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Introduction

As Nazi Germany successfully attacked country after country, resistance movements all over Europe emerged to combat the enemy. Resistance included many activities. The Belgian resistance developed numerous “escape lines” and helped liberate Belgium. The Netherlands had massive worker strikes. In France, resistance members altered shipping manifests, changed labels on cargo, and continually mixed up the German supply lines. Denmark successfully saved most of its Jewish population. Although resistance movements were similar, the types of activities varied and were unique to each country.

Historians have sometimes overlooked resistance as a component of warfare, for these movements are confusing and usually difficult to document. Frequently, resistance operations have many components, each person plays only a small role and the stories of average men and women go untold. Those who played larger roles had their stories told after the war, but sometimes these stories turned into books of hero worship, not accurate biographies. Some government documents are still classified, and the story of resistance is still subject to political manipulation and myth making. In addition, because of the clandestine nature of underground movements, some events were never recorded. Unlike information from other government branches, documentation of resistance movements was discouraged, especially by the underground in occupied countries, for fear that it would fall into the enemy’s hands. When historians do locate information, names have often been changed or multiple aliases used. All of these elements make evidence on resistance difficult to find and to use.
Resistance information is also highly political. After a war, people exaggerate and all of a sudden the entire population claims to have always sided with the victors. In secret warfare, it is easy for people to embellish their roles and to convince others that they helped the winning side during the war. The occupied populace frequently claims that collaboration was small and that everyone was a part of the opposition. People do this to become heroes or in some cases to avoid discovery of collaboration and possibly persecution, investigation and prosecution by the winning governments. The tendency for exaggeration and for individuals to side with the victors makes some information, especially if written immediately after the war, suspect.

In addition, governments have a tendency to propagandize. The historians of countries that win wars write the history of the conflict and their political views develop as truth, in part because historians initially have access to the memoirs of citizens who fought for the winning side, not the memoirs of those who fought and collaborated with the losing side. Often those people who collaborated with the losing countries are dead or imprisoned and those who are free do not want to publicize their traitorous acts. Historians sometimes have access to the losing countries’ archives but have limited access to government documents on the winning side and are culpable for some myth making and celebratory writing. Although all historians strive for accuracy, they cannot separate themselves from the atmosphere of the contemporary culture around them. For example, we now know that World War II resistance in France was not nearly as prevalent as originally thought and that collaboration was significant.
How do we measure resistance? How do we show the impact of something so elusive and how do we judge the effect on morale? How do we measure the success of propaganda and judge the significance of the created illusion? How do we measure the cost of sabotage versus its benefits? How few deaths make sabotage worthwhile? Some questions are not answerable. Knut Haukelid, a Norwegian saboteur, stated, “Of all the BUTS and IFS which follow all historical discussions, none are so unstable and encumbered with variable values as those which come as an aftermath of war.”

The significance of resistance is impossible to measure, but resistance fighting—part propaganda, part psychology—should not be underestimated as a component of war. Dwight D. Eisenhower said, “Resistance in France alone was the equivalent of five extra divisions.”

Norway played a unique role in the resistance effort during World War II. As the first West European country occupied by Germany and one of the last countries liberated, Norway had one of the longest wartime resistance movements. Officially, Norway never surrendered to Germany. The Norwegian government-in-exile had the legitimacy and money to defy the Nazis. King Håkon VII also encouraged defiance and became a rallying point for his people. Norway’s geographic location helped the resistance, for the country’s 1,000-mile border with neutral Sweden and over 13,600 miles of coastline with access to England over the Norwegian Sea made it difficult for the Nazis to contain the conquered Norwegians. Germany could not truly occupy the

---

1Knut Haukelid, Ski against the Atom (Minot, ND: North America Heritage Press, 1989), 241.
3Countries such as Denmark were allowed to keep their own government institutions and retained some freedoms unlike Norway, which was subjected to absolute occupation relatively quickly.
vast isolated areas of Norway, where Norwegians had family cabins in the mountains. While radio operators hid and Great Britain parachuted in supplies, the terrain and dispersion of the population allowed the resistance to hide and escape the Nazis. During the winter months, hours and at times days of darkness helped the resistance carry out its operations. No other occupied country had all of these advantages.

Norway's sabotage effort developed with the help of its resistance movement, which grew out of both the civilian and military populations. Civilian resistance and civil disobedience included labor, churches, and amateur athletes. The Norwegian military organized a home front organization that civilians joined throughout the country. Although only a small percentage of the population officially joined a resistance group, a large percentage of the population supported their king, the government-in-exile and the resistance movement. The exact number of active participants in the Norwegian resistance is not known. Norwegian resistance was significantly higher than in many other countries: compared to the Netherlands, which had only about .06 percent of its population involved with resistance, we know Norway's resistance was considerably higher.\(^4\) Overall, historians estimate that no more than 2 percent of any nation's population was actively involved in resistance.\(^5\)

The slowly growing Norwegian domestic resistance was successfully involved in numerous activities of defiance and civil disobedience but was limited to actions that were more passive. A few Norwegians wanted more powerful action. Sabotage was the last form of resistance to take place because it had the greatest risks, needed the most training and required special equipment. The Norwegians needed external

help to conduct aggressive resistance and Norway’s allies were anxious to combat the mutual enemy.

Although getting outside help was necessary, it was not always popular because using external help meant giving up control and required a certain degree of trust. In 1940, only Britain remained unoccupied and at war with Germany, so Norway had to accept British help on British terms. Norwegian and British goals were different and their competing agendas started a debate not only between the British and Norwegian government-in-exile, but also between Britain and the local resistance at home. A power struggle developed because it was impossible to satisfy all parties involved. Clarifying this struggle is difficult not only because of all the groups involved, but also because limited documentation and research is available on the political debate.

Defining and documenting the success of sabotage has similar problems. Norwegian resistance and sabotage efforts are not as well documented in the early years as they were as the later years, making it more difficult to make comparisons and judgments on the total sabotage efforts. As late as 1993, no more than 15 percent of the British Special Operations Executive (SOE) documentation had been released to the public. Only in recent years have government documents been available to historians. Since the SOE conducted the majority of Norwegian sabotage operations, firm conclusions are difficult to reach.

Agents involved in sabotage composed the smallest group within the wider resistance movement, but despite the tiny numbers, Norwegian sabotage operations

---

were important. The price of occupying Norway was high. The cost for occupying Denmark was 22 percent of the national income per annum and for Belgium 52 percent, while for Norway it was 67 percent.\(^7\) This cost is directly related to sabotage. The Norwegian resistance destroyed more property and caused more damage to its economy than other resistance movements.

The Norwegian resistance was very important to the outcome of World War II because of a key sabotage operation. Germany was working on an atomic bomb. Although historians still debate the success of the German atomic program, the Germans no doubt would have used heavy water as moderator for their atomic reaction. The Norsk Hydro plant in Rjukan, Norway, produced over 99 percent of the world's heavy water. The destruction of this heavy water supply was one of the most important acts of sabotage by the allies during World War II.

Although civilian resistance in Norway was possible without foreign help, Great Britain was the catalyst for and the facilitator of Norwegian sabotage. The British SOE made Norwegian sabotage both possible and successful: Norwegians were not able, nor were they inclined, to sabotage the Nazis without external help. The SOE controlled, trained, and supplied Norwegian sabotage operations and helped create the illusion of British military actions, which was necessary to safeguard the civilian population.

\(^7\) The author of the article included no information on how the numbers were calculated. Bob Moore, ed., *Resistance in Western Europe* (New York: Berg, 2000), 96.
Chapter 1

Invasion, Nazi Goals, and the Origins of Resistance

In 1940, Norway lived in its own isolated world. The Storting, or the Norwegian government, emphasized economic, political and social progress but did little in the area of defense.\(^1\) Government officials mostly believed in neutrality. In 1902, the Storting unanimously voted to seek neutral status to emulate Belgium and Switzerland. After Norway became independent from Sweden in 1905, it continued this policy and successfully remained neutral throughout World War I.\(^2\) With neighboring Sweden also neutral, Norwegians assumed that Scandinavian neutrality would be respected and their country left alone. Major General Bjørn Christophersen summarized what he learned from 1940:

> Warfare makes people experience that which they never ought to forget. Let us mention the most important: that people desire to live in peace, to be in and for themselves without protection against attack.\(^3\)

Members of the Norwegian government therefore failed to recognize any danger in the 1930s; they assumed that no country would attack Norway. Those who recognized the danger generally believed that Great Britain and Germany were equally dangerous. King Håkon VII was one of the few people in Norway who understood that even neutral countries should have a good defense.

Håkon was born on August 3, 1872, in Charlottenlund, Denmark. Originally named Prince Charles, he was the second son of Frederik VIII, king of Denmark, and

\(^1\) François Kersaudy, *Norway 1940* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990), 10.
\(^3\) Generalmajor Bjørn Christophersen, *Krigen i Norge 1940 (War in Norway 1940)* (Bergen: Forsvarets krigshistoriske avdeling, 1965), 29.
Louise Josephine Eugenie of Sweden. He married Maude Charlotte Mary, a daughter of the British king Edward VII, at Buckingham Palace on July 22, 1896. When Norway became independent from Sweden in 1905, the newly elected Storting asked Prince Charles to be Norway's new king. Giving up his role as a naval officer, he accepted and was crowned in 1906.

King Håkon took his role as the new Norwegian king with great pride and sincerity; consequently, he became well liked by his subjects. He took an interest in political affairs and had great concerns about Norway's lack of defenses. According to Kersaudy, King Håkon told British Admiral Sir John Kelly, "If Hitler comes to power in Germany and manages to hold onto it, then we shall have a war in Europe before another decade is over." Thus, the king tried to exert pressure on the Storting to improve national defense, but the Norwegian Constitution strictly limited the king's power and the Storting ignored him. Even when the naval chief of staff told the press in January 1939 that the navy was "worse off than in 1914, both in men and in equipment," the Storting refused to improve security believing that Norwegian neutrality would be honored.

Germany and Great Britain both understood that Norway was strategically important and feared that Norwegian neutrality would help the other side or, worse yet, that the enemy would control Norway. Winston Churchill went a step further: "No other measure...gives so good a chance of abridging the waste and destruction

---

5 Cited in Ibid., 12.
of the conflict, or of perhaps preventing the vast slaughters which will attend the
grapple of the main armies [...] The ore for Narvik must be stopped . . .  

Besides the strategic location of the Norwegian land, Great Britain’s survival
depended on keeping sea-lanes open, which meant ensuring continued access to the
North Sea and the Norwegian Sea. With these aims in mind, the British planned to
release mines and to take over of some key port cities in Norway, Sweden and
Finland, but it is unclear if occupation would actually have taken place. After
numerous urgings from Churchill, Parliament approved mining Narvik, which was
accomplished on April 8, 1940. Germany too deemed it necessary to control Narvik
and the Germans arrived on April 9.

The small country of Norway, which had a population of only 2,810,000
people at the beginning of World War II, was geographically important for the
Germans to control as well. In October 1939, German naval leadership discussed the
need for bases in France and Norway for the coming war against England. Besides
actual bases, the Germans wanted to protect their ports in the Baltic Sea by blocking
allied access. As long as Sweden remained neutral, Germany only had to control
Norway and Denmark to maintain control of the Baltic. The Norwegian coastline and
shipping industry were also key because Germany received over 80 percent of its iron
ore from Sweden. For much of the year, the iron ore was shipped from Luleå,
Sweden, a northern port in the Gulf of Bothnia, but during the winter months when

---

6 Cited in Ibid., 20. (Brackets in original)
8 Kersaudy, *Norway 1940*, 56.
9 Gerhard Weinberg, *A World at Arms: A Global History of World War II* (New York:
this port froze the alternative port of Narvik, Norway, was used. The delivery of
Swedish iron ore had to continue in order for Germany to win the war.

Germany invaded neutral Norway and Denmark on April 9, 1940. The Hoff
children remembered, “When we awoke that morning, we could hear the sounds of
the troops marching in the streets. They were making their presence known as
dramatically as they could.” The attack on Norway was the first in history to include
land, air, and sea. German ships and submarines had been moving toward Norway
in the preceding days, which should have alerted the Norwegian military, but did not.
Near Oslo, a whaling vessel sent a warning a few hours before the actual attack, but
the Norwegian military responded by calling up the troops by mail. Overall, military
resistance was weak and many harbors gave up without a fight.

By a twist of fate, fog in Denmark stopped German paratroopers from flying
in. This lack of air support and a cannon shot changed the entire outcome of
Norway’s war effort. The Norwegians sank the German warship Blücher in Oslo
Fjord, which gave the Storting, Prime Minister Johan Nygaardsvold and the
Norwegian royal family time to escape to nearby Elverum, where, unbeknownst to
the Norwegian people, King Hakon and the government issued a decree declaring
that they would not cooperate with the Germans.

---

10 Kersaudy, Norway 1940, 17.
11 “April 9, the whole manoeuvre was explained to the world as a step taken by a kind friend
in the best interests of Norway herself. German troops had entered Norwegian soil ‘not in hostile
spirit,’ said the German Government on the morning of April 9.” New York Times, 28 April 1940.
12 Catherine Hoff Mount and Karen Hoff Lafnear wrote Six Years to Sunrise. In this book,
they published the letters between their mother living in Bergen, Norway and their father living in
Detroit, Michigan, as well as their own reactions of what they remember from the time.
13 Mount, Lafnear, and Knitter, Six Years to Sunrise, 72.
14 Nation to Nation. “Battline Invasion of Norway,” prod. and dir. Sherman Grinberg, 30
15 Kathleen Stokker, Folklore Fights the Nazis: Humor in Occupied Norway, 1940-1945
Great Britain responded to the invasion almost immediately and joined in the effort to keep Norway free. The Foreign Office cabled, “His Majesty’s Government have [sic] decided forthwith to extend full aid to Norway, and will fight now in full association with them [. . .] HM’s Government are taking immediate steps to deal with German invasion . . .” 16 The British response lacked vitality; however, as Max Manus, a sabotage-resistance fighter, put it, “As far as we in Norway could see the British weren’t taking [the war] too seriously.” 17

On the same day as the attack on Norway, Vidkun Abraham Laruitz Jonssøn Quisling, the founder of the Nasjonal Samling (NS), or the Norwegian Nazi party, appointed himself the leader of Norway over the radio. Many Norwegian citizens were unfamiliar with the NS leader. Norwegians around the world took notice of Quisling for the first time when he declared himself Norway’s leader. “‘Who was Quisling?’ No one on board knew much about him” were comments made on the ship Livard. 18 If Norwegians had heard of Quisling, they did not consider him a major political player. Almost everyone thought Quisling had betrayed Norway and did not support him — a feeling that grew as the war continued.

Quisling was born on July 18, 1887, in the province of Telemark. His father was a clergyman. This young man was a loner, which coincided with his preoccupation that everyone would betray him. He was an extremely smart child and when he was twelve he invented a mathematical demonstration that is still taught in Norwegian schools today. He graduated at the age of 24 from the military academy

---

16 Cited in Kersaudy, Norway 1940, 75. (Brackets in Kersaudy)
with the highest marks ever granted. He was an officer on the General Staff between 1911 and 1923. Fluent in Russian, he served as a military attaché in the Soviet Union and became the liaison between the British and the Soviet governments when Great Britain broke off relations in 1917. In 1922, Quisling organized foreign aid to help Ukraine, which was devastated by war and famine. He returned to Norway in 1930.

Quisling became the Minister of Defense on May 12, 1931 and served until the end of that coalition government on March 3, 1933. He then organized and founded the fascist Nasjonal Samling party on May 17. The NS was never popular and never elected a single representative to national government. During the first elections in 1933, the Nasjonal Samling party received 2.2 percent of the vote, but by 1936, the last free election, the NS received only 1.84 percent of the vote. In fact, when the Nazis invaded, the NS was losing popularity and only had about 5,000 members.

Hitler was not prepared for Quisling’s seizure of power, but chose not to question Quisling’s authority publicly. That the Germans left Quisling in power was unique, for Hitler usually placed his own people directly or indirectly in charge.

The Nazis did try to limit Quisling’s power by stalling the official establishment of a

---

19 Kersaudy, Norway 1940, 39.
21 Kersaudy, Norway 1940, 39.
22 May 17th is Norway’s Independence Day.
23 Abrahmasen, Norway’s Response to the Holocaust, 46-47.
24 Quisling had been to Germany in December to convince Hitler that the Nazis would receive a good reception in Norway. However, Quisling never discussed, nor was it agreed upon, that he would become the Nazi leader in Norway. Once Quisling appointed himself over the radio, Hitler decided to leave him as a figurehead but that the real power would be left in the German command of Josef Terboven.
25 Moore, ed., Resistance in Western Europe, 251.
Nazi government. By keeping the ‘temporary government’ in place, they were able to keep most of the leadership in the hands of German Josef Terboven. It was not until February 1, 1942, that Germany formally recognized new “ministers” and Terboven appointed Vidkun Quisling as Minister President.  

The Nazis made few administrative changes in the first days of the war mainly because Germany hoped to befriend the Norwegians. During this time, the Nazis had only one major goal: to capture Norway’s gold reserves. The Norwegian government stored its gold, an equivalent of a half billion dollars, in the Bank of Norway. Georg Stabell, a bank bookkeeper, remembers that the “first thing the Germans did after the bombing was to come to the Bank of Norway to get in touch with the gold, but there was no gold in the bank.” When the Germans invaded, the bankers decided to get the gold out of Oslo and on invasion day, April 9, Georg Stabell and a half-dozen other bank employees loaded 58 tons of gold onto 23 trucks destined for Lillehamer. Never knowing where the Germans were or what they planned next made it a difficult journey. After playing hide and seek with the Germans all the way, the gold reached Lillehamer. An engineer named Fredrik Haslund took over the arrangements for the gold; his goal became getting the gold out of Norway to keep it safe. The British asked the Norwegians to hand over the gold (as well as the merchant fleet) for the

27 In 2002 dollars.
duration of the war, but the Norwegians rejected this request and instead negotiated successfully for British protection of the gold.\(^{29}\)

From Lillehamer, Haslund arranged to have soldiers transport the gold by train to the port city of Åndalsnes. When the soldiers reached Åndalsnes the Germans were bombing the city and the Norwegians team was only able to get about one-third of the gold onto a British cruiser before it had to leave for safety. Haslund and his helpers loaded the remaining 42 tons of gold onto trucks once more. He planned to have the gold shipped out at Molde with the royal family. When they arrived, the royal family had already fled because the Nazis had been tipped off to their whereabouts. Nevertheless, Haslund was able to get 27 more tons on a ship to Great Britain.

The Norwegians desperately wanted to get the remaining gold out of Norway. Nordhal Grieg, a crew member, wrote in his journal, "In a strange way we felt our fate was bound up with the gold...Our cargo had its own secret life, it would enable Norway to buy arms, resurrect its army to regain its freedom."\(^{30}\) They loaded the remaining 15 tons onto an old steamer, but the steamer was an easy target for German U-boats. Next, they moved the gold onto numerous fishing boats to head north up the coast. The group continually tried to get in touch with Great Britain; it was not until 500 miles later that they loaded the remaining gold in Tromsø. Little did the bankers know when they started loading the trucks on April 9 that the entire journey would


\(^{30}\) "Norway's Gold"
take four months, of which two and a half were under German occupation, and traverse over 6,000 miles.

After the last of the gold reached England safely, Haslund wanted the gold transported to the United States and Canada for safekeeping. 31 Haslund equipped the gold with flotation devices and loaded the bullion onto several ships. All but one reached North America without a mishap. The Nazis managed to sink one gold-carrying ship, but the gold floated and the allies recovered it. This cargo, too, reached North America safely. The Norwegian government used this gold to finance resistance and sabotage. 32

While this small group of soldiers took four months to secure the Norwegian gold, most other soldiers continued to fight for control of their country. Norwegians civilians were in shock. Initially, it was a time of great confusion and Norwegians were unsure about what was happening in other parts of the country. As one sailor aboard the Livard put it, “An incredible report was flying round the world—the Germans had invaded Norway and Quisling was in power.” 33 As the author of the book Flight from Dakar summarizes, “The thought was absurd. Their countrymen at home were no doubt equally paralyzed.” 34 A few Norwegians joined up with Quisling and the Nazis, but most were unsure of how to respond. Some people were fearful of not joining the NS party but also hesitated to join the invaders. Others felt abandoned by their government and uncertain of the king. Still others wanted to join in defending Norway but did not know which way to turn.

31 The British also shipped their gold to Canada in June 1940. Weinberg, World in the Balance, 11.
32 Eventually, this money was used to rebuild Norway after the war. “Norway’s Gold,”
33 Hauge and Hartmann, Flight from Dakar, 13.
34 Ibid.
The occupation was successful. On April 24, 1940, Hitler appointed *Reichskommissar* Josef Terboven to control Norway; he would be the man with real control, while Quisling maintained some noticeable power. Terboven was a protégé of Herman Goering and had been stationed in the Rhineland as Hitler’s *Gauleiter* in Essen. All accounts describe Terboven as ruthless, brutal, and lacking in morals. As J. E. Bell of the British Consul General wrote,

> He was a true fanatic, a man who should not be underestimated. He can be both courageous and ruthless. I think he entirely believes the Nazi creed and the Führer is to him something of a prophet.

This was the man in whom Hitler invested absolute power to control Norway.

Hitler believed that the Third Reich would be an empire of a thousand years because of the superiority of Nazi doctrine and its people. This empire intended to remove unwanted people and to rely on the superior Aryan race. Although many of the countries invaded by Germany included “undesirables,” Norway for the most part did not fall into this category. Blonde, blue-eyed Norwegians were the “racial type” the Nazis were looking for. Hitler thought that the Norwegians would eventually be part of the Nazi party and would help the empire willingly. Thus, the German policy aimed at quietly forcing the acceptance of the new government and Nazi ideals.

Meanwhile, the Norwegian military struggled because the military lacked equipment and training. Although the British had reclaimed ports such as Narvik on April 13, 1940, and were making some headway in Norway, they were unable to win victories on the continent. Germany invaded Belgium, Luxemburg and the Netherlands on their way to France on May 9-10. The Netherlands surrendered on

---

35 Kersaudy, *Norway 1940*, 150.
May 15. The Belgians surrendered after three weeks of fighting and Great Britain was forced out of Dunkirk on June 4, 1940. With all these setbacks, Great Britain had to retreat from Norway to reorganize, which left most Norwegians resentful and disillusioned.\textsuperscript{37} Without the British military help, the weak Norwegian army could not sustain fighting against the German invasion and suspended military operations on June 7. General Ruge announced on Tromsø radio,

> The first chapter in our struggle for freedom is over, and we have a dark time to face now in a conquered land. But the war, continues on other fronts—Norwegians are joining in the struggle there.\textsuperscript{38}

The royal family and some members of the Norwegian government left on the \textit{Devonshire} for London from Tromsø, to continue the war effort from abroad.\textsuperscript{39}

Although King Håkon was in exile, Norwegians did not have to wait long for him to respond. After the defeat of France on July 17, fear spread among the Storting members left behind. At the request of Dr. Curt Bräuer, the German minister to Norway, these politicians decided that the king should abdicate, and if he declined, the Storting should overthrow him. King Håkon responded on London radio by refusing to abdicate or to give in to the Nazis. In September, the Storting refused, by a very close vote, to remove the king and thus a newly organized government-in-exile became the official government of Norway.\textsuperscript{40} This government refused to surrender to the Germans. The king’s refusal to abdicate and his defense of the Norwegian Constitution created a focal point for the Norwegian resistance movement.

\textsuperscript{39} Abrahmasen, \textit{Norway’s Response to the Holocaust}, 63.
\textsuperscript{40} Derry, \textit{A History of Modern Norway}, 385.
While the new government organized in England, Hitler ordered Terboven to gradually win over the Norwegian people so that these “Aryans” could help Germany win the war. Hitler stated that there was “no greater favor than to make these people our friends.” Max Manus wrote, “They had very strict orders from Hitler not to offend us and not to give us reason for resistance.” Soft missions of friendship and subtle Nazification became the official policy on September 25, 1940, when Terboven replaced all non-NS members in the government with “commissary ministers” who were placed in charge of all departments.

At the end of the military fighting on June 7, the German “Nazification” of Norway began, and military action transformed into several types of underground resistance. The first act of resistance came in the form of civil disobedience. Teachers were asked to teach Nazi propaganda but most were unwilling to do so and tried their best to ignore such directions. During the autumn of 1940, the Germans asked teachers to sign loyalty oaths; the teachers refused. For the next two years, the Germans tried to control Norwegian teachers. After the initial civil disobedience of the teachers, many groups and professions followed and refused to take part in the Nazis plans. Physicians developed their own resistance momentum and refused to join the NS Guild for Health and Hygiene in November. The Norwegian Lutheran Church moved underground on January 15, 1941. These three groups were

---

45 Ibid., 35.
followed by the sports societies. In addition, the judges, lawyers and the courts refused to cooperate.

The only group that the Nazis had significant success in recruiting or replacing with their own membership was the state police, which was a special department of the Norwegian police force. Before the war, the state police consisted only of a few hundred people which was a small number compared to all the local police forces. The Nazis were unable to infiltrate the local police forces but were quite successful in seizing control of the state police force. About 60 percent of the state police were Nasjonal Samling members, although reasons for NS membership varied. Obviously a few officers joined because they believed in the new Nazi order, and a few officers joined to help the Norwegian resistance. The majority of the state police officers responded to other considerations. The Nazis wanted a loyal police force and pressured the police to join the party. Some police officers joined the NS in order to keep their job security and feed their families, but did not necessarily believe in Nazi ideology. Many NS members were given police jobs as a reward for party loyalty and replaced non-NS police officers. It is unclear, however, how many police officers were recruited into the NS as opposed to the number of NS members who replaced non-NS police.

In addition to organized civil disobedience by teachers, lawyers, clergy and physicians, many individual Norwegians refused to follow German orders. Norwegians buried their weapons and hid their radios instead of giving them up.

47 Ibid., 46.
48 Abrahmasen, Norway's Response to the Holocaust, 76.
Many outward symbols identified loyalty to the Norwegian government: wearing a paperclip, a Norwegian invention, on the lapel became one of the most widely recognized symbols of resistance. Other artifacts showed opposition to the Nazis—flowers appeared in buttonholes on the king’s birthday and coins displaying the king were worn. Some groups had their own weekly resistance symbols. Members of a student group wore potatoes on stickpins that they replaced with larger and larger potatoes symbolizing the growing resistance to the Nazis. Nazis outlawed red hats because they had become symbols of defiance. Norwegians refused to sit next to Nazis on public transportation and eventually the Nazis outlawed getting up from a seat if a Nazi sat down.

Another form of resistance was resistance literature. Occasionally, pamphlets were used, but a larger impact was made by the newspapers that developed. There were many underground newspapers throughout the country: *Alt for Norge* (Everything for Norway), *Frihet* (Freedom), *Hjemmefronten* (The Home front), *London-nytt* (London News), *Norges budstikke* (Norway’s Messenger), and *Eidsvoll*, just to name a few. According to Arnfinn Moland, after the first Norwegian newspaper editor was placed in jail in the summer of 1940 for stating “No Norwegian for sale,” newspapers all over the country started to go underground. By the end of 1943, over 5,000 people were distributing and producing approximately sixty different underground newspapers.


50 Frankie Denton, *The German Occupation of Norway*.

51 Moore, ed., *Resistance in Western Europe*, 224.
Hundreds of copies of these various newspapers were typewritten from unknown locations that constantly changed. Much of the news came from England and sometimes included instructions on how to sabotage the Germans and Quisling. The underground created elaborate networks to distribute these newspapers, which were then passed from hand to hand. The Germans tried to catch those who were responsible for distributing the newspapers, so it was a dangerous job. Helen Astrup described how she was able to distribute her part of the route.

Cycling was a good way of avoiding attention. Pedestrians were occasionally stopped on the sidewalks and motorists at control points on the roads. Cyclists came between and no one troubled much about them . . . I used to go around unmolested, leaving a bundle here and few there. Occasionally Nazis caught the distributors and sent them to prison camps. Eventually, paper and ink became scarce, but the Germans never did put a stop to the underground newspapers.

As the war continued, the Germans had to put a more permanent government into place and were unable to keep Quisling out of that Nazi-dominated government. On February 1, 1942, Terboven appointed Vidkun Quisling as Minister President in an Act of State, and Germany formally recognized this new government. Quisling strongly believed in Nazism. He stated in a speech to his people,

For the first, we must place our confidence and our hope to the Germans victory, and we must do everything that we can to facilitate Germany in this task. For the second, we must ourselves develop our own national force. The Norwegian people must assemble if Norway's National government and its national program are to stand fully by, entirely by Germany's side for at the close, the strong German

---

53 Ibid., 30.
block which can be a guaranty also for Europe's collective new order and which can stand for all always.\textsuperscript{54}

Once named Minister President, Quisling immediately acted, issuing his first orders to "reeducate" the Norwegian people. Wanting the troublesome teachers to help in this endeavor, the Nasjonal Samling organized a new teacher's union and Quisling required the membership of all teachers in the Laerersamband on February 1, 1942.\textsuperscript{55}

Next, he ordered all children between ages nine and eighteen to join the newly created National Youth Service. The teachers decided immediately that they should refuse membership but debated how this was to be done.

After a couple of weeks of discussing whether they should respond as a group or as individuals, teachers decided this "group action" must be done independently. Individual teachers from all over Norway mailed identical letters refusing to join the new union on February 20, 1942. The letter stated,

\begin{quote}
According to what the Leader of the new teachers' organisation has said, membership of this organisation will mean an obligation for me to assist in such education, and also would force me to do other acts which are in conflict with the obligations to my profession. "I find that I must declare that I cannot regard myself as a member of the new teachers' organisation." \textsuperscript{56}
\end{quote}

Afterward, the Nazis attempted to replace these teachers with people more sympathetic to their cause, but found it difficult to find enough people and temporarily school closures took place. The Nazis announced that fuel shortages required closing the schools and they shut down all schools for the month of March.

Starting on March 20, 1942, about 1,000 teachers were arrested; the police took them

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{54} Vidkun Quisling, \textit{Tale den 1 februar 1943[speech of February 1, 1943]} (n.p., Riksproggagandaleielsen), 12.
\textsuperscript{56}Sharp, \textit{Tyranny Could Not Quell Them}, 12.
\end{flushright}
to Kirkenes on the Soviet-Norwegian border and placed them in a concentration camp.\footnote{Ibid., 3.}

While civil disobedience progressed, Norwegians who wanted to take up arms and fight against the Nazis were organizing behind the scenes. Military groups inside Norway’s borders coalesced into the Milørg whose official name was Militærorganisasjonen. Co-ordination was initially haphazard, for the small group lacked secure communications and a centralized bureaucracy.\footnote{Gjelsvik, Norwegian Resistance, 1940-1945, viii.} On November 20, 1941, the Milørg emerged as the official military group.\footnote{Moore, ed., Resistance in Western Europe, 225.} Its leadership was made up of senior officers from the general staff and had contact with the exiled government. By 1944, the Milørg had a membership of 32,716.\footnote{Charles Cruickshank, SOE in Scandinavia (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), appendix 4.}

The military goal of the Milørg was to prepare quietly for the allied invasion; members were not to actively resist until that time. The Norwegian government feared that acting too quickly would bring terrible repercussions on the civilian population. The British government planned for this organization to play a large role in regaining Norwegian independence. Thus, keeping members undiscovered and available until an actual offensive was the major goal. The British feared that the Milørg would act too soon and ruin the chances for a successful invasion. Despite the orders to quietly wait, the Milørg’s role grew and its members became involved in all acts of resistance. The Milørg helped facilitate civil disobedience as well. For example, the Milørg was used to hijack new ration cards for Norwegians withholding
their labor.\textsuperscript{61} In addition, the \textit{Milorg} helped Norwegians fleeing the Nazis to escape from Norway.

Despite Nazi success in capturing many of its members, the \textit{Milorg} was solely responsible for helping Norwegian Jews escape to Sweden.\textsuperscript{62} The Jewish population in Norway was extremely small because Jews had been systematically kept out of the country through severe immigration restrictions placed in the Constitution (Article 2) of May 17, 1814.\textsuperscript{63} Officially, the Jewish population was 1,400 but an additional 200 more Jewish refugees made their home in Norway.\textsuperscript{64} (Norway and Finland's Jewish populations were small compared to Sweden's 15,000 Jews and Denmark's population of 6,800).\textsuperscript{65} Despite Norway's restricted immigration policy, the Norwegian exiled government supported getting Jews out of Norway to safety.\textsuperscript{66}

Deportation of Norwegian Jews to Poland began on November 26, 1942.\textsuperscript{67} The \textit{Milorg} helped 800 Norwegian Jews to safety. Arnfinn Moland states, "This happened at a time when the escape lines of the resistance organizations had been badly affected by betrayals and arrests."\textsuperscript{68} In the beginning, the \textit{Milorg} haphazardly used its resources to help these Jews escape; over time, however the organization became more proficient in handling these escapes.\textsuperscript{69}

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{62}] Although essentially only the \textit{Milorg} movement helped the Jews to escape, there were protests made by the Lutheran Church over the Jewish deportation according to Samuel Abrahmasen in \textit{Norway's Response to the Holocaust}, 144.
\item[\textsuperscript{63}] Abrahmasen, \textit{Norway's Response to the Holocaust}, 4.
\item[\textsuperscript{64}] Ibid., 2-3.
\item[\textsuperscript{65}] Ibid., 1.
\item[\textsuperscript{66}] Ibid., 137.
\item[\textsuperscript{67}] Norske Regjerings Informasjonskontor, \textit{The Gestapo at Work in Norway} (London, Hodder and Stoughton, Limited, 1942) 35.
\item[\textsuperscript{68}] Moore, ed., \textit{Resistance in Western Europe}, 244.
\item[\textsuperscript{69}] Abrahmasen, \textit{Norway's Response to the Holocaust}, 12.
\end{itemize}
Helen Astrup described one escape in her memoirs. Nils, a friend and member of the underground, approached Astrup with a plan to help her Jewish neighbors. Nils summarized the plan: “A dead Jew is of no interest to the Germans.”

Astrup agreed to smuggle her neighbor Fru Hirschfeldt and her daughter out of Oslo in a coffin. With the help of other underground workers at the hospital, Astrup claimed the “body” of Fru Hirschfeldt. Astrup took the coffin with its two living occupants through numerous checkpoints out of the city. Once in the wilderness, her two neighbors got out of the coffin, and Astrup returned to Oslo. Other resistance members accompanied the Hirschfeldts across the Swedish border to freedom.

Despite the Milorg’s efforts, the Nazis successfully deported 763 Jews and only 24 of these deportees returned to Norway after the war. Deported Jews survived at significantly lower rates than non-Jews, for only 12 percent of the 5,431 deported non-Jews were murdered. Although unable to help all Jews to safety, the accomplishment of helping 800 Jews to safety shows the capability of the Milorg.

Although the Milorg helped Norwegian Jews escape the Nazis, use of the Milorg was initially limited because its possible contribution in operations was outweighed by the goal of keeping the membership secret. However, as the war went on, the Milorg was used increasingly to facilitate sabotage operations from within Norway and to help those agents coming in from abroad.

Civil disobedience, resistance, and the Milorg grew out of the Norwegian desire to be free; as the Germans increased restrictions, resistance grew. Resistance was a domestic response from within Norway that the royal family and government
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70 Astrup, and Jacot, Oslo Intrigue, 35.
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supported and encouraged. In addition, the British response in 1940 helped prolong
the inevitable occupation by the Germans. Great Britain became a sanctuary for
escaping Norwegians and helped facilitate the evacuation of Norway’s gold. Despite
help from the British, the first resistance movements were developed primarily by
Norwegians. Organized groups such as teachers, lawyers, clergy, physicians and
sport societies need no outside assistance to defy the Nazis. The Milørg developed
without outside help, but the saboteurs needed the British.
Chapter 2

Resistance Develops from Abroad

Occupied countries needed help from abroad, especially for supplies and equipment. Norway received help from three external organizations, whose headquarters were located in two countries—the United States and Great Britain. Great Britain played the largest role in the Norwegian resistance, in part because it was the first ally, along with France, to enter the war with Norway on invasion day April 9, 1940, and in part because Britain remained an unconquered ally. The Soviet Union, which shared a border with Norway, was geographically the closest of possible allies, but in 1940 the Soviet Union was not at war and did not enter the war until June 22, 1941. France was in no position to help because it was conquered shortly after Norway and it signed an armistice with Germany on June 22, 1940. After setbacks in France, the British evacuated Dunkirk between May 27 and June 4, 1940, and retreated from Norway on June 7 to regroup. The United States did not enter the war until after the attack on Pearl Harbor December 7, 1941.

Less than a month after withdrawal from the continent, the British government created a new agency. The Special Operations Executive (SOE) developed to coordinate several existing government departments. The government melded three units created in 1938—Section D, Department EH and MIR—into one centralized unit to better manage covert operations. As Neville Chamberlain’s memorandum stated, this secret service was formed “to co-ordinate all action, by ways of
subversion and sabotage, against the enemy overseas.” Prime Minister Winston Churchill said that the purpose of the SOE was “to set Europe ablaze.” The SOE officially started functioning on July 16, 1940, and the War Cabinet entrusted its leadership to Dr. Hugh Dalton, the Minister of Economic Warfare.

Section D had formed part of the Secret Intelligence Service (SIS), which was placed under the direction of the Foreign Office so that the SIS could not create its own foreign policy. The SIS’s mission was to collect intelligence, sometimes through espionage, whereas the mission of Section D, according to its section head Major Lawrence Grand, worked on “attacking potential enemies by means other than the operation of military forces” — that is, sabotage. After the start of the war, tension grew because the leadership of the SIS believed that sabotage sometimes hindered intelligence collection since it caused fear and retaliation. As a result of this problematic relationship all Section D activities had to be secret and deniable. Placing Section D with the SOE was thus advantageous to the SIS, which continued to concentrate on intelligence collecting.

Department Electra House (EH) was also part of the Foreign Office and many government officials knew about it, although the Foreign Office did not acknowledge its existence because this top-secret department was to produce propaganda. Created
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3 SIS has many different names, including MI6.
in 1938, this department had not accomplished much of significance by 1940 and in
the early years of the war was not vital to sabotage and resistance. Over the course of
World War II propaganda increasingly helped the military as well as the underground
movements as part of the overall war strategy and eventually became a separate
agency.

MIR, or Military Intelligence and Research, was a tiny section of the War
Office. Similar to the SIS, MIR collected intelligence, but targeted information
specific to the needs of the military. Department MIR paralleled Section D of the
SIS, but MIR activities could be publicly admitted.8 This military branch broke with
the traditional etiquette of war and was responsible for developing techniques of
guerrilla warfare as well as for the training of future underground participants. MIR
produced numerous pamphlets for underground fighters to educate them on various
topics, including the sabotage of railways, bridges, and buildings as well as the
responsibilities of resistance leaders.9

The most important of these three groups was Section D, which became the
core for the Special Operations Executive created in July 1940.10 The new
organization had two departments, sabotage and propaganda.11 Sabotage quickly
became the more important mission, which is why the SOE reported to the Minister
of Economic Warfare. The main task of this ministry was to stop the axis powers
from obtaining raw war materials, which became more difficult to accomplish as

8 Howarth, Undercover, 22-23.
9 Ibid., 20-21.
10 David Stafford, Britain and European Resistance, 1940-1945: A Survey of the Special
11 Cruickshank, SOE in Scandinavia, 1.
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Germany conquered more countries. The agency gave top priority to retaining and stealing basic supplies that could be useful to the Nazi war effort. As it became more difficult to reduce access to these materials from the Nazis, sabotage took on a greater role because it was a practical way of denying resources or preventing the transportation of these materials to Germany.

From its inception, the SOE was also interested in resistance movements in occupied Europe, which were instrumental in producing results for the Ministry of Economic Warfare. The agency acknowledged that each country’s resistance had specific requirements, but some practical measures needed to be taken in all occupied countries: to establish and maintain contact with the resistance movements and to provide them with needed supplies, especially wireless radio equipment.

In the summer of 1940, Norway’s resistance movement was just in its infancy and communication was very difficult, but the SOE took a special interest in Norway because controlling Norway’s ports would stop Germany’s iron ore supplies. As early as the first month of the SOE’s existence, it engaged in working on plans to drive the Germans out of Norway with massive retaliation strikes by the civilian population. By September 1940, however, some SOE planners saw that it would take a full-scale invasion of the country to drive the Germans out. Thus, sabotage in Norway became a main concern for the SOE, but the agency faced numerous challenges at the beginning of the war. Sir Frank Nelson, the first executive head of
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the SOE, acknowledged in the fall of 1940 that the SOE had no agents in the field at all and that it was training only six or eight Norwegians at the time. Nelson recorded, “I cannot see the possibility of any real activity in sabotage in Norway for several months at least.”

Although the SOE was created for sabotage and early on advocated the use of sabotage in Norway, its use was much debated at the beginning of the war. The Norwegian government-in-exile was concerned with liberation, not German war supplies, and wanted to use Norwegian refugees as soldiers, not SOE saboteurs. In addition, the new government-in-exile, officially created in September 1940, had questionable legitimacy since many, but not all, members of the London-based government, had been elected to the Storting. The members of the government-in-exile were therefore eager to keep the growing resistance movement at home happy and the resistance did not want sabotage. In addition, the Norwegian government-in-exile was concerned about giving too much power to the British, and members of the Norwegian resistance did not have great confidence in London after the British retreat. These differing viewpoints created conflict between the Norwegian and the British governments.

The Norwegian government’s main concern was the safety of the civilian population, and any type of sabotage risked repercussions against civilians, in both accidental deaths and Nazi retaliation. During the war, it was common practice for the Nazis to arrest innocent people, hold them hostage, and kill them in retaliation for any
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acts of sabotage. The Germans also carried out heavy reprisals. For example, the Germans made a practice of killing 10 Norwegians for every German killed. The Norwegian population was also vulnerable in other ways. Norwegians were highly dependent on imported food and clothing. Only 3 percent of Norway is suitable for agriculture, and in 1940 the country imported half of its food supply, which left Norwegians dependent on German food rations from abroad. The Nazis tried to eliminate conflicts by threatening conquered peoples with retaliations for any misbehavior, a policy known to the Norwegian government. In addition, the effectiveness of sabotage was uncertain at the beginning of the war. The SOE did not know how well the explosives would work or how long it would take the Nazis to recover from a sabotage strike. No one knew if sabotage really could have a significant impact. The fear of retribution against civilians and the questionable effectiveness of sabotage made the Norwegian government decide sabotage was not a viable option.

Despite Norwegian opposition, the SOE instituted its "Norwegian Policy" on December 11, 1940, because it saw sabotage as an important boost to Norwegian morale and also wanted Norway to be "a thorn in the German side." The SOE therefore began to act independently of all Norwegian authorities, including the unofficial Milorg and the Norwegian government-in-exile. The British wanted economic sabotage, and SOE plans included damaging pyrite mines, silicon carbide works, train tracks, ships and shipping yards. These facilities were being run by
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Germans, but from the Norwegian point of view the plants were owned either by the Norwegian government or by Norwegian citizens. The government-in-exile was initially unconvinced that destroying Norwegian property would be a significant blow to Germany; it also worried about what would be left after the war to rebuild Norway.  

Despite Norwegian objections, the SOE started to train and organize units during the fall of 1940 and a special Norwegian sabotage unit was developed in June 1941. Officially named “Norwegian Independent Company No. One,” it became known as the “Linge Company” after its company commander, Captain Martin Linge, was killed in December 1941. These saboteurs were SOE agents, with two minimum qualifications: they had to be able to pass unnoticed through the countryside and they had to be able to speak the language. The SOE had a relatively large pool of potential agents, for Norwegians escaped from their occupied homeland in comparatively large numbers: some historians estimate that as many as 80,000 people crossed the border into Sweden. For some people flight was not enough: they wanted more direct action, and about 4,000 in the first couple of years escaped to England to join Norwegian forces. Later, recruitment took place through word of mouth or discreet advertising.

In June 1941, the leaders of the Norwegian Military's Defense Command and the Norwegian government-in-exile continued to oppose sabotage on the basis that

unsuccessful operations would lead to strong German retaliation and would undermine all resistance at home. 28 By late 1941, however, cooperation between the British and the Norwegian governments became intimate both militarily and diplomatically because of the widening war. Germany invaded the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941. Although lacking a written agreement, the Soviet Union and the British reached an understanding during Churchill’s visit to Stalin in December 1941, which designated Norway as a British operational area. Great Britain therefore had sole responsibility for Norwegian operations until the Americans entered the war in December 1941, when the Soviets approved the operational area of Norway as a joint British-American operation. Even then, the British continued to take the primary role. 29

This close relationship was not without its disagreements, however. 30 London still wanted specific operations to be carried out whereas Norwegians continued to be more cautious and wanted the government-in-exile to be cautious too. 31 When pressed by the British for some action, the exiled government acquiesced, in large part because Norway’s armed forces were under British operational command. 32 The Norwegian government therefore made a more conscious effort to fight the Nazis and recognized the Milørg as an official military group on November 20, 1941. Charles Hambro, the head of British Division of Economics, and others from his department wrote a “Directive to the Military

28 Gjelsvik, Norwegian Resistance, 1940-1945, 88.
29 Udgaard, Great Power Politics and Norwegian Foreign Policy, 46.
30 Ibid., 47.
31 Moore, ed., Resistance in Western Europe, 253.
32 Udgaard, Great Power Politics and Norwegian Foreign Policy, 47.
Organization in Norway” (the Milørg) that outlined the need for the Norwegian resistance to follow the desire of British-led operations:

The first and main objective of the Military Organization in Norway must be to set up, train and equip a secret army to play its part at a given signal and in accordance with a prearranged plan... It is agreed that [sabotage] acts must be vigorously controlled and that indiscrimination or ill-planned sabotage can do nothing but harm, because of the reprisals which are bound to follow and the consequent effect on morale. On the other hand, it is important to cause the Germans as much trouble as possible and to force them to keep large garrisons there. Properly planned sabotage can be most effective... It is suggested that plans should be prepared for this type of sabotage to be carried out either by special sabotage groups in Norway, or by groups sent in from the United Kingdom.33

As Hambro stressed, the British in late 1941 wanted to carry out successful sabotage operations without the help of the Milørg for many reasons: to keep Milørg members safe until invasion, to keep SOE control of operations and to protect the civilian population. Over the next year, the SOE’s conception of Milørg’s role changed.

In addition to collaboration with the Norwegian government-in-exile, the British also began to have to deal with the United States government’s interest in Norway. Until Pearl Harbor, the United States was an isolated country across the Atlantic, and its population reacted differently to the April 9, 1940, invasion than did Great Britain. According to Udgaard, Americans of Scandinavian decent “were among the most isolationist minded” citizens.34 While the British government offered military aid to occupied Norway, the United States government was officially neutral. Not all Americans were isolationists, but Americans or Norwegians stranded in America had little opportunity to help the Norwegian military effort.

34 Udgaard, Great Power Politics and Norwegian Foreign Policy, 22.
The invasion of Norway was more personal to many Americans than to most Britons because of the large number of recent Norwegian immigrants and their descendents in the United States. Most Norwegian-Americans were looking for any way to help civilians, so a non-profit organization, Norwegian Relief Incorporated, was started and spread to over 15 states. Tiny newspapers, especially from the Midwest, ran articles for this effort. As an article in the *Burnett County Siren* stated, “There has been a widespread desire on the part of folks of Norwegian descent in America, to send contribution not only to their relatives in Norway, but to help make a up a sizable fund for general mercy work.” 35 The *Inter-County Leader*, another small local paper in the Midwest commented, “It is only natural that many folks want to make and extra effort to behalf of the land from whence they or their parents came.” 36 As word spread about the relief effort, individuals started donating despite questions about whether the money would actually reach Norway. 37 As one individual wrote in a letter to the Norwegian Relief Inc., “I’m afraid when the winter comes everybody are going to suffer terrible over there.” 38

Not until the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, did the United States enter the war and America military involvement began. The United States government became interested in covert operations to fight Nazi Germany. The United States counterpart to the British SOE was the Office of Strategic Services, which President Roosevelt established on July 14, 1942. The OSS was fashioned
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35 *The Burnett County Siren* (Burnett County WI), 13 June 1940.
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38 Thomas k. Eggerud to Mr. S---- M Kalmes passed on to William Theodore Evju, Wisconsin Chairman for Norwegian Relief, 16 June 1940, letter in Archives of Wisconsin State Historical Society, Madison, WI.
after the British SOE, although it had many more departments and developed a different orientation. The mission of the Office of Coordinator of Information (COI), for example was not sabotage, but rather collecting and analyzing information that helped national security. In March 1942, Great Britain and the United States made Europe a combined area of responsibility, and in 1943 America had its first involvement in Norway, including joint air raids. The OSS NORSO (Norwegian Special Operations Group) was not created until 1943, approximately two years after SOE Linge Company formed, and did not have an operational role in Norway until after April 1944.

The slow development of US capabilities and interest meant that the Norwegian sabotage movement occurred because the British Special Operations Executive persisted and those Norwegians trained by the SOE pressured the Norwegian military for the operations to move forward. The SOE began to realize that operations were much easier with the help of the Milorg, and a joint Norwegian-British committee for cooperation was set up in London in February 1942 to communicate and approve sabotage operations. Nevertheless, for at least six months, after the committee’s formation, the SOE continued to act in a headstrong manner, which came to a crisis at the end of April 1942.
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Both the SOE and the SIS\(^{45}\) had been dropping off agents unbeknownst to each other in the small city of Tælvåg on the island of Sorta (near Bergen).\(^{46}\) Tælvåg was chosen for its isolated location, but the numerous drops attracted German attention. When the Germans arrived, a gunfight broke out and two German soldiers were killed. A few days later, the Nazis destroyed the entire city, sank all boats, burned 300 houses and farms, killed all livestock, interned 260 women and children in Norway and deported 80 men to Germany.

As a result of this ghastly affair, the members of the Norwegian resistance and the government-in-exile questioned the necessity of British agents.\(^{47}\) Up to that point Nazi Germany had been attempting to befriend and convert Norwegians, and Norway was treated with some gentleness. For example, many prisoners were released from prison shortly after being arrested. As time passed, German occupation became more oppressive because the Nazis lost their illusions that Norwegians could be convert to the Nazi cause. A few Norwegians had joined the Nasjonal Samling party: In 1942, the party membership rose by 30,000 people, but party membership peaked in 1943 with 43,000 members.\(^{48}\) By early 1942, therefore Terboven decided try to and force Norwegians into submission.\(^{49}\)

\(^{45}\) According to Moore (page 253), the relationship between the SOS and the SIS was hostile and competitive. Peter Wilkinson, military assistant to SOE Director of Operations and Training wrote, “It stood to reason that activities of SIS that involved recruitment very often of large groups of people and the blowing up of buildings or bridges were directly inimical to the work of the Secret Intelligence Service which depend for its effect on melding into the local population and being invisible. Understandably they took a rather gloomy view of our activities.” Cited from David Stafford, \textit{Secret Agent: The True Story of the Covert War against Hitler} (Woodstock, NY: The Overlook Press, 2000), 22.

\(^{46}\) Sanstey, \textit{Report from #24}, 47-49.

\(^{47}\) \textit{Ibid.}


\(^{49}\) Ronald Seth, \textit{The Undaunted: The Story of Resistance in Western Europe} (London: Frederick Muller, 1956), 66.
As the Germans arrested and interrogated more and more people, civilians became increasingly hostile toward the Nazis and their collaborators. After an incident where two Norwegians collaborated with the Germans instead of refusing to cooperate with the Germans, David Howarth declared that “for the rest of the war, their lives were made a misery by their neighbors.” As Nazi treatment of prisoners became more brutal and prisoners began to be shipped abroad, Norwegian hatred of the Germans increased and more angry Norwegians joined the resistance. Terje Wold, the Norwegian Minister of Justice and Police, wrote, “Nothing has aroused the Norwegian people more than the brutal, sadistic treatment suffered by Norwegian prisoners at the hands of the Gestapo.” Thus, brutality backfired and instead recruited more people into the resistance. As Max Manus wrote,

The Germans held that threat [of reprisal] over our heads all the time, and for a time it worked . . . It wasn’t until later in the struggle that the men holding the positions of power began to realize that the threat of reprisal was a trump in the enemy’s hand . . . The day we disregarded the threat of reprisal . . . was the day the Germans lost their most powerful secret weapon.54

Peter Moen echoed these statements when he wrote, “Nazism will never take root in Norway. That gain is worth great sacrifice. Our personal fate does not matter.”55

51 Those inside Norway were not the only people to make such observations, but outsiders saw it as well. The Swedish newspaper Dagens Nyheter (Day’s News) on December 14, 1941 stated, “It appears that German attempts to break down the resistance of the Norwegians have become increasingly brutal. Reports received from a large number of reliable persons inside Norway indicate that the treatment of prisoners in German prisons and concentration camps has recently become absolutely outrageous.” Found in Norske Regjerings Informsjonskontor, The Gestapo at Work in Norway on page 8.
53 Manus wrote this in the section where his resistance group decides not to assassinate Himmler and Goebbels in Oslo.
54 Max Manus, 9 Lives before Thirty (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1947), 52.
55 The gestapo arrested Peter Moen because he was the editor of London Nytt one of the underground newspapers.
Quisling too was a catalyst for the resistance. Arnfinn Moland wrote, “it was
on the one hand the people’s contempt for the Quisling regime and on the other the
inherent urge of the Nazis to impose their ideology on their subject peoples that
caused Norwegians by the thousands to engage in a struggle.”\textsuperscript{57} Quisling did try
to impose Nazi ideology and stated his goals for Norway very clearly. Ironically,
Demaree Bess wrote “[Quisling] admitted that most Norwegians do believe that
England will win the war, but he himself has no doubt Germany will win.”\textsuperscript{58} As the
general sentiment in Norway shifted toward resistance, the Norwegian government-
in-exile was able to adopt SOE’s position on sabotage.

Norway had no experience with sabotage or fighting armies, and therefore had
no one to train agents. Alternatively, the British Army had engaged in 82 campaigns
during Queen Victoria’s reign alone.\textsuperscript{59} According to Seth, the most effective aid the
SOE gave the Norwegians was teaching the use of “weapons and explosives and the
intricacies of sabotage.”\textsuperscript{60} Training took place in numerous Special Training Schools
(STS) in isolated parts of England and Scotland. No one school taught a spy
everything. Usually, the SOE used old country homes and manors for training.\textsuperscript{61}
Often saboteurs attended the same schools as members of the military or air force, but
they were kept separate from the regular military personnel because the saboteurs
were seen as troublemakers while in England.

\textsuperscript{56} Peter Moen, \textit{Peter Moen’s Diary}, trans. Bjorn Koefoed (New York: Creative Age Press,
1951), 12.
\textsuperscript{57} Moore, ed., \textit{Resistance in Western Europe}, 241.
\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Saturday Evening Post}, 11 January 1941.
\textsuperscript{59} Howarth, \textit{Undercover}, 18.
\textsuperscript{60} Seth, \textit{The Undaunted}, 33.
\textsuperscript{61} Dear, \textit{Sabotage and Subversion}, 21.
Once in the field, agents had to follow the underground security rules that the SOE developed: do not share living quarters with or go out socially with another agent, do not write anything down, do not talk about any operations, do not get drunk in public, do not disclose identity card names or recognize other members in public, use only code names, do not ask what is going on in other areas, do not go directly to or from meetings, do not keep a girlfriend, do not sit in a public vehicle, do not join in more than one underground group or in more than one type of underground activity, approach rendezvous points carefully and be prepared to run, and always have an alibi to be able to explain your presence.\textsuperscript{62} The use of terms such as mistress and girlfriend clearly shows the assumption that agents were assumed to be men.\textsuperscript{63}

Women did play a large role in the domestic resistance. Women were teachers and participated in civil disobedience. Many women were local couriers because their movements were often less noticeable or suspicious than men’s. A homemaker doing her daily shopping could easily make the rounds and deliver information or underground newspapers. Women working in stores were often Mi\l ørg contacts. Women and men protected resistance members fleeing the country or in hiding from the Nazis. They carried guns and carried out missions. Although women played a large role under resistance, they are absent in the saboteur field. When the British trained people as SOE saboteurs, these agents were men.

Saboteurs needed special equipment to perform their duties. Most sabotage operations required some type of explosive. Although sometimes agents substituted

\textsuperscript{62} Cruickshank, \textit{SOE in Scandinavia}, 22.
\textsuperscript{63} Note that for a female spy a boyfriend would have been forbidden too. Although the SOE did hire women, most were used as office personnel and were rarely directly in the field: ergo, the linguistic assumption that a spy is male.
fake materials or mixed up labels and shipping manifests to wreck havoc in German
supply lines, usually an operation meant destroying various supplies. The British
developed some “toys” such as exploding bread, but there is no evidence that such
unique explosive devices were ever used. 64 The SOE developed a variety of plastic
explosives because the saboteurs could mold plastic explosives into any shape, which
made them easier to hide. Plastic explosives were also very stable and hence safe.65

The limpet, which was designed to destroy ships, was one of the most
successful explosives and was very popular with the agents in Norway. A limpet
used six magnets to hold a box containing the explosive to the side of a ship. A fuse
was attached to one end with a butterfly nut. An agent used various fuses depending
on the desired time delay. Despite its later popularity, the limpet had uncertain
beginnings when used in some of the first SOE sabotage operations. Max Manus, one
of the first trained-Norwegian saboteurs, reported that many of the limpets did not
ignite: “They [the military authorities in London] wouldn’t accept my report that I
was sure . . . We must improve the limpet.”66 Eventually the problem of salt
dissolving the limpet was diagnosed and a release switch was added for more
success.67

Besides carrying explosives, agents needed to transport food and clothing, and
delivering the individual or team back to Norway with provisions to carry out a
mission had its own problems. Essentially, the SOE had three options when returning
an agent to Norway, all of them treacherous: by boat, through Sweden, or by plane.

64 Dear, Sabotage and Subversion, 39.
65 Ibid., 38.
66 Manus, 9 Lives before Thirty, 176.
67 Ibid., 183.
Often the SOE used a boat if a saboteur did operations along the coast; locals waited at rendezvous places along the shore to help carry supplies and hide the returning agents.

Fishermen and small boats traveling back and forth across the North Sea between the English Shetland Islands and Norway became known as the “Shetland bus.” While Germany invaded Norway, thousands of Norwegian shipping boats were sailing around the world and many of them escaped to America or Great Britain. Thus, the SOE had access to many boats for the Shetland bus. 68 This winter trip could take as long as three weeks to cover 2,000 miles of sea. As David Howarth commented, “Nothing but war would have made seamen attempt such dangerous journeys.” 69 The Shetland bus played an important part in SOE activities in Norway during the whole war. 70

The Shetland bus developed both from within Norway and with British help in the Shetland Islands. Major General Bjørn Christophersen recorded,

All the summer of 1940 came Norwegian motorboats through the intense activity that featured incidents in the British channels, under German preparations, with only thoughts about landing in Great Britain. While at the same time, a pair of Norwegian destroyers escorted them towards the British East shore. 71

The service was originally set up as a joint SOE-SIS operation and in the later years, when it became more difficult for fishing boats to get through, submarines replaced fishing boats. 72 David Howarth, who was second in command of the Shetland Base
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68 Foot, Resistance, 117.
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72 Cruickshank, SOE in Scandinavia, 4.
and in charge of all operations, initially located the base at Lunna for its remoteness and capacity to house the workforce.\textsuperscript{73} A year later, he moved operations to Scalloway because the islanders knew about Lunna anyway and it was difficult to repair the boats in the isolated location.\textsuperscript{74} At the end of the war, despite the fact that 50 people died in the first three seasons (none died the last two years when submarines were used), the bus service had delivered 219 agents to Norway, as well as 33 agents and over 200 refugees to England.\textsuperscript{75}

Many Norwegians escaped to Sweden, although crossing the Swedish border presented many challenges. An agent usually only escaped to Sweden after a mission took place; rarely did an individual return to Norway through Sweden. At first, the political situation of Sweden’s neutrality made it difficult to cross the border in either direction. Agents were often typically in as much danger in Sweden as in Norway, and in 1942, more couriers were arrested in Sweden than in Norway.\textsuperscript{76} As the war progressed and it became clearer that the allies would win the war, border crossings became easier, but carrying any type of explosives or arms usually made the risk too great to enter from Sweden. Agents also could not carry enough supplies for a mission launched from Sweden because an operation of any magnitude needed more equipment than an individual could carry on his back. Thus, most operations required some type of airdrop near the actual target.

The SOE airdropped many saboteurs into Norway along with their provisions. To avoid any breach in security, supplies had to be retrieved before the Nazis arrived

\begin{footnotes}{\textsuperscript{73} Howarth, The Shetland Bus, 12.}  
\textsuperscript{74}Ibid., 118-119. \textsuperscript{75} Foot, Resistance, 280. \textsuperscript{76} Cruickshank, SOE in Scandinavia, 13.}
and discovered them. Unless the SOE was already had contact with agents in the vicinity, a saboteur had to be dropped along with his supplies—both weapons and food—but airdrops faced considerable problems. Sometimes not all the cargo was collected, sometimes it was damaged and sometimes especially if plans were changed saboteurs ran out of food. As saboteur Clause Helburg, one of the men who blew up the heavy water plant said, “We had no food. I remember took [sic] reindeer moss from the ground. We ate few meals that I remember.” 77

Even though airdrops were usually the most practical delivery for a job, they had a few unique problems. Agents could walk or sit in a boat without any training, but parachuting required agents who were willing to jump out of airplanes. Parachuting was in its infancy, and training was limited, which created the risk that the mission would not be carried out because a person refused to jump. Training was usually lacking because of time. Max Manus reports the uniqueness of a saboteur’s training in his conversation with a Frenchman. Max Manus asks,

“How long have you been in training here?”
“Almost two months.”
“I’m going to jump today,” I told him. I wanted to impress myself with this fact as well as the Frenchman.
“So! How long have you been in training?”
“Since yesterday.” 78

Besides the human element necessary for parachuting, the geography of Norway itself was a significant problem because of the hazardous mountainous terrain. In addition, the weather in England and Norway was often the opposite, making flight from one country to the other impossible. The SOE frequently had to cancel its missions, and
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the pilots often had difficulty finding the rural drop sites because of the lack of landmarks and limited season for dropping cargo and agents. Darkness was preferred for any clandestine operations and Norway was the land of the midnight sun, which made operations impossible part of the year.

At the beginning of the war especially, drops were not very successful. In 1942, the SOE was able to make drops only 21 times; however, as the war continued and as technology improved, more success was achieved. The use of the S-phone, precursor to the walkie-talkie, enabled field agents to communicate with aircrafts without switching from send to receive modes. In addition, the Eureka, a homing device for planes, was developed to help guide airdrops into the right locations. During the whole war, 717 sorties out of 1,241 attempts were successful and dropped over 10,000 containers (and packages) as well as 208 agents.

Once agents were in place, the challenge of communication began. Some countries were able to use their own infrastructure for communication, but in Norway most normal forms of communication were unusable. The Germans censored the Norwegian postal service, making the messages insecure. In addition, the remoteness of some areas in Norway made mail service a poor form of communication. In some areas, the resistance used the telephone, but “veiled language” had to be implemented to confuse anyone tapping the phone. The resistance often used
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couriers who would travel to Sweden to get messages out of the country. For Norway, the most significant form of communication became the radio.

Trained operators and radio set technology became essential to the SOE activities in Norway. Initially the SOE had to use other agencies' radio transmissions for information; however, this impeded the SOE's abilities and the agency was given permission to construct its own sets, create its own code names and develop its own stations in June 1942. Radio at that time meant morse code because transmitting voice was less secure. To increase security for the radio operators, strict timetables were developed. By 1944, radio operators were not allowed to operate for more than five minutes at one time nor more than 20 minutes a day.

Radio operators had a very dangerous job. The Germans had the technology to home in on radio transmissions, and the Nazis placed a high priority on capturing radio operators because they were transmitting intelligence for British operations. Usually an agent had friends who stood guard while he was working. Agents preferred to take a poison pill than to be captured. Oluf Reed Olsen, an SIS agent said, "If anyone was injured we should shoot him . . . just think what would happen to anyone of us being caught." Agents went to great lengths not only to protect themselves but the radio operations.

[Gunvald] Tomstad was to become a Nazi, to go openly into the enemy's camp and wage a secret, lone struggle to bluff the Germans and, if possible, get from them the details of what they had discovered about the Resistance, warn those in imminent danger of arrest . . . But
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first and foremost the object of the plan was to provide the Helle transmitter with effective camouflage.88

Tomstad became an effective double agent, saved his operation numerous times and helped British intelligence operations, including the sinking of the Bismark.

The United States was dependant upon British intelligence gathering because they did not have radio operators in Norway and had no practical way of organizing radio setup from the United States. Although the United States was quickly involved in Norwegian air raids and navy missions, US involvement in sabotage operations did not occur in large part because the OSS’s main goals varied from the SOE’s goals in Norway. The OSS wanted a strategic military offensive location for use in the “invasion sphere.” Thus, the US goal was not to destroy military raw materials but to gain position on the European continent.89

Given this difference, the SOE was not pleased that the OSS wanted to join in on the Norwegian campaign. Having two external special ops groups not knowing what the other was doing, which had caused the Tælvåg disaster, caused lengthy arguments over having the OSS join in the Norwegian fight. A political struggle thus developed between the SOE and the OSS, and Leif Eide, a member of the American 99th Battalion, wrote, “I believe that the Brisish [sic] were rather keen on preventing Americans from going to Norway. Norway was in a way the operational area of the British.”90 Despite the tension, the Americans pursued involvement in Norway. As General William J. Donovan, SOE co-ordinator, wrote,
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The [US] Command was very anxious to participate in operations against Norway, as being one of the flanks from which the German main defenses might be turned... Finally, America had in the Middle West a large population of Norwegian origin, who were anxious to take part in the liberation of Norway and were clamoring to be used in the theater.91

The two agencies reached a compromise: the OSS was to do all of the training and receive approval for its operations from the SOE, and Norway was initially divided into two areas of jurisdiction with the SOE responsible for almost all of Norway and the OSS taking responsibility for the far northern tip of the country.92

Although all OSS agents eventually trained in Great Britain, the OSS recruited its Norwegian agents differently. The OSS used Norwegian seamen like the SOE, but the OSS also took volunteers from the US army and, specifically, from the 99th Infantry Battalion, an all-Norwegian army unit created for special assignments.93 A few Norwegian-Americans left the civilian population, too. In 1943, the US formed the Norwegian Special Operations Group, or NORSO, which received its initial training in the United States but finalized its training in the SOE schools in Scotland. NORSO did not have the advantages that most of the Linge company did because NORSO’s members often were not fluent in Norwegian and most members of NORSO had never been to Norway, whereas almost all of their SOE counterparts had lived in Norway.94

Language was also a problem for the OSS. Most, if not all, of these American soldiers were not native speakers of Norwegian and often had a poor command of

91 Jakub, Spies and Saboteurs, 80. Original source Donovan to CD – Ref. /4226 (declassified from ‘MOST SECRET AND PERSONAL’), 14 January 1943, RG 226, M1642, Roll 111, (NARA), pp. 1-2. (Author’s interpolation)
92 Dear, Sabotage and Subversion, 13.
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grammar. The Norwegian language has many diverse dialects, so even those soldiers who spoke their own dialect well could not understand other dialects. This was enough of a problem that in 1942 the army created a special language-training program headed up by Norwegian Professor Einar Haugen at the University of Wisconsin.\textsuperscript{95}

Problems in training were not the only issues that hampered the United States sabotage efforts. Disagreements over territory emerged with the SOE, and questions arose about coordination with the allied military forces, which hindered many missions of the OSS. All activities had to be cleared through Dwight D. Eisenhower, who continually put off operations for various reasons, ranging from overall military strategy to the political balance between the allies and the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{96} The OSS’s first sabotage raid took place in March 1945, four years after the SOE conducted their first sabotage operation.

Essentially, the SOE was responsible for successful Norwegian sabotage; no other group had the capabilities and the initiative. Given its concerns about civilians, the Norwegian government-in-exile was unlikely to have started a sabotage movement—and certainly not as early—without the pressure of the British Special Operations Executive. The British started training agents before Norway even agreed to sabotage, and Britain’s role in training remained primary throughout the war. Inadvertently, the Germans themselves provided much of the impetus for shifting Norwegian sentiment toward support for the resistance and sabotage. Once this had been achieved, the SOE was able to conduct more complicated operations that hurt

\textsuperscript{95} Newspaper clipping from unknown newspaper, 12 August 1945, found in William Theodore Evjue’s papers in Archives of Wisconsin State Historical Society, Madison, WI.
\textsuperscript{96} Udgaard, \textit{Great Power Politics and Norwegian Foreign Policy}, 56.
the German war effort. A diverse group of sabotage operations was developed and planned by the SOE, supported by the Norwegian government-in-exile, and helped by the Norwegian resistance. Sabotage became a recognized part of Norway’s war experience.
Chapter 3
The Achievements of Wartime Sabotage in Norway

The SOE conducted three main kinds of sabotage in Norway with increasing help from the Milorg. The first type of sabotage—economic sabotage—lasted the longest, from March 1941 to the spring of 1945, and aimed to limit German access to war resources. The second type of sabotage, which was conducted between March 1943 and August 1944, aimed at protecting Norwegian civilians and the underground movement from Nazi labor conscription. The last type of sabotage, which the SOE organized with help from OSS between December 1944 and April 1945, aimed to stop German mobility and to prevent German troops from joining other German forces in central Europe.

The contributions of the Milorg increased over the course of the war. During 1940 and 1941, the Milorg and the SOE agents did not cooperate for the most part both groups did not want to work with the other because of mutual distrust and various methods. The SOE originally kept the Milorg out of sabotage because the SOE wanted trained personnel conducting controlled operations and intended to use the Milorg only in the future allied invasion. The SOE was capable of excluding the Milorg because the SOE trained and supplied the agents. The Milorg did not have access to explosives did not have the knowledge to use them and knew nothing of the effective strategies for their use. Moreover, the Milorg did not want to work with the British: after the British retreat in June 1940, the Milorg felt betrayed. In the first year of the war, the Milorg participated in civil disobedience, distributed underground
newspapers, helped refugees, and prepared for the allied invasion. Like the Norwegian government-in-exile, the Milørg feared Nazi retribution towards the civilian population.

Once the joint Norwegian-British committee for co-operation was set up in London in February 1942, cooperation began to emerge slowly during the summer of 1942 but SOE and Milørg agents were still frequently working at cross-purposes. By September 1942, the SOE’s long-term policy changed to include collaboration with the Milørg,¹ and the British admitted that their treatment of the Milørg had been rather underhanded.² During the last two years of the war, these agencies had maximum cooperation.³ Thus, the Milørg participated in all three types of sabotage but did not help in sabotage operations early in the war.

The early tensions between the SOE and the Milørg emerged clearly in the “Scandinavian Policy” of April 16, 1941, in which the SOE issued after its first successful sabotage operation in the previous month. The leaders of the SOE emphasized “its desire to pursue its own policy.”⁴ Although the policy stressed the importance of not jeopardizing the Milørg, the central issue was the chain of command. The Milørg was not responsible to England, but became an official military group on November 20, 1941, under the direction of the Norwegian home front defense in London. SOE agents, however, cleared everything through England before attempting a mission, and no agents worked without permission from the SOE
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headquarters. By not permitting the Milorg to participate, the SOE limited the Norwegian government’s involvement in sabotage operations.

The SOE also discouraged the use of the Milorg because it did not trust the organization after numerous security breaches in late 1941 and early 1942. Colonel John S. Wilson, head of SOE’s Norwegian sector, stated:

There existed . . . a distrust of Milorg’s ability to take ordinary security precautions. The arrests in the autumn of 1941 gave apparent reason for this distrust . . . the tendency of the British officers concerned was to demand that all SOE organisation should be independent of Milorg.5

The Milorg was vulnerable, and the Nazis destroyed many local branches and arrested many of the leaders. The underground had formed through trial and error and made many mistakes in the beginning. Max Manus, who after escaping to England became an SOE agent, commented that in the first six months of the war “We were very definitely amateurs at the game and made hundreds of mistakes, taking chances which later on I shuddered to think of."6 The SOE feared that too much involvement with these amateurs would endanger their agents and operations. The British and Norwegian governments were also concerned about involving civilians in sabotage because of fear of Nazi retribution. The Milorg policy until 1943 was thus to avoid sabotage, to continue to prepare for future military offensive and to participate in civil disobedience.7

Although the Milorg developed out of the Norwegian military, civilians quickly joined. Unlike combat, underground fighting required more creativity and less obedience to orders and military regimen. Therefore, as time passed, private

6 Manus, 9 Lives before Thirty, 52.
7 Cruickshank, SOE in Scandinavia, 187.
citizens rose into the Milørg leadership because underground operations needed citizens from diverse backgrounds to be successful. The home front organized people from all occupations for intelligence, medical personnel helped underground members escape, farmers assisted refugees to Sweden, and homemakers became couriers; people from all lifestyles offered what they could to the movement.

Although the British and Norwegian leadership continued to be concerned about protecting the civilian population, the Milørg improved on security measures for the recruitment of civilians. By late 1942, the Milørg central leadership had drawn up a security code for all Norwegian citizens, but particularly for resistance members. The rules had some similarities with the SOE agents’ code, for the Milørg list including the following: do not gossip and participate in careless talk, do not write down information that might be useful to the Germans, if information absolutely has to be written down it must be carefully guarded, any resistance member who has been out of touch with the resistance for sometime should be contacted by a second party through a pay phone to ensure that the resistance member’s home has not been taken over by the Nazis after an arrest. Another suggestion included:

Be prepared for the Gestapo to come and inquire for you at work during the day, or at home at night; but remember, they may not always come to arrest you, but to make some fairly innocent inquiries. If you can avoid seeing them, do so. If you are arrested, accept it with dignified silence or haughty indignation. Don’t defy them. Take warm clothing with you.

This security code, as well as a greater awareness of security after numerous arrests, made the Milørg a more cautious and a more secure organization.⁸
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As the war continued, potential Norwegian recruits also became more careful. The Milørg started a new policy that helped protect not only the Milørg but also new members. Prospective members were told to listen to London radio to prove that the recruitment was real. The potential resistance members would tell the recruiter what they wanted said on the air, and the resistance told them at what time to listen for their message. When the specific message was sent on the radio, the person knew that their contacts were actually connected to London. This cautious policy helped the Milørg too, for the leadership suspected that people who were too anxious to join might be Milørg Nazi informers. Also, potential members who exhibited a lack of caution might be more easily caught by the Nazis than people who were not so willing to join the first time asked.

This modification in recruitment, the adopted security codes, and the changing relations with the Norwegian government made the SOE more eager to work closely with the Milørg by late 1942. Eventually the SOE realized as well that trying to act independently of the Milørg and of the Norwegian authorities in Norway created complications, misunderstandings, and dangerous situations. This was the rationale behind forming the committee for co-operation in early 1942, although it was still almost a year before the SOE stopped ordering their agents to avoid contact with the Milørg.9 Once the local Milørg supported sabotage, the SOE trained the local Milørg and eventually the Milørg became so involved that it took over the decision-making in Norwegian sabotage operations. Even though SOE commandos continued to
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commit sabotage in Norway, the British planned their last operation in Norway in April 1944.

Although sabotage had different purposes, all sabotage in Norway had common themes besides a continually growing relationship with the Milorg. All sabotage operations were supplied by the SOE because the Norwegians did not have access to explosives. Some Norwegians did have guns and radio equipment, but replacement parts and ammunition were impossible to find within Norway. Airdrops and the Shetland bus kept the Milorg supplied with the necessary materials. In addition, agents created the illusion that the British were ultimately responsible for most operations. The use of explosives to destroy equipment implied British involvement because the Germans knew that Norwegians did not have access to explosives. The Norwegians did have access to some incendiary materials such as gasoline or oil, but they were heavily rationed, dangerous to use, and thus impractical for sabotage. The resistance preferred to use gasoline for transporting agents and refugees than for building bombs. The intentional use of explosives from England also helped distance civilians from sabotage operations.

That the Nazis thought the British were taking an active role in Norway was important for numerous reasons. First, the illusion of British commandos completing missions in Norway was good propaganda for the allies. The SOE wanted to convince the Nazis that the British had a larger presence in Norway than it in reality had to show that German defenses were vulnerable. The false impression increased the fear that the British could attack more easily and decreased the morale of the German stationed in Norway. The illusion of a British presence forced the Germans
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to look for ways to protect Norway from the allies. Hitler was convinced that the allies were going to regain the continent by landing in Norway. Thus, the Germans spent time, money and reinforcements in trying to make Norway impregnable, which helped achieve one British goal from the fall of 1941—to keep more German troops in Norway.

In addition, if the Germans thought the British had committed sabotage, they paid less attention to local Norwegians, which protected informants and saboteurs who worked within the factories or local communities. Thus, on actual missions the SOE and the saboteurs often tried to create the illusion that the British attacked. The saboteurs donned British uniforms before going to carry out their missions, so if guards saw the attack, they claimed that they saw the British. If German guards captured the saboteurs, it also helped.

[The British uniform] designated us as soldiers, not civilians, engaged in sabotage. If we were caught, we would expect to be tried, condemned, and punished by the military authorities. We could hope to be sent to a military prison, along with other prisoners of war, and not to a concentration camp. ¹¹

To protect the illusion of a British presence in Norway, Norwegian saboteurs had to conceal all associations with Great Britain when in hiding and then they did everything possible to fit in. Manus wrote, “It was immensely important, in case we were captured, that we should have nothing on us that would betray the fact that we had come from England.”¹² Only on actual missions did the SOE agents try to create the illusion of British commandos.
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The first sabotage raids into Norway were conducted to destroy war materials. Economic sabotage conducted by SOE units was the most common type of sabotage thought out the war to stop Germany from getting war materials. The British discovered early that transporting materials from Norway to England was all but impossible, so the most feasible way to deny Germany resources in Norway was to destroy them.

The first sabotage mission took place with the team wearing British uniforms and without the help of the Milorg on March 4, 1941; the group — which later became the Norwegian Independent Company Number One, landed in the Lofoten Islands.\textsuperscript{13} Captain Martin Linge and Captain Andre Croft led British and Norwegian commandos for “Operation Claymore.” The group successfully sank eleven ships and blew up cod liver oil and herring factories. The company returned with 213 German and 12 Norwegian collaborators prisoners. Another 314 Norwegians volunteers returned with them to enlist to fight the Nazis. The SOE regarded the mission as a great success, but the Norwegian government-in-exile was far more skeptical. Nonetheless, the SOE Norwegian Company became official in July 1941.\textsuperscript{14}

In the summer months, the new company was in training and no operations were carried out. The next two raids, also in Lofoten, did not occur until December. The Linge Company had some success with sabotaging war materials on these next raids but also had significant casualties. Linge himself was killed in the second raid.

\textsuperscript{13} The Lofoten islands, off the coast of Norway, are one of the largest island groups. They are located at approximately 70 N degrees latitude well above the Arctic Circle. This location makes them ideal for clandestine missions because of its extended darkness.
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in December. Raids continued through the winter months, followed by heavy German retaliations, culminating in the German destruction of Tælvåg in April 1942.

The most famous and most complicated example of economic sabotage was the Vemork Norsk Hydro plant in Rjukan, Norway. Hugh Dalton, Minister of Economic Warfare, wrote in his memoirs: “Of all our operations, that against German heavy water supplies in Norway was, in my view, by far the most important.”

Heavy water looks and tastes like normal water, for it is chemically identical. The only difference is that heavy water contains the hydrogen isotope deuterium; in other words, it has an extra neutron, which makes it ten percent heavier than normal water.

Most scientists researching in the nuclear field considered heavy water the best possibility for creating plutonium from uranium because the heavy water’s extra weight slowed the speed at which neutrons were set free in a uranium pile. Scientists involved in nuclear research believed that the heavy water allowed neutrons to collide and to break apart uranium 235 without absorbing the neutrons. The only other suitable moderator was graphite. German physicists discovered in 1940 that the
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graphite available to them did not work because they could not purify it enough.\textsuperscript{19}

Thus, the Vemork plant was indispensable to Germany.

Norsk Hydro was the only company in the world that commercially produced heavy water,\textsuperscript{20} and the company only produced heavy water at one plant that was located in Rjukan about 80 miles west of Oslo. Heavy water was a by-product from the plant's electrolytic process. The new plant had started producing heavy water in 1934, and by 1939 the plant was producing ten kilograms a month. The company sold this heavy water to laboratories around the world.\textsuperscript{21} Before 1940, the Germans had attempted to purchase the entire supply of heavy water from the Norsk Hydro plant, but the general manager declined the order. In 1940, the plant sold all heavy water and future production to France. Fortunately, Rjukan was the last town conquered in southern Norway in the beginning of May and the Germans secured the plant but discovered the plant had no heavy water.\textsuperscript{22}

Although most people knew nothing about heavy water, those in intelligence work concerned about nuclear research did know some details regarding the German nuclear program and had many reasons to believe that the Germans were building a nuclear device. German researchers Otto Hahn and Friedrich Strassmann discovered fission in 1938,\textsuperscript{23} and the Germans captured thousands of tons of uranium ore in Belgium.\textsuperscript{24} Danish and Swedish intelligence reported that Werner Heisenberg, head
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of nuclear research at Kaiser Wilhelm Institute in Berlin, was consulting with many physicists and conducting nuclear experiments. British intelligence had discovered that fifteen of the top sixteen German scientists were working on nuclear research. All of this information coupled with the German attempt to purchase the heavy water stock made the allies nervous. Nuclear authorities accepted that Germany excelled in nuclear physics and fear spread about what would happen if Hitler had an atomic bomb. Heavy water thus became the most valuable war resource and the British War Cabinet ordered the SOE and SIS to make neutralizing the atomic threat “the highest possible priority.”

In the autumn of 1939, prominent physicists Leo Szilard and Albert Einstein urged United States President Franklin Delano Roosevelt to start a nuclear research program, but the US atomic energy effort started only at the end of 1941. It became known as the Manhattan Project in September 1942, when General R. Groves became the head of the project. Some of the Manhattan Project’s top scientists believed that Germany’s first bomb was only months away, whereas the Americans had not even tested a reactor. Groves wrote in his memoirs, “Our chief danger was that [the Germans] might come up with relatively simple solutions to the problems we were finding so difficult.” As allied nuclear researched progressed, allied scientists

---

thought that the only practical possibility for Germany to create an atomic weapon was by using heavy water.\(^{30}\)

In February 1942, Norwegian radio operators reported that the Germans had increased the production of the heavy water plant in Norway by ten-fold. Although one head of MI6 reacted to this news as “bloody silly, Whoever heard of heavy water?” others in the intelligence field understood that an increase in heavy water meant that the Germans were working on the atomic bomb.\(^{31}\) Churchill wrote:

[Roosevelt and I] both felt painfully the dangers of doing nothing, we knew what efforts the Germans were making to procure supplies of ‘heavy water’—a sinister term, eerie, unnatural, which began to creep into our secret papers. What if the enemy should get an atomic bomb before we did! However skeptical one might feel about the assertions of scientists, much disputed among themselves and expressed in jargon incomprehensible to laymen, we could not run the mortal risk of being outstripped in this awful sphere.\(^{32}\)

The British wanted to bring the heavy water production in Norway back to England, but that task was impossible so they decided instead that the plant must be bombed or sabotaged.

The SOE destruction of the Norsk Hydro plant followed a series of attempts before succeeding in stopping the Germans from safeguarding and producing heavy water. First, the SOE needed information. Professor Leif Tronstad\(^ {33}\) was brought from Norway to London to elaborate on his report on German activities and helped


\(^{31}\) Dear, *Sabotage and Subversion*, 120-1.


\(^{33}\) Tronstad refused to give information when questioned the first time in summer of 1941 because he thought that Imperial Chemical Industries, a British competitor, was making the request. In his response he stated, “Remember blood is thicker than heavy water.” He later was convinced that the information was a legitimate war objective and became willing to work with the SOE and SIS. Cited from Thomas Gallagher, *Assault in Norway: Sabotaging the Nazi Nuclear Bomb* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975), 11-12.
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plan the attack on the factory. The SOE selected Einar Skinnerland, a contact of Professor Tronstad's and a supervisor at the Norsk Hydro plant, to be parachute-dropped into Vemork to gather additional intelligence.³⁴ (Skinnerland had just escaped to England on the pretext of going on a mountain vacation; the British returned him quickly so that he could return to his life before the Nazis had realized he left the country). With the help of local underground and workers inside the plant, data was collected for SOE analysis about how best to destroy the heavy water plant.

Sabotage was not the only option considered by the British government; an air raid option was examined, but the village was located in a deep gorge close to ammonia storage tanks, and a misplaced bomb could have destroyed the entire village. Norwegian intelligence also questioned how much damage would be done to the actual equipment within the plant because of the thick walls of the Vemork plant. The British and Norwegian governments were determined that sabotage would be safer and more effective than bombing raids which would have meant heavy civilian casualties and doubtful results. The SIS wanted gliders to be used instead of parachutes because they were quiet and could be landed in a specific area. This would be the longest glider tow ever attempted. The SOE argued that Norway was too treacherous and too far to make such an attempt, but the SIS won out.³⁵

A reconnaissance group was sent ahead to act as guides and prepare the way for the gliders.³⁶ SOE agents Jens Poulsan, Knut Haugland, Klause Helburg, Arne

³⁴ Dear, Sabotage and Subversion, 121.
³⁵ Kurzman, Blood and Water, 61.
Kjelstrup, parachuted into Norway on October 18, 1942. A briefing officer told Jens Poulsan that failure could mean the Germans might achieve a weapon that could destroy all of London. Jens Poulsan said, "At the time, I didn't think that could be true, I only thought he was saying this to make us do a good job." The initial attempt to destroy the heavy water plant was a complete failure. The British glider-borne attack was hampered by bad weather. Unbeknownst to the ground crew in Norway or to the British leadership, the entire group of forty crashed or was killed. Unfortunately, the glider attempt alerted the Germans as to the target and they improved security at the heavy water plant, bringing in anti-aircraft guns, searchlights and an additional 300 men.

Immediately following the glider disaster, the SOE organized another attempt to sabotage the heavy water plant. Six men under Joachim Ronnenberg were trained in England to join the group already on the ground. The SOE needed to send this group as quickly as possible because Poulsan and his group had not been restocked with food and supplies. Poulsan's crew could no longer concern themselves about the mission because the commandos now had a different concern—they needed to stay alive during the winter months in the mountains of Norway. They scrounged food from cabins and preyed on reindeer to keep the group alive.
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38 Colonel John S. Wilson, head of the Norwegian section for the SOE, was Poulsan’s briefing officer. Cited from Kurzman, *Blood and Water*, 60.
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On January 23, 1943, the second group of saboteurs attempted a parachute drop into Norway but had to return to England because they did not find the target Poulsan and his group had laid out. Instead, the parachuters returned to Norway on February 16, but jumped some forty miles north instead of fifteen miles northeast. A few days later, the two groups intercepted one another.\textsuperscript{43} The saboteurs took some time to organize themselves, but on February 27, 1943, the following men successfully bombed the guarded Norsk Hydro plant: Jen Poulsan, Klause Helburg, Knut Haugland, Arne Kjelstrup, Joachim Ronnenberg, Knut Haukelid, Frederick Kayser, Kasper Idland, Hans Storhaug, and Birger Stromsheim.\textsuperscript{44} The men skied down the mountain to the gorge, crossed the river of ice and climbed the 600-foot cliff to reach the plant undetected by the German patrols. At 12:30 a.m., the group crawled through a cable duct, the only unguarded entrance to the building.

The saboteurs attached prefitted charges to the eighteen heavy water tanks. Twenty-five seconds after the last explosives were strapped on to the equipment, the explosives went off, and the team was already crossing the river. The group took three hours to ski back up the mountain next to the plant; all the while, the group feared that the Nazis would cut off their escape by using a cable car that could reach the top of the mountain in only minutes. After the attack, the saboteurs separated and fled into the mountains to avoid the Nazi search parties. The Germans pursued them over the next few days, but all the men escaped. Five men skied 300 miles to

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 157-162. \\
\textsuperscript{44} Dear, \textit{Sabotage and Subversion}, 125.
Sweden while the others returned to Norwegian cities. Haukelid survived in the mountains of Telemark alone for the next year.\textsuperscript{45}

Even though the mission was a success, the Nazis had the Norsk Hydro plant operating again in a couple of months. The British government and the saboteurs eventually launched other attacks on the heavy water supply, but sending in a small saboteur team seemed impossible because of the increased security. The allies started numerous bombing raids to destroy the plant; although the bombers sometimes hit the target, the thick walls of the plant usually protected the heavy water production.

After the bombing at Norsk Hydro, the SOE followed with more economic sabotage. Wearing British uniforms, Maximo Manus and Gregers Winter Wulfsberg Gram, parachuted into Norway on March 12, 1943. Once they had collected their gear and hidden in the mountains for a couple of days, they made their way to Oslo.\textsuperscript{46} Manus decided to bring in some help from the Mil\textsuperscript{o}rg because as he put it "if demolition was spread more widely through the harbor shipping, [the Germans] would believe what we wanted them to believe—that it was the work of British commandos, who had been landed secretly, right under their haughty noses."\textsuperscript{47}

SOE agents Manus and Gram prepared to sabotage at Akers and Gronlia harbors, located around Oslo. They were helped by a few Mil\textsuperscript{o}rg members, including Sigurd Jacobsen, who worked at Akers Mechanical Works, Kris Dahlman, and Henrik Martinsen. The targets included the Tai Wan, the Tuguela, and the Von

\textsuperscript{45} Charles Curalt, \textit{The Heroes of Telemark}.
\textsuperscript{46} Manus, \textit{9 Lives before Thirty}, 154.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 160.
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After a coin toss, it was decided that Henrik Martinsen\(^{48}\) and Gregers Gram were to commit sabotage at Akers harbor, while Kris Dahlman accompanied Max Manus to Gronlia harbor. Sigurd Jacobsen and his inside men were to sabotage the Akers Mechanical Works.\(^{49}\)

On the night of April 4, 1943, Manus and Dahlman,\(^{50}\) dressed in British uniforms, paddled a canoe to sabotage the German ships. In an attempt to create the illusion that the British were present, they stopped off at a nearby island to place cigarette butts with H.M.F. (His Majesty’s Forces) markings on the ground, as well as their empty limpet boxes. They also placed a fake letter on a tree for the Germans to find. Manus wrote that he intended “the Germans to look for British commandos, and not Norwegian saboteurs.”\(^{51}\) Continuing on the mission by canoe, Manus and Dahlman were lucky: because Germany wanted to get ships underway as quickly as possible, crews worked around the clock and on their way across the harbor to the Tuguela, they were sighted.\(^{52}\)

I saw [a miracle] that night . . . two men in a canoe . . . moved across the face of the water in full sight of a dozen or more men. I swear I saw the Germans and the laborers working at loading the ship. I saw the German guard, rifle on shoulder, grenade in his belt. But the funniest thing of all was a workman who stared at us . . . He saw us all right, but he didn’t do a thing. Maybe . . . he thought he was having hallucinations. Maybe he thought we were an advance patrol of the invasion . . . Maybe—as I like to think—he was a good Jøssing [loyal Norwegian]. He served his country by keeping his mouth shut.\(^{53}\)

---

\(^{48}\) Henrik Martinsen is the named use in 9 Lives before Thirty but he is named Halvor in the book Underwater Saboteur by the same author.

\(^{49}\) Manus, 9 Lives before Thirty, 158-164.

\(^{50}\) Manus called this man Kris Dahlman in 9 Lives before Thirty but used the name Einar in his book Underwater Saboteur.

\(^{51}\) Manus, 9 Lives before Thirty, 165.


\(^{53}\) Manus, 9 Lives before Thirty, 168-169.
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They placed British limpets set to go off at 6:00 a.m. on the *Tuguela*. After their first close encounter, Manus decided not to continue the mission because the *Von Knippode* was well illuminated and located farther. Dahlman and Manus paddled to safety and found Gram and Martinsen who had also completed their mission. At around 6:00 a.m., three ships in Akers harbor slowly sank and twenty-four Germans were killed. The explosions drew crowds to see the “first shout of the campaign for Norway.”

The saboteurs were pleased but had encountered some unexpected predicaments in the operation. First, the number of German boats in the harbors was smaller than they had hoped. Second, some of the limpets did not work: one Norwegian freighter in Akers harbor and the three ships sabotaged by Jacobsen’s crew had not exploded. Throughout the day at the mechanic shop, numerous workers had spotted the explosives, but had agreed not to say anything. Eventually, one worker informed the Germans and an expert was sent in to remove the explosives. This expert stated that he did not suspect the workers at Akers Mechanical Workshop and believed that the sabotage had been accomplished by British commandos who had arrived by submarine. After the mission, all the saboteurs, with the exception of Jacobsen and his crew, escaped to England. Manus and Gram returned to Norway and conducted numerous other sabotage operations throughout the war. According to Gunnar Søntesby, Max Manus and Gregers Gram had their private war on shipping.

---

54 Ibid., 169-173.  
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While Manus and Gram continued to have successes with small sabotage missions on shipping resources, the Germans worried that sabotage would continue and their main concern was the heavy water plant. In 1943, an American air raid damaged the plant slightly. As Knut Haukelid\(^5^9\) describes, “The Germans realized that [Norsk Hydro plant] would be bombed and bombed and bombed again so they had to move it to Germany and start producing down there some place where the allied bombing couldn’t get at it.”\(^6^0\) In the winter of 1943 and 1944, Haukelid received information from the SOE that the Germans planed to move all the heavy water by train and by barge to Germany. Haukelid noted, “They had moved in extra forces and everything and they were actually sitting on the railroad cars that were carrying the transport. A general told the commandant to sit on the golden chest and he sat on it but he forgot the weak point that was the ferry,” which the train had to board at Mæl to cross Lake Tinnsjø.\(^6^1\)

With the help of the engineer in charge of transportation, the shipment was delayed until Sunday because the resistance hoped fewer passengers would be taking the ferry that day.\(^6^2\) Early on the morning of February 20, 1944, Haukelid boarded the ferry when only the Norwegian crew was aboard. Haukelid remembered, “Well, I went down to the bottom with the charge which would blow out the two square meters of the bottom of the boat.”\(^6^3\) In order for it to be impossible to beach the boat, the ferry had to sink within five minutes. Haukelid used two alarm clocks for timers

---

\(^{59}\) Haukelid had survived in the mountains of Telemark alone since the Norsk Hydro sabotage on February 27, 1943. He was the only saboteur that remained in Telemark area.

\(^{60}\) Charles Curalt, *The Heroes of Telemark*.

\(^{61}\) *Ibid*.

\(^{62}\) Haukelid, *Ski against the Atom*, 189.

\(^{63}\) Charles Curalt, *The Heroes of Telemark*. 
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and set them to go off. At 10:45 a.m. fourteen tons—nearly all of the world’s heavy water supply—sank in Lake Tinnsjø. Fourteen Norwegians and twenty Germans went down with the ferry. A German report on secret weapons stated, “build[ing] a new factory was now impossible because of the time involved and at several places it was attempted to build small experimental plants for the production of D₂O [heavy water].” At the end of the war the allies found a uranium pile, which lacked about 700 liters of additional heavy water. The SOE had accomplished the most important act of economic sabotage.

Economic sabotage—especially the destruction of heavy water—proved critical in the war, but the SOE and the MI/erg also became involved in a second tier of sabotage whose aim was to prevent the forced recruitment of Norwegians as laborers and soldiers. As early as January 1941 Quisling had tried to recruit Norwegian youth to Germany’s front lines. In early 1942, the Nazis finally realized that the Norwegians were not going to embrace the empire, so the Labor Service changed to suit the needs of the Nazis and became a tool of the Nazi government. Some workers who were “important and essential” had been drafted in the summer of 1941 and the Nazis called up an additional 15,000 men in May 1942. In desperation on February 22, 1942, Quisling introduced “the Law of the Common National Labor Effort,” which required men between 18 and 55 and women between 21 and 40 years of age to register for work. Rumors that the Nazis intended to mobilize a Norwegian

64 Haukelid, *Ski against the Atom*, 193.
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66 Haukelid, *Ski against the Atom*, 197.
67 Ibid., 238-239.
68 Moore, ed., *Resistance in Western Europe*, 228.
labor force for Germany were heard immediately. As Germans pressure grew on the Norwegians to be a part of their labor force, the underground set about trying to convince Norwegians not to join the Nazi labor service.

As Germans pressure grew on the Norwegians to be a part of their labor force, the Norwegian government-in-exile acted to stop German conscription. The standing order not to directly attack the Nazis remained, and the first attempts to stop Nazi labor drafts were cautious. Soon, however, the government-in-exile ordered attacks on "German government" buildings, which was a paradigm shift. Although not a direct assault on German personnel, sabotaging German government buildings had the greater potential of killing German officers than did sabotaging most industrial sites.

In March 1943, the underground responded to the Nazi labor draft by sending in false records in an attempt to cause chaos. The Germans found about 25 percent of the initial 43,000 returns to be false, but eventually the Germans had about 300,000 registered workers. Initially, the underground issued a boycott, that excluded citizens whom the Germans asked to work in agricultural or non-military positions. However, the government-in-exile feared that this service camouflaged military involvement and by the end of April the government requested the resistance change its stand so that all were to boycott service. The underground sabotaged the NS records at the conscription office on April 21, 1943. At the end of May 1943, the Nazis called up 400 men in east Norway, but less than 20 percent came. Statistically fewer men

---

69 Gjelsvik, Norwegian Resistance, 1940-1945, 92-94.
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showed up in the urban areas, than in rural areas, where it was harder for the underground to get the message out.\textsuperscript{71}

During the winter of 1943-44 the general military situation worsened for the Nazis: the allies started to conquer Sicily in July 1943; in November, the Soviet Union recaptured Kiev; and the British started intensive bombings on Berlin. The Nazis therefore instituted a labor draft in Norway in May 1944, and the home front organization “decided to institute a countrywide wave of sabotage”\textsuperscript{72} by blowing up the records of the labor service. Thus sabotage was undertaken by the so-called Oslo gang, a section of SOE Linge Company that was led by Gunnar Sønsteby and included Max Manus, Gregers Gram, Birger Rasmussen, Johan Tallaksen, William Houlder, Andreas Aubert, Arthur Pevik, Viggo Axlesen, and Martin Olsen.\textsuperscript{73}

The Nazis announced the first call-up of the Labor Draft on May 17, 1944.\textsuperscript{74} The resistance believed that the purpose of the draft was to mobilize young Norwegians to help Germany fight the war. London agreed with Sønsteby that these drafts should be prevented.\textsuperscript{75} The BBC transmitted the London response: “No one must obey the call-up to report for Labour Service.”\textsuperscript{76} The Oslo gang determined that the destruction of Watson and Company’s registering machines would cause delay in the drafts.\textsuperscript{77}

The Oslo draftees were required to report to the Labor Office on Akers Street on May 19th. On the night of the May 18th with only a few hours notice, Sønsteby

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 99.
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\textsuperscript{74} Gjelsvik, \textit{Norwegian Resistance, 1940-1945}, 153.
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\textsuperscript{77} Sønsteby, \textit{Report from #24}, 108.
and Gregers Gram set about to destroy the office at the request of Jens Hauge, the local Milorg leader. They got a key from a contact at the Labor Office, on the way, Max Manus joined the two. Gram promptly set up fifteen pounds of explosive on the second floor. Once the explosives were set, the team gave Sønsteby the signal to warn the workers in the building. Sønsteby ran throughout the building yelling, “Come on out of there! The building’s being blown up. You’ve two minutes to get out.” After escorting the civil servants out of the building, the three saboteurs jumped onto bikes to escape discovery. Sønsteby commented, “As both the papers and the offices were destroyed, the draft had to be postponed.” The Oslo gang saved the civilian population from the German draft, which was a great boost for the morale of the country. The resistance got word of another machine to be used for tabulating the draft, and Sønsteby and his group promptly destroyed that machine too.78

Most young people avoided the draft, which usually meant going into hiding. Some students were hidden by friends and others went to the mountains to hide. Many joined Milorg members already hiding out. This appearance of so many people seeking refuge caused many problems, for the Milorg had not prepared for the Nazi draft announcement and therefore did not have the food and supplies needed for this large group of people in hiding.79 These draft dodgers also could not get food supplies from home as many of the Milorg members could. When the young men did not report to the draft boards as ordered, the police immediately canceled their ration cards. Since the Milorg needed ration cards to feed all of the escaping people,

78 Ibid., 109-116.
79 Ibid., 130.
arrangements were made with the printing firm to contact the underground when the next shipment of ration cards were being moved.

On August 9, 1944, Sønsteby and two Milorg members met at 8:15 a.m. When the printing truck stopped for the underground’s vehicle which had the right of away, Sønsteby opened the driver’s door and forced the employees in the truck to drive toward the post office. Instead of stopping at the post office, they took the truck several blocks further to Skipper Street, where the group took ten minutes to unload 150,000 ration cards. The streets were swarming with people, who never realized that ration cards were being stolen in plain view. The men working for the printer’s offices were urged to go to Sweden to avoid German punishment. One of the truck personnel, it turned out, was a resistance member who was going to Sweden anyway; another employee decided to join him. They tied the other two employees onto the truck, also in view of onlookers from the street, before the resistance members drove off.80

Knowing that their new supply of ration cards could cause havoc for the Germans, Sønsteby and his men secretly contacted the Quisling government. “We informed Quisling’s Supply Minister that the cards would not be misused, would even be returned, if the order was rescinded that no ration cards should be issued to those evading registration for the labor draft.” The Quisling government gave in, but not before depriving the entire nation of five days of alcohol and tobacco rations as punishment for the theft. The resistance returned 70,000 ration books, 30,000 supplementary cards, and nearly 30,000 tobacco cards.81

80 Ibid., 132.
81 Ibid., 133.
Like economic sabotage, sabotage to protect the Norwegian underground was thus successful. The extent to which this was true was not known until January 1944, when the resistance discovered a secret memorandum from the Nazi Minister of Justice that stated that 75,000 men should be conscripted for war service. The SOE Oslo gang, which had thwarted German plans to send Norwegians to the front lines of the war continued its service for the rest of the war with the help of the local resistance. The gang attacked, among other targets, a sulphuric acid plant, aircraft engines at the Oslo bus depot, an oil-storage depot, a railway factory, an electric transformer plant and a ball bearing factory. In addition, the gang also captured the archives of the Department of Justice run by Quisling's government.

The last type of sabotage—to tie down German military units in 1944-45—was conducted with the approval of the Norwegian government-in-exile and under the orders of allied leadership but planned by the Milorg. Although the SOE agents still carried out sabotage in 1944, the Milorg planned and executed most sabotage operations by May 1944. By then, the SOE and the Norwegians had to deal with the U.S. interests in Norway, which had grown from aid to the Norwegians under occupation to involvement in sabotage. Adding another country's interests in Norway was so complicated that regardless of American desires, U.S. sabotage only operated during the last phase of the war and was directed to prevent the German retreat.

At the beginning of 1944, the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied European Forces (SHAEF) under Dwight D Eisenhower, directed military operations and the
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SOE agents and Norwegian resistance had to adjust themselves to the allies’ larger plans. Orders were reissued not to rise up and fight the Germans but to wait; even after D-Day, the Milorg was only permitted to continue the economic sabotage of war materials. At this time, SHAEF and others in allied command assumed that it was easier to allow the Germans to retreat and eventually surrender in Central Europe.

The liberation of Norway technically began in October 1944 when the Soviet Union crossed the Norwegian border while chasing the retreating German army. The Red Army stopped at the border town of Kirkenes because the Germans were practicing a scorched earth policy. The local population was under German control despite the Norwegian government-in-exile’s sending a force of 300 men to meet the Soviets. Despite this allied advance nothing essential changed for Norway.

Only on December 5, 1944, did SHAEF issue a new directive: no longer were the allies to drive the Germans out of Norway; instead, the allies were to stop the Germans from leaving the country to prevent the reinforcement of the German army further south. The main routes for German troops withdrawals were the railroads. Eisenhower told the Milorg to attack railways all over Norway. Rail routes throughout the country were targets because although some Germans escaped south to Denmark, many Germans were escaping through northern Norway because of the surrender of Finland. At the same time railroad sabotage became a main goal for resistance in many countries of Europe including Norway, Denmark and Luxembourg. Within the month of December, the Milorg and British commando
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teams conducted more than thirty sabotage attacks on railways and bridges. In a coordinated effort with Danish resistance, a large-scale operation was planned for spring 1945. On the night of March 14 and 15, a thousand Milorg members cut the north-south railroad in 750 places and the Oslo gang attacked the railway administration building.

In this final phase, the United States finally participated in the Norwegian sabotage effort. In March 1945, the OSS NORSO group conducted “Operation Rype.” A thirty-six-member team was to cut the Norland railroad line north of Trondheim to stop the deployment of 150,000 German troops. Problems occurred with the airdrop and only fourteen of the members parachuted into the staging area, while some of the others were arrested after being dropped in Sweden by accident. Ten of the men were killed in plane crashes. The fourteen remaining men skied for six days to reach the railway. On April 14, 1945, after changing from their original heavily guarded target, they blew up two and a half kilometers of track with plastic explosives. This operation slowed the German movement of troops from one battalion a day to one battalion a month.

Sabotage efforts to keep the Germans in Norway were a success because the attacks slowed the speed of German troop movements. Originally, the Germans could move four divisions a month but with fewer railways, they could only move less than one division a month. By the middle of April 1945, the SHAEF thought that the Germans in Scandinavia would not be able to arrive in time to help the main
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battle. Thus, the Milorg was told “to cease their present activities and build up for the future.” The SOE trained groups, however, continued with their activities.\footnote{Cruickshank, \textit{SOE in Scandinavia}, 244.}

The end of the war came unexpectedly quickly. The Milorg, which had prepared so diligently for the allied invasion, did not have to fight to free their country because the 60,000 underground members assisted by a few British troops, rounded up and disarmed some 400,000 German troops after their official surrender on May 8, 1945.\footnote{Stafford, \textit{Britain and European Resistance, 1940-1945}, 161.} The Milorg took over running the country until the king returned.\footnote{Foot, \textit{Resistance}, 282.} King Håkon arrived, exactly five years after his departure on June 7, 1945. A little over a month later, on July 15, 1945 the Milorg was formally disbanded and the Norwegian resistance was officially over.\footnote{Derry, \textit{A History of Modern Norway, 1814-1972}, 403.}
Conclusion

After 1945, Norwegian saboteurs became heroes and were decorated by the British, Norwegian and American governments. These SOE agents received the admiration of their country, and their autobiographies became best sellers. The Norsk hydro saboteurs themselves starred in the 1948 film version of their mission Kampen om tungtvannet (The Fight Over Heavy Water). Hollywood created its own movie version in 1965 entitled The Heroes of Telemark, filmed on location “for added authenticity.” General knowledge of Norway’s wartime resistance movement began to fade out at the end of the 1960s, however, despite the fact that many historians consider Norway’s resistance as strong as the better-known resistance in Poland, France and Yugoslavia.\(^1\) Norway’s initial advantages—the mountains, sparsely populated areas, a long coastline—provided Norwegians with opportunities to set up resistance. But these same geographic traits were disadvantages to effective resistance and so outside help was needed.

The failure of Norwegians to respond to “Aryan” brotherhood disillusioned the Germans, and Norway unexpectedly was a considerable problem. The German Commander and Chief of Military Occupation troops commented, “We were prisoners of the task set before us and it was true that troops that were in Norway were so many because the Norwegian resistance increased and increased.”\(^2\) Although the Germans did have some success in recruiting into the Nasjonal Samling party,

---
\(^1\)See for example Foot, Resistance, 61.
\(^2\) Frankie Denton, The German Occupation of Norway.
membership peaked in 1943 with 43,000 members, and the Germans arrested almost as many Norwegians: approximately 40,000 were put in concentration camps or imprisoned. After the return from exile in London, the Norwegian government charged more than 90,000 citizens, including many of the NS members, for collaborating with the enemy, but only convicted 46,000. In comparison, to other occupied countries the number of convictions after the war very small, and almost the twice that number (80,000) Norwegians escaped to Sweden; a few hundred more left the country by boat. Germany had to maintain 300,000 to 400,000 troops in Norway, which was more than one-tenth the size of the entire Norwegian population.

The large number of German troops was in part necessary because of the sabotage operations in Norway.

The cooperation of many groups made sabotage successful. Distinguishing the roles of many interdependent groups is a challenge, but the role of the SOE surpassed the rest. The SOE was the dominant outside organization in Norway and recruited the majority of the Norwegians. After realizing that an invasion of Norway was not practical in the fall of 1940, the SOE was the first group to recognize that making sabotage a top priority was an effective supplement to traditional military strategy.

The Norwegian government-in-exile moved to this position more slowly and until 1942 continued to want the Norwegians to become soldiers for a future
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liberation. The government wanted to protect civilians from the causalities that could occur during sabotage and from the German retribution, as well as to protect the growing resistance at home. The resistance in Norway did not want to engage in sabotage either. Finally, the government-in-exile wanted to appease the citizens at home and was concerned about destroying Norwegian property even if Germans were running these sabotage targets to further the war effort.

Despite Norwegians’ reluctance, the SOE took control anyway to achieve the Ministry of Economics’ goal of limiting German war supplies, and by 1940 sabotage was one of the few practical ways to accomplish this goal. The British thought that besides destroying war materials, sabotage would cause the Germans to keep large numbers of troops in occupied Norway, thus hampering future German plans and weakening German defenses elsewhere. The British argued not only that sabotage would not harm the resistance movement but also that it would boost Norwegian morale. When SOE’s position proved to be correct, Norwegian resistance to sabotage vanished.

The SOE trained Norwegians and supplied the equipment, the technology and the coordination to make successful sabotage possible. Norway did not have any experience with sabotage operations whereas the British had had many experiences within their empire. The British had people to train saboteurs and agents whereas Norway did not. The British eventually made equipment available to both SOE saboteurs and the Norwegian resistance. The Norwegian government had money to purchase equipment, but did not have factories to produce its own equipment. Even if the Norwegian government had had access to the needed materials, only the British
could supply equipment through airdrops. Although the Shetland bus was partially operated by the Norwegians nationals, the British organized the actual planning and supplies. The Norwegian government could not have supplied the resistance alone. The SOE also benefited from this joint cooperation, for Norwegian civilians, supplied intelligence and helped agents in the field.

No other foreign agency or individual took on a greater role in making Norwegian sabotage a success than did the SOE. It is true that the SIS documentation is lacking because, after the war, SIS continued as MI6. Therefore, exacting how dependant the SOE was on the SIS overall is still not known, but it seems that eventually the SIS concentrated on information gathering because overlapping agencies had caused horrific consequences like Tølvåg. The SIS definitely was helpful in the information gathering process for the heavy water operation and also provided many of the radio operators throughout the war.

The success of the initial sabotage operations belongs primarily to the SOE, but from 1943 on the Milørg also played a critical role in successfully stopping the German operations. Many authors note that the increasing interactions of these agencies contributed their overall success. Cruickshank quotes from FO 371 General Political Correspondence that the Milørg help to the SOE was profound:

Even if sabotage operations were originating from Great Britain, and even if the agents were under directives to refrain from involving Milørg, it could not be avoided that Milørg people get involved . . . I doubt whether you can find any SOE sabotage action not being assisted by members in one way or the other, even during the period when they were not supposed to do so.\(^{10}\)

\(^{10}\) Cruickshank, *SOE in Scandinavia*, 187.
Cruickshank overstates the relationship. Although the SOE cooperation with the Milørg was necessary for logistical reasons in Norway, the Milørg was even more dependent on the SOE for equipment and training. However interdependent these agencies became, the SOE initiated, planned and supplied sabotage operations for most of the war.

The SOE provided a unique protection for the Norwegian civilians by creating the illusion of a British presence in operations. A good example of maintaining the illusion of the British whenever possible was the attack on the German labor conscription. The call-up cards were taken under heavy guard from the German Labor Office to Watson’s and there punched by the machine. The easiest method for the resistance would have been to smash the machines at Watson’s with hammers, but this would have brought suspicion on the firm and their employees who were the expert operators of this machine. To avoid reprisals as far as possible, Milørg often carried out sabotage so it looked as if parachute saboteurs were responsible. The attack on Watson’s machine gave the impression that British commandos were responsible.\(^\text{11}\) Also by using explosives that were not available to labor department employees, the operation interfered in German goals but protected Norwegians. It also showed cooperation between the SOE and the Milørg: the explosives came from Great Britain and the agent who set the explosives was trained there but the information and the key were attained through Milørg contacts.

Although the SOE and the Milørg needed each other, neither needed the OSS, which played only a small role in Norway’s sabotage efforts and always operated in

\(^{11}\) Seth, *How the Resistance Worked*, 141.
cooperation with Great Britain. Even the final training of the OSS NORSO group took place at SOE saboteur schools. The SOE did not need the OSS at all; in fact, the OSS was more of a burden than help. The debates that arose between the OSS and SOE over involvement in Norway were a distraction, and although the US did help encourage the decision to bomb the heavy water plant, that decision would have probably been reached anyway.

The overall contributions of helping civilian resistance and keeping German units tied down in Norway are debatable—at least for the overall course of the war. From the Norwegian point of view, SOE's contributions to civilian resistance were of course critical. The SOE facilitated civilian resistance, protected civilian protests, and stopped labor conscription. In addition, SOE protection of civilians helped the underground keep its membership secure so that it could keep the Germans from leaving Norway. Whether tying down Germans units played a critical role in winning war is doubtful, but the Norwegian units’ sabotage of German escape routes was impressive. Norway’s mountains and modest infrastructure made railway the most significant form of transportation for German troops, and after the December 1944 orders from the SHAEF, literally thousands of people destroyed thousands of miles of Norwegian railways in a matter of months.

The Norwegian resistance should be studied for its significant contributions to war, especially the economic sabotage. Most Norwegian sabotage destroyed German war materials, but no resources were more important than those that helped German nuclear capabilities. Many authors maintain that the series of attacks on Norsk Hydro were the most successful acts of sabotage in World War II. Foot wrote, “The
Rjukan raid alone may well have turned the course of the war: nine men can seldom have deserved better of their fellows.”  

Ian Dear saw these raids as the “most important Allied sabotage operations of the Second World War.”  

Even individuals who did not believe that sabotage was efficient or even worthwhile comment on the significance of the heavy water plant bombings were worthwhile. “Alan Milward picks on the Rjukan heavy water raid and a series of small raids on French wolfram mines as the only examples he knows of really worthwhile sabotage.”  

The allies had no way of knowing exactly what the Germans had discovered in nuclear research, but once intelligence information indicated that Germany was gathering the necessary resources, the allies had to assume that Germany would succeed in creating an atomic weapon if heavy water was obtained.

The Norwegian resistance was thus significant, despite the small number of saboteurs. Most Norwegians were not part of the official resistance and resisted only in peaceful ways, but the majority wanted the resistance to succeed. The allied military leaders well understood the significance of resistance, both narrowly and broadly defined. As General Eisenhower stated,

I wish as Supreme Commander of the allied Expeditionary Forces to pay sincere tribute to the officers and men of the resistance groups who, in carrying out my orders, have fought so magnificently. They can be justly proud of having by their devoted heroism contributed so largely to the liberation of their beloved homeland.

---

12 Foot, Resistance, 314. 
13 Dear, Sabotage and Subversion, 119. 
14 Foot, Resistance, 314. 
15 Speech to the Belgium resistance on October 3, 1944, upon entering Belgium. 
Timeline

1905—Norwegian independence: union with Sweden dissolved

1906—Prince Charles of Denmark became King Håkon VII of Norway

May 17, 1933—Quisling founded the Nasjonal Samling Party

January 1939—Naval chief of staff confessed defenses were “worse off than in 1914”

September 1, 1939—Great Britain declared war on Germany

December 14, 1939—Quisling met Hitler

March 19, 1940—Churchill proposed mining the Norwegian coast, but the War Cabinet objected

April 1, 1940—Allies told Norway - - We reserve the right to stop German iron ore transport

April 8, 1940—Britain mined Narvik Harbor

April 9, 1940—Shortly after midnight Germany invaded Norway
  — Blücher sunk in Oslo Fjord
  —Royal Family and the Storting escaped to Elverum
  —British Government offered military aid
  —7:32 pm Quisling appointed himself the leader of Norway over the radio

April 13, 1940—The British arrived at Narvik; destroyed all 10 German ships, and took Narvik

Spring 1940—Shetland bus began

April 24, 1940—Third Reich appointed Terboven in charge of Norway

May 10-11, 1940—Radios belonging to Jews were confiscated

May 15, 1940—Southern Norway conquered; fighting continued in the north

May 1940—Germany ordered Norsk Hydro to increase heavy water production to 3,000 lbs per year

June 1940—US organized a relief effort

June 7, 1940—Military fighting discontinued; King Håkon departed for England
  — Milorg organizations began

June 8, 1940—All allies left Norway

June 17, 1940—King Håkon refused to abdicate
Summer 1940 — Nazis jailed the first Norwegian-newspaper editor
— Underground Newspapers began

July 19, 1940 — Section D of the Secret Intelligence Service, Department EH and MIR of the War Office become the Special Operations Executive or SOE

July 1940 — The SOE planned future strategies to drive the Germans out with massive retaliation strikes by the civilian population

September 1940 — Storting refused to force the king to abdicate and the government-in-exile became the official government
— The SOE planners reasoned that to drive the Germans out it would take a full-scale invasion of the country

Sept 25, 1940 — Nazification began when non-NS member replaced by 'commissary ministers'

Autumn 1940 — Quisling asked teachers to sign loyalty oaths
— Teacher resistance began
— Three Norwegian soldiers returned from England to launch intelligence work, but the Germans captured and executed them.
— Nazis arrested numerous members of the resistance movement

November 1940 — Norwegian physicians refused to join the NS Guild for Health and Hygiene

December 12, 1940 — Norwegian Supreme Court resigned

Throughout 1941 — Nazis squashed most of Bergen's intelligence groups

January 15, 1941 — Norwegian Lutheran church moved underground

July 1941 — SOE Independent Company Linge started

September 1941 — Nazis ordered all radio sets to be turned in

November 20, 1941 — Milorg became an official military group

December 7, 1941 — Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, Hawaii

February 1, 1942 — Germany formally recognized its 'ministers'; Terboven appointed Vidkun Quisling as Minister President

February 3, 1942 — National Youth Service became obligated for all Norwegians between ages nine and eighteen

February 5, 1942 — Quisling made a law requiring all teachers to become members of the new NS union Laerersamband

February 11-12, 1942 — Teacher directive decided (see February 20)
February 14, 1942 — Bishops protested against youth service law

February 20, 1942 — Teachers mailed letters and refused membership into Laerersamband

March 1942 — No school; ‘fuel famine holiday’

March 20, 1942 — Nazis arrest teachers (about 1,000 the next few weeks)

June 1942 — SOE constructed own radio sets, developed their own stations and their own code names

July 14, 1942 — United States Office of Strategic Services or OSS established (NORSO established 1943)

November 26, 1942 — Nazis began to deport Norwegian Jews to Poland

1942 — Germany orders Norsk Hydro to increase heavy water production to 10,000 lbs per year

February 27, 1943 — Saboteurs bombed Norsk Hydro plant

May 19, 1943 — Oslo squad blew up three tabulating machines

July 20, 1943 — 75,000 new ration cards stolen by Milorg

Throughout 1943 — Sabotage; Pyrite Mines, Silicon Carbide Works, Shipping Industry

March 14, 1945 — Operation ‘Concrete Mixer’ attacked railway lines

May 9, 1945 — Civil servants take over central administration

May 13, 1945 — Crown Prince Olav returns

June 7, 1945 — King Håkon VII returns
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