



Tirza Meyer

The Fear of the Crowd – A Matter of the Obscure Other?

The debate about universal suffrage
in Norway in 1897/1898

Master's thesis in History

Trondheim, November 2014

Acknowledgements

Jeg takker min veileder Håkon With Andersen for troen han hadde på mitt prosjekt. Uten din tillit, dine gode råd og ikke minst oppmuntringer ville jeg aldri kommet så langt!

Tusen takk til mine venner og min familie for en fantastisk støtte gjennom den tiden. En spesiell takk til korrekturleserne Louis Hunninck, Masa Smole og Tale Reiersen Stensdal for en fantastisk innsats fra deres side.

Table of content

1. Introduction – The fear of the obscure other.....	1
1.1. The conservatives attitude towards the introduction of universal suffrage and the 'new voters' – How can we examine this?.....	2
1.2. Newspaper articles as the main source.....	5
1.3. Literature.....	7
1.4. Structure.....	9
2. Theoretical background Gustave Le Bon, Peter Sloterdijk and Albert O. Hirschman.....	12
2.1. Gustave Le Bon.....	12
2.1.1. Cultural pessimism, conservatism, religious criticism, anti-educational and anti-democratic tendencies.....	13
2.2. The crowd in disguise?.....	16
2.3. Peter Sloterdijk: “Genius go home”.....	17
2.3.1. Sloterdijk and the media – 'A startled chicken pile'.....	20
2.4. Le Bon and Sloterdijk.....	22
2.5. Perversity, futility, jeopardy - Hirschman and the argumentation pattern of the conservatives.	24
3. Historical preconditions – Leading to the debate about the male universal suffrage in Norway.....	27
3.1. The Constituent Assembly in Eidsvoll 1814 and it's consequences.....	27
3.2. The rise of the power of the Storting on the edge to parliamentarianism.....	28
3.3. Conservatism and the formation of the party Høyre.....	31
3.4. Høyre's main topics from 1884 until 1905 - The union and universal suffrage.....	33
3.5. Høyre's attitude towards democracy.....	36
4. The introduction of the male universal suffrage in Norway in 1898 – a heated debate.....	38
4.1. The result of the passing on April 21 st 1898.....	38
4.2. The news coverage concerning the debate on 21 st April – Protocol and reports.....	40
4.3. The comment and debate articles issuing male universal suffrage.....	43
5. Frequent used terms, phrases and stylistic devices in the articles concerning the debate.....	46
5.1. General observed pattern of the debate visible in the headings.....	46
5.2. Metaphors and comparisons and other stylistic devices.....	48

(1) general warnings	
(2) The new majority	
(3) The proletariat and the guarantees	
(4) Other countries	
5.3. Often used terms and phrases.....	55
(1) The crowd	
(2) Socialists and radicals	
(3) Proletarians	
(4) Hazards	
5.4. The sinking state ship – Language as a weapon. How the conservative newspapers advised against universal-suffrage.....	61
6. The argumentation pattern of the conservatives.....	63
(1) The crowd is a hazard	
(2.) Selvhjulpenhed – the crowd is not able to make reasonable decisions	
(3.) in the first place the crowd has no need to take part in political decisions	
(4.) a “rule of the crowd” will lead to horrible consequences, as is demonstrated in other countries	
7. Conclusion.....	70
7.1. A conservative argumentation pattern?.....	70
7.2. Albert O. Hirschmann and the rhetoric of reaction.....	73
7.3. Gustave Le Bon's description of the crowd reflected in some description of <i>the new voters</i> in Norway.....	76
7.4. Sloterdijk's <i>Genius go home</i> attitude – reactionary rhetoric today – Is the fear for the crowd a shared reactionary belief?.....	78
7.5. Challenges and perspectives.....	79
8. Bibliography.....	81

1. Introduction – The fear of the obscure other

“Jeg er ikke redd for 'de andre', for de fremmede. Jeg er redd for det som skjer med oss når vi ikke lenger er i stand til å se det enkelte mennesket”¹

This quote is taken from Margreth Olin's documentary “De andre” that was released in 2012, which tells the stories of teenage asylum-seekers in Norway. Margreth Olin criticizes the authorities for their rigid asylum policy. Her concern is that the individual fate of each teenager is overseen. Instead, the society is confronted with an anonymous mass of people they can not relate to because they are alien to them: “the others”. The moment we are no longer able to see the individual, we see a crowd.

Why is Margreth Olin's documentary 'De andre' relevant for my thesis about the introduction of universal-suffrage in Norway in 1898? It is the element of “the others” which is crucial here. “The others” are the alien masses of people entering a public space they have not had access to before. Margreth Olin talks about the asylum seekers who come to Norway. She documents how the authorities meet the challenge of their immigration and balance either welcoming them or sending them back. In her documentary *the others* are the asylum seekers. When universal suffrage was introduced in Norway in 1898 the authorities also had to deal with a mass of people, 'the new voters', who were entering a public space they had not been a part of before: political decision-making.

In this thesis I want to examine how the introduction of universal suffrage was dealt with in Norway in 1898. I will concentrate on the opponents of universal suffrage: the conservatives. I want to study how they met the challenge of having to accept 'the others', 'the new voters', to be a part of political decision making.

In the end of the 19th century social and political dynamics in Europe were going through a transition. Parliamentarianism and democracy were on the rise. In Norway one particular event marked a great step towards democracy: the introduction of male universal-suffrage in 1898.² Due to the old suffrage legislations only state officials, citizens paying a certain amount of taxes and those who owned property were allowed to vote.³ But with the rise of the party *Venstre*, that won the elections in 1884, the old legislations were questioned. *Venstre* advertised the

1 Olin 2012

2 Aftenposten (Nr. 299) 1898: 1

3 Cf.: Berg Eriksen 1992: 66, Kaartvedt 1984: 161/162/163, as well as St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 508.

introduction of universal-suffrage while the conservatives were critical towards that. They had already been overruled by a party that stood for a more democratic government. Consequently, they were not too keen on having to deal with a big number of 'new voters' who most likely would support the *Venstre* and strengthen their political power. The conservative's monopole over political decision-making had long been gone, there was no reason for them to support the democratization process if this implied a further weakening of their political influence.

1.1. The conservatives attitude towards the introduction of universal suffrage and the 'new voters' – How can we examine this?

My thesis has two main aims: first, I want to examine the arguments the conservatives used to advise against universal suffrage. Second, I want to suggest that their aversion of letting 'the new voters' enter the public space of decision making is in accordance to the negative image of the crowd in the 19th century in Europe, which was fueled by the shift from the estate to the class society and the introduction of parliamentarianism and democracy.

I believe that debates about 'the crowd' are reappearing phenomenons. Therefore it is interesting to watch 'the crowd' from a historical point of view. Indeed there are a number of different works that examine different kinds of crowds⁴ and all those works share a common ground: it seems like a discourse about 'the crowd' is always a matter of the obscure other. Reflections about 'the crowd' are mainly philosophical ones, however, they reveal and reflect real emotions like fear, disgust or refusal. My motivation to write this thesis was to approach 'the crowd' on a historical level. The emotional philosophical pamphlets must be somehow reflected in the “real” world and those reflections must be historically observable.

We can find several examples of today's news covering issues that can be linked to this refusal of 'the others'. We just have to think of debates about the mass-migration (“masseinvandring”⁵), the masses of asylum-seekers from northern Africa coming to the European continent⁶ and a growing islamophobia in the western world.⁷ The debates and comments in newspapers but also on web-pages are even more straight forward. On the debate-platform of the newspaper *Verdens Gang* a user states: “Ein skulle tru dette fører til at dei etniske europeiske folkeslaga ikkje berre mistar

4 Canetti 1960; Moscovici 1985- to name some

5 Hjerpset-Østlie: 2014

6 Ibid.: "Den blå blå regjeringen har til nå vært passive og helt uten profil i innvandringspolitikken"

7 Stærk: 2014.

landa sine, men at dei rett og slett vert byta ut. [...] Det me opplever er altså masseinnvandring til Europa, med full stønad frå EU.”⁸ This user is concerned that mass-migration will lead to the extinction of the ethnic Northern European. Newspaper articles dealing with the challenges of establishing a well functioning migration and asylum system is one thing, another are the personal opinions available for everyone on the internet on debate platforms and blogs, Facebook or twitter. Just recently a young member of the *Fremskrittspartiet* was caught writing islamophobic comments in an Facebook-group called "Stopp islamifisering av Norge"⁹ and gave up his party membership after his statements where made public.¹⁰

All those debates seem to share one thought: the reservation against a group of people or a religious community which is suspected to negatively influence the society. 'The others' seem to be perceived as an alien mass or crowd that could invade a social sphere that they do not belong to. Which makes me wonder if it is a coincidence that masses or crowds mostly seem to be mentioned in negative context and with a negative connotation.

To avoid misunderstandings it is essential to explain how I am going to use the following two terms: *the crowd* and *fear*. In the Oxford Dictionary the noun “crowd” is described as “a large number of people gathered in a disorganized or unruly way”.¹¹ The noun originates from the verbs to press, to haste, or to push.

Old English *crūdan* 'press, hasten', of Germanic origin; related to Dutch *kruien* 'push in a wheelbarrow'. In Middle English the senses 'move by pushing' and 'push one's way' arose, leading to the sense 'congregate', and hence (mid 16th century) to the noun.¹²

Obviously the crowd has a negative keynote. The noun originates from verbs which carry unpleasant meanings. The verbs to press, to haste or to push imply disorganization and unruliness. An accumulation of human beings is usually labeled as a crowd.

When I talk about 'the crowd' in connection with the debate about universal suffrage, I mean the 'crowd of new voters' that was introduced to political decision making. We observe this crowd from the conservative's point of view. The party *Venstre*, which initiated the introduction of universal suffrage, did not perceive the new voters as a hostile or dangerous crowd. Consequently, whether a gathering of people is labeled crowd depends on which side one stands

8 VG 2011

9 Dahl 2014

10 Ebd.:

11 Oxford Dictionary 2014

12 Oxford Dictionary 2014

on.

Which leads us to the next term: 'the fear for the crowd'. We will come across arguments in which chaos and terror is predicted if 'the crowd of new voters' is going to get suffrage. We should not take this too literal. After all, the passing of the new legislation concerning universal suffrage in the National Assembly on 21st April 1898 had to be, and was accepted by, the conservative politicians. I suggest that we view the terms concerning the hazards of universal suffrage as exaggerated rhetoric tools that were used to prohibit the introduction of universal suffrage.

Before I turn to the methods which were applied to examine the conservative's arguments concerning universal suffrage, I would like to comment on the theories that will be introduced in chapter 2. The first theory we will deal with is Gustave Le Bon's¹³ work about the psychology of the crowd.¹⁴ Le Bon is the founder of the crowd-psychology. His perception was influenced by the French Revolution and the consequences the revolution had for France: radical upheavals as a side effect of democratization. This negative side of the Revolution contributed to Le Bon's dislike of masses or crowd-phenomenons. He perceived them as something dangerous and uncontrollable. Le Bon's work has been the cornerstone for several further publications that deal with the crowd. Until today his theory is referred to in newspaper articles or philosophical works. Just recently an article in the *Frankfurt Allgemeine Zeitung* mentioned Le Bon in connection with collective-panic in life threatening situations.¹⁵

In the second part of chapter 2 we will examine the work from Peter Sloterdijk¹⁶ concerning the mass media in the year 2000. We will see that he carries on the heritage of Le Bon's crowd-psychology but applies it to modern crowd-issues that arose with the mass-media. The German philosopher Peter Sloterdijk had a quarrel with the mass-media in the year 2000. He held a controversial lecture and was later criticized by all big newspapers in Germany. But he refused to put up with that. He was convinced about the fact that he was mobbed because he did not represent the convictions of the crowd. As a consequence he wrote the book *Die Verachtung der Masse*¹⁷ where he accused the mass-media of having an equalization-spleen because they only

13 Cf.: Teigen (2005-2007): French physician and sociologist

14 Le Bon 1922

15 Cf.: Schwenkenbecher 2014

16 Sloterdijk (Vita): German philosopher

17 Sloterdijk 2000

published articles which represent the crowd's convictions. Different opinions, he stated, would be run down by the mass-media. He called this a "Genius go home"¹⁸ attitude. From his point of view the crowd was average. He basically stuck to Le Bon's perception of the crowd but transferred it into the modern-mass-media world. The genius, and he perceived himself as one, was being mobbed because the average crowd could not stand that someone is smarter than them. And the mass-media, he found, was the spokesman of the crowd.

In the third part of the theory chapter we will deal with Albert O. Hirschman's¹⁹ work about reactionary rhetoric. He discovered three different reactionary argumentative strategies: perversity, jeopardy and futility.²⁰ With Hirschman's strategies, I will examine if some of the strategies might be reflected in some of the arguments of the conservatives.

1.2. Newspaper articles as the main source

I used two sources to study the arguments of the conservatives: articles of the two conservative newspapers *Aftenposten*²¹ and *Morgenbladet*²² and the protocol in the "Stortingsforhandling" from the day of the passing. The complete editions of the years 1897 and 1898 were scanned for articles dealing with universal suffrage with the aim to capture a close to holistic picture of the news report concerning universal suffrage. Naturally, a fair share of articles was later estimated to be irrelevant concerning the aim of this thesis. Therefore, articles dealing with female universal suffrage or communal suffrage are not mentioned in this paper even though those topics were often issued in articles in the year 1897 and 1898.

To be able to examine the conservatives' arguments, I decided to concentrate on the two biggest conservative newspapers that were published in 1897-1898: *Aftenposten*²³ and *Morgenbladet*^{24, 25}. Due to the limited extent of my thesis it was impossible to cover the whole debate from the first time universal-suffrage was mentioned until it was introduced and the last word about it was

18 Sloterdijk 2000

19 Hirschman 1991

20 We will come back to those strategies in subsection 2.5

21 Cf.: Høeg 1974: 21: "Aftenposten 1860-"

22 Ibid.: 20: "Morgenbladet 1819-1943. 1945-"

23 Ibid.: "Aftenposten 1860-"

24 Ibid.: Høeg 1974: 20: "Morgenbladet 1819-1943. 1945-"

25 "En stor del av de avisene som har sett dagens lys og vært virksomme i Norge, har hatt forankring i politiske partier og bevegelser. De har vært etablert av personer eller grupper som har ønsket å støtte politiske partier eller retninger." Seip 1992: 25

said. I thus limited my search and defined a time-span in which I could expect the debate to be fierce, maybe on its fiercest. Therefore, I decided to examine the newspapers right before and after the voting about the introduction of the universal-suffrage. The voting took place in the National Assembly in April 1898. Right before the decision was made I suspected that every argument that had been brought up in the course of the debate over the years would be repeated, the concerns would be summed up and after the voting the negative predictions would be tested. Instead of working my way through a decade of literature, I worked through the complete editions of the year 1897 and 1898 and collected relevant articles about universal suffrage. I ended up using only a fraction of the articles I had read. The main articles that I worked with in this thesis are from the first half of the year 1898 and the last half of 1897. In addition, I consulted the protocols in the “Stortingsforhandlinger”²⁶ from the day of the passing. They will serve as a comparison to the newspaper reports. They will also give us the chance to compare Høyre's arguments with those printed in the articles.

While working with the sources it became clear that when dealing with the news coverage of the debate about universal suffrage it is crucial to distinguish between different types of reporting: debates or comments and widely re-narrating reports. I will now present attributes of the different reporting categories. They only apply to this specific case-study and were developed in the working process.

Debates and comments are articles in which the author is incorporating his or her own opinions and evaluations. Those can be based on personal experiences, mere feelings or have a political agenda. This does not exclude proper reasoning or consideration of the situation where positive and negative examples are given. However, we have to assume that the reasoning has a certain goal: to convince the audience to believe in the authors own conviction.²⁷

Re-narrating reports, on the other hand, are articles describing mainly parliamentary debates. They will typically follow almost the exact course of an assembly, citing different speakers and sometimes incorporating side happenings or small comments about the atmosphere in the assembly. Those reports are widely impartial and should thus be objective. However, there can be a thin line between objective comments and intentional manipulation. Here, the protocols of the parliamentary debates (that where mentioned earlier) will be used as a comparative value.

26 St. meld. nr. 7 1898

27 A typical example: *Aftenposten* 20.04.1898: “Stemmeretten. Skal vi give Løsgjængerer og Drankeren?”.

That way, comments from the journalist reporting about the debate can be distinguished from the mere protocol.²⁸

I met one major challenge concerning the sources: the language. I decided to write the quotes in the original language, Norwegian, instead of translating them to English. The main reason for that was that I wanted to make sure that the exact original meaning of the terms and phrases would not get lost in the course of translating them. Therefore, I decided to explain them further in English after I had quoted the original citation. If this thesis would be published in another form I would translate all quotes in the footer but due to lack of time and the fact that we are in Norway I expect that everyone will understand both English and Norwegian.

Naturally, I can not claim to have studied the attitude of all conservatives in Norway towards universal suffrage by examining the two conservative newspapers and the protocol. My aim is to illustrate the clear tendencies I have found in my research which allows me to state that the newspaper articles I found were opposed to universal suffrage and that I could find the same arguments the politicians used in the assembly in the newspapers in a more drastic way.

1.3. Literature

The thesis has a theoretical frame: two philosophical theories concerning 'the crowd' build the ground of my examinations. I decided to concentrate on the work of Gustave Le Bon "*Psychologie der Massen*"²⁹. He is one of the founding fathers of modern crowd-theories and is being cited in several modern pamphlets, books and articles about 'the crowd', for instance, in Elias Canetti's "*Masse und Macht*"³⁰. Serge Moscovici transfers Le Bon's conception of the crowd into the modern era in the "The Age of the crowd"³¹. Some newspaper articles are also mentioning him when the topic comes up.³² Another post modern work about the crowd in which Le Bon is mentioned is Peter Sloterdijk's "*Die Verachtung der Massen – Versuch über Kulturkämpfe in der modernen Gesellschaft*"³³. This work represents the post-modern perception

28 A typical example: *Aftenposten* 21.04.1898: "Stemmeretten. Stortingets Dagsmøde. Almindelig stemmeret bifaldt med 78 mod 36 St."

29 Le Bon 1922

30 Canetti 1960

31 Moscovici 1985

32 Martenstein 2011: "Auf der Suche nach einer Antwort – was wird zum Mainstream? – landet man bei Gustave Le Bon, der 1895 den Klassiker *Psychologie der Massen* geschrieben hat. Le Bon war Arzt und Anthropologe, das Massenverhalten konnte er im Krieg von 1870/71 studieren, im belagerten Paris, und während der Tage der Pariser Kommune." Also: Henrichs 1982

33 Sloterdijk 2000

of 'the crowd' in a mass-media society. My intention was to pick two works that could serve as a frame with regards to the question if “the fear for the crowd” is a timeless conflict and how it might have changed through time. While Le Bon resembles the state of mind in a time of social and political upheaval (i.e. the French revolution) and its long-term impacts on social and political life, Sloterdijk resembles the post-modern virtual upheaval: the internet and mass-media. In addition, another theoretical work was included: “*The Rhetoric of Reaction*”³⁴ of Albert O. Hirschman. This will serve as a tool to understand conservative argumentative strategies in the last chapter of the thesis. I considered his work to be important because I studied the discussions about 'the crowd of new voters' from a conservatives point of view. Therefore, it was helpful to have a deeper understanding of reactionary rhetoric.

Concerning the chapter dealing with the historical pre-conditions, I was in many ways bound to fairly old but well-established works about the time around 1890 until 1898 concerning parliamentarianism, the formation of parties and the introduction of universal suffrage.

In the 1980s, Alf Kaartvedt wrote about party *Høyre* in Norway. In this context one of the three volumes about party's history will be especially important: “*Høyres Historie 1- Drømmen om borgerlig samling 1884-1918*”³⁵. All three volumes are edited by Francis Sejersted, who contributed several important works concerning nation building and the history of the conservatives in Norway. His article “Hvordan og hvorfor lese Høyres historie”³⁶ will be central to understand the motivation of the historian to work with the history of a political party.

Furthermore, Alf Kaartvedt's “*Kampen mot parlamentarismen 1880-1884*”³⁷ is important. He gives us an overview of the development within the political environment in Norway from a right-wing point of view. Another classical work that was used to illuminate the historical development in Norway in the 1890s was Jens Arup Seip's “*Utsikt over Norges Historie*”³⁸.

It quickly became clear that there were several books published in the beginning of the 20th century, which dealt with the conservative party *Høyre*. For example “*Unionspolitikken og Høire*”³⁹ from Halvor Storm. Yet again, the work had been published in 1926, which makes it

34 Hirschman 1991
35 Kaartvedt 1984
36 Sejersted 1993
37 Kaartvedt 1956
38 Seip 1997
39 Storm 1929

difficult to use as a secondary-source. The same applies to Magnus Hylde's "*Midlerne: Høires, Samlingspartiets og 'de frisindedes' agitation*"⁴⁰ that was published in 1910, to name some.

Therefore, it was necessary to take a closer look at Norway's history around the late 20th and early 21th century to get an overview of the social and political changes. The following works seem to be relevant in this context: "*De nasjonale strateger*"⁴¹ from Rune Slagstad, "*Nasjonsbygging - folkestyre – idékamp. Utviklingslinjer på 1800-tallet*"⁴² by Anne-Lise Seip and Trond Nordby's work "*Grunnlov og styreform. Norge 1814-2010*"⁴³.

As we can see, the literature dealing with the political changes (mainly the period of the nation building from 1814 until 1905, which is interesting for my thesis) is quite old. This is due to the fact that this is an old research field that has not been in focus lately.

1.4. Structure

The thesis consists of seven chapters including the introduction and the conclusion. The five main-chapters cover the theoretical part in chapter 2, the overview of the historical background in chapter 3 and chapters 4, 5 and 6, in which we deal with the examination of the newspaper articles. Those last three chapters of the main-part represent the core of my work: the study of the sources. Hence, I have decided to dedicate three chapters to this key aspect of my thesis.

The main part begins with the introduction of the three different theories that form the frame and background of the thesis in chapter 2. First, Gustave Le Bon's theory about the popular mind will be explained. After that, Peter Sloterdijk's work about the mass media will be summed up and interpreted. In subsection 2.4 the two theories will be connected. By connecting them I want to examine to what extent the main ideas of those two mass-theories have stayed the same throughout a century. The last subsection of chapter 2 deals with the work of Albert O. Hirschman concerning reactionary rhetoric with the aim to provide a tool to understand the argumentation pattern and strategy of the conservatives mainly in chapter 6.

Chapter 3 illuminates the historical background and preconditions that led to the introduction of

40 Midlerne: 1910

41 Slagstad 1998

42 Seip 2001

43 Nordby 2010

universal suffrage and the preceding debate about it. Four subsections will lead us from the Constituent Assembly in Eidsvoll (1814) to the introduction of parliamentarianism, the formation of the party *Høyre* and finally to the party's main topics from 1884 until 1905: the union and the universal suffrage.

After having prepared the ground by understanding the historical preconditions as well as the philosophical theories, we will start to examine the newspaper articles and the “Stortingsforhandlinger” in chapter 4. This is the first part in which we start dealing with the sources. Here we concentrate on the news covering at the day of the passing, April 21st 1898 and the day after that, April 22nd. Chapter 4 has three subsections. First, we will take a brief look at the result of the passing by studying the protocol of the “Stortingsforhandlinger”. In the second subsection the reports in the newspapers about the voting and passing of April 21st will be compared to the official protocol. Finally, we will examine the comment and debate articles which were published on the 21st of April and were related to the debate about the passing. Because the passing was preceded by an ongoing debate in the newspapers in 1897 and 1898, it is necessary to study the news covering of the debate that preceded the passing.

In chapter 5 we will dig deeper and concentrate on debate and comment articles concerning the debate about universal suffrage in the years 1897 and 1898. Here we will focus on striking terms, phrases and other stylistic devices that were used to argue against universal-suffrage. Subsection 5.1 is concerned with the headlines with the aim to reveal a general pattern of the use of terms and phrases which is already visible in the headlines. In subsection 5.2 the use of stylistic devices like metaphors and comparisons will be examined. Finally, in the last subsection 5.3, we will study terms and phrases that were used repeatedly in debate and comment articles that were critical towards universal-suffrage.

The last chapter of the main part, chapter 6, deals with the argumentation pattern of the conservatives. Here the impressions from chapters 4 and 5 concerning the news covering and the use of terms, phrases and stylistic devices will be collected. The aim of this chapter is to reveal an argumentation pattern of the conservatives. I will then try to compare those arguments to Albert O. Hirschman's conservative argumentative strategy.

Finally, in the conclusion I attempt to build a bridge between the theoretical part of the thesis

with the findings from the newspaper articles. The conclusion consists of 6 subsections. Subsection 7.1 will be a summary of the argumentation pattern, 7.2 will be the attempt to connect Hirschman's theory with the findings that were made concerning the argumentation pattern. Subsection 7.3 will deal with Gustave Le Bon's description of the crowd and the question whether and how his description is reflected in some description of 'the new crowd of voters' in Norway. In a second step in subsection 7.4 I will attempt to integrate Sloterdijk's post-modern view on 'the crowd' by trying to draw a line from the newspaper articles to the post-modern mass-media society. In subsection 7.5 I suggest that the fear for the crowd could be a shared reactionary belief. I finalize this thesis with some challenges and perspectives.

2. Theoretical background Gustave Le Bon, Peter Sloterdijk and Albert O. Hirschman

2.1. *Gustave Le Bon*

When Gustave Le Bon's book "*The crowd – A study of the popular mind*" was first published in 1895, it was a product of its era. France had not only been shaken by the cruelty of the French Revolution almost a hundred years ago but also by the social changes the revolution caused. Not in the least, the Paris Commune with its bloody riots in 1871.⁴⁴ Those riots were often linked to the broadened suffrage in France that came as a result of the French Revolution and the reformed political system. We have to keep this in mind when dealing with the universal suffrage debate in Norway in 1898, in which the conservatives repeatedly referred to the situation in France.

Le Bon published a work which aimed towards explaining the social changes and displaying the risks for civilizations. His book is as much a foresight as it is a retrospection of causes that led to the "rotten system"⁴⁵ of civilization that is in any moment in danger of collapsing.

The work is divided into three books: "The mind of crowds", "The opinions and beliefs of crowds" and "The classification and description of the different kinds of crowds". The disposition of the three books reflects Le Bon's theory, namely the circular rise and fall of civilization. In Le Bon's theory the civilization is based on collective ideas. The process of civilization begins with the formation of many single individuals into a race. This marks the beginning of a civilized society based on collective ideas. If then the race operates as a crowd and questions those ideas, the civilization itself is on the downturn of its existence.

The first book concentrates on defining the characteristics of the crowd by naming the main traits of the condition of its mind: simplicity, exaggeration, irrationality, conservatism, moralism and intolerance.⁴⁶ Le Bon describes the crowd as a single organism formed by individuals giving up their personality to serve the purpose of the crowd.⁴⁷ All actions committed as a crowd are hence legitimated through the secure setting of being a crowd. The feelings shared by all members of the crowd are therefore the feelings of unlimited power and might, anonymity, irresponsibility and contagion.⁴⁸ Referring to those traits, Le Bon draws the conclusion that the crowd is easily suggestible, credulous, irritable and altogether stupid, as well as hazardous. Le Bon prepared the

44 Cf.: Martenstein 2011; Henrichs 1983

45 Cf. Le Bon 1922: 151

46 Cf. Le Bon 1922: 13-37

47 Cf. Le Bon 1922: 13

48 Cf. Le Bon 1922: 14

ground for his circular-theory in the first book by illustrating the state of mind of the crowd. Thereby he establishes a determined pattern of the actions, thoughts and ideas of the crowd.

The second book pursues the theory by explaining the origins of the revolutionary ideas. Every civilization is a product of the race it has been formed by. The crowd consists of individuals belonging to the same race.⁴⁹ Therefore, the revolutionary ideas are a product of the race as well. This implies that no revolutionary idea is coincidental.⁵⁰

In a second step, Le Bon explains how the crowd is mobilized. The nature of the crowd requires a leader with specific attributes. The most important one is “prestige”⁵¹. The leader's prestige will help him to capture the crowd with pictures, illusions and associations. Reason, on the other hand, is more an obstacle than a benefit.

Die größten Führer aller Zeiten, besonders die der Revolution, waren kläglich beschränkt, und gerade die beschränktesten haben den größten Einfluss ausgeübt.⁵²

In the third book Le Bon describes and classifies the different kinds of crowds from the criminal crowd and the electoral crowd to the parliamentary assembly. The most important findings about those crowds is their similarity: every crowd-discourse is ruled by the crowd-psychology. This means that the individuals disappear in favor of the crowd. The decisions that are taken by a crowd are always worse than the decisions taken by one individual alone. Le Bon makes no difference between a crowd of uneducated and a crowd of scholars.⁵³ The reason for this is that his theory of the crowds mind and mechanism shows that individuals will be acting in a determined pattern – in the pattern of the popular mind.

2.1.1. Cultural pessimism, conservatism, religious criticism, anti-educational and anti-democratic tendencies

Preparing the ground with the help of Le Bon, five main characteristic features can be detected in his reasoning reflecting the “Zeitgeist”⁵⁴ of this era: cultural pessimism, conservatism and religious criticism plus anti-educational and anti-democratic tendencies.

49 Further information about his theory of race: Gustave Le Bon: Grundgesetze Völkerentwicklung (fr. 1894), Leipzig 1922.

50 Cf.: Le Bon 1922: 53, 54.

51 Cf.: Ibd: 92.

52 Cf.: Ibd.: 141.

53 Cf.: Ibd.: 133, 138, 143

54 Johann Gottfried Herder, German philosopher. [*Geflügelte Worte*, VEB Bibliographisches Institut Leipzig, 1982, p. 303-304]

The cultural pessimism is expressed in the circular-theory that frames his work.⁵⁵ Le Bon describes the rise and fall of civilization. Before civilization there is barbarism which is a mix of different individuals of different offspring. They speak different languages and have different beliefs. The only thing they share is the loose gathering around a more or less accepted chief. As time goes by, they shape their lives together and start to share more and more beliefs. At this point they are in transition from barbarism to a race. Their shared race-beliefs make it possible to create a blooming culture. However, when the culture has reached a certain point of evolution, when it is on its evolutionary high point, the tables turn and the deconstruction of culture begins. Finally, the race falls back to barbarism.⁵⁶ This process is inevitable because of the crowd's state of mind. As soon as the individuals of a race gather as a crowd, and they will do this in their evolutionary state of creating a culture, they will start functioning by the rules of the popular mind. By classifying the crowd's state of mind and attributes, Le Bon presupposes that the crowd's actions, decisions and judgments can only be foolish. This makes it impossible to avoid the deconstruction of culture. Le Bon states that the crowd is caught in a vicious-circle by its own nature.

The circular rise and fall begins when stable main ideas, which initially formed a race, are destabilized. We can understand Le Bon's conservatism on this premise: reforms are risky because they lead up to the degeneration of culture. This happens when the civilization is on its evolutionary high point. Reforms and revolutions will deconstruct the culture. It is not surprising that socialism is one of the main threats in Le Bon's argumentation.⁵⁷

Le Bon is at the same time conservative but critical towards religion. He states that the religious illusions have been replaced by the social illusions.⁵⁸ His religious criticism is expressed by the comparisons he draws between the dogmatic thinking of a bigot and the fanatic commitment of the crowd to revolutionary ideas. Both the crowd and the bigot are led by illusions, pictures and dogmatic beliefs that lack reason and logic.

Although Le Bon criticizes the lack of reason and logic in the beliefs of the crowd, he is anti-educational.⁵⁹ At first sight this might seem irrational, but Le Bon denies the individual the

55 Cf.: Le Bon 1922: 150

56 Cf.: *Ibid.*: 149-151

57 Cf.: *Ibid.*: 1922: 42

58 Cf.: *Ibid.*: 75

59 Cf.: *Ibid.*: 61: “[...] daß die schlimmsten Feinde der Gesellschaft, die Anarchisten, sich oft aus den Laureaten der

ability of logical thinking and reasoning when being a member of a crowd. In fact, Le Bon warns that education can function as a temptation. Being too educated, the laborer does not want to be a laborer anymore and covets the scholars position.⁶⁰ The crowd of the dissatisfied worker is, according to Le Bon, the crowd-phenomenon being most dangerous at that time.

That is also the reason why he is highly critical towards universal suffrage.⁶¹ Thereby he reveals an anti-democratic attitude. He dislikes the thought of the socialist parties gaining power through universal suffrage because they are the root to the collapse of civilization. His concerns goes further: it is not only the electoral crowd of laborers which is unable to come to the best decision, it is also the parliament itself. The reason for this is the constitution or nature of the crowd: when individuals form a crowd, every individual will give up its reason and logic and will be influence by the mechanisms of the crowd. The decisions taken by the crowd will always reflect the average insanity of the little sane crowd. Nevertheless, Le Bon admits that until today, the parliamentary assembly is the best political solution,⁶² yet far from ideal.

The last important aspect of Le Bon's work about the crowd is that he is critical towards the media. He claims that the newspapers only distribute the official beliefs of the crowd. The media has turned to a plain information-organ, he claims, which is ruled by the crowd. The ideal would be that the government rules the press and thereby the beliefs of society and not the other way around.⁶³ Le Bon's attitude towards the media only reflects his overall belief that individuals take better decisions than crowds. He does not say that the politicians should lead the media but that the government should. Obviously, an ideal government from Le Bon's point of view would be absolutistic.

We have to be attentive when reading Le Bon's work. It would be too easy to attest him a sheer dismissal of the labor-class. It would be blindness to allege him of only being terrified of the rise of the working class. As much as he seems to support the right-wing attitudes at that time, Le Bon condemns both the privileged and the laborer, the educated and the simple minded. Because when gathered as a crowd they will be stupid, they will be radical and they will tear down the

Schule rekrutieren.“

60 Cf.: Ibd.: 63, 69: “In der Schule bilden sich heute die Unzufriedenen und Anarchisten, un dhier bereiten sich für die lateinischen Völker die künftigen Zeiten des Niedergangs vor.”

61 Cf.: Ibd.: 132: «Das Dogma des allgemeinen Stimmrechts hat heute die Macht, die einst die Idee des Christentums besaßen.“

62 Cf.: Ibd.: 145

63 Cf.: Ibd.: 108

fundamental ideas of an era and cause its civilizations fall.

Nevertheless, his work contains a high number of side blows against the socialist movements at that time. Le Bon displays socialism as the root of all evil. He repeatedly refers to the French Revolution using it as an example for the crowd in rampant action. It is the socialistic-idea that threatens the stability of the civilization. It is the educated laborer who will be the first one forming a furious crowd lead by the socialistic dogmas. It will be the electoral crowd voting for a leader who will manipulate the crowd and cause the collapse of the civilization.

According to him, however, it will be the course of time that builds and destroys a civilization. The socialist movement might be the latest revolutionary idea, but it will be followed by others. Le Bon's conservatism is the most significant element. No revolutionary ideas, thus no crowd, no change.

Is it surprising that Gustave Le Bon's only escape from the vicious circle of civilizations rise and fall would be stagnancy? Is the wish to freeze the given structures by those who felt they were serving their purposes typical for the turn of the 19th century? Did the privileged witness the revolution of the socialist-movement as inevitable? Gustave Le Bon himself resigns without giving a solution at the end of his work. The socialists labor-movements all over Europe continued to spread their thoughts at the beginning of the 20th century. Today, we can say that this led to a number of changes also resulting in the weakening of the right-wing politics. However, the influence and changes were less dramatic than what was feared in some right-wing circles.

Anyhow, it is doubtful to assume that Gustave Le Bon was trying to find a solution. His aim was much more to present his theory of the rise and fall of civilization. His work is philosophical and theoretical. He is neither trying to mobilize a contra revolution, nor doing more than giving general advice on how to handle the recent development. And what kind of solution could he provide? Based on his circular-theory, the only alternative would be stagnation or the radical alteration of the human condition.

2.2. The crowd in disguise?

The journalist Benjamin Henrichs wrote a newspaper article in 1983 with the headline "Die Psychologie der Massen".⁶⁴ Around a hundred years after Le Bon had published his work,

64 Henrichs 1983

Henrichs makes the effort to sum up the prognoses Le Bon gave for the future. Was he right in saying that we are about to enter the “age of the crowds”⁶⁵?

Henrichs comes to an interesting conclusion: the modern-mass-media has taken the position of the crowd. This, in fact, is a development Le Bon could not foresee. In contrast to the leader of the socialistic- and fascistic-movements or dictatorships. Henrichs states that he portrayed them quite precisely while they were only children.⁶⁶ However, after the fascistic-dictatorships are abandoned, another crowd-phenomenon is rising.

Aus unserem Land [...] sind die Diktatoren verschwunden – niemand weiß, für wie lange. Statt der Massen regieren einstweilen die Mehrheiten; nicht die Massenpsychologie ist deshalb die Wissenschaft der Stunde, sondern die Demoskopie. Nicht mehr die Politiker sind heute Le Bons gelehrigste Schüler, sondern: die Medienfürsten, die Unterhaltungsfabrikanten, die Bilder-Produzenten.⁶⁷

We can follow this development and find a modern philosopher who has carried that idea further: Peter Sloterdijk. He is a witness of the modern mass-media in contrast to Le Bon who was a witness of the former crowd-riot. Sloterdijk is the bridge we have to cross to understand the old and the new fear of the crowd. He can help us understand if this fear is permanently present throughout time, only appearing in different disguises, or if every form of “fear” is its own phenomenon that has its own set of rules and appearance. To find this out we have to take a closer look at one of his books.

2.3. Peter Sloterdijk: “Genius go home”

Talentet som man tidligere forsto det, virker bare forstyrrende. For den som har det er det bare en felle, for den som ikke har det en erregelse. *Genius go home*. Så snart dette er skrevet ned, har vi i prinsippet kommet til klarhet om premissene for samtidskulturen [...].⁶⁸

Genius go home. How can we understand this proclamation in Peter Sloterdijk's work “Die Verachtung der Massen – Versuch über Kulturkämpfe in der modernen Gesellschaft”? Is it an

65 Le Bon 1922: 2.

66 Henrichs 1983

67 Ibid.: “The dictators from our countries have disappeared, no one know for how long. The majority is ruling instead of the crowd. It is not the crowd-psychology but the opinion poll that interests the scientific discourse. Instead of politicians have others taken the place of Le Bon's eager students: the media-rulers, the entertainment-bosses, the image-producers.”

68 Sloterdijk 2005: 94

invitation? A recommendation? Or maybe the pessimistic anti-democratic view of an angry philosopher?

To understand the motivation of this book we have to travel back in time to a philosophical symposium in Munich in 1999. At this symposium, Peter Sloterdijk held a lecture about genetic technology and humanism that caused a heated debate in some of Germany's most important newspapers.⁶⁹ The speech was later published in the newspaper *Die Zeit*⁷⁰. The whole dispute started with a sharp commentary of Thomas Assheuer, a German journalist, where he accused Peter Sloterdijk of using Nazi-terminology.⁷¹ In the course of the discussion, Peter Sloterdijk repeatedly complained about the hysterical way the media coped with the subject.⁷²

Keeping that in mind, we turn back to the work with the title “Die Verachtung der Masse”, that was published in 2000, one year after the debate. In the five chapter long book, Sloterdijk seems to be squaring up with the modern mass-media world. He describes the situation of the modern society and its transformation into a faceless crowd, that does not tolerate success or uniqueness. Underlying is the premise that all humans are equal from birth. The motor of this process is the mass-media supporting the crowd's equalization spleen.

In the first chapter, “Svart av mennesker/Menschenschwärze”, Sloterdijk describes the historical development of the crowd. He states that the consistence of the crowd has changed from physically unified to discarnated but unified in the mind. The 20th century big crowd phenomenon described by Elias Canetti in “Masse und Macht”, has been replaced by the 21st century discarnated crowd of mass-individualists.⁷³

Referring to Sloterdijk the media has overtaken the position of the former leader. The leader of the mass is a medium that joins the crowd's attributes. The leader is, in other words, the mirror in which the attributes of the crowd are reflected.⁷⁴ Sloterdijk takes Hitler as example to illustrate the way the crowd reflects itself in its leaders:

Han var, da han fremsto som fører, på ingen måte noe fremragende motstykke til de

69 Mainly the newspaper *Die Zeit* but also *Die Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* and *Der Spiegel*.

70 Sloterdijk: 1999

71 Assheuer: 1999

72 Tjønneland 2005: 20

73 Cf.: Sloterdijk 2005: 27 ff.

74 *Ibid.*: 36-40.

massene han bandt til seg, men deres representant og konsentrat.⁷⁵

Hitler was the essence of the crowd that looked up to him. At the same time is the medium, in which the modern mass-individualist reflects himself, the media itself. Or, as Sloterdijk detects, “i én eneste, en slik fører, en mediestjerne, er det faktisk svart av mennesker”.⁷⁶

The main problem, Sloterdijk states, is the fact that the crowd becomes more and more the status of a subject instead of being an insignificant material.⁷⁷ In the second chapter, “Forakt som begrep/Verachtung als Begriff”, Sloterdijk detects a vicious circle as a consequence. The problem: the crowd as subject will develop needs and wishes. One of them is approval. However, following the rules of the fluctuating market, goods are only valuable when they are scarce. As everyone in the modern society of the individualistic crowd demands approval, the approval will inevitably turn to be disapproval or contempt.⁷⁸

He then draws a historical line from Thomas Hobbes, the explorer of the crowd, to Spinoza, Marx, Nietzsche and Heidegger in the 20th century. He traces the roots of the modern mass-society back to Hegel who saw the crowd's potential in its equity. In contrast to Marx, however, he saw the crowd not as an autonomous force, but as subjects of a monarch.⁷⁹ While the monarchs have been abolished, the equity has stayed, with serious consequences for the post-modern society: ethical standards are banalized.

Epoken med nedbygging av de vertikale strukturene begynner med at man alltid søker mennesket på det laveste nivå.⁸⁰

The third chapter's heading “Dobbelt sår/Doppelte Wunden” already describes the dilemma Sloterdijk approaches in this chapter: the mutual contempt between the elite and the crowd in today's society that leads to a cultural struggle where each opponent sees its shortcoming in the other. The fight between vertical and horizontal, between “massens usikre narcissisme og elitens feilslagne ambisjoner[...].”⁸¹

75 Ibid.: 41.

76 Ibid.: 44.

77 Ibid.: 45.

78 Ibid.: 45-48.

79 Ibid.: 48-53.

80 Ibid.: 54.

81 Ibid.: 75.

In the fourth chapter, “Om antropologisk differens/Von anthropologischer Differenz”, Sloterdijk makes the imploring exclamation: *Genius go home*. He claims that the 17th and 18th century were already participating in abolishing anthropological differences. He describes the trend of an anti-essentialism where it has become popular to abolish all differences. The modern state has been transformed into an equalization institution, where individualism is not wanted, if not fought.⁸²

The last chapter “Identitet i massen: indifferensen/Identität in der Masse: die Indifferenz” sums up the main problem of the modern-society. With everyone seeking approval, approval turns to contempt. The result is a trivial search of a banal sovereign: the media. The only instance allowing distinction, God, is dead. This indifference has a devastating effect on otherness: “Massenkulturen forutsetter at alle forsøk på å-gjøre-seg-interessant [...] ender med fiasko”.⁸³

2.3.1. Sloterdijk and the media – 'A startled chicken pile'

With the *fiasko* in mind let us turn back to the first quote: “Talent can be a trap for those who have it and an offense for those who lack it.” *Genius go home*. Sloterdijk has detected the root of evil: the anti-elitist democratic movements that already started in the 17th century. In his work he presents the results of those movements. More precise, his interpretation of the post-modern multimedia world.

There is the crowd, or better: the mass-media, and the elite, (i.e. those who are beyond the crowd) those with talent. The first sentence of the last chapter in his book leaves no doubt about where Sloterdijk places himself in this system:

Det er historiens hevn over *oss egalitarister* at også vi må gjøre våre erfaringer gjennom tvangen til å se forskjellen.⁸⁴

We egalitarians. And what is it they have to learn? That they will be fought, criticized maybe, and even derided when uttering a theory or calling attention for the differences in a society that refuses otherness.

Keeping that in mind it is necessary to take a look at the foregoing debate about Sloterdijk's

82 Ibid.: 83-88

83 Ibid.: 99.

84 Ibid.: 97

lecture in 1999, it is not possible to summarize the exact content of his speech here. The important point is that Sloterdijk must have hit a sore spot. However, this led to a heated media-campaign in which Sloterdijk himself took part by providing a number of open letters that were published in the same newspapers. The most prominent one being the first letter “Die kritische Theorie ist tot”.⁸⁵

The letter is directed to the journalist Thomas Assheuer who criticized his lecture openly in the commentary that was mentioned before. Sloterdijk answers with a complaint about the medial hysteria and the way Assheuer used his statements to provide a much more offensive picture of what Sloterdijk had said. His open letter is a sideswipe directed to the media in the postmodern society.

Denken Sie [...] an die kapitolinischen Gänse, die einst das alte Rom mit ihrem rechtzeitigen Schnattern zu nächtlicher Stunde vor den Galliern gerettet haben.[...] Das kapitolinische Geflügel, das funktional in unserer Presse und unserer Ideologiekritik weiterlebt, hat von da an auch das Recht, Fehlalarme auszulösen, ohne geschlachtet zu werden.⁸⁶

The picture he paints speaks for itself. The analogy of the media and ancient Rome's poultry is certainly meant to provide a certain understanding of today's media: a startled chicken pile. Those who manage to alarm this chicken pile will be trampled down.

Assheuer blamed Sloterdijk to be pursuing a Zarathustra-project. Zarathustra is Nietzsche's forever-misunderstood loner who wanted to share his epiphany, only to find that the ordinary crowd was not interested.⁸⁷

Is Sloterdijk pursuing a Zarathustra-project? Sloterdijk's work can be seen as cultural-critic, anti-socialistic and critical towards the modern multimedia-society. Culturally critical because he criticizes the current structure of the society, which has its roots in the abolition of the absolutist monarchs. Anti-socialistic because he rejects the thought of equity and horizontal differences, which presuppose equal opportunities and refuse otherness. Critical towards the modern mass media-society because the media is the motor transporting the modern-crowds obsession of

85 Sloterdijk: 1999

86 Ibid.: 1999. Translation: “Remind yourself of the Capitoline geese. They once save ancient Rome from the Gallic invasion by their alarming chatter. The Capitoline poultry is today's media and ideology critique. And they have the right to set off false alarm without being slaughtered right away.”

87 Nietzsche 2009

banality and equity.

The media is the personification of the leader who is always as banal and ordinary as his crowd. Which, in turn, means that the products of the media are spawns of the equitization-, banalization- and condemnation spleen of the modern society.

Sloterdijk lifts himself over this condition of being. He wants to contribute, to allow the genius. He wants to fight the *genius go home* attitude of today's mass-media-society. However, he does not provide any solutions. As God would have been the only instance being allowed to make differences, rise some and press others down, there is until today, no replacement, so Sloterdijk.

Sloterdijk himself states that his work was motivated by the debate in 1999.⁸⁸ "Die kritische Theorie ist tot" is a heading that could as well have suited his book. That the crowd can only be ordinary and does not except otherness, implies that statements leaving this frame will be fought.

It would be a false conclusion to assume that Sloterdijk believes that vertical differences are abolished or that he wants to reinvent absolutist ideals. It is quite the contrary: what Sloterdijk describes is the urge of modern society to abolish differences and the dangers he sees in that. As a matter of fact, what he really does is to contribute to a lament that might be observable in all epochs at all times: the fear of the elite for the marauding crowd of the under-privileged.

2.4. Le Bon and Sloterdijk

It is amazing how closely the two works are related, despite the fact that they were written in two different centuries. A number of similarities can be detected, which can help us understand the relations between the two works: the nature of the crowd, the leader and the cultural-criticism.

When taking a look at the nature of the crowd, we can see that Le Bon's crowd is corporal, a marauding mob, whereas Sloterdijk's crowd is discarnated. Nevertheless, they are similar in their ideas and state of mind. It might seem like the crowds are not comparable at first glance, but the nature of their ideas and their attributes are they same. Even though Le Bon could not foresee the development in the future, he already stated that the crowd could also be united in mind.⁸⁹

88 Sloterdijk 2000: 107

89 Le Bon 1922: 9-10.

This leads us to the head of the crowd: the leader. When looking at the leader we have to recall how the nature of the crowd was described. Both authors, Le Bon and Sloterdijk, state that the nature of the crowd is reflected in their leader. Le Bon's and Sloterdijk's leaders are little sane, but good speakers, who can motivate and activate the crowd.

Both works are cultural-critique. While Le Bon's cultural-criticism expresses itself by a pessimistic viewpoint, Sloterdijk is more observant. Both authors develop theories that predict a cultural-decay that is self-reinforcing. While Le Bon sees no escape, Sloterdijk's theory is optimistic. He states that the decay might not be inevitable.

The last striking parallel is their attitude towards the media. Le Bon already complains that the media is lead by crowd-beliefs. Sloterdijk states the same, and 'proves' this through his 'genius go home' experience.

The challenge is to combine Sloterdijk and Le Bon. How can we use them in a historic context when observing the “fear” of the elite for the crowd?

Le Bon is supposed to be the starting point, the origin, the basis. The historical events in this thesis that will be evaluated are events happening approximately at the same time as Le Bon wrote his work.

In comparison, Sloterdijk's work proves the continuity of the problem throughout a long period of time. From Le Bon in 1870 until the year 2000. His work will be used as a frame. With his culture critique theories we are able to draw a line from Le Bon to the modern crowd issues. However, the main focus will be on Le Bon and the fear for the crowd at the end of the 19th century.

He provides a theory trying to understand a movement in Europe that was highly alarming in the eyes of the well-faring part of the population. As much as it can be used in a historical thesis, the work itself is not a historiographical one. In fact, it is historical itself. Le Bon tried to understand and interpret the “Zeitgeist” of his era. Hence, it can be ranged under the cultural philosophical works of the 19th century.

That is why the work can help us to understand specific events and movements in the turn of the 19th to the 20th century in other European countries, in this case, Norway. Le Bon provides us with a bigger picture of the concerns of the conservative parts of the population. His work can be used as a framework to interpret situations in smaller regions and cultural circles. We can picture Le Bon's work as the long shot in a film: it helps illustrating and describing a current general spirit. The next step will be to zoom for a close up. This close up will be Norway, the party *Høyre* and the media. All struggling with the same fears on a regional level. Before that we have to prepare the ground for conservative argumentation strategies.

2.5. Perversity, futility, jeopardy - Hirschman and the argumentation pattern of the conservatives

In “The Rhetoric of Reaction”, Albert O. Hirschman develops a counter-thesis concerning T.H Marshall's work “Class, citizenship, and Social Development”⁹⁰ where he designs a theory about the big social and political changes concerning the “development of citizenship”⁹¹ of the last three centuries in three steps. Beginning with the “civil citizenship”⁹² in the 18th century to the 19th century battle about the “political aspects of citizenship”⁹³ and the 20th century efforts to develop citizenship in the “social and economic sphere”⁹⁴.

Crucial about Marshall's theory is the fact that he inclines that this development was, and is, under constant progress. Critiques, as Hirschman argues, have pointed out that this view is too optimistic. Some argue that quite the opposite has happened: for every step forward in that development, there has been a backlash. Albert Hirschman calls this phenomenon a “[...] protracted and perilous seesawing of action and reaction[...]”⁹⁵. This seesawing of action and reaction is the ground on which he develops his thesis about the rhetoric of reaction.⁹⁶

Hirschman reveals three different reactionary argumentative strategies which are used to prevent reforms or changes in social and political orders: perversity, futility and jeopardy.⁹⁷ We will now take a closer look at each of those.

90 Cf.: Hirschmann 1991: 1

91 Ibid.: 1

92 Ibid.: 2

93 Ibid.: 2

94 Ibid.: 2

95 Ibid.: 2

96 Cf.: Ibid.: 1-3

97 Cf.: Ibid.: 3

The perversity strategy is the claim that every intended aim of a reform will result in the opposite. Hirschman summarizes: “[...] the attempt to push society in a certain direction will result in its moving all right, but in the opposite direction.”⁹⁸ There is a general unity among the users of the perversity strategy claiming: “Attempts to reach for liberty will make society sink into slavery, the quest for democracy will produce oligarchy and tyranny [...]. Everything backfires.”⁹⁹ We will soon see that the conservative opponents of universal suffrage were all too familiar with the slogan “everything backfires”. One point of criticism of the perversity strategy is that there are several unintended consequences of human action, both negative and positive. Reactionists plainly focus on the negative consequences that are closest to the plain opposite of what was intended. Thereby they construct a seeming coherence in the claim that instead of the aim, the opposite of it is reached.¹⁰⁰

The users of the futility strategy, however, are guided by the conviction that real changes are plain illusions that can not shake the foundation of society and politics. They are at best “cosmetic”¹⁰¹ and “largely on the surface”¹⁰². Being convinced about the pointlessness of changes, it quickly becomes clear that an attempted reform is pointless as well.¹⁰³ The problem with the futility argument is that “it does not take itself and its own effects on events seriously enough”¹⁰⁴.

As reactionaries can make use of both, the perversity and the futility strategy, this comes with some challenges. How can you simultaneously warn against something and claim its ineffectiveness?¹⁰⁵ Often those two arguments appear with a time lag in a debate.¹⁰⁶ We will soon see that the conservatives make use of both argumentative strategies in the debate. Funny enough, with no time lag.

The jeopardy strategy is more complex than the first two. Users of this strategy warn about the loss of an old and hard-won concept that would be jeopardized by introducing the new reform.

98 *Ibid.*: 11

99 *Ibid.*: 12

100 *Ibid.*: 38-39

101 *Ibid.*: 43

102 *Ibid.*: 43

103 *Cf.*: *Ibid.*: 43-44

104 *Ibid.*: 78

105 *Cf.*: 45

106 *Cf.*: 45-46

They do not “contend that the proposed reform itself is wrong”, rather, they claim that it will lead to “a sequence of events such that it would be dangerous, imprudent or simply undesirable to move in the proposed [...] direction”¹⁰⁷. The weak point of this strategy is that it cannot be used unless there exists a newly won change that came with high-costs and unless this change is fresh in remembrance.¹⁰⁸

We shall keep Hirschman's argumentative strategies in mind when examining the conservative's way of dealing with the issue of male universal suffrage. Hirschman will be especially interesting in connection with the argumentation pattern. Before that we have to take a look at the conditions in which the debate about male universal suffrage in Norway arose: the historical background.

107 *Ibd.*: 83

108 *Cf.*: *Ibd.*: 1991: 127

3. Historical preconditions – Leading to the debate about the male universal suffrage in Norway

To be able to interpret the newspaper articles referring to the electoral-rights-debate, it is essential to be familiar with the historical events that lead up to the debate in 1898. For that purpose we will take a look at the development of the political system in Norway from 1814 until 1898.

3.1. The Constituent Assembly in Eidsvoll 1814 and its consequences

The fall of Napoleon was of great importance for Norway. The Treaty of Kiel,¹⁰⁹ signed in January 1814, changed the borders of the Scandinavian countries. In the case of Norway, a union with Sweden was established. Christian Fredrik¹¹⁰, the Crown Prince of Denmark and Norway, saw the chance to take a lead in the independence movement in Norway. His aim was most likely to be able to re-unify Norway with Denmark at a later date.¹¹¹

For these purposes, he convened the Constituent Assembly in Eidsvoll in spring 1814.¹¹² In this assembly Norway composed its constitution and was declared as a free country. However, the highly opposed union with the Swedish king could not be avoided. Norway was still dependent on the Swedish neighbor, not least because of Sweden's military predominance.¹¹³

However, the new constitution opened possibilities for a more self-determined government. A National Assembly (Storting) was constructed and, with limitations, all men aged 25 and older had the right to vote.¹¹⁴ They had to either be state officials, live in Norway for at least 5 years or own or rent property for a time and they had to have some funds.¹¹⁵ The constitution was an expression of the general western civilization's urge towards a revolution inspired by the

109 Mestad & Michalsen 2005: 20: “Det første rettslige dokument i året 1814, som stod sentralt for de unionsrettslige debatter gjennom hele unionshistorie, var Kieltraktaten som fulgte Kielfreden. Traktaten var en folkerettslig avtale mellom den danske og svenske konge, og som først og fremst bestemte at den danske konge skulle overføre Norge til den svenske.”

110 Weidling 2014

111 Cf.: Nordby 1992: 115

112 Cf.: Dyrvik 2005: 8-11

113 Cf.: Nordby 1992: 116

114 The suffrage-debate will be discussed in subsection 3.4

115 Cf.: Hommerstad 2010: 111

Enlightenment ideals of Rousseau¹¹⁶ and Montesquieu¹¹⁷ about “national will” and “division of powers”.¹¹⁸

The constitution's central elements where: religious liberty (§6), freedom of the press (§100) and freedom of trade (§101).¹¹⁹

Hovedtanken var at kongen var den utøvende makten (§3) som fritt valgte sitt råd (§12). Folkevilje var til stedet i Stortingets lovgivende makt (§49), og kongemaktens begrensninger lå først og fremst i at han var forpliktet til å følge loven (§9). Grunnloven I 1814 skiller svært skarpt mellom kongen og hans råd på den ene siden og Stortinget på den andre (§ 62).¹²⁰

The years from 1814 until 1884 are in general called the period of the “Embedsmannsstaten”¹²¹. This is explained by the missing aristocracy in Norway, which resulted in the fact that the country was not ruled by leading aristocratic families, as in other European countries, but by state officials, who replaced the missing aristocratic class.¹²² However, the term “Embedsmannsstaten” can be discussed. Alf Kaartvedt states that the term is only valid if it refers to the dominance of state officials in political and administration affairs, not if we look at the social foundation of the conservative regime.¹²³

3.2. The rise of the power of the Storting on the edge to parliamentarianism

The *Embedsmannsstaten* was under transformation in the years following 1814 up to 1884. In the course of almost a century, Norway managed to free itself totally from the Swedish Crown. This was partly because of the fact that Norway and Sweden had an issue: the countries stood on different sides concerning their conception of the union. Sweden was inclined to see itself in the role of a “primus inter pares”¹²⁴, the “First among Equals”, concerning the balance of power in the union. In contrast, Norway was determined to be accepted as an equal partner and hoped for an “innocent revision”¹²⁵ of the existing relation, with the aim of gaining more voice without

116 Rousseau: nation will = Volkswille. Rousseau's political theory based on the social contract. In: Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *Du Contract Social ou Principes du Droit Politique*, Amsterdam 1762.

117 Montesquieu: About the division of powers. In: Montesquieu, Charles Louis, *De l'esprit des loix*, Genève 1748.

118 Cf.: Berg Eriksen 1992: 64; see also Nordby 1992: 117 and Seip 1999: 329

119 Cf.: *Ibd.*: 64

120 Berg Eriksen 1992: 64

121 Cf.: Trond Nordby 1992: 117. However, the term “Embedsmannsstaten” can be discussed. Read Kaartvedt 1984: 10: “Klisjeén embedsmannsstaten er imidlertid bare dekkende hvis trykke legges på embedsstandens dominans i de sentrale politiske og administrative organer, men misvisende om den brukes til å beskrive det konservative regimes sosiale fundament.” Also Slagstad 2001: 18

122 Cf. Trond Nordby 1992: 117; Berg Eriksen 1992: 63

123 Cf. Kaartvedt 1984: 10

124 *Ibd.*: 13

125 *Ibd.*: 13

committing to a closer relation to Sweden.¹²⁶

In connection with the history of law, the relation between the two union partners is clear:

Unionen bandt ikke Norges indre suverenitet, den strakk seg bare til å binde Norges ytre suverenitet. Men nettopp derfor ble nasjonalitet en betydelig faktor, også i den unionelle relasjon.¹²⁷

Norway wanted to gain more power in the policy of foreign affairs as early as 1835. Discussions started, concerning the allowance of attending meetings of the Swedish cabinet ministry. That was important for Norway because foreign policy and diplomacy concerning the union were discussed in the cabinet ministry. The outcome of the discussion in 1835 was that one Norwegian minister was allowed to attend the meetings concerning Norway's foreign policy in particular.¹²⁸ This, however, was only one of many steps towards more self-governance.

The most important shift in the history of the political system in Norway was the shift to parliamentarianism. This social and political revolution originated in the composition of the voters. Though the state was called *Embedsmannsstaten*, a great share of eligible voters were farmers.¹²⁹ Consequently, they were critical of the “upper class” of state officials. The farmers argued that their needs were not represented sufficiently by the state officials. This led to a constitutional dispute known as *forfatningskampen* or *forfatningsstriden*¹³⁰. In the course of the debate, the farmers, as well as the conservative government, swapped sides. In the 1830's the farmers were highly alarmed when Fredrik Stang¹³¹ proposed the presence of the cabinet ministers in the National Assembly (Storting). The farmers were opposed to this proposal because they feared the rising influence of the state officials. However, in 1872 the fronts had shifted. The farmers were now eager to increase the responsibility of the cabinet ministers in the National Assembly to control the state officials in the parliament, while the government, now led by Stang, vetoed the proposal. They saw the balance of power endangered and feared the rise of a parliamentary government.¹³²

The proposal was vetoed again in 1874, 1877 and 1880. The last proposal in 1880 is called the 9.

126 Cf. Kaartvedt 1984 13

127 Mestad & Michalsen 2005: 19

128 Cf.: Kaartvedt 1984: 12

129 Cf.: Nordby 1992: 117

130 Cf.: Nordby 2010: 36. Also: Kaartvedt 1984: 23 uses *forfatningskampen* while Trond Nordby uses *forfatningsstriden* in Nordby 1992: 119

131 Cf.: Slagstad 2001: 13. Slagstad about Emil Stang.

132 Cf.: Nordby 1992: 117-118

*juni beslutning*¹³³. On 9th June 1880 the National Assembly passed the change of the constitution concerning the cabinet minister issue (*statsrådsaken*) by determining that the cabinet ministry was now responsible towards the National Assembly.¹³⁴ However, the government vetoed again. The cabinet ministry issue (*statsrådsaken*) had now become first and foremost a veto-issue.¹³⁵ During this process a clear opposition, the *Venstre*, was formed.¹³⁶ The aim at this point was to out-rule the government by approaching the Court of Impeachment (*riksretten*). In January 1884 the sentence was told and the government under prime minister Selmer had to retreat.¹³⁷ The year of 1884 has traditionally been seen as the year of the breakthrough of a parliamentary government.¹³⁸

Parlamentarismen[...] innebar at regjeringen til enhver tid måtte ha tillit i nasjonalforsamlingen. Parlamentarismen begrenset kongens myndighet ytterlige i forhold til Grunnloven og gjorde den utøvende makt til en ren eksekutiv for den lovgivende makt.¹³⁹

Trond Nordby challenges this view. He argues that the breakthrough of parliamentarianism was a more complex development that cannot be dated to one specific event.¹⁴⁰

The debate about parliamentarianism entailed the formation of parties. The first party in Norway was called *Venstre*. It emerged from the necessity to form a strong opposition in the constitutional dispute (*forfatningsstriden*) and the cabinet ministry issue (*statsrådsaken*) with the veto-issue.¹⁴¹ However, not only the opposition developed a clearer identity, the conservatives answered to the foundation of *Venstre* by founding the party *Høyre*.¹⁴²

133 Kaartvedt 1984: 27. Also Kaartvedt 1956: 83

134 *Ibid.*: 27

135 Cf.: Seip 1997: 201

136 Cf. Kaartvedt 1984: 27: "For nyere historieforskning står derfor 9. juni som venstre-fraksjonenes samling til stortingsparti 'den store koalisjonens fødsesdal'." Also: Seip 1997: 201; Nordby 1992: 119: *Venstre* "[...] var et produkt av forfatningsstriden."

137 Nordby 2004: 77. Read also: Kaartvedt 1984: 30: "Statsministeren ble dømt til å ha forbrutt sitt embete og ilagt betydelig saksomkostninger for bruken av grunnlovs-, bevilgnings- og delvetoet." Also mentioned in Kaartvedt 1956: 99.

138 Cf.: Nordby 1992: 118-119. Also in Berg Eriksen 1992: 65: "Kampen for parlamentarisme i Norge regnes gjerne som vunnet etter vetostriden og riksrettssaken mot ministeriet Selmer (1883-1884). Kongen måtte bøye av. Johan Svederup ble regjeringssjef. Dermed hadde man delvis gitt avkall på det viktigste maktfordelingsprinsippet."

139 Berg Eriksen 1992: 65

140 Cf.: For further reading Nordby 2004: 37: "Alt i samtiden ble regjeringdannelsen i 1884 oppfattet som en bekreftelse på at overgangen til parlamentarisme var gjennomført. Helt fram til våre dager har denne misoppfatningen holdt seg. Noe slikt vedtak forelå i hvert fall ikke, og parlamentarismen var ikke tema for Riksretten." Also Nordby 2004: 13

141 Cf.: Seip 1997: 201

142 Cf. Kaartvedt 1984: 52, 56, 57. Also Seip 1997: 207: "Motstykket til at venstre ble bundet sammen, var at høyregrupper og moderate grupper drev inn i felles holdning. [...] Konsekvensen ble da at to politiske

3.3. Conservatism and the formation of the party Høyre

To understand the changes in the conservative milieu in Norway that led up to the formation of parties, we have to return to the year 1814. The state officials and the bourgeoisie were the leading classes in Norway, replacing the aristocracy.¹⁴³ Those classes represented a loose but clear majority in the new National Assembly. The conservatives stood for a modernized state with a developed infrastructure to favor trade- and industrial capitalism.¹⁴⁴

As we have seen, tensions increased in the following years. Especially from the 1870s onwards, when an opposition was formed with the aim to introduce parliamentarianism.¹⁴⁵ The conservatives were highly opposed to this development. To understand this we have to take a look at the conservative's convictions.

From a conservative point of view the royal power and the union with Sweden that preserved conservative values. By weakening or even abolishing the influence the royal power, the conservatives saw their values in danger. The veto was their only instrument with which they were able to further their interests.¹⁴⁶ Concerning this Alf Kaartvedt states:

Vi kan i 1870-årene regne med to konservative motstandsposisjoner. For det første regjeringen, som på grunn av den eiendommelige norske ettkammerforfatning uten noe eksklusivt førstekammer alltid hadde vært, og enda i 1870-årene fremdeles var, selve den konservative hovedfestning. Og for det annet en løs og heterogen gruppe i stortinget, som ikke følte politisk åndsfelleskap med opposisjonen, og som [...] hadde større politisk affinitet til regjeringen enn til venstre.¹⁴⁷

This conservative stronghold had to be defended against *democratic interference*. Within the conservative party, different approaches were discussed to prohibit losing influence and power. One approach was to play on time, to be able to establish a conservative chamber (*førstekammer*)¹⁴⁸ and, to make sure the conservative interests could be defended without the help of a conservative veto personified by the king. A more moderate conservative believe was that *Venstre* and a majority rule was less dangerous. The moderate believed that a solution in the

grupperinger konsoliderte seg: en venstrebevegelse og en høyrebevegelse.”

143 See also: Nordby 1992: 117; Berg Eriksen 1992: 63; Seip 1999: 329

144 Cf.: Kaartvedt, 1984: 9

145 See Nordby 1992: 117-118; Kaartvedt 1984: 27

146 Kaartvedt 1984: 26-27

147 Kaartvedt 1956: 21

148 Førstekammer Kaartvedt 1984: 22

*statsrådsaken*¹⁴⁹ would decrease tensions and lead to the dissolution of the opposition. The third approach, later called *systemet Stang*¹⁵⁰, did believe neither that a conservative first chamber (*førstekammer*) was an acceptable solution, nor that the opposition would be satisfied with the solution for the *statsrådsaken*. Stang's strategy was to maintain the conservative's resistance, believing that the opposition would scatter.¹⁵¹

[...] i håp om at en reaksjon ville inntre og i tillit til at det norske folk igjen ville vise at det var trofast mot Grunnloven og det gamle, prøvede regjeringssystem med kongemakten som forfatningens modererende element.¹⁵²

However, the course of happenings in the following years proofed him wrong. After minister Selmer was convicted in 1884, it became clear that this was the beginning of a new era. The party *Venstre* was formed and there was no doubt that the conservative's only chance was to form an own party the party *Høyre*. The official name of the party was *Det konservative parti*¹⁵³. However, it was common to call the party *Høyre* even though the name was officially changed as late as 1913.¹⁵⁴ Emil Stang who was elected as the first party leader, was aware of the necessity to adapt to the inevitable development.¹⁵⁵ Nevertheless, the party was first and foremost seen as an election campaigns instrument to secure the conservative interest and to make them visible in society.¹⁵⁶ A central board (*sentralstyre*) with 5 members was set up as the head of the daily business.¹⁵⁷ The party in cooperation with the members of parliament (*stortingsgruppe*) where now the alternative “conservative stronhold” that before had been represented by the king.¹⁵⁸

Having lost the battle for the constitutional dispute, the *statsrådssaken* and *grunnlovsveto*, the new founded conservative party concentrated on new issues: maintaining the union with Sweden and preventing the introduction of the universal suffrage.

3.4. Høyre's main topics from 1884 until 1905 - The union and universal suffrage

149 Cf.: Kaartvedt 1984: 27

150 Kaartvedt 1956: 21

151 Cf.: Kaartvedt 1956: 22

152 Ibid.: 23

153 Kaartvedt 1984: 58

154 Cf.: Ibid.: 58: In newspaper articles is the party also referred to as “Høire” (mind the spelling i instead of y)

155 Cf. Ibid.: 55-56: about the formations of the parties: “Den tonangivende retning på landsmøtet var en allianse av de moderatkonservative og tyngden av de ministerielle systemtilhengere fra før 1884. Motsetningene mellom de to fraksjonene ble utjevnet etter avslutningen av forfatningskampen og nederlaget for systemet Stang og gjennomføring av statsrådssaken. Denne alliansen avviste tokammeridéen som urealistisk og revansjepolitikk som dødslinje for Høyre.”

156 Cf. Kaartvedt 1956: 57

157 Cf.: Ibid.: 57

158 Cf.: Ibid.: 57

The first program of the party was released in October 1884. The program was an overall evaluation of the recent changes in the country's political landscape. It was highly critical towards the new *Venstre* dominated government. The program can be read as a forecast concerning the upcoming development of the political system in Norway. It is obvious that *Høyre* viewed *Venstre*, which was now the leading party in the government, as a threat against the conservative ideals *Høyre* stood for. It is not surprising that the program includes a number of warnings. The most prominent ones: The dissolution of the union with Sweden would lead to misery and be a hindrance for the national development. It was also expected that new reforms would shake the foundation of the welfare of the society.¹⁵⁹

There was, however, also an optimistic tone. The party's hope was to be able to reach a majority after new elections, hoping that *Venstre* would be torn from the inside because of disagreements within the party. By representing itself as a Christian moderate alternative, *Høyre* hoped to find approval with the less radical centered *Venstre* supporters.¹⁶⁰

The issue of parliamentarianism was still central in those first years. The party found itself in an ambiguous position. On the one hand, the party was an active participant in parliamentarianism, on the other hand, they still followed the conviction that parliamentarianism was in conflict with the constitution.¹⁶¹ The solution was to view the political effort as a necessity, forced by abnormal circumstances¹⁶². This was also an explanation, later used by Stang to justify his minority government in 1893.¹⁶³

However, *Høyre* had to play after the rules which were underlying the changes in the political system. The aim was now to try to preserve the remaining conservative *values*: The Union and the limited voting rights.¹⁶⁴

Three main points were crucial concerning the preservation of the union: security policy,

159 Cf. Kaartvedt 1984: 59: to quote in full: "Man måtte også vente nye reformer som ville 'undergrave grundpillarene for det norske folks borgerlige lykke', og siktet mot 'en omdannelse af snart sagt alle vore samfundforhold.'"

160 Cf.: *Ibd.*: 60

161 Cf.: *Ibd.*: 60-61

162 Cf.: *Ibd.*: 61 "unnormale tilstander"

163 Cf.: *Ibd.*: 61

164 As mentioned before: Only men older than 25 with a set value of property were allowed to vote. Cf.: Hommerstad 2010: 111; also: Nordby 2010: 29

economy and the monarchy.¹⁶⁵ Concerning the safety policy, the party was convinced that Norway's security depended on the strong Swedish neighbor. Not only Russia, but also Finland were considered to be a potential threat. This was also due to Norway's strategic favorable coastline. Another reason was Norway's economic situation and the trade with Sweden. The last point, the monarchy, can be seen as an expression of the ideological foundation of the conservatives. They were convinced that the monarchy was preserved as long as Norway was ruled by the Swedish Crown and that the monarchy was a guaranty against radical democratic influences from *Venstre*.¹⁶⁶

By preserving the union, the conservatives hoped to preserve a set of conservative values they believed were represented by the monarchy.¹⁶⁷

Another major topic of the party was universal suffrage. In contrast to *Venstre*, Høyre's aim was to prohibit its introduction. After being forced to give in concerning the *statsrådssaken* and *grunnlovsveto* under the constitutional dispute in 1884, the conservatives were eager to preserve the existing rules concerning the suffrage.¹⁶⁸ They considered this egalitarian system, which only gave the right to vote to a privileged minority as the last effective, conservative guaranty, Kaartvedt states:

Høyre *klynget* seg formelig til den siste, effektive, konservative garanti: stemmeretts systemet fra 1814/1884, som tross innebygde svakheter dannet en barriere mot det masseherredømme partiet fryktet ville bli følgen av alminnelig stemmerett.¹⁶⁹

The mob rule (*masseherredømme*)¹⁷⁰ the conservatives feared was programmatic in the debate about the universal suffrage. It is one of Høyre's main arguments to preserve the existing system of limited suffrage. The rules concerning the suffrage for men were expanded in several steps in the years 1884 until 1898.¹⁷¹

While *Venstre* worked towards and implementation of the universal suffrage for men since 1884,

165 Cf.: Kaartvedt 1984: 61

166 Cf.: *Ibd.*: 61-62. Monarchy as a guarantee for a well functioning government. Also mentioned in: Seip 1992: 224

167 Cf.: *Ibd.*: 61

168 Cf.: *Ibd.*: 158

169 *Ibd.*: 158

170 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 153) 1897: 1

171 This thesis will concentrate on the year 1898 when the "allminnelig stemmerett" for men was introduced by "Venstre" government. In the years before the communal suffrage had been expanded. The universal suffrage for women was fully introduced in 1913.

Høyre, in turn, tried to implement an altered version of the “proportional representation” (*forholdstallsvalg*)¹⁷² to secure the conservatives interests. This claim was taken into program in 1888. *Venstre* was underrepresented in the cities. Consequently, *Høyre* would benefit from this regulation because they were mainly represented in cities with small electoral districts.¹⁷³ However, *Venstre* was not eager to cooperate.

A nearly universal communal suffrage for men had already been introduced in 1896¹⁷⁴ and in 1898 universal suffrage for men should follow, introduced by the *Venstre* government after their election victory in 1897.¹⁷⁵ In both cases *Høyre* opposed the proposals but was overruled by the majority. The conservative argumentations stayed was the same: The sudden increase of voters would lead to the exploitation of the minority that economically contributed to the state. Negative prognoses were made concerning the radical increase of voters from 196 000 til 374 000.¹⁷⁶ In addition, the conservatives doubted not only the integrity of *the crowd*, but also their motivation to vote by pointing to the low voter turnouts the previous years.¹⁷⁷

Etter Høyres oppfatning savnet de brede lag som ville trekkes inn i politikken, de nødvendige kvalifikasjoner, som en derimot fant hos 'de bedre stillede i samfundet'. De ville ha vanskelig for å følge med i og gjøre seg opp en selvstendig mening om politikken og være tilbøyelig til å la seg lede mer av instinker enn av forstand og rolig overveielse.¹⁷⁸

Even after having lost their battle in 1898, the conservatives held onto their concerns and frequently warned about the hazards of this new social order. In fact, numbers proof that voters were eager to use their right to contribute to the political era. 85,9 percent of men voted in 1898 and 1901. However, still only 16 percent of the whole population had the right to vote.¹⁷⁹

Nevertheless, we have to be aware of the fact that universal suffrage for men excluded several groups in society. In addition, there were some restrictions concerning the allowance to take part in the political decision making. Citizens receiving poor relief were not allowed to vote. Furthermore, women were not allowed to vote before 1913 and men had to be 25 years old.¹⁸⁰ On

172 Forholdstallsvalg: Proportional representation. Kaartvedt 1984: 158

173 Cf.: Kaartvedt 1984: 158

174 Cf.: *Ibd.*: 161: Hagerup was forced to go along with the propositions concerning communal suffrage

175 Halvorsen, Marit: rett p. 277 and Kaartvedt p. 163

176 Cf. Kaartvedt: Was an underestimation because 427 000 was actual number. Estimation of *Høyre* can be found in: St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 489

177 Cf.: *Ibd.*:161

178 *Ibd.*. 161

179 Cf. Halvorsen 2005: 277

180 Women's suffrage: Berg Eriksen 1992: 66; Kaartvedt 1984: 161,162,163; as well in: St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 508

April 22nd, the day after the voting in the National Assembly, the newspaper Aftenposten released following statement:

[...] almindelig Stemmeret for norske Borgere over 25 aar, som har været bosat i Landet i 5 aar og opholder sig der, med Suspension i Tilfælde af Fattigunderstøttelse. [...] Forslaget bifaldtes med 78 mod 36 St.; de 36 var Høire og Moderate samt Fasting.¹⁸¹

Obviously the approved proposal did not explicitly exclude women. Instead the formulation stayed the same as it had been in 1814: “§ 50. Stemmeberettigede er kun de norske Borgere, som have fyldt 25 Aar, have været bosatte i Landet i 5 Aar, og enten [...]”¹⁸². In 1818 it was discussed to insert “af Mandkjøn” to explicitly exclude women. However, the proposal was rejected: “At kvinner skulle kunne ha stemmerett var åpenbart en så fjern tanke, at det var overflødig å presisere i loven.”¹⁸³ This also explains the absence of this specification in the paragraph of 1898. This was first changed in 1913, when women gained the right to vote and the insertion “norske Borgere, mænd og kvinder”¹⁸⁴ was added to paragraph 50.¹⁸⁵

3.5. Høyre's attitude towards democracy

What can we learn from the conservatives hesitation concerning the democratization process? Is it appropriate to state that the conservatives tried to hinder the democratic development in the end of the 1890s? Francis Sejersted writes about this phenomenon in the article “Hvordan og hvorfor lese Høyres historie”¹⁸⁶. In this article he seeks to differentiate the view on the conservative party in the 1890s. Instead of viewing the party's policy as an anti-democratic one, he pleads for taking another perspective and seeing the development and prevailing sentiments of the party in their historical context. He explains the misinterpreted “anti-democratic” movement by examining the underlying principles. In the ideological conviction of Høyre it was the right of ownership that was crucial for gaining the civil right of determination. Consequently, the conservatives were highly opposed to sharing the rights of determination, the right to vote, with a majority of the dispossessed. Sejersted proposes that *Høyre* was not anti-democratic, they instead pleaded for democratization by spreading ownership.¹⁸⁷

181 Aftenposten (Nr. 299) 1898: 1

182 Koldstad 1963: 5

183 Skaarer & Kåss 2013

184 Koldstad 1963: 119

185 *Ibd.*: 119

186 Sejersted 1993: 143

187 *Ibd.*: 149: “[...]demokratisering gjennom eiendomsbredning. - Alt skulle bli middelstand, - alle skulle bli eiendomsmenn. - Alle samfunnsgrupper skulle etterhvert inkluderes i det nasjonale felleskap.”

Additionally, Sejersted supposes that the party's political decisions have to be examined in the light of their historical background, the *Embedsmannsstaten*. Sejersted states: “Det har gjennom hele Høyres historie vært en bevisst vilje til å ta vare på de opprinnelige idealer fra embedsmannsstaten. Det er her Høyre hentet sin identitet.”¹⁸⁸ Sejersted also criticizes Seip and Mauerseth who claim that the state officials were a leading class. Instead he proposes that “Borgerskapet styrte [...] ved, 'remote control, Through the power of its ideal’”.¹⁸⁹

The knowledge Sejersted provided here, that is relevant for this thesis, is to view the history of the Høyre, and therefore also particular issues like the electoral-rights-debate, in a bigger context. To understand the ideology of the “Høyre” we have to understand the conservative's political mindset and its origin: The *Embedsmannsstaten* that arose in a social context different from the context in 1898 with a strong believe in conservative values that could only be secured by a strong king in the union with Sweden.

Consequently, when examining the conservative's mindset and argumentation pattern in this thesis, it can be an advantage to keep following statement in mind:

Den konservative tradisjon representerte i utgangspunktet en liberalistisk-optimistisk overbevisning om at den beste sosialmedisin var 'sunn og sann' opplysning. Den ville i forening med liberal næringslovgivning løse fattigdomsproblemet og skape moralsk høyverdige, økonomisk fremgangsrike og politisk fornunfuge borgere.¹⁹⁰

We will come back to Sejersted's statement in the conclusion. It will be interesting to shed a light on the conservative's attitude towards democracy in connection with Hirschman's work about conservative argumentative strategies.

188 Sejersted Høyres 1993: 151

189 Sejersted 2001: 208. The whole passage about the ruling-class: 208-210

190 Kaartvedt 1984: 71

4. The introduction of the male universal suffrage in Norway in 1898 – a heated debate

The voting about the male universal suffrage in Norway in April 1898 was preceded by a vivid discussion amongst politicians. The issue was also taken on by the newspapers. Articles for and against the male universal suffrage were written, politicians and respectable citizens held speeches and wrote pamphlets.¹⁹¹ Some to advertise universal suffrage, some to advise against it. This part of the thesis deals with the arguments of the opponents of male universal suffrage: the conservatives in general and largely the members of the conservative party “Høyre” as expressed through two newspapers. We want to observe how the debate about the male universal suffrage proceeded, how heated it was and how this was reflected in the use of terms and phrases, stylistic devices and argumentative strategies.

In the following chapters I will examine the news coverage of the voting in the National Assembly. The main focus will be on articles printed on April 21st and 22nd. The aim of this chapter is first, to give an overview of the debate content and the different arguments that were used by the conservatives. In a second step, I attempt to uncover an argumentation pattern the politicians used in the debate. I propose that this can also be found in the debate and comment articles issuing universal suffrage that were published in 1897 and 1898, as we will see in the next chapter.

In this chapter the news covering concerning the debate on April 21st will be examined and compared to the “Stortingsforhandlinger” that will serve as a comparative item. This will give us the chance to see how the newspapers describe their notion of the atmosphere in the hall, as well as it will give us a better picture of understanding the newspapers choices concerning the reports about the debate. In the next step, the arguments for and against male universal suffrage will be examined with the aim to unveil the argumentation pattern that is assumed to be underlying in the whole debate. For that purpose I will also examine the comments and debate articles that were published in 1897 and 1898. This will be done in chapter 5 and 6.

4.1. The result of the passing on April 21st 1898

On April 21st Aftenposten's evening editions titles: “Almindelig stemmeret bifaldt med 78 mod 36 St.”¹⁹² Morgenbladet's evening edition's title is more simple: “Vedtaget.”¹⁹³, “the passing”. The

191 Bjørnson 1881. Bjørnson held a speech about "Frygten for Flertallet"

192 Aftenposten (Nr. 298) 1898: 1

193 Morgenbladet (Nr. 255) 1898: 2

official paragraphs of the passing are documented in the “Stortingsforhandlingen” and went as follows:

“Grundlovens §§50 og 52 skal herefter lyde som følger:

“§ 50. Stemmeberettigede er de norske Borgere¹⁹⁴, som have fyldt 25 Aar, have været bosatte i Landet i 5 Aar og opholde sig der.

§52. Stemmeret suspenderes:

- a) ved Anklage til Thinge for Forbrydelser, der kunne medføre saadan Straf, samt i §53 a er nævnt;
- b) ved Umyndiggjørelse;
- c) Ved Opbud eller Fallit, der ikke er foraarsaget ved Ildsvaade eller andet utilregneligt og bevisligt Uheld, indtil Skyldneren enten ved fuld Betaling til Fordringshaverne eller ve Akkord igjen er bleven raadig over sit Bo;
- d) ved at nyde eller i de sidste Aar før Valget at have nydt Understøttelse af Fattigvæsenet.”

-blev med 78 mod 36 Stemmer bifaldt.”¹⁹⁵

The crucial part of this passing comprises § 52. In this paragraph rules are defined, specifying who is suspended from the right to vote and in which circumstances a person may lose this right: “The right to vote can be suspended when a) the person is impeached at court, b) the person is placed under guardianship, c) the person is bankrupt. The least does not apply when innocence of the person for this circumstance can be proved. The suspension is in force until the debts are paid or another solution is found that secures back-payment at a later date, d) when the person receives, or has received, welfare aid in the last year before the election.”

The Assembly voted on 15 different proposals concerning the limitations before they settled with the 16th proposal resulting in the final passing that is presented above.¹⁹⁶ The most distinctive alternative proposals were those including “Mænd og Kvinder”¹⁹⁷ and those lowering the age of the voters to 21 years.¹⁹⁸ The third proposal, including women and men over 25 as well as formulating restrictions for “Fattigunderstøttede”¹⁹⁹, was supported by 33, whereas 81 were against it.²⁰⁰ That was the only proposal including women that was supported by so many men. The remaining proposals often differed between none or five, in two cases more than 25 approving votes.²⁰¹

194 Explanation to the use of the term “de norske Borgere” in preference to a specification of gender can be read about in chapter 3. cf.: Skaarer & Kåss (2013)

195 St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 508

196 For more detailed information about the different proposals: All proposals are listed in the “Stortingsforsamlingen” on the following pages: Cf.: St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 507-508

197 St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 507

198 Cf.: St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 507

199 St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 507

200 Cf.: St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 507: Proposal nr. 3

201 Cf.: St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 507-508

After the passing, already on april 30th April, a preposition was outlined including the necessary changes that would have to be made in the constitution concerning universal suffrage. Especially in § 52 and § 53.²⁰²

§52.

Stemmeret suspenderes:

a. ved offentlig Tiltale for strafbare Handlinger, der kunne medføre Stemmerettens Tab;

§53.

Stemmeret tabes:

a. ved Domfældelse for strafbare Handlinger overensstemmende med, vad derom i Lov bestemmes;²⁰³

The proposal is followed by the explanation that the criminal law commission has elaborated regulations about the suspension or loss of the vote. Those are then listed and described in detail in several paragraphs.²⁰⁴

4.2. The news coverage concerning the debate on 21st April – Protocol and reports

In the first section of the report, Morgenbladet published in its evening edition right after the passing of the universal suffrage, it is interesting how the overall impression of the debate is described:

En Fremmed, som idag var tilstede i Stortinget, vilde ikke lettelig have forstaaet, at der debatteredes og voteredes over den mest vidtrækkende Grundlovsforandring, som siden 1814 er vedtaget i Norge. Debatten, der i Forhold til det sædvanlige i vor Nationalforsamling var kortvarig, fulgtes ikke med nogen særdeles spænt Opmærksomhed, hverken fra Repræsentanternes Side eller fra det godt besatte Galleri, og de Haandklap, hvormed nogle af Tilhørerne hilsede Voteringen bifald, havde mærmest Karakteren af det parodiske.²⁰⁵

The criticism is clear: The most comprehensive constitutional amendment since 1814, the universal suffrage, should have been discussed more extensively. In fact, as the journalist states, the debate was short and not really followed with great attention by the state officials, or the audience. This introductory section of the report suggests that the debate was lifeless. However,

202 Sth. Prp. No. 84 1898

203 Sth. Prp. No. 84 1898

204 For further information about the exact content of the relevant paragraphs: Cf.: Sth. Prp. No. 84 1898: § 15, § 16, § 29, § 30, § 31, § 75, § 76.

205 Morgenbladet (Nr. 255) 1898: 2

we have to keep in mind that there had been several debates about universal suffrage preceding the final passing. The majority points out that by announcing that the issues is “uddebatteret”²⁰⁶. The journalist seems to ignore that announcement which could explain the rather moderate debate, at least from the majority's point of view. According to the journalist, on top of the missing enthusiasm in terms of the debate, the meeting ended with a parodical note: Applause from the audience on the gallery after the universal suffrage was passed. So far the journalist's interpretation of this situation. In fact, it is quite simple to re-examine this little scene by taking a look at the protocol. De facto, it tells another story: After the final proposal is passed the audience applauds which results in following short dialog between Emil Stang and the president of the Assembly:

Emil Stang: Tør jeg spørge, om disse Demonstrationer er tillad, Hr. Præsident?

Præsident: Nei, de er ikke. Dersom de gjentager sig, er jeg nødsaget til at lade Galleriet rydde.

Emil Stang: Jeg skulde ønsket, at det var blevet tilkjendegivet saa betimeligt, at de kunde været hindrede.²⁰⁷

It is doubtful to assume that the majority was insulted by the applause from the audience. On the contrary, Stang and the minority had a legitimate reason to dislike this obviously impulsive stamp of approval from the audience. They had first lost the election, now the debate and they were possibly not keen on witnessing this little sign of support and even victory that applied to the majority and their *signature* matter, the universal suffrage. On that account, the impression the newspaper creates, seems questionable. Was it the applause that added a parodic element to the last minutes of the meeting? This representation seems far-fetched, not least, because the small dialogue between Stang and the President (Hr. Ullmann) is not mentioned.

A comparable picture is drawn in the introduction of the report about the debate in Aftenposten:

Situationen saadan som den vitterlig for alle var – en paa Forhaand afgjort Sag, et angiveligt imperativt Mandat, hvis Paalæg det nu kun gjaldt for en lydige Majoritet at indregistrere, samt en vel forstaaet Parole til denne Majoritets Medlemmer om fra sin Side ikke at inblade sig paa nogen virkelig Debat – Havde fra det første Øieblik paatrykt Dagens Møde dets Præg.²⁰⁸

In accordance with Morgenbladet's news coverage, Aftenposten suggests that the majority gave the impression that the decision had already been made in advance: “[...] en paa Forhaand

206 St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 490: “Uddebatteret” but not decided. Read: “Den har sagt, at der har været talt og skrevet saameget om denne Sag, at nogen større skriftlige Utredninger i en Indstilling ansaa man uførnøden [...]”

207 St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 509

208 Aftenposten (Nr. 298) 1898: 1

afgjort Sag [...]”²⁰⁹. The newspaper goes even further by, indicating that the majority obediently follows the slogan not to get involved into any kind of debate. Keeping in mind that the majority was openly suspected to have made a decision in advance, it is interesting that the response to that accuse is not printed. Especially, because this suspicion is uttered, not only by the newspaper, but by Stang in his first speech as well. Interestingly, there was a reply to that accusation: The response from the spokesman of the committee after Emil Stang's speech:

Den sidste ærede Taler ([sic] Stang) begyndte med, at Komiteens Majoritet havde gaaet ud fra, at denne Sag var en afgjort Sag, at der ikke skulde staa tilbage noget at gjøre i denne Sag. Det har Komiteen aldeles ikke sagt; men hvad den har sagt i sin kortfattede Indstilling, det er at Sagen er uddebatteret.²¹⁰

In Aftenposten's report, in contrast, following statement is printed: “Af Komiteens Flertal havde derefter Hr. Saakvitne og af dens Mindretal Hr. Steffensen Ordet til Foredrag, der vil findes gjengiven i det officielle referat [...]”. No counterstatement, instead a reference to the official protocol. Naturally, the lack of this small sentence can just as well be due to lack of space. The official protocol comprises 24 pages, in which the different speakers are cited. However, it is impossible to determine certainly, if this was a deliberate omission or not. However, it is an interesting reminder on how journalism can manipulate or channel beliefs by mentioning one thing and leaving out another.

The first article leaves out a great deal of the debate, but in the same edition on page two there is a more detailed report where the response of the “Saakvitne” is printed.²¹¹ In addition, the almost exact protocol is printed in the edition on April 22nd.²¹²

Let us turn back to the first section of the first article Aftenposten published on the 21st April one last time. One more comment is eye-catching: The last sentence before the journalists starts to retell the debate. The journalist comments on the way the president is asking the assembly whether someone wants to rise to speak concerning the universal-suffrage. This is how the attitude of the president is described: “Der er da vel ikke nogen, som forlanger Ordet i denne Sag?”²¹³. Naturally, this is a hypothetical statement expressing the journalists interpretation of the president's question. It seems plausible that this hypothetical question is a stylistic device to

209 Aftenposten (Nr. 298) 1898: 1

210 St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 490

211 Aftenposten (Nr. 298) 1898: 2

212 Aftenposten (Nr. 299) 1898: 1

213 Aftenposten (Nr. 298) 1898: 1

empathize the assumption that the majority was not interested in debating the universal suffrage.

If we turn to the first article *Morgenbladet* published about the debate in the National Assembly and compare this with the first article in *Aftenposten*, there is no doubt that both newspapers chose to introduce their news coverage by a mixture of objective report and propaganda. Both begin their first paragraph with an overall description of the atmosphere in the assembly and as propagandist comments about the attitude of the majority. However, both printed fairly complete copies of the protocol in editions published the following day, included the majority's statements.²¹⁴

4.3. The comment and debate articles issuing male universal suffrage

Apart from the reports about the day of the debate, both newspapers printed articles issuing the universal-suffrage. In the following, we will examine the comments and debate articles that were printed at 21st and 22nd April besides the news coverage of the debate, beginning with *Morgenbladet*.

In the morning editions on 21st April two short articles are printed that issue the universal suffrage with the headlines “Frygden for massene”²¹⁵ and “Pligt og Ret”²¹⁶. The first article cites an old *New York Times* article in which the Panama Scandal in France is discussed. Following comment on the universal suffrage is reprinted in *Morgenbladet*:

Had, Mistro, Pøbelherredømme synes at være det naturlige Resultat af almindelig Stemmeret. Lad europæiske statsmænd andstille Betragtninger over, hva den almindelige Stemmeret i 40 Aar har bragt Frankrige.²¹⁷

According to the quote, the introduction of the universal suffrage has brought hate, mistrust and mob rule to France. The *New York Times* also suggests to ask European state officials about the consequences of universal suffrage. *Morgenbladet* takes the opportunity to add:

Det Tryk, Masserne i Frankrige har øvet paa Regjeringen, ja endog paa Retten i Zola-Affæren, bærer ogsaa Vitnesbyrd om den almindelige Stemmerets fordarvelige Virkninger.²¹⁸

Just like *The New York Times*, *Morgenbladet* chooses to fall back on a precarious state affair in

214 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 256) 1898: 1

215 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 253) 1898: 1

216 *Ibd.*: 2

217 *Ibd.*: 1

218 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 253) 1898: 1

France, the Zola affair, to point out “den almindelige Stemmerets fordarvelige Virkninger”²¹⁹. Unfortunately, it is not possible to pre-date the exact publishing date of the article in the New York Times. The only time frame indicated is the insertion: “[...] skrev Times for nogle Aar siden [...]”²²⁰. This article is worth mentioning because it fits to the trend the newspaper follows in all articles which examined about universal suffrage: To point out the negative consequences the introduction of universal suffrage can have on the society. The New York Times and Morgenbladet use France as an example for the negative consequences of the universal suffrage. This is a typical argument that emerges in many articles issuing the universal suffrage: Other countries as negative examples.

Besides, it is remarkable that Morgenbladet, in turn, makes use of a fairly old article in the New York Times. It seems likely to suspect that Morgenbladet revitalized the article from the good and probably world-famous newspaper to make a point: We share the same belief and the status of the New York Times might rub off on us. A seal of approval to support one's own aims: to advise against universal suffrage?

There is a small comment published in the same morning edition. “Ret og Plikt”²²¹ appears to be a pamphlet pledging for the difference between the right and the duty of citizens. To understand why this is a matter of discussion we have to look at one argument the majority used to justify the universal suffrage: the citizens serving civic duty should also have the right to take part in the political decision-making by voting. This statement is also supported by prime minister Steen in the debate later that day, when he states that the universal suffrage is a matter of justice for those who fight for it: “[...] i sig selv og efter den almene Betragtning [...] er denne Folkets Opfatning Utrykket for et Retfærdighetskrav [...]”²²².

The aim of the comment seems to be to contradict this argument. (Of course not directly Steen's statement, which was uttered after the morning edition was printed):

Det siges, at Alle som bidrager til Samfundet enten i Form af direkte og indirekte skatter eller ved at tjene sin Værnepligt og, om det fornødiges, ofre Liv og Blod for Fædrelandet, de maa have Stemmeret. Hvis ikke, da har de kun Pligter og ikke Rettigheder.

219 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 1

220 Ibd.: 1

221 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 2

222 St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 496

Ingens Paastand kan være mindre sand. Hvortil ydes Skatterne? Til Skole og Fattigvæsen, til Landets Barn og Styre som til Rettens Pleie, til Kommunikationsvesen og Næringsveie. Kommer alt dette kun Stemmeberettigede tilgode? Og om Faren kalder Landets Sønner til Grænsen, for hvem ofrer de da Liv og Blod? Bærger de ikke den Fattiges Hytte, hans Fred og Næring saavist som Rigmanden?²²³

The quintessence of the article is the following: Those claiming more rights by referring to justice ignore the fact that the biggest share of the taxpayer's money supports every citizen via school, the system of poor relief and other social benefits. How is this injustice if everyone contributes and receives appropriate to their potential?

This small comment brings us one step further: to the argumentation-pattern of the conservatives. Not only was it strategically printed on 21st of April to underline the newspaper's position concerning the debate, being against universal suffrage, it also exemplifies one way of arguing against it, according to Albert O. Hirschman's²²⁴ theory of conservative arguing, the perversity thesis.²²⁵ In this case: The aim to reach justice leads to injustice.

We now have a general view over some main arguments the conservatives used against male universal suffrage in the debate on April 21st. In addition we have an overview of the news covering of idea about the debate and the passing from the 20th until the 22nd of April. In the next step we need to look at how those arguments actually function. Above the fear for the crowd was issued. The next chapter will dig deeper into the question about how this 'fear' was fueled. For that purpose it is necessary to dig deeper and look at more hidden patterns that lie in the use of specific terms and phrases in the articles of the conservative newspapers. What words are used? How are they used and what associations do they evoke?

223 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 2

224 Hirschman 1991

225 Cf.: Hirschman 1991: 11

5. Frequent used terms, phrases and stylistic devices in the articles concerning the debate

When working with the debate and commentary articles I assumed that would be possible to detect specific words and arguments that were used repeatedly. Were certain words used more often than others? Were specific topics linked to specific words? For example, how articles dealt with the new voters and how they were described. I assume that it might be possible to find a shared pattern of reasoning. This could indicate an underlying consensus or agreement in the attitude of those writing the articles and those printing them. This is not necessarily to be perceived as a conspiracy, but more a mindset or discourse joined by a fair share of the society. In this chapter I attempt to unveil those topics and to examine the specific words and arguments.

The first part of the chapter will deal with the general observed pattern in the debate and commentary articles concerning specific terms and phrases that were used repeatedly and were connected to specific topics. The second part will deal with the stylistic devices that were used to underline the message of the articles. Finally, in the last part we will concentrate on the specific terms and phrases that were mentioned in the first part. Here four categories of terms and phrases will be introduced, which correlate with the argumentation pattern I suspect to be underlying the whole debate. Here we will see how negative connotations were imprinted on terms and how this can effect the impact and power of persuasion of an argument.

To provide a basis we will start by looking at the general observed pattern that was visible in the headlines.

5.1. General observed pattern of the debate visible in the headings

A striking heading was found in a fairly small newspaper Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende²²⁶. The heading is formulated as question: “Skal Socialisterne blive Herrer i Landet?”²²⁷. Naturally, as we find out by further reading, the answer is “rather not”. The article belonging to the heading makes a great effort to explain why it would be a disadvantage for the country to introduce universal suffrage. Because this would lead to the rule of the socialists, which is undesirable. They pretend to be helping the weak and poor in society but in reality help tramps “Løsgjængere”²²⁸ in their damaging effort to enrich themselves by exploiting the hard working rest of the society. The heading “Stemmretten. Skal vi give Løsgjængere og Drankere?”²²⁹ that was published in Aftenposten a year later seems to be the perfect addition to the heading of

226 Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende was a regional newspaper in the district “Sogn og Fjordane”. The newspaper was published from 1874-1930. Cf.: Høeg 1974: 72.

227 Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende 1897

228 Ibid.:

229 Aftenposten (Nr. 295) 1898: 1

Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende.

Those two headings comprise three crucial terms which are used when arguing against universal suffrage: “Socialisterne”, “Herrer i Landet”, “Løsgjængere og Drankere”. Why is that so? Those three terms can hardly be split. On the contrary, they are closely related to each other and the terms can only unfold their effect when they are assembled. A socialist itself, a person representing a political attitude, would already rise suspicion in the conservative mindset. The newspapers added even more meaning to enhance its negative connotation. Here the tramps and drunkards “Løsgjængere og Drankere” enter the scene. By implying that the socialists mainly will support tramps and drunkards instead of the hard working laborer, a rule of the socialists, as is described in the first headline as “Herrer i Landet”, does not seem to be too desirable. We can observe this in a headline of Morgenbladet, titles: “Kjøbenhavn udleveret til Socialdemokratiet”. The term “udleveret”, “handed over to”, is another sign of rejection. It functions in two ways. First, when the reader already is convinced about the negative influence of social democracy. Who wants to be handed over to something that bodes ill? Second, when the reader is inclined to social democracy but not sure. In this case to imprint a negative connotation to the term: To be “handed over to” something or someone comprises a threatening note as if an unknown power is about to take control. The same applies to the second headline in Morgenbladet “Kur mot Socialismen.”²³⁰, which is the headline to a short comment stating that socialism can not be abandoned by introducing reforms that partially favor socialistic ideals to appease the socialists and stop their urge to reform the society. By using the term “Kur”, “cure or treatment against socialism” socialism is associated with a disease that needs a cure. As if socialism is a plague poisoning the society.

Other headings like “Den almindelige Stemmeret. Et belærende Exempel”²³¹ or “Den almindelige Stemmeret. En uheldig Henvisning.”²³² are more straight-forward. Not only because the universal suffrage is named, but also because the message of the article is quite clear. Especially in the second heading “Universal suffrage. An unfortunate suggestion.” The next heading is not only more straight forward but also figurative: “Stemmeretten. Et Monstrum af en Forfatning”²³³. The universal suffrage as a monstrous constitution. The term monstrous evokes associations with the term monster: a not controllable, equal dangerous constitution. The

230 Morgenbladet (Nr. 175) 1898: 1

231 Aftenposten (Nr. 153) 1897: 1

232 Aftenposten (Nr. 623) 1897: 1

233 Aftenposten (Nr. 733) 1897: 1

universal suffrage as a monster? And Morgenbladet even titles: “Frygten for masserne”²³⁴, the fear for the crowd. In the short comment that was mentioned earlier in this thesis Morgenbladet quotes a New York Times article about the consequences of universal suffrage which was “Pøbelherredømme”²³⁵.

Other headings seem less self-explanatory but carry a very important meaning. For example: “Selvhjulpne Mænd.”²³⁶ This was one of the keywords in the debate on April 1898. The article discusses the term of “selvhjulpnehed”, “self-reliance” and questions the reliability of this. We have to remind ourselves that one of the main concerns of the conservatives was that there was a lack of guarantees keeping the “weakest links” of the society out of the universal suffrage. The same concern is reflected in following heading: “Hvem vil faa godt av almindelig Stemmeret?”²³⁷. Who will benefit from universal suffrage? The answer is given in the article: Not the hard-working laborer but:

[...] de, som ved almindelig Stemmeret vil komme til en hidtil ukjendt Magt og Indflydelse, er Bærmen inden alle Samfundsklasser, de, som selv ikke gider bestille noget ordentligt, men finder det bekvemmere at ligge andre til Byrde og lade sig ernære af dem.²³⁸

Those who are a burden for society will benefit from universal suffrage, not the “selvhjulpne Mænd” as Venstre claims.

Those headings are loaded with meanings, they evoke pictures and show how negative connotations are imprinted on terms. And we have not even turned to the stylistic devices that were used in some of the articles. However, those few headings already give us a taste of what might await us in the next subsection.

5.2. Metaphors and comparisons and other stylistic devices

In the comment and debate articles two specific stylistic device were used very often to illustrate the horrible consequences of universal suffrage or to advise against it: metaphors and comparisons. We will now take a look at the most striking metaphors and comparisons that were found concerning (1) a general warning, (2) the new majority, (3) the proletarian and the guarantees and last (4) other countries.

234 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 1

235 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 1

236 Morgenbladet (Nr. 237) 1898: 2

237 Aftenposten (Nr. 737) 1897: 1

238 Aftenposten (Nr. 737) 1897: 1

(1) General warnings

Beginning with the general “warnings” about the universal suffrage. One article warned that:

At indføre denne Reform isoleret vilde være at sende det norske Statskib ud drivende for Vind og Vove med en vældig Seilmasse, men uden Ballast og Ror.²³⁹

Here the state is compared to a ship “der norske Statskib” that, if universal suffrage will be introduced without any guarantees, will be floating with wind and waves, great sails but without dead freight and rudder. Initially the comparison of the state with a sailing ship without dead freights and rudder tells us something about the time in which this article was written. Obviously people would understand the comparison because they were aware of the concept of sailing ships: Without rudder and dead freights the state ship is at the mercy of the wind and waves. It will be impossible to steer it and the huge amount of sails will make it even more vulnerable to the wind. It will be blown in all directions and possibly be destroyed entirely. Without doubt, this metaphor is one of the most representative ones. It comprises one of the key-concerns of the conservatives: The loss of control. A sailing ship without rudder can be blown in every direction by the smallest flaw. Consequently, a state with universal suffrage is out of control. But why is that so? The next quote from *Morgenbladet* can help us to explain that:

Fordi den almindelige Stemmeret og Valgene afgjør Regjeringens Liv eller Død; fordi Regjeringen derfor altid er en Slave af Øieblikkets Flertal, det være nok så knapt, og fordi Regjeringens Fremtid er afhængig af det nye Flertal.²⁴⁰

Universal suffrage and the elections will decide about the life and death of the government; because the government is at all times the slave of the majority of the moment, however marginal it is. This quote reveals another concern: An unstable parliament with ever-changing minor majorities lacking a clear consensus. Consequently, it is the dependence on the new majorities that leads to the loss of control. In this example the government is the “slave” of the majority. A minor servant without rights but duties. Not only the negative image of the slave is introduced, but also death to illustrate the amount of control the majority will be having when universal suffrage is introduced: the power over life or death of the government. However, we can still question why this *new majority* is considered to be a hazard. To understand this, we have to take a look at how the *new majority* is described.

(2) The new majority

239 Aftenposten (Nr. 733) 1897: 1

240 Morgenbladet (Nr. 134) 1898: 1

To study this, it is necessary to examine some quotes from the article in Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende. Here the journalist makes the “false” attempt to explain the concept of universal suffrage:

Stemmeretten er simpelthen Retten til at stemme ved alle offentlige Valg, og det, at Stemmeretten kaldes almindelig, betyder kun, at denne Ret er given til alle Mennesker. Den, som betaler store Summer i Stat til Etat og Kommunen, og den, som intet betaler, har begge den samme Ret til at øve Inflytelse paa Pengenes Anvendelse. Enten Du sidder med Gaard og Grund og svarer dine Forpligtelser, eller Du er en Løsgjænger, det ene Aar her, det andre Aar der.²⁴¹

This quote is typical for what I have found concerning the conservatives attitude towards universal suffrage: To give universal suffrage to all members of a society will lead to injustice because it will give power to some who do not deserve it. Those who do not contribute to the welfare of the society but who are “Løsgjængere”²⁴², “Drænkere”²⁴³, and maybe most important: who do not pay any taxes but will gain the right to decide about the tax-payers money. And what are they suspected to be doing when they, as the “new majority”, gain more power? They will help the “Levebrodpolitikere”²⁴⁴ from the “radicalsocialistiske parti”²⁴⁵ to “med Mængdens Hjælp kryber op paa Madbjerget og forsyner sig selv”²⁴⁶. This is a strong image: the politicians who crawl up a food-pile and feast on it. It creates the impression that the politicians are like maggots feasting on a rotten pile of food. This quote has two messages: First, that the politicians are going to exploit the society after having gained power and second, that it is the “new majority”, the crowd of new voters, that will help them to get in this position.

This article serves as a good example for the strategy the conservatives seemed to use when arguing against the universal suffrage: to imprint Negative connotations on terms and derby on social groups or political opponents. The social group is represented by the members of the lower class of workers “proletaren”²⁴⁷ who are constantly under suspicion: are they really able to make such important decisions? Are they respectable citizen or are they tramps and drunkards? The political opponent is labeled “socialist”²⁴⁸ or “radikal”²⁴⁹ and the party who wants to introduce universal suffrage, “radicalsocialistisk parti”²⁵⁰, even though no definition or classification of

241 Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende 1897

242 Aftenposten (Nr. 295) 1898: 1

243 Aftenposten (Nr. 295) 1898: 1

244 Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende 1897

245 Ibid.

246 Ibid.

247 Aftenposten (Nr. 295) 1898: 1

248 Morgenbladet (Nr. 241) 1898: 1; Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende 1897

249 Morgenbladet (nr. 250) 1898: 1; Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende 1897

250 Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende 1897

socialists and radicals is made. In fact, the terms are being mixed. One journalist in *Aftenposten* states: “Socialismen følger Radikalismen lige i Hælene”²⁵¹. Socialists are right on the heels of the radicals. And “synderlig lenge blev imidlertid ikke den radikale Adam i dette Paradis. Socialisterne Havde lært, hvorledes Samfundet skulde erobres [...]”²⁵². This evokes the false impression that radicals are closely related to socialists. *Morgenbladet* presumes that the argument of wanting to help the poor underprivileged is only a trick to cover their real intentions by, “dække sig bag et saa gjennemsigtigt Figenblad som dette, at han er med paa almindelig Stemmeret af Forargelse over Myrmænd og Fattiglemmer, som under Beskyttelse af de nurværende Regler vandrer ind og tager Plads i Mandtallene.”²⁵³ The classical “fig leaf” metaphor speaks for itself. Furthermore, it is presumed that the socialists nourish the belief that the radicals will dance to their tune: “Socialister, der her som andersteds forlanger, at de Radikale skal danse, naar Socialdemokraterne plystrer.”²⁵⁴ This seems to be a warning: the radicals mix with the socialist but will not be controllable once the power is seized and then the “rotten” individuals” will “kryber op paa Madbjerget og forsyner sig selv”²⁵⁵.

Which means no more than loss of control. However, it never really becomes clear who exactly is meant.

(3) The proletarian and the guarantees

This “new majority” of socialists and radicals seems to entail several problems. The problems apply to the lowest of the low: the proletarian. Here the terms are being mixed. Who is a “decent worker” and who is a proletarian? In an article in *Aftenposten* the new voters are referred to as “stemmekvæg”²⁵⁶, “ignorant voters” who will be no more than a means to the politicians (socialist and radicals), a way to seize power, walking with the herd like cattle. In two articles in *Aftenposten* the proletarian is compared to a parasite feasting on the body of society: “[...] Proletaren, der lever som Snyltedyret paa Samfundslegemet”²⁵⁷. Furthermore, one article claim that the proletarian avoids duties and finds his own ways around the law: “[...] skyr Proletaren al Forbindelse med det Samfund, han har sagt sig løs fra, og gaar sine egne Veie, udenom Loven.”²⁵⁸

251 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 732) 1897: 1

252 *Ibd.*: 1

253 *Morgenbladet* (nr. 250) 1898: 1

254 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 241) 1898: 1

255 *Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende* 1897

256 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 737) 1897: 1

257 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 295) 1898: 1 and *Aftenposten* (Nr. 737) 1897: 1

258 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 295) 1898: 1

But not only is the “proletarian” presented as a hazard. In one article also “myrmændsvæsenet”²⁵⁹ and “fattiglemmer”²⁶⁰ are issued. Let us remind ourselves of the debate in the National Assembly and the comment Stang uttered concerning the “myrmændsvæsenet” and “fattigkasser”. He suspects the Venstre to manipulate the so called “guarantees”:

Hvis Partiernes gaar til at oprette sine egne Fattigkasser, hvoraf de understøtter de siste Aar før Valget, saa har vi ogsaa disse understøttede med, hvis der er Brug for dem. Det er ikke min Mening, at min Parti vil gjøre det; det er heller ikke vort Parti, som har begynt med Myrmændsvæsenet [...] ²⁶¹.

Stang is skeptical because he suspects that the guarantee, ensuring that those receiving social benefits will be suspended from universal suffrage, is insufficient. The parties can find loopholes if needed: for example by establishing an own poor relief fund. This will make it possible to govern the number of those receiving poor relief and to lower it to get more voters if needed. Another issue is the “myrmændsvæsenet” which was an arrangement where valueless ground was sold at a symbolic price with the aim to recruit more voters.²⁶² The “radicals” pretend to pledge for universal suffrage because they pity the “Myrmænd”²⁶³ and “Fattiglemmer”²⁶⁴ even though it was they who were the driving power of the “myrmændsvæsenet”:

Det lader sig ikke anstændig anføre, at man maa ty til almindelig Stemmeret for at slaa en Pæl igjennem Myrmændsvæsenet, af den Grund man selv har legaliseret denne ved [...] at lukke Øiene og godkjende vitterlige bedragerske Omgaaelser af Loven. ²⁶⁵

They are accused of pretending to “slaa en Pæl igjennem Myrmændsvæsenet”, although it was they who introduced and tolerated this questionable procedure to gain more voters. This reminds us of the quote about the proletarians who “gaar sine egne Vege, udenom Loven.”²⁶⁶ Obviously the same applies to the radicals who close their eyes and wittingly approve the treacherous “Omgaaelser af Loven”²⁶⁷.

259 Morgenbladet (nr. 250) 1898: 1

260 Ibid.: 1

261 St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 489

262 Mandal 2009: “Myrmænd kaldtes I aarene omkring 1880 personer, som under de dengang gjældende sterkt begrænsede stemmeretsregler skaffede sig stemmeret ad omveien ved ad kjøbe eller bygsle værdiløse jordlapper, som overlodes dem kun til dette brug for en bagate; der fandtes mange eksempler paa at folk fik en saadan eiendoms- eller bygselret for 2 kr.” Fra 1. vol. Aschehougs leksikon (1906-13)

263 Morgenbladet (nr. 250) 1898: 1

264 Ibid.: 1

265 Ibid.: 1

266 Aftenposten (Nr. 295) 1898: 1

267 Morgenbladet (nr. 250) 1898: 1

(4) Other countries

All those quotes share the same purpose: To warn against the universal suffrage by showing who will gain power and take over the country if universal suffrage is introduced: the socialists, radicals and proletarians. Let us look at the remaining argument: the deterrent example of other countries:

Det ligger i Kristianias Vælgeres Haand at afgjøre, om vi skal blive Europas andet Grækenland med den sletteste og farligste Forfatning, som menneskelig Opfindsomhed endnu har kunne udklækket.²⁶⁸

The message is clear: It lies in hand of the voters in Kristiania to determine the fate of the nation. And this can be fatal if the wrong decision is made. The result will be to become Europe's second Greece with the worst and most dangerous constitution that had ever been hatched by the humanity. (“[...] den sletteste og farligste Forfatning, som menneskelig Opfindsomhed endnu har kunne udklækket”) In another quote the constitution is compared to an egg. When it is opened a dangerous creature will rise from it. This is reflected in an other quote where the universal suffrage is called a monstrosity: “et Misfoster av en Forfatning, som strider mod alle Erfaringer om en sund Samfundsstyrelse, som andre Nationer har gjort.”²⁶⁹ In both metaphors the most striking image is the birth of something, the constitution, that appears to be cruel, a monstrosity, a “misfoster”, after being born, while its “wrapping”, the eggshell, the womb, first and foremost seems harmless. The message: the real consequences will be visible after the reform is introduced. When it is too late: the egg has hatched, the monstrosity is born, there is no way back. Except we look at the countries where this has already gone wrong. That is the reason why Greece is taken as an example is named with the call to learn from others bad experiences: “som strider mod alle Erfaringer om en sund Samfundsstyrelse, som andre Nationer har gjort.”²⁷⁰

In an article in *Aftenposten*, France is taken as an example: “Det vilde være en Haan mod Sandheden, om man sagde, at de franske Folk i de 22 aar, Konstitutionen af 1875 d.r. været i Kraft, ikke havde misbrugt sine Rettigheder eller trampet sine Pligter under Fødder.”²⁷¹ The people have trampled their rights and duties under their feet instead of profiting from them. This is another example that underlines the risks of introducing universal suffrage. It introduces another strong image: The people that trample on their rights and duties. This evokes pictures in

268 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 733) 1897: 1

269 *Ibd.*: 1

270 *Ibd.*: 1

271 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 233) 1898: 1 (franske Valgforhold)

the readers mind which are connected to violence and. The can even remind us slightly on Le Bon's mass in rampant action. It would have been much less effective to write: "The people did not apprehend their rights and duties". Again it is at learning effect that underlies this quote: universal suffrage had severe consequences in France, the same consequences will await us if universal suffrage is introduced. Things have gone wrong in France, they will most likely go wrong here as well.

However, humanity is unteachable, as it is lamented about in an article in Morgenbladet:

Der er en Ting, som altid i nogen Grad stiller sig hindrende iveien for, at et Folk kan tage Lærdom af andre Nationers bitre Erfaringer, det er denne Selvgodshedens Arvsynd, som gjør, at enhver Nation sætter sig selv, sin egen Begavelse og sine egne Evner høiere end alle andres.²⁷²

The article tries to give an answer on why humanity is unteachable: Because every nation has a higher self-image and therefore refuses to gain knowledge by studying other country's "bitre Erfaringer". The journalist ascribes this to the "Selvgodshedens Arvsynd", the original sin of conceit. Furthermore, the attempt is made to explain what parliamentarianism and the pursuit of freedom of the people have resulted in: parliamentarianism. The freedom of the people as a treasure "Folkefriheds Klenodier"²⁷³ has not been defended and taken care of, but in turn has morphed into "[...] et Styre, der uvis om Morgendagens mulige Omskiftelser lever fra Haanden til Munden, en Vold for Øieblikkets Stemninger, uden moralsk og historisk Ansvar, misbruger sin Magt for at forlænge sin levetid med nogle Dage eller Uger [...]".²⁷⁴ Instead of stabilizing the nation, parliamentarianism has lead to instability where people have to live from hand to mouth, a violence of momentary moods has evolved, without historical and moral responsibility, were power is miss-used by individuals who want to benefit from the situation.

When we buy into the picture the newspapers painted in 1897 and 1898 who would support universal suffrage? We get not only the answer to who is going to take the power, the socialists, radicals and proletarians, but also a vivid illustration of the consequences the introduction of universal suffrage would have for the country. The result would be a hand to mouth government, instability and uncertain future.

Now we have seen how the arguments were supported by using certain terms and imprinting

272 Morgenbladet (Nr. 134) 1898: 1

273 Ibid.: 1

274 Ibid.: 1

negative meanings to them. For example by reporting about radicals and socialists and mixing the terms as well as by ascribing negative attributes to them like in the case of the proletarians who are “Løsgjængere og Drankere”, if we shall believe the newspaper articles. Another method to convince the readers was the use of stylistic devices like metaphors and comparisons. Those, as we have seen, were images which carried negative meanings like the “monstrosity of a constitution”, “the ship at mercy of the wind and waves” and the “fig leaf” the radicals were suspected to cover their actual intentions with. Just to name some of the examples above. In the next step we will study the words and expressions that were used in all of the articles I dealt with.

5.3. Often used terms and phrases

Now that we have examined some striking headings, metaphors and comparisons it makes sense to take a closer look at the terms and phrases that are used repeatedly. I tried to arrange them into four categories in the attempt to unveil an argumentation pattern..

Hence, the four categories are: 1. the crowd, mob rule (massen, pøbelherredommen) 2. radicals and socialists, (radikalerne, socialisterne) 3. proletarian, tramp (proletaren, løsgjænger) 4. hazard, tyranny and violation (fare, tyranni, herredom, overgreb).

(1) The crowd

In the first category, the crowd, (massen), I collected ten quotes, in which the words “masse”, “mengde”, “flertall” or “majoritet” were mentioned. Those terms were used to predict the crowd's rule when universal suffrage is introduced. One article forecasted a “plumt og hensynsløst Majoritetstyranni”²⁷⁵ (a vulgar and reckless tyranny of the majority). Here not only the term majority occurs, in addition, it is directly linked to the noun tyranny, which implies that any rule of the majority will lead to tyranny. This is a surprising argument when we see it in the light of today's understanding of governance and democracy. Today the majority is the most important element in political decision-making. In 1898, in contrast, it was linked to tyranny. The next quote warns of a “Overgreb fra et magtlystent Flertals Side”²⁷⁶ (a invasion of the majority greedy for power). Again the majority is labeled: it is greedy for power and will take over as soon as the chance arises. Another states that the nation “lettelig kunne beherskes af en enkelt Stand, den talrigste”²⁷⁷ (can easily be controlled by one class, the most numerous). Once again

275 Aftenposten (Nr. 153) 1897: 1

276 Aftenposten (Nr. 733) 1897: 1

277 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 1

the predominance in numbers is issued. The quote implies that the crowd will take control if the chance arises just because they out-rule them in numbers. This will lead to a “Pøbelherredømme”²⁷⁸ (mob rule), which is the reason why the crowd should be feared. One headline states this in an article about the state of affairs in France and predicts the future if universal suffrage is introduced in Norway: “Frygten for masserne”²⁷⁹ (the fear for the crowd). Another quote, in which the crowd is mentioned, is: “med Mængdens Hjælp kryber op paa Madbjerget og forsyner sig selv”²⁸⁰. Here, in contrast to the other quote, the crowd or majority is a tool that helps others to gain power: the socialist and radicals.

(2) Socialists and radicals

Earlier in this paper I have mentioned the sometimes unclear division between socialist and radical movements and parties. In some articles the terms are mixed or used in turn without further specification. We find quotes mentioning the “radicalsocialistiske Parti”²⁸¹ in Norway, the radical wing of the *Venstre* and the labor movement. Another article talks about “socialistiske og radikale Fraktioner”²⁸², yet another suspects a “radikal-socialistiske Valgforbund”²⁸³ and states: -”Socialismen følger Radikalismen”²⁸⁴. Matching the presumption that the radicals are collaborating with the socialists an article in *Morgenbladet* suspects a “Samarbeidet mellem Radikale og socialistiske Elementer”²⁸⁵. *Aftenposten* even fears “radikalt-socialistiske Enevælde”²⁸⁶. Terms like “radikale lederkreds”²⁸⁷ and “socialistiske Organisationer”²⁸⁸ only further the ambiguity and a couple of questions occur: Which organizations are meant? What is a radical circle of leadership and who is involved?²⁸⁹ We have to remind ourselves of the fact that the aim of the articles hardly was to weigh up arguments for and against universal suffrage, but to convince the reader about the disadvantages of universal suffrage. Therefore, it might have been helpful to blur the lines between the socialists and the radicals to evoke the impression that they are closely connected and to advise against a “radikalt-socialistiske Enevælde”²⁹⁰.

278 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 253) 1898: 1

279 *Ibd.*: 1

280 *Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende* 1897

281 *Ibd.*

282 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 710) 1897: 2

283 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 732) 1897: 1

284 *Ibd.*: 1

285 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 174) 1898: 1

286 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 733) 1897: 1

287 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 252) 1898: 2

288 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 175) 1898: 1

289 Maybe Bjørnson as a spokesman for the socialist movement? Which persons exactly are meant is not further explained in the articles I read.

290 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 733) 1897: 1

Moreover, the terms socialist and radical were often linked to other questionable terms with negative connotations. For example: “socialistiske Propaganda”²⁹¹, “socialistiske Fremdtidsideal”²⁹² or “socialistisk farvede Lokkemidler”²⁹³. Socialist propaganda implies the message: be alert. Socialist are not to be trusted, they use propaganda. And finally, do not let them trick you into swallowing the bait. We can observe the same pattern concerning the radicals and the terms they were connected with. For example: “en radikal almindelig Stemmeret”²⁹⁴, or “utidig radikal Reformiver”²⁹⁵, “radikale Demokrati”²⁹⁶ and “vore Radikales Stemmeretsarbejde”²⁹⁷. All those terms imply that universal suffrage is especially furthered by the radicals. They refer to it as “radical universal suffrage”, an unreasonable radical eagerness to introduce new reforms. They write “radical democracy” which gives the term democracy, which as well as parliamentarianism was ill-posed in conservative circles, an even more negative connotation by adding the attribute “radical”. The same applies to the last quote in which those working for introducing universal suffrage are being labeled as radicals. And who wants to support a radical democracy and a radical universal suffrage enforced by socialist propaganda and baiting?

(3) Proletarians

This leads us to the next category: the proletarian that might swallow the bait and is presumably, according to the article, in danger of “tjene som stemmekvæg”²⁹⁸. Especially one article in *Aftenposten* gives a quite vivid indication on how some conservatives viewed the proletarians. We will begin by collecting the attributes that were found in this article and round them with additions from other articles issuing the proletarian or the new voters. In this specific article the proletarian is suspected to “leve[r] paa andres Bekostning”²⁹⁹ (to live at the expense of others), “range”³⁰⁰ (to loiter), they practice “Rangel og Lediggang”³⁰¹ (loitering and idleness) are “Snyltedyrr på Samfundslegemet”³⁰² (parasites that feast on the society), “tigger sig til lidt her og lyver sig til lidt”³⁰³ (beg and lie to get a little) and “arbejder en Dag og drikker to”³⁰⁴ (work one

291 *Morgenbladet* (nr. 250) 1898: 1

292 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 732) 1897: 1

293 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 250) 1898: 1

294 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 249) 1898: 1

295 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 733) 1897: 1

296 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 249) 1898: 1

297 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 249) 1898: 1

298 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 737) 1897: 1

299 *Ibd.*: 1

300 *Ibd.*: 1

301 *Ibd.*: 1

302 *Ibd.*: 1

303 *Ibd.*: 1

304 *Ibd.*: 1

day and drink two). Another article in *Aftenposten* uses similar words to describe the proletariat: Among other things they are called “professionelle Løsgjængere og de erklærede Drankere”³⁰⁵ (professional tramps and drunkards), the very figurative expression of “Snyltedy paa Samfundslegemet”³⁰⁶ (parasites that feast on the society) is repeated, they are called a “Byrde paa Samfundets Rase”³⁰⁷ (a burden for the race of the society) and a “Fare for den offentlige Orden og for Retssikkerheden”³⁰⁸ (a hazard for the public order and safety), as well as “Lediggjænger”³⁰⁹ (idler), “Dagdrivere”³¹⁰ (dawdler) and “Vagabonder”³¹¹ (vagabond). In another article the term “Løsgjænger”³¹² occurs one more time. However, we have to be aware of the fact that those terms which were used to describe the proletariat in the four articles we have taken a look at, did not apply to the common laborer. *Aftenposten* states: “Hvem vil faa godt af almindelig Stemmeret? Man siger, at det er Arbejderne. Men det er ikke sandt. Af de hæderlige og flittige Arbejdere har allerede de allerfleste Stemmeret [...]”³¹³ The journalist states that tramps and drunkards can be found in all classes of society. The conservatives advise against those “damaging individuals”. They suspect the non-taxpayers to use their vote to benefit from other peoples money and wealth.

Another article states: “Proletaren er en Fare for den offentlige Orden og for Retssikkerheden, og hans Levemaade en Fare for Samfundets Interesser.”³¹⁴ Actually, the descriptions of the proletariat depict a central problem in the debate about universal suffrage: the guarantees. The central question is: who is going to be included and who is going to be excluded. By arguing that the common hard working laborer already is included, even before the universal suffrage is introduced, it is implied that all those who will gain suffrage after the voting in the National Assembly most likely are “Løsgjængere og Drankere”³¹⁵ and all those who, by choice, have decided to “bidrager aldrig noget til at vedligeholde en god Samfundsordning [...]”³¹⁶ Hence, why should they enjoy the privilege of taking part in political decisions? Of course, this way of presenting *the crowd of new voters* bodes ill for the future of the country. Especially by drawing a clear line between the hard working laborer and the proletariat we have to be aware of the way

305 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 295) 1898: 1

306 *Ibd.*: 1

307 *Ibd.*: 1

308 *Ibd.*: 1

309 *Ibd.*: 1

310 *Ibd.*: 1

311 *Ibd.*: 1

312 *Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende* 1897

313 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 737) 1897: 1

314 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 295) 1898: 1

315 *Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende* 1897

316 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 295) 1898: 1

the conservatives used the term “proletarian”. In fact, the term originates from the Latin word “proles” which meant “offspring” as the poorest of the Roman Empire's only possession was their offspring.³¹⁷ It seems like the conservatives used the term referring to the older connotation as the term proletarian was later used by the labor movement to label the hard working laborer.³¹⁸

(4) Hazards

We will now study how the consequences and hazards are presented. The predictions that are made in the newspaper articles concerning the consequences of the introduction of universal suffrage are depressing. To describe the situation the country will be facing when introducing universal suffrage, following words are used: “Krise”³¹⁹ (crisis), “Tyranni”³²⁰ (tyranny) and “Overgrep”³²¹ (violation). One article warns about a “vilkaarligt Magtmisbrug”³²² (random abuse of power) and “Skatteplyndring”³²³ (plundering of taxes). Others predict “Had”³²⁴ (hate), “Mistro”³²⁵ (distrust) or “uheldige Bivirkninger”³²⁶ (unfortunate side effects). It becomes clear that the conservatives suspect “Parityranniet”³²⁷ (tyranny of parties), which became severe after the parliamentarianism debate in 1884, and other forms of abuse of power by those who will gain it by introducing the universal suffrage. One term that is used repeatedly is “magt”³²⁸ (power). The newspapers are concerned that the parties are going to “optraadte [...] almægtigt”³²⁹ (appear omnipotent), “anmassede sig Magt og Myndighed paa alle Felter”³³⁰ (claim power and authority in every area), “betragtede Statens Kasse som sin egen Kasse”³³¹ (view the treachery as their own) and simply “misbruger sin Magt”³³² (abuse their power). A very strong image is the loss of power: “Magten lægges i Hænderne paa et Flertal, som tilsammen betaler en forsvindende Brøkdæl af Skatterne”³³³ (the power is handed to a majority that pays a small part of the taxes).

It is also interesting to take a look at the words, with which the rise of power is described:

317 Berg 2014

318 Berg 2014

319 Aftenposten (Nr. 153) 1897: 1

320 Aftenposten (Nr. 623) 1897: 1

321 Aftenposten (Nr. 733) 1897: 1

322 Morgenbladet (Nr. 134) 1898: 1

323 Morgenbladet (Nr. 134) 1898: 1

324 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 1

325 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 1

326 Morgenbladet (Nr. 249) 1898: 1

327 Morgenbladet (Nr. 289) 1898: 1

328 Morgenbladet (Nr. 250) 1898: 1

329 Morgenbladet (Nr. 289) 1898: 1

330 Morgenbladet (Nr. 289) 1898: 1

331 Morgenbladet (Nr. 289) 1898: 1

332 Morgenbladet (Nr. 134) 1898: 1

333 Morgenbladet (Nr. 181) 1898: 2

“Samfundet skulde erobres”³³⁴, those who are made responsible for that called “Folkeoppviglere”³³⁵ and the rule of the universal suffrage is predicted: “en almindelige Stemmerets herredømmen”³³⁶. Furthermore, the socialists are suspected to take over and rule the country: “socialistiske Ledere til Herrer i et Land”³³⁷. Hence, the terms that are used to describe the rise of power are quite aggressive: the country is conquered by socialists who rise to power by inciting the population.

The newspapers warn that the universal suffrage will lead to a “sletteste og farligste Forfatning”³³⁸ (most ill and dangerous constitution), their negative prophecy for the future: “uvis om Morgendagens mulige Omskiftelser”³³⁹ (uncertain about the changes of tomorrow) and “Vold for Øieblikkets Stemninger”³⁴⁰ (violence of the momentary moods) and they foresee a “almindelige Stemmerets Vilkaarlighed”³⁴¹ (a randomness of universal suffrage). All terms “slett, farlig, omskiftelser, uvis, øieblikkets stemninger, vilkaarlighed” contain an element of uncertainty and hazard. The same applies to the other warnings: The vote about the universal suffrage is seen as a “skæbnesvanger afgjørelse”³⁴² (a fatal decision) with “en farlig Grund ([sic]ligger i vor Valgordning)”³⁴³ (dangerous ground) that might lead to a “usikkert, uretferdigt Styre”³⁴⁴ (an unstable, unjust government). As we have seen when examining the argumentation pattern, the newspapers used examples from other countries to prove the negative consequences of universal suffrage: “advarende historisk Parallel”³⁴⁵ (a cautionary historical parallel). And in the end the final warning: If universal suffrage is introduced it will be “til Norges Skade og Straffelse”³⁴⁶ (to Norway’s punishment and damage). All those terms and phrases were used to warn the reader. They comprise elements of uncertainty, as we have seen above, and fear like “skæbnesvanger, farlig, usikkert, uretferdig, advarende, Skade, Straffelse”.

There is no doubt that the use of specific terms and phrases will influence the readers opinion, as well as they tell us something about the writers convictions. We have dealt with conservative

334 Aftenposten (Nr. 732) 1897: 1

335 Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende 1897

336 Aftenposten (Nr. 623) 1897: 1

337 Aftenposten (Nr. 732) 1897: 1

338 Aftenposten (Nr. 733) 1897: 1

339 Morgenbladet (Nr. 134) 1898: 1

340 Morgenbladet (Nr. 134) 1898: 1

341 Morgenbladet (Nr. 134) 1898: 1

342 Morgenbladet (Nr. 250) 1898: 1 and Morgenbladet (Nr. 252) 1898: 2

343 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 1

344 Morgenbladet (Nr. 249) 1898: 1

345 Morgenbladet (Nr. 289) 1898: 1

346 Morgenbladet (Nr. 250) 1898: 1

newspapers, consequently, we can assume that the articles which were published reflect the opinion of the conservatives. Not in detail, but in a bigger picture concerning the different elements the arguments against universal suffrage comprises of. This is not least indicated by the fact that the arguments the politicians used in the debate at the voting in the National Assembly were reflected in the news coverage as well as in the debate articles and comments that issued universal suffrage. Naturally, we have to be cautious especially when looking at some of the really strong terms and phrases that were used. I have pointed out earlier that comments or debate articles are interesting because here the writer wants to convince the reader about a certain statement or attitude. Therefore, the statements brought forward comprise the personal opinions of the writer. However, since I have found certain terms and phrases repeatedly in different articles, not only in one newspaper but also in two, we can be rather sure about the fact that those terms were widely used thorough the debate. The unflattering descriptions of the socialist, the radical and the proletarians were not repeated by politicians in the parliament. This might be due to political correctness while the newspapers are much more open and straight forward when pointing out the disruptive elements of society. In the protocol we can read a interesting passage in which Stang is accused for perceiving *the new voters* as a hostile army. Saaksvitne replies to Stang's concernce stating: "Jeg kan for mit Vedkommende ikke betragte disse 175 000 Personer, som ikke er stemmeberettigede, som en fiendtlig Armee, - som en Flok, der staar færdige til at overfalde os paa enhver Kant [...]"³⁴⁷. This image of the hostile army sums up the view the conservatives seemed to nourishe concerning *the new voters*.

5.4. The sinking state ship – Language as a weapon. How the conservative newspapers advised against universal-suffrage

The conservative newspapers were not hesitant to use strong words and pictures to advise against universal suffrage. Already the headlines gave us an indication on that. We just have to recall the image of the monstrous constitution or the tramps and drunkards one was concerned would get the right to vote, if the legislation was changed. Another headline expressed the worry that the socialist would take over the country if they would not be stopped. Terms like "handed over" to the socialists and a "cure or treatment against socialism" were used to depict the future of the country if universal suffrage would be introduced. We found headlines comprising terms like "self-reliance" and "the fear for the crowd" which we later saw were used vividly in the articles

347 St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 492. "Saksvitne" is most likely referring to following statement of Stang in Stortingsforhandling 1898: 490: "Jeg tror altsaa, at vi gaar indtil den Grad, at vi giver fuld Stemmeret til enhver Betler, og jeg tror, vi giver fuld Stemmeret til enhver Mand, som den ene Dag gaar paa Gaden og tigger og den næste Dag sidder paa Tvangsarbejdsanstalten for Betleri, naar han blot passer sig for, at han ikke gaar til det offentlige Fattigvæsen og beder om Understøttelse."

concerning universal suffrage.

It was no surprise that the metaphors and comparisons we found only strengthened the negative connotation that was indicated in the headlines. We found the metaphor of the state ship at risk of sinking and the socialists who crawled up the food-pile to feast on it as if they were parasites. The proletariat was labeled “stemmekvæg” who works one day and drinks two and other countries were taken as examples to illustrate how fatal the introduction of universal suffrage would be. Universal suffrage was even compared to an egg. One article advised against hatching it. Once it would be hatched the monstrosity it contained would come to life.

Finally we studied often used terms and phrases. Here we got to examine and sort the different expressions that were used to dismiss the suffrage-proposal and the new voters. Four main categories were found: The first category was *the crowd*. One journalist was concerned about the “a vulgar and reckless tyranny of the majority”, another was worried about an “invasion of the majority greedy for power”. One article feared that a mob rule would be the consequence of universal suffrage. The socialists and radicals were in the second category. In this category the initiators of universal suffrage are the target. One article predicted radical-socialist absolutism, another feared a radical democracy. In the next category were the proletarians. Obviously they suffered the worst treatment language-wise. They were suspected “to live at the expenses of others”, “to loiter”, “to be a parasite that feasts on the society” and “to work one day and drink two”. We get the impression that they were under suspicion because they did not have the right to vote. It is no coincidence that one of the main arguments of the conservatives was that every hard working laborer already had universal suffrage. The terms that foreshadow the country's fate if universal suffrage is introduced are in the last category: the hazards. The message is clear. Universal suffrage will lead to tyranny, crisis, plundering of taxes and other unfortunate side effects like tyranny of a party, who abuse their power and claim the treachery to be theirs. To introduce universal suffrage was said to be a fatal decision to Norway's punishment and damage.

After we have examined the terms and phrases there is no doubt that the conservative newspapers used harsh words to advise against universal suffrage. In addition, their arguments correspond with the arguments the conservatives brought forward on the day of the passing, though in a more moderate tone.

6. The argumentation pattern of the conservatives

On basis of what we have found when examining the articles concerning the arguments the conservatives used and link them to the words, phrases and stylistic devices, I suppose that a certain argumentation pattern can be detected.

If universal suffrage is introduced:

1. The crowd of new voters will overrule the foremost leading political class and force them into a permanent minority position. Therefore, the leading political class has to be protected from *the crowd* to prohibit a chaotic and reckless rule of *the crowd*. The key word for the first argument is: massen.

2. Furthermore, the crowd of new voters is not able to decide for its own best based on lack of common sense and reasoning and should therefore not be allowed to influence political decisions. Therefore, guarantees have to be provided assuring that decisions can be reverted if needed. Those who are entitled to vote should be those who pay taxes because their decisions influence their own economy directly. Accordingly, non tax payers should be excluded. Keyword: Selvhjulpenhed.

3. Moreover, the crowd of new voters has never expressed the merest desire to gain the right to vote. The discontentment of the crowd is economical - not political. Keyword: Misfornøielse, Gjæring.

4. Those claims are proven when considering the situations of countries that have introduced universal suffrage. The political and social conditions have changed for the worse after universal suffrage had been introduced. Keyword: Other countries.

In short: (1.) The crowd is a hazard because (2.) individuals in crowd are not able to make reasonable decisions and therefore we need guarantees, (3.) in the first place they do not have the need to make those decisions and finally the proof: (4.) a “rule of the crowd” will lead to horrible consequences, as is demonstrated in other countries where *the crowd* already rules.

Let us see if we can find quotes that support our presumption of an argumentation pattern. Additionally, we will make use of Hirschman's argumentative strategies perversity, futility and jeopardy to see if we can find some typical reactionary argumentative strategies in the conservative's arguments advising against universal suffrage.

(1) *The crowd is a hazard*

Det siges, at Alle som bidrager til Samfundet enten i Form af direkte og indirekte skatter eller ved at tjene sin Værnepligt og, om det fornødiges, ofre Liv og Blod for Fædrelandet, de maa have Stemmeret. Hvis ikke, da har de kun Pligter og ikke Rettigheder.

Ingens Paastand kan være mindre sand. Hvortil ydes Skatterne? Til Skole og Fattigvæsen, til Landets Barn og Styre som til Rettens Pleie, til Kommunikationsvesen og Næringsveie. Kommer alt dette kun Stemmeberettigede tilgode? Og om Faren kalder Landets Sønner til Grænsen, for hvem ofrer de da Liv og Blod? Bærger de ikke den Fattiges Hytte, hans Fred og Næring saavist som Rigmanden?³⁴⁸

This argument makes a nice starting point because it illustrates the two sides in the debate. The majority calls for justice, whereas the conservatives state: Justice is not an issue, the society is just. As long as this is the case, there is no need to change anything. Quite the reverse, the attempt to change this order will most likely lead to a disaster and injustice. And this is nothing more than the incarnation of the perversity argument: everything backfires, the attempt to gain more justice will lead to injustice. However, how do the conservatives explain and justify this assumption? Why is *the crowd of new voters* a hazard?

In the National Assembly Emil Stang warns about the hazards of introducing the universal suffrage and states that this would lead to a loss of influence for the leading political class in favor for a class that is influenced by momentary moods.

“Man vilde lægge den afgjørende Magt i Hænderne paa en Klasse, af hvem man ikke kan vente et sikkert Herredømme over Øieblikkets Stemninger”.³⁴⁹ This prediction is shared by Steffensen who states that the *audience* should: “[...] betænke sig to Gange for de gik med paa en Stemmeretsudvidelse, der før eller senere udværgerlig vilde føre til, at den Magt, vi har arvet fra vore Fædre, glider over til andre Lag i Samfundet.”³⁵⁰ This argument functions as a warning: Everyone who is voting for this reform will automatically have to take the responsibility for his choice. An unpleasant thought if one believes in the prediction the conservatives made concerning the introduction of the universal suffrage: an unruly, unpredictable mob will suddenly be in charge because “[...]Forøgelse af Urvælgernes Tal med nær 80 pCt. vilde medføre, at de nye Vælgere kom i Flertal over de gamle.”³⁵¹ The last sentence is especially important because it shows the main concern the conservatives had: The fear for the crowd to overrule them in

348 Morgenbladet (Nr. 252) 1898: 2

349 Aftenposten (Nr. 298) 1898: 2

350 Aftenposten (Nr. 299) 1898: 1

351 Ibid.: 1

numbers. “[...] de nye Vælgere kom i Flertal over de gamle”³⁵². Consequently, this would lead to a loss of power which “glider over til andre Lag i Samfundet”³⁵³.

With that said, the conservatives need to explain why it would be a problem that other social classes gain more power. They do that by ascribing *the crowd of new voters* a series of unflattering attributes. Referring to Stang the crowd of new voters is lead by moods. The new voters would simply not be competent. This allows them in turn to speak about the hazards that would arise of the introduction of universal suffrage.

I at medtage denne Klasse af Samfundsmedlemmer blandt de Styrende ser Mindretallet en alvorlig Fare. Saa nær Partierne her i Norge synes at være hinanden i Styrke, vil Indførelse af almindelig Stemmeret i mange Tilfælder lettelig lægge Afgjørelsen i den heromhandlede Masses Hænder.³⁵⁴

The quint essence here is clear: It would be a serious hazard to give *the crowd of new voters* more power. But why exactly? Because of the inadequate limitations of:

(2.) Selvhjulpnehed – the crowd is not able to make reasonable decisions

This leads us to the second argument: The crowd is not able to make reasonable decisions. Because of this conviction, the conservatives were eager to keep the limitations which were connected to the right to vote as much as possible. While *Venstre* mainly talked about that “Selvhjulpne Mænd”³⁵⁵ should be allowed to vote, the conservatives fought for a more critical interpretation of “selvhjulpnehed”. They stated: “Ad Enhver, der ikke faar Hjælp af det Offentlige, skulde være "selvhjulpnen", kan mindretallet ikke medgive.”³⁵⁶ One of the main arguments was that the claim of self-reliance was too vague and left loopholes that could be used by the majority to gain more votes. Stang argued:

Den Bestemmelse, at offentlig Fattigunderstøttelse udelukkede fra Stemmeret, kunde omgaaes ved, at de enkelte Partier holdt sin særstilte Fattigkasse, hvoraf der kunde uddeles Understøttelser det sidste Aar før Valgene, saa fik man det fattigunderstøttede ogsaa med, hvis man behøvede dem.³⁵⁷

352 Aftenposten (Nr. 299) 1898: 1

353 *Ibid.*: 1

354 Morgenbladet (Nr. 249) 1898: 1

355 Cf.: St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 491: “Komiteens Flertal har i Lighed med saa mange andre ment, at Stemmerettens Begrænsninger skulde ligge i økonomisk Selvhjulpnehed.”

356 Morgenbladet (Nr. 249) 1898: 1

357 Aftenposten (Nr. 298) 1898: 2

They also argued that not every man who was not receiving poor relief was automatically responsible and self-reliant because as a lot of men were dependent on their family or friends.³⁵⁸

The main concern was that universal suffrage was given to social classes which were not able to take this responsibility and that to broaden limitations would include those, who were perceived to be unsuitable to the job:

Omstreifere, hvorledes var det med dem? Taleren henstillede til Komiteflertallet at paapege, om ikke de vilde faa Stemmeret, et Spørgsmaal Komiteens Formand besvarede derhen, at Omstreifere ikke kan faa Stemmeret, da de ikke kan siges at være "bosatte" i Lande eller at være "Indvaanere" af Kjøpstad eller Prestegjæld. Men Betlere, ja selv de, som sidder paa Tvangsarbeide, de kommer med. Dernæst den store Gruppen, som vel ikke ligger so lavt, men som dog maa siges ved egen Skyld at være mindre selvhjulpne.³⁵⁹

On this quote, we can demonstrate a classic issue: Who is more or less self-reliant and who should have the right to vote? The discussion about self-reliance is a discussion about limitations. The whole debate about universal suffrage was a debate about to which extent the old limitations should be extended to include a bigger share of the population. Naturally, the conservatives did not wish to extend them at all. They exclusively wanted the taxpayers to retain the monopoly on the political power: Those who vote should also be those who pay taxes because their decisions directly influence their own economy. That is why non-taxpayers should be excluded.³⁶⁰ However, they should not only be excluded because they were not able to take the responsibility for their votes, the conservatives also denied that they were interested in taking part in political decisions. Which was supported by the argument that:

(3.) in the first place, the crowd has no need to take part in political decisions

because the disconnectedness of *the crowd* is due to economic, - not political reasons. "Gjæring og Misfornøielse i Samfundets brede Lag [...]begrundet i økonomiske, ikke politiske Forhold og synes ikke at staa i nogen paaviseligt Forholdt til Stemmeretsreglerne."³⁶¹ However, this is not the only objection the conservatives have. They plainly presume that those social classes do not

358 Aftenposten (Nr. 737) 1897: 1: "Det er ikke Fattigvesenet, som i almindelighed føder dem. Så længe de er friske viser Fattigvesenet dem fra sig. Nei, de har Slegtninge, som understøtter dem [...]."

359 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 2

360 Aftenposten (Nr. 748) 1897: 1: "Skatteyderne kommer jo altid i en sødt og hjælpeløs Minoritet ligeoverfor dem, som intet betaler, men desuagtet har faaet Retten til å bevilge skatte." "

361 Morgenbladet (Nr. 249) 1898: 1

have any urge to gain universal suffrage which is demonstrated in this comment:

Der kunde ikke siges at være nogen væsentlig Trang for nogen stemmeretsudvidelse før Øieblikket, idet ca. 25 pCt. Af de stemmeretskvalificerede ikke benytter sin Ret; og heller ikke var det nødvendigt at gaa til almindelig Stemmeret for at berolige nogen Gjæring i de lavere Lag.³⁶²

Here we can observe a rather interesting antagonism: On the one hand, they advise against the introduction of universal suffrage because it will empower the lower social classes. This crowd of new voters is not able to take responsibility for its decisions, nor is it able to make rational decisions. This in turn, as they assure, will lead to a chaotic mob rule. On the other hand, they claim that the lower social classes never uttered the wish or need to gain suffrage. They base their argument on the claim that 25 percent of those who are entitled to vote did not show up at the last elections. Thinking back on Hirschman, it seems like the conservatives have walked straight into the trap of the ambiguity between the perversity and the futility strategy.

I will demonstrate that with two statements Emil Stang uttered in the Assembly:

1. “[...] saa vil vi se, at i det Øieblik, Valget skal foregaa, styrter om ikke hele denne Masse, saa dog den overveidende Del af den til Valgurnen.”³⁶³
2. “Jeg kan ikke finde, som ogsaa udhævet i Mindretallets Votum, at der kan siges at være nogen væsentlig Trang til en Stemmeretsudvidelse for Øieblikket [...]. Jeg kan ikke fatte eller forstaa, hvorledes, at de, som var udenfor og ikke havde Betingelserne, at de skulde have nogen færdelig sterk Trang, naar de, som har Betingelserne, ikke i større Utdstrækning [...] benytter sig af sin Ret.”³⁶⁴

He claimed that the lower social classes are indifferent towards taking part in political decision-making. At the same time he argues that their taking part will lead to chaos. Perversity: Universal suffrage will lead to chaos and mob rule instead of furthering democracy. Futility: The lower social classes have no interest in gaining suffrage. Most likely they will not show up at the elections. Consequently, to introduce universal suffrage would be without effect. The lower classes are economically dissatisfied, not politically. Well, if its introduction causes no change, why do the conservatives worry so much about the mob rule?

362 Aftenposten (Nr. 298) 1898: 2

363 St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 489

364 Ibid.: 490

Naturally, this question is never really answered. This excursion into reactionary rhetoric outlines the fact that the conservatives used arguments which can be connected with Hirschman's argumentative strategies. It shows us that the conservatives made use of all kinds of arguments to convince themselves and others of the negative consequences of universal suffrage. To underline this conviction they used following argument:

(4.) a “rule of the crowd” will lead to horrible consequences, as is demonstrated in other countries

It is always a clever move to provide some scary examples of cases, in which things actually or seemingly have gone wrong already: other countries.

Den omtalte Misfornøielse og Gjæring i de brede lag synes der i Europa at være stærkest i Lande med almindelig Stemmeret; i Frankrige, Tyskland, Danmark o. Fl., medens den enten maa siges ikke at være tilstede eller i alle Fald kun i mærkbar ringere Grad at være tilstede i Lande med begrænset Stemmeret, som Storbritannien og Irland, Norge og Sverige m. fl.³⁶⁵

We have seen the same argument in the small comment in the New York Times³⁶⁶, in which the readers are invited to look at other European countries if they want to see the negative consequences of universal suffrage. The same argument is used in the section above. We have to be cautious here, universal suffrage as we know it today, had not been fully introduced in any of the countries mentioned above. However, the countries with “seemingly” universal suffrage serve as deterrent examples. Not only in articles issuing the universal suffrage, but also in small comments and stories about upheavals or socialist in Copenhagen, France and other countries.³⁶⁷

The situation was even worse: those countries have the guarantees, the two chamber system, Norway is lacking.³⁶⁸In spite of that, the introduction of universal suffrage had severe consequences for the countries:

Mindretallet maa befrygte, at Stemmeretsregler, som de af Flertallet anbefalede, ikke vil virke veld hverken i Stat eller Kommune, og tror ikke, det med Sandhed kan siges, at de

365 Morgenbladet (Nr. 249) 1898: 1

366 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 2

367 Aftenposten (Nr. 733) 1897: 1: “Men kanskje det ikke er ligesaa klart for alle, at vi gennem en saadan Reform vilde faa en Forfatning endog langt mere ultra-demokratisk og langt fattigere paa Garantier mod Overgreb og mod Vraakast i den politiske Udvikling end de Forfatninger, der anses som Verdens Frieste og mest fremskredende demokratiske. Lad os nævne den engelske, den nordamerikanske, den franske og den Schweiziske.” Aftenposten (Nr. 274) 1898: 1: about Copenhagen

368 Aftenposten (Nr. 748) 1897:1; Aftenposten (Nr. 623) 1898:1

har virket heldigt der, hvor man har prøvet dem, endog under mere konservative Institutioner forøvrigt end Norges.³⁶⁹

How will the lack of guarantees influence the Norwegian government? The message of this argument: They will not go well. Clearly, the aim of the conservative's in the Assembly was to convince the others to vote against male universal suffrage. The same is reflected in the articles in which the journalists try to convince the readers about the negative consequences of male universal suffrage.

369 Morgenbladet (Nr. 249) 1898: 1

7. Conclusion

In this thesis I have shed a light on how conservative newspapers reported about the debate about the introduction of universal suffrage in Norway in 1897 and 1898. The aim was to examine how the conservatives dealt with the debate about universal suffrage and the prospect of a reduced influence in political decision making when being faced with *the crowd of new voters*.

We have seen that the newspaper articles reported critical about universal suffrage. The language was drastic and the reports were very negative. In addition, we have studied the arguments that were used to advise against universal suffrage and identified some main arguments that were used repeatedly. In the following, I will present my results and in a last step connect the theories about the crowd to my empirical findings.

7.1. *A conservative argumentation pattern?*

I examined the news-covering on the day of the passing on April 21st 1898 and the day after. I expected the news-covering to be very dense that day. I made a distinction between plain news-reports and more controversial debate- and commentary articles which were published alongside the reports about the passing. At first, I compared the reports to the protocol in the “Stortingsforhandlinger”. Both newspapers wrote an introductory passage before mostly citing fragments from the protocol. In those passages they described the scenery and shortly commented on the atmosphere in the assembly. The articles primarily cited the arguments of the conservatives. In one case the response to a critical statement was left out. In the report no doubt was left about the side the journalist stood on. I compared the reports with the protocol to confirm that the news-covering was tendentious. Even though that was no big surprise I consider it to be worth mentioning. We know that the newspapers were clearly related to different political parties in 1897 and 1898, much more than they are today.³⁷⁰ Consequently, we could expect critical articles about universal suffrage from *Morgenbladet* and *Aftenposten*. However, it is remarkable that plain news-reports about the voting in the assembly had a clear critical twist.

After the reports I studied the debate- and comment articles that were printed on 21st and 22nd April 1898 along-side the reports. Some articles issued the debate about universal suffrage or were related to it without directly talking about the passing. All articles I examined were critical towards universal suffrage. One article, for instance, predicted that universal suffrage would lead

370 Seip 1992: 26

to “Pøbelherredomme”³⁷¹. To underline this statement an old article from the New York times was cited in which France suffrage legislation were criticized. I suppose that *Morgenbladet* cited a well known, world-famous newspaper to reinforce their own arguments, probably to justify their own view-point. Backed up by this world-famous newspaper, their criticism about universal suffrage seems plausible.

We learned that the conservatives accused the politicians of *Venstre* to refuse a further discussion of the matter. The conservatives stated that it seemed like the decision had already been made. In the protocol we found out that the representative of *Venstre* responded to that accuse by replying that the matter is “uddebatered”³⁷². Obviously the parties were not agreeing on whether the topic was exhausted or not. Even though the conservatives put forward their main concerns and arguments this indicated that we had to take a look at the discussions that preceded the passing.

When reading the articles concerning universal suffrage it became clear that certain arguments were used repeatedly. The arguments Stang and his party-fellows brought forward on the day of the passing could also be found in newspaper articles that were published in 1897 and 1898 The main difference is that the language in the articles is more straight forward and in many cases insulting.

In chapter 5 I collected all the articles I found and studied specific words and arguments that were used repeatedly. The aim was to examine if a certain argumentation pattern of the conservatives could be detected.

When scanning the newspapers to find relevant articles I quickly detected a number of words I had to look after. If an article had headings which, besides “stemmeret”, comprised the words “socialister”, “proletaren” or “radikalerne” it often dealt with the debate about universal suffrage. In subsection 5.1 I showed that already the headings comprised several key-words like “socialisten”, “selvhjulpshed” or “Frygten for massene”. The headings left no doubt about the opinion of the journalist: The introduction of universal suffrage would be unfortunate. The best example might be the heading: “Stemmretten. Skal vi give Løsgjængere og Drankere?”³⁷³. “Universal-suffrage. Are we giving it to tramps and drunkards”? This heading suggest that the state risks to give suffrage to tramps and drunkards by changing the suffrage legislations.

371 *Morgenbladet* (Nr. 253) 1898: 2

372 St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 490

373 *Aftenposten* (Nr. 295) 1898: 1

What was foreshadowed in the heading, was even more drastic and clear found in subsection 5.2. I examined the stylistic devices which were used in articles concerning universal suffrage. The graphic descriptions about the consequences of the introduction of universal suffrage left no doubt about the attitude of the journalists writing those passages. The quotes that were found could be ordered into four categories: First “general warnings”, where we dealt with the catchy metaphor of the state ship sinking in wind and waves. Second, “the new majority”, where socialists and radicals were under suspicion to “med Mængdens Hjælp kryber op paa Madbjerget og forsyner sig selv”³⁷⁴. Third, the proletarian “[...] der lever som Snyltedyret paa Samfundslegemet”³⁷⁵ and whose purpose is to serve as “stemmekvæg”. We learned that the concern of the conservatives was the absence of guarantees. They stated that only guarantees, the two chamber system, could conserve the national safety. And finally “other countries”, where one journalist lamented about the “Selvgodshedens Arvsynd”³⁷⁶ that kept countries from learning from other countries mistakes.

In subsection 5.3 I studied the terms that repeatedly appeared in the different articles. I collected and sorted them into four categories: “the crowd”, “socialists and radicals”, “proletarians” and “hazards”. The first category, the crowd, represents the anticipated outcome or consequence of the introduction of universal suffrage: the reckless, tyrannic rule of the crowd. The second category, the socialists and radicals, represents the characterization of the leaders of the crowd: the socialists and radicals with their corrupt leadership and rotten convictions. In one article they were suspected to crawl up the food-pile to feast on it. The third category, the proletarian, represents the 'new voters' from the conservative's point of view: They have no right to gain universal suffrage because they are most likely lazy and unpredictable. Finally, the fourth category, the hazard, represents the prohibited outcome of a crowd rule. In this category all concerns are collected. We learned that universal suffrage is said to lead to the rule of the crowd or an unruly majority of the socialists, radicals and proletarians.

After having examined the headings, terms and stylistic devices, I finally made the attempt to reveal a “hidden” argumentation pattern in chapter 6. After having considered my findings I suggest one “possible” conservative argumentation pattern which went as follows:

374 Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende 1897

375 Aftenposten (Nr. 295) 1898: 1; Aftenposten (Nr. 737) 1897: 1

376 Morgenbladet (Nr. 134) 1898: 1

The introduction of universal suffrage will lead to or leads to (after April 21. 1898) the authority of the crowd. A tyrannic, chaotic and reckless majority.³⁷⁷ How come? By giving universal suffrage to “Radikalerne”³⁷⁸, “Socialisterne”³⁷⁹ and “Proletaren”³⁸⁰. Those three are often mentioned in one set as if their members incorporated the uselessness and danger for society. Those groups are described with several unflattering attributes: from being drunks and unwilling to work, “arbejder en Dag og drikker to”³⁸¹, to being a hazard for society because of their evil instincts and laziness. This implies that the opponents would give every decent citizens the right to vote, but that there are too many indecent individuals that would get the right to vote as well, which the politicians can not allow. This would lead to “plumpt og hensynsløst Majoritetstyranni”³⁸² and “Overgreb fra et magtlystent Flertals Side”³⁸³.

There is one thing I would like to note concerning the argumentation pattern I attempt to uncover. I am aware of the fact that this is a controversial claim. Therefore I suggest to level my claim. I can state that I have found main arguments that seem to appear in a certain pattern. “The” argumentation pattern of the conservatives, however, is rather a construction that resulted from the categorizing of the findings I made. To presume that the conservative's have followed a certain pattern is a bit far fetched.

7.2. Albert O. Hirschman and the rhetoric of reaction

After having examined how the conservative newspapers reported about universal-suffrage we have seen that the same terms and phrases were used over and over again to advise against it. In addition, the arguments that were used left no doubt about the fact that the conservatives were highly opposed to universal suffrage. How can we connect the main arguments to Hirschman's findings about reactionary rhetoric?

In one article the journalist implies that everyone gaining suffrage is a tramp or drunkard because every decent worker already has the right to vote. A similar example is the argument about the lower classes indifference concerning political decision-making. Other articles, in contrast, advised against universal suffrage because they feared the marauding crowd to take over the

377 “Plump og hensynsløst Majoritetstyranni” Aftenposten (Nr. 153) 1897: 1

378 Aftenposten (Nr. 732) 1897: 1

379 Aftenposten (Nr. 733) 1897: 1

380 Aftenposten (Nr. 295) 1898: 1

381 Aftenposten (Nr. 737) 1897: 1

382 Aftenposten (Nr. 153) 1897: 1

383 Aftenposten (Nr. 733) 1897: 1

country.

Here we can make an interesting observation: The two last arguments fail logically. If the lower class is indifferent concerning political decision-making and they are suspected not to make use of the right to vote, why would the introduction of universal suffrage be hazardous? Why would one hesitate to introduce universal suffrage if it has no effect on the outcome of the elections? Assuming that the latter statement is true, the conservatives have no reason to be concerned about the a marauding crowd.

Hirschman's revelation of reactionary argumentative strategies can gives us an indication on how to interpret the ambivalence of some conservative arguments. With Hirschman's strategy we can reveal some classic perversity and futility arguments. For example the claim that the yearning for political participation with the aim to gain justice would automatically turn to injustice. The classic perversity-strategy. The jeopardy strategy seems to be hidden but we can assume that it is present in the warning of the crowd, the mob rule and the violence which were vividly described in the newspaper articles. At the bottom of that lies the message: Why should we risk our national safety by changing legislations if this opens the doors for upheavels and turmoils? We studied how the new voters where described we found that they were suspected to be "Løsgjængere og Drankere"³⁸⁴ dangerous, lazy and that they had no interest in political participation. The latter is an argument that belongs to the futility strategy and is related to the claim that the "normal hard working laborer" already has the right to vote. This claim indicates that the changes would only be "cosmetic"³⁸⁵, or in worst case include the lowest of the low of society.

There is a second aspect to Hirschman's work. His work can help us to shed a light on the question about to what extent the conservatives were anti-democratic. To understand this we have to recall Hirschman's main point. He claims that the strategies he describes are methods with which conservatives reject the approaches of reaching a certain goal. This way of arguing comprises that reactionaries basically agree on the goal but point out that the plans to reach it will not work out. They then reject the proposal by stating that implementing the changes will cause the reverse (perversity), nothing is changing (futility), or the aim will be reached but at a much higher cost than its worth (jeopardy). Transferred to our case this would mean that the

384 Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende 1897

385 Hirschman 1991

conservatives are not opposed to parliamentarianism and democracy, but that they doubt that the introduction of universal suffrage will further the democratization process. So far to Hirschman's strategies.

The interesting question is: are the conservatives agreeing on the aim, namely democratization? I doubt that. In fact, we seem to face a reverse situation of “The end justifies the means”³⁸⁶.

Neither in the articles I read, nor in the protocol did I find convincing evidence that would verify the assumption that the conservatives wanted to further the democratization process but were unsure about the procedure of reaching this aim. One argument which indicates the consideration that “universal suffrage could be a good solution” is the argument which points out the missing guarantees. However, even this argument is used to depict other countries disturbing fate after having introduced universal suffrage. The guarantees are brought up in this context because other countries even have the guarantees Norway is lacking. Consequently, despite guarantees universal suffrage is seen to be a hazard. The argument that almost every “decent laborer” has suffrage also contradicts the assumption that the conservatives wanted to further democratization.

I suggest that the conservatives were more “reactionary” than the reactionaries Hirschman described. However, we should recall Francis Sejersted's explanation concerning the conservative party's attitude towards democratization and universal suffrage in subsection 3.5. He suggests that *Høyre* was not anti-democratic but wanted to broaden political participation by spreading property instead of changing the suffrage legislations. He explains that the party was still intertwined with the *Embedsmannsstat* and based its ideologies and understanding on the Constitution of Eidsvoll. I have found one quote in the protocol that enhances Sejersted's assumption:

Vor Pligt er at give – som vore Fædre paa Eidsvold tænkte at give det – en Statsforfatning, der kan lede til en for Landet i Tidernes Længde udover Aarene lykkebringende Styrelse, og det var ikke dengang deres Mening og kan ikke nu være vort Udgangspunkt, at disse Spørgsmaal forenkles derigjennem, at alle Mennesker har Ret til at være stemmeberettiget, saa der er ikke mere at snakke om.³⁸⁷

Stang talks about the duty they were given by their fathers in Eidsvoll. The quote confirms that the party *Høyre* was intertwined with the old *Embedsmannstat* and the Constitution of 1814.

386 “Der Zweck heiligt die Mittel”

387 St. meld. nr. 7 1898: 488

However, it also reveals that the conservatives did not deem every citizen worth of gaining the right to vote. This corresponds very well to the arguments we found in the newspaper articles. A lot of articles deal with the question whether and who should be gaining universal suffrage. A fair share of the articles study and describe the 'unworthy new voters'. This brings us back to 'the others' and how they are dealt with. However, before I turn to Le Bon, I would like to level my criticism concerning Sejersted.

Based on the finding I made, especially in the newspaper articles, I suggest that some conservatives, hence also member of Høyre, were more anti-democratic than one would expect today. However, due to the limited empirical data I collected from the sources, I cannot claim to be able to provide a complete understanding of Høyres convictions concerning universal suffrage. First of all, I have only examined a fraction of articles concerning the debate about universal suffrage. The debate was carried out over more than a decade and various meetings in the assembly preceded the final passing. All of them could have been relevant. Due to the limited length of my thesis I had to make a choice. It seemed reasonable to concentrate on the news-covering of the debate that preceded the voting on April 21st 1898. There I expected to find an overview over all concerns and arguments that had been brought forward in the course of the years. Consequently, even though I have covered only a fraction of the news covering about universal suffrage on the whole - the debate on the day of the passing and the newspaper articles that were published in 1897 and 1898 – it is possible to make some evaluations concerning the view-point of the conservatives on this basis. Therefore, I stick to the claim that the conservatives were more “backwards” in terms of democratization than Sejersted likes to admit. The language and the consequently negative reporting in the conservative newspapers speak for themselves.

7.3. Gustave Le Bon's description of the crowd reflected in some description of the 'new voters' in Norway

Le Bon was highly opposed to universal suffrage. He based his refusal on the conviction that universal suffrage would lead to a mob-rule. We just have to recall how he described the popular mind. He stated that every decision that is taken by a crowd is worse than a decision taken by an individual. Even in the parliament. This is an expression of an anti-democratic attitude. He could not approve of universal suffrage because that would raise the numbers of participants in political decision making. According to his theory crowd-decisions can never be wise decisions. The conservatives are in good company here. The anti-democratic tendencies plus the crowd-

terminology they use remind us on Le Bon's theory about the popular mind.

When we examine the words that were used against *the new voters* we find parallels to Le Bon's understanding of the crowd. Terms like “mob rule” (Pøbelherredømme³⁸⁸), a “tyrannic majority” (Majoritetstyranni³⁸⁹) and “the fear for the crowd” (Frygten for massene³⁹⁰) remind us on Le Bon's description of the crowd as a hazard for society. Le Bon provides us with a theory about the characteristics of the crowd, which are reflected in the conservative's descriptions of the new voters. Hence, I suggest that *the new voters* represent the crowd phenomenon in 1898 in Norway.

Le Bon's description of the crowd has given us a theoretical basis: How the crowd was perceived in the end of the 19th century by Le Bon and how this again is reflected in how conservative politicians perceived 'the crowd' which threatened their egalitarian position in society in the turmoils that accompanied the development towards democracy and parliamentarianism.

However, we should not be too naive. There is one significant difference between the philosopher Le Bon and the conservative politicians of the party Høyre in Norway. The conservatives had no choice after the proposal was passed and universal suffrage was introduced. They had to stick with it. It might have been another story if they had won the parliamentarianism-conflict in 1884, well this ship had sailed. They had to accept the final passing and play along with it. Even though they criticized the new suffrage legislation and used anti-crowd phrases to describe *the new voters*, which remind us on Le Bon, they did not really fear the crowd to take over. It seems likely that they just wanted to make a point. They were opposed to universal suffrage because they had already lost their majority. The introduction of universal suffrage would only diminish their chances of winning the next elections. Today we see that this concern was not confirmed. The party had to adapt to the democratization process and they succeeded in doing so. They still exist as a party and won the elections in 2013.

Le Bon, in contrast, was a witness of the Paris Commune³⁹¹. He had seen *the crowd* in rampant action. Most likely he perceived *the crowd* as a threat or at least had severe concerns regarding to his conviction that the nature of the crowd would prohibit any good coming from it. However, he designed a theory about the rise and fall of civilization that is inevitable. The theory is circular,

388 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 2

389 Aftenposten (Nr. 153) 1897: 1

390 Morgenbladet (Nr. 253) 1898: 2

391 Cf.: Martenstein 2011; Henrichs 1983

the crowd, the society can not escape. Maybe Le Bon dreamed of Plato's Philosophers state³⁹² and the rule of the wise men. A nice utopia.

7.4. Sloterdijk's "Genius go home" attitude – reactionary rhetoric today – Is the fear for the crowd a shared reactionary belief?

Finally we turn to the very beginning of this thesis: The motivation that was rooted in the interest for today's development concerning 'the crowd', or 'crowd-phenomenons'. I suggest that Margreth Olin's sentence about 'the fear for the other' is relevant in debates today as much as in debates 115 years ago. Does the fear of *the obscure other* play a role whenever a group of people is entering a public space for the first time.

To answer that we have to turn back to Sloterdijk. He is an example of a modern philosopher who dealt with a modern form of crowd-phenomenon: The mass-media. Sloterdijk builds a bridge from the past, Le Bon, to the present. He lamented about how the "mass-society" takes over and oppresses any kind of difference. *Genius go home* exemplifies the masses contempt of the elite. Sloterdijk complained that the media in the modern society, the mass-media, is a startled chicken pile with an equalizer-spleen. Sloterdijk's description of the modern mass-media crowd only differs slightly from Le Bon's crowd. The mass-media is unified in mind and less materialized, but already Le Bon mentioned the possibility of a crowd forming itself by sharing the same thought. Is it surprising that Assheuer accuses Sloterdijk for developing a Zarathustra-project: Nietzsche genius loner who failed to enlighten mankind, or should we say 'the crowd'?

The conservatives in Norway in 1898, Gustave Le Bon in France in the late 19s and Peter Sloterdijk in 2000, they have one thing in common: The 'fear' of the elite for the marauding crowd of the under privileged. Two terms have to be specified: the fear and the elite versus the crowd. First, I suppose, that Le Bon, the conservatives in Norway and Sloterdijk are representatives of a higher social class. They, the elite, are pondering about the muddy ground of society, about the underprivileged, the grass roots. They come to a similar conclusion: The crowd could be a potential threat might be a hazard for them. A threat to their privileges, their possessions or their safety.

392 Platon "Politeia"

7.5. *Challenges and perspectives*

When I began to study history I believed that history repeated itself. I was wrong. However, I never came to terms with the relativistic attitude stating that we know nothing for certain. To doubt that reality exists erases the ground for reasoning. I am in good company here. Various modern historiographical works³⁹³ have come to the conclusion that relativism and skepticism will not only devalue historical knowledge but also historical research itself. Neglecting the possibility of finding truth neglects the possibility of learning from history. To learn from history is, I believe, the most important task history has. At least humanity could learn from history even though I often wonder if they will ever take the chance to do so. What we can learn is that history, the past, can tell us something about our present.³⁹⁴ Historians raise questions about the past that are motivated by their present. And so did I.

I admit that especially the second aim of my thesis was quite ambitious. First, because I was determined to “build a bridge” from the 19th century challenge of democratic development until today, to demonstrate the continuity of thoughts in a historical perspective. The continuity of *the fear of the obscure other*. Second, because I used a small case study, the debate about male universal suffrage in Norway, and attempt to fit it into a general theoretical construct: My theoretical ground, the philosophic pamphlets about the crowd from Le Bon and Sloterdijk and the reactionary rhetoric work from Hirschman.

This method holds some risks. It is always tempting to stress the interpretation of a theory to make it fit to the empirical data, or vice versa. I tried to avoid that by using the theories as an orientation. Hence, I compare parts of the empirical data to parts of the theory. When examining the argumentation pattern I claim that some of the conservative's arguments correlate to the perversity-, jeopardy- and futility strategy. However, I do not claim that the objections of the conservatives were solely rhetoric.

Sloterdijk's work about the crowd was the most challenging theory. He criticizes the mass-media while I researched on two newspapers articles from 1897 and 1898. The challenge here is the question if those two are even comparable. One could criticize me for desperately clinging to the theory of Sloterdijk just because it comprises *the crowd* and *media*. One could ask: is this link to

393 Ex: Cf. Appleby & Hunt & Jacob 1995: 10; Munslow 2003

394 Appleby & Hunt & Jacob 1995: 3

the present merely symbolic? I shall reply by referring to following statement about historiography: “[...] what historians do best is to make connections with the past in order to illuminate the problem of the present and the potential of the future.”³⁹⁵ I looked at today's media with all it's challenges and different platforms, not least, the internet. My first question was: how does this influence our debate-culture? My second: can we find a comparable event in the past? I suspect that the debates in the Norwegian newspapers *Aftenposten* and *Morgenbladet* were at least as heated as some debates today. To investigate that, one would have to write a comparative study about the differences and parallels of today's debates in mass-media and debates before the media went viral. This would definitely reach beyond the scope of my thesis.

No matter what we discuss today, *the crowd* seems to be a re-appearing phenomenon. We just have to recall discussions about the mass-media, mass-migration or the masses on the internet. There is one sentence Margreth Olin said in her documentary which I would like to recall in this context: “Jeg er redd for det som skjer med oss når vi ikke lenger er i stand til å se det enkelte mennesket.”³⁹⁶ This is relevant for today's discussions about *the others* as much as it was relevant for the debate about universal suffrage in Norway where *the new voters* resembled *the others*. Maybe *the crowd* is always relevant when we examine discussions about *the others*?

Should we fear *the fear of the crowd*?

395 Appleby & Hunt & Jacob 1995: 9

396 De andre 2012

8. Bibliography

Sources

St. meld. nr. 7 (1898). Kongeriget Norges Storthings Forhandlinger (Syvende Del): Stortingstidende: *Indstilling fra Konstitutionskomiteen ang. De paa Storthinget i 1895 fremsatte Forslag til Forandringer i Grundlovensbetingelser for Stemmeret, beh. 485-509. Sanktion 773.* Kristiania: Centraltrykkeriet. Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digistorting_1898_part7_vol-a

St. meld. nr. 2 (1898). Storthings proposition Nr. 84: Proposition til Grundlovsbestemmelse angaaende Forandring af Grundlovens §§ 52 a og 53 a. 1897-1898 (pp. 1897-1898). Kristiania: Centraltrykkeriet. Available at:

Stortingsforhandlinger. Meld. St. (1898). *Møde den 21. April.* (pp. 485-510).

Stortingsmeldinger. (1898) Nr. 84 Proposition til Grundlovsbestemmelse angaaende Forandring av Grundloven §§ 52 a, 53 a. = Sth. Prp. No. 84. (1898.) pp. (1897-1898).

Literature

Appleby, Joyce & Hunt, Lynn & Jacob, Margaret. (1995). *Telling the Truth about History.* New York/London: W.W.NORTON&COMPANY.

Berg Eriksen, Trond. (1992). Frihet og demokrati i Norge. In: Segelcke, Nanna (Red.), *Norge Ad Notam*, (pp. 61-72). Oslo: Aventura Forlag A/S.

Bjørnson, Bjørnstjerne. (1881). *Frykten for Flertallet. Tale af Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson ved Folkemødet paa Hadeland d. 19de Aug. 1881.* Kristiania: Selskabet for Folkeskrifters Udbredelse.

Canetti, Elias. (1960). *Masse und Macht.* Hamburg: Claassen.

Dyrvik, Ståle. (2005). *Året 1814.* Oslo: det Norske Samlaget.

Halvorsen, Marit. (2005). Kapittel 12 1905: legitimitet, demokrati og den alminnelige rettsoppfatning. In: Mestag, Ola & Michalsen, Dag (Red.). *Rett, nasjon, union. Den svensk-norske unionens rettslige historie 1814-1905*, (pp. 277-309). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Hirschman, Albert O. (1991) . *The Rhetoric of Reaction. Perversity Futility Jeopardy.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hommerstad, Marthe. (2010). Bonden og stemmeretten – embetsmennene og syne på bøndene. In: Sandvik, Hilde (Red.), *Demokratisk teorie og historisk praksis. Forutsetninger for folkestyre 1750 1850*, (pp. 105-122). Oslo: Scandinavian Academic Press.

Høeg, Tom Arbo. (Red.), (1974). *Norske Aviser 1963 – 1969.* Oslo: Universitetsbibliotekets

Hustrykkeri.

Hydle, Magnus. (1910). *Midlerne: Høires, Samlingspartiets og 'de frisindedes' agitation*, Kristiania: NORGES VENSTREFORENING. Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digibok_2008040804105

Kaartvedt, Alf. (1984). Drømmen om borgerlig samling 1884-1918. Høyres historie 1. In: Sejersted Francis (Red.), *Høyres historie* (Vol. 1-4). Oslo: Cappelens Forlag.

Kaartvedt, Alf. (1956). *Kampen mot parlamentarisme 1880-1884*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Le Bon, Gustave. (1922). *Psychologie der Massen*. Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag.
Original: *La Psychologie des foules*, (1895).

Mestad, Ola & Michalsen, Dag. (2005). Kapittel 1 Rett, nasjon, union 1814-1905. In: Mestag, Ola & Michalsen, Dag (Red.). *Rett, nasjon, union. Den svensk-norske unionens rettslige historie 1814-1905*, (pp. 19-32). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Midlerne, Magnus. (1910). *Høires, Samlingspartiets og 'de frisindedes' agitation*, Kristiania.

Montesquieu, Charles Louis. (1748). *De l'esprit des loix*. Genève: Chatelain.

Moscovici, Serge. (1985). *The age of the crowd*. Cambridge: University Press.

Munslow, Alan. (2003). *The New History*. London: Pearson Longman.

Nordby, Trond. (2010). *Grunnlov og styreform. Norge 1814-2010*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Nordby, Trond. (2004). *I politikkens sentrum. Variasjoner i Stortingets makt 1814-2004*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Nordby, Trond. (1992). Vårt politiske system. Statsstyrets utvikling fra 1814 til i dag. In: Segelcke, Nanna (Red.), *Norge Ad Notam* (pp. 115-125). Oslo: Aventura Forlag A/S.

Rousseau, Jean.Jacques. (1762). *Du Contrat Social ou Principes du Droit Politique*. Amsterdam: Marc. Michel Rey.

Seip, Anne-Lise. (1999). Nasjonsbygging - folkestyre – idékamp. Utviklingslinjer på 1800-tallet. In: J. E. Hansen (Red.), *Norsk tro og tanke, bd. 3*, (pp. 327-336). Oslo: Tano-Aschehoug. Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digibok_2010060103073

Seip, Helge. (1992). Pressen, eierforholdene og demokratiet. In: Holand, Johan E. & Larssen, Svein Døyle & Julsrud, Ottar. *Presse med mening. Den Konservative Presses Forening 1892-1992*, (pp. 25-35). Askim: Østfold Trykkeri A.s.

Seip, Jens Arup. (1997). Utsikt over Norges historie. Tidsrommet ca. 1850-1884. Tidsrommet ca. 1850-1884. Trondheim: Gyldendal.

Sejersted, Francis. (2001). *Demokrati og rettsstat*. Oslo: Pax Forlag A/S.

Sejersted, Francis. (1993). Hvordan og hvorfor lese Høyres historie. In: Brende, Børge et al. (Red.), *Politikk og ansvar. Debattskrift til Kåre Willom 3. oktober 1993*, (pp. 143-151). Oslo: Schibsted.

Slagstad, Rune. (2001). *De nasjonale strateger*. Oslo: Pax Forlag A/S.

Sloterdijk, Peter. (2000). *Die Verachtung der Massen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Sloterdijk, Peter. (2005). *Masseforakt – kampen mellom høy og lav kultur i moderne samfunn*. Trondheim: N.W.Damm&SØN AS.

Storm, Halvor. (1929). *Unionspolitikken og Høyre*, Oslo: Steenske. Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digibok_2006120801050

Tjønneland, E. (2005). Innledning. In: Sloterdijk, Peter. *Masseforakt – kampen mellom høy og lav kultur i moderne samfunn*. Trondheim: N.W.Damm&SØN AS.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. (2009). *Also sprach Zarathustra*. (2. edition). Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.

Newspaper articles

Aftenposten. (1898, 20.04). Stemmeretten. Skal vi give det til Løsgjængere og Drankere. (Nr. 295, p. 1). Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_aftenposten_null_null_18980420_39_295_2

Aftenposten. (1898, 21.04). Stemmeretten Stortingets Dagsmøde. Almindelig Stemmeret bifaldt med 78 mod 36 St. (Nr. 298, p. 1). Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_aftenposten_null_null_18980421_39_298_4

Aftenposten. (1898, 21.04). Stortinget Almindelig Stemmeret. (Nr. 298, p. 2). Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_aftenposten_null_null_18980421_39_298_4

Aftenposten. (1898, 22.04). Stortinget. Almindelig Stemmeret. (Nr. 299, p. 1). Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_aftenposten_null_null_18980422_39_299_1

Aftenposten. (1897, 01.03). Den Almindelig Stemmeret. Et belærende Exempel. (Nr. 153, p. 1). Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_aftenposten_null_null_18970301_38_153_1

Aftenposten. (1897, 04.09). Den Almindelig Stemmeret. En uheldig Henvisning. (Nr. 623, p. 1). Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_aftenposten_null_null_18970904_38_623_2

Aftenposten. (1897, 12.10). Almindelig Stemmeret. Et Monstrum af en Fortfatning. (Nr. 733, p. 1). Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_aftenposten_null_null_18971012_38_733_3

Aftenposten. (1897, 14.10). Hvem vil faa godt av almindelig Stemmeret? (Nr. 737, p. 1). Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_aftenposten_null_null_18971014_38_737_1

Aftenposten. (1897, 07.10). Socialisterne og Venstre. Da de fand hinanden. (Nr. 719, p.2.). Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_aftenposten_null_null_18971007_38_719_2

Aftenposten. (1897, 12.10). Den almindelig Stemmeret. (Nr. 732, p.1). Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_aftenposten_null_null_18971012_38_732_2

Aftenposten. (1897, 18.10). Politiske Fredsutsigter?. (Nr. 748, p.1). Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_aftenposten_null_null_18971018_38_748_1

Aftenposten. (1898, 13.04). En Parallel i Samfundspolitik. (Nr. 274, p.1). Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_aftenposten_null_null_18980413_39_274_2

Morgenbladet. (1898, 05.05). Af Andres Erfaring. (Nr. 289, p. 1). Available at: http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?modus=sok&vis_startnummer=337408&beh_aargang=1898&heftenummer=288&utgave=&katalog_http=&katalog_fil=&side1=no-nb_digavisside_337408&side=2&publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=05&dag=04&hefte_urn=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_95314&vis_tiffbilde=JA& neste+hefte.x=9& neste+hefte.y=7

Morgenbladet. (1898, 22.03). Kursen er rigtig. Faarte upaaklagelig. (Nr. 181, p. 2). Available at: http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=03&dag=22&side=2

Morgenbladet. (1898, 03.03). Folkefrihed og Stemmeret. (Nr. 134, p. 1). Available at: http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=03&dag=03

Morgenbladet. (1898, 19.03). Kur mod Socialisme. (Nr. 174, p. 1). Available at: http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=03&dag=19

Morgenbladet. (1898, 07.04). Franske Valgforhold. (Nr. 223, p. 1). Available at: http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=07

Morgenbladet. (1898, 14.04). Selvhjulpne Mænd. (Nr. 237, p.2). Available at: http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=15&side=2

Morgenbladet (1898, 16.04). Uvidenhed og Uærlighed. (Nr. 241, p. 1). Available at:
[http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?
modus=sok&vis_startnummer=337239&beh_aargang=1898&heftenummer=240&utgave=&katalog_http=&katalog_fil=&side1=no-nb_digavisside_337239&side=1&publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=16&hefte_urn=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_95263&vis_tiffbilde=JA& neste+hefte.x=13& neste+hefte.y=11](http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?modus=sok&vis_startnummer=337239&beh_aargang=1898&heftenummer=240&utgave=&katalog_http=&katalog_fil=&side1=no-nb_digavisside_337239&side=1&publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=16&hefte_urn=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_95263&vis_tiffbilde=JA& neste+hefte.x=13& neste+hefte.y=11)

Morgenblade. (1898, 19.04). Gameldagse Folk. (Nr. 249, p. 1). Available at:
[http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?
modus=sok&vis_startnummer=337270&beh_aargang=1898&heftenummer=248&utgave=&katalog_http=&katalog_fil=&side1=no-nb_digavisside_337270&side=2&publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=19&hefte_urn=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_95271&vis_tiffbilde=JA& neste+hefte.x=13& neste+hefte.y=12](http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?modus=sok&vis_startnummer=337270&beh_aargang=1898&heftenummer=248&utgave=&katalog_http=&katalog_fil=&side1=no-nb_digavisside_337270&side=2&publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=19&hefte_urn=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_95271&vis_tiffbilde=JA& neste+hefte.x=13& neste+hefte.y=12)

Morgenbladet (1898, 20.04). Paa Tærskelen. (Nr. 252, p. 2). Available at:
[http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?
modus=sok&vis_startnummer=337281&beh_aargang=1898&heftenummer=252&utgave=&katalog_http=&katalog_fil=&side1=no-nb_digavisside_337281&side=1&publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=20&hefte_urn=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_95275&vis_tiffbilde=JA& neste+side.x=17& neste+side.y=19](http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?modus=sok&vis_startnummer=337281&beh_aargang=1898&heftenummer=252&utgave=&katalog_http=&katalog_fil=&side1=no-nb_digavisside_337281&side=1&publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=20&hefte_urn=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_95275&vis_tiffbilde=JA& neste+side.x=17& neste+side.y=19)

Morgenbladet. (1898, 20.04). Manglerne. (Nr. 250, p. 1). Available at:
[http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?
publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=20](http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=20)

Morgenbladet. (1898, 21.04). Pligt og Ret. (Nr. 253, p. 2). Available at:
[http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?
publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=21&side=2](http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=21&side=2)

Morgenbladet (1898, 21.04). Frygten for Masserne. (Nr. 253, p. 1). Available at:
[http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?
publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=21](http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=21)

Morgenbladet. (1898, 22.04). Stemmeretsdebatten i Stortinget. (Nr. 256, p. 1). Available at:
[http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?
publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=22&side=1](http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&modus=sok&tittel=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=22&side=1)

Morgenbladet. (1898, 21.04). Vedtaget. (Nr. 225, p. 2). Available at:
[http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?
modus=sok&vis_startnummer=337291&beh_aargang=1898&heftenummer=255&utgave=&katalog_http=&katalog_fil=&side1=no-nb_digavisside_337291&side=1&publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&tittel=URN:NBN:no-](http://www.nb.no/avis/programvare/vis_sider.php?modus=sok&vis_startnummer=337291&beh_aargang=1898&heftenummer=255&utgave=&katalog_http=&katalog_fil=&side1=no-nb_digavisside_337291&side=1&publisert=&vis_tiffbilde=JA&tittel=URN:NBN:no-)

nb_digavishefte_8&aarstall=1898&maaned=04&dag=21&hefte_urn=URN:NBN:no-nb_digavishefte_95278&vis_tiffbilde=JA& neste+side.x=13&neste+side.y=13

Nordre Bergenshus Amtstidende. (1898, 18.09). Skal Socialisterne blive Herrer i Landet? Available at: http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-nb_digavis_nordrebergenhusamtstidende_null_null_18970918_24_38_1

Sloterdijk, Peter. (1999). Regeln für den Menschenpark, *Die Zeit*, Nr. 37.

Assheuer, Thomas. (1999). Das Zarathustra-Projekt, *Die Zeit*, Nr. 36.

Martenstein, Harald. (2011, 14.11). Der Sog der Masse. *Die Zeit*. Available at : <http://www.zeit.de/2011/46/DOS-Mainstream>

Henrichs, Benjamin. (1983). Psychologie der Massen. *Die Zeit*. (Nr. 42). Available at: <http://www.zeit.de/1983/42/psychologie-der-massen/komplettansicht>

Hjerpset-Østlie, Nina. (2014 , 27.06-03.07). Den blå blå regjeringen har til nå vært passive og helt uten profil i innvandringspolitikken. *Morgenbladet*. p.6.

Stærk, Bjørn. (2014, 20.10). Svensk innvandringsdebatt trenger mer ytringsvennlighet. *Aftenposten*. Available at: <http://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/kronikker/Essay-Svensk-innvandringsdebatt-trenger-mer-ytringsvennlighet--7747362.html>

Obsvik, Andreas Hadsel. (2012, 26.10). Dette er ikkje Margreths personlege politiske prosjekt. *NRK-P3*. Available at: <http://p3.no/filmpolitiet/2012/10/dette-er-ikkje-margreths-personlege-politiske-prosjekt/>

Dahl, Kjetil Brorson. (2014, 20.10). Preistorpet har meldt seg ut av Fremskrittspartiet. *Østlendingen*. Available at: <http://www.ostlendingen.no/nyheter/sol%C3%B8r/peistorpet-har-meldt-seg-ut-av-fremskrittspartiet-1.8626033>

Jupskås, Stein Halvor. (2013, 04.09). Nytt skritt mot lokalt tiggerforbud. *Stavanger Aftenbladet*. Available at: <http://www.aftenbladet.no/nyheter/lokalt/stavanger/Nytt-skritt-mot-lokalt-tiggerforbud-3500422.html>

Brandett, Bjørn-Martin. (2011, 21.02.) Nivået på ulvedebatten når nye høyder. *Østlendingen*. Available at: <http://www.ostlendingen.no/nyheter/nivaet-pa-ulvedebatten-nar-nye-hoyder-1.6044618>

Hagen, Rune. (2014, 09.10). Nekter å ha skutt etter ulv. *Østlendingen*. Available at: <http://www.ostlendingen.no/nyheter/nekter-for-a-ha-skutt-etter-ulv-1.8612680>

Internetpages

Berg, Ole T. (2014). Proletar. *Store Norske Leksikon*. Available at: <https://snl.no/proletar>

Mardal, Magnus A. (2009). Myrmenn. *Store Norske Leksikon*. Available at: <https://snl.no/myrmenn>

Weidling, Tor Ragnar. (2014). Christian Fredrik. *Store Norske Leksikon*. Available at: https://snl.no/Christian_Frederik

Teigen, Karl Halvor (2005-2007). Gustave Le Bon. *Store Norske Leksikon*. Available at: https://snl.no/Gustave_Le_Bon

Oxford Dictionary. (2014). *Crowd*. Available at: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/crowd?q=crowd>

Olin, Margreth. (2012). *De andre*. [Trailer]. Available at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FBhhZTjpvVE>

Sloterdijk, Peter. Vita. Available at 15.11.2014: (<http://www.petersloterdijk.net/vita>)

Skaarer, Camilla Åse & (edited by) Kåss, Ingrid Wrede. (2013). *Stemmeretten på Stortinget*. Available at 07.11.2014: http://www.stemmerett.no/tema/ilddap/Utviklingen_i_Stortinget.html

Koldstad, Eva (1963). *Utsnitt av lovforslag, komite-innstillinger og debatter i Stortinget om Stemmerett for kvinner*. AIS O. FREDR. ARNESEN BOK-OG AKCIDENSTRYKKERI. Available at 07.11.2014: https://www.stortinget.no/Global/pdf/Diverse/Stemmerett%20for%20kvinner_hefte_1963_III.pdf?epslanguage=no

VG-Debatt. (2011). *EU vil ha felles innvandrings- og asylpolitikk*. Available at: <http://vgd.no/samfunn/norge-og-eu/tema/1654940/tittel/eu-vil-ha-felles-innvandrings-og-asylpolitikk/innlegg/31787477/>