

### Appendix 3 : Psychoanalytic & rhetorical political science

Some ideas have been difficult to use because they are so contrary to the functional structure of the book. This applies especially to the psychoanalytic and rhetorical arguments which, if taken seriously, transform the monarchy into an irrational cultural manifestation.

\* \* \*

#### A. NAÏVE MONARCHISM

Monarchists are often portrayed as ignorant. The term "naïve monarchism" is used in research. The term is said to have been coined by Karl Marx in his pamphlet (1852) "Louis Bonaparte's eighteenth brumaire", where he emphasizes that the importance of the monarchy is often exaggerated. However, this is a misunderstanding. The term is older than that. I quote Mamonova (2018):

"The belief in a good tsar and bad boyars is known in Russian history as naïve monarchism. This myth was the backbone of the Tsarist regime, contributing to the regime's persistence for many years. It portrayed the tsar as a just and benevolent intercessor of ordinary people, whereas all failures were ascribed to officials, who deliberately misrepresented and misinformed the country's leader.

This myth was personally maintained by the tsar to secure his authority and existing order. Symbolic acts such as standing godfather to the child of a poor peasant or public instances of humiliating or executing arrogant nobles and officials were practised by many Russian tsars, including Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great.

Peasants, in their turn, expressed reverence and devotion to the tsar and asked for his patronage and intervention in their disputes with local authorities. Some of them truly believed in a good tsar and evil boyars. However, many people purposefully employed this myth in their grievances. By demonstrating their naively and misguided loyalty to the tsar, peasants obtained significant immunity from prosecution and managed to defy noblemen and reduce tributes and taxes."<sup>1</sup>

There is no corresponding Swedish subject mentality. After all the upheavals, the Swedish attitude to the royal house was rather lacking in dramatics: Respectful but familial. The monarchy was not of God. Monarchs had of late been elected, dethroned, abdicated, and executed. It was also this that the Parliament of the Estates was an ongoing lesson in how the political system worked. The everyday Swede was better informed than the everyday Russian. Swedish kings did not rule by decree. They negotiated with the Estates. (See chapters 1 & 28; Nordin 2009.)

The Russian definition of the "true nature of the monarchy" seems to have found its way into the Swedish debate via the syndicalists. For example, Vilhelm Moberg claimed that he already in his youth hated the monarchy after reading the anarchist Krapotkin & the Young Socialist (=syndicalist) newspaper *Nya Folkviljan*.

\* \* \*

---

<sup>1</sup> Mamonova 2018.

## B. LOYALTY AS SOCIAL VIRTUE

*It is not the case that monarchists are loyal to the system. Loyalty is the system.*

In monarchist circles, loyalty to the royal house remains a tradition. The Republican suspicion is that loyalty to the royal house means that they have renounced democracy & parliamentary government. However, this does not seem to be the case. In that case, the majority of the population would already have voted in favour of a change in the form of government. The monarchists' loyalty seems to be about something other than politics. Hypothetically, it is understandable as interpreted by Josiah Royce's moral philosophy based precisely on loyalty:

“If loyalty is a supreme good, the mutually destructive conflict of loyalties is in general a supreme evil. If loyalty is a good for all sorts and conditions of men, the war of man against man has been especially mischievous, not so much because it has hurt, maimed, impoverished, or slain men, as because it has so often robbed the defeated of their causes, of their opportunities to be loyal, and some times of their very spirit of loyalty. ...

And so, a cause is good, not only for me, but for mankind, in so far as it is essentially a loyalty to loyalty, that is, is an aid and a furtherance of loyalty in my fellows. It is an evil cause in so far as, despite the loyalty that it arouses in me, it is destructive of loyalty in the world of my fellows. My cause is, indeed, always such as to involve some loyalty to loyalty, because, if I am loyal to any cause at all, I have fellow-servants whose loyalty mine supports. But in so far as my cause is a predatory cause, which lives by overthrowing the loyalties of others, it is an evil cause, because it involves disloyalty to the very cause of loyalty itself.”<sup>2</sup>

Loyalty in Royce's interpretation therefore seems to be the last “argument” of the losing side. When all rational arguments are exhausted, loyalty remains to a lost, meaningless or useless cause, which gains its value through the commitment itself, not through any expected success or reward.

\*

Royce's moral philosophy was published in 1908. The next monograph on the subject, John Connor's “The sociology of loyalty”, had to wait until 2007 & is an attempt to define the concept of loyalty as an emotion, to be able to express itself generally about the subject. In our case: Is loyalty to the royal house the same as loyalty to one's own family or nation? The answer to that is that loyalty to one's own family is strongest, but that the royal house & nation by being described with family attributes, they too can arouse the same feelings, though not as strong. There is an extensive release of royal “family albums” which I skip. The monarchists expect that the royals as “family members” shall be treated with respect. The Republican respect has been in short supply, however.

Connor's conclusions are common knowledge in advertising research, where “exposure”, “band loyalty” & “transfer” are important concepts. Monarchies, especially the English monarchy, are considered through their long history, media exposure, positive associations & recognizability to have high market value and therefore contribute to at least the tourism

---

<sup>2</sup> Royce 1908: ss. 116-119.

industry & media. Since the modernization of the British royal house followed the Swedish pattern as described in Balmer et al (2004, 2005 & 2006), Swedish monarchy appears to be at the forefront of development. The bleeding edge of modernity, as the Americans put it. In practice, members of the royal family feel sorry for themselves, and sympathizers hold them in high esteem for their will to sacrifice.

\* \* \*

### C. OBSCURE OBJECTS OF DESIRE

When defined as a symbol rather than an authority, the monarchy falls under the domains of psychoanalysis. Historian of ideas Edda Manga (2020) has written an essay about the monarchy as an irrational feature of Swedish politics where she puts forward ideas similar to political scientist Cecilia Åse, ethnologist Mattias Frihammar & mass media researcher Kristina Widestedt who all places the monarchy in a borderland between fact & fiction. Like Åse, Manga believes that it makes the role of the monarchy in society impossible to analyse. "The monarchy escapes political analysis by preferentially having an effect on emotion and identification." However, she does try:

"The starting point is the observation that Swedish political monarchism is replete with elements of unwillingness to think, denial, whitewashing, paralysis and nonsense. Psychoanalytic theory [Jacques Lacan] seems particularly well suited to highlight such phenomena."<sup>3</sup>

If you ignore the psychoanalytic terminology Manga's article is an attack on the weekly newspapers, which allegedly have made the royal house immune from political criticism by appealing to the readership's interest in beautiful images, gossip, etc. & exclude what does not fit the "fairy tale". Instead of political facts, the readers are treated to a non-political imaginarium. A resulting fantasy with political consequences is, according to Manga, the myth of the monarchy's importance for social cohesion, a false community, which, like national sentiment, hides the class struggle:

"Is there a place for the royal house in democracy? The short answer is no. Demands for loyalty to the monarchy as a precondition for membership of the nation and conditions for democratic rights highlight a fundamental social conflict which concerns democracy as such. A unified national state with shared interests need no democratic decision-making processes, only good interpreters of the will of the people and effective ways of denying democratic rights to those who do not belong to the people (in the sense that they have other interests or perspectives). It is an autocracy."<sup>4</sup>

In particular, Manga seems angered by the Swedish democratic (SD) parliamentary motion that immigrants (she comes from Colombia) should swear an oath of loyalty. In SD's formulation: "A foreign national wishing to obtain Swedish citizenship should be required to take an oath to swear allegiance and loyalty to the King of Sweden, the Swedish State and the Swedish nation."<sup>5</sup>

\* \* \*

---

<sup>3</sup> Manga 2020: s. 116.

<sup>4</sup> Manga 2020: s. 134.

<sup>5</sup> Motion 2014/15:2911.

## D. SENSE, SENSIBILITY & REALPOLITIK

*They got all the power,  
But we got all the good songs!*  
Tom Lehrer

It has been difficult to find research on how to deal with the electorate's emotive positions within the framework of parliamentarianism. Historically, they have been treated as contempt of politics & politicians. Nowadays as contempt of fact. The monarchy debate, however, is more about political passivity and how to counteract it. Historian Jens Ljunggren has much to say about how parties and organizations have proceeded:

”The word 'emotional politics' has often been used derogatory. The historian Ute Frevert has recently redefined the term and made it analytically useful. In her view, emotional politics is *politics with feelings about feelings*. The interest in research is not what political actors feel, but how they use emotions such as resources, raw materials and tools. The 20<sup>th</sup> century has seen politicians working on formulating ideologies and on representing certain social interests, but this has not been enough. They have also pursued emotional politics by actively expressing, communicating and staging emotions in both democracies and dictatorships. At the same time, Frevert shows that this has certainly not been the case only in modern times.”<sup>6</sup>

The criticism has been that conflicts of interest always create feelings, strange otherwise, but that the problem is secondary. In Ljunggren's version, emotions are used to legitimize opinions and call for action. They are part of the political rhetoric. Another version is the Marxist division into under & over determined conflicts: Feelings, attitudes, images of reality, discourses, etc. have become independent (cultural) politics without any obvious connection with the economic base of society. Ideology has become emotionology. Political science defines this as affective polarization. that the views held are unfounded.<sup>7</sup>

Ideology and emotionology are difficult to manage within the framework of the parliamentary system. In parliamentarianism, it is a question of convincing your opponent or compromise. Then you have to have the same general picture of reality as the opponent. In the monarchy debate, this is not the case. In consequence the issue has been taken over politically by the media, which is a more natural forum given the conditions.

\*

Emotionology is often about empathy, the ability to share the feelings of others. If nationalism, patriotism, racism, class feeling, etc. works through imagined communities, it is but a short step to monarchism as an imagined community with the regent, royal house & establishment. It's the same psychology. Probably one can rank the ”integrative effect” of empathy by the number of people who are part of the imagined community. Monarchy least. Then social classes & nations. Religion & races the most. Which is probably why monarchy is often combined with a state church or something else with broad support.

The degree of empathy varies. Women are more empathetic than men. Older people are more empathetic than younger people. Those with short education more

---

<sup>6</sup> Ljunggren 2015: s. 7.

<sup>7</sup> Renström m fl. 2020.

empathetic than academics. The more in common & the longer the acquaintance, the more empathy. And so forth.<sup>8</sup> This is consistent with the opinion polls (see chapter 33). The monarchy has thus been able to live on, as the political science arguments are perceived as irrelevant. The only arguments that bite are emotional arguments of the type character assassination & rude conduct. The defamation campaigns have therefore, at least in the short term, been very effective (see chapter 34).

---

<sup>8</sup> Davis 1996.

## Referenser

- +Andersson, Ulrika, Carlander, Anders & Öhberg, Patrik. (red.) (2020.) Regntunga skyar. SOM-rapport nr 76. Göteborg: SOM-institutet, Göteborgs universitet.
- \*Balmer, John M T, Greyser, Stephan A, Urde, Mats. (2004.) Monarchies as Corporate Brands. Bradford University School of Management. Working Paper No 04/24, july 2004. <researchgate.net> (2018-01-01).
- \*Balmer, John M T. (2005.) Comprehending the Constitutional Monarchies of Britain and Sweden : Issues of Trust and Corporate Brand Management. Working Paper No 05/35, december 2005. <researchgate.net> (2018-01-01).
- \*Balmer, John M T, Greyser, Stephan A, Urde, Mats. (2006.) The Monarchy as a corporate brand : Some corporate communications dimensions. European Journal of Marketing, july 2006. <researchgate.net> (2018-01-01).
- +Burman, Anders & Kaveh, Shamal. (red.) (2020.) Demokratin och det politiska : Essäer om samtidens politiska tillstånd. Södertörn Studies in Intellectual and Cultural History 2. Södertörns högskola.
- \*Connor, James. (2007.) The sociology of loyalty. New York: Springer.
- \*Davis, M. (1996) Empathy : a social psychological approach. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.
- \*Ljunggren, Jens. (2015.) Den uppskjutna vreden : socialdemokratisk känslopolitik från 1880- till 1980-talet. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- \*Mamonova, Natalia. (2018.) Vladimir Putin – a tsar without loyal subjects? I: <utrikesmagasinet> (2018-04-23). [Utrikespolitiska institutets nättidning.]
- \*Manga, Edda. (2020.) Kungligt begär : Den undertryckta konflikten mellan monarki och demokrati. I: Burman & Kaveh red. 2020: ss. 115-138.
- \*Marx, Karl. (1852.) Louis Bonapartes adertonde brumaire. <marxists.org> (2021-01-01).
- \*Motion 2014/15:2911. David Lång och Mikael Jansson (SD). Medborgarskapets betydelse.
- \*Nordin, Jonas. (2009.) Frihetstidens monarki – Konungamakt och offentlighet i 1700-talets Sverige. Stockholm: Atlantis.
- \*Renström, Emma A, Bäck, Hanna & Schmeisser, Yvonne. (2020.) Vi ogillar olika. Om affektiv polarisering bland svenska väljare. I: Andersson m fl. 2020.
- \*Royce, Josiah. (1908.) The Philosophy of Loyalty. New York: The MacMillan Company. <iupui.edu> (2019-01-01).