

Socialism, Liberalism or Political Neutrality? The Balancing Act of the Consumer Co-operatives in Inter-war Norway

Iselin Theien

This article explores the political manoeuvring of the Norwegian union of consumer co-operatives NKL in the period prior to the second world war, with particular attention devoted to the 1930s. One of the most pressing issues the NKL was faced with in this period was how far the co-operative movement would be able to stay out of party politics and, moreover, of the expanding realm of state regulations. The co-operative principle of political neutrality was challenged at the inception of the 1930s when the Labour movement attempted to integrate the NKL as a 'third pillar' of socialism. Later in the decade, political planners of both Liberal and Socialist origins opened up for increased state supervision of the consumer co-operatives as part of a proposed anti-trust legislation. The ensuing debate regarding the position of the consumer co-operatives in relation to the political sphere brought the NKL to the core of the broader debates of the era surrounding the fate of liberal democracy.

The co-operative movement in Norway has been largely neglected by historians and social scientists alike.¹ This is somewhat surprising when considering the sheer size of the organisation. As early as in 1870, close to seventy thousand Norwegians were members of local consumer co-operatives, a number that had increased to three hundred thousand by the end of the second world war and which is approaching nine hundred thousand today. Considering the small size of the Norwegian population, numbering no more than five million at present, the scale of the co-operative membership is impressive. Already in 1946, when household rather than individual membership was the norm, it has been estimated that one in every four Norwegian had ties to the co-operative movement, a ratio which has remained largely unchanged since.²

The way in which the Norwegian consumer co-operatives have managed to steer between the stronger, political currents of socialism and liberalism is one aspect which may help explain the broad popular appeal of the movement. However, as this article will explore, the co-operative position in relation to the political parties and, indeed, in relation to the political sphere as such, remained ambivalent throughout the inter-war period. Particular attention will be devoted to the uneasy relationship between the consumer co-operatives and the radicalised Labour movement at the inception of the 1930s, when the co-operative principle of political neutrality was put under much pressure from the left in Norway. In order to understand the inter-war debates surrounding the issue of political neutrality it would, however, be useful to begin with a look at some aspects of the early history of the co-operative movement in Norway.

Liberal beginnings: 1860-1920

The first viable consumer co-operatives in Norway were established in the 1860s, and they soon prospered as part of a wider, liberal rising. There were two segments of the broad, liberal alliance which displayed a particular zeal in promoting consumer co-operatives. In the Norwegian capital of Kristiania, a number of prominent middle-class philanthropists and Christian socialists familiar with the British co-operative movement sought to spread the new ideas among the workers. In the countryside, farmers campaigning for free trade welcomed consumer co-operatives as a lever needed to remove all traces of the old system of trade privileges for the few.³ When the first wave of co-operative organisation reached its zenith in the mid-1870s, the number of local associations was approaching three hundred, most of which were to be found in rural areas. However, many of these early associations proved rather short-lived, and it was only with a campaign launched from Kristiania in the 1890s that the first successful steps towards establishing a national co-operative union were taken.

It is worth dwelling for a moment with Ole Dehli, the leading figure behind the renewed co-operative effort of the

1890s. Dehli was a Liberal lawyer who resembled the middle-class reformers who had tried to spread the co-operative gospel before him, in the sense that he explicitly based his co-operative ideas on the British model, which he first tried to introduce to the audience of the so-called Kristiania workers' association.⁴ In the early 1890s, this was a non-revolutionary, educational working men's society chaired by Dehli. However, the influence from the newly established Labour Party was gaining in strength and, in 1893, Dehli left the workers' association after the members had voted in favour of aligning it to the socialist party. Dehli then moved on to establish a rival, non-socialist workers' club, the *Værnelaget*, and it was from this platform that he launched his campaign for establishing a national union of consumer co-operatives. This eventually resulted in the establishment of the Norwegian co-operative union and wholesale society *Norges Kooperative Landsforening* (NKL) in 1906, which remained under Dehli's leadership until 1919.⁵

In Norway as in many other places in Europe, the nascent Labour movement nourished a scepticism towards the consumer co-operatives. In addition to the sense of institutional rivalry stemming from the conflict over the workers' associations in Kristiania, the Labour movement also held objections of a more ideological character against the consumer co-operatives. In this respect, the Norwegian Labour movement drew upon the heritage of leftist criticism of the consumer co-operatives associated with Karl Marx and some of his German contemporaries of more social democratic leanings, including Karl Kautsky and Ferdinand Lassalle.⁶ For instance the chairman of the Norwegian Labour Party of the 1890s, Carl Jeppesen, was clearly inspired by the latter when he denounced the consumer co-operatives as a dead-end road on the grounds that whatever savings the workers would be able to make on their expenses would only lead to a corresponding cut in their wages.⁷

The criticism of the consumer co-operatives from the left often went beyond the economic argument considering the impact price savings might have on wages advanced by Lassalle. By labelling the embryonic co-operative ideals of Robert Owen as 'utopian' in the sense that they were aimed

at improving the lot of the whole of humanity rather than emancipating a particular class, Friedrich Engels had in the 1880s set the course for an enduring Marxist scepticism of the virtues of consumer co-operatives in the larger class struggle.⁸ To the Norwegian Labour movement, this scepticism carried into an inkling that the NKL was in fact inherently reactionary. Their suspicion was fuelled by the admiration that the NKL founding father Ole Dehli displayed for what the socialists regarded as a bourgeois British co-operative movement.⁹ In 1910, the trade union AFL established a co-operative committee, which found further proof of the reactionary character of the NKL in that

a dedicated Conservative, professor [Bredo] Morgenstjerne, has to his great joy observed, that we have a co-operative union patterned on the English co-operation. In the consumer co-operatives, he has found a *bulwark against socialism*.¹⁰

Nevertheless, by 1910 the Labour movement had found hope that the consumer co-operatives might serve as valuable instruments for the workers in the class struggle.¹¹ To realise this ambition, the trade union co-operative committee recommended that Norway looked to the Continent rather than to Britain.¹² The committee was aware that a number of socialist consumer co-operatives had been established in France and Germany, not to mention in Belgium, where the co-operatives had been fully integrated as a 'third pillar of socialism'.¹³ In particular, the Norwegian trade union was impressed by the co-operative society *Produktion* in Hamburg. Part of the reason why *Produktion* represented an ideal to the Norwegian socialists, was that rather than allotting dividends to individual members, this German co-operative channelled its surplus into emergency strike-funds for workers as well as into co-operative production.¹⁴

Following in the footsteps of Co-operative Wholesale Society (CWS), NKL entered into the field of industrial production as it took over the running of a margarine factory in 1911. Neither this nor any later production unit established

by the NKL was, however, organised along the lines of the workers' co-operatives that the trade union had called for in 1910. Instead, a general agreement on wages and working conditions was agreed upon in 1916 between the NKL as employer and the trade union AFL on behalf of the workers. While confirming the traditional division of labour, the agreement contained elements which demonstrated that co-operative factories were somewhat different from privately-owned production units. For instance, the NKL was to guarantee its workers that their salaries and general working conditions should be at least as good as the going standard for private firms. And, as a gesture to the AFL, NKL agreed to exclusively employ trade union members. In addition, the parties agreed to rule out the use of lock-outs and strikes if work conflicts should arise in the co-operative factories.¹⁵ This clause may be seen as a valuable concession to the NKL, especially when taking into account the damage caused by labour conflicts within the CWS in the 1920s.⁶

The 1916 compromise can be seen as an expression of the generally increasingly amicable relations between the NKL and the Labour movement. The relationship between the two organisations may appear to have been further improved when prominent members from the trade union co-operative committee of 1910 moved into positions in the NKL leadership. In 1919, Andreas Juell took over the position of NKL chairman from the pioneer Dehli, and his fellow social democrat Randolf Arnesen was installed in the central positions of general secretary of the NKL and as editor of the co-operative magazine *Kooperatøren*.¹⁷

The dilemmas of political neutrality: Entering the 1930s

The image of, if not perfect harmony, then at least a state of peaceful co-existence between the NKL and the Labour movement is, however, deceptive. The socialist ambition of integrating the co-operative union as a 'third pillar' of the Labour movement, alongside the trade unions and the political party, was to prove resilient throughout the inter-war

period.¹⁸ This ambition was at odds with the co-operative principle of political neutrality as interpreted by the NKL. The inherent conflict between the socialist and the independent vision of the consumer co-operatives came most visibly to the fore in 1929, when the NKL received an invitation to enter into closer co-operation with the Labour Party and the trade union AFL.¹⁹ This invitation presented the NKL with a dilemma, as it would be highly problematic to decline the offer without appearing as a class enemy to the Labour movement at that point.

Nevertheless, the NKL board of directors attempted to solve the issue by sending a letter of reply to the Labour Party in which it politely turned down the invitation with reference to the established practice that the consumers' co-operatives should observe the strictest political neutrality.²⁰ Much to the grievance of the NKL leadership, however, this by no means marked the end of the matter. In response to the rejection of their invitation, Labour simply announced that it would mobilise its supporters to vote socialist at the elections which were to be held at the approaching co-operative national congress. By this action, Labour aimed to overthrow what it somewhat paradoxically regarded as the bourgeois NKL leadership, and replace it with leaders who would be prepared to co-operate more closely with the socialists. Only thus would the NKL serve the purpose that Labour bestowed upon it, namely as "an instrument at the disposal of the working classes in their struggle against the capitalists".²¹

In order to meet this challenge to their authority, the NKL leadership had little choice but to set the stage for an ideological debate it would have preferred to avoid. As Randolph Arnesen had put it in an editorial in the co-operative mouthpiece *Kooperatøren*, the NKL was "no student debating society ... but an economic association", and, as such, the movement would be better served by avoiding potentially divisive political debates.²² As this preferred course of action had been effectively cut off by the latest Labour campaign, however, the NKL leadership made good use of the *Kooperatøren* to spread their opinions on why the organisation ought to stay neutral. In an editorial of 1

February 1930, Arnesen drew attention to two principal reasons why the NKL leadership was opposed to abandoning the principle of political neutrality. Firstly, a concern for protecting the unifying character of the NKL, in terms of it being a movement for consumers of all classes and political persuasions, was advanced as an argument why it ought to stay out of party politics. Secondly, the NKL was characterised as primarily an economic and social organisation, which for that reason should not get entangled in politics.²³

The most pressing problem with this line of reasoning was that by insisting on maintaining its neutrality, the NKL faced the prospect of alienating the socialists amongst its own ranks, and thus cause the very split it sought to avoid. Moreover, the supporters of the alliance proposed by the Labour movement stood particularly strong in the Norwegian capital of Oslo²⁴ which added a geographical dimension of town versus countryside to the conflict. Indeed, Norway needed look no further than to 1917 Finland to find an example of how the division between socialist urban workers and liberal farmers was capable of splitting a co-operative organisation in two.²⁵

The leading trade unionist Jens Teigen defended the standpoint of the Oslo co-operative organisation, for which he acted as chairman, on the grounds that the NKL should not restrict its scope of action to the economic sphere. The purpose of consumer co-operatives was not "merely to engage in retail", Teigen argued, as the business of selling goods could only be a means to an end, which, in turn, broadly corresponded to the aims of the Labour movement.²⁶ Thus, the Oslo co-operatives called for the NKL board of directors to reconsider the Labour invitation before the national congress of 1930, at which the issue of political neutrality was to be settled. Against the votes of two of the board members, Bjarne Jullum and Sigrid Syvertsen, the proposal from the Oslo co-operatives was rejected by this central NKL body.²⁷

In the discussion over the identity of the consumer co-operatives, the prominent Swedish co-operator Anders Orne came to the assistance of the NKL leadership by

launching into a polemic against Teigen. According to this Swedish co-operative pioneer,

those who do not understand the importance of supplying families with household goods ... should also keep quiet on co-operative matters.²⁸

In extension of this perspective on what constituted the true mission of the consumer co-operatives, Orne warned his Norwegian counterparts against entering the field of politics on the grounds that this threatened to split the organisation and thus impair its abilities as a large-scale retailer.²⁹

Important as the co-operative retail functions were to the everyday lives of both Swedish and Norwegian families and thus to the co-operative identity, the reasons why the NKL was reluctant to enter the sphere of politics cannot be reduced to economic pragmatism. In stressing the non-political character of their movement, the NKL also drew upon the utopian heritage of Robert Owen and the vision of a Co-operative Republic developed by the French co-operator and economist Charles Gide.³⁰ The idea that the consumer co-operatives were capable of building a new social order from below without engaging in any political revolution was a central element to this ideological heritage, which was also applied in the neutrality debate in Norway as *Kooperatøren* declared that the ambition of the movement was nothing short of reforming Norwegian society on the basis of the consumer co-operatives.³¹ This line of reasoning can also be detected in the speech H J May, the general secretary of the International Co-operative Alliance, gave as a guest of honour at the opening of the NKL national congress of 1930. He proclaimed the aim of the consumer co-operatives to be a reform of the social and economic basis of society along the lines of finding truly democratic alternatives to capitalism. In order to create a new, co-operative civilisation, H J May maintained that the movement had to preserve its political neutrality, although he admitted that certain political parties were 'more agreeable' than others.³²

Finally, the NKL congress of 1930 reached the point where it was to settle the issue of whether the consumer

co-operatives should preserve or abandon their commitment to staying out of party politics. As a concession to the pro-Labour Oslo organisation, the NKL board of directors had withdrawn their original petition to include the principle of political neutrality in the co-operative statutes, as this had been regarded as 'criticism levelled at one specific party'.³³ Instead, the congress adopted a resolution, which declared that

The congress is convinced that it would do irredeemable harm to the consumer interest if the co-operative movement was to be divided according to the political preferences of the consumers. [...] The congress would appeal to the entire population of consumers to join the co-operative movement.³⁴

Although presented in the form of a resolution rather than a statute, this compromise clearly stated that the NKL would not abandon the principle of political neutrality and that, by implication, it would not enter into any alliance with the Labour movement.

Moreover, the socialists did not succeed in overthrowing what they regarded as the bourgeois NKL leadership. Andreas Juell was re-elected as chairman of the organisation, supported by 454 of the 526 votes cast, while only four voted for the leading spokesman of the Oslo opposition, Jens Teigen. Similarly, Randolf Arnesen was re-elected general secretary of the NKL by 419 out of a total of 502 votes cast, while the opposition's candidate to this position, Bjarne Jullum, received 81 votes.³⁵ Thus, the co-operative congress of 1930 had in many respects displayed the sense of unity which was part of the reason why the NKL leadership had insisted on preserving political neutrality in the first place.

After 1930, the tide of revolutionary socialism passed away in Norway and left the country with a more reformist Labour movement, which helped ensure that the political neutrality of the NKL was never put under similar pressure again. This, of course, greatly ameliorated the relationship between Labour and the NKL. Evidence that the two movements had grown closer can be found in connection with a 1933 debate

surrounding the issue of taxation of the consumer co-operatives.

Competition or state regulation? Co-operators versus political planners in the 1930s.

At the height of the economic depression in Norway, the Liberal government suggested that, as an extraordinary measure to increase state revenues, an income tax should be levied at the consumer co-operatives.³⁶ The NKL pointed out that around the world, consumer co-operatives were normally exempted from this form of taxation, as the notion of a taxable income or profit made no sense when talking about co-operative shops. Thus, the organisation emphatically protested against the government's proposal.³⁷ In parliament, the Labour Party took on the responsibility of defending the co-operative interest in this case. The Labour representative Andreas Moan stated that his party regarded the emergency tax proposal as indicative of a wider trend of anti-co-operative sentiments spreading in Norway. The Conservatives had, of course, always been enemies of the consumer co-operatives, Moan maintained, what was new, was that they had been joined by the traditional friends of the co-operative movement situated in the Liberal Party.³⁸

Against the votes of the Labour Party, parliament agreed upon the emergency taxation of the co-operatives in 1933. This, in turn, heightened the sense among the co-operators that despite their inherent scepticism against becoming entangled in politics, the NKL at some level had to make sure parliament paid attention to the co-operative interests. Consequently, as the 1933 parliamentary elections approached, the *Kooperatøren* encouraged its readers to 'vote co-operative'.³⁹ Having the official organ of the NKL printing such an appeal was not as straightforward as it would have been in Britain, for instance, as no co-operative party existed in Norway. However, the NKL leadership did not regard this action as tantamount to renouncing the principle of political neutrality. After the elections, which had brought a landslide victory to the reformed Labour Party, an editorial in the *Kooperatøren* remarked that political neutrality was not to

be confused with passivity, and that in this case political action had been necessary to throw out a parliamentary majority clearly hostile to the co-operative interests.⁴⁰

It soon became evident that the ideological current of scepticism against political interference in social and economic matters had not been entirely washed away by the interest NKL had taken in the parliamentary elections of 1933. The co-operative ambition of staying as far as possible independent of political institutions came to the fore two years later, when the NKL was invited to join an official anti-trust committee headed by the prominent Liberal Wilhelm Thagaard. Significantly, this committee was the product of two cabinets; it was designed by a Liberal cabinet and then brought into life by the Labour cabinet which moved into office in 1935. According to the instructions of the latter, the anti-trust committee was assigned the task of preparing "guidelines for the regulation of production and distribution of goods".⁴¹ The NKL representative on the anti-trust committee, Andreas Juell, protested against the very idea that any state regulation of the distribution of goods was necessary beyond what the co-operatives already provided.⁴² As Juell saw it, the existence of non-profit, transparent and honest economic organisations such as the consumer co-operatives provided the frame of reference which the political authorities needed to measure privately-owned firms against, and that any state regulation would only disturb this independent control function of the co-operatives.⁴³

The faith that Juell had displayed in the virtues of competition between co-operative and private enterprises as a guarantee of the public interest constituted one important reason why, the NKL was against the proposed anti-trust legislation.⁴⁴ The NKL feared that excessive regulation would disturb the competition between the three principal forms of economic organisations which existed in Norway; private, co-operative and state enterprises. Of the three, the co-operatives regarded themselves as the superior middle road between private and public companies. For, in the same way as with private enterprises, the co-operatives applied the instrument of private capital, but in contrast to the private

companies, co-operatives "were in reality a capitalism turned upside-down. The members, not the capital, are on top".⁴⁵

Even though the NKL believed that the proposed anti-trust legislation was going too far in curbing competition, it was not entirely out of touch with the political atmosphere of the 1930s, in the sense that it accepted that some degree of state control was desirable as laissez-faire politics seemed to have failed in most of Europe.⁴⁶ The sense that Norway had to enter the age of statist solutions in fact constituted one of Thagaard's proclaimed ambitions for the anti-trust committee he was heading. According to this Liberal planner, the international developments demonstrated that a 'new social outlook' of increased regulation was the way forwards, not only for the fascist or communist dictatorships, but also for the remaining democracies.⁴⁷ To the NKL, however, the proposed anti-trust legislation appeared to go much further than necessary in the direction of providing political authorities with control of social organisations such as the co-operatives. In fact, the *Kooperatøren* attacked the proposed anti-trust legislation for being in accordance with the totalitarian policies of the Nazi regime in Germany.⁴⁸

In the anti-trust committee, the representatives of the Conservative and the Farmers' parties shared the NKL scepticism of expanding the regulatory powers of the state along the lines suggested by the Labour government. The proposed anti-trust legislation also met with substantial opposition in parliament, which simply deferred making a decision on the matter for the rest of the decade.⁴⁹ This was noted as a victory by the NKL, which had lobbied against the regulation plans both in and out of the anti-trust committee.⁵⁰ The role played by the NKL was also recognised by the relevant committee in parliament dealing with the case, as it stated the many petitions it had received from co-operative and private business associations alike as a reason why it had postponed presenting the anti-trust law to the vote.⁵¹

The way in which the NKL opposed ideas involving political interference with the mechanisms of the market is quite remarkable when considering how far the disenchantment with liberal democracy had spread among the political establishment in Norway in line with the broader

Continental trends of the 1930s.⁵² In rejecting the proposed anti-trust legislation on the grounds that it approached the policies of the totalitarian regimes by blurring the distinctions between state and society, the NKL found itself at odds with both socialist and liberals in 1930s Norway.

The fervour with which the NKL had defended its political neutrality may thus be regarded as a prerequisite for the independent position adopted by the co-operative union in relation to the anti-trust proposition of 1935. This case had, in turn, brought out the other current of co-operative thought inherent in the NKL interpretation of political neutrality, namely the anti-statist ideas associated with the 'utopianism' of Robert Owen.⁵³ Despite the party political overtones of the NKL 'vote co-operative' campaign before the parliamentary elections of 1933, the reluctance to enter the 'age of statism' two years later pointed to the continuing influence of this strand of co-operative ideology on the Norwegian consumer movement.

The notion of anti-statism could also be defined in more positive terms in relation to the co-operative movement, namely as their belief in the capacity of society to organise the interests of the consumers more efficiently than the state. Indeed, the other side to the NKL's scepticism of political regulation was its confidence in the consumer co-operatives as the ideal form of economic organisation, which would provide benefits for all consumers if allowed to compete freely with both public and private firms.⁵⁴

In this respect, the British influence on the Norwegian consumer movement can be regarded as important beyond having provided the co-operative model upon which the NKL was based. For, by refusing to transfer the task of protecting the consumer interests to the state within the framework of the proposed anti-trust legislation, the ideals of the inter-war NKL reflected the British model of a strong consumer movement anchored in civil society.⁵⁵ Consequently, the close, informal alliance between the consumer co-operatives and the social democratic regimes often associated with a Scandinavian model of well-regulated consumer protection from the state is, at least in the case of Norway, perhaps best described as a post-1945 phenomenon.

Dr Iselin Theien is working on a history project funded by Co-op Norway.

Notes

- 1 The author of this article, Dr Iselin Theien, is working on a broad history project funded by Coop Norway (formerly **NKL**) and directed by Prof Even Lange at the University of Oslo, which seeks to raise academic interest in the consumer co-operatives in Norway. The project will be running until 2006, and it involves both historians and social scientists. An important aim of this endeavour is to place the developments of the Norwegian consumer co-operatives within a broader, comparative framework.
- 2 Statistics compiled by Soltvedt, K: 'Statistiske hovedtrekk i forbrukersamvirkets utvikling' (working paper, Institute for Social Research, Oslo 2002).
- 3 Debes, I: *Forbrukerkooperasjonens historie i Norge I* (Oslo, 1931), p120.
- 4 Ibid
- 5 Debes, I: *Forbrukerkooperasjonens historie i Norge II* (Oslo, 1936), pp22ff.
- 6 Fairbairn, B: 'The Rise and Fall of the Consumer Cooperation in Germany' in Furlough, E and C Strikwerda (eds): *Consumers against capitalism? Consumer Co-operation in Europe, North America and Japan, 1840-1990* (Lanham, 1999), pp276ff.
- 7 Debes, I: *Forbrukerkooperasjonens historie i Norge I*, p224.
- 8 Engels, F: 'Socialism: Utopian and Scientific' in *Marx/Engels Selected Works, Volume 3* (Progress Press 1970), pp95-151.
- 9 Bonnevie, C: *Fagforeningen og kooperationen. Indstilling til den faglige landsorganisations kongress 1910* (Kristiania, 1910).
- 10 Ibid, p7. (Italics in the original) Breda Morgenstjerne was a prominent Norwegian law professor.
- 11 Resolution adopted at the Scandinavian Labour Congress of 1907. See Bjørnson, Ø: *På klassekampens grunn* (Oslo, 1990), p284.
- 12 Bonnevie, C: *Fagforeningen og kooperationen*, op cit.
- 13 On the Continental development, see Furlough, E and C Strikwerda (eds): *Consumers against capitalism*, p17.
- 14 Bonnevie, C: *Fagforeningen og kooperationen*, p12.
- 15 *Samfo hovedavtalen utgave 1997* (Oslo, 1997) pp5-6.

- 16 See Gurney, P: Co-operative culture and the politics of consumption in England, 1870-1930 (Manchester, 1996) pp226ff.
- 17 NOU 1978: *Samvirkebeskatning*, p45.
- 18 Ousland, G: *De store kampara 1921-31* (Oslo, 1975) pp157ff. See also Furlough, E and C Strikwerda (eds), op cit, p17.
- 19 The NKL archives at Kirkegaten 4, Oslo, hereafter referred K4: 6b, 1/2: Documents prepared for meeting of co-operative council, 12.05.1930.
- 20 K4: 6b, box labelled: 'Representantskapet 1930': Documents prepared for 17th national NKL congress.
- 21 Open letter from Labour Party Chairman Oscar Torp, referred in the 'Kooperatøren', 15 March 1930.
- 22 'Kooperatøren', 1 March 1930.
- 23 'Kooperatøren', 1 February 1930.
- 24 To the observant reader: Kristiania had been renamed Oslo in 1925.
- 25 See Altonen, E: *Finlands konsumenter i samarbeite* (Helsinki 1954), pp81ff.
- 26 Referred to in K4: 6b, 1/2: Documents prepared for meeting of co-operative council, 12.05.1930.
- 27 K4: 6b, box labelled: 'Representantskapet 1930': Documents prepared for 17th national NKL congress.
- 28 'Kooperatøren', 15 March 1930.
- 29 Ibid
- 30 See Furlough, E: 'French Consumer Co-operation, 1885-1930. From the "Third Pillar" of Socialism to "A movement for All Consumers"' in Furlough, E and C Strikwerda (eds), op cit, p86, and Gide, C: *Les Colonies Communistes et Coopératives* (Paris, 1928).
- 31 'Kooperatøren', 15 July 1930.
- 32 Minutes from 17th national NKL congress, printed in 'Kooperatøren', 15 July 1930.
- 33 Ibid
- 34 K4: 6b, box labelled: 'Representantskapet 1930': Documents prepared for 17th national NKL congress.
- 35 K4: Safe: Protocol of the NKL congress 1911-33, minutes from congress of 1930.
- 36 Parliamentary records: St forh. 1933, vol 2a: St prp. nr40.
- 37 K4: 6b, box labelled 'Representantskapet 1933': Resolution to Parliament from the NKL council of 20 April 1933.
- 38 Parliamentary records: St tid. 1933, p1832.
- 39 'Kooperatøren', 1 October 1933.
- 40 'Kooperatøren', 15 November 1933.