Balancing ‘the heartless head and the headless heart’

Averting from chaos and crisis to a policy of sustainable immigration in Norway

Author: **Kristine Fjelde Heimstad**

Abstract

Originally a master’s thesis, this narrowed-down article aims at examining the term sustainable immigration by applying it to a Norwegian context. It concludes that the term lacks value due to its vague nature and finds that it is difficult to measure. Further, by assessing Norwegian immigration policy in terms of sustainability, the article showcases that i) Norway rescues fragile societies from mass despair by providing humanitarian aid, but by doing so, it promotes brain drain; ii) Norway assists and protects refugees on paper but rather doubtful in practice; iii) Norway’s voting patterns reveal citizens’ preference of restrictive immigration policies but opinion polls and surveys indicate a nuanced picture; iv) Norway makes an effort to inform would-be migrants but migrants still seek to be returned to their country of origin v) Norway disregards the origin state when drafting immigration policy and; vi) Norway bases its immigration policy on long-term demographic, economic and social forecasts.

Keywords: Sustainable immigration; Norwegian immigration policy; migrants

Introduction

Starting in late 2014 and culminating in 2015, Europe witnessed a growing number of arrivals of African and Asian migrants. Most migration scholars referred to this phenomenon as the 'migration influx', while the media, the political and public sphere rapidly titled it the 'refugee crisis'. Naming the phenomenon a crisis contributed to a discourse of chaos and disorder. The so-called refugee crisis sought immediate attention and had to be addressed. In Norway, this meant a reassessment of the current immigration policy (Hagelund, 2020, p. 2). In order to deter crisis-like migration, there was an increasing call for a policy of sustainable immigration (Matlary, 2015; Solberg & Listhaug, 2016; Støre, 2018; Gjerde, 2019). It was a matter of balancing "the heartless head and the headless heart" (Betts and Collier, 2018) ; to avert from crisis and chaos to a policy of sustainability. However, the question rose: what is sustainable immigration? Actors across the spectrum claimed it and made it part of their discourse, ultimately diluting the meaning of the term. For example, both the Progress Party and the Christian Democratic Party declared a platform of sustainable immigration, even though their immigration politics differed significantly (Blaker, 2019). When parties with conflicting stands on immigration all seek a policy of sustainable immigration, it is reasonable to question what this term entails. This article aims to examine the term sustainable immigration by applying it to a Norwegian context.

Sustainable Migration Framework

The research field of sustainable immigration is characterized as relatively new and modest but growing. Despite prominent research by Erdal, Carling, Horst and Talling (2018), Betts and Collier (2018) and Jaer (2020) among others, no universal definition of the term exists. Nevertheless, this article utilizes a theoretical framework shaped by the definition put forth by migration specialist Alexander Betts and economist Paul Collier. It was selected because of its tangibility and for being the only framework which operationalizes sustainable immigration known to date. This Sustainable Migration Framework holds that sustainable immigration is 1) Immigration based on basic ethical obligations 2) Immigration based on democratic support in the receiving state, and 3) Immigration which leads to 'no regret' situations (Betts & Collier, 2018, p. 7). Each of these elements are further operationalized by several criteria.

While sustainable immigration as a theme has been addressed in academia, its application to national immigration policies is arguable yet to be studied. This article is a contribution to bridge this gap.

Methodologically, the article relies on document analysis and single case study. These methods combined promote research built upon critically examined data and in-depth studies with attention to detail (Grønmo, 2004; Wæhle & Dahlum, 2018). The selected data originate from an assortment of sources; Standpoints from the international sphere have been collected from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations like the Norwegian Organization for Asylum Seekers, United Nations and Amnesty International; Political points of view derive from official press releases announced by political parties or the government; Informative and popular reports are provided by media outlets such as the Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation, Aftenposten and Klassekampen; A legal aspect is added by the Norwegian Immigration Act and; Statistics stem from the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development and Statistics Norway. The selected sources are considered useful contributors to the sustainable immigration debate. By selecting data from international, governmental and popular sources, different sides to a story are told. They challenge each other and together create a greater understanding of the term. Combined, the sources say something about the value of sustainable immigration and Norway's relationship to such a policy. What these sources do not tell, however, is to what extent the findings for Norway can be generalized to other countries. Neither do the sources question the content of the Sustainable Migration Framework. How can the framework simply refer to aid as rescue from mass despair in fragile societies? If a policy of sustainable immigration must include a democratic mandate, doesn't that exclude a significant number of governments? And is it realistic to expect states to take other states into account when drafting a policy of sustainable immigration? Questions like these further enhance the development of the sustainable immigration term.

Norway's basic ethical obligations

The Sustainable Migration Framework suggests that a sustainable immigration policy bases immigration on basic ethical obligations. These ethical obligations are i) to rescue fragile

societies from mass despair and ii) to assist and protect people who flee dysfunctional societies (Betts & Collier, 2018, p. 8). Referring to the first criterion, the duty to rescue fragile societies from mass despair is in practice to assist poor societies with humanitarian and development aid. Norway established an aid fund in 1952 and has devoted a few percentages of its annual budget to assist developing countries since then. Tanzania, Mozambique and Afghanistan represent the greatest receivers of Norwegian aid, each receiving over 10,000 million NOK in total throughout the decades (Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, n.d). The top three receivers of Norwegian aid today are Syria, Afghanistan and Ethiopia (Ibid.). This speaks of aid contributions aimed at war-torn, malfunctioning and unstable societies. At a global scale, Norway is one out of five that donates 0,7 % or more of its Gross National Income, a target set by the United Nations (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2020). It is evident that Norway generously allocates financial assistance to poor societies, but by doing so, is the country promoting brain drain? This is a phenomenon described as a region's "loss of skilled workers or students" (Cavallini et al., 2018, p. 5). Norway is a potential destination for foreign skilled workers due to its high wages and welfare benefits. By scrutinizing the Norwegian Immigration Act, Norway's active choice of prioritizing foreign skilled workers is apparent; A work permit is only granted if the applicant has received a specific offer of employment which is within an acceptable field according to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' fixed quota and the position cannot be filled by domestic, European Economic Arena or European Fair Trade Association laborers (Immigration Act, 2008, §23). When Norway simultaneously aids fragile societies out of poverty while granting immigration permits to its skilled workers, Norway promotes brain drain. As it cannot be sustainable to drain a fragile society of its intellect, this criterion is thus questioned to work against its end goal of a policy of sustainable immigration. It appears ambiguous to achieve sustainable immigration by a non-sustainable solution.

Addressing the second criterion of the basic ethical obligations, the state's effort to protect and assist forced migrants require another examination of the Norwegian Immigration Act. The extent of protection of forced migrants is arguably far-reaching policy-wise. While international treaties often are interpreted in a narrow sense globally, Norway expands refugees' rights beyond its international commitments. For example, the categories of

persecution which gives grounds for asylum are enlarged and specified in Norwegian law to include physical violence, mental violence, sexual violence, punishment defined as disproportionate or discriminatory, and acts of gender and child specific nature (Ibid., §29a-f). Further, the Act clarifies that it is not only states that persecute: organizations, groups and non-state actors can be perpetrators too. In theory, Norway is protecting forced migrants, but how well does Norway protect and assist forced migrants in practice? The question results in a compound picture. Norway seems to uphold its obligations towards the refugees – as long as they are on Norwegian soil. For while Norway can showcase grants of asylum based on homosexuality, persecution by non-state actors and fear of genital mutilation, honor killings and forced prostitution for women (Skjeggestad, 2012; Selmer, 2015), the country has made it increasingly difficult to reach its border to apply for asylum. The only border crossing to Norway is through Russia if one wants to avoid the risk of being returned to its first Schengen country of arrival. When the so-called refugee crisis reached Europe, and eventually Norway, the Parliament decided to alter the Immigration Act in such a way that all refugees could be returned to Russia without processing their claim of asylum in Norway (Flyktninghjelpen, n.d). In practice, Norway shut down the asylum institution on the Norwegian-Russian border and put a stop to the flow of asylum seekers on this route (Austenå, 2018). This decision, along with other immigration restrictions, received international attention and was criticized by more than 150 organizations, academic institutions and individuals, among them the United Nations Refugee Agency, Amnesty International and several state departments (Regjeringen, 2015; Crouch, 2016). Instead of providing protection to refugees in Norway, the country sought to financially support them through the United Nations Refugee Agency in their neighboring areas (Alfa, n.d). Norway prioritized United Nations' quota refugees as an alternative to welcoming asylum seekers.

Despite Norway's relatively good merit in upholding refugees' rights within its borders, controversies have taken place. For instance, when the Directorate for Immigration doubted asylum seekers' claims regarding their age, medical examinations of teeth and hands were institutionalized. These tests were labelled 'problematic' and 'unreliable' yet affected the outcome of asylum applications (Malmo & Strøm, 2017). Furthermore, the Norwegian government was criticized for forcefully repatriating the so-called 'October children' to

Afghanistan in 2017 (Amnesty International, 2017; Norwegian News Agency, 2017). These persons arrived as single minors during the so-called refugee crisis of 2015, and by 2017 many of them had turned 18 years old and were hence legal to return. The Norwegian government considered parts of Afghanistan safe, and thus, did not regard repatriation as problematic to the non-refoulment principle (Tjernshaugen & Olsen, 2017). Even though the government saw no wrongdoing of its own, a French court stopped a return of an Afghani asylum seeker to Norway. It regarded Norway in breach of European minimum standards for cessations and returns, and ultimately, international human rights law (Norwegian News Agency, 2017). Due to these controversies and critics, Norway's practice of providing protection to refugees is questionable. Sub-conclusions like these create doubt about the value of the sustainable immigration concept. Is it a useful term when its core elements are so challenging to measure? By stating that on the one hand, yes, Norway assists and protects refugees, but on the other hand, no, Norway hinders asylum seekers from reaching their border, no clear answer is given to whether Norway fulfills its basic ethical obligation. Unmeasurable core elements speak of a term which simply falls short.

Norway's democratic support

According to the Sustainable Migration Framework, a sustainable immigration policy must take citizens' preferences into account. If it does not, the policy will not endure, and chaos and crisis might erupt. Betts and Collier suggest evaluating democratic support through i) voting patterns and ii) opinion polls and surveys (2018, p. 17). In Norway, the right-wing Progress Party is known to have 'ownership' of the immigration issue with its strict immigration policies (Stand, 2017). The Party has seen a steady rise in voter turnout since it changed its campaign to an anti-immigration tone in the municipality election of 1987. With the exception of the 1993 and 2021 election, the Party has held the position as the second or third biggest political party in Norway (Polls of polls, n.d). It first came to power in 2013, after two record-high years of immigration. Throughout its period in government, the Party managed to implement "the most restrictive asylum and immigration policies ever taken place in Norway, resulting in the lowest inflow of asylum seekers of 20 years" (Fremskrittspartiet, n.d). The Party has often been the center of attention; In the span of six years, no more than six of its Ministers of Justice resigned. Their responsibility was withdrawn, among other

issues, due to critic-worthy administration of children repatriations and disputed social media campaigning aimed at foreigners (Prestegård, 2020). The Party leader Sylvi Listhaug has attracted considerable media attention, for example by stating how "foreigners are being carried into Norway on golden chairs", swimming in a survival suit by the Greek islands to "understand the refugees better" and actively participating in a search for illegal immigrants together with the police and a television crew (Zaman, 2016; Prestegård, 2018). The Party's immigration policy has been concluded as the main reason for its electoral success (Gjerde et al., 2015). In the so-called climate election of 2021, the Party lost voters leaving it the fourth largest in Norway. However, in the 2021 national high school election, its youth party saw the greatest increase of voter turnout (Aas & Lunde, 2021). Even though it's the Progress Party which is known to have restrictive immigration policy at its core in Norway, other parties have increasingly followed its path. Norway's largest party, the Labor Party, described their immigration politics as 'human, fair and consistent' during the election of 2009 (Arbeiderpartiet, 2009, p.65). Today, 'consistent' has been replaced by 'strict' (Arbeiderpartiet, n.d). The Party has been accused of copying the immigration policy of the Progress Party (Krosby, 2018), and it's been questioned if a 'race to the bottom' in immigration policy is beginning to take shape in Norway (Johnsen, 2018). The fact that Norway's been conducting a restrictive approach to immigration at least since the Progress Party came to power in 2013 is an expression of citizen's preferences.

Voting pattern is a measure of public opinion, but it only depicts a nation's preference every four years and disregards the details of the political scenery. Opinion polls and surveys have the opportunity of providing a more nuanced picture by asking the right question at the right time. According to Statistics Norway, 52 % of the population believe that the access to the country should stay the same as today for asylum seekers and migrants (Statistics Norway, 2021). Those who desire less restrictive access make up 20 % and those who want more restrictive access results to 16 % (Ibid.). These numbers show that even though a slight majority agree to government policy, the rest of citizen's preferences range as both less and more restrictive. It is a reminder of the individuals behind the democratically supported government with the restrictive immigration policies. Further survey results reveal the range of Norwegian public opinion. For instance, in the 2017 repatriation case of the Afghani 'October children', 77 % of Norwegians supported reopening their application claims while

staying in Norway (Støbakk & Karlsen, 2017). Another example of range is the public's attitude towards forced returns to Afghanistan in general. Opinion polls show how only 22 % of the public was in favor of the Afghan repatriation policy, while 41 % wanted to stop all forced returns to the country (Gullestad & Skårderud, 2017). These examples illustrate that the picture is not black and white. Even though there is democratic support for restrictive immigration policies in Norway, not all policies are of the majority's preference. Betts and Collier warn that "there are particular challenges relating to establishing which aspects of citizen preferences are fixed and which ones are malleable and can be influenced by political leadership" (Betts & Collier, 2018, p. 17). These challenges add to the account of a comprehensive and unmeasurable term of sustainable immigration.

Norway and situations of 'no regrets'

The Sustainable Migration Framework stresses that a policy of sustainable immigration promotes situations of 'no regrets'. It is not preferable if a migrant is regretting the journey, the origin state is suffering from the departed migrant or the immigration harms the receiving country. Situations of 'no regrets' are operationalized as situations when a state i) provides sufficient information to would-be migrants, ii) regards origin states when implementing policy, and iii) bases policy on long-term demographic, economic and social forecasts (Ibid.). First, Norway's main channel for communication to would-be migrants is through the internet. Governmental websites offer concise information in English about migration to Norway. The authorities have additionally experimented with other information platforms of less formal character. For example, it has been revealed that millions of Norwegian kroners have been invested in governmental information campaigns aimed at discouraging migrants to come to Norway (Ramnefjell, 2017). During 2014 and 2015, the Ministry of Justice financed a 94-page Somali cartoon that portrayed Norway as cold, brutal and racist (Brandvold, 2017). It is reasonable to question whether this type of information is regarded as reliable and accurate, or simply a scare tactic with misinformation from the government. Since the Norwegian authorities started using social media as an information platform, would-be migrants have been reached on a greater level than with previous conventional approaches (Beyer, 2017, p. 6). The Ministry of Justice's 2015 Facebook campaign "Stricter asylum regulations in Norway" reached 11 million people and its videos were viewed over 21 million

times (Brandvold, 2017). The page showcased videos with dramatic footage of journeys in rubber boats across the Mediterranean with voiceovers explaining that people seeking economic fortune in Norway would be forcefully repatriated. It also informed about potential return agreements with Eritrea and Iraq, indicating how there was no reason for these nationals to even make the journey to Norway (Gjerde et al., 2015). The Ministry's use of social media campaigns has raised questions regarding government communication on social media, specifically regarding "transparency, communication format and rhetoric, norms of dialogue and target group identification" (Beyer, 2017, p. 6).

Despite the government's effort to inform would-be migrants, there have been cases where migrants have returned to their country of origin due to a mismatch of expectation and outcome. Following the record-high year for asylum applications in 2015, the International Organization for Migration assisted 1,500 people in leaving Norway voluntarily, allegedly due to unexpected realities (Reinholdtsen & Alayoubi, 2017). For instance, there were reports of Afghani asylum seekers coming from Russia who believed that all applicants were granted asylum in Norway. They were hence in for a surprise when they discovered that most Afghanis were rejected asylum and indeed at risk of being returned to Afghanistan (Strand, 2015). The asylum seekers in question decided to retract their application and rather stay in Russia. Another example is the family of forced migrants who were granted residence in Karasjok, Northern Norway. According to the family, they were promised a paradise, but were confused when they arrived in a small town where the sun never rose and with temperatures down to 40 minus degrees Celsius. The family preferred the refugee camp in Lebanon over the spacious house in Norway (Reinholdtsen & Alayoubi, 2017). Norwegian authorities cannot be completely satisfied with their effort to inform would-be migrants for as long as migrants seek to be returned.

Turning to the second criterion, a state should take the origin state into regard when implementing a policy of sustainable immigration. It has already been concluded that Norway does promote brain drain through its cherry picking of skilled workers in low and middle-income regions. It does not regard the origin state when creating immigration policy.

The bright side of brain drain is the remittance economy. When skilled workers are hired in more developed countries, it often includes a higher wage and the opportunity to send money home. Economically, a migrant is able to gain substantially in Norway and transfer remittances to their country of origin. The relationship between brain drain and remittances and whether they balance each other out is precarious (Betts & Collier, 2018, p.6). A way to counter for Norway's brain drain-supported policies, is to restore pride and purpose in countries of origin. What is necessary is to empower origin states to such a degree that people see opportunities and prefer to stay. By investing in education, entrepreneurships, private companies, job creation and youth, Norway can restore some of the damage it has imposed by draining low and middle-income countries for talent.

Lastly, situations of 'no regrets' are advocated through immigration policy based on long-term demographic, economic and social forecasts. Demographic statistics predict that in the decades to come, Norway will witness an increasingly aging population and a decreasing birth rate (Leknes et al., 2018, p. 126). Simultaneously, long-term economic forecasts are predicting that there will be a 20-90 billion NOK increase in social security costs in the decades towards 2060 (Stavrum, 2018). The disproportionate relationship between the number of workers and amount of elderly demanding their pension can cause problems for the survival of the welfare state. There will not be enough people to take care of the elderly and not enough money to support them due to the decreased number of taxpayers. Some argue that issues predicted in the long-term forecasts are reduced by admitting more migrants and that immigration is a prerequisite for the wellbeing of the welfare state (Hultgreen, 2013). More migrants will increase population growth, and if integrated properly, result in net contributions to the state. Migration specialist and chairman of the Norwegian Welfare and Migration Committee, Grete Brochmann, however, underlines that immigration is not a solution to the sustainability issues of the welfare state, it is rather a measure to postpone the welfare dilemmas (Lorentsen, 2019). It is emphasized that in order for Norway to address future welfare challenges, the solution is increased fertility rate, not immigration rate. These arguments indicate that Norway does base its immigration policy on long-term forecasts. But, like previous criteria evaluations, situations of 'no regrets' remain difficult to measure. There is no index displaying a state's regard of other states or the coherency between policy and forecasts. This element

touches upon grand issues beyond this article, such as empowerment of states and welfare state survival. The term sustainable immigration is proving to be complex.

Conclusion

Through the theoretical lens of Betts and Collier's Sustainable Migration Framework, this article has examined the term sustainable immigration by applying it to the case of Norway. It found that i) Norway rescues fragile societies from mass despair by providing humanitarian aid, but by doing so, it promotes brain drain; ii) Norway assists and protects refugees on paper but rather doubtful in practice; iii) Norway's voting patterns reveal citizens' preference of restrictive immigration policies but opinion polls and surveys indicate a nuanced picture; iv) Norway makes an effort to inform would-be migrants but migrants still seek to be returned to their country of origin v) Norway disregards the origin state when drafting immigration policy and; vi) Norway bases its immigration policy on long-term demographic, economic and social forecasts. Based on these findings, it is concluded that the term sustainable immigration is a term lacking value due to its vagueness and unmeasurable elements. Throughout the article's assessment of sustainable immigration criteria, the findings have promoted an understanding of a deficient term. One of the framework's criterion has been proven contradictory as it seeks to achieve sustainable immigration through non-sustainable solutions (i.e., brain drain). Other criteria have forwarded confusion and doubt concerning the term's importance due to its lack of measurable elements. It is questioned whether the term holds value as long as there are great challenges with measuring a state's fulfillment of basic ethical obligations, a people's democratic mandate and situations of 'no regrets'. The difficulties related to the term's vagueness and ability to measure depicts how sustainable immigration is more than just a popular word but rather multifaceted and complex.

Author's affiliation

Kristine Fjelde Heimstad

MSc Development and International Relations graduate 2020

Bibliography

Aas, Odd Inge and Adriane Lilleskare Lunde (2021). Frp-sjokk i skolevalget: – Dette er helt vilt! *Aftenposten Media.* Accessed 13.11.2021: https://www.aftenposten.no/norge/politikk/i/Wj6r22/frp-sjokk-i-skolevalget-dette-er-helt-vilt

Alfa, Nadine (n.d). Norway protects refugees through education. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Accessed 23.04.2020: https://www.unhcr.org/neu/government-donors/norwegian-government/norway-protects-refugeesthrough-educationcnorway-protects-refugees-through-education

Amnesty International (2017). NORGE: STANS RETURENE TIL AFGHANISTAN!. Accessed 17.04.2020: https://amnesty.no/aksjon/norge-stans-returene-til-afghanistan

Arbeiderpartiet (2009). Skape og dele. Arbeiderpartiets program 2009-2013. Accessed 28.04.2020: https://nsd.no/polsys/data/filer/parti/10337.pdf

Arbeiderpartiet (n.d). Flyktning- og asylpolitikk. Accessed 28.04.2020: https://www.arbeiderpartiet.no/politikken/flyktning-og-asylpolitikk/

Austenå, Ann-Magrit (2018). Ap-utvalg vil ha A- og B-lag blant flyktninger. Norwegian Organization for Asylum Seekers. Accessed 23.04.2020: https://www.noas.no/ap-utvalg-vil-ha-a-og-b-lag-blantflyktninger/

Betts, Alexander and Paul Collier (2018). European Migration Network, Norway Occasional Papers: Sustainable Migration Framework. Accessed 15.01.2020: https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/59c035d6145c48a59d834ce1969f33cb/emn-norway occasional-papers-sustainable-migration-framework-oxford-uni.pdf

Betts, Alexander and Paul Collier (2018) Refuge: Transforming a Broken Refugee System. UK: Penguin Random House, 288 pp.. ISBN: 13 978-014198704 and ISBN: 10 0141984708

Beyer, Audun; Jan-Paul Brekke and Kjersti Thorbjønsrud (2017). Communicating borders: Informing migrants and potential asylum seekers through social media. Institute for Social Research. Accessed 06.05.2020: https://samfunnsforskning.brage.unit.no/samfunnsforskning-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2452544/Rapport_4_17_Communicating%2bBorders_web.pdf?sequenc e=1&isAllowed=y

Blaker, Magnus (2018). Dette er den nye, norske innvandringspolitikken. *Nettavisen Media*. Accessed 24.05.2020: https://www.nettavisen.no/nyheter/dette-er-den-nye-norskeinnvandringspolitikken/3423581853.html

Brandvold, Åse (2017). Skremmer med rasisme. *Klassekampen Media*. Accessed 05.05.2020: https://www.klassekampen.no/article/20170918/ARTICLE/170919963

Cavallini, Simona; Rossella Soldi; Lorenzo Di Matteo; Mihaela Alina Utma and Beatrice Errico (2018). *Addressing brain drain: The local and regional dimension.* Brussels: European Union Publishers Collier, Paul (2013a). *Exodus*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Crouch, David (2016). Norway criticized over deportation of asylum seekers to Russia. *The Guardian Media.* Accessed 23.04.2020: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jan/19/norway-criticised-overdeportation-of-asylum-seekers-to-russia

Erdal, Marta; Jørgen Carling; Cindy Horst and Cathrine Talleraas (2018). Defining Sustainable Migration. Peace Research Institute Oslo. Accessed 19.01.2022: https://www.prio.org/utility/DownloadFile.ashx?id=1567&type=publicationfile

Flyktninghjelpen (n.d). Derfor er det så vanskelig å søke asyl i Norge. Accessed 22.04.2020: https://www.flyktninghjelpen.no/shorthand/stories/derfor-er-det-sa-vanskelig-a-soke-asyl-inorge/index.html

Fremskrittspartiet (n.d). Dette har vi gjort i regjering. Accessed 13.11.2021: https://www.frp.no/om-frp/dette-har-vi-gjort-i-regjering

Gjerde, Robert (2019). Høyre frykter Aps nye asylpolitikk kan føre til økt innvandring. *Aftenposten Media*. Accessed 24.05.2020: https://www.aftenposten.no/norge/politikk/i/a2Qe6d/hoeyre-frykter-apsnye-asylpolitikk-kan-foere-til-oekt-innvandring

Gjerde, Robert; Karen Tjernshaugen and Solveig Ruud (2015). Asylsøkerne strømmer til Norge, velgerne strømmer til Frp. *Aftenposten Media*. Accessed 27.04.2020: https://www.aftenposten.no/norge/politikk/i/qm9z/asylsoekerne-stroemmer-til-norge-velgerne stroemmer-til-frp?

Grønmo, Sigurd (2004). *Samfunnsvitenskapelige metoder*. Bergen: Universitetsforlaget

Gullestad, Frida Holsten and Jo Røed Skårderud (2017). Kun 22 prosent støtter Norges tvangsretur til Afghanistan, sier meningsmåling. *Klassekampen Media*. Accessed 28.04.2020: https://www.klassekampen.no/article/20171103/ARTICLE/171109982

Hagelund, Anniken (2020). After the refugee crisis: public discourse and policy change in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. *Comparative Migration Studies*. Vol. 8:13: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0169-8

Hultgreen, Gunnar (2013). Uten innvandrere stopper Norge. *Dagbladet Media*. Accessed 10.05.2020: https://www.dagbladet.no/nyheter/uten-innvandrere-stopper-norge/62953818

Immigration Act (2008). Act relating to the admission of foreign nationals into the realm and their stay here. LAW-2008-05-15-35. Accessed 21.04.2020: https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/2008-05-1535

Jaer, Øyvind (2020). European Migration Network, Norway Occasional Papers: A Sustainable Migration Approach. Towards a Common Platform? Accessed 19.01.2022: https://www.udi.no/globalassets/global/european-migration-network_i/emn-norway-papers/emn-occasional-paper-the-sustainable-migration-approach-2021.pdf

Johnsen, Alf Bjarne (2018). Ap ba Frp om garantier for fortsatt streng innvandring. Nå er Venstre rasende. *Verdens Gang Media.* Accessed 13.11.2021:

https://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/i/P3o9o5/ap-ba-frp-om-garantier-for-fortsatt-streng-innvandring-naa-er-venstre-rasende

Krosby, Silje Lunde (2018). Mener Ap kopierer Frps innvandringspolitikk. *TV2 Media*. Accessed 13.11.2021: https://www.tv2.no/a/9648786/

Leknes, Stefan; Sturla A. Løkken; Astri Syse and Marianne Tønnessen (2018). *Befolkningsframskrivingene 2018. Modeller, forutsetninger og resultater.* Kongsvinger: Statistics Norway

Lorentsen, André (2019). Forskere: Innvandring kan ikke erstatte fødsler. Forskning. Accessed 10.05.2020: https://forskning.no/innvandring-ntb-velferdsstat/forskere-innvandring-kan-ikke-erstattefodsler/1279415

Malmo, Vilde Kristine and Petter Strøm (2017). Unge asylsøkere vant mot staten: – Det er en stor glede. *NRK Media*. Accessed 23.04.2020: https://www.nrk.no/tromsogfinnmark/unge-asylsokere-vant-mot-staten_-_-det-er-en-storglede-1.13803110

Matlary, Sophie (2015). Migrasjon er en ressurs bare når den er planlagt og bærekraftig. *Aftenposten Media*. Accessed 10.11.2021: https://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/debatt/i/LkqJ/migrasjon-er-en-ressurs-bare-naar-den-er-planlagt-og-baerekraftig-soph

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (n.d). Norwegian Aid Statistics. Accessed 13.11.2021: https://norad.no/en/front/toolspublications/norwegian-aid-statistics/?tab=geo

Norwegian News Agency (2017). Fransk Domstol Stanset Asylretur Til Norge. *NRK Media*. Accessed 24.04.2020: https://www.nrk.no/urix/fransk-domstol-stanset-asylretur-til-norge-1.13482248

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2020). Official Developmental Assistance. Accessed 19.04.2020: https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/official-development-assistance.htm?fbclid=IwAR3sDYDIH56QGwkz1RFy2fcVWIZJqRIzcfcyTyxEL8WaB8a7qnET17Ue6zI

Polls of polls (n.d). Valgresultater. Accessed 13.11.2021: http://www.pollofpolls.no/?cmd=Valg

Prestegård, Sofie (2018). Åtte Listhaug-skandaler vi ikke glemmer. *Dagsavisen Media*. Accessed 27.04.2020: https://www.dagsavisen.no/nyheter/innenriks/2018/03/20/atte-listhaug-skandaler-vi-ikke-glemmer/

Prestegård, Sofie (2020). Seks år i regjering: Her er Frps seks største skandaler og seire. *Dagsavisen Media*. Accessed 28.04.2020: https://www.dagsavisen.no/nyheter/innenriks/seks-ar-i-regjering-her-erfrps-seks-storste-skandaler-og-seire-1.1650534

Ramnefjell, Geir (2017). En skremmekampanje om Norge ute av kontroll. *Dagbladet Media*. Accessed 05.05.2020: https://www.dagbladet.no/kultur/en-skremmekampanje-om-norge-ute-avkontroll/68705112

Regjeringen (2015). Høring – endringer i utlendingslovgivningen (innstramninger II). Accessed 24.04.2020: https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/horing--endringer-i-utlendingslovgivningeninnstramninger-ii/id2469054/?expand=horingssvar

Reinholdtsen, Linda and Mohammed Alayoubi (2017). Drømmen om Norge brast. *NRK Media*. Accessed 06.05.2020: https://www.nrk.no/norge/langt-flere-migranter-og-flyktninger-vil-forlateeuropa-1.13361920

Selmer, Victoria Benedicte Sandum (2015). *Adgang til asyl på grunnlag av kjønnsrelatert forfølgelse, med hovedvekt på kvinner som "sosial gruppe", jf. utl. § 28 litra a*. Bergen: University of Bergen

Skjeggestad, Helene (2012). Enklere for homofile asylsøkere å få asyl i Norge. *Aftenposten Media*. Accessed 23.04.2020: https://www.aftenposten.no/norge/i/QoKq8/enklere-for-homofile-asylsoekereaa-faa-asyl-i-norge?

Solberg, Erna and Sylvi Listhaug (2016). Innstramminger for bærekraft. Høyre. Accessed 24.05.2020: https://hoyre.no/aktuelt/nyheter/2016/innstramminger-for-baerekraft/

Statistics Norway (2021). Holdninger til innvandrere og innvandring. Statistics Norway. Accessed 20.01.2022: https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/statistikker/innvhold

Stavrum, Gunnar (2018). Løsningen er ikke økt innvandring - men flere arbeidsinnvandrere. *Nettavisen Media*. Accessed 12.05.2020: https://www.nettavisen.no/meninger/gunnarstavrum/losningen-er-ikkeokt-innvandring---men-flere-arbeidsinnvandrere/3423410515.html

Strand, Tormod (2015). Asylsøkere angret - dro rett tilbake til Russland. *NRK Media*. Accessed 06.05.2020: https://www.nrk.no/norge/asylsokere-angret---dro-rett-tilbake-til-russland-1.12631296

Støbakk, Torun and Kirsten Karlsen (2017). Sju av ti støtter utsettelse for oktoberbarna. *Dagbladet Media*. Accessed 28.04.2020: https://www.dagbladet.no/nyheter/sju-av-ti-stotter-utsettelse-foroktoberbarna/68924901

Støre, Jonas Gahr (2018). Når verden endres, må politikken endres. Migrasjonsfeltets virkelighet er endret. *Aftenposten Media*. Accessed 24.05.2020: https://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/debatt/i/G1Alam/naar-verden-endres-maa-politikken-endresmigrasjonsfeltets-virkelighet-er-endret-jonas-gahr-stoere?

Tjernshaugen, Karen and Thomas Olsen (2017). Har du ikke skjønt hvorfor alle snakker om "oktoberbarna"? Da bør du lese dette. *Aftenposten Media*. Accessed 17.04.2020: https://www.aftenposten.no/norge/politikk/i/p03EV/har-du-ikke-skjoent-hvorfor-alle-snakker-omoktoberbarna-da-boer-du-lese-dette?

Zaman, Kadafi (2016). Her jakter Sylvi Listhaug på ulovlige innvandrere. *TV2 Media*. Accessed 27.04.2020: https://www.tv2.no/a/8756850/

Wæhle, Espen and Sirianne Dahlum (2018). Case studie. Store Norske Leksion. Accessed 19.01.2022: https://snl.no/case-studie