

This file was downloaded from BI Open Archive, the institutional repository (open access) at BI Norwegian Business School <http://brage.bibsys.no/bi>.

It contains the accepted and peer reviewed manuscript to the article cited below. It may contain minor differences from the journal's pdf version.

Bang, T. (2017). Targeting crowds: A study of how the Norwegian Labour Party adapted Nazi rhetorical methodology. *Public Relations Review*, 43(3), 635-643

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.02.014>

Copyright policy of *Elsevier*, the publisher of this journal.

The author retains the right to post the accepted author manuscript on open web sites operated by author or author's institution for scholarly purposes, with an embargo period of 0-36 months after first view online.

<http://www.elsevier.com/journal-authors/sharing-your-article#>

This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this paper is to shed light on similarities between propaganda practices in the parallel worlds of the 1930s labour movement in Scandinavia, with emphasis on Norway, and the NSDAP, the German Nazi-Party, and how the Norwegian Labour Party knowingly utilized methods developed by the NSDAP.

Background

Following the 1917 Bolshevik revolution, labour leaders expected a European revolutionary wave. Germany had undergone a series of revolution-like political changes between 1918 and 1933. The most dramatic, by far, was that of Hitler's NSDAP, which initially drew support from wide segments of the capitalism-skeptical Left (Benz 2009; Klee 2003; Maser 1981).

Strive for the Working Class Vote

In 1930, the Norwegian "working class", was narrowly defined as "industrial workers" and encompassed only about 27.5 % of the social stratum that defined the labour movement's primary target. (www.ssb.no, 30th November 2014; Granat 1934). The defining persona, in movement norms and sentiment, was nevertheless a male manual worker. Peasants and coastal fishermen, many of whom impoverished, owned their means of production and were generally not willing to hand over land and cattle, tools and vessels to co-operatives.

Scandinavian labour parties' goal was political power through democratic elections. Their objectives were to 1) attract voters, and 2) prevent voting for totalitarian parties. Such circumstances necessitated a persuasive communication strategy, capable of turning class brethren into sympathizers and voters.

Research Questions

While pre-1930 social-democratic communication had emphasized a rhetoric of logos, i.e. the statistical and societal rationale of applied Marxism, Nazi communication tactics focused on pathos: entertaining crowds by one-liners and slogans. Judging by period literature, it is evident that there are methodological similarities between 1930s Scandinavian labour movement rhetorical strategies and those of the NSDAP. The research questions for this paper are therefore:

How can the Norwegian labour movement's 1930s propaganda be traced to NSDAP methodology? And, what is the role of the crowd in period communication strategy?

The field of research is tracing potential influence on the 1930s Scandinavian labour movement rhetorical strategies.

Key Concepts and Literature Review

The 1930s' Norwegian, and Swedish, literature on intentional communication is anecdotic as well as applied, and based in social science and psychology. From the 1920s, theories of social psychology were applied in intentional communication theory and methods. Such means of persuasion, labelled "propaganda", and/or "advertising", is a key concept here.

A second concept, "crowd", appears in late 19th and early 20th century psychological research (Le Bon, 1895; Trotter, 1917; Sombart, 1925; Moe, 1934). "Crowd" was subsequently adapted by scholars and strategists embedded in political discourse.

Literature points to research and practice developed in the USA shortly after WWI. Edward Bernays (1922; 1928; 1965) introduced himself as a "propagandist" because "propaganda", intentional, strategic communication, was what he pursued:

When I served on the U.S. Committee on Public Information in World War I, 1918 – 1920, "public information" was the term used for the war's informational effort. But I

did not hesitate to call myself a propagandist, even though the word had been tarnished by the German propaganda of the Kaiser and by the Communists (1965, p. 287).

He argued that “propaganda” was a common term, i.e. in the presidential “US Committee on Public Information”. Miller (2004) argued that Bernays’ motivation for using “propaganda“ of such activity could have been

to rid the word of its bad smell [...] Bernays always deemed himself to be both “a truth-seeker and a propagandist for propaganda” [...] his interest would be purely scientific; and so his effort to redeem the word is based to some extent on intellectual necessity, there being no adequate substitute for propaganda. In this Bernays was right and never gave up his preference for that word over all the euphemisms (p. 15).

Bernays was familiar with negative connotations and associations of “propaganda”.

Nevertheless, he argued:

[...] the poor connotations of the word in the postwar period induced George Creel, when he wrote his story of the U.S. Committee on Public Information in 1920, to call his book *How We Advertised America*. This was illustrative of the uncertainty with which new meanings found words to express them (1965, p. 288).

Miller emphasized that the fields of propaganda and publicity overlap in the sense that “admen and publicists, no longer common hucksters, but professionals, sold their talents to Big Business through a long barrage of books, essays, speeches and events extolling the miraculous effects of advertising and/or publicity – i.e. propaganda” (2004, p. 12). Bernays’ WWI-insight proved transferable to civilian and commercial purposes in post-war America: Such “peacetime propaganda [...] would at once exalt the nation and advance the civilizing process, teaching immigrants and other folks of modest means how to transform themselves, through smart consumption, into happy and presentable Americans [...]” (2004, p. 13).

Man, argued Bernays, (1922) is blinded by own prejudice and is therefore unable to see and interpret the world unconditionally, a point of view he claimed to be sharing with contemporary psychologists and sociologists. He recommended propagandists to spread their ideas as widely as possible (Ellul, 1965; Moe, 1934): “He transmits his ideas, however, through all those mediums which help to build public opinion – the radio, the lecture platform,

advertising, the stage, the motion picture, the mails” (Ellul, 1965, p. 57). Reaching out to the uninformed was not easy. Bernays went on:

It is axiomatic that men who know little are often intolerant of a point of view that is contrary to their own [...] Intolerance is almost inevitably accompanied by a natural and true inability to comprehend or make allowance for opposite points of view [...] It is clear [...] that these beliefs are invariably regarded as rational and defended as such, while the position of one who holds contrary views is held to be obviously unreasonable (1922, p. 65-66).

Propaganda methods could be justified through a perception of communication exchange as asymmetric, in which the sender had at his disposal scientific knowledge and methods, and sender perception of receivers was one of ignorance and prejudice. The radical asymmetry between actors in a communication process is an important new formation of the modern propaganda literature (Moe, 1934; Granat, 1934; Grunig & Hunt, 1984).

As a reaction to America’s remarkably strong Nazi, Communist and isolationist movements, and their propaganda, academics founded the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, whose primary objective was to teach the public in general, but especially students, how to identify and interpret “common propaganda devices” (1938, p. 49 - 55). The list of such devices includes “name calling”, “glittering generalities”, “testimonials”, “plain folks” and “propaganda and emotion”. The common denominator is “appeal to our emotions rather than to our reason. They make us believe and do something we would not believe or do if we thought about it calmly, dispassionately” (p. 50). Techniques similar to the mentioned devices were in common use in 1930s political discourse, as they are in some sectors of the current political debate, i.e. the 2016 U.S. presidential race.

In his classic *The Formation of Men’s Attitudes* (1965), Ellul discussed primarily European perspectives on “propaganda“. In accordance with Bernays (1922; 1928), NSDAP propaganda, and Swedish and Norwegian propaganda handbooks, Ellul emphasized that propaganda, for it to be effective, must be continuous over long periods of time:

[propaganda] must fill the citizen's whole day and all his days; lasting in that it must function over a very long period of time [...] successful propaganda will occupy every moment of the individual's life; through posters and loudspeakers when he is out walking, through radio and newspapers at home, through meetings and movies in the evening (p. 17).

Ellul's advice on effective propaganda, and techniques to be avoided, is in accordance with modern (2017) research techniques. He recommended that the propagandist start with an environmental scanning, followed by a communication audit:

He must know the sentiments and opinions, the current tendencies and the stereotypes among the public he is trying to reach. An obvious point of departure is the analysis of the characteristics of the group and the current myths, opinions, and sociological structure. Methods and arguments must be tailored to the man to be reached. The technique of propaganda consists in precisely calculating the desired action in terms of the individual who is to be made to act (1965, p. 34).

Warning future propagandists that one size does not fit all, Ellul pointed out that propaganda must fill a gap: "The propagandist cannot simply decide to make propaganda in such and such a direction on this or that group. The group must need something, and the propaganda must respond to that need" (p. 37). Touching on the large segment of undecided, Ellul drew a line between the undecided and the indifferent, the latter constituting "more than 10 percent of the population" (p. 48; Granat 1934, p. 187). The undecided "are susceptible to the control of public opinion, and the role of propaganda is to bring them under this control" (p. 49).

Ellul's term "agitation propaganda" forms a relevant bridge to the study of 20th century political mass movement. In its most primitive form, he claimed, such propaganda was practiced "by a party seeking to destroy the government or the established order. It seeks rebellion or war" (p. 71). The nature of such propaganda changes once the rebellions have become the establishment: "Thus Lenin, having installed the Soviets, organised the agitprops and developed the long campaigns of agitation in Russia to conquer resistance and crush the kulaks."

In his *The Politics of Crowds* (2012), Borch explores “crowds” semantically, historically and sociologically. European revolutionary history owes its success to crowds. Borch first draws on Plato’s term “plethos”, the political mass of citizens, via the crowds of the 1789, 1830 and 1848 French revolutions, social-Darwinism, political mass movements, and related phenomena. Early sociologists, i.e. Le Bon (1895) and Tarde (1910), as well as Darwinian zoologists Trotter (1917) discuss “crowd” as actors in various contexts. Trotter, Freud (1921) and Canetti (1960; 1980) argue that crowds are governed by invisible forces. Michels (1915) suggests that crowds need and want leadership, and that masses are ready to express political gratitude in exchange for leadership. Crowds are grateful to leaders who speak on their behalf: “These men [leaders] who have often acquired [...] an aureole of sanctity and martyrdom, ask one reward only for their services, gratitude [...] Among the masses this sentiment of gratitude is extremely strong” (Michels 1915, p. 41).

Trotter’s research on the concept of “herd instinct” (1917) is based in Darwinism’s key hypothesis: only a thin layer of civilization separates man from beast. Trotter expands the Darwinian hypothesis of “survival of the fittest” to include a concept of necessary “gregariousness”, an inherent and instinctive mental propensity imperative to survival. Behavioural patterns are extreme and unpredictable in herds; characteristics dissolve when the herd disintegrates. Prominent characteristics include

1. most evident in man’s behaviour when he acts in crowds, and are then evident as something temporarily superadded to the possibilities of the isolated individual.
2. [...] the cardinal quality of the herd’s homogeneity. It is clear that the great advantage of the social habit is to enable large numbers to act as one, whereby in the case of the hunting gregarious animal strength in pursuit and attack is at once increased to beyond that of the creatures preyed upon, and in protective socialism the sensitiveness of the new unit to alarms is greatly in excess of that of the individual member of the flock [...] (1917, p. 29).

Trotter finds no evidence of order or leadership in crowds. He takes it for granted that an invisible and undetectable hand controls, or at least sets herd behaviour in motion, for example in a flock of migrating birds. In exchange for protection and potency, individuals dissolve into crowds, willingly giving up their individuality:

To secure these advantages of homogeneity, it is evident that the members of the herd must possess sensitiveness to the behaviour of their fellows [...] Each member of the flock tending to follow its neighbour and in turn to be followed, each is in some sense capable of leadership; but no lead will be followed that departs widely from normal behaviour (1917, p. 29).

Although Trotter's research is on non-human samples, his findings fit into Elias Canetti's narrative on behavioural patterns, discussed in his autobiographic *Crowds and Power* [Masse und Macht, (1960)] and *The Torch in My Ear* [Die Fackel im Ohr, (1980)]. Canetti gives evidence to the potential in maddening power, and the sense of invulnerability experienced in crowds, "protective socialism" (Trotter, 1917, p. 29).

In a retrospective narrative, Canetti (born 1905) reflects on a 1927 revolt, *Julirevolte*, in Vienna: Three men, connected to the Austrian fascist movement, had rightfully been accused of having murdered a Croatian migrant worker. However, they were acquitted in a scandalous trial. In retaliation and revenge, leftist crowds flung themselves onto the streets and set the courthouse, *Wiener Justizpalast*, on fire. Canetti reflected on his bottomless attraction to the violent mob, losing his sense of self and being steered by an alien, undetectable will. Similarly, in a workers' demonstration in Frankfurt, he described an urgent sense of erotic attraction to marching in the crowd. The experience, in his words "epiphany", ["Erleuchtung"], never left him:

It came very suddenly over me as a fierce sense of expansion [...] As a single moment it has remained present in me; after 55 years, as long as it is precisely here, I feel it as something *unexploited* (author's translation). [Es kam sehr plötzlich über mich, als ein heftiges Gefühl von Expansion [...] Wie ein einziger Augenblick ist sie mir gegenwärtig geblieben, nach 55 Jahren, solange genau ist es her, empfinde ich sie als etwas *Unausgeschöpftes*. (1980, p. 140)].

That was the very watershed moment in Canetti's life. It stayed with him for fifty-five years, twenty of them all consuming.

While Canetti's notion of and description of "crowd" was psychological in a qualitative sense, Werner Sombart's social scientific definition and discussion of it categorized the basic term into subdivisions, using aspects of members' characteristics: He identified four subcategories of "crowd" in *The Proletarian Socialism*, [Der proletarische Sozialismus, (1925, p. 99 - 100)]:

- A "statistical crowd" connotes a numerical perspective that is of importance in analyzing impact of a large, versus a small crowd. By contrast, claimed Canetti, a crowd may consist of only a few, "five or ten or twelve, no more", ["fünf oder zehn oder zwölf, nicht mehr" (1960, 14)].
- A "cultural crowd" connotes the uninformed, lower strata of the proletariat.
- A "sociological crowd" connotes a crowd void of all ambition, an urban *Lumpenproletariat*, coined so by Marx; people living miserable lives near society's bottom.
- A "psychological crowd" connotes a crowd in which its inseparable members seem interconnected by an undetected mental frame of mind, and how they act collectively without a centralized direction; as also described by Trotter (1917).

Understanding and acknowledging the 1930s "crowd" as a political actor is essential for understanding 1930s political discourse. In as much, the Scandinavian Left arguably shared fundamental views on "crowds" with most European populist political movements.

Sigmund Freud reviewed Gustave Le Bon's essayistic *The Crowd. A Study of the Popular Mind* [Psychologie des Foules (1895)] in his *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* [Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse (1921)], especially Le Bon's argument that

crowds are constituted of makeshift collections of individuals animated by an undefined collective will. Freud, and Canetti (1960; 1980) suggest that individuals in fact may experience a quasi-erotic longing for crowds. Chiractophobia [Berührungsangst], argued Canetti, represents man's deepest fear: [only] by letting oneself dissolve into a crowd can one overcome *Berührungsangst* and achieve catharsis. He reported that after having felt void of life before joining and after leaving the crowd, his experience while absorbed therein was "a complete change of consciousness [...] as profound as puzzling" ["eine völlige Änderung des Bewußtsein [...] ebenso einschneidend wie rätselhaft" (1980, p. 94)].

Michels, in another classic, *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy* (1915) discussed obstacles caused by "direct democracy," and why modern democracy therefore needs political parties. As an example of direct democracy chaos, he described a Prussian political experiment (1848/49) in which the entire population was divided into sections that were to meet in public spaces to discuss political issues: "Every citizen was to have the right of speech. In this way the intelligence of every individual would be placed at the service of the fatherland [...] No legislative proposal was to come from above." (1915, p. 20). Michels also discussed the role of the masses as political actors. His notion of the role of the masses represented an elitist point of view: masses are indifferent and ignorant and must be governed by a stratum of leaders, an oligarchy.

Granat, provost of the Swedish labour movement rural college, discussed "crowd" in a Nordic social-democratic context (1934). Party meetings were poorly attended. Looking at Germany, where NSDAP rallies drew enormous crowds, Granat suggested that the Labour Party should take lessons from Goebbels, whom he ranked as "intellectually superior to the other leadership" (p. 188). Without crowd support, Granat argued, labour parties would never win elections, as under universal voting rights the politically naïve and uninformed are on par with party elites; one person, one vote. Granat worried over the fact that large fractions of

working class German brethren had succumbed to German socialism. [Deutscher Sozialismus] (Sombart, 1934).

Norwegian Sources

Having been in a partial political union between 1814 and 1905, with a mutual monarch and common foreign policies, Sweden and Norway were, and are (2017) twin nations on the Scandinavian peninsula. The respective national tongues form a continuum of mutually intelligible variants. For centuries there has been unhindered migration across the 1,630 km long border. Labour movements in the two lands share narratives and pools of research and insight. Swedish leftist literature is therefore an integrated and natural part of the source material for this article.

The Norwegian Labour Movement Archives and Library [Arbeiderbevegelsens arkiv og bibliotek], a documentation centre founded in 1908, has kept records on most political activity in the sphere of the political left for over a century. The main source material consists of:

- The Labour Party's 1933 national election manifesto, had been titled "Jobs for all!" ["Hele folket i arbeid!"]: A trial balloon at first, it proved to be an exceptionally successful campaign. Party legend to this date (2017) credits the 1933 election landslide victory to the campaign.
- Another central source for this paper is the June 1934 special issue of *The 20th Century*, [Det 20de århundre], a journal published by the Labour Party. The journal contributors leaned on "modern psychological research" and looked to Nazi-Germany. The issue was titled "New Tasks" ["Nye oppgaver"], a term whose far-reaching connotations could be interpreted near the Rooseveltian "New Deal".

- Prior to the 1934 elections, the Labour Party secretary, Haakon Lie, published the handbook *Agitation and Propaganda* (Norwegian: *Agitasjon og propaganda*). In it, he advised local organisers on rallies, canvassing and speech writing. The handbook deepened, broadened and concretized the general outlines in the June 1934-edition of *Det 20de Århundre*. The handbook was reedited and republished in 1936 and in 1938.

Other sources stem from findings, footnotes, and references in the above-mentioned publications which have been approached with an organic study method. Some sources are well referenced in other literature; some are serendipitous. The perhaps most interesting source was found in a footnote in the 1936-edition of *Agitation and Propaganda*, referring to an article by “Rektor Alf Ahlberg” (Moe in Lie, H. (Ed.). 1936, p. 17). In his article, Ahlberg, then president of the Swedish labour movement rural college, referred to the works of German economist and sociologist Werner Sombart (1933, p. 67). Sombart, a renegade who had been working alongside Engels on editing Marx’ *Capital*, ended up as an underwriter for Hitler’s 1933 and 1934 referenda. Sombart proclaimed his political views in an impressive literary production, including ten issues of *Socialism and Social Movement* [Sozialismus und soziale Bewegung (1896-1925)]; its tenth, two volume-issue was renamed *Proletarian Socialism* [Der proletarische Sozialismus (1925)].

Sombart’s Ideological Platform

For years prior to Hitler’s rise to power, Sombart had been a proponent of socialism adapted to the perceived mentality, values and needs of Lutheran Northern Europe, in period terminology, “national socialism”. Sombart’s former peer Friedrich Pollock had countered Sombart’s views in *Sombart’s Falsification of Marxism* [Sombarts Widerlegung des Marxismus (1926)]. Pollock’s book was made available to Scandinavian labour movements’ libraries, probably shortly after its release. The libraries that have provided literature for this

article have no lending records dating back to the interwar-era. It is not evident, however likely, that Pollock's criticism of Sombart was known in Scandinavia at the time.

Sombart had joined the Nazi academic body Academy of German Law [Akademie für Deutsches Recht] in 1933. In August 1934, he co-petitioned with German academics in favour of Hitler's assumed double role, as chancellor, and as president, to become *Führer*. The list of petitioners was published in the notoriously anti-Semitic daily *Völkischer Beobachter*. In his *A New Social Philosophy*¹ [Deutscher Sozialismus] (1934), Sombart condemned Marxist socialism as *Jew-infested*. He had expressed racial prejudice towards Jews in his *The Jews and Modern Capitalism* [Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben] (1911). A Jew could, in Sombart's words, never be, or become German. In fact, "the Jew" was the very anti-thesis of "the German", racially, morally and spiritually. Sombart was, beyond doubt, a prominent member of the Nazi academic echelon, an active proponent of Hitlerism, far beyond the role of a passive follower or collaborator.

Dr. Ahlberg's Selective Plagiarism

In *Proletarian Socialism*, Sombart (1925) applied certain semantic techniques to present his views, among those, qualifying adjectives, like the *so-called working class* [sogenannte Arbeiterklasse] (p. 178), as well as extensive use of quotation marks, as in "crowd" ["die Masse"]. Through intertextual figures, some of them quasi-biblical, he suggested that Marxism was de facto a religious dogma, not merely a social and political ideology:

[...] that also *heretics*, who have never been in doubt about the *truth of the dogma*, as *proclaimed* by Marx, just claiming to be in possession of the *true dogma*, founded in a *congregation of believers* with a recognized head. Those were the *confessions* in Germany [...] (author's Italics and translation).

[[...] daß auch diese *Ketzer*, die niemals die *Wahrheit der Lehre*, wie sie Marx *verkündet* hat, angezweifelt haben, sondern nur behaupten, im Besitze der *wahren Lehre* zu sein, wieder zu *gläubigen Gemeinden* mit einem anerkannten Oberhaupte sich

¹ German title: *Deutscher Sozialismus*. It was translated into English in 1969. The English title, *A New Social Philosophy*, is a euphemism, and does not reflect the period connotations of term «German Socialism».

zusammengeschossen haben. So gab es in Deutschland die *Konfessionen*. (1925, vol. 2, p. 180)]

It is highly unlikely that Dr. Ahlberg, a scholar of Schopenhauer, and a leading researcher of political science, could have misinterpreted the German and thus misread Sombart's sarcasms and loudmouthed criticism of the Left. In fact, Dr. Ahlberg must have turned a blind eye to any reservations he might have had in the matter, i.e. Sombart labelling Marxism a quasi religion. Ahlberg not only translated long passages from *Proletarian Socialism*, he did so omitting qualifying characteristics and semantic marks, i.e. quotation marks and adjectives, such as "so-called", thus emphasizing the Sombart sarcasms. The Ahlberg adaptation of the Sombart text is selective, and ethically questionable.

Ahlberg intentionally copied and plagiarized essential parts of Sombart's writings on crowds, presenting them as his own in his *Social psychology* [Social psykologi (1933)]. One of the chapters therein, "Psychology of Agitation" ["Agitationens psykologi" (p. 65 – 79)], contains quotes and selected misquotes from Sombart's chapter "B. The Propaganda" ["B. Die Propaganda" (vol.2, p. 169 – 215)]. The Sombart chapter's focal point is on the plasticity of the masses, the uninformed and the uneducated, and how such strata can be persuaded into a preferred voting behaviour. "Psychology of Agitation" was in turn translated from Ahlberg's native Swedish into Norwegian, and published in various leftist publications.

Descriptions of Propaganda Methods in Labour Movement Communication Tactics

There are two theoretical levels of NSDAP traces in the Norwegian labour movement literature: In the June 1934 edition of *The 20th Century*, Labour Party elites outlined a radical change of communication strategies and tactics, thus opening the movement's rhetoric to two parallel paradigms:

- one factual paradigm, based on statistics and reliable research. Representing an old school of thought, it was aimed at pundits and study circles for party members intellectually capable of accepting socialism's social and economic rationales.
- another paradigm, in which slogans, entertainment and audience participation should persuade less interested voters and voters with limited critical ability. Inspired by Nazi success among German working class voters, and realizing that the average voter was uninterested in politics, this paradigm sought to win indifferent voters to the Left and keep them from the Right.

The new methods were applied into Labour Party manuals and handbooks. Similarities between the respective Left and Right methodologies were especially evident in pathos as applied mode of persuasion: Rhetorical strategies that formerly had targeted man's perceived rationale must be supplemented with simple one-liners and slogans. Party meetings, attended by few (Granat 1934), were replaced with mass rallies in town squares. Party elites, once featured attractions in campaigns, would now have to share podiums with music hall entertainers.

Moe argued: "It is [...] important to conquer the minds of the masses, it is now a matter of life or death for the socialist movement" (1934, p.185). Politically inactive masses, distraught by economic hardship and crisis, would be willing to revolt against societal elites and class enemies. Since masses lacked guidance and channels as to where to petition their grievances, there was a dire need for effective modes of communicative influence. The labour movement had to learn from "modern research on psychology" and "modern advertising" (p. 186), acknowledging pathos as a potent mode of persuasion, not challenging individuals' critical ability. The struggle between fascism and socialism was "first and foremost a

psychological fight, a propaganda fight”, a textbook statement of the purpose sanctifying the means, a struggle over the minds of the masses, not policies.

Granat came to similar conclusions (1934). Resigned to the perception that working class voters did not know their own good, he concluded that “one has found out that less than 10 percent of voters attend political meetings” (1934, p. 187; Ellul 1965, p. 48). Like Granat, Michels suggested that “the number of those who have a lively interest in public affairs is insignificant [...] It is only a minority which participates in party decisions.” (1915, p. 36). The party was unable to reach a critical mass of voters through its media, as many did not read newspapers. A dilemma was, argued Granat, that under universal voting rights, absent and passive voters had the numeric power to decide elections. Hitler had looked for, and found his reserves in, such strata. To counter Nazism, “one must use methods that to a certain degree differ from printed information, naturally without setting aside propaganda that must be the moral backbone [...] Without doubt, the labour movement [...] may benefit from some Nazi methods of agitation.” Following up the principal recommendation with an explanation, near apologia, he argued:

Nazi politics is, to a great extent, characterized by brutality and scurrility; however, one must admit that the Nazis in one field have played their role cleverly and skillfully [...] the propaganda [...] Goebbels’ intellectual capacity is considered to reach way and high above the other Nazi tops’ (p. 188).

Towards the end of his short (3.5 pages) article, Granat suggested that the labour movement copy some of the Nazi Party’s concrete measures and methods.

Propaganda Presence

Granat admitted to being fascinated by the swastika, which “[...] associated with Hitler’s fierce speeches and attacks. Because it was in use by the hundreds of thousands, it contributed to making Hitler’s words relevant, and thus became an integrate part of the psychological manipulation of the masses” (p. 188). Granat proposed that the labour movement

must adopt symbolism, slogans, music and rallies in its propaganda, rather than an anemic, passionless delivery, presented in a bureaucratic manner. He quoted *Mein Kampf*:

The audience enter and take their seats, a professor gives a speech on today's topic that only half the crowd understands and one third comprehends, the moderator thanks for the brilliant speech; "Deutschland, Deutschland über alles" is sung, all leave. (Hitler. *Mein Kampf*, in Granat 1934, p. 188).

Hitler instinctively dismissed such meetings. Nazi demagogue intuition promoted huge rallies, music, flags, crowd singing party and patriotic songs. The popular perception of homogeneity, security and protective socialism (Trotter 1917, p. 29) and the will to fight, got a fierce boost during mass rallies. Granat emphasized the necessity of acknowledging such elements:

It is important that rally audiences are not passive, but in fact take an active part in meetings. One must therefore not ignore the importance of unison singing. The psychological impact of demonstrations, torchlight processions and marches meets and gratifies participants' need [longing] for activity" (1934, p. 188).

Granat identified relevant methods, and made recommendations, in minute detail:

During all rallies, there should be music before and after the speech; no dance music, of course [...] no music that suggests a quiet and introvert emotional mood. The music must fit the situation and should stress strong will, it must be rhythmic and be easy to catch (p. 189).

The speaker would have to simplify messages to match audience abilities and intellectual levels, while still adhering to facts:

A public speaker must find the courage to express banality. That means that he must not be reluctant to repeat facts well known to himself and to the politically versed, but unknown to the less interested and less enlightened. Regular party slogans must be repeated in varying forms (p. 189).

Granat proposed use of expressive symbols, slogans and mottos to express party goals and policies. He argued that the strategy must include tepid oratory and take into account that many voters seek entertainment and escapism, not ideological lectures:

[...] it is necessary to maintain propaganda that does not necessarily inform or shed light on problems, although it [propaganda] gives the [great] masses the correct idea of

socialism's goals and methods, and that it strengthens the communal spirit, the will to fight, and the idealism within the movement (p. 189).

Central items in NSDAP methodology were thus transformed, adapted and integrated into Norwegian Labour Party communication manuals in 1934, on the notion and claim that crowds would be persuaded by catchy slogans and effective propaganda. Former Party Secretary Haakon Lie confirmed such reasoning in a conversation with professors Anders Johansen and Jens E. Kjeldsen during data collection for an anthology on Norwegian political speeches:

The [Nazi] menace was a useful tool as a lever for transformation *to new methods*. The Nazis should f[...]ing not be allowed to have it to themselves, [... Haakon Lie ...] We should take it from them and use it against them (Johansen & Kjeldsen, 2005, p. XXXIX–XXXX).

Linguistic and cultural translations of slogans will more often than not be inaccurate, as translations rarely carry the slogan's original metaphors and content. Some period slogans have survived and have been recycled in campaigns until this day (2017): “By og land, hand i hand”, [“Town and country, hand in hand”], carries timeless qualities. It is a feel-good, non-provocative one-liner. Its central and essential metaphor is, in the party's evaluation, its best slogan ever. The original was however, a direct translation from a 1933 Nazi country fair. The German original, “Stadt und Land, Hand in Hand”, translates well into the Germanic Norwegian: “By og land, hand i hand”. The English translation version carries none of the rhythmic elegance of the Germanic texts.

As of 1934, mass rally ideological messages stepped aside to allow for participants' aesthetic and emotional experience. For a 1936 rally in front of the Labour Party headquarters in Oslo, the then tallest building in the city, oversize portraits of the party leadership decorated the building, and two popular vaudeville artists performed apolitical acts. There was amateur theatre, motor cycle processions and choral speaking. A small plane circled over the rally while writing “Vote Labour”, [“Stem DNA”], in pyro letters across the autumn sky. A possible

outcome of the 1930s propaganda was the Left's electoral success: The Norwegian Labour Party formed all cabinets between 1935 and 1965, only interrupted by the Nazi occupation. Moe argued that "criteria of straightforwardness" are the most important. Everybody must be able to understand the content:

That is the only way that way that we shall be able to reach the politically passive, who [...] form the majority of the public. [propaganda] has to be present, day in and day out. Slogans must be repeated, all the time. Rally must follow rally [...] Order, precision, nicely decorated venues and premises, well designed posters, evoke sympathy (1934, p. 16).

The essential intensity, continuity and duration of propaganda was also discussed by Ellul (1965, especially p. 17 – 24).

Sombart described slogans as effective intentional communication (1925). A good slogan should be universally intelligible and enthuse. A slogan should be neither too personal nor too contextual. It must carry qualities that can be recycled. Moe argued:

We have not acknowledged that a good slogan might be more useful than a long manifesto. The labour movement has disallowed, and failed to acknowledge, the force of human emotion [...] One may pound simple truths into people's minds by using simple slogans. A slogan may well contribute a standard and an objective to a political campaign (Moe, in Lie (ed.) 1934, p. 12).

Findings, Summary

There is evident methodological overlap between Labour Party period political propaganda and propaganda found in the Third Reich, with the former borrowing from the latter. Norwegian Labour Party elites made no attempt to conceal an admiration for NSDAP propaganda methods, although the Party's political substance was very different from policies proposed by Nazis. Norwegian labour leaders realized that it was essential to reach out to, and include, the less interested and uninformed segments of the working class, lest they fall victim to the radical Right. Hence, there was a dire need to expand the scope of rhetorical strategies

and tactics, from somber logos, based on the rationale of Marxist politics, to a propaganda, aiming at including potential voters, keeping them away from the extreme Left and Right.

It was stressed that communication actors must realize that they play to “the crowd”, not an “assembly of individuals”. “Crowd” is a polysemy, with wide statistical, cultural, sociological and psychological connotations. It possesses dynamics of its own and responds simultaneously to external stimuli; like a herring shoal, or a flock of birds, apparently governed by one communal mind and will. The “crowd” is therefore a primary target in period political propaganda.

The rhetorical strategies found in articles and handbooks continually stressed that people are emotional, not necessarily rational beings. Most have short concentration spans and must be entertained, not lectured. Entertainment can come in many shapes, often limited by lack of economic resources.

There is still research to be done on the Sombart – Ahlberg connection, as well as the influence that Ahlberg’s selective adaptation of Sombart writings might have had in other European democracies, not only in Norway.

References:

- Ahlberg, A. (1933). *Social psykologi. Massans och gruppens, nationens och klassens sjålsliv*. [Social Psychology. The Mentality of the Mass and the Group, the Nation and the Class]. Stockholm: Tiden.
- Ahlberg, A. (1934, 31st October). *Arbeiderbladet*, p. 3. [Arbeiderbladet; Oslo daily newspaper]
- Ahlberg, A. (1934). Agitasjonens psykologi. [Psychology of Agitation]. In Moe, F. (Ed.), *Det 20de Århundre. Tidsskrift for Det norske arbeiderparti* no. 35 (6).4.
- Benz, W. (2009). *Wie wurde man Parteigenosse? Die NSDAP und ihre Mitglieder*. [How did One become Party Comrade? The NSDAP and its Members]. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Bernays, E. L. (1922). *Crystallizing public opinion*. New York: Boni and Liveright.

- Bernays, E. L. (1928). *Propaganda*. New York: H. Liveright.
- Bernays, E. L. (1965). *Biography of an idea: memoirs of public relations counsel*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Borch, C. (2012). *The Politics of Crowds. An Alternative History of Sociology*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Canetti, E. (1960). *Masse und Macht*. [Crowds and Power]. München: Carl Hanser.
- Canetti, E. (1980). *Die Fackel im Ohr. Lebensgeschichte 1921-1931*. [The Torch in My Ear, Memoar]. München: Carl Hanser.
- Colbjørnsen, O., & Det Norske Arbeiderparti. (1933). *Hele folket i arbeide! Det norske arbeiderpartis kriseprogram*. [Jobs for All! Den Norwegian Labour Party's Crisis Program]. Oslo: Det Norske Arbeiderparti.
- Ellul, J. (1965). *Propaganda. The Formation of Men's Attitudes*. New York: Vintage Books. A Division of Random House.
- Freud, S. (1921). *Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse*. [Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego]. Wien: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag.
- Granat, H. (1934). Fremtidens propaganda. [Future Propaganda]. In Moe, F. (Ed.), *Det 20de Århundre. Tidsskrift for Det norske arbeiderparti*. no. 35 (6).4.
- Grunig, J. E. & Hunt, T.T. (1984). *Managing Public Relations*. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- How to Detect Propaganda. (1938). *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* (1915-1955), 24(1), 49-55. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40219502>
- Johansen, A., & Kjeldsen, J. E. (2005). *Virksomme ord. Politiske taler 1814–2005*. [Effective Words. (Anthology of) Political Speeches 1814 - 2005]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Klee, E. (2003). *Das Personenlexikon zum Dritten Reich: wer war was vor und nach 1945*. [The Encyclopedia of the Third Reich: Who was what before and after 1945]. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.
- Le Bon, G. (1895). *Psychologie des foules*. [The Crowd. A Study of the Popular Mind]. Paris: Felix Alcan.
- Lie, H. (Ed.). (1934). *Agitasjon og propaganda. Håndbok for tillitsmenn i de norske arbeiderorganisasjoner*. [Agitation and Propaganda. Handbook for Elected Officers in Norwegian Labour Organizations]. Oslo: Arbeidernes opplysningsforbund.
- Lie, H. (Ed.). (1936). *Agitasjon og propaganda. Håndbok for tillitsmenn i de norske arbeiderorganisasjoner*. [Agitation and Propaganda. Handbook for Elected Officers in Norwegian Labour Organizations]. Oslo: Arbeidernes opplysningsforbund.
- Maser, W. (1981). *Der Sturm auf die Republik. Frühgeschichte der NSDAP*. [The Storm on the Republic. Early NSDAP History]. Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein.

- Michels, R. (1915). *Political Parties. A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*. Kitchener, Ontario: Batoche Books.
- Miller, D. C. (2004). Introduction. In Bernays, E. (1928). *Propaganda*. New York: H. Liveright.
- Moe, F. (1934). De moderne propagandametoder. [New Propaganda Methodology]. In Lie, H. (Ed). *Agitasjon og propaganda. Håndbok for tillitsmenn i de norske arbeiderorganisasjoner p. 5–17*. Oslo: Arbeidernes oplysningsforbund.
- Moe, F. (1934). Nye oppgaver. [New Tasks]. In Moe, F. (Ed.). *Det 20de Århundre. Tidsskrift for Det norske arbeiderparti* no. 35 (6).2. [20th Century. Journal for the Norwegian Labour Party].
- Pollock, F. (1926). *Sombarts Widerlegung des Marxismus*. [Sombart's Falsification of Maxism]. Edited by Carl Grünberg. Vol. Heft 3, *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung*. Leipzig: Verlag von C. L. Hirschfeld.
- Sombart, W. (1896). *Socialismus und sociale Bewegung im 19. Jahrhundert*. [Socialism and 19th Century Social Movement]. Jena: Verlag von Gustav Fischer.
- Sombart, W. (1911). *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben*. [The Jews and Modern Capitalism]. Jena: Gustav Fischer.
- Sombart, W. (1925). *Der proletarische Sozialismus ("Marxismus")*. [Proletarian Socialism. ("Marxism")]. Jena: Gustav Fischer.
- Sombart, W. (1934). *Deutscher Sozialismus*. [A New Social Philosophy]. Charlottenlund: Buchholz & Weisswange.
- Tarde, G. (1910). *L'opinion et la foule*. [The Opinion and the Crowd]. 3. ed. Paris: Felix Alcan.
- Trotter, W. (1917). *Instincts of the herd in peace and war*. London: T. F. Unwin ltd.