Hanne Hestnes Lervik

Party-Based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s: The Political and Cultural Reasons

A Comparative Study

Master's thesis

NTNU
Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Faculty of Humanities
Department of Language and Literature

Master's thesis in Master's Programme in English
Supervisor: Astrid Rasch
May 2019

NTNU
Norwegian University of
Science and Technology

Hanne Hestnes Lervik

Party-Based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s: The Political and Cultural Reasons

A Comparative Study

Master's thesis in Master's Programme in English
Supervisor: Astrid Rasch
May 2019

Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Faculty of Humanities
Department of Language and Literature

NTNU
Norwegian University of
Science and Technology

Abstract

The purpose of this master's thesis is to show the difference between British and Norwegian party-based Euroscepticism during the 1970s and 1980s, and highlight the major cultural and political reasons for this difference. A thorough comparative study of party-based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway has not been done earlier, and this thesis is an attempt to fill this gap and expand the existing knowledge on party-based Euroscepticism. The thesis has employed the method of comparative history, and has by discovering unique traits at a national level contributed to a greater knowledge on how party-based Euroscepticism differs in two relatively similar countries. The study argues that it is necessary to look at the memory of the past, and the countries' political systems, and use these as frameworks in order to understand 1970s and 1980s Euroscepticism. The thesis is centred around a few chosen events and developments, as these represent party-based Euroscepticism at the time. These events are the 1972 referendum held in Norway, the 1975 referendum in Britain, the EEC entry negotiations, and the government breakdowns caused by Euroscepticism in both countries.

The differences found were caused by national identity, exceptionalism, type of governments, and referendum results. The countries' national identity created a predisposition for scepticism towards the Community, whereas the type of government provided a political environment for party-based Euroscepticism where it could potentially be quite powerful. The referendum results shaped the mainstream attitude towards the Community, causing a pro-EEC stance to be the norm in Britain, and a mainstreaming of Euroscepticism in Norway. The thesis showcases the significance of these, and why they were able to affect and shape British and Norwegian party-based Euroscepticism during the 1970s and 1980s. These factors, and their impact, varied in the two countries, and shaped opposition towards the Community at the time.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my brilliant supervisor, Associate Professor Astrid Rasch, for all her advice and encouragement during this project. You have given me valuable feedback and help, as well as making me feel confident in this task, and for that I am eternally grateful. I always looked forward to our feedback sessions, and I could not have asked for a better supervisor than you.

Secondly, I would thank Synne Falch, Seline Eskedal Amundsen, and Kåre Scott Urke for giving me feedback on my project. I really appreciate that you have read my thesis, and have given me suggestions on how to improve it.

Thirdly, I would like to thank my parents, my brother, and my relatives for their amazing support throughout this project. I have really appreciated all the free dinners, and your encouraging words.

Finally, I would also like to thank my friends from NTNUI Fekting, my coursemates, my housemates, my UK-based friends, my bandmates, and everyone else in between for supporting me during this project. Thank you for all the pizza/taco nights, film nights, board game nights, parties, fencing bouts, jam sessions, supportive text messages, and whatnot in this time period. Time off from the thesis work was needed, and I could, and still can, always count on you guys for a great time!

Party-Based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s: The Political and Cultural Reasons – A Comparative Study

Table of Contents

1. Introduction **6**

1.1. Thesis Question *6*

1.2. The Structure of the Thesis *7*

2. Literature Review **10**

2.1. Euroscepticism *10*
2.1.1. Definition 10
2.1.2. Party-Based Euroscepticism 11

2.2. Why Is It Useful for My Thesis? *15*

3. Methods and Materials **17**

3.1. Comparative History *17*
3.1.1. Introduction 17
3.1.2. Discussion 17
3.1.3. Conclusion 20

3.2. Materials *21*
3.2.1. Primary Sources 21
3.2.2. An Overview of the Primary Sources Used in this Thesis 22
3.2.3. Secondary Literature 23

4. The Memory of the Past as a Reason for Party-Based Euroscepticism **25**

4.1. Introduction *25*

4.2. European Integration in the 1940s-1960s. *26*

4.3. Britain and Norway: The Memories of the Past *27*
4.3.1. "Great Britain has lost an empire and has not yet found a role" 27
4.3.2. Norway: Once Bitten, Twice Shy 30

4.4. The Community and the Past *32*

4.5. Conclusion *34*

5. Party-Based Euroscepticism: The British and Norwegian Governments, and the Political Systems **36**

5.1. Introduction *36*

5.2. The Governments: Majority Governments and Coalition Governments *37*

5.3. British Political Parties: Support or Opposition Towards European Integration *39*
5.3.1. The Conservatives: Extinguishing the Existing Euroscepticism? 41
5.3.2. The Labour Party's Internal Division Caused by Euroscepticism 42
5.3.3. The Dividing Power of Euroscepticism 43

5.4. Norwegian Political Parties *43*
5.4.1. Eurosceptic, Pro-EEC, or Locked in Status Quo? 44
5.4.2. Fixed Opinions on the EEC? 46
5.4.3. Coalition Governments and Euroscepticism 47

5.5. Party-Based Euroscepticism Typologies for British and Norwegian Parties *49*

5.6. Conclusion *50*

6. The 1970s: Entering Europe? **52**
6.1. Introduction *52*
6.2. Exceptionalism: What Separates Britain and Norway from the Other European Countries? *53*
6.3. Common Agricultural Policy and Common Fisheries Policy *55*
6.3.1. CAP: Fair for All Members? 55
6.3.2. CFP: A Sneaky Manoeuvre by the EEC 58
6.4. Norway's First 'No' *60*
6.5. "Should I Stay or Should I Go"? Britain's 1975 Referendum and Renegotiation *64*
6.6. Conclusion *68*

7. The 1980s: Latent Euroscepticism? **70**
7.1. Introduction *70*
7.2. Britain: Role-Swap *70*
7.2.1. The Aftermath of the 1975 Referendum 70
7.2.2. The Labour Party: From Eurosceptics to Pro-Europeans 71
7.2.3. The Conservative Party: Thatcher's Road to Euroscepticism 73
7.3. Norway: Increase in European Integration, and the 1990 Government Breakdown *76*
7.3.1. After the Referendum: Lack of Interest in the EEC 76
7.3.2. Norway: The EEC Becomes Interesting Again 77
7.3.3. The Syse Government: A Catastrophic Combination of Parties 78
7.4. A Changing Community: The Single European Act *81*
7.5. Conclusion *82*

8. The Conclusion of the Thesis **85**
8.1. Introduction *85*
8.2. Party-Based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway: The Differences *85*
8.3. Cultural Reasons: The Comparison *86*
8.4. Political Reasons: The Comparison *88*
8.5. Conclusion *90*
8.6. Suggestions for Further Research *90*

9. Literature **92**
9.1. Primary Sources *92*
9.2. Secondary Sources *98*

Introduction

In 2016, the British people voted to leave the European Union (EU). This opposition did not appear out of nowhere, and Britain has often been described as a reluctant European. This, alongside Norway's history of opposition towards the European Economic Community (EEC)/EU, became the starting point for my master's thesis. Britain and Norway are two similar countries, and no one has done a thorough comparative study of party-based Euroscepticism in them. Because a vast amount of literature on both British and Norwegian Euroscepticism already exist, it could be beneficial to look at the two countries in comparison to each other. A more thorough comparison than the ones found in newspapers will give new insight into both British and Norwegian Euroscepticism, but also into Euroscepticism as a phenomenon. I believe it is time to go through the existing literature on party-based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway, and look at it in a new way. This thesis argues that employing the method of comparative history will provide more knowledge in the field of party-based Euroscepticism.

1.1. Thesis Question

The results of Britain's 2016 referendum and Norway's 1994 referendum showed that Euroscepticism was apparent in both countries. My aim with this thesis is to look at party-based Euroscepticism in the 1970s and 1980s, see how it developed in these two countries, and what the differences were. I believe the recent EU rejections stem from an earlier time period. This master's thesis intends to shed light on the reasons for, and acts of Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s. I will look at both cultural and political reasons for the two countries' scepticism towards the Community, and how these reasons played out during this time period. The countries' past and earlier experiences with the European continent, their notions of national identity, and if it makes politically sense to be a part of a bigger European cooperation, have often been used in political rhetoric to show why Britain and Norway are different, and possibly, incompatible to the EEC/EU. My thesis will explore whether these reasons have created a predisposition for Euroscepticism, and have turned the countries Eurosceptic. The Norwegians have rejected the EEC/EU twice, and have more or less become a Eurosceptic country by default because of this, and the Britons voted to leave the EU as the first country to do so, suggesting that scepticism towards the EEC/EU have been existing for quite a while. I believe it would be beneficial to go back to an earlier time and have a closer look at the party-based Euroscepticism in these two countries. My thesis question for this study

is: *how did party-based Euroscepticism differ between Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s, and what were the main cultural and political reasons for this?*

1.2. The Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is a comparative study of British and Norwegian party-based Euroscepticism during the 1970s and 1980s. It aims to compare these two countries, and explain the reasons for the differences found in their party-based Euroscepticism.

The literature review will discuss the theories of party-based Euroscepticism. It is a field with great variety, and I have decided to include different typologies in this chapter. Pinning down one definition is a difficult task, and I believe it is important to have knowledge of some of the different frameworks. None of the Euroscepticism typologies have been constructed to fit the political parties in both Britain and Norway as it is difficult to capture the many different nuances and variations found in the parties' European policy. It is, however, possible to use the existing ones, and I have chosen the soft-hard typology by Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart. The purpose of the literature review section is therefore to inform the reader of why the soft-hard typology is the right choice for this thesis, and of the nuances found in the field of party-based Euroscepticism.

The method and materials chapter follows the literature review. For this thesis, I have chosen to use a comparative framework, and the method section will be discussing the benefits of comparative history as a method for writing history. I will also be explaining why this method is a good choice for my thesis. This chapter gives an overview of the types of sources and literature I have chosen to use. This includes both primary and secondary sources. In the primary sources section, I will be giving an account of what a primary source is, and of the types used for this thesis. Following this chapter are the main chapters of the thesis with the analyses and comparisons of party-based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s.

The fourth chapter will be discussing Britain and Norway's historic reasons for opposing Europe, and how these differ between the two countries. My research question for this chapter is: *what are the major historical-cultural reasons for Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway, and does the memory of the past contribute to party-based Euroscepticism*? From today's point of view, Britain and Norway appear to be relatively similar. They are both West European, welfare states, and are often associated with Euroscepticism. The chapter sheds light on Britain's path from a great imperial power in the world to becoming a part of Europe, and on

Norway's past of foreign rule. The chapter will serve as a framework for the thesis, as it is necessary to understand the countries' past in order to look at more recent times. I will argue that the memory of the past is an important reason for recent party-based Euroscepticism.

Chapter five will also work as a framework, but the purpose of this chapter is to gain knowledge on the different parties' stances on the European question, as this is crucial for understanding party-based Euroscepticism. The research question for this chapter is: *how does the type of government affect party-based Euroscepticism, and are coalition governments more likely to struggle with disagreements related to the relationship with Europe than majority governments are*? The chapter's focus will be on the governments and parties of Britain and Norway, and if some of the different types of governments are more prone to affect Euroscepticism than others are. These types of governments are majority, minority, and coalition, and this could be a reason for the difference found in the countries' party-based Euroscepticism. In addition to the political systems, this chapter will contain a brief section on the different parties and how applicable the Eurosceptic typologies presented in the literature review are. I argue that Euroscepticism can have a splitting effect upon coalition governments causing the parties to leave office, whereas it divides majority governments but lets the party stay in power.

Chapter six will be discussing party-based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway during the 1970s. In this decade, the two countries chose different paths when Britain joined the EEC, and Norway did not after the 'no' side won in the 1972 referendum. The research question for the chapter is: *how did the 1970s referendum results influence Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway, and how did the EEC's interventionist policies, the CAP and the CFP, add to an existing opposition*? The focus of this chapter will be the negotiations that took place before the accession to the EEC, and particularly the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP). It will also look at how party-based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway was influenced by the referendum results and what the effect of this was. In addition to this, the chapter contains a section about exceptionalism and shows why Britain and Norway regard themselves as different from the rest of Europe and how they have become reluctant Europeans. This chapter argues that the referendum results caused a mainstreaming of Euroscepticism in Norway, but had the opposite effect in Britain, and states the importance of the CAP and the CFP during the entry negotiations as reasons for party-based Euroscepticism.

In chapter seven, I look at 1980s party-based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway. The chapter will briefly discuss the post-referendum years, and how party-based Euroscepticism evolved during the 1980s. The research question for this chapter is: *how did party-based Euroscepticism evolve in Britain and Norway during the 1980s, and how did the Single European Act influence the countries' relationship with the EEC*? The chapter will focus Labour's path to becoming the pro-EEC party after being a hard Eurosceptic party, and the consequences of Euroscepticism for Thatcher and her government. On the Norwegian side, this chapter will discuss Norway's move towards Europe as an effect of the creation of the single market, and how Euroscepticism caused the 1990 coalition government breakdown. Additionally, the impact of the Single European Act (SEA) on Britain and Norway will be discussed. Chapter seven will argue that party-based Euroscepticism evolved differently in the two countries, and that the SEA, and the prospect of a single market, enabled further European integration in both countries.

Chapter eight serves as the conclusion of the thesis, and will present the findings. It will do so by presenting the differences found in British and Norwegian party-based Euroscepticism, and show the differences between these countries' cultural and political reasons for Euroscepticism during the 1970s and 1980s. I will argue that there are differences between these countries to be found, and that they are caused by national identity and exceptionalism on a cultural level, and by the type of government and the 1970s referendum results on the political level. A section on further research will also be provided in this chapter.

Literature Review

2.1. Euroscepticism

2.1.1. Definition

'Euroscepticism' is used to describe opposition towards the EEC/EU, and European integration. The term itself surfaced during a public debate in Britain during the 1980s.[1] Regardless of when the term was first coined, scepticism and opposition towards the EEC/EU and European integration could be found in the decades before the 1980s. The terms were different, but they all imply a negative attitude towards Europe. Examples of these terms are 'Europhobia', 'Europragmatism, and 'Anti-marketeers'.[2] They do not contain the suffix '-sceptic(ism)', but they do share a similar meaning. Because of the many different terms, it is important to define Euroscepticism in order to avoid confusion. Euroscepticism is a broad field, and there exists a plethora of definitions. It is found amongst the public, in the media, in politics, and in economics. Pinning down its definitions is slightly problematic as it can be applied to several different fields. Political science and economics scholar Liubomir Topaloff spends much time trying to define Euroscepticism, and looks at the pros and cons of looking at Euroscepticism as a symptom, or as a strategy in politics before concluding that it is a complicated term.[3] Euroscepticism is prone to changes, something that has created a need for the many variations in definitions. In Topaloff's words, defining this phenomenon "seems to be among the most notoriously difficult tasks".[4]

The word itself has been criticised for being a misnomer, and scholar Chris Flood believes the term should be 'EU-sceptic' rather than 'Eurosceptic', as 'Euro-' could be interpreted to include a scepticism for the continent, not the EEC/EU.[5] Simply put, "the European Union is not

[1] Cécile Leconte, *Understanding Euroscepticism*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 3; Sofia Vasilopoulou, "Varieties of Euroscepticism: The Case of the European Extreme Right", *Journal of Contemporary European Research* 5, no. 1 (2009), 4.
[2] Cécile Leconte, "From Pathology to Mainstream Phenomenon: Reviewing the Euroscepticism Debate in Research and Theory", *International Political Science Review* 36, no. 3 (2015), 251; Petr Kopecký and Cas Mudde, "The Two Sides of Euroscepticism: Party Positions on European Integration in East Central Europe", *European Union Politics* 3, no. 3 (2002), 299; Anthony Forster, "Anti-Europeans, Anti-Marketeers and Eurosceptics: The Evolution and Influence of Labour and Conservative Opposition to Europe", *The Political Quarterly* 73, no. 3 (2002).
[3] Liubomir K. Topaloff, *Political Parties and Euroscepticism*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 19.
[4] Ibid., 17.
[5] Flood, cited in Marianne Sundlisæter Skinner, "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation" (PhD diss., University of Bath, 2011), 42.

identical to Europe".[6] Despite Flood's suggestions for more suitable terms for it, I have chosen to use 'Euroscepticism'. I agree with Flood's point on the prefix 'Euro-' suggesting Europe rather than the EU, but because the meaning of the term 'Euroscepticism' is already well established, there should be no confusion regarding its meaning. I will always be referring to opposition towards the European Economic Community (EEC), the European Union (EU) and European integration processes, and not to the continent Europe when using the term 'Euroscepticism'.

In this thesis, I will be comparing the party-based Euroscepticism found in Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s, and I need a definition in order to do so. Szczerbiak and Taggart's works are important in the field of party-based Euroscepticism, and I will rely mainly on their definition. To prove how diverse party-based Euroscepticism can be, I will also briefly present a few typologies that differs from Szczerbiak and Taggart's soft-hard typology. For the purpose of this thesis, a soft-hard distinction of Euroscepticism, or variations of it, will be sufficient in order to categorise the political parties discussed in the thesis. In a study that is not comparative, or a more extensive comparative study, a different and improved Euroscepticism typology might be more useful. I am aware that Szczerbiak and Taggart's work, *Opposing Europe?*, has received criticism by scholars such as Petr Kopecký and Cas Mudde, Sofia Vasilopoulou and Marianne Sundlisæter Skinner, because of how the different authors in the two volumes have different understandings of party-based Euroscepticism.[7] Each of the chapters in *Opposing Europe?* is a case study of a country, and it can be problematic to use the same typology for all of these. Euroscepticism will vary depending on the region, and creating a typology that suits all is an immensely difficult task.[8] For this reason, I will be relying on the definitions as presented by Szczerbiak and Taggart, and not as it might be presented by the other authors found in *Opposing Europe?*.

2.1.2. Party-Based Euroscepticism

There are many different definitions of Euroscepticism. For this thesis I will focus on 'party-based Euroscepticism', and the typologies I have looked at belong to this group of Euroscepticism theory. It is not unusual for parties in European politics to have Eurosceptic elements in their policies and visions. Most of the typologies are developed to sort political

[6] J. Peter Burgess, "What's so European about the European Union? Legitimacy between Institution and Identity", *European Journal of Social Theory* 5, no. 4. (2002), 469.
[7] Vasilopoulou, "Varieties of Euroscepticism: The Case of the European Extreme Right", 5.
[8] Topaloff, *Political Parties and Euroscepticism*, 20.

parties in different categories ranging from a very Eurosceptic stance to one that is almost pro-EEC/-EU.

According to Leconte, there are two dimensions of party-based Euroscepticism: the strategic dimension and the ideologic dimension.[9] In this paragraph I will focus on Euroscepticism as a strategy. Euroscepticism as a party strategy can create difficulties for a party when it comes to wooing the voters, as parties on the extreme right and left are often associated with Euroscepticism.[10] It is therefore unlikely to find the most Eurosceptic parties in office.[11] That being said, it is still possible to find these parties in government, but they tend to be a part of a coalition. In some countries, Norway in this case, the people have a past of being part of unions, and as a result of this, EEC/EU entry does not appeal to them. A poll from 2014 showed that 70.5% of the Norwegian population would vote 'no' to membership.[12] Because of this, the Norwegian parties will not assign their EEC/EU policies too much attention. Opposition towards the EEC/EU can be regarded as a continuation of the people's fight for independence after their past union memberships.[13] Scholar Nick Sitter in his article on party-based Euroscepticism in Norway points out that the party positions on the EEC are "the product of how the issue affects the four central goals".[14] The four goals are "the survival and continuity of the party, the pursuit of a set of policy goals, maximizing votes, and the quest for office".[15] If the EEC is of no interest or the public's wish is to remain a non-member, then the four central goals of a party can be achieved by keeping the status quo and by not giving the European question much attention. Whether a country is a part of the EEC/EU or not, its government still has to handle European integration, and needs to make sure cooperation with the other European countries is possible.

[9] Leconte, *Understanding Euroscepticism*, 106.
[10] Charles Lee, "The Limits of Party-Based Euroscepticism in Germany", in *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism, Volume 1: Case Studies and Country Surveys*, ed. Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 19.
[11] Charles Lee, "The Political Opportunity Structure of Euroscepticism: Institutional Setting and Political Agency in European Polities", in *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism, Volume 2: Comparative and Theoretical Perspectives*, ed. Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 31.
[12] NTB, "Massiv norsk EU-motstand", *Aftenposten*, 30 August, 2014, accessed 7 February, 2019, https://www.aftenposten.no/norge/i/bK6w5/Massiv-norsk-EU-motstand.
[13] Iver B. Neumann, "Hvorfor er ikke Norge med i Den europeiske Union?", *Internasjonal politikk* 67, no. 3 (2009), 423.
[14] Nick Sitter, "The European Question and the Norwegian Party System since 1961: The Freezing of a Modern Cleavage or Contingent Opposition?", in *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism, Volume 1: Case Studies and Country Surveys*, ed. Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 334.
[15] Ibid.

2.1.2.1. Szczerbiak and Taggart's Soft-Hard Euroscepticism

Szczerbiak and Taggart are important to this field due to their works and particularly the two book volumes, *Opposing Europe?,* which are the main works of the Sussex School of Euroscepticism. The field of Euroscepticism is divided into two schools: the Sussex, and the North Carolina School. Briefly explained, the focus of the Sussex School is "detailed national case studies and definitional refinements", and the North Carolina School focuses on "broad ideological positions and their connection to parties and public opinion across Europe".[16]

Opposing Europe? contains single-state studies and with this, attempts to map out Euroscepticism found in political parties in the European countries. Contributors were asked to only employ Szczerbiak and Taggart's model of soft-hard Euroscepticism for their research.[17] My own research will focus on party-based Euroscepticism in both Britain and Norway, and I believe this will contribute in the field as there are no studies comparing the situation in these two countries.

Beginning with Szczerbiak and Taggart's model, it is useful because it makes it possible to categorise a political party as being either soft Eurosceptic, or hard Eurosceptic. Szczerbiak and Taggart, however, warns about defining party-based Euroscepticism as something that is over-inclusive.[18] Soft Euroscepticism can be applied to parties that do not have "a principled objection to European integration or EU membership", but feels the national interests will in some way be threatened by the EU.[19] Hard Euroscepticism is used about parties that have "a principled opposition to the EU and European integration" and would prefer if the country withdrew its membership.[20] According to Topaloff, the soft-hard Euroscepticism definition is used because it is simple, and avoids "petty debates about nuances".[21] It does indeed avoid these debates, but it is no simple task to place the many different political parties into one of these groups.

---

[16] Chris Gifford, *The Making of Eurosceptic Britain* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2014), 2.
[17] Paul Taggart and Aleks Szczerbiak, "Introduction: Opposing Europe? The Politics of Euroscepticism in Europe", in *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism, Volume 1: Case Studies and Country Surveys*, ed. Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 9.
[18] Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart, "Introduction: Researching Euroscepticism in European Party Systems: A Comparative and Theoretical Research Agenda", in *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism, Volume 2: Comparative and Theoretical Perspectives*, ed. Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 4.
[19] Taggart and Szczerbiak, "Introduction: Opposing Europe? The Politics of Euroscepticism in Europe", 8.
[20] Ibid., 7.
[21] Topaloff, *Political Parties and Euroscepticism*, 25.

2.1.2.2. Other Party-Based Euroscepticism Typologies

Szczerbiak and Taggart's model might not be able to cover all of the nuances found in party-based Euroscepticism. Kopecký and Mudde have developed a two-dimensional model in order to show political parties' stances on European integration, and they believe the stances are coming from ideology rather than from strategic reasons. In this model, they aim to show the different levels of support for European integration and support for EU by using terms like 'Europhile'/'Europhobe', and 'EU-optimist'/'EU-pessimist'. The first dimension of the model shows support for European integration, and the second dimension is support for the European Union.[22] I have chosen to not use this typology due to it being too complicated, and not suited for a comparative study.

Flood's typology consists of the categories: 'rejectionist', 'revisionist', 'minimalist', 'gradualist', 'reformist', and 'maximalist'.[23] The three former categories display Euroscepticism, and the latter pro-EU sentiments. By doing this, he avoids an overlapping of pro-EU and anti-EU positions as is the case in Kopecký and Mudde's typology. This is the strength of the typology, but just like the previous typology, this contains too many categories, and will make a comparative study unnecessarily complicated.

Vasilopoulou has developed a typology that builds on Kopecký and Mudde, but "offers a concrete explanation of what EU *principle* and *practice* are, [and is] based on the EU's own legal documents".[24] Vasilopoulou's definition of Euroscepticism is based on her three-dimensional conceptualisation of European integration. This conceptualisation consists of 'principle': "the wish and willingness for cooperation at a European multilateral level"; 'practice': "the EU institutional and policy status quo"; and 'future': "the deepening of European integration".[25] These three criteria create the foundation of Vasilopoulou's Eurosceptic typology in which she places the extreme right nationalist parties. Three types of Euroscepticism are identified in Vasilopoulou's definitions: 'Rejecting Euroscepticism'; 'Conditional Euroscepticism'; and 'Compromising Euroscepticism'. This typology was developed for nationalist parties found on the extreme right end of the spectrum, and for that reason it would not suit the British and Norwegian parties.

[22] Kopecký and Mudde, "The Two Sides of Euroscepticism: Party Positions on European Integration in East Central Europe", 301.
[23] Flood, cited in Skinner, "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation", 42.
[24] Vasilopoulou, "Varieties of Euroscepticism: The Case of the European Extreme Right", 7.
[25] Ibid., 6-7.

Skinner's typology was created specifically for Norwegian Euroscepticism. The reason for Skinner's own typology she argues, is Norway's status as a non-member country "where European integration is primarily debated in terms of 'yes' or 'no' to membership".[26] Skinner's typology of Euroscepticism contains Szczerbiak and Taggart's, Flood's, and Vasilopoulou's models. On the top of the model are Flood's 'minimalists', 'revisionists', and 'rejectionists' categories. In the middle is Taggart and Szczerbiak's soft-hard typology, and on the bottom is Vasilopoulou's compromising Euroscepticism, conditional Euroscepticism, and rejecting Euroscepticism. According to Skinner, the three typologies work together instead of competing. Skinner developed this typology for Norwegian Euroscepticism, and it will not suit British Euroscepticism because of the differences between them.

2.2. Why Is It Useful for My Thesis?

Getting a nuanced definition of Euroscepticism is crucial for my thesis. I will be comparing party-based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s, and I need a typology that can be applied to both. I have therefore chosen to use Szczerbiak and Taggart's soft-hard Euroscepticism typology. In order to make their model more nuanced, I argue that it is possible to add an extra category, as this thesis has required me to place some of the political parties in a 'softer hard' Eurosceptic group. This would function as a category between soft and hard, and is necessary to categorise parties that oppose membership, but not further European integration.

My reasoning for including several typologies/definitions of Euroscepticism was to show how difficult the concept of party-based Euroscepticism is to define. It is a concept that is difficult to explain in just one way, and with just one model. It is therefore very useful with the different scholars publishing their typologies as criticisms or improvements of the work of others. Using the soft-hard distinction as a framework for Euroscepticism will help me categorise the British and the Norwegian political parties and governments. Using just one typology might not have been sufficient in a more extensive study, but for two countries with different political systems and tradition I argue that a simple typology is the best solution. I find Taggart and Szczerbiak's model useful as a starting point, and it is possible to place all the parties there, but the model lacks a way to capture the smaller differences between the political parties. The model being

[26] Skinner, "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation", 42.

too broad might be a weakness. However, it is easily applicable, and because this is a comparative study of only two countries, a simple model will work.

Methods and Materials

3.1. Comparative History

3.1.1. Introduction

For my master's thesis, I am employing the method of comparative history. This is because both Britain and Norway have Eurosceptic characteristics, and are suitable for comparison. In doing so I am limiting my research, as I will not be able to look at every detail when looking at two countries. Skinner provides a good point about not doing a comparison as this limits the scope of the research, and that comparison can be difficult due to the countries' different historical pasts.[27] It certainly makes it easier to go deeper into the object of study if there is just one of them. I, however, believe a comparison will be a strength. By doing a comparative study, I will be able to look at what is different, what is similar, and what is incomparable in two countries that at first glance appear to have a lot in common. I have yet to find earlier studies doing a thorough comparison of Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway. By using a method of comparison, my thesis will therefore fill a gap in the field.

3.1.2. Discussion

Comparative history is, simply put, "nothing more than historical investigation that works at multiple sites (two or more) in order to tease out similarities and differences, […] and [tests] what the local might help reveal at the level of the general".[28] As a historical method, it can provide new insights by highlighting differences and similarities in the different sites. Very few, if any, countries, or objects of study, are completely unique from everything else.[29] Historian Marc Bloch stated that comparative history is a necessity for the field of history as history needs to "succeed in establishing explanatory relationships between phenomena".[30] My thesis will be comparing two countries, and according to historian Philippa Levine, a common assumption for comparative history is that the comparison will have the countries' national identity as its basis.[31] Both Britain and Norway are prone to exhibiting Euroscepticism, and it is likely a part of their national identities. Particularly for Norway, as its citizens has rejected

[27] Ibid., 33.
[28] Philippa Levine, "Is Comparative History Possible?", *History and Theory* 53, no. 3 (2014), 332.
[29] Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, "Comparative History: Methods, Aims, Problems", in *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective*, ed. Deborah Cohen and Maura O'Connor (New York/London: Routledge, 2004), 25.
[30] Marc Bloch, cited in William H. Sewell Jr., "Marc Bloch and the Logic of Comparative History", *History and Theory* 6, no. 2 (1967), 208.
[31] Levine, "Is Comparative History Possible?", 332.

an EC/EU membership twice. Britain entered the Community, so the country can be considered less sceptic towards it than Norway is, but its national identity has caused it to be branded an awkward European for a long time. Additionally, the majority of the voters in the 2016 referendum voted 'leave', and proved that there has been some growing discontent with British EU membership.

Bloch described two ways, or processes, for comparative history: the Universal Comparison, and the Historical Comparison.[32] The first type, the Universal Comparison deals with societies that are separated in time and space. Phenomena found in that type of study cannot be explained by "mutual influence or by a common origin".[33] The other type of comparative history is the Historical Comparison, and it is the process I have used for this thesis. This is because it is a study of societies "that are at once neighbouring and contemporary".[34] Additionally, the societies, in this case Britain and Norway, exhibit a "constant mutual influence" and "they are close and contemporaneous, and owing their existence in part at least to common origin".[35] Choosing the Historical Comparison gives a more precise study.[36] For this reason, I believe comparing Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s is a good choice.

Aside from Euroscepticism, there are other reasons for choosing to compare these two countries in my thesis. Both Britain and Norway are relatively similar as they are wealthy welfare states, and both are West European. They share the same main religion, protestant Christianity, and they have been closely tied together economically since the early years of European integration through the European Free Trade Association (EFTA). For these reasons, I find it natural to compare them, as they are not too different from each other, and it is likely to be similarities and differences between them. Choosing countries that are too different to each other will most likely create biased history. Doing so would make it easy to list up what one country is missing compared to the other one, rather than what is unique in both. Historian Heinz-Gerhard Haupt exemplifies this by saying a history of Eastern Europe will be an "unsatisfactory history of what is missing" if one applies "the criteria of a civil society defined on the basis of Western European experiences".[37] This will not show Eastern Europe as unique and with its own history,

[32] Alette Olin Hill, Boyd H. Hill, and Jr., "Marc Bloch and Comparative History", *The American History Review* 85, no.4 (1980), 830.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Marc Bloch, cited in Hill, Hill, and Jr, "Marc Bloch and Comparative History", 830.
[37] Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, "Comparative history – a contested method", *Historisk Tidsskrift (Sweden)* 127, no. 4 (2007), 707.

but rather not as successful as Western Europe. Britain and Norway are, as mentioned above, similar to each other, and the comparison will be more unbiased than Haupt's example. This thesis is not about showing which country is better or more advanced, but rather looking at how one phenomenon, party-based Euroscepticism, affects two similar countries in different ways.

Choosing different periods in time for the two countries would create difficulties.[38] I have therefore restricted the time period to the 1970s and 1980s for both countries, and I have looked at events related to party-based Euroscepticism. The time period was chosen because of the referenda during the 1970s, and Euroscepticism becoming latent during the 1980s. These are important points in the British and Norwegian EEC histories, and they mark the time when political opposition towards the Community was becoming a serious issue unlike earlier time periods. The first EEC related referenda were held in the 1970s, and the EEC became an important point on the political agenda from then on. Chapter six will be dedicated to the events of the 1970s, and chapter seven to the events of the 1980s. Different time periods can potentially cause misunderstandings in comparative history, but this will not be the case for my thesis as I am looking at the two countries during the same time period. With that being said, it is possible to compare events happening at different points in history, for example the revolutions in France 1789 and Russia 1917, as they are tied together through an event, a revolution.[39] With a topic like Euroscepticism as the common denominator, I believe choosing a few periods, or points, in time, and then look at Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway during those years would be the most suitable approach for my master's thesis.

In the early phases of European integration, both Britain and Norway belonged to the Seven group. The Seven was proposed as a free trade area for the countries without an EEC membership, and would later become the EFTA. In addition to Britain and Norway, Denmark, Austria, Switzerland, Portugal, and Sweden were also part of the Seven.[40] Britain and Norway therefore share a similar history in the early days of the European Community. Their shared history in the decades before the 1970s is an important reason for how their relationships with Europe have developed, and my comparative research will shed light on why the countries ended up on different paths.

[38] Leidulf Melve, "Komparativ historie: ei utfordring for historiefaget", *Historisk tidsskrift* 88, no. 1 (2009), 67, 73.
[39] Ibid., 69; Haupt, "Comparative history – a contested method", 698.
[40] Benjamin Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 239.

'National identity' and a 'country's uniqueness' are important in the field of comparative history. Putting two countries up for a comparison is a way to show what is typical for these two and how they differ from each other. According to William H. Sewell jr., the second use of Bloch's method of comparative history is to demonstrate how a society differ from another. It is, however, wrong to assume that comparative history is synonymous with cross-national, and that comparing two nations is the only thing the comparative method does.[41] It does compare nations, but with a focus on a particular subject. Doing a comparison will enable the researcher to gain more knowledge on this subject, or phenomenon, as well as the different countries' take on it, and if they share similarities or not. Do the differences exist because of how the political situation in Norway is unique with its many coalition governments and folkestyre (local participatory democracy[42]), or because of Britain's geographical position as an island physically separated from the rest of Europe? I believe comparative history can be a useful tool for answering questions like these.

Comparative history became a method in the latter half of the 1800s. At the time it became more important than ever to show the uniqueness of each nation. Nationalism was on the rise and the nation-state building processes in Europe became important for the comparative method.[43] To find something that was typical for a country could be done by comparing it to another. The main target was to find the differences between the nations, rather than similarities.

A comparison of two different countries requires fluency in their respective languages.[44] The primary material I have collected for my thesis have been in English and Norwegian, and understanding the languages is crucial. Fluency in both English and Norwegian allows me to use the primary material and the secondary literature available in both languages in order to execute a thorough research. The amount of secondary literature available in English far exceeds the material available in Norwegian, but I aim to have an even comparison with the same amount on focus on both countries as far as this is possible.

3.1.3. Conclusion

I am aware of the difficulties my choice of time period will create for my thesis. The years 1971-1973 will have plenty of primary sources available from both countries, but there is a very

[41] Levine, "Is Comparative History Possible?", 333.
[42] Translation by Skinner found in "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation", 78.
[43] Serkan Gül, "Method and Practice in Comparative History", *Journal of Black Sea Studies; Ankara* 7, no. 26 (2010), 144.
[44] Melve, "Komparativ historie: ei utfordring for historiefaget", 75; Levine, "Is Comparative History Possible?", 346.

visible gap when it comes to Norway and the EEC after the 1972 referendum. I will attempt to keep a few important events in 1972-1990 as the main time periods for my thesis, but there will be some deviations due to the lack of material, both primary and secondary, for Norway because of the cease-fire in the Norwegian EEC debates after 1972. My thesis will therefore be slightly uneven, as there is more material available on Britain. The events I will include are the negotiations, referenda held in both countries, and government and party division caused by Euroscepticism.

Comparative history can be a useful way to gain new insights, but it is no stranger to criticism. It does have its limitations regarding how thorough the research can be. It will not be possible to look at every single detail, and it is therefore necessary to choose a few events and focus on these. For comparative research in history there are rarely more than two objects of study involved, but it is possible. Adding more could potentially create difficulties concerning the uniqueness of each object.[45]

3.2. Materials

3.2.1. Primary Sources

3.2.1.1. What Are Primary Sources?

Primary sources are considered to be "original textual and nontextual sources of information that are available to learn more about a time period, person, or particular event".[46] These are the raw source material used to understand the past. Primary sources come in many different forms, but they can all provide valuable insight to the past. Examples of primary sources are letters, recordings, art, or something else that originates from an event or a certain time period. The primary source usually originates from the same time as an event, and can be used to describe or to understand this event.[47] However, it is important to note that a primary source is rarely neutral. If the primary source was created by a person, it will most likely "carry a point of view".[48] Because of this, combining primary sources with secondary sources is the best way to get a good grasp of what really happened. Most of the primary sources I have used in this

[45] Melve, "Komparativ historie: ei utfordring for historiefaget", 67.
[46] Denise N. Morgan and Timothy V. Rasinski, "The Power and Potential of Primary Sources", *The Reading Teacher* 65, no. 8 (2012), 584.
[47] William Kelleher Storey, *Writing History: A Guide for Students* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 32.
[48] Susan H. Veccia, *Uncovering Our History: Teaching with Primary Sources* (Chicago: American Library Association, 2004), 3.

thesis carry a political stance, or a point of view, and I believe these sources are crucial in order to understand the different political parties' views on the EEC/EU and European integration.

3.2.1.2. Benefits of Using Primary Sources

There are a few benefits from using a primary source. Firstly, the source lets me get "as close to a moment in time as possible".[49] It gives a better understanding of the event, the actor, or the phenomenon being studied. Secondary sources can also be able to give an understanding of this, but it will be another person's interpretation, which might be different from my own. Secondly, the primary source can lead to another primary or secondary source, and show an interesting connection. New sources can be mentioned in a primary source, or even originate from the same event. Putting them together with existing secondary sources will give a fuller picture of the event being studied.

Because my thesis is a comparative study, I have relied mainly on existing secondary literature and compared Britain and Norway. However, primary sources were used as they often were proof of what the secondary literature claimed, and my own interpretation of the primary sources was used where there was little secondary literature available. Furthermore, the primary sources gave an insight into the political parties' Europe policy and their stances.

3.2.2. An Overview of the Primary Sources Used in this Thesis

3.2.2.1. Documents

One of the main categories of primary source material is documents.[50] I have used political party manifestos, debates from Stortinget (the Norwegian Parliament), a telegram sent by the British embassy in Oslo, a pamphlet issued by the government, autobiographies, and transcripts of speeches. They are textual, and should be accurate because they are originating from political parties, governments, and politicians. However, they are political, and therefore not objective sources. I have to consider who they are produced by, and who the intended reader is when reading them. Because I am comparing the political parties with each other, I regard this subjectivity to be a strength as their rhetoric often can have Eurosceptic characteristics, and is useful for my thesis. I am sure of the documents' suitability for this thesis because they are political. They are true to the parties' ideology and agenda, and give insight into their European policy. The documents have been acquired at the National Archives in London, and online using

[49] Morgan and Rasinski, "The Power and Potential of Primary Sources", 585.
[50] William H. McDowell, *Historical Research: A Guide for Writers of Dissertations, Theses, Articles and Books* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 110.

various websites and databases such as www.nsd.uib.no, www.labourmanifesto.com, and www.conservativemanifesto.com, and the Norwegian government's own online archive.

3.2.2.2. Oral Evidence

In addition to the documents, or textual primary sources, I have also used oral evidence. There were very few sources available on the Norwegian Syse government (1989-1990), but an interview was available on NRK's online TV archive and I made a transcript of it. The interview was broadcast on 29th October 1990 on *Dagsrevyen*, a daily evening news programme for NRK1 (then NRK). Because it is an oral primary source, I am aware that the interviewees may be wrong as it is possible that they have "distort[ed] their recollection of events to make them consistent with their own preconceived ideas, motives, attitudes and values".[51] Nonetheless, the parties' disagreement over the European question is very apparent in the interview, as well as their different stances on EEC membership. This source provides valuable information about the 1990 government breakdown for my thesis.

3.2.3. Secondary Literature

The main source material for my thesis is the secondary works, or secondary literature. The definition of this is "books and articles by writers who are interpreting the events and primary sources".[52] These sources are in most cases written by "people who were not present at the events" described.[53] Most historians will aim to write from an objective point of view, but it is important to take into account that this might not be possible. Using the works of different authors is crucial in order to get a fuller picture of the events.

There is a vast number of secondary literature on British Euroscepticism available, and this has been useful for this thesis. There is less available literature for Norwegian Euroscepticism, but what I have found has been sufficient for my thesis and I have been able to use primary sources where the secondary literature was lacking. For my master's thesis, I have relied on books and articles written by mainly historians and political scientists. I regard these to be reliable, and I will be using a great number of sources in order to compare British and Norwegian party-based Euroscepticism between 1970-1990.

The secondary literature has consisted of studies of Euroscepticism in either Britain or Norway, but no comparisons. The literature has provided in-depth studies, and this has allowed me to

[51] Ibid., 114.
[52] Storey, *Writing History: A Guide for Students*, 32.
[53] McDowell, *Historical Research: A Guide for Writers of Dissertations, Theses, Articles and Books*, 55.

find what is unique about British and Norwegian Euroscepticism during the 1970s and 1980s. My task has been to look at the literature available for each country and put it up for comparison.

The Memory of the Past as a Reason for Party-Based Euroscepticism

4.1. Introduction

In order to examine party-based Euroscepticism in the 1970s and 1980s, it is necessary to have a look at Britain and Norway's past in pre-European integration times. Additionally, this chapter will be looking at early European integration. Both Britain and Norway have had a somewhat strained relationship to the European Community. Britain spent the first years of the Community's existence on the outside, and Norway has never been a member at all. These two have been known to be particularly Eurosceptic.[54] One of the reasons for Eurosceptic attitude could be found in their pasts. Britain was caught in a struggle involving its new position in Europe versus its previous position as a world power. For centuries, Britain had been a dominating power in the world. This position underwent great changes after the Second World War. The EEC caused Norway too, to consider its previous role in the world.

The focus of this chapter will be on the historical pasts of Britain and Norway as these have shaped the Britons' and Norwegians' opinions about being part of a bigger European cooperation project. For Britain, this meant looking at the loss of empire, and for Norway, the many times under foreign rule. The decline of the British empire began after the Second World War, and the Commonwealth countries were an important topic during the early Community negotiations. Norway have been ruled by foreign powers several times, and the impact this have had on the national identity is great. It has led to Norwegians wanting to keep their independence and sovereignty to themselves. Looking at these historic reasons for Euroscepticism is crucial as they are one of the causes for a more current party-based Euroscepticism. The past of these countries has, after all, created a memory for its peoples, and this is what the political parties have to take into consideration when trying to attract voters. This chapter will provide a framework for the rest of the thesis as it is important to understand the past of these two countries in order to get a better understanding of the party-based Euroscepticism in the 1970s and 1980s. The reasons for being Eurosceptic discussed in this

[54] Stephen George, "Britain: Anatomy of a Eurosceptic state", *Journal of European Integration* 22, no. 1 (2000); Gifford, *The Making of Eurosceptic Britain*; Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*, 55; Thomas Raines, "An Island Apart?, *The World Today* 68, no. 5 (2012), 27.

chapter will be mainly historical/cultural as they are connected to the national identities of Britain and Norway and most likely served as a path towards Euroscepticism.

The research question for this chapter is *what are the major historical-cultural reasons for Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway, and does the memory of the past contribute to party-based Euroscepticism*? The research question will help explaining some of the 'cultural reasons' included in the thesis question, and showcase how Britain and Norway's historical pasts have affected the countries' party-based Euroscepticism differently in more recent times.

4.2. European Integration in the 1940s-1960s

The world had never before seen the likes of the Second World War. The European continent suffered from war-torn cities, the loss of millions of lives, and an uncertain future. The post-war period saw the beginning of a bigger European project. A new world war was to be avoided at all costs, and tying the European nations together through an economic community was a way to do that. Furthermore, there was a consensus of keeping Germany from reaching such powers ever again. Britain due to its geographical location, had not been occupied by Nazi Germany, but Norway and several other countries had.

European integration was born out of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). Members of the ECSC had a common market for coal and steel. With the addition of the ECSC, Eurosceptics in Britain moved from anti-Europeanism, a notion of general opposition towards the continent because they were not British, to anti-market, highlighting that their reasons for being sceptic were mainly economic, and caused by European economic integration, and not because of their past history with Germany and France.[55] Norway too displayed some scepticism when the ECSC member-states established the EEC. The Norwegians' reasoning for being sceptic was due to the fact that the European continent had become increasingly more federate, and the Norwegian government wanted Norway to remain a separate state, and not part of any unions.[56] Anti-Europeanism was found in Norway as well. The Norwegians showed signs of anti-Europeanism and were sceptic towards other cultures found in European countries.[57] An understandable reaction due to the country's past.

[55] Forster, "Anti-Europeans, Anti-Marketeers and Eurosceptics: The Evolution of Labour and Conservative Opposition to Europe", 300.
[56] Geir Ketil Almlid, "Splittelse og dobbeltspill – Borten- og Bratteli-regjeringens forhandlinger om EF-medlemskap i 1970-72", *Historisk tidsskrift* 92, no. 2 (2013), 235.
[57] Skinner, "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation", 111.

4.3. Britain and Norway: The Memories of the Past

Becoming part of a bigger European community required both Britain and Norway to examine if it was worth it considering their past histories. Although not a strictly political reason for Euroscepticism and opposition towards a European integration, the past mattered. What the countries had been through earlier in terms of unions and empires, was used as reasons either for or against when discussing reasons for joining a larger European community. European integration began when Britain's grip on its empire and its role as a great world power began to weaken, and when Norway, once again, had just reclaimed its country from foreign rule.

4.3.1. "Great Britain has lost an empire and has not yet found a role"[58]

Britain has been known as a great power for centuries, and as a great empire. The British empire had colonies and citizens in all parts of the world, and was the empire on which the sun never set. The country's past as the ruler of a mighty empire was bound to be influential even in modern times, and would not be forgotten by its people. The Commonwealth countries had always been considered by British politicians to be of great importance, and during talks on European cooperation was no exception.[59] Britain was losing its position in the world, a position it had held for centuries. There were several reasons why the empire was in decline during the 1900s, and the scholar S.J.D. Green lists some of them to be third-world nationalism, the two world wars, and the costs of the empire becoming a burden.[60] In addition to these reasons, Britain owed £3567m to India and the Dominions after the Second World War.[61] These difficulties were problematic for Britain, and the empire shrank because of them.

Winston Churchill, in a speech held in 1950, described Britain as having three different circles. The three circles consisted of a Commonwealth circle, the Atlantic circle, and a Europe circle.[62] Each of these was linked to Britain. These circles were ordered in a certain way, with the Commonwealth at the top, and Europe at the bottom of the list. Churchill's speech demonstrated how Britain regarded Europe in the years leading up to European integration. Britain's main

[58] Dean Acheson, cited in Alex May, "'Commonwealth or Europe?': Macmillan's Dilemma, 1961-63", in *Britain, the Commonwealth and Europe: The Commonwealth and Britain's Applications to Join the European Communities*, ed. Alex May (London: Palgrave Publishers Ltd, 2001), 82.
[59] Alex May, "The Commonwealth and Britain's Turn to Europe, 1945-73", *The Round Table* 102, no. 1 (2013), 29.
[60] S.J.D. Green, "Letter from London: Britain in Europe: Half-hearted and Ambivalent Forever?", *The Antioch Review* 58, no. 1 (2000): 10.
[61] David Sanders, *Losing an Empire, Finding a Role* (New York: Macmillan Education, 1989), 47.
[62] Gifford, *The Making of Eurosceptic Britain*, 33.

concerns were with the Commonwealth countries, which were a part of the British Empire.[63] It was therefore a struggle to find a solution that included an EEC membership, and did not threaten existing relations. Losing the Commonwealth had been a fear since the early talks of membership.[64] At this point, Europe was clearly perceived as an 'Other' and something strange, whereas the Commonwealth was familiar and considered safe.

4.3.1.1. The Empire Did Not Strike Back

By the 1950s, the empire had begun to crumble before the Britons' eyes. The loss of India in 1947 demonstrated how vulnerable the empire had become. Britain's prime minster at the time, Clement Atlee, granted India and Pakistan independence due to the growing tensions, and because India "had ceased to be an imperial asset".[65] Attempts by the British politicians to keep the Commonwealth unaffected by the current trends were unsuccessful, with the Suez crisis as a particularly severe embarrassment for Britain and Prime Minister Anthony Eden in 1956.[66] The Suez crisis highlighted how much Britain's imperial position was in decline.[67] Britain was losing its grip on the world, and its place in a modern world. The new political trend was independence, and colonies and British mandates were on their way out. During the 1950s and 1960s, decolonisation was sweeping over the African continent as well.[68] According to Churchill, the Commonwealth circle was supposed to be Britain's number one priority, but the country was quite unsuccessful in taking care of its Commonwealth, and the empire was shrinking. Their wish to keep Commonwealth as their number one priority quickly became incompatible with the political trends in the Commonwealth countries at the same time.

4.3.1.2. Britain, the Commonwealth, AND the EEC?

The former colonies in the Commonwealth were not Britain's only concern when entering talks about Europe. The Commonwealth consisted of, and still does, larger nations like Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. Some of these were less enthusiastic about the prospect of Britain becoming a part of a bigger European unit rather than focusing on them. New Zealand accepted the fact that Britain as a part of a united Europe would have its upsides, but due to its geographical location, New Zealand would not be able to join. New Zealand's prime minister,

[63] Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*, 278.
[64] Andrew Thorpe, *A History of the British Labour Party* (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1997), 152.
[65] Nicholas J. White, *Decolonisation: The British Experience Since 1945*, (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014), 30-31; Sanders, *Losing an Empire, Finding a Role*, 77.
[66] White, *Decolonisation: The British Experience Since 1945*, 113.
[67] Peter Lyon, cited in May, "The Commonwealth and Britain's Turn to Europe, 1945-1973", 32.
[68] Jarle Simensen, "Afrika – eliter og omverden", in *Krig og fred i det lange 20. århundre*, ed. Hilde Henriksen Waage, Rolf Tamnes, and Hanne Hagtvedt Vik (Oslo: Cappelen Damm, 2013), 150.

Peter Fraser, and his government stated in the 1940s that they accepted the fact that New Zealand would be unable to become part of a United Europe, but regarded this as a great loss.[69] British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan visited New Zealand in 1958, and he tried to convince the New Zealanders that everyone would be better off with a free trade area that also included the EEC, but failed to do so.[70] The New Zealand government could not see how trade deals with a European Community would be a better way to protect their interests than "by maintenance of unrestricted duty-free entry".[71]

In 1971, a pamphlet with the title "Britain, New Zealand and the EEC: A New Zealand Government Statement" was released by the New Zealand government. EEC was described as "the sword over [New Zealand's] heads". It was expected that the EEC would take over Britain's role when trading with New Zealand.[72] If the negotiations with the EEC were unsuccessful, this would have a negative impact on New Zealand's economy and cause the disintegration of their dairy industry. Barring the economic reasons, New Zealand was not entirely against European integration as this would promote peace and stability in the world.[73]

Macmillan had to defend British actions regarding EEC talks when he visited Australia, and stated that free trade between the EEC members would not in any way threaten the existing trade relations between Britain and Australia, and the other Commonwealth countries. The Australian government, however, regarded Britain's membership application as a threat to their export trade.[74] Much like New Zealand, Australia's worries concerning the European Community were mainly economic as Britain was their most important trading partner. A memorandum from the 6th July 1961 stated that the government in Australia did not consider themselves as against the EEC, but they did not support it either.[75] Canada too, were worried about the existing Commonwealth ties if Britain chose to enter the EEC. Despite Britain's attempt in 1961 at convincing the Commonwealth countries, the Commonwealth and the EEC were regarded as incompatible with each other.[76] The first of Churchill's circles therefore

[69] Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*, 55.
[70] Ibid., 233.
[71] May, "The Commonwealth and Britain's Turn to Europe, 1945-73", 34.
[72] PREM 15 (365), "1971 Britain, New Zealand and the EEC: A New Zealand Government Statement", printed by The Tweeddale Press Ltd, 6.
[73] Ibid., 12.
[74] John B. O'Brien, "The Australian Department of Trade and the EEC, 1956-61", in *Britain, the Commonwealth and Europe: The Commonwealth and Britain's Applications to Join the European Communities*, ed. Alex May (London: Palgrave Publishers Ltd, 2001), 50.
[75] Ibid.
[76] Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*, 274.

consisted of some hostility towards Britain joining the EEC as they were risking the strong ties and the trade relations that already existed between the Commonwealth countries. When Churchill spoke of how "the first circle for [them was] naturally the British Commonwealth and Empire", he had no idea how the British empire would turn out. [77]

For Eurosceptics, a potential entry could be seen as a threat to the existing system. The British Conservative Party, led by Macmillan, was the pro-EEC party at the time, and they regarded membership to be in Britain's best interest. Memories of the past, of Britain's time as a great world power, could not be removed from the public. The importance of the British empire to the Britons was showcased by the Conservatives' many attempts at bringing the Commonwealth countries with them into the EEC.

4.3.2. Norway: Once Bitten, Twice Shy

4.3.2.1. United We Stand… in Unions

The memory of Norway's past, like Britain's, stretched out for centuries. The country had been a part of various Scandinavian unions.[78] Not since the Viking age had Norway been considered to be a ruling power in Europe, and even then, it was nowhere near Britain's empire. A shared monarch with Sweden in 1319 developed into a union, and the Kalmar Union was established in 1397. The three Scandinavian countries, Norway, Denmark and Sweden, were supposed to share monarch and power.[79] In reality, Norway became the least important member of the union, and Denmark seized more and more of the power as the decades went by. By the early 1500s, Sweden had left the union. This became the end of the Kalmar Union, but it was far from the end of Danish rule in Norway.

The state Denmark-Norway was established in 1537, and lasted until 1814. This was a dual-kingdom with all power coming from Copenhagen in Denmark.[80] After centuries of Danish rule, the Norwegians attempted to break free in 1814. This would prove to be harder than imagined. Denmark-Norway had been one of Napoleon Bonaparte's allies during the Napoleonic wars, and with his loss came Norway's role as a spoil of war. Through the Treaty

[77] Christopher Lord, *Absent at the Creation, Britain and the Formation of the EC 1950-1952* (Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1996), 62.
[78] Skinner, "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation", 79.
[79] Olav Riste, *Norway's Foreign Relations – A History* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2005), 27.
[80] Ibid., 31-51.

of Kiel, Sweden had managed to secure its right to Norway with the support of Britain and Prussia.[81]

1814 saw the birth of a new union for Norway, this time with Sweden. Although the Norwegians had more political power this time, the monarch and the government ruled from Stockholm. It would take another 91 years before the Norwegians finally gained their independence. In a public vote in 1905, the majority voted to leave the union. However, leaving the union was no easy matter. The Swedish parliament refused to dissolve the union as this required the consent of both the king of Sweden and the parliament. After much negotiating and a threat of war, Norway was finally allowed to become independent.[82] With its own government, and its own royal family, the future looked bright for Norway.

4.3.2.2. Don't Mention the War

By the end of the 1930s, a new European power was looming over Europe. Nazi Germany invaded Norway on 9th April 1940, and they did not surrender until 8th May 1945.[83] The occupation of Norway would never be forgotten. European integration after the war was promoted by the government in order to prevent a new war from happening. Eurosceptics still felt sceptical towards Germany and potential new threats with Sosialistisk Venstre (the Socialist Left Party) as a good example of a hard Eurosceptic party not trusting Germany.[84] In Norway, Nazism and the atrocities of the war would be used as rhetoric in discussions about European integration during the 1960s as there was an anti-German notion to be found, "[…] a Germany where Nazism smoulders in the best of health and could feasibly break out in flames […]", and a fear of German Nazism rising again.[85]

After the Second World War, the European countries wanted to keep the peace and stability, and Norway was no exception. European cooperation would tie the nations together and obstruct the chances of a new world war. Norway had to somehow become a part of a nited Europe, but the many attempts at EEC membership failed. Norway's past has been shaped by

[81] Ibid., 42.
[82] Ibid., 69-71.
[83] Ola Svein Stugu, *Norsk historie etter 1905* (Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget, 2015), 109-142; R.R. Palmer, Joel Cotton and Lloyd Kramer, *A History of Europe in the Modern World* (New York: McGraw-Hill Education, 2014), 854.
[84] "Sosialistisk Folkepartis arbeidsprogram 1965 - 69", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 1 April, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:14&fq=aarstall:1965.
[85] Alf Rolfsen, cited in Skinner, "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation", 111.

the various forms of foreign rule. The Norwegians' road independence was by many considered long and hard.[86] Euroscepticism found amongst the Norwegian people could have the hard-earned independence as one of the reasons for its existence. The importance of this independence must be stressed, as EEC membership was not associated with it. The memory of the many struggles Norway had been through, had turned the people sceptic towards greater powers and made them eager to be on their own for a change.

4.3.2.3. In Britain's Footsteps

When Britain applied for an EEC membership in 1961, it was also time for Norway to consider if they too wanted to become a part of a greater European Community.[87] British membership meant that Norway would lose the customs benefits with Britain granted by the EFTA. British membership was likely to happen. The Norwegian government, led by Einar Gerhardsen of Arbeiderpartiet (Labour Party), decided to apply, but withdrew due to French President Charles de Gaulle's veto against British membership. A comment made by Karl Brommeland, an MP from Kristelig Folkeparti (Christian Democratic Party), stated that "the best solution to Norway's EEC problem is if Britain decides to remain outside the EEC".[88] This statement showed that the Norwegian politicians were not yet ready to consider Norwegian membership. Joining the EEC had its economic advantages, but it also meant going into a community, a union, and away from the hard-earned independence. Scepticism towards Europe is understandable as the membership was not really the choice of the Norwegian government, but something they had to do in order to continue trade with Britain.

4.4. The Community and the Past

What does the two countries' memories of their past tell us about their reasons for being Eurosceptical or for showing opposition towards European integration? Joining the Community proved to be difficult. Britain saw itself as a natural leader of a united Europe, but France did not share this view. De Gaulle made Britain's road into the Community difficult by vetoing the British membership applications twice during the 1960s.[89] Along with Britain, the United States (US) government also believed that Britain should be part of a European leadership. This would

[86] Ole Wæver, "Nordic Nostalgia: Northern Europe after the Cold War", *International Affairs* 68, no. 1 (1992), 91.
[87] Sitter, "The European Question and the Norwegian Party System since 1961: The Freezing of a Modern Cleavage or Contingent Opposition?", 329.
[88] Almlid, "Splittelse og dobbeltspill – Borten- og Bratteli-regjeringens forhandlinger om EF-medlemskap i 1970-72", 236.
[89] Gifford, *The Making of Eurosceptic Britain*, 51, 60; White, *Decolonisation: The British Experience Since 1945*, 38.

be beneficial for the European integration process as the US hoped British leadership would "guarantee continental stability".[90] To just be a part of a bigger community rather than being the leader of it, meant that the role of Britain in the world would drastically change. The increasing importance of Europe and EEC happened with or without Britain's participation. Britain was not the natural choice to lead Europe, unlike earlier when it had been a great world power.

Tracing back to the 14th and 15th century and the Hundred Years' War, France has become "an object of discourse" in English history.[91] The scholar Stephen George identifies several statements about France that were used in British EEC/EU debates. If Britain joined the EEC, France would be able to dominate them, and would turn the EEC protectionist; and impose their own idea of democracy upon the EEC's member-states.[92] Similar statements are found about Germany too, but with references to the world wars rather than to medieval times.[93] Britain regarded itself as the natural leader of a European community. Lord George Brown, the Labour Foreign Secretary in the late 1960s, demonstrated this view by saying "our role is to lead Europe… Western Europe in the first place, and of as much Europe as will come together later on".[94] His reasons for wanting Britain as a leader would make it "impossible for Germany to be the focal power point of the continent", and to keep France from power for historic reasons.[95] Memories of war complicated a British EEC entry as they now had to enter a bigger group led by two former enemies.

Norway was not too keen on the idea of becoming a part of a bigger European Community. It regarded itself as having a unique historical past and having a political system that was not to be meddled with by bigger European powers as had been the case with the various union memberships. The past was far away, but the memories of the times where Norway had been under foreign rule still existed amongst the public. The EEC was mainly an economic cooperation project in the early days. However, for a country like Norway, membership meant they once again would find themselves as a part of a group consisting of much more powerful states, and in a way, relive parts of their pasts. Twice, the Norwegian government had found

[90] Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*, 22-23.
[91] James Noel Currid cited in, George, "Britain: Anatomy of a Eurosceptic state", 18.
[92] George, "Britain: Anatomy of a Eurosceptic state", 18-19.
[93] Forster, "Anti-Europeans, Anti-Marketeers and Eurosceptics: The Evolution of Labour and Conservative Opposition to Europe", 299, 301.
[94] George Brown cited in Green, "Letter from London: Britain in Europe: Half-hearted and Ambivalent Forever?", 15.
[95] Green, "Letter from London: Britain in Europe: Half-hearted and Ambivalent Forever?", 17.

itself being rushed into applying for membership because of the British government. Due to their close relationship stemming from the North Atlantic Treaty in the 1950s, Norway was oriented towards the Atlantic, and the Norwegian government felt obliged to follow Britain in applying to the EEC.[96]

4.5. Conclusion

Is it possible to compare the pasts of Britain and Norway due to their obvious differences? This chapter argued that it is the memory of the past, rather than the specific events in the past that shaped the people's opinions on the EEC, and European cooperation. Imperial times, and decolonisation mattered to the Britons, and a new order with Europe, where France was in the lead, had become the reality. The power of the British empire was fading fast after the Second World War.

In the beginning, the EEC was an economic integration project that was meant to benefit all its members and keep the peace. For countries like Britain and Norway, a cooperation and integration project like the EEC required them to change their current roles. It was not possible to oppose European integration completely, as all the European countries had been affected by the war and were now eager to keep the peace. The two countries had two very different starting points, and membership would affect their national identity as well as their economy. The memory of the past had to be considered in both countries. A small country like Norway placed on the outskirts of Europe was sceptic toward membership due to the unions with Denmark and Sweden in the past, and the German occupation during the Second World War. Independence and freedom had become essential to the Norwegians. An EEC membership would of course have turned out differently from the former unions, but a people finally getting used to being on their own was difficult to convince. The long struggle for independence, and the history of being at the bottom of the food chain had become an important part of the Norwegian national identity, as well as a reason for being sceptic towards the greater powers of Europe. The country's past meant something to the public. The people never forgot what had been, and the political parties had to take this into consideration. I argue that the memory of the past is therefore an important reason for Norwegian party-based Euroscepticism. It is not a political reason for opposition, but rather a cultural one. The EEC membership would not necessary have been bad for Norway, but the memory of centuries of oppression made it difficult for the

[96] Kjetil Skogrand, "Allianser i alliansen, 1949-1989", in *Selvstendig og beskyttet: Det stormaktsgaranterte Norge fra Krimkrigen til NATO*, ed. Roald Berg (Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2008), 100.

political parties to convince the public that the EEC and European integration could be beneficial for the economy.

Britain had been one of the greater powers of Europe, but this had changed after the Second World War. It was still one of Europe's greater powers, but Britain was not a world power like it used to be. Several Commonwealth countries had gained their independence, and the British Empire was crumbling. Britain had managed to be somewhat independent from Europe up until this point because there were massive amounts of resources to be found in the Commonwealth, and many trading partners. After the war, Britain had to turn to Europe, and a Community run by France and West Germany. Britain's past was very different to Norway's, and I argue that the scepticism towards the EEC and Europe came from confusion regarding a new role rather than giving up independence. However, British membership was not completely without a sacrifice: it would not be possible to bring the Commonwealth countries into the EEC. The British government kept trying to include Australia and New Zealand in an EEC membership. These countries had relied on Britain as a trading partner for so long, and British EEC membership could potentially put this in jeopardy.

Keeping the peace in Europe was in everyone's bests interest, but it meant giving up some of their independence. Although not at previous heights, Britain was still an important state, and the British government had chosen to apply for membership. In Norway, the government felt rushed into submitting an application due to the fear of losing Britain as a trading partner. Because of de Gaulle's vetoes, none of the countries ended up joining the EEC during the 1960s. The historical reasons discussed in this chapter are regarded as political decisions, but they shaped the countries' national identity. Despite both countries being West European, these identities differ greatly: Britain had been at the top, ruling a large empire, whereas Norway was a small country and too familiar with foreign rule. This chapter argued that entering the Community required great a change in the current roles, and that the memory of the past shaped party-based Euroscepticism in the later decades. Britain would have to give up its grasp on a shrinking empire, and thus cut bonds that had lasted for hundreds of years. Joining the Community would make them one of several European countries, and the loss of the role as a great power of the world would be even more apparent.

Party-Based Euroscepticism: The British and Norwegian Governments, and the Political Systems

5.1. Introduction

This chapter will discuss the party-based Euroscepticism, and if there is a difference to how a coalition government might affect Euroscepticism versus a majority government. Britain and Norway are different in this regard, and it is therefore important to consider the differences found in their political systems when looking at party-based Euroscepticism. In Britain, entering the EEC began as a Conservative idea driven forth by Churchill's United States of Europe movement after the Second World War.[97] A Conservative government managed to get Britain into the EEC, and the following Labour government held a referendum to make sure membership was what the British people wanted.[98] The referendum came as a result after pressure from several interest groups such as Common Market Safeguards Committee, and Get Britain Out, but also because of internal disagreements within the Labour Party.[99] In Norway, the first EEC membership application came in 1962 when the country was led by an Arbeiderparti government. When Charles de Gaulle vetoed the British applications twice during the 1960s, Norway withdrew its applications as this was a way out of a choice they did not want to make. Britain was one of Norway's main trade partners, meaning Norway would have to follow them, and the British membership application became an important reason for discussing, and eventually, applying for membership. The Borten government was relieved in 1967 when de Gaulle vetoed Britain, and Norway did not have to enter.[100] Norway applied once more for membership in 1971 and a referendum was held in 1972. The results showed that a slight majority voted 'no' in the referendum and Norway remained on the outside of the EEC.

Out of three Norwegian governments from 1969-1973, two of them were coalitions. Unlike Britain's tradition of majority government, the Norwegian governments are generally coalitions consisting of parties with a different opinion on European integration and EEC membership.

[97] Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*, 50.
[98] David Butler and Uwe Kitzinger, *The 1975 Referendum* (London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1976), 1.
[99] Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*, 388.
[100] Almlid, "Splittelse og dobbeltspill – Borten- og Bratteli-regjeringens forhandlinger om EF-medlemskap i 1970-72", 237.

The purpose for this chapter is therefore to see how the different parliamentary systems shape Euroscepticism found in the parties in the government. The chapter will explain what the governments of Britain and Norway looked like during the 1970s and 1980s, the individual parties' stances on EEC, and how the government structure either allowed for, or prevented a pro-EEC stance. It will also be discussing a few governments from outside of the thesis scope, as these are relevant, and shows the type of government's effect on Euroscepticism. In addition to this, I will look at the typologies for party-based Euroscepticism to see how applicable they are for categorising the British and the Norwegian parties. This chapter will provide knowledge on the various parties' stances, and in doing so, create a frame for the rest of the thesis.

The research question for this chapter is: *how does the type of government affect party-based Euroscepticism, and are coalition governments more likely to struggle with disagreements related to the relationship with Europe than majority governments are*? The question is connected to the 'political reasons' for Norwegian and British party-based Euroscepticism mentioned in the thesis questions. It will give an insight of the type of government's effect on Euroscepticism in the two countries, and thus show why they differed during the 1970s and 1980s. Britain and Norway have quite different political systems, and I have included this chapter for that reason.

5.2. The Governments: Majority Governments and Coalition Governments

The governments in Britain and Norway have one difference that is particularly striking. Whereas the British governments have tended to consist of only one party at a time, the Norwegian governments are often a coalition of several parties. Traditionally, Britain has been led by either the Labour Party or the Conservative Party. Norway have been through many different coalition governments, as it is rare for parties, with the exception of Arbeiderpartiet, to be able to form a majority government. Britain and Norway are both known to be Eurosceptic, and reluctant Europeans, and a difference in their political systems will have a different effect on party-based Euroscepticism.

The definition of a majority government is "when the party wielding executive power in a government controls the majority of seats in the legislature". It can be a preferred system as "legislation is passed more easily, and the leadership is able to win the confidence vote of the

legislature".[101] With this definition, it looks as if majority governments are less likely to experience division and disagreements coming from the European question. This chapter will argue that this might not be the case, and that both Labour and the Conservatives have found themselves divided because of the Europe question. This rarely happens with Norwegian majority government, and there have not been any severe disagreements within the party caused by the European question, so this a unique characteristic for the British political system.

A coalition government on the other hand, is defined as "political parties […] who join together at a particular time for a limited period to advocate a specific agenda".[102] This happens because in many parliamentary democracies it is rare for a party to "[attain] a majority status", and the solution is to "form partnerships to gain control of the government".[103] This was the situation several times in Norway during the period covered by this thesis. The danger of the coalition government is that if a "member leaves the government, the coalition will lose its power".[104] This possibility, or threat, was useful for the Eurosceptic parties in Norway. They could make sure the government did not move towards EEC membership by being able to end the coalition, and also the government, at any time.

Britain was not led by any coalition governments in the time period covered in this thesis. The British political system contains fewer parties than the Norwegian system does, and coalition is less likely. There are less compromising to be found in a majority government as the politicians share the same, or a similar, ideology. However, the parties can be quite large, and division is possible, and the European question could have a dividing effect on majority governments. Britain's relationship with the EEC have caused disagreement in both the Labour Party and the Conservative Party. Britain was led by six majority governments, and one minority government during the 1970s and 1980s. This period was characterised by many EEC-related events causing the British government to adopt a certain stance for, or against the Community, in order to protect British national interest in the way they saw best.

Because there are several different governments covered in this thesis, I will present a brief overview of them here. During the 1970s and 1980s, the Conservatives, as majority government, led Britain in 1970-February 1974, 1979-1983, 1983-1987 and 1987-1990. Labour

[101] Larry E. Sullivan, "Majority Government" in *The SAGE Glossary of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*, ed. Larry E. Sullivan (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2009), 301.
[102] Larry E. Sullivan, "Coalition" in *The SAGE Glossary of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*, ed. Larry E. Sullivan (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2009), 80.
[103] Ibid.
[104] Ibid.

led Britain as a majority government in October 1974-1976 and 1976-1979, and as minority in February 1974-October 1974.

The Norwegian political system is more prone to coalitions than the British is, and the 1970s and 1980s were no exception. Coalition governments required the parties to cooperate, and this meant setting aside their differences. Arbeiderpartiet has since after the Second World War been the only party in Norway able to form a majority government, with the exception of Høyre in 1981-1985. Because none of the other parties are able to secure enough votes, coalition is crucial for the Norwegian political system. Coalition governments do, however, require some compromising between the different parties. The Europe question was a splitting issue. Several of the Norwegian coalitions contained both Eurosceptic and pro-EEC parties. This meant that the government was often locked in a Eurosceptic stance. EEC membership was a serious issue in Norway, and the negotiations in the early 1970s caused the breakdown of both a coalition government and a majority government.

Norway was led by a Senterparti-Høyre-Kristelig Folkeparti-Venstre coalition in 1969-1971. A majority Arbeiderparti government led the country in 1971-1972, 1973-1976, 1976-1981, 1981, and 1986-1989. A Kristelig Folkeparti-Senterparti-Venstre coalition was in office in 1972-1973. And finally, a majority Høyre government in 1981-1985, and a Høyre-Kristelig Folkeparti-Senterparti coalition in 1985-1986, and 1989-1990.

5.3. British Political Parties: Support or Opposition Towards European Integration

Because the thesis focuses on the 1970s and 1980s, it is natural for the Labour Party and the Conservative Party to be focal points on British side. However, in addition to these two, there is a Liberal Party, but it was not part of any government in the time period covered by this thesis. Britain joined the EEC in 1973, and the membership required discussions within the parties. The Conservative Party was considered to be a very pro-EEC party from the beginning. The party, led by Edward Heath, managed to enter Britain in the EEC, but without a referendum and not with the consent of the people. Despite the party being positive to a future as a member of a European Community, letting go of the imperial past proved difficult as this had been important for Britain's uniqueness.[105] As discussed in the previous chapter, the Commonwealth

[105] May, "'Commonwealth or Europe?' Macmillan's Dilemma, 1961-1963", 85; Nicholas J. Crowson, *The Conservative Party and European Integration since 1945: At the heart of Europe?* (London: Routledge, 2007), 18.

and the empire had been important for Britain, but times were changing. For centuries, the British empire had been a great power in the world, and becoming a member of the EEC seemed like a poor substitute. Hugh Gaitskell, leader of the Labour Party from 1955 to 1963, described "the end of Britain as an independent European" as "the end of a thousand years of history".[106] The 1960s saw many unsuccessful attempts by the British government to bring the Commonwealth countries with them into the EEC. The memory of a once great empire was stuck in the minds of both the public and the politicians. There was a need for a closer European integration, but the Britons were not too keen on sacrificing their former greatness for economic benefits. Because of this, the European question proved a challenge for the British political parties.

Euroscepticism within the British parties is a complicated matter. The different parties' stances on the matter is described to always be changing as "parties have embraced and then abandoned Eurosceptic policies", something that reflects the difficulties found in defining the term.[107] A change in leadership can cause the party to change their stance, which is what happened in the Labour Party during the 1980s, but also because of European integration becoming more comprehensive. The EEC had begun as cooperation on a purely economic level, but by the 1970s and 1980s, the Community had become more supranational. It can be assumed that the political parties closely involved with the EEC experienced a change in their stance caused by developments in the EEC.

What were the British political parties' stances on scepticism towards the EEC during the 1970s and 1980s? For this thesis, I have looked at party manifestos from the 1960s-1980s as this gives valuable insight into the different parties' views and opinions on European integration and the Community. According to the party manifestos, there seemed to be a general pro-EEC sentiment in the British political system for this period, with the exception of a few Labour manifestos. Both the Conservatives and the Liberals appeared to be pro-EEC from the 1964 manifestos to the 1987 manifestos. Labour displayed a very visible Euroscepticism in two of their party manifestos, the 1964 manifesto and the 1983 manifesto. In the 1964 manifesto, Labour showed a clear orientation towards the Commonwealth, but they were still keen to

[106] Hugh Gaitskell, "Speech at the Annual Labour Party Conference" (speech, Sports Stadium, West Street, Brighton, 3 October, 1962), CVCE, https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/1/1/05f2996b-000b-4576-8b42-8069033a16f9/publishable_en.pdf.

[107] David Baker, Andrew Gamble, Nick Randall and David Seawright, "Euroscepticism in the British Party System: A Source of Fascination, Perplexity, and Sometimes Frustration" in *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism, Volume 1: Case Studies and Country Surveys*, ed. Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 93.

improve the current relationship between Britain and Europe. In 1983, the party had turned hard Eurosceptic and stated that the EEC "was never devised to suit us".[108] The early 1980s saw Michael Foot being the leader of Labour, a prominent left-wing Eurosceptic.[109] The party's Euroscepticism was short-lived, and Labour's Eurosceptic shift will be discussed in further detail in chapter seven. With all that being said, very few of the manifestos showed a total acceptance of the EEC. Both the Conservatives and Labour have a general pro-EEC stance, but close-reading of the party manifestos from this time period show some discontent with certain EEC policies. This is a characteristic of soft Euroscepticism.

5.3.1. The Conservatives: Extinguishing the Existing Euroscepticism?

The European question did cause tension within the parties. A well-known example of this was Prime Minister Harold Macmillan of the Conservative Party's reshuffling of the Cabinet in 1962. The event is outside of the time period covered in this thesis, but it does demonstrate how much impact the Europe question had within a British party. The event was called the 'Night of the Long Knives', and Macmillan reshuffled the Conservative Cabinet in order to get politicians loyal to his vision of Europe in power, and to remove the anti-marketeers from the Cabinet.[110] This event is not to be confused with the 1934 purge that took place in Nazi Germany with the same name.

Another, and more recent, event from outside of the thesis's scope, was when Conservative Prime Minister David Cameron tried pleasing the Eurosceptics of the party.[111] For the 2015 election campaign, Cameron promised a referendum on whether or not Britain should remain in the EU. The Conservatives were part of a coalition government with the Liberal-Democrats, a pro-EU party, and Cameron had hoped that would be enough to block the Euroscepticism that existed amongst some of the Conservatives. When the election came, the Conservatives secured enough votes for a majority government, and Cameron had no choice but to hold the

[108] "1964 Labour Party Election Manifesto: The New Britain", *Labour Party Manifestos*, Labour Party Manifestos, accessed 29 April, 2019, http://labourmanifesto.com/1964/1964-labour-manifesto.shtml; "1983 Labour Party Manifesto", *Labour Party Manifestos*, Labour Party Manifestos, accessed 29 April, 2019, http://labourmanifesto.com/1983/1983-labour-manifesto.shtml.
[109] Mark Wallace, "Where Are All the Leftwing Eurosceptics?", *The Guardian*, 17 January, 2014, accessed 1 February, 2019, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jan/17/leftwing-eurosceptics-eu-british-left.
[110] Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*, 290.
[111] Oliver Wright, "Brexit: What Is It and Why Are We Having an EU Referendum?", *Independent*, 23 June, 2016, Accessed 1 February, 2019, https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/what-is-brexit-why-is-there-an-eu-referendum-a7042791.html; Daniel Boffey, "Cameron Did Not Think EU Referendum Would Happen, Says Tusk", *The Guardian*, 21 Jan, 2019, accessed 1 February, 2019, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jan/21/donald-tusk-warned-david-cameron-about-stupid-eu-referendum-bbc.

referendum. Cameron chose to resign when the 'leave' side won.[112] Being in a coalition government with the pro-European Liberal Democrats was not enough to extinguish the looming Euroscepticism found in the Conservative Party, and the European question forced the prime minister to resign. Events like these proved that Euroscepticism could be held at bay to a certain degree, but the opposition towards the EEC, or the EU in this case, never went completely away.

5.3.2. The Labour Party's Internal Division Caused by Euroscepticism

The Labour Party also had its internal struggles regarding the European question. The Labour disagreement surfaced after the Conservatives' defeat in the 1974.[113] The division was between the left and the right faction of the party. Prime Minister Harold Wilson had, in the years before Labour was in office, been opposing the idea of holding a referendum, but the divisions in his party prompted it.[114] The left faction of the party had turned anti-market, and the Eurosceptics of the party outnumbered the pro-marketers.[115] During his time in office, Wilson had to restrain the Labour anti-marketers, and he struggled to keep his party together. In order to keep the party together, Wilson called for a referendum as a 'yes' majority would have silenced the Eurosceptics of the Labour Party.[116] The leftists of Labour were hard Eurosceptic and wanted Britain to withdraw its membership.

After criticising the terms the Conservatives had agreed to upon accession ("The Labour Party opposes British membership of the European Communities on the terms negotiated by the Conservative Governments"[117]), Wilson had to hold a referendum, propose a new EEC deal, and get his own party to agree to this.[118] Referenda were considered to be un-British at the time, and a weak move from the government, which was one of the reasons for Wilson's initial opposition to them.[119] This government was not a coalition government, but a compromise, the

[112] Boffey, "Cameron Did Not Think EU Referendum Would Happen, Says Tusk".
[113] Robert Saunders, *Yes to Europe!: The 1975 Referendum and Seventies Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 62.
[114] Ibid., 64; Paul Martin Gilddon, "The Labour Government and the Battle for Public Opinion in the 1975 Referendum on the European Community", *Contemporary British History* 31, no. 1 (2017), 94; Andrew Marr, *A History of Modern Britain* (London: Pan Books, 2017), 329.
[115] Marr, *A History of Modern Britain*, 328.
[116] Anthony Forster, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties since 1945* (London: Routledge, 2002), 32.
[117] "February 1974 Labour Party Manifesto: Let us work together – Labour's way out of the crisis", *Labour Party Manifestos*, Labour Party Manifestos, accessed 29 April, 2019, http://labourmanifesto.com/1974/Feb/1974-feb-labour-manifesto.shtml.
[118] Saunders, *Yes to Europe!: The 1975 Referendum and Seventies Britain*, 65.
[119] Ibid., 67-68; Gilddon, "The Labour Government and the Battle for Public Opinion in the 1975 Referendum on the European Community", 93.

referendum in this case, still had to be made by Wilson in order to keep the party together. The party was divided between the left and the right faction, a split that would eventually led to the creation of the Social Democratic Party in 1981.[120] However, the government promoted the 'yes' side campaign of the referendum, and the event was "seen as a government-controlled referendum".[121] This case showed how strong the European question could be as a dividing force. Referendum had been considered un-British, but in the end, Wilson saw it as his only option for keeping the party together. The result showed that the British public wanted Britain to remain an EEC member, and silenced the Eurosceptics until the 1980s.

5.3.3. The Dividing Power of Euroscepticism

In the British political system, Euroscepticism can be regarded as a dividing force for a party. It caused tension within the parties rather than between them. Macmillan ridding his government of those opposing the EEC, and Wilson calling for a referendum in order to settle the division in Labour are good examples of Euroscepticism's dividing effect. Disagreement over the European question existed between the parties as well, but these were mainly stated in the manifestos as examples of 'what not to do', and served to show the rivalry between the parties rather than a debate on the Community.

5.4. Norwegian Political Parties

The political system of Norway consisted of quite a few parties in the 1970s and 1980s. From left to right on the political spectrum, the parties of Norway are Sosialistisk Venstre (Socialist Left Party), Arbeiderpartiet (Labour Party), Senterpartiet (Centre Party), Venstre (Liberal Party), Kristelig Folkeparti (Christian Democratic Party), Høyre (Conservatives), and Fremskrittspartiet (Progress Party). The party names in English are the same as used by Skinner, but to avoid confusion with the British parties, I will use the Norwegian names.[122] In order to determine the different parties' stances, I have looked at various Norwegian party manifestos from the 1970s and 1980s, and also at Sitter's table.[123] I have used both sources in order to get a more thorough understanding of the various Norwegian parties' opinion on the EEC and membership. Whereas Sitter's table is a brief overview of their attitude, the party manifestos

[120] Thorpe, *A History of the British Labour Party*, 179.
[121] Gilddon, "The Labour Government and the Battle for Public Opinion in the 1975 Referendum on the European Community", 92.
[122] Skinner, "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation", 27.
[123] Sitter, "The European Question and the Norwegian Party System since 1961: The Freezing of a Modern Cleavage or Contingent Opposition?", 331.

mentioned the parties' specific issues with the EEC, and if the parties were supportive of Norwegian membership.

5.4.1. Eurosceptic, Pro-EEC, or Locked in Status Quo?

During the 1960s, Arbeiderpartiet and Høyre, the largest parties, were pro-EEC. However, Arbeiderpartiet respected the 1972 referendum results and did not bring up membership on their political agenda.[124] The party can therefore be regarded to support the status quo, rather than directly oppose membership. Because the party adopted a stance that meant opposition towards membership, Arbeiderpartiet can be considered hard Eurosceptics. However, they did not have a strong opinion against European integration, so it would not be entirely correct to place them on the hard end of the scale, but rather as softer hard Eurosceptics. The referendum results had an interesting effect upon most of the Norwegian parties: the status quo entailed no membership, and by Szczerbiak and Taggart's definition, they resemble hard Eurosceptics. I argue that this is incorrect as many of the parties were advocating a close relationship with the EEC, despite opposing membership. The Norwegian parties are all Eurosceptic by default due to the referendum results, but I believe they still can be pro-EEC, or supportive towards integration, despite of this. Arbeiderpartiet preferred the EFTA and improvements of it, as well as a stronger Nordic cooperation, suggesting that they regarded Norway and the Nordic as separate units from Europe.

The left-wing and centre parties showed opposition towards EEC membership consistently in all of their party manifestos from the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s.[125] Sosialistisk Venstre was Norway's most Eurosceptic party at the time, and have been opposing Norwegian membership since the beginning. The referendum result was described by the party as a great victory, and the party was even opposing European integration.[126] The party was not in government during

[124] "Trygghet for folket: Det norske Arbeiderpartis arbeidsprogram for perioden 1974 - 77", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 26 March, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:21&fq=aarstall:1973

[125] "Sosialistisk Folkepartis arbeidsprogram 1961-1964: Vedtatt på 1.landsmøte 17-18 juni 1961", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 26 May, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:14&fq=aarstall:1961; "Program for Sosialistisk Venstrepartis arbeid i Stortinget 1977 - 1981", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 5 May, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=aarstall:1977&fq=partikode:14; "Sosialistisk Venstreparti arbeidsprogram 1989 – 93", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 26 May, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:14&fq=aarstall:1989&fq=.

[126] "Program for Sosialistisk Venstrepartis arbeid i Stortinget 1977 - 1981".

the 1970s and 1980s, but this was because it was a small party and not a natural coalition partner for the larger parties. Because of the party's hard Eurosceptic stance, coalition with pro-EEC parties would be difficult to achieve.

Kristelig Folkeparti was leaning towards Euroscepticism, but mainly focused on an improvement of the EFTA. Barring EFTA improvements, the party did not have particularly strong preferences towards or against EEC membership.[127] The party did however support EEC to some degree, as long as Christian values were respected.[128]

Venstre was pro-EEC during the 1960s, but their stance is considered by Sitter to be ambiguous. However, Venstre's party manifestos displayed no wish for EEC membership, as the party was content with strengthening the EFTA and the trade deals with the EEC. Except for those, the party showed little interest in the EEC.[129]

Much like the Conservatives in Britain, Høyre was pro-EEC from the beginning. The Høyre manifestos showed that they aimed to convince the public that EEC was the best solution for Norway and its economy, and wanted towards the end of the 1980s to hold a new referendum.[130] Membership was not possible, but Høyre was promoting European integration and cooperation. Their pro-EEC stance would eventually lead to the breakdown of the Syse government in 1989.

Fremskrittspartiet was formed in 1973 (under a different name, Anders Langes Parti), and did not have any strong views supporting, nor opposing membership. Looking at the party manifestos showed that Europe was not an important topic for the party and is not mentioned

[127] "Kristelig Folkeparti 1969-1973: Valgprogram", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 5 February, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:51&fq=aarstall:1969; "Kristelig Folkeparti: Program for stortingsperioden 1973-77", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 5 February, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:51&fq=aarstall:1973&fq=.

[128] "4 år med Kristelig Folkeparti: Program ved stortingsvalget 11. sept. 1961", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 5 February, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:51&fq=aarstall:1961&fq=.

[129] "Venstres arbeidsprogram 1977 - 81", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 5 May, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=partikode:31&fq=aarstall:1977&fq=.

[130] "Ny vilje, ny fremgang: Høyres program 1989-1993", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 5 May, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=partikode:71&fq=aarstall:1989.

until the 1989-1993 manifesto, where the party appeared to be neutral, but wanted a clarification of the relationship between Norway and the EEC.[131]

The parties clearly have different stances on the European question, and because coalition government is very likely in Norway, it is crucial to know their stances on the EEC. All the parties, with the exception of Arbeiderpartiet, had to rely on cooperation in a coalition government during the time period covered in this thesis. Because of this, the parties have been able to keep each other in check regarding EEC membership. This is observed in the party manifestos, where the non-Eurosceptic parties accepted the status quo, and were not interested in membership. A pro-EEC party like Høyre will therefore be unlikely to apply for membership as they would be stopped by their coalition partners. The Eurosceptics were quite powerful, and were at any time able to break the government. The parties were more or less locked into a default Eurosceptic stance. Only Høyre would suggest membership in their manifestos, whereas the other parties, with the exception of Sosialistisk Venstre, wanted to improve the current situation and support European integration from outside the EEC.

5.4.2. Fixed Opinions on the EEC?

The 1960s saw the beginning of the European Community discussions. Britain first applied in 1961, an action that forced the European question into the Norwegian political debates.[132] At this time, it was therefore necessary for the political parties to take on a stance about whether or not they wanted to become a part of a greater European Community. All the parties have been more or less consistent in their stances towards European integration since the early 1960s, suggesting that their opinions on European integration are set and non-changeable. Because of this, I argue that Norwegian party-based Euroscepticism, as well as the level of support for European integration, is a stable phenomenon. The referendum results caused the European question to become dormant, and membership became irrelevant for all parties, but the Norwegian parties never underwent major changes in their stances towards the Community like the British parties did.

[131] "Fremskrittspartiet: Fremtiden skapes – den vedtas ikke (Program 1989-1993)", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 5 February, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=aarstall:1989&fq=partikode:81.

[132] Sitter, "The European Question and the Norwegian Party System since 1961: The Freezing of a Modern Cleavage or Contingent Opposition?", 329; Riste, *Norway's Foreign Relations – A History*, 241.

5.4.3. Coalition Governments and Euroscepticism

According to Topaloff, the majority of opposition towards European integration comes from the smaller parties.[133] This correlates with Sitter's table, as the two biggest parties in Norway, Arbeiderpartiet and Høyre, have had a generally pro-EEC stance from the 1960s to the 1990s. Sosialistisk Venstre on the other hand, is a small party, and was hard Eurosceptic, opposing both membership and further European integration. However, the public's opinion was of great importance to all of the parties, and the 1972 referendum result put its mark on Norwegian European policy for many years.

Because of the parties' different stances on Euroscepticism, Norwegian coalition governments required some compromising when it came to their Europe policies. The pro-EEC Høyre formed governments with the hard Eurosceptic Senterpartiet and the more ambiguous Kristelig Folkeparti during the 1980s. This combination of parties happened twice during the 1980s, and both coalition governments were short-lived. The first Høyre-Kristelig Folkeparti-Senterpartiet coalition was led by Kåre Willoch of Høyre, formed in 1985, and lasted until 1986. The reason for this government's breakdown was not Euroscepticism, and this coalition is therefore not relevant for this thesis. The second coalition government was also led by a Høyre prime minister, Jan P. Syse, and only lasted from 1989 to 1990 due to conflict regarding the European question. Disagreement caused by the EEC could potentially split governments, and a combination of both pro-EEC and Eurosceptic parties was not ideal.

Already before the 1972 referendum was on the table, the parties of the Borten government had different interests when it came to the European question. This coalition consisted of Per Borten's own party, Senterpartiet, as well as Høyre, Kristelig Folkeparti, and Venstre. An EEC membership was considered to have a negative impact on the primary sector. Senterpartiet was tied to this sector, and wanted to protect it, whereas Høyre had urban ties and was in favour of membership.[134] This combination of both pro-EEC and anti-EEC parties created difficulties and compromise was not easy to achieve. The government resigned before the referendum was held, and Trygve Bratteli of Arbeiderpartiet had to pick up the reins and lead the country through the EEC negotiations and the 1972 referendum. The Bratteli government was short-lived, and resigned because of the referendum result, similar to Cameron's government resigning in 2016. A new coalition government was formed and led by Lars Korvald from Kristelig Folkeparti,

[133] Topaloff, *Political Parties and Euroscepticism*, 63.
[134] Almlid, "Splittelse og dobbeltspill – Borten- og Bratteli-regjeringens forhandlinger om EF-medlemskap i 1970-72", 237.

and had to negotiate a suitable trade deal for Norway with the EEC.[135] The Korvald government only lasted until the 1973 election when they lost to Bratteli and Arbeiderpartiet. The Korvald government was not short-lived because of the European question, but because it was a difficult time politically, and they were unable to secure enough seats.

A similar division in the government happened in the Syse government in 1989. At this point, joining the Community had become a possibility. The Eurosceptic Senterpartiet would not be in the same government as the pro-EU Høyre, and left the government in 1990 in order to prevent a potential membership application. The disagreements within the government had been visible since the beginning because of Høyre's and Senterpartiet's very different stances on the European question.[136] The government broke down when Senterpartiet left, symbolising that the tension in the Norwegian EEC debate was still very much present. Once again, Euroscepticism had caused a government's downfall. Government breakdowns like this one, the Borten government and the Bratteli government show that the Norwegian political system is difficult for parties supportive towards the EEC. As the majority of the political parties are opposing membership, or prefer the status quo with no membership, it creates a difficult political environment for those in favour of membership.

Coalition governments before and during the time of the referendum were problematic due to the parties' various stances on EEC. However, the public's opinion was quickly adopted by the Norwegian political parties, and caused them all to show a slight, or in some cases very visibly opposition towards membership. Coalition governments gave Euroscepticism more power during the 1970s and 1980s, as it was not possible to move towards membership due to this Eurosceptic blockade. Høyre attempted this in 1989, and was rewarded with a government breakdown.

---

[135] *200 år på 200 minutter*, NRK2, 28 February, 2014, television broadcast.

[136] Wæver, "Nordic Nostalgia: Northern Europe after the Cold War", 91; "Jan P. Syse: Statsminister 1989-1990", *Tidligere regjeringer og historie*, Regjeringen, 27 December, 2013, accessed 7 February, 2019, https://www.regjeringen.no/no/om-regjeringa/tidligere-regjeringer-og-historie/historiske-artikler/embeter/statsminister-1814-/jan-peder-syse/id463464/; "Jan P. Syses regjering: 16. oktober 1989-3. november 1990", *Tidligere regjeringer og historie*, Regjeringen, accessed 7 February, 2019, https://www.regjeringen.no/no/om-regjeringa/tidligere-regjeringer-og-historie/sok-i-regjeringer-siden-1814/historiske-regjeringer/regjeringer/jan-p-syses-regjering-1989-1990/id438730/.

5.5. Party-Based Euroscepticism Typologies for British and Norwegian Parties

Parties belonging to the soft Euroscepticism category do not have "principled objection to European integration or EU membership", but they fear that the country's national interests will collide with the EU's policies.[137] Hard Euroscepticism means opposition towards the EU and European integration in any shape or form, and parties in this category believe in withdrawing from the European Community.[138]

Placing the political parties into these two categories creates somewhat of a difficulty. Euroscepticism and opposition towards EEC/EU membership can be a changing state as seen in Britain, and several of the parties in Norway allow European integration even though they do not want to pursue membership. I have used the party manifestos from the time period 1960-1989 in order to determine if the parties were Eurosceptic, and if so, how Eurosceptic. In my attempt at using Szczerbiak and Taggart's model, I found that the categories were slightly too broad, but they were sufficient for my study. Ideally, the soft-hard distinction would have had a 'support' and a 'neutral' category, but that would remove the model's simplicity. The Norwegian parties do have a principled objection towards membership after 1972, and they do not fit in the soft category because of that. For this reason, I introduce a softer hard Eurosceptic category in Szczerbiak and Taggart's model, and this is opposition towards membership, but not necessarily against European integration. After the 1972 referendum, most of the parties were opposed to membership, and displayed a softer hard Euroscepticism.

Another issue is a sudden change in a party's stance. Some parties would have to be branded both soft and hard as their stances have changed throughout the years. An example of this is the Labour Party which is generally soft Eurosceptic, or even pro-EEC, but displayed hard Eurosceptic under the leadership of Foot during the early 1980s. The Norwegian parties did not undergo changes like these, but became locked in opposition towards membership after 1972. Szczerbiak and Taggart's model might be regarded as the main work in the field of Euroscepticism but it was not developed specifically to suit the British and Norwegian parties. However, it does work when placing the parties in a more general manner, as the parties can be placed in a soft-hard Euroscepticism typology. Unfortunately, the nuances of the parties' different forms of Euroscepticism will not appear because the soft-hard typology is very broad.

[137] Taggart and Szczerbiak, "Introduction: Opposing Europe? The Politics of Euroscepticism in Europe", 8.
[138] Ibid., 7.

Using all of the different typologies presented in the literature review gave a variety of results for the different parties. I found that there was particularly one interesting point when attempting to use all the typologies. Sosialistisk Venstre ends up in the most Eurosceptic category in all of the typologies: hard Euroscepticism; Eurorejects; Rejectionist; and Rejecting Euroscepticism. It was particularly sceptic towards membership and European integration during the first half of the 1980s as the party manifestos stated they would oppose to any attempt at tying Norway closer to the EEC.[139] The other Eurosceptic parties showed more variety when it came to the Eurosceptic categories of the different typologies. It would therefore be impossible to use them all, as they all have different criteria for their categories. The soft-hard typology contains two categories, and with my own 'softer hard' category, it gives a sufficient overview of the various parties' stances.

5.6. Conclusion

As this chapter has argued, the type of government does indeed influence Euroscepticism. In Britain where there are fewer, but larger political parties, Euroscepticism has been a dividing force within a party, rather than between parties in a coalition. This division has happened in both the Labour Party and the Conservative Party. Macmillan replaced several Conservative ministers as they were not pro-Europe enough, and did so to gain support within the government for EEC membership and European integration. This event was, however, not as critical as the Labour division during Wilson's time as leader. The split within Labour led to the 1975 referendum. The 'remain' side won the referendum and silenced the right-wing for the rest of the decade. Both these events happened in majority governments, where the parties did not have to make compromises on their policies. Although both Labour and the Conservatives were regarded as generally positive towards the EEC and membership, there were plenty of anti-EEC attitudes found within the parties. The majority governments in Britain during the 1970s and 1980s managed to constrain Euroscepticism because their policies were generally pro-European, or soft Eurosceptic at its worst.

Unlike Britain, Norway has a political culture for coalition governments. Parties have been made to make compromises when it came to the European question, as their stance on Europe often differed greatly. 1971-1973 saw three short-lived governments, a testament to the strain caused by the European question. The 1989-1990 coalition broke down when Senterpartiet left

[139] "Program for Sosialistisk Venstrepartis arbeid i stortinget 1981-1985", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 12 February, 2019, https://nsd.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=aarstall:1981&fq=partikode:14&fq=.

because their opposition towards EEC membership was incompatible with Høyre's eagerness to apply for membership. I argue that Eurosceptic parties in Norway often, if not always, have the last say in the European question. Many of the manifestos from these parties referred to the 1972 referendum results as the main reason for staying outside, as this was the people's choice. Barring Høyre, and Fremskrittspartiet which was not interested in Europe at this time, all of the Norwegian parties display Euroscepticism to some degree, and a wish to remain on the outside. Because of a normalising of Euroscepticism, and the a 'no to Norwegian membership' stance caused by the 1972 referendum, the pro-EEC parties were, and are still, powerless while in government.

Euroscepticism did not cause parties to leave government in Britain, and this effect can therefore be regarded to be unique for Norway. However, there has been more unity within the Norwegian parties than in the British ones. Conflicting views on European integration and the EEC caused problems for both Labour and the Conservatives during the 1970s and 1980s, but this chapter argued that these problems were not major enough to make the party leave office. Because of this, Norwegian governments, and mainly the coalition governments, can be considered to be more Eurosceptic than the British. In Norway, opposition and a status quo meaning no membership were common opinions amongst the parties with a few exceptions. Britain continued its membership despite of the referendum and internal division within the parties. However, the solutions to internal party conflicts regarding Europe have been for the benefit of the pro-Europeans, whereas the Eurosceptics had all the power in Norway.

The 1970s: Entering Europe?

6.1. Introduction

The Community saw a rise in the number of member states when Britain, Ireland and Denmark joined in 1973. Norway was supposed to be part of this group as the government had applied for membership at the same time in 1971, but a referendum stopped it from joining the EEC. Britain entered the EEC without the people's consent, despite Edward Heath's implication of one.[140] However, when they did hold a referendum, the people of Britain voted to continue staying in the EEC. The 1970s were the first time both countries held a referendum regarding the European question.

The early 1970s mark the time when Britain and Norway went separate ways. In this chapter, I will discuss the referenda that were held, and how the results of these influenced the existing scepticism towards the Community. Although generally positive towards the EEC, the policies of the EEC were an issue for countries like Britain and Norway. In addition to the referenda, I will be discussing the interventionist policies, the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the Common Fisheries Policies (CFP), and how the political parties dealt with them during negotiations, and post-referendum. The chapter also consists of a section on British and Norwegian exceptionalism. This is to show why the countries have regarded themselves as different from the rest of Europe, something that could explain an ingrained scepticism towards the rest of the continent, and ultimately, the EEC. The purpose of this chapter is to shed light on how the results of the referenda in 1972 and 1975 affected party-based Euroscepticism, and why the CAP and the CFP contributed to opposition towards toward the EEC, and how this played out differently in Britain and Norway.

The research question for this chapter is *how did the 1970s referendum results influence Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway, and how did the EEC's interventionist policies, the CAP and the CFP, add to an existing opposition*? This chapter argues that the referendum results had a different effect upon party-based Euroscepticism in the two countries, and would shape the European policies for the rest of the decade. I also argue that the CAP and the CFP played an important role in the opposition towards the Community.

[140] Gifford, *The Making of Eurosceptic Britain*, 62.

6.2. Exceptionalism: What Separates Britain and Norway from the Other European Countries?

Both Britain and Norway have always had a somewhat unique relationship with Europe. Due to the fact that Britain is an island, and not part of mainland Europe, the Britons have tended to regard themselves as outsiders.[141] Norway is not physically separated from the rest of Europe, but it is placed far away from the centre of it. Exceptionalism is one of the reasons for scepticism towards the Community, but it is important to state that it is not the only one, nor the most important.[142] However, it is still important to view exceptionalism as a part of Euroscepticism, and also as an important aspect of a country's national identity. The opposition towards the EEC/EU "differ[s] by region", and this is due to the countries' unique past and experiences with Europe.[143] It is therefore natural to include a section on exceptionalism.

Charles de Gaulle regarded Britain's island position to be awkward, and he thought they looked towards the ocean, and the US, rather than towards France and the Community.[144] In de Gaulle's opinion, Britain was too oriented towards their Atlantic allies, the US, and too concerned about their Commonwealth ties for it to be considered a worthy member of the EEC. Britain shared the same language with the US, and Churchill had regarded the relationship with the English-speaking world, particularly the US, to be of greater importance than of that with Europe. Part of British scepticism towards Europe can be explained by the fact that the country was tied more closely to the US and the Commonwealth countries because they shared languages and cultures that were similar.[145] Additionally, they were bound together by their pasts. For these reasons, Britain seemed to have a close bond to states sharing the English language.[146] Europe, and more specifically the Community, was a mix of many different languages and cultures,

[141] Olav Riste, "The Nordic Angle II: Norway – The Reluctant European", *The World Today* 44, no. 1 (1988); Oliver Daddow, "Interpreting the Outsider Tradition in British European Policy Speeches from Thatcher to Cameron", *Journal of Common Market Studies* 53, no. 1 (2015).
[142] Baker et al., "Euroscepticism in the British Party System: A Source of Fascination, Perplexity, and Sometimes Frustration", 109.
[143] Topaloff, *Political Parties and Euroscepticism*, 20.
[144] Kristian Steinnes, "Britain's EEC application in 1961", in *National Interests and the EEC/EC/EU*, ed. Svein Dahl (Trondheim: Tapir Publishers, 1999), 41; Oliver Daddow, "Margaret Thatcher, Tony Blair and the Eurosceptic Tradition in Britain", *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 15, no. 5 (2013), 212.
[145] Baker et al., "Euroscepticism in the British Party System: A Source of Fascination, Perplexity, and Sometimes Frustration", 109.
[146] Krishan Kumar, "Britain, England and Europe: Cultures in Contraflow", *European Journal of Social Theory* 6, no. 1 (2003), 16; Peter Dorey, "Towards Exit from the EU: The Conservative Party's Increasing Euroscepticism since the 1980s", *Politics and Governance* 4, no. 2 (2017), 34.

where the English language and Britishness would only make up a tiny part of it. Old ties were not easily cut, and de Gaulle's hostile attitude did not help improving the Britain-EEC relations.

Norway, although not an island, was also regarded to be far away from the centre of Europe, and the heart of the EEC. It is placed "at the margins of the continent".[147] In addition to the geographical reasons for being outsiders, both Britain and Norway had the historical reasons presented in chapter four for being sceptic towards Europe. As the 1970s approached, the exceptionalist reasons for not joining had to be put away in order to secure good economic deals. Both countries were part of the EFTA, but this did not give them the same access to the European market as an EEC membership would have done. The economic reasons had at this point outweighed the wish to stay an outsider, and when Britain applied for EEC membership, Norway had no choice but to follow.[148]

Norway, along with the other Nordic countries, has a sense of Nordic exceptionalism to it. Norwegians consider themselves European, but place more importance on being Scandinavian or Nordic. Being Nordic "meant being part of Europe, but being a little better off than the rest" according to scholar Ole Wæver.[149] This was due to the Nordic region being considered "more peaceful than Europe [and that it had] more social and global solidarity".[150] The status as a Nordic country, however, does not necessarily mean anti-EEC/EU sentiments. Except for Norway and Iceland, the Nordic countries are all members of the EU. Denmark joined alongside Britain in 1973, and Sweden and Finland joined in 1995. Thus, Nordic exceptionalism alone is not enough to explain Norway's opposition towards the EEC.

Similarly to Britain and the Anglosphere, the Nordic countries share culture, and have similar languages.[151] The Nordic region is its own community through mutual history and language, and cooperation which further strengthens the possibility of staying out of Europe. Due to this unity, there have always been a strong wish for Nordic cooperation. When EEC membership was out of the question, the Norwegian parties and particularly Arbeiderpartiet, aimed for improvements in the Nordic unity. The cooperation would be in areas of economy, environmental issues, and culture.[152]

---

[147] Wæver, "Nordic Nostalgia: Northern Europe after the Cold War", 88.
[148] Almlid, "Splittelse og dobbeltspill – Borten- og Bratteli-regjeringens forhandlinger om EF-medlemskap i 1970-72", 237.
[149] Wæver, "Nordic Nostalgia: Northern Europe after the Cold War", 84.
[150] Ibid.
[151] Ibid., 95.
[152] "Trygghet for folket: Det norske Arbeiderpartis arbeidsprogram for perioden 1974 - 77"; "Arbeiderpartiet: Du skal vita kva det gjeld: solidaritet, arbeid, miljø: Arbeidsprogram 1978 - 81", *Partidokumentarkivet*, Data om det

Religion was an important matter to both Britain and Norway, and a part of their exceptionalism. The EEC and several continental Europeans, with France in the lead, had strong ties to Catholicism. Britain and Norway were Protestant countries, and could not identify themselves with the Catholic countries in the Community: France, Italy, Belgium, and Luxembourg.[153] Catholicism was one of the examples used to paint Europe as the 'Other'. The religious aspect is important to consider as it is a part of the national identities of both Britain and Norway. France was undoubtedly the leader of the EEC, and the country was both powerful, and had Catholicism as its main religion. This religious aspect made the EEC somewhat incompatible with Britain and Norway's Protestant traditions. Britain had since the Reformation been withdrawing from the European mainland through loss of land, and had in earlier times been confronted by both Spain and France in wartime, two great Catholic powers at the time.[154] The Nordic region, and thus also Norway, regarded Catholicism as a threat to their independence and traditions.[155]

Although the reasons listed above are not mainly political, they are still very relevant for party-based Euroscepticism. History is not easily forgotten, and sceptics would use reasons like these to demonstrate their own country's uniqueness compared to the 'Other', which in this case was the EEC. These reasons create a predisposition for Euroscepticism, which both politicians and public alike will use to their own advantage. This predisposition is important to consider when looking at party-based Euroscepticism. Political parties will play on the public's worries in order to gain support, and painting the EEC as the 'Other'.

6.3. Common Agricultural Policy and Common Fisheries Policy

6.3.1. CAP: Fair for All Members?

Some of the more important issues of the EEC membership negotiations were the CAP and the CFP. These policies created difficulties for both Britain and Norway.[156] Entering the EEC meant having to accept the CAP and the CFP. Doing so would harm the farmers and the

politiske system, accessed 26 March, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:21&fq=aarstall:1977.

[153] Skinner, "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation", 111; Baker et al., "Euroscepticism in the British Party System: A Source of Fascination, Perplexity and Sometimes Frustration", 110; Richard Davis, "Euroscepticism and Opposition to British Entry into the EEC, 1955-75", *Revue Française de Civilisation Britannique* 88, no. 2 (2017), 6; Linda Colley, "Britishness and Otherness: An Argument", *Journal of British Studies* 31, no. 4 (1992), 316.

[154] Kumar, "Britain, England and Europe: Cultures in Contraflow", 15.

[155] Sverker Åström, "The Nordic Angle I: Sweden's EC Dilemmas", *The World Today* 44, no. 11 (1988), 193.

[156] Robert Cooper, "Britain and Europe", *International Affairs* 88, no. 6 (2012), 1195; Clive Archer, "Euroscepticism in the Nordic region", *Journal of European Integration* 22, no. 1 (2000), 96.

fishermen as there would be an increase in the competition from Europe. In Norway's case, the CAP would have meant an end to the existing agricultural policies. The CAP aimed to create a common price level for all the EEC members. For the Norwegian farmers this would mean a significant reduction in their income.[157]

The government, and the rest of the political parties, saw a need for a special agreement. The rural community was crucial to the country, and the farmers' income had to be protected at any cost. If Norway were to join the EEC, the agricultural sector had to be protected, and the government came up with two possible solutions. The first solution was to shield Norwegian agriculture from the EEC and keep it completely out of the CAP's reach. The second solution was to compensate the farmers by subsidising them.[158] None of them were ideal, and they created opposition from the public. Norwegians would not look kindly upon an attack on their farmers and the rural community by a great entity like the EEC. Equally, the EEC members would not show sympathy towards Norway if the country was allowed to not participate in the CAP.[159]

Britain too regarded the CAP as a hard pill to swallow. The CAP system was completely different to their existing one, which was based on their trades with the Commonwealth.[160] Although agriculture in Britain was not considered to be a crucial part of the national identity the same way it was in Norway, it was still of great importance. In their 1970 party manifesto, Labour stated that "the importance to the economy of British agriculture [was] beyond question", which is a proof of this notion.[161] In the Conservative manifesto from the same year, the British farmers are described as "frustrated and disgruntled", and the Conservatives blamed Labour for not letting the British agriculture "expand and prosper". In addition, the party claims that the sector needed to expand, which it could only do by joining a larger market.[162] Statements like these show the importance of agriculture to Britain, and the British opposition towards the CAP is understandable. Labour and the Conservatives displayed soft Eurosceptic

[157] Almlid, "Splittelse og dobbeltspill – Borten- og Bratteli-regjeringens forhandlinger om EF-medlemskap i 1970-72", 240.
[158] Ibid., 241.
[159] Riste, *Norway's Foreign Relations – A History*, 244.
[160] Daniel Guéguen, "British Have Always Detested the CAP: What Now, with UKAP?", *Euractiv*, 22 January, 2018, accessed 25 March, 2019, https://www.euractiv.com/section/agriculture-food/opinion/british-have-always-detested-the-cap-what-now-with-ukap/.
[161] "1970 Labour Party Manifesto: Now Britain's Strong – Let's Make It Great to Live In", *Labour Party Manifestos*, Labour Party Manifestos, accessed 29 April, 2019, http://labourmanifesto.com/1970/1970-labour-manifesto.shtml.
[162] "1970 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto: A Better Tomorrow", *Conservative Party Manifestos*, Conservative Party Manifestos, accessed 29 April, 2019, http://www.conservativemanifesto.com/1970/1970-conservative-manifesto.shtml.

characteristics because of their discontent with the CAP, but unlike Norway, they did so for economic reasons rather than because the agriculture was of major importance to the British national identity.

Britain chose to accept the CAP in order to become an EEC member, but was eager to reform the policy. In their 1974 February manifesto, the Conservatives vowed to reform it, and achieve the necessary changes. Despite this, the party regarded the CAP to "provid[e] British agriculture with very real opportunities for expansion". [163] Soft Euroscepticism can be applied here, as the party was pro-EEC, but opposed the CAP the way it was currently run. This correlates with the definition of a soft Eurosceptic as they do not oppose European integration, nor the EEC itself, but are unhappy with certain EEC policies. The same can be said about the Labour Party. The rhetoric in Labour's 1974 February manifesto was less friendly towards the CAP. It was described as a "threat to world trade in food products".[164] Like the Conservatives, Labour wanted the policy to undergo changes in order to suit the British agriculture better. The wish for changes in the CAP was found in all the manifestos of both the Conservatives and the Labour Party from the 1970s.

The CAP proved to be a serious issue for both countries during the negotiations while applying for membership, and also as a member in Britain's case. The Norwegian prime minister, Per Borten, was the leader of Senterpartiet, a party strongly associated with the primary sectors of Norway. The Borten government would eventually break down as a consequence of the EEC negotiations, as selling EEC membership to a country with strong ties to agriculture and the farmers was a task that proved impossible. The EEC's demands left the agricultural community of Norway with a deep sense of unease. The farmers would have been hard Eurosceptics as a starting point because they viewed the CAP as a serious threat, and would struggle compared to farmers in the other member countries.

Britain did not have the same relationship with its agricultural sector, and the British government did not fight as hard as the Norwegian government did in order to protect its agricultural community from the EEC. However, both of the major parties in Britain were interested in seeing the CAP change. It was a smaller issue in comparison to the situation in

[163] "February 1974 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto: Firm Action for a Fair Britain", *Conservative Party Manifestos*, Conservative Party Manifestos, accessed 29 April, 2019, http://www.conservativemanifesto.com/1974/Feb/february-1974-conservative-manifesto.shtml.
[164] "February 1974 Labour Party Manifesto: Let us work together – Labour's way out of the crisis".

Norway, but both the Conservatives and Labour expressed unhappiness with the current CAP whereas the CAP was more or less unacceptable in Norway.

6.3.2. CFP: A Sneaky Manoeuvre by the EEC

In addition to the CAP, the CFP was also one of the requirements for full membership. Much like the CAP, this too became a serious issue, and especially in Norway. In Britain, it seemed to be of little interest to the parties, and was barely mentioned in the manifestos from the 1970s. Being one of the very few island state members of the EEC, Britain certainly relied on its fishing industry, and more so than its Community partners. The Conservatives addressed the special arrangements made for the EEC entry: British fishermen would be protected for ten years as part of a transition period, and the party stated in their 1974 October manifesto that they were eager to protect this sector.[165]

One issue with the CFP was that a new rule had come since the Treaty of Accession was signed in 1972, the 200-mile limit. This granted the rights to these waters to Britain. According to the Conservative 1979 manifesto, the "United Kingdom waters contain[ed] more fish compared to the rest of the Community countries put together".[166] Euroscepticism is apparent here as the Conservatives regarded Britain as a completely different and a more resourceful country to those other EEC members with this statement. The party was not interested in sharing their fishing sector, and risk losing to other European countries.

For Norway, the CFP was as unacceptable as the CAP was. Similarly to agriculture, fishing was crucial to Norway's national identity as well as being important for trade.[167] The CFP would have allowed Norway to take part in a duty-free market, but the cost was high. It would mean granting access to Norwegian waters to all fishermen from the EEC member countries.[168] Norwegian fishermen would have benefitted from access to the European market, but it would put their chances in Norwegian waters at risk. In order to protect Norwegian fishermen from

[165] "October 1974 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto: Putting Britain First", *Conservative Party Manifestos*, Conservative Party Manifestos, accessed 29 April, 2019, http://www.conservativemanifesto.com/1974/Oct/october-1974-conservative-manifesto.shtml.
[166] "1979 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto", *Conservative Party Manifestos*, Conservative Party Manifestos, accessed 29 April, 2019, http://www.conservativemanifesto.com/1979/1979-conservative-manifesto.shtml.
[167] Iver B. Neumann, "This Little Piggy Stayed at Home: Why Norway Is Not a Member of the EU", in *European Integration and National Identity: The Challenge of the Nordic States*, ed. Lene Hansen and Ole Wæver (London: Routledge, 2002), 115.
[168] Almlid, "Splittelse og dobbeltspill – Borten- og Bratteli-regjeringens forhandlinger om EF-medlemskap i 1970-72", 242.

the European competition, similar solutions to the CAP issue were suggested, but these proved to be unrealistic.

The CFP was a good reason for both Britain and Norway to be sceptic towards the EEC. Although there was a great difference in how closely the countries tied the fisheries to their national identity, they were both eager to protect the sector from European community. The CAP had been an established fact since before the negotiations, but the CFP had not.[169] Britain, Norway, Denmark, and Ireland had already entered the negotiation talks when the CFP was implemented. These four applicants had great fishing industries and fishing grounds, and the EEC members could not match this. Implementing the CFP during the negotiation appeared to be a somewhat sneaky manoeuvre. The timing of the CFP being brought into the negotiations could easily have worked in the Eurosceptics favour. By acting this way, the EEC appeared to be extremely eager to gain access to the fishery sectors of the new applicants. The fear of losing sole access to the waters might have influenced the governments of Britain and Norway. Fisheries were a part of their economy, and a very important one in Norway's case.

Neither governments were satisfied with the current forms of the CAP and the CFP. The major difference between Britain and Norway in this case was how important agriculture and fisheries were to the national identity. However, the economic impact of the CAP and the CFP cannot be overlooked. The Norwegian government committed themselves to a referendum where the people would decide the country's path ahead, and it would not go down well if the primary sectors were threatened. Britain did not hold a referendum before their EEC entry, and when the referendum was held, the people voted to stay in. The British party manifestos showed a great interest in changing the CAP and less, if any interest at all to change the CFP. For the renegotiation, it was "barely featured", and thus suggesting the issue was not as important as it first had appeared to be.[170] Britain had great resources when it came to fishing, but was less interested in fighting for this sector than Norway was. The Norwegian fisheries sector was not doing too well at the time and competition from the EEC would just have made it worse.[171] The

[169] Cooper, "Britain and Europe", 1192; Riste, "The Nordic Angle II: Norway – The Reluctant European", 194; Saunders, *Yes to Europe! The 1975 Referendum and Seventies Britain*, 294.
[170] Saunders, *Yes to Europe! The 1975 Referendum and Seventies Britain*, 294.
[171] "Politikk for en ny tid: Vekst-Trygghet-Trivsel: Arbeidsprogram for Det norske Arbeiderparti 1970-1973 vedtatt på landsmøtet 11.-14. mai 1969", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 26 March, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:21&fq=aarstall:1969; "Høyres hovedprogram og arbeidsprogram 1969 – 73: Et samfunn i samarbeid", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 26 March, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=aarstall:1969&fq=partikode:71&fq=.

sector meant something to the people, and along with the agricultural sector, it was considered a part of the national identity.

6.4. 1972: Norway's First 'No'

On 25th September 1972, the Norwegian people voted 'no' to becoming a member of the EEC. This was the first time a country had said 'no' to EEC membership.[172] The European question had been settled, and parties would have to respect the people's decision from now on, further establishing Norway as a country that wanted to keep its distance from Europe. The referendum became an important event in Norwegian history and split the country into 'yes' and 'no' sides, where all counties apart from Oslo, Akershus, Vestfold and Buskerud had at least 50% of 'no' voters.[173] The voting pattern shows that the more sparsely populated counties were against EEC, correlating with the primary sector's hostility towards the CAP and the CFP. Entering the EEC would mean access to the European market, something the export industries regarded as beneficial. On the other hand, primary industries like agriculture and fisheries would suffer due to the increase in foreign market competition.[174]

Becoming a member of a bigger European community appeared to be incompatible with Norwegianness. Political scientist Iver B. Neumann has described a dichotomy where 'Norway' and 'Europe' are regarded as opposites. The same goes for 'self-determination' and 'union', and 'sovereignty' and "supranationalism".[175] As mentioned in chapter four, Norway is a relatively young state, and the road to independence was long for the Norwegians. To a certain degree, entering the EEC made sense economically, but it seems that the idea of giving up part of the sovereignty their ancestors had fought so hard for to the Community was unpopular.

By the end of December 1971, Britain, Ireland and Denmark had reached agreement in their negotiations with the EEC, whereas Norway carried on with their negotiations. Worried for the Norwegian primary industries, the government aimed for good deals for this sector.[176] The EEC negotiations took its toll on the Norwegian governments. At the beginning of the EEC negotiations, the prime Minister was Borten of Senterpartiet. The party had close ties with the

[172] "26. september 1972", *Dagsrevyen*, NRK1, 26 September, 1972, television broadcast.
[173] Almlid, "Splittelse og dobbeltspill – Borten- og Bratteli-regjeringens forhandlinger om EF-medlemskap i 1970-72", 232; Dag Seierstad, *Folket sa nei: Norsk EU-motstand frå 1961 til i dag* (Oslo: Samlaget, 2014), 43; Dag Axel Kristoffersen, "Norges nei til EF i 1972", *Norgeshistorie*, 31 August, 2017, accessed 26 March, 2019, https://www.norgeshistorie.no/oljealder-og-overflod/artikler/1945-norges-nei-til-ef-i-1972.html.
[174] Stugu, *Norsk historie etter 1905*, 222.
[175] Neumann, "Hvorfor er ikke Norge med i Den europeiske union?", 414.
[176] Almlid, "Splittelse og dobbeltspill – Borten- og Bratteli-regjeringens forhandlinger om EF-medlemskap i 1970-72", 232.

primary sector, making them sceptic about joining the EEC. The coalition government consisted of both Eurosceptic and pro-EEC parties and this created difficulties when it came to the membership application.[177] However, the important trade partners Britain and Denmark had applied, and thus forced the Norwegian government to join them in applying for EEC membership. Similar events had happened twice during the 1960s, but because of de Gaulle's vetoes against British membership, the Norwegian government did not have to follow through with their applications.[178] With de Gaulle gone, the possibility of British membership was real, and the Norwegian government had to make a decision.

With Britain's, Ireland's, and Denmark's negotiations already agreed upon, the Norwegian government could use these agreements as a frame for their own. These four countries were promised a ten-year transition period where they would have some exemptions from the EU policies, including the CAP and the CFP. When these ten years had passed, the EEC would have to consider if the exemptions would still be valid. Carrying on alone could potentially give Norway a better deal than the other three had agreed upon. Britain's agreement was used as a minimum of what the Norwegian government wanted from the EEC, and also to get an even better deal. This was not entirely unproblematic as the British government would not accept Norway landing a better EEC deal than they had.[179]

It was no easy matter for the government to reach agreement in the European question. Borten's government had broken down during the negotiations due to disagreement between the coalition parties in early 1973, and Trygve Bratteli of Arbeiderpartiet had to carry on with the task of finding a solution suitable for Norway.[180] The Borten government had consisted of four parties, Senterpartiet, Høyre, Kristelig Folkeparti, and Venstre. It had been an interesting mix due to Senterpartiet's and Venstre's very apparent Euroscepticism and Høyre's pro-EEC stance. Prime Minister Bratteli led a majority government, but in this case Arbeiderpartiet shared Høyre's positive attitude towards EEC membership. When the results of the referendum came,

[177] Skinner, "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation", 119.
[178] Hans Otto Frøland, "Advancing Ambiguity: On Norway's Application for EEC-membership in 1962", in *National Interests and the EEC/EC/EU*, ed. Svein Dahl (Trondheim: Tapir Publishers 1999), 56.
[179] Almlid, "Splittelse og dobbeltspill – Borten- og Bratteli-regjeringens forhandlinger om EF-medlemskap i 1970-72", 252-253.
[180] Ibid., 257.

and showed a slight majority for 'no', Bratteli and Arbeiderpartiet stepped down.[181] This was the second government to break down because of the 1971 membership application.

In a summary letter sent from the British embassy in Oslo to the British prime minister, the reasons for Norway's 'no' are listed up. Farmers and fishers had great doubts about their future within the EEC as this meant competition from bigger European states. Their worry, although they only made up a quarter of the 'no' voters, was of great importance due to Norway's tradition of agriculture and fisheries. Furthermore, the 'no' voters were described as believing that Norway's presence in Brussels "will [not] make much difference to Europe's course".[182] Also mentioned was how the costs of staying out and the "positive prospect of a united Europe" were both largely ignored during the campaign.[183] EEC membership threatened the Norwegians' idea of sovereignty. Norway was finally independent and not under foreign rule, and the public would not let EEC membership change this. The observations made by the British embassy correlates with the idea of Norwegian exceptionalism and how the primary sectors' presence in the country influenced the voters. The rhetoric of the letter is pro-EEC, and the British embassy was clearly disappointed in the referendum results. Norwegians were described to be "less European than the Danes" and that they "dislike most present members of the Community".[184] Statements like these display the British embassy's pessimism regarding the matter, and are proof of the existing Euroscepticism in Norway.

In the eyes of the British diplomats who wanted Norway to join them in the EEC, the letter displayed a clear Eurosceptic attitude amongst the people due to economic reasons and the unwillingness to give up sovereignty. The referendum in itself did not turn all of Norway Eurosceptic, but even the pro-European parties had to respect the results, something that caused an entrenchment of Euroscepticism in the country. The referendum result gave a boost to the hard Eurosceptic parties, Senterpartiet and Sosialistisk Venstre, whereas Arbeiderpartiet and the rest of the parties would refer to the result in their later party manifestos because they respected the referendum results, and would keep the status quo where membership was out of the question for the time being.[185] The people of Norway had decided the European question.

---

[181] Skinner, "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation", 155.
[182] PREM 15 (868), "Prospects Following the Norwegian Referendum Summary", 4 October ,1972, 1
[183] Ibid.
[184] Ibid., 2.
[185] "Trygghet for folket: Det norske Arbeiderpartis arbeidsprogram for perioden 1974 - 77"; "Program for Sosialistisk Venstrepartis arbeid i Stortinget 1977 - 1981"; "Program: Stortingsvalget 73: Senterpartiet", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 27 March, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:41&f

This was a setback for the pro-EEC party Høyre, which would attempt to change the public's minds while still respecting the referendum result. Arbeiderpartiet aimed for improving the existing trade deals with the EEC. Because the Korvald government had only lasted until 1973, Arbeiderpartiet had to lead Norway through the rest of the decade as a non-member. They were not interested in applying for membership, because the referendum results had caused a change in their EEC policy and the party wanted to appeal to voters and its party members.[186] However, they still regarded the EEC as very important for trade and close ties to the them were important for the Norwegian economy.

The referendum result turned Euroscepticism mainstream in Norway, and as mentioned above, the political parties were now bound to act in accordance with the results. It was what the majority wanted. The referendum results showed 53.5 % against, and 46.5 % in favour of membership.[187] The majority was not overwhelming, but it stopped Norway from entering the Community. It was a great victory for the 'no' campaigners and the Eurosceptic parties. Norway's 'no' created a new situation: it was the first country that had rejected Europe, and the path ahead was unknown. The country was still a member of EFTA, but had to get a sufficient trade deal with the EEC because of Britain and Denmark's memberships. Choosing a more Eurosceptic route was now safer for the political parties. This reflected the majority's will, and it meant avoiding the European question for a long time. Norway entered a stage of 'Eurosceptic by default' as membership was out of the question. Regardless of what stance the parties had had before 1972, they were now on the harder end of the Eurosceptic scale, because of their principled objection to membership. Some of them were softer hard Eurosceptics, as they were only opposed to membership because of the referendum results, and were still supportive of integration.

Høyre, however, would not stray from its path to Europe. The party was one of the largest parties in the country and aimed to appeal to the general public, but not in the European question. Høyre claimed in its 1973 manifesto that it was necessary for Norway to enter the

---

q=aarstall:1973; "Program 1981 – 85: Senterpartiet", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 27 March, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:41&fq=aarstall:1981&fq=; "Venstres arbeidsprogram: 1981 - 1985", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 27 March, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=aarstall:1981&fq=partikode:31&fq=.

[186] Pascal Sciarini and Olav Listhaug, "Single Cases or a Unique Pair? The Swiss and Norwegian 'No' to Europe", *Journal of Common Market Studies* 35, no. 3 (1997), 420.

[187] Riste, *Norway's Foreign Relations – A History*, 244.

EEC in order protect Norwegian interest.[188] On the Eurosceptic side, Senterpartiet states in their 1973 manifesto that the referendum results had confirmed the party's view. The party's focus was on improving the relationship with the organisations Norway already was a member of.[189] This view was shared by the majority of the other parties. They were appealing to the public by keeping the status quo, to keep Norway out of the EEC, while improving the existing trade deals and the EFTA cooperation.

6.5. "Should I Stay or Should I Go"? Britain's 1975 Referendum and Renegotiation

Unlike Norway, Britain entered the EEC in 1973 without holding a referendum.[190] The situation in France in the late 1960s had opened the door for British membership. Economic uncertainty and growing doubts in de Gaulle's leadership meant that the general would not be able to block British membership for much longer.[191] There had been a change in de Gaulle's feelings towards Britain as a member, and he was now willing to consider Britain a worthy applicant to the EEC. Harold Wilson observed that de Gaulle expected the Community to undergo changes soon and become "a [looser] form of free trade area with arrangements by each country to exchange agricultural produce".[192] The EEC was changing, but there would be no major changes until the mid-1980s.

At the time of de Gaulle's death, the Labour Party was no longer in government, and Edward Heath and the Conservatives were in charge. The very pro-EEC party wanted Britain in the Community, and the entry finally happened on 1st January 1973.[193] Heath considered Britain joining the EEC "[his] greatest success as Prime Minister" and stated this in his autobiography, *The Course of My Life: My Autobiography*, proving his pro-European stance.[194] The British public, however, was less pleased about the entry, with only 36% being happy according to a

[188] "Høyres program: Stortingsvalget 1973", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 25 April, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:71&fq=aarstall:1973.
[189] "Program: Stortingsvalget 73: Senterpartiet".
[190] Gilddon, "The Labour Government and the Battle for Public Opinion in the 1975 Referendum on the European Community", 94.
[191] Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*, 339.
[192] Harold Wilson, *A Personal Record: The Labour Government, 1964-1970* (Boston: Little Brown, 1971), 610.
[193] Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*, 367.
[194] Edward Heath, *The Course of My Life: My Autobiography* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1998), 380.

poll held the week following the entry.[195] Discontent was looming among the public, and as mentioned in the previous chapter, the Labour Party had become divided over the European question.

With regards to Britain's economy at the time, entering the Community in 1973 had been far from ideal. The government had floated the pound the year before, and in doing so, dismantled the Sterling Area. The entering terms accepted by Heath were therefore heavily criticised, and the economic plight was blamed on his European policy. The inflation was rising, and all these reasons created difficulties for Heath and the government. With food prices also rising, Labour had no difficulties in convincing the voters that the blame was to be put on the EEC entry and the terms accepted by the Conservative government.[196] In reality, all of the EEC members were experiencing economic setbacks as a result of the oil crisis caused by problems in the Middle East.[197] Heath and the Tories struggled to resolve the crisis, and the EEC accession came at a bad time for the country. To make matters worse for Heath, one of the Conservatives' own MPs, Enoch Powell, had before the general election urged the British public to vote against Heath because of his pro-Europeanism.[198] Because of both external and internal problems, the Conservative Party was unable to win the February 1974 election, and instead, Wilson formed a minority Labour government. The minority government did not last long, and Wilson and Labour had the majority of seats by October 1974.

A renegotiation of the Conservative terms was needed, and Wilson was pressured towards a referendum by the leftist faction of his party, including Eurosceptics Michael Foot and Tony Benn.[199] The Labour Party was troubled by a split between the left and right factions. The right side of this conflict, including Roy Jenkins and Bill Rodgers, would eventually go on to form the Social Democratic Party. These Labour MPs were in favour of keeping the EEC membership.[200] The European question was an important reason for the Labour split. The left faction of the party wanted Britain out of the Community, and this view was not compatible with Jenkins and Rodgers' wish to stay a member at any cost. Holding a referendum would be

[195] Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*, 367.
[196] Ibid., 370.
[197] Terry Macalister, "Background: What Caused the 1970s Oil Price Shock?", *The Guardian*, 3 March, 2011, accessed 25 April, 2019, https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2011/mar/03/1970s-oil-price-shock.
[198] Dominic Sandbrook, *State of Emergency: The Way We Were: Britain, 1970-1974* (London: Penguin Books, 2010), 631.
[199] Thorpe, *A History of the British Labour Party*, 187.
[200] Ibid., 179, 183.

a way to please both sides as the decision would be made by the people of Britain, and not by the party leader, or by the prime minister.

The question asked in the referendum was "do you think that the United Kingdom should stay in the European Community (the Common Market)?".[201] Britain had entered the EEC under a Conservative government, and Labour was in power now. They saw a renegotiation of these terms as a necessity for the country, as well as an opportunity to do better than the Conservatives. In the October 1974 manifesto, the Labour Party called the EEC accession "the greatest single peacetime decision of this century", and stated that "the British people were not given a chance to say whether or not they agreed to the terms accepted by the Tory Government".[202] Labour won the election, and Wilson called for a referendum as had been promised.[203] The party was divided in the European question, and the majority of party members outside of Parliament was anti-EEC. However, the Cabinet was in favour of membership, and the results of the referendum held on 5th June 1975 showed that 67% of the British public were in favour of full EEC membership, versus 33% against.[204] This was a great contrast to the poll results from 1973 when only 36% had been happy with EEC entry.

For an island separated from continental Europe, and as former rulers of their own empire, being in control, and not controlled from a supranational level, was important. The wish for renegotiation showed that although positive towards the EEC, something that can be observed when placing the British parties into the different Eurosceptic typologies, the Britons were less accepting of the way it was run. By being a member, there was a possibility of being able to influence or change the way the EEC was run and their policies.

Referenda were not common in Britain, but a change as great as EEC membership required the consent of the British public. Douglas Jay, a Labour MP, expressed that membership meant a "drastic change in [their] constitution", and this was something that the people of Britain, and not only the government, should have a say in.[205] If Britain was to remain a member of the

[201] Butler and Kitzinger, *The 1975 Referendum*, 1.
[202] "October 1974 Labour Party Manifesto: Britain Will Win with Labour", *Labour Party Manifestos*, Labour Party Manifestos, accessed 29 April, 2019, http://labourmanifesto.com/1974/Oct/1974-oct-labour-manifesto.shtml.
[203] Colin Seymour-Ure, "Press and Referenda: The Case of the British Referendum of 1975", *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 11, no. 3 (1978), 602; N. Piers Ludlow, "Safeguarding British Identity or Betraying It? The Role of British 'Tradition' in the Parliamentary Great Debate on EC Membership, October 1971", *Journal of Common Market Studies* 53, no. 1 (2015): 18.
[204] Andrew M. Kirby and Peter J. Taylor, "A Geographical Analysis of the Voting Pattern in the EEC Referendum, 5 June 1975", *Regional Studies* 10, no. 2 (1976), 183.
[205] Saunders, *Yes to Europe!: The 1975 Referendum and Seventies Britain*, 68.

EEC, both the consent of the people and new terms were needed. Wilson's Labour government promised

> major changes in the CAP; new and fairer methods of financing the European Community budget; resistance to proposals for EMU […]; retention of national Parliamentary powers to pursue effective regional, industrial and fiscal policies; better safeguards for Commonwealth and developing countries; [and] no harmonisation of VAT which would require Britain to tax necessities.[206]

The renegotiation began and ended before the referendum was held, but the Labour government did not achieve much.[207] Because there were only minor changes, the renegotiation did not particularly affect the political parties', nor the public's opinions on the EEC. Wilson and Labour had been opposing the terms agreed upon by the Conservatives, but in the end they too were unable to achieve better terms for Britain. Despite being presented with new terms that closely resembled the old, the majority voted 'yes' in the 1975 referendum.

The referendum results had showed a majority of two-to-one, a result which silenced the Eurosceptics of the party. The 'problem' was settled for now in Britain. Euroscepticism became less apparent, and both the major British parties were accepting towards the Community, although still opposing the current CAP. The British Eurosceptics were beaten for now, but this would change in the 1980s when both Labour and the Conservatives went through a change in leadership. For the rest of the 1970s, British Euroscepticism became dormant, and it was a topic of interest for the political elite rather than being something engaging the public.[208] The results showed little Euroscepticism amongst the public, and that most people, despite the economic setbacks the years before, were happy to stay in the EEC.

Wilson resigned the following year after the referendum, and was succeeded by James Callaghan, a pro-EEC prime minister from Labour. At this time, the EEC was not a major issue for the government, and they were working on improving the existing relations. The latter half of the decade was characterised by a unity amongst Labour and the Conservatives regarding the European question. Labour was led by Callaghan, and the Conservatives who up until 1975 had been led by pro-European Heath, were now led by Margaret Thatcher. She would later go

---

[206] Stephen Wall, *The Official History of Britain and the European Community, Volume II: From Rejection to Referendum, 1963-1975* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 511; Forster, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties since 1945*, 48-49.

[207] Chris Gifford, *The Making of Eurosceptic Britain: Identity and Economy in a Post-Imperial State* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008), 61.

[208] Daddow, "Margaret Thatcher, Tony Blair and the Eurosceptic Tradition in Britain", 217; Forster, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties since 1945*, 50, 78.

on to shape Conservative Euroscepticism in the 1980s, but was, during her first years as party leader, in favour of keeping Britain's EEC membership. Unlike the situation in Norway, Britain did not experience Euroscepticism becoming mainstream and the status quo. The sceptics had been defeated in the referendum, and the poll results had showed that the majority of the British public were happy staying in the Community. This fact and the generally pro-EEC attitude observed in both Labour and the Conservatives would make mainstreaming of Euroscepticism impossible.

6.6. Conclusion

The referenda, and the CAP and the CFP, changed Euroscepticism in both Britain and Norway, but did so in different ways. Due to exceptionalism, Britain and Norway already had their reasons for not identifying themselves with the rest of the Community members. The referenda, and disagreement over the EEC's policies, added to an existing scepticism towards the continent. The British referendum confirmed that entering the Community had been the right call, despite some dissatisfaction amongst the public at the time of the entry. The reluctant European became slightly less reluctant, but there were more issues related to the EEC than staying in or leaving. Fair deals regarding the CAP and the CFP were important for Britain, but not as important as it was for Norway. Britain's national identity was never tied to the farmers and the fishermen. In Norway, the fisheries sectors had influenced settlement patterns on the coast, and historically, the country had consisted of agricultural societies, and smaller cities and towns. Interventionist policies like these proved that the EEC would be incompatible with the way the countries had been run up until now. For a country like Britain, where the farmers and fishermen were not the 'heart and soul' of the country, the CAP and the CFP were manageable. However, as seen in various party manifestos, both Labour and the Conservatives were unhappy with the original CAP and CFP, and displayed soft Euroscepticism. They were in favour of membership, but disagreed with certain policies, and their aim was to change the EEC from within. In Norway, demands like these were unlikely to succeed. Many of the parties favoured the primary sectors, and these sectors were regarded to be an important part of Norway's national identity. The CAP and the CFP added to existing scepticism in Norway, but did less so in Britain. Creating disadvantages for farmers and fishermen for the benefit of the EEC made the Norwegians more sceptical towards the EEC. The political parties struggled to find a way to combine membership with attempting to please all. Because of this, the EEC negotiations were more complicated for the Norwegians than for the Britons. The British government accepted the EEC's demands and became a full member, whereas the Norwegian government

struggled to achieve an agreement upon agriculture and fisheries that would work, and eventually failed to convince the people to vote 'yes' to membership.

It is important to note that the referenda held in Britain and Norway were different. Britain entered through the will of the politicians, and the decision to hold a referendum came after a year of membership. In Norway, the referendum was held before a potential entry, and a 'no' majority prevented that from happening. Still, the outcome of them influenced party-based Euroscepticism in both countries, and would continue to do so in the following years. Because the 'stay' side won in Britain, opposition towards the EEC did not become mainstream, and the British political parties, and particularly the Labour Party, went through a pro-EEC phase. The European question was from now on of little interest to the public, and engaged only the politicians. Because of the general pro-EEC attitude at the time, Britain's relationship with the EEC became about improving Britain's place in the Community, and making sure it was economically beneficial. A different effect was seen in Norway, as the public voted 'no' to the EEC. Following this result, all of the political parties had to take this into consideration, and an EEC membership, was completely off the table. The status quo meant the political parties had to respect the people's wish, and remain a non-member. Thus, Norway entered a phase of default Euroscepticism as entry to the Community was not relevant anymore. It is therefore possible to speak of a mainstreaming of Euroscepticism as most of the parties adopted an approach that kept the country out of the EEC in order to appeal to the majority of the voters.

The 1980s: Latent Euroscepticism?

7.1. Introduction

The 1980s are significantly different than the 1970s when it comes to Euroscepticism. Whereas the 1970s were characterized by EEC referenda and negotiations surrounding these, the 1980s saw first a decline, and then an increase of Euroscepticism towards the latter half of the decade. After the public's opinion settled the question in 1972 for Norway, and 1975 for Britain, the following decade became about improving the status quo. The British government worked on improving the membership terms as they were not completely satisfied with the way the EEC was currently run. The 1980s also saw the rise of more Eurosceptic figures in Britain. Norway turned its focus to the EFTA and on improving its relationship with the EEC as an outsider.

The first half of the 1980s was characterised by a more latent Euroscepticism than the 1970s were. It was barely visible to the public, but party-based Euroscepticism was very much alive. The main focus of this chapter will be to discuss the evolution of party-based Euroscepticism during this decade. This includes looking at how party-based Euroscepticism changed in the Labour Party and the Conservative Party during the 1980s, and Norway's move towards the EEC and the 1990 government breakdown. In addition to these, it is necessary to have a brief look at the changes in the EEC at the time, particularly the Single European Act (SEA). This chapter argues that it was a major change in how the EEC operated and affected both Britain and Norway's relationship with the Community.

The research question for chapter seven is: *how did party-based Euroscepticism evolve in Britain and Norway during the 1980s, and how did the Single European Act influence the countries' relationship with the EEC*? This is the fourth and final sub-question, and will shed light on the development of British and Norwegian party-based Euroscepticism, and help explain the political reasons for the difference between the two countries.

7.2. Britain: Role-Swap

7.2.1. The Aftermath of the 1975 Referendum

After the 1975 referendum settled the 'stay' or 'leave' question for Britain, Euroscepticism lost its appeal to the public and became an issue for the political elite.[209] The people of Britain had

[209] Baker et al., "Euroscepticism in the British Party System: A Source of Fascination, Perplexity, and Sometimes Frustration", 105; Forster, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties since 1945*, 50.

spoken, and the referendum result became an obstacle for Eurosceptics at the time. Neil Marten, a Eurosceptic, said "we, the anti-Marketeers, pressed for this referendum. We had it and we've got the result. And I think we've got to accept that this is the wish of the British people".[210] It was therefore in the best interest of the political parties to keep the EEC membership. Harold Wilson and the Labour Party renegotiated the terms, and Labour stayed in government until the Conservatives won the 1979 election.

Euroscepticism became latent after the 1975 referendum, but it never disappeared completely. Labour and the Conservatives both went through a change in their stance on Euroscepticism during the 1980s: a sort of role-swap of which party was the pro-/anti-European party. For both parties, the decade can be split into two: 1979-1988, and 1988-onwards for the Conservatives, and 1980-1983, and 1983-onwards for Labour.[211] Party-based Euroscepticism is difficult to define, and an obvious change in stance like this, proves why it is difficult to find a suitable typology. Where should a party that used to be hard Eurosceptic, but is not anymore, be placed, and vice versa? The various existing typologies could have worked for the parties up until the 1980s, but are unable to account for the changes happening during the decade.

7.2.2. The Labour Party: From Eurosceptics to Pro-Europeans

The Labour Party had been sceptical during the early days of the EEC, and had favoured close ties to the Commonwealth over closer ties with Europe. Under the leadership of Wilson, Labour had steered Britain through a renegotiation and a referendum, and had kept the country's EEC membership. By the early 1980s, however, party-based Euroscepticism peaked in the Labour Party. The Community members had suffered from economic problems, and a Labour Party led by Eurosceptics suggested a withdrawal from the EEC to be the best solution for Britain.[212] The party was at the time led by hard Eurosceptic Michael Foot.[213] Fronting a more Eurosceptic line did not do the party any favours. The 1983 party manifesto was said by Labour's own Gerald Kaufmann to be "the longest suicide note in history".[214]

The "Britain and the Common Market" section of the manifesto said "geography and history determine that Britain is part of Europe, and Labour wants to see Europe safe and prosperous.

[210] Butler and Kitzinger, *The 1975 Referendum*, 274.
[211] Forster, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties since 1945*, 63-64.
[212] Thorpe, *A History of the British Labour Party*, 217.
[213] Forster, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties since 1945*, 64.
[214] Nyta Mann, "Foot's Message of Hope to Left", *BBC News*, 14 July, 2003, accessed 13 April, 2019, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/3059773.stm.

But the European Economic Community, which does not even include the whole of Western Europe, was never devised to suit us […]".[215] The party blames the EEC because membership made handling the economic and industrial problems of the 1970s difficult. According to Labour, EEC membership was not compatible with their "radical, socialist policies for reviving the British economy".[216] The party therefore suggests withdrawal as this would have improved Britain's current situation. Cutting the ties to the EEC in such a way shows Labour's move towards a harder Eurosceptic stance. The party fits well into the definition of hard Euroscepticism because they now had a principled opposition towards the Community, and they wanted Britain to withdraw its membership. Labour did not do well in the 1983 election, and although the party's negative view on the Community was not the only reason for that, it did not help.[217]

The Labour Party's view on the EEC changed in a more positive direction in the mid-1980s under the leadership of Neal Kinnock, a leader who was positive towards the EEC. The party's critique towards the Community had declined, and membership was regarded to be beneficial. The EEC had gone through changes, and was now fronting social policies Labour could support. [218] Due to political trends in the Britain at the time, there was an opening for a European-friendly party. The leader of the Conservative Party, Margaret Thatcher, was displaying an increasing opposition towards European integration. In addition to this, Jacques Delors, the President of the European Commission, had in a speech "emphasised the social policy and workers' protection aspects of the EC".[219] This correlated well with Labour's own policies, and the party left their Eurosceptic path, and became the pro-EEC party in Britain. The 1980s therefore mark a significant change in Labour's history. Labour moved from proposing withdrawal from the EEC to supporting membership. However, this shift did not mean complete acceptance of the Community's policies. The CAP was still very much unpopular in Britain, and the Labour Party wanted "to put an end to the abuses and scandals of the [CAP]".[220] Despite being considered a pro-EEC party during the end of the decade, there were still some traces of party-based Euroscepticism to be found. The CAP issue places Labour on the very soft end of Euroscepticism, as they only showed opposition towards certain policies.

[215] "1983 Labour Party Manifesto".
[216] Ibid.
[217] Thorpe, *A History of the British Labour Party*, 212.
[218] Ibid., 228.
[219] Ibid., 223.
[220] "1987 Labour Party Manifesto: 'Britain Will Win with Labour'", *Labour Party Manifestos*, Labour Party Manifestos, accessed 3 May, 2019, http://labourmanifesto.com/1987/1987-labour-manifesto.shtml.

7.2.3. The Conservative Party: Thatcher's Road to Euroscepticism

The Conservatives too saw a change in their stance on Europe during the latter half of the decade. The party won the 1979 election, and Margaret Thatcher became the prime minister of Britain. She is regarded to be a prominent figure in British Euroscepticism. At the time, the party was still considered to be an EEC-friendly party, a sharp contrast to the Labour Party under Foot's leadership. Thatcher had an interesting effect on her party. They were the pro-European party during her time as leader, but her legacy led to the party becoming more Eurosceptic after her resignation.[221] She was the one who signed the SEA, one of the more controversial revisions of the EEC.[222] The SEA would allow further European integration, and it was therefore a strange move by an Eurosceptic. Thatcher, however, was not as hostile towards Europe as her legacy would indicate, and she fits the description of a soft Eurosceptic. Thatcher's position on Europe was described by one of her foreign secretaries to be "No No Yes".[223] On the basis of this description, Thatcher appears to have a more Eurosceptic stance in public, but being willing to compromise and cooperate with the Community behind closed doors.

The 1980s mark the time when Thatcher's view of EEC membership changed. She was the leader of the pro-EEC party of Britain, and up until now there had not been any major issues with British membership as far as the Conservatives were concerned. However, Thatcher's policies were somewhat incompatible with the EEC's, and her discontent was growing. Thatcher had regarded EEC membership as a good opportunity for Britain economically speaking.[224] In their 1983 manifesto, the Conservatives regarded both Labour's wish to withdraw from the EEC, and the Liberal Party and the Social Democratic Party's wish "to stay in but never upset our partners by speaking up forcefully" as extreme views.[225] The rhetoric of the manifesto shows how eager the Conservatives were to stay in the EEC because leaving would "be a catastrophe for the country".[226] Unlike the Labour Party of the same time, the Conservatives regarded membership withdrawal as a very bad idea for Britain. And using the

[221] Cary Fontana and Craig Parsons, "'One Woman's Prejudice': Did Margaret Thatcher Cause Britain's Anti-Europeanism?", *Journal of Common Market Studies* 53, no. 1 (2015), 97.
[222] Forster, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties since 1945*, 63; Daddow, "Margaret Thatcher, Tony Blair and the Eurosceptic Tradition in Britain", 217.
[223] Hugo Young, cited in Forster, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties since 1945*, 63.
[224] "1979 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto".
[225] "1983 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto", *Conservative Party Manifestos*, Conservative Party Manifestos, accessed 15 April, 2019, http://www.conservativemanifesto.com/1983/1983-conservative-manifesto.shtml.
[226] 1983 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto".

noun ‘catastrophe’ to describe a situation in which Britain is not an EEC membership showcase the Conservatives’ EEC support at the time.

Thatcher was particularly invested in “getting [Britain’s] money” back.[227] When Thatcher entered office, Britain’s net contribution to the EEC was £780 million. Of the other member countries, only West Germany contributed more. £780 million meant Britain was “the second largest contributor […] despite being the third poorest member of the Community”.[228] In the 1983 manifesto, the party stated that they stood up for Britain’s interests, and had managed “to cut [the] country’s financial contribution to the Community Budget to a fairer level”.[229] Thatcher’s Euroscepticism sprung out from Britain’s economic obligations to the EEC because she feared Britain’s contribution would continue to increase.[230] Because of Thatcher’s issues with this, it is reasonable to categorise her as a soft Eurosceptic at this point. Thatcher regarded British national interests to be at risk, a typical characteristic of soft Euroscepticism. It must, however, be noted that Thatcher’s Euroscepticism might not reflect that of the party, although it is likely with the discontent in Conservative opinions regarding the CAP.

By 1988, Thatcher was really starting to appear as a harder Eurosceptic. The EEC was implementing more social policies. This was welcomed by the Labour Party as they now could relate more to the policies of the current EEC. For Thatcher and the Conservatives, ‘social Europe’ had the opposite effect.[231] Social Europe became a reason to support British EEC membership for Labour, but for Thatcher and her party, this socialism was incompatible with their ideology and the current neo-liberalistic trends.

Thatcher was no supporter of Britain being ruled from Brussels, as can be observed from her Bruges speech of 1988: “we have not successfully rolled back the frontiers of the state in Britain, only to see them re-imposed at a European level”.[232] Thatcher’s speech emphasised how Britain’s national identity and their political sovereignty should be held high. Social Europe was a problematic concept for Thatcher, and she did not want to see her own neo-liberal policy being overruled by socialism coming from Brussels. About British national identity, she

[227] Forster, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties since 1945*, 66.
[228] Crowson, *The Conservative Party and European Integration since 1945: At the Heart of Europe?*, 47.
[229] “1983 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto”.
[230] Crowson, *The Conservative Party and European Integration since 1945: At the Heart of Europe?*, 48.
[231] Baker et al., “Euroscepticism in the British Party System: A Source of Fascination, Perplexity, and Sometimes Frustration”, 113.
[232] Margaret Thatcher, “Speech to the College of Europe” (speech, Bruges, Belgium, 20 September, 1988), Margaret Thatcher Foundation, https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107332.

said "Europe will be stronger precisely because it has France as France, Spain as Spain, Britain as Britain, each with its own customs", and trying to fit the member states into "some sort of identikit European personality" would not do.[233] According to Thatcher, "the European Community is *one* manifestation of [the] European identity but it is not the only one".[234] The Community benefitted more from consisting of different countries.

Rather than being Eurosceptic for economic reasons, the Bruges speech showed Thatcher speaking up against what she thought was a threat against the Britain's national identity from Brussels. Thatcher regarded Britain as European as any other European country was, and her speech put emphasis on 'Europe' not being synonymous with 'the EEC'.[235] She described Britain as an island fortress, signifying an obvious difference between Britain and the rest of Europe. This correlates to British exceptionalism about being an island separated from mainland Europe. From the Bruges speech in 1988 and onwards, soft Euroscepticism had a growing role in the Conservative Party.[236] However, the new role as a Eurosceptic party did not happen without objections. Thatcher's Eurosceptic stance appalled some of the Conservative Party members. Her anti-EEC sentiment would eventually lead to her resigning as prime minister. Michael Heseltine challenged her for the leadership in 1990. Thatcher, unable to defend her position, resigned and was succeed by John Major, a Conservative with a more positive attitude towards the EEC.[237]

A role-swap in British politics happened during the 1980s. The once pro-European Conservatives, under Thatcher's leadership, gradually moved towards Euroscepticism during the 1980s, and the once divided Labour ended up becoming Britain's pro-EEC party. Labour had struggled with internal division during the 1970s, and was steered in a Eurosceptic direction by Foot from 1980 to 1983. However, the party dropped their hard Eurosceptic stance when they changed leader and the Conservative's, or rather Thatcher's, new Eurosceptic orientation gave room for a pro-EEC party in British politics. Furthermore, Labour's policies were compatible with social Europe, so it was logical for the party to support British membership. The Conservatives were guided by Thatcher into becoming a Eurosceptic party in Britain. The party would go through division caused by Euroscepticism after the Maastricht treaty in 1992,

[233] Thatcher, "Speech to the College of Europe".
[234] Thatcher, "Speech to the College of Europe".
[235] Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*, 440.
[236] Baker et al., "Euroscepticism in the British Party System: 'A Source of Fascination, Perplexity, and Sometimes Frustration'", 98.
[237] Thorpe, *A History of the British Labour Party*, 225.

but this is outside of the time period covered in this thesis.[238] Thatcher's Euroscepticism had inspired some of the members of the Conservative Party, and this would eventually lead to the party adopting a more Eurosceptic stance.[239] Thatcher's, and the party's, Euroscepticism in the first half of the decade belongs to the softer side as they wish to reform the Community from within, and the scepticism itself was primarily targeted at economic issues and the EEC's social policy.

7.3. Norway: Increase in European Integration, and the 1990 Government Breakdown

7.3.1. After the Referendum: Lack of Interest in the EEC

When the result of the 1972 referendum was presented, the European question ceased to be an important topic of discussion in Norway. The people had spoken, and the political parties had to act in accordance with the referendum result. Skinner describes the period between 1973 and 1989 as a quiet one regarding Norwegian Euroscepticism. There was a cease-fire between the 'yes' side and the 'no' side.[240] However, this thesis argues that although this time period was characterised by a lack of interest in the EEC, Euroscepticism had by no means gone away, and Norwegian Euroscepticism during 1980s cannot be ignored. When the EEC was going through its second enlargement during the 1980s with Greece, Portugal and Spain joining, a new membership application from Norway never even appeared on the political agenda.[241] The European question at the time was of little of interest.

Euroscepticism never went away from Norway. It had since the referendum result was presented become latent and the default opinion of Norway, and the relationship with the EEC became characterised by indifference. Historian Olav Riste presents three reasons for Norway's lack of interest in the European question: economic setbacks and mass unemployment in the EEC; strengthening of Norway's relationship with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and the discovery of oil and gas reserves in the North Sea.[242] Norway had applied for membership because Britain and Denmark had done so, but these two were experiencing economic setbacks

[238] Crowson, *The Conservative Party and European Integration since 1945: At the Heart of Europe?*, 151.
[239] Fontana and Parsons, "'One Woman's Prejudice': Did Margaret Thatcher Cause Britain's Anti-Europeanism?", 97.
[240] Skinner, "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation", 154.
[241] Sitter, "The European Question and the Norwegian Party System since 1961: The Freezing of a Modern Cleavage or Contingent Opposition?", 330.
[242] Riste, *Norway's Foreign Relations – A History*, 245.

as well. Unemployment in the EEC increased every year from 1973 to 1986, and Norway, along with non-members Sweden, Switzerland, Austria and Finland, managed to stay mostly out of the economic problems.[243] Norway was not really in the need of being a member of a community or organisation at the time. The oil age had begun, and the country saw an immense increase in their wealth. This reason, in combination with the economic setbacks seen in the EEC members, further convinced the Norwegians that saying 'no' had been the right call. Oil and gas made Norway a more interesting trading partner to the larger countries in the EEC as they now did not have to solely rely on the Middle East, North Africa, or the Soviet Union to get these resources.[244]

7.3.2. Norway: The EEC Becomes Interesting Again

By the mid-1980s, it became clear that the existing EFTA deal was not enough. The EEC wanted to introduce a single market. EFTA was weakened by Britain leaving in 1973, and by Austria and Sweden's wishes to follow and join the EEC.[245] The European question had been dormant since the referendum, and Norway's existing relations with the EEC needed reforming. In 1986, Arbeiderpartiet, under the leadership of Gro Harlem Brundtland, returned to government, succeeding a coalition government led by Høyre. Parts of Arbeiderpartiet had become increasingly more pro-EEC towards the end of the 1980s, and Brundtland is known as a very pro-EEC figure in Norwegian politics even to this day due to her work for the 'yes' side in the 1994 referendum. Arbeiderpartiet had a different reason from the British Labour, in addition to social Europe, for looking towards the EEC after years of little interest. Norway's non-member position put them in a difficult position when the SEA was implemented in the EEC. Arbeiderpartiet's reasoning for seeking towards the EEC during these years was to gain access to the single market, as the SEA would create trade barriers for non-members.

However, the 1980s were still too early for considering applying for membership again, and Arbeiderpartiet therefore settled on aiming for improvement on their current trade deals with the EEC.[246] It is important to note that mainly the leadership of the party was pro-EU, and not all of the party.[247] Arbeiderpartiet's manifesto from 1989 did not suggest applying for

[243] Seierstad, *Folket sa nei: Norsk EU-motstand frå 1961 til i dag*, 55.
[244] Riste, *Norway's Foreign Relations – A History*, 247.
[245] Ibid., 249.
[246] "Ny vekst for Norge: Arbeiderpartiet: 86-89 Arbeidsprogram", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 16 April, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:21&fq=aarstall:1985&fq=.
[247] Sciarini and Listhaug, "Single Cases or a Unique Pair? The Swiss and Norwegian 'No' to Europe", 419.

membership, but rather seeking access for Norway to the EEC's single market. Norway's relationship with the EEC was to be based on Norway's national interest.[248] Brundtland and Arbeiderpartiet thought that access to the single market was of national interest. The government therefore pushed for a closer relationship between the EEC members and the EFTA members. Their wish for a closer European integration would lead to the European Economic Area (EEA) agreement in 1992.[249]

According to Riste, the public's interest for the European question came back towards the latter half of the 1980s, something that correlates with Brundtland's time as prime minister. However, a poll showed that the majority of the Norwegian public was against membership. Only a third of those asked was in favour of full membership. The main reason for the poll result was economic. Norwegians were feeling self-sufficient due to the exports of oil and gas. In addition to this, the opposition from agrarian and fisheries communities stemming from the 1970s had never really disappeared, so the EEC was still seen as incompatible with these groups.[250]

7.3.3. The Syse Government: A Catastrophic Combination of Parties

At first glance, the 1980s seem uneventful regarding Euroscepticism in Norway, but opposition towards European integration was very much present as shown in Sitter's table of party programmatic positions.[251] Norway's coalition governments are known to be slightly problematic regarding the European question. A combination of both pro-EEC and hard Eurosceptic parties could be a challenge, and because the referendum result turned out to be a 'no', it was the Eurosceptic parties that kept the pro-EEC parties in check. There were two coalition governments (1981-1985, and 1989-1990) in Norway during the 1980s, and both were led by Høyre, a pro-EEC party. Both governments resigned due to disagreement between the parties, but only the Syse government (1989-1990) is relevant for this thesis.

Pro-EEC Høyre formed a coalition government with Kristelig Folkeparti, and the hard Eurosceptic Senterpartiet. Kristelig Folkeparti had a less clear stance than the other two, but they wanted to keep Norway out of the EEC due to the 1972 referendum results. Scholar Dag

[248] "Krav til innsats for felles framtid: Arbeidsprogram for Det norske arbeiderparti 1990-1993", *Data om det politiske system*, Partidokumentarkivet, accessed 16 April, 2019, http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:21&fq=aarstall:1989&fq=.
[249] Sitter, "The European Question and the Norwegian Party System since 1961: The Freezing of a Modern Cleavage or Contingent Opposition?", 343.
[250] Riste, "The Nordic Angle II: Norway – The Reluctant European", 194.
[251] Sitter, "The European Question and the Norwegian Party System since 1961: The Freezing of a Modern Cleavage or Contingent Opposition?", 339.

Seierstad claims Senterpartiet joined the coalition in an attempt to control the negotiations with and regarding the EEC. The party wanted from the beginning to be able to resign from government should the disagreements prove too great.[252] This coalition government is a good example of how a Eurosceptic party held all the power, and would use this power to keep Norway out of the Community. In an interview with Prime Minister Jan P. Syse, Kjell Magne Bondevik and Anne Enger Lahnstein shown on *Dagsrevyen,* and broadcast by NRK, the 1990 government breakdown was discussed. Lahnstein, Senterpartiet's parliamentary leader, stated that the party pulled out due to Høyre's European policy. Høyre had announced their aims for the EEA at their annual conference. Senterpartiet considered this to be a step towards full EEC membership by Høyre, and reason enough to end the cooperation, letting the coalition government break down. Lahnstein further stated that the EEC issue was of greater importance than being a part of the government.[253] A close-reading of the transcript of Syse's speech at the annual Høyre conference shows that Høyre displayed a very pro-EEC stance in 1990 and that Syse mentioned Norwegian EEC membership as the best solution for Norway several times.[254] For a hard Eurosceptic party like Senterpartiet, any suggestions of Norwegian membership was incompatible with their stance.

A declaration by the government showed that the Syse government had from the beginning said that they would base Norway's relationship with the EEC on the single market created by the SEA, and on the fact that Norway was not a member of the Community.[255] Applying for EEC membership was not mentioned at all in this government declaration from 19th October 1989. The transcript of this declaration was retrieved from the Norwegian government's online archives. The coalition appeared to be neutral towards the EEC, and was interested in improving the current EFTA deals and the existing relationship with the EEC. These were policies which even a Eurosceptic party could support. When membership and all the possibilities regarding European integration were mentioned at the Høyre conference, further cooperation between the parties was not possible due to Senterpartiet's hard Euroscepticism. Syse said Høyre had been clear in their stance on membership, but that they have always been taking the will of Stortinget into consideration. Lahnstein, and Bondevik of Kristelig Folkeparti, however, opposed

[252] Seierstad, *Folket sa nei: Norsk EU-motstand frå 1961 til i dag*, 68.
[253] "29. oktober 1990", *Dagsrevyen*, NRK, 29 October, 1990, television broadcast.
[254] Jan P. Syse, "Tale til Høyres landsmøte" (speech, Norway, 3 May, 1990), Regjeringen, https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/smk/vedlegg/taler-og-artikler-av-tidligere-statsministre/jan-p.-syse/1990/tale_til_hoeyres_landsmoete.pdf.
[255] "Erklæring fra Regjeringen", Stortingstidende inneholdende 134. ordentlige Stortings forhandlinger 1989-1990 forhandlinger i Stortinget, 19 October, 1989, 52-55.

membership. Unlike the other two parties, Kristelig Folkeparti did not have any particular strong opinions towards the EEC, but Bondevik stated in the interview that the party refused to accept an EEA deal that is too similar to full EEC membership.[256]

This government breakdown was important in the history of Norwegian Euroscepticism. It showed how a Eurosceptic party could topple a government. The combination of the parties in government had been an interesting one, but it created difficulties regarding the European question.[257] As discussed in chapter five, a coalition government could affect Euroscepticism, and the 1990 government breakdown is a proof of this. Because of Senterpartiet's hard Euroscepticism, the entire government was de facto hard Eurosceptic. If the combination included a party against membership, the government was locked to this decision, and was to be considered hard Eurosceptic, or softer hard Eurosceptic. In the NRK interview, Syse said he was disappointed by the government breakdown, and stated that he had been optimistic when forming the government in 1989. Syse stated that Høyre was the only party in the government with a clear stance on EEC membership, but considering that Senterpartiet had always been against it, a statement like this would be wrong.

Existing opposition towards membership was further fuelled by the fact that the Community had changed since the 1970s. Debating whether or not this was the right solution for Norway had become an entirely different matter than it had been in the late 1960s and early 1970s. At this point, it was not just a question about economic cooperation as had been the case in 1972; it meant giving up part of the country's power to an EEC that had become increasingly more supranational.

There is no doubt that the European question disappeared from the political agenda after the 1972 referendum. The Norwegian government had its reasons for ignoring the issue when the oil age begun, and the EEC was struck by economic problems and unemployment. The fact that Norway had been less affected than the EEC's members proved that Norway did not need to be a part of a bigger community to thrive. By the mid-1980s, the single market came up on the political agenda, and required close ties to the EEC. This, in addition to a Europe-oriented government, led to the European question being brought back to Norwegian politics by the end

[256] "29. oktober 1990".
[257] Sitter, "The European Question and the Norwegian Party System since 1961: The Freezing of a Modern Cleavage or Contingent Opposition?", 342.

of the decade. Party-based Euroscepticism had never completely gone away, and the 1989-1990 coalition government did not stand a chance.

Norwegian Euroscepticism had an interesting development during the 1980s. It went from being barely relevant to breaking up a coalition government. The 1990 breakdown was a great contrast from Brundtland's pro-EEC attitude. It showed that party-based Euroscepticism was still very much present in Norwegian politics.

7.4. A Changing Community: The Single European Act

The 1980s saw the second enlargement of members when Greece, Portugal and Spain joined. However, the addition of new members into the Community did not push the Norwegian government towards a new membership application. Additionally, the SEA was introduced in 1986.[258] The SEA signified a change in the way the EEC operated. Parts of sovereign powers had now gone from being at the state level to a supranational level.[259] It was the first revision of the EEC since the Treaty of Rome in 1957.[260] The EEC was not just a community of states cooperating economically anymore, it had become a greater unity in which members had to transfer some of their sovereign powers to. The single market was part of the SEA, and the EEC's aim was to have this ready by 1992. Thatcher was in favour of the single market, and therefore accepted the SEA and "any sacrifice of sovereignty involved" when signing it in 1986.[261] Her discontent with the EEC did not overshadow her strong wish for British access to the single market.

The common market was troubled by obstacles, and the creation of a single market would solve these. However, for countries not part of the EEC, the establishment of a single market would be problematic. 70% of Norway's export had gone to the EEC members, and the single market would lead to "economic isolation" for those outside of the Community. The prospect of a single market led to concerns in Norway as this would restrain them in the European market.[262] Up until now, the EFTA countries benefited from having no obstacles between them and the

[258] Skinner, "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation", 156.
[259] Renee L. Buhr, "Seizing the Opportunity: Euroscepticism and Extremist Party Success in the Post-Maastricht Era", *Government and Opposition* 47, no. 4 (2012), 551; Forster, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties since 1945*, 64.
[260] Forster, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties since 1945*, 67.
[261] Forster, "Anti-Europeans, Anti-Marketeers and Eurosceptics: The Evolution and Influence of Labour and Conservative Opposition to Europe", 301.
[262] Riste, "The Nordic Angle II: Norway – The Reluctant European", 194.

EEC countries in trades. The EFTA members were worried that the SEA would inhibit them as competitors in Europe.[263] The SEA would eventually lead to the EEA in 1992, and this granted access to the single market for the EFTA members and removed their disadvantages.

The goal of the governments of Britain and Norway was access to the single market, as remaining on the outside would mean economic disadvantage. Both countries would eventually be granted access to the single market, but because Britain had full EEC membership, and Norway did not, their paths to the single market was different. For Britain, the SEA marks the time when the Community required the members to give up some of their sovereignty. However, for Thatcher and her government, access to the single market was worth this. In Norway, and the other EFTA members, the SEA was a cause for worry. A single market would indeed be economically beneficial for the EEC members with access to it, but it would shut the EFTA members out. The fear of economic isolation can therefore explain the Brundtland government's push towards the EEC in the latter half of the decade. The EEA can be contributed to Brundtland's initiative to have closer ties between the EEC and the EFTA.[264] The SEA caused less party-based Euroscepticism because of its economic importance, and further European integration was necessary for the governments of Britain and Norway at the time. It did not make economic sense for Britain, nor for Norway, to stay out of the single market.

7.5. Conclusion

Euroscepticism became latent after the referenda, but it played out differently in the two countries. Norway had become a 'Eurosceptic by default' country. The public had settled the issue in 1972, and the political parties adopted a Europe policy that did not include Norwegian membership. No new membership application was sent during the 1980s despite the EEC undergoing its second enlargement. The mainstreaming of Euroscepticism during the 1970s had put its mark on Norwegian politics. The pro-EEC party, Høyre, wanted full EEC membership for Norway, but were unable to achieve it as they were still bound by the referendum result. Britain remained member after the referendum, but Europe was of little interest to the public. The evolution of party-based Euroscepticism during the 1980s played out very differently in these two countries. In Britain, Labour had begun the decade as hard Eurosceptics, and the Conservatives as pro-EEC. The mid-1980s marked a shift in the EEC's policies and the idea of

[263] "Fra frihandelsavtale med EF til EØS", *Europapolitikk*, Regjeringen, 15 April, 2016, accessed 21 April, 2019, https://www.regjeringen.no/no/tema/europapolitikk/eos1/ef-til-eos/id2458261/.
[264] Robert Geyer and Duane Swank, "Rejecting the European Union: Norwegian Social Democratic Opposition to the EU in the 1990s", *Party Politics* 3, no. 4 (1997), 551.

a social Europe gave a reason for EEC support from the Labour Party, and incompatibility with the EEC for the Conservatives. In Norway, all of the parties had adopted a 'Eurosceptic by default' stance after the 1972 referendum, but Brundtland and her government became important contributors to the EEA and an increase in European integration. In addition, it made sense for Arbeiderpartiet to show an increasing support towards the EEC for the same reasons as Labour: social Europe. In 1990, Høyre suggested an increase in European integration and the possibilities of membership, which resulted in the government breaking down. This event showed how powerful Euroscepticism was, and how solid its grip on Norwegian politics were. Senterpartiet was a much smaller party than Høyre, but had no difficulties in defeating them because of difference in opinions on the European question.

Britain differed greatly from Norway regarding the political parties' stances on Euroscepticism in the 1980s. The Norwegian parties kept the same stance as they had had during the 1970s. The only difference now was that pro-EEC parties were unable to seek out membership. However, they would still show some support by engaging in the EFTA, and eventually the EEA, and were keen to preserve Norway's ties to the EEC. In Britain, the parties went through great changes in their opinions towards the EEC. In Labour, the right faction of the party had been ruling since the referendum in 1975. This changed drastically in 1980 when Foot, a hard Eurosceptic, became party leader. However, the hard Eurosceptic Labour Party had little success, and Foot's time as leader was short. Withdrawal from the EEC, in addition to other factors, was not well received by the public. The Conservatives went from the being the pro-EEC party of Britain to becoming more openly Eurosceptic. Thatcher had begun her time as prime minister as a supporter of British membership, but became increasingly more opposing towards the EEC and Brussels towards the end of the decade. The Conservative's move towards Euroscepticism created a need for a large pro-EEC party, and with a change of leadership, the Labour Party managed to fill this role. The chapter argued that the Eurosceptic 'role-swap' was unique for Britain, as the Norwegian parties did not want to change their stances, and were softer hard to hard Eurosceptic by default as they choose to not pursue membership.

A shared worry for both countries was the SEA. This revision of the EEC would grant more power to the EEC, and the Community moved up to a supranational level. The big issue of the SEA, however, was the creation of a single market. This would remove the last trade barriers between the members, but it would also shut non-members out. Thatcher was in favour of a single market and appeared to have no problem with signing the SEA, and thus giving away some of Britain's sovereignty. Norway, as a non-member, would not have to give up its

sovereignty, but exclusion from the single market was troubling. The prospect of SEA and the introduction of the single market led to the EEA, an agreement which granted non-members access to the single market. Because of this, the SEA eventually strengthened the bonds between the EEC and non-members. The implementation of the SEA marks an increase in the European integration for both members and non-members. It made the Norwegian government, led by Brundtland and Arbeiderpartiet, change its stance towards a more positive one. The EEA would make it simpler to be closely integrated with the EEC without being a full member.

The positive Norwegian EEC attitude did not last for long. A new coalition government, led by Jan P. Syse of Høyre, and consisting of Senterpartiet and Kristelig Folkeparti, was a mix of both positive and negative attitudes towards the EEC, something that would eventually lead to the government's downfall. The parties' views on EEC membership were too different, and Senterpartiet left the coalition when they believed Høyre was going for membership. Britain had no coalition government at the time, but the EEC issue caused disagreements within the Conservative Party. Thatcher had signed the SEA in 1986, and ultimately accepted an increase in European integration. The contrast to the Bruges speech was great. Thatcher's Bruges speech in 1988 marked the Conservative Party's beginning as a Eurosceptic party in Britain. However, Thatcher's hard stance on Europe displeased some of the Conservative Party members, and this became her end as both prime minister and party leader. Euroscepticism broke both the British and the Norwegian government in 1990, but did so in different ways. The countries had different types of government, majority in Britain and coalition in Norway, and I argue that they both broke down as a result of party-based Euroscepticism causing internal division for Thatcher's party, and division between the coalition partners in the Syse government.

The Conclusion of the Thesis

8.1. Introduction

As this master's thesis has argued, party-based Euroscepticism was very much present in both Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s. These two West European welfare states shared many similarities, but Euroscepticism affected them very differently during this time period. This thesis has presented some of the differences and similarities found in British and Norwegian opposition towards Europe/EEC/EU in various aspects and time periods, as I believe this is necessary in order to explain party-based Euroscepticism in these two countries during the 1970s and 1980s. Chapter four argued that the memory of the pasts was crucial in order to understand party-based Euroscepticism: Britain's time as a crumbling empire and Norway's many times under foreign rule. The following chapter argued that the type of government affects party-based Euroscepticism, and that Eurosceptic parties are the most powerful in coalition governments. These two chapters provided a historic framework, and a framework for the political systems, and thus, set the scene for the following two chapters. Chapter six discussed Euroscepticism during the 1970s, and argued that the CAP and the CFP, and the referenda affected the countries' existing opposition. It also argued that the CAP and the CFP were particularly unpopular in Norway due to the primary sectors being closely tied to the country's national identity. Finally, chapter seven discussed British and Norwegian party-based Euroscepticism during the 1980s, and how party-based Euroscepticism evolved differently in the two countries. The chapter argued that the British parties underwent a role-swap when Labour went from hard Euroscepticism to pro-EEC, and the once very pro-EEC Conservatives under the leadership of Thatcher began to show harder Eurosceptic characteristics. Furthermore, the chapter also argued that Euroscepticism was still powerful in Norwegian coalition governments after being latent for years. This final chapter will use the findings and discussions from the four chapters mentioned, and answer the thesis question: *How and why did party-based Euroscepticism differ between Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s, and what were the cultural and political reasons for this difference*?

8.2. Party-Based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway: The Differences

This thesis has argued that there are some important differences between British and Norwegian party-based Euroscepticism during the 1970s and 1980s. There was, however, a similar

development happening in the two countries. Party-based Euroscepticism became latent after the 1970s referenda, followed by an increase towards the end of the 1980s. The difference between them is to what degree this phenomenon affected the various parties and governments. Euroscepticism took its toll on the individual political parties in Britain causing division, and both Labour and the Conservatives underwent changes in their stances on the EEC during the time period covered in this thesis. In Norway, all of the parties kept their pre-referendum stance towards the EEC, but was locked into a softer hard Eurosceptic stance by having a principled opposition towards membership.

8.3. Cultural Reasons: The Comparison

There are two main cultural reasons for party-based Euroscepticism that differ greatly between Norway and Britain. These are the memory of the past, and national identity. The memory of the past is a part of the countries' national identity. Cultural reasons were not the most important for party-based Euroscepticism, but they are nonetheless very relevant, and have created an ingrained scepticism in the public towards the EEC. Because of this, the political parties have had to take the cultural aspect into consideration when appealing to voters. Beginning with the memory of the past, Britain joined the EEC in 1973, and in doing so, showed a willingness to stop clinging on to the past, and accept their new role as a European. Up until this point, the greatness of the past, of being a great world power ruling an empire, had been difficult to let go of. The European question also caused Norway to consider importance of the past. However, the country was not ready to give up the independence they had fought so long and hard for to become a member of the EEC.

It is importance to stress the difference of these memories of the past. Whereas the mindset of the Britons was that they had once been a great empire and ruled the world, the Norwegians remembered a past filled with foreign rule and fighting for the independence. Both memories gave a reason for Euroscepticism, but placed the countries in different situations. Britain could not go back to what had been. Several of the Commonwealth countries had claimed their independence, those left would not come with Britain into the EEC, and Britain would never again reach the level of power they had had at the height of the imperial times. The economic advantages of membership were considered to be beneficial, and the government accepted membership, and thus Britain's new role as a European rather than a world power.

For Norway, entering the EEC meant going back. 'Union', 'occupation', and 'foreign rule' were no unknown terms to the Norwegians, and an EEC entry gave associations to these.

Norway is not just different from Britain in this regard, but also from its Scandinavian counterparts. Denmark and Sweden had ruled over Norway for centuries, and these unions were never forgotten. Because of this, it is interesting that there was more opposition towards the EEC than towards Scandinavian or Nordic cooperation. The reason for this is likely because the EEC required membership and had its own policies. It was more similar to a federate than Nordic cooperation was. Culturally, EEC membership would be a step back, and a sacrifice of their hard-earned independence. A combination of this cultural reason and letting the public decide made Norwegian membership unlikely. If the memory of the past was important to the public, it was important to the political parties.

The memory of the past was not the most important reason for party-based Euroscepticism in neither Britain nor Norway. I have, however, included it because it was important to the public at the time and explains why Britain and Norway have a predisposition for opposition towards Europe. Because the public would never forget the glorious past, or the early hardships, the parties had to take this into consideration. The British government accepted the EEC's demands and became a member in 1973, and thus also accepting that Britain could not return to its former days of glory. The Norwegian government struggled to reach agreement in their EEC negotiations, and they found themselves in this situation because of Britain's application. The European question felt forced upon them, and the public would most likely not support going back to being ruled by foreign powers because their past that had put its mark on them.

The memory of the past can be tied to the countries' exceptionalism. Exceptionalism was still very much relevant during the 1970s and 1980s, whereas the past was long gone. Britain and Norway shared several reasons for distancing them from the European mainland. Both countries were physically far away from the centre of the Community, with Britain being an island nation, and Norway being at the outskirts of the continent. Because of this, the peoples of Britain and Norway would look at Europe, and the EEC, as something different from themselves. Physical distance can, however, not be a major reason for EEC opposition, as both Britain and Norway had close ties to the US. The EEC, under the leadership of France, represented something else than distance; it represented the 'Other', which for Britain and Norway included Catholicism. These two countries, due to their strong Protestant traditions, were unable to relate to the many Catholic countries in the EEC. It is difficult to measure how much impact the memory of the past and the country's exceptionalism had on party-based Euroscepticism. However, they cannot be ignored as they are a part of the countries' history and their national identity.

The countries' national identity played a crucial role for party-based Euroscepticism, and in the EEC negotiations. EEC membership meant accepting the CAP and the CFP. These interventionist policies could be regarded as a political reason for Euroscepticism, but this thesis argues that it was more of a cultural reason, and particularly in Norway. This was a major difference between the countries. Agriculture and fisheries were important in Britain, but it was nowhere near as important to the national identity as it was in Norway. The CAP and the CFP caused great problems for the Norwegian government. Britain eventually accepted the CAP, and the CFP, but the party manifestos from the 1970s and 1980s showed that there was a constant discontent over them. Implementing the CAP and the CFP in Norway was comparable with attacking the farmers and fishermen. Convincing the public was an immensely difficult task for the Norwegian government, and in the end, they were unable to do so. The primary sectors were considered of such a great importance, and the government wanted to protect them from European competition. The CAP and the CFP were unpopular in Norway because the farmers and the fishermen were an important part of the country's national identity. It is not possible to ignore the agricultural or the fisheries sectors in Britain, but they did not make up a great part of the British national identity. Because of this, the CAP and the CFP were regarded to be of a mainly economic and political matter in Britain.

8.4. Political Reasons: The Comparison

In addition to the cultural reasons for party-based Euroscepticism, there were also political reasons. The political systems of the two countries differ, and this thesis has argued that this affected party-based Euroscepticism in different ways. Because Norway was, and still is, prone to coalition governments, Euroscepticism was a quite powerful force. A small Eurosceptic party could easily topple the government. Because the 1972 referendum results made Euroscepticism mainstream and accepted by all the parties as a status quo, the Eurosceptic parties were the ones with all the power. Høyre attempted to move towards EEC membership in 1990, and was easily stopped by Senterpartiet. No matter which parties are cooperating, it seems they will always be kept in check by the Eurosceptics regarding the European question.

Britain has rarely had coalitions, but majority governments have had their effect on Euroscepticism as well. This type of government has given Euroscepticism a dividing effect. Unlike Norway, Euroscepticism has not been a reason for the party to leave office, but it has caused prime ministers and their governments to resign due to internal disagreements within the party. Additionally, parties with internal disagreements have been able to stay in

government, suggesting that leaving office as a result of Euroscepticism happened on an individual level, and not on party level. This is unique for Britain, and can be exemplified through Macmillan's Night of the Long Knives in 1962 and Thatcher resigning when challenged for leadership in 1990. It is important to note that Macmillan did not resign, but many anti-EEC Conservatives were removed from office. In both cases, the Conservative Party continued to stay in office. Thus, the amount of power party-based Euroscepticism had was a major difference between Britain and Norway during the time period covered in this thesis. Party-based Euroscepticism never got a grip on mainstream British politics, and in cases of disagreements, the Eurosceptics were the losing part as was the case with Thatcher, the left faction of Labour in the mid-1970s, and Labour during its hard Eurosceptic phase in the early 1980s. This difference between Britain and Norway can be credited to the referendum results.

The referenda of Britain and Norway had different outcomes, and led to a mainstreaming of Euroscepticism in the Norwegian political parties, and a mainstreaming of a pro-European attitude in the British parties. The Community became an irrelevant topic in Norway, and all parties, regardless of pre-referendum stance, were now locked in a status quo. A step towards the EEC was made by Brundtland and her government in the mid-1980s when the SEA was introduced, and required a closer integration from non-members. The European question had been largely ignored, but it never went away. The parties had entered a stage of 'no membership' after 1972, one that was Eurosceptic by default. Despite this, they never changed their European policies, so the opposition seen in the more pro-EEC and the neutral parties induced by the referendum results only applied to the membership issue. In Britain, party-based Euroscepticism was more fluctuating, and both Labour and the Conservatives have at some point been the pro-EEC party, but have also been opposing the Community. Because the British referendum results had showed a 'remain' majority, a pro-EEC stance was necessary to stay in office. Thatcher had to resign because members from her own party felt she was damaging the Conservatives' image with her growing discontent over the Community.

The Norwegian government held a referendum before accession, but this was not the case in Britain where the public was asked if they wanted Britain to remain a full member of the EEC. Despite being referenda held for different reasons, they both had an effect upon the countries' party-based Euroscepticism, and as I have argued, they are one of the major reasons for the difference between British and Norwegian Euroscepticism during the 1970s and 1980s. The results showed the will of the public, or at least of the majority, and the political parties adapted their European policy to appeal to the majority of the voters.

8.5. Conclusion

In this thesis, I have compared party-based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s, and found what I regard to be the major differences. These have been presented in chapter six and seven. Furthermore, I have also presented the main reasons for why party-based Euroscepticism differed in the two countries during this time. The three reasons for this phenomenon were, firstly, the national identity's compatibility with EEC membership. This entails the memory of the past, exceptionalism, and traditions. Secondly, the type of government's effect on Euroscepticism. Party-based Euroscepticism could potentially be extremely powerful in coalition situations regardless of the party's size, and had a splitting effect on majority governments, albeit in most cases, an unpopular one. Finally, the referenda held in both countries. The referendum results created a standard for attitude towards the Community not only amongst the public, but also for the political parties that aimed for European policies that appealed to voters.

8.6. Suggestions for Further Research

This thesis has showed that national identity, type of government, and referenda play important roles in British and Norwegian party-based Euroscepticism, and caused the phenomenon to affect the countries differently during the 1970s and 1980s. Further research could include different research objects, that is, other countries. And by doing this, see if the reasons for party-based Euroscepticism found in this thesis can be found elsewhere. It is also possible that Britain and Norway are unique cases, and stand out from the rest of the European countries. A potential new study could include both Britain and Norway, and add more European countries as an extended version of this study, or keep the objects of study down to two. As an example, Britain could be compared to another EEC/EU member, or to one of the European non-members to see if they have different or similar reasons for party-based Euroscepticism. By using comparative research, the findings on the local level, party-based Euroscepticism in a country, might give new insight into party-based Euroscepticism as a phenomenon.

It is also possible to extend the time period covered in this thesis. Two decades make up only a small part of the countries' EEC/EU history, and there is undoubtedly more to find. As shown in chapter four, both Britain and Norway have a long history with Europe, and it could be interesting to see if party-based Euroscepticism in the 1970s and 1980s is different from the time periods preceding and following these. Doing so will not only provide valuable new insight into Euroscepticism as a phenomenon, but also give a deeper understanding of these countries'

EEC/EU history. No comparative studies of British and Norwegian party-based Euroscepticism have been done earlier, and further research could reveal if national identity, type of government, and referenda were the causes before the 1970s, and after the 1980s, or if these are unique to the 1970s and 1980s. The framework developed in my thesis, national identity, the type of government, and the referenda as reasons for party-based Euroscepticism, can enable further comparative studies of Britain and Norway during other time periods, and also for comparative studies with different research objects.

Literature

9.1. Primary Sources

"29. oktober 1990". *Dagsrevyen*. NRK. 29 October, 1990. Television broadcast.

Conservative Party Manifestos. "1970 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto: A Better Tomorrow". *Conservative Party Manifestos*. Conservative Party Manifestos. Accessed 29 April, 2019. http://www.conservativemanifesto.com/1970/1970-conservative-manifesto.shtml.

Conservative Party Manifestos. "1979 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto". *Conservative Party Manifestos*. Conservative Party Manifestos. Accessed 29 April, 2019. http://www.conservativemanifesto.com/1979/1979-conservative-manifesto.shtml.

Conservative Party Manifestos. "1983 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto". *Conservative Party Manifestos*. Conservative Party Manifestos. Accessed 29 April, 2019. http://www.conservativemanifesto.com/1983/1983-conservative-manifesto.shtml.

Conservative Party Manifestos. "February 1974 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto: Firm Action for a Fair Britain". *Conservative Party Manifestos*. Conservative Party Manifestos. Accessed 29 April, 2019. http://www.conservativemanifesto.com/1974/Feb/february-1974-conservative-manifesto.shtml.

Conservative Party Manifestos. "October 1974 Conservative Party General Election Manifesto: Putting Britain First". *Conservative Party Manifestos*. Conservative Party Manifestos. Accessed 29 April, 2019. http://www.conservativemanifesto.com/1974/Oct/october-1974-conservative-manifesto.shtml.

Gaitskell, Hugh. "Speech at the Annual Labour Party Conference". Speech, Sports Stadium, West Street, Brighton, 3 October, 1962. CVCE. https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/1/1/05f2996b-000b-4576-8b42-8069033a16f9/publishable_en.pdf.

Heath, Edward. *The Course of My Life: My Autobiography*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1998.

Labour Party Manifestos. “1964 Labour Party Election Manifesto: The New Britain”. *Labour Party Manifestos*. Labour Party Manifestos. Accessed 29 April, 2019. http://labourmanifesto.com/1964/1964-labour-manifesto.shtml.

Labour Party Manifestos. “1970 Labour Party Manifesto: Now Britain’s Strong – Let’s Make It Great to Live In”. *Labour Party Manifestos*. Labour Party Manifestos. Accessed 29 April, 2019. http://labourmanifesto.com/1970/1970-labour-manifesto.shtml.

Labour Party Manifestos. “1983 Labour Party Manifesto”. *Labour Party Manifestos*. Labour Party Manifestos. Accessed 29 April, 2019. http://labourmanifesto.com/1983/1983-labour-manifesto.shtml.

Labour Party Manifestos. “1987 Labour Party Manifesto: ‘Britain Will Win with Labour’”. *Labour Party Manifestos*. Labour Party Manifestos. Accessed 3 May, 2019. http://labourmanifesto.com/1987/1987-labour-manifesto.shtml.

Labour Party Manifestos. “February 1974 Labour Party Manifesto: Let Us Work Together – Labour’s Way Out of the Crisis”. *Labour Party Manifestos*. Labour Party Manifestos. Accessed 29 April, 2019. http://labourmanifesto.com/1974/Feb/1974-feb-labour-manifesto.shtml.

Labour Party Manifestos. “October 1974 Labour Party Manifesto: Britain Will Win With Labour”. *Labour Party Manifestos*. Labour Party Manifestos. Accessed 29 April, 2019. http://labourmanifesto.com/1974/Oct/1974-oct-labour-manifesto.shtml.

Partidokumentarkivet. “4 år med Kristelig Folkeparti: Program ved stortingsvalget 11. sept. 1961”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 5 February, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:51&fq=aarstall:1961&fq=.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Arbeiderpartiet: Du skal vita kva det gjeld: solidaritet, arbeid, miljø: Arbeidsprogram 1978 – 81”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 26 March, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:21&fq=aarstall:1977.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Fremskrittspartiet: Fremtiden skapes – den vedtas ikke (Program 1989-1993)”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 5 February, 2019.

http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=aarstall:1989&fq=partikode:81.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Høyres hovedprogram og arbeidsprogram 1969 – 73: Et samfunn i samarbeid”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 26 March, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=aarstall:1969&fq=partikode:71&fq=.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Høyres program: Stortingsvalget 1973”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 25 April, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:71&fq=aarstall:1973.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Krav til innsats for felles framtid: Arbeidsprogram for Det norske arbeiderparti 1990-1993”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 16 April, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:21&fq=aarstall:1989&fq=.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Kristelig Folkeparti 1969-1973: Valgprogram”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 5 February, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:51&fq=aarstall:1969.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Kristelig Folkeparti: Program for stortingsperioden 1973 – 77”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 5 February, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:51&fq=aarstall:1973&fq=.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Ny vekst for Norge: Arbeiderpartiet: 86-89 Arbeidsprogram”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 16 April, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:21&fq=aarstall:1985&fq=.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Ny vilje, ny fremgang: Høyres program 1989-1993”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 5 May, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=partikode:71&fq=aarstall:1989.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Politikk for en ny tid: Vekst-Trygghet-Trivsel: Arbeidsprogram for Det norske Arbeiderparti 1970-1973 vedtatt på landsmøtet 11.-14. mai 1969”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 26 March, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:21&fq=aarstall:1969.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Program 1981 – 85: Senterpartiet”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 27 March, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:41&fq=aarstall:1981&fq=.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Program for Sosialistisk Venstrepartis arbeid i Stortinget 1977 – 1981”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 27 March, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=aarstall:1977&fq=partikode:14.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Program for Sosialistisk Venstrepartis arbeid i stortinget 1981-1985”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 12 February, 2019. https://nsd.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=aarstall:1981&fq=partikode:14&fq=.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Program: Stortingsvalget 73: Senterpartiet”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 27 March, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:41&fq=aarstall:1973.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Sosialistisk Folkepartis arbeidsprogram 1961-1964: Vedtatt på 1. landsmøte 17-18 juni 1961”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 26 May, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:14&fq=aarstall:1961.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Sosialistisk Folkepartis arbeidsprogram 1965 – 69”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 1 April, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:14&fq=aarstall:1965.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Sosialistisk Venstreparti arbeidsprogram 1989 – 93”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 26 May, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:14&fq=aarstall:1989&fq=.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Trygghet for folket: Det norske Arbeiderpartis arbeidsprogram for perioden 1974 – 77”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 26 March, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=partikode:21&fq=aarstall:1973.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Venstres arbeidsprogram 1977 - 81”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 5 May, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=partikode:31&fq=aarstall:1977&fq=.

Partidokumentarkivet. “Venstres arbeidsprogram: 1981 – 1985”. *Data om det politiske system*. Partidokumentarkivet. Accessed 27 March, 2019. http://www.nsd.uib.no/polsys/data/parti/partidokumentarkivet/?q=&rows=10&fq=doktype:2&fq=aarstall:1981&fq=partikode:31&fq=.

PREM 15 (365). “1971 Britain, New Zealand and the EEC: A New Zealand Government Statement”. Printed by The Tweeddale Press Ltd.

PREM 15 (868). “Prospects Following the Norwegian Referendum Summary”. 4 October, 1972.

Stortingstidende inneholdende 134. ordentlige Stortings forhandlinger 1989-1990 forhandlinger i Stortinget. “Erklæring fra Regjeringen”. 52-55.

Syse, Jan P. “Tale til Høyres landsmøte”. Speech, Norway, 3 May, 1990. Regjeringen. https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/smk/vedlegg/taler-og-artikler-av-tidligere-statsministre/jan-p.-syse/1990/tale_til_hoeyres_landsmoete.pdf.

Thatcher, Margaret. “Speech to the College of Europe”. Speech, Bruges, Belgium, 20 September, 1988. Margaret Thatcher Foundation. https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107332.

Wilson, Harold. *A Personal Record: The Labour Government, 1964-1970*. Boston: Little Brown, 1971.

9.2. Secondary Sources

"26. september 1972". *Dagsrevyen*. NRK. 26 September, 1972. Television broadcast.

200 år på 200 minutter. NRK2. 28 February, 2014. Television broadcast.

Almlid, Geir Ketil. "Splittelse og dobbeltspill: Borten- og Bratteli-regjeringens forhandlinger om EF-medlemskap i 1970-72". *Historisk tidsskrift* 92, no. 2 (2013): 231-259.

Archer, Clive. "Euroscepticism in the Nordic Region". *Journal of European Integration* 22, no. 1 (2000): 87-114.

Baker, David, Andrew Gamble, Nick Randall, and David Seawright. "Euroscepticism in the British Party System: A Source of Fascination, Perplexity, and Sometimes Frustration". In *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscpeticism, Volume 1: Case Studies and Country Surveys*, edited by Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart, 93-116. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Boffey, Daniel. "Cameron Did Not Think EU Referendum Would Happen, Says Tusk". *The Guardian*. 23 June, 2016. Accessed 1 February, 2019. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jan/21/donald-tusk-warned-david-cameron-about-stupid-eu-referendum-bbc.

Buhr, Renee L. "Seizing the Opportunity: Euroscepticism and Extremist Party Success in the Post-Maastricht Era". *Government and Oppositions* 47, no. 4 (2012): 544-573.

Burgess, J. Peter. "What's So European About the European Union?: Legitimacy Between Institution and Identity". *European Journal of Social Theory* 5, no. 4 (2002): 467-481.

Butler, David, and Uwe Kitzinger. *The 1975 Referendum*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1976.

Colley, Linda. "Britishness and Otherness: An Argument". *Journal of British Studies* 31, no. 4 (1992): 309-329.

Cooper, Robert. "Britain and Europe". *International Affairs* 88, no. 6 (2012): 1191-1203.

Crowson, Nicholas J. *The Conservative Party and European Integration since 1945: At the Heart of Europe?*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Daddow, Oliver. "Interpreting the Outsider Tradition in British European Policy Speeches from Thatcher to Cameron". *Journal of Common Market Studies* 53, no. 1 (2015): 71-88.

Daddow, Oliver. “Margaret Thatcher, Tony Blair and the Eurosceptic Tradition in Britain”. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 15, no. 2 (2013): 210-227.

Davis, Richard. “Euroscepticism and Opposition to British Entry into the EEC, 1955-75”. *Revue Française de Civilisation Britannique* 88, no. 2 (2017): 0-15.

Dorey, Peter. “Towards Exit from the EU: The Conservative Party’s Increasing Euroscepticism since the 1980s”. *Politics and Governance* 4, no. 2 (2017): 27-40.

Fontana, Cary, and Craig Parsons. “’One Woman’s Prejudice’: Did Margaret Thatcher Cause Britain’s Anti-Europeanism?”. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 53, no. 1 (2015): 89-105.

Forster, Anthony. “Anti-Europeans, Anti-Marketeers and Eurosceptics: The Evolution and Influence of Labour and Conservative Opposition to Europe”. *The Political Quarterly* 73, no. 3 (2002): 299-308.

Forster, Anthony. *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties since 1945*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Frøland, Hans Otto. “Advancing Ambiguity: On Norway’s Application for EEC-membership in 1962”. In *National Interests and the EEC/EC/EU*, edited by Svein Dahl, 55-76. Trondheim: Tapir Publishers, 1999.

George, Stephen. “Britain: Anatomy of a Eurosceptic State”. *Journal of European Integration* 22, no. 1 (2000): 15-33.

Geyer, Robert, and Duane Swank. “Rejecting the European Union: Norwegian Social Democratic Opposition to the EU in the 1990s”. *Party Politics* 3, no. 4 (1997): 549-562.

Green, S.J.D. “Letter from London: Britain in Europe: Half-hearted and Ambivalent Forever?”. *The Antioch Review* 58, no. 1 (2000), 5-20.

Gifford, Chris. *The Making of Eurosceptic Britain*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2014.

Gifford, Chris. *The Making of Eurosceptic Britain: Identity and Economy in a Post-Imperial State*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008.

Gilddon, Paul Martin. “The Labour Government and the Battle for Public Opinion in the 1975 Referendum on the European Community”. *Contemporary British History* 31, no. 1 (2017): 91-113.

Grob-Fitzgibbon, Benjamin. *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Guéguen, Daniel. "British Have Always Detested the CAP: What Now, with UKAP". *Euractiv*. 22 January, 2018. Accessed 25 March, 2019. https://www.euractiv.com/section/agriculture-food/opinion/british-have-always-detested-the-cap-what-now-with-ukap/.

Gül, Serkan. "Method and Practice in Comparative History". *Journal of Black Sea Studies: Ankara* 7, no. 26 (2010): 143-158.

Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard. "Comparative History – A Contested Method". *Historisk Tidsskrift (Sweden)* 127, no. 4 (2007): 697-716.

Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard, and Jürgen Kocka. "Comparative History: Methods, Aims, Problems". In *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective*, edited by Deborah Cohen and Maura O'Connor, 23-40. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Hill, Alette Olin, Boyd H. Hill, and Jr. "Marc Bloch and Comparative History". *The American Historical Review* 85, no. 4 (1980): 828-846.

Kirby, Andrew M., and Peter J. Taylor. "A Geographical Analysis of the Voting Pattern in the EEC Referendum, 5 June 1975". *Regional Studies* 10, no. 2 (1976): 183-191.

Kopecký, Petr, and Cas Mudde. "The Two Sides of Euroscepticism: Party Positions on European Integration in East Central Europe". *European Union Politics* 3, no. 3 (2002): 297-326.

Kristoffersen, Axel. "Norges nei til EF I 1972". *Norgeshistorie*. 31 August, 2017. Accessed 26 March, 2019. https://www.norgeshistorie.no/oljealder-og-overflod/artikler/1945-norges-nei-til-ef-i-1972.html.

Kumar, Krishan. "Britain, England and Europe: Cultures in Contraflow". *European Journal of Social Theory* 6, no. 1 (2003): 5-23.

Leconte, Cécile. "From Pathology to Mainstream Phenomenon: Reviewing the Euroscepticism Debate in Research and Theory". *International Political Science Review* 36, no. 3 (2015): 250-263.

Leconte, Cécile. *Understanding Euroscepticism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Lee, Charles. “The Limits of Party-Based Euroscepticism in Germany”. In *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscpeticism, Volume 1: Case Studies and Country Surveys*, edited by Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart, 16-37. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Lee, Charles. “The Political Opportunity Structure of Euroscepticism: Institutional Setting and Political Agency in European Polities”. In *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscpeticism, Volume 2: Comparative and Theoretical Perspectives*, edited by Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart, 28-51. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Levine, Philippa. “Is Comparative History Possible?”. *History and Theory* 53, no. 3 (2014): 331-347.

Lord, Christopher. *Absent at the Creation, Britain and the Formation of the EC 1950-1952*. Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1996.

Ludlow, N. Piers. “Safeguarding British Identity or Betraying It? The Role of British ‘Tradition’ in the Parliamentary Great Debate on EC Membership, October 1971”. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 53, no. 1 (2015): 18-34.

Macalister, Terry. “Background: What Caused the 1970s Oil Price Shock?”. *The Guardian*. 3 March, 2011. Accessed 25 April, 2019. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2011/mar/03/1970s-oil-price-shock.

Mann, Nyta. “Foot’s Message of Hope to Left”. *BBC News*. 14 July, 2003. Accessed 13 April, 2019. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/3059773.stm.

Marr, Andrew. *A History of Modern Britain*. London: Pan Books, 2017.

May, Alex. “The Commonwealth and Britain’s Turn to Europe, 1945-73”. *The Round Table* 102, no. 1 (2013): 29-39.

May, Alex. “’Commonwealth or Europe?’: Macmillan’s Dilemma, 1961-63”. In *Britain, the Commonwealth and Europe: The Commonwealth and Britain’s Applications to Join the European Communities*, edited by Alex May, 82-110. London: Palgrave Publishers Ltd, 2001.

McDowell, William H. *Historical Research: A Guide for Writers of Dissertations, Theses, Articles and Books*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Melve, Leidulf. “Komparativ historie: Ei utfordring for historiefaget”. *Historisk tidsskrift* 88, no. 1 (2009): 61-80.

Morgan, Denise N., and Timothy V. Rasinski. “The Power and Potential of Primary Sources”. *The Reading Teacher* 65, no. 8 (2012): 584-594.

Neumann, Iver B. “Hvorfor er ikke Norge med i Den europeiske union?”. *Internasjonal politikk* 67, no. 3 (2009): 413-425.

Neumann, Iver B. “This Little Piggy Stayed at Home: Why Norway Is Not a Member of the EU”. In *European Integration and National Identity: The Challenge of the Nordic States*, edited by Lene Hansen, and Ole Wæver. 88-129. London: Routledge, 2002.

NTB. “Massiv norsk EU-motstand”. *Aftenposten*. 30 August, 2014. Accessed 7 February, 2019. https://www.aftenposten.no/norge/i/bK6w5/Massiv-norsk-EU-motstand.

O’Brien, John B. “The Australian Department of Trade and the EEC, 1956-61”. In *Britain, the Commonwealth and Europe: The Commonwealth and Britain’s Applications to Join the European Communities*, edited by Alex May, 39-52. London: Palgrave Publishers Ltd, 2001.

Palmer, R.R., Joel Cotton, and Lloyd Kramer. *A History of Europe in the Modern World*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education, 2014.

Raines, Thomas. “An Island Apart?”. *The World Today* 68, no. 5 (2012): 26-27.

Regjeringen. “Fra frihandelsavtale med EF til EØS”. *Europapolitikk*. 15 April, 2016. Accessed 21 April, 2019. https://www.regjeringen.no/no/tema/europapolitikk/eos1/ef-til-eos/id2458261/.

Regjeringen. “Jan P. Syse: Statsminister 1989-1990”. *Tidligere regjeringer og historie*. 27 December, 2013. Accessed 7 February, 2019. https://www.regjeringen.no/no/om-regjeringa/tidligere-regjeringer-og-historie/historiske-artikler/embeter/statsminister-1814-/jan-peder-syse/id463464/.

Regjeringen. “Jan P. Syses regjering: 16. oktober 1989-3. november 1990”. *Tidligere regjeringer og historie*. Accessed 7 February, 2019. https://www.regjeringen.no/no/om-regjeringa/tidligere-regjeringer-og-historie/sok-i-regjeringer-siden-1814/historiske-regjeringer/regjeringer/jan-p-syses-regjering-1989-1990/id438730/.

Riste, Olav. “The Nordic Angle II: Norway – The Reluctant European”. *The World Today* 44, no. 11 (1988): 193-194.

Riste, Olav. *Norway’s Foreign Relations – A History*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2005.

Sandbrook, Dominic. *State of Emergency: The Way We Were: Britain, 1970-1974*. London: Penguin Books, 2010.

Sanders, David. *Losing an Empire, Finding a Role*. New York: Macmillan Education, 1989.

Saunders, Robert. *Yes to Europe!: The 1975 Referendum and Seventies Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Sciarini, Pascal, and Ola Listhaug. “Single Cases or a Unique Pair? The Swiss and Norwegian ‘No’ to Europe”. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 35, no. 3 (1997): 407-438.

Seierstad, Dag. *Folket sa nei: Norsk EU-motstand frå 1961 til i dag*. Oslo: Samlaget, 2014.

Seymour-Ure, Colin. “Press and Referenda: The Case of the British Referendum of 1975”. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 11, no. 3 (1978): 601-615.

Sewell Jr., William H. “Marc Bloch and the Logic of Comparative History”. *History and Theory* 6, no. 2 (1967): 208-218.

Simensen, Jarle. “Afrika – eliter og omverden”. In *Krig og fred i det lange 20. århundre*, edited by Hilde Henriksen Waage, Rolf Tamnes, and Hanne Hagtvedt, 139-164. Oslo: Cappelen Damm, 2013.

Sitter, Nick. “The European Question and the Norwegian Party System since 1961: The Freezing of a Modern Cleavage or Contingent Opposition?”. In *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscpeticism, Volume 1: Case Studies and Country Surveys*, edited by Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart, 328-347. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Skinner, Marianne Sundlisæter. “Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Egotism? A Multi-level Mixed Methods Investigation”. PhD diss., University of Bath, 2011.

Skogrand, Kjetil. “Allianser i alliansen, 1949-1989”. In *Selvstendig og beskyttet: Det stormaktsgaranterte Norge fra Krimkrigen til NATO*, edited by Roald Berg, 99-113. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2008.

Steinnes, Kristian. “Britain’s EEC Application in 1961”. In *National Interests and the EEC/EC/EU*, edited by Svein Dahl, 39-45. Trondheim: Tapir Publishers, 1999.

Storey, William Kelleher. *Writing History: A Guide for Students*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Stugu, Ola Svein. *Norsk historie etter 1905*. Oslo: Det norske samlaget, 2015.

Sullivan, Larry E. “Coalition”. In *The SAGE Glossary of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*, edited by Larry E. Sullivan, 80. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2009.

Sullivan, Larry E. “Majority Government”. In *The SAGE Glossary of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*, edited by Larry E. Sullivan, 301. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2009.

Szczerbiak, Aleks, and Paul Taggart. “Introduction: Researching Euroscepticism in European Party Systems: A Comparative and Theoretical Research Agenda”. In *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscpeticism, Volume 2: Comparative and Theoretical Perspectives*, edited by Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart, 1-27. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Taggart, Paul, and Aleks Szczerbiak. “Introduction: Opposing Europe? The Politics of Euroscepticism in Europe”. In *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscpeticism, Volume 1: Case Studies and Country Surveys*, edited by Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart, 1-15. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Thorpe, Andrew. *A History of the British Labour Party*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1997.

Topaloff, Liubomir K. *Political Parties and Euroscepticism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Vasilopoulou, Sofia. “Varieties of Euroscepticism: The Case of the European Right”. *Journal of Contemporary European Research* 5, no. 1 (2009): 3-23.

Veccia, Susan H. *Uncovering Our History: Teaching with Primary Sources*. Chicago: American Library Association, 2004.

Wall, Stephen. *The Official History of Britain and the European Community, Volume II: From Rejection to Referendum, 1963-1975*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Wallace, Mark. “Where Are All the Leftwing Eurosceptics”. *The Guardian*. 17 January, 2014. Accessed 1 February, 2019. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jan/17/leftwing-eurosceptics-eu-british-left.

White, Nicholas J. *Decolonisation: The British Experience Since 1945*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2014.

Wright, Oliver. “Brexit: What Is It and Why Are We Having an EU Referendum”. *Independent*. 23 June, 2016. Accessed 1 February, 2019. https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/what-is-brexit-why-is-there-an-eu-referendum-a7042791.html.

Wæver, Ole. “Nordic Nostalgia: Northern Europe after the Cold War”. *International Affairs* 68, no. 1 (1992): 77-102.

Åström, Sverker. “The Nordic Angle I: Sweden’s EC Dilemmas”. *The World Today* 44, no. 11 (1988): 191-193.

Hanne Hestnes Lervik

Party-Based Euroscepticism in Britain and Norway during the 1970s and 1980s: The Political and Cultural Reasons

NTNU
Norwegian University of
Science and Technology