

# More on Ibsen



by Miles Mathis

February 3, 2026

I kept studying *An Enemy of the People*, because even after that long paper yesterday I didn't feel I had gotten to the bottom of it. On a second re-read, it occurred to me that Ibsen himself might have been blackwashing his main character on purpose, and that the strange failure of Dr. Stockmann's speech to the town wasn't an accident.

What I found most suspicious was the start of the speech, where he says that in his time doctoring to the people in the woods of the far north, he found the people so wild he should have been a veterinarian instead of a doctor. That line made it into the 1978 film untouched. The townsfolk are offended by that, as they should have been, since he is basically calling them animals. Not a great way to start such a speech, is it? Insulting your audience on purpose. Not only was it completely unnecessary and impolitic, it was a hanger, since it didn't lead anywhere in his argument.

His next major claim is that leading men should be exterminated. Again, a bit extreme, isn't it? That didn't need to be said at that point. He needs to convince his audience he is right and that his opponent (his brother) is wrong, and suggesting extermination isn't really the way to do that, is it? So Ibsen doesn't seem to be going to much trouble to give Dr. Stockmann the superior or more intelligent speech, is he? It shouldn't be that hard to do, since his brother is an obvious crook and conman, without much intelligence and not much of a speaker, so for the doctor to lose here he has to go pretty far out of his way.

The doctor then switches from attacking the leading men to attacking the masses, calling them stupid several times. Yes, they are acting stupid, not allowing him to speak about the spa, but he needs to educate them and he won't do that by leading with the argument that the majority (them) is an ignorant mass that can do nothing but get in the way.

Next he goes off on that long tangent about truths lasting only twenty years, which also goes nowhere. It is actually counterproductive, since it sounds like he is selling relativism—which is why Wiki was able to spin it that way. I was trying to figure out why Ibsen would include any of that and I couldn't come up with anything. It is convoluted and confusing and doesn't support his argument in any way.

It was at that point that I began to smell a rat. Although what Stockmann was saying was roughly true, it was being so poorly presented and argued I could no longer pass that off as a natural failure of Ibsen. No one who really wanted his readers to embrace the doctor or his side would have put those words into his mouth. These failures must have been intentional.

Just imagine you are one of Ibsen's intelligent "men of the future", civic-minded and well-intentioned, loving your fellow man and wanting to help your hometown and nation thrive. Would you give that speech to the townspeople? No. Even if you were angry at being silenced about the springs, you wouldn't give that speech. As I said in my first paper on this yesterday, the best thing you could do is let the spa fail and try to pick up the pieces afterwards, once it was clear you were right. But if you saw an opening and were allowed to speak of something else (you wouldn't be, but say you were), you would realize your only hope was to turn the people to your side with a better speech. As the better educated person, you should easily be able to come up with a speech better than that of your brother, right? The **absolute last thing** you would do is start the speech by calling the working people animals and idiots, then say your brother and all like him should be exterminated. The last thing you would do is get bogged down in an incomprehensible tangent on relativism. The last thing you would do is admit you would rather see the town ruined than that it proceed on a mistake.

In fact, Dr. Stockmann's speech is so bad, and so *purposely* bad, you get to the end of it being surprised he wasn't tarred and feathered immediately, as he would have been in any real situation.

That would also explain the other thing I mentioned from Act V, where he sends his kids off to school alone the next morning. Outlandishly stupid under the circumstances, so I again suspect Ibsen of writing it that way on purpose, again to blackwash the doctor.

This is why the play was so confusing to me yesterday: the doctor was clearly in the right at the beginning, and his brother and the rest are clearly in the wrong, but the big speech mysteriously goes way off track from the first word. As a speech it is a horrible failure, making a win into a loss. Why? Possibly because Ibsen needed his hero to lose as part of the story arc? Everyone had to turn against him to highlight the injustice of the modern alliance of money and the masses?

Or was that really the answer? Had Ibsen in fact blackwashed his own main character on purpose, as yet another instance of controlling the opposition and making the truth look bad? The fact that Ibsen was a rich guy from very old money tells us the latter is likely the case. But that then leads us to ask why he would have been censored in his own time. Or was that also staged? Certainly he wasn't censored in the longterm, being extremely famous. He has had more promotion in the 20<sup>th</sup> century than any other Norwegian, and his plays have been staged more than anyone else except Shakespeare. This requires more research, but I am now very suspicious.

I encourage you to re-read those passages several times: doesn't it seem like Ibsen is doing everything he can to *prevent* an alliance between the doctor and the townspeople, ie the natural leaders and the everyday folk? That alliance is the only hope for defeating the mayor and his ilk (the industrialists), but the doctor's speech guarantees it won't happen.

I put it that way because now I want to jump to the present. This interests me so much because it translates directly into current problems. What was true in 1882 is still true, though far worse. The doctor says the leading men are "most admirably paving the way for their own extinction", but that hasn't yet happened. By allying to the masses in the 20<sup>th</sup> century in ever greater schemes—mainly via

the ever-expanding media—the Phoenicians have been able to solidify their positions. The natural leaders needed to win the people back to their side, but instead they have suffered a series of accelerating defeats, becoming almost extinct by the time the 21<sup>st</sup> century rolled around.

That is, until recently. A major structural weakness opened up after 2000, first with 9/11 and then with the Covid/vaccine catastrophe and the incredible treasury theft, which has allowed formerly marginalized leaders to more easily convince the people their old alliance to the industrialists was a fatal mistake. That is what the collapse of the mainstream media and Hollywood is about, you know. When they say trust is gone, what it means here is that the old alliance is breaking, leaving an opening for a new alliance between the people and those who should have been leading them all along: their own best children.

You will have noticed I have avoided the terms “intelligentsia” and “aristocracy”. Although *aristos* just means best, that word has been sullied beyond all cleaning. I feel the same way about the word *intelligentsia*, since although it just means a group of the most intelligent, it has been sullied by a century of fake intellectuals and other cultural frauds. I will never connect to the people talking about an intelligentsia or claiming to be a member of it.

I know that many of my readers think that if Covid was proof of anything, it was proof the judgment of the majority of people is too poor for them to ever be worthy of an alliance. Yes, you would have thought that after a century of being lied to, and knowing many of those lies, and given the fact that Pfizer and these other big pharmaceutical companies already had a terrible track record before 2020, the people wouldn't have fallen for that scheme. But the news hasn't been all bad, as we now see some five years later. Although the majority was fooled at first, many of them have seen the light since then. History moves like molasses, and the majority has a great mass and therefore a great inertia.

People are quitting the mainstream in numbers never before recorded, though they don't know where to turn. They are discovering the extinction event: their natural leaders are mostly not there, having been wiped out like whooping cranes. The Phoenicians, seeing this, are rushing into the gap, trying desperately to supply you with an alternative. They have cloaked thousands of their children and propped them up in the new media, selling them to you as from your own towns and lines. They convincingly mouth the first lines of the revolution, then turn you subtly back to the old channels and alliances. That is what the so-called alternative press is, as I have shown you over the past 15 years. It isn't really alternative, it is a culture-wide and worldwide capture of the opposition, as in a vast net. These people aren't middleclass or protectors of the middleclass, any more than your favorite movie star is. Like the movie stars, they are sold to you as the sons and daughters of truck drivers and possum trappers, but they are actually from top Phoenician lines going back centuries. I have outed hundreds of them (see “Tommy Robinson”, real name Stephen Yaxley-Lennon, as perhaps the easiest example), as my readers are aware. Their job is to target you, tag you, and plug you back into the old alliance with the plutocrats by any means possible. They do this by making you think you are on a path to change, while inserting you into the next superhighway to nowhere.

Which is why you should be extremely leery of all these promoted personages online, all the bloggers and vloggers and substack writers and youtube yakkers and professional interviewers. You can't just follow them blindly, you have to research them and question them and fact-check them. You have to start with their bios: who are these people and where did they come from? You cannot skip over that. If they don't have an air-tight bio posted, ditch them immediately. They should be able to tell you that.

Unlike Dr. Stockmann, I have come to the conclusion that you have to talk to everyone, or all classes at

any rate. I even talk directly to the Phoenicians, as you know, looking directly into the camera. I have converted a few of the enemy, since even they get tired of being the bad guys. It gets old, I imagine. Mordor doesn't look as funny as it used to, as it comes into greater focus in the near distance.

Of course I talk to the people, since it is hard to build an alliance without talking to them. I am very far from giving up on them, even after Covid and all the abuse I took then. I chose my side long ago, picking the people over the Phoenicians, come what may, so they should trust me like my cats do, implicitly. I should be able to fly them around the room upside-down, with no fear I will drop them, even though I occasionally get angry at them. They should trust me implicitly since who else in my position would choose the people over the Phoenicians? The Phoenicians offered me everything and the people offered me nothing but abuse, but I still chose the people. Why? Because the Phoenicians are liars, cheats, and frauds, and I won't be a part of it for any price. I would rather live in a boxcar with hobos than live among those people, and have come pretty close to that already.

But mostly I am talking to other whooping cranes like me, reminding them who they are and trying to wake them from their slumbers. The time is at hand and an opening has arisen! The armor has cracked and the alliance has failed. Smaug is flying over and his scales are falling like snow: fire the arrows now while you may!