

The Ugly Truth about Norway's "Democracy"

Contrary to what mainstream media is telling us, corruption and human rights violations in Norway are common.

FAMPO¹ is a Human Rights Organisation struggling to stop abuse of power in Norway.

Censorship, the Norwegian way.

On Sept. 6th 2000 a local radio station called *Radio Modum* broadcasted the second program in its series "*Det skjulte Norge*" (The veiled Norway). The following day, Irene Mjøseng, editor of a local newspaper called *Bygdeposten*, situated in the same area (at the countryside north west of Oslo), commented the content of the radio show, about the veiled Norway - in her newspaper's editorial.

The next day she was called upon by the paper's board chairman, Bjørn Larssen. He told her that he had received two negative reactions on Mjøseng's editorial. He declined to tell her who had reacted negatively, but said there were two "external persons" who had contacted him.

Mjøseng understood that the chairman denied her publishing more editorials or articles, of the same kind. She found that her chairman's demands that she stopped covering certain issues, was in conflict with the guidelines that an editor is supposed to follow. This demand coming from the chairman, she commented in a later editorial - on Sept. 12th.

The following day Mjøseng was suspended. The Oct. 31st she was sacked. To the regional newspaper *Drammens Tidende*, Larssen stated that the board of *Bygdeposten* had decided to suspend her, "in order to protect her security." He said that she had by herself been telling him, that she was in danger, because she had been "expressing herself too much" (sic).

Mjøseng sued *Bygdeposten* for sacking her without sufficient reason. During the following trial, the board of *Bygdeposten* put forward another reason for the dismissal: The main point was now that Mjøseng was not willing to follow the newspaper's fundamental views, including that *Bygdeposten* "ought to be a newspaper according to a local newspaper's concept". This she even had, according to the owner of the paper, been confirming during a board meeting on Oct. the 10th. Protocols from this meeting expose this to be a lie.

Judge Hagelund in Drammen Municipal Court wrote in his verdict: "The court agrees with the defendant that she thereby has parted with the newspaper's editorial fundament, because this topic does not coincide with the local newspaper concept, which she as an editor, is bounded by."

This is, needless to say, an absurdity. The fact that a newspaper is edited according to a local newspaper's settings, means that it shall be clever in presenting local stuff, but not that certain topics shall be banned. Besides, the actual articles really did have local connections, due to the fact that the organisation Fampo, which provided documentation for the articles at issue, was registered in the same area.

¹ People's Action Against Abuse of Power, Police State and Culture of abuse - see <http://home.no.net/fampo>

It is an acknowledged principle in Norwegian press that the editor, not the board of staff, is in charge of deciding what shall be published. Nevertheless, judge Hagelund pointed out that Mjøseng had continued publishing her articles and editorials concerning abuse of power in Norway – in spite of the fact that the board chairman had told her not to do this.

Mjøseng appealed to Borgating High Court, which had to dismiss the City Court's decisions in all points. However, this did not mean that the Court agreed with editor Mjøseng. The High Court writes that it seems “evident that Mjøseng has been influenced by Dag Hiåsen [Fampo's chairman], to the extent that there can be raised rightful suspicion, that this influence has influenced her editorial practice - and thereby her independence.” The High Court did not make attempt to justify its claims, that the editor had let “herself become influenced,” - but claimed that it was “evident.”

Let us have a look at what was published by *Bygdeposten* before the editor was removed. The article: *Coercively hospitalised without reason* described a case where a woman from one of Oslo's suburbs was picked up three times in her home, and brought to a mental asylum, without any requested papers present.

In the article *The last Soviet Republic* the editor informed that Sunnmøre Police Office (at the western coast) demanded that Kåre Torvholm and Oddmar Remøy, both fishermen with clean legal records, should be subjected to mental examinations. We'll come back to Torvholm's struggle and revealing of extensive economical criminality, later on.

Both Oddmar Remøy and Kåre Torvholm were accused for “posing threats against, and acting threatening towards,” a police officer in Herøy municipality. In the article *Wants judicial murder* on April 27th 2000, editor Mjøseng cited an article in the newspaper *Fiskaren*, (*the Fisherman*) where prosecutor used a journalist as a witness.

This journalist admitted later on (in a taped conversation), that he was not at all present when the alleged threats had been posed. And that he had not even heard the conversations, written in *Fiskaren*.

The case *Bygdeposten* is the main topic in the report called *Ytringsfrihetens pris i det skjulte Norge*² (The price of freedom of speech in the veiled Norway). In this report, Dag Hiåsen documents that two levels of court both have been withholding important documents provided by the plaintiff, which is a clear violation of Norwegian law. The report also exposes lies concerning cases, being planted in regional media.

In her editorial *Radio med mening* (Meaningful Radio), Mjøseng wrote: “Three local radio stations, spending time on these issues, have all lost their publishing licences immediately. One of them was the student's radio in Tromsø”. With help from the Norwegian judicial system, journalism exposing abuse of power was stopped also in *Bygdeposten*.

Psychiatry worthy a dictatorship.

Norway is *the* European country with the highest amount of people being coercively hospitalised, relative to the population numbers. An analysis made by SINTEF (research organisation) in the year 1996, it showed up that at about 45 per cent of all hospitalisations in

² Published at <http://home.no.net/fampo/ytringsfriheten.pdf>

Norwegian psychiatric clinics, are coercive. In other European countries the same numbers are between 5 to 15 percent.

The Norwegian numbers were, however, only an estimate. This is due to the fact that many hospitals do not even report coercive hospitalisations at all. Therefore, no good statistics are available.

In several other countries there are courts deciding whether or not a person shall be coercively hospitalised. This is not the situation in Norway. In Norway one may only complain to a so called “Control Commission” - after being hospitalised! In that situation it is often difficult for the patients to further their cases, because they are being drugged.

We have many examples of an utmost grave form of abuse of psychiatry – hospitalising people who have disclosed corruption and abuse of power. The most well known example is the infamous so called Juklerød-affair.

Arnold Juklerød was hospitalised at Gaustad Psychiatric Hospital in 1971, with the diagnosis “*cverulantia paranoia*,” According to the psychiatrists of Gaustad, Juklerød was diagnosed having “unchangeable paranoid false ideas”. This because he was able to prove, that the local authorities had broken the law, when shutting down a school.

As Trond Skaftnesmo later on documented, and also admitted by the Department itself in 1995, Juklerød’s “false ideas” were proven to be true! In spite of this, his so called “diagnosis” was never deleted.

Another one who was labelled mentally ill and coercively hospitalised was Synnøve Fjellbakk Taftø, a diplomat and a jurist. Taftø has written a book called *Skjoldmøysagaen*, where she writes about her experience from the Norwegian Diplomacy Service.

As mentioned before, the police in Sunnmøre wanted Kåre Torvholm and Oddmar Remøy mentally examined. In the case of Remøy, the argument for hospitalising him, tells a lot. This is what Bjørn Martin Aasen, municipal doctor in Herøy, and former secretary in one of the departments of Gro Harlem Brundtland’s government, wrote to justify coercive hospitalisation:

“He belongs to a civil network with both local, national, and international connections, which purpose is to disclose criminal things, happening in the public sector, and to get things on to a more productive track. In my opinion the requirements in lph 3 are fulfilled” (Lph 3’ is a shortage for the Law on Mental Care).

In a report written in 1999, when a new law concerning psychiatry was carried, Dag Hiåsen wrote about the control commissions. In the year of 1997, as many as 9,651 Norwegians citizens were coercively hospitalised. The number of complaints on coercive psychiatric treatments, endorsed by the control commissions during the same year, was 49. That number was exceeded by the number of the control commissions at that time - which was 57!

During the last years the use of medication against ADHD has soared and has increased by 900% in the period 96-06. The UN’s drug organ has voiced concern about the strong increase in Norway, which is exceptional in Europe. There exist noteworthy warnings about side

effects of this medication, as well as interesting alternatives to medication. (see <http://home.no.net/fampo/adhd.html>).

Child care

In the year 1996 scientist Joar Tranøy wrote a report to the University in Stockholm, about Norwegian child care departments and the methodology of the psychologists who are entitled to write official reports about whether or not parents are fit to raise their children. Tranøy scrutinised the reports in 37 cases, where parents had contacted him, and found several methodological weaknesses.

Lack of criticism of sources: In 32 out of 37 cases sources had not been scrutinised; Allegations against parents were uncritically adopted. The conclusion in 18 of the cases referred to second hand information i.e. from the Departments of Children's Care. In 16 reports, the psychologists made use of pure slander.

Non scrutinised information was uncritically referred to as facts in 18 cases. Tranøy found decontextualisation in 28 of the 37 reports. Decontextualisation may imply that facts relevant to descriptions of persons, is not being mentioned. It may also mean that statements and actions are separated from its context, so that those who are reading the report may easily misinterpret the situation.

Tranøy also found citation errors in disfavour of biological parents - and biased statements. An example of a biased statement is the following remark from a report: *"Dad occupies the whole dining table with his hobby activities and there is quite untidy and somewhat dirty in the house"*.

The psychologist observed this during quite short time (15 min, according to parents). According to the neighbours of the children, they often participated in the hobby activity, building up model planes, together with their father, which created a certain disorder. The psychologist did not examine this.

In his report, Tranøy describes general legal protection problems in the child care system. One can compare the report in child care cases with the task of a police investigator. Both are supposed to find the relevant facts, and ask questions like; "should the accused be found guilty"? Or; "should the child be removed from its family"?

The role of the police investigators is regulated by law. Child care cases are different. There are no rules at all concerning collection of information. The child care workers are deciding themselves, whether or not discussions with the parents, or witnesses, shall be taken by phone or face to face. Telephone is often used. The parents are not presented with what the psychologist write down, and the information is often written down without control questions being asked.

Child care cases often rely on "information" from anonymous sources. It may prove impossible to defend yourself against anonymous sources. You never know who the sources are, and whether the sources are reliable. Or whether the sources possess first hand information, or are pure rumours.

We never know whether there is a possible clash of interest present, between the source and the parents. In criminal cases this kind of use of anonymous sources is by law illegal. In a letter the Public Prosecutor has warned against the use of anonymous sources, mentioning that these cases very often are driven by revenge, envy, or malice.

The psychologists in the child care cases are often taken from lists made by the Department of Children's Care, or they may have close relationship to the department. Psychologists operating in several child care cases - are very often present during the meetings in the department, without the presence of the parents, and thereby they only get a one sided information.

Another problem is the swift change of roles in child care cases. Sverre Kvilhaug has long experience being a lawyer in child care cases. He is a critic of the role of the experts in child care cases. Kvilhaug poses the question whether the demands for a fair trial are fulfilled:

“Article 6 in The Human Rights Convention entitles everyone to a fair trial. This is also the case in a child care case in county organs or in courts - when the issue is whether parents shall lose or regain the care for the children. In these cases psychologists have a special role. They are paid by the department to influence the outcome. In this way they frequently change their hats. The extent and economical importance of this practice, makes it reasonable to ask whether their reports and votes, are influenced by their interest in getting renewed their assignments from the department. This question does not seem to have bothered any county bureaucrats, courts or the department. In criminal cases such a change of hats would never have been accepted, nor even conceived”.

Sverre Kvilhaug continues:

“I shall illustrate the extent: In the year 2001, a psychologist in Nordfjordeid (Western Norway) informed us that she had been an appointed expert paid by the Department of Children's Care in at about 40 cases. In 50 cases she had been an expert member of two different committees. One year later, she had had 11 assignments for the department and 5 for the county committee. She had also been an expert member of the county jury. Can we rely on that one single expert, who is as economically dependent on the department, as in this case, be trustworthy able to give the private part in a child care case, a fair treatment? Wouldn't most people tend to believe that these psychologists would support the department in nearly 100% of the cases? And isn't that just what we're seeing experts actually are doing? Would anyone believe that an expert voting against the department would be able to get renewed their assignments from the department?”

One example can serve to illustrate the way many psychologists act in child care cases. Lawyer Herman Berge found the following pattern in the work of a central psychologist connected to FOSAP (Forum for Psychological Experts):

By examining the 33 decisions I found at Lovdata [an official law website] you will find no decision where Poulsson has not concluded in favour of the assigning authority. You may safely conclude that Poulsson consequently has been concluding in favour of the Child Care Department. In my opinion Poulsson's work has no scientific value, and is worthless, not to say detrimental, concerning child care cases” (. You may read more about child care in Norway here: <http://www.barnasrett.no>).

Economical criminality – the fishing industry as an example.

Due to Kåre Torvholm (1941 - 2000) and other people's will of investigating, it's today well known among most people that economical criminality in Norway has been (and still is) rampant in the fishing industry. Torvholm was a pioneer in exposing illegal fishing and thefts.

He even reviled money stolen from the fishermen's pensions, and was an external mentor for Torstein L. Hansen, when he documented severe economical criminality, in his post-graduate thesis at the University of Tromsø. The following are extracts from journalist Kjetil Haanes's article "Kåre Torvholm should have been alive to see this" in *Sunnmørsposten* July 17. 2001:

"The last year hardly a week has passed without disclosures of fishing related cheating. The confidence is all time low, and the fishing industry is to blame. Many have had knowledge about, and participated in, cheating in a lot of ways: faking fishing diaries and the amounts, weights, and species of the fish. Dock's documents and export's documents are all falsified. This is documented in trial after trial.

For too long time the fishermen's spokesmen have been silent about this culture. For a long time excuses like this; "with such complicated laws, 100 per cent law obedience, has never been possible. We have also been told that fishermen from other nations, like Iceland and Russia, have acted far worse."

Haanes concludes as follows:

Former Fishing Ministers can't have been ignorant, at least not if they have been reading some of the hundreds of faxes coming from the now deceased fish cheating discloser, Kåre Torvholm from Moldtustranda. (western coast).

And now I will explain the choice of title for this commentary. In the last days I have been phoned by many people declaring that "*Kåre should have experienced this*", as the scandals have been unfolded.

Several active fishermen have also contacted me and said: "You should have known how right Kåre was about the cheating". And a former politician occupied with fishing politics, and a former critic of Torvholm, said: "He seems to have been right after all".

Warned journalists.

History judges and the verdict may be merciless, especially for those who are exposed playing with false cards. Some of these are now trying to avoid attention. This includes persons who have been calling journalists, urging them to avoid contact with Kåre Torvholm. If they had contacted him, they would not have been regarded as serious. And they would have got difficulties in collecting information - it was said.

Kåre Torvholm wanted the truth to be known, so that people in positions would not misuse their power to gain benefits. He wanted justice and equal opportunities for all, and he was fond of the fishermen and the coastal Norway.

In the attempt of stopping the fishing hoax in Norway, one should not forget honouring Kåre Torvholm.

Marie Lovise Widnes, member of Stortinget (Parliament) from 1989-93, was a big supporter of Torvholm and his struggle against the fishery swindle. She wrote a book called "Fragler, finst dei? (Fraggles, do they exist?), where she was describing his fight for justice.

Politicians informed.

All parliamentary parties in Norway are informed about the grave conditions Fampo can document. In September 2004 Erik Strand, board member of Fampo, sent an open letter to the members of the Committee of Justice in the parliament. In this letter Strand described the *Bygdeposten* trial, human rights violations in Norwegian psychiatry, and other conditions not worthy of a democracy.

Then a member of Stortinget, (Parliament) and today Minister of Justice, Knut Storberget (Labour), confirmed in an e-mail that he had received and read the open letter. Strand also sent a letter to the candidates in the 2005 parliamentary election; all the MPs are informed.

Odd Einar Dørum (Liberal Party), Minister of Justice until the 2005 election, is even more than well informed; Fampo was actually invited to a meeting with representatives from the Department of Justice in August 2004. At that time a debate had been going on for some time on the Liberal Party's Internet debate forum.

In February 2004 Erik Strand posted a debate article on the Liberal Party's debate forum on the Internet, "*Talerstolen*" (*rostrum*). Strand commented that the Liberal Party's chief of staff, Runolv Stegane, had sent a letter with negative remarks about Fampo's chairman Hiåsen, to Hiåsen, himself, and with a copy to the mayor in Sigdal, where Hiåsen lives.

Stegane signed the letter as a Vice Mayor in Sigdal. In his posting, Strand wrote about some of the personal consequences for Hiåsen, due to his engagement for human rights in Norway, and the report *Ytringsfrihetens pris i Det skjulte Norge*. (The price of free speech in the veiled Norway).

Stegane replied with several false allegations. According to him, Hiåsen had served as a lawyer for Mjøseng, which was not right, because he was denied to be that. And he also claimed that Hiåsen had declined to show up in court, which consequently was a big lie. Stegane also claimed that the report "*The price of free speech...*" was filled up with surveillance stories. In dead the word surveillance was not even mentioned in the report!

Stegane ended his participation in the debate with the following remark about the *Bygdeposten* case: "This is a sad story which could have been avoided if she [Mjøseng] hadn't let herself become brainwashed by people acting like religious fanatics, with monopoly on the right lore. It is sad to observe that even Erik Strand, Cand. Scient. [University degree] is falling into the same trap".

In an e-mail Thomas Hansen, editor of the Liberal Party's member's magazine (liberal.no) expressed his disgust about Fampo's participation in the Internet debate in this way: "If there is something that is polluting the Internet debate, it is not spam, but madmen who are out to defame and poisoning the entire debate environment - with their outrageously narrow and unimportant issues."

In an open letter to the Liberal Party leader Lars Sponheim, Strand demanded that Sponheim distanced himself from the allegations that Stegane had posted on his party's debate forum.

Sponheim didn't even answer, but the party's Secretary General, Terje Breivik, wrote an "answer" without any comment upon Stegane's allegations. Breivik only concluded that the party could not instruct Stegane in his task as a Vice Mayor, and that one eventually could strive to get him out of office in the next election - an answer with no relevance to Strand's open letter. In a posting at "*Talerstolen*", Sponheim's advisor Geir Olsen denied that Stegane had posted false allegations.

The open letter may be read at <http://home.no.net/fampo/lettersponheim.html>.

In August 2004, Strand posted an open letter to Dørum as a debate article on "*Talerstolen*." In a reply later the same day, Dørum's advisor Marit Meyer confirmed that the letter was received by the Department of Justice, and that Fampo soon would be invited for a meeting in the Department of Justice.

After some phone calls, Fampo received an e-mail with the following message: "Parliamentary Secretary Rita Sletner may meet you August 31d, between 13.00 and 14.00". When arriving for the meeting, Fampo was told that Sletner was not able to meet up, and that the meeting couldn't last for an hour as planned. Dørum was represented by his two advisors Marit Meyer and Kjersti M. Høgestøl. A representative from the Police Department was also present!

The meeting lasted less than 40 minutes, hardly giving time for needed explanation. Nevertheless Fampo managed to present several examples of human rights violations, by giving the department an issue of the article "*The price of free speech in the veiled Norway*." Fampo also used a tape recorder during the meeting. Therefore everything Fampo was promised by the department, is documented

A year later Fampo still had not received any response from the Department of Justice. Erik Strand therefore posted another debate article to "*Talerstolen*," asking why. Then a local Liberal Party chairman replied saying that "taping of a meeting without their knowledge, did not show openness and honesty." Also a former board member of Young Liberals of Norway expressed his doubt about the legality of this. This is certainly absolutely full out legal!

Then in a reply Marit Meyer wrote that she had been present during the meeting, and" that she was not aware of any tape recorder." When Strand asked about the promised responses, she didn't even give an answer. No response was never ever given by the Department of Justice.

Robbery and neutralising.

In the report *Ran og nøytralisering. - Stat i staten-klanens velferdsstat* (meaning "robbery and neutralising. – The welfare state belonging to a state-in-the-state-clan", Dag Hiåsen examines a broad spectre of conditions in Norway, spotlighting directly towards severe lacks of judicial security, being a direct cause of the increasing of poverty among ordinary people in Norway. By a diversity of arrangements, the sources of wealth are put in the hands of the few. In his report Hiåsen cites news- and debating programs, taken from the media. Thus he's demonstrating that the official explanations of the increasing of poverty – are enhanced with a failure to mention facts.

"*The courts are dangerous for ordinary peoples*" was the headline of an article in the magazine *Økonomisk Rapport* (02/1998). (Economical Report) The article begins as follows: "Scaring is the reality that *Økonomisk Rapport* has disclosed (...)". The magazine continues:

“The judges judge arbitrarily.” “They misunderstand laws (...), do not understand what the case is all about, or let sympathy weigh more than reason, when they judge.”

Under the headline “*Dangerous trials*” the following text was emphasised: “Frightening is our conclusion after having examined almost all the verdicts from Borgarting High Court last year. Common people have no judicial security, but risk losing up to half a million Kroner, in small cases. If you are not on the guard, you might be the next victim.”

The description given by Økonomisk Rapport is unfortunately correct. Several judicial murders are infamous in Norway (Fritz Moen, Per Liland, and Ferdrik Fasting Torgersen).

Andreas Skartveit, a former director of a publishing house, put it in this way in a letter published in the Oslo newspaper *Aftenposten* (June -98) after having summed up several serious cases: “**The most serious about these mistakes is not that they are so many, but that they are so ugly. But the worse is that one can see a pattern behind the mistakes.**”

Fampo has been contacted by a huge number of people being victimized by the judicial system. Documents show corruption in a frightening scale. This is including cases where people have been forced to sell their houses, as a result of judicial murder. And a large number of people have experienced that they have been sold down the river by their own lawyer.

Notorious is the case where the farmer Nils T. Koppen’s property was coercively sold for 350.000 kroner, while local authorities were hiding the fact that his property sooner or later could have been sold for at about 16 million kroner!

Hiåsen also explains in details why the case against the homeopath Atle Johan Løvaas may be called a “legal witch hunting process” directed by the Civil Prosecutors. Being the first Norwegian to be accused for breaching a new law on alternative medicine, Løvaas was acquitted in High Court.

But after the prosecutor’s own appeal to Supreme Court, the case was dismissed there. The reason was this: The prosecuting authorities themselves, which in this case were the police, suddenly heard in Supreme Court - that they *didn’t have the needed formal competence to conduct a trial of this juridical level!*

This happened in spite of the truth, that Løvaas, through his lawyer, in due time before the first trial, had sent a letter to City Court, pinpointing just this.

In an article in the paper Bergens Tidende, with the headline: “*Police blunder exposed*” (April -07), journalist *Eir Stegane* was citing the First State Prosecutor in Hordaland County, Walter Wangberg, saying: “the verdicts against Løvaas” have been nullified by Supreme Court.

Which “*verdicts against Løvaas*” he was talking about, is unknown, since Løvaas was acquitted in High Court.

In Bergen, where Løvaas lives, people are confused and misled to believe, that there still exists a verdict against him, because of the “nullifying due to a police blunder.” Wangberg also presented other lies in the same run.

Bergens Tidende declined to publish Hiåsen's documentation, where he revealed lies in their article. This in spite of, that Hiåsen stated that both Wangberg, and the newspaper itself, could be held responsible for their lies.

Hiåsen reported their lies to the Attorney of State (Riksadvokaten) who sent the case further on to the so called *Spesialenheten for politisaker* (*The Special Unit for Police Affairs*). This organ is infamous for its high percentage of dismissals, and it also dismissed this case.

In his "arguing" the Assisting Director of this Spesialenheten, failed to even mention one single word about the article in Bergens Tidende, which had been the springing point in Hiåsen's letter.)

In his report, Hiåsen quoted the following from text-TV news: "One third of the employee within the health care system, schools, and child care system, are claiming they are afraid of going to their leaders, to report conditions that ought to be criticised. The reason is fright from retaliations.

The largest survey concerning whistleblowers hitherto shows, the text-TV news continues: "Among the retaliations one finds social exclusion, losing tasks, not getting salary rise, and becoming excessive." The report "Prosjekt Munnkurv" (project muzzle) was worked out by Norsk Sykepleierforbund (Nurse Trade Union).

Here is a comment from Bente Riise, former editor of the magazine *Psykisk Helse*, (*Mental Health*) published in the newspaper *Dag og Tid* the 18th of Dec -04: "Forty three per cent of the nurses fear sanctions, if they express themselves publicly about the conditions concerning the patients' health. Half of the nurses have either got, or have seen their colleges getting, negative sanctions, as a result of discussing problematic issues internally. The restrictions on freedom of speech is unacceptable."

In his article "Whistle blowing - a risky sport", Jan Helge Solbakk, Professor in medical ethics, discusses a proposed new law, concerning whistle blowers. In a hearing note sent out by the department on Dec. the 23rd 05, the department (for work and social issues) writes:

There is proposed a general rule which states that employees have the right to speak on their own behalf about conditions concerning the entity where they work. This shall be done in a way that does not harm the employer's relevant and essential interests. There is also proposed a special rule concerning the right to speak about conditions worthy of critique. This shall be done in a responsible way. When whistle blowers go to the media, it must be especially looked upon, that the whistle blowing has a solid foundation, provided the relevant conditions have general interest, and if the employee has spoken out about the conditions internally, in a rational way."

Solbakk starts his comment by mentioning that out of 176 institutions and persons receiving the hearing note, only 56 have replied. He states: "Among the central medical institution and health institutions, Statens Helsetilsyn (The State's Health Care) is the only one that has responded. This in spite of that the law proposal cannot easily be seen as a strengthening of the employees' freedom of speech. Or right to blow the whistle, but might rather be seen as a defence of the employer's need for protection in such cases. Helsetilynet has not got any critical remarks about the proposals that shall replace § 2 - 4 in the work environment law."

Solbakk continues: “As Henning Jakhelln - one of the most learned within this area is commenting, a law where the focus is moved away from the object of whistle blowing, to its subject. This will lead to the questioning of correct procedure from the whistle blower’s side, and be reducing their possibilities severely.”

Hiåsen mentions several examples of people who have met retaliations because they dared to disclose conditions hidden for the public. He comments on threats against Kåre Torvholm and his family (this was mentioned in the newspaper *Sunnmørsposten*). The threats also involved Torstein L. Hansen and his family.

The threats against Torvholm were also mentioned in the book *Oppgjør* (an important book about secret services in Norway) by Oddmund Hammerstad, former Secretary in the Ministry of Defence. A sinister case was the one of architect Eirik Finne, who lost his job when he demonstrated that a common roof’s construction could radically increase the danger of fire.

Also a report from 1999 about psychiatry in Norway discusses causes of poverty. Hiåsen cites a study showing that people with a psychiatric diagnosis, had worse economical conditions than other groups. In the study group, a relatively larger amount of people, with a background in psychiatry, had spouses being in jobs. That should indicate that the situation among people who have been detained in psychiatry, is worse than the study tells.

Never again!

In his book *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, historian Anthony C. Sutton documented that Wall Street was deeply involved in Hitler’s takeover in Germany, with its genocidal consequences. And in the book: *George Bush The Unauthorized Biography*, Anton Chaitkin and Webster G. Tarpley are pointing the role of Prescott Bush’s (Georg W. Bush’s grandfather) and his involvement in this concern. The story about Hitler’s takeover is one of many sincere stories, about the ruinous effect of the existence of powerful networks, working outside all democratic rules. This will happen as long as ordinary citizens are doing nothing. The most meaningful thing a citizen of today can do - is fighting back against these networks. This includes spreading the word about the real situation - also in Norway.

Please note.

There are several indications that people are hindered from reading the material on Fampo’s website. Several people have responded that they have not been able to read certain articles. But after having mentioned this over the phone, they have suddenly been able to read the articles again, which is indicating illegal wire tapping of the phones. Please remember this if you do not get into Fampo’s website.