)

Fieldwork in Oslo, Norway

One year study/1.year bachelor in Development Studies

Faculty code: UTVÅR1200

Faculty of Education and International Studies, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences

Spring Semester 2017

Submission deadline: 10.may

Number of words: 15737

Ida Helen Rossehaug - Candidatenummer: 141

Piri Babayev - Candidatenummer: 154

I. English abstract

Our fieldwork in Norway lasted for five weeks. During that time we took 10 interviews from the professionals working in the field of foreign aid. Our interviewees ranged everywhere from Norad, The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and The Parliament to big NGOs like Doctors Without Borders, Red Cross, Save Children to name a few. We also spent our time gathering and analysing publicly available data from various sources to learn more about the history of Norwegian humanitarian aid and build a proper understanding of all its nuances. In this paper we tried to answer the questions “Why does Norway give emergency aid?”.

The number of emergency events and its consequences have been on the rise for the past 50 years, and so was the budget allocated to alleviate those effects. Norway has continuously increased foreign aid budget - it had grown from 8.4 million NOK in 1960 up to 36 557 million NOK in 2016, resulting in the total sum of 531 862 million NOK up today. The various criticisms of aid suggests that events in the past have changed the way it is handled today. Is priority number one is still to save human lives and alleviate suffering? Or are there any other reasons to for the government to provide humanitarian aid?

Based on the results from our interviews and research, we divided our findings into two groups. The first one is titled as “traditional” approach - our interviewees believe that Norwegian proactivity as a donor country is explained as a traditional, altruistic intention to help others. The second one, titled as “cynical” approach have different thoughts to as why Norway spends so much money on emergency aid.

The traditional part looks at aid as sincere intention of Norway to help others. It is explained by having a long aid history with a baggage of knowledge and experience; sources to do so; feeling obliged to help those who are less fortunate with their circumstances and to contribute to overall development of less successful countries. A high number of Norwegian population supporting foreign aid and Norwegian peace and reconciliation works can also be considered to support this approach.

The "cynical" approach comes from the "securitization of aid" criticism . Aid is increasingly given to the "fragile states" which are deemed as the source for a number of problems for industrialised countries - like refugees, terrorism, diseases, crime syndicates and others. Emergency aid can be used to prevent the spillover effects of disastrous situations, that could be of some negative influence for the donor countries. Our interviews with NGO representatives have confirmed an increasing influence of country's foreign policy on humanitarian aid - it was described as being politicized and serving the country's own interests. By april 2004 The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has taken over most of the responsibilities from Norad and since then has managed 92% of all emergency aid projects. The situation gets even more complicated since NGOs get funding from the government, and as our interviews showed in some cases the government can decide on what specific projects or how the money should be used on. The response to Syrian crisis and failing to adequately respond to the other emergencies along with the leak of the Foreign Affairs documents are the evidence that support the "cynical" look at Norwegian aid.

But, almost all of our interviewees agreed that one approach does not exclude the other, and the answer to our question is a combination of both. There are clear indications that Norway has other, non-benevolent intentions to provide humanitarian aid. These reasons are taking a toll on potential aid recipients who are far from interest for Norwegian international policy. There is indeed a clear shift from ethically based aid towards more politicised and "securitized" aid, but it does not discard the fact that Norwegian aid policy has been and still is saving lives and alleviates suffering all over the globe.

II. Preface

We would like to thank Simon Pahle for helping us in the start of our work, and helping us getting interviewees. We would like to thank Jill Tove Buseth for helping us through this paper and directing us to the right track. Without their help, we wouldn't have been able to complete our work. We also would like to thank every interviewee for taking some time out of their busy schedule for an interview with us - their expertise and knowledge helped us to properly understand complex nuances of Norwegian humanitarian aid.

Oslo, 2.may

Ida Helen Rossehaug and Piri Babayev

III. Table of Contents

I. English Summary

II. Preface

III. Table of Contents

IV. Abbreviation List

1.	Introduction.....	p. 1
1.1.	Narrowing and defining the scope.....	p. 2
1.2.	Research question.....	p. 3
1.2.1	Choosing our research question.....	p. 3
1.2.2	The structure of report.....	p. 4
2.	Background and Theory.....	p. 6
2.1.	What is Aid and why is it given?.....	p.6
2.1.1	Classifying aid.....	p. 7
2.1.2	Who delivers aid?.....	p. 7
2.2.	Short history of Aid.....	p.8
2.2.1	1940s and 1950s.....	p. 8
2.2.2	1960s and 1970s.....	p. 9
2.2.3	1980s and 1990s.....	p. 9
2.2.4	Modern history.....	p. 10
2.3.	Aid in numbers.....	p. 11
2.3.1	Norway as an aid donor.....	p. 11
2.3.2	Emergency aid in Norway.....	p. 12
2.4.	Emergencies.....	p. 12
2.4.1	Emergency situations.....	p. 12
2.4.2.	Emergency situations in numbers.....	p. 13
2.5.	The effects of disaster events.....	p. 14
2.5.1	Migration.....	p. 14
2.5.2	Refugees and IDPs.....	p. 15

	2.5.3 Population displacement in numbers.....	p. 15
2.6.	Norwegian aid today.....	p. 16
2.7.	Critique.....	p. 17
3.	Research method.....	p. 19
3.1.	Choice of research method.....	p.19
3.2.	Secondary data.....	p. 19
3.3.	Qualitative data.....	p. 20
3.4.	Interviews.....	p. 21
3.5.	Choosing the interviewees.....	p. 22
3.6.	Challenges.....	p. 23
3.7.	Ethical considerations.....	p. 24
4.	Analysis and discussion.....	p. 25
4.1.	“Traditional” approach.....	p. 25
4.1.1.	“Help them where they are”.....	p. 26
4.1.2.	History and Tradition.....	p. 26
4.1.3.	Norway is a rich country.....	p. 27
4.1.4.	Peace and reconciliation works.....	p. 27
4.1.5.	“To help those in need”.....	p. 28
4.1.6.	Other claims.....	p. 30
4.2.	"Cynical" approach.....	p. 31
4.2.1.	Securitization of Aid.....	p. 32
4.2.2.	War on Terror.....	p. 33
4.2.3.	UD and aid.....	p. 33
4.2.4.	Refugee crisis and a UD document leak.....	p. 35
4.2.5.	The effects of UD paper.....	p. 36
4.2.6.	“Keep them where they are”.....	p. 37
4.2.7.	Choosing the recipient.....	p. 38
5.	Summary.....	p. 39
5.1.	For future researches.....	p. 40

Reference list

Attachments

IV. Abbreviations List

CSO - Civil Society Organization

DAC - Development Assistance Committee

ECHO - European Community Humanitarian Aid Department

EU - European Union

GNI - Gross National Income

ICRC - International Committee of the Red Cross

IDP - Internally Displaced Person

IMF - International Monetary Fund

MDG - Millennium Development Goals

NGO - Non-Governmental Organization

NOK - Norwegian Kroner

ODA - Official Development Aid

OECD - Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

UD - The Ministry of Foreign Affairs

UDI - The Norwegian Directorate of Immigration

UJ - Ministry of Justice and Public Security

UN - United Nations

UNDP - United Nations Development Programme

UD - The Ministry of Foreign Affairs

UNOCHA - UN Office for Coordinated Humanitarian Assistance

UNHCR - United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

SAP - Structural Adjustment Programme

SAR - Syrian Arab Republic

SSB - Statistics Norway

WFP - World Food Programme

1. Introduction

We are two students at the first year of Development Studies at Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences. Since both of us were interested in aid, we decided to write our fieldwork report on emergency aid. Our fieldwork lasted from 30 January till 3rd of March. During this time we were gathering information by studying publicly available data and took 10 interviews from the experts of the field.

The (in)famous “Indo-Norwegian Project” started back in 1952 and it was the first Norwegian foreign aid development project. While it proved to be somewhat successful and the project contributed to development of fish industry in Kerala, it was also criticised as it was deemed to be the main reason of overfishing in the area and increased wealth difference between fishers. In the 1960s Norway was increasingly involved in aid projects and development assistance was expanded to reach more countries in Asia and Africa. Since then commitment for aid was big, and by today Norway has reached more than half of the countries in the world (Rønning Balsvik, 2016, s. 163)

According to Norad’s webpage “Norwegian Aid in numbers” (Norad, 2017b) ¹ In 2016 Norway has spent 36.6 billion NOK on all foreign aid, an increase of 2 billion from the year earlier. That corresponds to 1,11% of Norwegian GNI (Gross National Income) placing it as the first biggest donor in the world by GNI percentage given as a donor country. 111 countries have received help channeled through sectors like Education, Economic Development and Trade, Health, Environment and others. 4663 projects/agreements have been implemented. A sum of whopping 531 862 million NOK accounts to total money spent on aid from 1960 till 2016 included. In addition to this, Norway hosts big offices for many big foundations and humanitarian (and not only) NGOs (non-governmental organizations) like Doctors without Borders, Norwegian Church Aid, Save the Children, Red Cross and others. In 2016 62% (22 665 million NOK) of all foreign aid was channeled through three big organisational “partners”: 1. Multilateral organisations (43%

¹ Here and after all numbers are from the earlier mentioned source.

- 15 726 million NOK); 2. Norwegian NGOs (14% - 5 009 million Nok); and 3. International and local NGOs (5% - 1 978 million NOK).

1.1 Narrowing and defining the scope

As seen above, Norway presents a very interesting field to conduct a study on aid. But aid is an immensely big and complex subject field, so we have decided to narrow our fieldwork focus down to emergency help. This aid is dispatched to help those whose everyday lives are affected by natural or man-made disasters - it is known as humanitarian aid, but also is widely referred to as emergency aid, or sometimes relief aid (Riddell , 2007, p.311). There is a bit of confusion about aid classification (Riddell , 2007, p.21) and in order to avoid this in our paper we will use the terms “emergency aid”, “humanitarian aid” and “disaster relief aid” interchangeably, to refer to aid which is used for urgent humanitarian and emergency purposes. When using just the term “aid” or “foreign aid” we refer to all aid types of aid combined, unless the context shows otherwise. We will take a proper look into aid classifications a bit later.

Humanitarian aid became the focus of our research as it has attracted us more due some recent events we will discuss later (War on Terror, armed conflicts in Syria and its consequences, refugee crisis etc.), among which the leak of the The Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ (here and after we are going to use Norwegian abbreviation UD) documents (Mosveenog E., Byermoen T., 2016) takes the cake. The need for humanitarian aid is immense - as we will show later, there are increasingly more natural and manmade catastrophes occurring in the world. Norway has (along with other Scandinavian and West European countries) many times been praised as an exemplary aid donor for putting interest of the countries in need before of its own (Riddell , 2007, p.70, p. 96) but the above-mentioned document has several lines of utmost interest which we will examine later. It has mainly raised doubts about the true motives of emergency aid and the country’s activity in this field altogether.

In this paper we will take a deeper look into the incentives behind emergency aid - we will attempt to see whether decision over aid distribution is being influenced by more factors than seem at the first glance. Emergency aid is viewed as a very noble deed for saving lives of people, alleviating suffering etc., but there have been a number of takes on it which claim that the

motives globally have changed over the years and now are perverted and have a completely different purpose. These criticisms assert that aid has continuously deviated from helping those in need to serve the (hidden) agenda of governments and has become a self-serving tool. The effects of this self-centered aid (both development and emergency) have been broadly and in detail researched before, for example in *The Securitization of foreign aid* by Brown and Grävingsholt (2016) or in *Complex Emergencies* by Keen (2008) - our intent is to see whether similar trends have occurred in Norwegian humanitarian aid policy.

1.2 Research question

1.2.1 Choosing our research question

Both of us wanted to do our fieldwork within a relevant topic for today. Our research question is “Why does Norway give aid?”. By asking this question we hope to find out what are the reasons for Norway’s proactivity in humanitarian aid sphere. To do so, we believe we also need to look at two other aspects of Norwegian humanitarian aid:

“The history of Norwegian humanitarian aid”

By examining the history we want to find out: **a.** What explains aid being “traditional” in Norway (we will explain this more in the later chapters) and **b.** How emergency aid has changed and developed over the course of the history. By looking at the history we hope to find some answers that could explain some nuances of today’s humanitarian aid.

“How can the present Norwegian humanitarian aid be explained?”

The core of our research is to see how Norwegian humanitarian aid is today and whether reasons to provide it are still the same. Our aim is to explain the generous aid budget.

To sum up, we will try answer our research question by (1) examining the history of emergency aid in Norway; (2) analysing publicly available data on aid and (3) through in depth interviews with field experts. It is difficult, if not impossible to draw conclusions based only on publicly

available data, due as we will see later, to inaccuracy and lack of some of it; while some of our findings are deemed to be ambiguous and can be interpreted in different ways.

By dividing our research question into these smaller chunks, we hope to properly illustrate the state of Norwegian humanitarian aid. This, in turn, will give ground for our discussion when we analyze our findings.

1.2.2 The structure of report

In our report we opted for a standard and simple structure after the introduction:

2. Background and Theory

In this chapter we are going to look into aid in general, for purposes of properly understanding its aspects on the later chapters. We will look into terms, theories, classification, history of aid globally and in Norway, catastrophes and their consequences, and also pure, dry numbers - statistics. Last, but not least, we will also look into criticism of aid - as our research question derives from some of them.

Usually, Background and Theory are two different chapters, but we have decided to include theory chapter into background to explain all theories and definition along the way.

3. Research Method

In this chapter we will explain which research methods we have used during our fieldwork. We are going to use curriculum books to explain our choices of research tactics. We will also describe the timeline of our data gathering fieldwork.

4. Analysis and discussion

This is an important chapter, since here we are going to outline and analyze our findings. We will present the thoughts, experience and some anecdotes of people we have interviewed and support/contradict those with data we have researched online.

5. Summary

As it stands from the title here we are going to sum up our findings and try to give an answer to our research question.

2. Background and theory

2.1 What is Aid and why is it given?

Foreign Aid is a very big and complex field - and it is difficult to fully explain its meaning with just one definition. Marshall's Plan is considered to be one of the first aid cases - it happened after World War II when US decided to help war ravaged Europe by giving away considerable amount of money as aid. So, a voluntary help, in any form, be it money in form of loans or "gifts", physical goods like food and clothes, skills which is transferred from donor countries to recipients (like US and Europe respectively in the example above) (Riddell , 2007, p.17). Donors are the ones which give aid, while recipients are the ones receiving it.

This aid is rarely given for free and it usually brings some sort of conditionality along - like returning part of a grant or demanding some adjustments within economic policies like Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) implemented by International Monetary Fund (IMF, 2017). In the case of SAPs, to get more loans in the future, or lower the interest rates on the current ones, recipients must be willing to do some changes demanded by the giving institution.

ODA (Official Development Aid) is a term established by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) to measure aid:

"ODA consists of flows to developing countries and multilateral institutions provided by official agencies, including state and local governments, or by their executive agencies, each transaction of which meets the following two criteria: (1) it is administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective, and (2) it is concessional in character and contains a grant element of at least 25% (calculated at a rate of discount of 10%)" (OECD, n.d. (a))

2.1.1 Classifying aid

Aid can be classified into different types depending on reasons why the help is given, urgency or who is giving the aid. To avoid confusion, in our research we should properly distinguish which aid is which, and we have decided to use urgency classification.

The first one, development aid, is help given with the purpose to help development in economically less-successful countries to reduce poverty and inequality, and contribute to development growth in recipient countries. It has no time urgency and is usually targeted to help people in a long run. This aid is given through government-to-government transfers or through institutions like the World Bank.

Our focus, emergency assistance, is aid given to those whose everyday life is endangered by a disaster of one form or another (We will expand on these disasters a bit later). Emergency aid is a quick reaction towards an unexpected disastrous event, designed to help people in need and alleviate the immediate effects of the crisis. This help usually comes in form of food, clothes, medicine, water, logistics, transport, housing etc. The money is given by the governments using public funds and are sometimes donated by population directly through various organisations (Riddell, 2007, p.260).

2.1.2 Who delivers aid?

There are several organisations with aim to reduce and alleviate the effects of these disastrous events - those who do so are referred to as humanitarian aid agencies. Humanitarian agencies consist of government donors, multilateral agencies, particularly different United Nations agencies and NGO's. The majority of official donors give their funds to NGOs and UN agencies, who are actually undertaking most of the work. The two largest official donor providers (by total amount of money given) are the United States and the European Community Humanitarian Aid Department (ECHO) (Riddell , 2007, p. 315).

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the World Food Programme (WFP) are two of the biggest operational UN agencies. Coordinating the work of the

UN agencies is the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), which by their own definition “is responsible for bringing together humanitarian actors to ensure a coherent response to emergencies”. (OCHA)

Among big international NGOs providing humanitarian aid, it is worth mentioning Oxfam, World Vision, Save the Children, Doctors without Borders and others. When it comes to NGOs, some of them raise money from “commercial activities” (like trading), but almost all of them get funding from private donations, governments and private foundations (like the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Gatsby Foundation, etc.) (Riddell, 2007, p.260-261)

Aid channeled directly from one government directly to another one is called bilateral aid (Norsk bistandshistorie, p. 10), while multilateral aid is channeled through international organisations like World Bank, IMF and UN (Norsk bistandshistorie, p. 36).

2.2 A short history of Aid

2.2. 1940s and 1950s

After the Cold War humanitarian aid became more important than ever before. It would stabilize the complex and unpredictable situations around the world, where conflicts and poverty could have ripple effects that threatened Norway’s welfare and security (Østerud, 2006). Since 1948, Norway has been active with relief aid, including through the UN peacekeeping forces (UN, 2016 (b)). This was initiated as a result of the Marshall Plan in 1947 - government states that it (the Plan) was effective (Regjeringen, 2002 (a)).

No aid history is told without mentioning the famous Marshall’s Plan - and it is also an exemplary instance in our case. In 1947 US Secretary of State, George C. Marshall drafted a plan, “a rescue package” by which the US would give 20\$ billion dollars (adjusted to inflation it is cirka 100\$ billion dollars these days) in order to help rebuild devastated Europe after World War II. 14 countries received help from the US, including GB, France, Italy, Germany, and Norway. It helped rebuild damaged infrastructure and brought economic stability back to

European countries. Marshall's Plan did indeed help Europe, but has also well served States' own political agenda - this aid plan was also a very clever political move. It won US allies in Europe, "protected" them from communism and kept "US economy afloat while the world around it crumbled". (Dambisa M.,2010, p.12)

Another historical date for foreign aid is 20th January 1949 when then-president of USA, Harry S. Truman in his inaugural fourth part of speech talked about foreign assistance. Truman believed that the difference between developed and "underdeveloped" world was in industrialization of the economy. That is why millions of US dollars have been channeled as scientific and technical help to the third world by this "Point Four" program. (Nordhaug, 2013, p.86-87)

2.2.2 1960s and 1970s

In April 1963, the Norwegian Peace Corps was established, and in december of the same year, Norwegian peace corps came to Uganda. In 1962 Norwegian development aid was created, which in 1968 was changed to Norad. Norad's mission is to "draw up plans for the application of Norway's overall public aid to developing countries and for coordination of this assistance" (Our translation, Norad, n.d. (a)). After the discovery of rich oil and gas deposits, aid budgets increased in the 1970s. More expertise emerged, and development projects that came from humanitarian organizations and missionary companies became more interesting and as we will show later, the need for also has relief increased. This meant that there were countries in need, and Norway could not prioritize countries to work with. Norwegian assistance was provided through many various channels, reaching most developing countries in the world (Balsvik, 2016, p. 71).

2.2.3 1980s and 1990s

It is claimed that during the struggle against apartheid policy in South-Africa, 2 million NOK which was given as humanitarian assistance to support the resistance in 1980s. Assistance that came from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Norway to South Africa was largely channeled through private organizations (Balsvik, 2016, p.120).

For the past 25 years Norway has been known for being actively involved in peacebuilding activities in conflict and war zones, where, through a dialogue between the conflicting parties it was possible to arrive to peaceful and nonviolent solutions (Balsvik, 2016, s.170). In the 1990s, major efforts were made on non-governmental organizations (Balsvik, 2016, p.103). The amount of money given as a support to these organizations increased by NOK 320 million from 1980 to 1987. NGOs became a major part of Norwegian aid (Balsvik, 2016, p. 104).

In the 1990s, the commitment came to environmental and peace. This is when Norway started actively to work on conflict prevention and peacebuilding, as mentioned earlier. The fight against poverty also gained new weight in the 1990s. In 1992 there was 1.20 billion poor people, i.e. 20 percent of the world's population. There was also an increase of objectives the Norwegian aid should have (Balsvik, 2016, p.124).

2.2.4 Modern history

In 2000, the UN adopted the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which was going to reduce extreme poverty in the world by 2015 (Norad, n.d. (b)). The amount of women who die during childbirth and pregnancy should also fall down; young children who die before age 5 should be reduced by two thirds; HIV/AIDS spread should be reversed and school should be ensured for all children, both for girls and boys. This marked a milestone in international cooperation on development. (Regjeringen, 2002 (b)).

Before 2004 Norwegian responsibility over foreign aid was divided between The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Norad. Norad was responsible for long-term bilateral assistance, and the UD was responsible for managing assistance through international organizations such as the World Bank, the UN, the International Monetary Fund - multilateral assistance. They also had responsibility for emergency relief and humanitarian assistance (Norad, n.d. (a)). Responsibility for all embassies with aid missions was transferred from Norad to the UD in 2004. In April of the same year, they also took over the administration of state-to-state cooperation. From now on Norad has become the central academic body responsible for quality assurance, evaluation and distribution of Norwegian aid. This is happening in cooperation with partners in Norway,

developing countries and internationally. Norad also supports Norwegian NGOs' work on aid activities with over one billion dollars each year. (Norad, n.d. (a)).

Norwegian politics has in recent years integrated humanitarian aid to a greater extent. An example of this is the refugee crisis, where many people now need assistance (Dybdahl, 2016). The world is increasingly affected by disasters as a result of conflicts and climate change (FN, 2016(a)).

2.3 Aid in numbers

How much is being spent on helping those in need?

In UN General Assembly in 1970 some of the developed countries have agreed to increase their foreign aid spending and equate it to 0.75% of their GNP. Sweden was the first country to reach the goal in 1974, followed by the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, and others (OECD, 2010). In 2016 only 6 countries (the above-mentioned ones plus Luxembourg and UK) have met that plank. According to the data by The World Bank (The World Bank, n.d.(a)) starting from 1960 with 4.233 billion US \$ it has ever been growing at a very quick rate, reaching 152.513 billion US \$ by 2015 (grown as much as 38 times). The “*Compare your country*” public tool by OECD (OECD, n.d. (b)) shows that out of 28 DAC countries USA takes the first place as the biggest country aid donor (33.59 billion USD), followed by Germany, UK, Japan, France and others, while the most generous countries (that is compared by aid as a percentage of GNI) are Norway with 1,11%, followed by Luxembourg, Sweden, Denmark, Germany and others.

2.3.1 Norway as an aid donor

When it comes to foreign aid Norway has always been a quite active donor country. Norwegian foreign aid has grown from 8.4 million NOK in 1960 up to 36 557 million NOK in 2016, resulting in 531 862 million NOK up today. More than 150 000 agreements/projects have been signed up to this point reaching 160 countries, which is categorized into several sectors: Emergency help, Environment and Energy, Education, Economic development and Trade, Good governance, Donor costs and Multilateral aid. These money are usually channeled through

different partners - in 2016 the biggest ones were 1. Multilateral organisations (43% - 15 726 million NOK); 2. Public Sector in Norway (35% - 11 558); 3. Norwegian NGOs (14% - 5 009 million NOK); and 4. International and local NGOs (5% - 1 978 million NOK). (Norad, 2017b)

2.3.2 Emergency aid in Norway

Emergency aid budget was always relatively small - for the past 25 years emergency aid was 10% of the total foreign aid provided. In 2016 Norway was the most generous emergency aid donor in the world (Irin, 2016). Norway in total has given over 45 billion NOK as a humanitarian aid - it has started with 72.3 million NOK in 1980 and have risen up to the record high 3.7 billion NOK in 2016, averaging an incredible growth of 18.1% a year. 289 agreements were implemented, delivering help to 42 countries through big organisations, UN agencies and NGOs like Norwegian Refugee Council, Norwegian Church Aid, Norwegian Red Cross, Save the Children International, UNHCR, UNDP - (United Nations Development Programme) and others. When it comes to partners, emergency aid was divided in a more interesting fashion - the NGOs got the biggest share of the pie. Multilateral organisations got 44% (1 624 million NOK), Norwegian NGOs - 52% (1 934 million NOK) and International and local NGOs got 3% (99 million NOK).

Norwegian humanitarian aid is divided into three large sectors - “Emergency response”, “Reconstruction relief and rehabilitation” and “Disaster prevention and preparedness”, with “Emergency response” receiving 88% of all the funds. Norway has directed its funds as humanitarian assistance to unrest regions in South Sudan (297 million NOK) and Afghanistan (227 million NOK) but in 2016 most of the emergency aid (1.9 billion) went to Middle East countries in order to alleviate the effect of Syrian Civil War - Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Jordan, and Turkey has received 834, 275, 236, 182 and 54 millions NOK respectively. (Norad, 2017b)

2.4 Emergencies

2.4.1. Emergency situations

As we stated earlier, emergency aid is a quick reaction towards an unexpected disastrous event, designed to help people in need and alleviate the immediate effects of the crisis. We are going to

use terms as emergency situations, catastrophes and disasters interchangeably. These catastrophes come in many different forms. There are two big categories - natural and manmade (sometimes the term technological is used as well). Natural disasters are called so because they happen because of natural processes - that would include earthquakes, hurricanes, tsunamis, stormwinds, etc. Manmade disasters are the ones which are caused by human activity, such as wars, industrial hazards etc.

Some of them are unexpected (earthquakes, tsunamis etc.) and some are more predictable and can develop slowly over time (famine, wars, etc.). Their effects can be restricted to small regions, or extend to several countries and even continents. The consequences of these disasters can vary from several hundred or thousand death; to millions without a home to live in (Riddell, 2007, p.311). Examples of these would be 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami affecting 14 countries and killing approximately 2280 000 people in two largely affected countries - Indonesia and Sri-Lanka (UNHCR, 2007) or the 2010 Haiti earthquake with death toll of 230 000 (BBC, 2010).

2.4.2 Emergency situations in numbers

The effects of these catastrophes (as well as budget allocated as pointed earlier) has been increasing over the past 50 years. The total amount of these events (both natural and technological disasters) has increased from 80 in the middle of 1950s to almost 810 in 2005 (Riddell, 2007, p. 314) and 529 in 2013 (IFRC, 2014)². The amount of people killed and affected by these disasters per year varies quite a bit - for example, year 2013 was relatively lenient (129 000 people with 58%/42% ratio of killed/affected) while 2010 was one of the most decimating (645 143 people with 47%/53% ratio of killed/affected). In a period from 2004 to 2013 floods (1 752 or 45% of total) and windstorms (1 011 or 26% of total) were the most often occurred disasters; earthquakes/tsunamis (650 321 or 66% of total) along with windstorms (183 457 or 18% of total) - the most deadliest. These numbers above exclude wars, conflict-related famines, diseases and epidemics. Recent armed conflicts in Afghanistan, Sudan, Iraq, Syria etc.; famines in Somalia, South Sudan, West Africa etc. and various epidemics outbreaks (for example

² Here and after numbers are from above mentioned source.

swine flu, zika virus, ebola) in India, West Africa etc. - including these will obviously raise the plank even higher.

2.5 The effects of disaster events

In a period from 2004 to 2013 (with the latter included) IFRC (IFRC, 2014) estimates more than a million human death and almost two million people who were one way or another affected by these events. The estimated damage these catastrophes have dealt for the same period of time is an incredible damage of 1.6 trillion US dollars damage. As mentioned above, these numbers exclude wars, famines, epidemics and others.

The before described events take lives of millions, damage infrastructures leaving no houses to live in, schools to study at and places to work in - hence altering the lives for many. These disasters “.. not only destroys infrastructure, including social infrastructure; it also encourages criminality, deters investment and makes normal economic activity impossible.” (European Security Strategy [EU], 2003)

2.5.1 Migration

These disasters affect vast amount of population. And one of its big effects is migration. As put by UN migration “is the crossing of the boundary of a political or administrative unit for a certain minimum period of time.” (UN). Simply put by Koser (Koser K., 2007 , p.16) a migrant is a person who is “someone living outside their own country for a year or more”, but as he later remarks, one simple sentence is not enough to define this group of people. Migrants can be separated into different groups depending on the reason of their move, necessity, destination or others. In our case we are interested in two types - voluntary and involuntary migrants, or as Koser puts it “forced” migrants:

“are people who have been forced to leave their own country for another, because of conflict, persecution, or for environmental reasons such as drought or famine. These people are usually described as refugees ...” (Koser K., 2007 , p.16, p. 17)

2.5.2 Refugees and IDPs

As a result of a catastrophe, having no future in the ravaged home population tends to move elsewhere to rebuild their lives afresh - they might migrate or move (often used verb *displaced*) somewhere abroad or stay within the national borders. The first group, refugees, according to the Convention and protocol relating to the status of refugees (UNHCR, 1951) is “... someone who is unable or unwilling to return to their country of origin owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion.” United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) also accepts those who are “unable to return there owing to serious and indiscriminate threats to life, physical integrity or freedom resulting from generalized violence or events seriously disturbing public order” (UNHCR, 2011) as refugees.

The second group, known as Internally displaced persons or IDPs - are also displaced by the same reasons as refugees, but choose to/have no option but to remain within national boundaries of their countries and they are considered to be among of the most vulnerable in the world (UNHCR, n.d. (a)).

2.5.3 Population displacement in numbers

UNHCR supplies with the data (UNHCR, n.d (b))³ which helps to properly understand how many people there are affected by these disasters and see what is the global pattern of their movement. By the end of 2015 alone the estimates show an alarming number of 63.91 million persons of concern (approximately as big as population of France) - out of which 16 million or 25% people are refugees and 37.5 million or 85.7% are IDPs. The data also shows that these numbers have reached the apex and have been on the rise for as long as the data was collected (from 1951). More and more people remain within the country - the global percentage of IDP to “Persons of Concern” has increased from 19.6% in 1993 to 58.7% in 2015. But the percentage of refugees has been in decline from 76.3% to 25% in the very same years although the total amount of refugees, has been drifting between from 9.5 millions people up to 17.8 millions.

³ Here and after referring to data fetched from earlier mentioned source

2.6 Norwegian aid today

As we mentioned earlier, since 2004 Norway's humanitarian assistance is managed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but a large part of it is carried out NGOs and UN organizations. One of the ministry's main responsibilities is to ensure provision of aid in accordance with the objectives that are adopted and envisaged by the Parliament. (Riksrevisjonen, 2008).

Norway was very generous in their humanitarian aid - Syria and neighboring countries are the ones who received most of it in 2016. Quite a bit of humanitarian assistance was also given to Yemen, South Sudan and Ethiopia. Norway will also provide a lot of support for humanitarian aid next year. In December 2016 it was announced that next year NOK 380 million from Norway will be given to UN's Emergency Aid Fund Cerf. Since the launch of the fund 10 years ago, Norway has been among the largest donors (Speed, 2016). Over 6.5 million NOK was spent inside the country, as consequence of high number of refugees arrived in late 2015 (Norad, 2017a).

Norway wants to strengthen the coherence with domestic policies, to ensure that no measures taken in Norway can hinder the fight against poverty in developing countries (Regjeringen, 2002(a)). New Norwegian foreign policy has a big ambition to go beyond just a peaceful solution to acute conflicts. There is desire to build well-functioning states where both the peace and development problem are resolved. Norway's aid and peace policy merge together here (Østerud, 2006). Education is a priority area for Norway today. Norway has prioritized education in crisis for a long time now, and therefore has a lot of experience in this area. Good education can be life-saving, short-term (safe schools) and longer term, where you can gain skills and knowledge for survival, productivity and peaceful coexistence (Dybdahl, 2016).

Environmental and energy assistance fell 14 percent in 2016, from NOK 4.2 billion in 2015 to NOK 3.6 billion in 2016. This is largely due to lower payments for climate and forest investment to the government in 2016. The expenses for refugees on the other hand, increased sharply. This is due to the large number of refugees who came to Norway by the end of 2015. NOK 7.4 billion

in assistance were budgeted for refugee expenses in 2016. The final figure was lower than planned, according to statistics (Norad, 2017a).

2.7 Critique

When speaking of aid the first and foremost we understand a positive notion of helping someone in need. Aid has always been perceived as “the right thing to do”. But nevertheless, there has been a number of takes on aid which criticized the effects, usage, (hidden) purpose and generally how effective aid really is.

Dambisa Moyo in her “*Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is a Better Way for Africa*” (2010) book criticizes how aid has worsened situation in Africa by creating dependency on constant aid flow, damaging economies with conditionalities and increasing corruption, authoritarianism, laziness and irresponsibility in african governments. She argues that Africa would have been better off without aid altogether and claims that foreign aid is the reason behind Africa's struggle.

Riddell in “*Does Foreign Aid Really Work?*” (2007) analyzes the effectiveness of foreign aid. Among the problems he had described are the disagreement between agencies to as how to measure aid data (p.321) and major problems with humanitarian aid provisioning - “large gaps between the amounts of (humanitarian) aid needed and the amounts provided, major inadequacies in the way emergency aid is allocated, and fundamental weaknesses in the coordination of the humanitarian response.” (p.323). He also points to UNOCHA Financial Tracking Service showing how largely emergency situations remain underfunded (UNOCHA, n.d.)

In “*Complex Emergencies*” by David Keen (2008) showed cases where humanitarian aid was used to justify military operations advancement (p.118); create dependency culture undermining government's' accountability in recipient countries (p.128, p.135); “encouraged and legitimised international political inaction” (p.117) and on several occasions prolonging the war (p.22).

The last, but not least, Brown and Grävingholt (2016) in *“The Securitization of Foreign Aid”* examine the impact of security concerns on foreign aid and examines how Western countries give aid, to whom and why. Their study asserts that securitization has a significant impact on the distribution of aid, and has increased ODA (Official Development Aid) spending in the “conflict and security sector”. This criticism is particularly important for us, and we will look into it more deeply, as by our research there has been a number of similar occurrences described in this book.

3. Research method

3.1 Choice of research method

In our field we chose to use secondary data (Desai, V. & R. B. Potter, 2006, s.262) and qualitative data (Johannessen m.fl., 2010, s.33). We believe that these methods would provide us with the information we need to give a good answer to our research question. Our research design was focused on getting the most information about the field through interviews.

3.2 Secondary data

Secondary data is data that is collected by other parties, and which today is easy to find using internet or books. It is data collected by others for another purpose than our own (Hansen, 2015). We chose this method to properly prepare ourselves for interviews by creating a foundation. We had to cover a lot of material in the beginning of the fieldwork so we could adjust our interview guide accordingly on the go and drive the conversation in the direction we needed. Therefore we have read books, articles online, reports and quick-analysed numbers on Norad, SSB (Norway Statistics), UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees), ICRC (International Committee of the Red Cross) and other websites. This gave us a better understanding to as what to put our focus of research on and gave us new perspectives on the topic. We also used it to get an understanding of Norwegian emergency aid and find information about history and different numbers from surveys that were useful to our problem.

We have worked through secondary data throughout the field work. We have examined books, articles and other publications - to look for changes and what has been highlighted in the aid for the last 60 years in Norway and worldwide. The data we found, we have analyzed to look for the prerequisites for the changes in the Norwegian Emergency Aid History. We have seen how Norwegian humanitarian aid is in Norway today and how it works.

To better understand the facts and “claims” found in the books, articles and interviews we used publicly available reports from the government, NGOs to analyze raw numbers and facts. This way we can see how the emergency aid was distributed, who and when received it from Norway, for what reasons, and which relevant trends were developing and changing when (e.g. the proportion of refugees and IDPs to population affected during and after conflicts, refugee population in the world, etc.).

This is how we get the “hard data” (Johannessen et al., P.37) and it helped us to align information we have received in interviews with what we had in order to support or disprove it. Analyzing the numbers also gives us a quick overview and explanation (albeit, it is just the tip of the iceberg and these numbers and trends can have very different reasons to occur) about the state of Norwegian emergency help - it shows the choices the government has made through the years and how it has decided to drive its agenda. Using secondary data has helped us immensely in a long way into the field work, and we have examined and read through a lot of different sources that have been relevant to our problem.

3.3 Qualitative data

By having a qualitative research approach, we collected data from few, but went into the depth of the topic, as opposed to quantitative methodology, which collects little data from many (Johannessen et al., 2010, p. 363). We have interviewed 10 people, who gave us a lot of useful information. The interviewees are experts in the field who have expertise and experience in the field of development (See Appendix 2). These people are politicians and diplomats in the government; managers and employees who work in various fields in different aid organizations. The reason we chose to interview experts only was that we felt this would give us the most information. The experts we interviewed have worked quite some time in the field, and thus it led to different people being able to tell us about the changes that have taken place in the humanitarian aid history.

Since our interviewees also work in the humanitarian aid field every day, they also have a very good understanding on how the government works with humanitarian assistance. One can even say that the organisations we had interviews in are those who “steer” Norwegian emergency aid today. Their expertise and knowledge on the subject is crucial for our research. The interviewees also had some strong opinions about Norwegian emergency aid (and emergency aid in general), and about what is right and what should possibly be changed. By interviewing these people, we have gained a better understanding of why emergency relief in Norway is the way it is. By using this method, we also received quick response to specific questions that were relevant to our research.

3.4 Interviews

We had interviews with predetermined questions, that we asked in a particular order. Nevertheless, we would ask additional questions along the way, depending on the topic our interviewee would have a weight on. This way we were able to learn more on the topic that would not be included in our interview guide. By having same questions we were able to later compare the answers we have received. Although we had a structured interview guide, we took liberty to talk about different parts of our research afterwards. Because of this we can say that we had semistructured interviews (Desai, V. & R. B. Potter, 2006, p.144). We also believe it was a smart choice to use qualitative method, since we were able to quickly find the areas which we should focus on. This way we could also quickly confirm much of the secondary data we examined earlier.

To create an interview guide we came up with two research questions that we hoped would give us answers to the issue. These questions are:

1. How has Norwegian humanitarian assistance been through the times?
2. How can the present Norwegian humanitarian aid be explained?

Using these questions we came up with our interview guide that could help us to drive answers in the direction we needed. The interview guide is attached at the end of this assignment (see

Appendix 1). These interviews and secondary data that are the foundation of our analysis and discussion chapter.

3.5 Choosing the interviewees

We approached to the selection of the interviewees strategically. That is, we thought about the target group we had to interview so that we could get the necessary data for the task (Johannessen et al., 2010, p. 106). We sent e-mails to experts recommended by our field teachers, those we had heard of and through mentions in relevant books, articles, documentaries, etc. We also used the snowball method, what is, asked interviewees whether they could recommend or help us to get in touch with other potential interviewees (Johannessen et al., 2010, p. 109).

We contacted about 30 people and got in total 10 interviews. Many did not respond to us, did not follow up on the time and date of the interview or simply were unavailable. We have been contacting these experts based on:

1. Workplace - we wanted to get as many different organizations and government departments as possible. We believe this resulted in a broader opinion spectre, different anecdotes, approaches and thoughts on the topic.
2. Position and past work experience - we approached people who were **a.** more relevant to our paper based on the position within a given organisation and **b.** based on their past work experience. This way we were able to get more specialised perspectives - for example in one case, expert's previous experience in PR and Media Relations within a big international NGO allowed us to learn more about effects of public media coverage on funding of a disaster relief project.
3. Years when an expert held the position - our focus was not only on people who currently work in the emergency aid related spheres but also those who have already retired or changed their occupation. It helped us to learn more about the features of emergency aid in previous years.

At the end of each week, we delivered a report describing our activity for the past week and by the end of our field work itself we have compiled a last report which explained what we had done and found out.

3.6 Challenges

During the fieldwork we encountered some challenges in the process. We experienced this with both secondary and the qualitative data gathering. It was difficult for us to get enough interviews, as we chose to focus only on experts. We wanted to get more than 10 interview informants, but since we chose to focus on only experts, we expected that they already had a pretty packed schedule. Setting an interview with our interviewees proved to be very time consuming, but this was something we had been informed by the supervisor earlier the made us prepared for this.

We also need to acknowledge potentially biased answers we got from our interviewees. We suspect that on several occasions our interviewees were not completely honest with us or may have driven the response in a different direction. In addition, some of our interviewees chose to avoid answering some of or questions altogether or could have deliberately be dishonest with us. We believe that their position in NGO/governmental organ (e.g. their opinion could contradict with the public statement), and/or personal position to the case can be the reason.

When talking about secondary data, even if we had difficulty in finding material we can reference to, we still were able to find information to set the foundation of our research and some pure data for analysis and comparison. But, there are several problems with the numbers - by Riddell (2007). He points out that there is: a. Difficulty in measuring numbers behind concrete type of aid, since parties involved could not fully agree on where emergency aid ends and development aid starts (Riddell , 2007, p.325, p.332) ; b. Changes in how humanitarian aid is assessed (Riddell , 2007, p.331 - 333) c. How accurate and/or correct the data is (Riddell , 2007, p.331 - 332). We have experienced the very same problems as well on a couple of occasions ^{4 5}.

⁴ An example is on “Norwegian Aid Statistics” page managed by Norad - “Note we do not have complete information on partners and sectors before 1980, and that different classifications systems have been in use 1980-1998 and from 1999 until today.” Note: you need to select the period to earlier than 1998 in order to see this message.

⁵ Statistics about refugee and IDPs population may differ from source to source based on the classification.

For our main qualitative research source for budget spendings we chose Norad, and have faced a couple of cons - for one, the data on capital spent on aid is not inflation-adjusted, which can give a distorted understanding of budget spending over time.

3.7 Ethical considerations

When we conducted the interviews and wrote the assignment, there were some ethical problems that we had to take into account.

Usually, the details of interviewees must be anonymized and sensitive information should be treated with caution (Fangen. 2015). But, in our case, we have decided to attach the list of interviewees, and have decided to provide names along the quotes, when appropriate. The reason behind it is that we believe it is essential in our case, since those quotes and opinions gain more weight depending on who has said that.

During the interviews, one of us asked questions, and both wrote down notes. In addition, we also recorded the interviews - we asked for permission in the beginning of each interview. The interviewees were informed in an interview request that they would be interviewed as representatives from government agencies, politics and non-governmental organizations. This interview request is attached at the end of the assignment (See Attachment number 3).

We were also critical to the statements and opinions of our interviewees and investigated them before using it in our research. We did so in order to not only make our research paper as objective as possible, but also to discuss different statements and support them with facts.

It was also important for us to be critical of what we found when we examined secondary data. Some of the secondary data we present in the assignment are pure facts, and not statements.

4. Analysis and discussion

As we were advancing into our research we started noticing a pattern in answers we were receiving from our interviews. For the purposes of making it easier to study our findings we have decided to separate our results into two parts. We got the idea after our interview with previous Minister of Development Heikki Eidsvoll Holmaas, who for the sake of making a more structured answer, separated opinions on aid into two groups - “Traditional” and “Cynical”. We decided to keep this categorisation, since it also properly reflects the answers we got from other interviewees.

The first one, since many of our interviewees seem to believe that emergency aid altogether has somewhat become traditional for Norway we called “Traditional” approach. It has a positive outlook on aid, which presumes that reasons behind aid donations have remained somewhat similar, if not the same, to its original mission to help people in need.

We titled the second one as "cynical" approach. It is called “cynical” for there are doubts about pure-altruistic incentives behind aid. This approach suggests there is evidence that humanitarian aid has changed its original purpose, and became a tool to serve Norway’s economical and political interests.

4.1 “Traditional” approach

We heard the word “tradition” everytime we asked a question “Why do you think Norway is so active as a donor country?”. Many of our interviewees looked at Norwegian humanitarian assistance purely in a positive way, explaining Norway’s proactivity as a part of creating a better world. In this chapter we are going to look at what we called “Traditional” approach. Generally, our interviewees believed that incentives behind Norwegian generosity were purely of altruistic intention to help people in need.

4.1.1. “Help them where they are”

This expression was used quite often during our interviews and while at first glance beyond doubt it should be in the "cynical" approach category, the meaning behind the phrase is ambiguous. In the traditional part we decided to call it “Help them where they are” and in the “cynical”, “Keep them where they are”. We have failed to locate the origins of this phrase - there does not seem to be one main source, but interestingly, almost all of our interviewees have used it. It is particularly fascinating, for the phrase was always used exceptionally in English while the majority of our interviews were held in Norwegian, suggesting there should be one common source. Since the context it was used in during the interviews can be perceived differently, we have decided to expand on it in both optimistic and pessimistic way.

As we mentioned earlier, as a result of emergency situation, populations tend to shift and many run abroad as refugees. Emergency aid can be used to “help them where they are” by providing instantaneous needs (food, medicine, housing, etc.) so the country can recover faster in the aftermath of the disastrous events. Many refugees leaving affected countries can also have economic incentives (Koser, 2007, p.18, p.31). Having many people leave the country can be disruptive and unfavourable for the economy and future development of the affected country (Koser, 2007, p.51), especially in the case of Less Developed Countries. This unwanted effects turn the “weak economy” - “development aid” wheel again leaving affected country in a loop.

The other point was to help affected population continue their lives as it was before. One of our interviewees said “Who would want to live in an unknown country with an unknown culture versus living in the homeland?”(03.03.2017. Our translation.). By looking at this phrase from a perspective of helping people re-establish their lives which would overall positively impact the economy the phrase “keep them where they are” takes on another meaning.

4.1.2. History and Tradition

As we mentioned earlier, the word “tradition” was used quite often during our interviews. In the Background and Theory chapter we showed that Norway was an active donor country since 1948 - and our informers believed that it also explains Norwegian proactivity today as well. The question to “Why Norway is so active as a donor country?” would be met by “It is a part of our

tradition”(07.03.2017. Our translation.) or “We have been helping other countries for many years now, it is a part of what we do”(20.02.2017. Our translation.). Another answer puts it slightly differently: “It is a heritage of humanitarian thinking... news about starving children makes many people want politicians to do something about it” (02.03.2017. Our translation.)

This could also explain the aforementioned eagerness of Norwegian population to continue with aid politics. Norway has been an active donor country for a long time now, and it seems like Norway wants to work actively on emergency aid, as Norwegian policy has in recent years been more integrated emergency relief, partly because of the refugee crisis. (Dybdahl, 2016).

4.1.3. Norway is a rich country

Another reason why Norway is so proactive and generous is because it can afford it - would agree most of our interviewees, or it was nicely said by Thomas Lid Ball, Vice President at UD during our interview “Being successful and rich, we also have a lot of responsibility..” (28.02.2017. Our translation). This quote is a good example to show what our interviewees thought of this.

Aligning Norwegian GDP graph (The World Bank, n.d.(b)) with Norad’s spending on foreign aid (Norad, 2017b) would be a good evidence to support this. Especially, as we mentioned earlier, and as it was discussed in the interviews - discovery of oil and gas deposits, especially Ekofisk in 1969 (Norsketroleum, n.d.) played a big role here. Our interviewees also noted that Norway can afford being generous thanks to Norwegian history along with current economical stability.

4.1.4. Peace and reconciliation works

Norway is not only a big aid donor, but Norway also is very active in peace and reconciliation works - it has made contributions to peace processes in conflict affected countries like Afghanistan, Colombia, Sri Lanka, Sudan/South Sudan, Somalia, Israel and Palestine to name a few from quite a list (Regjeringen, 2016(a)). As government states on their website:

“Support for affected countries during and after conflicts has become an important part of

Norway's foreign and development policy, both because conflict is one of the primary obstacles to development and because unstable states can pose a threat to global security” (Regjeringen, 2016(b)).

The main objectives of these works are to “Support peaceful, democratic development” and “Prevent, de-escalate and resolve armed conflicts... to save lives and promote development”. (Regjeringen, 2016(b)).

As mentioned in 2.3.2, Norway has for the past 25 years been known for being actively involved in peacebuilding activities in conflict and war zones. This by having a dialogue between the conflicting parties, that would maybe make it possible to arrive to peaceful and nonviolent solutions (Balsvik, 2016, s.170). Most of our interviewees mentioned peace and reconciliation works - it is with no doubt a supporting evidence for the “traditional” approach.

4.1.5 “To help those in need”

A genuine will “to help others” or “to help those in need” was something that was mentioned several times during our interviews, and many said it had a big influence on Norwegian humanitarian aid. This is a good example of the “traditional” way of thinking about aid. Previous Minister of Development Heikki Eidsvoll Holmaas during our interview noted:

“... I believe i can say that equality and standing up for each other, are foundational Norwegian values” (03.03.2017. Our translation.).

In the book “Utvikling - en innføring i utviklingsstudier” author also supports this, by saying: “..Most donor countries put weight on compassion and the humanitarianism. Central to the foundational values for Norwegian aid are Christian brotherhood “thinking” and radical ideas of solidarity and international cooperation” (Our translation, Eriksen & Smukkestad, p. 289).

It was also mentioned by the interviewees that today it could be that Norway no longer provides emergency aid because of people affected by crises and conflicts, but rather it is believed that it will be a human right realized by giving this support - a genuine desire to help those who are less

fortunate than people here in Norway. As Siv Maaland from NGO Save Children said:
“Everyone has a right to realize their basic needs such as food, water, health, education, etc.”
(02.03.2017. Our translation).

During our interviews “to help others” was used quite often amongst the interviewees, and in our research it is a main argument for “traditional approach” - a genuine desire to help others. Heikki Eidsvoll Holmaas as an answer to our question number 6 “There is a lot of criticism diverted to emergency help, that claims that it does more damage than good. Why do you think 10% of all budget is constantly used on emergency help?” said:

“Because there is crisis in the world and that crisis is now. And to watch people die from hunger in another country... it's something very concrete that we have to give food to people who starve and we have to give a tent to those who are on the run, and we have to make sure that people who lost their house, get one. This makes people think it (emergency aid) is important... There is something something basic and ethical about it..”
(03.03.2017. Our translation).

“Do No Harm” method was also quite often mentioned when asking the aforementioned question. According to Norad this method is used to:

“One has to act in ways that does not worsen the situation, but strengthen the forces of peace. It applies either to the aid which has a direct goal of achieving peace, or seeking to relieve distress and create development despite the conflict. This method is called “Do No Harm”” (Norad, 2011. Our translation)

When we asked the question regarding the criticism of emergency aid, many of our interviewees agreed that Norwegian humanitarian aid should not be targeted a lot, since “Do No Harm” method has been increasingly used across humanitarian projects.

This opinion is also supported by Norad's information of the method:

While our understanding of the importance of assistance is conflict-sensitive, the willingness and ability of Norwegian and international aid organizations to put this knowledge into practice also increases. Both in Norway and internationally, efforts are made to develop better methods for a more systematic approach to conflict sensitivity.

(Norad, 2011. Our translation.)

We should therefore be careful about how critical we are to emergency help, as Norway seems to work actively for the emergency response to work in the best possible way, and that it will primarily help others.

4.1.6 Other claims

During our interviews there were also a few different statements that could explain Norway's emergency aid proactivity in a positive way.

Several of the interviewees said that Norway is working to make emergency aid better. For example, instead of providing food in an emergency situation, one would rather give cash so food could be obtained from the local market. Thus helping boost the local economy and allowing local food production to thrive. This will of course only be done if it is appropriate and the area has access to food from its own local production.

Some of the interviewees said that Norway also has a focus on working with a local population in an emergency situation. According to Arne Næss Holm from Norwegian Church Aid, they have been working on this for a while: "We are encouraging to work with local civil society, and Norway also has focus on that." (20.02.2017. Our translation)

Working with local population can have several advantages in an emergency situation. First of,

Norway can save a lot of money as by not sending the "unnecessary" resources, if there are local people who can do the job instead. Secondly, this can help those who have are in emergency situation - instead of just waiting for help, those who have the ability to help themselves can do the required work. Working with locals uses local resources, and that could positively stimulate the economy in the affected country.

Last, but not least, our interviewees also mentioned disaster prevention methods. Norway is continuously working on prevention so that a disaster's effects can be reduced before it occurs. According to Norad, 169,8 million norwegian kroners was used on disaster prevention and preparedness in 2016 (Norad, n.d. (c)). The former Minister of Development said: "We have been concerned that money should be used for prevention methods" (Heikki Eidsvoll Holmaas. Our translation).

It was not only Holmaas, but some of our interviewees were also a bit critical to Norway's focus on prevention methods, namely, it was mentioned by several interviewees that there should more funds directed to this field. One of our interviewees showed concern that "There is not much focus in disaster prevention, funds are preferably given when the disaster has already occurred" (07.03.2017, Our translation). There are several different opinions on how much focus that has been put on this - while some, as showed above, believed it wasn't enough, some of our interviews argued that the reasons behind it is the unpredictability of some of the disasters.

Our interview findings led us to think that Norwegian emergency aid is continuously evolving and is on the track to reach and help as many people as possible. While in our next chapter we are going to show other, non-moral motives behind humanitarian aid, it is still important to remember that there is substantial support to "traditional" approach.

4.2 "Cynical" approach

"Cynical" approach assumes that under certain influences aid has become a tool for Norway to be used in own interests. For the first, we will see what reasons are there to believe that such usage of aid is possible and then look at our findings to see whether we can identify behaviour

rationale in modern Norwegian aid.

4.2.1 Securitization of aid

As mentioned earlier, securitization is one of the most relevant aid criticisms for our paper. The aforementioned book “The Securitization of Foreign Aid” by Brown and Grävingholt (Brown&Grävingholt, 2016) explain securitization this way:

“Securitization can be said to occur, for instance, when donors increasingly justify aid in terms of national or international security, when they provide the highest levels of assistance to specific countries and sectors based on security imperatives” (Brown&Grävingholt, 2016, p.3).

As we mentioned earlier, their study asserts that securitization has a significant impact on the distribution of aid, especially to the countries which are in focus of the “War on Terror” (Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq) and has increased ODA spending in the “conflict and security sector”. Authors concluded that some level of securitization can be justified and is not very problematic, while some of their case studies have proven that securitization have corrupted the core purpose of aid and shifted it away from “ethically based, poverty-focused practice”, by becoming donor countries’ self-serving tool and putting national security and economic interests as a priority. Northern countries have displayed fragile states as “breeding grounds for terrorism, crime syndicates, diseases and other problems” and aid now was used as a preventive tool.

The idea behind the securitization is simple - aid is used to prevent the spillover effects of emergency (and not only) situations, that could boomerang back to donor countries. While the book is focused on foreign aid in general, humanitarian aid presents a perfect tool for a donor country to use for its own interests. And indeed, our interviewees have showed concerns that incentives behind aid have become more politicised; aid is used to limit refugee flow into country and to prevent muslim extremism or to put it simply ”..it is about global and own interests” (Our translation, Kjersti Haraldseide, Norwegian refugee council).

As we saw earlier, Norway responded to many major and minor emergency situations, and whether some of them had just pure altruistic intentions or bits of self-interest is nearly

impossible to differentiate. As Brown&Grävingholt (Brown&Grävingholt, 2016, p. 237-240) said:

“It is sometimes difficult to determine to what extent the new discourses are oriented towards national self-interest or focused on global public goods. The two often overlap, as achieving greater stability in fragile states could be good for donor countries and the stability of the international system. “

Control over emergency aid can be an important part of Foreign Affairs’ strategy, and as we will show later, it indeed became one.

4.2.2 War on terror

The War on Terror (WoT), or Global War on Terrorism - phrase was coined by then president of USA George W. Bush after 9/11 terrorist attacks in 2001 (Schmitt E.&Shanker T., 2005), when he announced a new military campaign against terrorism. It was quite often used during our interviews to show how it influenced aid distribution. Particularly, WoT is relevant for our paper because of its influence on **a.** Increase of spending on WoT countries and **b.** governmental cooperation - after 9/11 attack all major donor countries in Europe, North America and Japan has reorganized their aid systems to “reflect better coherence between development assistance and more traditional foreign and security policies” (Brown S., Grävingholt J. , 2016, p. 4). At European Union, for example, in 2003 the European Commission adjusted its development objectives with a new focus on security (Brown S., Grävingholt J. , 2016, p. 4-5).

4.2.3 UD and aid

“There is a general agreement in the Parliament to keep on giving aid... but not so much on how to run it.“ (our translation, Heikki Eidsvoll Holmaas, Ministry of Development 2012-2013)

A trend of restructuring the aid systems to create a better communication within the state has happened in Norway as well. As we mentioned before, in 2004 there has been some changes in the management of aid - in already april UD overtook most of the responsibilities from Norad and along the essential task “to work for Norway’s interests internationally: to safeguard the

country's freedom, security and prosperity" (Regjeringen, 2017) now ministry also manages Norwegian multilateral and emergency aid and is responsible for managing the most of the state's aid (Norad, n.d.(d)). For the past 22 years (1994-2016) of Development Aid Norad is listed as "Extending Agency" for as much as 50% of all projects/agreements (115098 to be precise), while UD has "humble" 41%. The picture changes drastically when the same data is checked for Emergency Aid - UD takes care of whopping 94% of all projects. The ministry does not simply assign the aid budget, but also largely decides where the money will go, especially in an emergency situation.

Riddell (2007, p. 77) says that the aid through multilateral agencies has been favored over bilateral aid and considered to be "less politically driven, and more likely to be channeled to recipients on the basis of need". He further notes that this might not always be the case, especially if an organisation is being generously funded by one or a small group of donors.

"The greater the contribution... the more it is able to influence and shape the policies of that agency: the decisions made about the aid allocated, the form in which it is given, and the conditions under which it is provided" (Riddell, 2007, p. 77).

As stated earlier in 2016 cirka 97% of all emergency aid Norad/UD channeled through NGOs - while an organisation can apply for a grant for a specific emergency case, some of the funds can be/are assigned directly by UD. According to responses from our interviews, there is a concern about the influence a state can have on the focus of organisations. To illustrate better how this would affect NGOs' work, one of our interviewees shared a little anecdote with us - in 2015 their NGO unexpectedly received a fund from Norad (without applying for it), which was given specifically to alleviate the effects of earthquake in Nepal. While this particular story can be deemed to be harmless, this project-based, unexpected grants can shift the attention of NGO to the case that is of interest to UD. The influence of ministry can be particularly even more powerful if a given organisation is fully dependent on funds from the government while other means of funding, like public donations, are insufficient.

4.2.4 Refugee crisis and a UD document leak

Situation in Syria has become a hot-button topic for the past several years and is one of our main interests. 500 million USD aid money was directed as a part of Humanitarian Response Plan to Syria conflict, which still largely remains underfunded - the sum mentioned above is just a small 14.7% of forecasted need (UNOCHA, 2017). As of March 2017 UNOCHA (UN Office for Coordinated Humanitarian Assistance) estimates that 5 million have fled the country, over 6.3 million people were internally displaced (half of them children) and 13.5 million people are in need of humanitarian assistance. These numbers are frightening and has been a number one focus for many aid countries including, as mentioned above, for Norway as well. People are in grave danger, have no shelter and food and in need of help, but is this is the only motive for donor countries to provide humanitarian assistance?

This is when the UD papers come into the play. A 10 page UD document with a title “Flight and migration to Europe and Norway 2016. Scenarios, consequences, measures” (Our translation), dating January 2016 was leaked in March (Mosveen og E., Byermoen T. , 2016) and opens with a powerful statement - “Europe and the EU / Schengen cooperation are in a serious situation. We can during the next six months get a comprehensive crisis, where migration crisis and several other negative conditions would trigger a significant political and institutional setback” (Our translation). In it, a senior adviser in UD asserts how refugee influx from Middle East and North Africa/Sahel into Europe may bring many problems for Norway as well. The document portrays the situation Europe is in, what possible scenarios might develop in nearest future and how it may influence Norway.

There is much to underline in this document ⁶. As described in the leak, the migration crisis is characterized by several factors. Europe is swarmed by illegal/unregistered/undocumented migrants - the number is estimated to be around 5-600.000 people. “These are worrisome numbers in terms of security, black economy, etc.” (Our translation) reads the document, and this also increases probabilities for new terrorism acts, similar to recent incidents in Paris. “..the country (Greece) provably does not work as an external border..”(Our translation.) which could give incentives to central european countries including Germany to close their borders, Greece

⁶ Here and after our text is fully based on the above-mentioned document.

losing their Schengen membership, or move the outer border from Greece/Turkey to Slovenia. Document also warns about potential collapse of Schengen and Dublin agreements, British exit from European Union (or by now better known as Brexit) and political polarising alongside “strengthening of ‘extreme’ forces (France, Germany, UK, Sweden)” (Our translation).

While the author believes that development aid will help reduce migration influx, it will do so in a long run and thus to avoid potential “systems clash and chaos prevailing” a couple of faster working measures/directions are proposed. Thus, reconstruction of working outer border by increasing support to Turkey, in order to keep refugees away from Schengen zone; a better coordination in Nordic countries and EU and take a better control over own borders (particularly Storskog) are advised. But proposed changes within the governmental structure are most interesting for our research. “Relevant government structures (Ministry of Justice and Public Security, police, UD, Norad) should be brought together to develop a policy and possible cooperation measures” (Our translation) and “concrete cooperation between migration, police and security authorities must be developed about border control and other measures in important origin and transit countries...”.

4.2.5 The effects of UD paper

A year has passed since the leak of UD papers, but it is quite difficult to see whether measures proposed in the leak have been implemented and to what extent. For the first, it is important to note that amount of asylum seeker applications went drastically down from nearly 12 000 in 2013 down to 3 500 in 2016 according to UDI (The Norwegian Directorate of Immigration) (UDI, n.d.) - did the document have any influence?

Notably, mentioned in the document the issue with Storskog border, which in autumn 2015 had cirka 5500 refugees bike to Norway (Matre J.&Johnsen N., 2016), has been solved after Ministry of Justice and Public Security (which was mentioned in the document) decided to refuse all without a valid application (Nguyen L., 2016). In addition to that Norway has prolonged passengers checks for ferry arrivals from Denmark, Sweden and Germany. This (arguably) can be considered to be the evidence that suggests that some measures from the document have been implemented.

And just as discussed in the document, Turkey has also received increased support from Norway from 12.2 to 76.3 million NOK from 2011 to 2016. This support have totalled in 185.1 million NOK, out of which 120 millions NOK came in last two years - 44 million NOK in 2015 and 76 million NOK in 2016. 85% of all aid in 2016 directed to Turkey, e.g. 65 million NOK was spent on Syrian refugees in Turkey only. Even though this increase of aid to Turkey has happened exactly according to the UD document, but can hardly be coincidental - refugee number in Turkey has also increased from 1.6 millions in beginning of 2015 up to 2.8 million by the end of 2016 (UNHCR, n.d. (c)), which could, in fact, explain the increased expenditure.

4.2.6 “Keep them where they are”

As we discussed this earlier in the “Traditional approach” chapter, the phrase “keep them where they are” can have an ambiguous meaning. In the context of our interviews it was used quite often in a negative way, and as one of our interviewees put it: “... Norway uses a slogan “help them where they are”, which could, in fact, mean “Keep them where they are” “.

When a disaster strikes/a conflict erupts local population falls under the classification of refugees by 1951 Refugee Convention (UNHCR, 2017) and their asylum claims must be examined on arrival (UN). Even if a number of refugees will return (or will be returned) back for one reason or another a big chunk still will be granted asylum. In order to prevent this, a timely and effective emergency aid syringe into ensuring safety, food security and accommodation for affected population could help prevent this. Using the phrase in this fashion suggests that aid is used to “protect” Norway from influx of refugees and the “problems” they bring.

An article published by SSB (Statistisk Sentralbyrå) (SSB, 2016) estimates that “In Norway, we can emphasise that the forecasted immigration from Syria could cost us NOK 430 billion, or we can present the cost as 0.53 øre per day per capita for the remainder of this century”. It is obvious that keeping refugees away in their own countries is also far cheaper. Even the Minister of Migration and Integration, Sylvi Listhaug, in her interview with TV2 have openly spoken to have “as few asylum seekers as possible” (Blaker M., 2016).

4.2.7 Choosing the recipient

Our interviewees showed also concern about how Norway selects whom to give aid, a thought that has been around for some time already. In 2013 NGO Doctors Without Borders have published a report “Der nøden er størst” (Leger Uten Grenser, 2013) where the organisation looks into on how Norway decided to distribute aid in 2012. The report shows how in some cases Norway distributed humanitarian aid arguably over the countries which had less need of it than others. An example from the report: “A child in Chad is over six times more prone to die before they are five than a Palestinian child. Nevertheless, Palestine received 3,5% of total humanitarian aid from Norway in 2012, while Chad received 0.00022%” (Our translation).

Had the trend remained? Comparing humanitarian aid expenditure with UNHCR statistics of IDPs and Refugees along disasters and conflicts happening for 2015⁷ show that the focus indeed could seem at the very least suspicious. For example, Columbia had almost 7 million people displaced (UNHCR, 2016), but has received just 29.5 million NOK. To this group we can add Nigeria (IDMC, n.d. (a)) with 2,1 million people displaced by “communal clashes, natural disasters and as a result of insurgency attacks by Islamists” which received 18 million NOK, Democratic Republic of Congo (IDMC, n.d. (b)) with 2,7 million people due to “conflict- and violence-induced displacement” due conflicts and 70 million NOK and Yemen (IDMC, n.d. (c)) with 2,8 million people due to recent armed conflicts and 45 million NOK. These states received notably less than other countries with high population displacement numbers like Syria, Iraq, South Sudan and Lebanon.

It is difficult to precisely point out which country was deliberately chosen to receive support and which was, mildly speaking, partially ignored since there are more factors in play (support from other countries and foundations for example). Nevertheless, we believe that decline towards assisting the countries which potentially would have more effects on Norway is unmistakably clear.

⁷ We were possibly able to only check 2015, since those are the latest available dates for the UNHCR data.

5. Summary

As we were progressing with our research we understood that the answer to our main question (“Why does Norway give emergency aid?”) is very complex and nuanced. This is why generalisations about Norwegian humanitarian aid are not always appropriate. As seen above, we differentiated two major thought approaches - a positive, “traditional” one and a negative, “cynical” one.

The traditional part looks at aid as sincere intention of Norway to help others. Being a rich and successful country, we can afford being proactive as a big humanitarian actor. Norwegian aid history starts as far back as in 1952. From that year onward 531 862 million NOK up today was spent on foreign aid. More than 150 000 agreements/projects have been signed, reaching 160 countries all over the globe. A glance at the history of norwegian aid, the amount of money spent, projects implemented, lives saved, suffering alleviated shows that helping other, less successful, countries indeed is a part of Norwegian tradition. A high number of Norwegian population supporting foreign aid and Norwegian peace and reconciliation works can also be considered to support this approach. We can see through our research for this part that there is a lot about norwegian emergency aid that is “pure” and the agenda behind it is to help the people that are less fortunate than ourselves.

As we showed earlier, the "cynical" approach comes from the “securitization of aid” criticism. Aid is increasingly given to the “fragile states” which are deemed as the source for a number of problems for industrialised countries - like refugees, terrorism, diseases, crime syndicates and others. Emergency aid can be used to prevent the spillover effects of disastrous situations, that could be of some negative influence for the donor countries. Our interviews with NGO representatives have confirmed an increasing influence of country’s foreign policy on humanitarian aid - it was described as being politicized and serving the country's own interests. By april 2004 The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has taken over most of the responsibilities from

Norad and since then has managed 92% of all emergency aid projects. The situation gets even more complicated since NGOs get funding from the government, and as our interviews showed in some cases the government can decide on what specific projects or how the money should be used on. The response to Syrian crisis and failing to adequately respond to the other emergencies along with the leak of the Foreign Affairs documents are the evidence that support the "cynical" look at Norwegian aid.

But, almost all of our interviewees agreed that one approach does not exclude the other, and the answer to our question is a combination of both. There are clear indications that Norway has other, non-benevolent intentions to provide humanitarian aid. These reasons are taking a toll on potential aid recipients who are far from interest for Norwegian international policy. There is indeed a clear shift from ethically based aid towards more politicised and "securitized" aid, but it does not discard the fact that Norwegian aid policy has been and still is saving lives and alleviates suffering all over the globe.

5.1 For future researches

We think it is a part of fieldwork, that by the end of it we realise that we could have asked different questions or drive our research in a bit of different way to acquire more relevant information. For future researches on our subject we would advise to look deeper into the relationship between Norad/Ministry of Foreign Affairs and NGOs. There is much to examine here, since NGOs are the one actually providing humanitarian aid. Putting a focus on how Ministry manages aid - on what grounds it gives grants, how it decides who gets it and what are the conditionalities behind those money (if any) could help to better understand how politicized and securitized aid has become.

The other point that could be of interest is how dependent humanitarian NGOs are on abovementioned state grants. While there are several possible income sources, government is potentially a big one - NGOs got cirka 3.6 billions in 2016. Examining public reports and putting a weight on this subject during interviews could be of help.

Last but not least - a comparison examination of countries who received foreign aid from Norway versus the emergencies and its effects could also yield some interesting results. We showed earlier that some countries have received more attention than others, and that focus was not always justified. A research through the years would certainly be of help, especially before and after WoT effects and UNOCHA's Financial Tracking Service (UNOCHA, n.d.) could be of help here.

Reference list

- BBC (2010). Haiti quake death toll rises to 230,000. Retrieved 18.april 2017 from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/8507531.stm>
- Blaker M. (2016). Listhaug: - Hele den tredje verden kan ikke komme til Norge. *Side 3*. Retrieved 28.april 2017 from <http://www.side3.no/listhaug---hele-den-tredje-verden-kan-ikke-komme-til-norge/3423283613.html>
- Brown S.& Grävingsholt J.(2016). *“The Securitization of foreign aid”*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dambisa M. (2010). *“Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is a Better Way for Africa”*. England: Penguin Books.
- Desai, V. & R. B. Potter (red.) (2006). *Doing Development Research*. London: Sage.
- Dybdahl, Ragnhild. (2016) Nødhjelp og utviklingsbistand - fagfelt som verktøy for å bygge bro. Retrieved 27.april 2017 from <http://www.noradbloggen.no/2016/06/nodhjelp-og-utviklingsbistand-fagfelt-som-verktoy-for-a-bygge-bro/>.
- Eriksen, T. L. & Smukkestad, O. (2013). Bistand og utvikling i et nytt landskap. Eriksen, T. L. & Feldberg, K.B. (Red.), *Utvikling. En innføring i utviklingsstudier*. (p. 287-311). Kristiansand: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- EU (2003). A secure Europe in a better world. Retrieved 16.april 2017 from <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf>
- Fangen, Katrine. (2015) Kvalitativ metode. Retrieved 27.april from <https://www.etikkom.no/FBIB/Introduksjon/Metoder-og-tilnarminger/Kvalitativ-metode/>.
- GPF (2017). Iraq's Humanitarian Crisis. Retrieved 22.april 2017 from <https://www.globalpolicy.org/humanitarian-issues-in-iraq/consequences-of-the-war-and-occupation-of-iraq/35742.html>
- Hansen, Tom. (2015) Sekundærdata. Retrieved 27.april 2017 from <http://www.analysen.no/latest-news/item/sekundaerdata>.

- IDMC (2017a). Nigeria IDP Figures Analysis. Retrieved 1.may 2017 from <http://www.internal-displacement.org/sub-saharan-africa/nigeria/figures-analysis>
- IDMC (2017b). Democratic Republic of the Congo IDP Figures Analysis. Retrieved 1.may 2017 from <http://www.internal-displacement.org/sub-saharan-africa/democratic-republic-of-the-congo/figures-analysis>
- IDMC (2017c). Yemen IDP Figures Analysis. Retrieved 1.may 2017 from <http://www.internal-displacement.org/middle-east-and-north-africa/yemen/figures-analysis>
- IFRC (2014). World Disasters Report. Retrieved 16.april 2017 from <http://www.ifrc.org/world-disasters-report-2014/data>
- Irinnews (2016). The biggest donors of 2016. Retrieved 18.april 2017 from <https://www.irinnews.org/maps-and-graphics/2016/12/20/biggest-donors-2016>
- Johannessen, Asbjørn m.fl. (2010). *Introduksjon til samfunnsvitenskapelig metode*. 4. utg. Oslo: Abstrakt forlag.
- Keen D. (2008). *“Complex Emergencies”*. Kundli, India: Polity Press.
- Leger Uten Grenser (2013). Der nøden er størst. Retrieved 28.april 2017 from <http://legerutengrenser.no/sites/default/files/rapporter/Der%20n%C3%B8den%20er%20st%C3%B8rst.pdf>
- Matre J.& Johnsen N. (2016). 10 ting du må vite om asylkaoset på Storskog. *VG*. Retrieved 15.april 2017 from <http://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/asyl-debatten/10-ting-du-maa-vite-om-asylkaoset-paa-storskog/a/23603522/>
- Mosveen og E., Byermoen T. (2016). Her er det hemmelige UD-notatet. *VG*. Retrieved 1.march 2017 from <http://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/solberg-regjeringen/her-er-det-hemmelige-ud-notatet/a/23628606/>
- Nguyen L. (2016). Derfor kommer færre asylsøkere til Norge. *TV2*. Retrieved 15.april 2017 from <http://www.tv2.no/a/8090540/>
- Norad. (2017a) Slik var norsk bistand i 2016. Retrieved 27.april 2017 from <https://www.norad.no/aktuelt/nyheter/2017/slik-var-norsk-bistand-i-2016/>.
- Norad (2017b). Norsk bistand i tall. Retrieved 18.april 2017 from <https://www.norad.no/om-bistand/norsk-bistand-i-tall/?tab=geo>
- Norad. (2011) Konfliktsensivitet. Retrieved 4.may 2017 from <https://www.norad.no/tema/demokrati-og-styresett/bistand-i-konflikt/konfliktsensivitet/>

- Norad. (n.d(a)) 50 år med Norad. Retrieved 27.april 2017 from <https://www.norad.no/om-norad/historie/>.
- Norad. (n.d(b)) Milepæler i norsk bistandsarbeid. Retrieved 27.april 2017 from <https://www.norad.no/om-norad/historie/milepaler-i-norsk-bistandsarbeid/>.
- Norad. (n.d. (c)) Norwegian Aid Statistics. Retrieved 4.may 2017 from <https://www.norad.no/en/front/toolspublications/norwegian-aid-statistics/?tab=geo>
- Norad (n.d. (d)). Slik er norsk bistand organisert. Retrieved 15.april 2017 from <https://www.norad.no/om-bistand/slik-er-norsk-bistand-organisert/>
- Nordhaug K. (2013). Utviklingsland i det internasjonale systemet. Eriksen, T. L. & Feldberg, K.B. (Red.), *Utvikling. En innføring i utviklingsstudier*. (p. 85-107). Kristiansand: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- OECD (n.d. (a)). Official development assistance – definition and coverage. Retrieved 26.april 2017 from <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/officialdevelopmentassistancedefinitionandcoverage.htm>
- OECD (n.d. (b)). Compare your country. Retrieved 26.april 2017 from <http://www2.compareyourcountry.org/oda?cr=20001&lg=en&page=0>
- OECD (2010). History of the 0.7% ODA target. Retrieved 15.april 2017 from <https://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/45539274.pdf>
- Regjeringen (2017). About the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Retrieved 22.april 2017 from https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/about_mfa/id838/
- Regjeringen. (2016(a)) Norway's engagement in peace processes since 1993. Retrieved 4.may 2017 from https://www.regjeringen.no/en/topics/foreign-affairs/peace-and-reconciliation-efforts/innsiktsmappe/peace_efforts/id732943/
- Regjeringen. (2016(b)) Norway's peace and reconciliation policy. Retrieved 4.may 2017 from <https://www.regjeringen.no/en/topics/foreign-affairs/peace-and-reconciliation-efforts/innsiktsmappe/facilitation/id708238/>
- Regjeringen. (2002(a)) 50 år med norsk bistand. Retrieved 27.april 2017 from <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/50-ar-med-norsk-bistand/id105818/>.
- Regjeringen. (2002(b)) Norsk bistand i fokus. Retrieved 27.april 2017 from <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/norsk-bistand-i-fokus/id105807/>.
- Riddell C.R.(2007). *“Does foreign aid really work?”*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

- Riksrevisjonen. (2008) *Riksrevisjonens undersøkelse av effektiviteten i norsk humanitær bistand*, Dokument nr. 3:2, 2008-2009. Retrieved 29.april 2017 from http://evaluering.nb.no/eval-utlevering/innhold/URN:NBN:no-nb_overfordokument_1593_Eval_0/pdf.
- Rønning Balsvik, R. 2016. *Norsk Bistandshistorie*. Oslo: Det Norske samlaget.
- Schmitt E.&Shanker T. (2005). U.S. Officials Retool Slogan for Terror War. *New York Times*. Retrieved 26.april 2017 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/26/politics/us-officials-retool-slogan-for-terror-war.html>
- Speed, Jan. (2016) Norge - verdens største humanitære giver. Retrieved 27.april 2017 from <http://www.bistandsaktuelt.no/nyheter/2016/norge-storste-giver/>.
- Statistisk sentralbyrå. (2007) Ni av ti sier ja til bistand. Retrieved 14.march 2017 from <https://www.ssb.no/en/offentlig-sektor/statistikker/uhjelphold/hvert-3-aar/2007-03-14>
- SSB. (2016). Refugees in Norway. Retrieved 28.april 2017 from <http://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/refugees-in-norway>
- The Humanitarian Aid project. [Picture] (2016) Retrieved 9.may 2017 from <http://www.pohlaw.org/humanitarian-aid.html>
- UDI (n.d.). Statistics on immigration. Retrieved 22.april 2017 from <https://www.udi.no/en/statistics-and-analysis/statistics/?filter=0&year=0&submit=Apply+filter>
- UN (2017). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Retrieved 28.april 2017 from <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>
- UN. (2016(a)) Hva er Nødhjelp? Retrieved 27.april 2017 from <http://www.fn.no/Tema/Humanitaert-arbeid/Noedhjelp>.
- UN. (2016(b)) Norge i FNs fredsbevarende operasjoner. Retrieved 27.april 2017 from <http://www.fn.no/Tema/Konflikt-og-fred/FNs-fredsarbeid/Norge-i-FNs-fredsarbeid>.
- UNESCO. International Migration. Retrieved 22.april 2017 from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/international-migration/glossary/migrant/>
- UNOCHA (n.d.). UNOCHA Financial Tracking Service. Retrieved 27 april 2018 from <https://fts.unocha.org/>
- UNOCHA (2017). Humanitarian Response Plan. Retrieved 27.april 2017 from https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/2017_hrp_syria_170320_ds.pdf

- UNHCR (2007). UNHCR's response to the Tsunami emergency in Indonesia and Sri Lanka, December 2004 - November 2006. Retrieved 26.april 2017 from <http://www.unhcr.org/afr/461504522.pdf>
- UNHCR (1951). Convention and protocol relating to the status of refugees. Retrieved 11.april 2017 fra <http://www.unhcr.org/protect/PROTECTION/3b66c2aa10.pdf>
- UNHCR (2011). UNHCR Resettlement Handbook. Retrieved 18.april 2017 from <http://www.unhcr.org/46f7c0ee2.pdf>
- UNHCR (n.d. (a)). Internally Displaced People. Retrieved 18.april 2017 from www.unhcr.org/internally-displaced-people.html
- UNHCR (n.d. (b)). UNHCR Statistics The World in Numbers. Retrieved 14.april 2017 from <http://popstats.unhcr.org/en/overview>
- UNHCR (n.d. (c)). Syria Regional Refugee Response. Retrieved 22.april 2017 from <http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/country.php?id=224>
- UNHCR (2017). The 1951 Refugee Convention. Retrieved 22.april 2017 from <http://www.unhcr.org/1951-refugee-convention.html>
- UNHCR (2016 December). Colombia situation. Retrieved 28.april 2017 from <http://www.refworld.org/country,,UNHCR,,COL,,58627cd24,0.html>
- The World Bank (n.d. (a)). Net official development assistance received (current US\$). Retrieved 2 may 2017 from <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/DT.ODA.ODAT.CD>
- The World Bank (n.d. (b)). GDP for Norway (current US\$). Retrieved 4.may 2017 from <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=NO>
- Østerud, Øyvind. (2006) Lite land som humanitær stormakt? *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift*. Retrieved 27.april 2017 from https://www-idunn-no.ezproxy.hioa.no/nnt/2006/04/lite_land_som_humaniterstormakt.

Attachment 1

Interviewguide

1. How would you describe the evolution of Norwegian emergency aid? E.g. How did it change over the past 20 years?
2. What were the prerequisites for these changes to occur?
3. How did you (organization, norad, etc.) adapt to these changes?
4. What and why do you think influences emergency aid the most? (External events, Norwegian and European political agenda, budget, ethics, etc.)
5. What drives Norwegian aid nowadays?
6. There is a lot of criticism diverted to emergency aid, underlining that it does more harm than good. Why do you think there is still a constant 10% of all aid budget used on emergency aid?
7. Why do you think Norway is so proactive as a donor country?
8. How do you think emergency aid should be managed and changed?
9. What is the difference between the agenda in the past and now?

Attachment 2

Inteviewinformant	Duration of interview
Terje Vigtel, Diplomat and aid worker, former director of Norad	40 minutes.
Anne-Marie Helland, General secretary at Norwegian Church Aid	45 minutes.
Erwin Van't Land, General secretary at Doctors without borders	50 minutes.
Odd Halgrim Evjen, Special advisor at Norwegian Church Aid.	45 minutes.
Arne Næss-Holm, Humanitarian Advocacy Advisor at Norwegian Church Aid	35 minutes.
Kjersti Haraldseide, Acting country director of Norwegian refugee council in Afghanistan for	55 minutes.
Thomas Lid Ball, Deputy Director, Section for Humanitarian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	45 minutes.
Siv Mjaaland, Development Policy Advisor, Save the Children	45 minutes
Heikki Eidsvoll Holmaas, Former Minister of Development	40 minutes.
Øivind Hetland, Regional representative Southern Africa and Indian Ocean Islands at Norwegian Red cross	1 hour.

Attachment 3

Interviewrequest



Oslo, 26. Januar 2017

Forespørsel om intervju (studentprosjekt)

Som del av bachelorgraden i Utviklingsstudier ved Høgskolen i Oslo og Akershus (HiOA) gjør studentene et gruppearbeid som skal baseres på et relevant, begrenset 'feltarbeid', og munne ut i en større semesteroppgave.

Gruppen bestående av Piri Babayev og Ida Rossehaug vil undersøke nødhjelpen sin plass i norsk utviklingspolitikk: Hvordan har argumentene rundt, rollen til og omfanget av nødhjelpen endret seg over tid? Hva er nødhjelpens rolle og omfang i dagens politikk, og hvilke debatter reiser dette? Prosjektet vil i hovedsak basere seg på intervjuer med relevante representanter fra embetsverk, politikk og frivillige organisasjoner.

I samråd med meg har gruppa kommet frem til at et intervju med deg – eventuelt den du henviser til som best egnet i din organisasjon – ville være høyst relevant og verdifullt for prosjektet. Som veileder for gruppa og på vegne av HiOA vil jeg med dette formidle at vi hadde satt stor pris på om du/dere kunne gi et intervju til gruppen.

Intervjuet vil ideelt vare ca. 1 time. Du vil motta en forespørsel på email direkte fra gruppas kontaktperson, Ida Rossehaug (s313695@stud.hioa.no). Hvis du har anledning til å imøtekomme vår forespørsel, vær så snill å avtale tid og sted direkte med henne. Utbe gjerne en foreløpig intervjuguide.

Vi på HiOA håper du vil være behjelpelig! Kontakt meg gjerne direkte dersom du/dere har spørsmål.

Vennlig hilsen

Simon Pahle, Førsteamanuensis, Utviklingsstudier

simon.pahle@hioa.no; +47 920 27 456

Institutt for Internasjonale Studier og Tolkeutdanning

Høgskolen i Oslo og Akershus, Pb 4 St Olavs Plass, 0130 Oslo