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Foreword

This report on armed violence in Norway was written before 22 July 2011, when Norway was hit by the worst attack against the country since World War II. On that day, government buildings were bombed and young politicians shot and killed at a youth camp on Utøya island. A total of 77 lives were lost.

Norway has consistently advocated the values of democracy, the rule of law, freedom of speech and human rights in our endeavours to overcome extremism and intolerance. The attacks on 22 July will not change our values or the way we engage internationally.

Armed violence and the links to international humanitarian and human rights law, development and humanitarian efforts have been on the international agenda for years. In May 2010, Norway and UNDP organised the Oslo Conference on Armed Violence to further increase international attention on the matter and help to reach agreement on some concrete measures in the field of armed violence prevention and reduction. At this meeting, where a large number of states, the UN, international organisations and civil society were represented, more than 60 states agreed on the Oslo Commitments on Armed Violence – a set of measures that states committed to implement with a view to reducing armed violence and its consequences.

One of these commitments concerns measuring and monitoring the incidence and impact of armed violence nationally in a transparent way. To respond to this commitment, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has produced the present report, which is Norway's first comprehensive national report on armed violence. In the process of writing this report, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs invited stakeholders from other state agencies, civil society and academia to contribute to the process. We would like to thank these resource persons for their active engagement in the process of producing this report. Involving a broad group of stakeholders in the drafting of the report has had the advantage both of ensuring that the report is interdisciplinary and of contributing to better understanding between the various sectors involved in different areas relevant to armed violence reduction and prevention.

Compared with other areas of the world Norway is not severely affected by armed violence. But certain similarities can be found with other and more heavily affected countries. This applies to risk patterns for armed violence and to some of the measures that are taken. Such findings demonstrate that countries attempting to reduce and prevent armed violence can learn from and assist one another, and that armed violence has to be understood as a global phenomenon.

Addressing armed violence is not a straightforward political exercise. This report shows that preventive and broad social interventions should be emphasised. Weapons control measures are important, but cannot solve the problem of armed violence alone. The only way we can address armed violence is by pursuing fact-based, long-term, multi-sector strategies. States, the UN, international organisations and civil society need to work together. But only states can implement the measures needed to address the problem fully, through fair justice systems, health care and education, social and economic development, employment and equitable distribution of resources. This requires concerted, coordinated and targeted efforts over time.

It is my hope that Norway’s first comprehensive national report on armed violence will be one of many national reports that can help us understand the issue better in order to reduce armed violence globally.

Jonas Gahr Støre
Minister of Foreign Affairs
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This report concerns the incidence and impact of armed violence in Norway and the strategies employed by both state agencies and civil society to prevent and reduce the phenomenon. The report also presents Norway’s broad range of responses to the global problem of armed violence.

Armed violence has been recognised by the United Nations, an increasing number of member states, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and civil society organisations as a global humanitarian, developmental and security problem. The UN estimates that armed violence claims some 740 000 lives each year, with several million more people being injured for life.

This report has been produced as a follow-up to the May 2010 “Oslo Conference on Armed Violence”, where some 60 states committed themselves to measure and monitor the incidence and impact of armed violence in a transparent way, and develop targets and indicators to assess progress on reducing armed violence. This was part of the “Oslo Commitments on Armed Violence”, the declaration endorsed by the conference. The conference was jointly organised by Norway and UNDP.

The Oslo Commitments identify four key actions states can undertake, alone or in cooperation with each other, the UN, international organisations and civil society to reduce the incidence and impact of armed violence, both at the national and international level. The actions concern monitoring and reporting, the rights of victims, the integration of armed violence prevention and reduction strategies into planning and programming, the relationship with, and the role of, international cooperation and assistance.

Armed violence is a global problem that manifests itself in a variety of ways in different geographical areas and political contexts in the world. Thus there is no one single way of addressing armed violence, and meaningful responses need to be multi-sectoral and adapted to local, national and regional contexts. A first step in developing effective responses is to acknowledge the problem and get an overview over its scope and magnitude.

Executive summary

There is no uniform, centralised system for monitoring or reporting on armed violence in Norway. More often than not, available data do not identify armed violence as a category distinct from other forms of violence. In addition, seemingly similar events may be coded differently, not only by different institutions but also within the same institution, and often for perfectly legitimate and rational reasons. There is for instance a continuum from threats of violence to the actual use of a weapon to inflict serious bodily harm. How such incidents are categorised and reported may thus vary. To get an overview, it is necessary to use several different data sources, and analyse them individually as well as in relation to each other. Data used in this report include police reports, health statistics and living condition surveys.

Police reports indicate that some 10%, or around 25 000, of all criminal cases recorded annually are violence-related. Living conditions surveys indicate that up to ten times as many persons have suffered violence

1 The “Oslo Conference on Armed Violence – achieving the Millennium Development Goals” was planned to take place in Oslo 20–21 April 2010, but was rescheduled to Geneva 12 May 2010 due to cancellation of air traffic in Europe following volcanic eruption in Iceland.
or threats thereof. But while the numbers provided by these sources differ significantly, an analysis shows an overall stability over time in incidences of violence in all data sources.

**Incidence and responses**

Over the last twenty years, there have been some 30-34 homicides in Norway annually, giving a homicide rate of 0.64-0.74 per 100,000 inhabitants. In about half of the cases, there is some kind of family relationship between the perpetrator and the victim. The use of alcohol, and to a lesser extent other substances, is a striking feature in both homicides and other violent crimes.

Norway has one of the highest rates of civilian ownership of firearms in the world, but stabbing and assaults with blunt objects are much more prevalent than incidents involving firearms. Firearms count for some 20% of homicides over the past decade. The by far most common form of violence does not involve the use of any arms or objects. For this reason, the focus has been on preventing violence in general, as opposed to armed violence specifically.

Both state agencies and civil society are engaged in projects to prevent and reduce violence. The police, which are normally unarmed, employ a range of methods, including integrated plans that combine zero-tolerance approaches and fast tracking of court cases with dialogue and direct engagement with perpetrators. The Ministry of Justice and the Police has launched an action plan to address domestic violence, while the Norwegian educational system – from kindergartens to secondary schools – has peaceful conflict resolution as an integrated part of the learning objectives. Civil society organisations conduct street mediation and engage in concrete conflicts.

**Victims**

More men than women are victims of violence, but the trend indicates an increase of female victims. Female victims tend to have a family relationship with, or to know, the perpetrator, and alcohol plays a less significant role in the incident. Male victims tend to be affected by alcohol or other substances, and they often have no relation to the perpetrator, who also tends to be intoxicated.

There is no special system for ensuring rehabilitation of individuals suffering from injuries or disabilities caused by armed violence. The social welfare system and the health system secures the right to care, rehabilitation and inclusion for all individuals in need of such services, whether due to physical or psychological disabilities from birth or to illness, injuries, traumas or violence that cause temporary or permanent disabilities.

**Addressing the global problem**

Addressing the global problem of armed violence is a priority for Norway. Efforts have been multi-tracked, through support for programmes aimed at reducing armed violence in affected areas and assisting victims, and through initiatives aimed at strengthening and developing relevant international normative and regulative frameworks, including arms transfer controls, international humanitarian law and human rights instruments.

The international conference on armed violence, organised by Norway and UNDP, resulted in the endorsement of the “Oslo Commitments”, which describe key strategic steps states and others should take to focus efforts aimed at preventing and reducing armed violence, including national monitoring and reporting. Norway supports the efforts by the UN to address armed violence, and works closely with the ICRC and with international and national NGOs on different aspects of this issue, including on the Arms Trade Treaty negotiations and through the Geneva Declaration initiative.

**Defining armed violence**

*Armed Violence is difficult to define, but easy to recognise* – this quote from the 2010 short film “Faces of Violence”\(^2\) produced for the Oslo Conference, neatly sums up the challenges of precisely defining the phenomenon of armed violence.

---

violence. Current definitions in use in international policy contexts reflect the multifaceted nature of armed violence, the many different political and geographical contexts in which it occurs and the concerns of the actors involved in the processes.

The UN Secretary-General defines armed violence as “the intentional use of physical force, threatened or actual, with arms, against oneself, another person, group, community or State that results in the loss, injury, death and/or, psychosocial harm to an individual or individuals and that can undermine a community’s, country’s or region’s security and development achievements and prospects.”

The OECD defines Armed Violence as “the use or threatened use of weapons to inflict injury, death or psychosocial harm, which undermines development”, while the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development defines it as “the intentional use of illegitimate force (actual or threatened) with arms or explosives against a person, group, community, or state, which undermines people-centred security and/or sustainable development”.

Norway fully supports this comprehensive approach to armed violence which recognises its developmental and humanitarian consequences. Norway too recognises that there is a strong interdependence and a dynamic relationship between armed violence and development. Armed violence is a threat to development, and lacking development can lead to armed violence. However, this focus on development and security is less relevant to the situation in Norway. While armed violence in Norway in some instances constitutes a threat to state security and may challenge the legitimate monopoly on the use of force, armed violence mainly threatens the lives and security of individuals.

For this reason, this report refers to several definitions of armed violence. A short working definition has been chosen to delimit the issue in a domestic context, while Norway’s international policies and practice are based on the more comprehensive definitions referred to above.

For the domestic context, the following definition has been chosen: “Armed Violence is the intentional use, or threatened use, of weapons against persons”.

This definition covers all acts performed with the use of arms of any kind, including explosives, firearms, blade weapons and any other objects that may be used to increase harm or injury. In a strict reading of the definition, the use of force without the use of arms, such as kicking, pushing or hitting, methods often associated with gender-based violence, falls outside this definition. Since the objective of this report is to provide a descriptive overview and it is not intended for scientific purposes, incidents of unarmed violence against persons may be included if they are deemed relevant to the overall picture.

Measuring armed violence

There is currently no generally recognised method for measuring and monitoring armed violence, a fact that is reflected in this report. There is however an increasing international effort to develop common goals, targets and indicators that may be used for recording and reporting on armed violence with a view to developing policies and strategies. For some time, UN organisations, the ICRC, the OECD, the World Bank and other international organisations, together with NGOs such as the Small Arms Survey, Viva Rio and Action on Armed Violence as well as academic institutions and field practitioners, have individually developed various ways of measuring armed violence in specific geographical and political contexts. Recently some of them have pooled their expertise in an attempt to bring forward a framework of goals, targets and indicators to track armed violence and support prevention and reduction activities.
This expert group, which has conducted its work within the framework of the Geneva Declaration, presented its findings in a background paper to the Oslo Conference. The report identifies three overall goals, eight targets and a corresponding set of 20 indicators. The three goals are:

1) To reduce the number of people physically harmed by armed violence
2) To reduce the number of people and groups affected by armed violence
3) To strengthen institutional responses to prevent and reduce armed violence

The work to develop a comprehensive and coherent framework for measuring and monitoring armed violence is still at an early stage. The report reflects an emerging consensus among practitioners on what may constitute meaningful and realistic goals, targets and indicators that are relevant for developing responses to armed violence.

The World Bank’s 2011 World Development Report addresses similar issues, although from a slightly different angle. The theme of the 2011 report is Conflict, Security and Development, and while the report has a different scope, it will help to shape the efforts to improve both the empirical baseline and the analytical framework for understanding the impact of armed violence on individuals and societies.

Measuring and monitoring armed violence concern more than statistics. A group of NGOs involved in armed violence prevention addressed the question of national reporting and data-collection at a conference in Amsterdam in January 2011. They agreed that, although a considerable amount of relevant data exists in most countries, it is often incomplete and structured in a variety of ways. This is not conducive to systematic armed violence measuring and monitoring. Furthermore, the information is often inaccessible to the full range of stakeholders. The conference highlighted the importance of making better use of existing data.

The conference participants agreed that a fundamental rationale for national armed violence monitoring lies in the need to build accountability among states to ensure the safety and security of their populations, and to hold states responsible to this end. In their view, national monitoring represents a concrete response to existing international obligations under international humanitarian and human rights law.

Participants also recognised the critical importance of national monitoring as the basis for building effective responses to the problem of armed violence. Monitoring armed violence at the national level makes it possible to identify specific affected areas or communities within countries, different types of problems associated with armed violence, and hence timely, targeted and appropriate humanitarian responses. In the view of the conference, national monitoring also enables analysis of patterns of armed violence. Such analysis helps to build understanding of the underlying factors that increase risk, and therefore also build support for establishing early warning capacity and, ultimately, effective prevention.

Measuring and monitoring armed violence is a means to an end. The purpose is to build recognition of the fact that armed violence is in essence a humanitarian and social problem. It is a way of acknowledging victims and survivors; it is crucial to understanding the nature of the problem and to designing appropriate policy and programming responses. It is also a prerequisite for evaluating their impact on improving public safety and citizen security.

It is not necessary to develop and implement complex or costly new data generation systems. Efforts undertaken by states, the UN, international organisations and NGOs demonstrate that in most country contexts, the basis of an armed violence monitoring system can be based on better use of existing data sources.

---

Reporting on armed violence in Norway

The objective of this report is to provide a description rather than a policy prescription. It does not suggest concrete new goals, targets and indicators for Norway, but is a first attempt to get a comprehensive overview of armed violence, the actors involved in responding to the problem and their strategies, how the problem is monitored and by whom, and Norway’s contributions to addressing the problem at an international level. Currently there is no overarching system for monitoring the incidence and impact of armed violence. Police and health authorities, academia and civil society all generate data in accordance with their own specific mandates, and rarely have the opportunity or resources to go beyond this.

As part of the preparation of this report, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs invited stakeholders from other state agencies, civil society and academia to contribute to the process. The authors conducted two stakeholder consultations, one at the start of the process and one when the first draft was ready. In addition, the authors worked with some of the stakeholders individually during the writing.

This model of consulting a broad group of stakeholders in the drafting of the report has two key advantages. It helps to cover what is a multifaceted and multi-sectoral area of policy and practice, and thus to get a better overview of the actual situation. It also helps to create awareness among practitioners who work within one sector about what takes place in other sectors and helps to nurture a better understanding of the overall policy and practice in the area of armed violence.

The two main sources of quantitative statistical information consulted here are the police register of criminal cases (STRASAK) and Statistics Norway’s living conditions surveys. These sources are open to the public and available online.

The criminal cases database only contains the criminal acts that have been reported and are known to the police. Some criminal acts are never reported. The statistics are influenced by a number of factors, including people’s inclination to report crime to the police, the probability of crime being detected, and the efforts, controls and priorities of the police and other government agencies.

Statistics Norway’s living conditions surveys, and public surveys conducted by the police, indicate that the numbers of criminal acts experienced by the population is higher than the numbers reported to the police. This discrepancy varies with the category of crime. Most of the data presented are quantitative, but the analyses being referred to are in some cases based on qualitative data.

Norway is a country with well-functioning institutions, and a high degree of validity can be expected in the relevant official statistics. However, the caveat applies here as everywhere else that statistics are influenced by practical limitations, methodological choices, institutional structures and legislative frameworks.

---

8 See Appendix for a list over institutions and organisations invited to the stakeholder consultations.

9 Police statistics and analyses are available in Norwegian on https://www.politi.no/strategier_og_analyser/statistiker_og_analyser/. For this report, the annual review of the criminal cases database (STRASAK) has been used, http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/JD/Vedlegg/Rapporter/KommenterteSTRASAK-tall2010.pdf. Statistics Norway collects police statistics and produces the surveys of living condition, all of which is available online, in Norwegian and in English, through http://www.ssb.no/english/.
Homicides

Statistics show that there are few homicides in Norway compared to other countries. Depending on how the statistics are calculated, the current annual homicide rate is between 0.64 and 0.74 per 100,000 inhabitants, i.e. between 30 and 34 deaths per year, in a population of 4.9 million. Both rates are calculated on the basis of criminal justice data sources. The lower rate, 0.64 per 100,000 inhabitants, is obtained from the official statistics on homicide from Statistics Norway and the National Criminal Investigation Service (KRIPOS) which are calculated using data from the police register of criminal cases (STRASAK), and are based on the number of victims of homicide pursuant to section 233 of the General Civil Penal Code, i.e. intentional or premeditated murder.

The higher rate, 0.74 per 100,000 inhabitants, is obtained by examining all cases of lives taken by another person, and where there is an enforceable conviction, pursuant to section 233 of the General Civil Penal Code, i.e. homicide, and infanticide (code 1710 – section 234), bodily harm resulting in death (code 1714 – section 229, third sentence option), grievous bodily harm (code 1706 – section 231), deprivation of liberty (code 1602 – section 223), rendering a person helpless (code 1718 – section 242), life, body, health – miscellaneous (code 1799), robbery, extortion – miscellaneous (code 2599), arson resulting in death (code 701 – section 148).10

By comparison, the world average homicide rate in 2004 was 7.6 per 100,000 inhabitants, i.e. 490,000 deaths.11

There are large regional differences in the world’s homicide rates. The rates vary with crime levels more generally, and are reflective of characteristics in certain contexts of armed violence. Furthermore, in many countries the numbers are difficult to calculate with precision, due to variations in aspects such as data quality, institutional capacities and legal frameworks. A study took on the challenge of gathering and comparing homicide statistics on a global scale,12 and came up with the statistics presented in the figure below.

In response to a number of homicides that took place in a relatively short period of time, during 2008 and 2009, where the media highlighted the perpetrators’ mental illness and/or substance abuse problems, the government appointed a committee to investigate homicides committed by individuals with known mental disorders.

The committee produced a report that analysed all homicide cases in the period 2004-2009, reviewing the relevant literature, describing the status of knowledge in relevant fields, and making a number of recommendations.  

Apart from its main conclusion that there tend to be few homicides in Norway compared with other countries, the report found a decline in the number of homicides in recent years. Indeed, over the last 30 years there appears to have been a decline in homicide rates, which have now reached levels similar to those recorded between the late 1950s and the early 1970s.

---

14 ibid. p. 31.
The report’s main findings about the perpetrators, victims and methods did not reveal evidence that would be sufficient to easily profile persons who would be likely to take another person’s life. The perpetrators seemed to be as diverse as the rest of the population. However, the report did highlight some general differences between the homicide perpetrators as a group and the population in general:

The perpetrators are often men aged 17 to 45 years. They generally have less education and are less likely to be in work. They are more often unmarried and more often have an unstable housing situation. They often have prior convictions, especially for violent crime. The perpetrators are more often born abroad. They more often have a serious mental disorder, such as schizophrenia. They also have a higher frequency of personality disorders than the average in the population as a whole.

Many of the homicides are linked to substance use: the perpetrator is under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of the offence or the perpetrator has an addiction-related diagnosis.

Most homicides are committed by one person and there is one victim. Half of the victims are related to the perpetrator, and it is rare that strangers are killed. The most common method of killing is stabbing with a knife.

Ninety per cent of the perpetrators were male, and their age at the time of the offence ranged from 15 to 86 years, the average age being 36 years and the median age 35 years, with 90% being under the age of 50. This is a higher average age than the average found in other countries. The report cites studies from England and Wales (median age 27) and Denmark (median age 30).

Socio-economic factors feature significantly in the report on homicides in Norway. This is the case despite the fact that Norway figures as number one not only in the UN’s Human Development Index (HDI), but also in the Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index (IHDI). The homicide perpetrators had a significantly lower educational level than the general population. Only 34% of the perpetrators were employed, compared to 72% of the general population. Only 27% of the perpetrators were homeowners, compared to 81% of the general population.

---

1 According to the committee’s review, homicide pursuant to section 233 of the General Civil Penal Code.
2 According to the National Criminal Investigation Service (KRIPOS), divided by the number of 100,000 inhabitants per year: KRIPOS, 2008.
5 ibid. p. 42.
6 ibid. pp. 33-34.
7 ibid. pp. 35-37.
8 IHDI is a “measure of the average level of human development of people in a society once inequality is taken into account. It captures the HDI of the average person in society, which is less than the aggregate HDI when there is inequality in the distribution of health, education and income. Under perfect equality, the HDI and IHDI are equal; the greater the difference between the two, the greater the inequality,” http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/ihdii/.
Having a history of violence and crime was found to be a salient predictor of future violence among the perpetrators, alongside gender and age.\textsuperscript{19} Approximately one-third had been convicted of violent crimes before the homicide (37%); a similar proportion had a known history of violence, but had not been convicted (32%); whereas the last third had no known history of violence (31%). By way of comparison, about one person per 1 000 is punished for violent crimes per year.

The most common method is stabbing with a knife (34%). If axes and other sharp instruments are included, the proportion rises to 42%.\textsuperscript{20} This is similar to the overall proportion of 40% in the European region, according to a recent WHO report.\textsuperscript{21}

The second-most common homicide method during the period 2004–2009 was shooting with a firearm (17%). In a previous Norwegian study, covering the years 1980-1989, killing with a firearm accounted for 35%, whereas a recent study from England and Wales recorded a significantly lower proportion, at 7%.\textsuperscript{22}

The global significance of firearms in the context of armed violence warrants a closer look at the statistics. According to the homicide statistics recorded by the National Criminal Investigation Service (KRIPOS) for the last twenty years (1991–2010), 171 out of 662 homicides were committed with a firearm (26%). The proportion of homicides perpetrated with a firearm varies between 7% (2007) and 36% (1993). Over the last ten years (2001–2010), the proportion of homicides carried out with a firearm is 21%, whereas during the last five years (2006–2010), the proportion is 17%.\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline
Method & Number & Per cent \\
\hline
Knife & 46 & 34 \\
Axe & 5 & 4 \\
Other sharp instrument & 5 & 4 \\
Blunt object & 10 & 7 \\
Hitting or kicking (physical force, unarmed fights) & 20 & 15 \\
Suffocation/hanging & 20 & 15 \\
Shooting & 23 & 17 \\
Fire & 4 & 3 \\
Other & 4 & 3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Homicide methods distributed according to the number of victims (N=137)}
\end{table}

The criminal cases database includes information on the perpetrators’ main motive for the homicide, classified according to certain legal categories. This is not the same as the reason, nor does the motive reflect the complexity of causal factors at play. According to the statistics, the following three categories of motive were the most prevalent in the homicide cases registered in 2004-2009: drunken dispute (29%), jealousy or reaction to intimate partner wanting to leave (19%), delusions of a paranoid or hallucinatory nature (12%).\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{19} NOU 2010:3 summary in English, pp. 37-38.
\textsuperscript{20} ibid. p. 40.
\textsuperscript{22} NOU 2010:3 summary in English, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{23} Drapsoversikt 2010, KRIPOS, the National Criminal Investigation Service, 14 January 2011, https://www.politi.no/aktuelt/Nybet_9474.xhtml.
\textsuperscript{24} NOU 2010:3, summary in English p 40.
The report on homicides in the period 2004–2009 found that half the victims (49%, 69 persons) had some kind of family connection with the perpetrator, whereas about one tenth (11%, 16 people) were killed by someone they did not know before the incident, out of which 4 people were killed without any interaction between the victim and the perpetrator before the homicide. Substance abuse was much more prevalent among the perpetrators of homicides than in the Norwegian population as a whole. Among the perpetrators of homicide in the period 2004–2009 the proportion that had engaged in harmful use of alcohol at some point in life was 45%, against 20% among the male population of Oslo, according to an epidemiological study. The proportion that had engaged in harmful use of drugs was 48% among the homicide perpetrators and 2% among the male population of Oslo.

**Violence and threats**

According to the national crime register based on the police register of criminal cases (STRASAK), violence is the third largest group of crimes, accounting for 10% of all criminal cases in 2010.\(^2^7\) The number of reported cases of violence has remained fairly stable over the last five years, at around 25-26 000 a year.

Violence as an overall category of crimes is subdivided into three main categories: crimes against life, body and health (55%); crimes against personal liberty (28%); and domestic violence (12%). Since 2006, domestic violence has been covered by a separate section (§ 219) of the Norwegian General Civil Penal Code.

Far from all instances of violence and threats are registered in the police records. For various reasons, citizens refrain from reporting certain cases to the police. The periodic living conditions surveys prepared every two to three years by Statistics Norway provide information that can be used to complement the police records. A comparison of these two sources of information shows that up to ten times as many persons report to Statistics Norway that they have suffered violence or threats (5% of the population 16 years of age or older in 2004; 2.5% for physical violence alone) compared with the number of violent crimes, including threats, that are registered in the police records (5.4 per 1000 citizens in 2004, i.e. 0.54%). However, data from Statistics Norway, from its first study of living conditions in Norway in 1983 and onward, suggest a high degree of stability in the proportion of the population that has experienced violence.\(^2^8\)
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<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inhabitants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and threats as a %</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 16 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{25}\) ibid. p. 39.

\(^{26}\) ibid. pp. 44-45.


The share of the population exposed to violence and threats of violence appears to be stable. In 2007, 5.5% of the population was exposed to violence or threats of violence, the same share as in the late 1990s.\textsuperscript{29}

The same pattern of stability has been registered over the last 11 years in the cases of violent offences (threats and physical violence) reported to the police. The share of the population reporting violent offences to the police has stayed at about 5.5 per 1000 citizens, i.e. 0.55%.\textsuperscript{30}

Whereas survey data on exposure to violent crime and the share of the population that has reported such offences to the police remain stable, displaying a continuous discrepancy (ten times as many Norwegians experience violence as the number that report violent offences to the police), the types of violent offences reported to the police have changed over time. According to Statistics Norway, incidents of assaults on public servants and ill-treatment within family relations have increased. At the same time, the numbers of assaults and cases of bodily harm have decreased.\textsuperscript{31}

A periodic review of violent crime in Oslo Police District covering the second half of 2009 contains a range of disaggregated statistics that enable a multifaceted analysis.\textsuperscript{32}

It is worth mentioning the Oslo police report’s data on the use of weapons.\textsuperscript{33} In most cases of violent crime – 83.5% during the second half of 2009 – the only weapon is the perpetrator’s own body, which is used to inflict harm by hitting, kicking, pushing, biting, strangling etc. Such acts may be no less serious or harmful than those committed with a weapon or any object being used as a weapon. Weapons and other objects were used in 16.5% of reported cases of violent crime during the same period in 2009. This represented a decrease compared with the previous periodic review, in 2006, where weapons and objects had been used in 20% of the reported cases of violent crime. The two tables below show a large degree of stability in the proportion of cases perpetrated with a weapon, and also a fairly stable distribution between types of weapon over time.\textsuperscript{34}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\hline
Use of body & 85.1 & 85.4 & 82.6 & 84.0 & 84.5 & 80.3 & 83.5 \\
Use of weapon & 14.9 & 14.6 & 17.4 & 16.0 & 15.5 & 19.7 & 16.5 \\
Total & 100.0 & 100.0 & 100.0 & 100.0 & 100.0 & 100.0 & 100.0 \\
\hline
\textbf{N=} & 2306 & 2264 & 1308 & 1244 & 2277 & 1330 & 1391 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Cases of physical violence reported to the Oslo Police District, by use of body and use of weapon. Periodic reviews of violent crimes at Oslo Police District 1998-2009. Percentages.}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{31} ibid.
\textsuperscript{33} ibid. pp. 21–23.
\textsuperscript{34} ibid. pp. 21–22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon</th>
<th>2003 Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>2nd half of 2006 Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>2nd half of 2009 Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own body</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt object</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp object</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid/electric/drug</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Looking at Norway as a whole, the criminal statistics for the last five years (2006-2010) demonstrate stability in the number of cases of bodily harm inflicted with a knife. In 2010, there were 275 such cases reported to the police. The numbers of cases of bodily harm inflicted with a firearm are relatively low. In both 2009 and 2010, there were 17 such cases reported to the police, which represents a 26% decrease compared with 2006.35

The mentioned police report on violence in Oslo registered 1391 victims of violent crimes during the second half of 2009. The report found that 61.5% of the victims were men and 38.5% women. The average age of male victims was 30.6 years and 32.4 years for female victims. The median age among male victims was 28 years. The median among female victims was 30 years.36

The perpetrators of violent crimes in Oslo during the second half of 2009 numbered 1297 persons. The perpetrators were predominantly male (89 %), female perpetrators accounting for 11 %. There is an increasing proportion of young violent offenders below the age of 20. Whereas the average age for male perpetrators was 30.6 years and 29.4 years for female perpetrators, the most common age span was 20-29 years, followed by 30-39 among females and males.37

Among the victims as well as the perpetrators, persons with their roots in Africa, Asia and the Middle East were overrepresented.38

In 29% of the cases of violent crime reported in the second half of 2009, the perpetrator and victim were previously unknown to one another, in 27% of the cases they were friends or acquaintances.39

The relationships in which violence occurs appear to be different for men and women. A higher proportion of violence that afflicted women occurred in current or previous partner relationships. In as many as 29% of the cases where a female was the victim of violence, the offender was her husband or partner, whereas in another 13.6% of the cases the offender was an ex-partner.40

Among male victims, their relationship with the victims is unknown in as many as 36% of the cases, compared with 16% among female victims.41

There is a significant correlation between violent crime and the influence of alcohol or drugs, both for perpetrators and victims. In the case of Oslo, this is particularly prevalent in violent crime occurring in the downtown area (see below table).42

35 Kommenterte STRASAK-tall 2010, Politidirektoratet, Sektion for analyse og forebygging, 10 January 2011, p. 16.
36 Vold i Oslo 2009, p. 25.
37 ibid. p. 29.
38 ibid. pp. 31–33.
39 ibid. p. 33.
40 ibid.
41 ibid.
42 ibid. p. 39.
## TABLE 5
Victims of violence in the centre of Oslo, by influence of drugs or alcohol. Oslo Police District 2nd half of 2009. Absolute numbers and percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victims Centre of Oslo</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not under the influence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## TABLE 6
Suspected/charged violent offenders in the centre of Oslo, by influence of drugs or alcohol. Oslo police district 2nd half of 2009. Absolute numbers and percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspected/charged offender Centre of Oslo</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not under the influence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Organised crime

A Government white paper in 2010 presented an overview of challenges related to organised crime and laid out how it should be confronted in a comprehensive manner by the police, the prosecutor and other branches of the authorities.  

It is impossible to give a full and precise description of the extent and scope of organised crime in Norway. According to threat evaluations and trend reports produced by the police, there are clear indications that organised crime is increasing. This is particularly the case with regard to the trafficking and selling of drugs. Human trafficking is also becoming a more serious problem. Negative trends have furthermore been recorded for information, communications and technology crime and for economic crime.

In addition to the statistical data, there is also the experience of certain concrete cases, which gives reason to assume that organised criminal networks are growing, particularly among biker gangs and mobile theft and robbery networks. They are especially involved in serious drug-related crimes, serious violence, threats, serious robberies, kidnapping, torpedo missions, attempted and committed homicides.

There is a general tendency to assume that gangs carry out organised crime. However, even though the police register various examples of gang-related confrontations and coordinated criminal activities, there is uncertainty about the degree of organisation behind these cases.

It is noteworthy that the police – since redoubling its efforts, particularly in Oslo Police District, starting in 2006 – seem to have been able to check the trend towards increasing violence among criminal gangs.

---

44 Ibid. p. 10.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid. p. 35.
47 Ibid. p. 10.
48 Ibid.
Gender-based and domestic violence

While male offenders account for 80% of all incidents of violence and threats of violence, men and women are victims of different types of violence. Typically, violence towards men is perpetrated by offenders influenced by alcohol or drugs in public spaces during weekends, and in half the cases the offender is unknown to the victim. A much larger share of violence against women occurs in residential areas, and the offenders are usually not influenced by alcohol or drugs.49

Domestic violence has historically been an issue confined to the private sphere. In recent years the Government has launched a concerted effort to disclose and prevent this form of violence based on the principle that helping to prevent violence in all population groups is a public responsibility. The Ministry of Justice and the Police has adopted an Action Plan against Domestic Violence for 2008–2011 called Turning Point.50 Public responsibility is predicated on the assertion that "[t]hrough improved prevention, more detection, more rapid reaction and better rehabilitation, we will promote a safer, fairer society". The Action Plan outlines the scope of the problem:

A nationwide survey carried out in 2005 showed that approximately nine per cent of women over fifteen years of age have been victims of serious violence from their current or former partner one or more times in the course of their lives (Haaland, Clausen and Schei, 2005). But women are not the only victims of domestic violence.

A significant number of children see their mother being abused. They see, hear and experience violence against their main carer. They are also victims. Every year, 1,500 children spend one or more nights in women’s shelters in Norway. A survey carried out among pupils in upper secondary schools shows that seven per cent have experienced partner violence against their mother and two per cent have experienced partner violence against their father. Two per cent have experienced gross partner violence against their mother (Norwegian Social Research (NOVA), 2007).

In extreme cases, violence leads to loss of human life, and we know that between twenty and thirty per cent of all killings in the past ten years were committed by present or former lovers, spouses or partners (National Bureau of Crime Investigation (KRIPOS)).

Persons other than the partner can also perpetrate domestic violence. Honour-related violence often occurs in close relationships, and is in most cases the result of a desire to control girls' and women’s sexuality. It is defined as a family or family group that collectively sanctions violence against a family member, or against another person who has brought dishonour on the family. Honour-related violence may consist of strong mental pressure, threats or physical violence and, in the most extreme cases, murder. This means that there may be several offenders of both sexes, and that the victims may be girls, boys, women or men. To be able to implement appropriate measures to provide good assistance for victims, and to act correctly in emergency situations or during the investigation and prosecution process, it is important to be aware of the special characteristics of honour-related violence.

Domestic violence also affects elderly people. In many cases the abuser is a child or grandchild of the victim, but partners also perpetrate violence. Relatively small, local studies indicate that between three and five per cent of persons over 60 years of age are abused, and in most cases the offender is a person known to the victim (Storberget (ed.) et al, 2007).

Domestic violence also occurs in homosexual and lesbian relationships. In this case, however, no surveys have been carried out in Norway to indicate how many people are affected. Swedish studies (e.g. Holmberg and Stjernqvist (2005)) show that homosexuals and lesbians are less likely than heterosexuals to seek help after being subjected to violence from a partner. Similarly, they are far less likely to report such abuse to the police.51

Current understanding of the role of weapons in domestic violence is limited and more research may be needed. However, the mandate of the commission currently reviewing the Norwegian firearms law includes consideration of domestic violence in relation to issuance and withdrawal of gun licences. In the future, the law may require that the partner be consulted in connection with gun licensing.

THE USE OF FORCE BY THE POLICE

The Norwegian police are unarmed in the daily conduct of their tasks. The police may use armed force in exceptional circumstances, and all officers receive training in the use of firearms as part of their regular education. The use of arms is regulated by special instructions issued by the Ministry of Justice and the Police. The instructions contain provisions for required training, set out the conditions for the use of arms and the procedures for reporting on incidents involving the use of arms.

All use of armed force by police officers requires prior consent by the local or regional chief of police. In general, permission for or an order to the use of arms will be given when:

• Concrete information gives reason to believe that police officers may confront an armed person
• The task is perceived as particularly dangerous for the involved officers
• The nature of the task necessitates arming for other reasons
• The Ministry of Justice and the Police has consented to, or ordered, that arms may be used under particular circumstances or for particular tasks.

The regulations on the use of arms (§24) require that all use, or threat of use, of arms by police officers, be reported to the National Police Directorate. An overview over such reports for the decade 1994–2004 shows a certain increase in such use until 2001, followed by a certain decrease.

Reported use of firearms by the police 1994–2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounds fired</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this period two people were killed as a result of police use of arms. In two occasions people were injured. Three police officers were killed in service by use of arms in the same period. The peak years 1995 and 2004 concerning rounds fired by the police were due to specific instances where police officers were engaged in direct fire fights with armed actors.

The emergency response unit

The police have a special emergency response unit (Beredskapstroppen) for use in particularly dangerous situations, including hostage taking, terrorism and organised crime. The unit receives extra training and conducts regular exercises for special situations. Permission to carry and use arms is subject to the same regulations as for the ordinary police. In the period 2000–2004 the unit has threatened with the use of arms on 83 occasions, and actually fired four times (1 in 2001, 1 in 2003 and 2 in 2004).

The police arms inventory

The police have access to a range of arms in their service, including short and long batons, CS and OC gas (tear gas) and different types of firearms. The standard service guns are the Heckler & Koch P30L pistol and the Heckler & Koch MPS submachine gun. The arms regulations deal with the use of firearms, while the Police Act regulates the use of other arms.

Norwegian Bureau for the Investigation of Police Affairs

The Norwegian Bureau for the Investigation of Police Affairs was established in 2004 as an independent body, with responsibility for investigating cases that involve the question of whether a person serving in the police or prosecuting authorities has committed a criminal offence in service.

The Bureau is not part of the police force or the ordinary prosecuting authority. Administratively it is subordinate to the Ministry of Justice and the Police. Professionally it reports to the Director of Public Prosecutions, who has the authority to instruct the Bureau to initiate or terminate an investigation, and who also deals with complaints about decisions reached by the Bureau.

Investigations are carried out by three regional investigative divisions, which make recommendations to the Director about whether or not a case should be considered for prosecution. As a matter of routine, the Bureau is notified in instances where police use of force has resulted in human injury. The Bureau then makes its own assessment of whether further investigation is required. In addition to this, members of the public may file a complaint to the Bureau.

52 Våpeninstruksen (regulations for the use of arms by police).
THE ARMED FORCES

The Armed Forces have access to a broad range of arms. If a member of the Armed Forces uses a service weapon outside of duty, the case falls under the civil penal code. If there is an issue where members of the Armed Forces have used arms in duty in ways that violate the military penal code, this will be investigated by the military police, and if relevant, prosecuted by the Judge Advocate General\(^\text{55}\), who, together with the Judge Advocates, constitutes the Norwegian military prosecuting authority. The Judge Advocate General may also recommend investigations on an independent basis. The Judge Advocate General's staff possesses significant competence in the areas of law of war, operational law and military law, and may also prosecute war crimes\(^\text{56}\).

ARMS IN NORWAY

With approximately 1.3 million firearms owned by civilians, Norway has one of the highest rates of private gun ownership in Europe. According to the first countrywide survey presented by the National Police Directorate in 2001, there were 990 000 registered shotguns, rifles, revolvers and pistols in civilian ownership. Among these, there were 600 000 rifles. These figures do not include an estimated 500 000 shotguns acquired before the registration duty was imposed on 1 October 1990. In 2006, however, the National Police Directorate published figures stating there were 1 316 000 registered firearms, the increase being due to new legislation requiring the registration of formerly unregistered shotguns. Recreational hunters own the majority of privately held firearms, while gun collectors represent a large share.

There are no exact figures for military firearms in Norway. The Armed Forces estimate that there are about 80 000 military firearms. Discrepancies in the registers explain why the estimated numbers of Norwegian military firearms in the illegal market range from 250 to 2000.

The regulations governing gun ownership have gradually become stricter over the past decade, and include obligations as regards keeping arms and ammunition physically apart in separate, secure steel safe boxes, and provisions for law-enforcement personnel to inspect private stores of arms. The most recent revision of the regulations\(^\text{57}\) brings Norwegian arms ownership control in line with EU regulations.

The Norwegian Armed Forces have also introduced new and stricter regulations for personnel who store firearms at home, requiring the use of gun locks and the physical separation of the firearms’ vital parts. These measures appear to have reduced the number of firearm thefts from private homes.

Amnesties to encourage registering or collection of unregistered arms are implemented occasionally, most recently in the autumn of 2008.

Knives and stabbing weapons

The majority of armed assaults involve knives or other objects that can be used for stabbing. Since 2004 it has been prohibited to carry knives and other sharp objects “suitable to inflict bodily harm” in public spaces.\(^\text{58}\) The Penal Code also prohibits ownership of certain types of knives, including stiletto, batanga and spring knives. The police have the right to search persons and vehicles for these objects.

---

55 Authors’ interview with Judge Advocate General Arne Willy Dahl, 20 May 2011.
56 Judge Advocate General website: http://home.c2i.net/genadv/english.htm.
58 Penal Code, Section 352(a).
Hate crimes

Increasing attention is given to “hate crimes”, i.e. crimes where the perpetrator targets a victim because of his or her actual or perceived membership of a certain social group. Such social groups can be defined by race, religion, sexual orientation, disability, class, ethnicity, nationality, age, gender identity or political affiliation. It is the motive that distinguishes hate crimes from other acts of intimidation, threats, property damages, assaults, murder or any other criminal offence.\(^\text{59}\)

While there is an anti-discrimination legal framework in Norway, there is no general provision for hate crimes in the Penal Code. This makes it difficult to obtain correct statistics on the number and scope of hate crime cases. The available statistics are based on police records where hate crime has been registered as a motive in criminal cases, a practice that began in 2007. These figures depend on the one hand on the subjective interpretation by the victims of the offenders’ motives, and on the other on the registration practices employed by the Police. These factors make the data prone to inconsistencies.

A report by the National Police Directorate on reported hate crimes during 2007–2009 found a relatively stable total number of such cases, between 220 and 260 a year.\(^\text{60}\) Among all three existing categories of hate crime – sexual orientation, religion, and race/ethnicity – violent crime was clearly the predominant type of crime.

The report concludes that there is reason to believe that a large number of cases of hate crime are still not registered. In order to better identify such cases, it is, according to the report, necessary that the Police pay more attention to these phenomena at the time of receiving reports of criminal offences and during investigation. There is also a need for clear definitions and training to ensure higher precision during data registration.

\(^{59}\) Hate crimes in Norway, presentation held 25 August 2010 at the National Police Directorate by Benedikte Lindland, Senior Advisor at the Prevention and Analysis Section, and Julie Platou Kvammen, Assistant Chief of Police, Organised Crime Section.

There is a broad range of responses and policies that address challenges posed by armed violence in Norway. Generally, however, these are not designed specifically to deal with armed violence as such, but are an integral part of public policy in areas such as social and economic development, education, public security, criminal justice and public health.

The rationale for a broad and inclusive preventive approach to armed violence is clearly laid out in the report on homicides during 2004-2009, mentioned in the previous chapter: “The majority of violent incidents, including homicides, are carried out by people who had not previously been considered to be in a high-risk group for violence, and it is virtually impossible to predict who is going to kill. Measures aimed at the entire population should therefore be a priority. Primary preventive measures will generally have a greater deterrent effect on the number of violent incidents, and thus homicides, than secondary preventive measures that target individuals.”

Studies have consistently shown that low levels of violence and homicide are found in countries with low levels of inequality. It is therefore likely that economic progress and general social assistance will have a preventive effect.

“More preventive measures are needed in order to have to repair less.” This sums up the Government’s Strategy for Prevention, from 2009, which takes a whole-of-government approach to prevention – including all sectors of society.

Also in 2009, the Ministry of Justice and the Police presented its action plan for crime prevention. This plan lists 35 measures for improved security. Responsibility for each measure is assigned to respective line ministries: the Ministry of Justice and the Police; the Ministry of Education and Research; the Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion; the Ministry of Health and Care Services; the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development; and the Ministry of the Environment. Children and young people are an important target group. The interventions have three strategic orientations: knowledge building (systematic knowledge production and measuring of crime prevention); early intervention; and cooperation and coordination (across the public sector and together with the private and voluntary sector).

The following are some examples of responses by public agencies and NGOs aimed at preventing and reducing armed violence.

---

61 NOU 2010:3 Summary in English: p. 52.
62 NOU 2010:3 Summary in English, p. 72.
63 ibid.
Police responses

Project Bullit: A police study of the illegal arms market in Oslo
In 2005, Oslo Police District initiated Project Bullit to study the illegal arms market in Oslo. There was particular concern about what appeared to be a spiral of violence between competing criminal gangs starting in 2001. A number of incidents took place in public spaces, thus putting bystanders at risk and endangering public security.

The study gathered all available information about legally registered firearms. While there are no indications of organised criminal networks specialising in the illegal import of firearms, it appears that this business is characterised by a number of actors dealing in other illegal imports, such as drugs, alcohol and cigarettes.

Project Bullit concluded that criminals had relatively easy access to illegal firearms. However, the largest group of buyers of illegal firearms appeared to be gun collectors without criminal records or known links to organised crime.

According to Project Bullit’s findings, criminals equip themselves with firearms to “buy” a sense of power and protection. In Oslo, a very limited number of organised criminal networks, or gangs, were considered to pose a threat to public security due to their access to and use of firearms, according to the project’s report.

Operation Crossfire 2
Acting under the Task Force on Organised Crime in the Baltic Sea Region, police and customs authorities from Denmark, Latvia, Finland, Sweden and Norway decided in 2006 to launch a joint operation, Crossfire 2, to identify the smuggling of firearms under the cover of legal trade. Europol and the World Customs Organisation supported the operation.

A worrying phenomenon identified by Crossfire 2 was the trade in insufficiently deactivated firearms. These are firearms that have supposedly been rendered unusable, enabling their deregulated trade. The problem is that these firearms can be reactivated relatively easily.

Operation Crossfire 2 concluded that the current control system need strengthening to effectively prevent the smuggling of firearms under the cover of legal trade.

The Gang Project and dialogue model in Oslo
On 20 August 2006, a shooting incident occurred in broad daylight at Aker Brygge, a popular and busy public waterfront area in Oslo. Two members of a criminal gang were shot in the legs by a number of attackers firing several weapons in the midst of a crowd of bystanders. This turned local concerns into a national issue, and there was a demand for action among the general public. As a response to this, Oslo Police District launched a special project against criminal gangs, known as the Gang Project.

The Gang Project involved other police districts in a concerted and time-limited effort specifically targeted at preventing violence and shootings in public spaces. In 2009, the Gang Project was turned into a permanent unit under the Section for Organised Crime of the Oslo Police District.

The results of this effort have been substantial. Between September 2006 and 1 January 2011 more than 600 persons have been arrested (some more than once), so far leading to around 90 convictions (some including several gang members). The police have also seized substantial quantities of drugs, cash and other valuables. Significantly, 140 firearms and a large number of knives and blunt weapons have been confiscated.

In the 2010 white paper on organised crime, the Government stated that the Police, over the last few years, seemed to have successfully controlled the spiralling violence between rival criminal gangs.66

The modus operandi of the Gang Project has also been called the Oslo Model. Given its good results, the model has also been employed on criminal biker gangs.

Lessons learned from the Gang Project indicate a number of aspects of the Oslo Model that seem to have contributed to the good results. The strategy of the project has been transparent and well disseminated to everyone involved. The Police have invested time and resources in being present in the environments frequented by the criminal gangs. Being fair towards everyone has been a matter of principle. At the same time, the Police have been deliberately unpredictable in their tactical and strategic responses to the criminal gangs. The Police have systematically acquired more knowledge about the criminal gangs, their cultures, codes, etc. Cooperation internally and externally has been a key to success. The Police have “followed the money”, targeting and confiscating illegal assets. There has been a carefully planned media strategy and perhaps crucially, the Police have also relied on dialogue with members of criminal gangs and persons in their environment.

Dialogue has been part of the police toolbox since the 1980s. Over the years, the dialogue model has been refined. The Police find that this has been a cost-effective way to better understand the workings of criminal groups and to reduce conflict levels among gangs and between them and the Police. In 2011, the Chief of Police in Oslo officially mandated dialogue as a method of preventing and combating serious and organised crime.

The dialogue model in Oslo is based on the following precepts:

- Oslo Police District shall try to engage in dialogue with criminal individuals and groups considered to represent a present or future criminal threat.
- Used in conjunction with other police methods, dialogue is a useful tool for reducing conflict levels between rival criminal gangs and threats towards servicemen.
- The Police must facilitate meeting places and invest time in building trust and security through their presence.
- The Police must play its role clearly, act where necessary, and explain why they are acting as they do.
- The Police enforces a zero-tolerance policy as regards criminal acts.
- The Police will take measures as appropriate depending on the counterparts’ actions and reactions.
- The Police will show restraint in employing force.
- Harassment and threats will not be accepted.

Integrated action plans and multi-sector responses

The SLT model
In 1980, the Norwegian Government instituted the National Crime Prevention Council. The Council is administratively attached to the Ministry of Justice and the Police, but it is professionally independent. The main aim of Norwegian crime policy is to prevent crimes taking place. The Council produces data and disseminates knowledge on crime and crime prevention work in order to reduce crime and improve levels of safety in society.

In the early 1990s, the Council introduced an inter-agency model for crime prevention at the municipal level, specifically targeting children and young people, called the SLT model (“Samordning av lokale kriminalitets-forebyggende tiltak”, which translates as “coordination of local crime prevention measures”). The SLT model has since been employed by more than 200 of Norway’s municipalities.

The SLT model aims to ensure that the municipality’s children and young people receive the right help at the right time, through a system characterised by inter-agency cooperation. The SLT model was developed to ensure coordination of knowledge, capacities and resources between the Police and municipal agencies in order to promote crime prevention. The model also includes two other fundamental elements of the local community: private enterprises and voluntary associations.

Oslo Municipality and Oslo Police District employ the SLT model in order to coordinate resources for crime prevention among children and young people.

The overall strategies of the SLT model in Oslo are:

• Coordinating a broad and comprehensive crime prevention effort.
• Developing a broad range of measures within and between the various sectors.
• Early detection, prevention and intervention of young people’s behavioural problems.
• Swift and effective follow-up of children and young people who have committed crimes.
• Increased support to children and young people who are exposed to crime.
• Building crime prevention work on knowledge, analysis and experience.
• Connecting prevention and treatment in responses to crime, drug abuse and mental health problems.
• Actively involving young people, parents/carers and voluntary associations in crime prevention work.

The main areas of intervention are:

• Ensuring safe and inclusive schools.
• Close and targeted follow-up of young offenders.
• Prevention and preparedness in relation to conflicts and violence.
• Targeted prevention efforts in downtown areas and other selected arenas and target groups.
• Developing good models for crime prevention efforts aimed at young adults (18–23 years of age).
• Information, knowledge development and transfer.

The SLT model seems to have borne fruit in Oslo. Statistics show stability in the numbers of children and young people reported to the Police for criminal offences during 2004–2008, despite a significant growth in the population of children and young people during the same period. 68

| TABLE 7 |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Key figures            | 2005     | 2006     | 2007     | 2008     | 2009     |
| Number of under 18-year-olds reported for crime | 1521     | 1632     | 1797     | 1573     | 1582     |
| Number of 18-23 year-olds reported for crime  | 3856     | 3645     | 3718     | 3516     | 3869     |
| Percentage of all reported crimes committed by an under 18-year-old | 6.9      | 6.7      | 8.4      | 7.3      | 7.4      |
| Number of recurring offenders, under 18-year-olds | 221      | 241      | 285      | 225      | 267      |
| Number of recurring offenders, 18-23 year-olds | 834      | 764      | 733      | 676      | 753      |
| Number of crimes with under 18-year-old victim | 1879     | 2020     | 1876     | 1604     |
| Number of crimes with 18-23 year-old victim | 6278     | 6539     | 6105     | 6355     |
| Total number of reported crimes in Oslo          | 80136    | 80937    | 83182    | 82660    | 87559    |
| Number of 12-23 year-olds resident in Oslo      | 66812    | 68689    | 71190    | 73410    | 75450    |


Red Cross street mediation

The street mediation programme of the Norwegian Red Cross trains young people and adults in constructive conflict management. This provides neighbourhoods and schools with resourceful community members. A team of experienced street mediators can be invited to carry out reconciliation processes in conflict situations. One example from Oslo in 2010 was a conflict that had persisted for about six months between a group of young people and a coffee shop. The Red Cross was contacted through its network in the neighbourhood and sent a volunteer street mediator who mapped the situation. A mediation meeting was organised which allowed parties to find common ground and end the conflict. 69

The programme receives public funding and is closely coordinated with the municipality and the Police under the SLT model. At the same time, the Red Cross identity – based on the principles of impartiality, neutrality, volunteerism, humanity, universality, unity and independence – is important to the volunteers as a door-opener to very different situations and people. 70

70 ibid.
Turning Point – addressing domestic violence

In its Action Plan against Domestic Violence – Turning Point – the Government states that domestic violence is a public responsibility.71 The rationale behind the action plan is to pursue a coherent policy to reduce the suffering and problems experienced by many victims of violence by implementing measures to improve the ability of all the parties concerned to give victims the care to which they are entitled and ensure that they are met with respect. This includes measures to improve the ability of the police to intervene against offenders and, if necessary, initiate criminal proceedings.

The action plan will help to ensure that the police, education institutions and support services are better trained, better coordinated and better able to detect, prevent and deal with the many complex issues related to domestic violence.72

It is generally recognised that to combat domestic violence effectively, it is not enough to improve services for victims after the violence has taken place. The aim must be to prevent and combat all forms of domestic violence by applying several different approaches:

- Victims of domestic violence will be ensured necessary assistance and protection.
- Improving treatment services for offenders will halt the spiral of violence.
- Victims of domestic violence will be offered supervised conversations with the offender (restorative justice).
- Cooperation between and competence in the support services will be improved.
- Research and development activities will be initiated and continued.
- There will be stronger focus on raising public awareness of domestic violence.
- Work to change attitudes to domestic violence.

Alternative to violence

Alternative to Violence (ATV) is a professional research and treatment centre for violent offenders and people who witness or are exposed to violence. ATV was set up in 1987 and currently receives funding from several municipalities, from the Norwegian government and from other organisations.73

Punishment and justice

Criminal law and imprisonment

The Norwegian Civil Penal Code dates back to 1902 and has been amended and revised since. A full review resulted in the proposition of a new Penal Code,74 which was adopted by Parliament in May 2009, but it has not yet been implemented by the police and court services.

The message from the Government has been that for a hundred years Norway has had a Penal Code created by and for men. According to the Government, the new Penal Code gives a clear signal to the courts that punishment for sexual crimes, serious violence and murder should be sharpened.75

The concept of punishment in Norwegian criminal law rests on five pillars: what the lawmaker has said is the purpose of the punishment; a humanistic perspective; the principles of due process of law and equal treatment; the principle that by serving the sentence one has settled one’s debt to society; and the normality principle.

The purpose of criminal law in Norway is to prevent criminal acts from occurring. The intended consequences of punishment can be divided into three main categories: prevention at the individual level, prevention at the general level, and the maintenance of public order.

According to a humanistic perspective, every human being is unique and inviolable. This means that punishment by imprisonment builds on the premise that each individual has the right to make his or her own choices and is responsible for the consequences.

While serving one’s sentence should mean cleaning one’s slate, in practice many people find it hard to return to society after a term in prison. They are frequently rejected by employers and feel unwelcome in their communities. An important task for the Norwegian correctional services is to contribute to reintegration and to facilitate a new start. New reconciliation methods and other forms of restorative justice have therefore increasingly been used in the implementation of punishment to further reintegration and the sense of debt-settling.

According to the normality principle, life for a person serving a sentence should be as similar to normal life in society as possible. It is the deprivation of freedom itself that constitutes the punishment. This principle means that conditions in the prison service should be so good as not to represent additional punishment. It also means that as long as security concerns allow, serving a sentence outside prison is considered to be an appropriate and cost-effective form of rehabilitation.

THE ANGER MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

The Anger Management Programme at Brøset Prison is a structured cognitive programme that focuses on violence triggered by specific emotions and situations. It is the only accredited violence therapy programme used by the Norwegian Correctional Services. The programme is based on the view that changes in cognitive processes, relational skills and emotional states can help reduce criminal behaviour. The prison programme attaches importance to the prisoners finding «their own way to change» through motivation, group therapy and individual adaptation of the programme.79

Mediation and counselling

In 1994, a nation-wide system of mediation services was established by law. The mediation services employ laypeople from the local communities to act as mediators in local conflicts. This system was conceived with a particular view to dealing with cases involving young offenders in a more constructive way than by means of the courts and the correctional services. The parties to the conflict meet face to face, they recount their personal experience and attempt to reach mediated settlements in the form of signed agreements.77

The Ministry of Justice and the Police is financially and professionally responsible for the mediation services, whereas the municipalities carry the administrative responsibility.

Since its inception, the system of mediation services has developed progressively, along with an increasing interest in the concept of restorative justice. Restorative justice concentrates on the needs of victims and offenders. Restorative justice processes involve victims in an active role, and offenders are encouraged to take responsibility for their actions. While traditionally only an alternative to punishment, mediation is now also a possible part of community service or of a suspended sentence. Mediation is also carried out within the prison service. There are special projects for mediation in cases of domestic violence, and there are models of mediation that involve groups of participants.78

The Norwegian Red Cross has a programme under which trained volunteers provide emotional and practical counselling to witnesses. The service is currently offered at around a third of the country’s courts. Testifying in court can be a tough challenge, especially for victims of or witnesses to violent crimes. Stress and insecurity may affect the witness and in turn the chances of reaching a verdict. The rationale for the programme is that a safe and secure witness is a good witness, and that this furthers due process of law.79

76 NOU 2010:3, Summary in English, p 55.
77 Konfliktrådets historie, (a history of the mediation services) by Alf Sigmund Larsen, 15 February 2010, http://www.konfliktnedt.no/no/info/Felles/om/Konfliktradets-historie/.
79 http://www.rodekors.no/nyheter/Nyheter/Kraftig-okning_i_vitnestotte_fra_Rode_Kors/.
Victims of armed violence

An appropriate response to the problem of armed violence starts with a proper awareness of the suffering it causes for the individual victims and the communities and societies affected. Victims and survivors of armed violence include all who, individually or collectively, have suffered physical or psychological harm, economic loss or substantial diminution of their fundamental rights. This includes, in many cases, the immediate family or dependants of direct victims. 

Internationally, particularly in the work to ban landmines and cluster munitions, there has been growing acceptance that a rights-based approach to victim assistance provides a strong framework for understanding state obligations and for strengthening responses to the impact of violence. Legally binding instruments and policy commitments have been developed. Examples include the 2006 Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the 2008 Convention on Cluster Munitions. These instruments are founded on the premise that states have responsibilities to ensure the full realisation of the rights of victims and survivors.

Rights to care, rehabilitation and inclusion

The social welfare system and the health system provides the rights to care, rehabilitation and inclusion for individuals in need of such services, either because of physical or psychological disabilities from birth or illness, injuries, traumas or violence that cause temporary or permanent disabilities. There is no special system to ensure rehabilitation for individuals suffering from injuries or disabilities caused by armed violence. This is also in line with thinking internationally. The work done under the 1997 Mine Ban Convention and the legal provisions in the Convention on Cluster Munitions are based on the principle that victims from these weapon types have the same rights as other people with disabilities, i.e. that each state has an obligation to provide assistance to victims, independent of the circumstances that led to the disability or injury. And other states have the obligation to assist affected states. Similarly, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability (CRPD) represents a human rights standard pertaining to persons with disabilities, including victims and survivors of armed violence. Norway has signed but not yet ratified the CRPD.

There has been growing recognition that in order to ensure effective rehabilitation, medical care and rehabilitation should not be two separate fields of work. Furthermore, the definition of rehabilitation used in Norwegian law includes the rights to both rehabilitation and social inclusion.

In Norway, the responsibility for providing for care and rehabilitation lies with the municipalities, while the funding for these services is allocated from a combination of local, regional and state budgets. The Norwegian Labour and Welfare Service (NAV) is the national institution tasked with providing basic social services and functions, including income security and employment support. NAV is also responsible for providing alternatives to ordinary employment for persons with special needs. It is prohibited by law to discriminate in any way against persons with disabilities. The law covers both acts of discrimination against individuals and physical exclusion and bars to accessibility.

In an effort to strengthen the legal rights of, and the services provided to, victims of violence and their families, the legislation regulating claims for compensation for victims of violence was changed in 2007 to allow economic compensation for children that have experienced violence against a person close to them.
Competence and capacity to rehabilitate victims of armed violence

A national strategy for rehabilitation launched in 2007 stated that the status rehabilitation had in the health and welfare sector did not match the goal of universal equal access to rehabilitation. Users of rehabilitation services are often in need of services from a range of actors and sectors, and one of the most important challenges to this system is coordination. However, the purpose of the 2004 regulations regarding individual care plans is precisely to ensure that the recipients of health care and social services are provided with coherent, coordinated and individually adapted services, and to improve interaction between service providers and recipients and their next of kin, if relevant. The municipalities have a central role in providing rehabilitation services. The objective is that services should as far as possible be given as close as possible to where the person lives. This would for most people mean the primary doctor, medical emergency service, home based services, etc. However, for some people most of the services they need are provided by specialised health services. This is the case first and foremost for those that have suffered sudden illness or injury, and also where it is expected that the person will be able to regain his or her normal functions without major assistance from municipal health services.

National Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress

In 2004, five ministries joined to establish the Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies (NKVTS). This centre develops and disseminates knowledge and expertise in the field of violence and traumatic stress. The objective is to prevent and reduce the health-related and social consequences that can follow from exposure to violence and traumatic stress.

In addition, there are five regional resource centres within the field of violence and trauma. The centres offer assistance to medical personnel and service providers by means of information, guidance and competence-building.

Victims’ shelters

Victims’ shelters are low-threshold crisis centres that provide shelter for persons subjected to domestic violence, including persons exposed to forced marriage and victims of human trafficking. The municipalities are responsible by law for providing a crisis centre service for persons who are subjected to domestic violence or threats of such violence, and who need counselling or safe, temporary accommodation. Individuals may contact the crisis centre service without a referral or appointment. By law, local authorities must provide the following services to victims of domestic violence:

- 24-hour telephone helpline providing information, advice and assistance.
- Shelter or equivalent safe, temporary accommodation including support and assistance.
- Day service including support and assistance information about statutory rights to assistance and, if necessary, practical help in contacting relevant agencies.
- Assistance during the re-establishment phase.
- Coordination of different services and development of an individual plan based on the needs of the victim.
- Qualified interpreting services (if needed).

Reception centres for victims of sexual abuse

All emergency rooms have special protocols that are to be used when they are contacted by victims of sexual violence. In addition, there are separate reception centres in the larger cities and towns for victims of rape and other sexual assaults. Victims are examined and given necessary treatment, evidence is secured and there are routines for contacting the police and a lawyer. Admission is free of charge and victims may spend the night.

87 Nasjonal strategi for habilitering og rehabilitering 2008-2011, p. 5.
88 Ibid. p. 6.
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91 Lov om kommunale krisesenterstøtte, 2009.
Addressing armed violence in an international context

Policies

Addressing armed violence domestically and globally is a priority for Norway. Efforts to reduce the incidence and impact of armed violence has been multi-tracked, through support to programmes aimed at reducing armed violence in affected areas and assisting victims, initiatives aimed at strengthening and developing relevant international normative and regulative frameworks, including arms transfer controls, international humanitarian law and human rights instruments.

This priority area was strengthened with the Government’s 2009 four-year policy platform, which emphasised the need to: “…strengthen the efforts to address armed violence, including by contributing to international regulation of the uncontrolled proliferation of arms and ammunition.” The action plan further commits the Government to “…continue and strengthen and improve the efforts to address violence affecting women and children” and to “…improve the follow-up provided to victims of violence and crime”.

Several policy papers, including white papers to the Storting (the Norwegian Parliament), have underlined this priority, and defined the focus on armed violence as an integral part of Norway’s engagement in humanitarian disarmament. This includes the work to follow-up the Mine Ban Convention, the Convention on Cluster Munitions and the various processes related to armed violence, small arms and light weapons.

The white paper Interests, responsibilities and opportunities – the main features of Norwegian Foreign policy identifies humanitarian disarmament as one of the main themes of Norway’s humanitarian policy. In addition to being motivated by humanitarian and development considerations, humanitarian disarmament “is also a concrete application of the humanitarian rules for the protection of civilians”. The white paper Norwegian policy on the prevention of humanitarian crises analyses key risk factors that increase vulnerability in humanitarian crises. It also proposes several changes to Norwegian and international efforts to reorganise humanitarian and development efforts in order to reduce these vulnerabilities.

As part of this effort, Norway promotes adherence to, implementation and common understanding of, and further development of, the international normative and regulative framework set up to protect people from armed violence. Over the past decade Norway has contributed actively to the development and implementation of several new international instruments and initiatives that in various ways address the multi-faceted issue of armed violence, including

- Mine Ban Convention.
- Convention on Cluster Munitions.
- Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

92 The policy platform is known as Soria Moria II: http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/SMK/Vedlegg/Rapporter/Plattform-sm2-a4-web-english.pdf.
95 Ibid. p. 36.
• UN Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Ammunition.
• UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.
• UN Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials.
• UN Program of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.
• International Criminal Court.

Currently, Norway is working actively with the Arms Trade Treaty process and the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development.

The recent strengthening of the international normative architecture has led to a stronger focus on the humanitarian and developmental costs of war, armed conflict and armed crime. Progress can also be found in the development of and adherence to norms to protect civilians in armed conflict. War tactics aimed specifically against women and children, such as rape and recruitment of child soldiers, have now been explicitly recognised as war crimes by the ICC Statutes.

Victims of armed violence are increasingly recognised as having rights to assistance and rehabilitation, and they are increasingly accepted as experts on how best to address armed violence and its impacts. This has been most clearly articulated in the landmine and cluster munitions processes, and is further strengthened by the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

One of the major remaining challenges is small-arms-driven armed violence in low-intensity or post-conflict zones and areas affected by organised crime. Most victims of armed violence do not die in war but as a result of violent acts in their own communities. Small arms violence constitutes a widespread and complex problem, which is not easily addressed by means of one specific international instrument.

Many of the agreements and initiatives above address the supply of weapons and other aspects of armed violence and its consequences. Stopping the use of certain weapons and reducing the circulation of and access to arms and ammunition is a core feature of actions to reduce armed violence. At the same time it is crucial to address the driving forces behind the demand for weapons and other instruments of armed violence.

Norway supports initiatives to reduce and prevent armed violence that address both supply and demand.

Partners

It is a key principle for Norway that multilateral humanitarian disarmament efforts build on the experience of the affected individuals and communities and of the practitioners involved in concrete programme work. Establishing long-term partnerships with NGOs, the International Committee of the Red Cross and field-oriented UN organisations is one way to facilitate this. These partnerships are usually a combination of programme support and policy dialogue.

Norway works closely with relevant United Nations organisations, such as UNDP, UNHCR and UNICEF, UN Special Agencies such as WHO and UNODC, as well as with international, national and local NGOs, and the ICRC. Several Norwegian NGOs are also important partners in this policy agenda.

Initiatives and processes

Efforts to prevent and reduce armed violence do not take place within one consolidated process with a clear policy track, arena and target. It is an agenda that is relevant to many on-going processes. To fulfil its commitments to address armed violence, Norway therefore pursues and promotes the armed violence agenda in a range of arenas.
In 2010, Norway, together with UNDP, hosted a conference on Armed Violence and Development, which resulted in support from more than 60 states to the Oslo Commitments on Armed Violence. These commitments set out a framework for action that if implemented, will contribute to reducing armed violence.

Norway is a signatory to the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence (2006) and is also a member of its core group. A 2nd Ministerial Review Conference of the Geneva Declaration will be held in Geneva on 31 October and 1 November 2011. Regional conferences focusing on promising armed violence reduction practices are being held throughout 2011 to prepare concrete input to the Conference. Norway supported the regional conference in West Africa in collaboration with the host nation Nigeria, UNDP and the Geneva Declaration Secretariat. Norway participates in the Arms Trade Treaty process and the UN Programme on Small Arms.

Norway sees both these processes as important contributions to reducing armed violence globally. Armed violence is caused by a complex set of factors, and better international control and regulation of the trade and flow of all conventional weapons, including ammunition, is an important element of armed violence reduction.

In 2009, OECD-DAC published a set of guidelines for donors and development practitioners of armed violence policies and programming. The OECD-DAC secretariat has been actively involved in many of the processes and initiatives that are taking place within the policy agenda of armed violence, and has provided support to an advisory working group on armed violence that has developed programming notes on several issues, including urban and youth violence, and on the linkages between security sector reform and armed violence. Norway participated in this advisory working group, and in the directors' group of the OECD International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF) that has approved these programming notes.

**Integration of armed violence reduction in practice**

As armed violence is caused by a complex set of interrelated factors, the responses needed to address the problems involve a number of areas such as law enforcement and crime prevention, justice, public health, peace and reconciliation efforts, arms transfer controls, and development. Strategies to address and reduce armed violence must reflect this complexity.

Armed violence policy and programming should be based on evidence from affected areas and target clearly identified risk factors using multi-sector interventions engaging relevant stakeholders and in cooperation with communities and national authorities.

Norway’s efforts to support actions to reduce the incidence and impact of armed violence have been multi-tracked. Support has been provided to programmes aimed at reaching the Millennium Development Goals and at reducing armed violence in affected areas and assisting victims, as well as to initiatives aimed at strengthening and developing relevant international normative and regulative frameworks, including arms export controls, international humanitarian law and human rights instruments.

**Humanitarian assistance**

Norway defines armed violence prevention and reduction as a humanitarian priority. The policy agenda on armed violence is presently organised in a separate project for humanitarian disarmament within the Section for Humanitarian Affairs through 2011. A separate budget for support for this policy agenda has been established, which includes support for specific armed violence prevention and reduction, including support to small arms and light weapons control and efforts connected with the Arms Trade Treaty. For 2011, this budget totals NOK 48 million.

The conference on armed violence that Norway and UNDP organised in 2010, contributed to raising the international awareness around armed violence as a developmental and humanitarian problem. This report, together with support to a range of partners that implement armed violence programs in affected countries is part of the Norwegian follow-up to the Oslo Commitments.

---

97 Full name: the UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

The humanitarian consequences of landmines and cluster munitions are also part of the global armed violence problem. Norway has a separate budget to support the implementation of the Mine Ban Convention and the Convention on Cluster Munitions. For 2011 the budget for this sector is NOK 246 millions.

Humanitarian crises are increasing in number and complexity. The international community is increasingly facing situations where fragile states are affected by conflicts and natural disasters at the same time. While it is impossible to predict humanitarian crises, it is possible to invest in prevention and future mitigation of the consequences. Acknowledging this, Norway has increased funding for prevention efforts and an action plan for the prevention of humanitarian crises has been formulated. In a similar vein, Norway has invested in preventive policy actions, such as strengthening of the international normative humanitarian architecture.

Over the last 60 years, international humanitarian law has established a comprehensive legal framework for the protection of civilians in armed conflicts. Nonetheless, civilians represent the vast majority of victims in armed conflicts. It is a widely accepted view that the main obstacles to better protection of civilians in armed conflicts is the way in which the existing provisions of international humanitarian law are implemented and the lack of respect for these rules shown by parties to conflicts.

Therefore there is a need to emphasise the implementation of, and respect for the international humanitarian law principles and rules. Norway, together with other partners, has taken the initiative to facilitate an international dialogue, aiming at strengthening the implementation of international humanitarian law in today's armed conflicts, and to reclaim the protection of civilians. The first of these international dialogues on Reclaiming the protection of civilians under international humanitarian law, was held in Jakarta in the beginning of November in 2010, in cooperation with the Government of Indonesia.

It is also worthwhile to note that armed violence in conflict does not only harm individuals. Armed violence also harms the social fabric and the physical infrastructure, such as buildings, markets and bridges. It affects the means of development, and the responses need to reflect that.

Gender
UN Security Council resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security is the cornerstone of Norway’s conflict and post-conflict humanitarian interventions. Two strategic actions plans on the implementation of resolution 1325 have been issued since 2005, the most recent for the period 2011–2013. This new strategic plan provides a framework for ensuring that resolution 1325 is integrated into all peace and security efforts. The plan has been developed as a joint effort by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defence, the Ministry of Justice and the Police and the Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion.

In addition to the implementation strategy for resolution 1325, Norway has introduced a grant-reporting requirement to monitor how grantees (recipients) are implementing a gender perspective in their humanitarian projects. Each year NOK 140 million is earmarked for the implementation of resolution 1325, and there is a specific annual allocation of NOK 300 million for women’s rights.

Support is also allocated over the humanitarian budget to projects addressing sexual and gender-based violence in conflict areas, including in DR Congo, Colombia, Haiti, Liberia and Burma.

Norwegian NGOs have established the 1325 Forum Norway to coordinate their activities and advocate implementation of the resolution.

---

101 This pertains also to projects that are supported over the budgets for peace and reconciliation and for human rights.
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Development aid
According to the OECD-DAC guidelines on armed violence reduction\textsuperscript{103} it is important that all development programming is AVR (armed violence reduction) sensitive. That means, among other things, that the conflict-sensitive assessments that are applied in conflict and post-conflict contexts, should also be adapted and applied in other situations in which there is armed violence.

The OECD-DAC guidelines also outline the two programming approaches to AVR: direct and indirect. Direct programming aims to explicitly prevent and reduce armed violence. Indirect programming requires development agencies to adapt existing sector-specific strategies and interventions in order to better address known risk factors that contribute to armed violence or to enhance protective factors. The guidelines mention the established programming areas that are particularly suited to integrating indirect AVR programming, namely poverty reduction, governance, security system reform, health and education and the environment. Direct AVR programming is a growing area of practice around the world. Important programming areas are community security, urban AVR, gangs and young people at risk, and organised and petty crime.\textsuperscript{103} Norway supports a range of AVR programmes through its humanitarian budget, as well as through its peace and reconciliation efforts (Viva Rio Haiti).

Through the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence (2006) and the Oslo Commitments on Armed Violence (2010), Norway is committed to integrating armed violence prevention and reduction into bilateral and multilateral development assistance. Although Norway’s engagement within the fields of poverty reduction, governance, security sector reform, health and education and the environment, are areas particularly relevant for indirect AVR programming, Norway has not yet systematically integrated AVR assessment and programming into its development policies and assistance.

NGO initiatives
A broad range of Norwegian NGOs are involved in armed violence related work. They include women’s groups, religious communities, development organisations, peace organisations and human rights organisations. Some have large programme portfolios within certain aspects of the sector, such as humanitarian mine action and small arms initiatives, while others take part in global and domestic coalition initiatives. Key actors include the Norwegian Red Cross, Norwegian People’s Aid, Norwegian Church Aid, Save the Children, the Norwegian Refugee Council, the Atlas Alliance, the Trauma Care Foundation, Norwac, the Norwegian Peace Council, the Forum for Development and Environment and the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has long been working in partnerships with NGOs on international policy issues of common interest, even when there are differences of opinion between the NGOs and the Government. Over the past years these include cooperation on UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women Peace and Security, the Arms Trade Treaty process, the UN Programme of Action, the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, the Mine Ban Convention and the Convention on Cluster Munitions.

Research
Several Norwegian research institutes carry out research and policy work relevant to the armed violence agenda. These include the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI), the Christian Michelsen Institute, the Tromsø Mine Victim Resource Centre, Sophies Minde Institute, the Norwegian Defence Research Establishment and the Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs attaches importance to evidence-based policy development and works closely with these independent institutions on several processes, and occasionally commissions research work to support ongoing processes.

\textsuperscript{103} OECD. Armed Violence Reduction. Enabling Development. 2009.
\textsuperscript{104} ibid. pp. 17–18.
Norway’s arms exports

Norway manufactures and exports arms, ammunition and other military materiel. From 2008 to 2009, the value of the exports of arms and military materiel rose by NOK 608 million, from approximately NOK 3.8 billion to NOK 4.5 billion, an increase of 16%.

Approximately 90% of Norway’s exports of defence equipment goes to NATO countries, Sweden and Finland. The US has traditionally been the largest importer. In addition, importing countries include Switzerland, Australia, Thailand, Singapore, the Republic of Korea and South Africa105.

Norway’s strategic export control regime is governed by the Act of 18 December 1987 No. 93 relating to control of the export of strategic goods, services and technology (Export Control Act). No goods, services or technology that may be of significance for another country’s development, production or utilisation of products for military use, or that may directly serve to develop a country’s military capability, or goods or technology that may be used to carry out terrorist acts, cf. section 147 a) of the Penal Code, may be exported without the permission of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. List I (weapons and military materiel) and List II (dual-use goods) specify the products and technology for which such permission is required. Control of technology also includes control of intangible transfers of technology.

The Act prohibits trading in, negotiating or otherwise assisting in the sale of weapons or military materiel from one foreign country to another without special permission. In addition, a licence is required for export of any goods, technology or services for military purposes to areas where there is a war or the threat of war, or to countries where there is a civil war, or to areas that are subject to an arms embargo adopted by the UN Security Council pursuant to Chapter VII of the UN Charter.

The regulations of 10 January 1989 laid down by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs provide further rules on the implementation of export control. These regulations include the requirement for a licence for the export of goods and appurtenant technology on List I (weapons and military materiel) and List II (dual-use goods).

A licence is also required for the export of certain technology, including intangible transfers of technology, technical data, production rights for goods, and certain services. A license requirement also applies to brokering of arms and military materiel between two third countries, as well as to brokering of dual-use goods under certain circumstances. Furthermore, the regulations contain several catch-all provisions, as well as provisions concerning exemptions from the licensing requirement and provisions concerning revocation of licences and the authority of the Ministry to set conditions for granting licences.

During the entire post-war era there has been broad political consensus on the control of the export of defence materiel. This is based on a government statement of 11 March 1959, which states that “[in] making the decision, importance shall be attached to foreign and domestic policy assessments, and the primary consideration should be that Norway will not permit the sale of arms or munitions to areas where there is a war or the threat of war, or to countries where there is a civil war.” In a decision of the same date, the Storting “takes note of the statement made by the Prime Minister on behalf of the Government. The Storting declares most emphatically that arms and munitions may be exported from Norway only after a careful assessment of the foreign and domestic policy situation in the area in question. In the Storting’s opinion, this assessment must be conclusive of the question whether such goods are to be exported.” The Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ assessment of the conditions includes a number of political and technical questions, such as issues relating to democratic rights and respect for fundamental human rights.

In 1997, the Storting unanimously endorsed a clarification related to the 1959 decision, stating that “an assessment by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs should include consideration of a number of political issues, including issues relating to democratic rights and respect for fundamental human rights.”

---

105 Statistics Norway, 2011.
Guidelines of 28 February 1992 for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for dealing with applications concerning the export of arms, military equipment and components, and technology and services for military use apply to the procedures to be followed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs when dealing with applications for the export of arms, military equipment and components, and technology and services for military use. The main principle is the government statement of 11 March 1959, as set out above.

NGOs have increasingly voiced criticism regarding how the Norwegian export control regime is applied. This criticism mainly concerns disagreement with the Government on the use of end-user-certificates when exporting arms to NATO countries. The NGOs argue that under the present procedure, arms manufactured in and exported from Norway to NATO member states, can be re-exported to states that are excluded by the export control regime, including to states with repressive practices towards their own populations, thus undermining the obligation to review the human rights situation in recipient states. The NGOs have further argued that the increase in the arms exports to allied states conducting wars that Norway is opposed to undermines Norway’s position on these issues, and could be seen as tacit support for those wars.\(^{106}\)

The guidelines of 1992 contain requirements for end-user documentation. According to these, documentation is always required before an export license for military equipment can be granted. An export licence will normally be granted for the export of arms and ammunition if the customer is, or is acting on behalf of, the defence authorities of NATO member states, Nordic countries or other countries that Norway has decided to sell such equipment to. The end user must be substantiated by documentation. A licence to export arms and ammunition to countries other than those mentioned above, must be dealt with by the Government, and the granting of such a licence requires the submission of an officially confirmed end-user statement containing a re-export clause, i.e. a statement to the effect that re-export must not take place without the approval of the Norwegian authorities.

For other military goods than arms and ammunition, an export licence shall be granted, provided the country in question is not located in a region where there is an ongoing war or a threat of war, provided there is not an ongoing civil war in the country, and provided the country is not subject to an arms embargo. For other military goods than arms and ammunition, a licence shall be granted for export to countries with the exception of regions where there is a war, threat of war or countries where there is a civil war, or to countries subject to an arms embargo. Documentation substantiating the end user shall be required.

Norway aligned itself with the EU Code of Conduct on Arms Exports in 1998. Since 2004, there has been closer cooperation with the EU within the framework of the Code of Conduct, including regular exchange of information on how the eight criteria set out in the Code of Conduct are applied in the assessment of applications for licences to export defence materiel from Norway. The EU Common Position on Arms Exports adopted in December 2008 has been included in the Guidelines since May 2009.

In the Arms Trade Treaty process, Norway has promoted the view that ammunition should be included in the scope of a future treaty. Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) has carried out research work to determine the need for and feasibility of such inclusion.\(^{107}\)

---

**International efforts to fight transnational organised crime**

Norway sees prevention of organised crime as a necessary part of conflict and post-conflict efforts. Transnational organised crime manifests itself in different activities, among others, drug trafficking, trafficking in human beings, trafficking in firearms, smuggling of migrants, money laundering, etc. As globalisation has expanded international trade, the range of organised crime activities has broadened and diversified as well. Organised crime groups involved in drug trafficking are commonly engaged in the smuggling of other illegal goods. In the 2010 white paper on organised crime, the Government emphasises the importance of better international cooperation and coordination to combat cross-border crime.\(^{108}\)

---

107 See for example the PRIO report “Small but lethal – small arms ammunition and the ATT”, PRIO 2010.
The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UN CATOC) is the main international instrument for countering organised crime. The purpose of the convention is to promote international cooperation to prevent and reduce organised crime in a more efficient manner. Norway ratified the convention and its additional protocols, including the Firearms Protocol, in 2003.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is the global forum for prevention and reduction of organised crime. UNODC also has the secretariat for UN CATOC, and assists countries in implementing the Convention, and works closely with governments, organisations, and civil society to enhance the international fight against transnational organised crime. Norway is among the major financial contributors to UNODC’s work.

In addition to cooperation within the UN, Norway also takes part in a range of other partnerships to fight cross-border national crime, for example within the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), Interpol, and different cooperation programmes among the European and Nordic countries.

**Support for peace operations**

International peace operations play a major role in international efforts to mitigate the effects of armed violence and to prevent future recurrence. Norway is a long-standing and active contributor to such operations. In 2011 Norway is taking part in operations in Afghanistan, the Balkans, the Middle East and Africa, with approximately 730 military personnel, 65–70 civilian police and a number of civilian experts.

Norway is actively engaged in strengthening the operational capacity of the various organisations that lead peace operations. Special priority is given to the UN, based on its key role as the provider of mandates for most international operations, in addition to being the only global organisation of its kind. Norwegian engagement includes support for the development of doctrines and guidelines, capacity-building programmes and mechanisms for training peacekeepers. Similar support is also given to the African Union.

Norway’s peacekeeping engagement is based on the conviction that sustainable peace demands a comprehensive approach, where peacekeeping is seen in conjunction with peace building, and where international partners work in tandem with the host government.

**International police cooperation**

Some 80 police officers are available for participation in peace operations led by the UN or regional organisations. Norwegian police personnel are currently deployed to the following UN operations: UNMIS, UNAMID, UNMIL, UNAMA and MINUSTAH. In addition, police personnel have been deployed to EUPOL Afghanistan, EULEX Kosovo, the OSCE Mission to Serbia, TIPH Hebron, as well as bilateral deployments. In 2011 approximately 65 police advisers are participating in international peace operations.

Norway also contributes through the Training for Peace Programme that supports training, policy advice, recruitment support and applied research through African and Norwegian civil society institutions, to build sustainable African civilian and police peacekeeping capacities that are needed in order to implement multidimensional UN and AU peacekeeping mandates.

**The Pool of Rule of Law Advisers**

The Norwegian Government has set up a pool of rule of law advisers that can take part at short notice in international civil crisis management operations, or in bilateral cooperation in the justice sector. The pool became operative in March 2004, and consists of judges, public prosecutors, police lawyers, defence attorneys and prison and probation advisers.
The Norwegian pool of rule of law advisers has so far been able to provide advice and assistance regarding institution-building in all parts of the criminal justice system in connection with democracy-building and establishing rule of law in countries that have been subject to war or internal conflict, and in countries that are in transition from totalitarian regimes to democracy, specifically in these fields:

- Advice and assistance in developing an independent judiciary.
- Advice and assistance with training at all levels in international human rights law and the application of international human rights conventions at all levels of the criminal justice chain.
- Participation in operational assignments in connection with the administration of justice in countries/areas placed under administration by the international community by judges and prosecutors.

The pool currently consists of 100 experienced members, including judges, public prosecutors/military prosecutors, police prosecutors, defence attorneys and prison and probation advisers. Some of the members have been on international assignments either as part of a bilateral cooperation or as part of international missions organised by the UN, the OSCE and the EU. The members of the pool make a commitment for a two-year period. Members may be sent on individual assignments or preferably in a team as part of a larger programme. Teams from the pool can be designed to cover every part of the judicial system. The Ministry of Justice and the Police administers the pool.

Currently, Norway has bilateral rule of law teams in Georgia and Moldova. The members of the team are judges, state and police prosecutors, defence lawyers and correctional service experts. Norway also second staff to the rule of law team at the OSCE office in Baku.

The Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights

The voluntary principles on security and human rights (VPs) are a set of principles developed in 2000 to serve as a guide for companies in the extractive and energy sectors that face a dilemma between the legitimate need for security services and respect for human rights of the local population. According to the principles, companies are to conduct a thorough assessment of the risks in their operating environment, both normal security risks and risks posed by conflict in the area. They should consider the potential for violence in the region, the human rights practices of public security forces, the causes of local conflicts and the responses of the authorities to allegations of human rights abuses.

The principles were developed through multi-stakeholder participation from governments, the extractive industry and NGOs. Statoil is among the participating companies.

The VPs are presented in the white paper on corporate social responsibility. The VPs are one of the voluntary multi-stakeholder initiatives Norway is participating in, and the Government recommends that Norwegian companies – and not only those in the extractives industries – should consider adopting the VPs where appropriate. Norway has also contributed to implementation of the VPs at policy and practical level by including the VPs in bilateral talks, supporting implementation in Peru and Colombia, and amending its own legislation regulating the activities of private security companies.

Participants at the stakeholder consultations

As part of the preparation of this report, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs invited stakeholders from government and civil society to contribute to the process. The authors conducted two stakeholder consultations, one at the start of the process and one when the first draft was ready.

**Government:**
- Ministry of Health and Care Services, Ms Inger Johanne Kvarme, assistant director general, Municipal health services
- Ministry of Justice and the Police, Mr Pål Meland, senior advisor, Police department
- Directorate of the Police, Mr Morten Glavin, police inspector, Section for organised crime
- Directorate of the Police, Ms Benedikte Lindland, senior advisor, Prevention and analysis section
- Oslo Police District, Mr Roger Stubberud, senior advisor, Strategic staff

**Civil society:**
- Atlas Alliance, Ms Trine Cecilie Riis-Hansen, advisor
- FAFO Institute for Applied International Studies, Mr Mark Taylor, senior researcher
- Forum for Environment and Development (FORUM), Ms Borghild Tønnessen-Krokan, advisor
- Forum for Women and Development (FOKUS), Mr Jon Rian, advisor
- Norwegian Church Aid, Ms Ingvild Langhus, programme coordinator
- Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Centre (NOREF), Ms Camilla Waszink, senior advisor
- Norwegian Red Cross, Ms Anne Cecilie Fossum, senior advisor for conflict management, Care and branch development department
- Norwegian Red Cross, Ms Lise Grung, mines and weapons advisor, International department