

Onni Pekonen

Debating
“the ABCs of Parliamentary Life”

The Learning of Parliamentary Rules and
Practices in the Late Nineteenth-Century
Finnish Diet and the Early Eduskunta



Onni Pekonen

Debating
“the ABCs of Parliamentary Life”

The Learning of Parliamentary Rules and
Practices in the Late Nineteenth-Century
Finnish Diet and the Early Eduskunta

Esitetään Jyväskylän yliopiston yhteiskuntatieteellisen tiedekunnan suostumuksella
julkisesti tarkastettavaksi yliopiston vanhassa juhlasalissa S212
lokakuun 4. päivänä 2014 kello 12.

Academic dissertation to be publicly discussed, by permission of
the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Jyväskylä,
in building Seminarium, auditorium S212, on October 4, 2014 at 12 o'clock noon.



UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 2014

Debating
“the ABCs of Parliamentary Life”

The Learning of Parliamentary Rules and
Practices in the Late Nineteenth-Century
Finnish Diet and the Early Eduskunta

Onni Pekonen

Debating
“the ABCs of Parliamentary Life”

The Learning of Parliamentary Rules and
Practices in the Late Nineteenth-Century
Finnish Diet and the Early Eduskunta



UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 2014

Editors

Jussi Kotkavirta

Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä

Pekka Olsbo, Ville Korhakangas

Publishing Unit, University Library of Jyväskylä

URN:ISBN:978-951-39-5843-5

ISBN 978-951-39-5843-5 (PDF)

ISBN 978-951-39-5842-8 (nid.)

ISSN 0075-4625

Copyright © 2014, by University of Jyväskylä

Jyväskylä University Printing House, Jyväskylä 2014

ABSTRACT

Pekonen, Onni

Debating “the ABCs of Parliamentary Life”: The Learning of Parliamentary Rules and Practices in the Late Nineteenth-Century Finnish Diet and the Early Eduskunta

Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2014, 357 p.

(Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research

ISSN 0075-4625; 505)

ISBN 978-951-39-5842-8 (nid.)

ISBN 978-951-39-5843-5 (PDF)

‘Parliament’ has become an empty word. Contrary to their historical purpose, parliaments today are often considered as merely representative and legislative assemblies. They are treated as parts of the system of government, while paying little attention to their deliberative character or modes of proceeding. This is also the case in Finland, although Finnish parliamentarism was in fact originally developed through intra-parliamentary procedures.

The study examines the learning and development of parliamentary rules and practices in the late nineteenth-century Finnish Diet and the early twentieth-century unicameral parliament, the Eduskunta. It highlights a lost history of Finnish parliamentarism. While parliamentary government was largely out of the question in the Finnish grand duchy of the Russian Empire, the discussions in Finland reflect an understanding of parliamentarism as a procedural mode of politics. Procedures were seen as the essence of parliamentary activity; they offered a means to introduce characteristics of modern parliaments within the obsolete four-estate system.

Contrary to the standard interpretation, the thesis shows that the formulation of Finnish procedures was a process based on an active following of a variety of foreign discussions. Utilising possibilities offered by the recent digitisation of historic Finnish newspapers, the study sheds light on previously unstudied topics and explores the press as a means for learning and teaching foreign parliamentary models and as an arena for debating Finnish procedures. Finland was part of a European discourse: newspapers offered a means to fill gaps in the availability of parliamentary literature in the European periphery.

The early debates that had a defining influence on Eduskunta procedures were struggles between different conceptions of parliament. The procedural debates were closely connected to political agendas and ideological positions. Consequently, political groups used foreign models selectively, giving parliament different purposes and character. In the thesis, the Finnish discussions are analysed through international nineteenth-century parliamentary literature and authors such as John Stuart Mill and François Guizot.

Keywords: Eduskunta, parliamentarism, parliaments, estate diets, procedure, transnationalism, newspapers, mandate, unparliamentary language, plenum plenum, publicity, stenography, obstruction, Helsingfors Dagblad

Author's address Onni Pekonen
Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy /
Political Science
P. O. Box 35, FI-40014

Supervisors Professor Kari Palonen
Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy
University of Jyväskylä

Senior Researcher Jussi Kurunmäki
Department of Political Science
Stockholm University

Reviewers Senior Researcher Petri Koikkalainen
University of Lapland

Docent Henrik Stenius
University of Helsinki

Opponent Professor Henk te Velde
University of Leiden

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My PhD project has been a meaningful and greatly enjoyable experience. I owe a debt of gratitude for this to the people I have had the pleasure to spend time and work with during my years at university. First and foremost I thank my supervisor Kari Palonen for his support and feedback. Kari encouraged me to continue with my studies after my master's degree and offered me a start in his Academy of Finland Professorship project *The Politics of Dissensus*. I want to thank my second supervisor Jussi Kurunmäki for his valuable and detailed comments on my papers and especially on the manuscript. I am thankful to the reviewers of the manuscript, Henrik Stenius and Petri Koikkalainen, whose encouraging feedback helped me to refine and further develop my ideas. A warm thanks is also due to Bill Hellberg for revising my English and helping me to clarify my style of presentation.

I have been fortunate enough to enjoy the support and friendship of brilliant colleagues at the Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy as well as at the various academic events in which I have participated in Finland and abroad. I am grateful to my long-time friend Anna Björk and to my university roommate Jouni Tilli. Both have been invaluable not only as colleagues, but in sharing and relieving the academic angst. Early on during my PhD Jouni tipped me about the digitised Historical Newspaper Library, which led my research to new fruitful paths. Expatriate Veli-Pekka Parkkinen deserves special thanks for his friendship within and without the academy as well as for understanding my taste in music. Dear friends at our department, such as Hannele Harjunen, Helena Hirvonen, Henna Seinälä, Johanna Kivimäki, Laura Mankki, Melissa Plath and Antti Vesikko have been invaluable in reminding that the academic community is not all about work. I would also like to thank Jarno Hietalahti for his daily morning drop-bys and companionship in bodybuilding.

Members of our research team, initially organised around the *Politics of Dissensus* project, have offered important peer support throughout my PhD. I want to also thank Pasi Ihalainen and his team for the possibilities to share ideas with inspiring researchers and for offering me the chance to take part in interesting academic events. For financial support I want to thank the Alfred Kordelin Foundation, the University of Jyväskylä, the *Politics of Dissensus* project, the Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy and the National Graduate School of Political Studies (POLITU). I owe my warmest thanks to the administrative staff of the Faculty of the Social Sciences for their advice as well as for their regular treats of cakes and goodies.

Friends outside the university, especially in the fields of fly fishing, football, floorball and music, have helped me to maintain a perspective and healthy balance in life. Finally, I am extremely grateful to my parents and Aada-Maria for their support and encouragement in my studies and in life in general.

Jyväskylä 1.9.2014
Onni Pekonen

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	13
1.1	Reinterpreting Finnish parliamentarism.....	13
1.2	Procedure for the procedure: debating within and outside the Swedish framework.....	15
1.3	Research material: the occasion provided by digitised newspapers	23
1.4	Research questions, approach and methodology	26
1.5	Composition of the study	34
2	THE PARLIAMENTARY LEARNING PROCESS IN FINLAND AND THE ROLE OF THE NEWSPAPER PRESS.....	37
2.1	Styles of learning: reading, travelling, doing.....	37
2.2	Russian censorship and the availability of parliamentary literature in Finland.....	38
2.3	The newspaper press as a means for studying foreign parliamentary models	43
2.4	The newspaper press as an arena for debating Finnish procedures	45
2.5	The newspaper press as a medium for transfer, translation and popularisation of parliamentary procedures, ideas and concepts	46
3	POLITICAL GROUPS AND COMPETING IDEAS ON PARLIAMENTARISM IN THE FINNISH PROCEDURE DEBATES.....	50
3.1	The <i>Dagblad</i> liberals	51
3.1.1	<i>Helsingfors Dagblad</i> and the <i>Dagblad</i> group.....	51
3.1.2	<i>Dagblad</i> liberals and the procedural aspect of parliamentarism	54
3.2	The Fennomans	57
3.2.1	Organisation and main newspapers in the procedure debates	57
3.2.2	Fennoman approaches to parliaments and parliamentarism	61
3.3	The Social Democrats	62
3.4	Debate, deliberation and representation	65
3.4.1	The <i>Dagblad</i> liberals and John Stuart Mill's notion of debate	65
3.4.2	Notions of debate in the Finnish newspaper polemics of the early 1860s	71

	3.4.3	J. V. Snellman on (public) debate and deliberation.....	73
	3.4.4	Debate and progress	77
	3.4.5	François Guizot on representative government	79
4		(UN)PARLIAMENTARY SPEECH AND LANGUAGE	87
	4.1	Speaking to the question.....	88
	4.2	Freedom of speech and (un)parliamentary language	90
	4.3	The speaker as the referee of parliamentary debate and representative of the assembly	92
	4.4	Unparliamentary language and conduct in the Finnish Diets.....	102
	4.5	Unparliamentary language and conduct in the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–06 and the early Eduskunta	106
	4.6	Conclusions	111
5		FREE AND IMPERATIVE MANDATE	114
	5.1	The break with the imperative mandate	115
	5.2	The ban on imperative mandate in Finland.....	117
	5.3	Demarcations between parliamentary and estate representation in the Finnish Diets.....	120
	5.4	Fennomans and <i>Dagblad</i> liberals on representation, corporatist interests and parties.....	122
	5.5	The Diet and the Eduskunta as parts of parliamentary history – from presentation of private interests to representation of the common good.....	126
	5.6	The elitist notion of representation	130
	5.7	The Social Democrats’ delegate model as a catalyst for disputes on imperative mandate.....	135
	5.8	The Eduskunta as a deliberative assembly	139
	5.9	Conclusions	143
6		PLENUM PLENORUM – THE ESTATES’ JOINT DISCUSSION	145
	6.1	Plenum plenorum in the Diet Act of 1869.....	145
	6.2	Finland’s two plena plenorum: 1872 and 1885.....	148
	6.3	Other procedures for overcoming the four-estate division.....	150
	6.4	Fennomans and the <i>Dagblad</i> liberal stands on plenum plenorum	155
	6.5	Negotiation versus debate.....	156
	6.6	Proposals for improving plenum plenorum.....	161
	6.6.1	Supplements to the Swedish model	161
	6.6.2	Chydenius’s proposal on plenum plenorum as an effort to parliamentarise the Diet readings	162
	6.6.3	Plenum plenorum as a means for parliamentary oversight and responsibility	167
	6.7	On the failure of plenum plenorum.....	174
	6.8	Parliamentary readings in the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1906.....	176
	6.9	Conclusions	179

7	PARLIAMENTARY MINUTES.....	181
7.1	From secretarial to the stenographic model	182
7.1.1	Parliamentary minutes and documents in the Diet Act of 1869	182
7.1.2	The January Committee of 1862.....	184
7.1.3	Stenography in the first Diets of Finland.....	186
7.1.4	Introduction of stenography in all four estates	187
7.2	Minutes and competing notions of objectivity	189
7.3	Minutes and deliberation	192
7.3.1	Political education among parliamentarians	192
7.3.2	Overcoming the estate divisions.....	195
7.3.3	Parliamentary continuity	195
7.3.4	Efficient deliberation	197
7.3.5	Debate tactics	198
7.4	Studies of past parliaments: Minutes as essential to constitutional, national and parliamentary history	199
7.5	The changing practices concerning stenographic minutes from the Diet to the Eduskunta	200
7.5.1	Procedures on minutes in the Diets.....	200
7.5.2	Transition to the unicameral Eduskunta	203
7.5.3	Learning by traveling: F. W. Kadenius's field trip to European parliaments	204
7.5.4	Institutionalisation of parliamentary stenography in the Eduskunta	206
7.5.5	Procedures on minutes in the early Eduskunta.....	207
7.6	Recurrent challenges of parliamentary minutes: Disputing objectivity and the stenographic ideal.....	209
7.6.1	Correction of minutes.....	209
7.6.2	Written statements	214
7.6.3	Insertions and removals.....	216
7.6.4	From verbal to literal - on the (im)possibility of true verbatim.....	219
7.6.5	Interjections.....	221
7.7	Conclusions	225
8	PARLIAMENTARY PUBLICITY	226
8.1	Introduction of parliamentary publicity in Finland	226
8.1.1	Publicity in the Diet Act of 1869 and the Swedish model	226
8.1.2	The Finnish estates' decisions on publicity in the Diet of 1863-64.....	229
8.2	Means and temporal audiences of parliamentary publicity	231
8.3	The newspaper press in the service of parliamentary publicity.....	234
8.3.1	Foreign models of parliamentary reporting.....	234
8.3.2	Quick and affordable, but limited and partial	240

8.3.3	<i>Dagblad</i> liberals and E. G. Palmén: Newspapers as perspectives to/in debate	244
8.4	Parliamentary newspapers – quick and accurate, but expensive....	246
8.5	Official parliamentary print – accurate, but expensive and slow....	250
8.5.1	Debates on official parliamentary print: economy, delays and the language question.....	250
8.5.2	Foreign models of parliamentary print.....	256
8.6	Arguments for parliamentary publicity	257
8.6.1	Informing the public	258
8.6.2	Reproducing the order of the parliament – parliament as a procedural model.....	260
8.6.3	Educating the people	262
8.6.4	Constraining members to perform their duty	267
8.6.5	Guidance of the public and profiting from its information..	270
8.6.6	Enabling the electors to act from knowledge.....	272
8.6.7	The Social Democrats’ ‘parliamentary publicity’ coup in the early Eduskunta	276
8.7	Parliamentary publicity as publicity between parliaments.....	278
8.8	Adopting procedures on parliamentary minutes outside the Diet and the Eduskunta.....	279
8.9	Conclusions	281
9	PARLIAMENTARY OBSTRUCTION	283
9.1	Obstruction and scarcity of parliamentary time	284
9.2	Introduction of parliamentary obstruction in Finland – the Irish obstruction in the Finnish press.....	286
9.3	Obstruction in the Fennoman rhetoric of progress and reform.....	292
9.4	Parliamentary obstruction in the debates of the Finnish Parliamentary Reform of 1906	296
9.5	The concept of obstruction and the Social Democrats’ attack on parliamentary debate	301
9.6	Conclusions	304
10	CONCLUSIONS.....	306
	TIIVISTELMÄ	316
	REFERENCES.....	323

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Reinterpreting Finnish parliamentarism

The Diet of the Grand Duchy of Finland was convened in 1863 for the first time since 1809. When the Diet convened, on 15 September, none of the members of the estates had experience in Diet proceedings and practices, due to the more than 50-year break in Finnish parliamentary life.

This fact opened up the question of the procedures of the Diet. It provoked an intense discussion about applying the ‘parliamentary’ manners of proceeding to the Finnish four-estate Diet. Early on during the Diets it was noticed that the existing collections of Diet procedures included rules that were inadequate, contradictory or impossible to implement (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981b). Therefore the broader European discussion on parliamentary procedures entered the Finnish debate; the problem was how and to what degree they might be applicable to the Finnish estates.

This thesis examines the parliamentary learning process that occurred in Finland during the late nineteenth-century Diets and during the early twentieth-century unicameral parliament, the Eduskunta. By analysing the discussions and argumentation behind Finnish parliamentary procedures,¹ the thesis connects Finnish parliamentary practices to the European parliamentary tradition and its debates, cultures and trends.

Based on the Diet Act of 1869 the Finnish Diets assembled regularly until the Parliamentary Reform of 1906 and the first session of the Eduskunta in 1907. The existing studies dealing with the period have emphasised that in Finland parliamentarism was still a distant dream: “There was no sign of any parlia-

¹ Parliamentary procedures regulate the proceedings of parliaments. Procedures consist of rules and practices established by the parliament itself. The purpose of parliamentary procedures is to secure regularity, continuity and efficiency of parliamentary work. More than determining how certain situations are to be handled or outcomes reached in a parliament, parliamentary rules and practices define what kind of a deliberative representative assembly a parliament is.

mentarism" (Vares 2000, 23), or if parliamentarism existed, it was "weak" (Pulkkinen 2003, 238).

Contrary to interpretations that have approached parliamentarism merely as a system of government, this study recovers a lost history of parliamentarisation in Finland. The Finnish debates since the 1860s indicate that while parliamentary government was largely out of question, the role of parliament and its mode of proceeding were a central political topic both in the Diet as well as in the newspaper press. The procedural aspect was prominent both in countries with and countries without a parliamentary government. Parliamentarism was explicated in the Finnish discussions through its procedure as a mode of speech, debate and deliberation.

The existing literature on the Finnish parliament has to a great extent neglected the procedural aspect of parliamentary politics and its international background. Histories of the Finnish parliament have lacked a historical and transnational analysis of parliamentary procedures, ideas and concepts. Instead of analysing the ideas, arguments and foreign discussions behind Finnish parliamentary procedures, the research on the Eduskunta's early phases has focused on the national context and the historical processes connected to the reforms of the Diet Act of 1869 and the Parliament Act of 1906 (e.g. Krusius-Ahrenberg 1944; 1981c; Mylly 2006).

Studies on the Eduskunta's procedures have concentrated on jurisprudential analyses aimed at evaluating the proper interpretation and application of the rules and practices of the parliament (e.g. Hidén 1967; 2007; Lilius 1974). However, even this research has not taken the procedures' international aspect into account: their role and meaning in the wider parliamentary context has been left unexplicated. Instead, the procedures have been interpreted narrowly from the Finnish legislators' point of view, searching for the rules' intended meaning and tracing possible changes in their application (*ibid.*).

The existing literature and public discussion limits parliamentary activity to the mechanics of responsibility of the government and representation of the will of the majority, seen as produced in elections, and pays little attention to the deliberations of the parliament. Such studies have focused instead on parliamentary government, elections and suffrage. At the same time, the lack of interest in deliberation has led to neglect of the rich variety of Finnish discussions and their linkages to foreign models.²

In this study, the Finnish procedure debates are re-evaluated. The present reading is critical of, firstly, the idea of parliamentarism to which the existing literature is indebted, and secondly, the conventional account of the style, timing and scope of the learning and adoption of parliamentary rules and practices in Finland. Thirdly, I focus on the political aspects of the debates. The study illustrates how rather technical questions of procedure were associated with different conceptions of parliamentary activity and profound ideological disputes.

² See the two histories of the Eduskunta mentioned above. See Conclusions for further reflections on the matter.

According to the standard interpretation, the Finnish procedures were adopted from the Swedish Riksdag law and practice.³ This study aims to produce a more detailed and balanced understanding by including the vast amount of unstudied newspaper material. The recently digitised newspaper sources offer new perspectives for the reinterpretation of Finnish parliamentarism. Newspaper discussions reveal the significance that the actors of the period attached to procedural aspects during the formative years of Finnish parliamentary life. The present thesis argues that the Eduskunta's procedures cannot be properly understood without a historical study of broader international character.

1.2 Procedure for the procedure: debating within and outside the Swedish framework

In 1809 Finland, until then an eastern part of Sweden, became a grand duchy of the Russian Empire. The same year, the Finnish estates were summoned by Tsar Alexander I for the *Diet of Porvoo*, but were not convened again for over fifty years until 1863. In 1809 the Diet, or *Lantdag*, assembled in Porvoo to pledge allegiance to the emperor and to discuss and to give advice on questions about the armed forces, imperial taxes, fiscal matters and the founding of a council of government. The pledge and imperial affirmation formed together a status treaty, whereby the ruler and the estates undertook to uphold the existing legal status. However, in the affirmation the emperor did not speak of a constitution as such and the affirmation did not denote a modern form of government in the sense of a constitutional state with constitutional laws. (Jussila 1999, 14–15) The question of which laws the affirmation actually dealt with remained unclear (Jussila 1969, 18–21). Thus, the expressions 'constitutional laws' and 'constitutional privileges' mentioned in the affirmation became understood, interpreted and disputed in a variety of ways until the 1860s (Jussila 1969).

When the Finnish estates assembled in the 1860s after an over 50-year hiatus, the external constitutional forms were the same as in 1809, but their content and significance were understood differently (Jussila 1969, II; Krusius-Ahrenberg 1934, 7–8). Similar was the case with the Diet procedures, a question which was seriously taken up in the early 1860s when the news on the convening of the Finnish Diet spread. The laws on which the Diet procedures were to be based became a central topic of discussion and controversy. Due to the long hiatus between the Diets, no tradition or fixed procedures were created in Porvoo. The practices of the Porvoo Diet, which were based on a selection of Swedish Gustavian laws seen as appropriate to the circumstances (Jussila 1969, 133–134), were rarely mentioned in the late nineteenth-century Finnish proce-

³ See e.g. the two vast histories of the Finnish Diet and the Eduskunta, *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia 1–12*, published by *Eduskunnan historiakomitea* 1958–1982 and *Suomen eduskunta 100 vuotta 1–12*, published by *Suomen Eduskunta* 2006–2008.

ture debates. The Porvoo Diet was held in a conservative atmosphere, paternalistic towards the people but submissive towards the emperor, in contrast to the Swedish Riksdag held in Stockholm the same year (Jussila 1969, 100, 132). Whereas the Riksdag assembled in 1809 to formulate a new constitution in the spirit of French and American models, in Porvoo the focus was on building on the old foundations (*ibid.*).

Finland did not remain totally excluded from the parliamentary discussions of Europe. A sign of the young Finnish intelligentsia's interest in parliaments was the Finnish newspaper reporting on foreign parliamentary debates early on in the nineteenth century. For example, in the 1820s newspapers such as *Finlands Allmänna Tidning* reported regularly and extensively on the British and French parliaments. Finnish university students applied newspapers' lessons on parliamentary style of debate to their student unions' mini-parliaments (Klinge 1967, 179). The Russian censorship did not stop the flow of political literature altogether, which, in the early nineteenth century Western political and legislative literature that came to Finland mostly through Sweden, included an emphasis on constitutions and on liberal and revolutionary thought. Part of the literature was smuggled into Finland and secretly circulated among the political elite. (Jussila 1969, 99–102, 127–129, 185) Already during this period Finnish constitutional matters were reflected on and discussed indirectly in Finland's newspapers by presenting foreign constitutions⁴ or by carrying on the discussion in Sweden's press (*ibid.* 125, 177).

Finland's status as a grand duchy of the Russian Empire to a great extent set the limits for Finland's parliamentary reform. The Crimean War (1853–56) marked a turning point in Finnish political life. In 1856, six days before the Treaty of Paris, Tsar Alexander II introduced to the Senate of Finland a reform programme, whose implementation gave the Finnish actors an opportunity to ask for a convening of the Diet. However, instead of the Diet, in the April Manifesto of 1861 the emperor convened a committee, which consisted of 48 members, 12 elected from each of the four estates. The January Committee was in session from 20 January to 6 March 1862. The Finnish liberals,⁵ who had originally strongly opposed the summoning of the January Committee and called it unconstitutional, were in the majority in the Committee. Eventually, the emperor promised to convene a real Diet and this was published before the January Committee met. Thus, the January Committee's task was to prepare and discuss matters for the proposed Diet of 1863–64.

The January Committee's procedures were problematic as no model for such a meeting existed in the laws available. The members had to adapt themselves to working in an assembly that had characteristics both of a committee and a larger assembly: the members saw their roles as individuals delegated by the estate, the committee held joint discussions of all four estates and voted by the 'one man, one vote' principle. (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981a, 25–92) The Janu-

⁴ See e.g. *Åbo Allmänna Tidning*, 26 Apr., 1817, 1–3; 29 Apr., 1817, 1–2.

⁵ The 'liberal group' will be dealt with in Section 3.1.

ary Committee's role in the development of the Diet procedures remained minor.

The emperor's promise to convene the Diet activated the Finnish discussion on possible and valid Diet procedures. Newspapers began to publish collections of Swedish laws and precedents in order to clarify and steer the establishment of Finnish procedures.⁶ In addition to the newspaper press, academics participated in the discussion by writing books on the matter. In 1861 Professor of Law Johan Philip Palmén published a collection of the constitutional laws of the Grand Duchy of Finland (Palmén 1861; 1862). However, when the preparations for the first Diet began during the sessions of the January Committee, the question of which procedures should guide the Diet work remained unclear. For example Palmén's collection gave very little information on the estates' rules of procedure, and the Riksdag Act of 1617⁷ as well as the Standing Orders of the House of Knights of 1626 included in Palmén's collection seemed strangely obsolete. This had been the case already in the Swedish Riksdags of the Gustavian era (1772–1809), when the latter two legal acts were followed only in part, often in the form amended by the Age of Liberty's Riksdag Act of 1723. (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981b, 95)

Due to the difficulties, the Senate of Finland gave jurist Eugen von Knorring the task of preparing a set of procedures for the upcoming Diet. Von Knorring made a study trip to Sweden where he discussed the matter with Johan Jakob Nordström, a Finnish expert on constitutional law who had moved to Sweden and became a member of the Riksdag. With the help of Nordström, von Knorring formulated a summary of the valid rules and practices to be followed in the Diet of Finland,⁸ which was accepted in St. Petersburg in March 1863 and published as an official statute in Finland. In 1862, J. J. Nordström had drawn up a memorandum on some aspects of the Riksdag procedures used before 1809 (Nordström 1912 [1862]). Professor Johan Wilhelm Rosenborg used Nordström's memorandum when publishing a book on the Swedish Riksdags, which was based on his lecture series at the University of Helsinki in spring 1863 (Rosenborg 1863) (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981b, 97). Parts of Rosenborg's book were published in the newspapers⁹. At the end of July 1863 Nordström sent to the Senate of Finland his proposal for the Finnish Diet Act (Nordström 1912 [1863]), but it arrived too late to be ratified and applied in the first Diet.

The efforts to define standing orders for the Diet did not satisfy the Finnish actors, who saw a new Diet Act as the primary and most important question

⁶ See e.g. *Åbo Underrättelser*, 7 May, 1861, 3; *Papperslyktan*, 22 Apr., 1861, 1–6; 21 May, 1861, 1–5; 27 May, 1861, 4–6; *Helsingin Uutiset*, 16 Apr., 1863, 2–4; 20 Apr., 1863, 2–3; *Suometar*, 5 May, 1863, 2–3; 8 May, 1863, 2–3; 12 May, 1863, 2; 15 May, 1863, 2.

⁷ The Act is often referred to as Riksdagsordningen 1617, although its original name is *Ordningen för ständernas sammanträden 1617*, or in full *Ordning som hållas skall uti Rikdens Ständers möter och sammankomster så ock uti omröstande*.

⁸ *Sammanfattning af gällande stadganden och vedertagna bruk, hvilka ega tillämpning på ordningen vid landtdag i storfurstendömet Finland*, published in *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 24 Apr., 1863, 2–3; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 25 Apr., 1863, 1–3.

⁹ See e.g. translations in *Suomen Julkisia Sanomia*, 7 Sept., 1863, 3; 10 Sept., 1863, 3–4; 14 Sept., 1863, 2–3; 24 Sept., 1863, 2–3; 28 Sept., 1863, 3–4; 1 Oct., 1863, 3; 5 Oct., 1863, 3–4.

regarding the Diet (see e.g. J. Ph. Palmén in *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 28 July, 1863, 1). When the Diet convened, none of the members of the estates had experience in Diet work. Early on during the Diet work it was noticed that the existing collections of Diet procedures still included rules that were insufficient, contradictory and impossible to implement (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981b). The estates resolved procedural challenges often *in casu* and formulated their own procedures.

In the Diet of 1863–64 the estates drafted a petition on a new Diet Act to be considered during the next Diet. At the end of the 1863–64 session, a Constitutional Law Committee was established to prepare a proposal for a revised Constitution Act and the new Diet Act that would set the procedures for the organisation and proceedings of the Finnish Diet. The Diet Act was ratified by the emperor 15 April 1869 after it had been examined by the Senate of Finland, the Committee for Finnish Affairs and the Finnish Diet of 1867. The reform on the Constitution Act failed due the radical character of the revisions proposed by the Constitutional Law Committee, especially on reducing the prerogatives of the emperor in relation to the Senate of Finland (see Grotenfelt 1912; Krusius-Ahrenberg 1944; 1981c; Tyynilä 1992, 190–200). The prerogatives of the emperor, separation of powers between the legislative and executive branches, and the idea that the government must enjoy the confidence of the parliament were questions the Finnish actors were careful about in relation to the imperial powers. These questions were considered delicate in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Finland and thorough reforms on them were understood to be difficult, if not impossible, to implement.

The Constitutional Law Committee began its meetings 1 February 1865. The Committee consisted of a secretary and nine expert members, almost all of whom had experience from the Diet of 1863–64.¹⁰ The Committee was instructed by the emperor to model the Act mainly after Sweden's Riksdag Act of 1617 as well as the parts of the Riksdag Act of 1723 that were established in Riksdag practice after 1772. Experiences from the Diet of 1863–1864 could also be used. (Bergh 1884, 476–477) Thus the Committee's proposal could not, due to the given instructions and under the political circumstances, refer to any Swedish laws or practices instituted after 1809, when Finland was incorporated into Russia. The Committee was, however, able to circumvent this, adopting later Swedish procedures, particularly concerning the Riksdag Act of 1810, by tracing its legal roots to precedents set during the Swedish-Finnish era and partly by hiding the models used. In view of the estates' more detailed rules and practices, the emperor's instructions left considerably room for manoeuvre. (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981c, 258–259)

¹⁰ Based in part on a proposal of the Senate of Finland and on the decision of the Committee for Finnish Affairs, the members of the Constitutional Law Committee were Chair J. M. Nordenstam, J. A. von Essen, N. Grotenfelt, J. G. Schatlovitz, G. Tengström, E. Bergenheim, J. W. Rosenborg, E. von Knorring and J. A. von Born. (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981b, 187) The secretary was Adolf Grotenfelt (Tyynilä 1992, 190–191). The Committee had a "liberal" majority, which tried (especially von Knorring, Grotenfelt, Tengström, Rosenborg and von Essen) to bend the letter of the Russian instructions (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981c, 260).

Although the formulation of the Diet Act in the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 took place in a short two-month period, the Act and its rules had been under discussion for years. The Committee utilised Nordström's *Promemoria* (1912 [1862]) and proposal for the Diet Act (1912 [1863]), von Knorring's *Sammanfattning* and Rosenborg's *Om riksdagar* (1863). In addition, the Committee applied in its secret sittings Swedish material concerning the Riksdag Act of 1810, on which also Nordström's proposal for the Diet Act was largely built.

Most importantly, the 1860s saw an increase in Finnish interest in foreign parliamentary topics. In the early 1860s first the rumours and then the emperor's call to convene the Diet raised hopes on the beginning of regular parliamentary life. The first Diets assembled in 1863–64 and 1867. Based on § 2 of the Diet Act of 1869 the Diet was convened regularly, every five years until 1882, and then at three-year intervals until the Parliamentary Reform of 1906, with extraordinary Diet sessions in 1899 and 1905–06. The Diets were normally in session from four to five months. During the period, members of the Diet, political groups and academia were showing increasing enthusiasm towards foreign parliamentary discussions. The interest in foreign parliamentary topics and models was motivated by a desire to develop the Finnish system towards the principles and procedures of modern parliaments, and consequently, to strengthen Finland's status in the eyes of European nations, most importantly in relation to the Russian Empire. The interest became apparent in the form of an increased amount of articles about foreign parliaments and their procedures. At the same time more and more references to foreign discussions were being made.

The efforts to revise the Finnish procedures in no sense ended with the Diet Act of 1869. The interest in, and learning of, foreign models was applied in procedure debates in order to 'parliamentarise' the Finnish procedures. Newspaper publications on parliaments pointed out the fact that the Diet lagged far behind the admired foreign models. Whereas Sweden had adopted a bicameral parliament in 1866 (see Kurunmäki 2000, 26–45), Finland retained the medieval four-estate system. The old Finnish constitutions, namely the Swedish Instrument of Government of 1772 and the Union and Security Act of 1789, prescribed a strict system of dualism in which the monarch and his government bodies vested with executive power on the one hand and the Diet on the other, were considered independent of each other. The Diet had merely an advisory role in relation to the monarch: the estates' task was mainly to examine, negotiate and approve or reject propositions of the emperor prepared by the Senate of Finland¹¹ and to present their wishes in the form of humble petitions. Individual members of the estate did not have the right to introduce motions and the estates were not given the right until 1886. The emperor had the sovereign right to

¹¹ The Senate of Finland (1816–1918), originally the Government Council (1809–1816), combined the functions of the executive branch and the supreme court and was divided into the economic division and the judicial division. The members of the senate had to be Finnish citizens.

turn down the passage of any bill¹² and to dissolve the Diet. The Senate of Finland, known as the 'domestic government', was appointed by the emperor and not responsible to the Diet but to the emperor alone.¹³ The four-estate representation was narrow: representatives were chosen from a small part of the population consisting of the grand duchy's most wealthy elite. The Nobility's representation was based on family origin, the Clergy's on official rank, the Burghers' on occupation and tax-paying capacity and the Peasants' on land ownership (Mylly 2006, 36).¹⁴

Lolo Krusius-Ahrenberg (1981a, 16) has argued that the language connection and societal similarities made the Finnish actors turn towards Sweden in search of models for developing the Diet procedures. However, it can be argued, based on a reading of Finnish procedure debates and newspaper material on parliaments, that for the Finnish actors the old Swedish model served rather as a starting point for developing the Diet, which could be easier legitimised for the Russian authority. As reforms on representation, parliamentary powers and parliamentary responsibility were unlikely to be granted, the student generation of the 1860s in particular wanted to develop the Finnish system indirectly by revising the Diet procedures towards the studied foreign models. Consequently, a series of procedural innovations were proposed, discussed and disputed in the Finnish estates and the press.

The knowledge gained about foreign parliaments was applied to the Finnish procedure debates starting in the 1860s. Swedish law was used purposefully already in the early formulation and selection of the Diet procedures in the early 1860s.¹⁵ Furthermore, the opportunities given by the vague Swedish framework were further utilised in and after the formulation of the Diet Act of 1869.

Based on the Russian instructions concerning the Swedish model, some of the procedures, involving e.g. members' rights, the powers, composition and election of the estates, the duties of the speakers, and organisation of the readings, committees and voting processes, were established by the Diet Act of 1869, while others more detailed and closely connected to the estates' daily deliberations were left to the estates to decide. Thus, the Act left room for the establishment and revision of new rules and practices. Especially in the 1870s and 1880s, the Diet Act offered a framework for Finnish reformists for developing the procedures. Such rules were often defined in the estates' own rules and practices. In some cases the Swedish Riksdag law gave the Finnish procedures a form, but their meaning and practice were disputed in relation to other foreign models. In several instances, the wording of Swedish law was understood as a convenient

¹² It became a practice for the emperor to either approve or reject laws in the form the estates presented them. If the estates had revised a proposal by the emperor, the emperor did not modify the estates' revision, but sent a new proposal to the estates. (Mylly 2006, 21) On the procedures for Diet readings, see Chapter 6.

¹³ In practice the Senate and the Diet often worked together to achieve reforms (Mylly 2006, 36).

¹⁴ For a presentation of the Finnish estate representation in English, see Alapuro 2006.

¹⁵ For examples, see the case studies in Chapters 4-9. Some examples of the purposeful use of the Swedish model have been acknowledged, most notably by Krusius-Ahrenberg (1981b; 1981c).

medium for the adoption of the types of procedures already widely established in European parliaments.

Although Swedish parliamentary discussions were reported in newspapers, the Swedish Riksdag was not presented in Finnish procedure debates and newspaper articles as an ideal model parliament.¹⁶ Instead, in several cases, Finnish actors emphasised the obsolete character of the Swedish practices.¹⁷ References to the Riksdag's procedures were made mostly in order to clarify the Finnish tradition and its origins. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, when the framework of the Diet procedures had become clearer, the Swedish case was used more seldom as one model among others.

An exploration of Finnish newspapers helps to uncover the variety of foreign models used and the well-developed understanding in Finland about international parliamentary discussions and trends. The analysis of the press material makes clear that the learning of parliamentary procedures in Finland was, instead of a mechanical adoption of the Swedish rules at hand,¹⁸ a learning process based on a close following of European discussions. From this point of view, the existing studies of the Diet procedures seem stuck in the polemics of the language question and Scandinavianism that were prominent in the day-to-day politics of Finland as well as in Finland's balancing act between the two mother countries of Sweden and Russia (cf. Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981a, 17).

The four-estate Diet was abolished by the Parliamentary Reform of 1906. The Reform has been highlighted as a significant turning point in Finnish parliamentary life (e.g. Seitkari 1958) as Europe's last four-estate Diet was transformed into a unicameral parliament elected by universal suffrage. In the last Diet elections of 1905 about 8 % (125,000) of the Finnish population had the right to vote, whereas in the first elections of the unicameral Eduskunta in 1907 the amount was tenfold (Jyränki 2006, 14).¹⁹ However, in terms of the Eduskunta's procedures, the Reform was a continuation of a learning process that had started already in the nineteenth century.

Similarly to the Porvoo Diet of 1809 (Klinge 2009) and the beginning of the Finnish Diets in the 1860s, the Parliamentary Reform of 1906 was a result of shifts in Russian and international politics. Against the backdrop of the Russo-Japanese War, the events of the Revolution of 1905 in Russia and the Great Strike in Finland, Tsar Nicholas II signed the November Manifesto on 4 November 1905 in which he pledged to convene the Finnish Diet to discuss the

¹⁶ A reason for this was also the Finnish politics of the period, which developed, or rather were positioned, around Finland's cultural relations to the old mother country (see Sections 3.1 and 3.2).

¹⁷ E.g. regarding parliamentary minutes; see Chapter 7.

¹⁸ For such an interpretation, see e.g. Jyränki 2006, 18.

¹⁹ Although the Reform of 1906 gave the right to vote and right to stand for election to Finnish citizens above the age of 24, this "universal" suffrage excluded one-seventh of the population of voting age. The restrictions on suffrage concerned especially the poor, the unemployed, the homeless, persons convicted of crimes, the disabled and members of the military.

question of parliamentary reform in Finland.²⁰ The Senate of Finland appointed a reform committee to prepare the question.²¹ The Parliamentary Reform Committee consisted of 14 members whose political stands reflected the current political setting.²² The Committee had a strong knowledge of foreign constitutions and vast experience in parliamentary work, ten of its members having been members of the Finnish Diet (Mylly 2006, 106).

The Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–06 prepared proposals for new legislation, the Parliament and Electoral Acts, and to a great extent formulated their final content. The Committee was in session from 8 December 1905 to 28 February 1906. Its proposal was examined by the Senate of Finland, Governor-General Nikolai Gerard, the Russo-Finnish Advisory Board, the emperor and the Diet of Finland. Tsar Nicholas II ratified the Parliament Act on 20 July 1906. The Parliament Act of 1906 replaced the Diet Act of 1869 and prescribed certain of the Eduskunta's procedures.

Due to the revisions made by the Russo-Finnish Advisory Board, the Finnish reformists did not succeed in their efforts to increase the powers of the parliament. No parliamentary government existed in Finland before the constitution enacted after the independence of 1917. The emperor maintained his right to decide on the passing of bills and to dissolve the parliament. The first parliamentary elections for the unicameral Eduskunta were held on 15 and 16 March 1907. The Parliament Act, which largely followed the form and model of the Diet Act of 1869, gave the Eduskunta's rights, powers and readings a general form. Within the framework of the Parliament Act of 1906, the Eduskunta created its practices and decided on its rules of procedure, which were first prepared by what were known as the Committee of Seven. The rules of procedure gave additional and more detailed rules on, for example, the organisation of the Eduskunta, the election and the work of the committees, the minutes as well as on speech, discussion and voting in the plenary sessions. The rules of procedure were revised during the first parliamentary sessions. After the Parliamentary Reform, the Eduskunta assembled for 90 days annually from 1907

²⁰ For a general overview and background of the Parliamentary Reform, especially from the point of view of suffrage and representation, see Mylly 2006; Jussila 1999, 79–86.

²¹ On 10 November the Senate, composed of Old Finns, named a committee: it met only once, however, due to the objection of the Constitutionalist, who saw the appointment of the committee as a task for the next Senate, which was appointed on 1 December. The new Constitutionalist Senate appointed a new reform committee on 4 December. Its members, however, were mostly the same as had been on the first. (Mylly 2006, 106)

²² The members of the Committee were Swedish Party members Chair Robert Hermanson, Emil Schybergson, T. J. Boisman and Felix Heikel; Young Finns Santeri Alkio, Thiodolf Rein, E. N. Setälä and K. J. Ståhlberg; Old Finns J. R. Danielson, J. K. Paasikivi and Juho Torppa; and Social Democrats Yrjö Sirola, Edvard Valpas and H. Lindroos. (Mylly 2006, 104–106; for detailed descriptions of the committee members, see Mylly 2006, 107–111). The political groups will be discussed in Chapter 3 and further in the case studies in Chapters 4–9.

until 1914, unless the emperor decided otherwise. In practice the emperor dissolved the Eduskunta several times.²³

Irrespective of the changes in the composition of the parliament and in the stages of treatment of matters, a large part of the rules of the Parliament Act of 1906 was a continuation of the rules and practices of the Diet or responses to the procedure disputes that had arisen in the estates. However, the discussions of the early Eduskunta brought new challenges concerning the implementation of the established rules. As a result of unicameralism, universal suffrage and the formation of new political parties, the old styles of deliberation and modes of proceeding became contested in a new manner especially by the Social Democratic Party. The Eduskunta was defended from the new attacks by referring to a variety of foreign models and discussions.

1.3 Research material: the occasion provided by digitised newspapers

The central novelty of the study is the systematic analysis of lately digitised newspaper material. The recent digitisation of Finnish newspapers in the *Historical Newspaper Library of the Finnish National Library*²⁴ has enabled a closer, more systematic and more efficient examination of discussions on Finnish and foreign parliaments than before. At this point, the digitised library includes most of the newspapers published in Finland 1771–1912. The utilisation of this occasion and new tool makes possible to challenge established interpretations of Finnish parliamentary politics and its history. As older literature has relied on microfilm and paper versions, studies on the Diet and the early Eduskunta have often discussed the same limited amount of articles over and over again, thus giving a relatively small section of material a canonical and dominating role in the historical interpretation.²⁵

In this study, the exploration of newspapers has guided the analysis towards procedures that, despite having received little attention in the scholarly literature, were regarded as highly important for parliamentary life by the actors of the period. The thesis invites closer attention to texts and speeches that have been considered minor works in the Finnish historical canon. Some of the

²³ The Eduskunta was dissolved in 1908, 1909 (twice), 1910 and 1913. In 1908 the reason was the Eduskunta's expression of no-confidence in the Senate as a result of the Russian Duma's interpellation on the status of Finland. In 1909 the question was about compensation to Russia for Finland's exemption from military service, which the Eduskunta refused to pass. In 1910 the dissolution was due apparently to Speaker Svinhufvud's critique in the Eduskunta's opening against the new order in which only the governor-general could present matters for decision to the emperor. In 1913 the reason was, in addition to the "military millions", the Parity Act of 1912, which gave civil rights to Russian residents in Finland. Speaker Svinhufvud refused to take these matters into the readings and the emperor dissolved the parliament.

²⁴ URL: <http://digi.lib.helsinki.fi/sanomalehti?language=en>

²⁵ This is a problem, for example, of the old history of the Eduskunta, *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia 1–12* published by *Eduskunnan historiakomitea* 1958–1982.

discussions remained “undiscovered” in the predigital newspaper archives, while others were discarded as unimportant for having no obvious immediate impact on the political system and political constellations of the period. In addition, understudied newspaper sources have enabled a new contextualisation of topics already discussed in the literature.

The primary research material consists of parliamentary debates, committee discussions and books, newspapers and journals published in Finland from early 1860s to the first years of the Eduskunta. The research material covers the period in which the procedural foundations of the Finnish parliament were laid down and interest in foreign parliaments was at its highest. The rules of the Diet Act of 1869, the Parliament Act of 1906, the estates’ rules and practices and the Eduskunta’s first rules of procedures have been to a great extent transferred to later Finnish parliamentary law and practice up to the present day. The period was characterised by a procedural understanding of parliamentary politics, an aspect lost in later studies and discussions.²⁶

I have used original archive sources in the analysis of the reforms on the Diet Act of 1869 and the Parliament Act of 1906. The Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 material in the National Archives and in the Library of the Eduskunta consists of the Committee’s proposal for the Diet Act, its justifications and members’ objections and remarks as well as some individual notes of the Committee’s work. The Committee’s archive material includes also the Senate of Finland report and proposal for the Diet Act and objections and comments of Senate members. The Constitutional Law Committee did not take minutes of its meetings, but Lolo Krusius-Ahrenberg’s (1944; 1981c) and Kustavi Grotenfelt’s (1912) studies of the Committee have been helpful in shedding light on the personal notes of Committee members. This literature has been informative with regard to the Act’s reading in the Committee of Finnish Affairs.

In the analysis of the debates on the Parliament Act of 1906 I have utilised the archival material available at the Finnish National Archive and the Library of the Eduskunta, which include summarised minutes of the discussions of the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–06 as well as attached written statements and proposals of individual Committee members. References to the Senate’s and the Russo-Finnish Advisory Board’s readings are based on secondary literature as their discussions were of lesser importance to my research interests:

²⁶ The research material ends at the first years of the Eduskunta after the main procedure debates of the early Eduskunta had taken place. After 1914 the Eduskunta was not convened again until the Russian Revolution of 1917, although elections were held in 1916. The research material is framed to exclude discussions of the Constitution Act of 1919, which was the first constitution of Finnish independence. The discussions on the constitution did not touch on the Eduskunta’s procedures: According to the Constitution Act, the procedures of the Eduskunta had been enacted in the Parliament Act of 1906 (Suomen hallitusmuoto 1919, § 17). The Act of 1906 was in effect until the new Parliament Act of 1928. The Constitution Act of 1919 introduced a semi-presidential system in Finland after efforts to import a German monarch failed. According to that Act, the Eduskunta exercised legislative power together with the president of the republic, but the president held the highest executive power and had the right to introduce motions and appoint the prime minister as well as other ministers. (Suomen hallitusmuoto 1919)

The Senate's discussions focused on the Electoral Law while the Governor-General's and Russo-Finnish Advisory Board's focus was on assessing and regulating the Eduskunta's powers, especially in relation to the emperor's prerogatives (see e.g. Mylly 2006, 190–194, 199–223).

In addition, I have analysed the debates on the Diet Act of 1869 from the Diet minutes of 1867 and the debates on the Parliament Act of 1906 from the minutes of the extraordinary Diet session of 1905–06. In the study, parliamentary minutes are also used to examine discussions on the estates' rules and practices and on the Eduskunta's rules of procedures along with their interpretation and revision. In view of the Eduskunta's rules of procedure, the Finnish practice followed the French model in which rules were written down, in contrast to the British tradition grounded in precedents. During the Diets, the estates (with the exception of the Clergy) formulated standing orders that did not lapse at the end of a parliamentary session but continued in effect until the estate changed them.²⁷ In addition to these more permanent standing orders, the estates decided on rules that were validated in the beginning of each Diet session, usually based on a proposal by the speaker of the estate.

The Eduskunta's first rules of procedure were prepared in the Committee of Seven. I have examined the Committee's modest minutes available at the Library of the Eduskunta (Seitsenmiehin komitea 1907). In addition, the analysis of parliamentary minutes, together with the newspaper material, has enabled examination of the discussions on the interpretation and revision of the rules. Furthermore, memoirs of parliamentarians (e.g. Heinämies 1947; Paasikivi 1986 [1957]; Wuolijoki 1934) have been useful for understanding what kind of meaning and importance the representatives themselves attached to parliamentary rules and practices and their own learning processes.

The Finnish research material consists of texts in Swedish and Finnish. From the 1860s to the late 1880s majority of the Finnish discussions on parliaments as well as the parliamentary debates themselves were conducted in Swedish both in the newspaper press and in the Diets, where especially the members of the Nobility and the Burghers spoke Swedish.²⁸ All members of the political elite, apart from some members of the Peasants, could speak Swedish. By the time of the Parliamentary Reform of 1906 and the early Eduskunta, however, Finnish had become the main language of parliament and the press. Most of the

²⁷ The Nobility and the Burghers had started to formulate specific standing orders already before the Diet Act of 1869. The Nobility held on to its *Standing Orders for the House of Knights* until the Parliamentary Reform of 1906, but the Burghers shortened its standing orders radically in 1872 after the Diet Act. The Peasants did not formulate specific standing orders until 1894, when the procedural challenges were increasingly pressing due to the scarcity of parliamentary time. (Lilius 1974, 247–248)

²⁸ Throughout this period over 90 % of the Nobility on average were Swedish-speakers; they gave their first speech in Finnish as late as 1894. Finnish was not spoken in the Burghers until 1885; in the Diets of 1904–1905 and 1905–1906 Finnish-speakers formed a majority in the estate. In the Clergy, Finnish was allowed but was not used until 1882, although the estate had a Fennomian majority from the Diet of 1877–78 on. Finnish-speakers had a clear majority in the Peasants throughout the Diets. (Lilius 1974, 188–189)

statements in the minutes of the Parliamentary Reform Committee, for example, are in Finnish.

1.4 Research questions, approach and methodology

In contrast to the traditional model of research in political and social sciences, the method of the study was not based on applying any particular theory to the phenomenon studied. Rather than starting from an accurately defined hypothesis, the research process began as a journey of exploration to the Finnish discussions. The analysis of the research material was based, to use parliamentary terminology, on three ‘readings’. In each stage of the reading the analysis was deepened by posing further questions to the research material. The three readings dealt with the transnational aspects of parliamentary procedures, the politics of the Finnish procedure debates and the Finnish ideas’ and positions’ theorisation in a broader international framework.

A reason for the neglect of the procedural aspect that once blossomed in the Finnish discussions can be found in the tradition of history writing that for long focused on building a coherent picture of, and for, the national history project. This tradition was rather disinterested in the transnational dimensions of Finnish parliamentary life. In recent decades, however, Finnish history writing has opened up to new perspectives and interpretations. At the same time the Finnish discussions’ debt to foreign influences and models has been increasingly acknowledged.²⁹ It has been recognised that the formation of the Finnish nation state and society was also an international and transnational process – building the Finnish polity was grounded in actively following, comparing and imitating foreign developments.³⁰ Similarly, the role of “the great men” of Finnish history has been re-examined especially in relation to foreign thinkers and discussions.³¹ However, Finnish parliamentary history has not received the international treatment it deserves.³²

In the *first reading*, my initial research interest was in the similarities between national parliaments in relation to their modes of proceeding. After an initial exploration of the research material, references to foreign models in the Finnish procedure debates encouraged me to examine the interconnectedness between parliaments further. Consequently, instead of merely comparing the formal procedures between parliaments, the analysis was conducted by examining the debates and argumentation *behind* the rules and practices.

²⁹ See e.g. Engman & Kirby 1989; Hyvärinen et al. 2003; Jalava, Kinnunen & Sulkunen 2013; Klinge 2009; 2010; Mylly 2002; Tommila 1989.

³⁰ E.g. Kettunen 2001, 213–269; 2007; 2008, especially 12–19.

³¹ For example the 200th anniversary of Johan Vilhelm Snellman in 2006 produced a variety of new studies on his thought. See e.g. Jalava 2006; Lahtinen 2006; Savolainen, Linnavalli & Selovuori 2002 and Rantala 2013.

³² Pasi Ihalainen is currently conducting a comparative study of discussions about parliamentary democracy in the constitutional debates held in Britain, Germany and Finland in 1917 (see e.g. Ihalainen 2014; 2013a; 2013b).

Due to the special conditions present at the beginning of Finnish parliamentary life and to the prominent study and use of foreign models in the Finnish debates, the thesis interprets the Finnish discussions and development of parliamentary procedures as a learning process. The analysis approaches the Finnish procedure debates through two initial research questions: What kinds of linkages and divergences can be found between the Finnish and foreign debates on parliamentary procedures? How were foreign discussions and models used in the Finnish debates?

In the analysis conducted, the transnational aspects of parliaments and parliamentarism offer a means to take a distance from the approach of national history writing and its language and conceptualisations. In this sense, the task of the study was to write a parliamentary history on the Finnish polity, instead of a mere history of the Finnish parliament. At the same time, foreign parliamentary discussions offer a means to re-examine the positions of Finland's historical figures and actors from a new perspective.

It should be noted that international comparison is not only a new research method or approach, but in fact an old and essential part of economic, political and cultural practices (Kettunen 2001, 213). In late nineteenth-century Finland, foreign models were actively used in argumentation on a variety of topics. The benefits of such comparisons were also explicit: The usefulness of international comparison included the idea that Finland, as a latecomer in its development out in the periphery, could benefit from experiments realised abroad and learn from their lessons. (Kettunen 2007, 8–10)

Instead of merely comparing different national cases as independent of each other, the role and use of foreign examples in national politics have been studied lately from the perspective of 'political transfer' (te Velde 2005), transnational and comparative conceptual history (e.g. den Boer 2007; 2011; Leonhard 2004; Marjanen 2009) and '*histoire croisée*' (Werner & Zimmermann 2006). Henk te Velde (2005, 206) has highlighted the fact that national practices and changes in politics cannot be properly understood unless foreign developments and examples as well as their use in national contexts are taken into account. In this sense, national stories of politics are always incomplete. According to te Velde, a focus on the concept of political transfer can be used to open up the practices of nationalist political history to perspectives that have often been consciously neglected, sometimes in order to hide the foreign origins of domestic political practices. (ibid.) Further, the history of political transfer can be used to demonstrate that the objects of transfer did not remain unchanged from one national context to another, that is, the transmission was not necessarily direct and immediate, but a connection is evident nonetheless (ibid. 208). As the styles and routes of transfers have been various, political and conceptual transfers should be analysed through concrete cases.

The focus on 'parliamentary history' sheds new light on the politics and history of the Finnish parliament, and offers empirical data as well on the international transfer and adoption of parliamentary procedures, ideas and concepts. The Finnish case illustrates the central role of foreign models in the work of par-

liaments, especially of young assemblies that are in the process of formulating their modes of proceeding. As the Finnish disputes analysed in the study drew their arguments and motivation from foreign parliaments, the Finnish discussions also offer a window on the European parliamentarism of the period. Thus, in the thesis, Finnish sources are examined not only as a final point of transfer, but also as a means to approach a wider international parliamentary problematic.

The *histoire croisée* approach (Werner & Zimmermann 2006) has noted that interaction between the objects of comparison in fact can modify them reciprocally. In addition, the approach has helped to highlight the fact that, due to the complex character of international networks, it can be in practice difficult to point out which side were the innovators, transmitters and receivers (te Velde 2005, 211, 216). The complexity of such interactions is clearer in the case of parliaments. National parliaments have formed international networks in which national practices, procedural challenges, ideas and arguments have been transmitted from one parliament to another. The networks have been based not only on official communications and exchanges of parliamentary minutes and documents, but (as will be discussed below) also on media and literature. The difficulty of detecting individual transfers becomes apparent in cases in which an old practice, idea or concept is adopted in a national parliament after having already been applied in several parliaments. Consequently, if no explicit reference to a certain parliament is made in the national context, several possible routes of transfer can be hypothesised.

The approaches of transnational conceptual history can be used to examine consistencies and discrepancies in the use of concepts transferred and translated from one national context and language to another.³³ National parliaments have formed an arena for the transfer and diffusion of parliamentary terminology and vocabulary, whose comprehension can be seen as indispensable for parliamentarians and for understanding parliamentary work internationally. In a sense, parliamentarians of different countries “speak the same language” regardless of which natural language they use (Palonen 2012, 32).³⁴ The ‘parliamentary language’, which has its own rhetorical conventions and systematic differences to colloquial languages, is derived largely from the internationally shared procedures and practices of parliamentary work. Although parliaments have formed a common forum for transfers of parliamentary concepts and vocabulary, they have been used variably in national political debates. As Kari Palonen (2003b) has noted, concepts are prone to alteration in translation as translation is always a ‘transport’ or ‘transfer’ between contexts. During the transfer it is always possible that ‘something else’ or unintended will creep into the concept. Therefore translation should be viewed as a selective process

³³ For translations and conceptual history, see e.g. Kontner 2007. For studies concerning the Finnish case, see e.g. Hyvärinen et al. 2003; Marjanen 2013.

³⁴ In Finland this international language was called as, for example, the “language of the parliament” (*parlamenttikieli*) (see *Uusi Suometar*, 9 Dec., 1910, 2).

which seeks to regulate, but not necessarily eliminate, this ‘something else’. (Palonen 2003b, 16)

Changes in concepts and practices during or after transfer raise the question of what exactly happens in the process and which factors have led to the changes. This helps to turn our attention to my *second reading* of the research material. In the thesis, a political reading of the Finnish procedure debates is conducted. Thus, special interest is paid to the political uses of foreign models, concepts and ideas. In national politics, foreign examples have not only influenced national practices, they have also been used rhetorically (te Velde 2005, 206). Similarly in the Finnish context, foreign comparisons have been used as political arguments and rhetorical resources (Kettunen 2001, 213–269; Kurunmäki 2003; 2004; 2008). Foreign parliamentary discussions and models were used to introduce ideas, arguments and conceptual tools into the Finnish procedure debates. Drawing on foreign cases, Finnish debaters formulated and advocated various interpretations of parliamentary activity and created competing contexts for disputing Finnish reforms, procedure revisions and practices. With the help of foreign models, the actors sought to influence what was seen as desirable and possible in Finnish parliamentary life. Foreign parliamentary lessons inspired Finnish actors to propose and implement procedural innovations as well as to build upon existing practices. In some cases foreign parliamentary origin was viewed as a drawback and an argument against a procedure’s adoption.

To explore the politics of parliamentary concepts, I focus on the use of the concepts in argumentation. This approach opens them to rhetorical and political analysis. The Finnish debates drew upon foreign discussions and models, but this did not make the parliamentary concepts immune to competing uses. The study approaches political concepts as contested and ambiguous. In political debates actors can give concepts different meanings in order to, for example, strengthen an argument, produce a change in how we look at the world, or broaden or limit the courses of action seen as possible. The study of political concepts and their uses helps one to discover and understand the different political strategies present in debates. In the thesis, the Finnish procedure debates are examined by asking what discussants were in fact doing with their speeches and texts.³⁵ Although the Finnish uses of parliamentary concepts are examined in relation to foreign discussions, the interest of the study does not lie in looking for or assessing the “correct” use of a concept, but rather, concepts are viewed as instruments of debate.

In the second reading of the research material, the Finnish debates were analysed by exploring the different notions of parliamentary deliberation and representation manifested in the procedure debates. Procedure debates are interesting, among other questions on a parliamentary agenda, because when disputing procedures participants speak about parliament itself – its organisation, tasks, purposes and possibilities – in other words, the very core of parliamentary activity. Thus, procedure debates are disputes *par excellence* in which

³⁵ See e.g. Skinner 2002, 46–47.

competing notions of deliberation and representation, two central characteristics of parliaments, and their interrelation are manifested. In the Finnish debates the competing notions were connected to wider political agendas and goals. This influenced the way in which foreign models and discussions were filtered into the Finnish debates.

The analysis of the Finnish procedure debates was conducted by combining newspaper and parliamentary material. In Finland, newspapers formed a close extension of, as well as a preparatory arena for, the debates in the parliament.³⁶ Procedure questions were prepared and examined in Finnish newspapers before their treatment in the parliament. The newspapers also participated in the ongoing debates by presenting more detailed and further developed argumentation on matters. As the case studies point out, during the Diets the proposals and arguments first presented in newspapers were often taken up in individual estate sessions and then spread through committee reports and publicity to other estates. Newspapers had a significant influence on the debates and their final outcomes. Hence, only a combined use of both parliamentary and press material enables a balanced account of the Finnish procedure debates.

In the study, members' statements in parliamentary minutes and newspaper articles on the procedure debates are analysed as speeches in a debate. In addition to the arguments presented, debates have been examined by analysing who made the proposals on a given procedure and its revision, who seconded and who objected, and who made the most notable or frequent speeches on a matter. The fundamental difference between the deliberations in the press and the parliament were that in newspapers discussants were not bound by the requirement to come to a decision. In addition, the parliamentary mode of proceeding forces the members to speak to the question in front of their opponents and present arguments for and against on matters discussed (Ihalainen & Palonen 2009).³⁷ However, the similarities in the styles of dispute between the newspaper press and the parliament in the Finnish procedure debates shows their close connection. Newspapers took stands and reacted to the proposals of their opponents, speaking *pro et contra* on questions on the agenda, although outside the parliament's procedural setting. The ideas and arguments presented in the Diet and in the press were developed in relation to opponents' arguments and counterarguments.

Finnish discussions on procedures, especially in newspapers, can be also viewed as 'deliberations with one's self'. Presentations and examinations on parliamentary activity were not only about convincing the opponent, but to work one's way through into a new paradigm.³⁸ The parliamentary modes of

³⁶ See details in Chapters 2 and 8.

³⁷ Whereas in the Diet and in the Eduskunta members spoke in public and on the minutes in plenary sessions, newspaper articles were often published anonymously. In the study, if a newspaper article was published without the writer's signature or there is uncertainty of the writer's identity, the article is referred to in the thesis by the name of the newspaper. The presumed writers as well as unidentified pseudonyms are mentioned in the main text or in the footnotes.

³⁸ I am grateful for this idea to Henrik Stenius and his pre-examination statement on this thesis.

proceeding and their application in Finnish politics were a new topic for many of the actors. Thus, the procedural aspect and the possibilities it offered were in the beginning far from obvious: they had to be reflected on and developed through written and verbal expression.

Based on the initial research findings of my first reading, I included foreign parliamentary discussions in my analysis. Thus, the study's research literature consists in part of foreign parliamentary literature, minutes and documents. Firstly, the examined texts served in some instances as models for the Finnish discussants and were a source of political argumentation and rhetoric. Secondly, the texts are used in the study as an interpretive instrument for contextualising and examining the Finnish discussions in an international framework.

In the dissertation, Finnish procedure debates are examined through international parliamentary classics of the period. Historically, comprehensive written compilation of parliamentary procedures started in the late eighteenth century. In Britain, John Hatsell's *Precedents of Proceedings in the House of Commons* (1818 [1781]) was the first attempt to provide a comprehensive account on the ancient traditions and rules of the House. Earlier compilations of established rules had not attempted to cover the proceedings as a whole. Hatsell's four volumes were followed by Thomas Erskine May's *A Treatise upon the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament* (1844), commonly known as *Parliamentary Practice*, which was updated and reprinted eight times during May's lifetime and continued to serve as the most authoritative work on parliamentary procedure in Britain. (Haapala 2012, 12–13) In France, parliamentary procedures were collected comprehensively from the late nineteenth century onwards, first in Jules Poudra and Eugène Pierre's *Traité pratique de droit parlementaire* (1878) and then in Pierre's *Traité de droit politique électoral et parlementaire* (1893), which was updated and reprinted several times well into the twentieth century. The French and British parliaments were followed closely and held in high esteem in Europe during the period studied and were widely used models in national parliaments. As no proper comprehensive procedure books exist for Sweden, various histories of the Riksdag (e.g. Hadenius 1997; Lagerroth 1915; Schück et al. 1985) and individual case studies (e.g. Brundin & Isberg 2009; Gränström 1916; Metcalf 1985; Skuncke 2003; 2011) are used instead.

It is to be noted that due to the limited time and finances available for doctoral dissertations and deficiencies in the digitisation of parliamentary records internationally, no detailed analysis of the parliamentary debates of the 'exporting nation' could be conducted. However, foreign parliamentary literature and a variety of authentic parliamentary minutes, such as the Hansard collection, procedure documents, standing orders and constitutions are used. In order to explore the translation and transfer of parliamentary concepts and vocabulary comprehensively, further and more detailed transnational conceptual history analysing of all the phases of transfer would be required. The analysis presented here focuses on the political uses of parliamentary vocabulary within the Finnish debates and on how this vocabulary was formed through the newspaper press.

The digitised Historical Newspaper Library enables word searches by date, density of occurrence and newspaper name. Individual newspapers can also be browsed. In selecting sources to be studied in detail I conducted searches first for the key terms in the case studies and then moved on to synonyms and other vocabulary used in the discussions, both in Swedish and Finnish.³⁹ Although the full reliability and coverage of the word searches is hard to estimate, the searches were repeated until a point of saturation was reached in which no significant new data was retrievable.

Word searches from the whole period covered by the digitised archive (1771–1912) have enabled early occurrences, spread, popularisation and disappearance of parliamentary vocabulary to be tracked and identified. Word searches have been useful also in locating and dating Finnish and foreign debates and the connections between them. Due to the wide publication of minutes of the Diet and the Eduskunta in newspapers, searches conducted in the Newspaper Library have guided me to a closer examination of debates in the official parliamentary minutes. Word searches have been of similar assistance in the examination of foreign discussions. After foreign discussions referred to in the Finnish debates were located through the searches, the newspapers provided an exact timing and reference point for further examination and contextualisation of the debate in the parliamentary literature. This procedure allowed a broader understanding of the Finnish discussions within the wider parliamentary framework.

Searches on the Digitised Newspaper Library have helped also to locate Finnish discussions on foreign authors and publications. This has been useful for finding direct references to foreign parliamentary literature. As word searches of the Newspaper Library also give hits for bookstore catalogues and advertisements, searches by author or publication name have been informative about what books were in circulation in Finland at various times. In this sense, newspapers also give a picture of the changing trends and censorship conditions in Finland.

In my *third reading* of the research material, the ideas and positions on deliberation and representation established in the Finnish procedure debates were analysed more closely. Authors such as John Stuart Mill and François Guizot as well as Johan Vilhelm Snellman's Hegelian ideas were used in the analysis. As with the parliamentary literature presented, the purpose of my inclusion of these authors is twofold: They serve not only to illustrate how much the Finnish discussions were indebted to them and what inspiration they gave to the Finnish debaters, but their ideas are also used as theoretical and methodological tools to deepen the interpretation and guide the presentation of the research findings. A comparison between Mill's, Guizot's and Snellman's (Hegelian) ideas reveals different approaches to parliamentary activity. The authors help

³⁹ In addition to the parliamentary vocabulary connected directly to and presented in the case studies, I conducted searches on translations of words such as 'parliament', 'parliamentary', 'unparliamentary' and 'parliamentarism'.

to situate the Finnish stands within the broader international framework and connect them to more general ideas on deliberation and representation.

Procedures have been rather neglected in the study of parliaments, especially in contemporary mainstream political science, although comparative studies on parliamentary systems have taken account of differences and similarities between, for example, committee systems and organisation of readings.⁴⁰ After the active compilation and discussion of parliamentary procedures in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, interest in procedures disappeared. However, international interest in parliamentary modes of proceeding has lately undergone a resurgence among political scientists,⁴¹ historians⁴² and linguists.⁴³

The purpose of parliamentary assemblies can be seen as offering an arena for the fair treatment of questions on an agenda according to certain rules laid down in advance (see e.g. Redlich 1908b [1905], 215). In this sense, parliamentary procedures are impartial regulators of deliberation that do not benefit any specific parties or ends, but protect both the rights of the majority and the minority (see e.g. May 1883 [1844], 306–307). Thus, codified parliamentary procedures have served as a model for different assemblies and meetings internationally.⁴⁴ With a view towards the theories of deliberative democracy, parliamentary procedures offer tools that are often neglected and overlooked for fair treatment of political disputes. In this sense, parliamentary procedures offer concrete models and perspectives on the ongoing discussions about deliberative democracy and the Habermasian search for the ‘best argument’ and ‘ideal speech situation’ (Habermas 1984 [1981]; 1987 [1981]).

Although the procedural aspect of parliamentary work is still rather neglected in today’s research and public discussion, the contemporary contestations of parliamentarism are based on argumentation and logic very similar to their historical antecedents. A reason for the critique and unpopularity of parliaments can be seen partly in a lack of understanding about parliamentary procedure and its role in relation to parliament’s deliberative and representative aspects. Thus, the analysis of procedure debates enables an approach that is historical, while at the same time theoretically topical and relevant.

⁴⁰ For such international comparison concerning the Finnish parliament, see Arter 1984.

⁴¹ Especially in Jyväskylä, the works of Kari Palonen (e.g. 2010a) and Taru Haapala (2012) may be mentioned.

⁴² See e.g. the activities of the *European Information and Research Network on Parliamentary History* (EuParl.net), which promotes comparative research on the development of parliamentary culture in Europe.

⁴³ See e.g. Ilie 2003; 2004; 2010.

⁴⁴ See e.g. *Robert’s Rules of Order*, which was originally (1876) modelled after United States House of Representatives procedures by Brigadier General Henry Martyn Robert and has been applied in part in the practices of a variety of organisations and societies.

1.5 Composition of the study

In the dissertation, the distinction between the conduct of the analysis, that is, the three readings of the research material, and the manner of presentation should be acknowledged. Chapters 1–3 present the approach and give an outline of some of the research findings. In Chapter 2, the Finnish parliamentary learning process is presented through three styles of learning: learning by reading, learning by travelling and learning by doing. The focus of the thesis is on learning by reading, and especially on the role of the newspaper press. The role of the Finnish press in the learning process becomes clear when considered against the backdrop of Russian censorship and the unavailability of foreign parliamentary literature (Section 2.2). The late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Finnish newspapers formed an essential means for studying and teaching foreign parliamentary models, an arena for debating Finnish procedures and a medium for the transfer, translation and popularisation of parliamentary procedures, ideas and concepts (Sections 2.3–2.5).

Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 give a general outline of the Finnish political actors of the period as well as the main newspapers analysed in the thesis and present general research findings in order to facilitate the reading of the dissertation. The competing notions of parliamentary activity are approached in Chapter 3 through the positions of the so-called *Dagblad* liberals and their Fenoman opponents, which will be examined in detail in the case study chapters. The division reflects also a confrontation between the procedural and the governmental understandings of parliamentarism, which will be presented in Sections 3.1.2 and 3.2.2. In addition, the theoretical framework for examining the Finnish notions of deliberation and representation is presented in Section 3.4 through texts of John Stuart Mill, François Guizot and J. V. Snellman.

The research findings are presented more specifically through six case studies. Each of the case studies focuses on Finnish discussions on a different parliamentary thematic. The selection of the case studies is based on several criteria that address the presented research problems. Firstly, the topics of the case studies were ones that were disputed in Finland and were considered of great importance for the development of Finnish parliamentary life. Secondly, the argumentation used in the debates was connected to foreign models and discussions. Finnish debaters based their argumentation both on ongoing international discussions as well as on historical events and literature. Thirdly, in the debates, the Finnish discussant spoke of, and referred explicitly to, a ‘parliamentary’ character. The disputes revolved around notions of the ‘parliamentary’ and ‘unparliamentary’. Thus, the debated procedures were used to highlight the parliament as an institution *sui generis* in relation to other political arenas and their modes of proceeding, and to emphasise the parliament as a valuable model for other assemblies. Fourthly, the procedure debates of the analysis were ones that forced discussants to reveal their underlying notions of deliberation and representation. Fifthly, the topics and material chosen for the case

studies have not previously been studied; their examination sheds new light and challenges the earlier interpretations. Sixthly, the examined procedures are connected to the role and purposes of speech and discussion in parliament.

In the thesis, the case studies are presented in an order that facilitates their reading. The case study chapters start from more general questions dealing with the basics of parliamentary speech, representation and deliberation and then move on to examine these aspects through more detailed procedural questions. At the end, the discussion is brought back to the problematic of speech in parliament and its limits.

Chapter 4 examines the Finnish discussions on '(un)parliamentary' speech and language and their connections to foreign parliamentary models. The Swedish model gave the Finnish Diet the general framework within which the practices of parliamentary speaking were disputed and further developed. This case study illustrates how foreign models were presented in the Finnish discussions in order to comment indirectly on the Finnish situation. During discussions on the sensitive topic of the role of the speakers of the estates, Finnish newspapers published presentations on the speakers of foreign parliaments in order to influence the Finnish practices and to direct attention to the international parliamentary standards. The newspaper articles also compensated for the lack of foreign parliamentary literature as the articles often contained translations from foreign procedure books. The newspaper press offered a medium to educate the Finnish parliamentarians as well as the general public on the practices of parliamentary decorum and style of presentation. The chapter also exemplifies the Finnish political groups' different styles and levels of interest in debate and procedure and their different uses of foreign models.

Chapter 5 deals with the ban on imperative mandate in the Finnish four-estate Diet, which has been recognised as an exceptional case in parliamentary history internationally. Whereas during the Diets the free mandate was discussed in order to emphasise representation of the people and thereby overcome the obsolete four-estate system of representation, in the Eduskunta the free mandate was defended by emphasising the character of the Eduskunta as a deliberative assembly. The chapter shows the variety of foreign parliamentary discussions that were presented in the newspaper press as well as how they were used as an authority to give meaning to and steer the interpretation of the old Swedish procedures.

Chapter 6 examines debates on the procedure of *plenum plenorum*, which enabled joint meetings of all four estates. Plenum plenorum, adopted from old Swedish Riksdag law, was the most significant single effort and innovation to introduce the egalitarian debating features characteristic of modern parliaments into the Finnish system while at the same time preserving old forms of estate representation. In the Finnish debates, the Swedish institution was further developed. The case illustrates the different emphasis on deliberation advocated in the Finnish debates: the *Dagblad* liberals saw plenum plenorum as important for improving the role of dissensual plenary debate against the Fennomans'

consensus approach and their emphasis on Diet committee negotiations and accommodation processes.

Chapter 7 explores the debates on the introduction of and disputes between different forms of parliamentary minutes in the Diets and the early Eduskunta. The process of introducing stenographic minutes was based on an active following of foreign models and developments. The analysis points out how procedures on minutes were formulated in Finland to serve the parliament's deliberative aspects. Minutes were argued to be important in the political learning and education of parliamentarians, overcoming the four-estate divisions, creating parliamentary continuity between the rare Diet sessions and in enabling efficient parliamentary work. Minutes also introduced new debating tactics typical of foreign parliaments. Debates on minutes raised a variety of challenges whose resolution was attempted with the help of foreign examples.

Chapter 8 examines the early Finnish debates on parliamentary publicity. The Finnish estates admitted free access to the audiences and newspaper reporters in 1863. The Finnish debaters discussed a variety of means for parliamentary publicity, all of which were grounded in studies of a variety of foreign conditions and developments. Again, the debates over parliamentary publicity reflected the political groups' competing notions of deliberation and representation as well as the groups' different appreciation of speech and debate in parliament. Publication of stenographic minutes was seen, for example, as important for reproducing and mediating the parliament's agenda items, and even its deliberative model, to the general public. In addition, minutes were considered as a valuable means of nation-building and education of the people.

The last case study, in Chapter 9, examines discussions on parliamentary obstruction and the concept's reception and political use in Finland. The concept was introduced in the Finnish debates by the Irish obstruction campaign in the British House of Commons in the late 1870s and early 1880s and its active reporting in the Finnish press. The dangers of obstruction were acknowledged in the Finnish procedure debates. In addition, in the Diets and early Eduskunta the concept was used to belittle the role of speech and debate in parliament. The debates on obstruction highlight different notions of deliberation and representation, and also illustrate how the international parliamentary discussions of the period were used to shape national politics.

The Conclusions chapter summarises, conceptualises and expands on the theses developed in the dissertation. The chapter brings together the details of the 'lost history' argument first presented in the Introduction and further reflects on it in relation to the wider developments of Finnish parliamentary history. The chapter views the idea of this lost history as a 'lost chance' for parliamentarisation in Finland. Finally, the thesis concludes by examining the concept of procedure and possible applications of parliamentary procedure in contemporary discussions.

2 THE PARLIAMENTARY LEARNING PROCESS IN FINLAND AND THE ROLE OF THE NEWSPAPER PRESS

2.1 Styles of learning: reading, travelling, doing

The study divides the Finnish parliamentary learning process into roughly three different styles of learning: reading, doing and travelling. The *doing* aspect becomes apparent in the training and application of parliamentary procedures in extra-parliamentary assemblies such as the University student unions' mini-parliaments (Klinge 1967, 179). In addition, in newspapers, other deliberative meetings and assemblies (such as municipal meetings, church assemblies as well as meetings of associations, clubs and political parties) were either described as following or urged to follow parliamentary procedures. It was argued that these assemblies served both as pre-Diet training grounds for the parliamentary style of deliberation and for further developing skills in parliamentary procedure and spreading the knowledge to other areas of society. The application of parliamentary procedures in different meetings, and even in the press,⁴⁵ was meant to enable efficient, orderly and fair discussion, as well as a way to develop "parliamentary education" in Finland.⁴⁶

The *travelling* aspect of the learning process is illustrated in the case studies as well. Finnish parliamentarians and parliamentary experts travelled abroad to learn from foreign parliaments or came into contact with them during

⁴⁵ For example, in the heated Finnish newspaper polemics of the 1860s over the proper style and procedure how to treat political disputes, parliamentary rules of debate were proposed as a tenable model (see *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 7 Dec., 1863, 2).

⁴⁶ See Section 8.6.2. On the need to introduce parliamentary procedures (*en parlamentarisk ordning*) in communal meetings, see e.g. *Österbottniska Posten*, 16 Oct., 1884, 3; on the application of parliamentary procedures in different meetings as an instrument for parliamentary education (*parlamentarinen kaswatus*), see e.g. *Wiipurin Sanomat*, 10 Aug., 1892, 1-2; in church assemblies, see e.g. *Satakunta*, 10 June., 1876, 1-2; in the Social Democrats' guidelines for meetings, see e.g. *Työväen kalenteri*, 2, 1909, 34; 5, 1912, 212-213.

their other trips. Although politically active members of the Finnish academia travelled relatively often and spent long periods abroad (see Mylly 2002, 264–280; Tommila 1989), the most illustrative examples of parliamentary excursions dealt with in the thesis are connected to the introduction of parliamentary stenography and to field trips to European parliaments to learn procedures on minutes. Finnish delegations also participated in international parliamentary conferences from 1906 on (Seppinen 2007, 334–342). In addition, Finnish actors benefitted from personal contacts with experts living abroad, such as J. J. Nordström.

The focus of the thesis, however, is on the *reading* aspect, which is discussed in relation to the newspaper press in particular. I highlight the role of Finland's press in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century as an arena for learning, teaching and discussing parliamentary procedures. The newspaper press was an arena where Finnish debates came into contact with foreign models. This aspect has been neglected both in the histories of the Finnish parliament⁴⁷ and of the newspaper press.⁴⁸

2.2 Russian censorship and the availability of parliamentary literature in Finland

In order to understand the role of the Finnish newspaper press in the parliamentary learning process, it is necessary to examine the role of the Russian censorship and the availability of parliamentary literature in Finland. The changes in the censorship also explain the increased flow of foreign ideas and literature that were applied in the Finnish procedure debates in the 1860s and the early twentieth century.

Russian censorship impeded, although varyingly, open discussion about the adoption of foreign parliamentary models into the Finnish system. Finland was subjected to a decree of censorship in 14 October 1829, which was based on earlier Russian decrees of 1826 and 1828. The 1829 decree functioned as a model for censorship in Finland until the Freedom of the Press Act of 1865. Based on the decree, a Censorship Directorate⁴⁹ was founded. The Directorate was assisted by a Committee on Censorship and each area of Finland was assigned its own censor.⁵⁰ The Directorate reported on applications for the founding of new newspapers, printing houses and bookshops. The Senate of Finland decided on

⁴⁷ See *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia 1–12* and *Suomen eduskunta 100 vuotta 1–12*.

⁴⁸ See *Suomen lehdistön historia 1–10* published by Sanomalehtien liitto 1987–1992. For example, in the book series early nineteenth-century Finnish newspaper reports on foreign parliaments have been noted, but not problematised or analysed (see Tommila 1988, 112).

⁴⁹ The Directorate consisted of a director, who was the vice-chancellor of the University, the procurator and the chief of the Senate's Office Commission.

⁵⁰ Helsinki was assigned a censor in 1847; until then the Censorship Committee had taken care of the task.

the licences and had the right to suspend newspapers. The postal service exercised control over the import of foreign newspapers. (Tommila 1988, 102–103)

The Finnish decree on censorship was not particularly strict in its wording: it prohibited offensive and derogatory writing about religion as well as about the emperor, the constitution and any texts deemed contrary to good manners and respect towards other citizens. However, censorship was used as a central means for ensuring internal unity and tranquillity in the empire and the decree was at times interpreted vaguely for political purposes. The censorship was also seen as necessary in order to restrain foreign influences and literature that could disrupt the social order. Censorship was especially strict during revolutionary times and on revolutionary actors. For example, while Sweden was turning towards liberal West Europe in the 1830s, the Finnish censorship stopped over one thousand Swedish newspapers from entering the country in 1831 and subscriptions of eleven Swedish newspapers were banned. As censorship eased elsewhere in Europe in the 1840s as a result of the expansion of liberal and democratic ideas, in Finland censorship tightened until after the start of the Crimean War, being at its strictest in 1848–1854, mainly as a result of the European Revolutions of 1848. When control over the Finnish-language newspapers became difficult, the Language Act of 1850 stipulated that only economic and religious content could be published in Finnish. (Tommila 1988, 103–105)

A lightened version of the Language Act was introduced in 1854. Publishing in Finnish was allowed, but the task of the censors was to oversee that no harmful material was distributed to the people. (Tommila 1988, 176) After the Crimean War (1853–56) the newspaper press became increasingly important as a public forum in Finland. This was reflected in the prolific discussions on the role of the newspaper press, polemics and the use of the notion of ‘public opinion’ in Finland. Russia’s defeat in the Crimean War resulted in reforms in Finland. The Language Act was abolished officially on 27 February 1860 and on 9 December 1861 the governor-general’s censorship authority was dismantled. The earlier, 1829 system of censorship was then restored. (Tommila 1988, 104–105, 176, 178)

In 1861 the control over the press, which in 1846 had been concentrated in the hands of the governors and the governor-general, was restored to the Censorship Directorate. In spring 1862 the Senate of Finland set up a committee to prepare legislation on publishing and printing. (Landgren 1988, 276–277) A new Press Act was passed in the Diet of 1863–64 and approved by the emperor in 1865. The Act was in a formal continuation of the freer conditions that had been in force in practice since the early 1860s. A new feature was the removal of pre-publication censorship – a condition which had not existed in Finland apart from a few years in the late 1770s. (Landgren 1988, 276–277; Tommila 1980, 15) The loosening of the censorship took place simultaneously with the activation of Finnish political life, which enabled a more efficient reception and application of foreign ideas in the Finnish procedure debates.

However, the Press Act of 1865 was due to expire at the end of the Diet of 1867. In May 1867 as the estates – the liberal members in particular – refused

to pass the restrictions proposed by the emperor on press freedoms a new Press Act was introduced through the administration.⁵¹ The Press Act of 1867 restored prepublication censorship in Finland. (Landgren 1988, 276–277) Section 31 of the Act criminalised, among other things, “all presentations dangerous to society and harmful to morality and decency”. The Press Act of 1867 as well as the Act on Foreign and Foreign-Language Print of 1867 gave the censorship officials control over all print material in Finland, including books, newspapers, periodicals and documents in every language imported, translated, published, sold or circulated in the country.⁵²

Based on § 4 of the Act on Foreign and Foreign-Language Print, everyone who imported foreign print in Helsinki had to present to the customs officer an official permit proving that the books were not banned from circulation within the grand duchy. For this, a list of the books in question had to be delivered beforehand to the head commissioner of the press, who decided which books were to be accepted. If an unknown book was included in the list, the book had to be delivered to the censor for examination and judgement. Banned books were sent back abroad at the importer’s expense, in addition to which the importer was given a hefty fine. Rules were similar in the provinces, whose censors were, in cases where they lacked the requisite language skills, to send the books to the head commissioner of the press for examination. According to § 6 of the Press Act, travellers returning from abroad had to similarly register their print material with the customs officer. Fines for illegal circulation of a single book were set. Section 7 ordered periodicals and books with “political content” entering the country by mail to be given immediately to the censors for examination. It is notable that according to § 8, the University staff and the members of the Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters had the right to receive any books they ordered “without problems”.⁵³ Thus, due to the hefty fines and close supervision, censorship was something that Finnish actors who wanted to import political literature were forced to take into account.

In the new system based on the Press Act of 1867, the Directorate of the Press⁵⁴ was responsible for the supervision of the press and printing. Prepublication censorship was taken care of by local censors and, in the capital Helsinki, by a head commissioner of the press and three commissioners. Publishing a newspaper without a censor’s stamp was illegal, and every issue had to be given to the censor for approval two hours before publication. Censors could demand the removal of parts of newspapers. The Directorate could also issue

⁵¹ Afterwards J. V. Snellman, who had taken a conciliatory stand towards the Press Law, accused the liberals of, by turning down the emperor’s proposal, destroying all possibilities for at least partial freedom of the press (Snellman 1872a; 1872b; 1881a; 1881b; 1881c).

⁵² The Acts were published in the official newspaper *Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti*, 4 June, 1867, 1–2; 7 June, 1867, 5–7; 11 June, 1867, 1.

⁵³ *Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti*, 11 June, 1867, 1.

⁵⁴ The Directorate consisted of a president, whom the emperor appointed based on the Senate’s proposal, and two members appointed directly by the Senate.

warnings to newspapers, and after three warnings a newspaper could be suspended.⁵⁵

The insertions of 1871 into the Press Act of 1867 increased the University's and academic societies' responsibility over their publications and ordered them to oversee that they met the censorship requirements. In addition, the insertions extended the list of banned topics and emphasised the need to protect the administration and maintain peace within the empire. Strong criticism of the general conditions in the empire was now explicitly forbidden alongside any presentations that could cause discord, uproar or revolt.⁵⁶

Between 1860 and 1889 only one newspaper was suspended (*Åbo Underrättelser* in 1869).⁵⁷ Prepublication censorship often resulted in hindrances to the press, such as removals of newspaper articles in full or part as well as delays in publication. Some issues were prevented from publication altogether. In 1860–1889 most of the press injunctions targeted Fennoman and liberal newspapers. (Landgren 1988, 276–279) In the 1880s the most common injunctions concerned articles on the Finnish government, foreign policy, conditions in Russia, the imperial family, Russian citizens in Finland, censorship, freedom of the press, the language question and nationality, and international relations. These interventions most often affected editorials, political articles and foreign news. The censorship system was criticised by arguing that the final decisions on censoring depended on the subjective views of individual censors and that differences existed between different regions. (Landgren 1988, 278) However, in the Finnish debates, these inconsistencies were taken as opportunities that could be used in that they provided potentially more room for manoeuvre.

The Press Act of 1867 was in effect until the November Manifesto of 1905. The year 1890 signified a change in the Finnish conditions: Alexander III, trying to silence critiques of Finland's exceptional status, introduced a manifesto that made the Finnish postal service part of the Russian service. This raised heated polemics, especially between the Finnish and Russian press. In 1891, censorship powers were granted to the governor-general, who gained the exclusive right to decide on newspaper publication. He also received the right to suspend newspapers. Whereas General-Governor Heiden (1881–1897) settled for issuing warnings and instructions to newspapers, Bobrikov (1898–1904) used all the tools available. The instructions given to censors were still vague in their wording and the Directorate of the Press instructed the censors by means of circulated letters, a practice that became common under Bobrikov's rule. Bobrikov introduced Russian nationals as censors and ordered them to work alongside the Finnish. (Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 440–442) This further hindered newspaper publication as the rarity of foreign proficiency in Finnish had earlier been used for the newspapers' benefit.

⁵⁵ The chief of the Senate's Department for Civil Affairs also had the right of suspension from 1871 on; the governor-general had the right after 1869, but did not use it until 1891.

⁵⁶ *Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti*, 16 May, 1871, 1.

⁵⁷ The newspaper continued soon after the suspension under the same name.

Hindrances to the press became common in the 1890s, especially after Bobrikov came in power in 1898. Censors forbid publication of whole articles or parts of articles and newspapers had to be re-edited, reprinted or appeals to the Directorate of the Press had to be made. Prepublication censorship often resulted in publication delays of several hours and delayed circulation in the provinces. At the turn of the century approximately three to four hundred injunctions were issued annually. In addition to the already mentioned, in the early 1890s the most common topics resulting in censorship were the reforms to the postal, customs and money services. After Bobrikov came into power, topics of current interest and the critiques against the administration system became censored increasingly as well as discussions about military service, the language manifesto, the status of officials, the rights of the Russian citizens, limitations on freedom of assembly, and censorship. In addition to these, warnings, forced dismissals, economic sanctions (bans on commercial advertisement and the selling of newsstand copies), denials of permission to publish and suspensions of whole newspapers were used as penalties. Bobrikov also started to suspend newspapers also for good – between 1899 and 1902, 22 newspapers experienced such a fate. (Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 554–560)

After Nicolas II acceded to the throne in 1894 the atmosphere in Finland was hopeful. However, as a result of the change of the balance of power in Europe and Germany's unification, Finland's position in the Russian security policy changed. The Baltic model of Russification was adopted in Finland. In order to protect St. Petersburg, the Finnish army was incorporated into the Russian. As a reaction to Finnish resistance, especially against military conscription after the February Manifesto of 1899, the emperor strengthened censorship in Finland. In 1902–03 Bobrikov was given extraordinary powers to contain the Finnish resistance and to banish members of the Finnish opposition. In 1904 the Russo-Japanese War raised new hopes in Finland as Russia's attention was diverted from Finland. As a result of Russia's defeat, civil unrest expanded to Finland and led to the Great Strike of 1905. The Great Strike signified the end of the first period of Russification in Finland as the statutes of the February Manifesto were abolished. Similarly to the reform of the 1860s, the loosening of censorship took place again in the context of the Parliamentary Reform of 1906 and the formulation of the new Parliament Act of 1906. Thus, the procedures and practices of the new Eduskunta could be reviewed rather freely in the light of foreign parliamentary models. The Great Strike removed prepublication censorship in Finland only temporarily, however, for it was tightened again in 1910. (Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 423–424)

Censorship caused asymmetry in the availability of parliamentary literature as well as in its treatment in the Finnish press. The censorship not only impeded the flow of foreign ideas to Finland and their circulation, but also forced Finnish actors to avoid expressing their indebtedness to foreign models explicitly. This is apparent in relation to references to foreign classics in the Finnish press discussions. For example, Walter Bagehot's "The English Constitution" was not discussed in Finnish newspapers and periodicals until 1909 (see Ursin

1909a). In the late nineteenth century, Bagehot was highlighted in newspapers as an economist (e.g. *Wiborg*, 29 Nov., 1873, 1–2). In one of the rare articles mentioning Bagehot, the leading (liberal) newspaper, *Helsingfors Dagblad*, reported on his death with a focus on his merits on matters of finance, banking and money, while only mentioning that he wrote texts “also on purely political matters” (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 16 Apr., 1877, 1). Only Bagehot’s “Lombard Street” (1873), his explanation of the world of finance and banking, was cited. In 1884 Finnish newspapers reported Bagehot’s texts to be among the ones forbidden by the Russian censorship (*Åbo Tidning*, 15 Oct., 1884, 2).

The system of censorship also put new pressures on the procedural aspect. While extensive and ground-breaking reforms of the parliamentary system could not be demanded and developed in public, Finnish actors found a means to effect gradual reforms in the Diet’s and Eduskunta’s modes of proceeding.

2.3 The newspaper press as a means for studying foreign parliamentary models

Regardless of the censorship, or rather as a result of it, the role of the Finnish newspaper press became central. Compared to the printing, publication and selling of books on foreign parliaments and constitutions, the newspapers had more room for manoeuvre, giving the Finnish actors the possibility to study current parliamentary topics, discussions and trends. Whereas the Russian censorship delayed and hindered the flow of political literature in Finland and in this sense defined the limits of political modernisation (Mylly 2002, 155), the newspapers could present foreign discussions as “daily news” and thus participate indirectly in the Finnish discussions.

Finnish newspapers began to follow foreign parliamentary politics in the early decades of the nineteenth century, but after the Diets began to meet regularly in the 1860s, the interest in parliaments rose to a new level. Finnish newspapers translated long sections of foreign parliamentary debates and presented an extensive series of articles on parliamentary traditions and procedures. The exposure given in the newspapers to foreign parliamentary discussions was especially significant during the long breaks between the Diets, when foreign parliamentary debates compensated for the lack of Finnish ones. In this sense the newspapers kept the Finnish political actors and the readership in contact and familiar with parliamentary life and its practices.

Newspaper articles on foreign parliaments not only served to feed the interest of the political elite in parliaments, but the publications filled gaps in the availability of foreign parliamentary literature. The newspaper articles on foreign parliaments included, for example, translations from procedure books that were hardly, if at all, available in Finland.⁵⁸

⁵⁸ On the use of British procedure tracts, see Chapter 4.

A reason for the newspapers' greater room for manoeuvre compared to other print press was the language used: articles were published in Swedish and Finnish, which in practice required the use of Finnish-born censors. Finnish newspapers proliferated towards the end of the nineteenth century in number, frequency of issues and the geographical and social groups they reached (Landgren 1988, 280–288; Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 443–461). Especially the expansion of the Finnish-language press was notable⁵⁹ (Landgren 1988, 280, 282). The major newspapers' circulation spread from Helsinki to the provinces, and an increasing number of smaller local newspapers were founded (Landgren 1988, 283–288). Although the Helsinki-based were the most important in Finland and to a great extent defined the foreign content of the provincial newspapers, the role of individual subjectivity in censoring the content remained significant. In terms of formal censorship, writing about foreign parliaments was treated as part of regular foreign news, so it was not censored as severely as direct statements on the prevailing political conditions. In this sense, the newspaper press offered the Finnish actors the possibility to circumvent Russian censorship by discussing Finnish reforms indirectly through foreign examples.

The Finnish press facilitated the learning process by following topical foreign discussions and trends and reacted to foreign events on relative short notice. In the early 1880s, for example, Finnish newspapers were able to publish telegrams about the debates of the British House of Commons two days after and longer translated excerpts of them a week later. The longer reports were often translated and compiled from foreign newspapers. Due to the newspaper press, the peripheral Finnish Diet and early Eduskunta were in no sense completely cut off from contemporary parliamentary discussions. On the contrary, foreign examples and concepts were actively used to shape Finnish politics. Finnish newspapers' reports and articles on foreign parliaments were motivated by domestic disputes: the use of foreign examples and discussions was framed to advance political agendas and to influence what was seen as desirable and possible in the Finnish debates. As the case studies of the thesis illustrate, different models were used in different Finnish debates, but also coherence can be found in their utilisation.

One aspect above all speaks for the deliberate use of the foreign models dealt with in the newspaper press: presentations on foreign procedures were often published concurrently with Finnish reforms and disputes. This is apparent, for example, in the early 1860s and in the Parliamentary Reform of 1906, leading up to which newspapers ran presentations on foreign parliaments and parliamentary histories. Before the beginning and during parliamentary ses-

⁵⁹ In 1860–1889 the number of Finnish-language newspapers increased from 9 to 29 and the Swedish-language newspapers from 8 to 23. The Finnish ones caught up with the Swedish in frequency: in 1860 the Finnish newspapers published 1.1 issues per week, in 1889 3.0 and in 1898 3.3; the respective numbers for the Swedish were 2.5, 3.9 and 3.5. (Landgren 1988, 282–283; Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 443–444) Finnish-language newspapers accounted for 75 % of the total circulation in 1900 (Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 453).

sions, newspapers presented foreign parliamentary rules and practices in order to educate and remind Finnish parliamentarians of the proper styles of speech and conduct.⁶⁰

2.4 The newspaper press as an arena for debating Finnish procedures

Newspapers formed an important arena for Finnish procedure debates. The role of the newspapers is connected to their character at the time. Many newspapers, especially the leading ones, were mouthpieces for parties and political groups *per se* – very few even tried to portray themselves as a neutral media for information and news. In the late nineteenth century, the main newspapers published their political programmes and influenced or even decided the nominations of candidates for elections. Newspapers' editorial offices formed an important meeting point for the politically active. As a result, political groups were named after newspapers, for example, the *Suomettarelaiset* and *Dagbladistit*. Eeva Aarnio (2003, 414) has noted that during the period the newspapers gave birth to political parties or were themselves parties.

In the late nineteenth century most newspapers did not have any full time staff. Editors, reporters and visiting writers were well-educated political activists, officials, members of academia and members of the Diet, who worked part-time and received texts from their colleagues and associates. Newspapers benefitted from politically like-minded persons who had connections to the paper either due to earlier assignments or through personal contacts. (Landgren 1988, 369–374) Especially during the early Diets, the political and academic elite formed the core of the writers and readership of the main Helsinki-based political newspapers. Professors and members of academia had a notable role in the Finnish procedure debates both in the press and in the Diet and were the most eager to draw upon foreign discussions for their argumentation. In the Diets, the narrow estate representation based on rank and occupation was widened to include university professors in the Clergy (Jutikkala 1974, 29–41). Members of academia followed Finnish and foreign newspapers and literature, possessed foreign language skills and spent periods abroad. In the early twentieth century, the newspaper staff was still relatively highly-educated and often drawn from the families of state officials; however their general level of education had already begun to drop (Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 570–572).

Due to the character of the newspapers, political groups provided background for and continued and deepened the debates of the Diet and the Eduskunta in the newspapers. The interplay between the press and the parliament was clear in discussions on procedures, whose interpretation and applica-

⁶⁰ See e.g. disputes on the rules on parliamentary speech and debate in Chapter 4, on the role of the speaker of the parliament in Section 4.3 and on free and imperative mandate in Chapter 5.

tion were frequently disputed in newspapers outside of the actual parliamentary debates. With the increasing pace of parliamentary work and the rare summoning of the Diets, parliamentarians did not necessarily want to spend much time discussing forms and procedures. This aspect became increasingly important towards the end of period studied as a result of the parliamentary workload and the scarcity of time.⁶¹ Thus procedures were discussed in the press more thoroughly than in the plenary debates.

The professional, political and academic background of the newspaper staff was reflected in their discussions of parliaments. In addition to actively reporting on the debates, newspapers discussed procedural challenges with a theoretical outlook and with analytical precision. For example, their discussions were of a high academic level, including topics such as perspectivist defences of the parliamentary theory of debate,⁶² the parliament as a deliberative assembly⁶³ and plenum plenum as a surrogate to enable egalitarian parliamentary debate.⁶⁴ In the press, the discussants were able to publish arguments and theorisations that would have been seen as excessive or irrelevant in speeches held in parliament. Newspapers gave the debaters the possibility to sit down, think and analyse the topic from a wider historical and theoretical perspective — speeches in the parliament could be reserved for shorter, more focused and programmatic argumentation.

The newspaper discussions on parliaments of the period were unique in Finnish history. The increased focus on the subject matters of parliamentary work, however, occurred at the cost of the procedural aspects, which in effect eliminated procedural discussion from the newspapers. The introduction of universal suffrage and the newspaper's transformation into a popular mass media caused the press over time to gear its content towards the supposed expectations and demands of the public. Similarly, the extensions of candidate eligibility resulted in a change in the general educational level and interests of MPs.

2.5 The newspaper press as a medium for transfer, translation and popularisation of parliamentary procedures, ideas and concepts

The press formed an arena for the encounter between foreign and Finnish debates on parliaments. As a result of juxtaposing the Finnish and the international, the work of the Diet and the Eduskunta was easily viewed and reviewed through the prism of foreign models. Consequently, newspapers played a cen-

⁶¹ Concern over the hurry and the workload in the Finnish Diet, see e.g. *Nya Pressen*, 11 Feb., 1885, 1–2; 26 Jan., 1886, 2; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 19 Apr., 1891, 1–2.

⁶² Section 3.4 and Chapter 6.

⁶³ Section 5.8.

⁶⁴ Chapter 6.

tral role in the popularisation of parliamentary procedures and the translation of concepts and vocabulary.

Finnish is unusual among European languages in that its political vocabulary was systematically constructed. Before the last third of the nineteenth century, Swedish was the language of government, politics and public debate in Finland. In the mid-nineteenth century, the Fennoman elite began to fight against the backwardness of the Finnish language by systematically adopting European political and scholarly vocabulary. (Hyvärinen et al. 2003) In this sense, a large number of Finnish political concepts and much of the Finnish “political literary language” were translated from pan-European concepts (Palonen 2003a, 571). Henrik Stenius (2003, 309) has noted that the formulation of the modern Finnish political language was a continuous process of applying European ways of using and defining political concepts to the Finnish experience. According to Stenius, in large language areas concepts may be examined as performances by individual actors without regarding them as reflections of the concepts of other language areas. Thus, the main European linguistic areas possess a self-sufficiency that the smaller ones lack. In small language areas like Finland, a comparative perspective is necessary. (ibid.)

Until the late 1870s and 1880s, Finnish lacked the tools to speak on parliamentary topics at a developed theoretical level. As a consequence, the most important discussions on parliamentarism and its procedures took place in Swedish. Finnish-speakers had to imagine their words first in Swedish and only after that give them a Finnish-language form. (Cf. Stenius 2003, 309–311 on the Finnish concept of citizen) Due to the long Swedish parliamentary tradition and its longer history of receiving and translating foreign concepts, the Swedish-language was equipped with a vocabulary for parliamentary matters. However, it seems that not everything in the Swedish parliamentary vocabulary was clear to the Finnish discussants. For example, Swedish articles on the British parliament also contained English terms without standard Swedish equivalents.⁶⁵

The interest in foreign parliamentary discussions, which reached its peak during the formative years of the Finnish political language, had an important role in the development of political vocabulary. When reporting foreign developments Finnish-language newspapers faced and reacted to topics and discussions for which no Finnish vocabulary or established expressions existed. Thus, the press became a central arena for the transfer and translation of foreign concepts and vocabulary. During the transfer many old Finnish words were given a parliamentary meaning.⁶⁶ Newspapers of the period offer material in which new words were constantly coined, new meanings were given to old words and other words were rendered obsolete.

The newspaper press played an important educative role in Finland. While in the beginning of the 1860s newspapers were still aimed at the political elite and were its means of debate, towards the end of the century the press was

⁶⁵ See Chapter 4. On the other hand, presentations of foreign parliamentary vocabulary can be seen as having been an expression of Finnish interest in parliamentary matters.

⁶⁶ See e.g. ‘the speaker’ (*puhemies*) in Section 4.3 and ‘obstruction’ (*jarrutus*) in Chapter 9.

increasingly reaching out to the masses. In 1860 Finland's newspaper readership was around 30,000. It consisted of Swedish-speaking officials, gentry and burghers of the shipping-oriented seaside towns, who subscribed to two-thirds of the 12,000 volumes published in Finland. (Landgren 1988, 286) From 1860 onwards, newspaper circulation grew and spread. The reforms that expanded the Finnish postal service from 1860 on and the development of road and railway networks spread the newspapers' circulation to all areas of the grand duchy (Landgren 1988, 275–276; Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 438–440). At the same time, the development of the school and library systems increased people's literacy and enthusiasm for reading.⁶⁷ The beginning of the regular Diets raised the level of political activity and interest among the peasantry, the petite bourgeoisie, and especially the Finnish-language intelligentsia, which underwent a considerable expansion especially from the 1880s on. Based on circulation, in 1885 about 55 % of the newspaper readership were Finnish-speakers, whereas in 1860 it had been 38 %. Newspapers were also read over the language barriers. (Landgren 1988, 286–288) During the period the bulk of the readership shifted from the southern towns up to the northern provinces. In addition to the main newspapers, which sought to spread their circulation around the grand duchy, a significant number of provincial newspapers were founded especially towards the end of the century. (Landgren 1988, 286–288; Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 453–457) By the 1890s newspapers had found their way into the hands of the intelligentsia, the burghers and farm-owners in the towns and the countryside. In addition, a large number of newspapers were subscribed to libraries and reading rooms. By the 1890s the lower classes were also accustomed to reading newspapers regularly.⁶⁸ (Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 457–459, 461)

The newspaper press influenced the popular understanding of parliamentary activity. It is probable that the procedure discussions remained the interest of a rather small group of political elite. However, the attitudes and positions of various political groups were mediated to the public through their mouthpieces. For the period studied, newspapers were the only source by which the public could gain accessible and up-to-date information about Finnish parliamentary work. Interest in parliaments was apparent not only in the main Helsinki papers, but the provincial newspapers as well were active in reporting and writing about parliaments. Provincial newspapers followed the major newspapers and often "cut-copied" their articles on foreign parliaments from their politically like-minded major newspapers. Similar was often the case with reports on the debates of the Diet and the Eduskunta produced by parliamentary officials and stenographers. In addition, provincial newspapers benefitted from having

⁶⁷ In 1890, 2.1 % of Finns over age 10 were totally illiterate, 61.5 % could read, and 17 % both read and write. In 1900, 35 % of the population could read and write; in 1910, 45 %. (Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 457–458)

⁶⁸ A reason was the founding of workers' newspapers in the late 1890s. Before then much of the working class had never subscribed to a newspaper. Another aspect was the enlargement of Finnish cities and the general increase in prosperity and rise in the standard of living. In the early nineteenth century the competition between the main Helsinki-based newspapers concerned circulation only among the social elite. (Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 457–459, 461)

local representatives in the parliament and often their own parliamentary reporters as well (Landgren 1988, 374), who wrote popular vernacular reports and causeries on parliamentary sittings. Thus, Finnish newspapers had a crucial role in popularising parliamentary topics and in translating and creating a vocabulary to describe them.

3 POLITICAL GROUPS AND COMPETING IDEAS ON PARLIAMENTARISM IN THE FINNISH PROCEDURE DEBATES

The study focuses on two contexts of analysis. The first deals with the beginning of the Diet work in the 1860s, the discussions of the Diet Act of 1869 and the debates on the estates' procedures until the mid-1880s. The second context is situated around the Parliamentary Reform of 1906 and the early Eduskunta. In the period between the two contexts the procedures examined in this dissertation were not actively discussed. The increased Russification policies shifted the attention of the Diet and procedure disputes were then handled using old and familiar arguments.

In the first context the analysis of the different notions of deliberation and representation will be approached through the disputes between *Dagblad* liberals and Fennomans. Although some general aspects of the two political groups are presented here, it should be noted that the groups were not stable or coherent in all political questions, but nevertheless they formed the main poles of the procedure debates from the 1860s to the mid-1880s and were active in discussing and disputing the role and development of the Finnish Diet. This analysis of the procedure debates reveals an opposition in the Finnish discussions that is unidentified in the earlier literature.

In the study, the debates on the procedures serve as the focal point to examine the Finnish politics of the period and its actors. Although the political disputes and constellations changed in Finland during the period, the stands taken on some of the procedure questions and the central problematics of parliamentarism remained stable. Chapter 3 offers a starting point for the examination of the Finnish debates, while finer distinctions between the political groups, disputes and contexts described in this chapter will be discussed and problematised in later chapters.

3.1 The *Dagblad* liberals

3.1.1 *Helsingfors Dagblad* and the *Dagblad* group

A group of persons associated with the newspaper *Helsingfors Dagblad* took an active role in the Finnish procedure debates immediately upon the group's formation. In the literature the newspaper *Helsingfors Dagblad* has been described as the most important cohesive force and chief organ of the network of like-minded Finnish 'liberals' from 1860s to 1880s (Landgren 1995; Numminen 1950). Similarly to other Finnish political "parties" of the period, the liberals organised around *Dagblad* did not have a proper party organisation with a distribution of tasks and duties, but the group tried to distinguish itself from other actors by taking a stand on different disputes through their newspaper. The group did not name its leaders, organise agitational or extensive electoral campaigns or recognise party discipline. In this sense, heterogeneity and diffuseness was characteristic of the group throughout its history. (See Numminen 1950, 164 on Finnish 'liberals')

From the 1860s on, *Dagblad* liberals were defined by their opponents and in part by themselves in relation to the heated language question that served as the basis for the Finnish party formation. Although the *Dagblad* liberals were Swedish-speakers, they tried to be or at least present themselves as neutral in the question (Stenius & Turunen 1995, 51) and thus remain between the polarised groups of the Finnish-speaking Fennomans and the Swedish-speaking Svecomans. The *Dagblad*ists advocated the idea of "two languages and one people" and argued for moving the political focus from language to other reforms.

Eventually the *Dagblad* liberals' position in the language question, which had long dominated the Finnish political agenda, prevailed. The *Dagblad* liberals as a political group came to its end in the mid-1880s after an unsuccessful attempt to establish a proper Liberal Party by publishing a party programme in 1880, which was signed by 53 individuals. After this a substantial number of Liberal Party members, including several central *Dagblad*ists, joined forces with the Svecomans. A major reason for the breakdown of the internally diffuse Liberal Party was the language question:⁶⁹ The *Dagblad* liberals' stand in between the Svecomans and the pro-Finnish Fennomans led to scepticism and critique from both sides, the most significant of which came from the Fennomaniologist and leader Johan Vilhelm Snellman, who attacked the Liberal Party Programme in the newspaper *Morgonbladet* immediately after its publication.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Ilkka Liikanen (1995, 108) has argued that the atrophy and weakness of the Liberal Party was not a result of its failure but of its success. According to him, Finnish liberals rose to leading positions and the liberal political and social goals were realised in a top-down manner. (ibid.) In view of parliamentary procedures, many of the *Dagblad* liberals' goals remained unrealised.

⁷⁰ See Snellman 1880. Snellman will be dealt with in Section 3.4.3.

The newspaper *Helsingfors Dagblad* published its first pilot issues in late 1861 and started a regular six-days-a-week publication in the beginning of 1862. From the outset *Dagblad* signified a change in the Finnish press due to its openly political, polemical and provocative character. According to the newspaper, the language question would be settled over time and did not belong to Finland's top priorities. *Dagblad* emphasised the need to "respect the constitution" and to "choose the path of bold lawful progress". In the Diet year of 1863 *Dagblad* demanded: regular Diets and the right to introduce motions for the estates; taxes were not to be ordered without the consent of the estates; the estates were to be given the right to supervise the finances of the state and the administration expenditures; the Finnish Senate was to be made responsible to the estates; pre-publication censorship was to be abolished and freedom of the press introduced. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 2 Jan., 1863, 1; 1 July, 1863, 1; Landgren 1988, 294–295)

The *Dagblad* liberals have been noted to have advocated "the liberal worldview" (e.g. Landgren 1995). Although this becomes apparent in *Dagblad*'s stands on foreign political disputes, some of the Fennomans shared similar goals in relation to social, political and economic reform. Members of both groups supported freedoms of the press, speech and assembly as basic civil rights, emphasised the importance of following constitutional forms and saw regular Diets as essential for progress. (Pulkkinen 1989, 115; Kurunmäki 2003) Because of this, the question of who in fact were 'liberal' in Finland remained disputed throughout the existence of the *Dagblad* group, although *Dagblad* used the term 'liberal' more actively than other groups in its discussions and reporting of news, whether foreign or domestic.⁷¹

The first editor of *Helsingfors Dagblad* was Otto Reinhold Frenckell,⁷² but in practice during the first years Edvard Bergh,⁷³ Robert Lagerborg⁷⁴ and Anders

⁷¹ For example, in the beginning of the 1860s, Finnish newspapers that used the term "liberal" were mainly part what was later called the liberal newspaper press of the 1860s (see Landgren 1980, 289–308), namely *Helsingfors Dagblad*, *Hufvudstadsbladet*, *Barometern*, *Papperslyktan*, *Åbo Underrättelser* and *Wiborg*, but also the official newspaper *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*. These newspapers used the term "liberal" in relation to foreign events and developments to describe "liberal ideas", "spirit", "tendencies", "direction", "politics", "actors", "institutions", "newspaper press" and "legislation". In this sense it can be said that at this point, Finnish "liberalism" was interest in European and American developments and discussions on politics and thought that the newspapers defined as liberal. In the disputes between the Fennomans newspapers and *Dagblad*, the latter argued that it was a liberal party representing liberal opinions against "reactionary" and Fennomans "conservative" stands (see e.g. *Helsingin Uutiset*, 5 Jan., 1863, 3; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Jan., 1863, 1; 15 Jan., 1863, 2).

⁷² Otto Reinhold Frenckell (1823–1880) was the owner of the family publishing house and bookshop J. C. Frenckell & Son's until 1865. After his years with *Helsingfors Dagblad*, Frenckell wrote occasional articles on the economy and theatre reviews, but was not otherwise active with the newspaper anymore. Frenckell built a career in banking. (Hanski 2001c)

⁷³ Edvard Bergh (1829–1903) was a liberal journalist, lawyer and member of the Burghers in the Diets of 1867 and 1877–78. Bergh started his newspaper career in *Morgonbladet* in 1853. After that, Bergh wrote for the newspapers *Papperslyktan*, *Helsingfors Tidningar*, *Åbo Underrättelser* (1860–63, 1857–59) and most importantly *Helsingfors Dagblad*. Bergh wrote most of the articles that defined *Dagblad*'s political profile in 1862–63. Bergh continued writing for *Dagblad* until the newspaper's abolishment in 1889, and after that for *Hufvudstadsbladet*. Bergh also wrote an influential two-volume

Herman Chydenius⁷⁵ were responsible for the newspaper's programme. Leo Mechelin,⁷⁶ Robert Montgomery⁷⁷ and J. A. Estlander⁷⁸ constituted *Helsingfors Dagblad's* directorate. After 1865 Lagerborg and Chydenius were in charge of *Dagblad* for the next twenty years and made the newspaper Finland's most notable paper in terms of circulation and influence, and indeed one of the leading newspapers in the Nordic countries. Following foreign models, Lagerborg developed *Helsingfors Dagblad* into a modern newspaper that lived up to European standards in style, practices and speed of reporting. *Dagblad* served as a model for the other Finnish newspapers, which actively copied its reports and edited them to suit their own purposes. *Helsingfors Dagblad* was often the only Finnish newspaper sold outside of Finland. In view of its circulation and finances, *Dagblad* was at its height during the second half of the 1870s, when it was Finland's largest newspaper. In the 1880s *Dagblad* became unprofitable due to the tightened competition between the growing Swedish- and Finnish-language newspaper press. Lagerborg's death in 1882 further complicated its finances and led to disputes within the newspaper and to increasing dissatisfaction with the editor A. H. Chydenius. The unsuccessful effort to found the Liberal Party and its inner controversies had a negative effect on *Helsingfors Dagblad*. It ceased

book on Finnish constitutional developments after 1809 called *Vår styrelse och våra landtdagar* (1884; 1888). (Hanski 2000; Landgren 1988, 292–296, 300, 302; Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 500; Tommila 1988, 145, 151, 190)

⁷⁴ Robert Lagerborg (1835–1882) was an active journalist who wrote for *Helsingfors Dagblad* and for *Papperslyktan*. Lagerborg was a member of the Nobility from 1863 until his death. (Hanski 2005)

⁷⁵ See Section 6.6.2.

⁷⁶ Leo Mechelin (1839–1914) was a prominent politician, a developer of Finnish state institutions, definer of the legal status of the Finnish grand duchy and a leader of the Finnish legal struggle. Mechelin was one of the founders of *Helsingfors Dagblad*. From 1872 on, Mechelin took part in every Finnish Diet, first in the Burghers in 1872 and after that in the Nobility. Mechelin was a representative for the Swedish People's Party in the Eduskunta of 1910–1913. He was a professor of constitutional law and politics in 1874–1882 and an acting professor of economics in 1877–1882. He worked in the Senate in 1882–1890 and was head of the economic division in 1905–1908. Mechelin saw Finland as part of the developing Western societies and published actively in Finland and abroad. (Helen 1997)

⁷⁷ Robert Montgomery (1834–1898) was a member of the Nobility in the Diets of 1863–1897. Montgomery studied abroad in Geneva, Paris, London and Edinburgh and made study trips to Stockholm and Germany. In 1867 Montgomery replaced Johan Philip Palmén, who was appointed senator, as the professor of civil and Roman law at the University of Helsinki and served there until 1882. Montgomery followed European developments actively and spent his leaves of absence abroad, mainly in Paris. Montgomery maintained close relations with foreign jurists. Montgomery worked also as procurator (1882–1886) and senator (1887–1890). Montgomery worked in close cooperation with Leo Mechelin. In 1880 he signed the Liberal Party Programme. As a parliamentarian Montgomery maintained his jurisprudential style of argumentation in highly politicised questions. (Tyynilä 2005) In the early 1860s Montgomery was part of the "Young liberals", who met regularly at Henrik Borgström's home, and he took part in the founding of *Helsingfors Dagblad* (Landgren 1995, 20, 37).

⁷⁸ Jakob August Estlander (1831–1881) was a politically active professor of surgery (1860–) and pioneer in antiseptics and in improving Finnish hospital conditions. (Scheinin 2003)

publication temporarily at the end of 1887 and, after a brief revival, came to its final end in 1889. (Landgren 1988, 296–300)

Throughout its existence *Helsingfors Dagblad* held its position as an arena for a somewhat changing group of political actors. Key liberals presented their views on current issues and *Dagblad* reporters recruited and endorsed ‘liberal’ candidates for elections. Almost all of its editors and active journalists were prominent members of the Diet. Political meetings were held at *Dagblad*’s editorial office, where Helsinki-based liberals congregated on a daily basis. (Numminen 1950, 165, 184; Landgren 1988, 297) ‘The *Dagblad* Party’ (*dagbladpartiet*; *dagbladister*; *dagbladistit*) was a common nickname for the group. In addition to the role of *Helsingfors Dagblad*, political clubs such as *G.V.*⁷⁹ and *LXI*⁸⁰ provided continuity for the *Dagblad* liberals’ political agenda.

Who can be defined as the Finnish ‘liberals’ of the late nineteenth century has been a controversial question both in the literature and in the political debates of the period (see e.g. Pulkkinen 1989a; Stenius & Turunen 1995; Vares 2000). It should be noted that I am not claiming that the loose group organised around *Helsingfors Dagblad* was necessarily advocating any ism or were or even tried to be ‘liberals’. Thus, in the newspaper sources my use of the term “liberal” as in ‘*Dagblad* liberal’ and the term ‘*Dagbladist*’ refers to persons who were described by themselves, and occasionally by their opponents, as liberals and who were associated with the *Dagblad* group as editors, journalists or associate writers of the newspaper or understood by the contemporaries as sharing a political agenda with the group. The actors’ relationships with the newspaper will be further explicated in the case studies.

3.1.2 *Dagblad* liberals and the procedural aspect of parliamentarism

The traditional emphasis on national history writing has resulted in neglect for the histories of ‘the losers’. This is apparent in the case of the *Dagblad* liberals, who, despite failing to establish a viable political party, had significant input in the development and modernisation of Finnish procedures. The *Dagblad* liberals played a central role in the introduction of parliamentary procedures and concepts in Finland.

Revision of the Diet procedures was high on the *Dagblad* liberals’ agenda from the birth of their newspaper. From the 1860s on, *Dagblad* liberals were prominent in discussing and developing Finnish procedures in relation to for-

⁷⁹ *G.V.*, *Grundlagens Vänner*, in *English Friends of the Constitution*, was established in 1877 and consisted of twenty-five to thirty-year-olds who were politically active and interested in constitutional questions. Most members graduated from University during the liberal tide of the 1860s, having studied law and worked in or had connections to the Diet. (Numminen 1950, 165–170)

⁸⁰ Leo Mechelin founded *LXI* (*Sextioettan*) in 1879. The club attracted a considerable number of leading Finnish political figures to its meetings, in which liberal Helsinki residents discussed courses of action in different questions. When liberals of the provinces came to Helsinki before the Diet sessions, questions and planned petitions were given to them for examination. Similarly to *G.V.*, *Sextioettan* consisted of Swedish-speaking aristocracy, who had a strong background in Diet work. (Numminen 1950, 170–176)

eign models. Firstly, *Helsingfors Dagblad* examined foreign parliaments and prepared and debated the Finnish procedures actively. Secondly, the bulk of the debates and revisions on the procedures were based on the proposals of prominent *Dagblad* liberals in the Burgers and the Nobility.

Dagblad liberals' interest in procedure debates differed from other political groups in three respects. Firstly, in the search for foreign procedure models, *Dagblad* liberals' focus was on the British parliament. Although *Helsingfors Dagblad* wrote on a variety of European parliaments and reported on their debates, it was the British parliament whose procedures *Dagblad* presented most eagerly and extensively. During the late nineteenth century the newspaper published a large number of specialised articles on the procedures of the British parliament.

Secondly, *Dagblad* liberals were interested in the procedural aspects of parliamentarism. The *Dagbladists* were pioneers in Finland in this respect and understood parliamentarism through its procedure as a certain mode or style of speech, debate and deliberation. Despite the obsolescence of the four-estate system, *Dagbladists* described Finland as part of international parliamentary history and parliamentary life. The group found grounds for this connection in procedures. According to their view, the Finland was a 'parliamentary country' due to Diet procedures and their development, which were based on the following and imitation of international parliamentary models.

The idea of family resemblance is illustrative of *Dagblad* liberals' procedural approach to parliaments. According to *Dagbladists*, it was procedure that gave parliamentary work its specific character and made parliaments institutions and arenas *sui generis* for politics and debate. At the same time *Dagblad* liberals did not give a detailed definition of parliament — the question of which procedures an assembly was to have in order to merit the status of 'parliament' remained unanswered. In their rhetoric 'parliamentary' was defined on a case-by-case basis by referring to rules and practices that had been adopted in foreign 'parliamentary assemblies' and 'constitutional countries' or by pointing to Finnish procedures that met these foreign standards. Thus, following the idea of family resemblance,⁸¹ in *Dagblad* liberals' rhetoric parliaments were not given any essential common feature or core, but were connected by a series or network of overlapping and crisscrossing procedural similarities. 'Parliament' and 'parliamentary' were rhetorical constructions and tools for the procedure debates. The procedural understanding and its learning process in Finland was explicated by referring, for example, to 'the ABCs of parliamentary life', 'the rudiments of parliamentary work', 'parliamentarily correct', 'parliamentary order', '(un)parliamentary language', '(un)parliamentary practice' and '(un)parliamentary procedure'⁸².

⁸¹ The idea of family resemblance was discussed by Ludwig Wittgenstein, for example, in the posthumously published *Philosophical Investigations* (1953) and by John Stuart Mill in *A System of Logic* (1843).

⁸² See case studies in Chapters 4–9 for a variety of examples.

Thirdly, *Dagblad* liberals' interest in developing the Diet modes of proceeding was strongly based in the deliberative character of parliament, more specifically, in their notion of debate.⁸³ This led *Dagblad* liberals to pay attention to and advocate for procedure revisions, such as plenum plenorum and stenographic minutes, which were not widely prioritised by other political groups. Their notion of debate was indebted to and grounded in their admiration for the British parliament and authors such as John Stuart Mill. In the early 1860s *Dagblad* liberals presented their notion of the style, purposes and role of debate in politics in their newspaper polemics against Fennoman and official government newspapers,⁸⁴ and they continued to promote their dissensual notion of debate in the Diet's procedure discussions.

From the beginning of the regular Diets in the 1860s *Dagblad* liberals repeatedly criticised the obsolete four-estate system and especially the hindrances it posed for deliberation. Although *Dagblad* liberals did not abandon their demands for thorough reforms of the system of representation and government, a bicameral parliament, increases in the powers of the Diet and a Senate responsible to the parliament, due to the improbability and possible uncontrolled risks of such reforms, their efforts focused on gradually developing the procedures. *Dagblad*ist Robert Castrén's⁸⁵ presentation in a meeting of the liberal club *LXI* in 1879 was illustrative of their procedure tactics. Castrén noted that two possible courses for parliamentary reform existed in Finland. Finland either had to change over to a bicameral system or it had to concentrate on developing the existing system step by step. According to Castrén, as the Finnish system had developed over centuries as a part of Sweden, it would be more secure to ground on the old foundations, as Britain had done. Castrén argued that "it might seem hopeless to build on ruins, but it is better to fix a hut with construction defects than to move to a palace whose suitability is yet unknown". (Robert Castrén's presentation in *Sextioettan*, 12 March 1879, in Numminen 1950, 179) For developing the existing system, the liberals took up two different themes: the question of franchise and candidate eligibility, and the question of improving the parliamentary rules and practices. (Draft for the programme of the National Liberal Club, in Numminen 1950, 179–180)

⁸³ See Section 3.4.

⁸⁴ See Section 3.4.2.

⁸⁵ Robert Castrén (1851–1883) was a liberal politician, historian, journalist and the editor of *Helsingfors Dagblad* from 1882 until his death. Castrén made several long trips around Europe and wrote for *Dagblad* and other newspapers from 1871 onwards. Castrén was a founder of the liberal clubs "G. V." and "LXI". Castrén was also one of the fathers of the Liberal Party Programme of 1880. (Landgrén 2002)

3.2 The Fennomans

3.2.1 Organisation and main newspapers in the procedure debates

The Fennomans were a nineteenth-century national movement that sought to raise the Finnish language to the position of a national language and to become a defining characteristic of Finland's national culture. The movement found its main opponents in the Swedish-speaking ascendant bourgeoisie and aristocracy, who according to the Fennomans held on to their old privileges and obstructed reforms crucial to the development of the people's Finnish-speaking majority.

Especially from the 1860s on, the dichotomy between the Fennomans and the Svecomans came to increasingly dominate Finland's political life. In general, it has been argued that the Fennomans saw Finland's status in connection with the Russian Empire as preferable to that during Sweden's rule. The relation to Russia made Finland's future as a culture and nation possible among the European countries, whereas the connection with Sweden meant inevitable cultural assimilation. The Svecomans, for their part, considered Russia a barbaric country that oppressed the peoples of Europe and saw that only through its relations to Sweden could Finland protect and develop its Western cultural heritage. (Pulkkinen 1989, 114–115) As mentioned, the *Dagblad* liberals tried to find a balance between the two sides: they searched for influences from the West, but tried to remain neutral in the language question. However, in the Diets the *Dagblad* liberals were usually treated by the Fennomans as Svecomans, who clung to their privileges, oppressed the peasants and invented empty words to mask their true aims (*ibid.*).

Maintaining the division between the Fennomans and Svecomans, an aim the two sides of the language struggle themselves actively pursued, is problematic in many respects. The Fennomans as a political movement consisted of groups and individuals who had varying views on the questions on the political agenda. Thus, the Fennomans cannot be considered as a whole or a monolithic political group as such, although some of its members rose to leading and even authoritative positions within the movement. Instead, their inner controversies led to the birth of different factions, such as the Young Fennomans in the 1860s, the *Valvoja* group in the 1880s and the Young Finns finally in the 1890s.

In the 1860s, the term Young Fennomans (*jungfennomaanit*) was used by contemporaries, especially the Fennomans' liberal opponents, to refer to Fennomans who by distancing themselves from the *Dagblad* liberals and turning towards Russia stood in marked contrast to the "Old Honest" Fennomans. By the 1870s the Young Fennomans led by G. Z. Forsman (Yrjö Koskinen)⁸⁶ had

⁸⁶ Georg Zacharias Forsman (1830–1903, after 1884 Yrjö Sakari Yrjö-Koskinen) was a senator, professor in history, journalist and the most prominent Fennoman politician together with J. V. Snellman. By emphasising the importance of Finnish language, education and school, Forsman sought to raise the Finnish people among the 'civilised European nations'. Forsman started his newspaper career in the liberal *Åbo Tidningar* in the 1850s, while during the 1860s he drove his Fennoman "one language,

become the mainstream Fennomania and was referred to as the Finnish Party. The most important mouthpiece of the party was the Finnish-language newspaper *Uusi Suometar*, which began publication in 1869 a few years after its predecessor, *Suometar*, was discontinued (1866). Viktor Löfgren was the newspaper's first editor-in-chief, a position he held for 35 years. *Uusi Suometar* was to a great extent Yrjö Koskinen's⁸⁷ newspaper, which aimed to fulfil Snellman's political programme of making Finnish the language of administration and education and raising the national self-esteem and spirit among the great majority of the people. All the main writers were prominent Fennomans such as Jaakko Forsman,⁸⁸ Thiodolf Rein⁸⁹ and Agathon Meurman.⁹⁰ From the early 1880s on, the polemics within the Fennoman movement became apparent as *Uusi Suometar* began its dispute with the radical Young Finn newspapers *Aamulehti*, *Kaiku*, *Savo*, *Keski-Suomi* and *Wiipurin Sanomat*. *Uusi Suometar* was left in the hands of the old Fennoman generation of Yrjö Koskinen and Agathon Meurman. (Landgren 1988, 320–322)

Although Yrjö Koskinen's *Uusi Suometar* paid close attention to the work of the Diet, its main focus was on the Diet's subject matters and particularly on reforms on the status of Finnish language. It took a relatively passive role in the procedure debates covered by this study, with the exception of those that had political significance in relation to the Fennomans' political goals. Since the discussions on the Diet procedures took place largely in Swedish, the Fennomans also took part in the debates through their Swedish-language publications. The argumentation over the procedures was not aimed at the wider population, but at a rather small Swedish-speaking political elite. Despite this, in the procedure

one nation" ideology in *Suometar*, *Uusi Suometar*, *Helsingin Uutiset*, *Morgonbladet* and *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti*. Forsman was a member of the Clergy in the Diets of 1872, 1877–78 and 1882, and a member of the Nobility after his ennoblement in 1885. He was a senator in 1882–1899. The 1890s was Yrjö-Koskinen's last decade in politics. (Sainio 2000a)

⁸⁷ In the study, G. Z. Forsman will be referred to as his author name Yrjö Koskinen.

⁸⁸ Jaakko Forsman (1839–1899) was a professor of criminal law and legal history and rector of the University of Helsinki. Fennoman Forsman was, together with his brothers, a central figure in the Finnish Party and a member of the Clergy 1882–1899. Forsman was also an active journalist and was with his older brother G. Z. Forsman (Yrjö Koskinen) a founder of *Helsingin Uutiset*, *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti* and *Valvoja* and a writer for *Suometar* and *Uusi Suometar*. Compared to Georg Zacharias, Jaakko Forsman was a moderate in the language question. (Sainio 2003)

⁸⁹ Thiodolf Rein (1838–1919) was a professor of philosophy after J. V. Snellman, in 1869–1900. Rein followed Snellman's Hegelian idealism and Fennoman stands and was a continuator of his work. In 1883–1897 Rein wrote for the periodical *Valvoja* and was its editor 1885–1887. In *Valvoja*, Rein supported transition to a unicameral parliament and was a moderate Fennoman in relation to the language question. Rein was a member of the Nobility 1872–1906. (Aho 2001)

⁹⁰ Agathon Meurman (1826–1909) was a long-time member of the Diet, a journalist and a close supporter of Yrjö Koskinen. Meurman was a conservative Fennoman leader of the Peasants. Meurman adopted an ideology of romantic nationalism according to which Fennomania was to rise to greatness through the peasantry. As a journalist Meurman wrote especially in the 1880s for the Swedish-language Fennoman newspaper *Finland*. (Vares 2001) Other early writers in *Morgonbladet* were the newspaper's first editor Ernst August Forssell, Kaarlo Bergbom, Otto Donner and Zacharias Topelius.

debates from the 1860s to the mid-1880s, the Svecomans remained passive, usually merely seconding or repeating the Dagbladist argumentation.

In the study, a special focus is given to the Fennoman Swedish-language newspaper *Morgonbladet*, which was more active in discussing parliamentary topics than other Fennoman publications. *Morgonbladet* was established, to a great extent, to counter the influence of *Helsingfors Dagblad*, and the two newspapers carried on disputes with each other throughout their existence. *Morgonbladet* was founded in 1871. A reason for its birth was the Diet Act of 1869, which by establishing regular meetings of the estates convinced the Fennomans of the need to establish a Helsinki-based Swedish-language newspaper. *Morgonbladet's* programme, which was formulated by Thiodolf Rein, did not differ significantly from the aims of the *Dagblad* liberals. The programme demanded an expansion of the estates' rights to decide on taxes and to introduce motions, as well as a fully independent Senate judicial division, freedom of the press and full equality between Finnish and Swedish in the language question. August Hagman's⁹¹ role was significant in the newspaper and he became its editor-in-chief in 1874. K. W. Forsman and Agathon Meurman also wrote for *Morgonbladet* and J. V. Snellman published his last writings there. *Morgonbladet* was the only Fennoman newspaper published six times a week in the 1870s and it continued to be published until 1884, when the newspaper went bankrupt. (Landgren 1988, 322–324)

The so-called *Valvoja* group broke loose from the Fennoman camp in 1880, when it organised around the periodical *Valvoja*. The periodical criticised the Finnish Party for bigotry in the language question and for its conservatism in questions of religion and science and shunned the main party's demands for a one-sided majority rule. The group sought to combine liberal social and political ideas with Fennomania. It tried to remain neutral in the language question and saw language rather as a means for politics than its subject matter. Instead, the *Valvoja* was active on questions of social and political reform concerning inequality and suffrage. Prominent members of the group were E. G. Palmén, Valfrid Vasenius, O. E. Tudeer, J. R. Danielson and Thiodolf Rein. From the 1880s on the *Valvoja* was situated between the old Fennomans and the rising more radical Young Finns. (Landgren 1988, 310–311; Vares 2000, 40–43)

In the 1880s the young student generation, born mostly in the 1860s, started to challenge the old Fennoman leadership. The so-called Young Finns formed a liberal and internationally oriented faction within the Finnish Party in the 1890s. They published a programme in 1894 and finally established their own official party in 1905. The group drew on empirical naturalism, individualism and moral relativism, and stressed the need for a wide and active application of European influences as well as for democratic reform, most of which stood in contrast to the old Fennoman generation. (Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 462,

⁹¹ August Hagman was a Swedish-speaking Fennoman, who followed the ideas of J. V. Snellman. Hagman wrote for several newspapers, such as *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti* and *Suometar* and was the founder of *Pietarin Sanomat*, a Fennoman newspaper published in St. Petersburg. (Virrankoski 2001)

Vares 2000, 31–32) According to the Young Finn programme of 1894, the party “aimed to develop political and social conditions in a more liberal and democratic direction”. This meant respect for the constitution and the law, increasing the estates’ possibilities to oversee the work of the government, expanding suffrage, improving the social conditions of the poor, removal of prepublication censorship and increasing the role of Finnish language in legislation, administration and education. (Nuoren suomenmielisen puolueen ohjelma 1894) The group included political figures such as Jonas Castrén,⁹² who was a strict Fenoman in the language question, but active supporter of radical democratic reforms. The Young Finns’ disaffiliation from the main party ignited a press war during which new Young and Old Finn newspapers were founded in opposition to each other. The Young Finns established their main mouthpiece, *Päivälehti*, in 1889, which changed its name to *Helsingin Sanomat* after being suspended in 1904.

During the first wave of Russification in the beginning of the 1900s, Young Finns joined the Svecoman Swedish Party under a coalition called the Constitutionalists to defend Finland’s constitutional status against the Russification. While the Constitutionalist adopted passive resistance to oppose the Russification, the conservative Old Finns wing of the Finnish Party led by Yrjö Koskinen, and after his death by J. R. Danielson and Agathon Meurman, supported appeasement. Illustrative of the changed political constellations, Leo Mechelin, one of the founders of *Helsingfors Dagblad* and a long-time liberal who had tried to remain neutral in the language strife was considered a main leader of the Constitutionalist movement. The (Old) Finnish Party and the Young Finnish Party were finally formally established in 1905 and both published party programmes in 1906 for the upcoming elections to the unicameral Eduskunta. Both parties highlighted the language question, education, the need to expand the powers of the Eduskunta and to enact a new constitution act. Compared to the Finnish Party, the Young Finns underlined the need for strict legalism in elevating the status of Finland and its legal position in the empire. (Nuorsuomalaisen puolueen ohjelma 1906; Suomalaisen puolueen ohjelma 1906)

Sometimes even *Valvoja* group and Young Finns members took different stands on questions on the agenda. This becomes apparent in procedure debates where some shared ideas with the *Dagblad* liberals while others adopted opposing stands or sought to distance themselves from the issue concerned. Since the focus of the study is on the procedure debates and on actors who participated in them, the procedure debates and the stands of the various actors have been approached on a case-by-case basis while at the same time looking for possible consistencies and discrepancies between the specific debates and

⁹² Jonas Castrén (1850–1922) was one of the most visible and colourful political characters of his time. He was a Young Finn and a Constitutionalist, who was forthright and unbending in his opinions and tended to cause a stir among his opponents. Castrén was a member of the Peasants 1885–1894 and 1905–1906 and a member of the Eduskunta 1907–1914 and in the first session of 1917. Governor-General Bobrikov deported him from Finland 1903–1905. (Hultin 1927)

the actors' more general ideas on parliamentary activity. Chapters 4–9 offer further contextualisation of the relevant political disputes and actors.

3.2.2 Fennomans' approaches to parliaments and parliamentarism

Some general remarks can be made about the Fennomans' participation in the procedure debates and their interest in parliaments from the 1860s to the mid-1880s. In comparing the Fennomans to the *Dagblad* liberals, three aspects can be raised. Firstly, whereas the latter admired the British parliament, the Fennomans did not focus on any particular parliament. Although both groups referred to the Swedish model actively, there were differences in its use. The *Dagbladists* used the Swedish constitutional framework as a starting point for further application of their parliamentary studies, whereas the Fennomans, in the debates analysed, referred to the Swedish procedures mainly in order to clarify Finland's procedural foundations.

Although *Uusi Suometar* and *Morgonbladet* reported actively on foreign parliaments, they showed very little interest in procedural aspects compared to *Helsingfors Dagblad*. In the procedure debates, the Finnish Party refrained from using foreign models in support of their deliberative model. Whereas leading Fennomans, such as Yrjö Koskinen and J. V. Snellman, highlighted the importance of comparing foreign practices in developing the Finnish society, this interest was not reflected in their stands in the procedure debates analysed in this study. Instead, the Fennoman newspapers and Diet members often criticised "the blind adoption" of foreign parliamentary models in the yet-underdeveloped conditions of Finland.⁹³ For many Fennomans, imitating foreign parliaments posed the threat of upsetting the calm and dignified character of Finnish politics. However, it is notable that towards the end of the nineteenth century the growing Fennoman press had an important role in popularising, translating and spreading parliamentary vocabulary and style of discussion.

Secondly, the Fennoman interest in parliamentarism had a different emphasis compared to that of the *Dagblad* liberals. The Fennomans rarely called the Finnish Diet a 'parliament' as such or defined its deliberations as 'parliamentary', although the Finnish word *parlamentti* was used in Finnish newspaper articles on a wide variety of foreign assemblies from the 1820s on, with the British parliament being the first example of this use. A reason for this was the Fennoman style to connect 'parliaments' to the parliamentary system of government. For Fennomans, the parliamentary system of government was the main arena for parliamentary activity. For example, Yrjö Koskinen's admiration for the British parliamentary system in the 1860s (Kurunmäki 2003, 293–294) was limited to the separation of powers and did not extend to procedures as the regulators of intra-parliamentary deliberation. Compared to *Dagblad* liberals, in the procedure debates the Fennomans had less interest in what actually took

⁹³ In addition to the case studies, see e.g. Snellman 1861b, 532–533; Danielson 1881; Palmén 1884a, 32–33; 1884b, 122. It is notable that E. G. Palmén also gave the *Dagblad* liberals credit for their positive influence on the Diet procedures (see Palmén 1884a, 32–33; 1884b, 122, 137).

place in the deliberations of the parliament and what were the parliamentary implications of the procedures. In other words, until the 1880s, prominent Fennomans refrained from explicitly situating procedures in an international parliamentary framework.⁹⁴ In addition to the debates examined in this dissertation, the difference becomes apparent in newspaper reporting and writing on foreign parliaments. Whereas *Helsingfors Dagblad* offered a procedural approach to foreign parliamentary events and disputes, Fennoman newspapers settled for a descriptive reporting of events.⁹⁵

Thirdly, whereas the *Dagblad* liberals highlighted the role of dissensual plenary debate as an essential part of parliamentary deliberation, the Fennomans countered by emphasising the importance of committee negotiation as a means for effective consensus-building between the prevailing estate opinions. In order to ensure sufficient leverage in the Diet's negotiations and accommodation process, the Fennomans prioritised reforms in estate representation and highlighted education as means for the Fennomans to rise within the estate hierarchy.

It is notable that the active role of the *Dagblad* liberals and their international scope of interest did not cause all Fennoman actors to remain passive or altogether obstructive in the revision of procedures. The passing of procedures required the Fennoman actors' blessing, and in some procedure debates, Fennomans such as E. G. Palmén played a central role. Thus, the analysis of the Finnish procedure debates sheds light also on the different Fennoman approaches to parliamentary deliberation and representation. Although the language question often characterised Fennoman stands on procedures, some of Fennomans, especially after the early 1880s, emphasised procedural aspects and advocated reforms based on foreign models.

3.3 The Social Democrats

The Social Democrats became active participants in the procedure debates during the Parliamentary Reform of 1906 and in the Eduskunta after the introduction of universal suffrage and extensions on the right to stand for election. In Finland the rise of the labour movement and social democracy occurred relatively late and calmly; however, the time period involved was short compared to neighbouring Sweden and Russia. The character of the Finnish labour movement changed in the 1890s. While the earlier workers' associations had been mostly organised by the intelligentsia and characterised by a paternalistic attitude that aimed to educate the workers and control their relations to employers, by the late 1890s the workers' associations in the biggest towns had adopted socialism. In the 1880s the associations were holding meetings in facilities offered by the gentry, who taught about such matters as occupational

⁹⁴ For exceptions to this, see e.g. E. G. Palmén in Chapters 7 and 8.

⁹⁵ See Chapter 4.

health and safety, taxation, Finnish constitution, the Diet, legislation, and Finnish autonomy in a patriotic spirit. (Laine 1951, 30–40) The workers' associations raised political demands increasingly towards the end of the decade, calling for radical reforms of suffrage, to which the members of the estates usually objected (ibid. 47–51). In the Diet, the workers were efficiently excluded from suffrage, with rare exceptions like the socialist member N. R. af Ursin.⁹⁶ In the Diet elections, workers' associations gave their support mostly to the Finnish Party (ibid. 48–49), whose programme was radical compared to that of the Svecoman Swedish Party and which invoked the 'will of the people'. In the beginning, the workers movement also sympathised with the Young Finns, but later renounced them after establishing the Finnish Labour Party in 1899. (ibid. 43–45, 54–55, 139)

After the establishment of the party most members of the educated upper class left the workers' associations. After the February Manifesto of 1899 the labour movement joined the common Finnish front against the policies of Russification. (Laine 1951, 109–120) In 1903 the party met in Forssa and changed its name to the Social Democratic Party of Finland, proclaiming itself in the *Forssa Programme* to be part of the international social democrat movement. The Programme was an almost direct translation from the *Hainfelder Programm* of the Social Democratic Party of Austria (1888–1889) written by Victor Adler and approved by Karl Kautsky. In 1904 the party distanced itself from the bourgeois parties in the constitutional struggle. (ibid. 162, 172)

The Forssa Programme combined revolutionary principles with practical social and political reforms, seeking in particular to achieve an equal distribution of political rights. The issues it addressed had for the most part already been discussed at the founding meeting of the Labour Party. The Programme demanded, for example, universal suffrage for all citizens above the age of 21 in national and municipal elections, full freedom of the press, association, assembly and speech and reforms of health care and workers' rights. (Sosialidemokraattisen puolueen ohjelma 1903) Due to Finland's status as part of the Russian Empire, Finnish Social Democracy was strongly characterised by opposition to autocracy and the monarch. The labour movement played a central role in pushing through the reforms on suffrage and unicameralism in the Parliamentary Reform of 1906 (see e.g. Mylly 2006).

Another feature of Finnish social democracy was its agrarian character. While the rise of the labour movement and socialism has been traditionally linked with industrial workers, in Finland they spread swiftly to the countryside and among the poor landless peasantry. This took place especially in the

⁹⁶ Nils Robert af Ursin (1854–1936) was an early theoretician of the Finnish labour movement, the first chair of the Finnish Labour Party and one of the founding fathers of the Social Democratic Party of Finland. Although af Ursin's political career was short-lived, his role in the early twentieth century gave him the status of 'the grand old man' of Finnish social democracy. Af Ursin was not re-elected to the Eduskunta after the first session of 1907–08 and his role as the first deputy speaker of the Eduskunta remained the high point of his parliamentary career. (Rahikainen 2000) Af Ursin wrote on foreign Social Democrat theory in Finnish (see e.g. Ursin 1909b).

context of the great mobilisation of the Great Strike of 1905 (Soikkanen 1975 117–119). Indebted to Kautsky, the Finnish labour movement emphasised the idea of educating the masses and increasing its collective power while waiting for the moment when a sufficient majority had been achieved to avert the need for violent revolution. (Majander 2011) With support in the countryside, the Social Democrats made significant victories in the first elections of the Eduskunta: in 1907 they became the largest party in parliament with 80 members out of the 200 total. The number of Social Democrat representatives continued to rise, reaching an absolute majority in the elections of 1916. By comparison, in 1907 the Finnish Party received 59 and the Young Finnish Party 26 seats.

Similar to Kautsky, the Finnish Social Democrats saw parliamentary majority rule, the delegate model of representation and universal suffrage as the most important means for reform. The delays in the political and social reform and disappointment at the lack of concrete results in the Eduskunta, however, increased the Finnish Social Democrats' frustration with parliament and its procedures. They saw that the majority's opinions and interests, already realised in the elections, did not have a sufficient impact in the Eduskunta. The system of representation had changed, but the powers of the representative assembly had remained the same. In addition, the Eduskunta's procedures included features that gave the bourgeois parties efficient means to obstruct reform. This fed the growth of a Social Democrat criticism that actively challenged the only partially established Finnish modes of parliamentary proceeding.

The Social Democrats referred to foreign models and Social Democrat authorities in the procedure debates relatively often. In the Finnish system of dualism, they approached parliamentarism as a system of government and emphasised the need to make the government responsible to the parliamentary majority. For the Social Democrats, the deliberative features of the parliament were supposed to enhance the implementation of the will of the majority of the people, that is, of the workers and the poor.

The Finnish Social Democrats were not united in all questions concerning the role of the parliament. The Eduskunta's role in the class struggle and cooperation with bourgeois parties in particular caused disagreements within the Social Democratic Party. This was reflected in the debates on whether the party should be in the government and have one of its members as the speaker of the parliament. Before and after the first Eduskunta elections, Af Ursin and Taavi Tainio argued, referring to August Bebel as well as French and Belgian Social Democrats⁹⁷, that the party should seek to gain seats in the government after the elections in order to create a strong Senate against the emperor and his autocracy. Edvard Valpas, for his part, argued that the Social Democrats should stay in the opposition, against the bourgeois parties, and thus keep their freedom of action. He also extended this idea to the speakership of the parliament.

⁹⁷ The French examples were Alexandre Milleran, Aristide Briand and René Vivian, who had participated in the government in France. Af Ursin had recently held personal discussions with August Bebel. The Belgian role model was Edvard Anseele.

O. W. Kuusinen⁹⁸ adopted a similar approach and noted that the government was not democratic in Finland, but a council of the emperor. Similar to Valpas, Kuusinen referred especially to Kautsky's argumentation on the matter: Obtaining individual government seats in a centralised system of government were to be used only as an emergency measure. (Soikkanen 1975, 120–124)⁹⁹

Instead of organising around individual national leaders, the Finnish labour movement organised around local newspapers. The newspaper *Työmies* played the most active role in the procedure debates. *Työmies* was established in 1895 first as a weekly. In 1900 Edvard Valpas,¹⁰⁰ a rather strict Kautskyan, became the editor of the newspaper and remained until 1918. The paper kept its position as the leading mouthpiece of the SDP throughout this period. (Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 537, 541, 543) During the early Eduskunta the newspaper was the primary forum for leading Social Democrats to discuss Eduskunta matters.

3.4 Debate, deliberation and representation

3.4.1 The Dagblad liberals and John Stuart Mill's notion of debate

The *Dagblad* liberals' emphasis on the debating and deliberative character of parliaments was based on a notion of political debate that differed from that of their leading Fennoman opponents. The Dagbladists' notion of debate was significantly indebted to John Stuart Mill and their admiration for the British parliament and its culture of debate. The group behind *Helsingfors Dagblad* adopted Mill's ideas, arguments and vocabulary from the beginning of the newspaper's publication in 1862, selectively incorporating them into the group's pro-

⁹⁸ Otto Wille Kuusinen (1881–1964) became a member of the Social Democratic Party in 1904. The Great Strike of 1905 and its aftermath radicalised Kuusinen's stands on the "reactionary bourgeois elite", which was reflected in his writings in the newspaper *Työmies*. In *Työmies* Kuusinen was influenced by Valpas's Kautskyan ideas. In 1905 Kuusinen was one of the founders of the periodical *Sosialistinen Aikakauslehti*, which became his primary forum. In 1907 Kuusinen prepared himself to become an MP by working as an Eduskunta journalist, and in 1908 he was elected to the parliament where he worked 1908–1909, 1911–1913 and 1917. Kuusinen was the chair of his party 1911–1917. (Sainio 2001b)

⁹⁹ The argument was based on Kautsky's statement at the meeting of the Second International in Paris in 1900.

¹⁰⁰ Edvard Valpas(-Hänninen) (1873–1937) was one of the first internationally aware Finnish socialists. With the help of his language skills, Valpas was able to follow German Social Democrat papers such as *Vorwärts* and the theoretical *Die neue Zeit* edited by Kautsky. Drawing on Kautsky, Valpas emphasised the need to follow the Marxist idea of class struggle and to limit cooperation with bourgeois parties to rare exceptions. Although Valpas was criticised for his theoretical approach that allegedly always left the possibility for second-guessing, his *Työmies* was the most important and respected Social Democrat publication in Finland. In 1904 Valpas secured his a position of authority in the SDP. After this, he was often able to decide the party's line of action according to what he saw as the most Kautskyan. Valpas was a member of the Eduskunta 1907–1918 and the chair of the SDP's parliamentary group. (Sainio 2001c)

gramme.¹⁰¹ The *Dagblad* liberals presented their notion of debate in the newspaper polemics of the early 1860s and continued to apply it in the procedure debates of the Finnish Diets.

A growing interest in John Stuart Mill's thought, which was facilitated by the loosening of censorship in the 1860s, was apparent in Finnish newspapers. In the early 1860s, Mill's *On Liberty* and *Considerations on Representative Government* were actively marketed and sold by Finnish bookshops and discussed in newspapers soon after their first publication. Mill's *On Liberty* was sold in Finland already in 1859, the year it was first published in Britain.¹⁰² Mill's ideas from the two works were presented in the liberal Finnish newspaper *Papperslyktan* in 1861, the same year *Considerations* was first published (*Papperslyktan*, 4 Nov., 1861, 2–6). In 1865 a Swedish-language translation (Mill 1865) of *On Liberty* was also printed and published in Helsinki. Finnish bookshops marketed the book in Finnish newspapers in the mid-1860s.¹⁰³ *On Liberty* was translated into Finnish in 1891 (Mill 1891).

In 1862 a Swedish translation of *Considerations on Representative Government* (Mill 1862) was published in Norrköping, Sweden, and sold and marketed by Finnish bookshops from 1863 on. In 1863 *Helsingfors Dagblad* (21 Jan., 1863, 3) reported that the Swedish translation (*Om det representativa styrelsesättet*) of Mill's famous work had been published and that it was "unnecessary to underline the usefulness of the book for the public during the present time in view of the question it discusses." A month later the book was marketed by Dagbladist Theodor Sederholm's bookshop in Helsinki (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 20 Feb., 1863, 4).¹⁰⁴

The *Dagblad* liberals had close connections to Finnish publishers and booksellers and could thus influence what was marketed and sold in the bookshops. For example, Otto Reinhold Frenckell, a member of a notable family in the Finnish printing and bookselling business, was *Dagblad's* editor during the newspaper's first two years in 1862–63. Similarly, Theodor Sederholm, publisher and bookseller, was one of the founding members of *Helsingfors Dagblad* and wrote in the newspaper regularly in 1862–63. Later Sederholm continued writing in *Dagblad* under the alias "Nisse" and "Nils Thomas" (see Section 8.3.3).

¹⁰¹ Lars-Folke Landgren (1995) has argued that *Helsingfors Dagblad* was indebted to Mill's claim that the private citizen should be able to form an image of the society with the help of a free press. Tuija Pulkkinen (1989a, 117–120) has argued that Mill's *On Liberty* brought the British concept of liberalism to Finland. Jussi Kurunmäki (2003) has examined Mill's concept of representation in the Finnish discussions of the 1860s.

¹⁰² See the advertisement for the bookshop *Frenckell & Sons* in *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 12 Aug., 1859, 4.

¹⁰³ See e.g. J. D. Palanders bokhandel in *Björneborg*, 2 Dec., 1865, 4; *Wasenius & komp.* in *Helsingfors Tidningar*, 27 Nov., 1866, 4; *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 21 Dec., 1865, 3; J. Th. Åkerman in *Åbo Underrättelser*, 31 Jan., 1867, 4.

¹⁰⁴ For more advertisements for the book, see e.g. *Sederholm & Komp.* in *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 May, 1863, 3; 18 Feb., 1864, 4; *Frenckell & Sons Bokhandel* in *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 29 July, 1863, 4; *A. Widerströms Bokhandel* in *Vasabladet*, 14 Nov., 1863, 4; *Frenckellska Bokhandeln* and *A. W. Edgren* in *Åbo Underrättelser*, 22 Aug., 1863, 6.

Sederholm's printing house printed *Helsingfors Dagblad* in 1867–1877 and the liberal newspaper *Hufvudstadsbladet* in 1864–68. (Landgren 2006)

The interest in Mill was not limited to the liberal newspapers,¹⁰⁵ although they gave the most attention to Mill's texts. His ideas were discussed on a variety of topics by different actors during the late nineteenth century. References to Mill were made during the following decades on, for example, universal suffrage, women's rights, protection of the minority, associations, representative government, publicity, public opinion, education, economics, judicial systems and administration.¹⁰⁶ His success in the British parliamentary elections was also reported in Finland.¹⁰⁷

Mill discussed his ideas of antagonism and pluralism, which were fundamental to his other texts as well, in *On Liberty*. According to Mill, Europe's progressive and many-sided development was a result of the existence of contrasting opinions and their constant tendency to challenge each other. For Mill, the lack of opposition to prevailing opinions signified stagnation (Mill 2001 [1859], 102–103). Similarly, in his essay on *Bentham* (Mill 1859 [1838], 379–380), Mill warned about the "despotism of public opinion" and the "absolute authority of the majority",¹⁰⁸ and noted that all countries that had long continued to be progressive or had been enduringly great had been so due to the existence of organised opposition to the ruling power. In addition, all of the greatest figures in history had been part of such an opposition.¹⁰⁹ According to Mill, it was to be remembered that the majority had the power not because it was "just in itself", but because it was "less unjust than any other footing on which the matter can be placed". He argued that it was necessary that the institutions of society made provision for maintaining a perpetual and standing opposition to the will of the majority. Identity of position, pursuits, partialities, passions and prejudices had to be counterbalanced by different sorts of the same, otherwise one narrow, mean type of human nature would become universal and perpetual. This would render any correction of imperfection hopeless and crush the improvement of man's intellectual and moral nature. (Mill 1859 [1838], 379–380) *Dagblad* liberals drew on a similar understanding of the relationship between the minor-

¹⁰⁵ By "liberal newspapers" I refer to *Helsingfors Dagblad* and its followers and predecessors such as the early *Hufvudstadsbladet*, *Barometern*, *Papperslyktan*, *Åbo Underrättelser* and *Wiborg*.

¹⁰⁶ E.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 5 Dec., 1862, 1; *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 16 Sept., 1862, 3; *Helsingfors Tidningar*, 12 June, 1865, 1–2; *Wiborgs Tidning*, 18 May, 1870, 2; *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 19 June, 1871, 3; *Morgonbladet*, 7 Aug., 1873, 1; 8 Aug., 1873, 1–2; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 16 Nov., 1871, 1–2; 24 Feb., 1879, 1–2; Perander 1879.

¹⁰⁷ See *Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti*, 19 Nov., 1868, 2.

¹⁰⁸ In the edited version of 1859 "despotism of Public Opinion" was replaced with "absolute authority of the majority".

¹⁰⁹ In *On Liberty* Mill wrote that "Persons of genius are, *ex vi termini*, more individual than any other people – less capable, consequently, of fitting themselves, without hurtful compression, into any of the small number of moulds which society provides in order to save its members the trouble of forming their own character." In order to benefit from the genius, society had to let her breathe in an atmosphere of freedom. (Mill 2001 [1859], 92)

ity and the majority in the Diets, which can be detected behind their aversion to the idea of a single Fennoman party as representative of the people.¹¹⁰

In *On Liberty* Mill presented his idea of the truth having different sides to be presented, debated and discovered. Mill argued against suppressing opinions and claimed that all sorts of opinions, whether they were false, partly true or true, benefitted the common good. According to Mill, persons and groups had the tendency to consider their own opinion as superior, and to exclude other parts of the truth. He noted that the prevailing, popular or general opinion was rarely or never the whole truth. Only by a collision of adverse opinions did the remainder of the truth have any chance of being supplied. (Mill 2001 [1859], 66, 75–76) Mill argued that to refuse a hearing to an opinion and to silence discussion was to assume infallibility and absolute certainty. (ibid. 29) Mill claimed that it was the duty of both governments and individuals to carefully form the truest opinions they could, but never to impose them upon others unless they were “quite sure of being right”. There was, however, no such thing as “absolute certainty”, only “assurance sufficient for human life” (ibid. 31). Mill argued that conflicting doctrines often, instead of one being true and the other false, shared the truth between them. The “nonconforming opinion” was needed to “supply the remainder of the truth, of which the received doctrine embodies only part.” (ibid. 66) Mill saw that man was “capable of rectifying his mistakes by discussion and experience” and emphasised the role of free discussion and open criticism in order to show how this experience was to be interpreted (ibid. 31–32). Prominent *Daglad* liberals drew on such an epistemology, or theory of knowledge, which relied strongly on perspectivism, especially in their views on political questions (see below and e.g. Mechelin 1879). The approach was adopted also by, for example, moderate Fennoman E. G. Palmén.¹¹¹

The idea of opposition and a clash of opinions in order to reveal different sides of the truth was central to Mill’s stand on education as well. In *On Liberty* Mill argued that education should be organised to encourage and enforce debating and thinking *pro et contra*. Mediated through George Grote’s work on the history of ancient Greece, Mill saw Socrates’s and Plato’s dialectics as prime examples of this mode of discussion. Similarly, according to Mill, in the medieval schools the principle had been used to make pupils understand their opponent’s argument as well as their own, and to invent objections to the opponent’s argument and strengthen their own. According to Mill, the achievements of the modern day owed much to these old practices that were to be recovered. (Mill 2001 [1859], 64–66)

In a passage in *On Liberty*, Mill presented his idea of antagonism in relation to a procedural aspect of *fair play*. Mill argued that there should be rules and institutions that ensured different opinions, in other words “all sides of truth”, the chance of fair play:

I am aware that there is not, in this country, any intolerance of differences of opinion on most of these topics. They are adduced to show, by admitted and multiplied ex-

¹¹⁰ See Section 5.4.

¹¹¹ See Section 8.4.3.

amples, the universality of the fact, that only through *diversity of opinion* is there, in the existing state of human intellect, *a chance of fair play to all sides of the truth*. When there are persons to be found, who form an exception to the apparent unanimity of the world on any subject, even if the world is in the right, it is always probable that dissentients have something worth hearing to say for themselves, and that truth would lose something by their silence. (Mill 2001 [1859], 69–70, italics added)

Austrian legal historian Josef Redlich explicated the British procedural parliamentary aspect of fair play in his *The procedure of the House of Commons*¹¹² (1908a [1905]). Similar to Mill, Redlich connected the idea of fair play to the principle of the protection of the minority, which was essential to British parliamentary practice. According to Redlich, parliamentary rules were meant to assure “fair play for each party” and to give the minority all conceivable rights to express its views and aims and to allow it to use all the permissible weapons of speech and political tactics in the parliamentary battle. Redlich argued that the principle of fair play was helpful for the nation as it subjected the majority to a constant test about its existence. According to Redlich, it was not in the interest of the majority to weaken the principle when in power, for it needed the same rights and means to advocate its own conceptions when the tables were turned. (ibid. 131)

Although Mill did not engage in a detailed study of parliamentary procedures, it was clear that he understood parliament as an arena where the principles of *pro et contra* and *fair play* were institutionalised and protected. Mill became a member of parliament in 1865 until 1868. He recognised the parliament’s role as an arena where the different sides of the truth could be examined according to a procedural setting. In *Considerations on Representative Government*, Mill described the parliament as “the nation’s Committee of Grievances” and “its Congress of Opinions”, in which opinions were spoken out in the face of opponents and tested through adversity and controversy (Mill 2001 [1861], 104). In addition to the parliament’s task to control and watch the government (ibid. 103), for Mill, the parliament was:

An arena in which not only the general opinion of the nation, but that of every section of it, and as far as possible of every eminent individual whom it contains, can produce itself in full light and challenge discussion; where every person in the country may count upon finding somebody who speaks his mind, as well or better than he could speak it himself— not to friends and partisans exclusively, but *in the face of opponents, to be tested by adverse controversy*; where those whose opinion is overruled, feel satisfied that it is heard, and set aside not by a mere act of will, but for what are thought superior reasons, and commend themselves as such to the representatives of the majority of the nation; where every party or opinion in the country can muster its strength, and be cured of any illusion concerning the number or power of its adherents; where the opinion which prevails in the nation makes itself manifest as prevailing, and marshals its hosts in the presence of the government, which is thus enabled and compelled to give way to it on employment, of its strength; where statesmen can assure themselves, far more certainly than any other signs, what elements of opinion and power are growing, and what declining, and are enabled to shape their measures with some regard not solely to present exigencies, but to tendencies in progress. (Mill 2001 [1861], 104, italics added)

¹¹² Originally published in German under the title “*Recht und Technik des englischen Parlamentarismus. Die Geschäftsordnung des House of Commons in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und gegenwärtigen Gestalt*” (1905).

In his defence of the parliament, Mill emphasised that parliament is an arena for debate. Mill noted that representative assemblies were often taunted by their enemies – such as Thomas Carlyle – as being places of “mere talk and bavardage”. This was, according to Mill, “a displaced derision”. The reason for the disparagement lay in false notions about the distribution of work. For Mill, parliaments were better suited for debating than legislating. He argued that a representative assembly could not more usefully employ itself than in talk when the subject of talk in the parliament was the great public interests of the country. For Mill, every sentence of such talk represented the opinion of either some important body of persons or an individual in whom some such body had placed their confidence. The parliament was “a place where every interest and shade of opinion in the country can have its cause even passionately pleaded, in the face of the government and of all other interests and opinions”. Mill argued that assemblies did not know or understand that talking and discussion were their proper business, while “doing”, the end result of discussion, was the task of officers, individuals specially trained for it. Popular assemblies tried to do what they could not, namely to govern, administer and legislate. One person or body might be able to control everything, but could not do everything. The task of the assembly was to oversee that the individuals who were responsible for “the doing” were honestly and intelligently chosen and to interfere their work only with suggestion or criticism. (Mill 2001 [1861], 89–91, 105–106)

As shown by Mill’s own references to classical thinkers and medieval practices (Mill 2001 [1859], 64–66), his ideas on debate were not novel, but rather a revitalisation. Versions of *pro et contra* debate had been practiced in several forums, such as the academia and courts of law. However, as Redlich’s crystallisation of parliamentary procedure suggests, Mill’s notion of debate was institutionalised in British parliamentary procedure. In the beginning of Finnish parliamentary life in the 1860s, Mill’s texts supported, actualised and awakened interest in the British parliament. The British parliamentary culture of debate had been examined in Finland through the press already since the 1820s, when newspapers highlighted the uniqueness of the British parliamentary tradition and procedure. The articles included translated speeches and reports of debates and showcased the British procedures on, for example, the three readings of the bill, committees, the course and closing of debates, voting, the passing of bills, the role of the speaker, the right of speech, naming, interjections, sanctions, parliamentary ceremonies and officials, unparliamentary language and the importance of precedents.¹¹³

¹¹³ See e.g. *Åbo Allmänna Tidning*, 26 Apr., 1817, 1–3; 29 Apr., 1817, 1–2; *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 28 July, 1821, 2–4; 21 Mar., 1822, 4–6; 21 Dec., 1826, 3–4; 28 July, 1827, 2–4; 31 July, 1827, 2–5; 28 Apr., 1829, 2; 21 Mar., 1831, 1–2; 11 Sept., 1834, 2; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 25 Apr., 1838, 1–3; *Wiborg*, 5 June, 1857, 2–3; 9 June, 1857, 2–3; *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 20 Feb., 1861, 2–3; 21 Feb., 1861, 2–3.

3.4.2 Notions of debate in the Finnish newspaper polemics of the early 1860s

Dagblad liberals advocated Mill's ideas on debate and fair play in the newspaper polemics of the 1860s over how political disputes should be treated in the recently activated public political life of Finland. *Dagbladists* brought their notion of debate out first in the polemics between *Helsingfors Dagblad* and the government's official newspaper, *Finlands Allmänna Tidning* (FAT).¹¹⁴ Whereas FAT saw its task mostly as being to serve as the official organ of the government and publish information accordingly in a top-down manner, *Dagblad* adopted a liberal press ideology according to which the citizens should be given the possibility to form their own opinions independently based on a variety of sources without government interference. *Dagblad* argued that the British press should serve as the model for Finnish journalistic activity, which was still taking its first steps. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 11 Apr., 1862, 1) In May 1862 *Helsingfors Dagblad* (19 May, 1862, 1) wrote about the current state of publicity in Finland and the aims of the Finnish press. It presented a Millian idea of objectivity¹¹⁵ and emphasised the benefits of inviting and maintaining different sides of a question in a direct opposition against each other:

The press must investigate a matter from its multiple sides. Within publicity, this takes place so that *the different sides are held against each other* – or in other words, *the different sides are invited in a battle against each other*. In such a struggle there is nothing dangerous; on the contrary. From this arises the only possible, real and lasting reconciliation.¹¹⁶ (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 19 May, 1862, 1, italics added)

Dagblad noted that in Finland people were so unaccustomed to publicity that they felt hurt by the openness with which the newspaper press by nature operated. *Dagblad* asserted that answering with arguments instead of lamentations and accusations demonstrated good tact. However, it was gravely mistaken to think that any kind of “courtier-speech” (*hovmannaspråk*), with its cautious insinuations, conditional negotiations, *approchers* and *contra-approchers*, which belonged to the world of diplomacy, had any place in the newspaper press. According to *Dagblad*, such a newspaper press would be useless. The duty of publicity was to state openly and frankly what was on one's mind (*ligger på hjertat*). If discontent existed it had to be spoken out. It was smothered resentment (*qväfdä harmen*) that “tore the heart and drained away all affection”. *Dagblad* noted that unfortunately the people tended to brood over feelings for too long and held onto their one-sided opinions (*ensidig uppfattning*). Arguments and

¹¹⁴ The editor of *FAT* was Fredrik Berndtson, who had earlier been the editor of the already discontinued old *Morgonbladet* (1845–1855), which was also a supporter of Snellman's newspaper *Saima* in the 1840s and the beginning of the 1850s (Tommila 1988, 141–142, 145, 172).

¹¹⁵ Cf. Mill 2001 [1859], 29, 31, 66, 75–76, 102–103; 2001 [1861], 104.

¹¹⁶ “*Pressen bör ju söka att utreda saken från dess mångfaldiga sidor*. Detta sker inom publiciteten sålunda att de skilda sidorna framhållas hvar emot annan – eller med andra ord framträda till kamp emot hvarandra. Ut i sådan strid ligger ingenting vådligt; tvertom. Just derutur framgår den enda möjliga, verkliga och varaktiga försoning.” (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 19 May, 1862, 1)

evidence resulted in success and proved to be more sustainable in a proper debate. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 19 May, 1862, 1)

Similar to Mill, *Helsingfors Dagblad* emphasised the fallibility of individuals, groups and majorities, and highlighted perspectivism in relation to the truth. It noted that the kind of openness in which *all* the causes of dissatisfaction could be expressed by a free press was a great benefit for representative government. It admitted that newspaper editors were equally prone to human weakness and error, and that newspapers could never by themselves alone present a question completely examined and investigated to the general public. According to *Dagblad*, under the eyes of the public, the newspapers' investigations were to take place through "articles for and against" (*artiklar för och emot*) – otherwise no convincing resolution could be won. For *Dagblad*, this was the only kind of possible "research" and means for "fact-based information" that the FAT (see below) had called for. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 19 May, 1862, 1) On the question of the role of the newspaper press in representative government, *Dagblad* felt that no newspaper should see itself as representing the public opinion or Finland's opinion: Only a country's lawful representation, in Finland's case the Diet, could claim to speak for the people. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 6 July, 1863, 1) *Dagblad* liberals had a similar stand on party formation.¹¹⁷

The official newspaper *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, *Dagblad's* main opponent in the dispute on the role and status of the Finnish press, shared *Dagblad* liberals' starting point on the character of public debate.¹¹⁸ However, FAT saw that by giving different opinions the possibility to be stated, a public (*allmänna*) or generally applicable (*allmängiltiga*) reasonable opinion could be reached (*Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 25 Nov., 1862, 6). FAT also emphasised the need for discussing questions *pro et contra* in public, and argued that the opinions that the newspapers expressed were neither general, final nor unanimous (*samfällig*). They were mere opinions and convictions on an issue. However, the publicity provided by the press was a medium for finding the existing, but at first imperceptible, public opinion. In a new matter, no public opinion (*allmänna mening*) could exist before the question had been developed and formulated in public discussion (*allmänna diskussion*) through different opinions' appearing against each other (*genom olika åsigtens uppträdande mot hvarandra*). (*Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 25 Nov., 1862, 5–6)

FAT emphasised that the task of newspaper publicity was "by research and fact-based information to assist the government similarly to other civilised countries" (*Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 16 May, 1862, 1). When public opinion was brought out, publicity had fulfilled its objective, a matter had been resolved

¹¹⁷ See Section 5.4.

¹¹⁸ FAT criticised the newspapers *Helsingfors Dagblad*, *Helsingfors Tidningar* and *Åbo Underrättelser* for blindly adopting and aping the ideals of modern liberalism (*den moderna liberalismen*). FAT criticised the "frivolity", "thoughtlessness", "bitterness", "blind arrogance", "despotic intolerance", "immature impatience" and "irresolute-ness" that characterised liberals' actions and worked against the existing polity and the common good. FAT claimed that the liberals made hasty proposals for exhaustive and impossible reforms based on foreign models. (*Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 18 Aug., 1863, 2; 19 Aug., 1863, 2)

and publicity could then hasten to other topical questions. (*Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 25 Nov., 1862, 6) Whereas *Dagblad* liberals saw the clash between different sides of the truth as necessary in order to justify opinions and decisions, in 1863 *FAT* argued that “artificial and fleeting opinions” were in fact developed and maintained most easily in countries where parties, partisan interests and divisions between different classes of society had been created. The Finnish liberals had neglected these lessons and Finland’s true aims and wishes as they were so eager to drive forward their own party business (*partisak*). (*Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 19 Aug., 1863, 2)

FAT’s views on publicity and debate were indebted to the ideas of the Fennomans’ mentor Johan Vilhelm Snellman. The editor of *FAT*, Fredrik Berndtson, had edited Snellman’s *Morgonbladet* in the 1840s when Snellman was formulating his notion of publicity and public debate (Tommila 1988, 141–142, 145, 172). In the early 1860s Snellman supported *FAT* against *Helsingfors Dagblad*’s criticism of it and of the Senate (see e.g. Snellman 1862c). The *Dagblad* liberals’ notion of debate differed radically from Snellman’s own views; it was predicated on a different conception of the truth and means to approach it. Although Snellman spoke for a multi-voiced society, his conception of political debate and politics suggests a more static understanding of the best interest of the nation compared to the *Dagblad* liberals.

3.4.3 J. V. Snellman on (public) debate and deliberation

Johan Vilhelm Snellman (1806–1881)¹¹⁹ was the leading ideologist of the Fennomans as well as a Hegelian philosopher and statesman who formulated the Fennomans’ theoretical foundations and practical goals (Liikanen 1995, 124). It has been argued that Snellman raised Hegelianism to the level of a “state philosophy” of Finland. (Pulkkinen 1987, 54–69) Snellman aimed to build the future of the Finnish nation on the basis of education of the people, which was to be reached through giving Finnish the position of the language of administration and culture. The first goal was to change the main language used by the elite. Snellman assumed the role of an active public critic in Finland in the 1840s, drawing upon his following of foreign events and literature as well as the lessons he learned from the periods he spent in Sweden and Germany. (Klinge 1997) Snellman was heavily indebted to Hegel and wrote his main academic works on Hegel’s thought (Pulkkinen 1989a). In 1842 Snellman published his main work on social and political philosophy, *Läran om staten*, in Stockholm. Snellman was appointed professor of philosophy at the University of Helsinki in 1856 after Alexander II had acceded to the throne. In 1863 Snellman was appointed senator, but was pressured out of the Senate in 1868 and continued as a member of the Nobility 1867–1878. He participated in public discussion actively in newspapers and periodicals, such as *Litteraturblad* and from 1876 in *Morgonbladet*. In the 1860s Snellman gained a reputation as a strong critic of the lib-

¹¹⁹ For a general presentation of Snellman in English, see <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/english/?id=3639>

eral approach to Finnish nationalism and adopted along with his Fennoman followers a policy of *realpolitik* in relation to the emperor, Russia and the domestic government. He was convinced that Russian security required the loyalty of the Finnish grand duchy and that the only way for Finland to preserve its special status was to accept this fact. The Finnish national culture could be developed under the protection of the emperor. (Klinge 1997)

From the 1860s on, Snellman to a great extent repeated and explained the philosophical stands he had established in the 1840s as well as his approach to questions of language and culture. Snellman became a cult figure in Finland already in his early years. As the leading ideologist of the Fennoman movement, his ideas were followed by other prominent Fennomans. (Klinge 1997) After Snellman's death, Hegelian views had an influence especially on the conservative wing of the Finnish Party, composed of the Old Finns and the peasantry, and also on the Finnish labour movement (Pulkkinen 1987, 55).

Snellman developed his ideas on publicity and public opinion in the 1840s and to a great extent held onto them into the 1860s when the question became topical. During the same period Snellman developed his idea of the nation, and he wrote in support of liberal press ideology in his newspaper *Saima*. He saw the publicity (*publicitet*) created in newspapers as a central mediator that enabled the birth of the nation; publicity was a unit in which individuals connected their own activity with that of others. For Snellman, a rational unit was founded on recognised and established principles. Following Hegel's ideas, Snellman saw that rational was not what an individual thought or what a newspaper stated to be public opinion (*den allmänna opinionen*), but what was commonly acknowledged. Publicity enabled to be in contact with the tendencies and demands of each period of history. Awareness of accepted principles required publicity, which could not exist without the newspaper press. For Snellman, the press was a means to overcome the complexity of differing opinions and factions and to integrate them. He argued that as the interests in societies had multiplied, perspectives that looked at the whole had become rare. Thus, journalists were not to write according to their own personal viewpoints, but according to the thoughts, beliefs and expectations of the public. The claim that the press moulded public opinion was false: newspapers as mouthpieces had importance only insofar as they could reach and mediate the already existing public opinion. However, certainty of the opinion could only be found during time when the opinions of the time had proceeded to become laws and public institutions. (Snellman 1844a; 1846a; 1846b; 1846c)

In Snellman's model, the most rational opinion eventually won out in public discussion while opposing opinions faded away. The process was two-stepped. First, the newspaper press mediated public matters for thinking people to participate in. A public that discussed the matters and clarified the differences of opinion was created. The press was the primary arena for representation of the variety of the people's opinions. Public discussion in newspapers forced the discussants to examine their own opinions closely and systematically. In the discussions, which could take place also in smaller private groups, the

most rational opinion prevailed. In the second phase, when the government posed a question on the matter to the different regions and classes of the country, the government received the same rational answer from each. Snellman saw this task of mediating between the government and law and the public opinion, as essential for the Finnish press. He argued that while the press had grown to become a 'political power' in Europe, the press itself was not the source of the power, but the power came from the public opinion, from the wishes and needs of the nation, which every wise government consulted (*rådfråga*). (Snellman 1844a; 1846a; 1846b; 1846c)

For Snellman the newspaper press was a medium to dig out the commonly acknowledged and rational public opinion from the complexity of factions and opinions. The process was to be based on education, knowledge and truth (Snellman 1862a; 1862b; 1862c, 196). *Dagblad* liberals, for their part, did not invoke the notion of the 'commonly acknowledged' and seemed untroubled by the complexity of different opinions and factions. Instead, similarly to Mill, *Dagblad* liberals saw that it was the task of *pro et contra* debate to question public and majority opinions. Whereas the Snellmanian view saw public discussion as a means to discover the rational public opinion, for *Dagblad* liberals it was the task of fair but dissensual debate to define what was politically reasonable and advisable. The Millian idea of debate encouraged actors to reinterpret any standpoints that had reached the status of a general truth or majority opinion. For Snellman, however, that stage signified the end of debate: debate was a mere phase in the rational and inevitable process of realisation of the national spirit.

Snellman's emphasis on the role of publicity reflected his views on representative assemblies. In addition, Snellman focused on the subject matters of the Diet work and paid little attention to the procedural aspects. From his Hegelian point of view, the forms, procedures and wording of the law were not important as such, but subordinate to the great projects of nation-building and the progress of education (Jussila 1969, 175–176; Klinge 1997). This approach became apparent in Snellman's role in the procedure debates, which was namely rather passive despite his remarkable literal activity and membership in the Nobility estate in the Diets of 1867, 1872 and 1877–78.

Some recurrent themes can be observed in Snellman's ideas on parliament, or, to use his own vocabulary, on representative and legislative assemblies. Snellman to a great extent ignored the question of the actual deliberative processes of parliament. His theoretical texts and newspaper articles gave the representative assembly a minimal, if any, debating or deliberative character. To put it crudely, for Snellman legislation was not a task of the parliament or any other state power, but of the nation. "The nation is its own legislator" (*nationen är sin egen lagstiftare*), he wrote in *Läran om staten*. Legislation was an act of the general will, which could not be based on particular interests. The duty of the representatives and the government was to listen to public opinion and legislate accordingly. (Pohjantammi 2003, 370–371; Snellman 1842, 369–370)

When discussing parliamentarism, Snellman saw the representative assembly primarily as a ratifier of government proposals. This fitted in well with the Finnish system of dualism. For example, in his commentary on the work of the January Committee in 1862 Snellman discussed the role and duties of 'representative' and 'deliberative assemblies' (*representantförsamling; rådplägande församling*). He argued that in order to secure efficient and useful readings, a government should give the assembly proposals the assembly could pass immediately or with only minor revisions. For Snellman, the best case was for actual discussions to take place in public before a proposal was formulated and negotiated in the representative assembly. The role of public discussion was essential, especially in cases in which the representatives did not yet have a clear opinion corresponding to the public opinion. Snellman noted, referring to the experiences of foreign countries, that since public opinion was formed slowly, the matter should be discussed several months in the press before decision-making. (Snellman 1862d, 341–342) For him, the members of a representative assembly were representatives of the public opinion. At the point when public opinion had been formed, there was basically nothing to debate about, except the formal wording of the resolution. The parliament worked as a mere rubber stamp, but not only of the government, but of the public opinion that rose from the wishes and needs of the nation.

In his texts and lectures, Snellman defended the idea of the government as a conservative safeguard against the representative assembly, which was vulnerable to the erratic "opinions of the day", "the interest of the nation on the election day", occasional majorities and party interests (Snellman 1842, 387–397; 1862; 1898 [1861–1862], 79). In the Finnish debates, he presented his desire to concentrate the preparation and treatment of questions in the Senate (Tyynilä 1992, 203–204, 207). In *Läran om staten* Snellman argued that when looking at the constitutional states of Europe, it was apparent that the benefits of a legislative assembly (*en lagstiftande församling*) depended on the competence of the government: A legislative assembly "acted as a jury" that voted to approve or to refuse proposals and presentations made by an understanding and experienced judge, that is, the government. (Snellman 1842, 372–373)

In *Läran om staten* Snellman defined a legislative assembly by the criterion that it had to know the public opinion. Through a legislative assembly the people had the possibility to influence the government and in that way promote the well-being of the nation. If the legislative assembly had the best knowledge of public opinion and its demands, it could force the government to take measures it would otherwise not undertake. This required, however, that the legislative assembly, and each of its members, had the right to introduce motions for changing the legislation. Without this right the assembly's influence was only paralysing, for the demands of public opinion could not then be transformed into actual reforms through the assembly. (Snellman 1842, 372–373) In the case of the Finnish Diet such a right to introduce motions was lacking as members and estates could approach the emperor only through petitions until 1886.¹²⁰

¹²⁰ See Section 6.3.

This may have motivated in part Snellman's further emphasis of the role of the government at the cost of the assembly. Another reason was Finland's low level of development in Snellman's model of historical progress (see below). All in all, Snellman's abstract ideas, which he held onto and passed onto his followers, disregarded procedure and the debating and deliberative aspects of parliaments.

3.4.4 Debate and progress

Typical to the period, both *Dagblad* liberals and Fennomans examined the idea of progress and applied it to their political argumentation. The groups gave, however, debate and deliberation different roles in the process. Although Mill did not always use the term itself, the principle of progress is implicit in almost all of his works, according to Robert Nisbet (1980, 226). Mill was explicit, however, when discussing the appropriate method of social and moral sciences in his *Logic* (Mill 1869 [1834]):

It is my belief indeed that the general tendency is, and will continue to be, saving occasional exceptions, one of improvement; a tendency towards a better and happier state. But this is not a question of the method of the social science, but an ultimate result of the science itself. For our purpose it is sufficient, that there is a progressive change both in the character of the human race, and in their outward circumstances so far as moulded by themselves: that in each successive age the principal phenomena of society are different from what they were in the age preceding, and still more different from any previous age. (Mill 1869 [1843], 576)

According to Mill, the order of human progression in all respects depended on the order of progress in the intellectual convictions of mankind, in the transformations of human opinions. Thus, Mill gave emphasis to "artificial means" and "practical instruction", which could be used to accelerate the natural progress. (Mill 1869 [1843], 586–587; Nisbet 1980, 226–227)

In *On Liberty* Mill formulated the principle of human freedom,¹²¹ but argued that the doctrine was meant to apply "only to human beings in the maturity of their faculties". Mill excluded children and persons who were still "in a state to require being taken care of by others" and who had to be protected "against their own actions as well as against external injury". Similarly, he excluded "those backward states of society in which the race itself may be considered as in its nonage". The principle of liberty had no application in earlier times, when mankind had not yet attained the capacity of being guided to their own improvement by conviction or persuasion. But since then, compulsion is no longer an admissible means to use towards mankind's own good; it is justi-

¹²¹ "The object of this Essay is to assert one very simple principle, as entitled to govern absolutely the dealings of society with the individual in the way of compulsion and control, whether the means used be physical force in the form of legal penalties, or the moral coercion of public opinion. That principle is, that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others." (Mill 2001 [1859], 18)

fiable only when needed for the security of others. (Mill 2001 [1859], 19–20) Thus, for Mill, the society was to have reached a certain level of maturity and progress before enjoying freedom was possible. The level of maturity was signified by the ability for discussion and debate.

Snellman also held an idea about different stages in human development and civilisation. The idea of regressive historical development was for him almost a logical impossibility (Rantala 2013, 113). Snellman was strongly indebted to Hegel and his idea of rational progress through successive stages, as marked by the great civilisations of the past (ibid. 235). According to Hegel, the past was the main source for historical and philosophical generalisation and analysis. In Hegel's interpretation, the past always carried the seeds of the future that demanded to be realised. (Pulkkinen 1989, 8) Fennoman leader Yrjö Koskinen also shared Snellman's Hegelian view of history as a movement towards a pre-determined purpose (Liikanen 1995, 135). Snellman wrote about history as a developmental process of humanity, and his notions of history and of man were based on an almost unlimited faith in humankind and its ability for progress and development. (Rantala 2013, 241–243).

Heli Rantala (2013) has noted that Snellman's ideas on history and progress are to be understood in relation to not only German and Hegelian concepts, but also to French historians such as Jules Michelet and François Guizot (ibid. 235).¹²² For Guizot, in *Histoire de la civilisation en Europe*, progress was self-evident and had led to the victory of the Enlightenment's liberal ideas. (ibid. 107) Snellman described the study of history, or cultural history, to have an idealistic task of examining the process of the enlightenment of humankind, and he saw Guizot's *Histoire de la civilisation en Europe* and *Histoire de la civilisation en France* as prime examples of this approach. (ibid. 213–215) This approach required a close analysis of a nation's own progress and civilisation. Snellman's historiography studied political events for what they told about the development of nations and humankind, and then, through a closer analysis of the judicial conditions, literature, economy, level of education etc. in a specific nation, Snellman drew conclusions about the nation's current status in the general progress of mankind. (ibid. 213–215) Snellman, similarly to Guizot, embraced ideas about the superiority of European civilisation over Asian civilisation. (ibid. 170)

Snellman's theory of history and progress influenced his views on reasonable and desirable parliamentary reforms – the required reforms were relative to the level of education and development of the nation.¹²³ For Snellman the demands on social and political reforms were to be based on tendencies of historical movement rather than on opinions or arguments about their usefulness (Pulkkinen 1989, 9). Although Snellman's assessment of Finnish culture was not always positive, his idea of culture was: Man was a social being, who fundamentally aimed at developing and innovating. For Snellman, this was also

¹²² Snellman criticised the quality of Finnish historiography and argued that Finns should read and learn more from the French historians, whose competence was higher than that of the German (Rantala 2013, 235).

¹²³ See e.g. Snellman 1863a; 1863b; on his ideas on representation, see Section 5.6.

mankind's moral duty. (Rantala 2013, 243) Similarly, Snellman saw the aim of nations as being to govern themselves and to increase the degree of people's participation in the nation's self-government. These were inevitable tendencies of progress. (Pulkkinen 1989, 9)

For their part, the *Dagblad* liberals with their debt to Mill gave debate an important role in their notion of progress and saw skills of debate and discussion as benchmarks of progress. Furthermore, again inspired by Mill, *Dagblad* liberals saw that the practices of debate should be taught and spread within a polity.¹²⁴ As Mill had argued, debating was seen to have educative value as it developed personal skills and capabilities, helped one to understand and respond to opposing opinions and helped representative government to succeed. In contrast, Snellman's Hegelian stand on progress was guided by the notion of the realisation of historical reason through the national spirit, which also set the pace for social development and progress. Although *Dagblad* liberals used a rhetoric that advocated some reforms as inevitable, in their theory of debate, political questions were always open to dispute and reinterpretation (see e.g. Mechelin 1879, 116). Compared to Snellman and his followers, *Dagblad* liberals had a stronger trust in progress without the need to recognise the existence of absolute philosophical principles¹²⁵ or historical or political truths. They argued that progress was to be reached through the development of the forms that best protected an open, free and dissensual debate on questions. With this in mind, the *Dagbladists* turned to parliamentary procedures in the Diets.

In contrast to Snellman's Hegelian influences, from the 1880s on the *Valvoja* group and the Young Finns began to pay more attention to the idea of progress that emanated from the doctrine of evolution and the developments and explanations of the natural sciences. They saw that the world and progress could be explained empirically on other grounds than mere speculation about the realisation of the spirit or reason. (Paaskoski 2002, 21–80; Tuominen 1964, 18; Vares 2000, 32–33) This was reflected also in their political argumentation. Distanting themselves from the old Fennomans, the *Valvoja* group and the Young Finns highlighted the positive effects of competition between different groups and classes within society, seeing them as a natural part of progress. In order to facilitate this while managing its negative side-effects, members of the groups sought to level social and political inequalities through education of the people as well as political and social reform.

3.4.5 François Guizot on representative government

François Guizot (1787–1874) was a prolific French historian and political theorist. Guizot was one of the most notable *Doctrinaires* of the Bourbon Restoration (1814–1830), who, after the excesses of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Empire, were in favour of a constitutional monarchy with restricted census

¹²⁴ See Chapter 8.

¹²⁵ For *Dagblad's* attack against “impractical abstractions” and “theorisation”, see e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 11 Apr., 1862, 1.

suffrage. Typical of the French political reflections of the period, Guizot was on the search for a rational government and a scientific politics. At the same time, Guizot's model for representation signified a rupture with the ideas of the French Enlightenment. (Rosanvallon 2006, 117-118; 1985, 55) In his *Memoirs*, Guizot described the starting point and background for himself and for the Doctrinaires. The Doctrinaires' philosophy was based on the idea of institutions, laws, and public powers as "nothing but the creations and servants of scientific reason (*les créations et les serviteurs de la raison savante*)" (Guizot 1858, 157). Guizot argued that the Doctrinaires sought to "found their government on the basis of reason", but a reason different from the theories that had destroyed the old society or from the incoherent maxims that were used to try to reconstruct it (ibid. 158).

According to Pierre Rosanvallon (2006, 122; 1985, 26-28), the Doctrinaires' mission as described by Guizot becomes understandable only in relation to the objectives formulated in a particular historical moment by the French liberal generation born with the century. Their goals were to end the French Revolution, construct a stable representative government and establish a regime that was founded on reason and guaranteeing liberties. Instead of popular sovereignty and divine right, both of which Guizot saw as usurpations of power, Guizot believed in the sovereignty of reason. Guizot argued that there was nowhere a legitimate sovereignty of reason, truth and justice that was complete or infallible: no man or assembly could possess them entirely without defects and limits. The reason that Guizot referred to was a transcendent reason that individuals could never wholly reach. (ibid. 123)

Whereas *Dagblad* liberals saw debate as a method to examine different sides of the truth and deliberate on the common good, Snellman renounced their perspectivism and gave publicity the mission to uncover the rational and real public opinion. In 1862, Snellman demanded freedom of the press, having the first Diet of 1863-64 in mind, but called for its responsible use. He emphasised the need for societal critique and assessment of the *status quo*, but argued that criticism should always be well grounded. Critique had to be based on firm knowledge and it should always "love the truth" (Snellman 1862a; 1862b; 1862c, 196; see also 1844b)

Snellman's model of the rational historical and "deliberative" processes can be examined in relation to Guizot. In addition to theoretical similarities, Guizot's texts raised interest in Finland in the 1860s. Although not a Hegelian, Guizot relied on rational principles in representation and embraced an idea similar to Snellman's where debate was a mere transitional phase in the realisation of a historical reason. Mill was also indebted to Guizot, but gave a different emphasis to the idea of antagonism and adopted an epistemology of debate that was foreign to Guizot. Both Snellman and Guizot emphasised the value of many-sided discussion and representative processes as tools for discovering the rational core amid the complexity and pluralism of society. Both views also aimed at controlling dissensus, incoherence and controversy by diminishing the role of debate.

Snellman followed Guizot's work and discussed it in his texts. Although Guizot's early works were considered old-fashioned or obsolete by many, the publication of his memoirs in the late 1850s and early 1860s raised interest also in his older books in Finland.¹²⁶ Another reason for the Finnish interest were the developments that took place in France during the latter half of the Second Empire. In April 1870, before the downfall of the Second Empire, Yrjö Koskinen's Fennoman periodical *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti* regarded Guizot and his school of thought as the main authors behind the "real notion of liberty", that is, "liberal Napoleonism", which sought to combine "strong centralisation with liberal democracy" or "the liberal legacy of the Revolution with a position of supremacy in European power politics". The recent developments had made France the centre of European political interest as well as Guizot as one of France's most influential authors (*Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti*, 4, 1870, 86).¹²⁷

In the late nineteenth century, Finnish political actors often turned to foreign authors and figures and used them as an authority and source of inspiration in the Finnish discussions. The political groups organised around the newspapers and periodicals disputed their ideas and programmes by taking sides in foreign debates. Consequently, Finnish interpretations of foreign actors did not necessarily do justice or present a fair evaluation of their thought and influence.

Especially Snellman and the Fennoman intelligentsia found support for their ideas in Guizot's work. For example, Snellman and his periodical *Litteraturblad* discussed Guizot's books on theory of history¹²⁸, society and representative government.¹²⁹ Similarly, Snellman noted in *Läran om staten*, referring to Guizot among others, that in France the Restoration had brought several able men to the forefront of political life (Snellman 1842, 376–377).

In 1870, Koskinen's *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti* regarded it as unfortunate that Guizot and his school had been more successful in realising "the Doctrinarian

¹²⁶ In the 1860s and onwards Finnish bookshops marketed and sold, for example, Guizot's *Histoire des origines du gouvernement représentatif et des institutions politiques de l'Europe* (1822), *Histoire de la civilisation en Europe* (1828), *Histoire de la civilisation en France I–IV* (1830), *Monk; Chute de la république et rétablissement de la Monarchie en Angleterre, en 1660 : Étude Historique* (1837), *Portraits politiques des hommes des différents partis* (1855), *Histoire de la république d'Angleterre et de Cromwell (1649–1658)* (1854) and *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps II* (1859). For Guizot in the advertisements of Finnish bookshops in the 1860s, see e.g. Frenckell & Sons' catalogue for new French literature in *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 7 Sept., 1860, 7; Sederholm & Komp. in *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 21 May, 1862, 3; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 19 Apr., 1866, 3.

¹²⁷ In the 1860s, during the reign of Napoleon III, the constitution was modified and the limited powers of the parliamentary assemblies were progressively increased. For example in 1861 the Legislative Body began to publish its debates, in 1867 the right of interpellation was restored, in 1869 the Legislative Body received the right to initiate and amend legislation and on 2 January 1870 the first responsible ministry was established.

¹²⁸ On Snellman's interest in Guizot's theory of history, see Rantala 2013.

¹²⁹ E.g. Snellman 1848, 235; Snellman 1856, 177; *Litteraturblad*, 5, 1858, 223–229; *Litteraturblad*, 11, 1860, 494–495. The author of the latter *Litteraturblad*'s article "G. F." was most probably historian (Johan) Gustaf Frosterus. Frosterus studied in Paris 1857–1858, wrote texts on French history and was influenced by Guizot. (Tommila 1989, 122–123)

programme, the moderate liberalism”¹³⁰ in historical literature than in actual history (*Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti*, 4, 1870, 86). Whereas *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti* named Guizot “one of the noblest men of the century” (*Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti*, 6, 1866, 128) and *Litteraturblad* called him “an outstanding man of peace” (*Litteraturblad*, 6, 1848, 169),¹³¹ the Finnish liberals took a different stand. In 1861, *Papperslyktan*, the predecessor of *Helsingfors Dagblad*, depicted Guizot, in a review of his *Mémoires*, as an irreconcilable enemy of democracy, who persistently maintained the same rigidity he had shown as a Doctrinaire (*Papperslyktan*, 5 Aug., 1861, 246). In 1865 *Helsingfors Dagblad* lambasted the newest volume of Guizot’s *Mémoires*¹³² (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 23 Mar., 1865, 3).¹³³

Guizot presented the idea of constant opposition and struggle in *Histoire de la civilisation en Europe* (1828), in which he saw the diversity of elements and their constant struggle as a peculiarity of the modern European civilisations compared to the ancient. According to Guizot, whereas elsewhere the predominance of one principle had produced tyranny, in Europe, the variety of elements and the inability of any one principle to exterminate the others and their constant struggle had given birth to liberty. (Guizot 1828, 2^e leçon, 1–12)

In *Histoire des origines du gouvernement représentatif* (1822) — which was banned in Finland and in the Russian Empire in the 1850s (Silander 1939, 288), but sold in Finnish bookshops in the 1860s — Guizot argued that the object of the representative system and its institutions was to provide safeguards against the emergence of an absolute power. According to Guizot, every power, in order to prove its legitimacy, should be constantly submitted to certain trials, encounter obstacles and face opposition in front of the nation. (Guizot 1852 [1822], 441) Guizot saw that in representative government, the right of sovereignty was recognised on the condition that it was continually justified (*ibid.* 61). Similar to Mill, Guizot emphasised that since no individual was infallible, and since imperfect human nature admitted no one perfect comprehension or perfect steadfastness in the application of justice and reason, true unity could only arise from plurality. In representative government all classes of society were perpetually invited and urged to elevate and perfect themselves and different social forces were “brought into competition”. (*ibid.* 61–62, 67)

Mill’s idea of antagonism was indebted to Guizot’s theory of history. However, in relation to the role they gave to parliamentary deliberation and debate, Mill and Guizot differed from each other in a manner similar to *Dagblad* liberals and Snellman. In *Histoire des origines du gouvernement représentatif*, Gui-

¹³⁰ For an examination of “doctrinary liberals” and the misleading character of the term *doctrinaires*, see e.g. Ankersmit 1996, 130–135.

¹³¹ The article was based on a translation of two chapters of *Un Hiver à Paris* (1843) by Jules Janin.

¹³² According to *Dagblad*, the book was not going to be popular as it portrayed Guizot as infallible. *Dagblad* noted sarcastically that the book began with “je” and ended with “moi”. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 23 Mar., 1865, 3)

¹³³ The *Dagblad* liberals’ aversion to Guizot subsided over time in part due to increasing recognition of Guizot’s influence on Mill. For a Finnish acknowledgement of this influence and on Mill’s and Guizot’s understanding of historical antagonism, see Perander 1879, 204–205.

zot gave a strong emphasis to the search for truth based on principles and methods different to Mill's. While Guizot stressed that no man or body could know and act fully according to reason, justice, and truth (Guizot 1852 [1822], 64), it was the task of representation to *collect* and *extract* public reason and public morality, which were disseminated throughout society, into one focus (ibid. 348).

What we call representation is nothing else than a means to arrive at this result: it is not an arithmetical machine employed to collect and count individual wills, but a natural process by which public reason, which alone has a right to govern society, may be extracted from the bosom of society itself. (Guizot 1852 [1822], 348)

Thus, Guizot presented a sociological solution to the problem of the absence and presence of reason. In the representative process, society worked for itself, brought itself into alignment and produced its identity under the guidance of reason (Rosanvallon 2006, 125; 1985, 57). Guizot saw representative government as a means to avoid harmful confusions and divisions. According to Guizot, representative government invited "the multitude to reduce itself to unity", and brought forth "unity from the midst of plurality". Individuals had the faculty to discover reason, justice and truth, and could be brought more and more to conform to it in their conduct. One of the central tasks of political institutions was to promote the progress and facilitate the application of these three in society. (Guizot 1852 [1822], 64)

Guizot's interest was in breeding unity and consensus from the dissensus of competing and opposing interests by pinning down what was rational. Power was legitimate in so far as it was conformed to reason (Guizot 1852 [1822], 349). The representative process, in which publicity, election and responsibility played central roles, gave public reason its legitimacy and put individual reasons to the test. (ibid. 348) According to Guizot, the principles of right could not be enumerated *a priori* in all its applications to social relations, that is, it was not possible to recognise and define all rights and discern the whole extent of rational laws that should regulate society. However, for Guizot, in each relation in society and in the vicissitudes they underwent, there existed a principle that was their legitimate rule. This principle had to be discovered. (ibid. 429-430)

According to Rosanvallon, the Doctrinaires introduced the "irresistible hand of reason", whose empire extended over the world (Rosanvallon 2006, 125). In practice, reason in the world could be found by turning to a sociological theory of capacities: Although no one could pretend to possess full reason, certain individuals were more capable than others of recognising and following it. Thus, Guizot and the Doctrinaires resolved the problem of the presence and absence of reason by using representation as a medium. The Doctrinaires' notion of representation drew on an idea of limited suffrage based on capacity and property, and Guizot gave the middle classes a central function that transcended their class and constituted them as agents in realising the universal. (ibid. 125-126) The events and discussions in France convinced Snellman of the ability of the middle classes to take moral and intellectual leadership of society. In

Finland, the Fennomans were to assume this role through strengthening their position in the middle class. (Lahtinen 2006, 97–105)

Guizot's renouncement of perspectivism and debate was apparent in his examination of British parliamentary procedure. Canadian Professor of Rhetoric James De Mille (1878) summarised the underlying epistemological principle of the British version of parliamentary procedure that was emphasised by *Dagblad* liberals and by Mill, and to which Guizot objected. According to De Mille:

The aim of parliamentary debate is to investigate the subject from many points of view which are presented from two contrary sides. In no other way can a subject be so exhaustively considered. (De Mille 1878, 473)

In his examination of the British system of petitions, Guizot saw that it was a great defect of representative government in that, as it necessarily led to the systematic organisation and permanent conflict between parties, it "divided the truth into two parts", tempted men never to consider questions on more than one side, and to see only half of the ideas and facts on which decisions were made. For him representative government, in this sense, was a system of exaggeration and partiality. Guizot argued that these features should be diminished as much as possible. (Guizot 1852 [1822], 473)

According to *Dagblad* liberals and Mill, however, it was exactly the division of the truth that enabled its accurate and persistent examination. As parliamentary procedures organised debate based on the principle of *pro et contra*, both sides of the question not only strengthened their narrow one-sided argument, but being familiar with the rules of the parliamentary game, knew the importance of preparing themselves for the opponent's objection with counter-arguments. Thus, imagining, thinking and inventing possible objections strengthened the arguments, raised the quality of debate and guaranteed as close an examination of the truth as possible (cf. Mill above on the use of *pro et contra* in education). As a result of the division of the truth and the principle of fair play, all opinions, sides and arguments on a given question could get their voices heard in the parliament, or in Mill's words, in the "committee of grievances" or "congress of opinions". According to this line of thought, subjectivity did not have to be seen as the polar opposite of objectivity, but as an inherent condition of it (see Palonen 2010a, 77).

PART TWO: CASE STUDIES

4 (UN)PARLIAMENTARY SPEECH AND LANGUAGE

The late nineteenth-century Finnish Diet was not isolated from the international practices concerning parliamentary speaking. The Swedish model provided the general framework within which the styles and practices of parliamentary speaking were disputed and further developed. This chapter illustrates how presentations on foreign parliamentary models were used in order to discuss Finnish concerns indirectly. During discussions on the politically sensitive role of the speakers of the estates, Finnish newspapers published presentations on the speakers in foreign parliaments in order to broach the issue of the establishment of Finnish practices and to compare such practices to international standards. The newspaper articles also filled the lack in the availability of foreign parliamentary literature. Articles appeared that were based on and contained translations of foreign procedure books. The newspaper press offered an effective medium to reach members of the Diet, and thus, to educate the parliamentarians as well as the general public on the practices of parliamentary styles of dispute.

The Finnish discussions on (un)parliamentary speech and language illustrate understanding of an international style of parliamentary speaking that is regulated by procedures largely similar from one national parliament to another. The similarities between the rules of speech manifest the existence of a particular parliamentary *decorum*. This decorum has been contested in national parliaments, while giving its general rules different emphases. In Finland the decorum created in relation to foreign models was challenged especially by the Social Democrats in the early Eduskunta.

4.1 Speaking to the question

Section 46 of Diet Act of 1869¹³⁴ laid down limits for members' right of speech in the Diets:

In a plenary sitting, each member of the Estate (*ståndsledemot*) has the right to speak freely (*att fritt tala; wapaasti puhua*) and state his opinion (*yttra sig; lausua mielensä*) on the minutes, in his turn, in every question under discussion (*i alla frågor, som då handläggas; kaikissa asioissa, joita silloin käsitellään*) and in the legality of all that takes place in the Estates' readings. Each member speaks (*yttrar sig; puhuu*), standing up at their place, in the order in which he has notified himself (*anmält sig; ilmoittanut itsensä*) and has been recognised (*uppropad blifver; ylöshuudetuksi tulee*); and no one has the right to speak off the record. (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869)

The section was adopted from § 36 of J. J. Nordström's proposal for the Diet Act (Nordström 1912 [1863], 100), which was in turn a revised copy of § 50 of the Swedish Riksdag Act of 1810 (Riksdagsordningen 1810). Rosenborg's *Om riksdagar* also proposed a similar procedure (Rosenborg 1863, 176).

Firstly, § 46 included the idea of speaking to the question, which highlights the parliamentary idea of debating and dealing with a single item on the agenda at a time. This speciality of parliamentary procedure has been explicated by James De Mille (1878), for example, who argued that what distinguishes parliamentary debate from other controversial debates is that in it "the subject to be examined is presented in a formal statement, called a resolution, or question, to which alone the discussion must refer" (De Mille 1878, 472). Apparently, the rule originates from the English parliament, where Thomas Erskine May (May 1883 [1844], 348) attested the date of its implementation to the fifteenth century. According to May, a member in parliament "in possession of the house" had not obtained the right to speak generally, but was "only entitled to be heard upon the question then under discussion". If a member introduced clearly irrelevant topics, the speaker reminded the member that he must speak to the question. (May 1883 [1844], 348)

The rule of speaking to the question was adopted in the first Finnish Diets of 1863–64, and in 1867 in the estates' rules of procedures before the implementation of the Diet Act of 1869. Similar to the practice of the Swedish Riksdag, in the Finnish Diets the speakers of the estates reminded members breaking the rule (see e.g. *Karjalatar*, 10 Apr., 1894, 2). However, there were differences between the estates: the Peasants, for example, took more liberties with the rule than did the Burghers (see *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 2 July, 1885, 2 below).

Whereas opponents in the Finnish newspaper polemics of the early 1860s often talked past each other (see e.g. Pulkkinen 1989, 112) and strayed to side issues, the parliamentary rule of speaking to the question aims to prevent such

¹³⁴ The Diet Act of 1869 was formulated originally in Swedish, and translated into Finnish. See References.

wastes of time and energy and deepen the examination of issues by exploring different sides of the question through maintaining a focused debate.

The Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–06, responsible for the preparation of the Parliament Act of 1906, saw the rule of speaking to the question as essential in order to save time and fight parliamentary obstruction (see Chapter 9). In the Committee, Old Finn member J. K. Paasikivi¹³⁵ and Swedish Party member Felix Heikel highlighted the rule in relation to Norwegian procedures. Paasikivi noted that the requirement needed to be clarified as it was vague in § 46 of the Diet Act. Similarly, according to the Committee Chair, Professor Robert Hermanson,¹³⁶ MPs in foreign parliaments were subject to the speaker's authority in relation to speaking to the question. (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 15 Dec., 1905)

Consequently, the rule of speaking to the question was adopted in § 48 of the Parliament Act of 1906. Neither the Diet Act nor the Parliament Act explicated the speaker's role in supervision of the rule. The rule and the speaker's role were stated in the Eduskunta's first rules of procedure in 1907:

Each orator has the duty to speak carefully to the question (*velvollisuus on tarkoin pysyä käsiteltävässä asiassa*). If she deviates from this, the speaker must remind her to stick to the matter (*muistuttaa häntä asiassa pysymään*). (Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys 1907, § 25)

Enforcement of this internationally practiced rule has not been left in the hands of the speaker alone. Regarding the British practice, May wrote that when a member wandered from the matter, he was liable of being interrupted by cries of “question” (May 1883 [1844], 348). Similarly in the late Diets and increasingly in the early Eduskunta, speeches that strayed off topic were interrupted by interjections “to the matter” (*asiaan*).

¹³⁵ Juho Kusti Paasikivi (1870–1956) was a doctor in law (1901), secretary of the Peasants 1904–1905, representative of the Finnish Party in the Eduskunta 1907–1909, 1910–1913 and senator 1908–1909. Later, Paasikivi was, among other things, the president of Finland (1946–1956). During his study years Paasikivi adopted Snellman's Hegelian ideas of the central role of language and nation in history. At the turn of the twentieth century Paasikivi joined the Finnish Party organised around the newspaper *Uusi Suometar*. Paasikivi was greatly influenced by J. R. Danielson's idea according to which appeasement to Russia required a tight coalition between the various classes and factions in the Finnish society. (Polvinen 1997)

¹³⁶ Robert Hermanson (1846–1928) was a professor of international and public law 1884–1908, an expert on constitutional law and a Diet representative of the University 1897–1906. Hermanson was a legal positivist who defended Finland's exceptional status in relation to the Russian Empire. In his publications and as an expert member of the Diet's committees Hermanson argued Finland to be an autonomous state. (Modéen 2002) In the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–1906 Hermanson opposed unicameralism and women's suffrage.

4.2 Freedom of speech and (un)parliamentary language

Section 46 of the Diet Act of 1869 set down the freedoms and speech rights of members: Each member had the right to speak freely on all questions under discussion. However, other rules were enacted that set limitations on the right. Before the beginning of the Diet of 1863–64, von Knorring's *Sammanfattning* contained vague instructions concerning the style of language to be used in the estates' discussions, which, in the plenary sessions, were presided over by the lord marshal¹³⁷ and the estates' speakers, who also ordained the order of the treatment of matters. In addition, the speakers were to ensure that "order and good behaviour" were observed in the proceedings (*att tillse det ordning och skick vid förhandlingarne iakttages*). (*Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 24 Apr., 1863, 2; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 25 Apr., 1863, 2)

A subsection of § 46 of the Diet Act, again adopted from Nordström's proposal and the Swedish Riksdag Act of 1810, stated:

No one is to use insulting (*förolämpande; loukkaavia*), taunting (*spefulla; pilkallisia*) or otherwise inappropriate expressions (*eljest opassande uttryck; tahi muuten sopimattomia sanoja*) about the government or individual persons. If this happens, the Lord Marshal or the Speaker may forbid him to speak (*ordet betagas; kieltää puhumasta*), and the Estate may then examine whether he has to receive reprimands (*föreställning; nuhteita*) and warnings (*varning; varoituksia*) from the Lord Marshal or the Speaker, or whether a hearing in a court of law is required or whether the question is to be left without further examination. (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869, § 46)

Section 8 of the Diet Act gave further instructions on the member's conduct and defined, in addition to § 46, the member's freedom of speech:

A Member of the Diet is to be serious and polite¹³⁸ in his statements (*iakttaga allvar och hofsamhet i sina andraganden; olla yksivakainen ja siivollinen lauseissansa*), but he cannot be charged or arrested for his opinions and thoughts or for his conduct in the Diet discussions unless the Estate to which he belongs has decided to do so by a majority of at least five sixths of the members present at the plenary meeting. If a Member of the Diet is being accused of a serious crime, he is not to be imprisoned unless he has been discovered in *flagrante delicto*, or unless a judge has, after examining the question, seen a reason to decide so. For misdemeanours a Member of the Diet shall not be arrested and be put in prison for unpaid debts during the Diet. (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869, § 8)

In its preamble for the Diet Act, the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 stated that § 8 was based on § 22 of the Swedish Riksdag Act of 1723, and that the requirement of a five-sixths majority for prosecution was set in order to minimise the influence of parties (*partiernas inflytande*) (Grundlagskomitén 1866a). However, sections 8 and 9 of the Diet Act, which ordered heavier sanctions for crimes committed against members of the Diet and thus extended members'

¹³⁷ The lord marshal (*lantmarskalk; maamarsalkka*) was, based on Riksdag practice, the speaker of the Nobility.

¹³⁸ The Swedish adjective *hofsam* refers to the royal court (*hov*); the Finnish *siivollinen* to decency in behaviour.

legal protections against violence and pressure, were in fact adopted based on Nordstöm's proposal (Nordström 1912 [1863]), which in turn was based on sections 110 and 111 of the Swedish Instrument of Government of 1809 (Regeringsform 1809). (On the discussions on § 9 of the Diet Act, see Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981c, 267–268, 337–338, 351)

The topic that § 46 and § 8 of the Diet Act addressed is, as discussed in parliamentary history, the demarcation between freedom of speech and (un)parliamentary language. The protection of member's freedom of speech and freedom from arrest protect the parliament and its members from outside influence and pressure. In other words, the rules are aimed at making parliamentarians independent of extra-parliamentary actors. However, typically, there are occasions in which a parliamentarian can lose his right of speech. Thomas Erskine May (May 1883 [1844], 123–124) wrote on freedom of speech and unparliamentary language:

But, although by the ancient custom of Parliament, as well as by the law, a member may not be questioned out of Parliament, he is liable to censure and punishment by the house itself, of which he is a member. [...] Members using *unparliamentary language* are promptly called to order, and generally satisfy the house with an explanation or apology; if not, they will be suspended under the recent Standing Order, or punished as the House may think fit. (May 1883 [1844], 123–124, italics added)

May specified rules for members speaking. Two of these were of special interest to the Finnish Diet (for examples, see Sections 4.4 and 4.5 below). The first concerned *words against the parliament and its chambers*.

It is obviously unbecoming to permit offensive expressions against the character and conduct of Parliament to be used without rebuke; for they are not only a contempt of that high court, but are calculated to *degrade the legislature in the estimation of the people*. [...] If directed *against the other house*, and passed over without censure, they would appear to implicate one house in discourtesy to the other; if *against the house in which the words are spoken*, it would be impossible to overlook the disrespect of one of its own members. Words of this objectionable character are never spoken but in anger; and, when called to order, the member must see the error into which he has been misled, and retract or explain his words, and make a satisfactory apology. Should he fail to satisfy the house in this manner, he will be punished by a reprimand, or by commitment. It is most important that the use of such words should be immediately reprov'd, in order to avoid complaints and dissension between the two houses. (May 1883 [1844], 371, italics added)

Another type explicated by May was *words against members*:

The use of temperate and decorous language is never more desirable than when a member is canvassing the opinions and conduct of his opponents in debate. The warmth of his own feelings is likely to betray him into hasty and unguarded expressions, which the excitement of his adversaries will exaggerate; and he cannot be too careful in restraining himself within those bounds which Parliament has wisely established. *The imputation of bad motives, or motives different from those acknowledged; misrepresenting the language of another, or accusing him, in his turn, of misrepresentation; charging him with falsehood or deceit; or contemptuous or insulting language of any kind*, all these are *unparliamentary*, and call for prompt interference. (May 1883 [1844], 371, italics added)

May presented several typical instances of unparliamentary language that have often appeared in national parliaments and were subject to disputes also in the Finnish discussions (see Sections 4.4 and 4.5 below). The Finnish Diets and the Eduskunta sought to give the speaker and the assembly the highest punitive power over individual assembly members, which, as explicated by May, was typical of parliaments.

4.3 The speaker as the referee of parliamentary debate and representative of the assembly

Before going closer into the Finnish discussions on (un)parliamentary language, I examine the role of the speaker in relation to the rules discussed. The politicisation of the speaker's role brought the examination of foreign parliamentary models to the core of the Finnish debates.

Section 45 of the Diet Act of 1869 gave speakers the duty to present the questions, lead the readings (*leda öfverläggningarne; johdattaa keskustelut*), make proposals for decision-making and keep order in the sittings (*vidmakthålla ordning; ylläpitää järjestystä*). Section 46 gave speakers the duty to interpret when a member exceeded the limits of orderly speech. (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869)

The Finnish Diets looked abroad for models of parliamentary speech. Whereas Finnish newspapers published reports on debates in a variety of foreign parliaments, it was the British parliament whose procedures received the most interest in relation to free speech, rules of debate and (un)parliamentary language. The *Dagblad* liberals used the British model most actively. *Dagbladists* showed a deep interest in British authors and culture in general, and understood that the model of debate they most admired (see Section 3.4) found its most coherent institutionalisation in the British parliament.

The *Dagblad* liberals regularly evinced interest in the British parliament and its culture of debate. In Finland, the British parliament was described as "the mother of all parliaments" and "the cradle of representative government". According to the *Dagbladists*, parliamentary life was most highly developed in Britain and its procedures offered a model for parliaments everywhere. *Helsingfors Dagblad* articles included detailed presentations of British procedures and parliamentary vocabulary with translations. The presentations began the first year the newspaper was published, when it had become clear that the Finnish Diet would be convened. In 1862 the paper published an extensive three-part series on the British parliament, which took up one third of the newspaper's total page space in three different issues (31 July, 1862, 2-3; 1 Aug., 1862, 2-3; 4 Aug., 1862, 2-3). Due to a temporary loosening of the censorship restrictions in Finland, the series was able to give an overview of the British system of government as a whole. The series began by presenting the organisation of the system of government and its history, as well as the composition of the House of

Lords (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 31 July, 1862, 2–3). In the second part *Dagblad* examined the House of Commons and discussed its powers, history and changes in composition (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 1 Aug., 1862, 2–3).

The article series dealt with questions important to the Finnish discussions, such as the frequency and regularity of parliamentary meetings, the parliament's right to decide on the budget, developments in the reporting of parliamentary debates and the parliament's powers (specifically, the right of peers to request an audience with the monarch to present their views). Adjournment and quorum practices were also presented. In the third part of the series *Dagblad* examined the parliament's opening ceremonies and gave short descriptions of the various roles and positions of personnel. However, the bulk of the article was dedicated to the procedures of readings and debate. *Dagblad* presented the procedure of how a bill was transformed into binding legislation (*ett lagförslags [bill] öfvergång till bindande lag*) and discussed the different stages of readings (*den andra läsning [second reading]; den afgörande tredje läsningen*), amendments, resolving into committees of the whole house, select committees and conferences of the Commons and Lords. The last part of the article series discussed freedoms and rights of the parliament such as freedom from arrest for parliamentarians and protecting the parliament from external offence and pressure. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 1 Aug., 1862, 2–3; 4 Aug., 1862, 2–3) Such articles illustrate that when the Finnish estates and the Constitutional Law Committee assembled (in 1863 and 1865, respectively), their members had knowledge of and interest in procedure and its wider parliamentary significance beyond the mere wording of the Swedish Riksdag law.

Helsingfors Dagblad paid attention also to parliamentary decorum and its bearing on the parliamentary mode of politics. *Helsingfors Dagblad* (4 Aug., 1862, 2–3) spoke of the importance of avoiding personal allusions and of the formal practice of addressing the speaker instead of the opponent. In the British parliament, the rule was taken to such an extent that in both Houses no member was to refer to another by name during debate. According to May, in the Lords every lord was "alluded to by the rank he enjoys", and in the Commons each member was "distinguished by the office he holds, by the place he represents, or by other designations, as 'the noble lord the secretary for foreign affairs,' 'the honourable' or 'right honourable gentleman the member for York,' or 'the honourable and learned member who has just sat down'." (May 1883 [1844], 373) During the Diets, the British practices on personal allusions were presented in Finnish newspapers and seen as a means to calm down the heated Finnish disputes (see e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 25 Jan., 1877, 3; *Uleåborgs Tidning*, 28 Oct., 1878, 2–3). In addition, the rule was illustrated through numerous translated excerpts from British parliamentary debates. In the Finnish Diets, although it was allowed to refer to other members by name, the practice of addressing and speaking to the speaker was in use (see *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 19 Apr., 1872, 3) and was further enforced in the Eduskunta. The rules forcing members to use formal language and titles and to address the speaker instead of one's opponent

directly were seen as a means of restraining impulsive, angry or belligerent attacks from members.

Finnish newspaper articles on British procedures of debate and speaking in parliament were numerous. For example, *Helsingfors Dagblad* (4 Aug., 1862, 2–3) presented the formal correct manners of addressing other members, practices on how “to catch the eye of the speaker” and parliamentary interjections. In 1866 *Helsingfors Dagblad* published an article on the procedures for opening the British parliamentary session and for electing the speaker (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 20 Feb., 1866, 3). In 1869 the liberal *Hufvudstadsbladet* wrote under the title “The English Parliamentary Practice” (*Engelskt parlamentsbruk*) that British parliamentary life (*parlamentslifvet*) had maintained a number of old forms that appeared strange to inhabitants in other constitutional countries, but that had historical roots and were thus carefully followed. The article presented how the parliament elected its speakers and discussed its old carefully protected privileges. (*Hufvudstadsbladet*, 3 Jan., 1869, 2) In 1870 *Åbo Underrättelser* (30 June, 1870, 2) published a similar article on the position and duties of the speaker. In 1877 *Helsingfors Dagblad* discussed the British practices of addressing the speaker and speaking to him when speaking to the house, avoiding personal allusions in debates and the speaker’s formula for calling the house to order and leading the debate. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 25 Jan., 1877, 3) In 1878 the Svecoman newspaper *Uleåborgs Tidning* (28 Oct., 1878, 2–3) gave a detailed presentation of the British rules on parliamentary debate (*debattregel*). The newspaper also presented practices for avoiding personal allusion and addressing the speaker, describing them as intended to promote civility (*hövlighet*) and a good temperament (*god lynne*). The article presented the orders a speaker could give as well as the interjections available to members. (*Uleåborgs Tidning*, 28 Oct., 1878, 2–3) Articles that were focused especially on the British rules of debate and the role of the speaker were published throughout the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-centuries in liberal and Swedish Party newspapers (see also e.g. *Wiborg*, 5 June, 1857, 2–3; 9 June, 1857, 2–3; *Nya Pressen*, 13 Oct., 1891, 3; 17 Mar., 1895, 3; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 7 Aug., 1895, 2; *Wasa Tidning*, 22 Aug., 1895, 2–3; *Nya Pressen*, 23 Mar., 1900, 2; *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 6 May, 1895, 3; *Helsingfors-Posten*, 11 Aug., 1905, 2–3).

It is notable that the procedure articles on the British parliament were often translations from foreign newspapers and periodicals and based on British classics of parliamentary procedure. Thus, the newspaper press gave the Finnish actors a means to fill in at least some of the gaps in the availability of foreign parliamentary literature. For example, *Uleåborgs Tidning*’s article (28 Oct., 1878, 2–3), which was based on “an English periodical” (*efter en engelsk tidskrift*) was the most clearly indebted to May. The rules of debate presented in the article followed May’s order of presentation in *Parliamentary Practice* (for an earlier edition see e.g. May 1851 [1844], 249–259). May’s *Parliamentary Practice* was also explicitly referred to in the translated Finnish newspaper articles. In 1883 the Svecoman newspaper *Åbo Tidning*, edited by Ernst Rönnbäck, a signer of the Liberal Party Programme and former editor of the liberal newspaper *Åbo Un-*

derrättelser, published a three-part series on the British parliament (4 Apr., 1883, 1; 5 Apr., 1883, 1; 6 Apr., 1883, 1), which was translated from an article written by the London correspondent for the Swedish *Sydsvenska Dagbladet*. The series called the British parliament “the cradle of the representative system” (*representativa systemets vagga*) and presented the parliament from its physical architecture to its terminology and procedures. When discussing the procedures, the writer noted May’s *Parliamentary Practice* as the best book on “the parliamentary mechanism” (*parlamentariska mekanismen*) in both houses as it “included 800 pages filled with numbers, examples and precedents” (*Åbo Tidning*, 6 Apr., 1883, 1).

It is also notable that the newspaper publications on the British procedures were not only made in order to meet the demands of an audience with a general interest in parliaments. The articles were often published concurrently with Finnish disputes with the purpose of taking part in the on-going debates. This becomes apparent in the Finnish disputes on the speakers of the estates. Their role was politicised due to increasing party struggles from the early 1870s on as well as the speakers’ difficult position between the emperor and the estates. The roles and decisions of the speakers were not heavily disputed within the estates themselves, as this was seen as inappropriate and unparliamentary, but in the newspaper press.

The role of the speakers of the estates was challenging in the Finnish Diets and the responsibility was not always received with pleasure. According to the Diet Act of 1869, the speaker’s seat in the Clergy was reserved for the archbishop, but the emperor appointed the lord marshal and the speakers of the Burghers and the Peasants from among the elected members of the estate¹³⁹ (*Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869*, § 23). In the opening ceremony of the Diet the speakers swore oaths to preserve and protect both the right (*rätt; oikeutta*) of the emperor and the freedoms and rights (*fri- och rättigheter; etuuksia ja oikeuksia*) of the estates (*ibid.* § 24). In addition, the speakers were obliged to oversee that no matters contradictory to the constitution or to previous decisions, or matters that were “too delicate” (*af grannlaga beskaffenhet; arka-laatuinen*) were discussed in the Diet readings (*ibid.* § 45, § 63). The speakers were assisted by the estate secretaries and procedural challenges were discussed in the speaker’s council, but the speaker’s own decisions were final and no right for appeal existed (Lilius 1974, 185). Thus, although the speakers were selected from the members of the estate, their position was constantly disputed in the Diets in relation to the Diet Act. Due to the vague wording of the Act, the speakers had occasionally opposing views as to what could be discussed and what could not. Such a practice was, however, seen as contrary to the principles of equality and uniformity, which were essential characteristics of any system

¹³⁹ In practice, the governor-general had great influence over the appointments. He usually appointed the speakers of the Burghers and the Peasants. In addition, the emperor’s decisions on the matter were often based on lists formulated by the governor-general. Occasionally the governor-general could select his candidates from a list drafted by the vice chairman of the Senate’s economic division. (Tuominen 1974, 350–351, 359–360)

of representation (*Morgonbladet*, 8 June, 1872, 1). Similarly, the Diet Act was seen as leaving too much power to the speaker to make individual decisions, thereby limiting the rights essential to a legislative assembly (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 1 Apr., 1867, 1-2).

Most disputed were the speakers' decisions to ban discussion infringing upon the rights and duties of the government and the emperor,¹⁴⁰ which were often placed under the category of "delicate"¹⁴¹ stated in the Diet Act. Whereas the speakers defended their decisions by referring to the wording of the Diet Act and the old Swedish statutes (see e.g. *Morgonbladet*, 6 Mar., 1872, 1-2, 2; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 6 Mar., 1872, 2), Finnish newspapers and members of the Diet emphasised the parliamentary principle of freedom of speech stated in § 46 of the Diet Act.¹⁴²

Continuous rhetorical and practical efforts to strengthen the ties between the speakers and their estates were made. The speakers were often highlighted as the estates' and Diet's highest representatives in relation to the government and the emperor, especially since they were entitled to speak on behalf of their estates in the opening and closing ceremonies of the Diet (e.g. *Päivälehti*, 28 Nov., 1899, 1). In addition, the speakers themselves, particularly in their opening speeches, highlighted their unity with their respective estates.¹⁴³ The ties between the speakers and their estates were consolidated in dinners that the estates organised for their speakers usually close to the end of the Diet session.

The challenges to the position and authority of the Diet speakers resulted in a new formulation in the Parliamentary Reform of 1906. The clause on the speaker's right to ban discussion and vote on the basis of a matter's delicacy was removed. In addition, the speaker's decisions could now be submitted to the Constitutional Law Committee for judgment and deliberation. (Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaan Valtiopäiväjärjestys 1906, § 69) Such a procedure had been proposed, following the Swedish model, already by the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865. The liberal members of the Committee of 1865 sought to establish in the Diet Act a committee that would bring balance to the relation between the government and the estates. In the Swedish Instrument of Government of 1809 and the Riksdag Act of 1810, the Constitutional Law Committee had developed into an important oversight mechanism. J. J. Nordström (1912 [1863]) proposed in the Finnish Diet Act a similar committee to act as an arbiter in disputes between the speaker and estate, for example, if an estate wished to challenge a speaker's decision to prohibit discussion. The proposal

¹⁴⁰ See e.g. debates and commentaries on the speakers' decisions to ban discussion of Leo Mechelin's proposal on the estates' right to participate in formulating the budget (*Morgonbladet*, 6 Mar., 1872, 1-2; 2 and *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 6 Mar., 1872, 2).

¹⁴¹ The liberal newspapers criticised the term "delicate" by noting that every single petition in the Diet could be considered "delicate" and that the early decisions of the speakers could set dangerous precedents for future practices (see e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 19 Apr., 1877, 1; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 7 Mar., 1872, 1-2).

¹⁴² Based on this e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad* argued that no legal or historical grounds for the prohibitions could be found (3 June, 1872, 1; 22 Jan., 1873, 1).

¹⁴³ See e.g. Speaker Kurtén of the Burghers in *Suomalainen*, 25 Jan., 1897, 2; Speaker Wallgrén of the Burghers in *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 2 Oct., 1877, 2.

was turned down in St. Petersburg. (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981c, 291–296; Nordström 1912 [1863], 101) However, Finnish newspapers expressed during later Diets the same desire that the procedure be adopted (see e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 1 Apr., 1867, 1–2; *Morgonbladet*, 8 June, 1872, 1).

The procedure of submitting the speaker's decisions to a committee, which was born of the speakers' special role between the governmental powers, is an example of practices that eventually gave the final say on decisions of the speaker to the parliament and its majority.¹⁴⁴ This practice was in contrast to the British and French parliaments, whose procedures gave the speaker an undisputable authority in practice (in the British case) or in parliamentary law (in the French case) (May 1883 [1844]; Pierre 1902).

Another set of reforms included in the Parliamentary Reform of 1906 concerned the speaker's role between the parliament and the government. The Parliamentary Reform Committee (Eduskuntakomitea 1906b) made two important decisions. Firstly, according to § 23 of the Parliament Act of 1906 the Eduskunta had the right to elect its speaker. In the Committee, the establishment of the rule in the Russian state *Duma* was seen to open a possibility also for the Eduskunta (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 27 Dec., 1905). The *Duma's* new procedures had been presented in the Finnish press the previous autumn (see e.g. *Hufoudstadsbladet*, 22 Aug., 1905, 2). The rule is the only occasion in which a Russian parliamentary rule or practice was referred to, according to the procedure debates examined in this study. It is notable that in the Swedish Riksdag the monarch had the right to appoint the speakers of the chambers until 1921 (Hadenius 1997, 144).

Secondly, the speaker's oath in the opening session of the parliament, formerly sworn to the emperor, was now replaced with "a solemn affirmation" (*juhlallinen wakuutus*) (Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaan Valtiopäiväjärjestys 1906, § 23). Social Democrat Yrjö Sirola presented the idea for this change in the Parliamentary Reform Committee. Committee Chair Professor Robert Hermanson noted that the oath had been earlier often misused. He was in favour of Sirola's proposal, since a total abandonment of the oath would be opposed in St. Petersburg. Hermanson emphasised that the speaker was "no ordinary member" and he should above all remain *impartial*. The affirmation would also be useful for reminding the speaker of his responsibilities. Swedish Party member Felix Heikel noted that the speaker had been the emperor's trustee, separate from the estate, but in the future he should be a *representative* (*edusmies*) and *trustee* (*luottamusmies*) of the Eduskunta. (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 27 Dec., 1905)

In the Diets, another major dispute that prompted study of the speaker's role related to the new politicisation of the Diet work. In the 1870s and 1880s the formation of political factions within the estates raised questions about the speaker's position. On whose behalf did the speaker of the estate speak in the opening and closing sessions of the Diet? Where there were internal factions, whom and whose interests should the speakers represent? The rising political

¹⁴⁴ For the speaker's and the parliament's role in sanctions on unparliamentary conduct, see Section 4.2 and correction of the minutes in Section 7.6.

conflicts became visible in speculation about who would be nominated as speakers and in reviews of their work. The speaker's office, decisions and person became focal points for political dispute.

The language strife became topical in the Diets of 1872 and 1877-78. In 1877 Yrjö Koskinen's Fennoman newspaper *Uusi Suometar* (21 Feb., 1877, 1-2) criticised Swedish-speaking Speaker Slotte of the Peasant estate of lacking "the clear political insight" (*tarkkaa waltiollista aistia*) that his office required and charged that Slotte had misused his speaker's rights at the expense of the estate's freedoms and right to decide. The dispute was about the language of the estate's minutes: Agathon Meurman had proposed that in order to save time, speeches should be included in the Diet minutes only in the language in which they were made. Slotte had banned discussion on the question based on the Diet Act of 1869 as according to him the topic was too delicate, was in contradiction with earlier decisions and breached the parliamentary principle of protection of the minority, which the *Dagblad* liberals and Svecomans highlighted. (For more critiques of Speaker Slotte, see e.g. *Morgonbladet*, 10 July, 1877, 1; *Tampereen Sanomat*, 3 July, 1877, 2)

The Fennomans connected the founding of the Liberal Party in 1880 to the language question. In 1881, *Helsingfors Dagblad* and *Uusi Suometar* debated speaker nominations. According to *Uusi Suometar*, Slotte was not a suitable speaker for the Peasants anymore as he had signed the Liberal Party Programme, which contrasted strongly with the views of the estate's Fennoman majority (*Uusi Suometar*, 2 Nov., 1881, 2). The opponents engaged in debate about the proper parliamentary role of the speaker, with the Fennomans emphasising the speaker as *representative of the assembly* while the *Dagblad* liberals stressed the speaker's role as a *referee of debate*.

In the Diets, the speakers from previous Diets were re-elected unless death or health issues hindered the fulfilment of the duties. For example, Joachim Kurtén was the speaker of the Burghers in six consecutive Diets 1885-1899 and Carl Johan Slotte in the Peasants in five 1877-1891. As the speakers were elected from among the members of their estate, the only direct way to influence the appointment of the speaker was to try to affect the local election outcomes. In the election of 1887 the Fennomans, on an initiative of the *Uusi Suometar* (11 Aug., 1887, 2), organised an electoral campaign in order to dethrone Slotte from the Peasants speaker's seat (see *Kokkolan Lehti*, 15 Aug., 1887, 1-2). Slotte was not elected in Kokkola, but after other failed attempts in Mustasaari and Lohja he was finally elected in Raasepori. The Fennoman newspaper *Uusi Suometar* argued that "in many other states' representative assemblies the chamber (the estate) had the right to elect its speaker". The newspaper noted that if this had been the case in Finland, Slotte would have not been re-appointed as speaker. According to the paper, the practice in foreign parliaments where the monarch appointed the speaker was for the speaker to be chosen from among the existing majority (*wallitsewa enemmistö*). Thus, in Finland the appointment violated the will of the majority. (*Uusi Suometar*, 5 Nov., 1887, 1-2)

The *Dagblad* liberals reacted to the Fennomans' tactics and rhetoric by publishing articles on the role of the speaker of the British House of Commons. The articles emphasised the speaker's primary duty as the *impartial referee of parliamentary debate*. Just before the Diet of 1872, *Helsingfors Dagblad* (21 Jan., 1872, 3) had published an article titled "The Speaker of the English House of Commons" (*Engelska underhusets talman*). In the article, *Dagblad* described the duties of the speaker, noting that some were "different from the ones that we according to our parliamentary tradition (*vår parlamentariska tradition*) tended to supply our speakers with". Namely, the speakers in reality had nothing to do with determining or introducing items onto the agenda (*bestämmandet af dagordning*). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 21 Jan., 1872, 3) Similarly, two days after the Diet of 1877–1878 opened on 23 January 1877 and before the actual debates had begun, *Helsingfors Dagblad* (25 Jan., 1877, 3) published an article entitled "Parliamentary etiquette" (*Parlamentarisk etikett*) in which, drawing on *Blackwood's Magazine*, practices concerning parliamentary debate and speech as well as the speaker's role in the British parliament were discussed.

In 1878 the Svecoman newspaper *Uleåborgs Tidning* (28 Oct., 1878, 2–3) published a lengthy article – filling a third of the issue – on the role of the speaker of the British House of Commons. The article began by emphasising that the speakers in the British parliament immediately upon appointment gave up all party affiliations and views. As a commentary on the recent Finnish disputes, the article detailed the process for electing the speaker of the House of Commons and included the established parliamentary terminology and phrases used. (*Uleåborgs Tidning*, 28 Oct., 1878, 2–3)

In 1884 *Helsingfors Dagblad* published an article entitled "The speaker of the House of Commons" (*Engelska underhusets talman*), on the new speaker there who had been elected unanimously according to the practices of the parliament. The article noted that although the speaker was elected from the majority party, in Britain the election of the speaker was not a party question to the same extent that it was in France and other continental representative assemblies¹⁴⁵ on which the Fennomans based their idea of the speakership. The article emphasised the practice according to which the speaker of the House of Commons observed "the strictest impartiality in leading the debates and the most powerful upholding of the prestige, ancient traditions and proud supremacy". *Dagblad* noted that before being elected speakers were often party men, but afterwards they "stood above and outside the parties (*står han alltid öfver och utom partierna*)" and were viewed as "the strict impartial leader of the whole house (*hela underhusets strängt opartiske ledare*)" (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 5 Mar., 1884, 2). The same article was published also in the Svecoman *Nya Pressen* (5 Mar., 1884, 3), the liberal *Åbo Underrättelser* (6 Mar., 1884, 2) and the Svecoman *Tammerfors Aftonblad* (7 Mar., 1884, 3).

The *Dagblad* liberals and Svecomans adopted the idea of the speaker as an impartial referee of parliamentary debate and applied it to the Finnish discus-

¹⁴⁵ On the deeply politicised elections of the speakers of the French Chamber of Deputies, see e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 23 Apr., 1885, 2.

sions, emphasising it against the Fennomans' interpretation. The Fennomans' emphasis on the speaker as a representative can be seen as relying on, in addition to the general Fennomans' stress on realising the will of the majority, the typical way *puhemies*, the Finnish equivalent of "speaker", was used. Outside the parliamentary context and especially before the Finnish Diets in the 1860s, the noun *puhemies* was used strictly in the meaning of one who speaks in place of, or on behalf of, another person or persons. Traditionally, *puhemies* was used to refer, for example, in courtship customs to someone of the groom's side who approached the bride's father to obtain consent before the marriage proposal.¹⁴⁶ In the mid- and late-nineteenth-century political vocabulary, a *puhemies* spoke on behalf of, or represented, "national endeavours",¹⁴⁷ "culture and intellect",¹⁴⁸ "burghers of the capital city",¹⁴⁹ "the Finnish Literature Society",¹⁵⁰ "public opinion" (*yleinen mieli*)¹⁵¹ and "the Finnish nation".¹⁵² The established meaning given to *puhemies* fit with the Fennomans' emphasis on the representative character of the speaker of parliament, while giving less emphasis to role of being a referee of debate. The Fennomans (see *Uusi Suometar*, 5 Nov., 1887, 1–2 above) found support in the continental European parliaments for their notion of the speaker as a representative of the majority.

The *Dagblad* liberals and Svecomans, however, emphasised the idea and of the impartial speaker and used corresponding vocabulary in the Finnish discussions. This aspect was central from the *Dagblad* liberals' point of view, which emphasised the deliberative aspect of parliamentary activity over the Fennomans' focus on the rhetoric of representation. Commenting on the Diet of 1872, *Helsingfors Dagblad* (16 July, 1872, 1) praised the Burghers' Speaker Henrik Wilhelm Johan Zilliacus for "realising the primary virtue of a speaker", namely "proving oneself to be completely impartial" (*opartisk*). Similarly in 1877, an obituary in *Helsingfors Dagblad* (17 June, 1877, 1) described the Burghers' Speaker Alexander Reinhold Frey as having "demonstrated impartiality (*opartiskhet*) in all his conduct as speaker". Similarly *Östra Finland* (18 June, 1877, 1) thanked Speaker Frey for "avoiding partiality (*partiskhet*) in all of his judgements" and *Hufvudstadsbladet* (19 June, 1877, 2) for his "impartial character" (*opartiska väsen*). Although obituaries spoke of the deceased in an appraising tone, the adjectives used illustrate the positive traits connected to the speaker of the parliament.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁶ In the Finnish newspapers, see e.g. *Sanan Saattaja Wiipurista*, 13 Nov., 1841, 1–2; *Maamiehen Ystävä*, 20 Sept., 1851, 4; *Suometar*, 11 Mar., 1853, 2–3; *Suometar*, 22 Apr., 1853, 2–3 and 29 Apr., 1853, 2–3; *Suometar*, 8 Dec., 1854, 2; *Sanan-Lennätin*, 20 Sept., 1856, 1–2; *Suometar*, 9 Jan., 1857, 2; *Suometar*, 20 Feb., 1857, 5–6.

¹⁴⁷ *Suometar*, 14 Jan., 1848, 2.

¹⁴⁸ *Suometar*, 22 June, 1849, 1.

¹⁴⁹ *Suometar*, 27 Apr., 1852, 4.

¹⁵⁰ *Sanomia Turusta*, 21 Dec., 1852, 2.

¹⁵¹ *Suometar*, 8 Aug., 1856, 1.

¹⁵² *Suomen Julkisia Sanomia*, 4 Sept., 1862, 3.

¹⁵³ For other uses of "impartial" in the Finnish liberal and Svecoman discussions on the Finnish speakers, see e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 28 Dec., 1880, 2 on Speaker Slotte; the Burghers on their speaker Wallgren in an estate dinner, *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 19 May, 1882; also on Speaker Slotte, see *Wasa Tidning*, 2 June, 1885, *Westra Finland*, 4 Mar., 1891, 2, *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 14 Nov., 1893, 2 and *Nya Pressen*, 15 Mar., 1894, 1; on

Despite the Fennomans' accusations that the decisions of "Svecoman speakers" were affected by partisan affiliations, the Fennomans did not demand speaker impartiality as such, but rather highlighted other attributes when appraising successful speakers. In acknowledgements and obituaries regarding their favourite speakers of estates, Fennomans emphasised oratorical skills, good memory, a serious and humble character, having an eye for what was best for the nation, and the ability to win the friendship, love and respect of the estate (see e.g. *Aura*, 8 Feb., 1887, 2; *Hämeen Sanomat*, 15 Feb., 1887, 1; *Mikkelin Sanomat*, 17 Feb., 1887, 2; *Uusi Suometar*, 9 Feb., 1887, 2).

The Fennomans' argumentation in procedure debates showed a dependency on the idea of reform based on the will of the majority. This became apparent in their rhetoric that changed according to the settings of the language question. Whereas earlier the disputes on the speakers focused on the Peasant estate, which had a Fennoman majority, at the end of the century, the Finnish Party adopted a different rhetoric in view of the Burghers that had a Swedish Party majority and had become a new centre of the language struggle (see debate on the suffrage of the Burghers in Section 6.2). In 1897 the Burghers' Finnish Party members published an open letter in the Helsinki press against estate Speaker Joachim Kurtén's appearance at a Swedish Party meeting. They emphasised that the speaker was to remain "free from a party stands" (*puoluekannasta wapaana*). (*Uusi Suometar*, 4 Apr., 1897, 2) The Finnish Party newspapers accused Kurtén of "caving into party passion" (*antautua puoluekiihkon waltaan*) and "paralysing his will to remain outside parties (*puolueiden ulkopuoella*)". Now they stressed that the speaker was to "look at matters from a more general point of view than through the coloured glasses of petty party politics (*katsoa asioita yleisemmältä kannalta kuin pienen puoluepolitiikan värillisten lasien läpi*)". The speaker's public orations were to contain "greater impartiality (*suurempaa tasapuolisuutta*) and respect even towards the minority in the estate he represented." (*Aamulehti*, 13 Apr., 1897, 2; *Savonlinna*, 9 Apr., 1897, 3)

The language strife began to lose importance as the main divide in the political struggles of the late nineteenth century and the political parties began to move closer to each other in a common front against the Russification. The Finnish-speaking majority's enhanced role in the Diet also changed the Fennoman rhetoric. The lessons of foreign parliaments reached the argumentation of the conservative Fennoman camp, which relied more on the ideas of Snellman and Yrjö Koskinen, later than it did other groups, such as the more internationally-oriented Fennomans, including the *Valvoja* group and the Young Finns. In the nineteenth-century Diets the Fennomans' focus on reform in the name of the majority gave little room for "splitting hairs" with procedures of deliberation.

The speeches delivered at the opening of the Diet by the speakers of the estates had been seen as a valuable occasion to present the wishes of the estates and the people to the emperor; however, they became deeply politicised in the

Speaker Kurtén, see *Svenska Österbotten*, 14 Jan., 1896 and *Wasa Nyheter*, 15 Jan., 1896, 2-3)

1890s due to increased Russian pressures on the grand duchy. What specific wishes and opinions of the estate should be expressed by the speaker remained a central point of contention until the Parliamentary Reform. In the “obstruction Diet” of 1904–05 (see Section 9.3), disputes on the speakers’ decisions and speeches were centred around the passive resistance of Constitutionalist legalism on the one hand, and the Old Finns’ appeasement to Russia on the other (see *Helsingin Sanomat*, 18 Nov., 1904, 2; *Uusi Suometar*, 6 Nov., 1904, 2). The establishment of the unicameral Eduskunta obviated estate interests in relation to the speaker as the estates were dissolved. The speaker was seen to speak on behalf of the Eduskunta, which represented the people as a whole. The main divide in the discussions on the speaker’s election, speeches and decisions became situated between the Social Democratic Party, which emphasised the speaker as the representative of the opinions of the majority of the people, and the bourgeois parties, which strove to emphasise the role of the speaker as an impartial referee of parliamentary work. Whereas the Fennomans had defined the majority by language, the Social Democrats defined the majority as comprising of the workers and the poor.

4.4 Unparliamentary language and conduct in the Finnish Diets

In addition to in-depth articles on British parliamentary procedures, members’ right of speech and parliament’s punitive authority over its members were showcased in newspaper reports on foreign parliaments. Translated debates gave examples of the speaker’s calls to order and of expressions¹⁵⁴ and conduct¹⁵⁵ considered unparliamentary. From the beginning of the 1880s Finnish newspapers gave increasing exposure to foreign parliamentary scandals and heated disputes. Most notable of these were debates connected to the obstruc-

¹⁵⁴ For example, on 22 July 1875 in the House of Commons, Samuel Plimsoll lost his composure and applied the term “villains” to members of the House, allegedly shaking his fist in the speaker’s face (for the original debate and Plimsoll’s repeated refusals to withdraw his words see:

<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1875/jul/22/parliament-breach-of-order-mr-plimsoll>). For reports in the Finnish newspapers see e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 30 July, 1875, 1; 10 Aug., 1875, 1.

¹⁵⁵ For example, in the 1880s atheist Charles Bradlaugh’s case was widely reported in the Finnish press. Bradlaugh was elected to the House of Commons in 1880, but refused to take the religious Oath of Allegiance in the parliament. The parliament denied his wish to make a non-religious affirmation instead as well as to take the Oath “as a matter of form”. Bradlaugh made several attempts to take his seat in the parliament and was arrested, briefly imprisoned, escorted from the House by police officers and fined for voting illegally. The dispute continued as Bradlaugh was re-elected by Northampton four times in succession. In 1886 Bradlaugh was allowed to take the Oath, and in 1888 a new Oaths Act was passed, which introduced the right of affirmation for members of both Houses. Although no such oaths were required in the Diets or the early Eduskunta, these events offered widely circulated examples of unparliamentary conduct and the parliament’s reactions to it. For Finnish newspaper reports on the matter, see *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 July, 1880, 1–2; *Morgonbladet*, 3 July, 1880, 2; 16 Sept., 1880, 2; 16 May, 1883, 2; *Nya Pressen*, 11 May, 1883, 3.

tion campaigns, which started with Irish obstruction in the British House of Commons in the late 1870s and early 1880s and soon spread across the parliaments of Europe (see Chapter 9). At the end of the 1870s newspapers began to highlight how Social Democrats challenged the accustomed speaking practices in the German Reichstag. Although newspapers disapproved the Social Democrats' disrespect towards the decorum, they saw that the proposed restrictions on freedom of speech in parliament would have been contrary to the principles of parliamentary system of government. (See *Uusi Suometar*, 17 Jan., 1879, 3–4; 29 Jan., 1879, 3)

However, there were differences in the Finnish reporting. The *Dagblad* liberals approached parliamentary topics from a procedural point of view and published specialised articles on the rules and practices behind the disputes. While *Dagblad* focused on the British parliament, the Fennomans turned to continental parliaments. The Fennomans' interest in parliaments was not, however, in the procedures and rules of debate as such: no specialised articles on the matter were published in the Fennoman newspapers. For example, in 1880 the Fennoman paper *Morgonbladet* published a report on a debate in the Prussian House of Representatives. The article gave an example of how parliamentary debate in the Prussian Landtdag took place and, in a journalistic style, gave a general image of role of the speaker and the use of interjections and unparliamentary expressions (*uttryck som betecknat såsom oparlamentariska*). (*Morgonbladet*, 18 Feb., 1880, 1–2) Similarly in 1882 the *Morgonbladet* (25 Nov., 1882, 2) gave excerpts from a debate in the French Chamber of Deputies, including the president's calls to order and the practice of avoiding personal allusions. Similar reports from the House of Deputies of the Imperial Council of the Austro-Hungarian Empire were published in the Fennoman newspapers at the end of the 1870s (see *Morgonbladet*, 12 Nov., 1879, 1–2).

The different emphasis of the Fennoman newspapers is apparent in their rare extended presentations on the British parliament. *Morgonbladet's* article series from 1874 on the House of Commons, which was a translation of an article written by the London correspondent of the Norwegian newspaper *Folkets Avis*, offers an illustrative example of the Fennoman attitude towards the parliament. *Morgonbladet's* shortened version of the article titled "An Afternoon in the British House of Commons" was a description of a visit to the parliament written from the reporter's point of view, without any general discussion or interest in the procedure or development of the debate. (*Morgonbladet*, 1 Aug., 1874, 2; 3 Aug., 1874, 2) When *Helsingfors Dagblad* a few days later published its translated version of the same article, it limited itself to a description of the House of Commons' procedures, that is, the very part that *Morgonbladet* had cut out. *Dagblad's* version was titled "A Vote in the English House of Commons" and consisted of a detailed presentation of the Commons' voting procedure written in an expository style. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Aug., 1874, 3)

In Finland the limits of orderly language were discussed with references to *oparlamentariska uttryck*, *epäparlamentaarinen puhe* or *parlamentaarisen tavan vastainen puhe* (unparliamentary expression, unparliamentary language), which

illustrate an understanding of parliamentary decorum. The estates and the early Eduskunta did not try to formulate exact written rules or lists on unparliamentary language. As in most parliaments, the procedures on unparliamentary language were based on practices that had evolved over time. The Finnish practice was grounded in an active following of the foreign discussions.

In the Finnish Diets several disputes occurred surrounding breaches of § 46 and § 8 of the Diet Act, which prohibited the use of insulting words and underlined the need for gravity and moderation. Although the sections gave the speakers and the estates disciplinary rights, these rights were relatively rarely used.¹⁵⁶ In addition, breaches of parliamentary language were often taken up by astute members of the estate instead of by the speakers. For example in 1877 Johan Erik Keto of the Peasants called the Clergy's Julius Immanuel Bergh a fortune hunter (*onnen-onkija*). Afterwards several members of the Peasants protested against Keto's use of words citing § 8 and § 46 of the Diet Act and their requirements for parliamentary decorum. In addition to defining Keto's remark as a personal insult (*words against members* and *imputation of bad motives*, in May's terminology) and since the name-calling had been made against a member of another estate, the unparliamentary remark was also considered as what May had referred to as *words against the parliament and its houses*. Members of the Peasants noted that such attacks against members of other chambers could produce bad blood and unnecessary schisms between the estates. Pointing to the traditional parliamentary expressions, Members Juhana (Idänpää-)Heikkilä and Heikki Jaatinen argued that Keto's words had "breached the prestige and honour of the estate" (*säädyn arwoa ja kunniaa*). Agathon Meurman reminded the members to maintain dignity in all their expressions about the Diet and its estates and to remember their position and the assembly they were addressing. Meurman noted that unparliamentary expressions were harmful as when insulting an individual member, the insult was also aimed at against other representatives holding the attacked opinion and supporting the same party and the estate and the Diet in general. Meurman argued that this had been forgotten in the current Diet and noted that such practices would spread if not properly constrained. (*Uusi Suometar*, 23 Nov., 1877, 2-3) Following internationally established procedures, Keto was asked to take his words back and present a formal apology. As Keto did not consent to this, the Peasants decided on Member Edvin Avellan's proposal that Keto was to be reprimanded by the speaker before the estate (*Uusi Suometar*, 28 Nov., 1877, 2).

In addition to attacks against members and houses, the third type of unparliamentary language discussed in Finland was insulting reference to members of the government and the emperor, which especially in the 1890s caused speaker interventions. This aspect was "delicate" and the limits for such expres-

¹⁵⁶ Due to the Diet practices on minutes (see Chapter 7), unparliamentary language could be removed from the minutes during correction, but they received attention in the newspaper press. This highlights the benefits of combining both parliamentary and newspaper material in the analysis of parliamentary debates.

sions were strict. Thus, the sensible course was often to avoid personal allusions in this respect.¹⁵⁷

A reason for the rarity of disputes on unparliamentary language and conduct was the character of the discussions in the Finnish estates. Commentaries of the work of the Diet work, both Finnish and foreign, often emphasised the calm character of Finnish parliamentary proceedings. Compared to foreign parliamentarians, Finnish members were portrayed as severe, calm and unwilling and unaccustomed to heated debate (see e.g. *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 19 Apr., 1872, 2-3; *Åbo Tidning*, 21 Apr., 1885, 1-2; *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 7, 1908, 51-52). In addition, estate representation and composition of the estates distinguished the Finnish Diet from foreign parliaments that had already moved on to modern systems of parliamentary reading with large chambers and heated party struggles. The estates were relatively small in number – only the Nobility was comparable to foreign chambers in terms of its size, its members numbering between 122 and 201 from 1863 to 1905 (Jutikkala 1974, 27). The Clergy usually had around 35 members (ibid. 29-41), the range of the Burghers was 37-73 (ibid. 112) and the Peasants 47-64 (ibid. 133). The estates' inner party factions became a defining aspect relatively late in the history of the Diets. An essential part of Diet deliberations was seen, especially by the Fennomans, as taking place in committees. The differences between debates in smaller estates and larger "unicameral" plenaries became apparent in the heated joint discussion of all four estates, plenum plenum, in 1885 (see Section 6.2). Finnish members also had a relatively high respect for rules and the awareness that the rules existed was often enough to ensure that they would be followed in the estates.

Helsingfors Dagblad (2 July, 1885, 2) gave an account of "estates' external physiognomies" and reviewed the parliamentary character of their debates in relation to foreign standards. The article is illustrative of the *Dagblad* liberals' willingness to reflect on Finnish practices in comparison to foreign models. According to *Dagblad*, words were the most carefully weighed in the Nobility. The newspaper saw the presence of the large audience in the chamber, containing many strangers, as a central reason for this. *Dagblad* also noted that personal attacks (*personliga utfall*) were in general rare in the Finnish Diet. In the Burghers, although "voices were occasionally raised during debates (*debatten*)" and "lips trembled of emotion", "the exchange of words concerned almost always the matter, not the person" (*gäller det hela ordbytet mest alltid sak, icke person*). For *Dagblad*, "the order in the Burghers had always been exemplary and the discussions truly parliamentary (*förhandlingarna rent parlamentariska*)". The newspaper noted regarding the Clergy that its plenaries more resembled committee work than parliamentary readings due to the estate's small size and constitution. Even the inclusion of University professors and school teachers had not changed the Clergy's character significantly. Thus, there was no felt need to

¹⁵⁷ See e.g. Lagerström commenting on the Finnish Senate in the Peasants on 20 May, 1894 in *Aura*, 29 Mar., 1894, 2; for other discussions of unparliamentary language in the Diets, see Iisakki Hoikka of the Peasant estate, who charged foresters of engaging in dishonest practices, in *Uusi Suometar*, 4 May, 1888, 2.

follow parliamentary forms (*parlamentariska formerna*) scrupulously. The newspaper described the Peasants as modest compared to the other estates. Although “the external forms of parliamentarism” (*parlamentarismens yttre former*) could not be manifested in such an estate as the Peasants, even its discussions progressed strikingly smoothly. However, the rule of speaking to the question was not always strictly followed and even strong personal attacks were not always avoided. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 2 July, 1885, 2) It is notable that in the Peasants the continuous interpretation of speeches hindered the debate character of deliberations. The interpreter stood up after each statement and interpreted it in Swedish or Finnish (see *Aura*, 13 Feb., 1894, 2–3).

Similar perceptions were made by foreign parliamentary reporters. In 1872 the Swedish newspaper *Göteborgs Handels-Tidning* (published also e.g. in *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 17 July, 1872, 1) reported on the plenary discussions of the Finnish estates. The newspaper argued that the Finnish deputies (*ombud*) had already “developed a political understanding (*ett politisk förstånd*), politeness combined with openness (*hovsamhet i förening med frimodighet*), the capability for clear presentation and, in general, a sound and proper judgment (*uppfattning*); [...] many other parliamentarily practiced representative assemblies (*mången annan parlamentariskt öfoad representantförsamling*) should follow the example of the small Finnish Diet”. The Swedish reporter took notice of the tact and self-control (*takt och självbeherrskning*) the Finnish representatives possessed. (*ibid.*) In 1872 the Russian liberal magazine *Vestnik Evropy* (known as ‘Messenger of Europe’ or ‘Herald of Europe’) made similar remarks. According to it, in Finnish parliamentary debates the members respected each other’s right of speech and maintained their dignity, regardless of the external modesty compared to foreign parliaments. (Published in *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 19 Apr., 1872, 2–3)

4.5 Unparliamentary language and conduct in the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–06 and the early Eduskunta

In the Finnish discussions the member’s right of speech was seen as one of the most sacred parliamentary freedoms. The parliament gave its members a possibility to speak in public in a respected arena in front of other members of the political elite, their proponents and opponents. This was especially valuable in the imperial context. Although threats to the right of speech were present, estate discussions were not subject to prepublication censorship until the 1890s. In the early Diets the privilege was pronounced, especially among *Dagblad* liberals in relation to the British model. In the Parliamentary Reform debates of 1906 and in the early Eduskunta, the British model was emphasised by several parties, though they did give the right of speech different content and limitations.

The discussions on the Parliamentary Reform took place against the backdrop of foreign parliamentary scandals, racket and tumult reported on almost daily in the Finnish press. Due to the deepened domestic party divisions, grow-

ing fears were expressed that ill foreign parliamentary influences might be adopted. Thus, the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–1906 devoted a substantial amount of time to rules concerning unparliamentary language and conduct. The Committee discussed which types of breaches should be left under the disciplinary authority of the speaker and Eduskunta, and which should be submitted to a court of law. The Committee members presented suspicions especially about whether a qualified majority had the right to submit a case to a hearing, as had been included in the Diet Act. Allegedly, the rule could serve as a means for party warfare and tyranny of the majority. (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 8 Jan., 1906; 12 Jan., 1906)

In the Committee J. K. Paasikivi proposed combining § 8 and § 46 of the Diet Act (see Section 4.2 above) with their rules on parliamentary language and conduct in order to more clearly point out that disciplinary sanctions could be used against both personal insults and disorderly behaviour. Thiodolf Rein of the Young Finns noted that misuse of speech should be prevented by rules that allowed members to be suspended. Emphasising the rules on *words against members* as well as *words against the parliament*, Heikel continued that members to be suspended were those who have not only insulted, but also disgraced themselves and others in parliament. Heikel remarked, referring to the Irish obstruction campaign and the British model, that suspensions occurred quite often in England and that the rules of the Eduskunta should be arranged accordingly. Heikel and Old Finn J. R. Danielson¹⁵⁸ proposed a qualified majority of four fifths for sentencing the suspension of a member in order to prevent its abuse in party warfare. Danielson argued that the speaker should first call a member to order and then, after a warning, suspend the member for three to four sittings. (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 8 Jan., 1906; 12 Jan., 1906)

Eventually, § 46 of the Diet Act, which forbade personal insults, as well as the first subsection of § 8 of the Diet Act, which called for gravity and politeness, was adopted in § 48 of the Parliament Act of 1906. Thus, Paasikivi's proposal on combining and clarifying the rules on parliamentary language was accepted. The Parliament Act demanded that representatives be calm and dignified in their speech and conduct (*tulee esiintyä vakaasti ja arvokkaasti*).¹⁵⁹ Based on Danielson's proposal, the speaker pursuant to § 48 was first obliged to call a member to order and then, after a reminder, to forbid the member to speak. The Eduskunta had the right to examine if the member guilty of a breach was to

¹⁵⁸ Johan Richard Danielson(-Kalmari) (1853–1933) was a member of the Clergy 1885–1906, representative of the Finnish Party in the Eduskunta 1907–1914, senator 1908–1909, professor in history (1880–1913) and a defender of Finnish autonomy, which he defended by historical rather than legal arguments. During Russification, Old Finn Danielson was considered a moderate supporter of appeasement. His Fennoman ideology and in part his theories of history and nationalism were indebted to J. V. Snellman and Yrjö Koskinen. Compared to the older Fennomans, Danielson put more emphasis on the importance of the social and economic needs of the masses. In 1881 Danielson was one of the founders of the periodical *Valvoja* and was the periodical's editor 1881–1884. Danielson became the leader of the Finnish Party after Yrjö Koskinen's death in 1903. (Vares 2003)

¹⁵⁹ Other requirements proposed in the committee were "sound" (*wiisas*) and "moderate" (*maltillinen*) (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 15 Dec., 1905)

receive reprimands and a warning from the speaker, be suspended from the Eduskunta for a maximum period of two weeks, be prosecuted in a court of law or whether the question was to be left without further examination. The Diet Act's clauses on members' freedom from arrest and parliamentary immunity were included in sections 10, 11 and 12 of the Parliament Act of 1906 with the requirement that the removal of these privileges required a qualified majority of five sixths (Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaan Valtiopäiväjärjestys 1906)

The procedures regulating freedom of speech and the speaker's role in the Diet Act of 1869, which were adopted in the Parliament Act of 1906, have had significant influence on the later practice of the Eduskunta (see Hidén 1967; Hidén 2007, 9–19, 21–22, 83–94, 121–123). The rules have remained included in the Eduskunta's contemporary procedures in the Constitution Act of 1999 and the rules of procedure of 2000.¹⁶⁰

In the early Eduskunta the limits of parliamentary language were tested, challenged and disputed in a manner unparalleled in the Diets. The first sessions were characterised by such heated disputes that Speaker P. E. Svinhufvud¹⁶¹ was challenged repeatedly to reconsider the limits of parliamentary conduct. The second session forced Speaker Svinhufvud to threaten the Eduskunta with the premature closing of a sitting, which had never taken place in Finland earlier. Differing interpretations of what constituted calmness and dignity in the manner of presentation, as required by the Parliament Act, were expressed in plenary debates and in the newspaper press in particular.

Charging a member with falsehood or deceit, in other words, to call a member a liar or accuse him of lying, is probably the most well-known *topos* of unparliamentary language internationally. During the Eduskunta's first parliamentary session in 1907–1908, based on the newspaper material and the official minutes, there was apparently only one instance of a member explicitly accusing another of lying. In the plenum of 15 September 1907 during a debate on the law on working in bakeries, Social Democrat Representative Edvard Helle ventured the opinion that Representative J. R. Danielson-Kalmari, when reading the following day's newspapers, would understand that he had lied in the Eduskunta (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, PTK 32/1907, 2127–2128). The statement led to the speaker's intervention and call to order. In the later Eduskunta, the rule on "liar" and "lying" was a well-learned practice. However,

¹⁶⁰ Sections 8 and 46 of the Diet Act were adopted with minimal changes in § 57 and § 58 of the Parliament Act of 1928 (Valtiopäiväjärjestys 1928), and after this in § 31 of the Constitution Act of 2000 (Perustuslaki 1999) and § 49 of the Eduskunta's rules of procedure of 2000 (Eduskunnan työjärjestys 2000).

¹⁶¹ Pehr Evind Svinhufvud (1861–1944) was a Finnish jurist, judge and a leading figure in the Constitutionalist struggle against Russification in the early nineteenth-century. In addition to law, he studied Finnish, Scandinavian and Russian history under the guidance of Yrjö Koskinen. Svinhufvud was a member of the Nobility as a representative of his family in 1894 and 1899–1906 and a member of the Eduskunta 1907–1914 as a representative of the Young Finnish Party. The February Manifesto of 1899 turned conservative Finnish Party member Svinhufvud into a strict Constitutionalist. He was the first speaker of the Eduskunta 1907–1913. Later, Svinhufvud continued to play a central role in Finnish politics and was the president of Finland 1931–1937. (Häikiö 1997)

in the early Eduskunta, under Speaker Svinhufvud's allegedly "too liberal" supervision (for such critique, see e.g. *Uusi Suometar*, 28 May, 1907, 2; 4 Nov., 1908, 4), the rule was actively circumvented by, for example, referring to statements as "not identical with the truth",¹⁶² as partial truths¹⁶³ or as half-truths.¹⁶⁴ Members described each other as "unwittingly lying",¹⁶⁵ "being on the verge of distortion"¹⁶⁶ and putting "hardly any truth" into a statement.¹⁶⁷ (For full quotes and more detailed discussion, see Pekonen 2012b)

Although such statements clearly violated May's notion of parliamentary words, being *accusations of misrepresentation and charges of falsehood or deceit*, they remained unpunished and typical in the early Eduskunta. The first sessions of the Eduskunta were characterised by heated plenary debates as the assembly was torn by deep party conflicts and competing understandings of the goals and the means of parliamentary work.¹⁶⁸ In this context the rules and practices of parliamentary speech were again in dispute. Svinhufvud admitted his inability to differentiate the parliamentary from the unparliamentary in all cases, citing his inexperience as a speaker of such an assembly. In the early Eduskunta the expressions used to avoid accusations of unparliamentary language were in many cases intentionally so loaded and obvious that they could convey the same meaning as the words they substituted. Instead of outright accusations of lying, there existed euphemisms referring only to personal misunderstanding, lack of information or varying degrees of truth and falsity.

It is notable that efforts to lay down definite and indisputable rules for speech have proven impossible due to the character of parliamentary debate. Even though it seems that the limits on the parliamentary use of language have been very similar in different European assemblies, parliament is never totally separate from the polity and its social, linguistic and historical norms. Thus, the successful speaker needs to be aware of the prevailing procedures as well as the changing nature of language and its use. Early disputes on the speaker's interpretations in the Eduskunta were tests of what could be discussed and how. An essential rhetorical feature of parliamentary debate is the fact that rules formulated to regulate speech, for example, the requirement for calm, serious and dignified presentation, can be not only contested, but also circumvented through rhetorical manoeuvring. As May put it in his main work on parliamentary procedure: "An ingenious orator may break through any rules, in spirit, and yet observe them to the letter." (May 1883 [1844], 367–368)

In the early Eduskunta the British parliament became again the most popular model of parliamentary decorum. Now the British model was embraced by the conservative Finnish Party and the more liberal Young Finns. The British

¹⁶² Renvall in PTK 32/1907, 2065.

¹⁶³ E.g. Danielson-Kalmari's "extreme amount of falsehood" and "an ounce of truth" in PTK 7/1908, 46.

¹⁶⁴ Malmivaara in PTK 39/1907, 2653–2654.

¹⁶⁵ Turkia in PTK 39/1907, 2685.

¹⁶⁶ Danielson-Kalmari in PTK 7/1908, 46.

¹⁶⁷ Sulo Vuolijoki in PTK 24/1908, 565.

¹⁶⁸ On the disputes between the Social Democrats and the bourgeois parties, see Sections 5.7, 5.8 and 9.5.

ideal came to the fore after the Social Democratic Party's success in the first parliamentary elections of 1907, which caused concern among some about how the newly-elected and uneducated parliamentarians would conduct themselves. In the Eduskunta, the Social Democrats criticised the established bourgeois parliamentary limits of speech as unsuited to their style of debate. The Social Democrats viewed the speaker of the Eduskunta's right to take the floor from members as 'unparliamentary' and that the rule was being employed deliberately against the Social Democrats (see e.g. Kuusinen 1906b, 246). The Finnish Social Democrats also looked to foreign role models for parliamentary speaking. For example, in the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–1906 Social Democrat leader Edvard Valpas remarked in the discussion on (un)parliamentary language that he greatly enjoyed reading the speeches of German Social Democrat August Bebel, especially the ones insulting the sanctity of the majesty. (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 12 Jan., 1906)

In the Eduskunta, the members of the Finnish Party and the Young Finns emphasised that parliament was a *locus sui generis* in terms of its procedures and its respect towards them. They highlighted procedure as an essential feature and determinant of the parliamentary mode of politics and understood parliamentary decorum as having an important influence on both the deliberative and the representative aspects of parliament. After the first sittings of the Eduskunta in 1907 the Finnish Party newspaper *Uusi Suometar* (28 May, 1907, 2) wrote that hints of the future good and bad aspects of parliamentary behaviour (*parlamentaarinen esiintyminen*) had already been given in the Eduskunta. The newspaper noted that the parliamentary environment had already forced the Social Democrats to formalise their language compared to that of agitators outside the Eduskunta. Still higher requirements on decency (*siivollisuus*), respectability (*säädyllisyys*) and decorum (*arvokkuus*) were to be set. According to *Uusi Suometar*, already in the first sittings Eino-Sakari Yrjö-Koskinen, son of Yrjö Koskinen, had been attacked unparliamentarily by the Social Democrats and Young Finns who had questioned his true motives and accused him of cheap partisan politics. The Finnish Party saw that these attacks, *imputations of bad motives*, had breached the Parliament Act's rule on personal insults. (ibid.) The new emphasis on the Eduskunta's deliberative character (see Sections 5.8 and 6.9) was reflected in the discussions on orderly speech. Highlighting the benefits of the parliamentary rules of speech and conduct, *Uusi Suometar* argued that all unparliamentary quarrels stole time from the actual work of parliament, namely, discussion on the issues themselves. (*Uusi Suometar*, 28 May 1907, 2)

In 1908 *Uusi Suometar*¹⁶⁹ (4 Nov., 1908, 4) emphasised the importance of the Eduskunta's first sessions in establishing a respectable parliamentary tradition, and underscored the importance of procedure on language and conduct. After the introduction of universal suffrage, parliamentary decorum was given increased importance in shaping the attitudes of the general public and engendering their respect towards the assembly. For *Uusi Suometar*, the British parliament had served as the main model for parliamentary forms everywhere,

¹⁶⁹ Pseudonym "Joh. ent. Lehteri".

including in Germany and France. The newspaper noted, using the British parliament as an example, that the respect that members showed towards the parliament would be reflected in the outside world. It was the parliamentary rules and practices that distinguished parliaments from chatty everyday meetings. In England breaches of procedures were considered sacrilegious. The newspaper reminded members that, since the Eduskunta was in the process of creating “binding practices for future representatives”, misconduct would create bad precedents for later conduct. Again referring to the British parliament, the Finnish Party demanded respectful language, refined manners and proper attire. The style of speech should be raised to international parliamentary standards, above the level of everyday colloquial speech and chit-chat. *Uusi Suometar* argued that the bourgeois parties should draw on foreign models and set an example for the Social Democrats, who would over time learn to follow and respect the model. (*Uusi Suometar*, 4 Nov., 1908, 4)

The parliamentary decorum was understood to be determined by practice. In 1908, the Young Finn newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat* (12 Aug., 1908, 3) emphasised that since the Parliament Act of 1906 could only give parliamentary work a general form, the Eduskunta had to supplement it by creating its own traditions and practices. No clear or exact definition of decorum was suitable for all the manifold cases that could appear in parliamentary life (*parlamenttaarinen elämä*). *Helsingin Sanomat* noted that there was very limited legislation defining the British parliamentary life, but the procedures that had been built up over its history were detailed, strong and binding. The newspaper argued that the influence, role and authority of any legislative assembly was dependent on the traditions and practices it was able to create. If parliamentary traditions were established based on general ideas of justice and morality (*yleisten oikeus- ja siweyskäsitteiden pohjalle*), the prestige of the parliament was inviolable. Where bad habits such as carelessness, or chicanery such as obstruction had been allowed to flourish, the prestige of the parliament had deteriorated, spawning distrust against the whole parliamentary system of government. According to *Helsingin Sanomat*, the Finnish Eduskunta should seek out and follow healthy foreign parliamentary models and avoid the harmful. The newspaper noted that over time, the adoption of practices similar to those of the British parliament would strengthen the prestige of the Eduskunta, and as a result the practices would become as determining as the written law. If the Eduskunta adopted bad practices and shenanigans from the outset, it would soon lose its prestige and be disregarded both at home and abroad. (*Helsingin Sanomat*, 12 Aug., 1908, 3)

4.6 Conclusions

The Diets and the early Eduskunta offer examples of discussions concerning the learning and formulating of the practices on parliamentary speech. The discussions took place in a situation where no binding tradition existed and where the

practices themselves were still largely under debate. Although there was a clear procedural continuity between the Diet and the Eduskunta in the rules on parliamentary speech, the new politicisation of the parliament opened the old rules for new disputes and interpretations.

The case illustrates how early Finnish procedure debates and their use of foreign models were deeply intertwined with daily politics. In the early Diets the Fennomans sought to subordinate the speaker's role to that of representing the majority, whereas the Dagbladists saw the highest value in ensuring impartial refereed debate that provided a safeguard for the minority. In the Eduskunta, the non-socialist majority emphasised the lessons that could be learned from abroad concerning parliamentary decorum. Their concerns and critique centred on the uneducated newcomers, the rising Social Democrats, for whom they saw themselves in role of modelling respectable parliamentary conduct. In the case of the Social Democrats¹⁷⁰ decorum was also a means to stand out and to distance themselves from the political elite. Although different interpretations of (un)parliamentary speech were presented during the learning process, the attachment to the expressions "parliamentary" and "unparliamentary" illustrate the understanding of parliamentarism as a procedural mode of politics.

In Finland, the will to rise to the ranks of genuine parliaments led to a close examination of foreign exemplars such as the British House of Commons. The foreign models played a significant role in the early Finnish teaching about parliamentary decorum. It is difficult to say definitely what influence the newspapers' parliamentary teachings had on the Finnish parliamentarians. However, the main newspapers, such as *Helsingfors Dagblad*, *Uusi Suometar* and *Helsingin Sanomat*, had a wide readership among the political elite as the newspapers formed a central forum for politics. Parliamentary topics appeared regularly, were popular and closely followed in the press, and editors and journalists participated actively in the work of the estates. Despite the long intervals between Diets, there was continuity: the main figures during the period were often re-elected and the speakers of the estates tended to be long-serving.

Parliamentary decorum points not only to a set of manners and customs, but a parliamentary mode of politics, which was seen as rather independent from such questions as the election of assemblies, their powers or representative character. The rules on parliamentary decorum were understood as inseparable from the parliamentary mode already during the early Diet debates of Finland. Although procedures on parliamentary speech often are connected to the respect and civility towards fellow parliamentarians, the procedures on (un)parliamentary language play a more significant role in terms of parliament's *modus operandi*. As the Finnish discussants understood, procedures that regulate how and what matters can be discussed serve not only to preserve mutual civility and respect, but ensure that agenda items are discussed without side-tracking into insignificant and time-consuming quarrels. This adds to the value of parliamentary deliberation and to the quality of discussion. Rules on parliamentary language protect the assembly from its own members and hinder

¹⁷⁰ See also Section 7.6.4 for the role of interjections in Social Democrat tactics.

the potentially self-destructive tendencies inherent in the use of freedom of speech.

5 FREE AND IMPERATIVE MANDATE¹⁷¹

It is customary to start the history of free vs. imperative mandates with the French Revolution and its break with estate representation. Nevertheless, in England the break with the bound mandate was undertaken already in the late Middle Ages. More interestingly, there were at least two other estate diets in which the imperative mandate was rejected, namely the Swedish and the Finnish.

This chapter focuses on the free mandate as a principle of parliamentary deliberation that was introduced in the Finnish Diet of four estates by the Diet Act of 1869. Section 7 of the Diet Act banned the imperative mandate, the practice according to which electors have the right to give binding orders or instructions to their delegates and recall them if their orders are not followed in the parliament. As central as the free mandate is to contemporary parliamentary rules, its introduction and early phases in the Eduskunta's debates have not been closely studied.

The adoption of free mandate in Finland serves as an example of the Finnish procedural innovations of the late nineteenth century: by using Swedish practices and precedents, the reformists implemented a parliamentary principle within an obsolete four-estate system, while the Swedish constitutions on which the Finnish reformists were to ground their work included no such clause. Although the wording for the Finnish ban was taken from the Riksdag law, the Finnish disputes reflect a wider understanding and knowledge of foreign parliamentary discussions on the matter.

The early Finnish disputes on the imperative mandate suggest a theoretical and practical understanding of parliamentary work as a procedural mode of politics. In other words, parliaments were seen as particular arenas for deliberation regulated by procedures. During the Finnish Diets, free mandates were discussed in relation to the idea of representation of the people and its difference to the estate representation. Free mandate became topical in the Parliamen-

¹⁷¹ A shorter version of the chapter has been published in *The Politics of Dissensus: Parliament in Debate* (see Pekonen 2014).

tary Reform of 1906 and the early unicameral Eduskunta when Finnish suffrage expanded and parties competing for wide support with detailed platforms were organised. In the Eduskunta, the imperative mandate became a rhetorical tool to emphasise the character of the Eduskunta as a deliberative assembly and to defend the trustee model of representation against the delegate model supported by the Social Democrats.

5.1 The break with the imperative mandate

The uniqueness of Finland's ban of the imperative mandate in a medieval four-estate system was recognised by Eugène Pierre¹⁷² in his exhaustive work on French parliamentary procedures (Pierre 1902, 314). Typical to historical presentations on the parliamentary mandate, Pierre's work connected the French ban to the dissolution of the Estates General. According to Pierre, the free mandate had been enforced in the French Constitutions and procedures since the Revolution of 1789 in order to prevent restraints on the freedom of parliamentary deliberations. After that, the electors' wishes and mandates were not been meant as imperative and binding, but as guidelines whose implementation were entrusted to representatives and the free exercise of their opinions and conscience in the context of parliamentary debate. According to the Constitution of 14 September 1791, the representatives were not representatives of the departments, but of the nation as a whole.¹⁷³ (Pierre 1902, 310–314) The rule was indirectly behind the Finnish ban as it had served as the model for the Swedish clause in the Riksdag Act of 1810 (see below).

British Member of Parliament and philosopher Edmund Burke (1729–1797) created a similar, and perhaps the most classic, formulation of the parliamentary mandate. In his speech to the electors of Bristol in 1774, Burke presented his definition of what was later known as the trustee and delegate model:

Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion. [...] To deliver an opinion is the right of all men; that of constituents is a weighty and respectable opinion, which a representative ought always to rejoice to hear, and which he ought always most seriously to consider. But *authoritative* instructions, *mandates* issued, which the member is bound blindly and implicitly to obey, to vote, and to argue for, though contrary to the clearest conviction of his judgment and conscience, – these are things utterly unknown to the laws of this land, and which arise from a fundamental mistake of the whole order and tenor of our Constitution.

Parliament is not a *congress of ambassadors* from different and hostile interests, which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, against other agents and advocates; but Parliament is a *deliberative* assembly of *one* nation, with *one* interest, that

¹⁷² Pierre was a former General Secretary of the Presidency of the Chamber of Deputies of France.

¹⁷³ “*Les représentants nommés dans les départements ne seront pas représentants d’un département particulier, mais de la nation entière ; il ne pourra leur être donné aucun mandat.*” (Pierre 1902, 312)

of the whole—where not local purposes, not local prejudices, ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole. You choose a member, indeed; but when you have chosen him, he is not member of Bristol, but he is a member of *Parliament*. (Burke 1887 [1774])

In the *trustee model*, in line with Burke's thinking, which served as the basis for parliamentary representation, the MP's decisions in parliament were based on his judgement and experience, allowing him to serve the interest of the nation as a whole. In a *delegate model*, on the contrary, the constituents elected their representatives as mere delegates and mouthpieces for the wishes of the constituency. The delegates had no autonomy and were not able to act based on their conscience.

Burke's trustee model and Pierre's examples of the French discussions presented the idea of a free deliberative parliament whose work was based on the protection of the common good and the interests of the nation. From a procedural point of view, these aspects distinguished the parliament from its predecessors, mainly the estate meetings, in which representation was based on private and estate interests and imperative mandates.¹⁷⁴ Burke's and Pierre's accounts described free mandate as a precondition for parliamentary representation and deliberation: It was the MPs as trustees who, after parliamentary reading and debate, had the power and responsibility to decide. Parliament and imperative mandate were mutually exclusive. As parliament was a place for free speech and debate, predetermined imperative mandates left the parliament and its members without purpose and value.

In Sweden, whose example served as the model for the Finnish case, the rejection of imperative mandate was not, however, a result of the dissolution of the estate system, but a step towards parliamentary ideas within it. The breakthrough of free mandate as a *legal principle* in Sweden took place in the 1740s in a debate on the Doctrine of Principalship, *principalatslära*. Section 9 of the Riksdag Act of 1723, which included the form of authorisation of members' mandates, obliged the members of the Riksdag to foster the Constitutions and the common good of the realm (*rikets allmänna bästa*). Section 22 prescribed that no member of the Riksdag should be addressed or molested due to his opinions and statements in the Riksdag. (Riksdagsordning 1723) However, the form of authorisation also demanded that members take their constituents' appeals into account, and therefore, confusion on mandates existed (Paloposki 1961, 398–399). The Age of Liberty (1719–1772) was an important period for the development of parliamentary practices in Sweden. The era was also marked by a growing desire to strengthen the influence of constituents in the politics of the realm, an effort that was advanced particularly by the Cap Party. In the early 1740s, Cap member Christoffer Springer argued that the principals, 'the estates that elected', were to have control over their delegates, 'the elected estates'. According to Springer's theory, the principals had the right to give instructions to and demand reports from their delegates and recall them. The Hats interpreted

¹⁷⁴ In practice, medieval parliament and estate diet members could also see themselves as free agents representing the realm (Pohjantammi 2003, 365, 368–369).

this as an assault against the Riksdag's representative character. Based on a decision by the Hat-dominated Riksdag of 1746–1747, members were not bound to the decrees of the principals, but had the right to present their own views and vote according to their personal convictions. (Lagerroth 1915, 334–386; Metcalf 1985, 141–142)

In Finland in the early 1860s, the rejection of imperative mandate and its parliamentary implications were studied not only in the case of the Swedish model, but also using other foreign literature. In *Considerations on Representative Government*, which became popular in Finland in the early 1860s, John Stuart Mill renounced the principle of imperative mandates. Mill's vocabulary and arguments on the topic were soon adopted in the Finnish discussions. Mill (2001 [1861], 218) noted that in most of the countries with representative constitutions, law and custom warranted members of the parliament to vote according to their own opinions. As the members, however, often felt bound in conscience by their electors' opinions, the matter was to be treated as a question of *constitutional morality*, of the ethics of representative government. As the electors could choose their votes freely, they could not be prevented from tying their votes to any condition they wished. By refusing to elect a member who did not pledge himself to the elector's opinion, the electors could reduce their representatives to mere delegates and mouthpieces. (ibid. 219) Mill saw that, to avoid this state of affairs, a representative government had to be framed in a manner that prevented class legislation for one's own benefit. (ibid. 220) According to Mill, the laws could not prescribe to the electors the principles by which they should direct their choice. However, what principles electors thought should guide their choice made a great practical difference. (ibid. 221)

Mill pointed out a central problematic in the question of the free versus the imperative mandate. This was discussed in Finland during the Diets and especially in the early Eduskunta. Even the most explicit ban on the imperative mandate could not restrain the practice altogether and remove its logic from representation. What Mill had referred to as 'constitutional morality' was tried to be guided in Finland with the help of foreign models.

5.2 The ban on imperative mandate in Finland

According to § 7 of the Finnish Diet Act of 1869, "In his duty, a member is not bound by any other orders than the Constitutions"¹⁷⁵ (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869).¹⁷⁶ The section banned the imperative man-

¹⁷⁵ In Finland, as well as in Sweden, there was no single document called 'the Constitution'. Instead, the Constitution consisted of several fundamental laws, including the Instrument of Government (*Regeringsform; hallitusmuoto*) and the Diet Act (*Riksdagsordning; valtiopäiväjärjestys*).

¹⁷⁶ "Landtdagsman är i utöfningen af denna sin befattning icke bunden af andra föreskrifter än landets grundlagar."; "Valtiopäivämies ei ole tointansa käyttäessä muiden määräysten kuin maan perustuslakien alainen." (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869, § 7)

date in the Finnish Diet. The Constitutional Law Committee of 1865, with assistance of J. J. Nordström,¹⁷⁷ adopted and modified this section from the Swedish Riksdag Act of 1810, which had confirmed the rejection of imperative mandate in the Swedish Constitution. According to § 1 of the Riksdag Act, “The Estates of the Realm are representatives of the Swedish people and cannot, in the practice of their duty as members of the Riksdag, be bound by any other orders than the Constitutions of the Realm”¹⁷⁸ (Riksdagsordning 1810). The section was adopted from the French constitution of 1791 presented above (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981c, 262). The Riksdag Act’s notion of the estates as representatives of the people was laid down in § 1 of the Finnish Diet Act: “The Estates of the Realm of the Grand Duchy of Finland, which, convened to the Diet, represent the people of Finland, are the Nobility, the Clergy, the Burghers and the Peasants”.¹⁷⁹ Thus, following the Swedish model, the Finnish reformists combined the estate system with the idea of representation of the people. Sections 1 and 7 of the Diet Act became legal grounds against imperative mandates in Finland.

In its justifications for the Diet Act, the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 noted that even though it was not explicated by the older Riksdag Acts, the estates should represent the interest of the country and the people as a whole (*hela landets och hela folkets intressen*). According to the Committee, the old idea of the estates as representatives of narrow local and estate interests no longer corresponded to the opinions of the Finnish people and the generally acknowledged principles of representative constitutions. As a result of historical developments, the representation of the Finnish people had been divided into four estates, each of which was composed of representatives (*ombud*) from different classes of the country’s population. The Committee noted concerning § 7 that experience showed, even of the Finnish Diet of 1863–64, that there existed constituency associations (*valkorporation*) that saw themselves as entitled to give orders to their representatives on how to vote in the Diet. For the Committee, it was necessary to rule out such an abuse. (Grundlagskomitén 1866)

The Constitutional Law Committee of the Diet of 1867 seconded the justifications of the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865. In its report on the proposal for the Diet Act, the Committee of 1867 referred similarly to the historical developments and principles of modern representative constitutions. The Committee of 1867 also noted the coherence-building potential of the idea of representing the people as a whole. It argued that § 1 prevented discord between classes (*folkklasser*), whose “interests differed only in institutions”.

¹⁷⁷ Nordström adopted § 1 of the Riksdag Act of 1810 in his proposal for the Diet Act (Nordström 1912 [1863], 81).

¹⁷⁸ “Riksens Ständer äro Swenska Folkets Representanter, och kunna, i utöfningen af deras Riksdagsmannabefattning, icke bindas af andra föreskrifter än Rikets Grundlagar.” (Riksdagsordning 1810, § 1)

¹⁷⁹ “Storfurstendömet Finlands Ständer, hvilka, samlade till landtdag, representera finska folket, utgöras af Ridderskapet och Adeln, Presteståndet, Borgareståndet och Bondeståndet”; “Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaan Waltiosäädyt, jotka, kokoutuneina waltiopäiwille, edustawat Suomen kansaa, owat Ritaristo ja Aateli, Pappissäätty, Porwarissäätty ja Talonpojansäätty”. (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869, § 1)

(Grundlags-utskott 1871 [1867], 31–32) The statement illustrated also the Snellmanian ideas of the national spirit and recognition of the ‘best option’, whose realisation the institutions could either carry out or slow down (see Sections 3.4.3 and 5.4).

The case of imperative mandate illustrates how the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 tactically hid its models. The Riksdag Act of 1810 or the Doctrine of Principalship, commonly seen later as the origin of the free mandate in the Finnish constitution, was not acknowledged in the 1860s reform due to the Russian directives. Similarly, neither the Diet nor the Senate discussions on the Diet Act, the Constitutional Law Committee’s proposal, the Finnish histories of the Riksdag¹⁸⁰ nor the newspaper articles¹⁸¹ that contextualised the reform in relation to Swedish procedures explicated the logic and implications of imperative mandate, but merely declared the idea of representation of the people and the break with estate interests. It is apparent, however, that foreign discussions on imperative mandate were familiar to the Finnish readership of the newspaper press.

The term ‘imperative mandate’ was discussed for the first time in the Finnish press in 1846–1847 in reference to a French debate on Representative Drault’s mandate in the French Chamber of Deputies¹⁸². Special emphasis was given to François Guizot’s attack against the imperative mandate (*imperativ mandat*) and the threat the mandate posed to parliament’s deliberative character. From 1869–1870 the imperative mandate, referred to as *imperativ mandat* or *tvångsmandat* in Swedish or as *mandat impératif* in French, was defined and explained in Finnish newspaper reports on the French Radicals, starting from *Programme de Belleville* and culminating in the debates on the election law in 1874–1875.¹⁸³ The Radicals presented the imperative mandate as the only means to replace the deputies’ personal interests with the interests of the electorate (*valkorporation*). According to the Radical model, the deputies, based on a written contract on an agreed agenda, acted as the lawful delegates of their constituents (e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 3 Jan., 1872, 1). In the Eduskunta, the French discussions became a common point of reference when defending the parliament as a deliberative assembly (see Section 5.8 below). In addition, Finnish newspapers

¹⁸⁰ Palmén 1861; Nordström [1912] 1862; Rosenborg 1863.

¹⁸¹ See e.g. *Papperslyktan*, 22 Apr., 1861, 1–6; 21 May 1861, 1–5; 27 May 1861, 4–6; *Helsingin Uutiset*, 16 Apr., 1863, 2–4; 20 Apr., 1863, 2–3; *Suometar*, 5 May, 1863, 2–3; 8 May, 1863, 2–3; 12 May, 1863, 2; 15 May 1863, 2. Free mandate was also not mentioned in E. von Knorring’s summary of the valid procedures of the Finnish Diet (see *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 24 Apr., 1863, 2–3; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 25 Apr., 1863, 1–3)

¹⁸² *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 16 Sept., 1846, 1; *Helsingfors Tidningar*, 24 Feb., 1847, 4–5.

¹⁸³ The Finnish liberal press followed with interest Victor Hugo’s attempt to replace the imperative mandate with a contractual mandate (*le mandat contractuel*, *kontrakts mandat*). Hugo defined the contractual mandate as a mutually binding contract (*contrat synallagmatique*) between the electors and the elected, which created an “absolute identity of purpose and principles” between them. According to Hugo, since “conscience did not accept orders”, the contract should be freely debated and agreed. If a representative broke the contract, his resignation could be demanded from him by an honorary jury selected by lot from the Republican members who had also signed the mandate. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 6 Jan., 1872, 1; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 9 Jan., 1872, 2; for Hugo’s original declaration in French, see Hugo 1876, 26–27)

reported on disputes on the imperative mandates of other European countries, such as Spain¹⁸⁴, Turkey¹⁸⁵ and Austria-Hungary¹⁸⁶ from the 1870s to the early twentieth century.

As imperative mandate became a familiar topic in newspapers of the 1870s, the term was also adopted in the debates of the Finnish Diet. For example, in 1877 in the Nobility Thiodolf Rein argued that since the members' remuneration was paid by their constituents instead of by state funds, the dependency of members on their electors increased. For Rein, this produced a conception of the imperative mandate (*imperativ mandat*) between the two, which contradicted the principles of constitutional life. Based on § 1 of the Diet Act of 1869, the Finnish estates did not represent corporations or municipalities, but the Finnish people, and therefore it was obvious that the Finnish people should pay their representatives, not individual corporations or municipalities. According to Rein, in other constitutional states the remunerations were paid from the state treasury. This made the representatives freer in relation to their constituents.¹⁸⁷ (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 13 Feb., 1877, 1)

5.3 Demarcations between parliamentary and estate representation in the Finnish Diets

Before and after the ban on the imperative mandate and the declaration of representation of the people in the Diet Act of 1869, references to both the free parliamentary and the binding corporate mandates were stated in the Finnish discussions.

In the procedure debates, the *Dagblad* liberals were active in highlighting the members of the Diet as representatives and trustees of the people, whose work was based on *moral responsibility*. For example, in the first Diet of 1863–64 in the Clergy, liberal Dean Henrik Heikel¹⁸⁸ argued in the discussion on parliamentary publicity that members spoke in the estate as “delegates of the country” (*landets ombud*), “not only before the audience of the plenary hall, but before the Finnish fatherland as a whole” (*inför hela det finska fosterlandet*) (Clergy 1863–64, I, 25). In the Burghers in 1872 Leo Mechelin spoke of “the moral responsibility before the country” (*moraliska ansvarighet inför landet*), which was “inseparable from the vocation of the representative” (Burghers 1872, I, 42). In the Diet of 1877–78 Edvard Bergh argued that the representative's task was a vocation built on trust and responsibility. He emphasised the importance of “the feeling of

¹⁸⁴ E.g. *Morgonbladet*, 10 Mar., 1873, 3; 16 Apr., 1873, 3; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 19 May, 1873, 3.

¹⁸⁵ E.g. *Morgonbladet*, 29 Dec., 1876, 3; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 29 Dec., 1876, 1.

¹⁸⁶ E.g. *Nya Pressen*, 10 Apr., 1884, 4.

¹⁸⁷ Rein's argument was plausible in view of the fact that in Finland during the Age of Liberty, for example, remuneration of the elected members of the Peasantry resulted in their being treated like personal advocates (Paloposki 1961, 399–401).

¹⁸⁸ Henrik Heikel (1808–1867), a vicar, a former teacher and principal, was a prominent liberal figure in the Diets of 1863–64 and 1867. Heikel pushed and spoke for liberal reforms in the Clergy together with Frans Ludvig Schauman. (Tiensuu 2001)

responsibility" (*den känsla av ansvarighet*), which each member of the Diet "has to foster as a representative of the Finnish people" (*bör hysa såsom en representant för det finska folket*). (Burghers 1877–1878, I, 177)

Although all political groups seemed to renounce imperative mandates in principle, the estate model of representation based on binding instructions, typical of the old estate diets, was manifested especially in the Peasants. For example, in the first Diet of 1863–64 Pehr Edvard Östring invoked the decisions of his electors' meeting to defend his proposals for the estate. According to Östring, his electors (*valitsijamieheni*) had unanimously ordered him to propose petitions for regular diet meetings of the diet with the right to introduce motions, ministerial responsibility (*ministerillistä edes-wastausta*) and so on (Peasants 1863–64, I, 66–67). The vocabulary of the old estate model was used most actively in the Peasants. For example, in 1882 in a discussion on printing of the estate's minutes, Daniel Edward Duncker stated that the electors had the right to know how their representative (*edustaja*) had pleaded their case (*ajaa asiaa*) (Peasants 1882, II, 1141).

However, especially from the Diet of 1877–78 onwards, references to representatives of the people became increasingly popular also in the Peasants and in the Clergy, where members of the academy were also represented. The representatives were described as speaking as "deputies of the general public" (*allmänhetens sakförare*) and "on behalf of the people" (*fört folkets talan*) (Clergy 1877–78, I, 435–437, 450). Regardless of the four-estate system, "the members sat in the estate plenaries not to represent the estate, but the Finnish people as a whole". (Clergy 1877–78, I, 452)

The Fennoman newspaper *Morgonbladet* gave the publicity of the Diet the task of enabling the educated public to participate and contribute to the Diet work through giving local information on questions (*Morgonbladet*, 18 Nov., 1873, 1; for a closer examination, see Section 8.7). *Dagblad* liberals and Svecomans regarded elections as the proper place for mutual communication between the representatives and the represented. The elections were the primary occasions in which the representatives and the represented could discuss their matters of interest. For example, in 1885 *Åbo Tidning* (10 Jan., 1885, 1–2), a Svecoman newspaper edited by prominent (ex-)liberal Ernst Rönnbäck, argued that the idea of a representative of the people (*folkrepresentant*) required electors to discuss, before elections, what kinds of questions they wanted to be presented at the estate meetings and what kinds of conduct they wished from their representatives. At the same time, the candidates were to be given the possibility to publicly state their opinions on these questions. Thus, the electors were given a possibility for making informed decisions. However, the representatives were not in any sense bound by the instructions or opinions of their electors, but they should strive to represent the people and its interest. (*ibid.*; for similar argumentation, see Mill 2001 [1861], 228–229)

5.4 Fennomans and *Dagblad* liberals on representation, corporatist interests and parties

Snellman's abstract views on national spirit and public opinion saw the forms of representation as secondary. Regarding electoral representation, Snellman noted in *Läran om staten* that in most European states only a relatively small part of the people had the right to vote and that these few hardly knew the persons they elected. (Snellman 1842, 373–375) Snellman argued that the people's participation in legislation was insignificant as such and benefitted the laws of the state only a little. For Snellman, the more democratic forms a system of government had, the smaller was each individual's political influence and the more uncertain it was that this influence would be focused on laws. However, this was all irrelevant when it came to the value of political freedom, which raised the consciousness of the nation, regardless of whether it was exercised or not. (ibid. 377–378)

Following these ideas, Snellman saw the reforms of Finnish estate representation as rather irrelevant. He argued that if the aim was to distribute political rights to as many people as possible, unlimited candidate eligibility rather than expanding suffrage was more efficient. For Snellman, the only good argument for expansion of suffrage was that it symbolically gave birth to and sustained a consciousness of political freedom of the nation. If elections were to be used to produce a clear expression of the will of the nation (*nationalvilja*) and to give the individuals the impression that they had an influence, popular elections seemed to have the opposite effect. (Snellman 1842, 382–383)

Snellman saw corporations as no hindrance to the representation of the nation. According to him, in a popular election the educated part of the people did not get their voices heard. As a result, suffrage was considered unimportant as the electors could not push their own opinions through into laws. Snellman noted that if suffrage was divided according to estates, and if the farmers (*jordbrukare*), burghers (*borgare*) and officials (*embetsmän*) elected among themselves (*välja för sig*), then the electors would be closer to each other in terms of their educational levels, have more attention paid to their opinions, and consequently be more interested in elections. The right to run for office was to be based on the same estate division. The right to vote could be given to every male of age, if an additional class or estate of hired workers and servants would be formed. For Snellman, the most capable and educated were to be given the widest possible representation in a legislative assembly (Snellman 1842, 382–383; see Section 5.6 below)

Snellman responded to the common critique according to which estate representation represented partial interests. He argued that a legislative assembly that was based on estate representation, in fact, represented the interests of the nation. "If the interests of the workers, the primary producers, the manufacturers and the officials were represented, which interest would then be forgotten?", he asked. (Snellman 1842, 382–383) Snellman defended estate representa-

tion in his later texts and even later when calling representation based on profession obsolete, he never created a model to replace it (see Pulkkinen 1989, 19). It is illustrative of his views that in his commentaries on the January Committee of 1862, for example, and in the beginning of the Diet work in the early 1860s, Snellman saw the forms and procedures of representation as secondary compared to the need to reach concrete results and make swift reforms (Snellman 1861a). Snellman's stands on political reform were relative to his views on historical development. His ideas were reflected in some Fennoman stands on parliamentary reform, which emphasised adapting to the existing laws and circumstances (e.g. *Suometar*, 3 July, 1863, 1) and the need to first reach a sufficient level of maturity of the people and a phase of favourable conditions in the historical progress (e.g. Rein 1885).

In Snellman's estate model of representation, the estate division was not a hindrance to the Diet work. In the best cases, a thorough discussion of the matters already takes place in the publicity before the official estate readings and reveals what is best for the nation. In the Diet, in Hegelian terms, the general would rise above the particular interests that the estates represented. The *Dagblad* liberals, on the contrary, saw the Diet as the main arena for debating the questions important to the nation. According to them, only the Diet had the right to speak in the name of the people, not any corporation, estate, newspaper or party (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 6 July, 1863, 1). *Dagbladists* saw the estate division as a hindrance to parliamentary style of deliberation. They argued that the Diet reading, which divided deliberation on questions into four separate plenary debates in four separate session halls, protected the corporate interests from a many-sided and thorough evaluation and examination. Only through a clash of opinions and arguments in a debate *pro et contra* could the goal of the common good be approached. (See Chapter 6)

In the daily politics of the Fennoman movement of the 1870s, Snellman receded into the background and Yrjö Koskinen's role became increasingly central. Koskinen based his political thought on the same Hegelian foundation as Snellman (Liikanen 1995, 133). Drawing on Snellman, Koskinen's Fennoman faction began to advocate reforms for Finnish-language education and invoked 'the will of the people'. Koskinen's *Uusi Suometar* sought to spread its circulation beyond the intelligentsia, especially among the land-owning peasantry. (Virtanen 2001, 91–92) Whereas Snellman rejected the idea of the majority of the people as the source of power and its legitimator, emphasised the need to limit the people's influence in representation, referred to abstract philosophical notions and did not use the concept of 'the will of the people', Koskinen and his followers replaced Snellman's concept of 'national spirit' with the concrete 'people' (Liikanen 2003, 276–277). In Snellman's texts 'the people' had not primarily been a political actor, but a cultural concept (Rantala 2013, 151–152).

It is notable that the idea of defining the Finnish people as a political and legal actor, especially in relation to the emperor was, not solely a product of, or material for, Fennoman history writing, but was adopted by the Svecoman and liberal actors as well (Liikanen 2003, 278–279). However, whereas Koskinen de-

scribed the (common) people as a central source for political power, for the *Dagblad* liberals the idea of the Diet as representative of the people did not signify that politics should be based on the will of the majority of the people. From the Millian viewpoint adopted by the *Dagblad* liberals, policies and the common good were to be *debated* by the most capable and educated members of the people (see Section 5.6 below). For the liberals, the point was to strengthen Finland's constitutional status and to establish 'the Finnish people' as a juridical subject in relation to the emperor (Liikanen 2003, 280–282). The Diet Act of 1869 confirmed the principles of free mandate and the representation of the people, but the forms of representation, parliamentary style and procedures based on which the interests of the people as a whole were to be found out continued to be disputed.

The parliamentary theory of the leading *Dagblad* liberals did not oppose parties as such or see them as a harmful force dividing the nation (cf. Liikanen 2003; Aarnio 2003), but, especially towards the publication of the Liberal Party Programme in 1880, the liberals emphasised parties as a necessary part of parliamentary politics (see e.g. Mechelin 1879). The *Dagblad* liberals' party critique was aimed against Yrjö Koskinen's Fennomans' rhetoric of a single party as representative of the interest of the people. Or, as Vares (2000, 23) has noted, Fennomania was not supposed to be a party, but the Finnish people were supposed to be the Fennomans. Snellman and Koskinen both saw all parties as harmful, that is, except for the Finnish Party (Liikanen 1995, 133). The *Dagblad* liberals' attitude towards parliamentary parties and the Liberal Party Programme resulted in protecting the Fennomans' party monopoly. From the late 1870s on, Koskinen condemned attempts to challenge the Fennomans' exclusive right to speak for the Finnish people, and tried to protect the movement from internal disintegration (Aarnio 2003, 424–425). The *Dagblad* liberals' view of parliamentary parties was shared in part by such Fennomans as E. G. Palmén, who also cooperated with the *Dagblad* group in some of the procedure debates (Aarnio 2003, 427–429; see Chapters 7 and 8). In 1878 Palmén argued that factions within the Finnish Party would only benefit the Fennomans' cause. If forced into unity, the party would only suffer from the "excessive fervour" of certain individuals. (Palmén 1878, 271) In addition, Palmén (1878) saw parties as a necessary step towards parliamentarism in Finland.

The aversion towards dissensus and political factions that *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, Snellman and his Fennomans' followers expressed in their press polemics of the 1860s was also manifested in the Diets in relation to party strife. The Fennomans emphasised national unity and aimed at disposing of parties outside the language question. A central feature of their rhetoric was portrayal of the threats and nuisances of party politics in foreign countries. In contrast, Leo Mechelin, the most prominent liberal member of the Diet, wrote an article in 1879 titled "The Political Parties" (*De politiska partierna*), in which he not only argued for the necessity of parties, but also explicated the *Dagblad* liberals' idea of debate transposed to and upheld in the parliamentary context.

In the article, Mechelin noted that political parties were found in all states with representative forms of government. According to him, political parties were a means to fight political questions with the weapon of words (*ordets vapen*) at the ballot box, in the press and on the speaking rostrum, instead of with fire and sword in a battlefield. Mechelin saw party formation and disputes as normal symptoms of freely pulsating political life. (Mechelin 1879, 116) He admitted parties could be abused as damaging and immoral means for politics. Personal ambition and lust for power could lead to party dictatorship (*partidiktaturer*), to party discipline (*partidisciplinen*), which was incompatible with the idea of an independent representative. If disputes became embittered to the level of party hatred (*partihat*), opponents saw each other as enemies and the aim of defeating the opponent became more defining than the desire to benefit the fatherland and the common good (*det allmänna bästa*). However, Mechelin saw that political parties were not at best a necessary evil, as was often seen in the Finnish discussions, but in fact, parties and their competition benefitted a country's political development by overcoming one-sidedness, abuse and exaggeration. A healthy and regulated competition could spur strengths and capacities (*sporrar krafterna*), contribute to raising the level of political pursuits (*bidrager att gifva sträfvandena högre lyftning*) and force participants to clearly and carefully examine what they were fighting for. (ibid. 118–119)

Mechelin understood the parliament (*parlament*) as an arena of debate where political and party disputes could be treated and regulated according to enacted procedures. The parliamentary mode of proceeding was to encourage dissensus, but at the same time offer rules on speech, debate and readings in order to secure many-sided deliberation. Mechelin argued that in parliament political strife took place according to law. The law itself could always be changed, but only in compliance with the order and procedures enacted in the law. (Mechelin 1879, 116–117) Mechelin understood the political aspect of procedure. Parliamentary procedures are contestable and open for debate. The rules define the character of parliamentary readings, but at the same time they can be changed and revised.

According to Mechelin, in parliaments, where representatives of the people took part in important public matters, different opinions collided with each other (*bryta sig de olika meningarne mot hvarandra*) and parties tested their strengths against each other. (Mechelin 1879, 116–117) Mechelin saw disagreement in political questions as natural and argued that it was false to expect unanimity (*enhällighet*) to be reached through persuasion in a debate.¹⁸⁹ On the contrary, debate in a representative assembly often clarified and intensified the divergence in opinions. This led necessarily to factions that reflected opposing standpoints (*gruppering efter motsatta synpunkter*) (ibid. 119). Mechelin explicated the perspectivism, which the *Dagblad* liberals underlined in the parliamentary context. He stated that “there is no absolute truth, no absolute wisdom in politics; new opinions and ideas occur constantly, new proposals become defining

¹⁸⁹ Mechelin argued that political disagreements were the result of differences in upbringing, experience, occupation and worldview (Mechelin 1879, 119–20).

or are rejected.”¹⁹⁰ Here, Mechelin typified the *Dagblad* liberals’ indifference to final truths in politics, which had been such major theoretical preoccupations of Snellman and Guizot. Mechelin saw that in parliaments the superiority of an argument was defined not based on its truthfulness and rationality, but primarily in numbers after a thorough and fair debate *pro et contra*. In parliaments victories and defeats were measured in votes (*ur omröstningarne framgår seger eller nederlag*). In this respect, the disputes in the press and election meetings were only preparatory. Although the same questions were discussed within and outside parliament, in parliament the struggle was a competition for power (*täflan om magt*), while in the press it was a competition for influence on the (public) opinion (*om inflytande på opinionen*). (ibid. 116, 120) Mechelin’s view on parliamentary politics shared Mill’s idea where deliberation was not aimed at reaching a consensus by burying dissent. Deliberation was about reaching decisions, but the decisions did not imply consensus. (See Urbinati 2002, 3–4)

Mechelin warned about the use of binding party mandates, a topic that caused heated dispute some 25 years later in the Eduskunta. He defined political parties as free associations based on a similarity of opinions (*en fri association på grundvalen af likstämmighet i åsigter*). For Mechelin, to follow a party leader’s positions at the expense of one’s duty to independently think and weigh up alternatives (*själfständigt tänka och pröfva*) was a mistake that could only be explained by party hatred. In such cases the common good, which the parties were to strive for, could only lose. (Mechelin 1879, 119)

5.5 The Diet and the Eduskunta as parts of parliamentary history – from presentation of private interests to representation of the common good

In Finland, presentations on the historical development of parliaments were used as method for producing what Mill referred to as ‘constitutional morality’. Such parliamentary histories highlighted the transition from old diets with imperative mandates to modern parliaments with free mandates.

In the late nineteenth century, the Diet of four estates was increasingly seen as out-dated in Finland. Regardless of the reforms on franchise and candidate eligibility, the estate division was not seen as corresponding to the character of the Finnish people and the structure of society. Reforms based on the bicameral model were discussed in Finland in the 1860s and especially from the 1880s on (Pohjantammi 2003, 381–382). In principle, both the Fennomans (especially the Young Finns and the *Valvoja* group) and the *Dagblad* liberals worked to bend and overcome the limitations of the estate system and the social and political hierarchy it represented (Liikanen 1995, 122). As Thiodolf Rein put it in 1885 in *Valvoja* (Rein 1885, 421–433), the four-estate division did not correspond

¹⁹⁰ “Den absoluta sanningen, den absoluta klokheten finnas ej i politiken; ständigt uppstiga nya meningar, nya förslag för att göra sig gällande eller förkastas.” (Mechelin 1879, 116)

to the divisions of labour and interests it had originally represented — the names of the estates had turned into anachronisms and the Diet was not a reflection of the society anymore (*peilikuva koko yhteiskunnasta ja sen toiminnan päämuodoista*). (Rein 1885, 427–429)

The estate model was reflected in the procedures of the Diet. Albeit estate interests were rejected in the Diet Act of 1869, the procedures of the Diet followed a negotiation model until the Parliamentary Reform of 1906. The estates discussed and voted separately and, based on § 67 of the Diet Act, in the absence of sufficient consensus, decisions could be sent multiple times back to joint committees for adjustment and negotiation before reconsideration in the estates. Especially the *Dagblad* liberals problematised the estate system in terms of its inhibition of the parliamentary style of deliberation. (See Chapter 6)

The desire for a proper parliament was reflected in Finnish historical accounts of parliaments. Whereas in the 1860s public commentaries on the Diet Act, the procedures were described as mere byproducts of historical circumstances and the Swedish tradition, discussions closer to the end of the century were linking Finland more explicitly to foreign parliamentary histories. The idea was to create contexts for procedural reforms by discussing what was possible and desirable and to influence the establishment of Finnish practices. As a result, a growing variety of foreign parliaments was examined, above all, in the newspaper press.

In 1876 Leo Mechelin wrote on the question of whether estate representation was still valid in Finland. According to him, estate representation (*ståndsrepresentation*) was originally, in a strict sense, something else than the representation of the people as a whole (*en hela folkets representation*). In estate representation each estate was entitled to speak for their particular interests. Based on this notion of representation, estate interests were decisive both within the individual estates as well as in the general treatment of questions (*de gemensamma ärendenas behandling*). Estate representation signified that each estate represented (*företräda*) a homogenous class (*en homogen klass*), a clearly narrowed and closed group of the nation (*en tydligen begränsad och utåt sluten grupp af nationen*). This was predicated on the existence of political privileges (*politiska privilegier*), which conferred on certain classes or corporations the right of representation, while others were excluded. (Mechelin 1876, 156–157) According to Mechelin, such a system could be found in the Swedish sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Riksdags and in earlier German states. The estates of the realm acted unfairly and unpatriotically when they compromised the well-being of the state and the whole (*äfventyrade statens, det helas väl*) through introduction of envy and feud. (ibid. 157) Mechelin noted that § 1 of the Diet Act of 1869 stated that the estates, convened in the Diet, represented the Finnish people. This meant that the estates were not entitled to defend the interests of separate estates, but that they both individually and collectively (*hvar för sig och gemensamt*) looked after the interest of the people as a whole (*bevaka och iakttaga hela folkets intressen*). Mechelin stressed that an estates' decision was not a decision on be-

half of the estates, but on behalf of the nation. He noted that promoting estate interests was thus contrary to the constitution (*grundlagstridigt*). (ibid.)

During the Parliamentary Reform of 1906 and the early Eduskunta, Finnish authors described parliamentary history as following a direct course with distinct phases of development. In this, the mandate played an essential role. Renouncing the obsolete practices, the Finnish authors who wrote on parliaments presented a distinction between diet system that was based on imperative mandates and local, private and estate interests, versus parliaments in which the free mandate had been introduced. These accounts were based on examples from the British, French and Swedish discussions and used authorities such as William Blackstone (1765), Thomas Smith (1583) and Pontus Fahlbeck (1904). According to the Finnish authors, imperative mandates, that is, in which “the principals gave binding orders to their delegates”, “made private interests defining at the expense of the common good”, signified the “authority of the unaccountable”, represented “obsolete practices of the past” and “the childhood of parliaments”, and “posed a major threat to modern parliamentary systems”. Finnish authors traced the rejection of the imperative mandate to Medieval England, the French Revolution and the Swedish Age of Liberty, of which the latter was named as the constitutional model for the Finnish tradition of the free mandate. (E.g. *Hufoudstadsbladet*, 22 Feb., 1905, 2–3; Schybergson, 1906, 1–2; *Östra Finland*, 10 July, 1906, 2; Rein 1908; *Wiipuri*, 14 Apr., 1907, 2; 15 July, 1910, 1; *Uusi Suometar*, 9 Dec., 1910, 2)

In the context of the Parliamentary Reform of 1906, the charge against the imperative mandate was led by the Swedish-speaking elite, mainly of the Swedish Party, which sought to spread its version of the ‘constitutional morality’. It is notable that these accounts did not yet discuss the parliament’s deliberative character *per se*. The emphasis was on representation and mechanics by which the influence of the uneducated masses, occasional majorities and mass parties could be restrained. These accounts confined deliberation to the idea of finding the existing ‘best option’, which stood in a clear contrast to the dissensual *pro et contra* debate highlighted earlier by the *Dagblad* liberals. During the Parliamentary Reform, Professor of History at the University of Helsinki M. G. Schybergson participated in the discussion by writing and lecturing on parliamentary history from an international and historical perspective (Schybergson 1906; on his public lectures held in Helsinki and Turku, see *Åbo Underrättelser*, 17 Dec., 1905, 2–3). Schybergson (1906) noted that the modern representative body stood, more than any other institution, for guarding the common good (*yhteishyvä*), that was, the state interest. Schybergson reminded the reader that modern representation was born from feudalism, which had been the system of private interests *par excellence*. Using the British case as an example, Schybergson described how personal participation had become impossible as representation had expanded and people had begun to oversee their interests through representatives (*asiamies*). The medieval estate system was based on the protection of individual interests, and the common good (*yleinen etu*) was rarely discussed. The delegates were bound to the will of their principals (*päämies*) by instruc-

tions and orders, by imperative mandates (*imperatiivinen mandaatti*). As a result, the delegates were not able to act for the common good (*yhteinen hyvä*). For Schybergson, the unfortunate result of the imperative mandate could be seen in many countries. For example, the weakness and final downfall of Poland, whose situation was closely followed in Finland, was a result of sticking to the medieval practice of pushing private interests at the expense of the common good, and of using the *liberum veto*, which was based on the imperative mandate. (Schybergson 1906, 1–2)

Schybergson referred to William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England* in order to emphasise the role of parliament in fostering the common good instead of the private interest:

And every member, though chosen by one particular district, when elected and returned serves for the whole realm. For the end of his coming thither is not particular, but general; not barely to advantage his constituents, but the *common* wealth. (Blackstone 1765, 155; Schybergson 1906, 3) and therefore he (member) is not bound [...] to consult with, or to take the advice, of his constituents upon any particular point, unless he himself thinks it proper or prudent so to do. (Blackstone 1765, 155)

Before the Parliamentary Reform, the Swedish Party newspaper *Hufvudstadsbladet* published a large volume of articles that celebrated the special character of the Swedish parliamentary tradition and its importance to the Finnish practices. The newspaper used the Swedish model particularly in order to support bicameralism against the threat of a 'non-regulated majority rule'. *Hufvudstadsbladet* published excerpts from Swedish political scientist and conservative politician Pontus Fahlbeck's *Sveriges författning och den moderna parlamentarismen* (1904)¹⁹¹ and used it as an authority in tying the Finnish and Swedish procedures together. In reference to Fahlbeck, *Hufvudstadsbladet* warned about the dangers that sovereignty of the people (*folksuveränitet*) could produce unless properly counterbalanced during the era of the 'majority cult'. According to *Hufvudstadsbladet*, imperative mandate, "the authority of the unaccountable", the voter's demand for the elected to follow his expressed will, posed a major threat to the parliamentary system. (*Hufvudstadsbladet*, 22 Feb., 1905, 2–3) In the same vein, the Swedish Party newspaper *Östra Finland* argued, again referring to Fahlbeck, that the imperative mandate belonged to the era of the estate meetings, when representation's primary task was to present the estates' wishes and complaints in front of the monarch. *Östra Finland* noted that the ongoing resurrection of the imperative mandate signified a return to the obsolete practices of the past. (*Östra Finland*, 10 July, 1906, 2)

In the Parliamentary Reform of 1906, representation of the people and the free mandate were adopted from the Diet Act of 1869 and incorporated into the new Parliament Act as part of an already-established Finnish parliamentary tradition. In the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–1906, section 9 of the

¹⁹¹ The book was sold in Finland and *Finsk Tidskrift* published a review and summary of it (see Furuhjelm 1906a; 1906b). *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift*, a Swedish political science journal, in which Fahlbeck published regularly, was followed and referred to in Finland.

Parliament Act, according to which “a representative is obliged to follow justice and truth in his or her office” and “he or she shall abide by the Constitution and no other orders are binding on him or her”¹⁹² was hardly discussed at all.¹⁹³ The Committee passed it over in the proposal’s justifications (Eduskuntakomitea 1906b). The Committee included “justice” and “truth” in the section in order to clarify the rejection of the imperative mandate, and not to strengthen the immunity of representatives, as for example Mylly (2006, 155) has suggested. This was also noted by the Constitutional Law Committee of the Diet of 1905–1906, which in its report on the Parliament Act, by referring to the Swedish Riksdag Acts of 1810 and 1865 as well as the Doctrine of Principalship, justified section 9 with the idea that representatives should not be bound by orders from their electors (Perustuslakivaliokunta 1906, 16). According to § 1 of the Parliament Act of 1906 “the Eduskunta represents the people of Finland” (Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaan Valtioapäiväjärjestys 1906). The Parliament Act’s sections 1 and 9 have remained in the Eduskunta’s procedures up to the present, that is, including the Constitution of 1999 (Suomen perustuslaki 1999, § 29).

It is notable that by the decision of the Parliamentary Reform Committee, ‘member of the Diet/parliament’ (*valtiopäivämies*) was replaced with ‘representative’ (*edustaja*) in the constitution and the Eduskunta’s procedures (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 30 Dec., 1905). This change can be seen as stressing members’ representative character at the cost of the deliberative. In the early Eduskunta the defenders of free mandate often used the term “representative of the people” (*kansanedustaja*) in order to emphasise the representative’s responsibilities over the interests of the people as a whole. Similarly, in the 1860s the term *kansan-edustaja* was used to describe a trustee of the people (Pohjantammi 2003, 369). Based on word searches in the Newspaper Library, the term *kansanedustaja* became more commonly used from 1879 and the early 1880s on (for other vocabulary of the representative, see Pohjantammi 2003, 366–369).

5.6 The elitist notion of representation

The argumentation presented above and its emphasis on the common good was put forth in order to protect parliamentary work from what was seen as the negative side effects of democratisation. The idea of limiting the influence of the uneducated was in no sense a product of the Parliamentary Reform in Finland, but had been presented by *Dagblad* liberals and Fennomans as well as the authors they were indebted to.

¹⁹² Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaan Valtioapäiväjärjestys 1906, § 9.

¹⁹³ When debating § 9 in the Reform Committee, Emil Schybergson, younger brother of M. G., noted that a representative should be bound by all laws of Finland, not only the Constitution. Committee Chairman Robert Hermanson noted vaguely that the section should be kept as it was in the Diet Act and that its practice, which was based on Swedish law, had taught how to properly interpret it. (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 5 Jan., 1906)

In *Läran om staten* Snellman argued that legislation and separation of powers required a substantial level of education from the representatives and the nation. For him, participation in the legislation required always a certain level of education, ability, knowledge, love of country and good morals. (Snellman 1842, 382) Snellman argued, based on an overview of the European states, that only a very small portion of the population was able to and did take part in legislation. Thus, the election of representatives was the only means for participation. Elections were also the only means to further the sensible aim of electing the nation's most notable and prominent members as its legislators. (ibid. 373–375) According to Snellman, the legislator was to have a good understanding of the laws of the fatherland in order to distinguish a beneficial law from a harmful. Whereas an individual could easily decide what was right in an individual case based on law and justice, legislation required “the creation of a general rule (*en allmän regel*) and knowledge of the manifold conditions, which constructed the political and civic life of the whole nation”. Snellman saw that if the nation elected those members who were most noted for their patriotism and capabilities, it could be assumed that the laws would better correspond to the nation's needs and be closer to its will. (ibid. 369–371)

Snellman noted, citing Alexis de Tocqueville's *De la Démocratie en Amérique II* (2009 [1840], Chapitre V, 24), that although the lower classes of the society thought less of self-interest in pursuing the best interest of the country than did the higher classes, they lacked the capability to assess various means for reaching the common goal, for they did not have time or opportunities to put one's mind into the long-term examination of issues. The assessments of the masses were immature and rash and were based only on the most superficial aspects. (Snellman 1842, 376–377)

Also Mill gave high standards for representatives in *Considerations on Representative Government*. According to Mill (2001 [1861], 221), there were two essential requisites of government. The first one was responsibility towards those for whose benefit political power was supposed to be employed. The second was to obtain “the benefits of superior intellect, trained by long meditation and practical discipline”. This was a central argument for the trustee model Mill advocated. Mill argued that electors should not consider party or class interests when voting, but choose the ablest men, that is, representatives who were more highly educated and wiser than themselves. The institutions of the country were to give more weight to the opinions of a more educated class than those of the less educated. Mill noted that “superior powers of mind and profound study” were occasionally in conflict with conclusions “formed by ordinary powers of mind without study”. Thus, electors did not do wisely if they insisted on absolute conformity to their own opinions as a condition for gaining the representative's seat. (ibid. 221–222, 225) Mill argued, emphasising his notion of constitutional morality, that:

Individuals, and peoples, who are acutely sensible of the value of superior wisdom, are likely to recognise it, where it exists, by other signs than thinking exactly as they do, and even in spite of considerable differences of opinion: and when they have recognised it they will be far too desirous to secure it, at any admissible cost, to be prone

to impose their own opinion as a law upon persons whom they look up to as wiser than themselves. (Mill 2001 [1861], 224)

According to Mill, if the electors adopted an attitude that looked up to no one and thought that no other person's opinions were better than their own, they would then elect no representative who did not seem to be the image of their own sentiments. This resulted in a situation where candidates began adapting and fashioning themselves after the model of the *demos*. For Mill, democracy had the tendency to cast the electors' sentiments into this mould. (Mill 2001 [1861], 225) He warned about the dangers of grounding representation in the demand for similarity between the representatives and the represented, or in Frank Ankersmit's terms, in the model of mimetic representation (see Ankersmit 1996).

For Mill, a central criterion for election of a representative should be the manner in which the candidates had performed in important posts and public services. Electors were to study how the candidates, in public speech and print, had discussed and displayed a serious study of public affairs.¹⁹⁴ In addition, electors were entitled to know how their representatives meant to act and what opinions on public duty were to guide their conduct. In clashes of opinion between the representative and the elector, the representative, as "a man of conscience and known ability", "should insist on full freedom to act as he in his own judgement deems best; and should not consent to serve on any other terms." The representative was to be able to step outside of the representation of individual opinions and represent in place of them the national interests. (Mill 2001 [1861], 228–229; see Section 8.7.6)

The idea of responsible representatives of high character was adopted in the Finnish discussions. Before the first Diet of 1863–64, Yrjö Koskinen's Fenoman newspaper *Helsingin Uutiset* used Millian and Burkean argumentation and vocabulary on the character of parliamentary work and representation. In an article series on the fundamentals of representative assemblies (*eduslaitos*) and the Finnish Diet, *Helsingin Uutiset* (16 Apr., 1863, 2), argued that a parliament, in which the people elected the most intellectual and right-minded (*tiedellisimmät ja järkewimmät*), protected the interest of the people (*walwoo kansan etuja*) (*Helsingin Uutiset*, 13 Apr., 1863, 3). *Helsingin Uutiset* noted that parliamentary work required a great amount of skill, knowledge and understanding; however, even those unable to use such power (*harjoittaa waltaa*) could choose a satisfactory representative (*kelwollisen edusmiehen*) who had a strong sense of responsibility (*wäkwämpi edeswastauksen-tunto*). According to the newspaper, representatives saw themselves as trustees (*luottamusmies*), i.e. entrusted to wield power on behalf of others and expected to weigh their votes in the parliament according to their best understanding (*punnitsee paraan ymmärryksensä mukaan annettawan äänensä*). (*Helsingin Uutiset*, 16 Apr., 1863, 2) *Helsingin Uutiset*

¹⁹⁴ In view of candidates who had not yet had the possibility to prove their abilities, the best criterion for voting them was their reputation for ability among those who personally knew them. In addition, the confidence and recommendations of other esteemed figures were to be taken into account. (Mill 2001 [1861], 226–227)

cited Rousseau's statement about liberty and elections in England: "The people of England regards itself as free; but it is grossly mistaken; it is free only during the election of members of parliament. As soon as they are elected, slavery overtakes it, and it is nothing."¹⁹⁵ (*Helsingin Uutiset*, 13 Apr. 1863, 3; Rousseau 1782 [1762], III, Ch. 15) The newspaper disagreed with Rousseau's claim and noted that the English people had kept their freedom without slavery by entrusting their powers to elected representatives. (*Helsingin Uutiset*, 13 Apr. 1863, 3)

Although Koskinen began strongly invoking the will of the majority of the people in the 1870s, it did not push aside his elitist notion of the representative. Koskinen's references to the people and its will were aimed for the Helsinki-focused political debates, while his rhetoric aimed at the countryside emphasised the requirement to educate the people and raise the national spirit. This dualism served the power ambitions of the Fennoman intelligentsia. (Liikanen 2003, 287)

The *Dagblad* liberals, who actively highlighted the Finnish system as one of "representation of the people" (*folkrepresentation*), in the vein of the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865, adopted Mill's arguments in their discussions on representation. In 1865 *Helsingfors Dagblad* commented on the work of the Committee and criticised the Finnish system of representation. For *Dagblad*, restrictions on suffrage based on the four-estate division and place of residence were obsolete and hindered the election of best of the nation (*nationens bästa krafter*), who had the trust and support of the whole nation and could enforce its opinions and interests. According to the *Dagblad*, the electors and constituency associations were to have the right to choose anyone they had confidence in (*hafva förtroende till*) regardless of the electors' class, estate and place of residence. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 25 Jan., 1865, 1; 26 Apr., 1865, 1)

Mill had presented similar arguments in *Considerations on Representative Government* in defence of Thomas Hare's theory on proportional representation. Mill supported the idea that electors in every part of the country should be allowed to vote for any candidate. According to Mill, this would better guarantee "a fair share of voices" for every opinion, since some opinions were in the minority in some areas and in the majority in others. (Mill 2001 [1861], 134) In addition, no elector would then be represented by a member whom he had not chosen. Every member would be "the representative of a unanimous constituency". If the pool of candidates was drawn from the whole country, the electors would be free to choose from a wide range of capable and intelligent members, not "merely from the assortment of two or three perhaps rotten oranges" in the local market. For Mill, such a procedure would strengthen the connection between the elector and the representative: every elector would be personally identified with his representative, and vice versa. The elector could vote for a candidate due to his abilities, character, opinions and the trust the elector

¹⁹⁵ "Le peuple Anglais pense être libre; il se trompe fort, il ne l'est que durant l'élection des membres du parlement: sitôt qu'ils sont élus, il est esclave, il n'est rien." (Rousseau 1762, 239)

placed in him. The system would also compel the majorities to look out for members of much higher calibre, and the intellectual standards of the parliament would rise. This would result in better government. (ibid. 140, 142)

Dagblad continued drawing on arguments similar to Mill's. According to *Dagblad*, among eligible candidates there have always existed persons unable to fulfil the duty of the representative for the benefit of the country. The newspaper noted that within a constituency there could be two candidates of high quality, of which only one could be elected to the Diet. As a result of the restrictions, a worse candidate could be elected and the nation's best forces (*bästa krafter*) excluded. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 25 Jan., 1865, 1; 26 Apr., 1865, 1)

Fear about the ignorant masses and their use of imperative mandates were discussed in the Finnish press also through foreign examples. In 1870 *Hufvudstadsbladet* (14 May, 1870, 1) wrote about the West European "struggle between the monarch and the republic", noting that in France the principles of 1789 could be soon transformed into reality. The newspaper found it almost comical how in France there was an anxious need to preserve the French farmer's sovereign legislative power, even though the farmer himself gave no value to it at all. *Hufvudstadsbladet* noted that while even the ignorant possessed the right to have a voice in society's most important concerns and to designate those men whose judgment he had confidence in, luckily, the trustees (*förtroendemän*) still had to comply more with their opponents' reasons and evidence than their constituents' desires and imperative mandates. Thus, the intelligent could not be trampled underfoot. (ibid.)

The idea of the Diet and the Eduskunta as institutions representing the people was used in creating the Finnish polity: the nation was built by representation based on its interest. In the late nineteenth century the conception of the people who was to be represented expanded according to who were counted as being among the active forces in society (Pohjantammi 2003, 389). However, at the same time, some were argued to be better at recognising, acknowledging and debating what was best for the nation than others.

Elitist views on representatives, which preserved a prominent role in discussions throughout the period of the Diets, emphasised representatives' personal qualities. Elitist figures of parliamentarians as trustees of the people were used in order to shape people's conceptions of the ideal representative, as well as to justify restrictions on the influence of the uneducated masses on decision-making. Such ideas were typical to the period internationally, but in Finland the arguments reflected concerns about the Finnish people's backwardness and slow political development in the European periphery. The elitist view of representatives as persons of high character was highlighted in the Parliamentary Reform Committee (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a) as well as in the early Eduskunta, particularly in relation to the Social Democrats (e.g. Willebrand 1910, 7; Wrede 1909). According to these views, the trustees not only represented what was 'the best for the nation', but in fact they were 'the best of the nation'. The concern about the power of the uneducated over the educated was prominent in the discussions on uni- and bicameralism and the procedures on the reading of the bill,

committees and sections (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a). In the early Eduskunta, the Social Democrats' delegate model challenged this elitist view of representation.

5.7 The Social Democrats' delegate model as a catalyst for disputes on imperative mandate

Even though imperative mandate was rejected as a legal principle in the Diet Act of 1869, in retrospect it is impossible to know precisely to what extent representatives still felt bound by their constituency's instructions and carried out this unconstitutional practice. In the Diets, the arguments and practices supporting the delegate model, however, were turned down by referring to § 1 and § 7 of the Diet Act and "foreign constitutions" (e.g. *Åbo Tidning*, 10 Jan., 1885, 1-2; 13 Jan., 1885, 2). The practice of imperative mandates was fought against by campaigning on their negative effects: first in view of representation, and then in the Eduskunta in relation to the parliament's deliberative character.

The imperative mandate did not become a heatedly disputed issue until the early Eduskunta, at which time the concept was taken up as a rhetorical weapon to attack the Social Democrat delegate model. The model was brought out in Finland especially during the Parliamentary Reform of 1906. After the Parliament Act had been discussed in the estates, Social Democrat Otto Ville Kuusinen commented on the principle of free mandate in the periodical *Sosialistinen Aikakauslehti*:

The relationship between the electors and the representatives [*edustajat*] will according to the new law be rather peculiar in the respect that the representatives [*edusmiehet*] are relatively little dependent on their electors. That is not an insignificant matter. The requirement of as close a relationship as possible between the electors (in other words, the people) and the representatives of the people [*kansanedustajain*] stems from the principles of democracy [*kansanvaltaisuuden periaatteista*]. There is the same relation between the cabinet and the parliament [*kabinettihallituksen ja eduskunnan kesken*] in parliamentary countries [*parlamentarisissa maissa*]. A representative is a trustee of his electors [*valitsijansa luottamusmies*], an interpreter of their opinions [*heidän mielipiteittensä tulkki*] and executor of their will [*heidän tahtonsa toimeenpanija*]. He is never allowed to act contrary to the will of his electors [*vastoin valitsijainsa tahtoa*]. And the people is, in every occasion, to oversee his actions as a representative [*valvoa hänen edusmiestoimintaansa*], and if the electors are not satisfied anymore, they should have the lawful right to immediately withdraw their trust [*ottaa luottamuksensa takaisin*] and to give his place to another [*luovuttaa hänen paikkansa toiselle*]. In Belgium such a claim seems to be included in the programme of the Social Democrats, possibly elsewhere as well. This should be sought also in Finland as otherwise we might get a similar "governing parliament" [*"hallitsevat valtiopäivät"*], that is, a parliament that does not care for the will of the electors, for which Sweden has often been infamous. (Kuusinen 1906b, 245, italics added)

Kuusinen interpreted the term 'representative of the people' to convey a close and binding relationship between the people and the representative. The Finnish Social Democrats' understanding of parliamentary work was influenced by Karl Kautsky, whose ideas were republished and translated into Finnish during

the early Eduskunta¹⁹⁶. Kautsky's concept of *Beaufragter*, which described the character of the Social Democrat MPs, was translated into Finnish as a functionary (*toimitsija*) and supervisor of the interest of the party (*puolueensa uskottumies*), who was to resign in case of conflict with the party. According to Kautsky, the MPs were not legally but factually delegates of the party, whose discipline was based – through the Social Democrat organisation – on the interests of the working class. Kautsky described the Social Democrat MPs as delegates analogous to the ones in estate systems. The difference was that Social Democrat delegates did not represent narrow local interests, but the workers at the state level. (Kautsky 2012 [1907], 133–134)

Similarly to Kautsky, the Finnish Social Democrats saw the parliamentary majority rule, delegate model of representation and universal suffrage as the most important means for social reform (Kautsky 2010 [1907], 218–223; 2012 [1907], 86, 137, 141–142; Seitkari 1958, 38). Leading Social Democrats referred to Walter Bagehot's "The English Constitution", for example, as a means to highlight parliament's powerful role in the political system (Ursin 1909a) and sought to develop the role of interpellations in the Finnish system of dualism (see Section 6.6.3). The delays in the political and social reforms and disappointment at the lack of concrete results in the Eduskunta fed an understanding of parliamentary work that was different to that of the other parties. While the Finnish Party, the Young Finnish Party and the Swedish People's Party argued that parliamentary business was about defending and discussing what was in the best interest of the nation and the people as a whole, the Social Democrat newspapers and representatives emphasised the parliament as a place where the will of the majority of the people should be realised and executed by voting. As a result, the Social Democrats often stated that the Eduskunta was to be a place for 'real work' and decision-making, not for 'idle words' and 'useless debate'. (Pekonen 2012a)

The Social Democrat delegate model emerged repeatedly in the early Eduskunta. In the plenary session of 10 September 1907, Social Democrat Representative and Deputy Speaker N. R. af Ursin argued that the representative's duty in the parliament was not to speak out what she personally thought, but what she believed the majority of the people thought (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, PTK 22/1907, 1276). In 1909, the Social Democrat newspaper *Työmies* (30 Jan., 1909, 5) argued that the voters should have the right to recall their representatives and revoke their mandate if they did not keep fulfil their election promises. Social Democrat Edvard Valpas had proposed the same procedure in the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–1906 for cases in which conflicts between the voters and the representatives appeared (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 13 Dec., 1905). Similarly, in the Eduskunta's plenary session in 1909, Social Democrat Representative Yrjö Mäkelin requested permission to give up his

¹⁹⁶ For translation of the *Erfurt Program* (1892), see Kautsky 2010 [1907]; for translation of *Der Parlamentarismus, die Volksgesetzgebung und die Sozialdemokratie* (1893), see Kautsky 2012 [1907]. The former was translated by J. K. Kari in 1899 and the latter by Erl. Aarnio in 1907.

mandate due to a conflict between him and his voters (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1909, 315). Surprisingly, the Eduskunta accepted Mäkelin's request. Mäkelin's case is exceptional in the sense that according to parliamentary procedures, in order to resign an MP must find a *suitable* excuse approved by the parliament. Mäkelin's resignation was an unconstitutional *de facto* recognition of the imperative mandate. After the early years of the Eduskunta, no similar incidents in which the parliament accepted a representative's resignation on such grounds have taken place (Hidén 2007, 62). For example, in 1912 Social Democrat Anton Kotonen asked to resign since those at his district meeting had asked him to give up his mandate since his stands in the Eduskunta "did not correspond to the expectations of his electors and the principles of Social Democracy". This request was now rejected by the Eduskunta. The question was discussed in the newspaper press and prominent Finnish jurist Rafael Erich presented his objections on the front page of *Helsingin Sanomat*. Erich gave a vast description of the free mandate principle and its implications in reference to several foreign parliaments. (Erich 1912)

The Social Democrats denial of practising the imperative mandates was belied by their detailed party platforms and election promises as well as their arguments for banning the secret ballot in the Eduskunta (see Section 8.7.7). This fuelled a rhetoric that used the concept of imperative mandate and its foreign parliamentary authority¹⁹⁷ as a tool against the idea of parties or voters as decision-makers. The rival parties argued that the Social Democrat delegate model and party discipline bound the representatives and implemented the imperative mandate. In 1908, Thiodolf Rein, at the time close to the Young Finns, reminded the Social Democrats in the newspaper *Suomalainen Kansa* that, according to the Parliament Act, representatives had to act according to what they, based on personal conviction, saw as being in the best interests of the fatherland. Representatives were not bound by electors' wishes and party platforms if they were in contradiction with the representative's duty to follow justice and truth. For Rein, the SDP's model saw representatives as party mouthpieces and instruments without an individual will (*tahdoton välikappale*). This had a negative effect on the quality of the Eduskunta since a preference was given to obedient candidates in the elections instead of to the intelligent. In order to avoid awkward conflicts of duties between party platforms and personal convictions, Rein proposed that parties should give up detailed platforms and stick to only few general aspects instead. The electors, on the other hand, were not to bind their representatives in detail and needed to remember that their representatives were in a better position to decide on questions. (Rein 1908, 2)

The Social Democrat efforts to introduce binding party mandates were also named "coercive mandates" (*pakkovaltuus*) and "shackle mandates" (*kahlevaltuus*). The Old Finn newspaper *Uusi Suometar* (17 Dec., 1910, 6) argued that

¹⁹⁷ Parliamentary concepts were eagerly adopted in the Finnish political rhetoric of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as they were seen to carry additional argumentative weight in the periphery. See e.g. Chapter 9 on parliamentary obstruction.

since representatives carried the responsibility, they also had to make the final judgement on questions discussed. Underlining the representative's role as a trustee against the socialist delegate model, the newspaper cited Burke's speech to the electors of Bristol and demanded similar parliamentary bravery from the SDP. (ibid.) *Uusi Suometar* discussed the German case that the Finnish Social Democrats followed closely and cited the ban on imperative mandates in the Constitution of the German Empire¹⁹⁸. The newspaper noted that only in the *Bundesrat* was the imperative mandate used to such an extent that only votes that were instructed by the electors were counted. The newspaper continued that the *Bundesrat* was not, however, a representative assembly of the people (*kansan edustuslaitos*) as such since the status of its members were, in Burke's terminology, more like ambassadors (*lähettiläs*) than representatives of the people (*kansanedustaja*). A representative was not the mouthpiece (*puhetorwi*) of her constituency, but a trustee (*luottamusmies*) with a free mandate (*avoim valtakirja*). (*Uusi Suometar*, 9 Dec., 1910, 2)

In the early Eduskunta, the Social Democrats did not use the term imperative mandate and turned down accusations of it. The SDP newspaper *Työ* (28 Dec., 1908, 2) named the rival parties' attacks as the latest example of the long-lived bourgeois theory to justify bourgeois parties' empty promises and false "election baits" (platforms). In 1910, the newspaper *Työmies* responded to *Uusi Suometar*'s accusations of imperative mandate by naming the latter's trustee model "a theory of platform deception" (*ohjelmapetosteoria*) and "freedom for deceit" (*pettämisvapaus*). *Työmies* noted that the alleged imperative mandate in form of detailed orders was included in some foreign Social Democrat platforms, but had not been discussed in Finland. *Työmies* remarked that the imperative mandate was not at play when electors and party organisations chose candidates who supported and promised to follow certain policies. (*Työmies*, 14 Dec., 1910, 2)

The rise of the disputes over the imperative mandate in the early Eduskunta is understandable in relation to the character of party mandates. Binding party mandates posed a notable threat to the parliament's deliberative character, compared to the binding instructions given by a relatively small and disperse group of electors in the Diets. When the mandate was given to a party organisation, the organisation could more easily impose discipline on its members to follow and execute the given programme than could a group of often anonymous electors in an electoral district. The *Programme de Belleville* and the French Radicals' contractual mandates, discussed in the Finnish newspapers, aimed to combine the two models.

¹⁹⁸ Article 29 of the constitution stated: "The members of the Diet shall be the representatives of the entire people, and shall not be bound by orders and instructions from their constituents." (Constitution of the German Empire 1871)

5.8 The Eduskunta as a deliberative assembly

While the discussions on Diet mandates had been on the question who represented whom, in the Parliamentary Reform and the early Eduskunta, the deliberative aspects of parliamentary work became disputed in a new manner. Now, free mandate was referred to highlight the Eduskunta as a deliberative assembly where representatives as trustees carried out discussions freely from different points of view before making their decisions. The Finnish debates followed the arguments of the British, Swedish and particularly French discussions in the parliamentary literature and the newspaper press.

Firstly, the Finnish arguments against imperative mandate emphasised the parliamentarians' *possibility to change their mind according to arguments presented in parliament, and to persuade and become persuaded* as an essential characteristics of deliberative assemblies. According to these views, the Eduskunta was more than the voting or negotiating assembly that the Diet had been.

In the Diet of 1904–1905 the Old Finns accused the Constitutionalists¹⁹⁹ of using the imperative mandate in the elections. According to the Old Finns' Agathon Meurman (*Uusi Suometar*, 10 Nov., 1904, 2), the Constitutionalist voters had ordered their representatives to work to abolish the unconstitutional Russian statutes or give up their mandates. According to Meurman, this kind of tactic meant that representatives would be forced to abandon their personal convictions and the principles of a 'deliberating assembly' (*neuvotteleva kokous*) would be lost. Meurman asked what the role and relevance of the assembly would be if matters were predetermined outside of it. If a representative was unable, due to the constituents' orders and his own promises, to change his mind on valid grounds, then why even discuss, negotiate or agree in the first place (*keskustella, neuvotella, sopia*)? (*Uusi Suometar*, 10 Nov., 1904, 2)

The Social Democrats' stress on the 'will of the people' and the civic unrest and political instability resulting from the Revolution of 1905 in Russia, which spread into Finland in the form of the Great Strike, were reflected in the work of the Parliamentary Reform Committee. The Committee majority, with the exception of the Social Democrat members, rejected the delegate model and underlined the importance of engaging in many-sided (*monipuolinen*), rich (*täyteläinen*), thorough (*perusteellinen*) and calm (*tyyni*) discussions (*keskustelu*), deliberation (*harkinta*), examination (*tutkiminen*), treatment (*käsittely*) and communication (*vuorovaikutus*) in the Eduskunta as a safeguard against immature (*kypsyvätön*), inconsistent (*vaihteleva*) or hasty (*hätiköity, äkkipikainen*) decisions made by occasional majorities (*satunnainen enemmistö*) (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a; 1906b). In the Committee's discussion on the election law, Robert Hermanson delivered a proposal in which he pondered the character of parliamen-

¹⁹⁹ The dispute was about whether the Diet should commence its work under the existing "illegitimate conditions" resulting from the policy of Russification in Finland. The Old Finns supported appeasement in relations with Russia while their opponents, the Constitutionalists, had called for a strike on Diet work until Tsar Nicholas II responded to the Great Petition of 1904. See also Section 9.3.

tary deliberation and criticised the idea of mimetic representation (Ankersmit 1996, 28–51):

The so-called will of the people is spoken about as if knowing it would be the only thing that the representative would have to do. There is truth and error mixed in this. It is important that the members of the Eduskunta have the trust of the citizens; if they do not, they cannot fulfil their task. It has been said that the representative should have an image of the people as a whole, but that is not enough. I do not think there is a man who can rightfully say that when examining the issues of society, no important points will be left unconsidered and incorrectly judged (*huomioon ottamatta ja oikein arvostelematta*). Every person has to deliberate (*neuvotella*) with others, to give reasons (*antaa syitä*), to listen to others' opinions (*kuunnella muitenkin mielipiteitä*), because so complicated are the issues on which the Eduskunta has to make its decisions. Thus, it should be clear that it is damaging for the people if it is peddled that only the will of the people must be followed without exception. What is the will of the people? These days, we have heard how totally opposite views have been called the will of the people, and still there are thousands who cannot relate to these opinions. And often, when a general public opinion seems to exist, it is not a result of calm and many-sided discussion (*keskustelu*) and consideration (*harkinta*). It can often happen that an opinion changes when one hears and calmly reflects upon (*tyynesti miettiä*) what has been said on the other side (*toiselta puolelta*). (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 9 Dec., 1905)

Hermanson emphasised the role of trust between voters and representatives and underlined the parliament as an arena for a debating, negotiating and deliberating interaction between opposing sides in which the members had the possibility to persuade and be persuaded. According to Hermanson, the parliament would rise above narrow standpoints and the arbitrary and fluctuating will of the public through mutual discussion and consideration.

In 1907 *Uusi Suometar* (9 Feb., 1907, 2–3) presented a similar view underlining parliament's deliberative role and the members' possibility to change their minds. The newspaper noted that imperative mandates had been forbidden as the decisions of the Eduskunta should be results of deliberation within the parliament (*eduskunnassa tapahtuwasta asian harkinnasta*), not of votes carried out in advance by opposing sides. In a system of imperative mandates, the parliament would lose its significance in the preparation (*valmistelu*), treatment (*käsittely*) and deliberation (*harkinta*) of questions. According to the newspaper, in the Eduskunta there should be room for formulation and reformulation of opinions even though they were increasingly discussed and settled in public debate. *Uusi Suometar* saw it harmful that more and more electors gave their votes to candidates who had already made up their minds. This helped the imperative mandate to gain popularity. (*ibid.*) *Uusi Suometar* defined parliamentary deliberation with the criterion that the constellations and opposing sides within the assembly should be able to change and be reshaped during and through the deliberations.

Whereas *Uusi Suometar* emphasised the natural need for party platforms and following them to some extent, Thiodolf Rein (1908) gave the representatives' personal conviction (*wakaumus*) and consideration (*harkinta*) the primary role in deliberation. Rein argued for the free mandate by noting that the representatives were given them because the citizens trusted in their knowledge, intelligence and good will and had confidence in their ability to formulate their

opinion in the interests of the nation after hearing the parliamentary debates *pro et contra* (*syineen ja vastasyineen*). For Rein the interest of the nation (*kansakunnan etu*) was not predetermined, but defined in the parliamentary process. Thus, imperative mandates would have stripped the Eduskunta's plenary and committee sessions off their true purpose. (ibid.)

The second aspect that was seen essential to deliberative assemblies was the representatives' possibility to *change their mind according to changing circumstances*. The system of imperative mandates was seen to forbid this, and disregard time as an inherent factor of parliamentary politics (see Palonen 2008, 101). In 1907 the idea was highlighted by the Finnish Party newspaper *Wiipuri*, which cited and translated Maurice Block's *Dictionnaire général de la politique's* entry on the imperative mandate (*Wiipuri*, 14 Apr., 1907, 2; Block 1884, 261). In support of the free mandate the newspaper highlighted Block's idea of the importance of thorough and mature parliamentary deliberation. Drawing on the ideas of Block, *Wiipuri* referred to the volatile times of the recent period of Russification and noted that representatives were often forced to work under changing circumstances that influenced what decisions could and should be made in the parliament. According to *Wiipuri*, the idea of detailed and binding orders presupposed that representatives either had no judgement or sense of duty and honour themselves, or that they would have to give them up during their three-year terms. Using an example of deliberation on the question of building a railroad,²⁰⁰ *Wiipuri* illustrated how sticking to a committed position could lead to a total loss in a debate. Here, the newspaper presented a parliamentary logic of negotiation. For *Wiipuri*, a wise representative was able to take a compromise position that would be advance his goal by hanging onto only the general outlines of the proposal, such as the station of departure and the terminal point, while leaving details such as other railway stops open to discussion. The imperative mandate made this kind of tactic impossible and hindered progress. *Wiipuri* emphasised the role of compromise-building: "In an assembly, the collective decision is often the result of a settlement" (*kokouksessa on yhteinen päätös usein sopimuksen tulos*). (ibid.)

One and a half year later *Vaasa* (3 Nov., 1908, 1-2), another Finnish Party newspaper, argued against the imperative mandate by again using Block's definition. The article referred to Representative Drault's case in the French Chamber of Deputies in 1846 and cited Guizot's speech, which was presented in Block's dictionary as well as in Finnish newspapers in 1846–47. Drawing on Guizot, *Vaasa* argued that the imperative mandate destroyed the principles of parliamentary life (*pakkovaltuus hävittää koko parlamenttaarisen elämän periaatteet*) as it ordered decisions to be made before discussion and deliberation (*ennen keskustelua ja harkintaa*). The power to decide was left for those who did not discuss and deliberate. The newspaper repeated Guizot's question: what was the

²⁰⁰ The example was based on a case in the Diet of 1882, in which poor deliberation tactics and the Diet procedures that were based on inter-estate negotiation and accommodation caused the fall of the whole question (see Section 6.5).

significance of discussion if the decision had already been made in advance?²⁰¹ *Vaasa* noted that the imperative mandate neglected the changing nature of circumstances under which the representatives were forced to work. According to *Vaasa*, in Finland platforms had been interpreted “word for word” and thus understood as imperative mandates. The newspaper noted that as long as any party did not have absolute majority in the Eduskunta, no party could realise its platform without reconciliation (*wiedä ohjelmaansa sowitteluita voittoon*) at least on the details. Applying Guizot’s argument, *Vaasa* noted that if the SDP stuck too strictly to its platforms, no decisions could be reached in the Eduskunta. (ibid.) Similarly *Uusi Suometar* (9 Dec., 1910, 2), underlining the need for compromise-building in parliamentary deliberation, wrote that the imperative mandate made parliamentary work impossible as decisions in the parliament were made by a majority decision, which could be achieved only if representatives were able to move closer to each other in their opinions (*edustajat itse lähestyvät toistensa mielipiteitä*).

The main Young Finn newspapers distanced themselves from the dispute on quasi-imperative mandates and only reacted to the blatant cases of Mäkelin and Kotonen (see Erich 1912). For example in 1910, *Helsingin Sanomat* (24 Nov., 1910, 2) noted that although binding instructions were contrary to the Parliament Act, quasi-imperative mandates could be excused by renaming them as “knowing the standpoint of the representative”.

An aspect of imperative mandate that was not mentioned in the discussions on party platforms was that not all agenda items were known before the parliament was in session and no defined stands could be presented in all questions until the beginning of the deliberations. Defining the final agenda was a deeply political matter whose results were hard to predict. For example, for the first session of 1907 the Eduskunta received 28 government proposals, 24 motions and 195 petitions. However, since only few of the motions or petitions were passed or even dealt with in the Eduskunta due to the limited three month sessions and enormous workload, the same questions often reappeared in one session after another, and so more time could be devoted to their preparation and discussion. In addition, priority was given to government proposals, which were largely based on questions left undecided in the Diets or that rose onto the agenda during the Great Strike of 1905.

The ideas about the character of deliberation in the Eduskunta were often ambiguous. However, the political groups in the early Eduskunta did not advocate a dissensual style of debate comparable to the *Dagblad* liberals’ model in the Diets, although some individuals, such as Thiodolf Rein (1908), argued that deliberation in the Eduskunta should be about free trustees debating the interest of the nation *pro et contra*. Hermanson’s statement in the Parliamentary Reform Committee referred to the incompleteness of individual perspectives, but

²⁰¹ “Le mandat impératif place la volonté décisive, la résolution définitive avant la discussion, avant l’examen ; le mandat impératif abolit la liberté de ceux qui discutent, qui examinent ; il donne le pouvoir absolu, le pouvoir de décider souverainement à ceux qui ne discutent pas, qui n’examinent pas [...] c’est l’abolition du gouvernement libre.” (Guizot according to Block 1884, 262)

did not take a clear stand on what grounds “many-sided deliberations” should take place. The *Dagblad* liberals had been the most active in using the vocabulary of debate (*debatt*) against the Fennomans’ emphasis on negotiation and accommodation (see Chapter 6). In the Eduskunta, after the practices of interstate negotiations had been renounced in the Parliamentary Reform, the Finnish vocabulary of deliberation was used interchangeably with an emphasis on compromise. Deliberation in parliament was described variously as being about weighing arguments, considering, arguing, negotiating, reconciling and discussing on the common good. The bourgeois parties stressed that clinging onto predetermined opinions was harmful and emphasised compromise as a means to reach decisions and sufficient consensus. However, ‘the common good’, ‘the will of the people’, ‘the national interest’ and ‘the best interest of the fatherland’, which were described as the goals of deliberation, were, in the majority of cases, based on an idea of a predetermined ‘best option’. This aggravated disputes and made compromise difficult to reach. In the early debates on the Eduskunta’s procedures, deliberation was often defined in relation to the potential threats of representation, which led to a decrease in analytical discussion of the philosophical character of deliberation. Deliberation in parliament was defended by practical arguments, such as the importance of reaching good decisions effectively.

5.9 Conclusions

The case of free vs. imperative mandate shows that the establishment of Finnish parliamentary practices was not a passive adoption of Swedish procedures, but a process in which varied foreign influences and a developed understanding of parliamentary work were applied. The Swedish law gave the Finnish ban on imperative mandates its form, but the meaning of the ban was discussed in relation to a variety of examples.

The significance of the free mandate for parliamentary work was acknowledged. In the Diets, the discussion on mandates focused on the idea of representation of the people, in contrast to the old estate representation of private and local interests. For the *Dagblad* liberals the principle of representation of the people signified a possibility for *pro et contra* debate on the opinions and interests of the people. As will be discussed in the next chapter, in the procedure debates leading up to the 1880s, the mainstream Fennomans highlighted deliberation in the Diets primarily in the form of consensual negotiation, including the use of committees to reconcile differences of opinion between the estates. The majority’s influence could be enhanced by winning more seats in the estates’ elections through the help of reforms on representation. In addition, for the Fennomans, the goal of strengthening the role of Finnish language could be facilitated by other means as well, such as through mass organisations and the newspaper press – which partly reduced their interest in revising the Diet procedures, which they saw as being of minimal practical importance. For the

Fennomans, the Diet was primarily a representative institution that poorly lived up to the name, especially in the Nobility and the Burgher estates. It was only at the end of the nineteenth century, and in earnest before the Parliamentary Reform of 1906, that the political elite of the Finnish-speaking majority began to explicitly relate mandate to the Finnish parliament's deliberative character and its foreign models.

In the Diets and in the early Eduskunta, the common notion of a representative was based on the idea of a high level of education and personal abilities. This 'best of the nation' notion was challenged in the Eduskunta after the introduction of universal suffrage by the Social Democrat party-delegate model, which emphasised the representative's duty to follow the will of the majority of the people, the workers and the poor, over the personal qualities of representatives. In order to carry out the urgent reforms in an inefficient parliament, the Social Democrats were willing to subordinate the parliament's deliberative character to the swift realisation of their agenda.

In the Eduskunta, the imperative mandate became a rhetorical weapon that conceived of it as a legal principle, mixed with the notion of quasi-imperative mandates, which were based on party discipline, platforms and election promises. Even though imperative mandates became part of the political rhetoric, it was understood that as a legal principle it would not come into use in the Finnish or any other modern parliament (see e.g. Erich 1910, 64–65). Instead, there was a fear that the imperative mandate could become an unconstitutional practice that would morally bind the representatives to act according to extra-parliamentary pressure. Consequently, this would have a negative influence on the quality of parliamentary work and the establishment of the Eduskunta's tradition. Therefore, the criticism of imperative mandates was not aimed against the improbability of their becoming legal by amendment of the Parliament Act, but against the message and ideas that such mandates, as well as their lighter versions, represented. The fear of imperative mandates as an unconstitutional practice was justified in the sense that, even though stripped of its legal meaning, the idea lives on in public discussions about parliamentary work.

6 PLENUM PLENORUM - THE ESTATES' JOINT DISCUSSION

The procedure of *plenum plenum*, which signified a possibility of assembling all four estates in the same plenary hall to discuss a question, was the most significant single effort to introduce features of egalitarian debating characteristic of modern parliaments into the Finnish system while at the same time preserving the forms of estate representation. Due to its poor practical success in the Diets – only two plena plenum were ever organised – the discussions on the procedure have been disregarded as a mere curiosity in the history of the Finnish Diet (see e.g. Lilius 1974; Tuominen 1981). However, examination of the debates and newspaper material on plenum plenum in relation to the *Dagblad* liberals' project on Diet procedures gives a different assessment of the institution.

6.1 Plenum plenum in the Diet Act of 1869

According to § 47 of the Finnish Diet Act of 1869 “the Estates can assemble in a room for joint discussion (*till gemensam öfverläggning; yhteisesti keskustelemaan*) of a general question that is under reading in the Diet (*rörande allmän vid landtdagen under under handläggning varande fråga; yleisestä, waltiopäivillä käsiteltävänä olewasta asiasta*), however, without the right to decide.” In addition, section 47 stipulated that the lord marshal (speaker of the Nobility) lead the discussion, and if he was unable to attend, a speaker from another estate according to the order given in § 1 of the Diet Act.²⁰² If an estate made a proposal for such a meeting and another estate seconded it, the joint sitting was held. The lord marshal and the estates' speakers decided on the time and place of the meeting. (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869, § 47)

²⁰² The order was the Nobility, the Clergy, the Burghers and the Peasants.

The possibility for joint meetings of all four estates was discussed in Finland before the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865. Plenum plenorum was not mentioned in J. J. Nordström's *Promemoria* or in his proposal for the Diet Act (Nordström 1912 [1862]; 1912 [1863]). However, J. W. Rosenborg (1863) in his book and lectures called the joint sitting of four estates, or plenum plenorum, a question of great value and importance. For Rosenborg, the plenum plenorum could have a great influence on the estates' decisions, especially on questions which did not concern only one estate, but were "of more general interest" (*af allmännare intresse*). He noted that in the Diet there were questions that required special knowledge (*detalj-kunskaper*) that could not be assumed of members in all four estates. It is true that efforts were made through committees to enquire after special knowledge as needed (*söker erhålla nödig utredning*), because the committees were composed in a manner that allowed representatives' higher knowledge (*representanters högre kunskaper*) and practical experience (*praktiska erfarenhet*) become defining in the preparation of matters (*ärendernas beredning*). This, however, could not always be counted on. The diet practice of four simultaneous readings in the estates could result in a situation in which one estate made a decision without receiving vital information present in the discussions (*öfoerläggningarne*) of another estate. In regular joint discussions between the estates, such information would be more generally reviewed and checked (*allmännare granskade*). Given the chance, the estates (*rikstånden*) would develop and compare different opinions (*utveckla och jämföra de olika meningarne*) before each other, and would more easily come to an accord and collaboration (*lättare komma till endrägt och samverkan*). (Rosenborg 1863, 179–180)

Rosenborg saw that plenum plenorum could be used regularly and was helpful for a close examination of questions and for strengthening the possible final passing of the Diet resolutions. He saw plenum plenorum as a means to overcome the four-estate division as it could be used in all politically significant questions.

In its preamble for the Diet Act, the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 grounded plenum plenorum in the Riksdag Act of 1617. According to the Committee, the Act was the first law to prescribe joint meetings for all estates in the *Rikssal*. However, as the following period in Sweden had been all too favourable for one-sided development of estate interests, the procedure died away. The Committee noted that the Riksdag Act of 1723 did not mention joint meetings of the estates, and even after 1772 no such meetings took place, although the Riksdag Act of 1617 was *de jure* valid. (Grundlagskomitén 1866)

The Finnish Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 did not refer to Sweden's discussions and laws on plenum plenorum from the nineteenth century, although they did to a great extent serve as the model for § 47 of the Diet Act. Plenum plenorum was not originally included in the Swedish Riksdag Act of 1810 either. Plena plenorum became popular in Sweden after 1823, first as private and then as semi-official conferences (Gränström 1916, 37–50). Such meetings were included in the Riksdag Act as late as 1856–58 (*ibid.* 72–79). Based on a proposal of the Constitution Committee of the Riksdag of 1853–1854, the new

subsection of § 46 prescribed: “The Estates are allowed to assemble in a room, nevertheless without the right to decide there; and the Lord Marshal leads the discussion”.²⁰³ The joint sitting was to take place if an estate made a proposal for it and another seconded it. The lord marshal and the estates’ speakers were responsible for deciding on the time and place of the meeting. (ibid. 72)

Section 47 of the Diet Act was a reformulation of the Swedish rule. It is notable that J. J. Nordström, one of the most persistent defenders of the estate representation in Sweden, objected plenum plenorum in the Riksdag as an anomaly to the estate system. For Nordström, such general meetings (*general-sammankomster*) of the estates could encourage the estates to arrogate power or to put pressure on individual estates. He warned that “*les états généraux* began and ended in a joint discussion”. (ibid. 78) Thus, it is understandable why Nordström did not include plenum plenorum in *Promemoria* or his proposal for the Finnish Diet Act. By § 41 of the Swedish constitution of the Riksdag of 1859–60, members’ of Sweden’s government (Statsrådet) were granted access to the plenum plenorum. (Gränström 1916, 95–96)

Ten years after the preparation of the Diet Act, *Helsingfors Dagblad* (7 Apr., 1877, 1) wrote that the abovementioned Swedish sections and the work of the Swedish Constitution Committee had served as the starting point for the Finnish plenum plenorum. In nineteenth-century Sweden, the institution became at first a popular success and joint meetings were organised often. However, complaints about the long and time-consuming discussions soon became common. The procedure did not shorten the Riksdag readings since, in addition to the joint meetings, discussions continued to be conducted within the individual estates, where members felt more comfortable speaking. It was argued that decisions should be made immediately after the plenum plenorum in order to raise the institution’s influence. However, due to the Swedish parliamentary reform of the 1860s, the amendment never became topical in Sweden. (Gränström 1916; Lilius 1974, 273) Thus, the Swedish procedures on plenum plenorum that were used as a starting point in Finland were still a work-in-progress, and had not proven their practicality. The *Dagblad* liberals continued to develop the institution for Finland on the Swedish basis.

J. W. Rosenborg was a member of the Finnish Constitutional Law Committee of 1865. His arguments taken from the nineteenth-century Swedish discussions he had presented in *Om Riksdagar* (1863) were transferred to the Committee’s report. In support of plenum plenorum, the Committee argued that the estates’ joint discussions would have a significant influence on decisions in questions of general interest that did not concern only one individual estate. The readings in the four separate estates at the same time led to a situation in which an estate might make a decision without knowing information (*upplysningar*) that could have influenced the result. The estates would more likely reach an accord (*endrägt*) and collaboration (*samverkan*) more easily if they held

²⁰³ “Stånden vare medgifvet, att på ett rum till gemensam öfverläggning sammanträda, likväl utan rättighet att där besluta; och före därvid landtmarskalken order.” (Gränström 1916, 72)

joint meetings so that different opinions (*meningarne*) could be heard, developed and compared (*utvecklade och med hvarandra jämförda*). (Grundlagskomitén 1866)

The Committee's other main argument in support of plenum plenorum was that it could serve as a means of exchanging ideas and opinions between representation of the people and the government, the Finnish Senate. In practice, this would have meant an introduction of a modest version of cabinet government, in which the estates together controlled or oversaw the work of the Senate. According to the Committee's report, under the existing system of representation (*representationssätt*) the members of the Senate had the possibility to take part only in the discussions of the Nobility in cases when they were members of that estate. The Committee saw estates' joint meetings as important for Senate members since the discussions included information valuable for the examination of the questions. As the members of the Senate had trouble attending four separate estate plenaries, the plenum plenorum offered a valuable solution. (Grundlagskomitén 1866) Thus, the Committee included in § 47 of the Diet Act: "The Chairman and the members of the Senate have admission to the Estates' joint meetings with the right to participate in the discussions". (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869, § 47)

It is notable that the expression 'plenum plenorum', used from the seventeenth century on, did not belong to the official Riksdag terminology and was not used in the Swedish constitutions. The constitutions instead referred to "joint discussion" (*gemensam öfverläggning*), which was used to underline the fact that the four estates only held discussions together but did not vote on these occasions. The wording was also used to distinguish the procedure from the ceremonial events in the *Rikssal* before the Crown. (Gränström 1916, 8-9) The term plenum plenorum was actively used in the Finnish discussions, however, although not mentioned in the Diet Act. The term was translated in Finnish as *yhteiskokous*, (*säätyjen*) *täysikokous* (*Uusi Suometar*, 17 June, 1872, 2), (*säätyjen*) *yleisistunto*, *yhteisistunto* (*Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti*, 16 Feb., 1882, 7), *säätyjen yhteinen täysikokous* (*Hämeen Sanomat*, 26 May, 1882, 1), (*kaikkien säätyjen yhteinen istunto*) (*Aura*, 2 Apr., 1885, 2; *Rauman Lehti*, 11 Apr., 1885, 1) and *yhteinen täysi-istunto* (*Aamulehti*, 20 Oct., 1896, 1) Plenum plenorum became also used as a general term to describe abolishment and removal of the division between the estates. For example in 1905 the Young Finns in their call for unicameralism stated that their aim was to "remove the walls between the classes, to open a plenum plenorum for all strata of the Finnish people" (*poistaa seinät luokkien väliltä, avata "plenum plenorum" Suomen kansan kaikille kerroksille*) (*Pohjan Poika*, 29 Nov., 1905, 2).

6.2 Finland's two plena plenorum: 1872 and 1885

Regardless of the wide public interest in plenum plenorum, only two joint sittings of all the estates were organised in the Finnish Diet, although several pro-

posals were made.²⁰⁴ The first was held on Thursday, 13 June 1872 on the question of a new House of the Estates. The Peasants had proposed the joint sitting, arguing it would lead to a better and more unanimous decision (*saattaisi parempan ja yksimielisempään päätökseen*) (Peasants 1872, II, 668). Lord Marshal Johan Mauritz Nordenstam was sick²⁰⁵ at the time and so Archbishop Edvard Bergenheim replaced him as the chair. The plenary took place in the Nobility's session hall at the House of the Knights. The desks that were usually placed in front of members' seats were removed and the chairs were rearranged in the form of a semicircle around the speaker. In Sweden, members had been free to choose their seats in plena plenorum (Lilius 1974, 277), but in Finland the seating was organised according to estate. This manifested a still prevailing leaning towards estate divisions. On the right of the speaker, the Nobility was placed closest, then the Clergy. The Burghers and the Peasants were seated on the left. Left of the speaker, a separate row of desks and chairs were reserved for members of the Senate. However, none of the members of the Senate, except those present as members of the Nobility, had acquired an entrance ticket or sat in attendance in the reserved seats. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 14 June, 1872, 1; *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 14 June, 1872, 1) According to *Helsingfors Dagblad*, the reason for this was that the question under discussion concerned only the estates and not the government's position in relation to representation of the people (*regeringens ställning till folkrepresentationen*). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 14 June, 1872, 1) The plenum plenorum lasted three hours during which time twenty speeches were given (Tuominen 1981, 408).

The second plenum plenorum convened on Saturday, 11 April 1885. The question under discussion was a government's proposal on suffrage in the Burghers' elections. Suffrage in the Burghers was based on a minimum income, and additional votes given to persons of higher income, which gave the Svecomans an advantage in the elections. Due to the majority requirement in the Diet's decision-making procedure, the Burghers and the Nobility could together obstruct any question from passing in the Diet. Thus, the question of the Burghers' suffrage was extremely important to the Fennomans, and the debates

²⁰⁴ E.g. Hjelt on the railway question in the Clergy 18 May 1877; on the question of the House of the Estates Heikkilä and Lukander in the Peasants 28 May 1877; in the *rusthållsfrågan* Hjelt and G. Z. Forsman in the Clergy 12 March 1882. In 1906 *Uusi Suometar* wrote that such claims had been presented in relation to the representation reform (see *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 24 May, 1906, 5). Smaller unofficial meetings open for all members of the estates were organised at the House of the Estates and called misleadingly a "plenum plenorum" (for an announcement of such, see *Nya Pressen*, 3 Aug., 1906, 2). These meetings were closed to the public (*Åbo Underrättelser*, 4 Aug., 1906, 2). Plenum plenorum was also used as a term to describe mutual sittings of the departments of the Senate of Finland (*Östra Finland*, 30 Mar., 1909, 2), of associations (see e.g. Swedish students' association in *Måndagen*, 22 Mar., 1909, 3), of early Eduskunta plenaries (*Åbo Underrättelser*, 16 Sept., 1909, 3), of the church's organisation (*Kotimaa*, 1 June, 1910, 4) and even of foreign parliaments (e.g. on a proposal for reorganising the British House of Lords, see *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 23 Nov., 1910, 8) as well as private meetings of the Fennoman and Svecoman clubs for Diet members (*valtiopäivämiesklubi*) in 1899 (Lilius 1974, 277).

²⁰⁵ It was rumoured that the "sickness" was in fact about the lord marshal's insufficient skills in the Finnish language.

of the second plenum plenorum were often cited in later discussions. The initiative for the joint sitting had come from the Clergy, where liberal Professor Otto Donner²⁰⁶ advocated for it, arguing it would provide an opportunity for contrasting opinions to struggle against each other (Clergy, 1885, I, 446).

The estates were situated in the Nobility's session hall (Riddarhussalen) so that the Nobility sat on the east and the other three estates on the west side. Stenographers sat at their desks between the two groups. On the right of the lord marshal, two rows of seats were reserved for the members of the Senate. On the left of those sat interpreter Master Almberg. Seats for newspaper reporters were reserved in the southwest corner of the hall. Low on space, no desks were provided to members. In the second plenum plenorum, members of the government did attend, including Senators af Forselles, Molander, Norrmén, A. Mechelin, Oker-Blom, Ehdström and Forsman, who sat on the government seats, and Yrjö Koskinen and Leo Mechelin among the members of the Nobility. Already within an hour of the start, the public galleries were full. The plenary began at 17.45 and continued until 5.30 the next morning. (*Finland*, 12 Apr., 1885, 3; *Nya Pressen*, 13 Apr., 1885, 2) The plenum plenorum of 1885 was a greatly discussed and polemicized event in the newspaper press and the expanding Finnish-language press also actively reported on it.

6.3 Other procedures for overcoming the four-estate division

In the Finnish Diets, the estates held discussions separately and voted separately in plenary sessions. In the first reading, all government (i.e. the emperor's prepared by the Senate) *proposals* (*propositioner; esitykset*) were either sent to committee unanimously or tabled²⁰⁷ (*ligga på bordet; olla pöydällä*) until the next meeting (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinanmaalle 1869, § 53). Proposals had priority over other matters and were to be treated first (*ibid.* § 55). The decision as to which committee a government proposal was sent to was usually based on a proposal by the Speaker's Council. (Lilius 1974, 234)

When the estates convened in 1863 Finland's constitutional laws did not prescribe anything on *petitions*, but J. Ph. Palmén (1861, x-xiii) and J. W. Rosenberg (1863, 288-289), for example, asserted that such a right existed. The *Dagblad* liberals interpreted the right to petition as extending also to constitutional matters (Lilius 1974, 245). The Diet Act of 1869 confirmed the estates' right to introduce petitions (*petition; pyyntö-esitys*) on all matters (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869, § 51). Petitions were introduced by individual members or, in case of the Clergy, Burghers and Peasants, also indirectly by electors whose representatives mediated the appeals and complaints

²⁰⁶ Otto Donner (1835-1909) was a professor of Sanskrit and comparative linguistics (1875-1905). Donner was considered a liberal who during his career moved from being a moderate Fennoman to Svecoman. Donner was a member of the Clergy 1877-1905. (Väisänen 2001b)

²⁰⁷ Here, in the sense of postponing the consideration.

(*besvär; walitus*) that had been included in the election minutes to the estate. However, after the Diet Act of 1869 and its notion of representation of the people, petitions and appeals on private matters touching only one estate began to lose their ground. (Lilius 1974, 264) In addition to estates' private petitions, petitions were now more often being transformed into petitions of all four estates after first being examined in a joint committee (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869, § 52). After the first reading in the estates, and possibly a period of postponement, petitions were either rejected or sent to a committee decided by the estate in which the matter had originally been taken up, usually in agreement with the petitioner. Other estates were able to take part in the reading of a petition only after they had received the committee report on the matter. (Lilius 1974, 234) Similar was the case with motions that concerned legislation or abolishment of laws²⁰⁸ that required concordant decision from the Diet and the emperor. The estates received the right to introduce motions in 1886 (*ibid.* 234, 269).

According to § 71 of the Diet Act of 1869, most of the questions in the Diets were decided by a majority of three estates, while matters of constitution and privileges required unanimity. Financial matters also required, in principle, approval of all four estates. In practice, based on subsections of § 72, dissent could be overridden in a strengthened finance committee (*förstärkt statsutskott; enen-netty waltiwaliokunta*) by a majority of two thirds (Lilius 1974, 282; see below). In the second plenary reading, the question could be either resolved or returned to the committee. In the separate estates, the speaker of the estate formulated a proposal, on which a vote of "yes" or "no" was carried out (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869, § 58–61).²⁰⁹ Decisions were made on a simple majority of the members present in the vote (*ibid.* § 61). No quorum existed. No individual votes were recorded in the minutes.

Petitions passed in the Diet were delivered to the emperor as "requests" through the Senate.²¹⁰ Petitions passed were rarely turned down at the highest

²⁰⁸ Financial, constitutional, military defence, church and press laws were excluded (Lilius 1974, 269).

²⁰⁹ The Diet Act of 1869 recognised two methods of voting. The Act set the voice vote as primary; a vote by secret ballot was to take place only on a member's request or when a qualified majority was required. In a voice vote, the members declared their vote by "yes" or "no" simultaneously and the speaker of the estate pronounced his conception of the side governing. The speaker could not demand a ballot vote, even if he was uncertain about the result of the voice vote. In the case of ballot votes, a deciding ballot was randomly taken aside before counting the votes in view of a possible tie, which was a Swedish invention from 1809 (Lilius 1974, 254) (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869, § 59, § 61). The same procedures on votes were adopted in the Parliament Act of 1906 (Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaan Valtiopäiväjärjestys 1906, § 65). The voice vote was quick, but imprecise; the ballot vote was time-consuming, but accurate. The first voting machine to replace voice votes was introduced in the Eduskunta in 1927. In addition, in the 1920s the rules on voting were moved from the Parliament Act to the Eduskunta's rules of procedure, and votes by standing up at one's seat took the place of voice votes. (Nousiainen 1977, 482, 484)

²¹⁰ In practice, Diet decisions on questions of legislation could be circulated to the emperor through the governor-general's secretariat, the Finnish minister-secretary's secretariat and through the Russian bureaucracy (Jyränki 2006, 25–26).

level, and even the ones that the Senate of Finland did not second were delivered to the emperor in the form of wishes and concerns of the people (Lilius 1974, 267).

In the 1860s, Diet procedures were developed to include several procedural innovations that helped to overcome the division of four estates by facilitating cooperation and communication between them. One of these was the *deputations*. "Deputations" were a remnant of the seventeenth-century Riksdag practice through which the estates negotiated questions on the agenda with each other during proceedings for the purpose of reaching consistent decisions. Deputations were used in Sweden throughout the period of the Riksdag Act of 1810, although they were not mentioned in the constitution. The Finnish estates adopted the procedure in 1863 in the form of "invitations", although it had no grounds in the constitutional or procedural framework given at the estates' disposal. Based on the practices of the first Diet, the procedure was included in § 66 of the Diet Act of 1869, in which the estates were obliged to inform each other about the estate's proceedings by excerpts of minutes or by sending deputations (*deputation; lähetystö*). The deputations and communications usually enquired another estate's support for a proposal. (Lilius 1974, 291–293)²¹¹

The Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 was well aware of the room for manoeuvre it had in relation to the Diet committees, and it used this effectively. The Committee sought to remove the four-estate division in the Diet's committee procedures, and formulated the Diet Act so that the estates' joint standing committees voted by heads with each estate given the same number of seats. The number of members on the standing committees was kept low (12 to 16) in order to avoid overburdening the small estates (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981c, 282–284; Valtioapäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinanmaalle 1869, § 29).

Combined committees (sammansatta utskotten; yhdistetyt valiokunnat), developed by the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865, were another procedural innovation created to enhance negotiation between estates and to bring the estate members' expertise together. Based on § 41 of the Diet Act, the combined committees were assembled of members of different estates in different standing committees. The standing committees chose the members for the combined committees, an equal number from each estate. In the 1870s the combined committees were organised as the Combined Finance and Economy Committee and the Combined Law and Economy Committee. Thus, no more than two committees were combined at a time. The procedure appeared to be problematic. Instead of members serving on both the combined and the standing committees, members were simply elected from and left the standing committees to serve on the combined committees. This defeated the original intent of the pro-

²¹¹ For example, in the British parliamentary tradition the use of official messages has been introduced in order to mediate truthful information and to prevent fruitless arguments between members of the two houses. To ensure this, allusions to debates in the other house have been ruled out as unparliamentary before an official communication is received. (See May 1883 [1844], 367–368) For a Finnish presentation of the British procedure, see *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 4 Aug., 1862, 2–3. In the Finnish Diets, speculation on possible decisions of the other estates was quite common.

cedure. Combined committees disappeared from the committee system by the mid-1880s, but were included in the proposal of the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–1906. Although combined committees were left out of the final Act, they were reintroduced in § 11 of the Eduskunta's rules of procedure in 1907. In the Diets from 1872 on, combined committees were replaced by simultaneously preparing questions in two standing committees, and also by organising *ad hoc* select committees as defined in § 30 of the Diet Act. (Lilius 1974, 224–225, 227)

The estate Diet's negotiation mode of proceeding became most apparent in the *accommodation* process, which through a carefully designed committee system aimed at producing uniform resolutions by reconciling the differences between the separate estate decisions. Both before and after the Diet Act, the Finnish procedures on accommodation were based on Swedish Gustavian practices. In the first Diet of 1863–64 and partly in 1867, accommodation was taken care of by the Expediting Committee (*expeditionutskott; toimitusvaliokunta*), but § 67 of the Diet Act of 1869 assigned the work to the committee that had prepared and reported on the matter. The reason for the change was the Expediting Committee's enormous workload. The procedure was adopted from the Riksdag Act of 1810. In Sweden it had been argued that the committee that examined the question had the best opportunities and knowledge to deal with accommodation questions. (Lilius 1974, 281, 284)

It is notable that in § 67, the committee's duty to negotiate and to resolve the estate differences was written in the form of an imperative: "If the committee finds the decisions so divergent (*i så skiljaktiga beslut; niin eroavaisiin päätöksiin*) that no lawful plurality of the different opinions can be composed (*bildas; syntyä*), the committee *must* seek, in so far as possible, to accommodate (*bör söka att sammanjemka; pitää kokea yhteen-sovitella*) the different opinions and to give the estates a proposal on the accommodation." (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinanmaalle 1869, § 67) As a result, negotiation was pushed to the extreme in the Finnish Diets, even compared to the Swedish Riksdag (Lilius 1974, 285–286). In contrast to Sweden, in the Finnish Diets accommodation, in other words a second round of committee negotiation, could be repeated from the Diet of 1877–78 on. Twice it occurred that accommodation was organised three times in a single question. Whereas in Sweden accommodation had played a rather minor role in the Riksdag's deliberations, in the Finnish Diets it became of the essence. (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981c, 318–319; Lilius 1974, 291)

Furthermore, in the case of an unsuccessful accommodation, the committee could be transformed into a *strengthened committee* (*förstärkt utskott; enennetty valiokunta, lisätty valiokunta*). The procedure was formulated by the Swedish reformists in 1809 as a means to overcome the endless disputes between the estates (Lilius 1974, 296–301). Based on § 74 and § 72 of the Finnish Diet Act of 1869, after an unsuccessful accommodation the number of members in the committee that had prepared the question was multiplied to fifteen from each estate and it was authorised to make a decision by a majority of two thirds. In Sweden only a simple majority had been required, which had also been the de-

mand of the Finnish liberals of the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865. Similarly, *Dagblad* had seen the simple majority requirement as a means to overcome the members' tendency to protect their own estate's interests and instead guide them towards an understanding of themselves as representatives of the people (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Apr., 1867, 1). However, during the reading of the Diet Act the estates saw simple majority as a possible means for party manoeuvring, arguing that two estates could win a vote in the case of a tie based on the procedure according to which one vote taken aside decided the final result. (Lilius 1974, 296–301; see footnote above) Krusius-Ahrenberg (1981c, 358) has interpreted the decision to require a qualified majority in the strengthened committee as an important departure from the Swedish model; it signified the beginning of the Finnish tradition of protection the minority in parliamentary procedure.

According to § 77 of the Diet Act, after a decision was reached the question was sent to the Expediting Committee consisting of two members from each estate to check the formulation of the estates' decision (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinanmaalle 1869, § 77). After this the decision was either approved at the estates' plenaries or in the Checking Committee (*justeringsutskott; tarkastusvaliokunta*), which consisted of two trustees appointed by each estate. If the Checking Committee or one of the estates rejected the formulation, it was remitted to the Expediting Committee. If that effort proved also unsuccessful, the two committees organised a joint sitting to discuss the problem. The Expediting and Checking Committees worked often long after the conclusion of a Diet session. The Checking Committee was a Finnish invention of the 1860s that had no direct foreign model or grounds in the constitutions. (Lilius 1974, 325–326) The Diet resolutions (*valtiopäiväpäätös*) that included responses to the emperor's proposals and the estates' presentations (*framställningar; esittelyt*) were submitted to the emperor in the form of a letter signed by each member at the closing of a Diet. (Lilius 1974, 330)

Finnish reformists of the Diet Act of 1869 sought to raise the importance of the Diet by establishing institutions that enhanced cooperation between the estates and increased their possibilities to produce strong resolutions effectively. The appearance of unanimity and consensus between the estates was seen as leverage that could augment the Diet's significance as a 'political power' (*statsmakt*) in relation to the Senate of Finland and the emperor. Also the long intervals between Diets increased the stress on consensus. When given the rare chance, decisions had to be reached. These ideas were apparent also in 1865 in the Constitutional Law Committee's justification that emphasised plenum plenorum's capacity to facilitate unity, and also in 1872 in the argument put forward by the mainly Fennoman estate of the Peasants in favour of plenum plenorum as a means for more unanimous decision (Peasants 1872, II, 668).

6.4 Fennomans and the *Dagblad* liberal stands on plenum plenorum

From the 1860s on, Fennomans and *Dagblad* liberals took different stands on the plenum plenorum. The differences were based on contrasting notions of deliberation. Interestingly, Fennoman interpretation of the plenum plenorum, which emphasised the institution's purpose to assist unanimity and consensus-building between the estates, has also dominated the later interpretations and discussions of the matter (see e.g. Lilius 1974, 274).

A typical Fennoman scepticism to plenum plenorum was demonstrated in 1866 during the Senate's discussion on the Diet Act of 1869, when J. V. Snellman took a sceptical stand towards plenum plenorum's possibility to enhance deliberation. According to Snellman, the benefit of the joint meeting would be in the fact that "the prevailing opinion" (*den rådande meningen*) of each estate would become known to the other estates. However, this could take place without holding a joint session since the prevailing opinions were already often clear in advance, and since the estates' final decisions could be mediated through deputations. For Snellman, plenum plenorum would shed little extra light on questions beyond what committee reports and the estates' discussions could illuminate. (Senate 1866, § 49)

Here, Snellman stuck within the framework of estate representation revealing an understanding of deliberation that saw definitive opinion, that is, the 'best option', as something already determined. This outlook, which prominent Fennomans highlighted in the procedure debates until the mid-1880s, saw the estates' joint accommodation as a means of arriving at the best option. This conception was indebted to Hegel's idea that the general would rise above the particular interests that the estates represented.

The consensus perspective, however, neglects a dissensual understanding of the purposes and possibilities of plenum plenorum, which the *Dagblad* liberals, the institution's most active advocates in Finland, embraced. *Dagblad* liberals approached plenum plenorum's ability to overcome the four-estate division by emphasising their notion of debate, which was heavily indebted to the model of the British parliament and the writings of J. S. Mill. *Dagblad* liberals emphasised plenum plenorum as a means to subject each question in the Diet to a close examination *pro et contra*, in which all possible arguments and counter-arguments were forced to clash against each other in an open debate. Similar to Mill, for the *Dagblad* liberals 'the best interest of the nation', or rather the winning opinion on it, could be justifiably invoked only after a debate. The differences between the two approaches was manifested in the Fennomans' emphasis on the consensus-seeking committee negotiations of the Diet accommodation versus the *Dagblad* liberals' stress on the importance of dissensual plenary debate.

Whereas the *Dagblad* liberals discussed the possibilities of plenum plenorum actively, the Fennomans took the question up rarely. As the Fennomans understood that large public plenary debates did not offer any significant assis-

tance for efficient accommodation in addition to the Diet's elaborated committee system, they turned their interest in plenum plenum to the accountability of the Senate and portraying of the language struggle. The Fennomans expressed an interest in the subject in the 1880s, when they conceived of the institution as a means to openly fight the Svecoman majorities in the Nobility and the Burghers.

6.5 Negotiation versus debate

Typical of the *Dagblad* liberals' argumentation, *Helsingfors Dagblad* situated plenum plenum in a wider historical and constitutional context. In 1877 the newspaper published a two-part series on the topic (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 7 Apr., 1877, 1; 8 Apr., 1877, 1). *Dagblad* mentioned two partly contradictory tendencies within the Finnish Diet. On the one hand, there was a prevailing conviction that the system of four estates was obsolete and unsuitable. On the other hand, there existed an awareness that it was impossible, at least for the time being, to replace the existing system entirely with another. According to *Dagblad*, the fractures caused by these two opposite tendencies had first become apparent in the Diet Act of 1869 in a number of reforms that, while letting the foundations of the old system remain, had essentially disturbed its character and forced "the old four-wheeled representation onto new tracks". *Dagblad* argued that this had taken place by expanding suffrage and eligibility in all three commoner estates (*öfrälse stånden*), which had changed the grounds of the estate representation. Through combined committees "a delegation of the Diet" (*delegation af landtdagen*) had been created that had the right to decide on questions that otherwise would remain unresolved. Most importantly, a way to overcome the defects of the four-estate division had been paved by the introduction of the plenum plenum. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 7 Apr., 1877, 1)

The *Dagblad* liberals saw plenum plenum as a means to develop the Finnish system to meet international parliamentary standards. In 1871, two months before the first Diet session under the new Diet Act, *Helsingfors Dagblad* argued that the Act included aspects that were dependent on the Finnish historical development, such as the division of four estates, but also institutions that were new to Finnish political life and constituted "a transition to representative forms that were unfolding in the constitutional life of European states" (*bilda en öfvergång till de representativa former, uti hvilka det konstitutionalla lifvet i öfriga europeiska stater uppenbarar sig*). The newspaper saw plenum plenum as such a feature *par excellence*. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 27 Nov., 1871, 1)

Dagbladists presented the introduction of plenum plenum in the Diet Act as a tactical move to introduce parliamentary characteristics in the Diet procedures. In 1877 *Helsingfors Dagblad* noted that some of the changes in the Finnish procedures had been a mere utilisation of the experiences from the last period of the Swedish estate representation. Some of the reforms, however, including plenum plenum stood out as "efforts to apply aspects that belonged to the

higher development of modern parliamentarism" (*ett försök att tillämpa synpunkter, hvilka tillhöra den moderna parlamentarismen i dess högre utveckling*). For *Dagblad*, in the case of plenum plenorum, the legislator's mission had not been to use the estates' joint meetings as "a mere secondary complement" (*ett underordnad komplement*) to the estate sittings. On the contrary, plenum plenorum was a vital parliamentary institution (*en lifskraftig parlamentarisk institution*) that had "greater importance for the Finnish parliamentary system" (*djupare betydelse för vårt parlamentariska system*) than being "the mere political decoration" (*en politisk dekoration*) it had been in Sweden (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Apr., 1877, 1).

What were the 'parliamentary forms' that were to be implemented through plenum plenorum? Firstly, when discussing plenum plenorum, the Finnish liberals repeated the argument of getting all different opinions and arguments under consideration in a joint parliamentary reading of the four estates. This, of course, meant increasing the influence of the best of the nation, which the *Dagblad* liberals emphasised (see Section 5.6). In 1872 *Helsingfors Dagblad* called the division of four estates "the four-legged absurdity" (*den fyrbenta orimligheten*),²¹² in which the estates were "like four voices shouting from different directions" (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 28 Mar., 1872, 1). In 1876 Leo Mechelin saw that only in a joint sitting of all the estates could benefit from all the insight and experience concerning a question. He argued that it was unreasonable to suppose that each estate could have enough special knowledge in every matter. Small joint committees did not sufficiently cover the same range of abilities and expertise of the estates overall. (Mechelin 1876, 165) Similarly, in 1877 *Helsingfors Dagblad* wrote that without holding a plenum plenorum certain points of view (*synpunkter*) could be defining in one chamber (*en kammare*) while never even coming to the surface in the other three, especially as § 54 of the Diet Act ordered that committee reports were to be brought to discussions simultaneously in the four separate estates.²¹³ As a result, special insight, parliamentary experience (*parlamentarisk vana*) or superior political capacity (*öfverlägsen politisk förmåga*) of one estate might not manifest in front of the representative assembly as a whole (*inför representationen i dess helhet*). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 7 Apr., 1877, 1) In this sense, the *Dagblad* liberals sought to include features of a unicameral parliament in the Diet.

However, for the *Dagbladists*, plenum plenorum did not signify a mere formal placing of members in one room in order to bring their insights and intelligence together or to demonstrate the obsolescence of the estate system, but a means to develop deliberation according to their notion of debate. In 1885 *Dagblad* argued that the uniqueness of plenum plenorum as a Diet procedure (*landtdagsprocedur*) was its possibility to present representatives' different points of view in a joint debate (*de olika synpunkternas uppträdande i gemensam debatt*) (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 17 Jan., 1885, 1).

²¹² According to *Dagblad*, the term was borrowed from Sweden and had become popular also in Finland.

²¹³ For similar argumentation in support of plenum plenorum, see e.g. Edvard Bergh in the *Burghers* 1867, I, 484 and J. A. von Born in the *Nobility* 1867, I, 58–59.

Thus, secondly, the *Dagblad* liberals emphasised plenum plenum as an arena for a fair and open parliamentary struggle between different sides of the debate. When all arguments and opinions were placed in the same plenary hall, they were made to clash, confront and test each other's strengths and weaknesses. In 1867 *Helsingfors Dagblad* (1 Feb., 1867, 1) commented on the readings dealing with the Diet Act and emphasised the need for an open clash of different opinions and arguments in the plenary debate. The newspaper criticised the developments in the Diet that pushed discussion into the committees. For *Dagblad*, it was a great weakness of the four-estate diet that a question (*fråga*) was read in four different places at the same time. As a result, the discussion in one estate could not be heard in another and arguments presented in different estates did not meet (*bemöta*) in mutual confrontation. This defect had been fought against through obligatory committee readings, which had become the crux of the diet machinery (*kärnpunkten af riksdagsmaskineriet*) and made the actual plenary discussions less important elements of the parliamentary process. *Dagblad* argued that the dominating role of committee work could not be changed without changing the multi-cameral system (*mångkammersystemet*). However, the proposal for the Diet Act had aimed at improving the situation by giving the estates the possibility to hold joint plenary discussions (*gemensam diskussion*). Here, the newspaper explicated an idea the *Dagbladists* were to repeat for decades to come. *Dagblad* argued that over time the plenum plenum could become a practice that would transform the separate estates into a single assembly (*genom bruket förvandla de skilda stånden till en enda församling*) and make the separate estate sittings mere voting institutions (*omröstningssinrättningar*). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 1 Feb., 1867, 1; see Chydenius's proposal below)

In 1876, in the article "The Four Estates" (*De fyra stånden*), Leo Mechelin elaborated on the *Dagblad* liberals' distinction between committee negotiation and plenary debate. Mechelin argued that whereas the strengthened committee was a means to bring together opinions that had been spoken out (*uttalade*) and defended (*förfäktade*) in individual estates, plenum plenum's aim, "in a direct and joint deliberation, [was] to let all different arguments clash against each other" (*i samfäld öfverläggning låta alla olika meningar bryta sig mot hvarandra*). (Mechelin 1876, 163) Mechelin highlighted the difference between the *Dagblad* liberals' standpoint and the Fennomans' approach to plenum plenum that paralleled committee and plenary discussion and à la Snellman defined deliberation as a mere manifestation of the prevailing opinion. According to Mechelin, plenum plenum gave the matters "the most many-sided examination" (*den mångsidigaste utredning; det större mångsidighet*). For Mechelin, the main advantage of plenum plenum was the fact that "the great assembly of all four estates lifted the debate to a parliamentary exaltation" (*debatten höjer sig till en parlamentarisk lyftning*) that did not become governing in "the committee-like negotiations" (*komitéartade förhandlingarna*) in the estates. (Mechelin 1876, 165–166)

Mechelin argued against the idea of consensus as the motivation and aim of a deliberative assembly. Mechelin saw the existence, presentation and competition between opposing opinions and arguments as the lifeblood of parliamentary work. For Mechelin, in a legislative assembly (*en lagstiftande församling*) different and conflicting opinions (*olika och stridiga åsikter*) would always appear (*framträda*) each seeking to become prevailing (*söka göra sig gällande*). The conflicting opinions could be based on the existence and establishment of political parties and factions or appear only in some questions. It was only natural that not all representatives thought similarly in all questions. The purpose of parliamentary discussions (*förhandlingarna*) was that different arguments (*olika meningarna*) struggled against each other (*kämpa mot hvarandra*) and arguments and counterarguments were weighed against each other (*skäl och motskäl skola vägas mot hvarandra*). Mechelin noted that the advocates of one opinion (*ena opinionens målsmän*) could rarely fully convince or disarm (*fullständigt öfverbevisa eller afoöpna*) the supporters of another. (Mechelin 1876, 170–171; see also Mechelin 1879) According to Mechelin, after a direct procedurally regulated debate and examination the superiority of arguments over others was determined and measured primarily in numbers, that is, in votes (Mechelin 1879, 120; see also Section 5.4).

Dagblad liberals continued to develop the distinction between negotiation and debate as different modes of deliberation and gave the latter a higher parliamentary value. In 1885 *Helsingfors Dagblad* (8 Jan., 1885, 2) posed the question, what in fact was a decision of the Diet (*landtdagens beslut*) and who was responsible for it? The newspaper argued that there was no clear answer to this and turned its critique against the Diet system itself, seeing it as based on committee negotiation rather than open debate. *Dagbladists* attacked the multi-phased accommodation process, the fitting of the estates' decisions together (*sammanjämknings*), for which no clear procedures existed.

Helsingfors Dagblad's critique was justifiable in that no detailed instructions on the formulation of the final Diet decision existed. According to the Diet Act of 1869, the accommodation was to be extended "as far as possible". In the Diets it was argued that the accommodation was to be based on the estates' decisions by avoiding any resolution not in accordance with them. However, this principle was not always followed. For example, in the Diet of 1885 the Law Committee justified its deviating formulation by arguing that the accommodation should pursue "a middle way between the decisions of the separate estates" (*tulisi kulkemaan keskitietä säätyjen päätösten välillä*). Differing and rather vague principles were presented for accommodation, for example in the Diet of 1888 V. M. von Born argued that "accommodation cannot take place other than in a way based on mathematical-logical grounds". In practice, accommodation was grounded on improvised rules and justifications, especially when two estates were opposed by two other estates, a difficult situation that became common after the language struggle became a defining feature of the Diets from 1877 on. (Lilius 1974, 286–295) In addition, editing and articulation of the estates' decisions was left to the Expediting and Checking Committees, which worked on

after the Diet sessions had concluded without any supervision by the estates (Lilius 1974, 329).

Helsingfors Dagblad argued that a decision of the Diet was mainly produced by the committee who handled the matter (*handlagt ärendet*) and formulated the letter (*skrifvelse*) to the government, and by the Checking Committee and the Expediting Committee, which reviewed (*granskar*) it. The four different decisions of the four separate estates were submitted to these committees, which had the authority then to examine possibilities for fitting the decisions together. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Jan., 1885, 2)

Dagblad noted that the estates' decisions were often made from very differently formulated voting proposals (*omröstningspropositioner*). From these the committees were to decide whether some kind of lawful unanimity (*lagenlig sammanstämmighet*) or (qualified) majority (*pluralitet*) could be found. *Dagblad* noted that no procedural guidance for the process was available or even possible. Sometimes the committees considered all of the decisions together as such and, if finding that they could not be harmonised (*harmoniera*), the matter was considered declined (*förfallet*). Sometimes the separate decisions were broken into pieces and the different parts were gathered and put together; then if three estates were in some point seen as unanimous, plurality was seen to have been reached and an estates' decision (*ständerbeslut*) was made. *Dagblad* noted that these decisions, however, did not necessarily correspond to the decision made by any individual estate. Consequently, a great uncertainty existed as to what the estates had actually decided and what they had not. The disorderly procedure was reflected also in harmful and unnecessary forethought and manoeuvring in the estates' deliberations.²¹⁴ (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Jan., 1885, 2) According to *Dagblad* liberals, compared to the obscure negotiation in committees, plenary debate offered an arena where sides could be taken openly, the reading could be procedurally regulated and legitimated, and clear grounds for decisions could be presented.

James De Mille (1878) argued that what distinguishes parliamentary debate from any other controversial debate is that in it "the subject to be examined is presented in a formal statement, called a resolution, or question, to which alone the discussion must refer" (De Mille 1878, 472). For De Mille, "the aim of parliamentary debate is to investigate the subject from many points of view which are presented from two contrary sides. In no other way can a subject be so exhaustively considered". (De Mille 1878, 473) Here, De Mille presented the

²¹⁴ *Dagblad* used the debate on the railway question (*järnvägsfrågan*) from the previous Diet as an example. According to *Dagblad*, many members of the representative assembly (*representationensmedlemmar*) had hoped that a railway would be built to both Oulu and Kuopio. However, none of the estates dared to vote for both railways, as they feared that if they did so and two other estates voted for only one, the majority would thereby go to building only one. Thus, each estate decided to vote strategically for only one railway to avoid the risk of losing their actual goal. Thus the possibility to build both railways became impossible because of the Diet procedure. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Jan., 1885, 2) The case was used along with other railway examples later in the disputes on free mandate in the early Eduskunta as an argument to stress the need for compromise (see Section 5.8).

parliamentary model to which the Finnish *Dagblad* liberals aspired with their proposals for procedural revision. From this view, Finnish Diet readings were due to the four-estate division, inconsistent rules and practices, unclear formulation of voting proposals and accommodation process, more a matter of negotiation and enquiry than a parliamentary deliberation on a specified question.

6.6 Proposals for improving plenum plenorum

6.6.1 Supplements to the Swedish model

Dagblad liberals sought to develop plenum plenorum according to their notion of debate and raise the institution to 'a parliamentary grade'. In 1877 *Helsingfors Dagblad* took a look at the history of plenum plenorum in the Swedish Riksdags and noted that the unicameral system was in fact an older practice in Sweden than the division of four estates. The newspaper asserted that in the *herredagar* of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries representation was divided by estate, but discussions were not conducted in different chambers. *Herredagar* acted similarly to the old English parliament, as representative bodies (*såsom representative enheter*) met together for discussions and decision-making. Similar was the case in the early Riksdags in view of their three and then four estates. Decisions to separate the discussing and decision-making chambers were made in the seventeenth century, first in the Riksdag Act of 1617 and then in the Instrument of Government of 1634. Referring to the differences between plenary and committee deliberations, *Dagblad* noted that the introduction of the Secret Committee (*det sekreta utskottet*), which became the focal point of parliamentary work (*det parlamentariska arbetet*), made the use of plenum plenorum rare in the Riksdag. *Dagblad* argued that as the Secret Committee was abolished in the Riksdag Act of 1810, a new need for closer relations between different elements of representation was called for. In the Riksdag of 1834–35 an amendment to include joint meetings in the constitution was made. The proposal was taken up again in the Riksdag of 1853–54 and led to a well-argued report of the Constitutional Committee which the Riksdag of 1856–58 included as an additional subsection under § 46 of the Riksdag Act. *Dagblad* admitted that these sections served as the basis and starting point for the Finnish Constitutional Law Committee of 1865's proposal for plenum plenorum in the Diet Act. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 7 Apr., 1877, 1)

However, *Dagblad* noted that the Constitutional Law Committee did not limit itself to copying the Swedish paragraphs, but made additions which the Swedish plenum plenorum had never contained and which had great political importance (*en stor politisk betydelse*). A subsection of § 47 of the Diet Act ordered the estates to make their decisions immediately after the joint meeting without further discussion on the question. In other words, the vote was to be a direct result (*omedelbart resultat*) of the joint deliberation (*den gemensamma öfverläggningen*). *Dagblad* noted that as this rule had not been adopted in the Riksdag,

plena plenorum had become “mere parliamentary parades” (*parlamentariska parader*) without direct influence on the decision. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 7 Apr., 1877, 1) Similarly, in 1885 *Dagblad* wrote that as the Swedish procedures had given the estates the possibility to continue discussion, plena plenorum had been given “the character of a club discussion” (*karakteren af blott en klubbdiskussion*) without any real importance. Thus, under the old practice the decisive debates for which the members saved their energy took place in the individual estates (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 15 Jan., 1885, 1–2). According to *Dagblad*, the clause banning further discussion in the Finnish Diet Act of 1869 was introduced in order to give plenum plenorum’s deliberations (*öfverläggningar*) the importance and significance of a decisive debate (*afgörande debatt*). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 17 Jan., 1885, 1)

Dagblad liberals’ repeated their interpretation of the § 47 subsection on various occasions. In the Burghers’ discussion on the Diet Act in 1867, Edvard Bergh argued that banning further debate was the only way to give plenum plenorum the value of a real discussion (*en verklig discussion*). The members were to present their opinions (*åsigter*) and arguments (*skäl*) so that they were given the possibility to be “on one side pleaded” (*å ena sidan kunn åberopas*) and “on the other side refuted” (*å andra sidan blifva bemötta*) (Burghers 1867, I, 482). *Dagbladists* emphasised also another aspect of § 47. *Helsingfors Dagblad* argued that proposals for the votes to be carried out immediately after plenum plenorum should be formulated at the joint sitting, not in the individual estates, as further discussion on the matter was banned. Alternatively, the task could be given to the Speaker’s Council (*talmanskonferensen*). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Apr., 1877, 1; see also Mechelin 1876, 166–167) *Dagblad* noted that in the first plenum plenorum (1872) Speaker Archbishop Bergenheim had given birth to a false and impractical practice when he had no grounds to make a voting proposal for all four estates. Consequently, the right to make the proposal was left to the speakers of the individual estates. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 15 Jan., 1885, 1–2) Bergenheim’s interpretation was supported by the majority of the *Juridiska Föreningen*’s central division in 1873, who saw the formulation of common voting proposals and banning of further discussion contradictory with the Diet Act’s sections 57–65 on reading and decision-making in the estates (see *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 22 Jan., 1873, 1). The only dissenting view within the *Juridiska Föreningen* was made by *Dagbladist* Anders Herman Chydenius (*ibid.*; on *Dagblad*’s critique against the association’s decision, see also *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Apr., 1877, 1).

6.6.2 Chydenius’s proposal on plenum plenorum as an effort to parliamentarise the Diet readings

Dagblad liberals not only advocated more popular use of plenum plenorum, but went on to propose that it be made a permanent and obligatory part of the Diet reading. *Dagbladists* argued the Finnish procedures to be developed into a form that would allow discussions to be conducted as carefully and many-sidedly as possible. For *Dagblad* liberals, this could be achieved by letting the different opinions and arguments clash in different phases of parliamentary

reading and by introducing features of unicameralism into the procedures. The Diet mode of proceeding was to be transformed to approach the parliamentary model of three readings of a bill, which had been a part of the British parliamentary model from the Middle Ages (Redlich 1908a [1905], ix). The purpose of the three separate readings was to allow sufficient time for deliberation and weighing the arguments between the different phases. Popular arguments for the intervals between readings had been that they gave opportunities to reflect and subjected the debates of the parliament to a public discussion and possibly to the review of experts. In the *Dagblad* liberals' model, which focused on the parliament's deliberative aspect, two of the three plenary debates were to be *plena plenorum*.

Dagblad liberals saw *plenum plenorum* as a means to simplify the Diet reading, save time and remove the ambiguity from deliberation and decision-making. Thus, for *Dagblad*ists following the 'analogy to parliament' would also enable decisions to be made more efficiently compared to the estate mode of proceeding. For example in 1877 *Helsingfors Dagblad* argued for simpler rules of procedure (*en enklare arbetsordning*) and criticised the Diet's stiff and ponderous multi-divided political organisation (*otympliga tunggrodda, mångdelta politiska organisationer*) (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 7 Apr., 1877, 1). *Dagblad* emphasised that if modified, *plenum plenorum* would save time from multiple discussions and the complex accommodation process. According to the newspaper, in the existing Diet procedure "arguments and counter-arguments (*skäl och motskäl*) are repeated again and again (*upprepas och återupprepas*) four different times instead of being presented (*framställas*) and refuted (*bemötas*) once." (ibid.) Similarly in 1867, representatives of the Nobility and the Clergy in the Diet's Constitutional Law Committee (Grundlags-utskottet) supported the banning of further discussion after *plenum plenorum* as a means to restrain duplicate discussion (*dubbla diskussioner*) and consumption of time. However, some of the committee members noted on the contrary that no exhaustive discussion could take place in a large assembly (*församling*) and thus further discussion should be allowed. (Grundlags-utskottet 1867, 53) *Dagblad* argued that *plenum plenorum* could save time since it would avoid the time-consuming accommodations (*sammanjemkningarna*) between estate decisions (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Apr., 1877, 1). If proposals for voting were given in the plenum, same proposals could be simply answered with 'yes' or 'no' in the estates (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 17 Jan., 1885, 1; Mechelin 1876, 166-167).

In the Burghers on 2 February 1885 *Helsingfors Dagblad's* editor Anders Herman Chydenius²¹⁵ presented a petition memorandum (*petitionsmemorial*)

²¹⁵ Anders Herman Chydenius (1833-1896) has been considered one of the first advocates of liberalism and one of the first professional journalists in Finland. Chydenius presented himself as an opponent of bureaucracy, who was oriented to the west and concerned over the status of Finnish. Chydenius studied abroad in Sweden and Denmark, and worked as a reporter with *Göteborgs Posten* as well as *Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfartstidning* 1860-61. Chydenius was involved in *Helsingfors Dagblad* throughout its publication: first as a reporter (1862-1883) and then as the editor (1883-87). Chydenius focused especially on foreign news and editorials. As a member of the Burghers (1877-1888) Chydenius was a leading liberal figure. Chydenius's

concerning revision of § 47 of the Diet Act.²¹⁶ Chydenius highlighted the benefits of unicameralism included in the plenum plenorum. He emphasised social aspects of the modern unicameral parliamentary model, noting that the estate system kept the members of the representative assembly (*folkrepresentationens medlemmar*) foreign to each other so that their different opinions rarely encountered each other (*möta hvarandra*) in a general debate (*i allmän debatt*) outside the committees. Chydenius proposed that, in addition to the rule that plenum plenorum be based on the wish of two estates, the procedure should be made obligatory for all government proposals, petition proposals and questions and their referral to committees. Furthermore, in an effort to move the emphasis of Diet work away from committee negotiations, Chydenius argued that all proposals for accommodation (*sammanjemkningsförslag*) given by committee should be handled (*behandlas*) in the plenum plenorum. (Burghers 1885, I, 173–175; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Feb., 1885, 2)

Chydenius saw that such an organisation could harmoniously mould the Diet mode of proceeding (*landtdagsproceduren för ärendenas behandling*) into four consecutive phases (*fyra efter hvarandra följande skeden*), which would to a certain degree correspond to “the procedure of multiple readings of the bill, which has been accepted in most other parliamentary assemblies” (*den procedur med olika läsningar som är antagen i de flesta andra parlamentariska församlingar*). The estates would come together twice in each matter, in the beginning and in the end, thus creating closer relations between themselves (*träda i en intimare ställning till hvarandra*), and give the presenters of the different opinions (*företrädarene af de olika meningarne*) the possibility at least twice in each question to confront each other in a general and joint debate (*tillfälle att åtminstone tvänne gånger möta hvarandra i allmän och gemensam debatt*). (Burghers 1885, I, 175) The Burghers estate voted in support of referring the proposal to the Law Committee (Burghers 1885, I, 177), but due to the hurried Diet work, the Committee declined to examine the question.

Chydenius’s petition was presented in detail, probably by Chydenius himself, in an extensive three-part article series in *Helsingfors Dagblad* (15 Jan., 1885, 1–2; 17 Jan., 1885, 1; 18 Jan., 1885, 1–2). The series was prefaced by an article entitled “Some Defects in our System of Representation” (*Några brister i vårt representationssystem*) (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Jan., 1885, 2). It argued that representation of the people had begun to play a larger role in political life (*statslifvet*) and that the question of a representation reform was becoming increasingly topical. However, the Finnish reform could not be similar to the British parliamentary reforms (*engelska parlamentsreformerna*), in which new groups of citizens had been given suffrage while the actual arrangements within the parliament and its mode of proceeding (*anordningarne inom parlamentet och dess arbetsätt*) had remained mainly unchanged. Finnish reform was to concern the inter-

father’s great-uncle was Anders Chydenius, a pioneer of Swedish liberalism. Chydenius family owned the Simelius publishing house. (Väisänen 2001a)

²¹⁶ Chydenius’s proposal included a presentation of the issue and proposals for improvements similar to those that had been presented in *Dagblad* less than a month earlier (see below).

nal division of representation of the people and its rules of procedure (*folkrepresentationens inre fördelning och arbetsordning*), similar to the Swedish reform of the 1860s. For *Dagblad*, the Finnish division of representatives (*representanternas fördelning*) and the forms of their work (*formerna för deras verksamhet*) were built on the old standpoint that forced the Finns to drag on their political life (*släpa fram vårt politiska lif*) with “perhaps the most defective parliamentary mechanism that could be found” (*den kanske mest bristfälliga parlamentariska mekanismen, som kan förefinnas*). One of the greatest shortcomings in the parliamentary deliberations were that the members of different estates remained foreign to each other and were unable to change a line (*replik*), resulting in one-sided decisions by the individual estates (*en betänklig ensidighet i de fyra skilda kamrarnes beslut*). Member never had the chance to hear the debates (*en debatt*) of other estates. The chances to read about the debates rested on the members’ own interest and initiative.²¹⁷ (*ibid.*)

In the article series on plenum plenorum, *Dagblad* argued that the obsolete division of four estates would have been abolished by the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 had it not been the emperor’s personal wish and order that they continue. Efforts to compensate for the defects were made by a variety of means considered possible. *Dagblad* examined in detail Chydenius’s proposal to make the plenum plenorum an obligatory part of the Diet deliberation. For *Dagblad*, the plenum plenorum should be obligatory in two different stages of the reading: discussions on referring a question to committee (*om remiss till utskott*) and on proposals for accommodation of the different decisions of the estates (*förslag till sammanjemkning af skiljakhet i ståndens beslut*) or in all final discussions on a matter (*eller öfverhufvud sista slutbehandlingen af hvarje ärende*). Four stages of a matter’s parliamentary deliberation (*fyra stadier för ett ärendes parlamentariska behandling*) would be organised: Two of these, the first and the last, would take place in joint discussions, with committee readings and individual estates’ discussions as phases in between (*mellanliggande skeden*). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 17 Jan., 1885, 1) The proposal was a variation on the principle of three plenary readings. According to *Dagblad*, the first reading would be a plenum plenorum to debate the question of which committee a matter was to be referred to for examination. In the second phase the matter was discussed in the committee. In the second reading the committee report was discussed in the individual estates that decided on the matter and then remitted it to the committee. If no unanimous or majority decision (*beslut för samstämmighet eller pluralitet*) was reached, the committee submitted a report on the accommodation (*sammanjemkningsbetänkande*) to a plenum plenorum (third reading). *Dagblad* argued that even if the committee saw that a coherent decision had been reached, it would be good if members of the Diet to have the possibility to make remarks and review the committee’s decision on the matter at the very end, in a plenum plenorum. (*ibid.*) Thus, *Dagblad* wanted to move the power over the

²¹⁷ It is notable that the efforts to develop the procedures on parliamentary publicity and minutes aimed at overcoming the deficiencies of the four-estate division in this respect (see Sections 7.3.2 and 8).

final articulation of the Diet's decision from committees to a plenum of all four estates.

For *Dagblad*, in the first phase of reading the plenum plenorum could advance and save time in both government proposals' and petition memorandums' referral to committees (*remiss-frågor*). In the case of government proposals, which were obligatorily sent to committees, the plenum plenorum could decide which committee²¹⁸ to refer the proposal to (for the referral of the petitions, see below). This would save time from later negotiation as individual estates often submitted question to different committees. In joint referral debates, proposals that were seen to be important to the committee's examination could be refuted (*framställning får bemötas*) and possible arguments against (*möjliga skälen emot*) could be brought to the committee's attention. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 18 Jan., 1885, 1–2)

Manifesting the *Dagblad* liberals' aim to give the final power of decision to a quasi-unicameral assembly, *Dagblad* argued that it was of great importance that in the final debate the opinions and standpoints, which had already been established and grouped *during* the earlier phases of the deliberation, could come into direct contact with each other (*få träda i direkt beröring med hoarandra*) and the supporters of the different standpoints received the possibility to hear the arguments and counter-arguments presented and refuted (*skäl och motskäl framställas och bemötas*) by those in the different estates who had the most influence in enforcing the opinions (*meningernas genomdrifvande*) in the question under discussion. At this stage also the government's point of view could have an important influence on the final result (see below). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 17 Jan., 1885, 1)

Dagblad argued that a procedure of four stages, two of which took place in a plenum plenorum, could be used as a means of moving closer to foreign parliamentary practice and preparing the Finnish system for the inevitable, but yet distant, representation reform. The reform would be easier to carry out if the system was already leaning (*böjd*) towards it (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 18 Jan., 1885, 2). For *Dagblad*, the practice of multiple readings of a bill constituted "one of the elements of modern parliamentary procedure most suitable for its purpose" (*utgör ett af det moderna parlamentariska förfarandets mest ändamålsenliga moment*). Although the suggested procedure (*antydd procedure*) could not within the four-estate system be fully equivalent to a regular parliamentary reading (*det vanliga parlamentariska tillvägagåendet*) of several readings, the revision could be used as a way to approach this goal. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 17 Jan., 1885, 1) According to *Dagblad*, plenum plenorum had the seeds of a more developed parliamentarism (*ett frö till en något mera utvecklad parlamentarism*). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 17 Jan., 1885, 1)

²¹⁸ The decision about which committee a government proposal was sent to was usually based on a proposal of the Speaker's Council. Rejecting the Speaker's Council's proposal required the support of two estates. Committees for petitions were decided by the estate in which the matter was taken up, usually unanimously with the petitioner. The other estates were able to take part in the reading of a petition only after they had received the committee's report. (Lilius 1974, 234)

6.6.3 Plenum plenum as a means for parliamentary oversight and responsibility

Under the rule of the Russian Empire, the old Finnish constitutions, the Swedish Instrument of Government of 1772 and the Union and Security Act of 1789 prescribed a strict system of dualism. In principle, the monarch possessed the highest governmental power and the parliament's significance was limited to a mere "contribution". In practice, a great part of the emperor's executive power in Finland was distributed to other organs, primarily to the Senate, which had significant power of decision in matters of governance and administration. The Senate prepared and enforced the decisions of the emperor and prepared the government proposals for the parliament. According to law, the senators were responsible to the emperor alone, who appointed them for periods of three years. The governor-general was the chairman of the Senate, but participated in its sittings rarely. His statements to the emperor could, however, influence the resolution of questions. (Brotherus 1963, 86–87; Jansson 1982, 12–13, 15–16, 21–22) In legislation the Diet decided on the content of the law, but a law could not be removed or enacted without the consent of the emperor. The estates had the right to decide on appropriation taxes and to check the state finances. The Parliament Act of 1906 did not change the situation, although it to certain extent strengthened the parliament's powers by, for example, introducing an elementary system of interpellations in § 32 which, however, had little meaning during the period of Russification. Hopes for a new Constitution Act that could have changed the parliamentary system were buried time and time again. (Jansson 1982, 12–13, 15–16)

Finnish actors, however, made procedural proposals in order to gradually develop the relation between the government and the parliament. One of the most notable of these was the estates' right to review government actions for the periods between Diet sessions – a topic that had been discussed already in the 1860s, although proper efforts to include it in the procedure were made only in the 1880s. In 1882 Fennoman Thiodolf Rein of the Nobility and a member of the *Valvoja* group and Fennoman Jaakko Forsman of the Clergy made a proposal for a regularly appointed audit committee (*tarkastuswaliokunta*) that would check the minutes of the Senate and report back to the estates on Senate adherence to the constitutions, the law and the best interest of the nation (*maan todellista etua*). The estates could also report their view on this to the emperor. The proposal was modelled on the Constitutional Law Committee in Sweden's Instrument of Government of 1809 and the Riksdag Act of 1810 (see Rein 1882a; 1882b; *Hämäläinen*, 25 Feb., 1882, 3). Rein's proposal was not sent to committee due to the Svecoman and Dagbladist opposition. Forsman's proposal was sent to committee, but never discussed there. In 1885 Forsman repeated his proposal, now together with leading Svecoman V. M. von Born of the Nobility. After debate, the estates passed a petition to revise the Diet Act so that the estates would be given a report on all important government actions that had occurred after the beginning of the previous Diet session. The emperor, however, rejected the petition after the Senate, the governor-general and the Committee for Finnish

affairs raised objections. (Tuominen 1964, 203) In 1882, the proposal was criticised as being too modest to have a real parliamentary influence and it would only undermine the power of the Senate. The *Dagbladists* saw that such a right should be extended to cover other governmental and administrative actors, such as the Committee for Finnish Affairs and the governor-general's office. In addition, they argued that the committee could be used to attack individual senators instead of making the Senate as a whole responsible to the Diet. The Fennomans claimed that the real reason behind the objections in the estates was a Svecoman effort to obstruct reforms. (Rein 1882a; 1882b; *Hämeen Sanomat*, 28 Feb., 1882, 1–2)

The question was taken up again in the aftermath of the Great Strike in 1905, when Tsar Nicholas II through the November Manifesto assigned the Senate the task of formulating a proposal for parliament's right to supervise the legality of the official acts of Senate members. The task was then given to the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–1906, whose proposal gave the Eduskunta the right to prosecute a Senate member in a tribunal. The emperor never ratified the law. (Tuominen 1964, 205–207)

According to Forsman's proposal, the purpose of the procedure was to increase cooperation between the government and the parliament (*wilkaampaa ja lähempää yhdys-waikutusta hallituskunnan ja eduskunnan välillä*) and increase trust of the people in government members, which were essential preconditions of constitutionalism. Forsman thought that such cooperation would decrease or eliminate the dissent between the government and the parliament and assist the passage of important reforms on language and education. (*Hämeen Sanomat*, 14 Feb., 1882, 1) Fennomans newspapers saw the proposal as "a beginning for the ministerial responsibility that existed in other constitutional countries".²¹⁹ They argued that in "parliamentary countries" the monarch was not allowed to decide anything without hearing from the ministers or to decide anything contrary to their advice. In "individual matters", the minister in charge of the matter was responsible. In "general matters" the whole cabinet (*ministeristö*) was responsible (*wastuun-alainen*) since the monarch decided on matters based on its advice. In cases of severe disagreement between the two, the ministers usually resigned. In addition, the government had to enjoy the confidence of the majority of the estates. If not, it was the government's moral and legal responsibility to resign. (*Hämäläinen*, 25 Feb., 1882, 3; *Hämeen Sanomat*, 28 Feb., 1882, 1–2)

Instead of a system of legal accountability, the *Dagblad* liberals emphasised plenum plenum and its debating characteristics as a means for parliamentary responsibility. In Millian terms, the idea was to debate, to plead interests and opinions "in the face of the government" (Mill 2001 [1861], 105). *Dagblad* liberals regularly took up the issue of parliamentary responsibility along with their project of developing the Diet's debating aspects. In the 1880s Fennomans also started to pay more attention to plenum plenum as a means of fighting the Svecoman majorities in the Nobility and Burgher estates. In addition, the Fen-

²¹⁹ "Alku siihen ministerien edeswastuu-alaisuuteen, joka muissa perustuslaillisissa waltakunnissa on olemassa".

nomans emphasised government participation in the plenum plenorum's discussions as a means of enhancing the exchange of information between the parliament and the government.

As presented earlier, the relations between the government and the Diet were recognised by the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865, which included a subsection of § 47 of the Diet Act on Senate access to the estates' joint sittings. The Committee emphasised plenum plenorum as an arena where ideas, opinions and information between the representation of the people and the government could be exchanged. Although the Committee did not explicitly mention 'parliamentary responsibility', the aspect was acknowledged. When discussing the Diet Act in the Senate, J. V. Snellman presented amendments to section 47. According to Snellman, members of the Senate could also convey information to the assembly, but this could lead to "an unedifying play" (*det föga uppbyggliga skådespelet*) in which two members of the government (*ledamöter i styrelsen*) would try to argue for their own opposing opinions in front of the representation (*skulle inför representationen söka göra gällande sina mot hvarandra stridande åsikter i frågan*). Snellman argued that the Constitutional Law Committee's proposal lacked one feature that was found in all representative assemblies (*representantförsamlingar*), namely, a defence for the government's proposals. Snellman saw that in order to advocate for proper mediation of opinions between the government and the Diet, a government commissioner (*Regeringskommisarie*) should be appointed for each plenum plenorum in order to communicate the required information (*meddela begärda upplysningar*); if a 'gracious proposal' (*Nådig proposition*) was negotiated (*förhandlas*), the commissioner explained its purpose and defended its content (*bestämmandena*). The commissioners could be appointed for different sorts of Diet matters (*för hvarje särskild slags aflandtdagsärenden*) such as economic, financial and ecclesiastic. (Senate 1866, § 49)

The Fennoman emphasis on responsibility was highlighted by Yrjö Koskinen's Fennoman periodical *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti* (4, 1869, 107–108) in its commentary on the Diet Act of 1869. According to the periodical, the Diet Act gave the government (*hallituskunta*) a very different position than before.

The estates' joint discussions offer the possibility for representatives of the government (*hallituksen edusmiehet*), that is, the members of the Senate, to be present, to speak and to be spoken to (*olla saapuwillä, puhuwaisina ja puhuteltawina*). In practice, this means that they have the duty (*owat welwolliset*) to report (*selkoa tekemään*) on the true nature and purpose of the government's actions (*hallitustointen todellisesta luonteesta ja tarkoituksesta*) in front of the estates; this is their ministerial responsibility (*ministerillinen edeswastuu*), to the extent that such is possible in our circumstances. (*Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti*, 4, 1869, 107)

Presenting the typical Fennoman idea of an already existing, predetermined best interest of the nation, *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti* saw that the procedure helped to keep out of government undefined (*epämääräiset*) and wavering (*horjuwaiset*) opinions that did not understand and correspond to the needs and wishes of the country. (*Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti*, 4, 1869, 107; on the relationship between the government and the estates, see also *Morgonbladet*, 1 Feb., 1872, 1)

Dagblad liberals treated the matter in terms of foreign parliamentary discussions. For example, in 1872 *Helsingfors Dagblad* (3 Oct., 1872, 1) wrote that in states with one or two chambers the ministers (*ministrarne*) were present in the meetings of the representative assembly (*representationens sammanträden*) and were interpellated (*interPELLERAS*) during debates, especially in questions whose approval raised doubts within the assembly. In Finland, by contrast, members of the government were present in normal debates (*normala debatter*) only as regular passive listeners. No interpellations could be made in order to become convinced of the government's point of view or to propose amendments to its positions. *Dagblad* argued that plenum plenorum offered the only means in Finland for such parliamentary feature. It encouraged the estates to use it more often and more efficiently. (*ibid.*) *Dagblad* saw that, in all countries with a constitutional system of government, government participation in the discussions of representative assemblies (*representantförsamlingar*) was a necessary condition for a healthy relationship between the government and the parliament (*sundt förhållande mellan regering och parlament*). However, in Finland only in the Nobility could government members make their voices heard (*göra sina roster hörda*). *Dagblad* noted that "according to modern demands, without joint sittings our Diets will remain without the essential preconditions for representative activity". (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 7 Apr., 1877, 1)

Leo Mechelin (1876, 166–167) noted that members of the government had access to the plenum plenorum, where they could give detailed clarifications (*förklara*) and defences (*försvara*) of government opinions and policies, as was stated in the parliament acts of most states (*i de flesta staters riksdagsordningar*). For Mechelin, frequent use of plenum plenorum would also help to promote coherence (*sådan samstämmighet*) through which the estates would have better prospects for winning approval of their decisions. Under the existing practices, a government rejection resulted in restarting the treatment of the question from the beginning. According to Mechelin, another political advantage (*en annan politisk vinning*) of government participation in a debate (*styrelsemedlemmarnes deltagande i debatten*) would be that the government could lean on (*stöda sig*) the representative assembly and know whether it had support for a program it embraced and wished to carry out. This was necessary and beneficial for the government's action and position. Mechelin saw plenum plenorum as a means to fight what was left of bureaucratic traditions (*byråkratiska traditioner*) and force them to yield to the constitutional notion of the politician's position (*en konstitutionel uppfattning af statsmannens ställning*). (Mechelin 1876, 166) Mechelin advocated plenum plenorum as a procedure that would facilitate deliberation between the government and the Diet, provide the Diet with a better success rate and greater leverage for its decisions, and at the same time give the government better support in protecting Finnish interests against Russia's imperial government. Thus, Mechelin's idea was to develop parliamentarism in an imperialist context in which a responsible parliamentary government was unlikely.

Fennomans of the early 1880s, instead of emphasising the development of deliberation between competing opinions and points of view, focused on ple-

num plenorum as a means to enhance the consensual cooperation between the Diet and the government. This was a result of their dissatisfaction with the alleged obstruction of the Senate against reforms to benefit the Finnish-speaking majority, especially in the question of the school system. In 1882 the Fennoman newspaper *Morgonbladet* (20 Jan., 1882, 1) called for an exchange of opinions and ideas between the government and the representative assembly (*meningsutbyte mellan regering och representation*). The newspaper noted that the Diet Act already included plenum plenorum as a means for a practice (*praxis*) that enabled both “political powers in the state” (*båda statsmakterna*) to negotiate (*samråda*) on matters. This was not to take place in a manner in which both sides merely presented their ultimatums. *Morgonbladet* noted that in foreign countries each minister had a branch he was responsible for. In the Finnish Senate the heads of the administrative departments (*expeditionscheferna*) were the closest counterparts to the ministers of other countries and therefore they could represent the government. The government participation in the joint meetings of the estates depended on a senators’ personal desire, but since the relations between the ‘political powers’ were generally recognised as necessary for the common good (*allmänna bästa*), the use of plenum plenorum was a duty prescribed by one’s love of country (*fosterlandskärleken*). (*Morgonbladet*, 20 Jan., 1882, 1)

In the mid-1880s, the Young Finns criticised the old Finnish Party leaders’ ideology of unanimity (*yksimielisyys-aate*) according to which the representative assembly was to present itself as unanimous to the monarch as internal disagreement deteriorated its role as a “political power in the state” (*waltio-mahti*). According to Young Finn newspapers, Agathon Meurman and *Uusi Suometar* as well as the *Dagbladists* were stuck with the rigid system of dualism that was based on “the liberal catechism” and defined the government and parliament as the two “political powers” standing with or against each other. This was based on the misconception that society was grounded on consensus (*yksimielisyys*) and harmony (*sopusointu*). The assembly that represented society represented also its opposing aims (*ristiriitaisia pyrintöjä*), parties and classes and could not pretend to be unanimous. It was politically shortsighted to promote the value of the estates by silence that was based on non-existent unanimity. The real word did not correspond to schematic theories of professors and their application in a four-estate system was impossible as such. The Young Finn attack was motivated by the old Fennomans’ demands to avoid petitions of individual estates, which for the Young Finns was a means to get the voices of factions heard. (*Aamulehti*, 25 June, 1885, 1; *Waasan Lehti*, 23 Dec., 1885, 1²²⁰) Their criticism of schematic separation of powers resembled Walter Bagehot’s stands on Mill in

²²⁰ The article of *Waasan Lehti* was published widely in the Young Finn newspapers. The writer of the articles was pseudonym “K. W. F.”, who was most probably school examiner Karl Waldemar Forsman. Forsman had earlier written in the Fennoman periodical *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti* and was the editor of *Morgonbladet* 1876–1878 (Landgren 1988, 323). In K. K. Forsman highlighted the importance of foreign models in developing the Finnish society and called for cooperation between the higher and lower classes of the society. He saw the political and social crisis as an inevitable part of the development of the society. (See Forsman 1874)

The English Constitution in which Bagehot argued that “an observer who looks at the living reality will wonder at the contrast to the paper description” (Bagehot 1867, 1).

The old Fennoman stand came up in the Nobility on 17 February 1882, in a debate on Rein and Jaakko Forsman’s petition memorandum on establishing the estates’ audit committee (*ståndernas granskningsutskott*). Fennoman Bernhard Fredrik Godenhjelm²²¹ supported Rein’s proposal and criticised a presented standpoint according to which “the petition did not contain enough liberal bearing” (*liberal riktning*) and “did not realise the ideal of constitutionalism (*det ideal af konstitutionalism*) that the modern political theory (*den moderna statsvisheten*) imposed” (Godenhjelm’s speech was published in *Morgonbladet*, 21 Feb., 1882, 1–2). For Godenhjelm, the demands of the liberal theories for wide ministerial responsibility (*ministeransvarighet*), two chambers and so on could not be realised without magic (*trollkraft*). He accused the liberals of rejecting the importance of small steps in developing the Finnish system of government in a liberal (or open-minded) spirit (*statskick i frisinnad anda*). Godenhjelm saw the importance of plenum plenorum not in the joint deliberations, but in its possibility to give the members of the government the possibility to publicly clarify their positions and defend themselves. Plenum plenorum should be used not for actual discussion (*en egentlig discussion*), but to investigate a real or factual state of affairs (*utreda ett faktiskt förhållande*). (*Morgonbladet*, 21 Feb., 1882, 1–2) Thus, the contrast between the Fennoman and the *Dagblad* liberal interests and approaches to deliberation was again manifested. Godenhjelm, prioritising the audit committee over the plenum plenorum, presented plenum plenorum’s many-sided discussions as confusing and contrasted it with the Audit Committee’s fact-based investigation and clarification.

In 1885 *Helsingfors Dagblad* examined the government’s participation in the estates’ joint sittings in connection with Chydenius’s petition. *Dagblad* emphasised the need to develop parliamentary cooperation between the government and the assembled representation of the people (*parlamentarisk samverkan mellan regeringen och den samlade folkrepresentationen*). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 15 Jan., 1885, 1–2) According to Chydenius’s petition memorandum, without efficient use of plenum plenorum the existing system robbed the assembly of the possibility to have parliamentary influence (*det parlamentariska inflytande*) on the government through a joint debate (Burghers 1885, I, 173–175). For *Dagblad* and Chydenius, in the case of government proposals the government was to be given the possibility to present and defend its views already in the referral debate. Thus, typical misunderstandings would be avoided, less written justifications would be required and the government could clarify what kinds of amendments (*modifikationerna och ändringarna*) it could support. The government members’ statements

²²¹ Bernhard Fredrik Godenhjelm (1840–1912) was a lecturer and journalist. Godenhjelm wrote for the journal *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti* from its birth and was an active member of *Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura* (Finnish Literature Society). Godenhjelm was a member of the Nobility 1867–1885 and an advocate of women’s education in Finland. Godenhjelm’s literary history, especially his *Handbook of the History of Finnish Literature* (1896), reflected the Snellmanian national project. (Varpio 2000)

would become binding on further treatment of the question. In this way “a step onwards would be taken in the development of parliamentarism and responsibility in front of the representation of the people” (*ett moment till utveckling af parlamentarism och ansvarighet inför folkrepresentationen i dess helhet*). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 18 Jan., 1885, 2)

Dagblad argued that the government members' participation in plenum plenorum was especially important in the case of individuals' petition memoranda (*enskildes petitionsmemorial*), which did not necessarily lead to any discussion after the preliminary referral debate, but served in the Diet as a *ultima ratio*, whose purpose was to call the government's attention to greater or lesser flaws (*missförhållande*) within the system of representation. If plenum plenorum was applied in the first stage of reading, not all petition memoranda would need to be sent to the committees since the government would be informed and questioned about them directly. Petitions sent to the committee would be taken under more serious examination and debate. Such a practice would save time and useless circulation (*omgång*) and writing. Petitions could thus serve as something similar to interpellations in the other countries' chambers (*något liknande interpellationerna i andra landers kamrar*), or even as a seed for parliamentary reading and government responsibility vis-à-vis the estates (*ett frö till parlamentarisk tillvägagående och regeringsansvarighet inför ständerna*). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 18 Jan., 1885, 2)

Although the plans for parliamentary responsibility were not fulfilled *in toto*, they paved way for new proposals and practices. Later in 1885 the estates passed a petition according to which Senate members had the right to participate in the plenary discussions of the individual estates. The petition was, however, turned down due to the objections of the governor-general and the Committee for Finnish Affairs. It was argued that such a procedure would signify a first step towards a parliamentary system of government that was in contradiction with the character of estate representation. This was the last time a change in the Senate members' relation to the estates was proposed in the Diet. (Tuominen 1974, 369)

During the late Diets and the early Eduskunta, it became a practice to appoint senators who enjoyed the confidence of the parliament. In 1878, E. G. Palmén had called for this although the Finnish constitution “was not cast in the mould of parliamentarism” (Palmén 1878, 266). In 1882 Mechelin and Yrjö Koskinen became the first political party representatives to be appointed to the Senate, and by 1885 the composition of the Senate reflected the relative strengths of the parties in the Diet. At the same time, the Senate began to consist of persons supporting a shared political programme, who all resigned if the programme could not be implemented. (Brotherus 1963, 87–88; Jansson 1982, 21–22; Tuominen 1964, 21–22)

Section 51 of the Parliament Act of 1906 gave the chairman, vice-chairmen and members of the Senate the right to attend Eduskunta sittings and to participate in their discussions. During the parliamentary session of 1907, members of the Senate participated in the Eduskunta sittings relatively often and thirty-six

of their speeches were recorded in the minutes (including a few who were also members of the parliament). In addition, section 32 of the Parliament Act gave the Eduskunta members the right to ask questions from the senators on matters concerning their branch of administration. The rules of procedure of 1907 stipulated that after a discussion on such an interpellation, the Eduskunta could decide if the question required further examination in committee. The interpellations were, however, to be submitted in written form and the senators could refuse to answer them. Even if an interpellation was answered, under the existing system of strict dualism it did not need to have any political consequences. As only a signature of a single member was required for an interpellation, twenty-five were presented in 1907–1914. In the sessions of 1907 and 1908 the Senate replied to all ten interpellations orally with discussion afterwards. In 1908, Mechelin's Senate resigned as a result of an interpellation about Finland's relation to Russia and the Russian efforts to undermine Finnish autonomy. After 1909, when the Russian authority shifted executive power even more strongly away from the Finnish actors, the Senate members participated in the Eduskunta sittings only to fulfil their obligatory tasks, such as handing in government propositions; all interpellations were left without reply. (Jansson 1982, 24–26)

6.7 On the failure of plenum plenorum

After the second plenum plenorum, held in 1885, none of the political groups was satisfied with the institution. Plenum plenorum in the way it was procedurally organised and put into practice suited neither the *Dagblad* liberal nor the Fennomans notions of deliberation. Dagbladists saw plenum plenorum's existing procedural form as insufficient to fulfil the debating purpose it was designed for. The Fennomans felt that the estates' joint meetings were incapable of producing concrete results or consensus, and thus brought no additional value to the committee system or to the accommodation model it facilitated. Fennomans in the 1880s understood plenum plenorum as an arena where the language strife could be highlighted and aggravated. Finally, the transition in 1907 to a unicameral Eduskunta made the institution purposeless.

A reason presented in the Finnish discussions for the unpopularity of plenum plenorum was the unaccustomedness to public speaking before large audiences. The two plena plenorum sessions that were held received wide attention in the press, especially the second one due to its topic. As a consequence, the atmosphere of a large public meeting caused trepidation and timidity among the members of the Diet. For example, the Law Committee of 1882 noted that the members were unwilling to arrange plena plenorum as the joint meetings required greater more formal presentation skills (*större anspråk på formell färdighet i framställningssättet*). This meant sacrificing the possibility to speak more freely and often within the smaller circle of an estate sitting. (*Nya Pressen*, 28 May, 1884, 2)

Another reason was members' attachment to the idea and principles of estate representation. It was argued that plenum plenorum rules were contradictory with the procedures for the estates' readings and threatening to the estates' rights and privileges. For example, according to the Law Committee of 1882, the rule on immediate decision-making after joint sittings made the estates hesitant, and some member's feared losing the possibility to continue holding individual estate discussions. (*Nya Pressen*, 28 May, 1884, 2) In the plenum plenorum, the Nobility was by far the biggest estate in number, and was thus seen also as the most influential. This had been seen as problematic also in the Swedish discussions (Gränström 1916). In the Diet's joint committees, in contrast, each estate was equally represented.

The subsection of § 47 of the Diet Act on immediate decision-making was interpreted as contradictory with the procedure according to which estate discussion could continue for as long as members wanted to speak on a matter. For example, before the plenum plenorum of 1885, Lord Marshal Samuel Werner von Troil stated in the Nobility that if some members did not want to speak in the plenum plenorum, they should have the opportunity to speak in their estate's plenary before the vote, since the Diet Act did not explicitly forbid such practice and since its rules on the estates' reading and decision-making permitted discussions to continue for as long as members wanted to speak. (Nobility 1885, II, 584) Due to the popularity of this argument, in 1882 the Diet's Law Committee saw that the only amendment that could make the joint meetings more popular was the removal of the ban on further discussion. However, at the same time some members of the Committee argued that such a decision would make the whole institution irrelevant, and make deliberation in plenum plenorum a mere meeting of "academic character" (*akademisk karaktär*). (*Nya Pressen*, 28 May, 1884, 2) Thus, clinging onto the model of estate representation affected the attitudes towards joint discussions. From both sides of the issue, the whole procedure, as such, seemed impractical.

Another popular argument was that plena plenorum were organised on the wrong questions. After the sitting of 1872, *Helsingfors Dagblad* argued in a Millian manner that plenum plenorum was not created for small economic issues, but for "the great questions that dealt with the life of the people" (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 14 June, 1872, 1). The topic of the plenum plenorum of 1885, on the other hand, was seen as so controversial and emotive that no real discussion, rapprochement, persuasion or deliberation could take place. The sitting was seen as a showcase for the prevailing language struggle. Fennoman newspapers called for concrete results to show that the joint discussions could be successful. In 1885 *Mikkelin Sanomat* (23 Apr., 1885, 1) noted that the expectations for the plenum plenorum had been low since reaching unanimity (*yksimielisyyden saavuttaminen*) had been seen as difficult if not impossible due to members' different opinions that would not change through discussion. Closer to the *Dagbladist* attitude, author Juhani Aho, who was a member of the Young Finn group, noted in the Oulu-based newspaper *Kaiku* on the expectations for the plenum plenorum that, although possibly no real results would be achieved

and “things would not move from place to another” (*asiat eivät siitä siirtyisikään sinne eikä tänne*), it was good that the language parties were for once speaking face-to-face about what was on their minds (*vasten naamaa toisillensa puhua, mitä mielessä liikkuu*). (Aho 1911, 23)

Another reason for plenum plenorum’s unpopularity was that it was considered a time-consuming institution. This opinion was strengthened by the plenum plenorum of 1885, which lasted twelve and a half hours.²²² This led to criticism and mockery of the institution, particularly in the conservative Fennoman press. For example, the newspaper *Hämäläinen* (30 May, 1885, 2–3; 29 July, 1885, 2) called plenum plenorum “comical” (*koomilliseen muistoon jäänyt säätyjen yhteinen istunto*) and “ever so hilarious” (*ikihupainen plenum plenorum*). In 1885 the Fennoman newspaper *Finland*, the successor of *Morgonbladet*, published statistics on who had spoken and how long in the second plenum plenorum (*Finland*, 14 Nov., 1885, 3; see also *Nya Pressen*, 13 Apr., 1885, 3). *Dagblad* liberals’ arguments on plenum plenorum’s ability to save time were aimed against such critique, and *Helsingfors Dagblad* (8 Apr., 1877, 1) admitted that the institution had been rarely used as the estates were drowning in different matters. In general, the liberal press published more complimentary descriptions of the plenum plenorum of 1885 (see e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 14 Apr., 1885, 2).

Another obstacle to more frequent use of plenum plenorum was argued to be the lack of a proper plenary hall. According to *Helsingfors Dagblad*, if a proper house of the estates were built, plenum plenorum would become a more often used procedure (*mer anlitaad procedur*). (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 28 Mar., 1872, 1; on a new session hall as a means to invigorate plenum plenorum, see also *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 27 Nov., 1871, 1; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 20 Mar., 1883, 1; *Nya Pressen*, 2 Feb., 1885, 1) Parliamentary architecture was discussed also in relation to the voting procedure of plenum plenorum. In 1885 Chydenius argued that the estates should be given the right to decide on a location close to where they voted after the joint sitting. Instead of returning to their separate halls or waiting for the next plenary, the decisions could be made immediately in the same building. (Burghers 1885, I, 173–175; on the options for facilities for immediate voting, see also *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 8 Apr., 1877, 1)

6.8 Parliamentary readings in the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1906

The Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–1906 included the idea of a unicameral parliament in its report. Unicameralism had gained wide support especially among the Finnish labour movement and the Old Finns before the Reform, and the public discussions gave impetus to the Committee. A bicameral parliament, adopted in most European countries (Seitkari 1958, 22–24), was on

²²² The plenum plenorum was argued to have lasted, depending on the method of assessment, from eleven-and-a-half to twelve-and-a-half hours.

the agenda of the Swedish Party, while some Young Finns also supported the model. (Mylly 2006, 121) In the Reform Committee the representation aspect and the possibilities to block the influence of the uneducated majority governed the discussion on unicameralism vs. bicameralism.

Whereas a bicameral parliament and its surrogates, such as sections (see Mylly 2006, 129–132, 138–140), were advocated on the grounds that they would restrain immature decision-making on the part of occasional majorities and secure calm and serious deliberation, in the Reform Committee the unicameral model was hardly at all defended for its deliberative character. In the rare examples, deliberation was reduced to the consensual idea of finding the best option, while at the same time highlighting the need to unify the people. Instead of plenary debate, many-sided examination took place in the committee. For example, Old Finn leader J. R. Danielson argued that the exclusion of the intelligentsia to the first chamber would only separate it from the people and create conflicts (*konflikttejä*) (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 8 Dec., 1905). Old Finn Juho Torppa argued that in the Diets the problem of reaching unanimity (*yksimielisyys*) was often the result of an inability to understand each other (*ymmärtää toisistaan*) rather than of holding different views on the common goals in the estates. Thus, full understanding (*täydellinen ymmärtämys*) and integration of different opinions (*eri käsityskannat tulisivat yhdistetyiksi*) could be reached only in a unicameral parliament. (ibid.) Old Finn J. K. Paasikivi argued that the best way to unify the people (*lujittaa kansa*) was with a unicameral parliament, and that a thorough and many-sided examination of matters (*asiat perusteellisesti ja monipuolisesti tutkitaan*) could be achieved with the help of a developed committee system (ibid.). Social Democrat Yrjö Sirola noted that a unicameral parliament would best serve the main purpose of “putting power in the hands of the people” (*kansa saa vallan käsiinsä*), “uniting the people” (*yhdistää kansaa*) and “satisfying the demands of the people” (ibid.).

The Reform Committee’s rhetoric focused on controlling and restraining dissensus, not on the importance of having an open and fair struggle between differing points of view and opposing opinions. Committee members highlighted the deliberative aspect in the discussions on the three readings of the bill, which the Committee ended up advocating. In the Eduskunta a referral debate and three plenary readings were accompanied by examinations in committee and the Grand Committee²²³ (Suomen Suuriruhtinaskunnan valtiopäiväjärjestys 1906, § 57). The model of three readings was in use in the most notable European parliaments. In addition to the British parliament, the model, with national variations, had been adopted in France in 1791 as well as in the Austrian Chamber of Deputies, the German Reichstag and the Danish Folketing

²²³ According to § 57 of the Parliament Act of 1906, the Grand Committee discussed all bills after their first reading in a plenary session. The Committee made a report which was then discussed in the second plenary reading. If the report was not accepted unchanged in the second plenary it was sent back to the Grand Committee with modifications. During the second reading the Grand Committee could require the bill to be sent back to the original committee for re-examination. (Suomen Suuriruhtinaskunnan valtiopäiväjärjestys 1906, § 57)

(Pierre 1902, 971, 978–979). In the Parliamentary Reform Committee, J. K. Paasikivi noted that his proposal for three readings was a combination of a “French-Belgian system” in which he had also taken into account “the readings in the German Reichstag” (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 18 Jan., 1906).

Similar to the view in classic works on parliamentary procedure (e.g. Pierre 1902, 971–979), the Reform Committee saw multistaged readings as promoting thorough treatment and calm deliberation of matters (*asioiden perusteellinen käsittely; tyyni harkinta*) (e.g. Danielson and Setälä in Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 21 Dec., 1905). The rotation between plenaries and committees was supported by arguing that in a smaller meeting, the critiques would be deeper (*kritiikki olisi syvempää*), while in a larger assembly the focus was on a many-sided examination of principled general points. Members of the Reform Committee argued that in a larger sitting the probability of passing hasty decisions was higher and party passions could more easily gain ground. (Setälä in *ibid.* 21 Dec., 1905 and 18 Jan., 1906; Hermanson in *ibid.* 18 Jan., 1906) According to Hermanson, stating one’s opinion in a larger meeting was difficult for many, while people felt “freer” (*tuntea itsensä vapaammaksi*) in smaller ones. Thus, bills which required detailed work (*detaljityötä*) were to be prepared in smaller committees. Hermanson saw that plenary debates were more for “stump orators” (*kansanpuhujat*). (*ibid.*) Danielson argued that smaller meetings, such as committees, enabled the parliament to focus its expertise on the specific matters (*ibid.* 27 Dec., 1905; for similar arguments in parliamentary literature, see e.g. Bentham 1843, XV, § 1). Committees were to be composed to reflect the representation in the parliament in a manner that enabled the presentation of different opinions (Torppa in *ibid.*). After the Parliamentary Reform and the introduction of the unicameral Eduskunta, the stress on the parliament’s deliberative character increased in the rhetoric of the Finnish and Young Finnish Parties (see Section 5.8).

The Fennoman emphasis on committee negotiation was transferred to the early Eduskunta, where members of the Finnish Party argued for moving the focus of the Eduskunta’s work from plenaries to committees and criticised the excessive amount of plenary speech and debate. For example in 1907 the Finnish Party newspaper *Wiipuri*²²⁴ (22 Sept., 1907, 2) argued that:

The representatives are not sent to the Eduskunta to hold long and wordy speeches (*pitämään pitkiä ja laueasanaisia puheita*), but to legislate (*vaan säätämään lakia*). And laws are not legislated by long speeches and peddling words (*sanaratsastuksilla*); it requires decisions. When discussion (*keskustelu*) lasts for hours and hours, decisions are naturally delayed (*wiipyä*). It is not a merit for the Eduskunta if it has spoken a lot, but decided little. It is said that by speaking things become clear, and this is true. However, the speech that clarifies and sorts things out (*se puhuminen, joka asiat selwittää*) takes place in committees. In committees the questions are prepared and the stands of different groups are mainly formed. This takes place rarely, if ever, in plenary sessions. There the long discussions are mere public tournaments, in which the most important thing is to deny the opponent the last word and nothing is left without a response. Such point of view is justified in debate meetings (*wäittelykokouksissa*) and civic meetings (*kansalaisykokouksissa*) where the purpose is to influence the audi-

²²⁴ *Wiipuri* was edited by Finnish Party member Väinö Kivilinna.

ence, but in the Eduskunta it is not appropriate. Different parties' stands are rarely formed in the discussions; they are clear beforehand (*ne ovat selvät edeltä käsin*) [...] It is a misconception that the electors have sent their representatives to speak. They have been sent to make decisions, not to hold debate meetings (*wäittelykokouksia pitämään*) after the matters have been already sorted out. [...] Decisions and action are needed, not empty discussion tournaments (*päätöksiä ja tekoja tarwitaan, ei tyhjiä keskusteluturnajaisia*). (*Wiipuri*, 22 Sept., 1907, 2)

Thus, typical to international parliamentary critiques, some of Finnish Party members contrasted speech and debate with decisions and action. Committees were a means to minimise excessive debate. Finnish Party members saw two or three statements as being enough in plenary debates in order for each side to state their opinions publicly, after which a vote could decide the question. Such a procedure saved time from useless wars of words (*sanasodat*), which were seen as bringing no value to the treatment of questions. (*Wiipuri*, 22 Sept., 1907, 2) From this point of view, debates as such could not bring anything new to the table, but merely present members' already formed opinions.

6.9 Conclusions

Proposals on developing plenum plenum were perhaps the most radical and at the same time simple procedural revisions aimed at dismantling the estate system from within. The purpose was to transform the obsolete "four-legged absurdity" gradually and indirectly towards the deliberative model of a unicameral parliament. Plenum plenum offered the *Dagblad* liberals a chance to apply their lessons on foreign parliamentary models broadly. The group's arguments on this matter, which relied strongly on their notion of debate and the parliament's deliberative character, remained substantially unchanged for over twenty years.

Procedure debates, as well as the 'deliberations with one's self' (see Section 1.4), had the tendency to clarify the debaters' conceptions of deliberation. Debates transformed vague notions into "ideal types". For example, while notions of debate and negotiation (in the Diet) and compromise (in the Eduskunta) were highlighted, the actors were aware that what in practice took place in the deliberations was rather a combination of these aspects.

Debates on plenum plenum open up a view to some essential aspects and problematics of parliamentary work. In the debates on plenum plenum the question of scarce parliamentary time played a vital role. In the context of overloaded parliamentary work and long intervals between the Diets, arguments against plenum plenum illustrated a growing scepticism towards plenary speech and debate. Fennoman views from the 1860s to the early 1880s saw debate as subordinate to their great national project. The Fennomans who contested the *Dagbladists* argued that debate was time-consuming and merely obstructed the inevitable and necessary reforms on language and education. For the Fennomans, debate, as the *Dagblad* liberals understood it, created unneces-

sary controversy, factions and partiality. In the discussions on plenum plenum, Fennomans saw debate to be secondary to the realisation of will of the majority and irrelevant compared to committee negotiation, which was able to better manifest and reconcile the opinions of the estates.

In this context, debate was difficult to put into practice and legitimise without democratic representation. Fennomans criticised the *Dagblad* liberals' focus on procedure and debate, seeing it as a means of carrying out only minimal reforms instead of focusing on the more significant issues of the representation of the Finnish-speaking majority. In a manner similar to the Social Democrats in the early Eduskunta, the Fennomans subordinated the Diet deliberations to their, "the majority's", political goals and agenda. The usefulness and meaning of the representative assembly was defined case-specifically. The more conservative Fennomans' and Social Democrats' rhetoric was joined by a strong dichotomy between action and decisions on the one hand, and speech and debate on the other. This aspect became apparent also in the early Eduskunta, where the Social Democrats and part of the Finnish Party membership argued that debate was something that only the political elite, among themselves, had time for. Without efficient representation and realisation of the interests of the majority, the representative assembly had the character of a mere debating club. Illustrative of the differences of emphasis between the deliberative and representative aspects, *Dagblad* liberals gave the value of a mere 'club' to a plenum plenum that had no power to finish its deliberations and decide its outcome through an immediate vote. In the Diets the character of a "private club" was transformed through parliamentary minute-taking and publicity, which will be discussed in the following chapters.

7 PARLIAMENTARY MINUTES

The following two chapters examine Finnish discussions on parliamentary minutes and publicity. The topics are closely related, but are approached by starting from the procedures on minute-taking and their implications for the parliament's deliberative character. This chapter discusses the learning of procedures on parliamentary minute-taking in Finland and focuses on the disputes that highlighted minutes' role in relation to speech and debate in parliament. Chapter 8 discusses publicity and the minutes' role in relation to the parliament's representative character.

The Swedish practices, on which the Finnish estates were to found their work in the early 1860s, were based on an old estate model of summarised minutes. The Finnish practices on minute-taking, however, developed towards other foreign parliamentary standards and the model of stenographic minutes. Finnish discussions on minutes took a different course compared to other Finnish procedures: their early planning and organisation rested significantly in the hands of experts of parliamentary stenography. Finnish stenographers and their associates in parliament and among the political elite took the initiative in developing the procedures from the early 1860s until the early Eduskunta.

Finnish procedures of parliamentary stenography were grounded in active international comparison and study. The learning took place by following foreign journals and literature, traveling, and benefitting from personal contacts. Finnish stenography journals that included articles on minutes translated from foreign journals were an important arena for teaching and discussing Finnish practices.

The chapter includes a rather detailed description of the Finnish procedures on minutes. In the literature, no close examination of these procedures and their study exists.²²⁵ Analysis of the procedure debates helps to understand the close relation between minutes and the parliament's deliberative aspect. Whereas parliamentary minutes are often approached from the points of view

²²⁵ The only study on the early stages of Finnish procedures on minute-taking, Kaarlo Kallioniemi's *Pikakirjoitus ja säätyoaltiopäivät* (1946), focuses on procedures of the Diet from a stenography point of view without considering their parliamentary aspects.

of publicity and representation, the discussions of the Finnish learning process invites one to examine the minutes' significance for the parliamentary style of politics. Stenographic minutes were seen as important in promoting political learning among representatives by teaching parliamentary modes of proceeding and decorum, in creating continuity between different parliamentary sessions, in overcoming the four-estate division, in offering material for later deliberations and in contributing to the establishment of procedures and to the study of precedents.

The *Dagblad* liberals took a central role in advocating parliamentary minutes and facilitating discussion on the matter in *Helsingfors Dagblad*. The *Dagbladists* were also active in discussing the technical side of minutes and interested in the minutes' role in developing the deliberative aspects. The *Fennomans'* argumentation focused on the parliament's representative character. The *Fennomans'* lower interest in debate long led them to prefer the old practice of summarised minutes instead of verbatim records.

After the establishment of stenographic minutes, Finnish disputes focused on challenges recurrent in international parliamentary history. In Eugène Pierre's (1902) words, the disputes focused on the questions of who had the right to act as the ears of the parliament and to decide on the content of the minutes, and of what "things heard in the parliament" were to be registered and published.

7.1 From secretarial to the stenographic model

7.1.1 Parliamentary minutes and documents in the Diet Act of 1869

Speaking on the minutes is an old practice in parliamentary meetings. Whereas for example the British parliament long refrained from taking minutes of its debates in order to protect its role in relation to the monarch and the general public (Peacey 2007), in the French parliamentary tradition (Pierre 1902) minute-taking has been highlighted as a means to objectively describe and record what takes place and is spoken in the sittings. Thus, the minutes serve as, and guarantee, the authentic, official and legally binding "testimony" of the discussions and decisions of the assembly. Parliamentary minutes are authenticated by the assembly itself, and the validity of the minutes and decisions is created by following a specific and established procedure. Speeches once entered into the minutes and officially authenticated remain the only valid and verified record of what was said. (ibid. 1099, 1107–1108)

The Diet Act of 1869 did not give much guidance for the estates' minute-taking in terms of form or accuracy. Section 46, which set the limits on the use of speech in the estates' plenary sessions (see Chapter 4), ordered that every member speak on the minutes and that no member speak off the record. The section was copied almost word-for-word from § 50 of the Swedish Riksdag Act of 1810. Section 28 of the Finnish Diet Act stated that in each estate the secretary

wrote the minutes. (Riksdagsordningen 1810; Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869)

The vagueness of the Diet Act of 1869 on the matter indicated that practices of minute-taking were considered a question under the estates' own authority. Before the formulation of the Diet Act, the practices on minutes had been formulated and tested in the Diet of 1863–64. In 1862, E. von Knorring's *Sammanfattning* stated that "the secretary of the Nobility fulfilled his task according to the Standing Orders of the House of Knights" (Riddarhusordningen); the secretaries of the other estates recorded orderly (*ordentligen*) and accurately (*noggrant*) what was dealt and decided in the estate. (*Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 24 Apr., 1863, 2–3; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 25 Apr., 1863, 1–3)

In addition, the procedures for the first Diet as well as the Diet Act were discussed in several histories of the Riksdag and collections of the Riksdag procedures that focused on the period before 1809. However, the books were of few words when it came to minutes and documents. In *Om riksdagar* J. W. Rosenborg (1863) pointed out that in the estates' plenary sessions the minutes (*protokoll*) were taken either by the secretary (*sekreterare*) or, in the case of hindrance, some other person from the estate's secretariat (*ståndets kansli*). In addition, what was dealt with and decided in the estate was to be recorded in the minutes in an orderly (*ordentligen*) and accurate (*noggrant*) manner. On the validation of minutes, Rosenborg wrote that the minutes – and even any excerpts from it that were delivered by the secretariat – were to be signed by the secretary or his substitute. In addition, the secretary was to keep, or assign someone else to keep, a journal (*diarium*) or a register (*förteckning*) of all the issues introduced in the estate and measures taken by the estate. The journal was to be kept in the estate's secretariat and accessible to the members of the estate. (Rosenborg 1863, 177) J. J. Nordström stated, in § 18 of his proposal for the Diet Act, that in each estate the secretary took the minutes, was responsible for the documents and signed the minutes and their excerpts. (Nordström 1912 [1863], 89–90)

The cited authors referred to the old Swedish practice according to which the duty of minute-taking was given to estate secretaries. In Sweden, until the second half of the nineteenth century, the estates' practice on minute-taking was that secretaries wrote short summaries of the orators' statements. More detailed speeches were included only if the orator gave written statements. Estates secretaries were often appointed based on recommendations and relations, not necessarily on skill or suitability for the task. The problem was taken up in the Swedish Nobility in 1823, which marked the beginning of a slow change in Swedish minute-taking. Michael von Hohenhausen made a motion on offering a price for the person who would acquire skill in shorthand and could be appointed as a clerk in the Riksdag. After a competition advertised in the newspapers, two winners, Silfverstolpe and Hierta, were announced. Their systems were adopted in the estate. (Melin 1929, 431–432) At the end of the Riksdag in 1830, the Directorate of the House of the Knights (*riddarhusdirektion*) placed a newspaper announcement asking for persons with a knowledge in shorthand

(*snällskrivning*) to give a detailed report on their system. As strengths and weaknesses were found in the three systems of Götrek, Silfverstolpe and Hierta, the estate decided not to choose any particular system, but to leave the question open for development. As Hierta gave up his position as a clerk in the Nobility and since Götrek, as a commoner, could not make his way to the Nobility's Secretariat, Silfverstolpe's system became governing until the Riksdag of 1853. (Melin 1929, 433–434)

In the Swedish Riksdag, until the representation reform of the Riksdag Act of 1866, stenography was used only in the Nobility. After the Reform, stenography was introduced in the rules of procedure of both the first and second chamber.²²⁶ (Melin 1929, 434) However, at this point, stenography was not an established practice. Not all clerks appointed to the task were capable of shorthand and took the minutes in longhand. In addition, the Riksdag still made the decision to take summarised minutes instead of full stenographic records. For example, in 1869 the Riksdag's first chamber decided to hire two clerks "whose duty was to carefully follow the discussion, to take notes only of the main points of the orators' statements, and with the help of the notes produce the first correction of the minutes." The decision was justified by the fact that some of the minutes were so poorly produced that the orators had trouble recognising their own opinions and speeches in them. (Melin 1929, 435)

7.1.2 The January Committee of 1862

Interest in stenography actualised in Finland in the early 1860s when the news of a possible convening of the Diet spread. As the emperor's proclamation on the assembly of the January Committee was published in 1861, the Finnish Senate, at the initiative of the Senate and *Dagblad* liberal Senator Fabian Langenskiöld,²²⁷ started planning for the introduction of stenography in Finland. The Senate decided to send three persons — the city court's clerk Svante Dalström, the Senate's copyist Wasilei Margunoff and candidate of philosophy Johan Edward Swan — to Leipzig to learn Gabelsberger shorthand and to prepare its adaptation to Swedish, after which they would work as stenographers, especially in the up-coming meetings of the January Committee. (Kallioniemi 1946, 7; Valta 1972a, 8) During this period, Gabelsberger was popular especially in Germany and Austria, while a Swedish-language variation of it had been de-

²²⁶ According to the second chamber's rules of procedure "Members' (*ledamot*) statements are recorded by officers specially appointed to the task, who, two at a time and in turns, each for a short period of time, take such notes, and immediately afterwards prepare (*uppsätta*) in the Chamber's Secretariat and as far as possible a word-for-word (*ordagrann*) reproduce (*återgiva*) what was recently dealt with and recorded." (Melin 1929, 434–435) According to the rules of procedure of the first chamber, "The statements that the members (*ledamöter*) in the Chamber's meetings (*sammanträde*) give should, as far as possible, be recorded word for word by officers specially appointed to the task; the statements should be submitted three days later at 10 o'clock at the latest, with their producer's signature, to the Chamber's Secretariat, where they are to be kept accessible for reading for the four following days". (Melin 1929, 434)

²²⁷ Langenskiöld wrote in *Helsingfors Dagblad* until his death in 1863 (Landgren 1995, 80, 82)

veloped and was in use in Sweden²²⁸ (Melin 1929, 57–103, 333–343; Olschewski 2000).

As it became evident during the sittings of the January Committee in 1862 that the wish for summoning the Diet would be fulfilled, the three Leipzig-taught stenographers were given the task to ensure that a sufficient amount of stenographers was available for the estates. This marked the beginning of the organised teaching of stenography in Finland. (Kallioniemi 1946, 10)

Thus, the origin of Finnish stenography is closely connected to the beginning of the Diets. As Kaarlo Kallioniemi's²²⁹ (1946) study on the early history of Finnish shorthand and the Diet, *Pikakirjoitus ja säätyvaltiopäivät*, points out, the close relation between the two resulted in mutual development and benefits. Stenography has had similar connections to parliaments internationally (Melin 1927; 1929). However, in Britain²³⁰ and France,²³¹ the practice of stenography in parliament was initiated by the newspaper press (see Chapter 8). In this sense, the development of parliamentary minutes in Finland was rather peculiar compared to the prominent European parliaments and differed also from the Swedish model (see below).

In Finland, the close connection between stenography and parliament inspired *Hufvudstadsbladet* (13 Feb., 1897, 2) later to call stenographers "the swallows of the spring of parliamentary life" (*det parlamentariska lifvets vårsvalor*). For the newspaper, in every country where a conscious political life (*ett vaknare politiska lifvet*) or parliamentary life (*parlamentariskt lif*) had germinated (*upp-*

²²⁸ Gabelsberger shorthand is a system of stenography created by the German Franz Xaver Gabelsberger. In the late 1850s and early 1860s the number of Gabelsberger stenographers rose in the Swedish Nobility: in 1856 two Gabelsberger stenographers were hired among the six in the Nobility; in 1865 all of the Nobility's stenographers were Gabelsbergers. (Melin 1929, 433–434) Gabelsberger was used in the Frankfurt Assembly in Paulskirche 1848–1849 (Olschewski 2000, 336).

²²⁹ Kallioniemi, formerly Kaarlo Jahnsson, worked as a parliamentary stenographer in the Diet and the Eduskunta 1904–1953. From 1936 Kallioniemi worked as the chief of the Eduskunta's Finnish-language Stenography Secretariat.

²³⁰ In the British parliament, shorthand came gradually into use. For long, the reporters used longhand in their note-taking, but at the end of the eighteenth century shorthand became increasingly popular in the Reporters' Gallery (Melin 1927, 311). In 1836 apparently about two-thirds of the reporters were longhand writers, but after that longhand became rarer and by 1860 it had basically disappeared from the gallery. (Jordan 1931, 445)

²³¹ In France, during the Revolution, due to the lack of stenographers, logographers were used as substitutes. Logographers tried to record the discussions of the National Assembly, but the practice was unsatisfactory since at that time the French, "who spoke fast, spoke even faster". (Melin 1927, 452–453) In 1814, as a result of the freedom of expression, several large newspapers began to use stenographers. Also the Chamber of Deputies wanted *Le Moniteur* to take detailed minutes of its discussions, but not enough stenographers were available. After the July Revolution *Le Moniteur* had six stenographers and was able to give out quite extensive reports two days after the sittings. The custom according to which most of the orators read their speeches from notes helped the stenographer's task. (Melin 1927, 453) In 1835 *Le Moniteur* received a subsidy from the Chamber of Deputies in order to organise the stenography of both chambers. In 1845, *Le Moniteur's* stenographers were officially hired to the Chamber of Peers, and after the February Revolution of 1848, stenography was established in the new National Assembly. In 1875 stenography was established in the French parliament in the form it remained in throughout the early twentieth century. (Melin 1927, 453–454; see Chapter 8 on publicity)

spirat), the blooming of stenography had immediately ensued. This had also been the case in Finland, where stenography did not exist before the awakening of constitutional life in the early 1860s. (ibid.)

Stenography was introduced in Finland on parliamentary grounds, but it had to fight to become accepted and institutionalised. Finnish supporters of stenography sought to make shorthand more popular with the help of the Diet and tried to spread its practice to other areas of the society. As a result of the experiences in the Diet, the practices on parliamentary minutes were adopted in associations, assemblies and meetings outside the parliament (see Section 8.9). The process was a mutual beneficial development: the Diet financed and facilitated the development of stenography while the national stenography association helped to modernise the Diet work. Stenography remained the only technique of minute-taking in the Finnish parliament until 1953, when tape recordings were introduced to assist the transcription of speeches.

7.1.3 Stenography in the first Diets of Finland

When the Diet convened in 1863, the Nobility and the Burghers each hired three stenographers. The decisions signified a rejection of the practice of using secretaries as minute-takers. In these two estates the *Dagblad* liberals in particular considered the use of secretaries in minute-taking as obsolete, arguing that it represented the outdated procedures of estate diets. *Helsingfors Dagblad* contrasted this vague and often arbitrary “obsolete estate practice” with the “parliamentary procedures of contemporary constitutions”, which favoured stenographic minutes for their accuracy and detail (see below).

In the Nobility, where the question was prepared by the Committee of the House of Knights (*riddarhusutskottet*; *ritarihuonekomitea*) stenography did not raise much dispute. This was probably due to the estate’s good finances and partly to the fact that stenography was securing its place in the Swedish Nobility. A concern over financial loss was presented, which led to a comparison of Finnish stenographers’ salaries with those of stenographers in the Swedish Riksdag (Nobility 1863–64, I, 43). In the Burghers, stenographers were hired on the proposal of the Speaker R. I. Örn. (Burghers 1863–64, I, 15–16) It is notable that the Swedish Burghers did not take stenographic minutes of their discussions (Melin 1929, 434).

In 1863–64 the Clergy and the Peasants settled for summarised minutes produced from the longhand notes of the estates’ secretaries and their assistants. Hiring of stenographers was not discussed in the plenary sessions of these two estates. In the Peasants, the question of stenography did not arise as no Finnish-language system of shorthand yet existed.

Again, in the Diet of 1867 only the Nobility and the Burghers decided to hire stenographers. In the Nobility, for economic reasons, the Committee of the House of Knights proposed at first that the estate would not need stenographers, but instead three clerks would be hired to take the notes. The lord marshal’s proposals and the estate’s decisions were to be included in their entirety, while only summaries of the plenary discussions would be taken into the

minutes. (Nobility 1867, I, 32–33) However, the Nobility turned down the proposal, and hired stenographers to take full verbatim records. (Nobility 1867, I, 52–53) It is notable that the Nobility printed its minutes for all Diets from 1863 on and the stenographic minutes were seen as an essential part of the “full publicity” advocated in the estate (see Chapter 8).

In the Burghers, liberal Speaker Frans Wilhelm Frenckell²³² argued that stenographers would be needed in the estate in order to take full records of the debates. Based on Frenckell’s proposal, the estate hired three stenographers. (Burghers 1867, I, 4, 6) The Clergy refrained from using stenographers on economic grounds. For example, County Dean Sirén supported summarised minutes and proposed that in order to lower the costs, the minutes should be even further shortened with only the orators’ main arguments included. (Clergy 1867, I, 29–30) Summarised minutes were seen as a cheaper alternative as no additional workforce needed to be hired. In addition, the possible printing costs for summarised minutes were lower since, with it, discussion could be easier summarised and shortened.

7.1.4 Introduction of stenography in all four estates

In the Diets of the 1870s stenographic minute-taking took important steps forward. In 1872 the Clergy decided to hire stenographers and the Peasants took measures to establish a system of Finnish-language stenography. The newly established Finnish stenography association, *Stenografiska föreningen*, took responsibility for organising the Nobility’s Stenography Secretariat. From this point on, the association approached the estates at the beginning of each Diet with a proposal for minute-taking. *Stenografiska föreningen* also started organising courses on minute-taking and held regular “speed practices” in Helsinki. The association consisted of stenographers who were often state officials,²³³ and also (later) prominent members of the academia, such as the brothers Axel Johan and E. G. Palmén.

In 1872, the economy argument continued to hinder stenography in the Clergy, although two estates had already hired stenographers. However, C. J. Lindeqvist, the candidate who would soon be appointed secretary of the estate, together with several other candidates stated that they would not accept the office unless stenographers were hired (Clergy 1872, I, 21–24). Secretaries’ eagerness to hire stenographers is understandable as stenographers lightened the secretaries’ workload in minute-taking. As a result, the Clergy decided to hire stenographers and abandoned the practice of the secretary’s summarised minutes.

²³² Frans Frenckell (1821–1878, after 1868 von Frenckell) was a Finnish industrialist and publisher. In the Diet of 1867 Frenckell was the speaker of the Burghers. After his ennoblement Frenckell was a member of the Nobility until his death in 1878. Frans was brother of Otto Reinhold Frenckell, first editor of *Helsingfors Dagblad*. (Hanski 2001b) On Frenckell’s liberal status in the Burghers, see Landgren 1995, 134.

²³³ In addition to the members sent to Leipzig, active members included August Fabritius (see below) and Fredrik Lerche, an official in the Secretariat of the Governor-General, its chief in 1874 and a senator in 1882 (Kallioniemi 1946; Sainio 2005)

As mentioned, in the Diet of 1872 the Peasants initiated the development of Finnish-language stenography. The lack of such had been criticised already in the January Committee and the press. In 1863 in the newspaper *Helsingin Uutiset* (4 May, 1863, 2–3) Yrjö Koskinen complained that none of the three persons who had been sent abroad to study stenography could properly speak Finnish and that the Gabelsberger shorthand they were taught could not be applied to Finnish as such. Whereas Koskinen proposed that two Finnish-speakers be sent abroad to learn stenography, the Peasants took a different approach. In the Peasants in 1872, Juhana Heikkilä²³⁴ made a proposal (*pyyntöesitys*) for creating a system of Finnish-language stenography after the matter had been taken up in *Uusi Suometar*.²³⁵ Heikkilä argued that although stenography could not yet be applied in the Peasants, efforts to create a system of Finnish stenography should be undertaken. In the future, Finnish-language speeches in the Diet would thus be given a treatment equal to Swedish. This was especially important in view of the joint sittings of the four estates (*plenum plenum*). Heikkilä proposed that the estate should formulate a petition (*alamainen anomus*) on the matter. (Peasants 1872, I, 166–167)

Heikkilä's proposal was supported by the Peasants' Committee of Appeals chaired by Agathon Meurman. The Committee proposed, following the example of the Riksdag of 1823, that a competition with prize money should be organised. The Peasants' proposal was approved by the Senate, the competition held and in the beginning of 1875 Master Lars Neovius,²³⁶ the sole participant, was announced as the winner. (Kallioniemi 1946, 40) Finnish-language shorthand was born on a parliamentary initiative.

After the creation of Finnish-language system, shorthand found sufficient support among the Peasants' Fennoman majority. In 1877, the Peasants decided without debate to hire stenographers (Peasants 1877–78, I, 10). Now, in principle, all four estates took full length minutes of their plenary discussions. However, stenography had not yet established itself as a practice as the Clergy in particular continued to dispute the matter. Furthermore, in 1877 the Finance Committee rejected a proposal on creating rules of procedure for the Diet Secretariat (*valtiopäiväkansliajärjestys*), arguing that the estates' budget was impossible to decide beforehand as it depended on whether the estates hired stenographers or not (Clergy 1877–78, V, 3035). After 1885, by which time all four estates had decided to print their minutes (see Section 8.6.1), stenographic minutes were no

²³⁴ Juhana (Idänpää-)Heikkilä (1818–1890) was a central Fennoman figure and an appreciated speaker in the Peasants. Idänpää-Heikkilä took part in the Diets of 1872, 1877–78 and 1882 (Seppälä 1952, 367–379).

²³⁵ *Uusi Suometar* had published an article on the question the day before the Peasants' sitting. In the first reading, Heikkilä deferred Heikkilä's proposal as he wanted to study *Uusi Suometar's* stand on the issue first (Peasants 1872, 176). In the article, pseudonym "E-s." presented possibilities for the application of shorthand to Finnish (*Uusi Suometar*, 6 Mar., 1872, 3–4).

²³⁶ Lars Neovius (Nevanlinna from 1906) had prepared his stenography system for four years before the competition. Neovius had become acquainted with the Swedish Gabelsberger during his time as a cadet, and with the Polish version of Gabelsberger during his military service in Warsaw 1868–71. During his stay in Warsaw, Swedish-speaking Neovius became interested in the Finnish language. (Räty 1972, 3)

longer objected to in the estates. In addition, the typewriter, which was of great help in the transcription of stenographic minutes, was introduced in the Diet in 1885.²³⁷

In the early 1870s, the Finnish stenography association began to train women, which signified the starting point for a practice that later became exceptional in international parliamentary history. Women were initially used in the transcription of stenographic notes, but in the Burgers in 1877–78 Hilma Aminoff became Finland's, and arguably the world's, first female parliamentary stenographer. (Kallioniemi 1946, 19–20, 23–25, 63)

7.2 Minutes and competing notions of objectivity

As the estates' discussions illustrate, there were basically two competing models of minute-taking. The first was the *secretarial model*, in which secretaries, clerks or their assistants summarised the main points of statements and discussion. The second was the *stenographic ideal*, which signified the hiring of professional shorthand writers, who were given the task of transcribing speeches "word for word". Until the mid-1880s the first notion continued to hinder the adoption of the latter. Even after the role of stenographers was established, the stenographic ideal continued to be challenged in the estates. The strongest objections and scepticism to stenography were presented among the Fennoman majorities in the Peasants and Clergy.

The main advantage of shorthand compared to summarised minutes was seen in its ability to take complete notes of the spoken word, while longhand could not properly follow the fast discussions that became increasingly popular in parliaments towards the end of the nineteenth century (see e.g. *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 5, 1908, 35). While longhand allegedly resulted in imperfect and faulty records, well-practiced stenographic minute-taking could ensure that all statements were taken word for word. The verbatim character of stenography was argued to provide the only method to reach objectivity in the minutes and give the representatives and the general public impartial information about the de-

²³⁷ In 1884, *Stenografiska föreningen's* August Fabritius got the idea to introduce typewriters, a new invention, into the estates' stenography secretariats and use them in transcription. Before the Diet of 1885, Fabritius wrote in *Tidning för Stenografi*, probably inspired by the stenography periodical *Den Stenografiska Budbären*, that typewriters were found to be efficient in stenography. Based on Fabritius's proposal, *Stenografiska föreningen* ordered a typewriter from the United States. After testing the machine, the association received funding from the Senate for purchasing typewriters for the Diet. In its typewritten letter to the Senate, the association underlined how the machine would help the Diet to get full minutes in an appropriate time frame and that it increased the quality, clarity and elegance of minutes. The *Stenografiska föreningen* started to organise courses in typewriting. (Kallioniemi 1946, 82–87, 89; about the Association and the typewriter, see also *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 25 Nov., 1884, 1) Especially in the beginning the benefits of typewriters were more in the appearance and printing of minutes. For example, two months before the beginning of the Diet of 1885, Fabritius praised some of the course participants for already having reached the speed of handwriting (Kallioniemi 1946, 89–90).

bates.²³⁸ Parliamentary stenography and its division of work (see Sections 7.5.1 and 7.5.5) helped to save time and effort in minute-taking. Similarly, in other assemblies professionalization of stenography helped to outsource secretarial duties and concentrate on deliberation, the actual purpose of the meeting. Although a variety of technical innovations²³⁹ were experimented with and introduced in parliaments throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, stenography remained the most popular means to attain full verbatim records.

The first and the most enthusiastic advocates of stenographic minute-taking were the *Dagblad* liberals, who, drawing on foreign models, saw verbatim records and their publication as essential parts of modern parliamentarism and representative government (see Chapter 8). Thus, the Nobility and the Burghers, which were liberal strongholds, were the first estates to hire stenographers. In advocating parliamentary stenography the *Dagblad* liberals joined forces with moderate Fennoman E. G. Palmén.²⁴⁰ Liberal newspapers reported regularly on *Stenografiska föreningen* and the latest developments in stenography and praised stenography's contribution to the development of Finnish parlia-

²³⁸ For summarised arguments on the advantages of stenography, see e.g. the newspaper *Finland*, 15 Jan., 1890, 1–2. *Finland's* article was a transcript from an article published in shorthand in *Tidning for Stenografi* by *Stenografiska föreningen*.

²³⁹ Foreign technical innovations applied in parliaments were reported in Finnish newspapers and followed by *Stenografiska föreningen*. The reports highlighted the inventions' abilities to take detailed records smoothly and even mediate them. See e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 28 Feb., 1881, 3 on the "mechanical stenography" invented by Michela, tested in the French Chamber of Deputies and used in the Italian parliament; *Morgonbladet*, 18 Sept., 1884, 3–4 and *Finland*, 17 Nov., 1890, 4 on a "stenotelegraph" invented by a Frenchman, Cassagnes, which could be used to write and simultaneously telegraph the words spoken; and *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 1 Dec., 1911, 3–6 on a dictation machine. The influence of these inventions on parliamentary speaking was predicted to be similar to that of stenography (see Section 7.3). For example in 1889, *Waasan Lehti* (2 Feb., 1889, 2) reported on an invention that was to replace stenography in the parliament. The invention was the phonograph, which was able to record speech and singing on a metal sheet through a horn. According to the newspaper, the device would be as useful as a stenographer in parliaments as it never made a single mistake. The phonograph would reduce the number of orators and speeches as it would not be possible to correct stupidities afterwards. This would encourage orators to weigh their words carefully and to stick to the truth. In the future the parliamentary minutes would be replaced by phonograms, which contained the debates in all their colourfulness, including interjections, the speaker's gavel blows and the whole atmosphere of the chamber. *Waasan Lehti* based its article on an article by Karl af Geijerstam published in the Swedish *Aftonbladet*.

²⁴⁰ Ernst Gustaf Palmén (1849–1919) was a professor in history (1884–1911), journalist and parliamentarian. Palmén was one of the founders of the *Stenografiska föreningen* in 1872 and served as the chair of the association from 1881 until 1905. Palmén started his career in the Diet as a stenographer in the Peasants in 1872. He was member of the Nobility 1877–85 as a representative of his family, member of the Clergy 1888–1906 as a representative of the university, and member of the Eduskunta 1907–09 as a representative of the Finnish Party. Palmén sought to raise the quality of Finnish culture to international standards. (Väisänen 2001c) In the 1880s and 1890s Palmén was one of the founders of the periodical *Valvoja* and a prominent member of the *Valvoja* group, in which he advocated his idea of "national liberalism". The idea was to combine aspects of Fennomania with liberal thought and to situate the *Valvoja* group between the two prominent political sides. (See Palmén 1884a; 1884b)

mentary life.²⁴¹ In addition, the liberal newspapers criticised the Finnish stenographers' poor salaries and working conditions in comparison to foreign parliaments.²⁴² Fennoman newspapers such as *Morgonbladet* also paid attention to the development of stenography, but put less emphasis on its parliamentary applications.²⁴³

The clashes between the two approaches to minute-taking, the summarised and the verbatim, arose throughout the Finnish Diets. As a sign of the *Dagblad* liberals' role in advocating the stenographic ideal, *Helsingfors Dagblad* published *Stenografiska föreningen's* lead spokesperson E. G. Palmén's articles on the advantages of stenography in parliamentary work. Palmén's arguments illustrate how Finnish advocates of stenography contrasted their ideal of parliamentary minutes with the old minutes of the estate diets. In his 1876 article series "The Diet Proceedings and Publicity" (*Landtdagens förhandlingar och offentligheten*), Palmén attacked the misconception that equated conventional note-taking with stenography. He criticised the idea of hiring clerks and secretaries to do stenographers' work by characterising secretaries' efforts to record speech as like "sending a cloud to chase the wind" (*sända molnet att jaga vinden*). Palmén noted that only stenographers were able to include every word in the minutes. (Palmén 1876b)

Similarly in 1891, Palmén (1891) emphasised in the moderate Fennoman periodical *Valvoja* the importance of accurate verbatim records in parliaments. Palmén associated the secretary model with arbitrary revision of speeches. For him, the idea of a parliamentary stenographer as a "recording secretary" who corrected the statements to make them "rhetorically satisfactory" (*retorillisesti tyydyttävää*) was simply obsolete. Palmén emphasised that the purpose of stenographic minutes was totally different. They aimed to depict the discussion and orators with "the accuracy of a photograph" (*kuvata valokuvan tarkkuudella*). (Palmén 1891, 61–62) The stenography's ability to "photograph" the spoken word was repeated in the estates. For example, in the Clergy in 1882 it was noted that stenography's idea and real task was to "vividly reproduce and photograph (*fotografera*) the spoken word". (Clergy 1882, I, 20–21)

The photograph metaphor was also used in the early Eduskunta. In 1908, Chief of the Eduskunta's Stenography Secretariat F. W. Kadenius again spoke of the benefits of stenographic minutes compared to note-taking. According to Kadenius, only authentic shorthand minutes gave "an objective image" (*objek-*

²⁴¹ For example in 1878 *Åbo Underrättelser* (12 Feb., 1878, 2) reported on *Stenografiska föreningen's* anniversary and emphasised the association's exceptional role among the country's free associations. According to the newspaper, the association had been instrumental in developing the "art of stenography", which was indispensable for each constitutional country. *A. U.* noted that the association's task had been difficult compared to its counterparts in foreign parliaments as its work had been complicated by the four-estate division and the long pauses between Diets. (*ibid.*)

²⁴² See for example E. G. Palmén's defence of Finnish parliamentary stenographers in *Helsingfors Dagblad* (Palmén 1876b).

²⁴³ For example in 1874 *Morgonbladet* published a four-piece article series about the international stenography conference in Leipzig 14–17 August 1874, in which Lector C. G. Swan had represented Finland. (See *Morgonbladet*, 7 Sept., 1874, 1; 8 Sept., 1874, 1; 14 Sept., 1874, 1; 15 Sept., 1874, 1)

tiivinen kuva) of parliamentary work (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 8, 1908, 57). Kadenius noted that the secretary's notes were based on different purposes and approaches compared to those of stenographers. The secretary's minutes aimed at summarising the issue and the decision as concisely as possible, while stenographic minutes presented "a photographic image of the readings" (*fotograafisen kuvan asiain kulusta eduskunnassa*) and presented in a form as close to the original as possible the *verba formalia* that the speaker of the Eduskunta used during decision-making. The Eduskunta secretary's task could be compared to the secretarial tasks of other public meetings in which no verbatim records were required. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 9, 1908, 65–66)

The metaphor of a "photographic image" was used to emphasise the accuracy of stenography during the period of the popularisation of photography. The photographic image represented in minutes was made up of the *words heard by the assembly*. For example, according to the procedures of the late nineteenth-century French parliaments, the words and phrases *entendue par l'Assemblée* were to be governing in the minutes: stenographers were not allowed to enter statements that were dictated to them in such a manner that all persons responsible for the records' supervision could not hear them; a member could not demand insertion of words that were not heard by the president of the chamber. (Pierre 1902, 1111) In the Finnish discussions, stenographers were, according to the stenographic ideal, the 'ears' of the parliament.

7.3 Minutes and deliberation

7.3.1 Political education among parliamentarians

In the Finnish discussions, stenographic minutes were seen to improve the quality of parliamentary deliberations. Firstly, in the "underdeveloped" Finnish parliamentary conditions, authentic minutes were seen as assisting with the education of parliamentarians and their healthy self-criticism. The minutes' value as *textbooks for new representatives* was emphasised. For example, in the Peasants in the Diet of 1877–78, Israel Karvosenoja noted that new representatives could use printed minute books to prepare themselves (*valmistaa itsensä*) on matters discussed in the previous Diet, especially in cases of the emperor's proposals (*armolliset esitykset*), which were based on earlier estate petitions (*pyyntöesitys*) (Peasants 1877–1878, I, 472; for a similar argument, see Pöysti in Peasants 1885, I, 292). Similarly in the Clergy in 1882 Professor Johan Wilhelm Runeberg²⁴⁴ argued that minutes included a significant amount of knowledge

²⁴⁴ Johan Wilhelm Runeberg (1843–1918) was one of the Finland's most prominent doctors and reached international recognition as a professor of medicine. Runeberg was a representative of the University of Helsinki in the Diets of 1882, 1885, 1894 1897–1906 and a representative of the Swedish People's Party in the Eduskunta in 1907–1908. In the Diets Runeberg was considered as a liberal due to his neutral stand on

(*upplysning*) for members to absorb. Individual study of a matter's development and of the opinions presented on it was a highly enlightening activity. (Clergy 1882, III, 1664)

In addition to studying the subject matters of parliamentary work, members of the estates saw minutes as a *means to learn parliamentary procedures, style and decorum*. Estates' minutes included information on procedures, forms and phases of reading and decision-making in the Diet. Minutes gave examples of communication between the estates (deputations) and the committees and plenaries (reports). Plenary minutes showcased different styles of argumentation, parliamentary speaking and debate as well as presented formulas for the speaker's interventions and members' appropriate reactions to them.

Arguments in support of stenographic minutes reflected an understanding of parliamentary work as a particular mode of proceeding whose proper mastery required an awareness of procedures. For example, in the Clergy estate in the Diet of 1877–78, Reverend Anders Gustaf Westerlund noted that the minutes had “educated members of the Diet about the style of representation” (*uppfostrat landtdagsmän för detta representationssätt*). According to him, this had been especially clear in the Peasants, where minutes had been read with great interest. (Clergy 1877–78, I, 447) In the Peasants in 1885, Pekka Leppänen argued that with the help of printed minutes new representatives, who came into the estates due to the long three-year intervals, could become familiar with the estates' work (*tulla tuntemaan säätyjen toimintaa kokonaisuudessaan*) (Peasants 1885, I, 299). In 1882 Senior Teacher (*yliopettaja*) Alfred Kihlman²⁴⁵ of the Clergy estate noted that as the older members of the estate would soon be replaced by younger members, printed minutes served as a good means for the novices to “prepare themselves for their vocation” (*förbereda sig för sitt blifvande kall*) (Clergy 1882, III, 1663). (For similar arguments, see e.g. Field Dean Erik Viktor Peterson in the Clergy 1882, III, 1665)

The term “parliamentary education” was used explicitly in the Finnish discussions on minutes. In the Nobility in 1885, E. G. Palmén emphasised the importance of well-produced and easily accessible minutes. According to Palmén, every member who had long followed the work of the Diet could confirm from personal experience of what immense importance the access to the earlier Diet discussions had been, both for “the treatment of questions” (*frågornas behandling*) and for “the members' parliamentary education” (*ståndets medlemmars parlamentariska utbildning*). (Nobility, 1885, I, 51)

Minutes were also seen to *develop characteristics and skills* beneficial for the parliamentary vocation. For example, in the Peasants in 1885, Edvin Avellan²⁴⁶

the language question. Runeberg was a son of the Finnish national poet Johan Ludvig Runeberg. (Leikola 2001)

²⁴⁵ Alfred Kihlman (1825–1904) was a member of the Diet from 1872–1897. Kihlman was a central Fennoman figure in the Clergy especially in questions of economy and education. Kihlman became known for introducing German theologian Johann Tobias Beck's biblical hermeneutics in Finland. Kihlman was also an active businessman. (Murtorinne & Rasila 2000)

²⁴⁶ Edvin Avellan (1848–1912) was a farm owner, translator, author and a member of the Peasants in the Diets 1877–1900 (Kotivuori 2005a).

argued that minutes were necessary for representatives in order to grow and gain “political maturity and patience” (*valtiollinen kypsytminen ja valtiollinen maltti*) (Peasants 1885, I, 294). The newspaper *Hufvudstadsbladet* (18 Nov., 1896, 3; 19 Nov., 1896, 1) emphasised the value of the minutes of the first Diets, as their debates had reflected the high ideals of liberality and open-mindedness (*frisinthet*), openness (*frimodighet*) and idealism (*idealitet*) that had been condemned later by philistines (*kätkborgerliga*) and partisanship (*partianda*). (ibid.)

In view of practical skills of a parliamentarian, minutes were seen to *improve the quality of parliamentary oratory*. Verbatim records were considered important study material for representatives, who could examine their speeches and reflect on their eloquence and argumentation. It was argued that in authentic printed minutes, mistakes that were otherwise easily overlooked or considered insignificant stood out sharply (see e.g. Estate Secretary C. J. Lindeqvist in the Clergy 1885, I, 200). In 1891 in *Valvoja*, E. G. Palmén emphasised the need for stenographic minutes as a means for parliamentarian’s self-reflection. As an orator saw himself “as if in the mirror” (*ikään kuin peilissä*) in stenographic minutes, he became accustomed to avoiding mistakes and to pursuing an ever better quality of speech (*tavottelemaan yhä parempaa esitysmuotoa*). (Palmén 1891, 62) In a similar vein, the Old Finn newspaper *Savo-Karjala* (23 Feb., 1891, 2) argued that verbatim records benefitted orators as they could see with their own eyes the deficiencies in their speeches, and could learn to avoid the same mistakes in the future. This self-reflection through the help of authentic minutes was seen as saving precious time. For example, in the Peasants in 1885 Erik Pöysti argued that when orators knew the minutes were taken word for word they spoke to the matter and did not consume precious time by speaking nonsense. (Peasants 1885, I, 7)

Authentic, published and well-preserved parliamentary minutes multiplied the orator’s audience, which was also seen as guiding members towards better presentation and oratorical skills. In the Clergy estate of 1877–78, K. E. Stenbäck noted that every self-respecting orator set stricter requirements (*strängare anspråk*) for his presentation as he knew that his expressions came to the knowledge of a larger audience. (Clergy 1877–78, I, 435–436) Similarly, in the Burghers Georg Wallgren noted that the fact that members knew that their speeches were made visible everywhere enhanced and elevated the level of the discussion (*höjer diskussionen*). (Burghers 1877–78, I, 176) In 1885, *Wasa Tidning*²⁴⁷ (1 Feb., 1885, 1) saw that publication of the minutes would gradually have a positive effect on representatives’ speaking skills (*talareförmåga*) as they knew that their speeches were read by the general public. It would be beneficial to create such “a speaking school” (*talareskola*) by printing and publishing minutes. *Savo-Karjala* (23 Feb., 1891, 2) argued that the benefit of stenographic minutes lay in the fact that the general public and the Diet members themselves

²⁴⁷ Pseudonym “P. S-d.” *Wasa Tidning* was a Swedish-language newspaper, whose political stand was hard to define. Originally considered as a Svecoman newspaper, *Wasa Tidning* was accused of supporting both Dagbladist and Fennoman ideas. (Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 448, 511; Landgren 1988, 328–330)

could trust that the published speeches corresponded to the ones spoken. As orators knew that their statements were subject to public critique, everyone tried to speak as clearly and perfectly as possible, without talking rubbish (*puuta ja heiniä*), as had often been the case in the Diet. (*Savo-Karjala*, 23 Feb., 1891, 2)

It is notable that parliamentary minutes played a central role also in a wider parliamentary learning process in Finland. The minutes' educating influence was seen to extend beyond the Diet. Parliamentary stenography in close cooperation with newspapers and official parliamentary print helped to reproduce, mediate and spread the parliament's model of deliberation in the Finnish polity. The Finnish actors saw the Diet, the Eduskunta and their procedural model as a means for "parliamentary education" that served the wider project of political and civic education in Finland. (See Chapter 8)

7.3.2 Overcoming the estate divisions

Efficient production of minutes was seen as promising the possibility to facilitate communication between the estates and thus *overcome the division of four estates* in deliberations. This idea was advanced especially by the *Dagblad* liberals, who sought to develop the Diet's deliberative character and to introduce aspects of direct parliamentary debate into the procedure. Minutes could mediate speeches of one estate to the members of the others who did not have the possibility to take part in several debates simultaneously. Thus, members could gain knowledge about other estates' discussions and react and reflect on a multiplicity of opinions and arguments. Circulation of minutes would result in a more multisided examination of questions than in the individual estates and enable a clash of different opinions.

This aspect was taken up by the *Dagblad* liberals in the early 1870s when the estates were struggling with the establishment of stenographic minutes. For example, in the Burghers in 1872 Leo Mechelin noted that minutes offered representatives the possibility to ask other estates for advice (*rådfråga*). (Burghers 1872, I, 264) Similarly, in 1874, Robert Castrén argued for efficient printing of the minutes by noting that in a country with a multicameral system (*flerkammar-system*), it was essential for the representatives to get detailed information about what took place in the other chambers. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 Oct., 1874, 1)

7.3.3 Parliamentary continuity

Members of the estates highlighted the practical value of the minutes in daily parliamentary work and saw them as a means to overcome the long three- and five-year intervals between Diets. Emphasising continuity between Diets, it was argued that with the help of minutes of past sessions, a rereading of a question did not have to start afresh: debates from earlier sessions served as sources for arguments and counter-arguments and provided historical examples and data on a wide range of topics. Thus, accessible minutes formed *an important (re)source and database for deliberations*.

In 1874, *Helsingfors Dagblad* argued that printed minutes and documents were especially important in Finland, where long intervals between Diets made it hard to develop “parliamentary praxis and continuity” (*parlamentarisk praxis och kontinuitet*). In the Clergy estate of 1877–78 Johan Gabriel Geitlin argued that minutes were important in order to “achieve the necessary relationship of continuity between Diets” (*för vinnande af nödigt kontinuitetsförhållande emellan de skilde landtdagarne*) (Clergy 1877–78, II, 911).

The idea behind the principle of continuity was explicated by reference to the interconnectedness of deliberations. Johan Gabriel Geitlin²⁴⁸ argued in the Clergy in 1885 that the matters discussed in the estates “do not stand alone separate from others” (*seiso yksinänsä erillänsä muista*), but in close relation to the work of the other Diets. Thus, the printing of minutes in smaller booklets would help to maintain the continuity (*yhdenjaksoisuus*) and uniformity (*yhdenmukaisuus*) essential for the work of a legislator (*lainsäätäjä*). (Clergy 1885, I, 150–151; see also e.g. Edvin Avellan in the Peasants 1885, I, 294)

Minutes were seen to offer a source for proper interpretation of the laws connected to ongoing deliberations. The Diet’s Finance Committee of 1877 argued that anyone who had experience in the interpretation (*la’in-selitys*) and application of the law (*la’in-käytteleminen*) knew how indispensable it was to grasp the roots and sources of the law and to look into the legislator’s original mind-set (*la’inlaatian todellinen mieli*). Thus, compared to mere documents, the minutes shed light on many aspects of the questions discussed (*valaisivat monin puolin esillä-olleita asioita*) and gave a clear picture of the prevalent thoughts and sentiments in the representative assembly (*eduskunta*) that influence its decisions. (Valtiovaliokunnan mietintö N:o 4, 1877) This aspect was important also for the legal education of the public administration (see *Päivälehti*, 18 May, 1893, 2; *Wiiipurin Sanomat*, 10 May, 1893, 2) and the general public.

Minutes served also as an essential reference for the *establishment of parliamentary procedures* as they offered a database for precedents. This aspect was emphasised by *Dagblad* liberals, who highlighted the importance of parliamentary praxis and continuity (*parlamentarisk praxis och kontinuitet*) in relation to procedures (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 Oct., 1874, 1). The long intervals between Diets posed the threat that not only might the subject matters of parliamentary work be consigned to oblivion, but also the procedures on which parliament’s mode of proceeding was based.

Especially in the British parliamentary tradition, precedents form the core of parliamentary practice. In procedure literature, justifications of specific rules are explicated through incidents that have led to the birth and revision of procedures. Parliamentary minutes have been used as a central source for these precedents (see e.g. May 1883 [1844]; Pierre 1902). In Finland, minutes were used in the reform committees of the Diet Act of 1869 and the Parliament Act of

²⁴⁸ Johan Gabriel Geitlin (1836–1890) built his career as a teacher and was a prominent promoter the Finnish national culture. Geitlin wrote textbooks, the most notable of which was on Latin. Geitlin was a member of the Clergy in the Diets of 1877–78, 1882, 1885 and 1888. (Pitkäranta 2004)

1906 in order to ground proposed procedures in already established practices, which raised the odds of the rules' passing especially in the Russian examination. In the Diets, first Swedish and then Finnish minutes were used in examinations of the customary practices. Minutes were especially important for the speakers of the estates, who had the responsibility to oversee the rules that had proven their practicality in earlier sessions, but which had to be re-enforced at the beginning of each session (see e.g. rules on speech in Section 9.4). In the estates, and especially in the Eduskunta, procedures and speaker's decisions on them were disputed in reference to minutes of earlier sessions (see minutes and debate tactics below).

7.3.4 Efficient deliberation

Parliamentary minutes were advocated as *a remedy for inefficient reading* caused by the scarcity of time, which were seen as disturbing the quality of the Diet deliberation and legislation. Some of these aspects have already been discussed above. Minutes made representatives more concise in their oratory and speak to the question. Due to the long intervals between Diets and the turnover in representatives, arguments were often repeated over and over again when matters were re-deliberated; the minutes' capacity to enhance continuity was seen as a solution to this repetition. The *Dagblad* liberals' idea of minutes and publicity as a means to overcome the division of the four estates was partly aimed at ensuring that not all arguments were repeated in the different estates.

However, minutes were also seen as making deliberations more effective since deliberations could benefit from them in Diet preparations: appropriately produced and circulated parliamentary publications were seen as enabling swift commencement of readings and thus secure efficient, close and careful examination of issues. In 1876 E. G. Palmén argued that minutes could be used to gather material on questions on the agenda prior to Diet sessions. If the preparations could be started before the opening, time would be saved and a thorough examination secured. (Palmén 1876a; 1876d) Similarly *Nya Pressen* (9 May, 1897, 2) proposed that relevant minutes and documents should be made available for representatives well in advance of sessions in order to avoid the danger of hasty legislation. Thus, also the referral debate (*remissdebatt*) would have the character of a real first reading (*första läsning*) as it would have more content and go more into detail. Consequently, also the committees would have more valuable guidance and have an overview of the situation and the existing opinions. Fragmentary committee reports and contradictory proposals could become rare if individual committee members could better calculate the odds for passage of their ideas. Long verbal introductory histories and summaries of committee reports would become less needed if members of the estates could familiarise themselves on their own with the matters before the Diet. (*ibid.*, for the importance of parliamentary print for the efficiency of the work and communication of the Eduskunta, see *Helsingin Sanomat*, 6 Oct., 1908, 3; *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 13 Mar., 1910, 8)

7.3.5 Debate tactics

As the printing of the official minutes developed and improved their accessibility, they became used as a resource in parliamentary debate tactics. The tactics involved highlighting statements and excerpts from earlier debates in order to speak for or against various policies.

References to earlier speeches have been common rhetorical instruments in parliaments internationally. For example, William Gerald Hamilton, in his maxims for parliamentary speaking in *Parliamentary Logick*, acknowledged the usefulness of allusions to earlier debates in illustrating and enlivening one's own argument (Hamilton 1808, 37). Hamilton advised members to take into account possible future debates when discussing a matter in parliament. "Having an eye" to other debates was important as any conduct could be defended or attacked by actions in another occasion. (ibid. 41–42)

Cross-references to other debates began to be used as rhetorical tools for or against policies and in attacking opponents or impugning their integrity during the Diets; they also became popular later in the Eduskunta, especially among the Social Democrats. For example, in 1908 Social Democrat Matti Turkia read citations from earlier verbatim records in order to point out how opinions of the members of the Finnish Party and the Young Finns had changed on the communal reform. Based on the minutes, Turkia argued that his opponents' stands as presented in party platforms did not correspond with their "true" opinions recorded in the official minutes (*Hufvudstadsbladet*, 3 Oct., 1908, 6; Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1908, 618–627).

References to earlier debates were also made when disputing procedures and their interpretation. In the Eduskunta's plenary on 19 June 1907, Social Democrat N. R. af Ursin read a statement given in 1904 by Julius Jansson of the Burghers and a fragment of the debate that had followed. Af Ursin found a precedent concerning violation of a representative's parliamentary immunity. He noted the assembly's reaction to it at the time, contrasting it by analogy with a current debate in the Eduskunta. The current debate was about an incident in which four Social Democrat representatives were allegedly attacked by the police on the street in 1907. Bourgeois parties in the Eduskunta were reluctant to take action on matter. Consequently, af Ursin aimed to indicate the parallels in the recent violation with one in 1904. For af Ursin, the only difference was that then the victims had been two bourgeois representatives from Åland. (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, PTK 17/1907, 1013–1016; *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 20 June, 1907, 4) Similarly, on 28 August 1908, the Social Democrats used verbatim records in order to contest Speaker Svinhufvud's decision to deny the floor from Representative Edvard Valpas-Hänninen. (*Hufvudstadsbladet*, 29 Aug., 1908, 6; Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1908, 277–278)

7.4 Studies of past parliaments: Minutes as essential to constitutional, national and parliamentary history

A central argument in support of stenographic minutes was their general importance for the creation of a parliamentary history, which the young Diet lacked. As part of the history of the Finnish people and its constitutional life, minutes were seen as possessing “intrinsic” value, separate from their deliberative and representative aspects.

Concerns about the possible destruction of minutes were presented in the Finnish discussions. Finnish and foreign parliamentary histories provided cautionary examples about what may occur if the preservation of parliamentary minutes and documents is neglected. For example in Britain, some of the manuscript journals of the House of Lords had been lost in the Palace of Westminster fire of 1834.²⁴⁹ In Finland, minutes of the Clergy from the Diet of Porvoo were destroyed in the Great Fire of Turku in 1827 and had been reassembled only with great difficulty and labour (see *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 23 Aug., 1890, 2; Burghers 1882, II, 704–705). With this in mind, before the printing of minutes was established in the Diet, estates’ decided to produce fair copies of their minutes in order to protect them from destruction (see e.g. Peasants 1877–78, I, 879).²⁵⁰

The *Dagblad* liberals took again an active stand on the matter. In the Burghers in 1882, Robert Castrén, who was also a historian and had written on the Diet of Porvoo, emphasised the importance of minutes in the short Finnish parliamentary history (*parlamentariska historia*) (Burghers 1882, II, 704–705). In 1874, *Helsingfors Dagblad* noted that in contrast to foreign parliaments, huge gaps existed in the availability of Finnish parliamentary printed material. The existing prints were buried and scattered around in different archives.²⁵¹ The newspaper saw it as ironic that in the times of “our recently acquired parliamentary life” (*vår nyfövärföade parlamentariska lif*) such an essential part of the proceedings were, due to mere economic hindrances, concealed in dusty caches and vulnerable to total destruction. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 Oct., 1874, 1)

Parliamentary minutes were argued to be essential to the constitutional as well as the general history of the Finnish people. In the Burghers in 1867 Carl Gustaf Wolff argued that the minutes’ importance should be understood in a wider context than the immediate as they would be useful for posterity, offering the following generations a source of knowledge of what their forefathers

²⁴⁹ As a sign of the carelessness in looking after the parliamentary documents, the missing journals were found in 1849 in a cheesemonger’s shop where they were about to be used as wrapping paper. (Macdonagh 1913, 108)

²⁵⁰ On the concern over possible destruction of minutes, see also e.g. Robert Castrén in the Burghers 1882, II, 704–705; Edvin Avellan in the Peasants 1885, I, 294; Johan Gabriel Geitlin in the Clergy 1885, I, 150–151; *Nya Pressen*, 8 Feb., 1885, 2; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 12 Nov., 1878, 2.

²⁵¹ The Clergy’s proceedings from the Diet of Porvoo were preserved at the library of the University of Helsinki, the Burghers’ at the Senate’s Finance Office (finans-expedition) and the Peasants’ in Åbo Gymnasium’s archive in Turku. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 Oct., 1874, 1)

had said on topical issues (Burghers 1867, II, 871–872). Minutes were described as essential for “finding lines to the contemporary history” and acquiring “detailed knowledge of the phenomena of the public life of the past”²⁵². They were called “pages in the history of our people”,²⁵³ “important parts of Finnish constitutional development”,²⁵⁴ “among the most important contributions to our awareness of Finland’s development and the opinion prevailing during the period”,²⁵⁵ “a valuable addition to our poor constitutional literature”²⁵⁶ and “real treasures of political and historical value”²⁵⁷. (For other arguments about the minutes’ importance for national history and future research see Otto Mauritz Nordström in the Clergy 1882, III, 1661; *Dagblad* liberal Professor of Law Robert Montgomery in the Nobility 1882, III, 1244 on “historical inquiry” [*den historiska utredningen*] and *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 18 Nov., 1896, 3; 19 Nov., 1896, 1)

7.5 The changing practices concerning stenographic minutes from the Diet to the Eduskunta

7.5.1 Procedures on minutes in the Diets

Parliamentary minute-taking can be viewed as a process, which aims to give an objective representation of plenary debate in a written form. The procedures of minute-taking were amended during the early Finnish Diets to better fulfil the stenographic ideal advocated by the *Stenografiska föreningen* and its associates. By the mid-1880s the estates’ practices on minutes were to a great extent harmonised and established in the form they maintained until the early Eduskunta. In 1886, Chief of Stenography of the Nobility, August Fabritius,²⁵⁸ wrote in the Finnish stenography association’s journal, *Tidning för stenografi*,²⁵⁹ about the procedures of stenography in the Nobility that served as a model for the other estates.

According to Fabritius, speeches in the Nobility’s plenaries were recorded by stenographers seated in front of the lord marshal. In the beginning of each sitting, all six stenographers were present, but when the workload increased in

²⁵² *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 23 Aug., 1890, 2.

²⁵³ Avellan in the Peasants 1882, I, 12.

²⁵⁴ *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 12 Nov., 1878, 2.

²⁵⁵ Porvarissäädyn Yksityisen Valitusvaliokunnan mietintö ehdoituksesta painattaa Porvarissäädyn pöytäkirjat näiltä valtiopäiviltä 1877–78; Peasants 1882, II, 689.

²⁵⁶ Valtiovaliokunnan mietintö N:o 4, 1877.

²⁵⁷ *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 23 Aug., 1890, 2.

²⁵⁸ In addition to being the Nobility’s chief of stenography 1872–1906, August Fabritius (1844–1915) was one of the founders of *Stenografiska föreningen* in 1871 and its vice-chair for twelve years. Fabritius worked as a stenographer in the Nobility in 1863–64 and 1867, developed a system of stenography that Swedish-language stenographers used in the Finnish Diets and was the editor of the *Tidning för Stenografi* 1871–94. (Sainio 2000b)

²⁵⁹ The article series *Våra landtdagskanslier* was published in *Tidning för Stenografi* (1886, 8–12; 22–23; 126–130; 139–142) in shorthand. For a transcribed version of the article series in Finnish, see Kallioniemi 1946, 101–108.

the Secretariat during a debate, only three were seated in the plenary hall. The six stenographers formed two working groups of three: the first consisted of the chief of stenography and two stenographers, the second of a senior stenographer with two younger assistants. If all six were present in a plenary, three were usually practicing or drafting summaries for the newspapers. (Kallioniemi 1946, 101–102)

The minutes were taken in two full versions using stenographer's pencils. The leaders of the two groups tried to take as full notes as possible of the debates. They left blanks or summarised the words spoken in parts where they could not follow the discussion word for word. One of the two assisting stenographers also took full notes, while the other took down details, such as foreign words and numbers. According to Fabritius, the procedure was found effective and useful as the leaders of the two groups were usually able to take full notes by themselves, but in case something was missing or vague, the assistants' notes were helpful. (Kallioniemi 1946, 102) In 1885 E. G. Palmén argued that due to the procedure, the Nobility's stenography worked more efficiently than that of the Swedish Riksdag, although the Finns worked with a smaller budget and personnel²⁶⁰ (Nobility 1885, I, 269).

After a shift of forty-five minutes or an hour, the group of three stenographers left the plenary hall. Outside the plenary hall, the leader of the group started formulating a summarised draft of the debate in shorthand for the newspapers. In the meantime, the two assistants started to decipher²⁶¹ their shorthand notes. When the summary for the newspapers was ready it was immediately given to the personnel in the Secretariat, whose task was to transcribe the shorthand into longhand.²⁶² With the help of typewriters the transcription of the newspaper summaries could be made simultaneously into the required five copies by placing a black or blue colour paper between the sheets. When the stenographers working in the Secretariat were ready with their shorthand summary, which usually took forty-five minutes to an hour, the two groups of stenographers changed shifts between the plenary hall and the Secretariat. This rotation was repeated until the end of the sitting. (Kallioniemi 1946, 103–104)

After each plenary session the stenographers were given parts of the summaries for correction and collation. If no problems occurred, the newspaper

²⁶⁰ E. G. Palmén reported that one week on average was given in the Riksdag to the production and correction of the minutes. In the First Chamber of the Riksdag twenty-one and in the Second Chamber twenty-nine staff members were responsible for the minutes, whereas the Finnish Nobility had six stenographers and a few women working with the transcription. The budget for stenographic minutes in the Riksdag was 16,000 Finnish marks, whereas the stenography in the Nobility used 3,400 marks. (Nobility 1885, I, 269)

²⁶¹ Fabritius used 'deciphering' (*dešifroiminen*) to refer to the process of going through the shorthand notes before transcription in order to make corrections and additions in parts where they were needed. In the easiest cases deciphering meant adding punctuation marks and sometimes replacing words. (Kallioniemi 1946, 105)

²⁶² In 1876, E. G. Palmén saw a problem in the small amount of capable stenographers available, so that the Diet stenographers themselves had to both transcribe and correct the minutes. As a result, the stenographers could not finish their work in time, which delayed the printing of the minutes several years after the Diets. For Palmén, this posed a serious challenge to parliamentary continuity. (Palmén 1876b)

summaries of the day's debate were ready fifteen to thirty minutes after the plenary. At this point, Secretariat personnel telephoned the newspapers' editorial staff to inform them that the summaries were ready to be collected. Often the newspaper messengers were already waiting at the hall of the House of the Nobility and delivering summaries to the editorial offices in parts. If the debate had been of particular interest, the newspapers asked for corrected and full versions of specific speeches, which were delivered to them later during the night or the next day. (Kallioniemi 1946, 103–104) The procedure illustrates how seriously the pace, accuracy and breadth of parliamentary reporting was taken during the Diet.

The following morning the stenographers, together with other personnel of the Secretariat, started their workday by deciphering their shorthand notes of the previous day's debate. Now, as the priority of the newspaper summaries had been dealt with, the aim was to produce full verbatim records. The chief of stenography distributed parts of the shorthand notes to stenographers so that the most challenging ones were given to the most experienced and the easiest to the inexperienced. Deciphering was organised so that mainly the leading stenographer's notes were followed, and the assistants' notes were examined only in sections where lacks or ambiguity existed.²⁶³ The estates' decisions and other texts between the debates were usually formulated by the chief of stenography. (Kallioniemi 1946, 105–106)

The transcription, which the "ladies of the Secretariat" took care of, took place simultaneously with the deciphering. The procedure, in which separate transcriptionists were employed, was rather innovative as usually in parliaments stenographers also took care of the transcription.²⁶⁴ The transcribed minutes were checked and compared to the shorthand notes in two or three groups led by the experienced stenographers. After this, the final verbatim records, which were often ready by noon, were delivered to orators for correction. If there were no more than two plenary sessions per week, the minutes were given to the orators in the next plenary. (Kallioniemi 1946, 106–108)

From early Diets on, members of the *Stenografiska föreningen* justified proposals on procedure revisions by comparing them to foreign parliamentary models (see e.g. E. G. Palmén on the number of stenographers and their rotation in Palmén 1876b²⁶⁵). An examination of the Finnish stenography journals *Tid-*

²⁶³ In earlier Diets, the stenographers deciphered the shorthand by sitting together at a table and going through the different versions of the text together. According to Fabritius, the new procedure saved time and did not lead to a dramatic increase in the amount of errors. (Kallioniemi 1946, 105)

²⁶⁴ Even though the Finnish distribution of work was seen by the Finnish contemporaries as unique in parliamentary history, in fact, members of the family Gurney had already taken minutes in the committees of the British parliament in a similar manner. (Melin 1927, 312; Melin 1929, 497; Kallioniemi 1946, 24)

²⁶⁵ Palmén noted that a visit to the parliamentary debates (*parlamentariska förhandlingar*) in Sweden, Denmark and Germany revealed that in plenary sessions two working stenographers were normally changed every ten or fifteen minutes. In foreign parliaments there were usually at least four rotating pairs. After a short turn of taking shorthand notes, the pair had approximately an hour to rest and decipher (*déchiffrer*) the notes. In Finland, on the contrary, a debate (*debatt*) could last five consecutive

ning för Stenografi and *Pikakirjoituslehti* reveals the interest Finnish stenographers had in the practices of foreign parliaments. A large number of the Finnish articles were translated from foreign journals. It is also illustrative that in 1889 *Stenografiska föreningen* decided to establish a post for a librarian, whose task was to follow foreign stenography literature and to supplement the association's library accordingly (Valta 1972a, 14).

7.5.2 Transition to the unicameral Eduskunta

Stenografiska föreningen took care of the procedures and personnel of the Diet stenography from 1872 on. In 1905, the language question, which had heated up in the *Stenografiska föreningen* during the late nineteenth century, resulted in the association's dissolution. The events culminated in the election of a new chairman at the annual meeting, during which time the long-time leaders E. G. Palmén and August Fabritius stated that they would not continue under any circumstances. Swedish-language members of the association objected to the Finnish side's candidate, Lars Neovius,²⁶⁶ and left the meeting, announcing their resignations from the association. (See *Helsingin Sanomat*, 10 Feb., 1905, 4) The Swedish section of the *Stenografiska föreningen* founded a new association for Swedish-language stenography called *Förening Gabelsberger*. The Finnish section continued under the name *Pikakirjoittajyhdistys*.

The Parliament Act of 1906 did not offer guidance for the procedure of minute-taking in the unicameral Eduskunta: the Parliamentary Reform Committee left such arrangements up to the Eduskunta's authority and its rules of procedure. This allowed them to be more easily modified according to current needs and challenges. Before the first session of the Eduskunta, the two associations drafted a plan for stenography in the new assembly. The plan, which mostly followed the accustomed model of the Diet, was temporary and valid only for the first session as the associations saw that there was not yet sufficient experience of the new parliament's organisation and practices. The associations justified their view on how many stenographers were needed by conducting an international comparison.²⁶⁷ (*Uusi Suometar*, 24 Apr., 1907, 4) At the beginning of the first session, after a dispute between the two associations over the number of Swedish stenographers, a decision was made to hire thirteen stenog-

hours and a morning session could be followed by an afternoon session that could last long into the night. Still, the same three stenographers worked throughout the debates. Palmén felt that in foreign parliaments such a procedure would not be possible. (Palmén 1876b)

²⁶⁶ Neovius (Nevanlinna), the creator of the first Finnish-language stenography system, had become a member of the *Stenografiska föreningen* in 1872 and served as the vice-chair of the association 1891–1905 and as the chair of the *Pikakirjoittajyhdistys* from 1905 to 1916. (Räty 1972, 5)

²⁶⁷ According to the final proposal, thirteen Finnish and four Swedish-language stenographers were needed, including a chief and two chief assistants. The associations had calculated that with this staff the minutes would be ready within an hour and fifteen minutes after each plenary. The comparison was made in relation to the Austrian, Hungarian, French, Swedish, Danish, Norwegian and Serbian parliaments. (*Uusi Suometar*, 24 Apr., 1907, 4)

raphers, including a chief and two chief-assistants, as well as six typists for transcription. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 8, 1908, 57²⁶⁸)

7.5.3 Learning by traveling: F. W. Kadenius's field trip to European parliaments

Soon after the transition to the Eduskunta, a close examination of foreign parliamentary models was initiated in order to create procedures for minutes. In 1907, Chief of the Eduskunta's Stenography Secretariat Master F. W. Kadenius²⁶⁹ was appointed to the job. Between 22 November and 24 December 1907, Kadenius made excursions to nine European parliaments. The field trip was funded by a scholarship from the Finnish stenography association, *Pikakirjoitajayhdistys* (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 8, 1908, 57). During the trip, Kadenius visited parliaments in Stockholm, Copenhagen, Berlin, Dresden, Vienna, Budapest, Munich, Stuttgart and Paris. Kadenius received a written report from the parliament in Kristiania (Oslo), which he had been forced to skip due to tight timetable.

In addition to the prominent parliaments whose work and procedures were reported in the Finnish press and stenography journals, the emphasis of Kadenius' trip was on the German parliaments, where Gabelsberger stenography, on which the Finnish-language system of Neovius-Nevanlinna was based, was used. The Finnish stenographers also had contacts with Germany earlier, since the training of the first Finnish stenographers had taken place there in the early 1860s. In addition, the German parliaments fitted Kadenius's schedule and travel plan geographically and linguistically. At that point, the British parliament had not yet established its own stenography secretariat and its minute-taking was left to the independent enterprise Hansard, which the parliament subsidised and whose minutes were based on newspapers' reports (Jordan 1931, 437–442; *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 11, 1911, 6–7; see Chapter 8).²⁷⁰ The travelogues of Kadenius' visits to the European parliaments were published in newspapers (see e.g. *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 22 Feb., 1908, 9; *Uusi Suometar*, 25 Jan., 1908, 4–5) and in detail in *Pikakirjoituslehti* in 1908–1909.

During his trip, Kadenius interviewed local parliamentary stenographers and personnel. He was given guided tours of the parliaments and followed their debates. In addition to informal discussions with parliamentary experts, Kadenius had prepared a list of forty questions regarding parliamentary

²⁶⁸ The Finnish stenography journal *Pikakirjoituslehti* was published from the beginning of 1908 both in shorthand and longhand, and thus offered material for practising skills in stenography as well as helping to popularise the journal's discussions with the wider public.

²⁶⁹ Fredrik Wilhelm Kadenius (1861–1942) worked as a Diet stenographer from 1882 until the Parliamentary Reform of 1906. Kadenius created stenography procedures for the Eduskunta and served as chief of the Eduskunta's Stenography Secretariat until 1920. Kadenius edited the Finnish stenography journal, *Pikakirjoituslehti* 1908–1915. (Kallioniemi 1946; Valta 1972a)

²⁷⁰ *Pikakirjoituslehti* published an article series on the British parliament and its stenography secretariat in 1912.

minutes. He was interested mainly in the organisation of parliaments and their calendars, their practices of minute-taking, the placement of orators and stenographers in the plenary halls, the premises and equipment of the personnel, the number of staff for different tasks, the rotation of stenographers as well as their salaries, selection and testing, the timetable of production and printing of minutes and the stenographers' role and rights in assisting newspaper reporters.

In his travelogues Kadenius described how his title and background in parliamentary stenography "opened the doors and hearts" of the European parliaments. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 1, 1908, 3) As a result of the network of parliamentary stenography based on personal connections and correspondence,²⁷¹ common training grounds and following of stenography journals and literature, parliamentary stenographers were often well-aware of the circumstances and practices in other countries (see *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 4, 1908, 30; 8, 1908, 60; 9, 1908, 68).

In general, Kadenius's travelogues give an interesting and vivid picture of the deliberations of European parliaments. Even though Kadenius's initial motivation was in stenography, the bulk of his writings consist of general observations on the practices and peculiarities of parliamentary debates. Kadenius was eager to distinguish and label characteristics of the different parliaments and their debate cultures. His texts point out how parliamentary stenography was not merely a business of reproducing what was said in plenary halls, but a procedural mechanism created to serve the character and purposes of parliamentary debate.

Some of Kadenius's general observations are worth mentioning here. His visit to the Swedish Riksdag and discussions with the local stenographers encouraged him to strengthen his assumptions about the state of Swedish parliamentary stenography. Kadenius noted that "in Sweden stenography is a total side issue, which the Swedes have no affection for". According to Kadenius, the Swedish did not consider stenography "either a science or an art" (*tiedettä tai taidetta*); it was a mere instrument for income. Kadenius criticised the skills of Swedish parliamentary stenographers, who had chosen Melin shorthand instead of Gabelsberger.²⁷² In addition, Kadenius noted that the system that had been used in the Finnish Diet twenty or thirty years earlier, namely, in which the stenographers were responsible for transcription, was still in use in the Riksdag. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 1, 1908, 3–4)

While Kadenius's assessment can be seen as reflecting a more general cultural disassociation from Sweden, it also points to how little influence the Swedish model had on the modernisation of parliamentary minutes in Finland. The Swedish model had given the Finnish reformists of the 1860s a vague framework, from which the practices soon developed independently. In the Finnish discussions on parliamentary minutes the Swedish case was rarely referred to,

²⁷¹ For August Fabritius on the importance of correspondence in developing stenography, see Kallioniemi 1946, 189.

²⁷² The competing schools of stenography often engaged in disputes with each other (see e.g. Kadenius in Berlin, in *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 6, 1 June, 1908, 44–45).

and sometimes the Riksdag was described as having learned from the Finnish practices.²⁷³

Kadenius, based on discussions with foreign parliamentary stenographers, made the observation that parliamentary stenographers in Europe shared a common challenge, namely, the increased speed and quantity of parliamentary speech (e.g. *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 5, 1908, 35). In addition, Kadenius noted that a general restlessness and racket were characteristic of parliamentary debates outside the Nordic countries. The popularity of disruptive interjections was prominent in the foreign parliamentary debates compared to the Finnish. (See e.g. the Reichstag in *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 7, 1908, 51–52; Vienna in *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 11, 1908, 84–85; Paris in *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 7, 1909, 50) Kadenius repeated the common observation that the Finnish parliamentarians were serious and calm compared to the foreign (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 7, 1908, 51–52). (For similar perceptions, see Section 4.4)

Kadenius was astonished by the debating character of the deliberations of foreign parliaments. In the Reichstag, Kadenius noticed how the debate took turns during a single speech: an orator could comment on an interjection and answer a question that had been presented from the audience during his speech. Still, the debate and reading seemed to proceed fluently and uninterrupted. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 7, 1908, 51–52) This differed strongly from the Finnish lecturing style of parliamentary speaking (cf. memoirs on the first years of the Eduskunta in Heinämies 1947 and Wuolijoki 1934).

7.5.4 Institutionalisation of parliamentary stenography in the Eduskunta

One of Kadenius's lessons from the field trip was the institutionalisation of parliamentary stenography as part of, and under the authority of, the parliament. Kadenius's interviews pointed out that the Finnish system of an extra-parliamentary association in charge of minute-taking was extraordinary. In foreign parliaments stenographers had been made official employees. In addition, in the light of the foreign models, *Stenografiska föreningen's* as well as individual stenographers' practice of offering their notes to newspapers – a practice adopted in the late Diets – was problematic. The problem was about demarcation between authentic and non-authentic reports: the use of an extra-parliamentary actor in the production of official minutes rendered them semi- or quasi-authentic; the distribution or "leaking" of non-checked and non-official versions of the minutes to newspapers caused ambiguity on their role and use. The latter aspect occasionally caused severe criticism of Diet stenographers and put them in a difficult position (Kallioniemi 1946, 248–249). In some parliaments efforts to overcome the problem had been attempted by the use of official newspapers (see Section 8.4).

²⁷³ For Finnish Gabelsberger as a model for the Swedish Riksdag, see *Hufvudstadsbladet* (13 Feb., 1897, 2). On influence in the opposite direction, see Kadenius on the 'reviser system' in Section 7.5.5.

In the Eduskunta's first session in 1907, the two stenography associations took care of the organisation of the Eduskunta's minutes (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, PTK 8/1907, 247–251). However, in the beginning of the second session in 1908 a dispute on fees caused the working relationship between the associations and the parliament to break down. In 1908, the Eduskunta decided to take care of stenography on its own.

On 17 February 1908, the stenography associations approached the Eduskunta with a letter in which they presented their wish that Eduskunta stenographer vacancies be regularised with annual salaries and the right to a pension. According to the associations, this would enhance practices found appropriate in foreign parliaments. (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, PTK 6/1908, 32–34) The Eduskunta's Office Commission (kansliatoimikunta) objected to the proposal, stating that no sufficient experience existed on the consequences of such appointments and that such a system would require revision of the law (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, PTK 24/1908, 579). On the contrary, the Office Commission argued, drawing on Kadenius's findings, that the biggest deficiency in the Eduskunta's stenography was that the parliament was dependent on extra-parliamentary associations. The Eduskunta was to decide on the organisation of a new Stenography Secretariat, and the hiring of stenographers should be left to the Office Commission. In this manner, the Secretariat could be laid on a more solid foundation, and the duration of the posts could be extended or made permanent for experienced stenographers, at the same time providing the Eduskunta the professional parliamentary experience it required. (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, PTK 24/1908, 579–580)

By the time the question was discussed in the Eduskunta, the MPs had started to see the haggling over stenographers' salaries increasingly awkward and tiresome²⁷⁴. In addition, a strike threat hinted by stenographers caused bad blood²⁷⁵. Illustrative of the change that had taken place was that Second Deputy Speaker of the Eduskunta E. G. Palmén, a long-time leading spokesperson of the Finnish stenography association, argued that it was indeed time for the associations' monopoly to come to an end. The funds given by the parliament for training new stenographers had not borne fruit. As not enough new stenographers had been trained, the associations had been able to make threats with possible strike actions and to dictate the prices of parliamentary stenography. (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, PTK 24/1908, 583) It is notable that Palmén had originally in 1872 objected to *Stenografiska föreningen's* role in influencing and participating in the Diet stenographers' work (Kallioniemi 1946, 20).

7.5.5 Procedures on minutes in the early Eduskunta

In 1910, Kadenius wrote in *Pikakirjoituslehti* (4, 1910, 26; 5, 1910, 37) on the procedures of the Eduskunta's minute-taking and described the work of the Ste-

²⁷⁴ See e.g. Representative von Alfthan, in Valtioapäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, PTK 24/1908, 581.

²⁷⁵ Valtioapäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, PTK 24/1908, 582.

nography Secretariat. Kadenius had applied the lessons he had learned from European parliaments to the Eduskunta. The foreign parliamentary models had leverage: the new procedures eased stenographers' workload in the form of shorter turns in rotation and a larger hired workforce. The Eduskunta's procedures of minute-taking were now based on a "reviser system", which Kadenius had become familiar with during his field trips.

According to Kadenius, in a plenary session of the Eduskunta, the chief of the Stenography Secretariat or one of his two assistants and a stenographer were present. The task of the chief or his assistant was to oversee the process and to take care of the formal accuracy of the minutes, while the stenographer took down the main notes of the speeches. A clock placed on the stenographers' desk gave a signal every seven and a half minutes. After the signal, the chief, or his assistant, called a replacement for the stenographer by pressing a button placed under the desk. The stenographer leaving shift took his and the chief's notes to the Secretariat. The chief or assistant worked for a half-hour in the plenary and a half-hour in the Secretariat. The rotating stenographers returned to the plenary after either forty-five or fifty-two and a half minutes, depending on whether there were seven or eight of them working. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 4, 1910, 26; 5, 1910, 37)

In the Secretariat the stenographer marked the orators' names and speaking order in a book. After this, the stenographer dictated his notes to a typist, simultaneously correcting possible errors in the sentences, unnecessary repetition and small formal mistakes. After the chief returned from his shift at the plenary, the stenographer read the transcription to him and the chief followed his notes and examined which parts needed further modification. The final transcribed speeches were marked with a stamp and the stenographers delivered them to each orator for checking during the plenary session. After the checking, orators left their speeches on the stenographers' desk, where the stenographers delivered them to the Secretariat. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 4, 1910, 26; 5, 1910, 37)

After a plenary session, the chief together with his assistants checked the formal accuracy of the minutes and delivered the speeches that were still unreviewed by the orators to the Secretariat of the Print, and informed the orators about their current status. If the question under discussion had been remitted to committee, the chief or the assistants delivered a copy of the minutes to the committee. Another copy was delivered to the secretary of the Eduskunta. Two extra copies of each speech were taken: one for the committee reading and one to be preserved in case the originals got lost or destroyed. On important issues, newspapers placed orders for statements from the Eduskunta Secretariat and more extra copies were required. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 4, 1910, 26; 5, 1910, 37)

The organisation of the Eduskunta's stenography was based on a procedure that was called in parliamentary stenography the "reviser system" (*revisorijärjestelmä*). A similar system had been adopted and applied in the parliaments of Vienna, Budapest, Paris, Norway and Sweden, which Kadenius had visited. In the system, the two chief-assistants were the "revisers": In the plenary

ry hall, the chief-assistants worked as the controlling stenographers (*kontrollipikakirjoittaja*), but in the Secretariat they checked and corrected the transcribed minutes. Also the chief of the Stenography Secretariat worked as a reviser in addition to his task as the leader and main organiser. During busy times, the roles in the Stenography Secretariat were mixed up and stenographers could take the reviser's role. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 5, 1910, 36–37)

7.6 Recurrent challenges of parliamentary minutes: Disputing objectivity and the stenographic ideal

Parliamentarisation of minute-taking in Finland extended beyond debates about summarised and verbatim records. Disputes on the role, character and purposes of minutes by no means ended with the formal approval of parliamentary stenography; on the contrary, its ideal continued to be contested in numerous ways resulting from challenges similar to those in parliaments internationally. Finnish actors sought answers to their problems from foreign models. Some of the problems faced point to the general character of written minutes and have remained unresolved up to today.

7.6.1 Correction of minutes

In order to provide parliamentarians protection against unfair treatment of their speeches in the minutes, after the minute-taking the members were given a limited time and right to correct their statements. The challenge was to find a balance between members' right to correction and the minutes' objectivity. Rules on correction were based on procedures established in foreign parliaments.

In the Diets, the procedures for correction and approval of minutes were set down within the individual estates. In the Diet of 1885 speeches recorded by stenographers and transcribed by the Secretariat personnel were delivered to orators for correction. Within a fixed deadline, corrected statements were to be returned to the Secretariat.²⁷⁶ (Nobility 1885, I, 392–393) The time reserved for orators' corrections varied by estate and by the year in question, but usually was set between several weeks to one day; the time was shortened towards the end of the nineteenth century in order to secure prompter printing of the minutes²⁷⁷ in the context of decreasing parliamentary time. In 1885, in the No-

²⁷⁶ Originally the Secretariat's messenger collected the corrected speeches from the members, but as he was often forced to return empty handed, the Nobility decided in 1885 that the members were responsible for returning the speeches to the Secretariat. (Nobility 1885, I, 392–393)

²⁷⁷ For example, the Standing Orders of the House of Knights in 1869 (*Ritarihuonejärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinanmaan Ritaristolle ja Aatelille 1869*) stated that the minutes should be ready for the estate's approval eight days after a plenary. In the Burghers in 1872, the deadline was shortened from fourteen days to a week. The main argument for this was to ensure swift printing of the minutes. (*Burghers 1872, I, 270–272*) In the Clergy in 1882, the deadline was eight days (see Dean Johnsson in

bility, the deadline was shortened to twenty-four hours.²⁷⁸ (Nobility 1885, I, 52–53, 157–158)

In the Eduskunta, based on the rules of procedure of 1907, typed statements were sent from the Stenography Secretariat to each orator for correction. If an orator wanted to correct his statement, revisions had to be marked in the typed document. The document was to be signed and returned to the Stenography Secretariat within forty-eight hours. (Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys 1907, § 34) In 1908, the deadline was shortened to twelve hours on Kadenius's initiative (Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys 1908, § 34). The Secretariat was under pressure to speed up the publication of minutes while its workload constantly increased. According to Kadenius, the MPs' slowness and use of middlemen in the corrections hindered efficient parliamentary work and prompt printing, and thus signified a turn backwards to the obsolete practices of the Diet. Drawing on his knowledge of foreign practices, Kadenius criticised the MPs for taking liberties in relation to the deadline and their right to correct their statements (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 7, 1908, 50²⁷⁹). According to the Eduskunta's rules of procedure, if a speech was not returned by the deadline, it was considered approved without corrections (Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys 1907, § 34).

In the Diets, after orators' corrections the statements were submitted to the estate's secretary, who checked that no unjustified revisions had been made (e.g. Nobility 1885, I, 392–393). Based on an international practice, only corrections on single words and word orders were allowed; no revisions on the content were permitted.²⁸⁰ In 1885, the Committee of the House of Knights prescribed that in order to protect minutes from carelessness (*inadvertens*), the secretary was to see that an orator "had not changed the content of his statement or removed anything that another orator had dealt with"²⁸¹ (Nobility 1885, I, 392–393). The rule, which was emphasised for example by E. G. Palmén (1891, 62–63), was adopted in the Eduskunta's first rules of procedure in 1907:

If the orator has made revisions on the content of his or her speech (*tehnyt asiallisia muutoksia*), and especially if the revisions deal with parts against which counter-claims (*vastaväitteitä*) have been presented, the scrutinisers of the minutes must inform the orator about the issue, and if the matter cannot be agreed on, inform the Eduskunta. (Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys 1907, § 34)

Clergy 1882, I, 20–21). The decisions to print and publish the minutes in booklets during the Diets shortened the deadline. For example, in the Peasants in 1897, the deadline was one day (Peasants 1897, I, 21).

²⁷⁸ E. G. Palmén noted that slow correction resulted in printing delays and therefore he proposed a deadline of six to twelve hours. (Nobility 1885, I, 52–53, 157–158)

²⁷⁹ Kadenius was the editor of *Pikakirjoituslehti* 1908–15 and most probably the writer of the journal's articles. However, as the writers of the articles are not named, they are referred to here by the journal's name.

²⁸⁰ For the similar rule of the Burghers, see Tengström in Burghers 1877, I, 20. The orators marked their corrections to the minutes with a pencil (*ibid.*).

²⁸¹ "Finner sekreteraren någon talare hafva vid justeringen ändrat det väsentliga uti innehållet af sitt yttrande eller derifrån utstrukt sådant, som af annan talare blifvit bemött..." (Nobility 1885, I, 392–393)

The rule protecting the content of speeches followed an internationally established practice. For example, the French parliament²⁸² traditionally followed a rule according to which orators' corrections could touch only the form, not the content of speeches (Pierre 1902, 1003, 1113).²⁸³ Similar rules were common to German parliaments (Olschewski 2000).

The rule prohibiting one from revising parts of her statement that other orators have dealt with underlines the debating character of parliamentary speaking. This rule protects not only individual orators and their statements, but debate in general. The procedure highlights the principle according to which, in a parliament, orators' speeches are not separate statements or single expressions of opinion, but speeches to a question – parts of a debate on a single matter on the agenda (see Section 4.1; De Mille 1878, 472), in which arguments are tested and contested and in which invention of arguments and improvisation are encouraged. Minutes, as representations of discussion, aim to preserve and mediate this character of parliamentary deliberation. It is notable that in the Finnish parliamentary rules, speeches were referred to as “statements” (*lausunto; yttrande*), which is suited to the “lecturing style” of delivery often noted by contemporaries (see Sections 7.5.3 and 7.6.2).

Finnish parliamentarians and experts on minute-taking warned about the risks of uncontrolled and unfair revisions. E. G. Palmén (1891) argued that unparliamentary revisions could be dangerous and used illegitimately as rhetorical weapons against opponents in parliament. He noted, using metaphors and vocabulary of classical rhetoric,²⁸⁴ that unrestricted revisions could be used to “smooth strong words” (*kovien sanojen heikontaminen*) or to “add new” ones, or “to smite the arms out of the opponent’s hands afterwards” (*jälestäpäin lyödä aseet vastustajan kädestä*). For Palmén, corrections on content had already been explicitly forbidden in the Nobility and the Burghers, and he urged proper enforcement of the rule in the other two estates as well.²⁸⁵ (Palmén 1891, 62–63)

F. W. Kadenius continued Palmén’s task of enlightening parliamentarians on their limited right to correct speeches in the early Eduskunta, when a large number of new representatives without earlier parliamentary experience were elected. Kadenius’s participation in public discussion on the matter was partly aimed at the criticism the Stenography Secretariat had received in the midst of a heated party struggle and increased public interest in minutes. Such an occasion took place, for example, in 1908 when journalist Sigurd Roos wrote in *Hufvudstadsbladet* that the Eduskunta’s printed minutes had failed to give a truthful picture of the debates due to misuse of members’ rights to make stylis-

²⁸² For discussion in the Finnish press about the French practices of revision and correction of minutes, see e.g. *Nya Pressen*, 7 Oct., 1892, 2.

²⁸³ “*Les rectifications des orateurs ne peuvent porter que sur la forme, et non sur le fond.*” (Pierre 1902, 1103). “...ce droit de revision s’arrête à la forme ; il ne s’étend pas au fond.” (Pierre 1902, 1113)

²⁸⁴ For similarities to the expressions of classical rhetoric, see e.g. Skinner’s (1996) examination of Roman authors.

²⁸⁵ Palmén argued that the most eager reviser of speeches in Finland was Jonas Castrén of the Peasants, who had, according to Palmén, misused his authority as the estate-appointed scrutiniser of the minutes. (Palmén 1891, 62–63)

tic reformulations (*stilistiska formulering*).²⁸⁶ Kadenius reacted to the critique by presenting the Eduskunta's rules on the checking and correction of minutes.

Kadenius used foreign models as an authority in the disputes and in educating stenographers. In 1909, *Pikakirjoituslehti* (1, 1909, 6-7; 2, 1909, 14-15) published a two-piece article "On the Orator's Right to Correct His Statement" (*Puhujan oikeudesta lausuntonsa korjaamiseen*). The article was translated and edited from the stenography journal *Stenographische Praxis* published in Berlin. According to Kadenius, the reason for the publication of the article was the fact that "several parliaments' rules of procedure include insufficient instructions, if any, on the question" (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 1, 1909, 6-7). In the article, stenographers of the Prussian parliament asked German parliamentarians about their opinions on the orator's right to correct speeches. The questionnaire showed, similarly to the teachings of the Finnish specialists in parliamentary stenography, that the majority of parliamentarians allowed formal corrections and small cosmetic embellishments as long as they did not change the content. Corrections that changed the content of parts that had been criticised by other orators were considered illegitimate. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 1, 1909, 6-7; 2, 1909, 14-15)

How was the validity of members' corrections scrutinised? How were the revisions on the form and content checked, and who had the final word in the approval of minutes? In the first Diets, based on an old Riksdag model, secretaries of the estates read the full minutes of the previous meeting at the beginning of each plenary session (see e.g. Burghers 1877-78, I, 18-26). The practice was soon renounced due to its time-consuming character and members' lack of interest. In the Burghers in 1877, the estate's liberal Deputy Speaker Carl Adolf Öhrnberg²⁸⁷ noted that the most accurate way to check the minutes (*justera protokollet*) was if the minutes were read. This practice that had been used in the early Diets was, however, both purposeless and time-consuming. Öhrnberg argued that only excerpts chosen and demanded by the estate should be read. Full minutes should be kept accessible for members' checking for one to two weeks. (Burghers 1877, I, 18-19)

²⁸⁶ According to Roos, such conduct was in contradiction with the practices of responsible assemblies (*församling med ansvar*), where changes on meaning (*betydelse*) and content (*innebörd*) were forbidden. Roos held Kadenius responsible for the minute's reliability since Kadenius verified the documents. (*Hufvudstadsbladet*, 11 Feb., 1908, 3; 12 Feb., 1908, 7; 14 Feb., 1908, 8) The episode resulted in a legal process when Alexandra Gripenberg, one of the representatives Roos had accused of unfair revisions, raised libel actions against Roos and *Hufvudstadsbladet*'s Editor-in-chief A. R. Frenckell. The charge was 'defamation against better knowledge' (*smädelse mot bättre vetande*). (*Hufvudstadsbladet*, 12 Apr., 1908, 9-10; *Nya Pressen*, 15 Mar., 1908, 7; *Uusi Suometar*, 19 Feb., 1908, 7) Frenckell was sanctioned with a fine of 150 marks and Roos with 300; both were also ordered to compensate the costs of the publication of the Court of Appeals's verdict in *Hufvudstadsbladet*. (*Uusi Aura*, 5 Apr., 1910, 6)

²⁸⁷ Carl Adolf Öhrnberg (1813-1877) was a respected and active liberal member of the Burghers 1863-1877. He was a member of the January Committee in 1862 and was active on several reforms of parliamentary procedure, such as the introduction of regular Diets and the estates' right to introduce motions. He was a founder of *Juridiska Föreningen* in 1862 and its board member until 1869. In the language question Öhrnberg was strictly Svecoman. (Sundström 2007) On Öhrnberg's connection to the policies of *Helsingfors Dagblad*, see Landgren 1995.

Based on such arguments, the reading of minutes was reduced and in the beginning of each plenary session the speakers usually read the estate's decisions and some sections of the previous meeting's minutes. The speakers also read letters and documents submitted to the estate and some of the members' statements and proposals, usually on a member's request. However, based on § 58 of the Diet Act of 1869, which was adopted from § 53 of the Riksdag Act of 1810, all of the documents related to a matter were to be read before the estate prior to a final decision on the question, if a member so requested (Riksdagsordningen 1810; Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869). The section was removed from the Parliament Act of 1906.

In addition to communicating information and reminding the members of previous discussions, the purpose of reading was to subject minutes and documents to the supervision of the assembly. Such control of validity has been traditional to parliaments. For example, in France in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries secretaries read the minutes (*procès-verbal*) of the previous meeting at the beginning of each sitting. The *procès-verbal* covered the proceedings and votes of the assembly and summaries of the orators' opinions. (Pierre 1902, 1100)

In Finland, a procedure was established that replaced this practice by assigning the task to a small correction committee (*justeringsnämnd* or *-utskott*) (Peasants 1877–78, I, 15). If secretary of the estate deemed that an orator had changed the content of his speech, the matter was submitted to the correction committee consisting of two or three changing members of the estate.²⁸⁸ The procedure was apparently introduced without an explicit foreign model. If the committee shared the secretary's opinion, the member was asked to recall his revision. If the member did not agree, the committee subjected the matter to the estate's deliberation (Nobility 1885, I, 392–393; Nybom in Burghers 1877–78, I, 20–21). Hence, the estate had the final word on possible revisions. The practice of rotating members appointed to oversee the correction was transferred to the Eduskunta. The Eduskunta's first rules of procedure stated that the Office Commission called on four MPs for a week to moderate the minutes (*pöytäkirjat*) (Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys 1907, § 33).

In the Diet, after the minutes had gone through the procedures for correction, the secretary of the estate verified the minutes with his signature (Lilius 1974, 179). In the Eduskunta, after the correction procedures, the four correctors deemed the examination complete and authenticated the document with their signatures. In addition, a short final protocol (*päätöspöytäkirja*) was to be presented to the moderators immediately after each plenary. (Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys 1907, § 35; Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys 1908, § 35) The final

²⁸⁸ In the Nobility in 1885 the committee consisted of two members; in the Burghers of three (Nobility 1885, I, 392–393). In the Burghers in 1877 the committee was elected for a two-week period by the estate's electors. K. F. Ignatius proposed a procedure that later became the general practice: the committee members were chosen to the task by lottery, each in turn (Burghers 1877–78, I, 20–21, 24). In 1882 the Clergy gave the duty of approving the minutes to the Office Commission (*kansliatoimikunta*) (Lilius 1974, 255).

minutes were approved by the chief of the Stenography Secretariat, who signed the documents.

According to the stenographic ideal, stenographers were the ears of the parliament (Pierre 1902, 1111). Orators' corrections and revisions were controlled in relation to "the photographic image of the discussion" produced by the stenographers. It is notable that in parliamentary history both stenographers and orators have been moved to different locations in plenary halls in order to secure the stenographers better possibilities to hear speech. For the same reason, stenography has partly influenced the placing of speaker rostrums in parliaments and enforcing the rule that members speak from the rostrum. In some parliaments stenographers had to move around the plenary hall in order to secure the best possible audibility.²⁸⁹

In the Diets all shorthand notes of plenary discussions were preserved in the estates' secretariats. Thus, in the case of a dispute, orators' corrections could be checked by comparing them to the stenographers' notes. (Kallioniemi 1946, 101, 106; Nobility 1877–78, I, 135; 1885, I, 10; Peasants 1885, I, 17–18, 25) Similar was the case in the Eduskunta (see Kadenius in *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 12 Feb., 1908, 7). In addition, according to the Eduskunta's first rules of procedure, verbatim records after the orators' corrections were made available for every member to examine at the Eduskunta's Secretariat for a day (Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys 1907, § 35). However, this procedure, was used in the Diets as well, was removed from the rules of procedure of 1908 as one of the unnecessary stages that, according to Kadenius, obstructed efficient publication of the minutes (see *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 7, 1908, 50).

7.6.2 Written statements

Several practices challenged the stenographic ideal. These practices were in contradiction with the idea of recording what was heard in the parliament and undermined the idea of minutes as a faithful reproduction of the debates. The first was the role of *written statements*. In the Diet of 1867 the Nobility decided that speeches written in advance were to be handed in to the persons responsible for the minutes. In addition, the estate gave its members a deadline of one day to submit oral presentations in written form. (Nobility 1867, I, 52–53) Similar proposal had been made already in the Senate in 1866 when discussing the Diet Act of 1869. Senator J. V. Snellman proposed an insertion into the Act according to which "the written statements (*skriftligt yttrande*) should be handed in after being read out". If a member who had "spoken freely" (*ståndsmedlem, som sig yttrat i fritt föredrag*) wanted to hand in a written version of his presentation, he had to do it before the end of the session. The oral and not the written presentation was to have priority in the corrected version. Snellman argued that the clause would "preserve good order in the discussion and protect the minutes' weight as evidence" (*bibehållande af god ordning vid diskussionen och för skyddande*

²⁸⁹ See Pierre 1902, 1031; for "*der wandernde Stenograph*" in Vienna see *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 11, 1908, 84–85, and in the Finnish Diets, see *Pikakirjoituslehti*, 5, 1910, 36–37).

af protokollets vitsord). (Senate 1866, § 48) Snellman had criticised the quality of the minutes of the January Committee in 1862, when he disapproved of their arbitrary corrections (1862d, 338).

Although not included in the Diet Act, the practice of accepting written statements was adopted in the Diets. The practice was in contradiction with stenography's photographic ideal. When handing in written presentations of "improvised speeches", their "weight as evidence" was based on the orators' intentions and conceptions, not on necessarily on the actual words spoken in the assembly. Similarly, when stenographers were hired in the estates, it became their practice to rest when members read written statements. In these cases, "what was heard in the parliament" was not governing rule in the minutes, and discerning changes of content was difficult due to the lack of stenographic notes. Thus, for example in the Clergy in 1882, Doctor Johan August Lindelöf argued that stenographers should take down speeches that were read from paper in the same form as they were actually heard in the estate, not rely only on the form they were handed afterwards (Clergy 1882, I, 20–21). Under Kadenius's supervision such reliance was renounced in the Eduskunta, and all heard speeches were recorded by the stenographers, with written statements playing only an assisting role.

Kallioniemi (1946) interpreted the Finnish parliamentarians' desire to hand in written statements as a result of their lack of confidence in their own oratorical skills and as a sign of the distrust towards, and lack of understanding of, stenographers' work. According to him, the members saw that only the literal form ensured that their opinions were properly recorded. (ibid. 16–17)

The practice of written speeches also reflects the "lecturing style" of Finnish parliamentary speaking acknowledged in the contemporary descriptions and memoirs of parliamentary work (e.g. Heinämies 1947; Wuolijoki 1934). During the period, European parliaments had differing rules on written speeches, and proposals for their banning were also heard in Finland. According to Thomas Erskine May the reading of written speeches had never been recognised in either house of the British parliament. A member was not permitted to read his speech, but was allowed to "refresh his memory by a reference of notes". May noted that "a member may read extracts from documents, but his own language must be delivered *bonâ fide*, in the form of an unwritten composition. Any other rule would be at once inconvenient, and repugnant to the true theory of debate." (May 1883 [1844], 340) In the French *États-Généraux* only written speeches were held in the majority of cases — a practice that continued until 1848, although Mirabeau, for example, fought against it. According to Mirabeau, "the method of written speeches is vicious in itself; it never makes men of force in a political assembly; it favours inertia of thought, and, as used to be done, throws in numbness and indolence." (Pierre 1902, 1033) During the Restoration (1814–1830) improvised speeches were an exception, but in the beginning of the July Monarchy in 1830 proposals for banning written speeches were made. Although these proposals were turned down, written speeches almost disappeared in the assemblies of the Second Republic (1848–1852), but became again popular

in the assemblies of the Second Empire (1852–1870). According to Pierre, although written speeches “did not respond to anyone” and were merely the “*hors d’oeuvres* in a debate”, they could, if well prepared, be valuable for deliberation. To prohibit written speeches would remove the right to express one’s opinion from members who were not accustomed to speaking. (ibid. 1034)

In his commentary on the January Committee, Snellman saw the reading of ready-made written dictations (*färdiga skriftliga diktamina*), often produced by actors outside the assembly,²⁹⁰ as problematic since they consumed time and remained separate from the actual discussion (*utan allt sammanhang med diskussion*) (Snellman 1862d, 338). In 1908 Social Democrat Väinö Vuolijoki’s proposal to ban the presentation of written statements in the Eduskunta was turned down on the grounds of the Finnish representatives’ unaccustomedness to public speaking (PTK 24 /1908, 586–589; see Section 9.4).

Apart from the Diet and election campaign debates, Finnish parliamentarians had rather few opportunities to practise their oratory. Also the absence of oratory in the Finnish curriculum was seen as having a negative effect on the quality of speeches. For example, Allan Serlachius, a member of the Diet and the Eduskunta and a professor of law, noted sarcastically that a German secondary school graduate had more developed skills in oratory than a Finnish professor (Vuolijoki 1934, 11).²⁹¹ The prepared written statements did not qualify as speeches *per se*, for they lacked improvisation and spontaneity and eliminated the debating character of plenary speech, which Kadenius, for example, had admired on his visits to European parliaments. Neither was the rule enabling the speaker to give the floor to members, alternating between speeches for and against, as was used in France during the Third Republic (Pierre 1902, 1039), ever introduced in the Finnish Diets or the Eduskunta. Speeches were held in the order of requests and no organised debate between sides took place.

7.6.3 Insertions and removals

Another point of contention about minutes was the *insertion and removal of statements*. According to § 46 of the Diet Act of 1869, no member had the right to speak off the record (*puhua pöytäkirjasta siwutse; tala utom protokollet*) in the plenary sessions. However, § 64 gave the members and the estate the possibility to insert or remove discussion from the minutes during correction if both the orator and the estate so wished, and if the discussion in question had not clearly affected any decision made. The section was adopted from § 58 of the Swedish Riksdag Act of 1810. The Diet Act’s § 46 was adopted in § 48 of the Parliament Act of 1906; § 64 in § 70. (Riksdagsordningen 1810; Suomen Suuriruhtinaskun-

²⁹⁰ Snellman was concerned about the harmful influence that “literate persons outside the institution” who “thought on behalf of the Peasants”, but “had nothing to do with the representation”, had on the Peasant estate. He was worried that in the Diet the Peasants could be manipulated by the liberals, Svecomans and their partisans in presenting reforms that were too radical. (Snellman 1862d, 338; 1863b, 275)

²⁹¹ Regardless of this, many of the Finnish representatives were highly respected for their oratorical skills. For example, Leo Mechelin and Lauri Kivekäs can be mentioned as examples discussed in this study.

nan valtiopäiväjärjestys 1906; Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869)

According to commentaries on the Diet work, due to inadvertence and indiscipline, illegitimate removals, often unacknowledged by the estate, took place throughout the Diets (see e.g. Palmén 1891, 62–63). Similarly, removals and insertions, apparently on an even larger scale, put into question the integrity of the Swedish Riksdag minutes throughout the nineteenth century (see Harvard 2011). One of the most striking removals of text in Finland took place in 1891 when the Peasants deleted from the minutes a whole discussion in which the minister-secretary had been criticised (Tuominen 1964, 63–65). However, removals took place also for individual members' benefit. In practice, it was very difficult to examine which parts of a discussion in fact affected the final decision and which did not. Removals were contrary to the stenographic ideal and its idea of minutes as photographic images of what took place in parliament. As a result, E. G. Palmén described the removal of statements as an unacceptable and unparliamentary form of revision. Emphasising the debate aspect of parliamentary speaking, Palmén argued that removals could put other speeches in an odd light if the speeches that followed touched upon the erased passages. (Palmén 1891, 62–63)

In the early Eduskunta the correction process was taken seriously and there was little room for manoeuvre on removals under the watchful eyes of the rival parties. In the Eduskunta on 10 September 1907, Social Democrat N. R. af Ursin requested removal of two of his statements of the previous plenary as he had "mistakenly presented false facts that he himself was not responsible for". In addition, he requested removal of a discussion that was about to come up on the matter. Af Ursin referred to § 70 of the Parliament Act and noted that he had already received an approval for the deletion from Representative Akseli Listo, who had replied to his statements. (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, PTK 22/1907, 1231–1233)

Defending the stenographic ideal E. G. Palmén, now a representative of the Finnish Party and the second deputy speaker of the Eduskunta, replied that although no damage would be done to posterity if such speeches were removed from the minutes, the creation of such a practice would be problematic for the Eduskunta. "After all, why are minutes taken if not to get a truthful picture (*todenperäinen kuva*) of the debate", Palmén asked. If everyone had the right to remove their words from the minutes "after saying something naughty", the principle of parliamentary minutes would be challenged. In addition, Palmén noted that the removed speeches would become juicy titbits (*maukas*) in the press and thus they could not be wiped them out altogether anyway. Palmén argued that in parliament there existed no separate "statements for publicity" and "statements for the minutes". For him, what was spoken to the minutes was to be included there, and everyone should be responsible for their words. Af Ursin's proposal lost the vote 77 against 105. (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, PTK 22/1907, 1231–1233)

The stenographic ideal did yield ground in certain occasions based on international parliamentary practice. Removals could come into question in cases of “unparliamentary” language against the assembly or its individual members, the government, the emperor, other individuals or in cases of unconstitutional matters. Similarly, for example in the French parliament, where the president of the chamber was given vast rights and duties in leading discussion and supervising the validity of minutes, the president also had the right to make corrections in the *procès-verbal* and did not have to approve all things spoken to the minutes. The president had the right to remove any “unconstitutional expressions” that he had heard, but had not at the time seen as meriting a call to order. In addition, the president had the right to remove statements that he deemed improper or that could cause conflicts between members. Orators were not allowed to correct or change statements that had led to disciplinary punishment. (Pierre 1902, 1103–1105, 1108–1111, 1113)

Another disputed procedure in the Diets was the insertion of objections outside the plenary discussions. According to § 62 of the Diet Act of 1869, a member had the right to state his objection in the minutes on a decision made by the estate, but could not start discussion on an already decided question. The rule was adopted from § 57 of the Swedish Riksdag Act of 1810. Section 65 of the Diet Act stated that a member who had not been present in a vote had the right to announce that he had not taken part in the decision, but could not comment or argue against the decision. A similar rule had been included in § 77 of the Riksdag Act of 1866. The Diet Act’s § 62 was adopted in § 68 of the Parliament Act of 1906, and § 65 in § 71. (Riksdagsordningen 1810; Riksdagsordningen 1866; Suomen Suuriruhtinaskunnan valtiopäiväjärjestys 1906; Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869)

In the 1870s the insertion of objections was disputed in the estates and the liberals defended the ideal that the minutes should be as faithful reproductions of debate. Everything that took place openly in front of the assembly was to be included in the minutes in accordance with “parliamentary practice”. For example, in the Nobility in 1872, the liberal Karl Johan Edelsköld²⁹² disapproved of an insertion expressing reservations against the estate’s decision on a petition proposal by Fredrik Pipping²⁹³ concerning the Press Law. Edelsköld noted that, according to the Diet Act, members were allowed to state their objections either in the same meeting without adding any arguments (§ 62) or, in the case of absence, at the next meeting (§ 65). Edelsköld argued that such a practice in which objections and arguments were secretly added afterwards was dangerous, as minutes were no longer read in the beginning of sittings. In order to prevent the establishment of a harmful “system of secrecy” (*hemlighetssystem*), Edelsköld demanded removal of the reservations. (Nobility 1872, I, 51–52) Secretly added objections removed the possibility to respond to them, and were thus in contra-

²⁹² Karl Johan Edelsköld was a lawyer and a liberal journalist who had worked as the editor of *Åbo Underrättelser* since 1869 (Landgren 1988, 304).

²⁹³ Fredrik Wilhelm Pipping (1783–1868) was a professor of history of science (*oppihistoria*), rector of the university and senator (Laine 2001)

diction with the idea of debate. It breached the principle of giving fair possibilities for each side of the debate to argue and participate (see Section 3.4.1). Another liberal, Robert Björkenheim,²⁹⁴ noted that the minutes were to be “a faithful picture” (*en trogen bild*) of what took place in the plenaries. Something that “did not take place” could not be taken into the minutes; a stenographic record could not contain anything that was not spoken. (Nobility 1872, I, 52) Robert Montgomery proposed that members should not present their objections privately to the secretary, as in the earlier Diets, but openly to the minutes before the estate (*inför ståndet och öppet till protokollet*). It would be appropriate to “establish such a procedure (*etablera en sådan procedur*) that “conformed to good parliamentary order” (*öfverensstämma med god parlamentarisk ordning*). (ibid. 53) In the end, the estate did remove the reservations from the minutes (ibid. 55).

7.6.4 From verbal to literal – on the (im)possibility of true verbatim

Perhaps the weightiest critique against the stenographic ideal was connected to the differences between the spoken and written language. A typical complaint against verbatim records was that the practices of stenography were in fact in contradiction with the photographic ideal it advocated. Stenographers claimed that they gave an objective image of the discussion, but at the same time members argued that they did not recognise themselves in the minutes. Speeches seemed to serve different purposes in the minutes than when held in parliament before a live audience.

These aspects were clearly presented in the Peasants in 1897 when discussing whether the estate should appoint members to oversee the correction of minutes. Some members felt the minutes’ formal style was foreign to their own style, whereas they wished to hold on to their peasant and local identity in the verbatim records. Hugo Gottfried Langren (later Kalima) noted that the minutes had “lost their real form” (*oikean muotonsa*) during correction. Statements appeared in the minutes as though “one and the same person had given them all”. Orator’s personal thought (*aate*), language (*kieli*), manner of speaking (*puhetapa*) and expression (*lauseparsi*) were not preserved. According to Langren, as a result of the revisions, the Peasants minutes “were not only good, but in fact had been made into literary masterpieces”. (Peasants 1897, I, 25, 28) Juho Torppa argued that the minutes’ style “imitated fashionable newspapers” (*muotilehtiä*) (ibid. 29). Kaarlo Kokkonen noted that as speeches were transformed into a written form, the minutes could not preserve “the real impressions and opinions for a future researcher”. For Kokkonen, even the orator’s dialect should be preserved in the minutes. (ibid. 25–26) Kalle Oittinen, who had worked as one of the scrutinisers of the minutes, noted that there were two reasons for the similarity of statements. Stenographers made formal corrections

²⁹⁴ On Björkenheim’s connections to the policies of *Helsingfors Dagblad*, see Landgren 1995. In the early 1860s Björkenheim was part of the “Young Liberal” group, who met at Henrik Borgström’s home (Landgren 1995, 20)

and revised the minutes into intelligible literary language, while members also “planed” (*höylätä*) their statements to resemble the speeches of others. (ibid. 26)

Several members emphasised the different character and purposes of written and oral presentations. Gustaf Viktor Eklund saw no use in trying to record the speeches word for word. Oral presentations were characterised by repetition, inarticulations and vulgar expressions, which did not warrant being preserved for posterity, but only made the minutes long, unclear and unpleasant to read. Thus, a member should have the right to make revisions and insertions if they mainly were consistent with what had been stated. (Peasants 1897, I, 28–29)

Similar arguments were presented in *Pikakirjoituslehti*'s interview of German parliamentarians, published in 1909. Representative Marx justified the orator's right to correct formal errors, and revise false or incomplete parts of one's statement with the idea that in order to properly reach the audience, an orator had to use different methods and styles in written text than in oral presentation. Thus, an orator was to be allowed to add sentences and parts of sentences if they fitted the general tone of the speech. Social Democrat Paul Singer noted that the goal of minutes was to represent the content of statements clearly, intelligibly and in a form suitable for print. Prince Henry of Prussia, a member of the Reichstag and of the Prussian House of Lords, argued that if stenographers did not edit speeches, they would be incomprehensible for the readers. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 1, 1909, 6–7; 2, 1909, 13–14)

The need to transfer speech to readable form was one of the main reasons why the Finnish estates gave the final responsibility for the minutes' form and appearance to the estates' secretaries. For example, in his 1885 proposal for organising the Estate's Secretariat, Secretary of the Clergy C. J. Lindeqvist noted that members rarely had the time to correct their speeches carefully; therefore, he proposed the responsibility be shared by the chief of stenography and the estate's secretary. (Clergy 1885, I, 200) However, the estate decided to give the responsibility to the secretary alone. The reason for this was that the estate trusted its secretary more than the stenographers, who were seen to have the skill to perform word-for-word reproductions of the spoken language, but lack the secretary's ability to edit the statements into the condition their publication required (see Dean Lyra in Clergy 1885, I, 160). Similarly the Peasants in debating the matter objected to *Stenografiska föreningen*'s proposal for stenographers to make, at the estate's request, the minutes shorter during transcription (Peasants 1885, I, 5). Hinting at his scepticism towards stenographers, Young Finn Jonas Castrén questioned the meaning and purpose of the proposal. Such a practice would take power away from the members, who could not read the original stenographic notes. Castrén argued that the clerks (*notaari, notarius*) should keep the right to “clean” (*siistiä, höylätä*) the minutes as had been the case in the earlier Diets.²⁹⁵ (Peasants 1885, I, 6, 7–8, 18, 20–21)

The revisions of speeches for print resulted in criticism of the dry and dull style in which plenary discussions were represented in the minutes. Thus, an-

²⁹⁵ Due to the special role of the Peasants' secretary as a legal advisor to the estate's speaker, some of his secretarial tasks were delegated to clerks.

other issue was raised: if stenography's idea was to "photograph" the discussion, how was the "photograph" to be framed? What of all the things heard in parliament should be included and what left out in the minutes?

The Svecoman newspaper *Åbo Tidning*²⁹⁶ (21 Apr., 1885, 1-2), in a report on the second plenum plenorum, rejected the idea that stenography produces a true or faithful picture (*en trogen bild*). Expressing suspicion towards shorthand the writer noted that he did not know "the secrets of stenography" (*hemligheterna vid stenograferingen*), but what he knew was that the minutes produced a dull (*matt*) and at times colourless picture (*färglös bild*) of the words spoken (*det talade ordet*). Intonation, facial expressions and gestures were naturally absent, but when reading the printed text even the words spoken felt sometimes strange and different compared to the real course of speech. The writer referred especially to the speech of the talented Young Finn orator Lauri Kivekäs and its presentation in *Nya Pressen*, which was based on the Diet's stenographic minutes. Kivekäs's speech was given a very different tone in the verbatim records. Only those present in the debate could recognise and understand Kivekäs's stress of "*viiiiinaa*" (*viina*, or liquor), his defiant posture, threatening gesticulations and articulations that occasionally "rose to the level of a fanatic scream". Thus, *Åbo Tidning* argued that through verbatim records it was impossible to convey aspects that were essential to speech and gave "a final spice to the oratorical dish" (*den sista kryddan till denna oratoriska anrättning*). (*Åbo Tidning*, 21 Apr., 1885, 1-2; for a similar account on the dryness and mechanical form of parliamentary minutes, see *Åbo Underrättelser*, 16 Aug., 1888, 1)

As British statesman George Curzon (1914, 5-7) has noted, the different audiences that a parliamentarian has to face when speaking in parliament, treated different orators differently. Some orators' excellence was impossible to grasp in written form, while others' fame was built on texts (*ibid.*).

The written word could never catch speeches as they were presented, but with the existing technology, stenography was seen to give the best possibility to approach the goal and reproduce the debates. Although technical devices have been introduced in parliaments to enable the closest possible word-for-word records, no innovation of the twentieth or twenty-first centuries has been able to resolve the challenge that lies in the different character of oral versus written presentation.

7.6.5 Interjections

In the early Diets, before the language question and party divisions divided the estates, interjections remained rare. Due to their rarity, they were long excluded from the official minutes. The conciliatory tone of the estates' discussions broke down in the late 1870s and 1880s as the Diets became increasingly dominated

²⁹⁶ The article was written by the pseudonym "Jo." At the time, *Åbo Tidning* was one of the three leading Svecoman newspapers together with *Nya Pressen* and *Wiborgsbladet* (Landgren 1988, 360).

by party disputes. Even at this point, the minutes served to produce a coherent and calm picture of the estates' work.

Interjections were included in newspaper reports from foreign parliamentary debates throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.²⁹⁷ Following foreign models, Diet stenographers included interjections in the minutes they produced for Finnish newspapers, although these were occasionally removed by the editors (see Palmén 1876c). The heated plenum plenorum of 1885, in which all four estates assembled in the same hall to debate Burgher suffrage (a question of great importance in the language strife), signified a change in the Finnish use of interjections and their recording in the minutes. In addition to the copious use of interjections, the plenum plenorum was apparently the first time when whistling was practised in a plenary in Finland. The whistling, which led to questions of its "parliamentary" or "unparliamentary" character, took place during the speech of radical Young Finn Lauri Kivekäs (Burghers 1885, III, Bilaga, XLVIII–XLIX).²⁹⁸

The plenum plenorum of 1885 stimulated newspapers to take stand on the minutes' ability to capture what took place in debate. Newspapers, especially ones with interest in foreign parliaments, criticised the general lack of interjections in the minutes. They argued that properly recorded interjections were essential parts of parliamentary deliberation. In its report on the plenum plenorum *Åbo Tidning* (21 Apr., 1885, 1–2) described parliamentary debate as a kind of a modern tournament. The newspaper complained that the interjections, the reception of speeches and the heated immediate feedback in the plenum were essential parts of debate, but had not been recorded in the Finnish minutes. Due to the "great Finnish calm" (*stora lugn*) and "peculiar considerateness" (*säregna betänksamheten hos det finska folklynnnet*), Finnish parliamentary debate (*parlamentariska debatten hos oss*), unlike French and German, was unfamiliar with such reactions. (*ibid.*)

Interjections remained rare in the minutes until the early Eduskunta, but newspapers occasionally included them in reports, often either to show support or to undermine speeches (see Palmén 1876c). In the Eduskunta, active use of interjections and their inclusion in the minutes began from the first sittings on. As part of their parliamentary style, which drew on foreign Social Democrat role models, members of the Finnish SDP, such as Edvard Valpas, were eager users of interjections and encouraged their representatives to adopt them. For example, before the Eduskunta's first session Valpas's newspaper *Työmies* (21 Dec., 1906, 4) complained that "interjections, which invigorate parliamentary life, are in disfavour among our order-loving people" (*parlamenttaarista elämää*

²⁹⁷ See e.g. the interjections reported on French parliament debates in *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 22 Jan., 1864, 2 and *Morgonbladet*, 25 Nov., 1882, 2.

²⁹⁸ In the minutes there are entries "noise and whistling" (*melua ja vihellystä*) (Burghers 1885, III, Bilaga, XLVIII–XLIX). According to *Åbo Tidning* (20 Jan., 1886, 1), plenum plenorum introduced whistling in the Finnish parliamentary debate (*lyckades införa hvisslingarne i den parlamentariska debatten hos oss*). In *Kaiku* Juhani Aho wrote on the whistling in the plenum plenorum that in "our decent country" (*siivossa maassamme*) whistling was not unparliamentary (*epäparlamenttaarista*), but the excitement about it was (Aho 1911), probably referring to the speaker's reactions to the incident.

elähyttävät välihuudahdukset owat huonossa huudossa meidän "järjestystä rakastawan" kansamme keskuudessa).

Even though the Eduskunta's first rules of procedure (Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys 1907, § 27) forbid noisy ovations, shouts and disturbing interjections as unparliamentary, their inclusion in the minutes has been a matter of interpretation. It has been under the discretion of the speaker of the Eduskunta and the stenographers to determine when the line between parliamentary and unparliamentary interjections has been crossed.²⁹⁹ Similarly in the French parliament, interruptions were in principle forbidden in parliament, and thus a member could not ask for correction of his interjections in the minutes (Pierre 1902, 1104). In addition, an interjection that the president did not hear could not be included in the minutes. The president could, if he wished, consult the Bureau or the *secrétaires-rédacteurs* as to whether certain interjections had been uttered or not. (Pierre 1902, 1112)

Interjections in Finland followed foreign models. Interjections in foreign parliaments were presented in the Finnish newspaper reports on the debates of foreign parliaments. Thus, Finnish interjections, such as "*Asiaan!*" ("To the matter!"; "Question!") and "*Järjestykseen!*" ("Order!"), were used accordingly with their established parliamentary meaning. Other interjections in minutes described the reception of speeches, such as "*Hyvä!*" (Good!), "*Alas!*" (Down with it!), "*Naurua*" (laughter) or "*Suosionosoituksia vasemmalta*" (ovations from the left). Similarly to foreign reports published in the press, interjections were marked in the minutes in parentheses to distinguish them from members' statements. Sometimes representatives were accused of adding laudatory interjections in the minutes in connection with their speeches (see e.g. the Young Finn newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat* on Social Democrat Representative Tuomi, 11 Nov., 1909, 5; for similar tactics in the French parliament see *Nya Pressen*, 7 Oct., 1892, 2)

The Chief of the Eduskunta's Stenography Secretariat F. W. Kadenius, having witnessed the popularity of interjections in the European parliaments during his field trip, emphasised their importance. Finland was not a latecomer in recording interjections. Kadenius noted that in the German Reichstag interjections had been taken regularly into the minutes for no more than a year. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 7, 1908, 52) For him, in the French parliament interjections were recorded too rigorously. Kadenius examined the insertion of interjections in foreign models in *Pikakirjoituslehti*. In 1910, in an article titled "Marking of Interjections in a Discussion" (*Välihuudahduksien merkintä keskustelussa*) Kadenius noted that the topic was "of interest both to parliamentary representatives (*parlamentti-edustajille*) and stenographers alike", but that the marking of interjections rested on the evaluation of the stenographer. According to Kadenius, the question was often discussed in foreign stenography journals and different opinions existed on it. He noted that although exclamations that violated an individual orator's parliamentary freedom of speech were usually forbidden in

²⁹⁹ For parliamentary interjections in the British parliament, see May 1883 [1844], 387–389.

parliaments, they were often used and also taken down in the official verbatim records. Kadenius made several distinctions based on foreign examples. “A stenographer of the parliament of Dresden” distinguished between interjections (*välihuudahdukset*) and asides (*yksinpuhelut*). The latter referred to parliamentarians’ bad habit of murmuring or to express resentment to an opponent’s speech in an undertone. These were not meant as interjections and had not the same meaning as they did not “represent the character of the effect of the discussion or speech” (*kuvaa keskustelun tai puheen vaikutuksen luonnetta*). Such asides were also impossible to record fairly as stenographers could only hear murmurs close to them. Thus, the recording of such expressions would unfairly portray the MPs sitting close by as malicious peace breakers. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 7, 1910, 51–53)

Similarly, general stir and restlessness in the chamber was not worth marking. At such times, parliamentarians usually saw an ongoing discussion as tiresome, which caused them to move around and chat without participating in the debate. Their behaviour could be compared to that of members who were absent and spending their time in other areas of the parliament. Interjections of a joking character also did not need to be recorded unless the orator herself replied to them,³⁰⁰ nor of interjections to correct a number or other information stated in error. In addition, Kadenius noted that in parliaments ovations were too often taken down in the minutes. Their excessive marking made it difficult to notice when the quantity of interjections deviated from normal. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 7, 1910, 51–53)

“The real interjections” (*varsinaiset välihuudahdukset*), on the contrary, were to be marked in as much detail as possible as they not only made the debates more vibrant, but indicated the influence the oratory had on the audience. Interjections sometimes “shed the right light on the statements” (*asettavat oikeaan valoon esiintyvän lauselman*) and occasionally “exposed the whole situation like a bolt of lightning” (*salaman tavoin valaisevat koko aseman*). (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 7, 1910, 51–53) Thus, Kadenius argued that interjections were a means to make aspects of debate represented that would be lost if only the actual speeches were recorded. With the help of interjections, debate could be mediated with authenticity, which was often lost in the transcription of the spoken language to the written. Under Kadenius’s lead, descriptions of the atmosphere in the chamber were increasingly included in the minutes, such as a speaker banging of the gavel (“*vasaranisku*”) to restrain interjections or restlessness.

Kadenius argued that interjections were to be taken seriously due to their potential to influence debate and change the setting. An interjection could be more efficient than a formal reply to a speech as it could be timed to a certain moment in a debate or point of a speech. An interjection could sometimes even replace a whole speech when the plenary was low on time. (*Pikakirjoituslehti*, 7, 1910, 51–53)

³⁰⁰ In the French parliament, if an interjection was answered, the person interrupting had the right to ask for the inclusion of his words in the minutes. (Pierre 1902, 1112)

7.7 Conclusions

The practices of foreign parliaments guided the discussion on Finnish minute-taking from the beginning of the 1860s on. Sweden's procedures gave the Finnish discussions a general framework, which was supplemented and developed with comparisons to a variety of foreign models. A reason for the explicit study and use of foreign models is the quality of the matter. Although minutes were given great significance in developing Finnish parliamentary life, it was seen not to touch directly on the delicate matters for the imperial Diet assembly, such as its powers, forms of representation, system of government and the privileges of the emperor. In addition, persons responsible for improving the minutes, such as Diet stenographers and F. W. Kadenius, were considered appointed officials, not active politicians, which gave them more room to act.

Minutes were seen as an essential part of the parliamentary mode of proceeding and its development. The discussions cited in this chapter illustrate how the minutes' importance was acknowledged in relation to the parliament's deliberative character. It was argued that they facilitated the parliamentary education of representatives and enhanced the continuity, efficiency and quality of deliberation. Minutes served as a source of information on readings and procedures, and enabled the development of debating tactics typical to foreign parliaments. In addition, minutes were highlighted as invaluable for the national and constitutional development of Finland.

The minutes had secured their place in daily parliamentary politics by the early Eduskunta; however their benefits for deliberation were not emphasised to the same extent as they had been in the Diets. Especially from the 1890s on, minutes were less and less presented as a means to teach parliamentarians and improve deliberations, but instead as a medium to educate the people. The increased emphasis on representation and efficient publicity also gave new impetus to the requirement for objectivity in minute-taking.

8 PARLIAMENTARY PUBLICITY

Regardless of the amount of interest and effort that late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century political actors put into discussing publication of the estates' and Eduskunta's proceedings, no detailed study exists of the early development of Finnish parliamentary publicity, nor of its relation to the newspaper press (see Lumme 2007, 221).

The printing and publication of minutes and other documents offer an example of procedures for which no detailed regulations existed in the Swedish laws that the Diet was, according to the Russian rules, to found its work on in the 1860s. Instead, the practices for publicity were created on an ad hoc basis in the Diets. The Diet Act of 1869 and the Parliament Act of 1906 did not give instructions on the publicity of the minutes and the question rested on the decisions of the parliament. Many questions on parliamentary publicity were discussed and prepared in the press.

Debates on publicity illustrate the difference of emphasis in the Fennomans and *Dagblad* liberal stands on deliberation and representation. The *Dagblad* liberals saw publicity primarily as a means to extend the parliamentary agenda and parliamentary debate – both its subject matter and its practices – to the public. The Fennomans until the 1880s, for their part, emphasised the centrality of the results of the Diet work; their primary aim was merely to mediate the final decisions and resolutions to the general public. For the Fennomans, the publication of stenographic minutes was secondary to the efficient circulation of Diet documents.

8.1 Introduction of parliamentary publicity in Finland

8.1.1 Publicity in the Diet Act of 1869 and the Swedish model

The third subsection of § 45 of the Finnish Diet Act of 1869 prescribed that “the discussions of the Estates are public (*ståndens öfverläggningar äro offentliga*;

säätyjen keskustelut ovat julkiset) unless the Estate decides otherwise" (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869). The Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 adopted this publicity clause from § 30 of J. J. Nordström's proposal for the Diet Act (Nordström 1912 [1863], 98), whose second subsection stated "The Estates' discussions must be public" (*Ståndens öfverläggningar skola vara offentliga*). The Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 addition of "unless the Estate decides otherwise" allowed the possibility for secret sessions (Grundlagskomitén 1866b, § 46). No such general clause on the principle of publicity existed in the Swedish Riksdag Act of 1810, which served as a model for several other procedures in the Diet Act of 1869. The closest Swedish model for the passage can be found in a Riksdag decision of 1830 (see below).

The Diet Act's paragraphs on publicity did not have constitutional grounds in the Swedish laws that the Russian authority had ordered the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 to ground its work on. The seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Riksdags were closed to the public and no proper reporting on their business existed. The Riksdag Act of 1617 stated that estate negotiations and their minutes were secret (Palmén 1862, 32–35). Section 48 of the Instrument of Government of 1720 ordered that estate and committee minutes were not to be issued outside the Riksdag (Regeringsform 1720). The same rule was adopted in § 22 of the Riksdag Act of 1723, according to which the minutes were to be stored safely in house (Palmén 1861, 231; Riksdagsordningen 1723). These rules were based on attitudes of the upper echelons of society towards public discussion. Public opinion (*allmänna opinionen*) and political discussion among the lower classes were seen as dangerous to the social order. The political elite defined public opinion as opposed to truth and justice. Persons who followed public opinion were seen as confused and losing their ability to distinguish right from wrong. (Sennefelt 2003, 214)

This outlook resulted in efforts to suppress any discussion about state matters outside the Riksdag. As a result, discussion about its deliberations took place through pamphlets, pasquinades, clandestine manuscript texts and gossip. (Sennefelt 2003, 215; Skuncke 2011, 134) The unorganised character of such publicity, however, created fear among the elite of distorted reports and rumours that could endanger the public order. (Sennefelt 2003, 215) Consequently, demands to publish faithful reports on Riksdag discussions increased.

A change in relation to the publicity of the Riksdag proceedings took place in the mid-eighteenth century when newspaper reporting on the Riksdag began. On Ulrik Scheffer's proposal in the Riksdag in 1756, a Riksdag newspaper, *Riksdags-Tidningar*, began publication. The paper focused on publicising the estates' and their secret committees' documents and decisions. More extensive documents were published in separate booklets by private publishers. (Suova 1953, 197) The Riksdag newspaper continued to be published in different forms until 1834 (Harvard 2011, 27).³⁰¹

³⁰¹ Initially, *Riksdags-Tidningar* did not include speeches, but over time the members started to give their speeches or summaries of speeches to the paper's editor. *Riksdags-Tidningar* suffered from delays: the first issues were published several weeks af-

Until the late Age of Liberty (1766–72), Sweden followed the norm of pre-publication censorship prevailing throughout much of eighteenth-century Europe. Britain was an exception and an important reference point for Swedish advocates of press freedom. (Skuncke 2011, 134) In 1766 Sweden's Freedom of the Press Act abolished prepublication censorship, with the exception of religious material. The Act was significant for parliamentary publicity as it established the principle of open access, which had no equivalent elsewhere in Europe (Skuncke 2011, 137). Citizens were permitted to access and publish official documents, such as Riksdag minutes and documents. (Bennich-Björkman 2003, 287, 290–292)

The most prominent argument in support of the Act in the Riksdag was that it was "favourable to parliamentary life". Publication of minutes would produce valuable parliamentarians also of those who could not attend the meetings. Another central point was that publicity would enable the represented to form an opinion about how their delegates had tried to promote their interests and the common good. (Lagerroth 1915, 591–593; Metcalf 1985, 151)

The Freedom of the Press Act led to an expansion of the press. Minutes and motions were published in vast series of books and used in political disputes. (Bennich-Björkman 2003, 299; Skuncke 2003, 264–268) Around 1770, the first daily newspapers in Stockholm began reporting on the Riksdag. In 1771 *Dagligt Allehanda* was able to report on the events of the four estates the following day with the help of contact persons working inside the estate secretariats. No individual members, except the speakers of the estates, were mentioned in the reporting and the paper focused on giving general summaries of the debates and on publishing the estates' decisions. (Skuncke 2003, 278–281; Skuncke 2011, 141)

Riksdag publicity did not get a stable footing during the Gustavian period (1772–1809), whose procedures were to set the framework for the Finnish Diet's rules and practices. Sweden's Freedom of the Press Act of 1766 was short-lived, for in 1774, two years after Gustaf III took power from the estates and restored a strong monarchy, a new Act was issued reducing the rights of the press. New restrictions succeeded one another throughout Gustaf III's reign (Skuncke 2011, 142). In 1786 the estates started printing their minutes, with the exception of the Clergy, which refrained from printing them until 1810. However, in 1789, fearful of losing their privileges, no publishing house dared publish the minutes of the Nobility, which was in the opposition. Then, in the Riksdag of 1792 the king forbade publication of documents that dealt with activities of the monarch due to the criticism of the king's finance policies. (Hirschfeldt 2009, 384–385) Later that year, after Gustaf III was assassinated, prepublication censorship was in-

ter the opening of the Riksdag and the paper lagged behind the end of the proceedings by several months. However, *Riksdags-Tidningar* was without comparison in international standards. While in Britain the right to report on parliamentary work was a result of the newspapers' efforts, in Sweden the Riksdag took the initiative of opening its business to the public. However, the motive behind *Riksdags-Tidningar* was partisan: it was founded, promoted and managed by the Hat party and reflected their fight against the court and the Caps. (Suova 1953, 197–199)

troduced. Beginning in 1798 newspaper publication required official permission from state officials. (Pietilä 2012, 166) As part of the wider censorship of public documents, the Riksdag minutes of 1800 were also banned from print (Hirschfeldt 2009, 385).

After the change of power, section 86 of the Instrument of Government of 1809 and the new Freedom of the Press Act of 1810 asserted the principle of open access to official documents and gave the citizens the right to print them (Regeringsform 1809; Skuncke 2011, 143). Section 59 of the Riksdag Act of 1810 ordered the estates' minutes to be printed as soon as possible in full form (Riksdagsordningen 1810). During these reforms, publicity was defended as promoting public enlightenment without disturbing the public order and as enabling formulation and development of opinions (Axberger 2009, 425; Hirschfeldt 2009, 395). The Constitutional Committee of 1809–10 saw that legislation produced, required and strengthened “a public way of thinking”. In addition, this way of thinking developed and supported legislation. (The Constitutional Committee's report for the Instrument of Government of July 1809 in Hirschfeldt 2009, 396)

After the Riksdag Act of 1810, delays in the printing and publication of the minutes continued (Hellstenius 1872, 38). The Riksdag plenaries became public in earnest in 1829–1830, when the estates decided to admit entrance to the public and the press to their plenary discussions (Alin 1881, 24). Now more than elected representatives could be present and mediate their personal observations and information about the discussions before the end of the Riksdag sessions. The decision was advocated by referring to the general public's interest in public matters, publicity's role especially in a constitutional society, parliamentary publicity's role in political education and the examples of foreign countries. (Alin 1881, 23–24; Hellstenius 1872, 37–44; Gränström 1916, 40) J. J. Nordström's vague expression of publicity, which was taken up in § 45 of the Finnish Diet Act of 1869, was based on this publicity rule passed by the Riksdag in 1829–1830.

The Finnish Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 formulated a proposal for a “Law for the Audience at the Estates' Meetings”, which included rules for proper behaviour for persons following the estates' discussions in the plenary sessions. The set of rules was passed together with the Diet Act. The rules ordered fines and possible prosecution for visitors who disturbed the discussions and ignored orders to leave a sitting. (See *Underdånigt förslag till lag för åhörare vid ståndens sammanträden under påstående landtdag 1866*) A similar law with a similar title (*lag för åhörare vid riksens ständers sammanträden*) had been passed in the Riksdag in 1830 (Alin 1881, 24).

8.1.2 The Finnish estates' decisions on publicity in the Diet of 1863–64

In the preamble to the Finnish Constitutional Law Committee's proposal for the Diet Act, the Committee stated that section 45 was a practice adopted in the first Diet of 1863–64 and thus in no need of justification (Grundlagskomitén 1866a) since the emperor's instructions allowed the Committee to use “the experiences from the Diet of 1863–1864” (see Bergh 1884, 476–477; see Section 1.2)

In 1863–64 the estates had manoeuvred outside the official framework set down for the Diet procedures. E. von Knorring's *Sammanfattning*, did not give any rules on publicity, accessibility of the sittings or publication of the proceedings (*Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 24 Apr., 1863, 2–3; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 25 Apr., 1863, 1–3). Neither did the old Swedish laws that *Sammanfattning* ordered to be read before the estates at the beginning of the Diet give instructions on the matter.³⁰² Similarly, J. Ph. Palmén's and J. W. Rosenborg's books, which informed the Diet's work and were based on the old Swedish procedures, did not discuss publicity. Palmén's collection included the Riksdag Acts of 1617 and 1723 with their sections that prescribed secrecy of the estates' sittings and minutes (Palmén 1862, 32–35, 244–245). Rosenborg's *Om riksdagar* passed over the subject altogether (Rosenborg 1863).

However, after the opening of the Diet in September 1863, all four estates admitted free access to the audience and members of the press. For example, on 26 September, the Peasants granted the general audience (*yleisö*) access to the estate's discussions (*keskustelemuksiin*). The estate announced in newspapers that "the estate's discussions are to be public" (*säädyn keskustelemukset tulewat julkisia olemaan*). In order to ensure enough seats for visitors, admission tickets were distributed through the porter. (Peasants 1863–64, I, 19–20) The Clergy declared that its plenaries were public (*offentligt*); no entrance tickets were required. (Clergy 1863–64, I, 24) The Burghers and the Nobility made similar decisions (Burghers 1863–64, I, 19). In 1867 the Nobility granted the audience access to the estate galleries and newspaper reporters were allowed to use the estate's minutes for reports and summaries of the debates (see *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 29 Jan., 1867, 1). In other words, the estates gave the press free hands in reporting on the discussions however they wished and with the help of authentic documents.

The Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 based its approval of publicity on these decisions. It is notable that when the Finnish estates decided in 1863 on free access and free reporting of their sittings, they in practice introduced publicity while the valid constitutions still imposed secrecy. This move was acknowledged by *Helsingfors Dagblad* (25 Nov., 1882, 2) some twenty years later.

In this respect, Finnish constitutionalism had a clear purpose with respect to parliamentary procedures. The adoption of foreign models in the Diet procedures was based on a rather "free" interpretation of the Swedish model ordered by the emperor and the wordings of the Diet Act. Finnish constitutionalism was rather prescriptive (see e.g. Jussila 1969), and it was, especially on the *Dagblad* liberals' side, based on the British constitutional idea according to which "everything which is not forbidden is allowed", as was explicated in discussions on Diet publicity. In 1882, *Helsingfors Dagblad* wrote that "everything that is not

³⁰² The laws included the Riksdag Act of 1617, Instrument of Government of 1772, the Riksdag Decisions of 26 January 1779 and 22 June 1786 and the Union and Security Act 21 February and 3 April 1789. In the Nobility the Standing Orders of the House of Knights of 1626 with the additions made 3 November 1778 was to be also read.

explicitly forbidden in view of the estates, their debates, minutes or documents may be interpreted as lawful". (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 25 Nov., 1882, 2)

Although the estates decided on free access and gave the press a free role in reporting, the practices were being challenged by Russian authorities already in 1863.³⁰³ Especially during the 1890s, Russian rulers imposed press limitations on Diet publicity. The Diet Act's clause "the discussions of the estates are public" became a central point of dispute.

By planting the ambiguous concept of 'publicity' in the Diet Act, the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 gave the estates a tool for protecting the estates' discussions and enabled several important future procedural revisions. The section of the Act raised questions on the detailed meaning of publicity and what means could be used to promote it: what was parliamentary publicity about and how was it best advocated?

8.2 Means and temporal audiences of parliamentary publicity

Jeremy Bentham discussed different means that could be used for publicity in his parliamentary classic, *An Essay on Political Tactics* (1843).³⁰⁴ According to Bentham, the means to be employed included *authentic publication* of the transactions of the assembly upon a complete plan; the employment of *shorthand writers* for the speeches; toleration of *other non-authentic publications* upon the same subject; and *admission of strangers* to the sittings. (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 5) Due to the late origin and special circumstances of Finnish parliamentary work, Bentham's four means were adopted in a different order in Finland than in prominent European parliaments. Publicity was implemented by simultaneously admitting free access to the audiences and newspaper reporters and only later by establishing the printing of the authentic stenographic minutes.

According to British statesman George Curzon, there are three audiences whom an orator in parliament has to face: *hearers of the moment*, *readers of the morrow*, and *a remote posterity* (Curzon 1914, 5). Hearers of the moment in whose hands "the fame of the parliamentarian as an orator lay" were, in the Finnish Diets and the early Eduskunta, the members of the assembly and the audience present at the plenary. Readers of the morrow referred to the general public, to whom the newspaper press as well as the later authentic publications strove to

³⁰³ In the Nobility, the lord marshal informed the estate of Governor-General Platon Rokassovsky's communication to him that newspapers were allowed to publish short reports on estate negotiations, but longer accounts required the estate secretaries' authentication. The other estates' speakers had received similar information and, to show their disapproval, paid a personal visit to the governor-general in order to demand the decree's abolition. (Nobility 1863-64, I, 45-46; see also Burghers 1863-64, I, 2-3; Peasants 1863-64, I, 16-17) The governor-general responded that the reason for the decree was only to prevent the spread of unreliable and false information about Diet discussions and to protect the estate members from unfounded accusations and discomfort (see e.g. in Clergy 1863, I, 30-31). The rule was never implemented.

³⁰⁴ It is to be noted that the chapter on publicity was not included in the 1791 version of Bentham's *An Essay on Political Tactics*.

mediate the proceedings as quickly as possible. Remote posterity consisted of the readership of minutes, which did not necessarily have any direct relation or influence on the matters discussed, but was intended for future examination of the proceedings as sources for information and study. Finnish actors understood the value of stenographic minutes for parliamentary continuity and high-quality deliberations (see Chapter 7).

The Finnish discussions focused around the readers of the morrow. Although innovations to replace stenography and mediate speeches directly were developed and tested, printing was the only means to reach wider audiences outside the plenary halls. Discussions about the readers of the morrow revealed competing understandings of publicity and its role in relation to the parliament's deliberative and representative aspects.

Helsingfors Dagblad and moderate Fennoman E. G. Palmén extended the cooperation on parliamentary publicity to cover more than just stenographic minutes. They were the most prominent advocates of "full publicity". The means for "full publicity" included the four aspects mentioned by Bentham (1843, chapter II, § 5). According to Palmén and Dagbladists, the estates were to take stenographic verbatim records of their discussions, publish them along with the Diet documents as authentic publications as quickly as possible, and preserve them for the posterity. Admission of strangers was to be allowed. Members of the newspaper press were to be given the right to report on the discussions free of all censorship, and thus, non-authentic publications on parliamentary work were to be tolerated. (See Palmén 1876a; 1876b; 1876c; 1876d)

One of the most notable accounts of Diet publicity in the late nineteenth century was E. G. Palmén's in-depth four-part article series "The Diet Proceedings and Publicity" (*Landtdagens förhandlingar och offentligheten*), which was published prominently in the front pages of *Helsingfors Dagblad* in 1876.³⁰⁵ In the series Palmén presented a variety of proposals for developing parliamentary publicity in Finland and discussed topics ranging from admission of audiences to the role of the newspaper press as well as the printing and publication of Diet minutes and documents. Palmén viewed "the Diet proceedings' relationship to publicity" broadly. As only very small audience could personally attend and follow the estates' deliberations (*handläggningar*), especially as the work of Diet was divided between four estates, the printed material formed the most essential part of publicity. (Palmén 1876a) Palmén noted that there was much to do in order to make publicity in Finland "something more than an empty illusion" and "bear fruit in the form of real interest by the general public and their insight into civic questions". (Palmén 1876a) For him, "the Diet's discussions should be accessible to every Finnish citizen not only in name, but in reality". Palmén argued that the doors of the Diet sittings were to be open "in a manner equal to the letter and spirit of the constitution". (Palmén 1876d)

Similarly to Palmén, the *Dagblad* liberals emphasised the full and efficient publication of the estates' proceedings as a natural extension to the rule on the

³⁰⁵ The series had three numbered parts, but was published in four different issues of *Helsingfors Dagblad* between 10 and 23 October 1876.

free admission to the plenaries. For example in 1874 *Helsingfors Dagblad* argued that “within the developed social conditions” the demand for publicity was not satisfied by reserving a few rows of benches or a gallery for the audience. In the contemporary conditions, publicity without printed minutes and documents “was more or less a mere chimera” (*chimère*).³⁰⁶ (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 Oct., 1874, 1) The logic of extending the principle of publicity characterised the *Dagblad* liberals’ argumentation. In 1882 *Helsingfors Dagblad* (25 Nov., 1882, 2) advocated the printing and publication of authentic minutes, highlighting the principle of publicity in the Diet Act and the practices of newspaper reporting. The newspaper argued that even though the publicity of the minutes was not separately mentioned in the Act, it was clear that if the publicity of the plenary discussions was once stated and newspaper reporting allowed, that meant the general public had the right to profit from the official printed minutes, which were nothing else but “a representation of the deliberations” (*återgifoande af öfverläggningarna*). If one was entitled to be “present and, according to one’s subjective understanding, report on the discussions (*förhandlingar*)”, one should also have “the right to have access to and publicise objective accounts” of them. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 25 Nov., 1882, 2; for similar arguments, see the Burghers’ Private Committee of Appeals of 1882, in Burghers 1882, II, 689)

In the Finnish Diets, no principled objections to parliamentary publicity were expressed in the Diet minutes or presented in the newspapers. Neither did, for example, the admission for audiences in the estates plenary discussions raise protest. Publicity was becoming an accepted part of parliamentary deliberations in European parliaments, and no fears were expressed of the estates becoming dependent on reporters or on “the newspapers’ greed”, as had been stated in the Riksdag (see Harvard 2011, 41). In this sense, Finland could benefit from being a ‘late-comer’ in the parliamentary learning process. In addition, publicity and its informative and educative tasks played a central role in Finnish political groups’ ideas on the development of the Finnish people and the nation (see Sections 8.6.1 and 8.6.3). Publicity of committee sessions was not, however, demanded.³⁰⁷

Different orders of priority were given to different means of publicity. Whereas Palmén and the *Dagblad* liberals spoke for their idea of “full publicity”, the Fennomans newspaper *Morgonbladet* and Fennomans in the estates gave less importance to printing and the publication of stenographic minutes. Illustrative of the Fennomans disinterest in debate, *Morgonbladet* and the leading Fennomans long felt that publication of the main results of the Diet work, such as decisions and reports, would suffice. For the Fennomans, these were crystallisations of the prevailing opinion, including in condensed form all the essential interests represented and negotiated in the Diet. Thus, the leading Fennomans Yrjö

³⁰⁶ On John Stuart Mill’s use of “chimera” see e.g. Mill 2001 [1861], 202; on Jeremy Bentham’s use of the term, see Bentham 1843, Chapter II, § 1.

³⁰⁷ With the exception of the Eduskunta’s Grand Committee, in whose sittings all members of the Eduskunta had the right to participate (see E. N. Setälä in Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 19 Jan., 1906).

Koskinen and F. W. Hjelt³⁰⁸ in the Clergy played a central role in delaying the estates' decision to print all minutes.

The *Dagblad* liberals and the Fennomans saw the press had an important role to play with respect to parliamentary publicity. Until the 1880s, Fennomans argued that the newspaper was a sufficient medium for publishing the estates' discussions. The *Dagblad* liberals and E. G. Palmén took a different stand and argued that the limited newspaper reports could, even at their best, offer only *perspectives* on the parliamentary debates. This was not, according to them, to be considered a flaw, however. On the contrary, the limited perspectives of the newspaper were part of the "full publicity" and only a question of the distribution of work. Newspapers were to be given free hands in debating their perspectives and programmes, while the task of publishing impartial representations of the Diet discussions were to be left to the official Diet print and its authentic stenographic minutes.

8.3 The newspaper press in the service of parliamentary publicity

8.3.1 Foreign models of parliamentary reporting

Newspapers were the most important means for mediating the proceedings of the Diets and the early Eduskunta for the readers of the morrow. The press was the only source for the public to gain more or less comprehensive, up-to-date information about parliamentary work. As a result of the developing cooperation between Diet stenography and the press, by the end of the nineteenth century, Helsinki newspapers were able to report on the Diet work the following day and the provincial newspapers a few days later.

Newspapers took their role in the Diet reporting seriously and defended their position in Finnish parliamentary life. The role of newspapers in parliamentary publicity was discussed in the press through foreign examples and literature. *Helsingfors Dagblad* and the early liberal *Hufvudstadsbladet* presented the practices used for reporting on parliament abroad and how those foreign reporters were essential and natural parts of contemporary parliamentary life. The articles also described the reporters' working conditions in the parliaments and the facilities and galleries provided for their use.³⁰⁹

Finnish newspapers defended their rights. In a manner similar to their foreign counterparts as presented in their pages, Finnish newspapers criticised

³⁰⁸ Frans Wilhelm Gustaf Hjelt (1819–1889) was a church dean, principal and prominent member of the Clergy 1867–1888. Until the Diet of 1872 Hjelt had opposed the estate's Fennoman majority, but soon he moved closer to the Fennomans and voted with them in the Diets. Hjelt made study trips to examine foreign school systems in Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland and Prussia. (*Suomen historiallinen seura* 1883, 292–293; *Uleåborgs Tidning*, 4 Oct., 1889, 2)

³⁰⁹ See e.g. Sweden in *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 21 Feb., 1867, 2; the United States of America in *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 28 Feb., 1873, 2–3; Britain in *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 18 Feb., 1874, 1; 13 Jan., 1881, 2; 1 Mar., 1887, 3; France in *Nya Pressen*, 7 Oct., 1892, 2.

for example the limited seating reserved for reporters in the gallery of the new House of the Estates (*Finland*, 27 Jan., 1891, 3) and the reporters' limited possibility to hear, write and see in the plenary halls due to limited lighting and bad acoustics (*Hufvudstadsbladet*, 12 Nov., 1886, 2). This illustrates not only the following of foreign models, but the fact that parliamentary reporters struggled with similar challenges internationally (see Macdonagh 1913).

The British model was prominent for three reasons. Firstly, British newspapers were admired and their fight for parliamentary openness and publicity was highlighted. No struggle similar to the British parliament was required in Finland, but the focus was on newspapers as defenders of publicity against the concealment practiced by parliaments and governments. Secondly, the British case offered a model that gave newspapers a central role in parliamentary reporting and provided examples for efficient reporting practices. Thirdly, the British case served as a model perspectivist approach, which was embraced by the *Dagblad* liberals and by Palmén.

In Britain, newspapers had a crucial role in providing information to the public about the parliament. From the viewpoint of parliamentary law, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the debates of the British parliament were still private. In the House of Commons, there was no distinction between private or public sittings, but they were all *de jure* secret (Redlich 1908b [1905], 28). The principle of secrecy dated back to a constitutional struggle between the crown and the parliament that began under Elizabeth (1558–1603): In order to secure their freedom of action, members of the Commons wanted to maintain their privacy and keep their speeches from the knowledge of the monarch. The members were bound to keep undisclosed anything spoken and done in the parliament to persons who were not members. Breaches of the rule were punishable with expulsion or imprisonment. (Macdonagh 1913, 81; Peacey 2007, 7) Strangers were excluded from both Houses (May 1883 [1844], 266–267).

Regardless of these rules, the parliament's debates were never entirely secret. The formal secrecy was selective, and while some measures were sanctioned heavily, some remained unpunished.³¹⁰ (Peacey 2007, 2, 7) The fight over publicity began with circulated manuscript letters in the early seventeenth century, which were based on intentional leaks of members notes³¹¹ (Peacey 2007, 2, 8). The leaks were condemned by the parliament.³¹² By 1722 newspapers and monthly magazines had become a serious competitor to newsletters (Mac-

³¹⁰ During the time of secrecy the debates were discussed over dinners and drinks, non-members could hear House speeches, which were audible in the lobby; members also intentionally leaked copies of their speeches, diarists exchanged notes and newsletters circulated parliamentary news. (Peacey 2007, 2, 7)

³¹¹ For example, in 1694 John Dyer circulated a newsletter on debates of the Commons. This led to series of sanctions by the House. The House prohibited any newsletter from intermeddling in House debates or proceedings and threatened to punish keepers of coffee-houses in which newsletters discussing parliamentary business were circulated. (Macdonagh 1913, 91–95)

³¹² In 1641 the parliament ordered that the reporting of its debates in the press was a breach of privilege punishable by losing the right of publication; in 1653 the Commons reaffirmed that no person was to publish proceedings of the Houses unless they were licensed by the clerk of the parliament (Peacey 2007, 9; Suova 1953, 191).

donagh 1913, 109) and came up with a means to circumvent and oppose the restrictions set by the parliament. It was generally thought that the resolutions against publishing were only in force while the parliament was sitting, so that Edward Cave's *The Gentleman's Magazine*, for example, tried to avoid punishment by late publication. Another way to evade penalties was that the members' names were disguised by giving only their initial and final letters (Macdonagh 1913, 118-119; Harris 2007, 67; Macdonagh 1913, 109-111). Doorkeepers were allegedly bribed for entrance to the gallery or to report on events in the chamber themselves. Speeches in parliament were rewritten more or less arbitrarily based on these observations. (Macdonagh 1913, 136-138; Suova 1953, 192)

In 1738, the Commons decided that the publication of debates during recess was a breach of privilege. Members were worried that their words and opinions might be incorrectly presented and would make them accountable to extra-parliamentary pressures. (Macdonagh 1913, 129-134; for similar worries in Sweden, see Harvard 2011, 41) However, periodicals invented new tactics to circumvent this ban, and *The London Magazine*, for example, started to report from "a political club", and later under the title "Debates of the Senate of Magna Lilliputia" while changing the MPs' names (ibid. 135, 140) These edited, and to a great extent invented, reports ended up being cited as official speeches in historical and political publications. (ibid. 140)

A concerted effort to publicise debates took place during the latter part of the eighteenth century, when demands for free press, competition among the growing metropolitan newspaper press and the determination of certain individuals to drive the issue became decisive (Peacey 2007, 9). In 1770, monthly magazines began to publish 'full-length' reports of the debates. Later the same year newspapers also started to publish the debates in a similar form. The parliament responded to the reporting with complaints and penalties, but could not put a total stop to it. In 1771, after a long fight between the parliament versus the journalist and MP John Wilkes, the parliament decided to end its actions against newspapers and their reporters. However, no official decision to allow reporting was made, and the parliament again prohibited note-taking during its debates. (Macdonagh 1913, 195-196, 290-298; Suova 1953, 194; Thomas 1959, 630) The presence of reporters in the debates was finally accepted in 1834 when press galleries were installed, though it was not until 1881 that reporters from provincial newspapers were admitted into the gallery. (Macdonagh 1913, 41, 392) In 1875 the practice according to which any member could cause the exclusion of all visitors, including reporters, from the House by informing the speaker "I spy strangers", was modified. As a result of the inconvenience of the rule and disputes over its application, the Commons decided that the removal of strangers required a division. (May 1883 [1844], 267-269; Redlich 1908b [1905], 28)

In the Finnish press the British newspapers' relentless struggle against the secrecy of the parliament was described in glowing terms. The lesson of the British case was that the mission of the press against censorship and oppression could not be stopped. In addition to *Helsingfors Dagblad* and its followers, the

Fennoman newspaper *Morgonbladet* was active in the discussion. For example, in 1874 the newspaper (13 Jan., 1874, 3) published a translated article³¹³ about reporters in parliament based on James Grant's "The Newspaper Press: Its Origin, Progress and Present Position" (Grant 1871a; 1871b). Drawing on the liberal press ideology *Morgonbladet* argued that despotism and the free press, 'the Fourth Estate', were incompatible. The newspapers' role in the British parliamentary proceedings was a sign of this. Drawing on Grant's work, *Morgonbladet* presented the historical developments and procedural reforms concerning British parliamentary publicity, in which the secrecy of the parliament and the role of the newspaper press had been tested.³¹⁴ In addition, the paper described the effective practices, distribution of work and workforce of Britain's parliamentary reporting.³¹⁵ (*Morgonbladet*, 13 Jan., 1874, 3)

Morgonbladet translated Grant's use of the term 'the Fourth Estate' (see Grant 1871b, 459) as "*den fjärde statsmakten*", "the fourth political power in the state". The English version referred to the press as the Fourth Estate in the British parliament (in the Reporters' Gallery), an addition to the traditional three British estates of the Lords Spiritual, the Lords Temporal and the Commons. In France the '*quatrième pouvoir*' was originally used in relation to the separation of the mutually balancing powers of the executive, legislature and judiciary. According to Clas Zilliacus (1985), the characterisation of the press as a 'political power' (*statsmakt, valtiomahti*) appeared late in Finland and the expression was used cautiously. While the idea was eagerly put forth in Britain and France during the first half of the nineteenth century and soon adopted in Sweden, in Finland such expressions could not be publicly formulated due to the Russian censorship and newspapers' self-censorship resulting from it. (ibid. 183–187) However, it seems that the expression of the press as a 'political power' was in popular use in Finland outside the press. For example, the newspaper *Savo* (25 May, 1889, 2) wrote that calling the press a 'third political power' was so popular that it seemed to be in daily use.³¹⁶ In newspapers the terms 'the third political power in the state' (*den tredje statsmakten, kolmas valtiomahti*) were mostly used in translations of foreign articles referring to foreign discussions, but became more popular in the Finnish context towards the end of the century. Similarly to parliamentary topics, the question was developed in newspapers first indirectly through foreign discussions. Finnish uses followed the model of Sweden, where 'the third political power' made reference to the two other as the government (in Finland the Senate) and the Riksdag (in Finland, the estates or the four-

³¹³ The article was translated from "a foreign newspaper".

³¹⁴ *Morgonbladet* described how reporters had been banned from parliament and the practice of "I spy strangers". Through historical examples, the newspaper argued that such moves could not, however, prevent press coverage.

³¹⁵ *Morgonbladet* described the current practices, including how *The Times* had 19 reporters in the parliament: one was in charge of the process, two wrote "parliamentary summaries" (*parlamentariska öfversikterna*) and the rest took down speeches. Few of the reporters used shorthand as it would have otherwise been difficult to get summaries in proper English due to "the unconstrained style" in which the MPs spoke. (*Morgonbladet*, 13 Jan., 1874, 3)

³¹⁶ The article was translated from a booklet written by ex-Dagbladists titled "*Fria blad*".

estate Diet). In the Finnish discussions, due to the existing system of dualism, the order of the first and the second ‘political powers’ was usually sidestepped, speaking instead only of “both of the two political powers”³¹⁷ or “the other of the two”.³¹⁸ In Finland the description of the press as a ‘political power’ was seen also as misleading due to the strong censorship, the late development of newspapers and the underdevelopment of the other two domestic powers (see e.g. *Kuopion Sanomat*, 20 Oct., 1881, 1; *Raahen Sanomat*, 18 Sept, 1889, 1).

Grant’s book series was summarised extensively also in *Helsingfors Dagblad’s* article series “A Page from the History of the British Press” (*Blad ur den engelska pressens historia I–IV*)³¹⁹ (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 13 Jan., 1874, 1–2; 30 Jan., 1874, 1; 8 Feb., 1874, 1; 18 Feb., 1874, 1). The newspaper had presented the British press as an ideal model for the Finnish newspapers already in the early 1860s (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 11 Apr., 1862, 1; Section 3.4.2). The series presented the historical transformation of the British press into an influential political actor from the late sixteenth century on as well as its current forms. *Dagblad* described *The Gentleman’s Magazine’s* confrontation with parliament as well as the accusations of breach of privilege against the press, the press’s use of bribery and other means to circumvent restrictions in order to report on the debates, and parliament’s eventual decision to allow reporting without, however, formally accepting it. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 13 Jan., 1874, 1–2) In addition, the newspaper described the contemporary work conditions and the facilities provided for British parliamentary reporters and explained how a report was produced from a speech heard in the house to a printed newspaper report.³²⁰ (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 18 Feb., 1874, 1)

The British case was used as a model for advocating the newspaper as the primary means of parliamentary publicity. In the Diets, several members took up Britain as an example of a parliament where the production and publication of parliamentary records was left in the hands of the newspapers (see e.g. Stenbäck in *Clergy 1877–78*, I, 436–437; Ignatius in *Burghers 1877–78*, II, 492).

The British parliamentary minutes were constructions of different perspectives on the debates produced by different newspapers. The parliament did not have an official report of its debates until 1909, when the parliament gave the

³¹⁷ E.g. *Morgonbladet* (20 Jan., 1882, 1) saw that plenum plenum could enable “both political powers” (*båda statsmakterna*) to negotiate on matters.

³¹⁸ For example, *Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti* (31 Mar., 1870, 1) wrote about the “respect that one political power must give to petitions of the other” (*arvon, minkä toisen valtiomahdin tulee antaa toisen lausumalle pyynnölle*). Finnish discussants described this dualism and division, but also the mutual goals and the fusion of powers between the legislative and the executive, referring to the two powers as acting “together”, “side by side one to another” (see e.g. *Karjalatar*, 10 Nov., 1876, 1).

³¹⁹ The article series was based mainly on “a lately published German work”, which “was an edit of” Grant’s book series (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 13 Jan., 1874, 1).

³²⁰ According to *Dagblad*, reporters worked in shifts of 15 or 45 minutes. After every shift reporters prepared their notes and sent them to the editorial offices. As a large part of the notes were taken in longhand, the reporter’s work required a high level of education and cultivation. Thus, the “gentlemen of the gallery” were highly appreciated both within and outside the parliament. The best or most frequent speakers also tried to establish good relations with the reporters since the presentation of their speeches to the public depended on their efforts. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 18 Feb., 1874, 1)

status to *Hansard*. Until that time, the parliament had never produced any authentic records of its debates. As late as 1908, both Houses decided to appoint an official reporting staff responsible for producing word-for-word minutes of the debates. (Melin 1927, 311) Before the implementation of the decision in 1909, *Hansard* had no reporter of its own and its reports were compiled from those in the daily papers. After the compilation, the proofs were sent to each orator for corrections and finally to print. (Jordan 1931, 437–438)

For long, newspapers also supplemented their own reports by using parts copied from their competitors, or sometimes they relied solely on pirated reports. Newspapers published the narratives and speeches they found convenient and the reports consisted usually of incomplete excerpts from debates. (Thomas 1959, 623–624, 626–629) From the late eighteenth century on, reporters also seasoned their reports with opinions that served various political causes (Macdonagh 1913, 195). However, over time, competition between the newspapers produced more fullness, variety and promptness in publication and accuracy, and the quality improved along with the development of stenography in the nineteenth century.³²¹ (Thomas 1959, 632, 636)

Compared to the strict stenographic ideal, the British newspaper reporting had a practice of clearing, “pruning and trimming” the speeches, which rested not so much on the verbatim character. Michael Macdonagh (1913, 32), who sat for thirty-five years as a parliamentary reporter at Westminster, noted that the reporter’s main task was to “unwind the verbose skein” and to “make clear the hidden governing principle, the salient points, of the speaker”. At the same time, the reports had the ability to give dull and dreary speeches “in ten crisp lines all a-sparkle”. (ibid.)

Due to the procedures on minutes, the abbreviation of speeches became an issue and *Hansard* was at the mercy of newspapers’ estimates of what was important. The condensation took place especially in the case of orators who were not “of national interest”. Speeches included in *Hansard* were thus rather dubious and reportedly seldom corresponded closely with the ones given in the Houses. According to the criticisms, members revised their speeches arbitrarily during the corrections process. In the beginning of 1878 *Hansard* agreed to put a reporter in the gallery in order to properly supervise the quality of the recorded speeches. (Jordan 1931, 439–440) From 1889 to 1908, the reporting and publishing of the *Parliamentary Debates* series was entrusted to various contractors who bid for the work. The changes in editors resulted in even more submissiveness to members’ corrections than *Hansard* had been. The only supervision over the contractors’ work was related to the quantity of output for which they were paid. (Jordan 1931, 440–442)

The British case offered a model for the perspectivist approach to parliamentary publicity, as advocated by E. G. Palmén and the *Dagbladet* liberals. For them, newspapers could form a truthful picture of parliamentary debates only

³²¹ In 1836 apparently longhand accounted for about two-thirds of the reporting, but after that it became rarer and by 1860 it had basically disappeared from the gallery. (Jordan 1931, 445)

through a differential perspective, that is, by comparing and reviewing the different descriptions together.

8.3.2 Quick and affordable, but limited and partial

Due to the newspapers' capability for quick and inexpensive reporting, some members of the Finnish Diet were ready to give them full responsibility for publication of the parliamentary proceedings. For example, in the Clergy in the Diet of 1877–78, Fennoman K. E. Stenbäck proposed that the estates' minutes should be published in newspapers by following the example of "the great civilised countries" (*de stora kulturländerna*) England, France, Italy, Belgium and small Denmark. He noted that the British press had developed parliamentary reporting to such an excellence that it was not necessary for the parliament itself to take or finance any verbatim records (*verbal-protokoll*) (Clergy 1877–78, I, 436–437) since the discussions (*förhandlingar*) came to the general public's attention quickly through detailed stenographic reports produced and distributed by the large newspapers (Stenbäck 1881). In the Burghers, Fennoman Karl Ferdinand Ignatius³²² argued that the minutes should be published as newspaper supplements; otherwise they could not be published on time. (Burghers 1877–78, II, 492)

From the Diet of 1863–64 on, Finnish newspapers reported regularly on the estates' proceedings. Several Helsinki-based papers published supplementary sections and special issues dedicated to the Diet work.³²³ The official newspapers *Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti* and *Finlands Allmänna Tidning* published special issues on the Diet during the Diet of 1863–64, and then from 1877 to 1888. Regardless of these efforts, the newspapers were continuously in trouble with the lack of space for Diet debates. The main challenge was the division between the four simultaneously deliberating estates. For example, in 1882 *SWL* complained that it was forced to publish some of the Diet reports in regular issues due to the lack of column space and the large amount of the Diet material (*Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti*, 24 Mar., 1882, 1). The estates' debates forced newspapers to compress other sections. For example, in 1882 *Morgonbladet* noted that the end of the Diet signified a return towards "normal conditions" in its news content. The newspaper hoped that in the future the problem could be solved by the establishment of a Diet newspaper. (*Morgonbladet*, 8 June, 1882, 3) Diet

³²² Karl Ferdinand Ignatius (1837–1909) was a historian, statistician and leader of the Fennoman minority in the Burghers in the Diets of 1877–1885. In 1885 he was appointed senator. In 1899 Ignatius adopted the Constitutionalist stand and took part in the Diet of 1904–05. (Luther 2000)

³²³ For example in 1863 the Young Fennoman newspaper *Helsingin Uutiset* published its special issue (*waltiöpäivälehti; landtdagsbihang*) every Friday (see e.g. *Helsingin Uutiset*, 2 Nov., 1863, 1). *Suometar* published eleven special issues on the Diet during the first Diet, but this series was discontinued on economic grounds at the end of 1863. It had been financed by several newspapers, but the unprofitability of the smaller newspapers' special editions affected the finances of the mutual publication and was in part responsible for the bankruptcy of the enterprise.

reporting was, however, a good business for the newspapers and reporting on the Diets tended to raise circulation³²⁴ (Rommi 1974, 410).

Newspapers used various styles in their reporting. From 1863 until 1885 the main Helsinki-based newspapers sometimes cut the length of the corrected parliamentary reports they received from the Diet Secretariat, and at other times published them in full (Rommi 1974, 414). In addition, newspapers had their own representatives in the estates' plenaries, either among the members or in the galleries. The Helsinki papers in particular used "freelancers", who often, as in the British parliament, later became "great names", such as Juhani Aho. Aho, an established Finnish author, honed his journalistic and literary skills as a parliamentary reporter for *Uusi Suometar* and several provincial newspapers (Suova 1953, 202). Charles Dickens was perhaps the most well-known of the British parliamentary reporters (Macdonagh 1913, 345–354).

Whereas reports based on excerpts from the stenographic minutes were often similar, newspapers also published their own descriptions, stories, columns and causeries on the Diet, which were thus a channel for expressing subjective views. Newspapers attacked their political opponents, gave vernacular representations of the discussions and procedures, and described the atmosphere, reception of speeches and prominent figures in the estates. The role of reporters became increasingly important in the 1890s when the Russian censorship strengthened its grip and the Directorate of the Press decided (in 1891) that the estates' minutes were to be subjected to prepublication censorship (Rommi 1974, 415–416).

From the 1860s Diets on, the estates gave official minutes for the newspapers' free use (see *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 29 Jan., 1867, 1). As Fabritius's description in Section 7.5.1 illustrated, the estates' procedures were developed to support close cooperation between the Diet stenography and the main newspapers in order to enable publication to be as quick as possible. In 1885, in search of new income, the stenography association sought to establish a business relationship with newspapers and to take a more active role in the Diet reporting³²⁵ (Kallioniemi 1946, 90–91). In January 1885, before the Diet, *Stenografiska föreningen* made a deal with the official newspapers *Finlands Allmänna Tidning* and *Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti*, *Helsingfors Dagblad*, *Nya Pressen* and *Finland*

³²⁴ For example, in 1877 *Wasabladet* (3 Jan., 1877, 1) noted that its circulation rose and dropped according to the Diet periods. In 1892 *Uusi Suometar* (31 Jan., 1892, 2) showed with the help of statistics that its drop in circulation was a cyclical event that took place after each Diet. In 1891, the newspaper (20 Jan., 1891, 2) informed its readers that the issues just prior to the opening of the Diet session had been sold out and could not be delivered to new subscribers.

³²⁵ Reasons for the association's initiative included its finances and its interest in developing Finnish stenography. At the start of the Diet of 1885 *Stenografiska föreningen* had more applicants for parliamentary stenographers than ever before. The increased number of parliamentary stenographers was in line with the interest of the association in developing Finnish shorthand and in providing full parliamentary minutes more quickly. A raise in the Diet's subsidy for the association, however, seemed unlikely. (Kallioniemi 1946, 90–91)

about supplying them with the full minutes (Kallioniemi 1946, 243).³²⁶ In the Diet of 1888 a similar arrangement was made with *Uusi Suometar* and to some extent with *Hufoudstadsbladet* (Kallioniemi 1946, 244–245).

In the Diet of 1891 these arrangements were denounced due to the newspapers' reluctance. The official newspapers condensed their Diet reporting due to prepublication censorship and *Dagblad* had been suspended by the Russian authorities in 1889. However, *Stenografiska föreningen* maintained the right of its member stenographers to submit notes and summaries to newspapers for payment. At this point, the newspapers were using their own reporters in addition to the parliamentary stenographers. In the Diets of 1894 and 1897 the estate secretariats were given the right to negotiate reporting matters with individual newspapers. The newspapers mostly used their own staff, and in cases where they needed speeches *in extenso*, they turned to the secretariats and paid them per centimetre. In the Diets from 1899 to 1905, *Stenografiska föreningen* again struck deals with the Helsinki newspapers. Now the contracts were not about giving the full minutes, but excerpts based on the newspapers' interest. The payment was determined by the length of the material published. (Kallioniemi 1946, 245–247)

The direct business relationship between the stenographers of *Stenografiska föreningen* and the newspapers was exceptional compared to international practices. For example, Swedish Riksdag's stenographers had told Fabritius that in Sweden such a practice would have led to the stenographer's dismissal (Kallioniemi 1946, 248). Also Kadenius expressed similar wonderment at the matter on his field trip to European parliaments in 1907. Typically, parliamentary stenographers were not allowed to work individually outside the parliament's supervision and only authentic proceedings were given to the press (cf. France below). In Britain, as discussed, parliamentary stenographers were not hired until 1909.

From the mid-1880s until the early Eduskunta, the *Stenografiska föreningen*, whose stenographers worked long hours and were poorly paid compared to their foreign colleagues, collected the profits of the cooperation with the newspaper press. The practice of using individual stenographers was renounced in the early Eduskunta. Stenographic reports continued to be published, but also increasing number of newspapers began to hire reporters to participate in the plenaries. The newspapers' task was eased by the Parliamentary Reform in that afterwards reporters were needed in only one plenary hall. In 1907, as part of the Eduskunta stenography's changing organisation, the Eduskunta's Office Commission decided also that the proceedings, which were published in three series as minutes, documents (such as committee reports) and supplements (petitions, motions and addresses), and had been earlier made available for some newspapers for free, would now to be charged for. It was argued that free copies could not be guaranteed equally for every newspaper in the country, and so

³²⁶ Kallioniemi's findings are based on the stenographic minutes of the meetings of *Stenografiska föreningen*.

was resulting in a loss for the provincial newspapers.³²⁷ (See *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 3 Sept., 1907, 4; 5 Sept., 1907, 3–4; *Uusi Suometar*, 3 Sept., 1907, 3)

The wide use of stenographic records in newspapers left its mark on the early development of Finnish parliamentary reporting. In a sense, the newspapers were stuck with “semi-authentic” stenographic minutes. As the reports produced by stenographers were supposed to be “official”, their revision by the newspapers was problematic. Consequently, different newspapers’ published reports on any given discussion tended to be very similar to each other, as in the case of provincial newspapers, which copied the major newspapers’ reports.³²⁸ Excerpts from official stenographic minutes presented speeches in the style of written statements rather than verbal performances in a debate, which for its part tended to lower appreciation of parliamentary speaking and debate.³²⁹ Compared to British reporting, for example, with its “seasoning, pruning and trimming”, Finnish reports gave a rather one-dimensional picture of the discussion. Reports aimed at presenting the opinions and facts “as they were”, often meant disregarding or removing rhetorical and eloquent nuances. The requirement of objectivity, in a sense, gave a death sentence to what was perhaps the best asset of newspaper reporting compared to the official verbatim records: the possibility for colourful and vivid representation combined with political insight. In Finnish newspapers, the actual parliamentary journalism was limited to shorter columns, causeries and editorials.

The wide use of stenographic reporting reflects how the Finnish actors were in a sense possessed by a notion of objectivity that was based on a rather simplistic conception of the truth. This became apparent in their belief that, even in the most nuanced political rhetoric, there was a level of “how things are”, which could be grasped, impartially represented and universally understood. This approach to politics was reflected also in a trust that even in complex political questions there was a best option to be found and followed. This was also expressed in demands for “objective investigation”, “fact-based information” and a search for “rational truths”.³³⁰ *Dagblad* liberals and E. G. Palmén questioned this understanding of objectivity in political questions.

Stenographic reporting’s influence on parliamentary oratory has been disputed. Whereas in Finland stenography was emphasised as a factor that forced members to better their self-expression, George Curzon (1914, 14), for one, noted that parliament eloquence and stenography were “not of congenial growth” — since as reporting improved, eloquence declined. Curzon illustrated the influence that stenographic reporting had on speaking in parliament by noting that, prior to having a consciousness that his speech might be publicised, the orator “could give the free rein to his imagination; could amplify, repeat, embel-

³²⁷ However, *Nya Pressen* (23 Mar., 1908, 5) complained that now the Helsinki newspapers had to bear alone the costs of enabling the country’s population to follow the Eduskunta’s work as the provincial newspapers often simply followed the reporting of the main Helsinki newspapers.

³²⁸ For a critique of such parliamentary reporting practices, see e.g. Palmén 1876c; 1876d.

³²⁹ For such a critique see e.g. *Åbo Tidning*, 21 Apr., 1885, 1–2.

³³⁰ See e.g. Sections 3.4.3, 6.5 and 6.8.

lish and adorn with impunity". After publicity was introduced, the orator was not speaking to "a private club" anymore, but was aware that every word could be taken down, and therefore the orator felt forced to "walk delicately and measure his paces", and was no longer able to "frisk and frolic in the flowery meads of rhetoric" or to "let himself go". (ibid.) In the late nineteenth-century Finnish Diets plenary sessions were public from the beginning and the members had no experience of private plenary debates. However, closed committee sittings were seen as the place for free talk without the pressures of publicity, which moved the emphasis of Diet work to committee negotiations.

8.3.3 *Dagblad* liberals and E. G. Palmén: Newspapers as perspectives to/in debate

Due to the newspapers' limited space, even stenographic reports were not sufficient to meet the need for full and impartial publication. In addition, as a result of heated language and party struggles in the 1870s and 1880s, the content and style of Diet reporting work became increasingly disputed. Political groups accused each other of distortion and of selective, partial and misrepresentative descriptions. More discreet forms of editing stenographic reports also took place. For example, E. G. Palmén (1876c) noted that some speeches were excluded from newspapers while others were published several times. In addition, the official newspaper cut off interjections of approval and "bravo" aimed at "liberal speeches", although they were included in the original stenographic accounts delivered to newspapers. The justification for such deliberate framing was "the lack of space" (ibid.). However, compared to foreign parliamentary politics, Finnish disputes on reporting were rather calm during the Diets (cf. French parliamentary reporting in *Nya Pressen*, 7 Oct., 1892, 2).³³¹

E. G. Palmén and the *Dagblad* liberals, who expressed appreciation to the value of journalistic parliamentary reporting, gave newspapers a special role in the service of "full publicity". In the final part of his article series "Diet Proceedings and Publicity", Palmén discussed the possibilities for objective newspaper reporting and its political implications. For him, it was naïve to think that politics and partisanship would not affect the objectivity of Diet reporting. Palmén argued that a common misconception was that if several reporters had access to the plenaries, one of their reports could be said to be more truthful than the others. He challenged this view by noting that different newspapers, as much as

³³¹ The article included a presentation of the French practices on parliamentary minutes and their publication. *Nya Pressen* argued that French parliamentary speaking and publication of speeches had always been subject to canvassing and flattering the general public and the electors. French deputies had abused their right of correction in order to embellish their speeches. In addition, in France, the emphasis was not on stenographic verbatim records, but on summarised minutes produced by the *secrétaires-rédacteurs*. After delivering their speeches, orators took their notes and dictated the best parts to the *secrétaires-rédacteurs* and to their trusted journalists of the provincial newspapers. (*Nya Pressen*, 7 Oct., 1892, 2) *Nya Pressen*'s article *Metamorfoser i fransk parlamentarism - mötesreferaten* was edited and translated from the French newspaper *Le Temps* (1 Oct., 1892, 3).

persons, paid interest to and emphasised different aspects of debate (*debatt*), and thus none could be said to be the only correct one and the others false. (Palmén 1876c) Palmén saw that objectivity was neither a quality of persons nor “impartiality” that excluded extreme opinions. On the contrary, objectivity could be reached only through a debate in which different points of view were put to the test against each other.

Here, Palmén embraced a perspectivism similar to that of the *Dagblad* liberals (see Section 3.4; Mechelin 1879, 116) and J. S. Mill.³³² According to Palmén:

A political or a social phenomenon (*en politisk eller social företeelse*) can be considered from different points of view (*kan betraktas ur divergenta synpunkter*). And thus, naturally, no newspaper or reporter has a monopoly on the truth (*monopol på sanningen*). (Palmén 1876c, italics added)

Similarly to the logic used in compiling the British Hansard, Palmén argued that the most truthful conception (*den riktigaste uppfattningen*) would be achieved through examination (*granskning*) and comparison (*jmförelse*) of several different descriptions (*af flere skildringar*). (Palmén 1876c)

However, Palmén then turned to warn about the possible influence of party politics, as had occurred in foreign countries, and he stressed the need to observe the principle of fair play among all sides in a debate. He noted that the need for multi-perspectivism in parliamentary reporting did not mean that the extreme examples of British, American and German parliamentary life were to be followed, where newspapers published speeches only of their own parties in stenographic detail, while mentioning only the names of political opponents. Analogically to this, in an actual parliamentary debate (*en parlamentarisk debatt*) a whole party faction could leave the room without hearing an opponent’s argument (*motsidans skäll*). (Palmén 1876c)

The *Dagblad* liberals emphasised the inevitability of perspectivism in newspapers’ parliamentary reporting, and they shared a similar view with Palmén on how work should be distributed in the “full Diet publicity”. According to the *Dagbladists* and Palmén, only full official verbatim records were able to present “reliable” and “complete” representations of parliamentary debates. This did not mean that the newspapers’ role was unimportant. In creating “real” and “full parliamentary publicity”, the tasks should be distributed so that political newspapers were given better possibilities and space to present and to carry out their programmes and to fight for the realisation of the opinions they represented, in other words, to debate. Daily papers that presented individual perspectives on parliamentary work were to provide summarised reports that allowed the majority of the people to follow the Diet discussions in general. These newspapers might focus only, for example, on the most influential speeches or give a general picture of a debate. The smaller papers that were forced to cope with very limited space were to concentrate on giving general summaries of debates on a single question in all four estates. The official verba-

³³² On E. G. Palmén’s general interest in John Stuart Mill’s thought, see Tommila 1989, 139.

tim records, which should be published within several weeks after the plenary, would give a full picture of the debates and the arguments used to persons interested. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 24 Oct., 1876, 1; Palmén 1876c; 1876d)

Following this distribution of work in Diet publicity, *Helsingfors Dagblad* emphasised the benefits of open and direct newspaper debate over the questions dealt with in the Diet. The paper also criticised individual representatives relatively harshly. *Dagblad* connected the mission and style of the press to the ‘maturity of parliamentary life’. One of the most prominent disputes on the issue took place in 1872, when *Dagblad*’s Theodor Sederholm³³³ (pseudonym “Nisse”) argued that members of the Peasants were acting “as mere puppets” of the Fennomans leaders. As a result of this article, the Peasants organised a secret sitting on possible measures to be taken against the newspaper. Sederholm then argued, drawing on the British model, that the touchiness of Finnish parliamentarians against public critique was a sign of the “infancy of Finnish parliamentary life” (*en barndomsperiod i vårt parlamentariska lif*) and its “immaturity in political liberty” (*barndomstillstånd i den politiska friheten*). In Britain such restrictions on freedom of the press had been given up already in 1830. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 25 Apr., 1872, 1–2) *Dagblad* described the newspaper debates as an inseparable part of their notion of “parliamentary life”.

8.4 Parliamentary newspapers – quick and accurate, but expensive

Foreign models offered the Finnish discussants a means for parliamentary publicity that sought to combine extensive minutes with the possibility for quick publication for the “readers of the morrow”. The idea of a special parliamentary newspaper that would quickly, regularly and comprehensively publish up-to-date reports of the estates’ proceedings was discussed already in the beginning of the Diet of 1863–64. As discussed, such publications, both by private enterprises and by state-funded printing of official minutes in shorter booklets, had been introduced in Sweden with varying success since the late Age of Liberty.³³⁴ In the Diets, the idea was first brought out by the *Dagblad* liberals, who saw a Diet newspaper as a means for “full publicity” at a time when the printing of official minute books suffered from massive delays. When printing of minute books was endangered after the first Diets, *Dagblad* liberals focused on defending them and gave up their proposals for a parliamentary newspaper. *Helsingfors Dagblad* was ready to support a diet newspaper if it could help to overcome the estate divisions by directly enabling members to follow the dis-

³³³ Theodor Sederholm (1832–1881) was a bookseller, publisher and journalist of the liberal (first) *Morgonbladet*, *Wiborg* and *Åbo Underrättelser*. Sederholm worked long on founding *Helsingfors Dagblad*, was a close member of its editorial staff and printed the newspaper in his own printing house from 1867 to 1877. (Landgren 2006)

³³⁴ See e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 Oct., 1874, 1 on the Swedish tradition of Riksdag publicity and the *Riksdags-Tidningar*.

cussions of other estates. Thus, the parliamentary newspaper was another means for the Dagbladists to overcome the estate divisions. Fennomans, for their part, took up the idea as a possible replacement for stenographic minute books, and based their argumentation on the French model. Also E. G. Palmén marketed the idea of a Diet newspaper as a business enterprise that could quickly publish stenographic minutes and strengthen the finances of *Stenografiska föreningen*.

In 1863 Gustaf Adolf Saxbäck, a church dean, spoke of having heard that a Diet newspaper (*landtdagstidning*) was in the planning that would consist of corrected estates' minutes (*justerade protokoll*) (Clergy 1863–64, I, 27). In the next Diet of 1867, *Dagblad* liberal Edvard Bergh of the Burghers noted that a Diet newspaper (*landtdagstidning*), which would “as completely as possible” report on the Diet proceedings, would serve the purpose of “full publicity” (*en fullständig offentlighet*) better than a folio-style minutes published long after the end of a Diet. (Burghers 1867, I, 433)

In the Diet of 1872, the idea was brought up by Leo Mechelin, who made a proposal on the publication of the estates' minutes (*diskussionsprotokoller; protokoller*) in the form of a Diet newspaper (*landtdagstidning*). Mechelin's proposal was made in view of both the readers of the morrow and remote posterity. Mechelin noted that the minutes had thus far been published only years after the sessions, when public interest in the matters had already faded. A successive and periodical publication would enable quick and detailed reporting that would not rest on short summaries and rumours. This newspaper would report separately on the discussions of each estate and be available by subscription to the general public. Afterwards the printed minutes would be bound and preserved as a printed collection for posterity. (Burghers 1872, I, 25, 41–43) During the Burghers' discussion, the newspaper character of Mechelin's proposal was transformed to signify a successive sheet-by-sheet publication of minutes (on the differences between the two, “*landtdagstidning*” and “*protokollsmemorial*”, see especially Carl Gustaf Berg and Mechelin in Burghers 1872, I, 249–252; *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 5 Mar., 1872, 1–2).

In the Diet of 1877–78, Fennoman Vicar K. E. Stenbäck³³⁵ began his tireless effort to establish an official Diet newspaper. In the Clergy on 10 April, Stenbäck emphasised the advantages of the newspaper press compared to regular parliamentary print. He noted that in France the National Assembly's minutes were published *in extenso* in the *Journal officiel*. In Finland the two official newspapers that were subsidised by the state should publish the estates' stenographic minutes. Thus, the costs of printing could be decreased and the Diet's discussions smoothly published. According to Stenbäck, in “the great civilised countries” the general public could every morning read detailed reports on yesterday's parliamentary discussions (*parlamentariska förhandlingar*).

³³⁵ Karl Emil Stenbäck (1834–1919) was considered a moderate Fennoman. Stenbäck, a member of an influential clerical family and an active translator of religious literature, was a member of the Clergy 1877–1900 with the exception of the Diet of 1888. (Mäkelä-Alitalo 2007) Karl Emil was brother of radical Fennoman student politician Lauri Kivekäs (1852–1893; named Gustaf Laurentius Stenbäck until 1876).

In Norway, the official newspaper *Norske Stortings Efterretninger* gave out comprehensive reports to the general public of how public matters were treated within the representative assembly (*de allmänna angelägenheternas behandling hos representationen*). For Stenbäck, in Finland a procedure similar to these foreign parliaments should be adopted: the ready-to-print minutes should be sent directly from the estates' secretariats to the newspapers' editorial offices. (Clergy 1877–78, I, 436–437) Drawing on Stenbäck's proposal, the Clergy voted against the Burghers' proposal of printing the minutes with public funds, arguing that the minutes could be published in a Diet newspaper or in the supplementary sections of the official newspapers.

Stenbäck developed his idea to follow the model of the French parliament in particular, where the official newspaper had been given priority in publishing parliamentary reports. In 1848 the French National Constituent Assembly decided to hire parliamentary stenographers in the Assembly. After this, the stenographic "*compte rendu in extenso*" became the official report (*compte rendu officiel*). The chief of stenography was ordered to be in charge of the reproduction of the debates, which were to be published in the *Journal officiel* the day after each sitting. (Pierre 1902, 1108) However, in France the official newspaper was, to a great extent, a means used by the assembly or the government to control reporting of the debates, while at the same time restrictions were imposed on regular newspapers' right to publish reports.³³⁶ For example, during the Second Empire (1852–1870) newspapers were only allowed to cite the official reports when writing about the Legislative Body. In the beginning of the Third

³³⁶ Before 1848 the parliamentary reports of the official newspaper *Le Moniteur* had no official status. Errors were plentiful, especially during the revolutionary periods, and thus anyone interested in objective texts of the parliament were forced to seek access to the *procès-verbaux*, which contained summarised points of the discussion and of the orators' opinions. (Pierre 1902, 1099–1100, 1108) During the July Monarchy (1830–1848) the newspaper press was given full liberty to report, but no means to report accurately on the parliamentary debates: the official minutes were printed for the use of the deputies, but were not given quickly enough to the press, and debates were constantly distorted. The minutes *in extenso* published by the official *Le Moniteur* reached only a very small readership, and its reports were not allowed to be published in the unofficial newspapers that would have been able to reach the general public. (Pierre 1902, 1109) During the Second Empire (1852–1870), the situation turned to the other extreme: only official minutes were allowed to be published. From 1852 on, the *secrétaires-rédacteurs* were ordered to produce separately a summarised (*procès-verbal succinct*) and a detailed version of the minutes (*compte rendu analytique détaillé*). In order to report on a sitting of the Legislative Body, papers had to reproduce the official summarised or detailed version. (Pierre 1902, 1108–1110) After the Second Empire, the Assembly National gave the newspaper a free hand to report on the discussions, but did not want to repeat mistakes related to the laxness of the July Monarchy: in 1873 the National Assembly decided that the proofs of the full minutes (*compte rendu in extenso*) would be communicated to all newspapers that requested them. In 1879 the Bureau of the National Assembly decided that full minutes of the debates (*compte rendu analytique*), in the format of the main newspapers, would be published daily and freely for the use of the newspapers of Paris and the departments. In addition to the full minutes, *secrétaires-rédacteurs* produced a summarised report (*compte rendu sommaire*), which was transmitted by telegraph during sittings to the President of the Republic, the Senate and to the association of Paris newspapers. In addition, the summarised report was displayed in the hall of the Palais-Bourbon for the use of journalists. (Pierre 1902, 1109–1110)

Republic the National Assembly renounced its restrictions on newspaper reporting, but at the same time tried to fight distortion in reporting by more quickly publishing the official reports. (Pierre 1902, 1109)

The Fennoman newspaper *Morgonbladet* promoted Stenbäck's proposal and published his revised proposal a month before the opening of the Diet of 1882. Stenbäck argued that an official Diet newspaper was a solution to the printing delays and the poor sales of official minute books. The Finnish system should be organised according to the model of the French official newspaper so that stenographers could produce print-ready minutes within twelve hours. In order to save time, the minutes would not be translated into both languages for publication. The printing of reports could thus start already a few hours after each plenary and the newspaper could be delivered the following day. The costs for the paper, print and the proofreading would be covered by subscriptions. (Stenbäck 1881)

Stenbäck brought the question up in the Diets of 1882 (Clergy 1882, III, 1660, 1666) and 1885 (Clergy 1885, I, 35–36). His proposal was supported because it allowed swift publication. In addition, it was thought a Diet newspaper could replace the poor and sometimes faulty summarised reports in the daily press (e.g. Kihlman in Clergy 1882, III, 1662). The proposal was also objected to on the grounds that such a paper would not serve the long-term historical purposes, that is, the readership of remote posterity, as well as the printed official minutes (e.g. Nordström in Clergy 1882, III, 1661). It was also argued that it would not be economically sustainable in Finland (e.g. Clergy 1885, I, 87). Representatives were sceptical about quick publication of discussions without members having the possibility to correct their statements, although Stenbäck noted that members could revise minutes afterwards and correct their statements in later issues of the paper, similar to the procedure in France (Clergy 1882, III, 1660–1666).

Stenbäck justified his proposal and the use of the French model with practical arguments and he did not explicitly promote it as a government-directed project. However, it seems that Stenbäck saw the government's participation in the Diet newspaper as a means to protect its impartiality from the politics of the party press. Stenbäck's proposal, nevertheless, marks a break with the old Fennoman conception of publicity and their belittlement of the estates' debates (see below).

Another central figure advocating a parliamentary newspaper in Finland was E. G. Palmén, who was able to advance the idea through his role in *Stenografiska föreningen*. In 1874, Palmén argued that if the quick publication of minutes could not be otherwise arranged, the records could be mediated through a particular Diet newspaper. He did not conceive the paper as a government-managed project in the sense of an official newspaper, but as a collective enterprise of several privately held companies or newspapers. According to Palmén, if several newspapers produced it together and without printing it expensively in a number of different printing houses, the publication could provide a better quality of reporting more economically. (Palmén 1874c) Palmén

developed his proposal in *Stenografiska föreningen* 1881–1885. The idea was to establish an enterprise between the association and the main newspapers of Helsinki, Turku and Vyborg (Kallioniemi 1946, 241–243; for a discussion of the plan see *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 31 Dec., 1881, 2; *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 30 Dec., 1881, 1; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 10 Jan., 1882, 3)

Helsingfors Dagblad (24 Oct., 1876, 1) supported Palmén's proposal for a Diet newspaper, but with on the condition that the estates' debates were published the day after the plenaries. Otherwise the publication would amount to nothing and would have only historical (*historiskt värde*) instead of practical (*praktiskt*) value. According to *Dagblad*, its main purpose would be to give, not only the general public (*allmänheten*), but first and foremost the members of the different estates the possibility to directly follow (*omedelbart följa*) what was spoken and decided. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 24 Oct., 1876, 1)

Due to continued delays in parliamentary print and allegedly incomplete reporting, the idea of a state funded parliamentary newspaper was taken up also during the early Eduskunta. The paper was advocated for by referring to the general public's right to receive inexpensive and complete up-to-date information about the proceedings while the parliament was still in session, and to the Finnish people's recent political awakening and interest in the Eduskunta, as well as to the limited space available in newspapers (regarded as insufficient to allow for impartial reporting) and to foreign examples, such as Norway and Hungary. (E.g. *Östra Finland*, 18 July, 1907, 1–2; 30 July, 1907, 1–2; 19 Feb., 1909, 1) The proposals were objected to by referring to the efficiency of the regular press at the task and the parliamentary newspaper's slow publication and translation into both languages (implying that neither a wide circulation nor cheap subscription rates could be guaranteed) (see e.g. *Åbo Underrättelser*, 25 July, 1907, 2). In addition, in the beginning of the Eduskunta's first session, Swedish Party members discussed the possibility of establishing a committee of elected reporters, whose task was to provide the provincial press factual (*sakliga*) and impartial (*opartiska*) accounts of the plenary sessions as well as other necessary news about important matters in parliament. (*Åbo Underrättelser*, 25 July, 1907, 2)

8.5 Official parliamentary print – accurate, but expensive and slow

8.5.1 Debates on official parliamentary print: economy, delays and the language question

The efforts made for increasing the role of newspapers did not eliminate the arguments for printing and publicising full, authentic verbatim records: the newspapers' reports remained limited and partial, and the idea of a parliamentary newspaper never materialised. Discussions on the printing of verbatim records illustrate the differences between the Dagbladist and Fennoman atti-

tudes towards debate. Whereas the *Dagblad* liberals emphasised the irreplaceability of printed full minutes, the Fennomans, even after the establishment of Finnish-language stenography, focused on advocating for Diet documents and government proposals, petitions, reports and decisions as the primary Diet publications.

In the early Finnish Diets, the Nobility and the Burghers took stenographic minutes while the Clergy and the Peasants held on to summarised minutes, which lacked proper oversight and coordination. Although stenographic minutes were adopted in all four estates in the Diet of 1877–78, the records remained to a great extent inaccessible,³³⁷ kept away in the estates' archives in the form of rare handwritten copies. The January Committee's minutes, the recording of which used stenography for the first time in Finland, were printed. Similar was the case with the minutes of all four estates of the Diet of 1863–64. However, from the Diet of 1867 until 1885, the estates' minutes were not printed, with the exception of the Nobility, who continued to print throughout, and the Burghers, who made a contract with a private printing house for the minutes of 1872. In 1885 a decision was made to print the minutes of all four estates and this was also done to the old minutes from 1867 to 1885. (Kallioniemi 1946, 238)

In the estates and in the newspaper press, the main objections to printing verbatim records were cost and slow publication (see *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 Oct., 1874, 1; *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 16 Dec., 1882, 2). Some members saw that, due to the slowness of printing, the general public had already lost interest in records.³³⁸ For example, in 1874 two years had gone since the previous Diet and parts of the official minutes were still unpublished (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 Oct., 1874, 1). In the Nobility in 1872, liberal Karl Johan Edelsköld noted that the belated printing of the minutes made them already "an outmoded antique" (*en föråldrad antiqvität*) (Nobility 1872, I, 214).³³⁹ The costs of printing were seen as too high, especially in the first Diets, when the general public was suffering or in a slow recovery from poverty and the Finnish famine of 1866–68.

In the Nobility, printing never became a controversy. This was partly due to the solvency of the estate. The Nobility printed its minutes itself, although for example in 1867 the lord marshal informed the estate that of the 500 printed minutes, only 150 copies had been sold and that a deficit of 8000 marks still remained of the total cost of 12,200 (Nobility 1867, III, 483–484). The *Dagblad* liberals, the prime movers of the printing, had strong support and representation in the Nobility. In 1872 the liberal Karl Johan Edelsköld argued that it was self-evident that if "full publicity" (*fullständig offentlighet*) in the Diet was to be achieved, the minutes had to be printed regardless of the few hundred marks increase in cost. According to him, the estate must "appreciate the value of publicity" (*veta uppskatta offentlighetens värde*) and see that the printing of the minutes

³³⁷ For a critique of the inaccessibility of the estates' minutes in the archives, see e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 19 Nov., 1882, 2; 24 Nov., 1882, 3; 25 Nov., 1882, 1–2; 25 Nov., 1882, 3; *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 16 Dec., 1882, 2.

³³⁸ The slowness was a result of the slowness of corrections and of getting the minutes into a print-ready form, in addition to the low capacity of the printing houses.

³³⁹ For similar estimation see e.g. Edvard Bergh in Burghers 1867, I, 433)

was to be treated like an already-decided question. (Nobility 1872, I, 215) In the Diet of 1872, when printing of the minutes became a regular topic of dispute in the other estates, the Nobility settled for discussing different printing options and their costs.

The Burghers, another liberal stronghold, was also active in getting the estates' minutes printed. The most significant proposals for printing were put forward in the Burghers after the groundwork was prepared in the pages of *Helsingfors Dagblad*. In 1872 Leo Mechelin's proposal on serial printing of the minutes started a ten-year debate in the Burghers about how the costs of the print should be covered, though the proposal had won the vote 20 to 16 (Burghers 1872, I, 41–42, 243–254). The main debate about the printing was whether it was to be paid by taxing the estates' principals and constituencies, or whether they should be charged from the state's public funds (*av allmänna medel*). At the centre of the debate was § 81 of the Diet Act of 1869, according to which "the proposals issued to the Estates by the Emperor and the Grand Duke, Committee reports as well as the Estates' letters to the Emperor and the Diet decisions are to be printed and published" (Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869).

In 1872 in the Burghers Gustaf Adolf Lindblom³⁴⁰ noted that according to the Diet Act only the documents listed in § 81 were to be printed, and that the Act did not order anything about the minutes of the individual estates. Liberal Gabriel Tengström,³⁴¹ who had strongly defended the importance of publicity in the January Committee (Landgren 1995, 108), noted that in the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865, when discussing Diet print, the general opinion had been that the question was to be decided by the estates, who were also to cover the costs of the printing. In 1872, due to the controversy over the question, the Burghers resolved their printing problem independently. In the plenary of 5 March, Mechelin stated that, since the opponents to printing had argued that principals should not be charged, some members decided to establish a private publishing house for the task. The Burghers accepted Mechelin's proposal. (Burghers 1872, I, 265–270)

The *Dagblad* liberals took an active stand on the interpretation of § 81 of the Diet Act and applied the idea "everything which is not forbidden is allowed". In 1874 *Helsingfors Dagblad* acknowledged that the Constitutional Law Committee of 1865 had meant by § 81 that the publication of the estates' minutes should be left for the respective estates to decide as their own economic affair. Thus, publication of the minutes was not *obligatory* either for the government or the estates. However, this did not mean that the minutes could not be published at the state's expense. The newspaper remarked that § 82 of the Diet Act stipulated that "general (*allmänna; yleiset*) expenses in and for the Diet,

³⁴⁰ Gustaf Adolf Lindblom (1828–1889) was an industrialist and a liberal member of the Burghers 1867–1888 (Hellsten 2005).

³⁴¹ For Gabriel Tengström's connections to the policies of *Helsingfors Dagblad*, see Landgren 1995.

with the exception of the ones listed in § 23 and § 28,³⁴² are to be paid for by appropriation taxes (*bevillning; suostuntavero*) or other public funds (*allmänna medel; yleisillä varoilla*). Drawing on this, *Dagblad* argued that the publication of the Diet minutes was of a “general” (*allmänna*) character. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 Oct., 1874, 1)

In the Diet of 1877–78 the discussions on printing started on the Burghers’ initiative. The Burghers’ Private Committee of Appeals wrote a proposal to the Diet’s Finance Committee for a petition to pay for the printing of the estates’ minutes from public funds. The Finance Committee’s reworked proposal was then submitted to the estates for deliberation. In the estates a major hindrance to the printing was argued to be its slowness. According to members, the minutes tended to be ready for printing so late that they lost significance among the general public. Secondly, printing was too costly compared to its benefits.

After debate, public funds were seen as the only option to cover the printing costs of all four estates. As the Burghers’ Private Committee of Appeals of 1877–78 noted, if the decision was left to the individual estates of each Diet, only some of the minutes would be printed. For the Committee, the option to tax constituencies, which had been used to cover costs in the Diet of 1863–64, would not find support among the represented. The Committee took the stand advocated by the *Dagblad* liberals: although § 81 of the Diet Act referred only to the Diet documents, it did not specifically forbid printing on public funds. In addition, as the costs of stenographers were already covered by public funds, it was natural that the printing could be dealt with similarly. (Porvarissäädyn Yksityisen Valitusvaliokunnan mietintö ehdoituksesta painattaa Porvarissäädyn pöytäkirjat näiltä valtiopäiviltä 1877–78)

While the Burghers took a supporting stand on printing using public funds, most opposition to the question was presented by the Fennoman Clergy³⁴³ and the Peasants. In 1877–78, when Finnish-language stenography was already in use, Fennoman leader Yrjö Koskinen³⁴⁴ held one of the most notable speeches against printing verbatim records in the Clergy. Koskinen argued point by point against the Burghers’ Committee of Appeals’s and the Finance Committee’s proposal for printing with on public funds. He argued that the breadth and detail of the stenographic minutes made printing both expensive and difficult. Stenographic minutes were “indigestible” and slow to read and thus robbed the general public (*allmänheten*) of the possibility to benefit from the minutes due to the unreasonable amount of time and effort required. For

³⁴² In practice, the section referred to the salaries of the estates’ speakers and the Peasants’ secretary.

³⁴³ The Clergy had been careful about revealing its debates to the public also during the Swedish period (Hirschfeldt 2009, 384–385; for the Clergy’s traditional viewpoint in the Finnish discussions, see e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 15 Aug., 1864, 2–3; 16 Aug., 1864, 3; Castrén in Peasants 1885, I, 297). In the Riksdag of 1800, members of the Clergy argued that if members were submitted to the general public’s judgment, it would easily lead to a revival of the detested *principalatsfråga* (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 15 Aug., 1864, 2–3; 16 Aug., 1864, 3).

³⁴⁴ Another persistent Fennoman opponent of stenographic minutes and their publication was F. W. Hjelt. For a critique of Yrjö Koskinen and Hjelt for belittling the Diet debates, see e.g. *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 16 Dec., 1882, 2.

Koskinen, the minutes were to be summarised for print and the stenographic minutes should be kept as “bundles of papers in the archives” (*arkivoluntor*) that could be used in research when searching for “the historical truth” (*den historiska sanningen*). Only in cases of important debates were the full minutes to be printed. Koskinen argued that newspaper reports that were published shortly after the plenaries were more useful than delayed official minutes. (Clergy 1877–78, I, 437–442)³⁴⁵

The Fennomans in the Peasants took a similar stand on the printing of verbatim records. For example, in 1877 Gustaf Wilhelm Liukkonen noted that the expensive printed minutes were unnecessary in general as the emperor’s proposals, committee reports, estates’ responses and the Diet’s decisions included “the essence of the Diet discussions” (*ytimen siitä, mitä valtiopäivillä on keskusteltu*) and “in short, what the estates had thought on the matter” (*lyhykäisesti lausuttu, mitä säädyt asiassa ovat miettineet*). For Liukkonen, reading of “what had been argued for and against” (*mitä on väitetty myöten, mitä vastaan*) was “a mere nuisance”. (Peasants 1877–1878, I, 472, 476) The Peasants rejected the Finance Committee’s report on printing with public funds by a vote of 42 to 11, and the question of printing the Peasants’ minutes was defeated crushingly by a vote of 38 to 6. (Peasants 1877–1878, I, 482, 484)

The Fennomans’ statements reflect a more general attitude towards parliamentary deliberation and debate. For the Fennomans, the most important Diet material for print was the output, the actual resolutions, and the decisions and reports, while debate and the arguments for and against remained secondary. As the Fennomans’ press already published the speeches of the leading Fennomans, printing of whole discussions was not seen as worth the effort.

In addition to the variety of arguments related to the purposes and character of parliamentary work (which will be discussed in the following sections), a strong emphasis was given to the “technical” challenges related to the minutes’ printing. For example, in order to refute the charges of economic loss and slow printing, it was argued that minutes should be printed in shorter booklets during the Diets³⁴⁶ in one format and in sufficiently large editions.³⁴⁷ In addition, minutes were to be made available to the general public through individual purchase or through subscription in order to decrease the final costs of printing.³⁴⁸ The Swedish Riksdag was used as a popular model for these proposals (e.g. on printing of Diet documents, see *Morgonbladet*, 9 Apr., 1872, 1; 18 Nov., 1873, 1; for minutes *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 24 Oct., 1876, 1).

³⁴⁵ Koskinen noted sarcastically referring to the stenographic ideal of a “photographic image” and the electors’ right to get a presentation of their representatives that one could argue the minute books should include illustrated portraits of the representatives as well (Clergy 1877–78, I, 441).

³⁴⁶ E.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 Oct., 1874, 1; *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 23 Aug., 1890, 2; Mechelin in Burghers 1872, I, 42; Valtiovaliokunnan mietintö N:o 4, 1877.

³⁴⁷ E.g. Palmén 1876a; *Morgonbladet*, 9 Apr., 1872, 1.

³⁴⁸ E.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 Oct., 1874, 1; *Morgonbladet*, 9 Apr., 1872, 1; 18 Nov., 1873, 1; Palmén 1876a; Valtiovaliokunnan mietintö N:o 4, 1877.

In the Diet of 1882 the printing of minutes on public funds was brought back to the estates for discussion, but did not pass. The attitude towards printing was, however, becoming more approving among the Fennoman majorities in the Clergy and Peasants, but the language question also was being given a greater emphasis. K. E. Stenbäck began the discussion in the Clergy by noting that the reasons for objecting to the proposal remained still valid: The general public would not be interested in acquiring minutes that came out so late, and consequently, the printing was a waste of money as its costs could not be covered by selling the minutes. (Clergy 1882, III, 1660) Seconding Stenbäck, F. W. Hjelt noted that in the previous Diet, ninety copies of the Nobility's minutes were sold, and for the Diet of 1882 thus far only thirteen subscriptions had been made. However, Hjelt noted that the main reason behind the unpopularity of the estates' minutes was the fact that they had been published only in the language in which the speeches were made, which meant in practice Swedish. According to Hjelt, the minutes would become popular only if they were published in both languages. (Clergy 1882, III, 1663) The proposal to print the minutes on public funds lost the vote in the Clergy by 12 votes against 20 (Clergy 1882, III, 1667).

In the Diet of 1885, the first of the two main objections to printing of the estates' minutes was overcome as the printing house Weilin & Göö's promised to print the minutes in shorter booklets already during the Diet (Clergy 1885, I, 34). After debate, the Clergy decided to support the printing of minutes with public funds (Clergy 1885, I, 157). Although translations for both languages were demanded in the estate and interpretations of § 82 of the Diet Act were heavily disputed, the Peasants also voted for the printing with public funds by 35 votes against 21 (Peasants 1885, I, 291–304).

A change among the Fennoman camp had begun to take place in the Diet. In the early 1880s a group of Young Finns began to take form and challenge the more conservative old Fennomans led by Yrjö Koskinen and Agathon Meurman. The Young Finns' arguments and vocabulary differed from those of the old leaders. For example, in the Peasants in 1885, Young Finn Jonas Castrén, in his first term in the Diet, held a prominent opening speech in support of printing the minutes with public funds. He strongly emphasised the duties (*velvollisuus*) of the members of the Diet towards their electors (*vaalimiehet*) and the general public (*suuri yleisö*), and called printing one of "the people's most natural rights" (*kansan luonnollisimpia oikeuksia*). Castrén referred to the "political education of the citizens" (*kansalaisten valtiollinen kasvatus*) and to the "fading away of the dark" that had been earlier used to veil actions in political life. Concerning the language question, Castrén noted that members could influence the language of the minutes by speaking Finnish in the estates, and he predicted that the majority of the three lower estates would eventually speak Finnish. (Peasants 1885, I, 291–293, 296–299) Castrén and his followers attacked Meurman and his supporters in the debate, and won over the majority of the estate to support the Finance Committee's report on printing (*ibid.* 291–304). Castrén's argumentation illustrates a change in the Fennoman rhetoric on parliamentary

publicity: the emphasis had moved from “obedience” to education (see Section 8.6 below).

8.5.2 Foreign models of parliamentary print

During the estates’ debates, newspapers, especially *Helsingfors Dagblad*, turned to foreign models. The procedures of several European parliaments, especially the Swedish and Norwegian, and the United States Congress were prominent. The Swedish case offered a natural reference point for the first Diets. Other models were used mainly to advocate printing as a parliamentary practice that had proven its usefulness elsewhere. Debates on the printing illustrate how foreign models presented in the press became central arguments in the Diet deliberations.

In defence of Diet publicity, *Helsingfors Dagblad* presented its interpretation of the Swedish tradition on parliamentary print and its constitutional setting. For example, the paper noted (9 Oct., 1874, 1) that the Swedish estates had begun the publication (*offentliggörande*) of their minutes already in 1786, though this became a standard practice only later, with the exception of the Clergy, which objected to any publication of its debates. According to the newspaper, in the Riksdag of 1809 a motion on the printing of the minutes at the state’s expense was made in the Nobility. Finally, based on a proposal of the Constitution Committee, the Riksdag Act of 1810 stipulated that the Riksdag’s minutes were to be published at the state’s expense in addition to other Riksdag documents. *Dagblad* noted that this section of the Act was adopted also in the Riksdag Act of 1866. (ibid.)

In the next Finnish Diet, the Burghers’ Committee of Appeals of 1877–78 referred to § 82 of the Swedish Riksdag Act of 1866, which ordered that “the minutes of the Chambers and other Riksdag documents are to be published as soon as possible, the documents in full and the minutes in the order decided by the Chambers” (Riksdagsordningen 1866, § 82). (Porvarissäädyn Yksityisen Valitusvaliokunnan mietintö ehdoituksesta painattaa Porvarissäädyn pöytäkirjat näiltä valtiopäiviltä 1877–78)

The United States Congress was used as a model for its unparalleled efficiency in parliamentary printing. In 1874 *Helsingfors Dagblad* (9 Oct., 1874, 1) wrote that in the United States the stipulation on the printing of discussions (*förhandlingar*) had been introduced already in 1778, when it was decided that each state would receive a copy of these congressional documents at the Confederation’s expense. Later on, the proceedings of the Congress were publicised immediately after the debates in a parliamentary newspaper, *The Congressional Globe*, which came out daily and included records of the previous day’s debates both in the Senate and the House of Representatives. According to *Dagblad*, each member of the U.S. Congress received 24 copies of each issue for free. In addition, each new member received all the earlier volumes of the publication. (ibid.) In the Diet of 1877–78, the Burghers’ Committee of Appeals also followed the United States’ example (see Porvarissäädyn Yksityisen Valitusvaliokunnan

mietintö ehdoituksesta painattaa Porvarissäädyn pöytäkirjat näiltä valtiopäiviltä 1877–78).

References to a variety of parliaments as well as to “civilised countries”, “foreign constitutions” and “modern states” were made in order to point out that printing was a widely accepted parliamentary practice. In the Clergy Otto Mauritz Nordström³⁴⁹ argued that printing of minutes was “a customary affair in civilised countries” (*civiliserade länder*), and that “if the printing had been found desirable and useful elsewhere, it was even more necessary in Finland, whose people were taking its first stumbling steps along the path of constitutional development” (Clergy 1877–78, I, 450). According to *Helsingfors Dagblad* (9 Oct., 1874, 1), a decision to print minutes had been made in Switzerland in 1815, and Norway’s Constitution of 1814 prescribed that “the Storting’s proceedings are published in print, unless otherwise is decided by a majority vote” (Grunnlov 1814, § 85). The newspaper argued that in other “modern states” (*moderna stater*) as well, the practice – if not the written law – ordered publication of chamber proceedings at the state’s expense (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 9 Oct., 1874, 1). In addition to the models mentioned, the Burghers’ Committee of Appeals of 1877–78 noted other foreign parliaments that were accustomed to publish their minutes through print: minutes were published in Germany, and in France the National Assembly’s (*kansalliskokous*) minutes were published in full in the official newspaper *Journal officiel*. (Porvarissäädyn Yksityisen Valitusvaliokunnan mietintö ehdoituksesta painattaa Porvarissäädyn pöytäkirjat näiltä valtiopäiviltä 1877–78)

8.6 Arguments for parliamentary publicity

In the following sections, Jeremy Bentham’s reasons for publicity in a parliament in *An Essay on Political Tactics* (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 1) will be used as a framework to organise the examination the Finnish debates on publicity. Bentham’s international perspective is beneficial for highlighting connections and discrepancies between the Finnish and foreign discussions. Bentham paid a significant amount of attention to the inner organisation of parliament and conducted a full study of the procedures of the British parliament and the provincial *parlements* of France (Greaves 1931, 308). Compared, for example, to Hatsell, May and Pierre, Bentham took a distinctively theoretical approach to parliamentary procedures and the advantages resulting from them. (*ibid.*)

According to Bentham, the main three reasons for parliamentary publicity are: (1) To constrain the members of the assembly to perform their duty; (2) to secure the confidence of the people, and their assent to the measures of the legislature; and (3) to enable the governors to know the wishes of the governed. In

³⁴⁹ Otto Mauritz Nordström was a member of the Clergy in the Diets of 1877–78 as a vicar and in 1882 as a dean. Nordström was a doctor of philosophy in history, had taught history and been a student of “liberal” Professor Gabriel Rein. Nordström also had experience as a journalist as editor of *Borgå Tidning* in 1846. (Kotivuori 2005b)

addition, Bentham gave three lesser considerations, which needed to be taken into account: (4) to enable the electors to act from knowledge when renewing the assembly; (5) to provide the assembly with the means of profiting by the information of the public; and (6) the amusement which results from publicity and increases the happiness of the nation. (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 1)

The Fennomans and *Dagblad* liberals had different arguments and emphases concerning Diet publicity. Whereas the Fennomans advocated the informative and later educative role of publicity in terms of the subject matter of political life and emphasised the importance of local information produced by people educated in the Diet work, the *Dagblad*ists saw publicity especially as an incentive for the moral responsibility of representatives and as a medium for checking and oversight.

8.6.1 Informing the public

Bentham's second reason for publicity was *to secure the confidence of the people, and their assent to the measures of the legislature*. In Bentham's system, the public needed information about the assembly and its discussions in order to offer better insight into the parliament. In this regard, the publicity of the assembly served also the parliament: under the guidance of publicity the public was "placed in a situation to form an enlightened opinion". For Bentham, "the public will always proceed, speaking and judging of everything", but publicity could help ensure that the public founded its opinion on facts instead of having to rely on insufficient or erroneous information. (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 1)

A typical idea concerning the publicity of estate assemblies was that the electors would be informed about how their delegates pleaded their case in the estate meetings. As discussed, for Snellman, the estate division and its representation of corporatist interests was not a hindrance to the realisation of the national spirit. In this respect, Snellman was indebted to Hegel, who developed his thinking on the publicity of the estate assembly in *Philosophy of Right* (1821). For Hegel, public opinion had the form of the common sense that was dispersed through a people and had attained consciousness of itself also in the estate assembly, through occupational status organisations of civil society which participated in legislation. Hegel's idea of publicity in estate assemblies did not attempt to link assembly discussions with public debates critical of and a check on government power (Habermas 1989 [1962]), 120). In Hegel's model, the publicity served an educational purpose: to integrate citizens into the state from above. Publicity was a means by which public opinion first reached thoughts that were true, attaining insight into the situation and concept of the state and acquiring the ability to evaluate these aspects more rationally. Publicity of the estate assembly helped public opinion to become acquainted with the governmental powers and officials and respect them and their work, abilities, virtues and skills. For Hegel, the public sphere was a mere means to "integrate subjective opinions into the objectivity assumed by the spirit in the form of the state". (ibid.)

In the Finnish Diet of Porvoo in 1809, publicity of discussions was argued for on grounds typical of other estate diets, although reference to the interests of “the general public”, instead of merely to the estates, was made. The printing of estate minutes was endorsed by appealing to their importance for *informing the public*. Regardless of the costs, printed minutes “were to be brought to the public attention”³⁵⁰. In the estates’ discussions, the purpose of printed minutes was merely declaratory. For example, the Clergy decided that “as has been the practice in the Swedish Riksdags, so too must the Honourable Estate now inform its brothers at home (*underrätta sina hemmavarande medbröder*) of matters discussed in the Diet and the humble petitions the Estate has presented before the Monarch” (Clergy 1809, 119). Publicity’s meaning for relations between the representatives and the represented was left without closer examination in the Porvoo Diet.

From the early 1870s on, Fennoman newspaper *Morgonbladet* took an active role in discussing Diet publicity. Following Snellman’s and Yrjö Koskinen’s Hegelian ideas, *Morgonbladet* gave publicity an informative and integrative role. From a Snellmanian point of view, the Diet publicity was about moulding and reproducing the culture of morality within the conditions of patriotism and national spirit. Patriotism and national spirit were based on a homogeneity of values among the polity and the idea of progress according to which there existed a certain rational path to be followed (Pulkkinen 1989, 36–38). Snellman’s concept of *Bildung* signified a constant will and ability to develop, “to go along with what was true and right” (Jalava 2006, 54). In 1874, K. W. Forsman, editor of *Morgonbladet* in 1876–1878, wrote in *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti* that the educated class had the responsibility to lead the development of the people and its education against the threats of those social movements (*yhteiskunnalliset liikkeet*) that were infiltrating national and political movements, turning the principles of society upside-down and “revealing its bottom muds”. The leading class was, under the guidance of the national spirit, to exert its influence among the people and to keep a watchful eye on it. This division of labour was the result of a natural historical development. (Forsman 1874)

Morgonbladet’s focus was on arguments that emphasised the general public’s possibility to keep track of the Diet work and to gain an awareness and interest in public matters. The newspaper advocated the printing of Diet documents, such as government proposals, committee reports, estate petitions and Diet decisions, while giving less importance to the publication of discussions. In this respect, *Morgonbladet* treated Diet publicity as a means to convince the people of the good sense of the Fennoman policies and decisions.

In 1872, *Morgonbladet* (9 Apr., 1872, 1) argued that the idea behind § 81 of the Diet Act, which made the printing of Diet documents obligatory, was to “facilitate a [public] overview” (*underlätta öfversikten*) and thus promote the general public’s possibility to “follow” (*följa med*) what measures had been taken on Diet matters. The newspaper saw Diet documents as essential contributions for

³⁵⁰ E.g. “*til Allmän kunskap*”, Baron Carpelan in Nobility 1809, 334; “*till allmänhetens kunskap*”, Mayor Winge in Burghers 1809, 78–79; Peasants 1809, 61.

the public to “gain knowledge of the course of the legislation and the government’s administration” (*bidrag till kännedomen om lagstiftningens gång och styrelsens förvaltning*). For *Morgonbladet*, the Swedish model, in which the Riksdag publications were available for subscription in a manner similar to official newspapers, would benefit the circulation of Finnish proposals (*förslag*) and of decisions (*beslut*) made by the ‘political power’ (*statsmakt*) as well as contribute to “building conviction” (*bilda en öfvertygelse*) among the public about legislative issues (*lagstiftningsärenden*) better than scanty newspaper reports. (*Morgonbladet*, 9 Apr., 1872, 1; for *Morgonbladet*’s use of the Swedish model see e.g. also 18 Nov., 1873, 1)

In November 1873 *Morgonbladet* (18 Nov., 1873, 1) commented on a recently published volume of the Diet documents,³⁵¹ and argued that for the majority of the people, who did not directly participate in the Diet work, the documents formed “the only exhaustive source for knowledge” (*den enda fullständiga källan till kunskap*) “about the measures of one of the political powers in current questions” (*om den ena statsmaktens åtgöranden i hvarje föreliggande fråga*). Opening the Diet documents to public subscription would, in addition to saving money and enabling the immediate publication of parliamentary print, “spread interest in the treatment of issues” (*utbreda intresset för frågornas behandling*) all over the country. On-time publication of Diet documents with their presentations of “important and decisive arguments” (*wigtiga och afgörande skäl*) would raise “awareness about political questions” (*vetande i politiska ting*) and “spread knowledge and powers of judgement about the country’s public affairs” (*kunskap och omdöme i landets allmänna angelägenheter*) among the population. (*ibid.*)

8.6.2 Reproducing the order of the parliament – parliament as a procedural model

Bentham’s second reason for publicity did not refer only to informing the public about the proceedings of the assembly, but included the idea that the models and orders governing in the assembly could be mediated through publicity to the general public and be reproduced there in the practices of all classes of society. According to Bentham, the example of the parliament encouraged respect for the law,³⁵² for taxes, for administrative measures and for the conduct of officials, and thereby was beneficial for government. Public assemblies helped the general feeling to arise “to a higher tone” and thus prejudices would have less

³⁵¹ The documents consisted of parts of government reports on “humble petitions” presented by the estates to the emperor during the previous Diet, government accounts on the state of the public administration (*relationer om statsverkets tillstånd*) and other financial issues, government proposals, and committee reports with the estates’ replies. According to *Morgonbladet*, this was the first implementation of § 81 of the Diet Act and the paper thanked the person responsible, Dean F. W. Hjelt, for extending parliamentary print beyond the scope of the usual government report (*Morgonbladet*, 18 Nov., 1873, 1). It is notable that Hjelt was one of the main opponents of stenographic minutes in the Diets.

³⁵² Mill also argued that efficient parliamentary publicity strengthened obedience to the laws laid down by the legislature (Mill 2001 [1861], 280–281).

dominion. Following the example of the assembly practices, discussion among the population would lean more on the sound opinions of statesmen than on the harmful rhetoric of demagogues and cheats of imposters. (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 1) In this respect, Bentham acknowledged parliament's special procedural setting and its paradigmatic model for other assemblies, an aspect which Habermas, for example, has neglected when viewing Bentham's parliament as "nothing but a part of the public deliberations of the public in general" (Habermas 1989 [1962], 100). Bentham noted that in addition to the assembly's customs of reasoning and discussion, the order of parliament was reproduced through publicity in "clubs and inferior assemblies", in which people were pleased to find "regularity formed from the greater model". (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 1)

This is what was partly aimed at, and at least to some extent took place, in Finland in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Some Finnish actors, mainly Dagbladists, Svecomans and Young Finns, understood "parliamentary life" broadly and argued for the application of parliamentary procedures in the practices of associations, clubs, church parliaments, parties, municipal and town meetings and newspaper polemics.³⁵³ For example, in municipal meetings the parliamentary mode of proceeding (*parlamentarisk ordning*) was argued to save time and to offer a means for calm encounter between different and opposing opinions and the treatment of matters, as well as to guarantee more comprehensive (*allsidigare*), thorough (*grundligare*) and exhaustive (*uttömmande*) consideration of questions (*frågor*). Parliamentary procedures were seen to encourage members to improve the preparation and delivery of their speeches and raise their value among the participants. Due to the similar procedural setting, municipal meetings were described as "a miniature of the Diet" (*en landtdag i smått*). (See e.g. *Österbottniska Posten*,³⁵⁴ 16 Oct., 1884, 3) At the same time, the application of parliamentary procedures in meetings and in associations was argued explicitly as a means of "parliamentary education" (see e.g. *parlamentarinen kaswatus* in *Wiipurin Sanomat*,³⁵⁵ 10 Aug., 1892, 1–2). The parliamentary mode of proceeding (*parlamentarinen järjestys*) guided persons to discuss matters calmly, respectfully, orderly and to the point, and gave citizens valuable experience in public speaking and the expression of opinions. Procedural organisation and the presence of opposing opinions in a meeting were seen as encouraging speakers to give up the facile assumption that their personal opinions were universally accepted. (*ibid.*)

³⁵³ On demands to introduce parliamentary procedure (*en parlamentarisk ordning*) in municipal meetings, see e.g. *Österbottniska Posten*, 16 Oct., 1884, 3; in meetings of various sorts, e.g. *Wiipurin Sanomat*, 10 Aug., 1892, 1–2; for use of parliamentary procedures in church assemblies, see e.g. Heliövaara 1945 and *Satakunta*, 10 June., 1876, 1–2 and in the newspaper press, e.g. *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 7 Dec., 1863, 2.

³⁵⁴ The Svecoman paper *Österbottniska-Posten*, published in Nykarleby, was at the time edited by Anders Svedberg, a Svecoman teacher, author, journalist and member of the Peasants in the Diets from 1877 to 1888. Svedberg was active on popular education. (*Suomi*, 30 Jan., 1889, 2) The article was written under the pseudonym "J. H-n."

³⁵⁵ *Wiipurin Sanomat* was at the time a Young Finn newspaper edited by Matti Kurikka and A. B. Mäkelä. The article was written under the pseudonym "Harrastaja."

In addition to spreading parliamentary models and the value of political action, municipal meetings were argued to be possible “training schools” (*öfningsskola*) for developing the abilities and competences (*förmåga och duglighet*) required from a parliamentarian. For example, according to *Österbottniska Posten*, if parliamentary procedures were adopted locally, “a parliamentary municipal meeting” (*en parlamentarisk kommunalstämma*) would offer an invaluable training ground in parliamentary speaking and practice. (*Österbottniska Posten*, 16 Oct., 1884, 3)

Even the labour movement, whose representatives in parliament often presented critical stands against parliamentary procedures, advocated their implementation as part of their meeting practices.³⁵⁶ The benefits of parliamentary procedures were supported with similar arguments in extra-parliamentary meetings as in the parliamentary context (see Section 8.9 below). This is understandable, due to the wide visibility of the Diet’s and the Eduskunta’s work in the press as well as the activity of members of the parliament in other social activities. A closer study would be needed of the actual implementation of the parliamentary model in the practices of Finnish parties, associations and other deliberative assemblies.

With a view to the spreading of the Diet model, the *Dagblad* liberals’ notion of parliamentary publicity differed from that of mainstream Fennomans. The *Dagbladists* sought to develop and spread their ideas and practices of debate both in the parliament and in public discussions.³⁵⁷ J. S. Mill highlighted this aspect by emphasising the importance of educating debate as well as the role of debate in education (Mill 2001 [1859], 64–66). For him, publicity enabled a sanctioning power over all public action. It educated individuals to defend their opinions, but also taught them to be capable of changing their minds if convinced by the arguments of others. (Urbinati 2002, 109–110; 116–117) Thus, in other words, publicity was a means to teach individuals to debate.

8.6.3 Educating the people

Swedish discussions had a long history of emphasising the educative role of Riksdag publicity. For example, the Swedish Constitutional Committee of 1809–10, whose work formed a central model for the Finnish Constitutional Law Committee of 1865, emphasised the importance of educating the public in the virtues of citizenship. The Committee saw freedom of the press and transparency in the exercise of power as a central means to this end. (Ihalainen & Sundin 2011, 182, 184) During the Swedish Reform of 1809–10 the publicity principle was argued to promote public enlightenment and foster the formation of opinions that strengthened “the public way of thinking” (Axberger 2009, 425; Hirshfeldt 2009, 395). The minutes’ educative role was also emphasised in the

³⁵⁶ See e.g. Social Democrats’ guidelines for meetings in *Työväen kalenteri*, 2, 1909, 34; 5, 1912, 212–213.

³⁵⁷ See especially Sections 3.4.2, 8.4.3 and Chapter 6 on the newspaper polemics of the 1860s, the proposals on plenum plenum and the perspectivist debating role given to newspapers in parliamentary publicity.

Helsingfors Dagblad's articles that focused on the Riksdag's publication practices (see e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 15 Aug., 1864, 2–3; 16 Aug., 1864, 3).

Compared to Sweden, Finnish discussions on publicity's educative role lacked the idea of individualism in the sense of giving political initiative to the individual. On the contrary, the Fennomans, in particular, highlighted the individual's duty to act for the benefit of the people or the society that she or he was a member of. Compared to Sweden, individualism was seen as something that a small country like Finland, lacking political freedom as part of the empire, could not afford.³⁵⁸ (See Stenius 2003, 346)

The idea of parliamentary minutes as rich sources for educating the public was brought up occasionally in the earlier Diets, but a concerted effort on the matter began only in the 1890s. Before this, the Fennomans did not highlight the minutes as part of the national literature that Snellman, for one, saw as essential for his project of educating the people and strengthening the nation. The transition period signified a break from the old Fennoman generation's belittlement of the Diet debates and their mediation to the public. Among the Fennomans, the turn was a shift of emphasis from the informative aspect of publicity to the educative. As a hint of what was to come, in the Peasants in 1885 Young Finn Jonas Castrén highlighted the importance of printed minutes in political education (*valtiollinen kasvatus*) of the people (Peasants 1885, I, 291). In the Peasants in 1885, Heikura also spoke of the minutes' capacity to "increase the people's political intelligence" (*kasvattaa valtiollista älyä kansassamme*) (Peasants 1885, I, 293).

After the decision to print minutes had been reached by all four estates in 1885, the discussion focused increasingly on developing the production pace, accessibility and circulation of printed minutes. Though minutes were printed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, they remained poorly accessible in the estates' archives³⁵⁹ and raised little interest among the public.³⁶⁰ The hard work that had been devoted to getting the minutes printed seemed to run into the sand. Due to the new Russian constraints and especially the Postal Manifesto of 1890, old liberals and leaders of the Finnish Party began to argue for forming a national front across party lines and to emphasise the importance of popular enlightenment (Liikanen 2003, 297). In the 1890s and 1900s, printed parliamentary proceedings were advertised in the press to such an extent that it may be called a marketing campaign. Minutes were marketed as a valuable collection of reference books on a wide range of matters for individuals and com-

³⁵⁸ See Thiodolf Rein's review of Agathon Meurman's translation of Snellman in Rein 1881, 67–68.

³⁵⁹ For example in 1897, the Young Finn newspaper *Päivälehti* (30 Oct., 1897, 2) described how difficult it was to get one's hands on the Diet minutes and documents. According to the article, their accessibility depended on chance. Only Diet documents were available at the library of the House of the Estates and the minutes had to be requested from the individual estate secretaries. The author (pseudonym "Kokenut") had also encountered severe difficulties in subscribing to the minute books. The minutes could not be acquired during the Diet, but were delivered late afterwards. (ibid.)

³⁶⁰ For example in 1898 *Björneborgs Tidning* remarked that the Diet proceedings were not popular outside the Diet circles: apart from members of the Diet, editorial staff of the bigger newspapers and few people who participated actively in political life, few people examined the Diet print (*Björneborgs Tidning*, 1 June, 1898, 2).

munities alike and as a means for civic education. The estates marked down the price of the minutes and made other proposals for promoting their circulation.

Articles on the official parliamentary materials were published by major as well as provincial newspapers. The Young Finns and the Constitutionals took the most active role on the matter. While Snellman had seen that the people was not to be trusted with power, but must first be educated, the Young Finns stressed the need for immediate democratic reforms and spoke for more active political participation by the people. This gave new momentum to the demands on education. One reason for the new importance of official minutes was the increased Russian pressure on the grand duchy. In 1891 after newspaper reports on the estates' discussions were subjected to prepublication censorship, official printing was seen as the only free means for their publication. Especially after the Great Strike of 1905 the elite's project of educating the people sought to calm down the situation and the adversial positions and disputes within the polity. Young Finn Constitutionalist K. J. Ståhlberg (1905) saw the primary mission of the nation as to strengthen and deepen the "internal harmony of the people". This was to be reached by "cultivating the spiritual, material and national ground" by "developing the inner strength of the nation". (ibid.) The danger of democratisation without education in the Finnish backwaters was stressed again in relation to the representation reform of 1906. The education of the people was to be grounded in an interaction between the highly educated and the masses. (Moilanen 2001, 31–34, 39–40; 2003, 525–527)

The education campaign, with its aim of building harmony and a national front, did not adopt the debate aspect of parliamentary publicity emphasised earlier by the *Dagblad* liberals. Instead, the campaign presented a rather moderate model of education, which continued to stress integrative aspects of publicity and avoided the idea of clashing opinions and conflicting interests. For example, the Constitutionalist newspaper *Turun Sanomat* (12 May, 1905, 1) saw the Diet statements and resolutions (*lausunnot ja ponnet*) as cornerstones of "the Finnish national and political entity" (*kansallinen ja valtiollinen olemus*) and of "the education of the people" (*kansanvalistustyö*). The newspaper emphasised the role of parliamentary print in establishing "a stable constitutional foundation" (*perustuslaillinen pohja*) to elevate political and parliamentary life "towards light and freedom". The newspaper argued that the "educational work" (*wallistustyö*) based on parliamentary publications was essential for establishing "a consciousness of legality" (*laillisuustajunta*) among the people. This would enhance the common struggle to secure the rule of law (*lailliset olot*) in Finland. (ibid.) Democratisation and the people's active participation in the national project required education. For *Turun Sanomat*, it was not enough for parliamentary print to be examined in the archives only by "bookworms" (*lukutoukka*) for the purposes of scholarly research after a Diet session (ibid.). Instead, "the search for the truths that had created the life-force of the nation" was to be undertaken by the whole people. Otherwise, the manifestation of the truths would be left to chance. By studying the parliamentary publications the people would "invigorate and strengthen its own existence". Every adult should use every opportuni-

ty to “gain knowledge about public matters” (*saavuttaakseen yleisten harrastusten asiantuntemista*) and reach the level of autonomy (*itsenäisyyttä*) needed “to fulfil their duties towards society (*yhteiskunta*) and the state (*waltio*)”. To facilitate this, society and the state had the duty to ensure that its members had the possibility to learn and develop. (ibid.)³⁶¹ From this perspective, parliamentary publicity’s task was to help individuals discover the common goals of the nation.

In addition to marketing parliamentary print as a means for political activation, minutes and documents were emphasised as valuable reference books, sources for historical data and a means to gain an all-round education. The Swedish Party newspaper *Hufvudstadsbladet* (18 Nov., 1896, 3; 19 Nov., 1896, 1) encouraged its readers to subscribe to or purchase parliamentary publications as they “had meaning for all times”. The print served as reference books (*uppslagsverk*), in which one could find statements and inquiries about all essential political, administrative, economic and social questions that had been central to the people’s development and had been subjected under examination of the representation of the people. For the newspaper, the need for parliamentary print was especially strong in the countryside. (ibid.) The Finnish Party newspaper *Raja-Karjala* (3 Dec., 1907, 3) argued that in addition to the social questions (*yhteiskunnalliset asiat*), parliamentary print included scholarly knowledge (*opillisia tietoja*) as speeches were filled with examples and models of foreign conditions and contained statistical and other forms of data.

“Sales talk” coloured newspaper articles on parliamentary print. *Björneborgs Tidning* (1 June, 1898, 2) noted that parliamentary print included interesting material, genuine knowledge (*gediget vetande*) and factual and practical expertise (*sak- och fackkunskap*). According to the paper, many people misleadingly thought that parliamentary print consisted of dry paragraphs and difficult juridical presentations. On the contrary, the minutes included interesting investigations and reflections on topics that “lay close to every thinking man and woman”. Unfortunately, many people put their money into light fiction, but never bought parliamentary publications. (ibid.) *Turun Sanomat* (12 May, 1905, 1) wrote that no reading more educative (*kehittävämpää*) for the people existed than the parliamentary proceedings. For *Päivälehti* (4 Mar., 1891, 1), parliamentary minute books and documents should be as widely available as the national epic *Kalevala* and its sister collection *Kanteletar*.

Parliamentary print was marketed by its affordable price. For example *Björneborgs Tidning*³⁶² (1 June, 1898, 2) noted that it was the cheapest literature available in Finland after the Bible: six volumes cost eight Finnish marks. The Young Finn newspaper *Hämetär* (21 Sept., 1907, 2) noted that by purchasing parliamentary minutes and documents, it was possible to acquire five to six thousand pages of valuable reading for only twelve marks.

³⁶¹ For responses, see *Åbo Underrättelser*, 13 May, 1905, 1; for the following of parliamentary work as a civic duty and right, see the Young Finn newspaper *Päivälehti*, 4 Mar., 1891, 1.

³⁶² *Björneborgs Tidning* was a Swedish-language constitutionalist newspaper published in Pori (Leino-Kaukiainen 1988, 513). The writer of the article was pseudonym “Justus”.

In addition to emphasising subscriptions and purchases of parliamentary print in bookstores,³⁶³ the libraries' role was also seen as central. The developing Finnish library system³⁶⁴ was utilised to spread parliamentary minutes in the name of national education. The library network was not only used to distribute parliamentary minutes and documents, but also to legitimise their printing. Libraries were organised by the elite and intended to serve the lower classes and their education. It was argued that the library network could also enable the poor to study the minutes,³⁶⁵ and so parliamentary print could be circulated to every town³⁶⁶ and rural area³⁶⁷ in Finland. Also the Library of the Finnish Parliament was utilised, and MPs made proposals for granting the minutes for free to local libraries.³⁶⁸ In addition to libraries, village communities, associations and societies were to acquire parliamentary print.³⁶⁹

In retrospect, the Finnish campaigning for authentic parliamentary minutes seems peculiar, especially when the press was offering, almost throughout the period, rather extensive reporting on parliamentary discussions. In addition to the high demands for objective accounts, the campaigning is to be understood in the context of a wider project of enlightenment and political education. Parliamentary publicity was given an important role in the self-realisation of the Finnish people. In this sense, the parliament and its publicity offered a means to give a vivid impression of the existence of a Finnish polity. The publicity of the assembly produced the people as it mediated and present-

³⁶³ See e.g. *Päivälehti's* campaign for selling parliamentary print in local book stores, 27 May, 1899, 2; 28 May, 1899, 3–4. For provincial newspapers' instructions on how to subscribe or purchase the print, see e.g. *Savo*, 26 Feb., 1910, 2. See also Pekka Aulin's (Ahmavaara) proposal for easily subscribing to the Diet minutes in 1899, *Päivälehti*, 27 May, 1899, 2; 28 May, 1899, 3–4.

³⁶⁴ Finnish libraries were transformed to serve the public as a whole in the beginning of the twentieth century. A sign of its national mission was its financing by most notably the *Kansanvalistusseura* (called today in English as The Finnish Lifelong Learning Foundation) and the state at the turn of the century. Other important means for funding were associations, parishes, municipalities, collective fund-raising and individual benefactors. In 1910–15, the Eduskunta appropriated significant grants to public libraries, but these were not approved by the Russian authorities. (Karjalainen 1977, 6–7, 15–16, 78–80, 115–127, 134–139, 143)

³⁶⁵ *Päivälehti*, 4 Mar., 1891, 1.

³⁶⁶ *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 18 Nov., 1896, 3; 19 Nov., 1896, 1.

³⁶⁷ See also *Björneborgs Tidning*, 1 June, 1898, 2; *Päivälehti*, 4 Mar., 1891, 1; *Turun Sanomat*, 12 May, 1905, 1; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 25 July, 1907, 2; *Jakobstad*, 29 Feb., 1908, 3.

³⁶⁸ In the early Eduskunta several proposals for developing the library system and benefiting the spread of parliamentary print were made. See e.g. Representative of the Finnish Christian League and a central figure in the Finnish temperance movement Matti Helenius-Seppälä's (Sainio 2001a) proposal on transforming the Eduskunta Library into a national public library open to all and on establishing a general office for parliamentary information (in *Anomusehdotus 174/1908*). For execution of the proposal, see Standing orders of the Library of the Eduskunta 1913 and Laaksovirta 2007. In 1909 Young Finn Representative Zachris Castrén made a petition according to which the Eduskunta would commit itself to the development of the public library with financial aid and by distributing for no charge the printed and bound versions of parliamentary documents and minutes to city libraries. (*Hufvudstadsbladet*, 19 June, 1909, 4; also 30 June, 1909, 4; *Nya Pressen*, 30 June, 1909, 3)

³⁶⁹ E.g. *Raja-Karjala*, 3 Dec., 1907, 3.

ed the matters discussed in parliament as being of general and shared interest. In other words, publicity strengthened the idea of representation of the people.

Although the campaign rhetoric differed from the earlier discussions on Diet publicity by highlighting the individual citizen's rights and duties in educating herself, newspaper articles on the importance of parliamentary print held on to the idea of integrative publicity, whose concept of education was rather paternalistic and slanted. It lacked the idea of educating the public on the practices of debate. Although trying in part to distance themselves from the old Fennoman background, a great number of Young Finns newspapers encouraged the people to adopt a Snellmanian morality, which signified obedience to the law in the sphere of the civil society (see Pulkkinen 1989, 15) and aimed to educate the people for political life by raising them above the individual standpoint to act for the benefit of the nation (for Snellman's ideas on this, see Pulkkinen 1987, 64–66; 1989, 17–20). In view of informing the public discussion with parliamentary matters, the purpose was, in Snellmanian terms, calmly and through gradual changes to develop the national culture by adapting one's consciousness to the tradition. In this sense, parliamentary print was part of the "national literature" that enabled the nation to learn its thoughts, existence and history, in other words, to know itself. (See Jalava 2006, 60–61, 114–116 on Snellman's *Bildung*; 119 on his "national literature")

8.6.4 Constraining members to perform their duty

Bentham's first reason for parliamentary publicity was *to constrain the members of the assembly to perform their duty*, which he used to refer to publicity or the public as "an external tribunal" that judged the work of the parliament (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 1).

The greater the number of temptations to which the exercise of *political* power is exposed, the more necessary is it to give to those who possess it, the most powerful reasons for resisting them. But there is no reason more constant and more universal than the superintendence of the public. The public compose a tribunal, which is more powerful than all the other tribunals together. (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 1)

Bentham did not refer to any system of imperative mandates, but his idea of public control was aimed especially against passive members of the parliament, and he created a system of fines for members who did not actively participate. (See Greaves 1931, 311–313) In this sense, for Bentham, a parliamentarian was not to settle for his status "as a mere member".

This aspect was present in the *Dagblad* liberals' notion of the moral responsibility of the representative. The idea was expressed by Leo Mechelin in the *Burghers* in 1872:

In the same way as the estates' readings are public in the sense that the audience can attend them, the readings should also be made public through print. It is not in order that the citizens gain knowledge about their trustees' deliberations and decisions only through scanty reports or rumours. The *moral responsibility* before the country,

which is inseparable of the vocation of the representative, presupposes full publicity.³⁷⁰ (Burghers 1872, I, 42)

Hence, publicity did not serve parliament's representative aspect in a strict sense by implementing or enabling a system of quasi-imperative mandates on specific questions on the agenda; instead, publicity bound representatives of the people morally through the idea of constant superintendence. In the Burghers in the Diet of 1877–78 Edvard Bergh argued:

I believe that the feeling of responsibility (*den känsla av ansvarighet*) that each member of the Diet must foster within himself as a representative of the Finnish people (*bör hysa såsom en representant för det finska folket*), does not reach completion (*fullständig*) unless his words and conduct are defined, and preserved for the posterity, through print. (Burghers 1877–1878, I, 177)

Thus, in addition to highlighting the superintendence that publicity enabled, Bergh noted that a representative's words became final only after going through the procedures of minute-taking and their full publication in print.

In the Diet of 1877–78, moderate Fennoman K. E. Stenbäck argued that “full publicity” of the estates' proceedings should be guaranteed through publication of minutes. In order for the representation of the people to fulfil its purpose, it was necessary that members speak at every occasion not only to their respective estate and the audience present, but “to the people as a whole” (*till folket i dess helhet*). (Clergy 1877–78, I, 435–436) Stenbäck had assimilated the idea of “a tribunal of the public” to such an extent that he employed court vocabulary. Stenbäck's statement can be viewed also as an example of an interrelation between juridical and parliamentary vocabulary that was present in Finland especially during the Diet. Also Snellman had used court metaphors when discussing the role of a legislative assembly (see Section 3.4.3 and Snellman 1842, 372–373). Stenbäck reiterated his argument on the general public's “rightful claim (*rättmätiga anspråk*) to acquire knowledge that was as trustworthy and complete as possible about the opinions spoken by the country's representatives (*landets representanter*)”, and noted that the representative's every statement was “a confession of his convictions in front of the whole nation” (*bekännelse inför hela landet af deras öfvertygelse*), “a testimony” (*ett vittnesbörd*) and “a report” (*en redogörelse*) of how he had “fulfilled his duty” (*uppfylla sina pligter*). According to Stenbäck, the representative's consciousness that the whole country was listening (*att landet i dess helhet lyssnar till hans ord*) undoubtedly “spurred his assiduity for the common good” (*sporra hans nit för det allmänna bästa*) and “sharpened his sense of justice” (*skärpa hans rättskänsla*). (Clergy 1877–78, I, 435–436)

J. S. Mill gave publicity an important role as a means for checking and oversight, which affected the conduct of the representative. Mill argued in *Con-*

³⁷⁰ “Likasom Ständens förhandlingar äro offentliga i den mening att åhörare få dem bivista, likaså borde de blifva offentliga genom trycket. Det är ej i sin ordning om medborgarene endast genom knappa referater, eller ryktesvis, få kännedom om deras förtroendemäns öfverläggningar och beslut. Den moraliska ansvarighet inför landet, som är oskiljaktig från representantkallet, förutsätter fullständig offentlighet.” (Burghers 1872, I, 42)

siderations on Representative Government that unrestricted publicity gave the representative the assurance that his every act was “immediately known, discussed and judged by his constituents”, and that he was “always either gaining or losing ground in the estimation” (Mill 2001 [1861], 215). Similarly, the task of a representative assembly was “to watch and control the government: to throw the light of publicity on its acts: to compel a full exposition and justification of all of them which any one considers questionable” (ibid. 103). In addition, efficient publicity encouraged the localities to practice checking and oversight of the state’s central authority (ibid. 280–281).

In Finland, while publicity of the Senate minutes was limited and the parliament had limited possibilities to check on its work (see Section 6.6.3), discussion on oversight focused on the parliament’s proceedings. Especially the Dagbladists presented parliamentary print as a means to facilitate and practise oversight. In October 1874 Robert Castrén³⁷¹ wrote in *Helsingfors Dagblad* (9 Oct., 1874, 1) on the *Dagblad* liberals’ ideas of publicity as an incentive towards moral responsibility and as a means to build a chain of responsibility between the different actors and levels of representation. Castrén argued that printing parliamentary minutes as well as documents was the only “means of producing a comprehensive relationship between (*medel att åstadkomma en allsidig rapport mellan*)³⁷² the Diet and the people, the representatives and the electors and the different estates”. Castrén argued that a people (*ett folk*) had the “valid claim to keep track of how public matters were treated by the representative assembly” (*eger giltiga anspråk på att erhålla kännedom om huru de allmänna ärendena af representationen vårdas*). Similarly, the electors had the right to know “how their representatives fulfilled their mandates” (*huru deras representanter fullgjort sina mandat*). (ibid.)

From the 1880s on, the Young Finns adopted the rhetoric of responsibility and oversight in the discussions on the Diet publications. In 1885 in the Peasants final debates on printing, Young Finn Jonas Castrén emphasised that printed minutes were a means for “public oversight” (*julkinen valvonta*). He noted that it was already clear that a member of the Diet (*valtiopäivämies*) had duties towards his electors, as well as towards the general public. The first of these duties was to give electors the possibility to acquire knowledge about their representatives’ (*edusmiehet*) stands on the matters dealt with in the representative assembly (*eduskunta*).³⁷³ (Peasants 1885, I, 291) Such arguments emphasising the general public’s right to receive trustworthy knowledge about their representatives’ work were instrumental in the final decision in 1885 to print the minutes of all four estates.

³⁷¹ Pseudonym “R. C.”.

³⁷² Here the Swedish term “*rapport*” means, instead of the popular contemporary meaning of a report or bulletin, a relation, connection or cooperative relationship (see “*rapport*” in *Svenska Akademiens ordbok*).

³⁷³ I identify ‘*eduskunta*’ here with ‘representative assembly’ since during the Diets, before the unicameral Eduskunta, the term was used to refer to the Finnish as well as foreign parliaments. The term stressed the parliament’s representative character as its origin was in representation and being in front of something (see Pohjantammi 2003, 366–369, 371–374).

In the early Eduskunta, the establishment of political parties gave emphasis to the demands for more efficient publication of minutes. During the pause in the Eduskunta's work in 1907, *Nya Pressen* (7 Aug., 1907, 2) wrote on the slow publication of proceedings. The paper argued that the situation should have changed as universal suffrage had been introduced and the masses (*de breda lagren af befolkningen*) were showing wider interest in parliamentary discussions. In the new system electors had to "take longer and more active control over their representatives' actions in the parliament than earlier" (*att hålla en långt verksammare kontroll öfver representanternas görande och låtande*). (ibid.)

It is notable that "full publicity" and its principle of quick publication and broad circulation of Diet discussions strengthened the idea of representation of the people and the trustee model, or at least strengthened the public expression of these ideas. Publicity compelled representatives to justify their choices in front of a large audience, and as a result, they could not comfortably openly declare that they were pursuing particularist interests (Urbinati 2002, 117). Thus, publicity was not only a requirement dictated by the idea of representation of the people, as the Finnish discussants argued, but also increased expressions of "the common good".

8.6.5 Guidance of the public and profiting from its information

Bentham argued that one of the main reasons for publicity of a parliament was *to enable the governors to know the wishes of the governed*. For Bentham, "under the guidance of publicity, nothing is more easy" (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 1). One of Bentham's additional reasons for publicity was *to provide the assembly with the means of profiting by the information of the public*. The elected deputies did not possess all the intelligence of the nation, especially as wealth and distinguished rank were "the most likely circumstances to conciliate the greatest number of votes". Thus, Bentham saw publicity as a means to include the most enlightened, capable and wisest private individuals of the nation in the deliberations of the parliament. Publicity was "a means of collecting all the information in a nation, and consequently for giving birth to useful suggestions." Contrary to Habermas's interpretation (1989 [1962], 100-101, 133), Bentham's model did not follow, a Guizot-styled conception of publicity as a "compulsion to reason". For Bentham, publicity, in addition to public petitions, helped parliamentarians to know the opinions present among the public and to transform them into the agenda of parliament. (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 1)

Bentham's ideas share similarities with Mill's stands. Mill saw that the task of the parliament was to publicly debate on various issues after transforming them into a treatable form. This helped parliament to moderate public discussion. In this way, "the utmost possible publicity and liberty of discussion" could serve to make the whole public to some extent "participants in the government, and sharers in the instruction and mental exercise derivable from it" (Mill 2001 [1861], 109-110). Mill argued that the central authority of the state must keep open a perpetual communication with the localities. The relationship must be based on mutual informing and advising, which also informed the de-

bates of the parliament, whose members, being the most educated and capable of the nation, could keep down any undue influence of public opinion. (ibid. 280–281) For Bentham, it was the task of publicity to engage the most capable in the debates of the parliament.

Due to the “elitist” notion of representation and the idea of a low level of development and education of the general population, the Finnish arguments for publicity rested more on informing and educating the public, obtaining its consent and legitimising the Diet work than on enabling the people to participate in the actual deliberations. For example, Snellman condemned the “outsider influence” on the uneducated Peasants, as it only distracted the Fennoman estate from following its and the nation’s best interest (e.g. Snellman 1862d, 338; 1863b, 275). The Diet publicity’s significance for participation was emphasised in Diet preparations. Efficient and early printing of the documents on the matters to be dealt with in upcoming Diets was seen as important for ensuring thorough, careful and well-functioning readings. Elections were prepared for by organising election meetings, especially in towns, a phenomenon the press commented on (Pohjantammi 2003, 378). Newspapers promoted their candidates, and in the language strife they began increasingly to attack opponents and launch campaigns for political purposes. Publicity of the parliament enabled a connection between the local and the national: people discussed topics of mutual concern (ibid.) and arguments could be mediated from one discussion to another.

In view of the information provided by the public, the *Dagblad*’s and Fennoman *Morgonbladet*’s views were close to each other, since both newspapers approved of the idea of extending the agenda of the Diet among the educated population. Mechelin saw the parliament as the primary arena for party dispute and formation, whose questions were transmitted to the public and the press (see Mechelin 1878; Section 5.4). In the early 1870s *Morgonbladet* argued that printing and publication of Diet documents would prompt greater participation and give the *educated* portion of the population the possibility to inform their representatives. Efficient publication of the Diet documents would contribute to the “building of a conviction” (*bilda en öfvertygelse*) in legislative issues (*lagstiftningsärendet*) (*Morgonbladet*, 9 Apr., 1872, 1). If the documents were published during the Diets, the up-to-date information could help “the educated public” (*den bildade allmänheten*) to “become familiar with the matters discussed” (*göra sig förtrogen med de diskuterade frågorna*) and to “contribute to the resolution of the questions” (*bidraga till frågornas lösning*) by giving “local information” (*lokala upplysningar*) about the questions. (*Morgonbladet*, 18 Nov., 1873, 1) Towards the end of the 1870s some Fennomans began to adopt the idea of benefitting from local information in relation to printed minutes.³⁷⁴

³⁷⁴ For example Johan Erik Keto of the Peasants noted that if the minutes were printed, the principals (*kommittenter*) would know how their representatives (*ombudsmän*) presented matters before the estate (*inför ståndet framställt sakerna*) and have a corrective (*ett korrektiv*) to them. (Peasants 1877–78, I, 471)

Morgonbladet's presentation resembled Snellman's ideas on benefitting from the thinking of the educated part of the people (see Section 3.4.3). In the model advocated by *Morgonbladet*, printed Diet documents informed the educated public about the questions on the agenda, which enabled them to approach their local or corporatist representatives and advise them. The uneducated were excluded. In the Diets, the uneducated members in the Peasants were considered best guided by the leading Fennomans rather than by their electors or, in the worst case, by the Fennomans' opponents (see Snellman 1862d, 338; 1863b, 275).

8.6.6 Enabling the electors to act from knowledge

In addition to the idea of constant superintendence that bound the representatives morally, the Finnish discussions on publicity highlighted the members' responsibility to the representative form of government as well as to the represented, who could reward or punish representatives for their actions in elections. This was argued to be central for legitimising the work and the existence of the representative assembly. Bentham referred to publicity's legitimising aspect in his reason of *securing the confidence of the people, and their assent to the measures of the legislature*. Whereas secrecy, mystery and darkness raised suspicion, "open and free policy" and "the light of day" secured confidence and took away weapons of discontent (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 1). In this respect the parliament differed from the government and the cabinet, where discussions were held secret.

The *Dagblad* liberals used the light metaphor actively in their general arguments for publicity.³⁷⁵ In the Diet of 1863–64, liberal Dean Henrik Heikel argued that the members were in the estate as "delegates of the country" (*landets ombud*), as "public persons" (*offentliga personer*), "not only before the audience of the plenary hall, but before their principals" (*kommittanter*), "before the Finnish fatherland as a whole" (*inför hela det finska fosterlandet*), who had "the right to receive knowledge about the members' words and discussions (*berättigadt att erhålla kunskap om alla våra ord och våra handlingar*)". Heikel argued poetically that "as life in general is dependent on light, so the Diet's lawful life (*landtdagens rätta lif*) requires its placement in open light". (Clergy 1863–64, I, 25)

In the Diets, publicity was argued to be an essential condition for the whole representative form of government. In 1882, the Burghers Private Committee of appeals argued that "publicity is one of the vital necessities of the representative form of government" (*Offentlighet är ett af det representativa statskicketets livsvilkor*). (Burghers 1882, II, 689) Drawing on this, O. M. Nordström of the Clergy supported the printing of minutes by arguing that "it is part of the lifeblood of representative government (*det representativa statskicketets livsvilkor*) that

³⁷⁵ For example in November 1863 J. A. von Essen held a speech in the Nobility in which he condemned censorship as contrary to the constitution. For von Essen, "censorship does not investigate or judge, it only removes and strangles", and "the free press is the same as the sun is to nature – it holds an enlightening, warming and life-giving power". (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 23 Nov., 1863, 1)

the general public (*allmänheten*) gains knowledge (*får kännedom*) about how their delegates (*ombud*) take care of the issue (*sköta den sak*) that it has entrusted to them". (Clergy 1882, III, 1661) In *Hufvudstadsbladet* (16 Dec., 1882, 2), pseudonym "Petrus" argued – highlighting the legitimising aspect – that printing and publication of the estates' debates was the only means for the representation as a whole to remain morally responsible. For "Petrus", it was only through the printing and publication of the full authentic minutes, including arguments for and against (*motiven för och emot*), that the representative body could "stand morally responsible in front of the general public" (*moraliskt kunna stå till swars inför allmänheten*) (*ibid.*).

Bentham argued that a reason for publicity in "an assembly elected by the people, and renewed from time to time" was *to enable the electors to act from knowledge*:

To conceal from the public the conduct of its representatives, is to add inconsistency to prevarication: it is to tell the constituents, "You are to elect or reject such or such of your deputies without knowing why – you are forbidden the use of reason – you are to be guided in the exercise of your greatest powers only by hazard or caprice. (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 1)

Diet publicity was defended on the grounds that printed minutes gave the electors the possibility to check on how their representatives had fulfilled their task, and then the electors could vote accordingly. For the *Dagblad* liberals, this was not possible through newspaper reports, which were limited and focused on only the most notable speeches. For example, the Burghers' Private Committee of Appeals stated in 1882 that "the individual delegate of the people (*det enskilda folkombudet*) can claim that his opinions, correctly published, can be used as evidence (*bära vittne om*) on the manner in which he has been worthy of the electors' confidence (*motsvarat deras förtroende*) (Burghers 1882, II, 689). In the later Diets the minutes' importance for enlightened voting decisions was emphasised especially by the Young Finns, who emphasised the obsolescence of estate representation and discussed possible reforms of suffrage. For example, in 1891 the Young Finn newspaper *Päivälehti* (4 Mar., 1891, 1) argued that the verbatim records were the only means for the people to properly examine their representatives' work and make wise voting decisions. The newspaper noted that as the use of suffrage was "one of the most precious civic rights and duties" (*kalleimpia kansalaisoikeuksia ja velvollisuuksia*), it was also a right and duty of the represented to find out (*ottaa selvää*) how the representatives fulfilled their tasks (*edusmiehet tehtävänsä suorittawat*). (*ibid.*; for a similar connection between suffrage and publicity, see e.g. *Jakobstad*, 29 Feb., 1908, 3)

In order to limit electors' influence on the representatives, *Dagblad* liberals focused on elections. Minutes offered the best means to fulfil the central criteria for the election of a representative. For Mill, the criterion was how the candidates had performed in public service and posts of magnitude. He argued that the electors should study how candidates, in public speech and print, had discussed and presented their serious study in public affairs. The electors were also entitled to know how the representative intended to act and what opinions

concerning public duty he intended should guide his conduct. (Mill 2001 [1861], 228–229)

Finnish liberals adopted similar argumentation and emphasised elections as an occasion for politics and for communication between the representatives and the represented. Their stand is illustrated in an article, by liberal Ernst Rönnbäck in *Åbo Tidning* (10 Jan., 1885, 1–2), which followed Mill's argument in *Considerations on Representative Government* (Mill 2001 [1861], 228–229). According to the newspaper, the idea of a representative of the people (*folkrepresentant*) required that, before elections, the electors discussed what kinds of questions they wanted to be presented in the estate meetings and what kinds of conduct they wished from their representatives. In addition, the candidates were to be given the possibility to publicly state their opinions on the question that their electors saw of interest. Thus, the electors were given a possibility to make enlightened decisions. The representatives were not in any sense bound by the instructions or opinions of their electors, but strove to represent the people and its interest. (*ibid.*)

In reviews of the Diet representatives' work, newspapers used estates' authentic minutes to examine how representatives had carried out their duties. Also the representatives themselves referred to the minutes in order to clarify their words and conduct. The Finance Committee of 1877–78 argued that whereas the public (*yleisö*) had the right to ask for full and reliable information about the opinions expressed by the representatives of the country (*maan edusmiehet*), similarly a member of the Diet (*valtiopäivämies*) could demand the "right to account for his actions" (*tehdä tiliä*) to the people he represented through the publication of his speeches. (*Valtiovaliokunnan mietintö N:o 4, 1877*). Before the estate minutes were printed, representatives asked for copies of the estates' discussions in order to report to their electors about their actions and legitimise their work in the Diet (see e.g. Holm in Burghers 1867, II, 873). Printed verbatim records were also considered a means to fight the spread of rumour, unfounded beliefs and accusations concerning a representative's work (see e.g. Mechelin in Burghers 1872, I, 25, 41–43; *Österbotten*, 20 Jan., 1866, 3–6; *Wiipurin Uutiset*, 1 Oct., 1887, 2; *Uusi Suometar*, 25 Nov., 1887, 3; *Savonlinna*, 3 July, 1890, 2; *Savo*, 28 Aug., 1890, 3; *Wasa-Posten*, 11 Feb., 1907, 4).³⁷⁶ Printing and publication of official verbatim records did not eliminate disputes about the wordings and arguments presented in parliament altogether, but they did make

³⁷⁶ *Österbotten* (20 Jan., 1866, 3–6), a newspaper aimed at the Swedish-speaking peasantry, wrote that the general public's expectations for tax relief had been too high, and now that the taxes had been raised, people in the province of Ostrobothnia were accusing representatives of not defending the best interests of the estate. The paper noted that everyone who followed the estate's discussions knew these accusations were false. It urged the accusers to study the estate's minutes. The newspaper also published excerpts from the official minutes in order to prove the critique wrong. (*ibid.*) Similarly, in *Wiipurin Uutiset* (1 Oct., 1887, 2), pseudonym "Talonpoika" ("peasant") responded to a critique presented against Colliander of the Peasant estate by citing minutes from the Diet of 1885 with page number references.

ex post facto reviews possible.³⁷⁷ This raised the threshold against making accusations lightly in public discussions about a political opponent's actions.

Minutes became tools for election campaigning. For example in an election campaign dispute in 1887, Edvard Duncker defended himself against his critics by advising them to take a look at the Peasants' printed minutes (*Uusi Suometar*, 25 Nov., 1887, 3). In 1890 the newspaper *Savonlinna* supported the candidate Hugo Landgren by citing his merits from the minutes of the Peasants (*Savonlinna*, 3 July, 1890, 2). The newspaper *Savo* (28 Aug., 1890, 3) defended Taavetti Savolainen's work in the Peasants against accusations of laziness by noting that Savolainen had, according to the official minutes, spoken sixty-seven times during the previous Diet. (For similar references to minutes during the campaigns of the early Eduskunta, see e.g. *Wasa-Posten*, 11 Feb., 1907, 4)

The printed authentic verbatim records enabled also a new form of reviewing the representatives' work. In the early 1890s newspapers started to publish statistics about the most active and passive orators. For example *Fredrikshamn's Tidning* (23 Sept., 1891, 1) published statistics on the hours spent in the Burghers' plenaries and marked how many times each member had spoken. The newspaper handed the "palm of victory" (*segerpalmen*) to the most active orator, ex-academic and researcher on law Julian Serlachius,³⁷⁸ who had held 133 speeches (*ibid.*). Similar statistics were published in newspapers regardless of party affiliation.³⁷⁹

The printed minutes and their analysis were seen to influence the representatives' behaviour. Young Finn newspaper *Wuoksi* (3 Feb., 1897, 2) noted that the representatives were well aware that the longer and the more stories (*tarina*) they could dictate in the minutes, the more satisfied their electors back home would be. The newspaper wrote, in the mouth of a fictional elector: "Is this how little our representative has spoken? With such a salary, more would be expected!" (*ibid.*) Regardless of the sarcastic tone, the example indicates the idea that speaking and discussion were seen as the main instruments and duties of a representative, although the limits for their reasonable use were disputed. Similarly, the newspaper *Savo* (28 Aug., 1890, 3) noted that the most popular accusation made against the members of the Diet was that they had not spoken enough.

³⁷⁷ For example, the Finnish Party newspaper *Raja-Karjala* (20 June., 1908, 2-3) criticised the Young Finn newspaper *Laatokka* of misleadingly editing and fabricating the Eduskunta's minutes. With citations from the official minutes, *Raja-Karjala* noted how *Laatokka* had given false implications by choosing short sections from long statements and placing them out of context.

³⁷⁸ Julian Serlachius (1854-1925) was a prominent researcher on law who had briefly served as a professor at the university in the 1880s, but after losing his professorship to R. A. Wrede in 1885, Serlachius left academia. He continued his research and served as a judge, senator and justice of the Supreme Court. Serlachius was known for his extraordinary wit, but also for his impatience in listening to others. (Kautto 2000)

³⁷⁹ See e.g. *Helsingfors Aftonblad*, 29 Oct., 1894, 1; *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 31 Oct., 1894, 2; 16 Oct., 1900, 3; *Nya Pressen*, 30 Dec., 1897, 2; 18 Sept., 1897, 2; *Uusi Aura*, 23 Oct., 1897, 3; *Uusi Suometar*, 13 Nov., 1900, 3; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 29 Oct., 1894, 2-3.

A change took place in newspapers' use of statistics in the early Eduskunta. In the Diet, statistics had been used to point out the most active members and parties, especially on the language strife, by comparing their use of Finnish and Swedish (see e.g. *Fredrikshamns Tidning*, 23 Sept., 1891, 1). In the Eduskunta, new party divisions entered the statistical analyses,³⁸⁰ which were now facilitated and enhanced by the introduction of subject and person index pages in the minutes (see *Åbo Underrättelser*, 27 Feb., 1910, 6). However, especially in the unicameral Eduskunta, statistical analysis began to be used against parliamentary speech and debate. The Social Democrats, and in some cases the conservative Finnish Party newspapers, used statistics to point out the "obstructionists", in other words, the biggest consumers of parliamentary time (see Section 9.5).

The Social Democrats, in their party-delegate model, also challenged the established notions of parliamentary publicity and took the idea of the electors' right to supervise their representatives' work to a new level. They highlighted procedures and proposed procedure revisions that could enable electors to better oversee how their representatives fulfilled election promises and party platforms. The Social Democrats challenged the idea of public opinion, which the Fennomans had based on the 'will of the people' and the Finnish-speaking majority, basing it instead on the opinion of the workers (*työtätekevä luokka*) and the poor (*köyhälistö*).

8.6.7 The Social Democrats' 'parliamentary publicity' coup in the early Eduskunta

The Social Democrats took publicity's goal of enabling electors to act from knowledge to a new level. They adopted the concept of 'parliamentary publicity' and used it to criticise procedures and practices of the Eduskunta. Publicity is one of the cases in which the Social Democrats rather innovatively took over a traditional parliamentary concept and used it as a tool for their parliamentary critique.³⁸¹ The Social Democrats took over the vocabulary and expressions traditionally used to advocate parliamentary publicity (such as metaphors of daylight and dark, and the secrecy of estate assemblies versus the publicity and openness of modern parliaments) and referred to a vague model of "foreign parliaments". With their demands for greater publicity, the SDP attacked procedures on closed plenary sessions and secret ballots as undemocratic.

In the beginning of 1907, Otto Ville Kuusinen wrote in the Social Democrat chief organ *Työmies* that the bourgeoisie had included features in the Eduskunta's procedures that were in a strong contradiction to democracy (*kansanvaltaisuus*). For him, the secret ballot (*salainen äänestys*), "the Parliament Act's devious twist" (*kavala mutka*), was one of these. Due to the secret ballot the people who had elected representatives to oversee its interests (*etujaan walwomaan*) never knew whether the representative had "fulfilled his obligation honestly"

³⁸⁰ See party divisions e.g. in *Kaleva*, 3 Mar., 1910, 3; *Länsi-Suomi*, 8 Oct., 1908, 3.

³⁸¹ For the free and imperative mandate, see Chapter 5; for parliamentary obstruction, see Chapter 9.

(*rehellisesti täyttänyt velvollisuutensa*) or whether he had “broken his promise and word” (*pettänyt sanansa ja lupauksensa*). According to Kuusinen, the procedure was a “shameless removal and breach of the rule of the people” (*julkeata kansan määräämisvallan syrjäyttämistä ja loukkaamista*). The secret ballot made the Eduskunta “a secret decision-making gang” (*salaisesti pääättelevä kopla*), whose members had assumed the right to “trample the obvious will of the people” (*rikkoa ja polkea kansan selvää tahtoa*). He saw the secret ballot as part of the bourgeois scheme, which gave them the possibility to “troll for votes” (*vaalikalastus*), arguing in fact that the bourgeoisie had granted universal suffrage in order to lure voters, only to betray them later in the Eduskunta’s voting. According to Kuusinen, “in foreign parliaments” the electors were well aware of their representatives’ actions and inactions. (*Työmies*, 10 Jan., 1907, 2; 11 Jan., 1907, 2–3)³⁸²

In addition to the demand for public votes (*julkinen äänestys*), the Social Democrats used these arguments in their critique of § 49 of the Parliament Act, which gave the possibility for closed sessions.³⁸³ In 1908, in an article titled “Publicity and the Speaker’s speech” (*Julkisuus ja puhemiehen puhe*), *Työmies* (13 Feb., 1908, 1) criticised the practice of discussing the speaker of parliament’s speeches to the emperor behind closed doors (*salaiset istunnot*). For *Työmies*, all tasks of the people’s Eduskunta should take place “under public oversight” (*tulisi olla kansan julkisen walwonnän alaisia*), in other words, matters were to be discussed and votes cast in public. The paper argued that the speaker’s speech should reflect and represent the wishes of the Eduskunta majority and its opinions about the Finnish government’s actions. The speech should be a summary of the opinions presented and supported by the vast majority. Such a speech could be best formulated through broad discussion (*laajan keskustelun perusteella*) and the general public should be able to oversee its preparation and check its final form (*walmistelua samoin kuin [...] sisältöäkin pitäisi saada suuren yleisön tarkastaa*). As a result of such publicity, the electors (*walitsijat*) would receive information about how their electees (*heidän walitsemansa*) had taken into consideration their electors’ wishes and opinions in their conduct (*waikuttaa menettelyynsä*). Through public reading the elected would be obliged to publicly defend their actions (*pakko julkisesti perustella menettelynsä*) and the public would gain knowledge about the reasons for their actions. (*Työmies*, 13 Feb., 1908, 1)

Similarly, in the article “Fear of Publicity” (*Julkisuuden pelkoa*), the SDP newspaper *Työläinen*³⁸⁴ (12 Aug., 1908, 1) disapproved of closed sittings. For *Työläinen*, in the speaker’s speech the Eduskunta presented the people’s opin-

³⁸² For the bourgeois parties’ responses to the critique, see Section 5.8.

³⁸³ In the Diets the possibility for secret sessions, included in § 45 of the Diet Act of 1869, was used with moderation. Similarly to the Eduskunta, the estates decided on a secret meeting usually when the speakers presented to their estate the speech they had prepared for the opening and closure of the Diet. A closed sitting was held also in cases when addresses to the emperor were formulated. When an estate decided to debate a certain topic behind closed doors, the other estates followed the decision. However, minutes were taken also from secret sittings and later printed and published in the official records. (Lilius 1974, 249)

³⁸⁴ Pseudonym “-er.” is probably the newspaper’s editor Kullervo Manner.

ions in a general form (*kansan mielipiteitä yleismuodossa*) to the government. The Eduskunta's discussions were to take place publicly "in front of the people's eyes" (*kansan kasvojen edessä*) as was the case in foreign parliaments. The newspaper saw the question as being about the bourgeoisie's fear of publicity (*julkisuuspelko*) and daylight (*päivän valo*), which were signs of their unwillingness to change the "old practices" of the Diet, such as "archaic secrecy" (*muinaisaikaista salaperäisyyttä*) and their dread of speaking their opinions out loud (*julkisesti awoimin ovin lausua mielipiteensä*). (ibid.)

8.7 Parliamentary publicity as publicity between parliaments

It is notable that the Finnish discussions brought out an argument for parliamentary publicity that was unacknowledged in the classic foreign arguments. Parliaments have throughout their history benefitted from each other's models and discussions. In the Finnish discussions, publicity was given a broader meaning and its scope extended beyond the national. Internationally, parliaments and their networks were seen to form a platform where information on assemblies' functions, procedures and debates could be exchanged. This aspect, often unacknowledged by national history writing, was used to facilitate the Finnish learning process.

Efforts to develop inter-parliamentary publicity were initiated within the Diet. In 1872 the Swedish Riksdag Library donated the Riksdag's minutes and documents to the Finnish estates.³⁸⁵ As a result, the Finnish Nobility made a proposal for establishing a Diet library in Finland. In a debate on the planning of a new Diet building, the Diet's Law Committee also proposed that a Diet library be established as well as an exchange of parliamentary minutes and documents with Sweden's *Riksdagsbibliotek*. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 30 May, 1872, 1) The Diet Library and Archive was established on 3 June 1872 with the mission to take care of parliamentary documents and other print material and literature useful for the Diet's work. As an example of the information exchange, the Library's charter included the duty to send the Finnish Diet proceedings to the Swedish Riksdag. (Charter of the Diet Library 1872) Proposals to supplement the Diet Library were made during the Diets. For example, in 1885 *Nya Pressen* argued that in addition to conservation and protection of the Diet documents, a more extensive collection of foreign parliamentary documents should be established. For the newspaper, the Swedish and Danish, which were already made available, were not alone sufficient. (*Nya Pressen*, 28 Feb., 1885, 1)

³⁸⁵ The person behind the idea of this parliamentary exchange was the Riksdag Librarian Doctor D. M. Sandahl, who, apparently on his own initiative, decided to send Riksdag documents, statistics and juridical literature to the Finnish estates. The oldest documents dated back to the end of the eighteenth century. Again in 1880, the estates received a donation from Sweden. This contribution (*Kongl. placater, resolutioner, förordningar och påbud samt allmänne handlingar*) consisted of a vast collection of Riksdag documents, statutes etc. from 1521 to 1823. (Laaksovirta 2012)

In 1908, in his proposal for developing the Library of the Eduskunta, Finnish Christian League member Matti Helenius-Seppälä highlighted the need for a better availability of Finnish and foreign literature on legislation. For proper benefit to be derived from the increased enthusiasm in parliamentary matters, broad and detailed knowledge of foreign social questions, conditions and legislation was needed, especially in the committees. The University's collections did not offer enough foreign periodicals or parliamentary documents, and the lack was causing delays in the parliamentary work. Helenius-Seppälä noted that while delegations and scholars were continually being sent abroad to study foreign models, the same results could be achieved with a proper library at the Eduskunta. Helenius-Seppälä saw the U. S. Library of Congress as a good model for Finland. (Anomusehdotus 174/1908) Helenius-Seppälä's proposal was not discussed before the end of the session of 1908, but its main points were introduced in the standing orders of the Eduskunta's library in 1913. The Library of Parliament has served as the main source for foreign parliamentary proceedings in Finland since its establishment.

International inter-parliamentary publicity can be understood more widely than as mere exchange of formal parliamentary print. In peripheral Finland, the press played an important role in mediating foreign models and their discussions. In this respect, newspapers, periodicals and their parliamentary reporters have also been part of the process by speeding up the transfer of procedures, ideas and concepts and their spread to wider audiences. Due to the international scope of reporting, parliamentary topics were studied before the acquisition of official parliamentary print and other parliamentary literature, which took much time to be produced and circulated. Thus, the learning and examination of the practices of parliamentarism were not left in the hands of "specialists" alone. The publicity of the parliament influenced the institution's procedural development.

8.8 Adopting procedures on parliamentary minutes outside the Diet and the Eduskunta

Parliamentary minutes and their publication offer an example of the influence of the parliamentary model in Finland. The Diet's practices concerning minutes were adopted outside the Diet by different associations, church assemblies, clubs, parties and municipal meetings. The publicity of the Diet served to spread the procedural model of the parliament, or in Bentham's terms, its procedural order to "inferior assemblies and meetings" (Bentham 1843, chapter II, § 1).

As discussed, stenography was introduced in Finland on parliamentary grounds. The mission of the Finnish stenography association, however, was from the beginning to spread the art to different areas of society. This took place with the financial support of the Diet. Members of the Diet participated actively

in different associations and meetings, and in doing so they transmitted their parliamentary experiences and practices. In the 1870s, stenography was still mostly limited to the Diet. In 1876, stenographic minutes were adopted in the first Finnish Church Assembly, after which *Stenografiska föreningen* took care of its minutes (Valta 1972b, 11). Neovius's Finnish system of shorthand was also used in that assembly as well as in the a teachers' meeting in Jyväskylä in 1875 (Valta 1972a, 4)

Closer to the 1880s, as the printing of minutes gained traction in the Diet, adoption of procedures on minutes was discussed in the press. Minute-taking was supported with arguments similar to those used in the Diet. City councils and municipal meetings, understood as mini-parliaments in view of their procedures (see e.g. *Österbottniska Posten*, 16 Oct., 1884, 3), were willing to follow the Diet model. In 1879, in the Svecoman newspaper *Helsingfors* (29 Nov., 1879, 3), pseudonym "En walman" ("an elector") advocated verbatim records in city councils. Following the arguments presented in the Diet, the writer argued that the opinions expressed in the debates were used as grounds for decisions, and objections and statements that diverged from the majority were of the highest importance for judging and understanding the questions. This was particularly important when the council's decisions were cited in the future and when a decision affected other matters and their understanding. In "a representative assembly" (*representativ församling*) it was important that "every member felt responsible for their statements and opinions". This responsibility disappeared if no minutes of discussion were taken. Without such evidence the statements "died away" and members did not weigh (*wäga*) their words or formulate clear opinions (*bilda en klar åsigt*). In the lack of minutes it was impossible to make enlightened election decisions. It should be a common right for the electors to turn to the minutes to get answers about a candidate's suitability or unsuitability for office. The writer proposed that, as in the Diet, newspapers should also publish summaries of city council discussions. (*ibid.*)

Explicit connections between the procedures of parliaments and local assemblies were drawn. *Wasa Tidning* (10 Jan., 1889, 1-2) argued that "in societies with developed parliamentary practices" (*parlamentariska vanor*) it was customary (*hör det till ordningen*) that statements (*andragandena*) in public meetings (*sammankomster*) were recorded as accurately as possible. Careful stenographic minutes forced orators to be concise and brief. In addition, they made it difficult for speakers to irresponsibly change their opinions (*läattsinnig frontförändring; prata i vädret*) and forced them consider their opinions before presenting them. *Wasa Tidning* saw parliamentary modes of proceeding as suitable for meetings where no public mandates existed or where every participant represented only themselves. Parliamentary procedure was also suited for meetings in which "designated trustees performed a public duty". Detailed verbatim records, which enabled electors to follow to what extent the persons to whom they had given their votes had the "ability and willingness to fulfil the expectations placed in them", was to be instituted also in municipal meetings. Thus far, the general public had floated around in total ignorance about their representatives'

capacities. *Wasa Tidning* connected “parliamentarism” (*parlamentarismen*) explicitly to regulation of speech and discussion through the procedures and public minutes that played a central role in this. Drawing on a local example, the paper argued that the lack of verbatim records had resulted in parliamentarism (*parlamentarismen*) not having taken the desired steps forward in Vaasa: only very few members spoke in the meetings, while others were “tongue-tied” and had remained silent for several years. The tendencies to keep silent or, on the other hand, to speak carelessly and long-windedly were both a result of the lack of verbatim records. For the latter, minute-taking created dams to stop for the flood of words; for the former, minute-taking posed the question of what representatives actually did in the deliberations (*rådslag*). (ibid.; on the incompleteness and ambiguity of the minutes of municipal meetings, see also e.g. *Uusi Auro*, 17 Mar., 1906, 7)³⁸⁶

The parliament’s practices and arguments on minutes were adopted by associations and in such meetings as the convention of the church priests in Kuopio (*Finland*, 23 Sept., 1885, 2) and a meeting of industrialists in Helsinki (*Nya Pressen*, 17 Sept., 1885, 2; see also on the publication of *Ekonomiska Samfundet’s* proceedings in *Nya Pressen*, 8 July, 1898, 2) Political parties also benefitted from the parliament’s model. In 1910, the periodical of the Social Democratic Party, *Sosialistinen Aikakauslehti* 32, 1907, 260–261) proposed that the minutes of their party conferences should be taken and published “similarly to the Eduskunta’s”. The proceedings were to be published in three parts: documents, minutes and supplements (which included committee reports and decisions). The proceedings should be printed in a single format from the beginning. A committee of three persons should be elected to be responsible for checking the minutes. The periodical proposed that the verbatim records could be compiled together with the party newspapers. These practices would save time and money, make the proceedings easier to examine and secure their swift publication. (ibid.; for similar procedures and arguments in the Eduskunta, see Sections 7.6.1 and 8.3.2)

8.9 Conclusions

Discussions on developing Finnish parliamentary publicity were inspired by foreign models, experiences and arguments. From the debates of the 1860s on, publicity was understood in Finland as an essential and inseparable part of par-

³⁸⁶ Taking of verbatim records in municipal meetings was also criticised. *Nya Pressen* (22 Jan., 1896, 2) published a letter to the editor that criticised verbatim records for their negative psychological influence. The writer argued that even though the meetings were public and their minutes offered important material for people interested, summarised minutes had proven to make discussions more natural and easy. The writer was pseudonym “V. M. v B.”, who was probably member of the Nobility Viktor Magnus von Born.

liamentary life. In addition, the parliament's procedural model was seen as useful for other assemblies and meetings as well.

Foreign models and international comparison were put to the service of competing ideas about the role of parliament. During the Diets from the 1860s to the 1880s, the discussions were developed roughly in two main directions. The Fennomans highlighted publicity's informative role. For the Fennomans, the main publications of the Diet were to deal only with the concrete questions and results of the Diet work. This in mind, the Fennomans gave priority to printing of the Diet documents, while opposing printed stenographic minutes as waste of money. The speeches of the leading Fennomans were already published in Finnish-language newspapers and publication of all arguments *pro et contra*, a large amount of which were in Swedish, was seen as unnecessary. Full minutes represented the Diet as discordant and gave unlimited visibility to the opponent's arguments. This did not fit either the Fennomans' consensual deliberative model that was based on the Diet's accommodation process or their stress on the unanimous 'will of the people'.

This Fennoman stand was increasingly challenged within the movement as the Young Finns with their emphasis on democratic reform began to highlight the rights of the general public, beyond the mere right to be informed about the actions and decisions taken by the representative assembly. In the 1890s, publication and circulation of minutes became a shared and important means for the political elite to strengthen the nation and educate the people.

The Fennomans' early ideas of developing Diet publicity reflect their view of political reform as a priority. What was needed, in their opinion, was to rapidly bring about the reforms seen necessary for the nation. The Diet and its procedures were reviewed on a case-by-case basis as to their usefulness for reaching this goal. In their haste to realise reforms important to "the Finnish-speaking majority", debate and arguments for and against were given a minor role compared to the end results.

The *Dagblad* liberals, on the contrary, saw the publication of the speeches and debates as essential for parliamentary life. "Full publicity" could be reached only through publication of stenographic records of all speeches and arguments. Only full minutes could preserve and convey the debating aspect. Although the *Dagbladists* presented the publication of stenographic minutes as a principled question and of intrinsic value, it was also a means to protect the minority, to which they themselves increasingly belonged in the Diet towards the 1880s. Publication of debates in their entirety and of all arguments *pro et contra* was an instrument to get the voice of the minority heard. Towards the end of the century, the publicity the newspapers and their summaries offered was becoming increasingly Fennomantic and Finnish-language focused. From the *Dagblad* liberals' point of view, Diet documents that include only the results of the estates' work could, at best, mediate only the majority opinions of "the four-legged absurdity".

9 PARLIAMENTARY OBSTRUCTION

The chapter examines discussions on parliamentary obstruction that started from the Irish obstruction in the British House of Commons in the late 1870s and early 1880s and soon spread across the parliaments of Europe. I analyse the adoption and modification of the concept of obstruction in the Finnish discussions and show how the concept was used to advance different notions of deliberation and to attack others. The concept of parliamentary obstruction was adopted in the Finnish disputes by the Fennomans after the presentation of the Irish obstruction in the newspapers. The Fennomans found the concept with its idea of superfluous speech well-suited to their rhetoric, which belittled the significance of debate. They saw debate as only a hindrance to the fulfilment of the inevitable and necessary reforms to be carried out in the name of the majority of the people. Social Democrats adopted the concept in the early Eduskunta, where they used it to attack the debating and deliberative character of the parliament based on their international party model. Whereas the Fennomans had emphasised the role of committee negotiation as the primary form of Diet deliberation for achieving reforms, the Social Democrats highlighted the Eduskunta as a decision-making body for executing the will of the majority.

The Finnish debates on parliamentary obstruction highlight different notions of deliberation and also illustrate how international parliamentary discussions shaped national politics. The “peripheral” Finnish Diet and early Eduskunta were in no sense isolated from contemporary parliamentary discussions and trends. To highlight this aspect, a closer conceptual analysis will be presented in this chapter. Parliaments of various kinds have faced common challenges, and the same ideas and models have therefore often been used. The risks of parliamentary obstruction were acknowledged in the Finnish procedure debates, where proposals for restricting speech were presented.

9.1 Obstruction and scarcity of parliamentary time

In parliamentary literature and debates the concept of obstruction has generally been used to describe actions aimed at intentional delay and obstruction of parliamentary business.³⁸⁷ Typically, obstruction is presented as a parliamentary tactic of the minority. The procedural differences between parliaments have made a general definition difficult. Provisions of the procedure, meant to guarantee the rights of the minority have been utilised in a variety of ways for obstructive purposes.

Obstruction as prolonged speechmaking, for example, has a long history in deliberative assemblies.³⁸⁸ In the House of Commons, *obstruction as a systematic parliamentary tactic* arose from using the procedure in a new way. Thomas Erskine May writes in *Parliamentary Practice*:

The rules of Parliament are designed to afford every legitimate opportunity of discussion, to ensure reasonable delays in the passing of important measures, and to guard the rights of minorities. In the observance of these rules, both houses have displayed a generous regard for the liberty of individual members, and of political parties. Freedom of debate has been respected with rare patience and self-denial. Nowhere have the principles of liberty and toleration been more conspicuously illustrated than within the walls of Parliament. [...] But, of late, these salutary rules have been strained and perverted, in the House of Commons, for purposes of obstruction. (May 1883 [1844], 380)

The Irish obstruction of the late 1870s and early 1880s that May refers to was originally aimed against the *Irish Coercion Bill* and the majority of the House.³⁸⁹ What made the Irish obstruction exceptional was its mission to bring the whole parliamentary work to a standstill. The Irish campaign was difficult for the British parliament as obstruction attacked the very foundations of its tradition. The Irish nationalist minority led by Charles Stewart Parnell³⁹⁰ exploited as its main instrument the existing freedom of speech, which manifested the core principles of the British parliament: equality between members and protection for the minority. Unlimited freedom of speech had been used earlier in obstructing manner, but only as momentary protests against an overbearing majority; in that form, it had been regarded as a permissible means in parliamentary business (Jellinek 1904, 580; Redlich 1908a [1905], 137–140). The Irish obstruction resulted in reforms of the parliamentary procedure,³⁹¹ including new rules to suspend

³⁸⁷ See e.g. May 1883 [1844]; Pierre 1902; Redlich 1908a [1905]; Jellinek 1904; Erich 1908; Törnudd 1961; Toivonen 1979; Koger 2010.

³⁸⁸ For a history of filibustering in the United States Congress, see Koger 2010.

³⁸⁹ For detailed description of the Irish obstruction and its effects on the procedure, see Redlich 1908a [1905], 133–185 and May 1883 [1844], 380–384.

³⁹⁰ The obstructionists consisted of members of the *Irish Home Rule Party* and particularly Charles Stewart Parnell as their leader.

³⁹¹ The first step in the process was the declaration of Speaker Brand proposing measures to prevent obstruction: "...any Member wilfully and persistently obstructing Public Business, without just and reasonable cause, is guilty of a contempt of this House; and is liable to punishment, whether by censure, by suspension from the service of this House, or by commitment, according to the judgment of the House."

obstructing members, the imposition of limitations on the right to speak,³⁹² the *Urgency Resolution*,³⁹³ the *clôture*³⁹⁴ and the *guillotine*.³⁹⁵ Following the example of the Irish campaign, obstruction became popular in parliaments across Europe in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Obstruction forced parliaments to change their procedures, and new punitive measures as well as limitations on the MPs' right of speech and initiative were implemented.

Parliamentary obstruction is essentially linked to the question of *parliamentary time* and its scarcity.³⁹⁶ The scarcity of parliamentary time became an issue particularly in the nineteenth century when parliaments' workloads increased rapidly due to democratisation, the development of parliamentary systems and party politics.³⁹⁷ Parliamentary time is created and scheduled in the parliamentary procedure. Parliamentary rules, in defining the duration of parliamentary sessions and electoral terms as well as in determining legislative procedures and differentiating items by type, create a framework in which agenda issues are dealt with. The order of business and the distribution of time between items are more or less in the hands of the parliament. In this sense, every item on the agenda can be seen as engaging in a struggle for its own share of the available parliamentary time. Without adequate regulation, obstruction can, by exploiting the scarcity of time, seriously delay or even effectively eliminate bills from the agenda and paralyse parliamentary business as a whole. Establishing a fair distribution of time is a recurring challenge and cause of dispute in parliaments. Obstruction has forced parliaments to reconsider how to

(http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1877/jul/25/committee#S3V0235P0_18770725_HOC_93)

³⁹² For debates on the speaker's and chairman's unconditional authority to silence, after repeated calls to order, a member and on member's suspension for the remainder of the sitting, or for a week, a fortnight or a month, see:

<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1877/jul/27/resolutions;>

<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1880/feb/26/resolutions.>

³⁹³ According to the procedure, if an urgent reading of a question was supported by 40 members standing up at their places, a vote on the motion was organised without further debate or proposals for adjournment. See

http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1881/feb/03/rules-of-debate-divisions-suspension-of#column_103

³⁹⁴ The *clôture*, closure or cloture, is a motion that gives the parliament the possibility to bring debate to a quick end. For putting the question by a majority of three to one, see: http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1881/feb/09/rules-framed-by-mr-speaker-for-the#S3V0258P0_18810209_HOC_23.

³⁹⁵ The *guillotine*, a motion to strictly allocate the time available, is used to ensure that certain stages of a bill are completed by a certain date or within a fixed number of sittings.

<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1881/feb/17/additional-rules-framed-by-mr-speaker;>

<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1881/feb/17/additional-rule-regulating-the;> Redlich 1908a [1905], 166–167.

³⁹⁶ On the specific nature of parliamentary time and calendarisation, see Palonen 2008.

³⁹⁷ According to Philip Salmon, the scarcity of parliamentary time became problematic and resulted in the decline of the private member in the House of Commons, not because of any "unprecedented growth of parliamentary business", but mainly as a result of "the growing tendency for MPs to speak and intervene in proceedings, not just in greater numbers but also more often and at increasing length" (Salmon 2009, 257). Salmon sees electoral reforms and the increase of public interest in parliament as reasons for this development (ibid. 258–268).

strike a balance between the scarcity of time and the requirements for carrying out adequate readings and debate.

9.2 Introduction of parliamentary obstruction in Finland – the Irish obstruction in the Finnish press

The Digitised Newspaper Library show that the topic of parliamentary obstruction as a systematic parliamentary tactic was introduced in Finland through reporting on the Irish obstruction campaign. The first coverage appeared in the Swedish-language press in the beginning of August 1877 after Parnell had taken the obstructive tactics to a new level during the second session of the parliament.³⁹⁸ On 10 August 1877 *Hufvudstadsbladet* wrote:

During the previous week, the British House of Commons has been a scene for peculiar incidents. A part of its Irish members have taken it into their heads to obstruct the readings (*hämna ärendenas gång*) by making unnecessary amendments and long speeches for their justification. Thereby part of their aim is to avenge the harsh treatment (*den omilda behandling*) that the house has let befall upon several of their proposals, and partly they would have the house tangibly feel the benefits of Ireland getting its special legislation. One of these "obstructionists" (*obstructiva*), who during discussion has let himself make highly improper expressions against the speaker and the house, was shown the door (*wisades på dörren*) and suffered a vote of censure from the house (*klanderoötum af huset*). On Tuesday the House of Commons assembled on a bill for confederation of the South African colonies, and the Irish knew how to drag out the discussion so that the house did not separate until late in the afternoon the following day. It was a meeting of 26 consecutive hours. The speaker, ministers and the delegates of the people (*folkombuden*) changed at fixed hours in order to give the weary time to sleep. The behaviour of the Irish has naturally raised general resentment. (*Hufvudstadsbladet*, 10 Aug., 1877, 1)

At first the Finnish newspapers used the English term *obstruction* along with Swedish modifications such as *obstructive*, *obstructiver*, *obstructionister*, *obstruction-taktik* and *obstructive-parti* (see e.g. *Uleåborgs Tidning*,³⁹⁹ 18 Aug., 1879, 2). Moving into the 1880s, the letter "c" was replaced by "k" (*obstruktionist*, *obstruktionspolitik* etc.). The first Finnish term was (*parlamentaarin*) *obstruktion*, with variations such as *obstruktionismi*, *obstruktio-politiki*, *obstruktionisti* and later also *obstruktsioni*, *obstruktsiooni*, *obstruktsionipolitiki*.

³⁹⁸ In the course of a debate on the great bill for confederation of the South African colonies, Parnell, in responding to accusations of obstructing the debate, stated that he in fact felt a special satisfaction in preventing and thwarting the intentions of the government in the question under consideration. (See Parnell on South Africa Bill in Committee 25 July 1877, HC Deb 25 July 1877 vol 235 cc1809: http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1877/jul/25/committee#S3V0235P0_18770725_HOC_60)

As a result, the speaker took the unprecedented step of basing anti-obstruction measures on contempt of the House (HC Deb 25 July 1877 vol 235 cc1814: http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1877/jul/25/committee#S3V0235P0_18770725_HOC_93)

³⁹⁹ The report was written by "*Uleåborgs Tidning's* correspondent".

Brief telegrams on the Irish obstruction were replaced by detailed descriptions in the early 1880s when the Irish took their obstructive tactics to a new level of intensity and duration.⁴⁰⁰ In 1880 the Finnish press reacted to a new procedure adopted in the House of Commons in order to fight the obstructionists. The speaker or the chairman was provided the possibility to suspend a member from the House for the remainder of the day's sitting. Speaker Brand had made a strong statement in favour of the proposal, citing similar regulations in the French and Italian chambers (Redlich 1908a [1905], 148). Following up on an idea of Mr. Newdegate,⁴⁰¹ who took a great interest in procedure, Sir Stafford Northcote proposed on behalf of the government increasing the speaker's powers to punish obstructionists. According to the new resolution, it was now the responsibility of the speaker or the chairman to decide what in any particular instance could be regarded as systematic obstruction. When a member had been suspended three times over a full parliamentary session, the third suspension would last a minimum of one week, to which the House could add an additional period of suspension.⁴⁰² (For Finnish newspaper reports, see e.g. *Åbo Underrättelser*, 11 Mar., 1880, 3) The rule was later taken up in the Finnish Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–1906 (see Section 9.4).

In the beginning of 1881, the House of Lords asked the government to confront obstruction by unconstitutional measures. Lord Redesdale recommended that the cabinet declare Ireland to be in a state of revolution and to introduce a bill for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in both houses at the same time, and as soon as the first reading had taken place, to act as if the bill had passed. Lord Chancellor pointed out that the suggested procedure would be illegal and such action by the government could seem to justify obstruction. The government refused to accept Redesdale's plan. (Redlich 1908a [1905], 151–152; see e.g. *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 13 Jan., 1881, 1; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 4 Jan., 1881, 2)

In their reports on obstruction, Finnish newspapers emphasised the British parliament's traditional freedom of speech as exceptional compared to other foreign parliaments, where votes for closing a debate could take place. Howev-

⁴⁰⁰ For reports on the Irish obstruction tactics, see *Wiborgs Tidning*, 9 Mar., 1880, 3; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 6 Sept., 1880, 2.

⁴⁰¹ Mr. Newdegate profiled himself as a "pioneer" in the matter, see HC Deb 26 February 1880 vol 250 cc1477, 1478 and 1484: http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1880/feb/26/resolutions#S3V0250P0_18800226_HOC_71

⁴⁰² For the resolution in its full length see HC Deb 26 February 1880 vol 250 cc1450-1451: <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1880/feb/26/resolutions>
For the debates on the resolution see:
HC Deb 26 February 1880 vol 250 cc1450-541: <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1880/feb/26/resolutions>
HC Deb 27 February 1880 vol 250 cc1580-668: <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1880/feb/27/adjourned-debate-second-night>
HC Deb 28 February 1880 vol 250 cc1669-708: <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1880/feb/28/adjourned-debate-third-day>

er, new pressures to change the standing orders were reported. (E.g. *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 13 Jan., 1881, 1)

On 24 January Gladstone gave a motion to suspend the standing orders and to give the Irish Coercion bill (Bill for the Protection of Life and Property in Ireland) priority over all other business. The Irish answered with obstruction. The sitting lasted twenty-two hours until it was possible to obtain a division, which resulted in acceptance of the motion. (See e.g. *Östra Finland*, 2 Feb., 1881, 2) The next day followed with even more intensive obstruction, resulting in a sitting of forty-one and a half hours. At this point the debate was closed by, as Redlich calls it, “the celebrated *coup d’état* of the Speaker” (Redlich 1908a [1905], 153). Speaker Brand, acting in contravention of traditional procedure, terminated the debate on his own authority. The Irish protested the speaker’s action as a breach of privilege. At this point the Finnish-language newspapers also became interested in the Irish obstruction:

The sittings of the British parliament have lately been peculiar and strange, since they have pointed out some aspects in its standing orders (*työjärjestyksestä*), to which nothing similar can be found anywhere in the world. No decision to end discussion (*keskustelu*) is ever made, but everyone can hold speeches as long as they want. Like this, anyone who wants to disturb an urgent matter (*kiireellistä asiata häiritä*) can stall it for very long (*muuttaa sitä äärettömän pitkäksi*) and thus tire (*wäsyttää*) the whole parliament. Such a trick is called “obstruction” (*“obstruktion”*). This means has been used before especially by the Irish, but hardly ever to such an extent as now. The parliament is discussing a bill (*lakiehdotus*), whose purpose is to end the mischief in Ireland, but the Irish members of the parliament (*parlamentin jäsenet*) are trying to obstruct it by every means (*kaikin tavoin estää*). The sittings of the parliament (*parlamentin istunnot*) are held in the afternoon and now the Irish are proceeding as follows: they hold speeches so long that it becomes late and then they propose that the sitting be closed and adjourned to another occasion (*ehdoittelevat että istunto lakkautettaisiin ja asia lykättäisiin toiseen kertaan*). Thus, the passage of this urgent and important bill is prolonged again and again. Then there is no other choice but to continue the sitting until the Irish gentlemen are tired. [...] One finds it hard to believe that such a ridiculous arrangement (*naurettavaa järjestystä*) could ever be possible in such a stable company (*wakaassa seurassa*) as the British parliament. As the telegrams have shown, the government is finally about to propose a law (*ehdoitella lakia*) according to which the house has the right to decide on closing a discussion (*päättää keskustelun lopettamisesta*), but it is still unclear whether this proposal will be accepted in the parliament. (*Uusi Suometar*, 4 Feb., 1881, 3)

At this point Finnish press published telegrams that came only two days after the actual debates in the parliament. On 3 February, Prime Minister Gladstone proposed an *urgency procedure*,⁴⁰³ based on which the Coercion Bill was finally

⁴⁰³ “That, if upon Notice given a Motion be made by a Minister of the Crown that the state of Public Business is urgent, and if on the call of the Speaker 40 Members shall support it by rising in their places, the Speaker shall forthwith put the Question, no Debate, Amendment, or Adjournment being allowed; and if, on the voices being given he shall without doubt perceive that the Noes have it, his decision shall not be challenged, but, if otherwise, a Division may be forthwith taken, and if the Question be resolved in the affirmative by a majority of not less than three to one, the powers of the House for the Regulation of its Business upon the several stages of Bills, and upon Motions and all other matters, shall he and remain with the Speaker, until the Speaker shall declare that the state of Public Business is no longer urgent, or until the House shall so determine upon a Motion, which after Notice given may be made by

declared urgent (e.g. *Helsingfors Dagblad*,⁴⁰⁴ 16 Feb., 1881, 2; *Östra Finland*, 7 Feb., 1881, 2). The urgency procedure was one of the main procedure revisions resulting from the Irish obstruction. It gave the speaker significant new powers in regulating debate (Redlich 1908a [1905], 164–166). On 9 February, Speaker Brand introduced a feature of closure (*clôture*): the proposal for closure was to come from the speaker, but had to be accepted by a three-fourths majority (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 16 Feb., 1881, 2; Redlich 1908a [1905], 166).

In the beginning of 1881 *Helsingfors Dagblad*, which had first broached the subject of obstruction by reporting on the Irish case in broad framework, started paying attention to the specific procedural challenges posed by obstruction. The *Dagblad* remained active on the matter, publishing excerpts from debates and speeches, including Gladstone's speech⁴⁰⁵ on the introduction of his resolution to prevent further Irish obstruction (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 17 Feb., 1881, 2).

In the beginning of the parliamentary session in January 1882 Gladstone presented a series of new procedures to fight obstruction, which included a proposal for making closure a permanent part of the standing orders (Redlich 1908a [1905], 168–169). The proposals were presented in Finnish newspapers in detail (e.g. *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 21 Feb., 1882, 2; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 21 Feb., 1882, 3; *Östra Finland*, 15 Feb., 1882, 2). The new rules were finally introduced in the autumn session of 1882 when a simple majority was decided to be sufficient for cloture (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 3 Nov., 1882, 2; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 16 Nov., 1882, 2; *Morgonbladet*, 13 Nov., 1882, 2; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 5 Dec., 1882, 3; Redlich 1908a [1905], 169–175). The closure rule was strengthened in 1887 and 1888 and the guillotine in 1887 (Redlich 1908a [1905], 175–181, 180–181).

When reporting events abroad, the Finnish newspapers relied heavily on foreign newspapers and telegrams. The articles on the Irish campaign were mainly translations from British and German newspapers. In Finland, smaller newspapers “cut and pasted” the articles of the main Finnish newspapers. As a result of these methods, the Finnish reports on the Irish campaign closely resembled each other. They emphasised obstruction as a peculiar and harmful (mis)use of speech. Speech was described as the main vehicle for obstruction, while less interest was shown towards other tactics, such as repetitive amendments, proposals and motions for adjournment. Obstruction was defined as *a new parliamentary tactic* of intentional delay, which aimed at testing the patience of and eventually exhausting one's opponents, the majority or the government by intentionally prolonging the debate (see e.g. “*den nya parlamentariska taktik*” and “*obstruction-taktiken*” in *Wiborgs Tidning*, 25 Nov., 1880, 3). Some articles used obstruction in order to mock MPs and the role of speech in the parliament as a “parliamentary charade”. The articles described MPs who were obliged to

any Member, put without Amendment, Adjournment, or Debate, and decided by a majority.” See HC Deb 03 February 1881 vol 258 cc103:
http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1881/feb/03/rules-of-debate-divisions-suspension-of#column_103

⁴⁰⁴ From a correspondent of *Kölnische Zeitung*.

⁴⁰⁵ http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1881/feb/03/rules-of-debate-divisions-suspension-of#column_88

stay at their posts, sleeping at their desks and snoring through the endless flow of empty insignificant words (*Uusi Suometar*, 4 Feb., 1881, 3; 7 Feb., 1881, 3). As the obstruction grew ever more prolonged, the campaign was seen to have consequences for parliament as a whole and to set a dangerous example for future parliamentary life. Obstruction was described as damaging the prestige of parliament, threatening to paralyse the legislative machine and eventually causing its unpopularity among the public.⁴⁰⁶ As discussed earlier, Finnish newspapers had highlighted the uniqueness of the British parliamentary tradition and procedure already from the 1820s. During the climax of the Irish obstruction the interest in British parliamentary tradition gained new momentum. The articles included translated speeches⁴⁰⁷ and described the growing unease of both the House and the British public.⁴⁰⁸ The press gave close-up reports on the obstruction tactics and clarified the procedure revisions planned in order to fight the obstructionists.⁴⁰⁹ While the Finnish newspapers disapproved of the tactics, they also showed concern about the consequences of the procedure revisions. The newspapers presented British suspicions about enhancing the powers of the speaker and the majority, which was often seen as unconstitutional and contrary to the parliamentary tradition (e.g. *Uusi Suometar*, 8 Feb., 1881, 3). For example, *Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti* stated that the revisions and the introduction of *clôture* signified a change in the nature of the British parliament as the ancient practice of unlimited speech came to its end (*Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti*, 18 Nov., 1882, 3). *Helsingin Wiikko-Sanomia* (15 Dec., 1882, 3) wrote that by adopting the cloture, the British parliament had given up its “best privilege” (*parhaimmasta etuoikeudesta*). The newspapers pointed out the dangers of the reform for the rights of the minority and referred to the possibility of a tyranny of the majority. The introduction of cloture was described as a revolution, an overthrow of the old rules and an epoch-making event.

Finnish newspaper reports presented arguments on different sides of the debate. In addition to a great emphasis on Gladstone’s central role in fighting the obstruction, *Helsingfors Dagblad* expressed the concern of some British Liberals about the limitations on members’ right of speech. As discussed above, *Dagblad* had embraced the rights and freedom of speech of the British parliament and it published the most radical wordings in the Finnish newspaper press on the cloture. For example, in 1882 *Helsingfors Dagblad* cited *The Globe’s* “epitaph” on the parliamentary freedoms that had “passed away”: “Here lies parliamentary freedom of speech, born in the Middle Ages during the era of

⁴⁰⁶ E.g. the obstruction “threatens the legislative system with a total standstill”, *Uleåborgs Tidning*, 18 Aug., 1879, 2; obstruction “violates the respect and privilege of the house and its work is made futile” in a translated statement of Speaker Brand in the House of Commons on his decision to end debate, *Uusi Suometar*, 8 Feb., 1881, 3.

⁴⁰⁷ E.g. *Uusi Suometar*, 8 Feb., 1881, 3; *Uusi Suometar*, 11 Feb., 1881, 1; *Uusi Suometar*, 13 Aug., 1881, 2–3; *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 30 Mar., 1882, 1–2.

⁴⁰⁸ For a lively example of this, see *Uusi Suometar*, 11 Feb., 1881, 3.

⁴⁰⁹ In addition to the Finnish-language newspapers mentioned, see *Uleåborgs Tidning*, 18 Aug., 1879, 2; *Wiborgs Tidning*, 9 Mar., 1880, 3; *Wiborgs Tidning*, 10 Feb., 1881, 2; *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 6 Mar., 1880, 2; *Morgonbladet*, 14 Feb., 1881, 2; *Morgonbladet*, 15 Feb., 1881, 2; *Finlands Allmänna Tidning*, 21 Feb., 1882, 2; *Åbo Underrättelser*, 12 July, 1882, 3.

freedom of thought and fairness (*rättvisa*), died on the 10th of November 1882 of obstruction in the bronchus following a congestion in the digestive system.” (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 26 Nov., 1882, 2)

After the Irish campaign the Finnish press continued reports on obstruction in other foreign parliaments,⁴¹⁰ with a new peak reached when obstruction by the German, Hungarian and Czech minorities became a popular tactic in the parliaments of Austria-Hungary in 1897. Obstruction was almost a daily topic on the Finnish news agenda. Newspapers described the obstruction in Austria to have reached a new scale of severity in parliamentary history. The speeches broke new records in length, their verbal brutality was unprintable and the chaos and violence unparalleled.⁴¹¹ A year later, obstruction occurred in the Hungarian parliament and remained a central news item for the first decade of the twentieth century (e.g. *Aamulehti*, 31 Dec., 1898, 4). Now the newspaper press described obstruction not only as a tactic, but as a *parliamentary weapon*. Along with the news on the turmoil of the obstruction inside the parliament, there was reporting on the civil unrest outside. Due to this marked unrest, obstruction was now described as a tumult (*meteli*), a fight (*tappelu*) and chaos (*kaaos*) (e.g. *Wiipuri*, 18 June, 1898, 3). Georg Jellinek’s article on parliamentary obstruction, which was referred to, summarised and translated in the Finnish press,⁴¹² gives an illustrative example of the change that took place in describing and understanding obstruction. According to Jellinek, obstruction had become an international phenomenon that threatened not only the power of the majority, but the whole future of parliamentarism.

In the Finnish press during the Irish and Austro-Hungarian campaigns, obstruction was connected to questions of nationality and language rather than to party politics as such. Near the end of the nineteenth century, however, the notion of the role of parties also became prominent. Expressions for obstructionists (such as *obstruktionistit*, *de obstructive* and *obstruktionister*) were now used more often in relation to party (*parti* and *puolue*). It became common to speak of *obstruktioparti*, *obstruktionistparti*, *obstruktionsparti*, *obstruktioonipuolue* and *obstrukt(s)ionipuolue*. Party conflicts, manifested for example as party hatred (*puoluewiha*), party quarrels (*puolueriita*) and party rage (*puolueraiwo*), were now described as causes of obstruction (e.g. *Uusi Suometar*, 30 Oct., 1897, 3). Reports on foreign obstruction used and translated expressions such as “a flood of speech” (*puhetulwa*), “a flow of speech” (*puheen-wirta*), “rage for speaking” (*puheraiwo*), “speaking nonsense” (*puhua tyhjää*), “wasting time” and “killing the question by speaking” (*kuluttaa aikaa hukkaan, tappaa asia puhumalla, muuttaa asia*

⁴¹⁰ E.g. Norway (1883), Greece (1884), Spain (1889), France (1889), Italy (1900). Obstruction was also reported from the Berlin (Congo) Conference in 1885, where it was allegedly practiced by Portugal (*Nya Pressen*, 2 Mar., 1885, 3).

⁴¹¹ Also outside the main newspapers, see e.g. *Tampereen Sanomat*, 14 Nov., 1897, 1-2; *Lappeenrannan Uutiset*, 1 Dec., 1897, 2-3; *Kaiku*, 3 Dec., 1897, 3.

⁴¹² See the article “Where Does Parliamentary Obstruction Lead to?” (*Hvart den parlamentariska obstruktion leder*) in *Åbo Tidning*, 5 Aug., 1903, 3. The article was originally published in and translated from the Viennese newspaper *Neue Freie Presse*. For Jellinek’s later published article on obstruction in English, see Jellinek 1904.

pitkäksi, asian wenyttelminen, puheenwenyttäjä), which were later used to describe excessive or misuse of speech in the Diet and the Eduskunta.

9.3 Obstruction in the Fennomans rhetoric of progress and reform

The idea of playing with scarce time and delay were, of course, not new in the context of the Finnish Diet before the Irish obstruction. Earlier, for instance, the verbs *wiiwyttää* and *förhala* (delay, play for time) and their derivatives had been used to refer to delaying questions on the agenda. The foreign examples, however, gave an understanding of obstruction as an active and systematic tactic used by a minority; above all, they offered a useful and credible rhetorical *topos* to highlight the severity of such actions. The term *obstruction* was adopted in the Finnish political disputes soon after the Irish campaign, even though its use remained occasional in the newspaper press during the 1880s and early 1890s. Based on word searches in the Digitised Newspaper Library, before the Irish campaign *obstruction* and *obstruktion* were used only as medical terms to describe illness and bad health.

In the early 1880s, during the Irish campaign, the Fennomans began to use the ideas, arguments and vocabulary of obstruction to attack Svecomans both inside and outside the Diet, wherever Fennoman ideas of progress and reform were being challenged. The first appearances of the term 'obstruction' in relation to Diet politics were connected to a petition on the reorganisation of the school system, which raised debate on the role of Finnish in education. The Fennoman newspaper *Uusi Suometar* (8 Apr., 1881, 1) demanded that, before the reform, the question should be re-negotiated in the Diet, because the planned government actions were not based on consensus, but on the opinions of the Nobility and the Burghers. As a result, *Helsingfors Dagblad* accused *Uusi Suometar* of "policy of obstruction" (*obstruktionspolitik*). *Dagblad* argued that a question already decided in the Diet could not be re-deliberated in the next Diet without reasonable grounds. (*Helsingfors Dagblad*, 1 Apr., 1881, 1-2) *Uusi Suometar* (8 Apr., 1881, 1) responded by pointing to what it saw as the original British and internationally accepted definition of obstruction. *Uusi Suometar* argued that obstruction was a weapon of the minority, in Finland's case of the Svecomans, not of the Finnish speaking majority:

As the newspaper *Dagblad* has dared to call our demands pure obstruction politics (*obstruktio-politikiksi*) – the word is borrowed from the English Parliament's derisive name for the Irish minority – we would like to tell *Dagblad* what kind of obstruction is practised in this country. [...] 'Obstruction' ("obstruction") is all of the obstacles that are repeatedly used against furthering the cause of the Finnish language. [...] Attempts made to block government reforms that would neglect representation of the people are not, at least elsewhere in the world, called obstruction. (*Uusi Suometar*, 8 Apr., 1881, 1)

In the Diet of 1885 Fennoman leader, now senator, Yrjö Koskinen, spoke in the Nobility on 'the stableyards question' (*rusthollarikysymys*). According to

Koskinen, the question had already been “fully prepared” (*täydellisesti valmistettu*) and no new aspects could be brought out. Koskinen appealed to the Nobility to pass the bill as the other three estates had done. Koskinen indirectly accused the Svecoman controlled Nobility of obstruction, using the term “system of obstruction” (*obstruktioidijärjestelmä*) from the debates on the Irish obstruction.⁴¹³

I do not dare to state the wish that a reform of our system of representation could be soon expected and that this reform could be easily executed or that it would even be politically wise (*poliittillisesti viisasta*) to bring out such a question during our current conditions. Thus, I see it more important that the representatives of the Finnish people (*Suomen kansan edustajat*) can prove that regardless of all the lacks in the representation itself, important questions can be resolved, and that this system of representation (*edustusjärjestelmä*) is not a system of obstruction (*obstruktioidijärjestelmä*), but a system through which improvements (*parannuksia*) can be achieved. Thus, I see it desirable that such an important question will be resolved through the Nobility’s enlightened contribution (*walistuneen myötävaikutuksen kautta*). (*Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti*, 2 May, 1885, 5–6)

As the examples show, in the early 1880s *obstruktio* and *obstruktioidi* were used — particularly by the Fennomans — to describe action that prevented or hindered the implementation of their ideas on progress and reform. The Fennomans, in their efforts to improve the role of the Finnish language, named Svecoman opponents and policies as obstructive. The critique of obstructive politics was aimed mainly at opposing estates and political groups in the Diet, but accusations of obstruction were also stated at the level of local politics and social and political movements.⁴¹⁴ Due to the absence of joint plenary sessions, charges of obstruction over estate lines were directed at committee sessions, where speech was seen as the main instrument of *obstruktio*, *obstruktioidi* and *obstruction*.⁴¹⁵

In the 1880s the Finnish translations of obstruction (*obstruktio*, *obstruktioidi*) followed their English model in spelling, but in the early 1890s a native Finnish term, (*parlamentaarinen*) *jarrutus*, was introduced.⁴¹⁶ From the 1890s *jarrutus* became used regularly in the Finnish-language discussions when referring to foreign obstruction campaigns (e.g. *Uusi Suometar*, 6 June, 1897, 4). In the Fennoman rhetoric, both of Young and Old Finns, *jarrutus* was used more frequent-

⁴¹³ See e.g. the pair of “system of legislation” and “system of obstruction” in House of Commons in 14 July 1879: <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1879/jul/14/parliament-public-business-orders-of-the> and Mr. Newdegate 2 September 1880: http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1880/sep/02/bill-297-third-reading#column_1105

⁴¹⁴ *Obstruktio*, and later *jarrutus*, were used also in the relation to youth associations (*nuorisoseurat*), temperance societies (*raittiuseurat*), the University of Helsinki and municipal politics.

⁴¹⁵ For example, in the Clergy in 1888 Alexander Wilhelm Lyra accused political opponents of obstruction in the committee sittings during a debate on the law on freedom of religion (*erisuskolaislaki*) (*Uusi Suometar*, 20 Apr., 1888, 1)

⁴¹⁶ *Jarrutus* was used in the Finnish newspaper press from 1893, first in relation to the House of Commons (*Päivälehti*, 15 Mar., 1893, 3; *Sanomia Turusta*, 11 Aug., 1893, 2) and the United States (*Päivälehti*, 19 Aug., 1893, 3; *Uusi Suometar*, 14 Jan., 1894, 2)

ly and explicitly than *obstruktio* to refer to general obstruction and delay of progress (*edistys, kehitys*) or reform (*uudistus*). In Finnish, the noun *jarru* and verb *jarruttaa* referred originally to brakes and the braking of vehicles.⁴¹⁷ In the late nineteenth-century political debates, they were used metaphorically, giving a sense of Fennoman progress as a steady and inevitable forward motion, which could only be slowed down, but not halted.⁴¹⁸

Such uses of the concept of obstruction fit well with Fennoman and liberal ideas, in which the idea of progress was central (see Section 3.4.4). At the end of the century *jarru* and *jarrutus* were adopted in criticising, procedures and practices that hindered reform, and institutions such as the first chamber in bicameral systems.⁴¹⁹ When discussing parliaments, the first metaphorical uses of *jarru* were used in relation to trains⁴²⁰ and machines⁴²¹ in expressions such as ‘the wheel of progress’⁴²² (*edistyspyörä, edistyksen [vauhti]pyörä*) and ‘the brake system (*jarrutuslaitos, jarrut*). These modes of speech gave birth to contrary conservative views that saw *jarru* and *jarruttaa* as positive features against the irrationality of unrestrained change and progress.⁴²³ In the newspaper press, the Swedish equivalent *bromsa* (brake) and *bromsning* (braking) were used only as translations when referring to Finnish-language newspapers’ articles and the Fennoman rhetoric.⁴²⁴

⁴¹⁷ According to the etymological dictionary the earliest uses of *jarru* were connected to the brake of a sleigh: “*reen jarru: vitsalenkki jalaksen ympärillä*” (Itkonen et al. 1992, 237). In nineteenth-century Finnish newspapers *jarrutus* and *jarruttaa* were used mostly in relation to trains.

⁴¹⁸ E.g. on the need to elect liberal Fennoman candidates that were “rotating the wheel of progress forward (*edistyksen pyörää eteenpäin pyörittämässä*) in the Diet and not braking it down (*eikä sitä jarruttamassa*)” see the Young Finn newspaper *Päivälehti*, 20 July, 1893, 2. For the accusation that the Swedish Party had opposed the reform on Burgher suffrage because they wanted to maintain two estates vs. two estates situation in the Finnish representative system (*eduskunta-laitoksessamme*), which they used to obstruct (*jarruttaa*) all Fennoman efforts (*suomalaisuuden pyrintöjä*), see *Uusi Savo*, 12 Aug., 1893, 1. For the argument according to which “everyone who opposed the efforts of the nationalists (*kansallismielisten pyrintöjä*) helped the Wikings (*wiikinkejä; the Svæcomans*) to maintain their power, who were a brake to all progress (*kaiken kehityksen jarrun*) in the Burghers”, see *Aura*, 6 Oct., 1893, 3. For the argument according to which *Uusi Suometar* had broken down the programme of the Liberal Party, which was “aimed as a real brake against the natural progress of Finnishness” (*suoranaiseksi jarruksi suomalaisuuden luonnolliselle edistymiselle*) see *Uusi Suometar*, 17 Apr., 1901, 5.

⁴¹⁹ E.g. *Keski-Suomi*, 8 Feb., 1894, 4; *Uusi Suometar*, 29 Sept., 1893, 2; *Wiipuri*, 5 Jan., 1894, 2; *Wiipuri*, 19 May, 1894, 2.

⁴²⁰ E.g. *Päivälehti* (14 July, 1893, 3) on *guillotine* as a “break” (*jarru*) which could stop “even the strongest system of obstruction” (*jarrutusjärjestelmä*) or “train of speech” (*puhejunan*) in the House of Commons, see the variety of examples in *Tampereen Sanomat*, 21 Mar., 1894, 2.

⁴²¹ See e.g. old candidates as breaks (*jarruna*) instead of progressive parts (*edistävänä jäsenenä*) of “the great machine of the community” (*yhdyskunnan suuressa koneessa*) in *Mikkelin Sanomat*, 9 Mar., 1899, 2.

⁴²² E.g. the British House of Lords as a “break” (*jarruna*) on wheel of progress (*edistyksen pyörä*) (*Wiipuri*, 19 May, 1894, 2)

⁴²³ E.g. *Tampereen Sanomat*, 21 Mar., 1894, 2; in Sweden’s discussions on suffrage, Bishop Billing called conservatives “brakes on the state railways”, without which “the train would be derailed”, see *Päivälehti*, 30 May, 1891, 2.

⁴²⁴ See e.g. *bromsningspolitik* in *Hufvudstadsbladet*, 19 Jan., 1896, 3; *Aftonposten*, 4 Mar., 1896, 2.

While foreign obstruction became regular news in the late nineteenth-century, debate on obstruction as a systematic parliamentary tactic endangering the whole of the legislative apparatus appeared only occasionally in the Finnish Diet until 1904. In the Diet of 1904–1905, the Constitutionalist majority, consisting of the Young Finns and the Swedish Party, strove for the total abolition of the Russification of Finland, but was forced to work in opposition to the Senate of the Old Finns. The dividing question between the Constitutionalists and their opponents was whether the Diet should continue to work or not under the prevailing (illegitimate) conditions. The Constitutionalists wished to wait for the response of Emperor Nicholas II to the Great Petition of 1904⁴²⁵ before the work of the Diet could commence. Using this justification, in December 1904 the Constitutionalist majority in the Speaker's Council prolonged the recess of the Diet. When the Diet finally was back in session in the end of January 1905, the Constitutionalists started to obstruct the committee work whose reports served as the basis for the estates' plenary work. The Constitutionalists abstained from committee sessions or, if they attended, refused to work and declined to call in replacements for themselves to reach a quorum.⁴²⁶ When the committee work finally did begin, the proceedings were called "only preliminary" (*valmisteleva, toistaiseksi*) and the committees refused to send reports to the estates.

The Old Finns argued that the alleged Constitutionalist *jarrutus* or *obstruktsiooni*,⁴²⁷ often also called a strike (*työlakko, lakkoilu, työttömyys, työnseisaus*), was *hindering progress* in a situation critical to the future of the people.⁴²⁸ On the other hand, drawing on the foreign debates and their vocabulary,⁴²⁹ the Old Finns described the Constitutionalist *jarrutus* as a *parliamentary tactic of delay*⁴³⁰ that consumed valuable time,⁴³¹ was aimed against questions on the agenda and the majority of the people,⁴³² endangered the whole legislative and representative body,⁴³³ diminished its prestige⁴³⁴ and gave it a bad reputation in the

⁴²⁵ The Great Petition included a list of eighteen sections demanding the reversal of different "illegitimate" statutes and decrees.

⁴²⁶ The committees in the Diet did not have explicit quorum requirements, but in practice, the committees worked only in full numbers (Tuominen 1964, 240). On obstruction in committee work, see Hollmén in the Peasants, 1904–1905, II, 602–604.

⁴²⁷ For debates on the Constitutionalist obstruction in the Diet, see the Peasants, 1904–1905, II, 31 Jan., 1905, 2 Feb., 1905, 563–614, 618–654; the Clergy, 1904–1905, 370–476; the Burghers, 1904–1905, II, 530–551, 566–575, 588–612; and the Nobility, 1904–1905, II, 364–412.

⁴²⁸ E.g. Hynén of the Burghers, 1904–1905, II, 532–535.

⁴²⁹ See e.g. Austrian and Hungarian examples of parliamentary obstruction used in the critique against the Finnish Constitutionalist obstruction, in *Wiipuri*, 5 Feb., 1905, 3.

⁴³⁰ *Jarrutus* was described as a parliamentary tactic by using vocabulary and expressions familiar to foreign reports on obstruction such as *taistelukeino, menettely, menettelytapa, viivyyttää, kuluttaa aikaa, lykätä, wenyttää asiaa* and *hidastella*.

⁴³¹ E.g. Huoponen in the Peasants, 1904–1905, II, 632; Palmén in the Clergy, 1904–1905, 371–372, 375–376; Lönnrot in the Clergy, 1904–1905, 388.

⁴³² See e.g. the Burghers 27 Jan., 1905 and *Uusi Suometar*, 28 Jan., 1905, 3; *Uusi Aura*, 29 Jan., 1905, 1.

⁴³³ E.g. Lönnrot in the Clergy, 1904–1905, 389: "The incessant obstruction (*yhä jatkuva jarrutus*) endangers our whole Diet system."

⁴³⁴ E.g. Koivisto in the Peasants, 31 January 1905, 1904–1905, II, 565: "Action in the committee has reach such a level that it will diminish the prestige of the Diet of Finland (*tulee alentamaan Suomen valtiopäivien arvoa*)."

eyes of the people.⁴³⁵ The Constitutionalist defended their tactics by referring to foreign examples of obstruction and by noting that proper obstruction was a tool of the minority in parliament to fight government policies; it was not a tool of the majority:

In parliamentary countries (*parlamenttaarisissa maissa*) a minority can oppose the passing of a certain bill by all kinds of obstruction, only to prevent the government of the opposing party (*estääkseen vastapuolueen ministeristöä*) from gaining popularity by implementing notable reforms. But the majority is nowhere an obstructive party (*jarrutuspuolue*), and none of the members restraining oneself from regular parliamentary work here have tried to oppose the progress of the questions regarding the railways, suffrage and so on, but are sincerely sorry for the circumstances, which, however, they cannot change due to their convictions and which are the reason for the current state of exception (*poikkeustila*). (*Turun Sanomat*, 17 Feb., 1905, 1)

The alleged Constitutionalist obstruction served the purpose of fighting for the powers of the Diet rather than obstructing certain questions on its agenda, although the latter can be claimed to have been the consequence.

9.4 Parliamentary obstruction in the debates of the Finnish Parliamentary Reform of 1906

As the example of the Old Finns' accusations of obstruction show, at the turn of the twentieth century, the rhetorical focus of *jarrutus* moved away from the language question and Fennoman ideas of progress towards new political divisions and policy disputes. In the debates preceding the Parliamentary Reform of 1906, the term *jarrutus* was used particularly by the Social Democrats to describe policies of the conservative and bourgeois minority, whom they argued were attempting to obstruct the will of the majority of the people. In newspapers, the charge of *jarrutus* was aimed at proposals that supported limitations on suffrage, bicameralism over unicameralism, the Senate's unaccountability to the Diet, and procedures that gave the minority the possibility to obstruct reform, such as those related to the Grand Committee.⁴³⁶

⁴³⁵ E.g. *Wiipuri* (5 Feb., 1905, 3) wrote that "obstruction is something that no man of the people (*kansanmies*) could not approve of". According to the newspaper, few obstructionists could turn the whole people against the representative assembly (*eduskunta*). *Wiipuri* noted that Finland was not yet Austria or Hungary, where the people had already learnt to despise the parliamentary mode of business (*parlamentaarista työtapaa*); Finland was accustomed to the idea that parliament could not reach any results. *Wiipuri* argued that obstruction would only decrease the value of the assembly, not increase it (*Wiipuri*, 5 Feb., 1905, 3). See e.g. also Koivisto in the *Peasants, 1904–1905*, II, 565.

⁴³⁶ For the Social Democrats' critique and commentaries on the Parliamentary Reform process and *jarrutus*, see the Senate's attempts to obstruct (*jarruttaa*) the will of the majority of the people in the Parliament Act in *Länsi-Suomi*, 10 Mar., 1906, 1; on the socialists' critique of the Reform Committee and its procedures that permit obstruction, such as the Grand Committee, see *Helsingin Sanomat*, 11 Mar., 1906, 3–4. For Otto Ville Kuusinen on the obstruction (*jarrutus*) practiced and protected by the Parliamentary Reform Committee, see Kuusinen 1906a. For a view against procedures pro-

The debates of the Parliamentary Reform Committee of 1905–1906, contrary to the newspaper commentary, did not resort to demagoguery or vagueness in their use of parliamentary concepts. The Committee worked more as a parliamentary committee than as a group of partisan representatives (see Paasikivi 1986 [1957], 158–184; Mylly 2006, 109–111). Its discussions indicate a strong knowledge of foreign obstruction debates and their procedural arrangements. In the Committee, obstruction as a systematic parliamentary tactic of a minority, referred to interchangeably as *obstruktion*, *obstruksioni* or *jarrutus*, was discussed in relation to excessive and disorderly speech. Obstruction was seen not only as a threat to the whole parliamentary system, but also and in particular as a menace to the parliamentary style of speech and calm parliamentary work. Although the Committee's focus was on the harmful use of speech, it was unwilling to limit the member's rights of speech since these were seen as the most essential of parliamentary freedoms.

In the Reform Committee, following a discussion on the Irish obstruction campaign, some of the committee members emphasised a need to establish and properly supervise a rule on speaking to the question. Old Finn J. K. Paasikivi noted that the Norwegian parliament had a law requiring members to speak to the question. The Chair of the Committee, Professor Robert Hermanson, stated that the question was important in order to fight obstruction, and that the use of the rule in foreign parliaments was left up to the discretion of the speaker. As discussed in Section 4.1, the internationally established rule and practice of the Finnish Diets was codified in the first rules of procedure of the Eduskunta in 1907. Although the Finnish reformists understood the rule's importance in saving scarce parliamentary time, it had not by itself been enough to prevent skilful obstruction, for example, in Britain during the Irish campaign.

It is notable that also other restrictions on the right of speech had been made in the Diets. From the Diet of 1863–1864 on, members of the estates made proposals for limiting the number of speeches allowed in a discussion. For example, in 1863 Aaron Gustaf Borg of the Clergy estate argued that “in Europe's freest states” (*i Europas friaste stater*) it was seen as sufficient for adequate examination of a matter if each member were allowed two speaking turns. According to Borg, in Finland the members of the Clergy estate were to be allowed to speak four times in a question (*fyra gånger yttra sig angående en och samma fråga*); otherwise much time would be lost in exchanges of words (*ordväxling*) unnecessarily long in view of the purposeful treatment of matters (*ärendenas möjligast ändamålsenliga behandling*) and prompt decision-making (*skyndsama afgörande*). The Clergy did not adopt this rule, however, and saw the existing rule of speaking to the question as sufficient. (Clergy 1863–64, I, 23–24) The Peasants decided in 1863 that each member should have the right to speak only three times on a question with the third speech (*puhe*) being only a shorter addition (Peasants

tecting obstruction (*jarrutus*), such as the requirement of a qualified majority of two thirds on constitutional matters, excessive protection of the minority, limitations on suffrage and the Grand Committee, see Kuusinen 1906b. In the Social Democrat rhetoric, also, the Reform Committee itself was accused of *jarrutus* as it allegedly spent weeks for “trivial lectures and discussion” (Kuusinen 1906a).

1863–64, I, 12). Similar rules were adopted in the Nobility and the Burghers. The rules were similar to those which had been adopted in parliaments internationally in order to achieve a fair distribution of time. In France a rule on speaking no more than twice on a question was adopted in 1789 and continued through 1848, but was removed from the procedures of the Chamber of Deputies during the Third Republic. (Pierre 1902, 1041; Poudra & Pierre 1878, 601) In the British parliament a member was allowed to speak only once. A second speech was allowed only as a short follow-up, for example, to explain parts of a speech that had been misconstrued, or to reply at the end of a debate or in a committee of the whole house (May 1883 [1844], 359–362).⁴³⁷

In the Parliamentary Reform Committee Young Finn Thiodolf Rein argued that excessive freedom of speech with the lack of disciplinary procedures would protect obstructionists. He continued with the customary argument that obstruction, in which a minority prevented organised readings could, were it to become popular, bring the parliamentary system of government as a whole into disrepute. According to Rein, obstruction should be prevented by rules that allowed members to be suspended. Drawing on the Irish obstruction, Felix Heikel of the Swedish Party remarked that suspension was used quite often in Britain and that the rules of the Eduskunta should be arranged accordingly. (On suspension of members, see Chapter 4)

No requirements for achieving a quorum in plenary sessions were included in the Parliament Act, for quorum rules could be used for obstructive tactics. Old Finn Juho Torppa argued referring to the alleged obstruction in the Diet of 1904–1905 that full numbers should not be required for committee sittings (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 26 Jan., 1906). However, eventually a quorum of four fifths for committee sittings was set (Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaan Valtio-päiväjärjestys 1906, § 45).

Regardless of the stated fear of obstruction, no limitations were proposed on the length or number of speeches in the Committee's proposal nor was the introduction of *clôture* or *guillotine* seen as necessary. The only limitations on members' freedom of speech were connected to parliamentary language and to speaking to the question. Consequently, based on the Parliament Act and the Eduskunta's rules of procedure, the parliament and its speaker were not given authority or means to restrain obstruction. In this sense, the sections of the Parliament Act which regulate speech were formulated mainly in order to protect the prestige of the new Eduskunta and its members, rather than to pre-empt undue speech.

Members of the Reform Committee emphasised the general atmosphere of the Eduskunta and the parliamentarians' personal morality as important protectors of the integrity of parliamentary deliberations. In his proposal for the

⁴³⁷ According to Pierre (1902, 1041), in the U.S. Chamber of Representatives members were allowed to speak once without the authorisation of the chamber and the same rule was adopted in Canada, Hungary and in the Italian Chamber of Deputies. In Holland and Belgium, members were allowed to speak twice on a matter. In Switzerland, members could speak three times, but members who had not spoken were given preference. (ibid.)

system of readings of the Eduskunta, Chair Robert Hermanson emphasised the need to preserve calm, open and congenial discussions and collaboration across party lines as important safeguards against obstruction (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 18 Jan., 1906). Similarly, Santeri Alkio, a Young Finn at that point, argued that “the spirit in the Eduskunta” (*henki eduskunnassa*) could best restrain disturbances. Thus, order could be achieved without severe measures. (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 12 Jan., 1906) Similarly, for example, Felix Heikel argued: “Everything in the Eduskunta depends on its spirit” (*kaikki eduskunnassa riippuu sen hengestä*). For Heikel, most important was that the Eduskunta have a common goal and a patriotic spirit (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 8 Dec., 1906). Rafael Erich, an eminent Finnish legal scholar and expert on constitutional and international law, prescribed a similar antidote against obstruction in his extensive article, “On ‘Parliamentary Obstruction’” (Erich 1908). Erich argued that proper rules and discipline could to a great extent prevent obstruction, but its possibility could never be totally ruled out. Thus, obstruction depended significantly on the parliamentarians’ educational, political and moral state of development (*edustajain sivistyksellisestä, poliittisesta ja siveellisestä kehityskannasta*). In addition, obstruction depended on the relations in society, legislation and parliament between minorities and the majority: The fewer reasons the minority had for discontent, the less obstruction was to be expected. (Erich 1908, 26)

The decision not to limit members’ speech rights and leave a great part of it to the morality and consideration of the parliamentarians themselves can be understood in the light of certain motives emphasised in the discussions of the Parliamentary Reform Committee. *Firstly*, the majority of the Committee repeatedly emphasised the importance of holding many-sided, rich, thorough and calm discussions and readings as a protection against immature, fluctuating and hasty decision-making by occasional majorities (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a; 1906b). Similar aspects were highlighted in the Diet readings of the Parliament Act (see e.g. Perustuslakivaliokunta 1906). Immature, inconsistent and erratic decision-making was seen as characteristic mainly of the poorly-educated masses, socialists and peasantry. The same aspects were emphasised when discussing the stages of parliamentary readings (see Section 6.8). Parliamentary procedure was seen as a means to prevent hasty action by the parliament. The idea was well present in nineteenth-century parliamentary literature, for example, in Walter Bagehot’s *Physics and Politics*. According to Bagehot, in a ‘government by discussion’, discussion is opposed to direct action:

If you want to stop instant and immediate action, always make it a condition that the action shall not begin till a considerable number of persons have talked over it, and have agreed on it. If those persons be people of different temperaments, different ideas, and different educations, you have an almost infallible security that nothing, or almost nothing, will be done with excessive rapidity. [...] But for the purpose now in hand — that of preventing hasty action, and ensuring elaborate consideration — there is no device like a polity of discussion. (Bagehot 1873 [1872], 192)

Secondly, freedom of speech was a matter of principle for the Finnish reformists. The idea of parliamentary freedom of speech as almost sacred, as highlighted in

the early Diets by the *Dagblad* liberals in relation to the British model, was advocated throughout the Finnish discussions. Limitations on parliamentary freedom of speech were seen to be in contradiction with this liberal and open-minded ideology.⁴³⁸ The Fennomans emphasised freedom of speech in relation to the development of Finnish culture, whereas the Social Democrats related it to the expression of the true opinions of the people and the carrying out of the will of the majority. Thus, free speech, which was argued to be an inherent and essential part of parliamentary life, was also advocated for in support of different political agendas.

Free speech was seen especially precious in the imperial context. The Parliamentary Reform Committee emphasised the parliamentarians' right to speak and discuss freely on a variety of topics without extra-parliamentary intervention and sanctions. The feared extra-parliamentary pressures were mainly Russian. The emphasis on the principle of free speech was apparent in view of several revisions the Committee made. The clause banning discussion on matters "unconstitutional" and "delicate" was removed from the Parliament Act of 1906. At the same time, the Eduskunta was given the right to elect its speaker, the speaker's oath was replaced with a solemn affirmation, and members' parliamentary immunity and freedom from arrest were strengthened (see Section 4.3).

The Committee worked against the backdrop of heated party disputes reported from foreign parliaments. Thus, the Reform Committee members repeatedly emphasised the need to minimise procedures that could be abused for party warfare. In this sense, limitations on the member's right of speech by giving the speaker or a qualified majority the power to decide on ending a debate was seen as a possible threat, especially as the speaker's position was during this period extremely politicised (see Section 4.3).

Consequently, regardless of the fear of obstructive speech, the reformists left parliamentary freedom of speech in the hands of the Eduskunta, giving it the power to decide on its rules of debate. When discussing obstruction, J. R. Danielson noted that some of the regulations important to the daily business of the Eduskunta should be left to be defined in the rules of procedure, instead of in the Parliament Act. Thereby it would be easier for the Eduskunta to change its procedures according to the daily challenges that arise. (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a, 15 Dec., 1905) However, in its rules of procedure, the Eduskunta only limited the time of debate speeches given from members' seats to two minutes, while leaving the duration of speeches from the rostrum unlimited (Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys 1907, § 24). Contrary to the Diets, no limitations were put on the number of speeches in the Eduskunta's rules of procedure. Based on § 30 of the rules of procedure of 1907, a new question was not to be brought up for discussion after 11 p.m.. According to the rules of procedure of 1908, the Eduskunta's plenaries could not continue after 11 p.m. unless the speaker saw a

⁴³⁸ E.g. in 1893 the Young Finn newspaper *Päivälehti* noted that the procedure of guillotine "does not fit together with liberal-mindedness (*wapaamielisyyden*) and the right of free speech (*wapaan sananwallan*)" (*Päivälehti*, 14 July, 1893, 3–4).

special reason for it and the Eduskunta so decided (ibid. § 30; Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys 1908, § 30).

In a discussion on the Eduskunta's rules of procedure in 1908, Social Democrat Väinö Vuolijoki repeated the proposal he had made in the Speaker's Council to ban written statements in the Eduskunta in order to avoid long time-consuming speeches, which were "often written by party secretaries". Vuolijoki argued that his proposal was based on German rules of procedure, and similar decisions had been made in France and England as well. Vuolijoki saw the rule as the "strengthening of a parliamentary practice (*parlamenttaarisen tavan vahvistamista*) that has proven very useful in other countries". (PTK 24 /1908, 586) Whereas in the French and British parliaments the ban had been aimed at enhancing the quality of debate (see Section 7.6.2), Vuolijoki presented it as a means to save the Eduskunta precious time. In Finland, the same argument as in France was used against Vuolijoki's proposal. Finnish Party member, farmer and preacher Emil Helkiö argued that the banning of written statements would effectively shut "the mouths of simple citizens" (*yksinkertaisten kansalaisten suut*), who had not gained experience in public speaking. (PTK 24 /1908, 588; see also Lagerlöf in ibid. 588–589) E. G. Palmén noted that he did not deny the possible usefulness of such a rule, but if the object was to save time, the rule should apply to the length of speeches that could be held (ibid. 587). It was also argued that written and prepared speeches in fact made the orations concise (Ahlroos in ibid. 586–587). Vuolijoki's proposal lost the vote.

9.5 The concept of obstruction and the Social Democrats' attack on parliamentary debate

In 1907, the Eduskunta started its work in an atmosphere of high hopes. The great expectations were not fulfilled, however, as the sessions were characterised by deep party conflicts, time used up in learning and disputing procedures, and Russian constraints, for example, in the form of dissolutions of parliament. The urgent need for social reforms, the scarcity of time resulting from heavy workloads and the short ninety-day sessions caused heated disputes over obstructive tactics and the alleged failures of the Parliament Act to prevent them. The disputes on obstruction focused on the length, content and character of speeches, as well as repeated deferrals of committee reports, delays in committee work and the Eduskunta's legislative procedure in general.

The Social Democrats condemned the Parliament Act as complex and multi-phased and criticised the legislative procedure for leaving too much possibilities for efficient obstruction (*Sosialisti*, 7 Nov., 1907, 2). The Grand Committee (*suuri valiokunta*), as planned by the Reform Committee, became a central target of the critique. The Committee was originally designed to incorporate characteristics of bicameralism in the procedure. In the socialist rhetoric, the Grand Committee was called a 'system for obstruction' (*jarrutuslaitos*) and described as

an unnecessary time-wasting device for conservative objectives; it made the Eduskunta a parliament of ‘one-and-a-half-chambers’ (*puolitoistakamarijärjestelmä*,⁴³⁹ *waleylikamari*,⁴⁴⁰ *keskenkasvuinen ylähuone*⁴⁴¹) while it hindered the legislative process and exhausted the MPs. In the Eduskunta in 1908, Social Democrats Frans Koskinen, Kalle Hämäläinen and Oskari Tokoi petitioned to amend the Diet Act in order to abolish the Grand Committee (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat 1907–1908, ANO 164/1908). Social Democrats criticised the Grand Committee for its secrecy as its sittings were closed to the public and the press. Allegedly, this left political opponents the power to practice obstruction and evade responsibility in relation to their electors.

The Social Democrats used the term *jarrutus* against procedures that empowered a relatively small proportion of members to influence readings and decision-making. Another procedure criticised by the SDP was the minority’s right to hold up proposed legislation until after the election of a new parliament (*lepäämään jättäminen*), which was an internationally unique product of the Finnish Parliamentary Reform of 1906. *Lepäämään jättäminen* was one of the proposals laid down in order to ensure that no momentary majority could have too much influence on legislation. The procedure was introduced in the Reform Committee after it had become obvious that the Eduskunta would be organised on the basis of unicameralism. *Lepäämään jättäminen* was strongly defended in the Committee by Old Finns Paasikivi and Danielson and eventually became part of the Parliament Act of 1906 (Eduskuntakomitea 1906a). Based on § 57, a minority of at least one third of the Eduskunta (67 out of 200 members) could during the third reading of a bill require that it be left in abeyance until the next parliamentary elections, after which it could be only passed or rejected. (For a detailed examination of the procedure, see Saraviita 1971)

Contrary to several other European parliaments, such as Belgium and Germany (see te Velde 2013, 136–142), in Finland the Social Democrats, who were the largest party in parliament (80 members of 200 in the first elections of 1907), did not engage in obstruction, but converted the concept into a rhetorical weapon that they used not only against political opponents, but against parliamentary debate and procedure. A major ingredient in the Social Democrats’ rhetoric was the term *jarrutus*, which during its existence in the Finnish political vocabulary had acquired a negative meaning, particularly among the Finnish-speaking majority. Their rhetoric described speech and debate, the main instruments of *jarrutus*, as with the goal of maintaining the *status quo* and the *ancien régime*, instead of promoting change, reform and democratisation. Social Democrat newspapers published articles titled, for example, “Obstruction in the Eduskunta” (*Jarrutus eduskunnassa*) (*Sosialidemokraatti*, 18 June, 1907, 2) and “Away with the Eduskunta’s Obstruction System!” (*Eduskunnan työtä hidastawa jarrutuslaitos pois*) (*Sosialidemokraatti*, 5 Mar., 1908, 1). The articles drew on newspaper reports on foreign obstruction campaigns and described how exces-

⁴³⁹ *Sosialisti*, 26 Nov., 1907, 2.

⁴⁴⁰ *Sosialidemokraatti*, 5 Mar., 1908, 1.

⁴⁴¹ Kuusinen 1906b, 246.

sive speech brought the whole Eduskunta to a standstill. Although no large-scale obstruction debates took place in the early Eduskunta,⁴⁴² the Social Democrats repeatedly stated their frustration over excessive speech and the absence of limits. They emphasised that they were themselves interested in the big questions of principle, not in the obstructive and time-consuming petty hair-splitting of their opponents. International Social Democrat theory, the Eduskunta's scarce time and the felt urgency of the social reforms motivated the SDP to emphasise the voting and decision-making aspects of the Eduskunta over its deliberative aspects. Finland's SDP viewed the parliament as a place for "real work" and decision-making, not idle words and useless debate. (See e.g. *Sosialidemokraatti*, 18 June, 1907, 2; *Savon Työmies*, 29 Sept., 1908, 1; *Kansan Tahto*, 29 Sept., 1908, 1; *Työ*, 10 Oct., 1908, 2)

The bourgeois parties' trump (*päävaltti*) in all questions is obstruction (*jarrutus*), in other words the aim of splitting hairs (*saiwarrella*) and complicating matters (*mutkistella*) as long as possible and kill time (*tappaa aikaa*) so that even the smallest reforms, which they should accept under the Social Democrats' pressure, would linger (*wiipyä*) as long as possible. (*Työ*, 20 Oct., 1907, 1)

Obstruction, which has gained such a huge and at the same time sad reputation abroad, has already been practised significantly in our Eduskunta. [...] Here lies the crux of these long and useless discussions, of this obstruction (*jarrutus*). Under the protection of the unlimited right of speech enjoyed by the Eduskunta members, as much time as possible is stolen for dwelling on trivial side-issues (*wähäpätöisten sivuseikkojen pohtimiseen*), and thus treatment of the great reforms, for the resolving of which the Eduskunta is really assembled, is hampered. (*Sosialidemokraatti*, 18 June, 1907, 1-2)

In the committees it has been observed how the gentlemen have been working their jaws (*pieksäneet suitaan*) and thus wasted precious time (*kuluttaneet kallista aikaa*). [...] It seems that the gentlemen's parties (*herraspuolueilla*) want to use up time so that the Communal Law would not be prepared during the whole parliamentary session. (*Savon Työmies*, 29 Sept., 1908, 1)

A long spell, another and a third have been wasted in idle blather, which amounts to nothing (*turhanpäiwäiseen jaaritteluun, jos ei ole tuon taiwaallista hyötyä*), if it is not counted as a benefit – as from some representatives' point of view it is – that the committee report is being delayed for weeks. (*Kansan Tahto*, 29 Sept., 1908, 1)

By extremely long discussions (*tawattoman pitkillä keskusteluilla*) the bourgeois parties have obstructed the passing of the law to an extent that it is uncertain whether the Communal Law will ever be realised. [...] It is not the Social Democrats but the bourgeois parties that can be blamed for dawdling in the treatment of the matter (*asian witkallisesta käsittelystä*). The numerous statements the bourgeois parties have put forth on minor things have wasted the Eduskunta's valuable time (*kuluttaneet eduskunnan kallista aikaa*). (*Työ*, 10 Oct., 1908, 2)

Socialist frustration with the Eduskunta's inability to realise social and political reform led to pejorative statements and cynicism about parliamentary proce-

⁴⁴² For later systematic obstruction debates in the Eduskunta, see Toivonen 1979 and Törnudd 1961. In the newborn Eduskunta a large-scale obstruction debate was seen both as a political impossibility as well as unnecessary in view of the scarce time and existing procedural arrangements that made delaying parliamentary work possible without systematic use of lengthy speech.

dures and speech. The Social Democrats compared the Eduskunta's work to foreign obstruction campaigns and used expressions similar to the reports on foreign obstruction campaigns to describe its excessive speech. Typical examples of these were "inundation of words" (*puhetulwa*), "rage for speaking" (*puheraiwo*), "mouthing off" (*suun pieksäminen*), "useless chatter" (*turhanpäiväinen jaarittelu, lörpöttelyistunnot*) and even "verbal diarrhoea" (*puheripuli*), which led to waste of time (*ajan tappaminen, kuluttaa kallista aikaa*) at the cost of the matter at hand (*asian tappaminen*). Social Democrat newspapers described their conservative and bourgeois opponents' time-wasting oratory as unparliamentary (*epäparlamenttaarinen*) or parliamentarily immature (*parlamenttaarisesti kypsymättön*) behaviour and published statistics on the biggest time-wasters based on the length and number of their speeches (e.g. *Työmies*, 29 Sept., 1908, 5; *Vapaus*, 25 Jan., 1908, 4; on introduction of speech statistics, see Section 8.7.6). By systematically employing a vocabulary that had been used for decades in reporting on the harm caused by parliamentary obstruction abroad and comparing this to the alleged obstruction of reform in Finland, the socialist rhetoric of *jarrutus* worked against the deliberative aspect of the early Eduskunta.

9.6 Conclusions

The case of obstruction illustrates how parliaments internationally shared common challenges when faced with increases in the amount of speaking and overloads in the amount of parliamentary work. As a result, national parliaments adopted similar arguments and procedural models. The newspaper press was the main arena where the Finnish debates came into contact with foreign parliamentary models. The case of obstruction illustrates how the formation of the Finnish political vocabulary and language were indebted to the foreign parliamentary discussions reported in Finnish newspapers.

The interest in foreign parliaments fuelled Finnish discussions in which new political vocabulary was coined, redefined or abandoned. The concept of parliamentary obstruction was originally introduced in Finland in the Diet, but its use was soon expanded to other disputes between the minority and the majority. Finnish newspaper reports on foreign obstruction translated and standardised expressions concerning the misuse or excessive use of speech. The rhetoric of obstruction reached its peak in the vocabulary of the Social Democratic Party in the early Eduskunta. Even though the fear of obstruction did not result in radical procedure measures in the Eduskunta, the concept of parliamentary obstruction was found useful in Finnish rhetoric that belittled debate and undermined its role.

The adoption of the concept of parliamentary obstruction in Finland is linked to an international parliamentary current of the period. However, it is not a coincidence that the idea of obstructive speech found support in Finland. The case of obstruction illustrates how Finns had problems accepting and acknowledging that the parliamentary mode of proceeding is based on the idea

that a sufficient amount of time be reserved for deliberation. In a parliament, the question is not merely about following through on a principle by a majority vote, but about the readings of the specific questions on the agenda. Formulating opinions and ideas into a parliamentary form takes time in itself, and the process of formulation produces new aspects and potential points of dispute. In principle, every stage of a reading offers the possibility to take a new position and potential for more arguments and counter-arguments.

Thus, from the traditional parliamentary procedure point of view, the parliament's purpose is not to merely answer the question of whether a reform is passed or not, but to deliberate on the character of the reform and its details. In the Finnish Diet, the estates' role in either approving or rejecting government proposals undermined this purpose. In the Diets the Fennomans and in the early Eduskunta the Social Democrats saw many of the debatable aspects as something already determined. The Fennomans, drawing on Snellman's Hegelian thought and Yrjö Koskinen, based their ideas of the 'already determined' on the realisation of a rational national spirit, and later on Koskinen's 'will of the people'. The Social Democrats based the priority of reform on the will of the majority of the people, the workers and the poor. It seems that neither Fennoman "idealism" nor socialist "materialism" saw parliamentary deliberation in the form of debate as able to bring anything significant to the table or change prevailing points of view. When the possibility for reform finally came, swift decisions were seen as of the utmost importance, not time-consuming debates and many-sided evaluations of alternatives.

From the procedural point of view, parliamentary time is incompatible with the idea of progress as conceived in the Finnish discussions. In parliament, every reading and speech is a possibility for a new turn. Time is not just something that passes by, but a means for politics. As this seemed not to have been understood, the Finnish parliamentary learning process was still "a work-in-progress". The Finnish discussions missed the point of the foreign obstruction discussions, which emphasised achieving a fair distribution of parliamentary time; the Finnish discussions focused instead on 'excesses of speech' without seriously taking on procedural measures to regulate it.

10 CONCLUSIONS

This study has explored the introduction of the forms of parliamentary life in Finland in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, approaching it as a learning process in which the Finnish newspaper press played a central role. Newspapers were used as a medium for the study and teaching of foreign parliamentary models and for debating Finnish procedures. The Finnish debate on parliaments was part of an international discourse and a joint publicity, although the relation was not reciprocal: Finland in the periphery did not actively contribute to the discussions in the centre. However, the special character of the Finnish Diet was acknowledged in foreign literature.⁴⁴³ Finland's position as a latecomer in parliamentary life and in the international discourse meant that Finnish actors and debaters could benefit from the experience of other countries by evaluating and comparing their practices.

The thesis has cast light on a lost history of Finnish parliamentarism. The Finnish discussions on parliaments and their rules and practices reflected an understanding of parliamentarism as a procedural mode of politics, which was seen relatively separate from the parliament's electoral system and powers. The indebtedness of the Finnish discussions to international debates illustrates that this aspect was well present in countries both with and without parliamentary governments.

Study of the Finnish discussions illustrates the early significance given to the parliament and its procedures in Finland. The parliament was not only understood as an important means for realisation of reforms and improvement of Finland's status, but it played a central role also in the activation of Finnish political life. The new beginning of the Diets in the 1860s and their regularisation by the Diet Act of 1869 caused an enlivenment and proliferation of the newspaper press and coincided with the rise of the mass organisation and the activation of civil society. During the period Finnish actors examined and debated the question of the manner in which political disputes were to be treated. This process was indebted to, and in a sense inseparable from, an examination of the

⁴⁴³ See Eugène Pierre's treatment of free mandates in Section 5.1.

parliamentary model. The practices of Finnish political life were developed and disputed simultaneously with an increased interest in parliaments and their procedures. As a result, parliamentary models were discussed in relation to the practices of a variety of different meetings, associations and deliberative assemblies as well as the practices of the newspaper press.

The simultaneous activation of parliamentary life and the press, as well as the close relation of the newspapers to Diet politics, gave birth to a Finnish peculiarity. In the European periphery, where topical political literature was difficult to acquire and circulate, the role of the parliament and its modes of proceeding were actively discussed and disputed in relation to foreign models through the newspapers. The press facilitated the Finnish parliamentary learning process by offering an arena for the transmission and translation of foreign procedure models, arguments and concepts. Study of the vast newspaper material illustrates what interest, energy and commitment the Finnish actors put into parliamentary matters.

A great share of the procedures and principles that regulate deliberations in today's Eduskunta were formulated already in estate rules and the Diet Act of 1869 and in the early Eduskunta's rules of procedure and the Parliament Act of 1906. The existing literature has presented the history of Finnish procedures as a straightforward and rather mechanical transition to the Swedish Riksdag model. However, as the analysis of the early Finnish procedure debates illustrates, there was no single, shared or uniform process of transmitting and learning parliamentary rules and practices in Finland, despite the later establishment of procedures in the Eduskunta. Rather, the rules and practices used in the current Eduskunta are the results of political disputes. Contrary to the interpretations that have emphasised following of *Staatsräsön*, adaptation to the prevailing conditions and the influence of *realpolitik* on the Finnish procedure discussions, a closer analysis indicates that possibilities for different modes of proceeding were present and proposed in the early Finnish debates. Finnish actors proposed a series of procedural innovations, some of which won sufficient support while others were turned down. With respect to the procedures, the parliament did have room to manoeuvre, and not all of the rejections and delays of procedural revision were the result of Russian, but of Finnish objections.

The Finnish learning of "the ABCs of parliamentary life", an expression used by E. G. Palmén in the Eduskunta in 1907,⁴⁴⁴ was largely political. Finnish procedure debates were struggles between different conceptions of parliament and competing notions of deliberation and representation. Based on these, political groups looked to different foreign models and gave parliament different purposes and character. The various ways of framing were connected to ongoing political disputes, settings and constellations. In other words, the politics of the day were an inseparable part of the procedure debates. In addition to different approaches to parliament, the argumentation in the procedure debates was also a means to keep one's distance from political opponents. Thus, the Fen-

⁴⁴⁴ Palmén was reminding Eduskunta representatives about the parliamentary purpose of a referral debate (PTK 11/1907, 506–508).

nomans with foreign interests were more aware of the international connotations of procedures than they were ready to admit in their stated arguments, which emphasised Finnish backwardness, low Finnish levels of development and education, and the harmfulness of a blind adoption of foreign models. Similarly for the *Dagblad* liberals Sweden was a far more important source and route of parliamentary ideas than they wanted to admit under the existing political circumstances. The Social Democrats, for their part, attacked conventional modes of speaking and proceeding as a further means to distance themselves from the bourgeoisie.

In the Diets until the mid-1880s the *Dagblad* liberals were the most prominent advocates for the procedural understanding of parliamentarism in Finland. While parliamentary government and radical parliamentary reform were largely out of question, procedures offered a means for the Dagbladists to develop the Diet towards the practices of modern parliaments and to overcome the deficiencies of the obsolete diet system. The procedural innovations, of which plenum plenum was the clearest example, offered occasions for alternative modes of proceeding while at the same time preserving the external forms of estate representation. In the procedure debates, the *Dagblad* liberals emphasised the Diet as “a parliamentary assembly” that was part of international “parliamentary life and history”. They gave priority to openly dissensual *pro et contra* plenary debate in which all opinions and arguments were brought into direct struggle and tested against each other. The Dagbladists’ perspectivistic notion of debate was indebted especially to the model of the British parliament and authors such as John Stuart Mill. According to the leading *Dagblad* liberals, in parliament the educated and capable representatives of the people, as trustees bound by moral responsibility, debated on the questions and direction of the nation. The decisions of the parliament were not and could not be based on any rational principle or general spirit. Instead of final truths, parliamentary deliberation – and politics in general – could at its best offer only decisions that were based on many-sided and fair debate of the questions on the agenda. A consensus as to the ‘best option’ could always be contested. According to Dagbladists, the debate in parliament was to be based on the models of the parliaments of foreign “constitutional and free states”. The *Dagblad* liberals held up a *debating parliament* as their ideal. The parliament and its debates had priority in the deliberations of the polity: Only the Diet could speak in the name of the people, and the model of a debating parliament was to be spread to the public by publishing its debates and encouraging other political and social actors to follow its style of debate and agenda.

In the Finnish procedure debates Fennomans, drawing on Snellman and Yrjö Koskinen, adopted a different approach to that of the *Dagblad* liberals. Giving priority to political goals and reform and showing disinterest in the deliberative procedure led the Fennomans to belittle the Dagbladist notion of debate and to neglect its role in deliberation. Fennomans saw the main work of the Diet as taking place in committees, where deliberation took the form of consensual negotiation and accommodation between prevailing opinions of the estates.

The estate division as such was not an insurmountable hindrance to the fulfilment of the main purpose of the Diet work, namely, realisation of the interests of the nation and its Finnish-speaking majority. Instead, in order to push through what they presented as the majority opinion into concrete decisions and reforms, the Fennomans focused on gaining the majority in the Diet through, for example, changing the forms of representation in the Burghers. From the Fennoman point of view, the usefulness of the Diet and its deliberations were evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

In the procedure debates, leading Fennomans saw the primary purpose of Diet deliberations as being to express and bring about actions that reflected the prevailing opinion and were in the nation's interest, the ideas about which were often already determined and explicated outside of the Diet, for example, among the Fennoman elite or within public discussion. Thus, for example the printing of full minutes of the debates of the Diet was long considered of secondary importance and argued to be a mere nuisance compared to the publication of actual results of the Diet work. Debates were given importance only after their educative and nation-building role was acknowledged. In contrast to the *Dagblad* liberals, Fennomans did not highlight the Diet as a 'parliament' comparable to its foreign counterparts, and they refrained from active or explicit use of foreign parliamentary models. Until the 1880s, the Fennomans in a sense adapted to the Diet's existing procedural setting, viewing the Finnish Diet from a procedural point of view as a *negotiating assembly* in the service of the majority. Fennomans in many aspects accepted the existing procedures, which had already been developed to facilitate efficient consensus-building, at least "for the time being". Although changes in the course of the Fennoman movement and its inner factions, such as the rise of the *Valvoja* group and the Young Finns in the 1880s, changed some of the Fennoman attitudes towards the work of the Diet and increased their regard for debate, their approach held on to the idea of coherent nation-building. In this they lacked the aspect of dissensual debate and the idea of procedure as its safeguard.

In the early Finnish procedure debates, the deliberative aspect was brought out when defence against the rhetoric of 'the will of the majority' or the excessive influence of the people was needed. In the Diets the *Dagblad* liberals' focus on deliberation was also aimed against the Fennoman idea that the work of the assembly was merely to carry out the purported majority opinion and its concomitant reforms. Although the *Dagblad* liberals seemed to give their notion of debate intrinsic value as a guarantee for well-argued decisions and close, fair and many-sided examination of political questions, the procedure debates gave the *Dagblad* liberals also the possibility to defend the role of the minority against the Fennoman emphasis on the representation of the national interest defined by, or in the name of, the Finnish-speaking majority. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, former *Dagblad* liberals distinguished increasingly as supporters and protectors of the interests of the conservative elite.

In the Parliamentary Reform of 1906 and the Eduskunta, the bourgeois parties allied against the Social Democrats with argumentation that highlighted

the Eduskunta as a deliberative assembly against the socialists' model of parliament as a *voting and decision making assembly*, whose primary duty was to realise the will of the majority of the people and execute the necessary reforms. Such emphasis had been typical for the Fennoman majority in the Diets as well. While the Social Democrats' argumentation in procedural debates rested on party-delegate model of representation and its efficient realisation, the bourgeois parties' views on deliberation highlighted compromise as a means to reach consent across party lines. This required giving up predetermined opinions and detailed election promises. The Eduskunta parties' views on deliberation were a contrast to the *Dagbladists'* openly dissensual idea of *pro et contra* debate. The bourgeois parties argued against the Social Democrat model that parliamentary deliberation was about calm search for the best option. This aspect was strengthened in the Parliamentary Reform Committee, which designed strong procedural measures to block the influence of hasty decisions made by occasional majorities. In the Eduskunta, the Social Democrats were not seeking consensus as such. However, they did not grasp the Eduskunta's procedure as a means to enhance the dissensual aspects of parliamentary work, but their dissensual emphasis remained on the level of rhetoric and subject matters. At the same time, the Social Democrat rhetoric drew greatly on a populist rhetoric that contrasted action, work and decisions with speech, deliberation and debate – an idea that had been typical to Fennoman stands as well.

The 'lost history' argument presented in the introduction deserves further examination. As discussed, the procedural aspect of parliamentarism and its importance in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Finnish discussions have not been acknowledged in the existing literature. A reason for this is that the connection between the procedural aspect and debate did not receive strong explicit support after the first decades of the regular Diets in Finland. Rather, this characteristic of parliamentary life was to a great extent neglected by political groups after the breakup of the *Dagblad* liberals in the Diets and the Eduskunta. Thus, in retrospect, the *Dagbladist* emphasis on debate from the 1860s to the mid-1880s can be easily interpreted as a mere curiosity.

However, the small but influential *Dagblad* liberal group, who were in the centre of Finnish politics during the period, played an important role in introducing parliamentary topics, models, procedures and concepts in the Finnish discussions. This has not been previously acknowledged in the literature. Although some of the *Dagbladists'* proposals and ideas remained unrealised, they were not without significance. When presented in the leading Finnish newspaper *Helsingfors Dagblad* and brought to the Diet agendas, the *Dagbladists'* proposals had to be taken into account also by their Fennoman adversaries. Thus, although not supported or passed, the procedure proposals forced the opponents to react, reflect and argue. Part of the *Dagblad* liberals' procedural innovations were, in fact, later adopted and applied in the Eduskunta as ordinary and established parliamentary characteristics. As a result of the nineteenth-century discussions, procedures and foreign models were already familiar in the Parliamentary Reform of 1906; for example, the core of the Parliamentary Reform

Committee consisted of persons who had been active in Finnish political life and the Diets for decades. Thus, while the claimed radicalism and unexpectedness of the Parliamentary Reform of 1906 concerned the suffrage and electoral system, in terms of the Eduskunta's procedures, the Reform was merely the continuation of a learning process that had begun in Finland already in the nineteenth century.

Another reason for the 'lost history' can be seen in the forms of the political system, which has influenced the understandings of the role and purposes of the parliament. Regardless of the centrality given to the Diet and the early Eduskunta by some of the Finnish political actors, the parliament was, and is, only a part of the political system, in addition to which its role is dependent on social and political disputes, upheavals and reforms taking place outside of it. Finland's status as a grand duchy put limits on reform. These aspects help one to understand the Fennomans and Social Democrat stands on procedure and debate. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the great social and political reforms in Finland were initiated and took place largely outside the parliament. The reforms were subordinated to the will of the emperor and dictated by shifts in Russian and international politics. At the same time, the Finnish parliament's role in the political system remained problematic and relatively insignificant. For the Fennomans and the developing labour movement the parliament offered only one – although a significant – arena for struggle and means for reform. Both the Fennomans and the Social Democrats saw the Finnish parliament as a tool subordinate to political goals, and their hopes for parliamentary work relied heavily on the realisation of reforms. As the reforms proved difficult to realise through the Diet and the early Eduskunta, debate and procedure seemed to lose their meaning. Thus, for the former Fennomans, for example, the proper time for embracing the deliberative aspect and expressing an interest in foreign procedures was only later, in the Parliamentary Reform and the early Eduskunta, after some of the most important reforms on representation, suffrage and the language question had been realised, and during which time the Social Democrat faction were posing a threat to the old majority. The Social Democrats' attitude towards established procedures and debate was influenced greatly by their disappointment and frustration with the Eduskunta's inability to execute important social and political reforms. In the early Eduskunta, the Social Democrats won the elections repeatedly, but the prevailing political conditions, fragmentary parliamentary work, Eduskunta's massive workload and scarcity of time hindered the fulfilment of the high expectations given to the new democratic unicameral parliament.

In the early twentieth century the role of the Finnish parliament was further complicated and tested by dissolutions of the Eduskunta, the Russian revolutions and the World Wars. However, as a sign of a parliamentary tradition, the Eduskunta was able to preserve its existence through the aftermath of the Civil War (1918) and the threat of the radical far-right in the 1930s. A significant hindrance to the establishment of the procedural aspect and debate was the introduction of the semi-presidential system after Finnish independence, which

undermined the parliament's deliberative role and which began to be dissolved only in the 1980s after President Kekkonen's rule.

In retrospect, the 'lost history' can be also viewed as *a lost chance*. As the study points out, alternatives and occasions for different modes of proceeding were available. However, the idea of organising parliamentary debate based on egalitarian but procedurally dissensual grounds and raising the debates of the parliament to a more significant role did not gain a strong hold in the Finnish procedures. In addition to the introduction of the semi-presidential system, in the Parliamentary Reform and the early Eduskunta the practices of plenary debate were not organised to facilitate the clash and test of opposing opinions and arguments, but were rather aimed at restraining controversy and protecting plenary speaking in the form of statements. For example, the early Eduskunta did not adopt the practice of *pro et contra* debate speeches; instead, the floor was given to members in the order of requests. Procedure revisions to enhance debate in the Eduskunta have been made only lately as part of the intentional parliamentarisation of the Finnish practices.⁴⁴⁵ Regardless of the recent procedural revisions, the Eduskunta's practices have continued to highlight the preparatory and compromise-building role of standing committees in parliamentary reading. Instead of centrality of plenary debate, the Eduskunta's work has largely focused on checking the details of bills and ratifying the governmental programme of the winning party or coalition, which has been marketed as the will of the majority of the electorate.⁴⁴⁶ The primary work of parliament is seen as taking place in committees behind closed doors, where deliberative talk is practised freely and can be seen to have a real influence.⁴⁴⁷

The importance of procedure for the character of deliberation can be further developed. As the thesis has pointed out, the Finnish learning process is not to be understood merely as a transfer of external forms of parliamentary life into the Finnish context. Some Finnish actors have explicitly emphasised that adaptation to a certain procedural model of deliberation can also guide the way in which parliamentary work, its character, possibilities and purposes is understood. In this sense, the procedure itself has an educating and attitude-evolving capacity. As Finnish discussants who spoke of the "parliamentary education" in applying parliamentary procedures in extra-parliamentary meetings and associations highlighted, the procedure can not only organise and regulate controversies and facilitate their fair and effective resolution, but it can also have an influence on the understanding of the character of political action. Adoption of a certain mode of proceeding can alter the way in which the questions under consideration are understood. As the Finnish debates and their debt to foreign discussions point out, different notions of deliberation are based on and implicate different approaches to politics and to the epistemology of political questions and concepts. A person, who has adopted a perspectivist approach to political questions and concepts deliberates in a different manner than a person

⁴⁴⁵ Hidén 2011, 88–95.

⁴⁴⁶ See Nousiainen 2006, 332 and Palonen 2010b, 134.

⁴⁴⁷ Pekonen 2011.

who negotiates only in order to reach a compromise or consensus or who believes her concepts are based on reason or their meaning is universally understood.⁴⁴⁸ A *pro et contra* approach to parliamentary procedure and its mode of thinking helps one to understand dissensus and dispute, and recognise them as unavoidable but yet natural and beneficial characteristics of politics.

Drawing on this, the 'lost history' argument can be developed in relation to contemporary discussions as well. The historical study of the procedure debates helps to open up contemporary practices to examination. Due to the active contribution of Finnish reformists and parliamentarians, the Finnish Diets and the early Eduskunta fulfilled certain conditions necessary to deliberative representative assemblies, such as free mandate, freedom of speech and parliamentary immunity. Only under such conditions, which are determined in detail largely through procedures, could parliamentarians independently weigh different options, argue freely, and persuade others and possibly become persuaded themselves on a given matter. In this sense, parliament was – before the introduction of party platforms, representation and mandates – in many ways a more deliberative assembly. This is what the *Dagbladists* highlighted. Using the ideas of Mill, it can be phrased that the *Dagblad* liberals saw that the Diet – the Finnish parliament of the time – was best suited for its purpose when it *debated* over the best interests of the nation and when the speeches in the Diet reflected the opinions of the most prominent members of the polity and of the persons who had elected them as their trustees.

Interestingly, although the procedural aspect of parliamentarism is rather neglected in today's research and public discussion, the contemporary contestations about parliamentarism are based on a style of argumentation and logic very similar to that of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Recent critiques and discussions have repeated the partly contradictory arguments of the parliament as a 'place for idle words', a 'rubber stamp of the government' and 'political theatre', which have been common to parliamentary histories internationally. *One* reason for the unpopularity of the parliament can be seen in the lack of an understanding of parliamentary procedure, which has led to attacks against both individual representatives and the parliament as an institution.⁴⁴⁹ However, compared to the historical debates, the contemporary discussion and defences of parliaments and parliamentarians have lacked the talk of parliament's singularity and the significance of parliamentary procedure for the deliberative aspect.

The recurrent critique of parliaments' modes of proceeding is in a sense understandable. Parliament is not only a deliberative, but also a representative institution. How to fairly or sufficiently combine the two aspects remains the unavoidable and at the same time the most disputed and problematic question of any representative assembly. From the point of view of the classic parliamentary procedures that were codified during the eighteenth and nineteenth centu-

⁴⁴⁸ See Stenius 2003, 310.

⁴⁴⁹ Malfeasance by representatives in the form of corruption *et cetera* is also a central ingredient, and a story of its own.

ries, the parliament is an elitist institution. Only a small amount of representatives can be elected and directly take part in parliamentary work. At the same time, procedures of parliaments traditionally offer a means to block, restrain and slow down the influence of representation and protect parliamentarians from extra-parliamentary pressures. The parliamentary mandate itself is an ambiguous and a widely disputed concept. The fact that the procedures have remained largely unchanged up today is a result of trying to maintain and protect the deliberative aspect during times in which the forms of direct democracy and people's possibilities to influence the work of the parliament have been increasingly highlighted. An historical approach helps one to understand the background and justifications for procedure. From a procedural point of view, the purpose of parliament and its procedures can be seen to be in upholding and protecting parliamentary deliberation as a means to debate and examine the pros and cons of each question on the agenda. This requires that a sufficient amount of time be reserved for each stage of the reading, with enough time for reflection between discussions. The characteristics of the parliamentary mode of proceeding that in public discussions are often criticised as the biggest flaws of parliament, such as the inefficiency in executing the 'opinions of the people' and accusations of parliament being 'all talk, no action', can be seen as parliament's most valuable features compared to merely carrying out the alleged and predetermined majority opinions without an examination and weighing of the competing points of view. From an etymological, procedural and historical point of view, speaking, discussing and debating are the very essence of parliament.

However, the procedural aspect has been largely marginalised in the literature and in public discussion. The approach to deliberation that relied on the procedural aspect and was rooted in an examination of different national parliaments and their discussions seems to have been neglected and lost. For example, since the end of the twentieth century, the mainstream focus of international research and literature on deliberation has been on theories of 'deliberative democracy'. This approach has rather unanimously neglected the historical singularity of the parliament and its procedural model. Instead, theories of deliberative democracy have presented their conceptualisations as mainly ahistorical. As is often the case, examination of past debates reveals the historicity of contemporary formulations, which are reproduced under new terminologies and conceptualisations. As the peripheral case of Finland already illustrates, topics and challenges common to contemporary theorisations of deliberation were already discussed by political actors of the past in relation to the problems set by the political life itself. Thus, the study of historical debates on procedure enables an analysis that is historical, but theoretically still relevant. In contrast to purely theoretical explorations, the historical analysis of parliamentary procedures and discussions could be further utilised in offering and developing fair methods and rules for regulating deliberation. In addition to the deliberations of parliament, the examination of the procedural aspect could be further extended to include the "pain points" of representative democracy. A subject

for such an approach could be, for example, political parties, which play a far more developed and decisive role in parliamentary politics today than in the period and material of this thesis.

TIIVISTELMÄ

'Parlamentista' on tullut tyhjä sana. Erotuksena parlamenteille historiallisesti annetuista merkityksistä nykypäivänä parlamenttia tarkastellaan usein vain edustuksellisenä ja lakia säätävänä elimenä osana parlamentaarista hallitusjärjestelmää. Samaa rajattua katsantokantaa seuraten eduskuntaa koskeva tutkimus ja julkinen keskustelu ovat nähneet parlamentin päätehtävinä hallitusohjelman tai vaaleissa muodostetun "kansan tahdon" toteuttamisen. Nämä painotukset ovat ohjanneet eduskuntatutkimusta kohti hallitusjärjestelmää, vaaleja ja äänioikeutta koskevia kysymyksiä. Samalla parlamentaarinen deliberaatio ja menettelytavat on jätetty vähälle huomiolle.

Käsillä oleva tutkimus nostaa esiin suomalaisen parlamentarismien unohdetun historian. Tutkimuksessa tarkastellaan suomalaisen parlamentaarisen elämän kehitystä 1800-luvun lopun säätyvaltiopäivillä ja 1900-luvun alun yksikamarisessa eduskunnassa. Suomi oli tuolloin osa Venäjän keisarikuntaa. Säätyvaltiopäiviä ja varhaista eduskuntaa koskevat tutkimukset ovat toistaneet, että aikakauden suomalainen parlamentarismi oli heikkoa tai sitä ei ollut. Toisin kuin nämä parlamentarismia hallitusjärjestelmänä lähestyneet tutkimukset tämä kyseinen tutkimus tarkastelee parlamentarismia parlamentaaristen menettelytapojen näkökulmasta. 1860-luvulta alkaen parlamentaarisen hallitusjärjestelmän ollessa tavoittamattomissa Suomessa parlamentin rooli ja menettelytavat olivat keskeinen debatin aihe sekä säätyvaltiopäivillä että sanomalehdistössä. Parlamentarismi nähtiin tietynlaisena tapana puhua, deliberoida ja debatoida. Tämä proseduraalinen aspekti oli läsnä myös maissa, jotka olivat jo siirtyneet parlamentaariseen hallitusjärjestelmään. Proseduurit tarjosivat suomalaisille debatoijille mahdollisuuden kehittää säätyvaltiopäiviä sisältä päin kohti ulkomaisia parlamenttiesikuvia kuitenkin nelisäätyedustuksen mallin säilyttäen.

Aiempi tutkimus on sivuuttanut menettelytapoihin liittyvän parlamentarismien tulkinnan sekä sen taustalla vaikuttaneet kansainväliset keskustelut. Eduskunnan menettelytapoja on tutkittu lakitieteen näkökulmasta, joka on keskittynyt menettelytapoja määrittävien tekstien ja käytäntöjen tulkintaan huomioiden niitä osana laajempaa kansainvälistä parlamentaarista kulttuuria. Eduskunnan varhaista historiaa käsittelevät tutkimukset ovat puolestaan keskittyneet pääasiassa valtiopäiväjärjestyksiin 1869 ja 1906, ja niiden sisältöön suhteessa Venäjään sekä Suomen entiseen emämaahan Ruotsiin. Samalla suomalaisten menettelytapojen muotoutuminen on kuvattu ruotsalaisen valtiopäiväsäännösten ja käytäntöjen mekaanisena siirtymisenä suomalaiseen kontekstiin. Tämä tutkimus kuitenkin osoittaa, että suomalainen parlamentaaristen menettelytapojen muotoutuminen oli oppimisprosessi, jossa hyödynnettiin laajasti aikakauden kansainvälisiä parlamenttikeskusteluja ja esimerkkejä. Ruotsalainen malli tarjosi pikemminkin valtiopäivätyön kehittämisen perustan, jonka pohjalta keskusteltiin erilaisista menettelytavoista ja niiden merkityksestä. Suomalaisissa proseduuridebateissa venäläisen hallinnon määrittämää vanhaa

ruotsalaista valtiopäivämallia käytettiin tarkoitushakuisesti ja valikoiden usein varsinaiset esikuvat peittäen.

Tutkimus hyödyntää aiemmin tutkimattomia, hiljattain digitoituja historiallisia sanomalehtiaineistoja suomalaisten parlamentarismikeskusteluiden kokonaisvaltaisemmassa ymmärtämisessä. Sanomalehtien lisäksi tutkimuksen keskeisinä aineistoina ovat valtiopäiväjärjestyksistä sekä säätyjen ja eduskunnan itse luomista proseduureista käydyt keskustelut. Sanomalehdistöllä oli keskeinen rooli näiden keskusteluiden valmistelussa, kommentoinnissa ja argumentaation syventämisessä. Sanomalehtiaineistojen digitointi tarjoaa tilaisuuden analysoida aiemmin tutkimattomia keskusteluja ja tehdä uusia tulkintoja jo tutkituista. Analyysi osoittaa, kuinka suomalaiset poliittiset toimijat käyttivät sanomalehdistöä välineenä ulkomaisten parlamentaaristen menettelytapojen tarkasteluun ja menettelytapojen opettamiseen sekä areenana suomalaisista menettelytavoista kiistelylle. Lisäksi lehdistöllä oli tärkeä rooli parlamentaaristen proseduurien ja käsitteistön siirtämisessä, kääntämisessä ja popularisoinnissa. Poliittisten ryhmien organisoima sanoma- ja aikakauslehdistö auttoi paikkaamaan puutteita ulkomaisen parlamenttikirjallisuuden saatavuudessa Suomessa julkaisemalla parlamentteja käsitteleviä erikoisartikkeleita ja kääntämällä ulkomaisia debatteja. Kirjallisuuden saatavuutta rajoittivat paitsi suuriruhtinaskunnan perifeerinen sijainti myös venäläinen sensuuri. Tutkimuksen parlamentti- ja sanomalehtiaineistoja yhdistävä retorinen ja käsitteellinen analyysi osoittaa, että suomalaiset keskustelut perustuivat aikakauden parlamenttikeskusteluiden läheiseen seuraamiseen. Perifeerinen Suomi oli osa eurooppalaista keskustelua ja julkisuutta, vaikka suomalaiset esimerkit eivät vaikuttaneetkaan keskustassa käytyihin debatteihin.

Tutkimuksen aineistoanalyysissä suomalaisia keskusteluja lähestyttiin kolmen eri vaiheen kautta. Nämä vaiheet on nimetty parlamenttitermistöä käyttäen ”käsittelyiksi”. Ensimmäinen käsittely keskittyi suomalaisissa keskusteluissa käytettyjen ulkomaisten esimerkkien etsimiseen ja tarkasteluun. Pelkän kansallisten menettelytapojen ulkoista muotoa keskenään vertailevan tutkimuksen sijaan huomio kiinnitettiin menettelytapojen perusteluihin. Toisessa käsittelyssä tarkasteltiin suomalaisissa debateissa esiintyneiden ulkomaisten esimerkkien ja mallien poliittista käyttöä. Suomalaisten debattien lähempi tarkastelu paljastaa, että poliittiset ryhmät ja toimijat käyttivät ulkomaisia esimerkkejä valikoiden. Valikointi perustui erilaisiin, keskenään kilpaileviin edustus- ja deliberaatiokäsityksiin – toisin sanoen erilaisiin käsityksiin parlamentin roolista ja sen toiminnan päämääristä. Ulkomaisia malleja käytettiin debateissa rajaamaan sitä, mikä nähtiin suomalaisessa parlamentaarisessa elämässä mahdollisena ja toivottavana. Ulkomaiset keskustelut toivat suomalaisiin debatteihin uusia käsitteellisiä välineitä, ideoita ja argumentteja. Ulkomaiset keskustelut auttoivat suomalaisia myös tekemään moderneja menettelytapoihin liittyviä innovaatioita vanhakantaisen säätyedustuksen puitteissa.

Suomalaisia proseduuridebateja tarkastellaan tutkimuksessa aikakauden ulkomaisten parlamenttiaineistojen ja -kirjallisuuden kautta. Niistä hyödynnetään klassisia brittiläistä ja ranskalaista parlamenttikulttuuria käsitteleviä pro-

seduuriteoksia, kuten Thomas Erskine Mayn *Parliamentary Practice* (ensimmäinen painos 1844) ja Eugène Pierren *Traité de droit politique électoral et parlementaire* (ensimmäinen painos 1893), sekä eri maiden parlamenttidebatteja, proseduuridokumentteja sekä perustuslakeja. Ulkomaisia parlamenttiaineistoja ja kirjallisuutta käytetään analyysissä kahdella tapaa. Ensinnäkin tietyissä tapauksissa niissä käsitellyt esimerkit toimivat malleina ja argumentaatiolähteinä suomalaisille debatoijille. Toiseksi parlamenttikirjallisuutta ja -aineistoja käytetään analyysivälineinä avaamaan ja teoretisoimaan suomalaisia debatteja laajemmassa kansainvälisessä kontekstissa.

Tutkimusaineistojen kolmannessa käsittelyssä keskityttiin analysoimaan suomalaisissa debateissa esiin nousseita deliberaatio- ja edustuskäsityksiä aikakauden kansainvälisten teoreetikkojen kautta. Suomalaisia käsityksiä avataan kirjoittajien, kuten John Stuart Millin ja François Guizot'n sekä Johan Vilhelm Snellmanin hegeliläisen ajattelun kautta. Kuten parlamenttikirjallisuuden tapauksessa kirjoittajia käytetään havainnollistamaan heidän rooliaan inspiraation lähteenä suomalaisille toimijoille, minkä lisäksi heidän ideoitaan hyödynnetään myös metodologisina ja teoreettisina välineinä syventämään analyysiä ja käsitteellistämään tutkimuslöydöksiä. Kolmannen käsittelyn kautta tutkimus pystyy osoittamaan, kuinka suomalaisissa keskusteluissa varsin tekniset ja yksityiskohdaiset menettelytapakysymykset liittyivät merkittäviin ideologisiin kiistoihin.

Säätyvaltiopäivien menettelytapadebatteja lähestytään tutkimuksessa fennomaanien ja ruotsinkielisten *Helsingfors Dagblad* -sanomalehden ympärille ryhmittyneiden dagbladistien vastakkainasettelun kautta. Aiempi tutkimus ei ole huomionnut tätä vastakkainasettelua parlamentaarista menettelytavoista käydyissä keskusteluissa. Dagblad-liberaalit korostivat proseduureista käydyissä keskusteluissa debatoivan parlamentin mallia. Heidän debattimallinsa perustui brittiparlamentin ihailuun sekä kirjoittajien kuten J. S. Millin teksteihin. Dagbladistit nostivat debattikäsityksensä esiin 1860-luvun alun sanomalehtipolemiikkeissa, jotka käsitelivät lehdistön roolia suomalaisessa poliittisessä elämässä. Säätyvaltiopäivätoiminnan alettua Dagblad-liberaalit korostivat debattimalliaan menettelytapakeskusteluissa aina liberaaliryhmittymän hajoamiseen asti 1880-luvun puolivälissä. Dagbladistien debatti-idea perustui voimakkaaseen perspektivismiin korostamiseen. He painottivat, että poliittisia kysymyksiä oli mahdollista tarkastella vain "eri puolilta", *pro et contra*, jolloin väitteet eri vaihtoehtoista ja toimintalinjoista tuli alistaa testiin suorassa ja avoimessa debattissa. Johtavien dagbladistien mukaan parlamentissa kysymyksiä ei viime kädessä ratkaistu niiden totuusarvon perusteella tai puhtaasti rationaalisin perustein vaan äänten enemmistöllä monipuolisen eri näkökantoja yhteentörmäykseen kannustavan debatin jälkeen. Vain tätä kautta oli saavutettavissa hyvin perusteltuja, tasapuolisia ja tarkoin harkittuja päätöksiä. Samaa ajatusmallia korostivat myös tietyt fennomaanit, kuten E. G. Palmén.

Fennomaanien valtavirta puolestaan korosti erityisesti 1860-luvulta 1880-luvulle asti konsensukseen perustuvaa neuvottelevan edustuslaitoksen mallia. Proseduuridebateissa menettelytavat pyrittiin alistamaan fennomaanien ajalle kansalliselle projektille, jonka keskiössä olivat suomen kielen aseman pa-

rantaminen ja kansansivistyksen kehittäminen. Siinä missä dagbladistit käyttivät ulkomaisia esimerkkejä aktiivisesti menettelytapadebateissa ja korostivat säätyvaltiopäivien proseduurien ”parlamentaaraisuutta”, fennomaanit pidättäytyivät vetoamasta toistuvasta ulkomaisiin malleihin eivätkä kuvanneet säätyvaltiopäiviä parlamenttina ulkomaisten edustus- ja lainsäädäntöelinten tapaan. Fennomaanit näkivät ”parlamentin” ja ”parlamentarismia” nimenomaan osina parlamentaarista hallitusjärjestelmää. Dagbladistien ja fennomaanien välinen asetelma murtui 1880-luvulla, jolloin Dagblad-ryhmä hävisi puoluekartalta ja fennomaanien leiriin syntyi uusia ryhmiä.

Kolmantena keskeisenä poliittisena ryhmänä proseduuridebateista tutkimuksessa nostetaan esiin sosiaalidemokraatit, jotka ottivat 1900-luvun alun eduskunnassa näkyvän roolin osin vakiintuneiden parlamentaaristen menettelytapojen ja käytäntöjen haastamisessa. SDP:n kritiikin taustalla oli puolueen ulkomaisten esikuvien seuraaminen, mutta erityisesti pettymys eduskunnan kyvyttömyyteen toteuttaa kansan enemmistön tahtoa ja tärkeitä poliittisia ja sosiaalisia reformeja. Sosiaalidemokraatit pakottivat kilpailevat puolueet puolustamaan deliberoivan parlamentin roolia Suomessa. Tätä puolustusta rakennettiin aktiivisella ulkomaisten mallien ja auktoriteettien käytöllä.

Suomalaisia menettelytapadebateja analysoidaan tutkimuksessa tarkemmin kuuden eri teeman kautta, joiden käsittely on jaettu jokainen omaan pääluokkuunsa. Nämä teemat on analysoitu esitetyn ”kolmen käsittelyn” mallin avulla. Ensimmäinen varsinainen analyysiluku käsittelee parlamentaarista puhetta ja kielenkäyttöä sääteleviä menettelytapoja. Suomalaiset debatit ja niiden yhteydet ulkomaisiin keskusteluihin havainnollistavat tietynlaisen kansainvälisen parlamentaarisen *decorumin* tai ”etiketin” olemassa oloa. Tämä näkyy siinä, että parlamentit kansainvälisesti ovat omaksuneet hyvin samanlaiset säännöt ja käytännöt säätelemään sitä, minkälainen puhe ja kielenkäyttö ovat hyväksyttäviä parlamentissa. Myös kansainvälisesti käytössä olevat ilmaukset ”parlamentaarinen/epäparlamentaarinen” havainnollistavat tätä kehitystä. Suomessa parlamentaarisen puheen rajoja määrittävät yleisluontoiset säännöt otettiin Ruotsin valtiopäiviltä, mutta niiden käytäntöjä määriteltiin ja opeteltiin suhteessa lukuisiin eurooppalaisiin parlamentteihin, joista keskeisin oli Britannian parlamentin alahuoneen esikuva. Suomalaisia kiistoja käsiteltiin ulkomaisten esimerkkien kautta julkaisemalla sanomalehdissä erikoisartikkeleita parlamentaarisen puheen sääntelystä ja puhemiehen roolista. Monet artikkeleista perustuivat brittiläisiin proseduurikirjallisuusklassikoihin. Dagbladistit korostivat puhemiestä parlamenttidebatin puolueettomana ”erotuomarina”, kun taas fennomaanit painottivat puhemiehen tehtävää hallitsemisessaan säädyissä enemmistön tahdon edustajana ja toteuttajana.

Toinen analyysiluku tarkastelee suomalaisia imperatiivisesta ja vapaasta mandaatista käytyjä keskusteluja. Suomi on vapaan mandaatin suhteen mielenkiintoinen poikkeus. Ruotsin ohella Suomi on harvoja tapauksia, joissa imperatiivisen mandaatin kieltäminen on otettu säätyedustukseen perustuvien valtiopäivien sääntöihin. Suomessa tämä tapahtui vuoden 1869 valtiopäiväjärjestyksessä. Suomen säätyvaltiopäivillä vapaata mandaattia korostettiin erityisesti koko

kansan edustamisen periaatteena säätyintressien sijasta. Termi 'imperatiivinen mandaatti' tuli käyttöön Suomessa 1840-luvulla ranskalaisten keskusteluiden kautta, ja ulkomaisia keskusteluja aiheesta seurattiin läheisesti suomalaisessa sanomalehdistössä. Vapaan mandaatin merkitys parlamenttideliberaatiolle tuli korostetuksi kunnolla vasta eduskuntauudistuksen ja varhaisen eduskunnan yhteydessä, jolloin sosiaalidemokraattien ajatus kansanedustajista puolueen delegaatteina nousi haastamaan säätyvaltiopäiviltä asti korostettua elitististä mallia edustajista "maan parhaina". Vapaasta ja imperatiivisesta mandaatista käydyissä kiistoissa käytettiin laajasti parlamenttiesimerkkejä vedoten paitsi kirjallisuusklassikoihin, kuten Edmund Burkeen ja Thomas Smithiin, mutta myös eri maiden valtiopäiväsäännöstöihin ja debatteihin. Eduskunnassa korostettiin säätyvaltiopäivien dagbladistien dissensuaalisen debatti- ja fennomaanien konsensushakuisen neuvottelukäsitysten jälkeen erityisesti kompromissien tärkeyttä vallitsevassa poliittisessa tilanteessa. Poliittisten ryhmien ja toimijoiden käsitykset "kansan tahdosta", "maan intresseistä" ja "yhteisestä hyvästä" perustuivat kuitenkin perspektivismiin sijaan pitkälti yhden totuuden ja vain yhden parhaan vaihtoehdon olemassa oloon ja toteuttamiseen, mikä teki kompromissien tavoittamisesta käytännössä vaikeaa ja syvensi puolueiden välisiä kuiluja.

Kolmas aineistoanalyysiluku käsittelee plenum plenorumia, säätyjen yhteistuntoa, johon vuoden 1869 valtiopäiväjärjestys antoi mahdollisuuden. Tämän menettelyn mukaan kahden säädyn niin päättäessä kaikki neljä säätyä koontuivat samaan saliin keskustelemaan tietystä asialistalla olevasta kysymyksestä. Plenum plenorum oli merkittävin yksittäinen yritys sisällyttää säätyvaltiopäiville ulkomaisille parlamenttiesikuvulle tyypillisiä täysistuntodebatin piirteitä. Plenum plenorum otettiin vuoden 1869 valtiopäiväjärjestykseen ruotsalaisesta valtiopäiväperinteestä, mutta erityisesti dagbladistit esittivät sarjan proseduuri-innovaatioita instituution jalostamiseksi ja painottivat sen merkitystä parlamentaarisen elämän kehittämisessä. Fennomaanien ja Dagbladliberaalien kannat plenum plenorum -kysymyksessä toivat jälleen esiin ryhmien erilaiset näkemykset deliberaatiosta. Siinä missä dagbladistit korostivat säätyjen yhteistuntoa paikkana ajamalleen debattimallille, fennomaanit painottivat tärkeimmän säätyjen välisen vuorovaikutuksen tapahtuvan säätyjen yhteisissä komiteoissa ja niiden mahdollistamassa konsensukseen perustuvassa yhteensovittamismenettelyssä. Tämän käytössä olleen menettelyn mukaan säätyjen yhteiset päätökset luotiin komiteaneuvotteluissa, joissa säätyjen usein keskenään erilaisia päätöksiä tarkasteltiin niistä yhtenäisyyttä ja yhdenmielisyyttä etsien. Dagbladistit kritisoivat menettelyä keinotekoiseksi ratkaisuksi, jolle ei ollut olemassa selkeitä sääntöjä tai periaatteita. Heidän mukaansa viimekätinen valta päätösehdotusten ja äänestyksiin vaikuttamisesta tuli jättää plenum plenorumille. Dagbladistit pyrkivät paitsi lisäämään säätyjen yhteistunnon käyttöä myös tekemään siitä vakinaisen osan asioiden käsittelyä valtiopäivillä ja täten muokkaamaan säätyvaltiopäiviä kohti ulkomaisten parlamenttiesikuvien kolmen täysistuntokäsittelyn ja yksikamarisuuden mallia. Lisäksi plenum plenorum nähtiin mahdollisuutena kehittää senaatin vastuunalaisuutta valtiopäi-

ville. Fennomaanien tähdentäessä hallituksen jäsenten laillisuuden valvontaa ja yhteisistuntoa välineenä tiedonvälitykselle kahden valtiiovallan välillä dagbladistit painottivat plenum plenorumin kykyä synnyttää vastuunalaisuutta nimienomaan debatin, poliittisten linjausten ja näkemysten jatkuvan puolustamisen ja haastamisen, kautta.

Neljännessä aineistoluvussa analysoidaan parlamenttipöytäkirjoista käytyjä keskusteluja säätyvaltiopäivillä ja varhaisessa eduskunnassa. Keskustelupöytäkirjat nähtiin keskeisenä osana parlamentaarista prosessia ja sen vahvistamista Suomessa. Parlamenttipöytäkirjoista käydyt kiistat keskittyivät lyhennettyjen säätyjen sihteerien ja notaarien pitämien pöytäkirjojen sekä toisaalta erityisten keskustelujen tallentamaan palkattujen pikakirjoittajien laatimien pikakirjoituspöytäkirjojen ympärille. Pöytäkirjojen tallentamisessa käytetyt proseduurit muotoiltiin käyttäen hyväksi ulkomaiden malleja ja kokemuksia. Malleja opiskeltiin erityisesti ulkomaisten julkaisujen ja opintomatkojen kautta. Pikakirjoituspöytäkirjat nähtiin tärkeänä osana edustajien parlamentaaristen taitojen kehittämistä, sillä ne opettivat muun muassa valtiopäivien säännöstöä ja käytäntöjä sekä parlamentaarista puhe- ja keskustelutapaa. Yleinen argumentti oli, että pöytäkirjojen avulla valtiopäiväedustajat pystyivät harjoittamaan tervettä itsereflektiota ja tätä kautta kehittämään itseään vastaamaan paremmin toimensa vaatimuksia. Pöytäkirjojen merkitystä painotettiin myös valtiopäivätyön laadun parantamisessa. Pöytäkirjojen nähtiin muodostavan korvaamattoman tietopankin tulevalle valtiopäivätyölle, historiallisille ennakkotapauksille ja menettelytapojen vakiintumiselle. Lisäksi pöytäkirjat loivat jatkuvuutta harvojen valtiopäivien välille ja yhtenäisyyttä säätyjen erillisiin käsittelyihin.

Viides aineistoluku käsittelee valtiopäiväjulkisuudesta käytyjä keskusteluja sekä tämän julkisuuden edistämiseksi esitettyjä vaihtoehtoja, jotka koskivat sanomalehtien, erityisen valtiopäivälehdten sekä painettujen virallisten pöytäkirjojen hyödyntämistä. Toimijat hyödynsivät ruotsalaisesta valtiopäiväperinteestä poimittua epämääräistä julkisuusperiaatetta keskustellen sen puitteissa laajasti eri maiden käytännöistä. Poliittiset ryhmät antoivat debateissa erilaisia painotuksia ja tehtäviä valtiopäiväjulkisuudelle, ja julkisuudesta käydyt keskustelut havainnollistavat ryhmien erilaista suhtautumista deliberaatioon. Dagbladistit esittivät pikakirjoituspöytäkirjojen tehokkaan julkaisemisen välttämättömänä osana valtiopäiväjulkisuutta ja debatin välittämistä, kun taas fennomaanit näkivät puolesta ja vastaan argumenttien julkaisemisen turhana. Heidän mielestään julkaisujen tuli keskittyä valtiopäivätyön konkreettisiin tuloksiin ja päätöksiin ei kysymysten kiistanalaisuuteen ja yksityiskohdista kiistelemiseen. Fennomaanien debattia vähättelevä suhtautuminen näkyi pöytäkirjojen julkaisemisesta käydyissä keskusteluissa aina 1880-luvulle asti, jolloin pöytäkirjoja alettiin korostaa tärkeänä osana kansankunnan rakentamista sekä kansan sivistämistä ja poliittista kasvattamista.

Kuudennessa aineistoluvussa paneudutaan parlamentaarisen jarruttamisen käsitteen omaksumiseen suomalaisissa keskusteluissa ja siihen, miten käsitteestä tuli keskeinen poliittinen kiistakäsite Suomessa. Parlamentaarisen jarruttamisen käsite tuli suomalaiseen keskusteluun irlantilaisen vähemmistön Bri-

tannian alahuoneessa 1870-luvun lopulla ja 1880-luvun alussa toteuttaman jarrutuskampanjan myötä. Fennomaanit omaksuivat käsitteen retoriikkaansa ja käyttivät sitä syyttäessään ruotsinkielistä vähemmistöä yrityksistä jarruttaa fennomaanien edustaman enemmistön reformeja ja heidän käsitystä kansallisesta ja historiallisesta edistyksestä. Fennomaanit, sekä myöhemmin eduskunnassa sosiaalidemokraatit, hyödynsivät jarruttamisen käsitettä kritisoidessaan puheen ja keskustelun liiallista määrää, jotka he esittivät työn ja toiminnan vastakohtina. Sosiaalidemokraatit korostivat eduskuntaa äänestävänä ja päätöksiä tekevänä instituutiona, jonka tuli toteuttaa, deliberaation ja menettelytapojen kustannuksella, kansan enemmistön tahtoa ja kiireellisiä reformeja. Luku osoittaa, kuinka perifeerisessä Suomessa reagoitiin ulkomaisiin parlamentti-ilmiöihin ja -keskusteluihin hyvinkin nopeasti. Jarrutuksen käsitteen retorisen käytön lisäksi jarrutuksen vaarat huomioitiin suomalaisissa menettelytapadebateissa, mutta tästä huolimatta edustajien puheoikeutta ei haluttu rajoittaa ulkomaiden esimerkkien mukaisesti.

Konklusioluvussa palataan alussa esitettyyn ajatukseen suomalaisen parlamentarismien unohdetusta historiasta. Unohdettua historiaa pohditaan luvussa myös ”menetetynä mahdollisuutena” suomalaisten menettelytapojen kehittämisessä sekä nostetaan väitöskirjan johtopäätöksiä laajempaan historialliseen perspektiiviin. Tutkimus päättyy esittämään, että parlamentin historialliset esimerkit ja mallit tulisi ottaa laajemmin huomioon myös nykykeskusteluissa koskien reiluja menettelytapoja ja niiden merkitystä erilaisille deliberatiivisille prosesseille.

Suomi oli kansainvälisessä parlamenttikehityksessä ”myöhästyjä”. Myöhästymistä pidettiin Suomessa kuitenkin myös hyödyllisenä, sillä se mahdollisti muiden maiden kokeilujen ja kokemusten hyödyntämisen suomalaisen parlamentaarisen elämän kehittämisessä. Tutkimus osoittaa, että parlamentarismia koskevilla keskusteluilla oli olennainen rooli suomalaisen poliittisen elämän kehittämisessä sekä sen käytäntöjen ja käsitteiden luomisessa laajemminkin. Sanomalehdistöaineistojen analyysi paljastaa, kuinka 1800-luvun lopun ja 1900-luvun alun Suomessa ”parlamentaarinen elämä” ja sen opetukset ymmärrettiin laajasti. Parlamentti nähtiin sopivana esikuvana erilaisille yhdistyksille, järjestöille, puolueille, kuntakoukuksille ja jopa sanomalehdille, joita kehoitettiin omaksumaan parlamentaariset menettelytavat. Parlamentaaristen menettelytapojen seuraaminen koettiin käyttökelpoiseksi välineeksi kiistojen sääntelyyn sekä parlamentissa että sen ulkopuolella. Erilaiset kokoukset nähtiin eräänlaisina ”miniparlamentteina” ja väylinä parlamentaariselle oppimiselle, mutta myös mahdollisina areenoina parlamentaariselle kasvatukselle.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

Newspapers and journals

- Aamulehti, 25 June, 1885, 1: "Wastinetta hra A. M:lle."
- Aamulehti, 20 Oct., 1896, 1: "Suomen perustuslakien sisälllys."
- Aamulehti, 13 Apr., 1897, 1-2: "Waltiopäiwäkirjeitä. V."
- Aamulehti, 31 Dec., 1898, 4: "Pula Unkarissa."
- Aftonposten, 4 Mar., 1896, 2: "Morgontidningarna."
- Aura, 2 Apr., 1885, 2: "Waalioikeus porwarissäädysä."
- Aura, 8 Feb., 1887, 2: "Sähkösanoma Auralle."
- Aura, 6 Oct., 1893, 3: "Tohtori N. R. af Ursinille."
- Aura, 13 Feb., 1894, 2-3: "Talonpoikaissäädyn lehteriltä."
- Aura, 29 Mar., 1894, 2: "Waltiopäiwät. Talonpoikaissäätty."
- Björneborg, 2 Dec., 1865, 4: "J. D. Palanders bokhandel."
- Björneborgs Tidning, 1 June, 1898, 2: "Större spridning åt landtdagstrycket."
- Danielson, Johan Rikhard 1881. Edustuslaitoksemme kehittämisestä. *Valvoja*. 22, 459-472.
- Erich, Rafael 1908. N. s. parlamentaarista obstruktionista eli "jarrutuksesta". *Lakimies*. 1, 11-29.
- Erich, Rafael 1910. Muutamia puolia kansanedustuksen teoriaa. *Lakimies*. 2, 55-65.
- Erich, Rafael 1912. Edustaja Kotosen wapautusanomus. Onko periaatteellisesti wäärä katsantotapa saatettava parlamentaarisessa elämässämme woimaan? *Helsingin Sanomat*, 23 Apr., 1912, 3.
- Finland, 12 Apr., 1885, 3: "Plenum plenorum."
- Finland, 14 Nov., 1885, 3: "Talförhetsstatistik."
- Finland, 7 May, 1886, 3: "Stenografen i rättsvårdens tjänst."
- Finland, 15 Jan., 1890, 1-2: "I stenografins intresse: En stenografisk arbetsbyrå."
- Finland, 17 Nov., 1890, 4: "En märkelig uppfinning."
- Finland, 27 Jan., 1891, 3: "Tidningsreferenterne och landtdagen."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 28 July, 1821, 2-4: "London den 22 Junii."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 21 Mar., 1822, 4-6: "London den 15 Februarii."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 21 Dec., 1826, 3-4: "England."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 28 July, 1827, 2-4: "England."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 31 July, 1827, 2-5: "England."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 28 Apr., 1829, 2: "England."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 21 Mar., 1831, 1-2: "England."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 11 Sept., 1834, 2: "England."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 16 Sept., 1846, 1: "Frankrike"
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 12 Aug., 1859, 4: "Till salu. Uti Frenckell & Sons bokhandel."

- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 7 Sept., 1860, 5-12: "Förteckning öfver Ny Fransysk Litteratur, till salu uti Frenckell & Sons Bokhandel i Helsingfors."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 20 Feb., 1861, 2-3: "Engelska författningens karakter."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 21 Feb., 1861, 2-3: "Engelska författningens karakter."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 16 May, 1862, 1: "Forstväsendet och dagbladspubliciteten."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 16 Sept., 1862, 3: "Om nationaliteten i dess förhållanden till den representativa styrelsen."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 25 Nov., 1862, 5-6: "Periodiska pressen och den allmänna meningen."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 24 Apr., 1863, 2-3: "Landtdagsordning för Storfurstendömet Finland."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 29 July, 1863, 4: "Samling af Böcker och Skrifter: Rätts- och Statsvetenskap, samt dervid nära liggande kunskapsgrenar."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 18 Aug., 1863, 2: "Muvemanget" och dess opinion.
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 19 Aug., 1863, 2: "Muvemanget" och dess opinion. (Forts.)."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 7 Dec., 1863, 2: "Pressfriheten och Tidningspressen."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 29 Jan., 1867, 1: "Landtdagen. Ridderskapet och Adeln."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 19 June, 1871, 3: "Sundt och osundt i frågan om kvinnans emancipation."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 5 Mar., 1872, 1-2: "Helsingfors. Landtdagen. Borgareståndet."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 19 Apr., 1872, 2-3: "Några dagar i Finland. Af L. A. Polonski."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 13 Jan., 1881, 1: "Det engelska parlamentet."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 30 Dec., 1881, 1: "Landtdagstidning."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 21 Feb., 1882, 2: "Förslaget till ändringar i engelska underhusets arbetsordning."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 30 Mar., 1882, 1-2: "England."
- Finlands Allmänna Tidning, 25 Nov., 1884, 1: "Stenografisk arbetsbyrå."
- Forsman, K. W. 1874. Siwistyneen kansanluokan asemasta. *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti*. 2, 29-36.
- Fredrikshamns Tidning, 23 Sept., 1891, 1: "Landtdagsstatistik."
- Furuhjelm, Elis 1906a. "Sveriges författning och den moderna parlamentarismen. I". *Finsk Tidskrift*. I, 77-91.
- Furuhjelm, Elis 1906b. "Sveriges författning och den moderna parlamentarismen. II". *Finsk Tidskrift*. II, 148-168.
- Helsingfors, 29 Nov., 1879, 3: "Stadsfullmäktiges protokoll."
- Helsingfors Aftonblad, 29 Oct., 1894, 1: "Borgareståndets diskussionsprotokoll"
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 11 Apr., 1862, 1: "Åter en kommunal fråga."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 19 May, 1862, 1: "Dagblads-publicitetens kall."

- Helsingfors Dagblad, 31 July, 1862, 2-3: "Det engelska parlamentet."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 1 Aug., 1862, 2-3: "Det engelska parlamentet."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 4 Aug., 1862, 2-3: "Det engelska parlamentet."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 5 Dec., 1862, 1: "Något om statslån. II."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 2 Jan., 1863, 1: "Helsingfors d. 2 Jan."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 8 Jan., 1863, 1: "Politiska partier i Finland."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 15 Jan., 1863, 2: "Helsingin Uutiset"
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 21 Jan., 1863, 3: "N. D. A. anmäler en värdefull nyhet i bokhandeln."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 20 Feb., 1863, 4: "Till salu. Uti Sederholm & Komp. bokhandel."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 25 Apr., 1863, 1-3: "Sammanfattning af gällande stadganden och vedertagna bruk, hvilka ega tillämpning på ordningen vid landtdag i storfurstendömet Finland."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 9 May, 1863, 3: "Till salu. Uti Sederholm & Komp. bokhandel."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 1 July, 1863, 1: "Hvad Finland har att önska?"
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 6 July, 1863, 1: "En insändare till F. A. T."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 28 July, 1863, 1: "Den första och sista landtdagsfrågan."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 23 Nov., 1863, 1: "Hr v. Essens tal öfver censurens afskaffande."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 22 Jan., 1864, 1-3: "Thiers' tal i franska lagstiftande korpsen."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 18 Feb., 1864, 4: "Till salu uti Sederholm & Komp. bokhandel."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 15 Aug., 1864, 2-3: "Några episoder från 1800 års riksdag."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 16 Aug., 1864, 3: "Några episode från 1800 års riksdag."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 25 Jan., 1865, 1: "De i vårt statsskick behöfliga reformerna. I."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 23 Mar., 1865, 3: "Parisnyheter."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 26 Apr., 1865, 1: "Representationsreformen. I. En föränmärkning."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 20 Feb., 1866, 3: "Talmansvalet i engelska underhuset."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 1 Feb., 1867, 1: "Helsingfors den 1 Febr. Landtdagsordningen."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 21 Feb., 1867, 2: "De svenska kamrarne."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 1 Apr., 1867, 1-2: "Nya landtdagsordningen."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 8 Apr., 1867, 1: "Den fyrbenta orimligheten."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 27 Nov., 1871, 1: "Helsingfors den 27 Nov."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 6 Jan., 1872, 1: "Victor Hugo."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 21 Jan., 1872, 3: "Engelska underhusets talman."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 6 Mar., 1872, 2: "Bondeståndet."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 28 Mar., 1872, 1: "Helsingfors den 28 Mars."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 25 Apr., 1872, 1-2: "Helsingfors den 25 April."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 3 June, 1872, 1: "Motivering af ett yttrande."

- Helsingfors Dagblad, 14 June, 1872, 1: "Helsingfors den 14 Juni. Ståndens gemensamma öfverläggning i går."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 16 July, 1872, 1: "Landtdagsmän II. Borgarestånd"
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 17 July, 1872, 1: "Resebref om Finland. (Af Göterborgs Handels-Tidnings utgifvare.) V. Landtdagen."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 3 Oct., 1872, 1: "Helsingfors den 3 Okt. Landtdagsfrågor. I."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 22 Jan., 1873, 1: "Några tolkningar af landtdagsordningen."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 13 Jan., 1874, 1-2: "Blad ur den engelska pressens historia. I."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 30 Jan., 1874, 1: "Blad ur den engelska pressens historia. II."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 8 Feb., 1874, 1: "Blad ur den engelska pressens historia. III."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 18 Feb., 1874, 1: "Blad ur den engelska pressens historia. IV."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 8 Aug., 1874, 3: "En omröstning i engelska underhuset."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 9 Oct., 1874, 1: "Landtdagstryck"
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 30 July, 1875, 1: "En scen i engelska parlamentet."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 10 Aug., 1875, 1: "Plimsollska saken."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 24 Oct., 1876, 1: "Helsingfors den 24 Okt."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 25 Jan., 1877, 3: "Parlamentarisk etikett."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 13 Feb., 1877, 1-2: "Landtdagen. Ridderskapet och adeln."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 7 Apr., 1877, 1: "Plenum plenorum."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 8 Apr., 1877, 1: "Plenum plenorum. II."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 16 Apr., 1877, 1: "Kommersiella bref från utlandet."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 19 Apr., 1877, 1: "Helsingfors den 19 April."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 17 June, 1877, 1: "Alexander Reinhold Frey."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 2 Oct., 1877, 2: "Borgareståndet."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 12 Nov., 1878, 2: "Litteratur"
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 6 Mar., 1880, 2: "Från England."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 8 July, 1880, 1-2: "Bradlaugh-äffären."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 6 Sept., 1880, 2: "Den s. k. irländska natten."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 28 Dec., 1880, 2: "Angreppen mot det liberala parties program. IV."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 4 Jan., 1881, 2: "Tillståndet uti Irland."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 1 Apr., 1881, 1-2: "Helsingfors den 1 April."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 13 Jan., 1881, 2: "Referentskapet i det engelska underhuset."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 16 Feb., 1881, 2: "De stormiga scenerna i engelska underhuset."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 17 Feb., 1881, 2: "Gladstones resolution."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 28 Feb., 1881, 3: "Mekanisk stenografi."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 19 May, 1882: "Middag för Borgareståndets talman."

- Helsingfors Dagblad, 3 Nov., 1882, 2: "Det viktigaste föremålet för det närvarande engelska parlamentsmötet."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 16 Nov., 1882, 2: "Debatten om ändringar i engelska underhusets arbetsordning."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 19 Nov., 1882, 2: "Den eninran"
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 24 Nov., 1882, 3: "Från allmänheten."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 25 Nov., 1882, 1-2: "Helsingfors den 25 November."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 25 Nov., 1882, 3: "Från allmänheten."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 26 Nov., 1882, 2: "Från England."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 5 Mar., 1884, 2: "Engelska underhusets talman."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 8 Jan., 1885, 2: "Några brister i vårt representationssystem"
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 15 Jan., 1885, 1-2: "Plenum plenorum."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 17 Jan., 1885, 1: "Plenum plenorum. II."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 18 Jan., 1885, 1-2: "Plenum plenorum. III."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 8 Feb., 1885, 2: "Landtdagspetitioner. XV. Om ändringar i stadgandena angående plenum plenorum."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 14 Apr., 1885, 2: "Tolf timmar på plenum plenorum. II."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 23 Apr., 1885, 2: "Franska deputeradekammarens president."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 2 July, 1885, 2: "Bilder från sista landtdagen. I. Ståndens allmänna yttre fysionomer."
- Helsingfors Dagblad, 1 Mar., 1887, 3: "Tidningsreferenterne i engelska underhuset."
- Helsingfors-Posten, 11 Aug., 1905, 2-3: "'Mr. Speaker'."
- Helsingfors Tidningar, 24 Feb., 1847, 4-5: "Ögonkast. 2. Frankrike år 1846."
- Helsingfors Tidningar, 12 June, 1865, 1-2: "John Stuart Mill, Lord John Russell och de politiska reformerna i England."
- Helsingfors Tidningar, 27 Nov., 1866, 4: "Hos Wasenius & komp."
- Helsingin Sanomat, 18 Nov., 1904, 2: "Puolueet ja waltiopiivät. I."
- Helsingin Sanomat, 10 Feb., 1905, 4: "Pikakirjoittajyhdistyksellä"
- Helsingin Sanomat, 11 Mar., 1906, 3-4: "Kirje Helsingistä."
- Helsingin Sanomat, 12 Aug., 1908, 3: "Eduskunnan tawat ja sosialistit"
- Helsingin Sanomat, 6 Oct., 1908, 3: "Valtiopäiviltä. X. Lykkäytyneet asiat."
- Helsingin Sanomat, 11 Nov., 1909, 5: "Kaksi kärpistä yhdellä iskulla."
- Helsingin Sanomat, 24 Nov., 1910, 2: "Suostuntakiellosta."
- Helsingin Uutiset, 5 Jan., 1863, 2-4: "Uusi vuosi 1863."
- Helsingin Uutiset, 13 Apr., 1863, 2-3: "Suomen hallitus-muoto."
- Helsingin Uutiset, 16 Apr., 1863, 2-4: "Suomen Eduskunta eli Waltiosäädyt."
- Helsingin Uutiset, 20 Apr., 1863, 2-3: "Suomen Eduskunta eli Waltiosäädyt."
- Helsingin Uutiset, 4 May, 1863, 2-3: "Suomenkielisestä pika-kirjoituksesta".
- Helsingin Uutiset, 2 Nov., 1863, 1: "Lukijoillemme maaseudulla."
- Helsingin Wiikko-Sanomia, 15 Dec., 1882, 3: "Englannista."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 21 Dec., 1865, 3: "Till salu i bokhandeln."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 3 Jan., 1869, 2: "Engelskt parlamentsbruk."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 14 May, 1870, 1: "Politisk revy."

- Hufvudstadsbladet, 14 June, 1872, 1: "Helsingfors. Landtdagen."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 28 Feb., 1873, 2-3: "Bref från Amerika. 3."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 19 June, 1877, 2: "Alexander Reinhold Frey."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 10 Aug., 1877, 1: "Engelska underhuset."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 31 Dec., 1881, 2: "Tillämnad landtdagstidning."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 16 Dec., 1882, 2: "Hwarför tryckas ej samtliga ständens diskussionsprotokoll wid landtdagarne?"
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 12 Nov., 1886, 2-3: "Krönika."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 23 Aug., 1890, 2: "Våra otryckta landtdagsförhandlingar"
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 14 Nov., 1893, 2: "Talmansplatsen i bondeståndet."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 31 Oct., 1894, 2: "Landtdagsprotokollen"
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 6 May, 1895, 3: "Huru det tillgår i världens förnämsta parlament."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 19 Jan., 1896, 3: "Tidningar."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 18 Nov., 1896, 3: "Landtdagstryck."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 19 Nov., 1896, 1: "Landtdagstryck."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 13 Feb., 1897, 2: "Stenografiska Föreningen i Finland."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 16 Oct., 1900, 3: "Borgareståndets diskussionsprotokoll."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 22 Feb., 1905, 2-3: "Sveriges författning och den moderna parlamentarismen. III."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 22 Aug., 1905, 2: "Finland och folkrepresentationens införande i Ryssland."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 24 May, 1906, 5: "Ett rykte."
- Hufvudstadsbladet 20 June, 1907, 4: "Hr Orasmaa och polisen"
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 3 Sept., 1907, 4: "Landtdagen. Landtdagens publikationer."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 5 Sept., 1907, 3-4: "Prenumeration af landtdagshandlingarna."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 11 Feb., 1908, 3: "1907 års landtdagsprotokoll."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 12 Feb., 1908, 7: "Från allmänheten. Landtdagens protokoll."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 14 Feb., 1908, 8: "Från allmänheten. Frågan om 1907 års landtdagsprotokoll."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 22 Feb., 1908, 9: "Stenograferingen i europeiska parlament. Utdrag ur. mag. Kadenius reseberättelse."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 12 Apr., 1908, 9-10: "Pressmålet fröken Gripenberg contra Hufvudstadsbladet."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 29 Aug., 1908, 6: "Landtdagen. Socialisterna protestera emot den af talmannen åt Valpas-Hänninen tilldelade anmärkningen."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 3 Oct., 1908, 6: "Landtdagen. Kommunalreformen."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 19 June, 1909, 4: "Folkbibliotekens utveckling."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 30 June, 1909, 4: "Understöd åt folkbibliotek. Kulturutskottet"
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 13 Mar., 1910, 8: "Ett missförhållande vid tryckning af landtdagshandlingar."
- Hufvudstadsbladet, 23 Nov., 1910, 8: "Ett förslag af lord Lansdowne."

- Hämeen Sanomat, 14 Feb., 1882, 1: "Anomus-esitys senaatin toimia tarkastawan waliokunnan asettamisesta."
- Hämeen Sanomat, 28 Feb., 1882, 1-2: "Tarkastuswaliokunta."
- Hämeen Sanomat, 26 May, 1882, 1: "Hämeenlinnasta."
- Hämeen Sanomat, 15 Feb., 1887, 1: "Aukusti Mäkipeska."
- Hämetär, 21 Sept., 1907, 2-3: "Kirje Hämeenlinnasta. 29-1907."
- Hämäläinen, 25 Feb., 1882, 2-3: "Waltiopäiwiltä."
- Hämäläinen, 30 May, 1885, 2-3: "Katsahdus waltiopäiwiin."
- Hämäläinen, 29 July, 1885, 2: "Jälkimuistoja wiime waltiopäiwiltä."
- Jakobstad, 29 Feb., 1908, 3: "Landtdagstrycket. För bibliotek att observera."
- Kaiku, 3 Dec., 1897, 3: "Waltiollinen pula Itäwallassa."
- Kansan Tahto, 29 Sept., 1908, 1: "Jälleenkö pettymys?"
- Karjalatar, 10 Nov., 1876, 1: "Waltiopäiwämiesten waalista."
- Karjalatar, 10 Apr., 1894, 2-3: "Waltiopäiwät."
- Keski-Suomi, 8 Feb., 1894, 4: "Ylähuone."
- Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti, 6, 1866, 127-135: "Franskan toinen keisarikunta ja sen kirjallisuus. III."
- Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti, 4, 1869, 107-108: "Kuukauskirje."
- Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti 4, 1870, 86-90: "Katsahdus ulkomaiden kirjallisuuteen v. 1869. Franskan kirjallisuus."
- Kokkolan Lehti, 15 Aug., 1887, 1-2: "Waltiopäiwämieswaali Kokkolan tuomiokunnassa."
- Kotimaa, 1 June, 1910, 4: "Hiukan wielä kirkolliswiraston l. ja o. kassasta."
- Kuopion Sanomat, 20 Oct., 1881, 1: "Epäkohtia maamme sanomakirjallisuudessa."
- Kuusinen, Otto Ville 1906a. "Eduskuntakomiteaa puolustetaan." *Työmies*, 15 Mar., 1906, 2.
- Kuusinen, Otto Ville 1906b. Eduskuntauudistuksen viimeiset vaiheet. *Sosialistinen Aikakauslehti*. 11-12, 242-247.
- Kuusinen, Otto Ville 1907a. Meikäläiset porwarispuolueet. I. Eräänlainen vuosikatsaus. *Työmies*, 10 Jan., 2.
- Kuusinen, Otto Ville 1907b. Meikäläiset porwarispuolueet. II. Joitakin omantunnonkysymyksiä niille. *Työmies*, 11 Jan., 2-3.
- Lappeenrannan Uutiset, 1 Dec., 1897, 2-3: "Häwäistysjuttu Itävallan edustajakunnassa."
- Le Temps, 1 Oct., 1892, 3: "Métamorphoses parlementaires." [Accessed 28 November 2013]
URL:<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k233463c/f3.image>>
- Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning, 6, 1848, 165-170: "Deputerade Kammaren. Politisk Revy."
- Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning, 5, 1858, 223-229: "Guizots memoirer, första tomen (Ur Journal des Débats)."
- Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning, 11, 1860, 490-498: "Frankrike och dess hädforskare."
- Länsi-Suomi, 10 Mar., 1906, 1: "Senaatti kunnostaa itseään."

- Länsi-Suomi, 8 Oct., 1908, 3: "Paljoko eduskunnassa on puhuttu."
- Maamiehen Ystävä, 20 Sept., 1851, 2-4: "Raittiudesta Rantasalmella."
- Mechelin, Leo 1876. De fyra Stånden. *Finsk Tidskrift för vitterhet, vetenskap, konst och politik*, 152-171.
- Mechelin, Leo 1879. De politiska partierna. *Finsk tidskrift för vitterhet, vetenskap, konst och politik*. Förra Halftåret. Tom. VI, 116-147. [Accessed 1 August 2013]
 URL:<http://openlibrary.org/books/OL23541628M/Finsk_tidskrift_f%C3%B6r_vitterhet_vetenskap_konst_och_politik>
- Mikkelin Sanomat, 23 Apr., 1885, 1-2: "Kirje Helsingistä."
- Mikkelin Sanomat, 17 Feb., 1887, 2: "August Mäkipeska."
- Mikkelin Sanomat, 9 Mar., 1899, 2: "Silmäyksiä uuteen holhouslakiin."
- Måndagen, 22 Mar., 1909, 3: "Den planerade reorganisationen av de svenska studenternas gemensamma delegation."
- Morgonbladet, 1 Feb., 1872, 1: "Helsingfors den 1 Februari."
- Morgonbladet, 6 Mar., 1872, 1-2: "Ridderskap o. Adeln."
- Morgonbladet, 6 Mar., 1872, 2: "Presteståndet."
- Morgonbladet, 9 Apr., 1872, 1: "Helsingfors den 9 April."
- Morgonbladet, 8 June, 1872, 1: "En lucka i vår landtdagsordning."
- Morgonbladet, 10 Mar., 1873, 3: "Spanien."
- Morgonbladet, 16 Apr., 1873, 3: "Spanien."
- Morgonbladet, 7 Aug., 1873, 1: "Ett swenskt omdöme om John Stuart Mill. I."
- Morgonbladet, 8 Aug., 1873, 1-2: "Ett swenskt omdöme om John Stuart Mill. II."
- Morgonbladet, 18 Nov., 1873, 1: "Helsingfors den 18 November."
- Morgonbladet, 13 Jan., 1874, 3: "Engelska tidningsreferenter."
- Morgonbladet, 1 Aug., 1874, 2: "En afton i det engelska underhuset."
- Morgonbladet, 3 Aug., 1874, 2: "En afton i det engelska underhuset."
- Morgonbladet, 7 Sept., 1874, 1: "Stenografiska kongressen i Leipzig. I."
- Morgonbladet, 8 Sept., 1874, 1: "Stenografiska kongressen i Leipzig. II."
- Morgonbladet, 14 Sept., 1874, 1: "Stenografiska kongressen i Leipzig. III."
- Morgonbladet, 15 Sept., 1874, 1: "Stenografiska kongressen i Leipzig. IV."
- Morgonbladet, 29 Dec., 1876, 3: "Orientaliska angelägenheterna."
- Morgonbladet, 12 Nov., 1879, 1-2: "Österriska deputeradekammaren."
- Morgonbladet, 18 Feb., 1880, 1-2: "Preussiska deputerade kammaren."
- Morgonbladet, 3 July, 1880, 2: "Bradlaugh'ska saken."
- Morgonbladet, 16 Sept., 1880, 2: "Engelska parlamentet."
- Morgonbladet, 14 Feb., 1881, 2: "'De iriska nätterna'."
- Morgonbladet, 15 Feb., 1881, 2: "Engelska underhuset."
- Morgonbladet, 20 Jan., 1882, 1: "Helsingfors den 20 Januari."
- Morgonbladet, 21 Feb., 1882, 1-2: "Helsingfors den 21 Februari."
- Morgonbladet, 8 June, 1882, 3: "Till läsaren."
- Morgonbladet, 13 Nov., 1882, 2: "Engelska parlamentet."
- Morgonbladet, 25 Nov., 1882, 2: "Ett uppträde i franska deputeradekammaren."
- Morgonbladet, 16 May, 1883, 2: "Edsfrågan i England."
- Morgonbladet, 18 Sept., 1884, 3-4: "Stenotelegafi."

- Nya Pressen, 11 May, 1883, 3: "Bradlaughska frågan."
- Nya Pressen, 5 Mar., 1884, 3: "Engelska underhusets talman."
- Nya Pressen, 10 Apr., 1884, 4: "Bönderna i Österrike."
- Nya Pressen, 28 May, 1884, 2: "Landtdagsordningens plenum plenorum."
- Nya Pressen, 2 Feb., 1885, 1-2: "Ständerhusfrågan"
- Nya Pressen, 8 Feb., 1885, 2: "Frågan om tryckning af ståndens diskussionsprotokoll."
- Nya Pressen, 11 Feb., 1885, 1-2: "Petitionerna."
- Nya Pressen, 28 Feb., 1885, 1: "Ett landtdagsbibliotek"
- Nya Pressen, 2 Mar., 1885, 3: "Afrikanska konferensen."
- Nya Pressen, 13 Apr., 1885, 2: "Plenum plenorum. (Från läktarn i riddarhuset)."
- Nya Pressen, 13 Apr., 1885, 3: "Huru länge man talade vid plenum plenorum."
- Nya Pressen, 17 Sept., 1885, 2: "Industriidkaremötet."
- Nya Pressen, 26 Jan., 1886, 2: "Långsamt, men säkert."
- Nya Pressen, 13 Oct., 1891, 3: "Bref från London."
- Nya Pressen, 7 Oct., 1892, 2: "Metamorfoser i fransk parlamentarism. Mötesreferaten."
- Nya Pressen, 15 Mar., 1894, 1: "Förre talmannen i bondeståndet häradsdomaren Karl Johan Slotte."
- Nya Pressen, 17 Mar., 1895, 3: "Speaker Peel."
- Nya Pressen, 22 Jan., 1896, 2: "Det tredje allmänna kommunalmötet"
- Nya Pressen, 9 May, 1897, 2: "Landtdagsbrådskan"
- Nya Pressen, 18 Sept., 1897, 2: "Borgareståndets diskussionsprotokoll"
- Nya Pressen, 30 Dec., 1897, 2: "Presteståndets protokoll"
- Nya Pressen, 8 July, 1898, 2: "Ekonomiska samfundets skrifter."
- Nya Pressen, 23 Mar., 1900, 2: "Engelska parlamentsleder."
- Nya Pressen, 3 Aug., 1906, 2: "Enskildt plenum plenorum."
- Nya Pressen, 7 Aug., 1907, 2: "Landtdagsförhandlingarnas publicerande."
- Nya Pressen, 15 Mar., 1908, 7: "Pressmålet fröken Gripenberg contra Hbl."
- Nya Pressen, 23 Mar., 1908, 5: "Småaktig knussel."
- Nya Pressen, 30 June, 1909, 3: "Landtdagsutskotten. Folkbibliotekens understödande."
- Palmén, E. G. 1876a. Landtdagens förhandlingar och offentligheten. I. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 10 Oct., 1876, 1.
- Palmén, E. G. 1876b. Landtdagens förhandlingar och offentligheten. II. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 13 Oct., 1876, 1.
- Palmén, E. G. 1876c. Landtdagens förhandlingar och offentligheten. III. *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 21 Oct., 1876, 1.
- Palmén, E. G. 1876d. Landtdagens förhandlingar och offentligheten. III (slut). *Helsingfors Dagblad*, 23 Oct., 1876, 1.
- Palmén, E. G. 1878. Mietteitä puolueista 1877-1878 valtiopäivillä. *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti*. 12, 265-273.
- Palmén, E. G. 1884a. Puolueitten nykyinen asema Suomessa. *Valvoja*. 1, 23-34.
- Palmén, E. G. 1884b. Jatkoa Suomen puolueitten nykyisestä asemasta. *Valvoja*. 3, 117-141.

- Palmén, E. G. 1891. Kirjeitä valtiopäiviltä. I. *Valvoja*. I, 59–64.
- Papperslyktan, 22 Apr., 1861, 1–6: "Den svenska riksdagens historiska utbildning. Från Tidskrift för litteratur år 1852 av Olof Wingqvist."
- Papperslyktan, 21 May, 1861, 1–5: "Den svenska riksdagens historiska utbildning. Ståndsinnrättningen: Adel och Prester."
- Papperslyktan, 27 May, 1861, 4–6: "Den svenska riksdagens historiska utbildning. Ståndsinnrättningen: Borgare- och Bondestånden."
- Papperslyktan, 5 Aug., 1861, 243–247: "Det andra franska Kejsaredömet's litteratur."
- Perander, Johan Julius Frithiof 1879. John Stuart Mill'in yhteiskunnallinen filosofia. *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti*. 9, 197–212.
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 1, 1908, 2–4: "Pikakirjoitusoloja oppimassa ulkomaiden parlamenteissa. 1. Tukholma."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 4, 1908, 27–30: "Pikakirjoitusoloja oppimassa ulkomaiden parlamenteissa. 2. Köpenhamina."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 5, 1908, 35–38: "Pikakirjoitusoloja oppimassa ulkomaiden parlamenteissa. 2. Köpenhamina."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 6, 1908, 41–42: "Pikakirjoituksen järjestäminen eduskunnassa."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 6, 1908, 42–45: "Pikakirjoitusoloja oppimassa ulkomaiden parlamenteissa. 3. Berlin."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 7, 1908, 49–51: "Pikakirjoituksen järjestäminen eduskunnassa."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 7, 1908, 51–53: "Pikakirjoitusoloja oppimassa ulkomaiden parlamenteissa. 3. Berlin."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 8, 1908, 57–59: "Pikakirjoituskanslian järjestely eduskunnassa."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 8, 1908, 59–62: "Pikakirjoitusoloja oppimassa ulkomaiden parlamenteissa. 3. Berlin."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 9, 1908, 65–66: "Pikakirjoituskanslian järjestely eduskunnassa."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 9, 1908, 67–68: "Pikakirjoitusoloja oppimassa ulkomaiden parlamenteissa. 4. Dresden."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 11, 1908, 82–86: "Pikakirjoitusoloja oppimassa ulkomaiden parlamenteissa. 5. Wien."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 1, 1909, 7: "Puhujan oikeudesta lausuntonsa korjaamiseen."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 2, 1909, 13–15: "Puhujan oikeudesta lausuntonsa korjaamiseen."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 7, 1909, 49–51: "Pikakirjoitusoloja oppimassa ulkomaiden parlamenteissa. 9. Paris."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 4, 1910, 25–28: "Kertomus Eduskunnan pikakirjoituskanslian toiminnasta."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 5, 1910, 36–37: "Kertomus Eduskunnan pikakirjoituskanslian toiminnasta."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 6, 1910, 41–42: "Kertomus Eduskunnan pikakirjoituskanslian toiminnasta."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 7, 1910, 51–53: "Välihuudahduksien merkintä keskustelussa."
- Pikakirjoituslehti, 11, 1911, 6–8: "Käynti Englannin parlamentin alahuoneen stenografibyroossa."

- Pikakirjoituslehti, 12, 1911, 3–6: "Sanelukoneet."
- Pohjan Poika, 29 Nov., 1905, 2: "Tahtomme 'yhden kamarin'."
- Päivälehti, 4 Mar., 1891, 1: "Waltiopäiväin pöytäkirjoja kansankirjastoihin."
- Päivälehti, 30 May, 1891, 2: "Kirje Tukholmasta."
- Päivälehti, 15 Mar., 1893, 3: "Jarrutusjärjestelmä Englannin parlamentissa."
- Päivälehti, 18 May, 1893, 2: "'Waltiopäivä asiainkirjoja' ja 'Säätöjen pöytäkirjoja' ei ole wirkakuntain arkistoissa."
- Päivälehti, 14 July, 1893, 3–4: "Homerule. 'Kuonokoppalaki'."
- Päivälehti, 20 July, 1893, 2: "Waltiopäivämieswaalin johdosta.I."
- Päivälehti, 19 Aug., 1893, 3: "Hopeataistelu Ameriikassa."
- Päivälehti, 30 Oct., 1897, 2: "Waltiopäiväasiakirjain saanti."
- Päivälehti, 27 May, 1899, 2: "Valtiopäiväin painotuotteet."
- Päivälehti, 28 May, 1899, 3–4: "Kirje Helsingistä."
- Päivälehti, 28 Nov., 1899, 1: "Säätöjen puhemiehet."
- Raahan Sanomat, 18 Sept, 1889, 1: "Lukijalle."
- Raja-Karjala, 3 Dec., 1907, 3: "Eduskunta-istuntojen asiakirjoja hankkimaan!"
- Raja-Karjala, 20 June, 1908, 2–3: "Suomalainen ketä äänestät? Laatokka taas väärentänyt eduskunnan pöytäkirjoja."
- Rauman Lehti, 11 Apr., 1885, 1: "Waltiopäivät."
- Rein, Thiodolf 1881. Kotimaan kirjallisuutta. 1. Valtiollista y. m. *Valvoja*. 3, 66–69.
- Rein, Thiodolf 1882a. Om ministeransvarighet i Finland. I. *Morgonbladet*, 7 Mar., 1882, 1–2.
- Rein, Thiodolf 1882b. Om ministeransvarighet i Finland. II. *Morgonbladet*, 11 Mar., 1882, 1–2.
- Rein, Thiodolf 1885. Mietteitä viime valtiopäiväin johdosta. II. Edustuslaitoksemme muutoksesta. *Valvoja*. 9, 421–433.
- Rein, Thiodolf 1908. Kansanedustajan tehtävä. *Suomalainen Kansa*, 22 Dec., 1908, 2.
- Sanan-Lennätin, 20 Sept., 1856, 1–2: "Millä tawalla naiminen tapahtuu Rautjärwellä"
- Sanan Saattaja Wiipurista, 13 Nov., 1841, 1–2: "Lemin Pitäjä."
- Sanomia Turusta, 21 Dec., 1852, 2: "Lukijoille."
- Sanomia Turusta, 11 Aug., 1893, 2: "Homerulekysymys."
- Satakunta, 10 June, 1876, 1: "Kirkolliskokouksesta. I."
- Savo, 25 May, 1889, 2: "Sanan wapaudesta."
- Savo, 28 Aug., 1890, 3: "Kuopion tuomikunnan waltiopäivämieswaali."
- Savo, 26 Feb., 1910, 2: "Puolueriennot. Eduskunnan asiakirjain tilaajille."
- Savonlinna, 3 July, 1890, 2: "Rantasalmen tuomiokunnan waltiopäivämieswaali."
- Savonlinna, 9 Apr., 1897, 3: "Kirkas kilpi ja epärehelliset keinot."
- Savon Työmies, 29 Sept., 1908, 1: "Kunnallislain wiiwytytys - häwettäwiä aikeita."
- Savo-Karjala, 23 Feb., 1891, 2: "Waltiopäiwäkirje."
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1844a. Publiciteten. I. *Saima*, 16 May, 1844, 2–3.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1844b. Publicitetens vådor. *Saima*, 23 May, 1844, 2–3.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1846a. "Allmänna opinionen". I. *Saima*, 23 May, 1846, 2.

- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1846b. "Allmänna opinionen". II. *Saima*, 30 May, 1846, 3-4.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1846c. Till artikeln: om Allmänna Opinionen. Bilaga I. *Saima*, 20 June, 1846, 2-3.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1848. Fransk Modern Litteratur. III. *Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning*. 8, 233-267.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1856. Litterära förhållanden i Frankrike. *Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning*. 6, 176-178.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1861a. Angående artikeln: 'Finska förhållanden och Svenska pressen'. *Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning*. 7, 328-336.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1861b. Om utskottets verksamhet. *Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning*. 12, 529-535.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1862a. Om fri yttranderätt. *Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning*. 3, 127-134.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1862b. Om tryckfrihet i Finland. *Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning*. 4, 145-156.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1862c. Opinioner angående den inhemska tidningspressen. *Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning*. 5, 193-199.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1862d. Några reflexioner öfver Januari-Utskottets verksamhet. I. *Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning*. 8, 337-346.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1863a. Om medborgerlig och politisk frihet. *Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning*. 6, 241-247.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1863b. Landtdagen. *Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning*. 6, 272-279.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1872a. Sanning om vår presslagstiftning, troligen obehaglig. *Morgonbladet*, 28 Dec., 1872, 1-2.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1872b. Sanning om vår presslagstiftning, troligen obehaglig. *Morgonbladet*, 30 Dec., 1872, 1.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1880. Dagbladpartiets program. *Morgonbladet*, 11 Dec., 1880, 1-2.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1881a. Förklaringar af J. V. S. I. *Morgonbladet*, 27 Jan., 1881, 1-2.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1881b. Förklaringar af J. V. S. 2. *Morgonbladet*, 1 Feb., 1881, 1-2.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1881c. Ännu om attentatet mot pressfriheten 1867. *Morgonbladet*, 9 Feb., 1881, 1-2.
- Sosialidemokraatti, 18 June, 1907, 2: "Jarrutus eduskunnassa."
- Sosialidemokraatti, 5 Mar., 1908, 1: "Eduskunnan työtä hidastawa jarrutuslaitos pois."
- Sosialisti, 7 Nov., 1907, 2: "Missä syy eduskunnan työn wähyteen?"
- Sosialisti, 26 Nov., 1907, 2: "Eduskunnan suuri valiokunta pois!"
- Sosialistinen Aikakauslehti, 32, 1907, 260-261: "Katsauksia. Oulun kokouksen pöytäkirja."
- Stenbäck, K. E. 1881. I frågan om tryckning af landtdags-förhandlingarna. *Morgonbladet*, 6 Dec., 1881, 1.

- Ståhlberg, K. J. 1905. Kansamme tärkein tehtävä. *Valvoja*. 11, 706–708.
- Suomalainen, 25 Jan., 1897, 2: "Porwarissääty."
- Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti, 4 June, 1867, 1–2: "Keisarillisen Majesteetin Armollinen Asetus painotoimen-asioista Suomenmaassa. Annettu Helsingissä, 31 p:nä Toukokuuta 1867."
- Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti, 7 June, 1867, 5–7: "Keisarillisen Majesteetin Armollinen Asetus painotoimen-asioista Suomenmaassa. Annettu Helsingissä, 31 p:nä Toukokuuta 1867."
- Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti, 11 June, 1867, 1: "Keisarillisen Majesteetin Armollinen Asetus Suomessa ulostulewista kirjoista muulla kuin ruotsin- ja suomenkielellä sekä ulkomaisista painotuotteista. Annettu Helsingissä, 31 p:nä Toukokuuta 1867."
- Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti, 19 Nov., 1868, 2: "Lennätinsanomiam."
- Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti, 31 Mar., 1870, 1: "Helsingistä."
- Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti, 16 May, 1871, 1: "Keisarillisen Majesteetin Armollinen Asetus, sisältävä muutoksia ja lisäyksiä Armolliseen Asetukseen 31 päiväältä Toukokuuta 1867, painotoimen asioista Suomenmaassa. Annettu Helsingissä, 1 p:nä Toukokuuta 1871."
- Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti, 16 Feb., 1882, 6–7: "Pappissääty."
- Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti, 24 Mar., 1882, 1: "Waltiöpäiwälisälehtemme."
- Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti, 18 Nov., 1882, 3: "Englannin alihuone."
- Suomalainen Wirallinen Lehti, 2 May, 1885, 5–6: "Senaattori Yrjö-Koskisen lausunto rusthollarikysymyksestä."
- Suomen Julkisia Sanomia, 4 Sept., 1862, 3: "Mitä Suomenmaan sanomalehdistä arwellaan."
- Suomen Julkisia Sanomia, 7 Sept., 1863, 3: "Waltiöpäiwistä."
- Suomen Julkisia Sanomia, 10 Sept., 1863, 3–4: "Waltiöpäiwistä."
- Suomen Julkisia Sanomia, 14 Sept., 1863, 2–3: "Waltiöpäiwistä."
- Suomen Julkisia Sanomia, 24 Sept., 1863, 2–3: "Waltiöpäiwistä."
- Suomen Julkisia Sanomia, 28 Sept., 1863, 3–4: "Waltiöpäiwistä."
- Suomen Julkisia Sanomia, 1 Oct., 1863, 3: "Waltiöpäiwistä."
- Suomen Julkisia Sanomia, 5 Oct., 1863, 3–4: "Waltiöpäiwistä."
- Suometar, 14 Jan., 1848, 2: "Waurastuwatko kansalliset harjoitukset."
- Suometar, 22 June, 1849, 1: "Kieli-murteiden arwo toisiansa kohtaan."
- Suometar, 27 Apr., 1852, 4: "Helsingistä."
- Suometar, 11 Mar., 1853, 2–3: "Samojediläistwen Häistä ja Naimiskaupasta."
- Suometar, 22 Apr., 1853, 2–3: "Hää-tawoista Hirwensalmessa."
- Suometar, 29 Apr., 1853, 2–3: "Hää-tawoista Hirwensalmessa."
- Suometar, 8 Dec., 1854, 2: "Muistelmia matkoilta etelä-osassa Wiipurin lääniä w. 1854."
- Suometar, 8 Aug., 1856, 1: "Wähäisen puheen jatkoa muukalaisten nimien kirjoittamisesta Suomeksi."
- Suometar, 9 Jan., 1857, 2: "Naimiskaupat Lappajärwellä"
- Suometar, 20 Feb., 1857, 5–6: "Muuan sana naimisen seikoista Pohjanmaan sopessa."

- Suometar, 5 May, 1863, 2-3: "Waltiopäivä-järjestys Suomessa."
- Suometar, 8 May, 1863, 2-3: "Waltiopäivä-järjestys Suomessa."
- Suometar, 12 May, 1863, 2: "Waltiopäivä-järjestys Suomessa."
- Suometar, 15 May, 1863, 2: "Waltiopäivä-järjestys Suomessa."
- Suometar, 3 July, 1863, 1: "Waltiopäiwän walmistus-puuhat."
- Suomi, 30 Jan., 1889, 2: "Anders Svedberg."
- Svenska Österbotten, 14 Jan., 1896, 2: "Kommerserådet Anders Joakim Kurtén."
- Tammerfors Aftonblad, 7 Mar., 1884, 3: "Engelska underhusets talman."
- Tammerfors Nyheter, 21.05.1900, 2: "Prässmysterier."
- Tampereen Sanomat, 21 Mar., 1894, 2: "Kirje Helsingistä."
- Tampereen Sanomat, 14 Nov., 1897, 1-2: "Katsaus ulkomaihin."
- Turun Sanomat, 17 Feb., 1905, 1: "Muut lehdet."
- Turun Sanomat, 12 May, 1905, 1: "Viime valtiopäivien asia- ja pöytäkirjat."
- Työ, 20 Oct., 1907, 1: "Kirje eduskunnasta."
- Työ, 10 Oct., 1908, 2: "Eduskunta ja uudistuskysymykset."
- Työ, 28 Dec., 1908, 2: "Katsauksia."
- Työläinen, 12 Aug., 1908, 1: "Julkisuuden pelkoa. Porwarit eiwät jaksa irtaantua wanhoista tawoista."
- Työmies, 21 Dec., 1906, 4: "Eläwiä kuwia eilisestä kokouksesta."
- Työmies, 13 Feb., 1908, 1: "Julkisuus ja puhemiehen puhe."
- Työmies, 29 Sept., 1908, 5: "Torpparilaki suuressa waliokunnassa."
- Työmies, 30 Jan., 1909, 5: "Kansanedustajan toimesta erottaminen".
- Työmies, 14 Dec., 1910, 2: "'Kahlewaltuus'."
- Työväen kalenteri, 2, 1909, 34: "Kokousneuvoja."
- Työväen kalenteri, 5, 1912, 212-213: "Kokousneuvoja."
- Uleåborgs Tidning, 28 Oct., 1878, 2-3: "Det engelska underhusets talman. (Efter en engelsk tidskrift)."
- Uleåborgs Tidning, 18 Aug., 1879, 2-3: "Bref från England. IV."
- Uleåborgs Tidning, 4 Oct., 1889, 2: "Dödsfall."
- Ursin, N. R. af 1909a. Välikysely eli interpellatsiooni. *Työväen kalenteri*. 2, 69-81.
- Uusi Aura, 23 Oct., 1897, 3: "Talonpoikaissäädyn keskustelupöytäkirjat"
- Uusi Aura, 29 Jan., 1905, 1: "Kirje waltiopäiviltä."
- Uusi Aura, 17 Mar., 1906, 7: "Kirje Piikkiöstä."
- Uusi Aura, 5 Apr., 1910, 6: "Hufvudstadsbladetia vastaan."
- Uusi Savo, 12 Aug., 1893, 1-2: "Waalit porwarissäätyyn."
- Uusi Suometar 6 Mar., 1872, 3-4: "Pikakirjoituksesta Suomen kielellä."
- Uusi Suometar, 17 June, 1872, 2: "Waltiopäiwät."
- Uusi Suometar, 21 Feb., 1877, 1-2: "Silmäys waltiopäiwien toimiin. II."
- Uusi Suometar, 23 Nov., 1877, 1-3: "Talonpoikaissääty."
- Uusi Suometar, 17 Jan., 1879, 3-4: "Ulkomaalta."
- Uusi Suometar, 29 Jan., 1879, 3: "Ulkomaalta."
- Uusi Suometar, 4 Feb., 1881, 3: "Ulkomaalta."
- Uusi Suometar, 7 Feb., 1881, 3: "Ulkomaalta."
- Uusi Suometar, 8 Feb., 1881, 3: "Englannin parlamentissa tapahtuneet selkkaukset."

- Uusi Suometar, 11 Feb., 1881, 1: "Englannin parlamentissa 3 p. helmikuuta."
- Uusi Suometar, 8 Apr., 1881, 1: "Dagblad ja säätyjen anomus kouluasiassa."
- Uusi Suometar, 13 Aug., 1881, 2-3: "Parnell alihuoneessa."
- Uusi Suometar, 2 Nov., 1881, 2: "Helsingfors Dagblad."
- Uusi Suometar, 9 Feb., 1887, 2: "August Mäkipeska."
- Uusi Suometar, 11 Aug., 1887, 2: "Ilmeistä 'naiwitettä'."
- Uusi Suometar, 5 Nov., 1887, 1-2: "Helsingistä."
- Uusi Suometar, 25 Nov., 1887, 3: "Lähetäjä X:älle U. Suomettaren 258 n:ossa."
- Uusi Suometar, 20 Apr., 1888, 1-2: "Pappissääty."
- Uusi Suometar, 4 May, 1888, 2: "Waltiovaraston tila."
- Uusi Suometar, 20 Jan., 1891, 2: "Uutisia Helsingistä."
- Uusi Suometar, 31 Jan., 1892, 2: "Uutisia Helsingistä."
- Uusi Suometar, 29 Sept., 1893, 2: "Kansallisliitto ylähuonetta vastaan."
- Uusi Suometar, 14 Jan., 1894, 2: "Niskoittelewia edusmiehiä vastaan."
- Uusi Suometar, 4 Apr., 1897, 2: "Ruotsinmielisten puoluekemut."
- Uusi Suometar, 6 June, 1897, 4: "Unkarin eduskunnasta."
- Uusi Suometar, 30 Oct., 1897, 3: "Itävallan puolueriidat."
- Uusi Suometar, 13 Nov., 1900, 3: "Talonpoikaissäädyn keskustelupöytäkirjain"
- Uusi Suometar, 17 Apr., 1901, 5-6: "Sananen puolueurheilujen johdosta."
- Uusi Suometar, 6 Nov., 1904, 2: "Perustuslailliset ja puhemiehen puolueettomuus."
- Uusi Suometar, 10 Nov., 1904, 2: "Perustuslaillisuutta sekin."
- Uusi Suometar, 28 Jan., 1905, 3: "Porvarissääty."
- Uusi Suometar, 9 Feb., 1907, 2-3: "Kysymys salaisesta tai julkisesta äänestyksestä eduskunnassa."
- Uusi Suometar, 24 Apr., 1907, 4: "Eduskunnan pöytäkirjanpito."
- Uusi Suometar, 28 May, 1907, 2: "Eduskunnan lauantaisten istunnon johdosta."
- Uusi Suometar, 3 Sept., 1907, 3: "Waltioapäiwäjulkaisut."
- Uusi Suometar, 25 Jan., 1908, 4-5: "Katkelma muistelmia käynnistäni Itävallan parlamentissa."
- Uusi Suometar, 19 Feb., 1908, 7: "Oikeus ja poliisiasioita. Painokanne."
- Uusi Suometar, 4 Nov., 1908, 4: "Ulkonaisesta esiintymisestä eduskunnassa viime istuntokaudella."
- Uusi Suometar, 9 Dec., 1910, 2: "Kahlevaltuus. Sosiaalidemokraattimme jälleen vaarallisilla teillä. I."
- Uusi Suometar, 17 Dec., 1910, 6: "Työmies-lehden täytyy koettaa puolustautua. Walpastelua."
- Vaasa, 3 Nov., 1908, 1-2: "Edusmiesten pakkowaltuus."
- Waasan Lehti, 2 Feb., 1889, 2-3: "Fonograafi."
- Vapaus, 25 Jan., 1908, 4: "Ketkä hidastuttivat Eduskunnan työtä. Tilastoa Eduskunnassa käytetyistä puheenwuoroista."
- Vasabladet, 14 Nov., 1863, 4: "Till salu i A Widerströms Bokhandel."
- Wasabladet, 3 Jan., 1877, 1-2: "Till tidningens resp. Läsarekrets 1877. Några ingångsord."
- Wasa Nyheter, 15 Jan., 1896, 2-3: "En bemärkelsedag."

- Wasa Tidning, 1 Feb., 1885, 1: "Landtdagsbref. II."
- Wasa Tidning, 21 Apr., 1885, 1-2: "Landtdagsbref. XVI."
- Wasa Tidning, 2 June, 1885: "Landtdagssilhouetter."
- Wasa Tidning, 10 Jan., 1889, 1-2: "Diskussionsprotokoll för våra stadsfullmäktige"
- Wasa Tidning, 22 Aug., 1895, 2-3: "Från världens ryktbarasta riksförsamling"
- Wasa-Posten, 11 Feb., 1907, 4: "Från allmänheten. En walman i norra walkretsen"
- Westra Finland, 4 Mar., 1891, 2: "Helsingforsbref IV. Ett besök i bondeståndet."
- Wiborg, 5 June, 1857, 2-3: "Engelska underhusets talmän."
- Wiborg, 9 June, 1857, 2-3: "Engelska underhusets talmän."
- Wiborg, 29 Nov., 1873, 1-2: "Den engelska penningmarknaden."
- Wiborgs Tidning, 18 May, 1870, 2-3: "Qvinnofrågan i England."
- Wiborgs Tidning, 9 Mar., 1880, 3: "Engelska parlamentet."
- Wiborgs Tidning, 25 Nov., 1880, 3: "Irland och Gladstoneska ministèren."
- Wiborgs Tidning, 10 Feb., 1881, 2: "Storbritannien."
- Wiipuri, 5 Jan., 1894, 2: "Wuosi 1893 muualla maailmassa."
- Wiipuri, 19 May, 1894, 2: "Waltiollinen katsaus."
- Wiipuri, 18 June, 1898, 3: "Uusi meteli Itäwallan edustajahuoneessa."
- Wiipuri, 5 Feb., 1905, 2-3: "Poskeisen pakinoita. Keskustelua waltiopäiwistä."
- Wiipuri, 14 Apr., 1907, 2: "Onko julkinen äänestys eduskunnassa samaa kuin n. l. pakkowaltuus?"
- Wiipuri, 22 Sept., 1907, 2. "Puhetulwa eduskunnassa".
- Wiipuri, 15 July, 1910, 1: "Nykyajan valtiomuodoista. Yksinvalta V. Kansanedustus."
- Wiipurin Sanomat, 10 Aug., 1892, 1-2: "Kokouksiemme ulkonaisesta järjestämisestä sananen."
- Wiipurin Sanomat, 10 May, 1893, 2: "'Waltiopäiwän asiakirjoja' ja 'Säätöjen pöytäkirjoja' ei ole asianomaisten Wirkakuntain arkistoissa."
- Wiipurin Uutiset, 1 Oct., 1887, 2: "Jälkikaikuja Wiipurin Sanomille ja Lappeenrannan Uutisissa kirjoitt. 'Tuomiokuntalaiselle' Lappeen tuomiokunnassa tapahtuneen waltiopäiwämieswaalin johdosta."
- Willebrand, Reinhold Felix 1910. Vid årskiftet. *Finsk Tidskrift*. 1, 3-12.
- Wrede, R. A. 1909. Om lagstiftning och lagstiftare. Tankar i anledning af de förestående landtdagsvalen. *Finsk Tidskrift*. 6, 401-413.
- Wuoksi, 3 Feb., 1897, 2: "Kirjeitä Helsingistä."
- Åbo Allmänna Tidning, 26 Apr., 1817, 1-3: "Om Engelska Constitutionen."
- Åbo Allmänna Tidning, 29 Apr., 1817, 1-2: "Om Engelska Constitutionen."
- Åbo Tidning, 4 Apr., 1883, 1: "Åbo den 4 April 1883."
- Åbo Tidning, 5 Apr., 1883, 1: "Åbo den 5 April 1883."
- Åbo Tidning, 6 Apr., 1883, 1: "Åbo den 6 April 1883."
- Åbo Tidning, 15 Oct., 1884, 2: "Rysk censur."
- Åbo Tidning, 10 Jan., 1885, 1-2: "Några ord i judefrågan."
- Åbo Tidning, 13 Jan., 1885, 2: "Ännu några ord i judefrågan."
- Åbo Tidning, 21 Apr., 1885, 1-2: "Ditt och datt från landtdagen. V."

- Åbo Tidning, 20 Jan., 1886, 1: "En ny politisk broschyr."
- Åbo Tidning, 5 Aug., 1903, 3: "Hvart den parlamentariska obstruktion leder."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 25 Apr., 1838, 1-3: "Något om Engelska parlamentet. Ur Tübinger Morgonblatt."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 7 May, 1861, 3: "Finlands grundlagar."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 22 Aug., 1863, 6: "I Frenckellska Bokhandeln och hos A. W. Edgren."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 31 Jan., 1867, 4: "Till salu hos J. Th. Åkerman."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 30 June, 1870, 2: "Talmannen i engelska parlamentet."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 16 Nov., 1871, 1-2: "Åbo den 16 november."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 9 Jan., 1872, 2: "Från utlandet."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 7 March., 1872, 1-2: "Åbo den 7 mars."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 19 May, 1873, 3: "Vid valen till den konstituerande församlingen i Spanien."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 29 Dec., 1876, 1.: "Den turkiska författningen."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 12 Feb., 1878, 2: "Stenografiska föreningen i Helsingfors."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 24 Feb., 1879, 1-2: "Qwinnan i Kristi kyrkas tjänst. I."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 11 Mar., 1880, 3: "Från England."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 10 Jan., 1882, 3: "Den landtdagstidning."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 21 Feb., 1882, 3: "Förslaget till ändringar i underhusets arbetsordning."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 12 July, 1882, 3: "Den irländska tvångslagen."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 5 Dec., 1882, 3: "Engelska underhusets arbetsordning."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 6 Mar., 1884, 2: "Engelska underhusets talman."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 16 Aug., 1888, 1: "Några stenografreflexerioner. (sic.)"
- Åbo Underrättelser, 19 Apr., 1891, 1-2: "Helsingfors-bref. IX."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 29 Oct., 1894, 2-3: "Borgareståndets diskussionsprotokoll"
- Åbo Underrättelser, 7 Aug., 1895, 2: "Underhusets talman."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 13 May, 1905, 1: "Landtdagshandlingarna till biblioteken."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 17 Dec., 1905, 2-3: "Professor Schybergsons föredrag."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 4 Aug., 1906, 2: "Privata meddelanden."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 25 July, 1907, 2: "Frågan om en landtdagstidning."
- Åbo Underrättelser, 16 Sept., 1909, 3: "Lantdagen"
- Åbo Underrättelser, 27 Feb., 1910, 6: "Hufvudstadsbrev."
- Österbotten, 20 Jan., 1866, 3-6: "Återhemtning från landtdagen."
- Österbottniska Posten, 16 Oct., 1884, 3: "Kommunalstämman."
- Östra Finland, 18 June, 1877, 1: "Alexander Reinhold Frey."
- Östra Finland, 2 Feb., 1881, 2: "Irländsk obstruktion."
- Östra Finland, 7 Feb., 1881, 2: "I engelska underhuset."
- Östra Finland, 15 Feb., 1882, 2: "Vid engelska parlamentets öppnande."
- Östra Finland, 10 July, 1906, 2: "Något om modärn parlamentarism."
- Östra Finland, 18 July, 1907, 1-2: "Behovvet af en landtdagstidning."
- Östra Finland, 30 July, 1907, 1-2: "Frågan om en landtdagstidning."
- Östra Finland, 19 Feb., 1909, 1: "Landtdagstrycket."

Östra Finland, 30 Mar., 1909, 2: "Arrangelagen promulgeras och trader i kraft från och med i dag."

Other primary sources

- Aho, Juhani 1911. *Sanomalehtimiesajoiltani*. Helsinki: Otava. [Accessed 10 October 2013] URL:< <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/11967>>
- Anomusehdotus 174/1908. Eduskunnan kirjaston laajentamisesta yleiseksi yhteiskunnalliseksi kansalliskirjastoksi ja tiedonantotoimistoksi ja 40,000 markan määrärahan myöntämisestä vuodeksi 1909 mainittuun tarkoitukseen. [Accessed 28 June 2014]
URL:<<http://lib.eduskunta.fi/dman/Document.phx?documentId=zi12813135718246&cmd=download>>
- Charter of the Diet Library 1872. [Accessed 28 June 2013]
URL:<<http://lib.eduskunta.fi/dman/Document.phx?documentId=iv04407095622065&cmd=download>>
- Constitution of the German Empire 1871. [Accessed 26 August 2014] URL:< http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Constitution_of_the_German_Empire>
- Eduskunnan työjärjestys 2000. [Accessed 18 November 2013]
URL:<<http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/2000/20000040>>
- Eduskuntakomitea 1906a. *Eduskunnan uudistamiskomitean pöytäkirjat 1905–1906*. Kansallisarkisto.
- Eduskuntakomitea 1906b. *Eduskunnan uudistamiskomitean mietintö. Ehdotus valtiopäiväjärjestykseksi. Ehdotus vaalilaiksi. Perustelmat ja vastalauseita*. Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Otava.
- Grundlagskomitén 1866a. Motiver till förslaget till Landtdagsordning för Storfurstendömet Finland. *Valtiosihteerinviraston akti 51/1866*. Kansallisarkisto.
- Grundlagskomitén 1866b. 'Förslag till Landtdagsordning för Storfurstendömet Finland'. *Valtiosihteerinviraston akti 51/1866*. Kansallisarkisto.
- Grundlags-utskott 1871 [1867]: Grundlags-utskottets betänkande N:o 1/1867. *Hans Kejsarliga Majestäts nådiga propositioner till Storfurstendömet Finlands Ständer å Landtdagen i Helsingfors år 1867. I*.
- Grunnlov 1814. *Kongeriket Norges Grunnlov av 17. mai 1814*. [Accessed 14 March 2014]
URL:<<http://www.stortinget.no/Global/pdf/Stortingsarkivet/17.%20mai-grunnloven.pdf>>
- Hansard 1803–2005. <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/>
- Heinäemies, Vilho 1947. *Uudet kasvot ja vanhat parrat: kuvia ja kuvauksia eduskunnan lapsuuden ajoilta*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Kautsky, Karl 2010 [1907]: *Erfurtin ohjelma*. Transl. by J. K. Kari. Tampere: Sosialismi.net. [Accessed 28 November 2013]
URL:<http://sosialismi.net/kirjasto/Karl_Kautsky_-_Erfurtin_ohjelma.pdf>

- Kautsky, Karl 2012 [1907]. *Parlamentarismi, kansanlainsäädäntö ja sosialidemokratia*. Transl. by Erl. Aarnio. Tampere: Sosialismi.net. [Accessed 28 November 2013]
URL:<http://sosialismi.net/kirjasto/Karl_Kautsky_-_Parlamentarismi.pdf>
- Nordström, Johan Jakob 1912 [1862]. Promemoria, rörande åtskilliga till det svenska riksdagsväsendet före år 1809 hörande omständigheter. In K. Grotenfelt *Den Finska Grundlagskomitén år 1865 jämte densamma rörande handlingar. Ett blad ur Finlands nyare politiska historia*. Helsingfors: Söderström & C:o förlagsaktiebolag, 67-80.
- Nordström, Johan Jakob 1912 [1863]. Förslag till Landtdagsordning för Storfurstendömet Finland, uppgjort af J. J. Nordström år 1863. In K. Grotenfelt *Den Finska Grundlagskomitén år 1865 jämte densamma rörande handlingar. Ett blad ur Finlands nyare politiska historia*. Helsingfors: Söderström & C:o förlagsaktiebolag, 81-107.
- Nuoren suomenmielisen puolueen ohjelma 1894. Hyväksytty perustavassa kokouksessa Helsingissä 25.11.1894. [Accessed 12 August 2014] URL:<<http://www.fsd.uta.fi/pohtiva/ohjelma?tunniste=nuorohjelma1894>>
- Nuorsuomalaisen puolueen ohjelma 1906. Hyväksytty edustajakokouksessa 9-10.12.1906 [Accessed 12 August 2014]
URL:<<http://www.fsd.uta.fi/pohtiva/ohjelma?tunniste=nuorohjelma1906>>
- Paasikivi, Juho Kusti 1986 [1957]. *Paasikiven muistelmia sortovuosilta I*. Juva: WSOY.
- Palmén, Johan Philip 1861. *Storfurstendömet Finlands grundlagar jemte till dem hörande statshandlingar*. Helsingfors: F. C. Frenckell & son.
- Palmén, Johan Philip 1862. *Suomen Suuriruhtinaskunnan Perustuslait ynnä niihin kuuluvain Waltiokirjoitusten kanssa*. Transl. by Wilhelm Lavonius. Helsinki: Frenckell.
- Perustuslakivaliokunta 1906. Perustuslakivaliokunnan mietintö N:o 1. *Suomen väliaikaisten valtiopäivien asiakirjat 1905-1906, II*.
- Porvarissäädyn Yksityisen Valitusvaliokunnan mietintö ehdoituksesta painattaa Porvarissäädyn pöytäkirjat näiltä valtiopäiviltä. *Asiakirjat valtiopäiviltä Helsingissä vuosina 1877-1878. Neljäs osa*.
- Regeringsform 1720. [Accessed 10 July 2013]
URL:<http://sv.wikisource.org/wiki/Regeringsform_1720>
- Regeringsform 1809. *Kongl. Maj:ts och Rikets Ständers fastställda Regeringsform dat. Stockholm den 6 juni 1809*. [Accessed 10 July 2013]
URL:<http://sv.wikisource.org/wiki/Regeringsform_1809>
- Riksdagsordning 1723. *Kongl. Maj:ts och Sweriges Rikes Ständers Riksdags-Ordning. Författad wid Riksdagen uti Stockholm den 17. October 1723*. [Accessed 28 November 2013] URL:<<http://wisberg.se/wisberg.se/pdf/delar/82.pdf>>
- Riksdagsordningen 1810. *Kongl. Maj:ts Och Riksens Ständers Faststälde Riksdags-Ordning; Dat. Stockholm den 10 Februarii 1810*. [Accessed 18 November 2013]
URL:<http://www.modern-constitutions.de/nbu.php?page_id=02a1b5a86ff139471c0b1c57f23ac196&show_doc=SE-00-1810-02-10-sv>

- Riksdagsordningen 1866. *Riksdagsordningen 22 juni 1866*.
- Ritarihuonejärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinanmaan Ritaristolle ja Aatelille 1869. [Accessed 7 March 2013] URL:<<http://www.histdoc.net/laki/rhj.html>>
- Rosenborg, Wilhelm 1863. *Om Riksdagar. Föreläsningar hållna vid Helsingfors' Universitet, vårterminen 1863*. Helsingfors: Theodor Sederholms förlag.
- Schybergson, M. G. 1906. Eduskunnan muutoskysymys historian valossa. In M. G. Schybergson, G. Schybergson, G. Estlander & E. Erkko *Lisiä eduskunnan muutoskysymykseen*. Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Helios.
- Seitsenmiehinen komitea 1907. *Seitsenmiehisen komitean pöytäkirjat*. Eduskunnan arkisto.
- Senate 1866. Senate's proposal for the Diet Act. *Valtiosihteerinviraston akti 51/1866*. Kansallisarkisto.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1842. *Läran om staten*. Stockholm: Haeggström.
- Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 1898 [1861–1862]. Om statsmakterna. Utdrag ur en föreläsningkurs läsåret 1861–1862 i samhällslära. In *Johan Vilhelm Snellmans samlade arbeten*. X. Helsingfors: Helsingfors centraltryckeri. [Accessed 21 December 2013] URL:< <https://archive.org/details/samladearbetenu00snelgoog>>
- Sosialidemokraattisen puolueen ohjelma 1903. Hyväksytty Forssan puoluekokouksessa 17–20.8.1903. [Accessed 12 August 2014] URL:< <http://www.fsd.uta.fi/pohtiva/ohjelma?tunniste=sdpohjelma1903>>
- Standing orders of the Library of the Eduskunta 1913. [Accessed 28 June 2013] URL:< <http://lib.eduskunta.fi/dman/Document.phx?documentId=vp12813135731246&cmd=download>>
- Suomalaisen puolueen ohjelma 1906. Hyväksytty puolueen yleisessä kokouksessa Helsingissä 22–24.10.1906. [Accessed 12 August 2014] URL:< <http://www.fsd.uta.fi/pohtiva/ohjelma?tunniste=spohjelma1906>>
- Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys ynnä määräykset valtiopäivillä suhteellisen vaalitavan mukaan toimitettavista vaaleista. 1907. M11/1907.
- Suomen eduskunnan työjärjestys ynnä määräykset valtiopäivillä suhteellisen vaalitavan mukaan toimitettavista vaaleista. 1908. M7/1908.
- Suomen hallitusmuoto 1919. [Accessed 4 February 2014] URL:<<http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/1919/19190094001>>
- Suomen perustuslaki 1999. [Accessed 18 November 2013] URL:<<http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/1999/19990731>>
- Suomen Suuriruhtinaskunnan Valtiopäiväjärjestys 1906. [Accessed 18 November 2013] URL:<<http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/1906/19060026>>
- Underdånigt förslag till lag för åhörare vid ståndens sammanträden under påstående landtdag 1866. *Valtiosihteerinviraston akti 51/1866*. Kansallisarkisto.
- Ursin, N. R. af 1909b. *Saksan sosiaalidemokratia, sen vaiheet, oppi ja rakenne*. Helsinki: Otava.

- Valtiopäivien pöytäkirjat ja asiakirjat 1809–1909. Minutes and documents of the Diet of Finland and the Eduskunta 1809–1909.
- Valtiopäiväjärjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaalle 1869. [Accessed 10 August 2013]
 URL:<http://fi.wikisource.org/wiki/Valtiop%C3%A4iv%C3%A4j%C3%A4rjestys_Suomen_Suuriruhtinaanmaalle> In Swedish in Finlands Allmänna Tidning 10 May, 1869, 1; 11 May, 1869, 1; 12 May, 1869, 1; 13 May, 1869, 1; 14 May, 1869, 1–2.
- Valtiopäiväjärjestys 1928. [Accessed 4 Aug 2011]
 URL:<<http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/1928/19280007>>
- Valtiovaliokunnan mietintö N:o 4 Porvarissäädyn tekemästä ehdotuksesta, että Säätyjen keskustelu-pöytäkirjat painettaisiin yleisellä kustannuksella. *Asiakirjat valtiopäiviltä Helsingissä vuosina 1877–1878. Neljäs osa.*
- Wuolijoki, Sulo 1934. *Yksikamarisen arkielämää: muistelmia nykyisen eduskuntalaitoksen alkuajoilta.* Jyväskylä: Gummerus.

The National Biography of Finland, online collection (Kansallisbiografia-verkkojulkaisu)

- Aho, Jouko 2001. Rein, Thiodolf (1838–1919).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3596/>>
- Hanski, Jari 2000. Bergh, Edward (1829–1903).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3134/>>
- Hanski, Jari 2001a. Ahmavaara, Pekka (1862–1929).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/5821/>>
- Hanski, Jari 2001b. Frenckell, Frans von (1821–1878).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/5998/>>
- Hanski, Jari 2001c. Frenckell, Reinhold (1823–1880).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/5999/>>
- Hanski, Jari 2005. Lagerborg, Robert (1835–1882).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/6178/>>
- Helen, Tapio 1997. Leo Mechelin (1839–1914).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3553/>>
- Hellsten, Tanja 2005. Lindblom, Gustaf Adolf (1828–1889).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/4318/>>
- Häikiö, Martti 1997. Svinhufvud, Pehr Evind (1861–1944).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/501/>>
- Kautto, Timo 2000. Serlachius, Julian (1854–1925).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3628/>>
- Klinge, Matti 1997. Snellman, Johan Vilhelm (1806–1881).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3639/>>
- Laine, Tuija 2001. Pipping, Fredrik Wilhelm (1783–1868).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/7972/>>
- Landgrén, Lars-Folke 2002. Castrén, Robert (1851–1883).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3165/>>

- Landgrén, Lars Folke 2006. Sederholm, Theodor (1832–1881).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/2947/>>
- Leikola, Anto 2001. Runeberg, Johan Wilhelm (1843–1918).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3610/>>
- Luther, Georg 2000. Ignatius, Karl Ferdinand (1837–1909).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3489/>>
- Marjomaa, Risto 2001. Munck, Johan Reinhold (1795–1865).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3561/>>
- Modéen, Tore 2002. Hermanson, Robert (1846–1928).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3478/>>
- Murtorinne, Eino & Rasila, Viljo 2000. Kihlman, Alfred (1825–1904).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/4300/>>
- Mäkelä-Alitalo, Anneli 2007. Stenbäck, Karl Emil (1834–1919).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/6423/>>
- Pitkäranta, Reijo 2004. Geitlin, Johan Gabriel (1836–1890).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/6008/>>
- Polvinen, Tuomo 1997. Paasikivi, Juho Kusti (1870–1956).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/631/>>
- Rahikainen, Marjatta 2000. Ursin, Nils Robert af (1854–1936).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/4442/>>
- Sainio, Venla 2000a. Yrjö-Koskinen, Georg Zacharias (1830–1903).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3696/>>
- Sainio, Venla 2000b. Fabritius, August (1844–1915).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/5974/>>
- Sainio, Venla 2001a. Helenius-Seppälä, Matti (1870–1920).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/6050/>>
- Sainio, Venla 2001b. Kuusinen, Otto Wille (1881–1964).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/640/>>
- Sainio, Venla 2001c. Valpas, Edvard (1873–1937).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/6509/>>
- Sainio, Venla 2005. Lerche, Fredrik (1826–1899).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/4557/>>
- Scheinin, Theodor Mikael 2003. Estlander, Jakob August (1831–1881).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3189/>>
- Sundström, Mia 2007. Öhrnberg, Carl Adolf (1813–1877).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/6554/>>
- Tiensuu, Kyllikki 2001. Heikel, Henrik (1808–1867).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/6045/>>
- Tyynilä, Markku 2005. Montgomery, Robert (1834–1898).
 URL:<<http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3328/>>
- Vares, Vesa 2001. Meurman, Agathon (1826–1909).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/4569/>>
- Vares, Vesa 2003. Danielson-Kalmari, Johan Richard (1853–1933).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3177/>>
- Varpio, Yrjö 2000. Godenhjelm, Bernhard Fredrik (1840–1912).

- URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/2884/>>
 Virrankoski, Pentti 2001. Hagman, August (1841–1885).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/2704/>>
 Väisänen, Maija 2001a. Chydenius, Anders Herman (1833–1896).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3169/>>
 Väisänen, Maija 2001b. Donner, Otto (1835–1909).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3179/>>
 Väisänen, Maija 2001c. Palmén, Ernst Gustaf (1849–1919).
 URL:< <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kb/artikkeli/3578/>>

Register of University Students 1640–1852 (Ylioppilasmatrikkeli 1640–1852)

- Kotivuori, Yrjö 2005a. *Edvin Avellan*.
 URL:<<http://www.helsinki.fi/ylioppilasmatrikkeli/henkilo.php?id=16649>>
 Kotivuori, Yrjö 2005b. *Otto Mauritz Nordström*.
 URL:<<http://www.helsinki.fi/ylioppilasmatrikkeli/henkilo.php?id=15452>>

Bibliography

- Aarnio, Eeva 2003. Puolue. In M. Hyvärinen et al. (Eds) *Käsitteet liikkeessä. Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin käsittehistoria*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 413–466.
- Alapuro, Risto 2006. The Construction of The Voter in Finland, C. 1860–1907. *Redescriptions*. Vol 10, 41–64. [Accessed 29 August 2014]
 URL:<http://www.jyu.fi/yhtfil/redescriptions/Yearbook%202006/Alapuro_06.pdf>
- Alin, Oscar 1881. *Minnen ur Sveriges nyare historia. Tofte delen. Carl Johan och hans tid (1828-1844). Förra afdelningen. (1828-1835). Samlade af B. von Schinkel*. Upsala: Victor Roos. [Accessed 12 January 2013]
 URL:<<https://archive.org/details/minnenursveriges12schi>>
- Ankersmit, F. R. 1996. *Aesthetic politics: political philosophy beyond fact and value*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Arter, David 1984. *The Nordic parliaments: a comparative analysis*. London: Hurst.
- Axberger, Hans-Gunnar 2009. Justitieombudsmannen, tryckfriheten och maktindelningen. In M. Brundin & M. Isberg (Eds) *Maktbalans och kontrollmakt: 1809 års händelser, idéer och författningsverk i ett tvåhundraårigt perspektiv*. Stockholm: Sveriges Riksdag, 414–451.
- Bagehot, Walter 1867. *The English Constitution*. London: Chapman and Hall. [Accessed 5 August 2014]
 URL:< <https://archive.org/details/englishconstitu05bagegoog>>
- Bagehot, Walter 1873 [1872]. *Physics and politics; or, Thoughts on the application of the principles of "natural selection" and "inheritance" to political society*. New

- York: D. Appleton and Company. [Accessed 27 February 2014] URL:<
<https://archive.org/details/cu31924014466209>>
- Bennich-Björkman, Bo 2003. Affärer i politisk tryck. Offentlighetsprincipen och spelet om den politiska makten 1766-72. In M.-C. Skuncke & H. Tandefelt (Eds) *Riksdag, kaffehus och predikstol: frihetstidens politiska kultur 1766-1772*. Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 287-314.
- Bentham, Jeremy 1843. An Essay On Political Tactics, Or Inquiries Concerning the Discipline and Mode of Proceeding Proper to Be Observed In Political Assemblies: Principally Applied to the Practice of the British Parliament, and to the Constitution and Situation of the National Assembly of France. In J. Bowring (Ed) *The Works of Jeremy Bentham. 11 vols. Vol. 2*. Edinburgh: William Tait. [Accessed 30 October 2013].
 URL:<http://oll.libertyfund.org/index.php?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=show.php&title=1921&search=%22Essay+on+Political+Tactics%22&layout=html#chapter_113915>
- Bergh, Edvard 1884. *Vår styrelse och våra landtdagar: Återblick på Finlands konstitutionella utveckling under de sednaste tjugo åren. Första bandet. 1855-1867*. Helsingfors: G. W. Edlund.
- Blackstone, William 1765. *Commentaries on the Laws of England. Volume I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [Accessed 26 November 2013]
 URL:<<http://archive.org/details/BlackstoneVolumeI>>
- Block, Maurice 1884. *Dictionnaire général de la politique. Tome 2*. Paris: O. Lorenz. [Accessed 28 November 2013]
 URL:<<http://archive.org/details/dictionnairegn02bloc>>
- Brotherus, K. R. 1963. *Suomen valtiollisen järjestyksmuodon kehitys*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Brundin, Margareta & Isberg, Magnus (Eds) 2009. *Maktbalans och kontrollmakt: 1809 års händelser, idéer och författningsverk i ett tvåhundraårigt perspektiv*. Stockholm: Sveriges Riksdag
- Burke, Edmund 1887 [1774]. Speech to the electors of Bristol. In *The Works of the Right Honourable Edmund Burke in twelve volumes. Volume the second*. London: John C. Nimmo. [Accessed 10 August 2013]
 URL:<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/15198/15198-h/15198-h.htm#ELECTORS_OF_BRISTOL>
- Curzon, George 1914. *Modern Parliamentary Eloquence; the Rede lecture, delivered before the University of Cambridge, November 6, 1913*. London: Macmillan and co., limited. [Accessed 18 January 2014]
 URL:<<https://archive.org/details/modernparliament00curzuoft>>
- De Mille, James 1878. *The Elements of Rhetoric*. New York: Harper & Brothers. [Accessed 10 August 2013]
 URL:<<http://archive.org/details/elementsrhetori01millgoog>>
- Den Boer, Pim 2007. Towards a Comparative History of Concepts: Civilisation and Beschaving. *Contributions to the History of Concepts*. 2, 207-233. [Accessed 21 May 2014]
 URL:<<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/berghahn/coco/2007/00000003/00000002/art00005>>

- Den Boer, Pim 2011. National Cultures, Transnational Concepts: *Begriffsgeschichte Beyond Conceptual Nationalism*. In J. F. Sebastián (Ed) *Political Concepts and Time: New Approaches to Conceptual History*. Santander: Cantabria University Press and McGraw-Hill, 205–222.
- Engman, Max & Kirby, David (Eds) 1989. *Finland: people, nation, state*. London: Hurst & Co.
- Fahlbeck, Pontus 1904. *Sveriges författning och den moderna parlamentarismen*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup. [Accessed 10 August 2013]
URL:<<http://archive.org/details/sverigesfrfattrn00fahlgoog>>
- Grant, James 1871a. *The newspaper press: its origin, progress and present position*. I. London: Tinsley Brothers. [Accessed 29 April 2013]
<URL:<http://archive.org/details/newspaperpressi05grangoog>>
- Grant, James 1871b. *The newspaper press: its origin, progress and present position*. II. London: Tinsley Brothers. [Accessed 29 April 2013]
URL:<<http://archive.org/details/newspaperpressi04grangoog>>
- Greaves, H. R. G. 1931. Bentham on Legislative Procedure. *Economica*. 33, 308–327. [Accessed 29 April 2014]
URL:< <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2548037>>
- Grotenfelt, Kustavi 1912. *Den Finska grundlagskomitén år 1865 jämte densamma rörande handlingar: ett blad ur Finlands nyare politiska historia*. Helsingfors: Söderström.
- Gränström, P. O. 1916. Om plenum plenorum i form af gemensam öfverläggning mellan de fyra riksstånden: studier i svenskt författningsslif. *Göteborgs högskolas årsskrift*. Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber.
- Guizot, François 1828. *Cours d'histoire moderne; histoire générale de la civilisation en Europe*. Paris: Pichon & Didier. [Accessed 12 August 2013]
URL:<<http://archive.org/details/coursdhistoiremo00guizuoft>>
- Guizot, François 1852 [1822]. *History of the origin of representative government in Europe*. Transl. by Andrew R. Schoble. London: Henry G. Bohn. [Accessed 12 August, 2013]
URL:<<http://archive.org/details/historyoforigino00guiz>>
- Guizot, François 1858. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps*. Tome premier. Paris: Michel Lévy Frères. [Accessed 3 February 2014]
URL:<<https://archive.org/details/mmoirespourse01guiz>>
- Haapala, Taru 2012. "That in the opinion of this House": the parliamentary culture of debate in the nineteenth-century Cambridge and Oxford Union Societies. *Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä*. [Accessed 14 November 2013]
URL:< <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-4970-9>>
- Habermas, Jürgen 1984 [1981]. *The theory of communicative action*. Vol. 1. *Reason and the rationalization of society*. Transl. by Thomas McCarthy. London: Heinemann.
- Habermas, Jürgen 1987 [1981]. *The theory of communicative action: Vol. 2. Lifeworld and system: a critique of functionalist reason*. Transl. by Thomas McCarthy. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Habermas, Jürgen 1989 [1962]. *The structural transformation of the public sphere: an inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Transl. by Thomas Burger with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hadenius, Stig 1997. *The Riksdag in focus. Swedish history in a parliamentary perspective*. Stockholm: Sveriges Riksdag.
- Hamilton, William Gerard 1808. *Parliamentary logick: to which are subjoined two speeches, delivered in the House of Commons of Ireland, and other pieces*. London: Printed by C. and R. Baldwin, for T. Payne. [Accessed 21 February 2014]
URL:< <https://archive.org/details/parliamentarylo00johngoog>>
- Harris, Michael 2007. Parliament in the Public Sphere: A View of Serial Coverage at the Turn of the Seventeenth Century. *Parliamentary History*, 26, 62–75.
- Harvard, Jonas 2011. Riksdagsprotokollen som medium. In S. Förhammar, J. Harvard & D. Lindström (Eds) *Dolt i offentligheten. Nya perspektiv på traditionellt källmaterial*. Lund: Sekel, 25–46.
- Hatsell, John 1818 [1781]. *Precedents of proceedings in the House of Commons, under separate titles, with observations. In four volumes. Vol. II.: relating to members, speaker &c*. London : Printed for L. Hansard and Sons. [Accessed 26 May 2014] URL:< <https://archive.org/details/precedentsofproc02hats>>
- Heliövaara, O. K. 1945. *Suomen evankelis-luterilaisen kirkon kirkkolaki vuodelta 1869 sekä siihen vahvistetut muutokset aina 7 päivään heinäkuuta 1944*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Hellstenius, J. A. C. 1872. *Minnen ur Sveriges nyare historia. Elfte delen. Carl Johan och hans tid (1823–1828)*. Samlade af B. von Schinkel; förf. och utg. af J. A. C. Hellstenius. Stockholm: Samson & Wallin. [Accessed 12 January 2013]
URL:< <https://archive.org/details/minnenursveriges11schi> >
- Hidén, Mikael 1967. Puhuja ja puhemies – huomioita sanankäytön vapaudesta eduskunnassa. *Lakimies*, 816–831.
- Hidén, Mikael 2007. *Juridiikkaa ja muotoja eduskuntatyössä*. Helsinki: Eduskunta.
- Hidén, Mikael 2011. *Juridiikkaa ja muotoja eduskuntatyössä*. Helsinki: Eduskunta.
- Hirschfeldt, Johan 2009. Den återerövrade tryckfriheten 1809. In M. Brundin & M. Isberg (Eds) *Maktbalans och kontrollmakt: 1809 års händelser, idéer och författningsverk i ett tvåhundraårigt perspektiv*. Stockholm: Sveriges Riksdag, 373–414.
- Hugo, Victor 1876. *Actes et paroles – Depuis l'exil*. Paris: J. Hetzel. [Accessed 26 November 2013]
URL:< <http://www.archive.org/details/actesetparole06hugouoft>>
- Hultin, Tekla 1927. *Taistelun mies: piirteitä Jonas Castrénin elämästä ja toiminnasta*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Hyvärinen, Matti, Kurunmäki, Jussi, Palonen, Kari, Pulkkinen, Tuija & Henrik Stenius (Eds) 2003. *Käsitteet liikkeessä. Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin käsitehistoria*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Ihalainen, Pasi & Palonen, Kari 2009. Parliamentary sources in the comparative study of conceptual history: methodological aspects and illustrations of a

- research proposal. *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*. 1, 17–34. [Accessed 5 February 2014]
URL:< <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02606755.2009.9522293>>
- Ihalainen, Pasi & Sundin, Anders 2011. Continuity and Change in the Language of Politics at the Swedish Diet, 1769–1810. In P. Ihalainen et al. (Eds) *Scandinavia in the age of revolution: Nordic political cultures, 1740–1820*. Farnham: Ashgate, 169–192.
- Ihalainen, Pasi 2013a. Poliittisen legitimitietin rakentamista ja poikkikansallisia yhteyksiä. Parlamentaarisesta hallinnon näkymät Britanniassa, Saksassa ja Suomessa vuonna 1917. *Suomen Historiallisen Seuran Jäsenlehti*. 3, 4–10.
- Ihalainen, Pasi 2013b. Vertaileva Euroopan historian tutkimus parlamentti-historian näkökulmasta. *Tieteessä tapahtuu*. 4, 30–35.
- Ihalainen, Pasi 2014. Prospects for Parliamentary Government in an Era of War and Revolution: Britain and Germany in Spring 1917. In K. Palonen, J. M. Rosales and T. Turkka (Eds) *The Politics of Dissensus: Parliament in Debate*. Santander: Cantabria University Press & McGraw-Hill, 423–448.
- Ilie, Cornelia 2003. Discourse and metadiscourse in parliamentary debates. *Journal of Language and Politics*. 1, 269–291.
- Ilie, Cornelia 2004. Insulting as (un)parliamentary practice in the British and Swedish Parliaments: a rhetorical approach. In P. Bayley (Ed) *Cross-cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 45–86.
- Ilie, Cornelia 2010. Strategic uses of parliamentary forms of address: The case of the U.K. Parliament and the Swedish Riksdag. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 4, 885–911. [Accessed 27 May 2014]
URL:< <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.08.017>>
- Itkonen, Erkki et al. 1992. *Suomen sanojen alkuperä: etymologinen sanakirja. Osa 1*. Helsinki: Suomen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Jalava, Marja 2006. *J. V. Snellman: mies ja suurmies*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Jalava, Marja, Kinnunen, Tiina ja Sulkunen, Irma 2013. *Kirjoitettu kansakunta: sukupuoli, uskonto ja kansallinen historia 1900-luvun alkupuolen suomalaisessa tietokirjallisuudessa*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Jansson, Jan-Magnus 1982. *Eduskunta ja toimeenpanovalta. Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Kahdestoista osa. (Eripainos)* Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea.
- Jellinek, Georg 1904. Parliamentary obstruction. *Political science quarterly*. Vol. 19, No. 4, 579–588. [Accessed 28 November 2013]
URL:<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2140322>>
- Jordan, H. Donaldson 1931. The reports of parliamentary debates, 1803–1908. *Economica*. 34, 437–449.
- Jussila, Osmo 1969. *Suomen perustuslait venäläisten ja suomalaisten tulkintojen mukaan 1808–1863*. Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura.
- Jussila, Osmo 1987. *Maakunnasta valtioksi*. Juva: WSOY.
- Jussila, Osmo 1999. Finland as a Grand Duchy 1809–1917. In O. Jussila, S. Hentilä & J. Nevakivi (Eds) *From grand duchy to modern state: a political*

- history of Finland since 1809*. Transl. by David & Eva-Kaisa Arter. London: Hurst, 3–98.
- Jutikkala, Eino 1974. Säätyvaltiopäivien valitsijakunta, vaalit ja koostumus. In O. Salervo et al. (Eds) *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Neljäs osa*. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea, 7–145.
- Jyränki, Antero 2006. Kansanedustuslaitos ja valtiosääntö 1906–2005. In A. Jyränki & J. Nousiainen *Eduskunnan muuttuva asema. Suomen eduskunta 100 vuotta; 2*. Helsinki: Edita, 10–177.
- Kallioniemi, Kaarlo 1946. *Pikakirjoitus ja säätyvaltiopäivät*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Karjalainen, Marjaana 1977. *Kansankirjastojen kehitys Suomessa vuosina 1802–1906*. Helsinki: Kirjastopalvelu.
- Kettunen, Pauli 2001. *Kansallinen työ: suomalaisen suorituskyvyn vaalimisesta*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.
- Kettunen, Pauli 2007. "Kansallisen" muuttuvat muodot. In P. Hyttinen (Ed) *Suomalaisia vai maailmankansalaisia? Chydenius, Snellman ja globalisaatio*. Kokkola: Anders Chydenius säätiö, 8–20. [Accessed 13 May 2014]
URL:< http://www.chydenius.net/pdf/jvs_kirja_korjattu.pdf>
- Kettunen, Pauli 2008. *Globalisaatio ja kansallinen me: kansallisen katseen historiallinen kritiikki*. Tampere: Vastapaino. [Accessed 22 May 2014]
URL:< <http://www.ellibs.com/fi/book/978-951-768-271-8>>
- Klinge, Matti 1967. *Ylioppilaskunnan historia. I*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Klinge, Matti 2009. *Napoleonin varjo: Euroopan ja Suomen murros 1795–1815*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Klinge, Matti 2010. *Suomalainen ja eurooppalainen menneisyys: historiankirjoitus ja historiakulttuuri keisariaikana*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Koger, Gregory. 2010. *Filibustering. A Political History of Obstruction in the House and Senate*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kontner, László 2007. Translation and Comparison: Early-Modern and Current Perspectives. *Contributions to the History of Concepts*. 1, 71–102.
- Krusius-Ahrenberg, Lolo 1934. *Der Durchbruch des Nationalismus und Liberalismus im politischen Leben Finnlands 1856–1863*. Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia.
- Krusius-Ahrenberg, Lolo 1944. Från grundlagskommitté till lantdagsordning. *Historiska och litteraturhistoriska studier* 20. Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland, 219–433.
- Krusius-Ahrenberg, Lolo 1981a. Valtiopäiväajatus etsii toteutumistaan (1856–1863). In O. Salervo et al. (Eds) *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Toinen osa*. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea, 11–92.
- Krusius-Ahrenberg, Lolo 1981b. Uutta ja luovaa valtiopäivätoimintaa vanhoissa puitteissa (1863–1867). In O. Salervo et al. (Eds) *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Toinen osa*. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea, 93–250.
- Krusius-Ahrenberg, Lolo 1981c. Vuoden 1869 valtiopäiväjärjestys. In O. Salervo et al. (Eds) *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Toinen osa*. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea, 251–374.

- Kurunmäki, Jussi 2000. *Representation, nation and time: the political rhetoric of the 1866 parliamentary reform in Sweden*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Kurunmäki, Jussi 2003. The reception of political concepts in the wake of Finnish parliamentary life in the 1860s. In J. Kurunmäki & K. Palonen (Eds) *Zeit, Geschichte und Politik = Time, history and politics: zum achtzigsten Geburtstag von Reinhart Koselleck*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Kurunmäki, Jussi 2004. Ulkomaiset mallit ja poliittinen traditio 1860-luvun alun suomalaisessa keskustelussa valtiopäivistä. In S. Hänninen & K. Palonen (Eds) *Lue poliittisesti: profiileja politiikan tutkimukseen*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 193–236.
- Kurunmäki, Jussi 2008. Different styles of parliamentary democratisation in Finland and Sweden: An analysis of two debates over parliamentary reform in 1906. In S. Soininen & T. Turkka (Eds) *The Parliamentary Style of Politics*. Helsinki: Finnish Political Science Association, 106–128.
- Laaksovirta, Tuula H. 2007. Eduskunnan virallinen tiedonvälitys. In V. Pernaa, T. H. Laaksovirta & P. I. Lumme *Ensimmäinen ja neljäs valtiomahti. Suomen eduskunta 100 vuotta; 10*. Helsinki: Edita, 116–218.
- Laaksovirta, Tuula H. 2012. Lahjoituksen voima. In *Neljä tarinaa*. Eduskunnan Kirjasto. [Accessed 28 June]
URL:<<http://lib.eduskunta.fi/Resource.phx/kirjasto/organisaatio/historia/neljatarinaajatko.htm>>
- Lagerroth, Fredrik 1915. *Frihetstidens författning: en studie i den svenska konstitutionalismens historia*. Stockholm: Alb. Bonniers boktryckeri.
- Lahtinen, Matti 2006. *Snellmanin Suomi*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Laine, Y. K. 1951. *Suomen poliittisen työväenliikkeen historia: 1, Kansanvaltaisuuden läpimurto*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Landgren, Lars 1988. Kieli ja aate – politisoituva sanomalehdistö 1860–1889. In P. Tommila (Ed) *Sanomalehdistön vaiheet vuoteen 1905. Suomen lehdistön historia 1*. Kuopio: Kustannuskiila, 267–420.
- Landgren, Lars-Folke 1995. *För frihet och framåtskridande. Helsingfors Dagblads etableringsskede 1861–1864*. Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Leino-Kaukiainen, Pirkko 1988. Kasvava sanomalehdistö sensuurin kahleissa 1890–1905. In P. Tommila (Ed) *Sanomalehdistön vaiheet vuoteen 1905. Suomen lehdistön historia 1*. Kuopio: Kustannuskiila, 421–632.
- Leonhard, Jörn 2004. From European Liberalism to the Languages of Liberalisms: The Semantics of Liberalism in European Comparison. *Redescriptions*. Vol 8, 17–51. [Accessed 21 May 2014]
URL:< http://www.jyu.fi/yhtfil/redescriptions/Yearbook%202004/Leonhard_2004.pdf>
- Liikanen, Ilkka 1995. *Fennomania ja kansa: joukkojärjestytyksen läpimurto ja suomalaisen puolueen synty*. Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura.
- Liikanen, Ilkka 2003. Kansa. In M. Hyvärinen et al. (Eds) *Käsitteet liikkeessä. Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin käsitehistoria*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 257–307.

- Lilius, Patrik 1974. Säätyvaltiopäivien työmuodot. In O. Salervo et al. (Eds) *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Neljäs osa*. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea, 149–341.
- Lumme, Pentti I. 2007. Eduskuntajournalismin vuosisata. In V. Pernaa, T. H. Laaksovirta & P. I. Lumme *Ensimmäinen ja neljäs valtiomahti. Suomen eduskunta 100 vuotta; 10*. Helsinki: Edita, 219–333.
- Macdonagh, Michael 1913. *The Reporters' Gallery*. London, New York, Toronto: Hodger and Stoughton. [Accessed 29 April 2013]
URL:<<http://archive.org/details/reportersgallery00macdrich>>
- Majander, Mikko 2011. *Suomalaiset puolueet: Suomen Sosialidemokraattinen Puolue*. Radio interview. [Accessed 12 August 2014]
URL:< <http://arena.yle.fi/radio/1297555>>
- Marjanen, Jani 2009. Undermining Methodological Nationalism: Histoire croisée of Concepts as Transnational History. In M. Albert, G. Bluhm, J. Helmig, A. Leutzsch & J. Walter (Eds) *Transnational Political Spaces: Agents – Structures – Encounters*. Frankfurt & New York: Campus, 239–263.
- Marjanen, Jani 2013. *Den ekonomiska patriotismens uppgång och fall: Finska hushållningssällskapet i europeisk, svensk och finsk kontext 1720-1840*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. [Accessed 22 May 2014]
URL:< <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-10-9560-3>>
- May, Thomas Erskine 1883 [1844]. *A Treatise upon the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament*. London: Butterworths. [Accessed 20 November 2013]
URL:<<http://www.archive.org/details/treatiseonlawpri00maytrich>>
- May, Thomas Erskine 1851 [1844]. *A Practical Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament*. London: Butterworths. [Accessed 20 November 2013]
URL:< <https://archive.org/details/practicaltreatis00mayt>>
- Melin, Olof Werling 1927. *Stenografiens historia. Första delen*. Stockholm: Kungl. boktryckeriet.
- Melin, Olof Werling 1929. *Stenografiens historia. Andra delen*. Stockholm: Kungl. boktryckeriet.
- Metcalf, Michael F. 1985. Frihetstidens riksdag. In H. Schück et al. *Riksdagen genom tiderna*. Stockholm: Sveriges riksdag, 117–159.
- Mill, John Stuart 1859 [1838]. Bentham. In *Dissertations and discussions: political, philosophical and historical, Volume 1*. London: J. W. Parker, 330–392. [Accessed 16 August 2013]
URL:< <http://archive.org/details/dissertationsan11millgoog>>
- Mill, John Stuart 1862. *Om det representativa styrelsesättet*. Transl. by T. Björck. Norrköping: Föreningens Boktryckeri.
- Mill, John Stuart 1865. *Om Frihet af John Stuart Mill*. Transl. by F. Berndtson. Helsingfors: Wikberg.
- Mill, John Stuart. 1869 [1843]. *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive: Being a Connected View of the Principles of Evidence and the Methods of Scientific*

- Investigation*. New York: Harper & Brothers. [Accessed 5 December 2013]
URL:< <https://archive.org/details/asystemlogicrat13millgoog>>
- Mill, John Stuart 1891. *Vapaudesta*. Transl. by N. Liakka. Helsinki: Otava.
- Mill, John Stuart 2001 [1861]. (*Considerations*) *On Representative Government*. London: Electric Book Company. [Accessed 15 April 2013]
URL:<<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/jyvaskyla/docDetail.action?docID=2001596>>
- Mill, John Stuart 2001 [1859]. *On Liberty*. London: Electric Book Company. [Accessed 1 August 2013]
URL:<<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/jyvaskyla/docDetail.action?docID=10015071>>
- Moilanen, Laura-Kristiina 2001. *Sivistyneistö ja myyttinen kansa 1905-1917*. Suomen historian pro gradu -tutkielma. Jyväskylän yliopisto. [Accessed 6 August 2014] URL:<<http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ju-2001865581>>
- Moilanen, Laura-Kristiina 2003. Myyttinen kansa. Sivistyneistön näkemysten jatkuvuudesta 1905-17. *Historiallinen aikakauskirja*. 4, 516-531. [Accessed 6 August 2014] URL:<<http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ELE-1365583>>
- Mylly, Juhani 2002. *Kansallinen projekti: historiankirjoitus ja politiikka autonomi- sessa Suomessa*. Turku: Kirja-Aurora.
- Mylly, Juhani 2006. *Edustuksellisen kansanvallan läpimurto*. Helsinki: Edita Prima Oy.
- Nisbet, Robert. A. 1980. *History of the idea of progress*. London: Heinemann.
- Nousiainen, Jaakko 1977. Eduskunnan täysistunto. In O. Salervo et al. (Eds) *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Kymmenes osa*. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea, 428-497.
- Nousiainen, Jaakko 2006. Suomalainen parlamentarismi. In A. Jyränki & J. Nousiainen *Eduskunnan muuttuva asema. Suomen eduskunta 100 vuotta; 2*. Helsinki: Edita, 180-335.
- Numminen, Jaakko 1950. G.V-LXI-K. Pieniä palasia liberaalisen liikkeen historiasta. *Historiallinen aikakauskirja*. 2, 164-185.
- Olschewski, Andreas 2000. Die Verschriftung von Parlamentsdebatten durch die stenographischen Dienste in Geschichte und Gegenwart. In A. Burkhardt & K. Pape (Eds) *Sprache des deutschen Parlamentarismus*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 336-353.
- Paaskoski, Jyrki 2002. "Tuo siunattu 80-luku" - Nuorsuomalaisuuden aatteellinen tausta. In V. Vares (Ed) *Valta, vapaus, edistys ja kasvatus: liberaalisten liikkeiden ja liberaalisen ajattelun vaiheita Suomessa ja Ruotsissa 1800-luvulta 1960-luvun puoliväliin*. Jyväskylä: Kopijyvä, 21-80.
- Palonen, Kari 2003a. Eurooppalaiset poliittiset käsitteet suomalaisissa pelitiloissa. In M. Hyvärinen et al. (Eds) *Käsitteet liikkeessä. Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin käsittehistoria*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 569-587.
- Palonen, Kari 2003b. Translation, politics and conceptual change. *Redescriptions. Yearbook of Political Thought and Conceptual history*. Vol 7, 15-35.
- Palonen, Kari 2008. *The politics of limited times: the rhetoric of temporal judgment in parliamentary democracies*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

- Palonen, Kari 2010a. Max Weber's Rhetoric of 'Objectivity': The Parliament as a Paradigm for Scholarly Disputes. *Max Weber Studies*. 10, 71–93.
- Palonen, Kari 2010b. The Parliamentarisation of Elections. A Redescription of the Relationship between Two Concepts. *Redescriptions. Yearbook of Political Thought, Conceptual History and Feminist Theory*. Vol 14, 133–156.
- Palonen, Kari 2012. Parlamentaarin retoriikka – puntaroivan ja suostuttelevan politiikan tyyli. In V. Heikkinen et al. (Eds) *Genreanalyysi – tekstilajitutkimuksen käytäntöä*. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten keskus, 31–62. [Accessed 27 May 2014]
URL:<
<http://kaino.kotus.fi/www/verkkojulkaisut/julk29/Genreanalyysi.pdf>>
- Paloposki, Toivo J. 1961. *Suomen talonpoikaissäädyn valtiopäiväedustus vapaudenajalla*. Forssa: Forssan kirjapaino.
- Peacey, Jason 2007. The print culture of parliament, 1600–1800. *Parliamentary History*. 1, 1–16.
- Pekonen, Kyösti 2011. *Puhe eduskunnassa*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Pekonen, Onni 2012a. From the Four-Estate Diet to the Unicameral Parliament: International Models of Parliamentary Politics in Finland. In L. Ionescu-Ruxandoiu (Ed) *Parliamentary Discourses across Cultures: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 35–48.
- Pekonen, Onni 2012b. Disputing the '(Un)parliamentary': Learning Rules of Debate in the Early Finnish Eduskunta. *Res Pública. Revista de Filosofía Política*. 27, 37–48.
- Pekonen, Onni 2014. Adoption of Parliamentary Models in Finland: Question of Free Mandate in the Early Debates on the Procedures of the Finnish Eduskunta. In K. Palonen, J. M. Rosales and T. Turkka (Eds) *The Politics of Dissensus: Parliament in Debate*. Santander: Cantabria University Press & McGraw-Hill, 349–374.
- Pierre, Eugène 1902. *Traité de droit politique électoral et parlementaire*. Paris: Librairies-Imprimeries Réunies.
- Pietilä, Kauko 2012. *Journalismi ammattina. Journalistiprofession teoria*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Pohjantammi, Ismo 2003. Edustus. In M. Hyvärinen et al. (Eds) *Käsitteet liikkeessä. Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin käsitehistoria*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 363–412.
- Poudra, Jules & Pierre, Eugène 1878. *Traité pratique de droit parlementaire*. Versailles: Cerf et fils, éditeurs. [Accessed 20 February 2014]
URL:< <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k58651348.langFR>>
- Pulkkinen, Tuija 1987. Kansalaisyhteiskunta ja valtio. Kaksi perinnettä poliittisen julkisuuden muotoutuessa. In R. Alapuro et al. (Eds) *Kansa liikkeessä*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä, 54–69.
- Pulkkinen, Tuija 1989. *Valtio ja vapaus*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.
- Pulkkinen, Tuija 2003. Valtio. In M. Hyvärinen et al. (Eds) *Käsitteet liikkeessä. Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin käsitehistoria*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 213–256.

- Rantala, Heli 2013. *Sivistyksestä siviilisaatioon. Kulttuurikäsitys J. V. Snellmanin historiallisessa ajattelussa*. Turku: Annales Universitatis Turkuensis. [Accessed 16 August 2013]
URL:< <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-29-5380-6>>
- Redlich, Josef 1908a [1905]. *The Procedure of the House of Commons, a Study of its History and Present Form. Vol. 1*. London: A. Constable & co., ltd. [Accessed 19 August 2013]
URL:< <http://archive.org/details/procedureofhouse01redl>>
- Redlich, Josef 1908b [1905]. *The Procedure of the House of Commons, a Study of its History and Present form. Vol. 2*. London: A. Constable & co., ltd. [Accessed 19 August 2013]
URL:< <https://archive.org/details/procedureofhouse02redluoft>>
- Rommi, Pirkko 1974. Lehdistö ja valtiopäivätoiminta. In O. Salervo et al. (Eds) *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Neljäs osa*. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea, 409–434.
- Rosanvallon, Pierre 1985. *Le moment Guizot*. France: Gallimard.
- Rosanvallon, Pierre 2006. *Democracy Past and Future*. New York: Columbia University Press. [Accessed 3 February 2013]
URL:<<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/jyvaskyla/docDetail.action?docID=10183580>>
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques 1762. *Du contrat social; ou, Principes du droit politique*. Amsterdam: Chez Marc-Michel Rey. [Accessed 26 November 2013]
URL:<<http://archive.org/details/ducontratsocial05rousgoog>>
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques 1782 [1762]. *The Social Contract, Or Principles of Political Right*. Transl. by G. D. H. Cole. [Accessed 28 November 2013]
URL:<<http://www.constitution.org/jjr/socon.htm>>
- Räty, Unto 1972. Suomalaisen pikakirjoituksen luoja Lars Theodor Nevanlinna. *Pikakirjoituslehti*. 1–2, 3–7.
- Salmon, Philip 2009. The House of Commons, 1801–1911. In C. Jones (Ed) *A Short History of Parliament. England, Great Britain, the United Kingdom, Ireland & Scotland*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.
- Saraviita, Ilkka 1971. *Lakiehdotuksen lepäämään jättäminen*. Vammala: Suomalainen lakimiesyhdistys.
- Savolainen, Raimo, Linnavalli, Sari ja Selovuori, Jorma (Eds) 2002. *Käännetty Snellman: suomentajien syöasukelluksia J. V. Snellmanin elämään ja toimintaan*. Kuopio: Snellman-instituutti.
- Schück, Herman et al. 1985. *Riksdagen genom tiderna*. Stockholm: Sveriges riksdag.
- Seitkari, Olle 1958. Edustuslaitoksen uudistus 1906. In O. Salervo et al. (Eds) *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Viides osa*. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea, 7–162.
- Sennefelt, Karin 2003. Mellan hemligt och offentligt. Sven Hofman vid riksdagen 1765–66. In M.-C. Skuncke & H. Tandefelt (Eds) *Riksdag, kaffehus och prediktstol: frihetstidens politiska kultur 1766–1772*. Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 209–228.

- Seppinen, Ilkka 2007. Eduskunnan ulkosuhteet. In J. Kallenautio et al. *Kansainvälinen eduskunta. Suomen eduskunta 100 vuotta; 11*. Helsinki: Edita, 334–403.
- Seppälä, Felix 1952. Juhana Idänpää-Heikkilä 1818–1890. In E. Aaltonen et al. (Eds) *Suomen talonpoikia Lallista Kyösti Kallioon: 74 elämäkerta*. Porvoo: WSOY, 367–379.
- Silander, Alpo 1939. *Ulkomaalaisen kirjallisuuden sensurointi Suomessa 1841–1855*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Skinner, Quentin 1996. *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin 2002. On Encountering the Past. *Finnish Yearbook of Political Thought*, 6, 34–63.
- Skuncke, Marie-Christine 2003. Medier, mutor och nätverk. In M.-C. Skuncke & H. Tandefelt (Eds) *Riksdag, kaffehus och prediktstol: frihetstidens politiska kultur 1766-1772*. Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 225–286.
- Skuncke, Marie-Christine 2011. Freedom of the Press and Social Equality in Sweden, 1766–1772. In P. Ihalainen et al. (Eds) *Scandinavia in the age of revolution: Nordic political cultures, 1740–1820*. Farnham: Ashgate, 133–143.
- Smith, Thomas 1906 [1583]. *De republica Anglorum; a discourse on the Commonwealth of England*. Cambridge: The University Press. [Accessed 28 November 2013]
URL:<<http://archive.org/details/derepublicaanglo00smit>>
- Soikkanen, Hannu 1975. *Kohti kansanvaltaa: Suomen sosiaalidemokraattinen puolue 75 vuotta. 1, 1889-1937*. Helsinki: Suomen sosiaalidemokraattinen puolue.
- Stenius, Henrik 2003. Kansalainen. In M. Hyvärinen et al. (Eds) *Käsitteet liikkeessä. Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin käsitehistoria*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 309–362.
- Stenius, Henrik & Turunen, Ilkka 1995. Finnish Liberalism. In I. K. Lakaniemi, A. Rotkirch & H. Stenius (Eds) *"Liberalism": Seminars on Historical and Political Keywords in Northern Europe*. Helsinki: Renvall Institute, 49–62.
- Suomen historiallinen seura 1883. *Biografinen nimikirja: Elämäkertoja Suomen entisiltä ja nykyajoilta*. Helsinki: G. W. Edlund. [Accessed 18 January 2014]
URL:< <https://archive.org/details/biografinennimi00seurgoog>>
- Suova, Eino 1953. Valtiopäiväselostusten historiaa. In U. Harva et al. (Eds) *Yhteiskunta. Yhteiskunnallisen Korkeakoulun vuosikirja 4*, 190–204.
- Svenska Akademiens ordbok. [Accessed 17 January 2014]
URL:< <http://g3.spraakdata.gu.se/saob/>>
- Te Velde, Henk te 2005. Political transfer: An introduction. *European Review of History*, 2, 205–221.
- Te Velde, Henk te 2013. Parliamentary Obstruction and the "Crisis" of European Parliamentary Politics Around 1900. *Redescriptions. Yearbook of Political Thought, Conceptual History and Feminist Theory*. Vol 16, 125–147.

- Thomas, Peter D. G. 1959. The Beginning of Parliamentary Reporting in Newspapers, 1768–1774. *The English Historical Review*. 293, 623–636. [Accessed 14 March 2014] URL:<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/558885>>
- Tocqueville, Alexis de 2009 [1840]. *De la Démocratie en Amérique, tome deuxième*. [Accessed 9 November 2013] URL:< <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/30514>>
- Toivonen, Ilpo. 1979. *Jarrutuskeskustelut Suomen eduskunnassa itsenäisyyden aikana*. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto.
- Tommila, Päiviö 1980. Sensuuriolot ennen vuotta 1865. In P. Leino-Kaukiainen (Ed) *Sensuuri ja sananvapaus Suomessa*. Helsinki: Suomen sanomalehdistön historia –projekti, 3–16.
- Tommila, Päiviö 1988. Yhdestä lehdestä sanomalehdistöksi 1809–1859. In P. Tommila (Ed) *Sanomalehdistön vaiheet vuoteen 1905. Suomen lehdistön historia 1*. Kuopio: Kustannuskiila, 77–265.
- Tommila, Päiviö 1989. *Suomen historiankirjoitus: tutkimuksen historia*. Porvoo; Helsinki; Juva: WSOY.
- Tuominen, Uuno 1964. Säätyedustuslaitos 1880-luvun alusta vuoteen 1906. In O. Salervo et al. (Eds) *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Kolmas osa*. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea.
- Tuominen, Uuno 1974. Säätyedustuslaitos ja hallitusvalta. In O. Salervo et al. (Eds) *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Neljäs osa*. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea, 343–369.
- Tuominen, Uuno 1981. Uuden valtiopäiväjärjestyksen alkukausi (1872–1878). In O. Salervo et al. (Eds) *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Toinen osa*. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea, 377–458.
- Tyynilä, Markku 1992. *Senaatti: tutkimus hallituskonselji-senaatista 1809-1918*. Helsinki: VAPK-kustannus.
- Törnudd, Klaus 1961. Obstruktion i Finlands riksdag. *Politiikka*. 1, 1–18.
- Urbinati, Nadia 2002. *Mill on democracy: from the Athenian polis to representative government*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Valta, Anna-Liisa 1972a. Suomen Pikakirjoittajayhdistys r.y. 1872–1972. I osa. *Pikakirjoituslehti*. 1–2, 8–21.
- Valta, Anna-Liisa 1972b. Suomen Pikakirjoittajayhdistys r.y. 1872–1972. II osa. *Pikakirjoituslehti*. 3, 11–21.
- Vares, Vesa 2000. *Varpuset ja pääskysel: nuorsuomalaisuus ja Nuorsuomalainen puolue 1870-luvulta vuoteen 1918*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Werner, Michael & Zimmermann, Bénédicte 2006. Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity. *History & Theory*. 1, 30–50. [Accessed 21 May, 2014] URL:<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3590723>>
- Virtanen, Matti 2001. *Fennomanian perilliset: poliittiset traditot ja sukupolvien dynamiikka*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Zilliacus, Clas 1985. Pressen som statsmakt. Historien om en rolluppfattning. In C. Zilliacus & H. Knif *Opinionens tryck: en studie över pressens bildningsskede i Finland*. Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 181–222.