Modernity, Rationality and Citizenship: Swedish Agrarian Organizations as Seen Through the Lens of the Agrarian Press, circa 1880-1917

Fredrik Eriksson

By the end of the 19th and during the early 20th centuries, the majority of the Swedish population lived off the land. In 1870, 72 percent of the population were engaged in agriculture, and 82 percent of the population lived in the countryside. Of the farmers, the majority were smallholders, as 64 percent of all Swedish farms had between 2 and 20 hectares arable land.1 This structure did not change drastically between 1880 and 1917, although the number of middle-sized farms increased.2

This text attempts to explore how the agrarian sector has coped with modernization, rationalization, and citizenship. It is also an attempt to study the image of agricultural change and its relation to politics and social transformation. At the same time, the study offers an insight into the ideological and social processes in Swedish agriculture and society at the turn of the 20th century. In general, the history of the development of citizenship has focused on either the bourgeoisie or working-class groups. In many cases, the agrarian sphere has been neglected, although this included the vast majority of the population.

Focus is on agrarian organizations and cooperative formation and its relations to modernity, rationality, masculinity, and citizenship. The sources have mainly been the national agrarian press. The press lends itself well as a mirror of the ideas in circulation in the stratified agrarian society. This study is also on how agrarian cooperatives were founded, either as elite projects (top-down) or emancipatory grassroots movements (bottom-up). The idea behind this question is the notion that the founding phases of organizations

1 Olsson, Sven-Olof, "Ensam är sällan stark. Om sammanslutningar mellan lantmän vid sekelskiftet 1900.", in Rydén, Reine (red.), Jordbrukarnas kooperativa föreningar och intresseorganisationer i ett historiskt perspektiv (Stockholm 2004), p. 172.
will provide certain institutional frames, and hence play a significant role for the future development of the organization.\textsuperscript{3} Secondly, I will discuss how organizations perceived and discussed citizenship with focus on cooperatives, gender, and education. Citizenship was closely related to modernity through ideals concerning rationality. It is also important to define cooperatives in relation to education, because this was one of the links to perceptions of citizenship.

There is also the need for a brief note on the translation of names of papers, institutions etc. The, at-the-time, common Swedish word Lantman (as in Landtmannen or Tidskrift för Landtmän) is translated to Farmer. However, this does not give the entire picture, since Lantman also entails a social position and relates to one’s standing. The closest description is perhaps an autonomous and independent farmer who leads the work at a farm. It is also a political term, since the autonomous farmer had a political position both as a voter and as being eligible for office.\textsuperscript{4}

Sources

The source material has consisted of agrarian papers, with somewhat different histories and publication periods. The Periodical for Farmers (Tidskrift för Landtmän) existed between 1880 and 1917. It originated in Lund, and its editors were H. L. O. Winberg, N. Engström, and M. Weibull. The journal was somewhat technical and semi-official, due to the close links between editors and central agrarian circles. The second journal is The Farmer. Periodical for Swedish Agriculture and its Subsidiaries (Landtmannen – Tidskrift för Sveriges jordbruk och dess binäringar), published between 1890 and 1917. From 1906, it was the official organ for The Swedish Agricultural Teachers Association (Sveriges lantbrukslärrarförening). It originated in Linköping and was edited by Wilhelm Flach. The people around it were all agriculturalists, teachers, and scientists lending a connection to central agrarian circles. These papers did not explicitly address the agrarian elites, but the owners of larger farms and/or manors were nevertheless its main audience.

\textsuperscript{3} Collier Ruth Berins and Collier, David, \textit{Shaping the Political Arena. Critical Junctures, the Labour Movement and Regime Dynamics in Latin America} (Princeton 1991). The perspective has been common in political science, where the different founding stages of political parties have created different paths of development. Panebianco, Angelo, \textit{Political Parties: Organization and Power} (Cambridge 1988).

\textsuperscript{4} A brief word concerning the footnotes. Firstly, concerning articles in agrarian journals I have given the name of the article, the year and the individual number. I have not given the page since journals only have 20-25 pages, and the articles are therefore easy to find. Secondly, sometimes the writer of an article is given, when it was presented in the journal. Otherwise it is an article written by the editorial office. Thirdly, during a brief period in the mid-1890s Tidskrift för landtmän was bound together in a yearly volume. In those cases I have given the page number of the official volume of the specific year.
The Farmer also had a monthly appendix called The Farmers Monthly Appendix (Landtmannens månadsblad/månadsbilaga) using a simpler, more romantic language and images directed to smallholders. The Farmers Monthly Appendix was a monthly supplement to the main paper, The Farmer, and was designed for smallholders. Both Periodical for Farmers and The Farmer were merged into the paper The Farmer in 1917 and became the official paper of the national Swedish Common Agricultural Association (Sveriges Allmänna Lantbrukssällskap) founded the same year.

A Brief Note on Citizenship in Theory

Citizenship as an analytical concept is always relational, since the citizen is defined through individual relationship to the state, either as individual participation or through demands on the individual, or as the relationship between rights and obligations. In terms of the agrarian sector, this liberal form of citizenship was supplemented with agrarian ideals. Agriculture was generally more traditional, less individualist, and more collectivist.

Landowning was the central agrarian concept that related to citizenship. Referencing of T.H. Marshall’s definition of citizenship, landowning belonged to the economic form of citizenship, through laws governing ownership and inheritance. It was also related to masculinity, since the ideal landowner was an independent man and the way to become independent was through landowning. This was also visible in laws concerning marriage, specifically in agrarian society. Landowning was also an ideological concept, and in Sweden it was often perceived as the very foundation of society, especially for conservative groups. Landowning was also linked to Marshall’s version of political citizenship, since Swedish farmers had held a political position for centuries, through the Farmers Estate (Bondeståndet) in parliament (Riksdagen). Naturally, all farmers were not incorporated and only the upper male stratum of the agricultural population was represented. The Representation Reform (Representationsreformen) in 1866 created a two-chamber parliament where the farmers became the most important political group in the Lower House (andra kammaren). The reform did not aim

---

at changing political life nor at challenging the political system.9 The franchise system was based on income and/or landowning and in general benefited the farmers, who were a strong political force and in 1897, 52 percent of the representatives in the Lower House were farmers.10

Agrarianism was the ideology of the time, and it can be described as a set of beliefs outside normal ideological frameworks. In the Swedish context, agrarianism shared interests in common with conservatism and liberalism. It also incorporated the notion of a specific agrarian culture that was threatened by industrialization and urbanization.11 For example, the small-holder proponent Per Jönson Rösiö had developed a radical and social liberal program that envisioned a prosperous society of smallholders. The basis was small-scale ownership of land, cooperation, and agrarian enlightenment. Its ideology was not anti-modern, but it incorporated many traditional ideals. It was, in fact, a cultural revolt against modern industrial society, and an ideological program with the purpose of creating a modern agrarian identity.12

Agrarianism included notions of a specific agrarian economic morality separated from the general capitalist order. Agrarianism was a cultural and ideological stance against the forces of modern capitalism and society. It incorporated ideas concerning morality, something that was linked to the conservative franchise reform of 1907–1909, where the right to vote was given to all men, but with moral restrictions. There was a taxpaying qualification as well as the disqualification of all receivers of social benefits. It was also thoroughly male, since fulfilled military service was a demand for franchise.13 The idea was that only the autonomous man could be a political being. These restrictions have been seen as a construction of the ideal citizen, i.e. the self-supporting male that fulfilled his obligations to society.14 This was not necessarily agrarian, but it meant that farmers strengthened their political position in the Lower House, and at the same time gained an increased access to the Upper House (första kammaren). Another aspect was

that agrarian groups easily fulfilled the economic restrictions in the voting system.\textsuperscript{15}

Hierarchy and patriarchy were important factors in society, especially in agrarian circles. The agrarian social hierarchy focused on the relationship between family and production. The farmer was the head of the household as well as the leader of the family as a production unit. This prevailed longer in agriculture than it did in other branches.\textsuperscript{16} The agrarian idea of hierarchy included the relationship between individual and collective. The village or local community had its own social structure that needed to be maintained according to agrarian ideology. Any reforms of the hierarchy could only be made with respect to traditional order. Agrarian society was believed to differ from modern industrial society, and it was not seen as another branch of business. Instead, it was a way of life tied to history, land, and tradition.\textsuperscript{17}

Masculinity was equally important in agrarian circles, and citizenship was formulated as a masculine project. Agriculture as such was masculine, and the farmer was by definition male. The concepts of citizenship and democracy are gender-neutral in one respect, but at the same time these concepts are imbued with notions of gender. The citizen was almost always male, the public arena was a male-dominated sphere, and the state was a male collective actor. Men were defined as citizens, especially the bourgeois man.\textsuperscript{18} It is therefore vital to incorporate masculinity as a category in studying the formation of citizenship in agriculture. The farmer became a vessel containing tradition, responsibility, collectivism, and patriotism and was seen as the defender of society against individualism, urbanization, and industry. The farmer, soil, home and countryside were masculine symbols of the nation.\textsuperscript{19} The farmer was seen as the bearer of tradition and at the same time was defined as both modern and rational.

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
The Founding of Cooperatives

In Sweden many of the agrarian cooperatives were founded in the 1890s, but the majority started during the first years of the 20th century. Relatively few of the early cooperatives were in fact cooperative, as many in-between forms of organization existed. The oldest agrarian organizations were the County Agricultural Societies (Hushållningssällskapen), founded by the state in the late 18th and early 19th century. The Agricultural Societies were governmental organizations with the purpose of modernizing agriculture with influences from Europe and particularly from the United Kingdom. The Royal Swedish Academy of Agriculture (Kungliga Lantbruksakademien) founded in 1811, was the top organization and the official representative of agriculture. It was the administrative nexus as well as an intermediary between government and county societies. The Academy representatives all belonged to traditional agrarian elites, and many can be traced back to the regional organizations.20

Previous research has defined that the Swedish agrarian cooperatives were largely founded through a top-down system, where the agrarian elites spread ideas and became leaders in the formative stages of organizations. Many ideas came from the Academy and the Agricultural Societies, promoting cooperative organization. But, in general, there was scepticism among elites concerning international cooperative ideology, and therefore many cooperative dairies used the names “common” and “mutual”.21

Elite Cooperatives or Cooperative Elites?

The initial question is who started and took part in organizational development. From previous research it is clear that elites were important in spreading ideas. But how is one to define said elites? The nobility, defined through birth, along with military officers and estate- and manor-owners, as well as the owners of large farms, all belong to the “old” agrarian elites. They were defined through tradition, social standing, and landowning. At the same time there was a “new” and emerging elite, defined through scientific knowledge, education, and expertise. Agronomists, dairymen, and engineers were all part of this group. This does not mean that there were strict boundaries between “old” and “new”, as there were many exchanges between the groups.22

---

In the agrarian press there are several examples of local organizations described through minutes and lists of participants. In general, the “old” elites were strongly engaged in establishing different associations. For example, in October 1887 the dairy producers in Gävleborg met in Storvik to discuss the export of butter and related issues. Captain A. Geijer arranged the meeting under the chairmanship of Major Lilliehöök. The meeting decided to form the Dairy Association of Gefleborg and Dalarna (Gefleborgs och Dalarnas mejeriförening). The board consisted of the two officers mentioned and Mr Steffen from Korsnäs. This was quite common in the initial stages of organization. The strong elite flavour was strengthened by the fact that all board members represented dairy companies. Another example was the Dairy Association of Södermanland (Södermanlands läns mejeri-idkarförening) formed in December 1894. It was not a cooperative organization, but instead aimed at strengthening dairy production in general as well as promoting new ideas in agriculture. The board consisted of eight people, including two counts, one baron, and one magistrate.

The elites were also visible in the agricultural clubs in major cities. For example, the Agricultural Club of Malmö (Malmö landbruksklubb) met in November of 1888. The first topic was dairy production, and several participants from the educated and scientific groups participated. The second topic concerned brood-mares, and the number of officers participating was ample. This was also quite a common phenomenon, with “old” and “new” elites founding clubs together.

The examples portray how traditional elites engaged in agricultural organizations. In general, the Swedish case shows the importance of elites in the initial stages of organization. But there are also other examples, especially from around 1900, when smallholders became increasingly successful on the market.

But at the same time the elites were changing, something visible through the reports from the national meetings for dairymen. Dairymen were part of the emerging agricultural groups, defined almost solely through education and expertise. The first meeting of Swedish dairymen was held in December of 1888, and was chaired by Count Hugo Hamilton (chairman of the Agricultural Society of Skaraborg).

23 “Gefleborgs och Dalarnas mejeriförening”, Tidskrift för landtmän, 1887:43 and ”Mejeriidkarmöte”, Tidskrift för landtmän, 1895.
25 “Från Malmö landbruksklubbs förhandlingar d. 29 Nov. 1888”, Tidskrift för landtmän, 1888:49. For example ”Sydvestra Uplands Landmannaförening”, Tidskrift för landtmän, 1892:45.
Table 1: Participants at the Göteborg meeting in December 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nobles</td>
<td>7 (incl. 1 count, 3 barons and the Lord Chancellor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians</td>
<td>2 (members of the Lower House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors &amp; Scientists</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairymen, Directors &amp; Wholesale tradesmen</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In 1899 a definite change had occurred, since the strong representation of nobles was more or less gone. Instead a new group had emerged: the educated, rational, and technical. The meeting took place in Stockholm and was chaired by *Supreme Director* (*öfverdirektör*) Odelberg, while K. F. Lundin (a dairy consultant from Separator Company) was the secretary. Other important representatives were state consultant G. Liljhagen, engineers Pettersson and Bagge, and director Hellström.  

The change shows quite clearly that a “new” elite had come forward. It is also interesting to note that it was no longer necessary to describe participants using noble titles. For example, the name Bagge is a noble name, but in this case this was not mentioned. Instead, the title “engineer” was used. This was of course a long process, and the nobility in general were influential during the 19th century. In 1851, for example, seven government ministers out of ten were noble. Twenty out of twenty-five *County Governors* (*landshövdingar*) were nobles. Twenty-nine out of thirty-one generals bore noble names. It was only in the academic sphere that a change was visible, since only one out of fifty-four professors was noble.

The modern and rational agriculturalists were also strongly connected to cooperative dairies. One of the more important actors in this process was K. F. Lundin. He was the originator of several articles, folders, and books on the importance and structure of cooperative dairies. These were, like the emerging elites themselves, described in technical, modern, and rational terms. Denmark was always used as a positive example, and Danish cooperative dairies were described as efficient and rational, producing high-quality butter (as opposed to Swedish dairies). The important fact was a clear definition of tasks: members delivered fresh and clean milk, and the dairyman ran the production, controlled quality, and held the books.

Lundin discussed why cooperative dairies were superior to all others, and why manors and companies were deemed inferior. He believed that competition led to lower milk quality, through a lack of expertise. The opposite was

the well-run cooperative dairy: modern, efficient, hygienic, and emancipating.\textsuperscript{30} The development of the dairy industry was a general trend in agriculture, since dairy production was a means of meeting the market. It was a form of self-reliance, contrasting with the ongoing industrialization in society.\textsuperscript{31}

The scepticism among the elites concerning cooperatives began to disappear as the new form of organization seemed more efficient. In 1894 discussions were held in the Farmers Association of Southwest Uppland (Sydvestra Uplands landtmannaförening) on the question of cooperative dairies. The description is very interesting. The meeting was held at the manor Brogård, belonging to Count Johan Sparre, and the participants travelled there by steamer. Led by a band, the participants were given a tour of the new and magnificent castle, described as unusually tasteful and comfortable, with well-kept gardens and livestock. The closing of the meeting was equally described with grand words. “The falling sun was accompanied by music, canon salutes, and fireworks.” \textsuperscript{32} Captain Vilhelm Nauckhoff described the benefits of cooperative dairies as a very positive, economically sound, and efficient form of organization. Model regulations for cooperative dairies were also distributed. Nauckhoff himself was the secretary of the Swedish Agrarian League (Sveriges Agrarförbund).

Conservatism, Agrarianism and Agrarian Politics

The 1890s was characterized by the political battle for democratization, in which farmers were very active. The divergence between conservative agrarianism and cooperative ideology is interesting, since cooperative ideology and its emancipatory ideal often conflicted with traditional conservatism. But it seems that the conservative agrarians managed this potential conflict through focusing only on the economic aspects of cooperation.

In 1895 a new contribution to the flora of agrarian organizations emerged, with the founding of the party Swedish Agrarian League. It was a conservative, agrarian organization encompassing the traditional elites, as well as conservative parliamentarians. The discussions concerning universal franchise incorporated the conflict between different versions of citizenship.

Discussing Swedish agrarian elites, it is impossible not to mention ideological conservatism. The League was strongly conservative, and in the societal context there were challenges to conservatives and agrarians alike. First of all, the controversy with Norway concerning the union brought sev-

\textsuperscript{30} “Är vårt mejeriväsende tillfredsställande och för framtiden betryggande?”, Tidskrift för landmän, 1890:16, 17 and 21. Also Lundin, K.F., Om andelsmejerier (Stockholm 1890).
\textsuperscript{32} “Sydvestra Uplands landtmannaförening”, Tidskrift för landmän, 1894, p. 748.
eral political issues to the forefront. For one, Norway was more liberal and had a working parliamentary system and extended franchise. Secondly, agricultural tariffs did not apply in trading with Norway. Thirdly, Norwegian patriotism challenged the equally nationalistic Swedish agrarians.33

The most vital political issue was the franchise question, where liberals demanded franchise reform. The League opposed changes on the basis that this would threaten the influence of farmers. The purpose was to congregate all farmers as a homogenous political force.34 It opposed industry, which it believed to be favoured by the state, and not least of all the forest industry threatened the agrarian community, as companies bought farmland.35 However, all agrarians were not in support of the League, since many believed that a national agrarian organization had to politically stand between left and right. The most important question was to keep out of the ongoing controversy over import tariffs on grain, something that severely threatened agrarian unity.36 The League was a political platform for both conservatism and agrarianism, visible through lectures held within the organization. At the yearly meeting in 1897, the topic was “the development of franchise in this century” (“rösträttens utveckling under innevarande århundrade”) by vicar Svensson, depicting franchise as a negative force threatening the very foundations of society.37 In 1898 the B.A. from Uppsala, Carl Sundbäck, spoke on the topic “the national importance of a self-owning estate of farmers” (“betydelsen för vårt land af ett sjelfegande bondestånd”). The lecture was traditionalist, and promoted the concept that farmers were the backbone of the nation, as opposed to the working classes.38

The relationship between the League and the conservatives was not clear. In 1903 they also changed their name to the Swedish Farmers Union (Sveriges landmannaförbund) and incorporated a new programme said to benefit the motherland and to guard the economic and political interests of the farmers. At the same time, they tried to attract small farmers through lowering the membership fees.39 These changes show that the organization became increasingly political during the first years of the 20th century. When

36 ”Landbruksklubben i Stockholm”, Tidskrift för landmän, 1894, p. 894.
37 ”Sveriges agrarförbund”, Tidskrift för landmän, 1897, p. 143.
38 ”Sveriges agrarförbunds årsmöte”, Tidskrift för landmän, 1899:2. Later there were ample discussions concerning political guarantees for the propertied classes, when a franchise reform seemed inevitable. ”Sveriges agrarförbund”, Tidskrift för landmän, 1903:15.
39 ”Sveriges agrarförbund”, Tidskrift för landmän, 1903:18.
the Swedish conservatives founded *Allmänna valmansförbundet* (AVF) in 1904 the *Union* did not join, although the AVF had a strong representation of farmers within the party. Instead the *Union* stated that they supported AVF in general, but could not accept the strong interests from industry within the party.

**The Threat from the Worker**

Echoing the stronger political conflict in society, the agrarian forces became more active. At the national level the *Union* described strikes and trade unions in agriculture (and it is safe to say that they were strongly against both). Strikes were named “violent acts” (“våldsgerningar”) calling for state action. The same kind of discussions existed both at local and regional levels. One example was the *Farmers Organisation of Skaraborg (Skaraborgs läns jordbrukareförening)*, founded in December 1908 with the purpose of countering the “dissolving and destructive” (“upplösande och nedbrytande”) tendencies among farmhands. It should offer support against travelling agitators and counter strikes. Its board consisted of ten members (all estate-owners, including one count).

The social tensions in society were also related to views on education, since it was believed that education brought orderliness, enlightenment, and stability. In 1895 an article defined the future threats to society as socialism, anarchism, and cosmopolitanism. The argument was that the “well-built” social structure could crumble into a shapeless mass. The answer was enlightenment through education, something that in turn would bring the classes closer together. Education and cultural refinement would “drive the threatening ghost of class hatred back into its dark den”. It was suggested that educated men, especially priests and farmers, should hold public lectures to invoke the desire to acquire knowledge among working classes.

One common concept in the political discourses of the late 1800s and the early 1900s was urbanization. It was often believed that urban life created rootless people, as the city offered leisure, amusements, and higher wages in industry. This affected the countryside, since many farmhands sought employment in other trades. Shortage of labour in the countryside was contrasted with unemployment in the cities. The agrarian press suggested a solu-

---

42 “Sveriges landtmannaförbund”, *Tidskrift för landtmän*, 1905:11.
43 “Skaraborgs läns jordbrukareförening”, *Tidskrift för landtmän*, 1909:1. The organization had predecessors, as meetings were held already in 1895. "Agarrörelsen", *Tidskrift för landtmän*, 1895, p. 34.
tion to keep the workforce in agriculture. Firstly, the employment system ("legostagdan") was outdated, and instead a system of contracts needed to be formalized, since the patriarchal system could not be maintained. Secondly, the conditions for farm labourers needed to be improved through better housing, clothing, and salaries. Thirdly, a system to counter labour organization was needed, since trade unions were seen as undesirable, but inevitable. Therefore, associations with the purpose of uniting the farmers had to be created, to build adequate housing for labourers and to distribute land to skilful and faithful farmhands. The article contained examples of how an employers association ought to be founded. Members could be any “välfrejudd” farmer employing farmhands. The term “välfrejudd” means well-reputed or well-esteemed, and needs to be discussed since it actually entails a civic reputation. Until 1918, Swedish laws incorporated “frej” as a prerequisite of certain rights. Therefore, this is an older version of citizenship dependent on local knowledge of an individual’s reputation. The membership in the organization was also connected to landowning (tenant-farmers could not be members). The fee was decided from the number of male farmhands employed. The idea of a patriarchal responsibility for the farmhands was quite common. The system with farm labourers paid in kind ("statare") was problematic, and the agrarian press described how to improve the situation of the employees: increased salaries, good and proper housing, introduction of piecework, including children and women in the process, educate the housewives, and finally, encouraging the farmhand to save money for the future.

The question concerning the relationship between employer and employee was filled with different ideological aspects and strong ideas focusing on hierarchy and tradition. The emergence of trade unions and political activism among farmhands was seen as a foreign and negative element in Swedish society. This threatened to create a capitalist system where work was another commodity. The opposite was the traditional Swedish agrarian patriarchal system, where the employer had the responsibility for employees. The patriarchal system was believed to foster a sense of family and duty, and required giving and taking. The employer was responsible for the employee in many different ways, for example: the living conditions in general, and more specifically for pensions, etc. According to the agrarian press, the patriarchal system differed from the modern industrial system, with regards to the relationship between the classes. The fear of socialism among employers was only part of labour relations. It was quite common that the agrarian press criticized employers for expressing no interest whatsoever in the situation of

the workers. The advice was that the employer should reward honest, hard-working farmhands instead of opposing demands.48

Modernization and Tradition

The discussions on citizenship in agrarian circles were often part of ideas on modernization. The rational farmer was the one who supposedly would obtain civic rights. On the other hand, agriculture stood between modernity and tradition, and hence the concept of modernity was attributed with different hierarchal and patriarchal notions. This section tries to define how rationality was depicted in the agrarian press in relation to modernity and tradition, with specific focus on dairies. Equally important was the relationship between modernity and masculinity. Lena Sommestad has pointed out that a modern and rational dairy industry completely changed gender patterns, as dairymen subsequently took over from dairymaids (in turn described as inefficient, un-rational, and traditional).49

Small against Large – Smallholders and Estate-owners

The smallholders were one of the most important groups when it came to rationalization, at least from the viewpoint of the agrarian press. In previous research, the question concerning smallholders and estates has been important. Historian Jan Kuuse has promoted that the smallholders could not compete and keep up with larger farms when it came to rationalization.50 The opposite relationship has been put forth by economic-historians Mats Morell and Kirsti Niskanen.51 Previous research has also showed that farmers and estate-owners went separate ways in relation to agricultural technology. The terms tradition-technology and reform-technology have been used to describe the phenomenon. However, it was not a clear-cut definition, but instead dependent on social factors. Other studies have pointed out that commercialization was strong among smallholders.52

In the agrarian press there was the notion that small farms did not progress due to the inherent conservatism among the proprietors. Political con-

servatism was in general seen as a commendable quality, but here it was the very thing that threatened future agriculture. For example, the conservative approach led to scepticism concerning dairy production, which was more seen as a supplement to the household, rather than the most economically vibrant part.\textsuperscript{53} There were several attempts to promote rationality, for example, through a reward system initiated by the government and performed by \textit{County Agricultural Societies}. All aspects of the small farms were evaluated, and rewarded farms were intended to act as positive examples. The evaluation was a function of the traditional division of labour, since housewives were also evaluated (and the results published concerning pigs, poultry, and the barn).\textsuperscript{54} The background of the reward system was the belief that smallholders in general were uninterested in development, sceptical of new methods, and did not communicate with each other. The language used was often semi-religious, as one article called for an agricultural mission to bring the smallholders into the modern world.\textsuperscript{55} Short texts, songs, and poems were common in the monthly appendix to \textit{The Farmer} and differed from the general language in the agrarian press. Patriotism and nationalism were in general un-reflected ideas. The appendix, on the other hand, used much space to promote patriotism, anti-urbanism, and the national importance of agriculture. The patriarchal idea was that smallholders were less patriotic than other groups in agrarian society.\textsuperscript{56} The propaganda portrayed agriculture as something totally different from industry. Agriculture was healthy, patriotic, modern, could “counter emigration, settle the countryside, work the soil and push people forward to the ballots.”\textsuperscript{57} The use of short stories and lyrics was a quite common phenomenon, and advice from the Finnish \textit{Pellervo} was often translated. These consisted of a collection of one-sentence statements concerning milking. One example was, “Milk with dry hands!”\textsuperscript{58} Education was extremely important in this respect, and the \textit{County Agricultural Societies} were the chief executives. Often the same kind of language was used in promoting modern agriculture. For example, “a kitchen garden at the farm gives occupation to the children, diversified food and brings atmosphere to the home.”\textsuperscript{59}

At the same time as smallholders were believed to be too conservative, this was also attributed to manors and estates, not least concerning buildings.

\textsuperscript{53} “Kan jordbruket på mindre egendomar i Sverige i allmänhet anses gå framåt?”, \textit{Tidskrift för landtmán}, 1881:29 and “Bör man tillråda de mindre mejerierna att upphöra och istället upprätta bolagsmejerier?”, \textit{Tidskrift för landtmán}, 1886:35.
\textsuperscript{54} “Några framstående smärre svenska jordbruk”, \textit{Landtmannens månadsbilaga}, 1903:12.
\textsuperscript{55} “En fråga för dagen”, \textit{Landtmannen}, 1902:42.
\textsuperscript{56} Thörn, Gustaf, ”Några tankar rörande jordbruket och fosterlandskärleken.”, \textit{Landtmannens månadsbilaga}, 1904:1 and ”Vi måste...!”, \textit{Landtmannens månadsbilaga}, 1906:1.
\textsuperscript{57} ”Småbrukets betydelse”, \textit{Landtmannens månadsblad}, 1908:19.
\textsuperscript{58} ”Mjölkare!”, \textit{Landtmannens månadsblad}, 1907:6. See also Odhe, Thorsten, \textit{Kooperationen i Finland} (Stockholm 1929).
\textsuperscript{59} ”Från en småbrukarkurs i Norrbotten”, \textit{Landtmannens månadsbilaga}, 1905:2.
Manors, it was said, often had “massive and prestigious buildings that would stand for centuries” or were “palace-like”. The same impressive manorial dairies had been state-of-the-art earlier, but now the very buildings countered the development of a modern dairy industry.\textsuperscript{60} Opposed to this, small farms were described as having the possibility of specialization. They could more easily manage green crops and new forms of production than could larger farms. The small farm also had an advantage in animal husbandry and milking. Since it was the farmer’s own wife and daughters that worked on the farm, the farmer could easily supervise and guide them.\textsuperscript{61} This view of the agrarian family as a production unit visualizes the strong patriarchal concepts in agriculture.

An example concerning the modern and rational farmer dealt with the relationship between science and practice. Sometimes, the agrarian press was believed to be too heavy on the science side. The ideal was an exchange of experiences between scientists and practitioners. The farmers had to be able to assess scientific results and the modern farmer was one who understood science and could apply it in the daily running of the farm.\textsuperscript{62}

Gendered dairies

In the discourses surrounding agriculture, hygiene was central, and was strongly connected to gender. Disinfection, cleanliness, and hygiene were used as arguments for developing the dairy industry, and were also linked to efficiency. Ventilation particularly became a way forward, as it was stated that good and fresh air increased working capacity both in barns and in living quarters.\textsuperscript{63} Milk quality, however, was the most important factor. This concept was integrated in the development of cooperative dairies by controlling deliveries. To enforce better quality, the cows had to be healthy, well-fed, and watered, and the barns had to be clean, airy, bright, and warm. The milking process needed structure and the farm-maids needed to be clean and properly dressed, with milking taking place at specific times. The purpose of the rules was to enforce order and discipline on the individual farm level. Farmers who were unable to maintain quality would be forbidden from delivering milk to cooperative dairies.\textsuperscript{64} The modernizing agenda focused on milking, and the problem was that farmers were believed to be uninterested in proper and hygienic production. The main reason was that milking was

\textsuperscript{60} “Om landtmannabyggnader”, \textit{Tidskrift för landmän}, 1883:5.
\textsuperscript{61} Insulander, Erik, “Det lilla jordbruket i jemförelse med det stora.”, \textit{Landtmannens månadblad}, 1902:8.
\textsuperscript{62} “Något om konsten att läsa”, \textit{Tidskrift för landmän}, 1882:34.
\textsuperscript{63} “En brännande fråga”, \textit{Landtmannens månadsblad}, 1910:8.
\textsuperscript{64} “Mjölkens frambringande och behandling för andelsmejerierna”, \textit{Tidskrift för landmän}, 1901:22 and 24.
seen as degrading (“vanärande”). One example comes from a Danish article discussing the problem of acquiring competent farm-maids. Instead of farm-maids, many manors had to use “wives, full-grown men, and one or two maids”, leading to inferior milking. The solution was to create a new order concerning animal husbandry. The farmers ought to give a young, energetic man the responsibility of milking, feeding, and managing cows and pigs, pay him enough to have his own household, and have the staff live with him. This would, according to the writer, solve the problem of inferior quality. This article is very interesting, since it clearly portrays how milking was perceived. First of all, it was a problem that full-grown men and dilettantes were forced to milk. Secondly, the responsible young man was the one who could solve the problem, by creating a basic and hierarchal family unit.

Milking was one of the more important issues in the modernity discourse as the agrarian press promoted it. For example, scientific advice was offered on the correct way to milk cows. The barn needed to be bright, clean, and airy and the cows should be clean, well-groomed and have plenty of space. The milk buckets needed to be extremely clean, etc. The advice continues with regulations concerning hygiene, and finishes with a proclamation of the need to milk out the cow completely. All of the advice on hygiene and quality created further issues. One was that the South Sweden Dairy Organisation (Sydsvenska mejeriföreningen) in 1900 decided to nationally distribute rules for the barn.

Research and education were discussed with a gendered pre-understanding. Men were described as rational and scientific, but also as practical in the daily running of the dairy, while dairymaids were seldom mentioned at all. In one article, the only feminine actor mentioned was the nation. Sweden was described as a feminine entity, where science and practice, hand in hand, would benefit the nation, who in return always benefited science. The connection between science and practice was portrayed as the central issue for the development of agriculture.

The Ideal Housewife

It is obvious that the rationalization of agriculture brought a perceived need to control production. The patriarchal concept of rationalization also led to
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65 “Om mjölkning, mjölkrening och mjölkens afkylning”, Tidskrift för landtmän, 1906:52. 66 Böggild, B., ”Om mjölkningen på herrgårdarne”, Landtmannen, 1898:49. 67 Flach, Wilhelm, ”Se till at korna blir väl mjölkade!”, Landtmannens månadsbilaga, 1897:3. Also ”Vigen af mjölkningens riktiga utförande”, Landtmannens månadsbilaga, 1898:11 (more scientific article) and ”Vigen af omsorgsfullt utförd mjölkning”, Landtmannens månadsbilaga, 1900:6. ”Om mjölkningens utförande”, Landtmannens månadsbilaga, 1903:7. 68 ”Sydsvenska mejeriföreningen”, Tidskrift för landtmän, 1900:31. 69 Sebelien, John (teacher at Ultuna Dairy School), ”Om mejeriskolor och mejeriförsök”, Tidskrift för landtmän, 1886:2.
ideas on how to control the household. One article describes the housewife holding mainly the same duties as the master, but within certain boundaries. The primary female quality was described as orderliness. The house should be kept clean and symmetrical, as everything should have its designated place. Daily work should be performed according to a written agenda. Meals should be served at the same time every day, sheets and towels should be changed at defined intervals. Orderliness was the cornerstone of every well-functioning home. An equally important quality for the exemplary housewife was firmness. Housemaids should be led with a firm hand, and the housewife should make it clear that she was in charge. On the other hand, a young and inexperienced housewife could take advice from the maids and the two should work together. Kindness and patience were part of the firm running of the household. She should always remain calm and not become upset or angry, since that affected the harmony of the household. A housewife with all of these qualities would become the supreme mother of the house.  

This approach signalled a need to reaffirm the traditional division of labour. At the same time, the obsession with hygiene, orderliness, cleanliness, and tidiness shows that a modern and rational running of the farm affected the traditional female sphere. It was a scientific way to re-enforce traditional boundaries.

One of the more important ideas concerned education for housewives, not least for the wives of smallholders. It points out that many farms had gone bankrupt because of female inability and ignorance. It did not matter that the man had knowledge if “the other leg of the horse” was weak. The idea was that housewives needed to be educated in the maintenance of the garden, household economics, food preparation, and animal husbandry. This would then avoid a situation where “large holes were gnawed in the wallet of the master through female ignorance, listlessness and laziness”.

Much of the rational and scientific approach to housekeeping focused on food and the responsibilities of the housewife. First of all, the human body was described as a machine that needed food like a machine needed fuel. A well-fed body could easily work and was resilient to disease. The most important food was meat, and the article refers to the Greeks and Romans, who lived on a meat-based diet. This gave them strength and endurance, and produced skilled warriors. Fat was also important, as it kept the cold away. Water and salt were essential. The good housewife should add to this the pleasures of life such as: spices, fruit, sugar, onions, vegetables, tea, coffee, beer, wine and alcohol.

70 “Om en husmoders pligter i allmänhet”, Tidskrift för landmän, 1890:2. The article originally came from the paper The Housewife (Husmodern).
72 “För hushållet. Mennisksans föda”, Tidskrift för landmän, 1890:6. The article originally came from the German Stütz der Hausfrau.
The modernization of the home was yet another important feature of the agrarian press and agriculture, and held a specific relation to gender. A speech held by Kerstin Hesselgren at the Smallholder’s day (Småbrukardagen) in 1912 focused on female tasks in modern agriculture. The home needed a well-performing and efficient housewife. Cooking, dishwashing, and cleaning should be modernized through the use of technology. The general attitude was that housewives were inept in managing the home. One example was that children were allowed to run around without wiping their feet. The speech aimed at enforcing strict and rational routines, and at the same time reaffirmed the female sphere and its traditional responsibilities. The speech was also extremely rational in its approach, since it promoted the idea of calculating the food intake of the family in the same manner as for cattle. It was also stated that “anyone who tries to replace real food with coffee, was as un-sensible as someone who tried to fuel a steam engine with straw”.73

The focus on structuring female labour in the home and maintaining female labour in the countryside increased with the outbreak of World War I. Rationality was increasingly important as food production became critical. Concerning female labour, it was stated that the new opportunities in the cities were due to female laziness and the existence of desk jobs (“frökenjobb”, a derogatory term). The article presenting this was not sceptical of modern society as such. Women had their rightful place, in industry as well as society. The problem was that women left the countryside and agriculture for the city, which was described as an anthill.74

The Image of Modernity

The ever-present K. F. Lundin presented a new, modern, and rational dairy in 1898. Hamra Dairy in Tumba, outside Stockholm, was described in lyrical terms. For instance, the milk was transported directly from the barn using carts, and only required the work of one man. The descriptions all focused on tidiness and efficiency, using a technical terminology. Hygiene was important at Hamra, as veterinarians and doctors supervised the staff and the livestock. Hamra also had specific rules for personal hygiene, and incorporated a bathhouse for the staff.75 The purpose, of course, was to present the modern dairy and at the same time portray the future possibilities of modern dairy production.

73 “Kvinnans uppgift i landbrukarehemmet.”, Landtmannens månadsblad, 1912:21.
75 “Hamra mejeri”, Tidskrift för landtmän, 1898.
Agricultural exhibitions were another arena where modernity was described. In 1901 the National Agricultural Exhibition (Landbruksmötet) was held in Gävle, and the contrast between old and new completely governed the descriptions. The display started with an exhibition of historical dairy production. All of the historical items were described as broken, dirty, smelly, unattractive, inefficient, and outmoded. This was contrasted to the modern dairy exhibition, where the terms spacious, airy, bright, practical, cheap, tasteful, efficient, modern, and remarkable were used.  

Yet other aspects of rationalization were centralization and standardization. From 1887 there was a Swedish dairy-agent in Manchester and in 1894 the Swedish National Butter Tests (Svenska smörprovingarna) were initiated. It was believed that a modern and centralized dairy industry could use technical benefits to the fullest extent, hiring the best dairymen as well as creating a “real” business. Against this stood household production, generally seen as outdated and lacking in quality, both by dairy consultants and others. Hand separators were increasing in numbers and efficiency. Dairy consultant K. F. Lundin was sceptical of household production (although he worked for the largest producer of hand separators). Firstly, household production threatened cooperative dairies; secondly, it led to the production of inferior butter; thirdly, it led to lower prices for individual farmers since they could not manage the market. Lundin’s proposal was, apart from strengthening cooperative dairies, that farmers should deliver cream to the dairies and keep the milk. The question of “farmer’s butter” (“bondsmör”) was common in the debates concerning dairy production. Although it was not seen as positive, advice was given on how to promote the quality.

Modern Education

Agricultural education became extremely important in the discourses concerning modernity and rationality. Agricultural education was primarily carried out by Adult Education Colleges (folkhögskolor), County Agricultural Society courses, or private schools. Another form involved travelling instructors and teachers.

---

76 “Landbruksmötet i Gefle”, Tidskrift för landtmän, 1901:32.
77 “Smörtillverkningens centralisering”, Tidskrift för landtmän, 1900:23 and 24.
78 Lundin, K. F., ”Vore det till vår mjölkhusshällnings fördel, om de mindre jordbrukare, som sjelfva tillverka smör,i stället levererade grädde till gemensamma mejerier”, Tidskrift för landtmän, 1902:49.
79 ”Om mjölkbehandling och smörberedning i hemmen.”, Landtmannens månadsbilda, 1900:3 and ”Vår hushållsmejerier och deras upphjelpande”, Tidskrift för landtmän, 1900:38.
80 The agricultural education system was described at length by Juhlin-Dannfelt, Herman, ”Hvilka åtgärder äro lämpliga för att sprida yrkeskunskap bland innehavare af smärrre jordbruk?”, Landtmannen, 1904:24, 25, 26 and 27. ”Jordbruksungdomens undervisning”, Landtmannens månadsblad, 1912:10 and ”Landtbruket och ungdomen”, 1912:19.
The entire concept of education focused on youth, but was at the same time a function of the agrarian vision of society. Agricultural education was generally seen as positive, while student education was more problematic. In one article, the writer said that the nation needed civil servants and that this was all and well. The problem was that farmers also sent their children on to higher education, due to the negative spirit in the countryside. This was taken as evidence for the fact that agriculture had lost its position as the backbone of the nation. The solution was to invoke a new spirit, a rebirth of agriculture focusing on youth.  

Dairy education was perhaps the most important factor used to improve Swedish agriculture. Modernity and rationality, as shown by Lena Somme-stad, were masculine ideals that did not encompass women, as did education. Dairymaids were often attributed with negative qualities, but there are, however, examples of other aspects relating to female education. In Malmöhus län in 1883, men and women were given more or less the same dairy schooling. The purpose was to educate able (“dugliga”) dairymen and dairymaids, with both a practical and theoretical education. The term dairymen was also used for both men and women. At the same time, the description contained a few differences between the sexes since women would also receive thorough training in writing and counting. Men were expected to have this knowledge from the beginning. Another difference was that the male students paid for their subsistence, while the female students were accepted free of charge. All students received an education in the management and maintenance of steam engines, and this also applied to the female students.  

Another example comes from descriptions of courses for dairymaids at Hvilan Adult Education College. The idea was that dairymaids employed at estate-dairies had several hours free from dairy work every day. Therefore they needed education to become useful help for housewives. Hvilan offered courses in handicrafts and housekeeping together with dairy education. An interpretation of this is that there was a need to control and define the exact nature of the work performed by dairymaids. It was a traditional view of managing labour, especially female labour. At the same time it was modern, since the maids received dairy education both a theoretical and practical dairy education. This is an example of one of the breaking points between modernization and tradition. The recruitment of students to Alnarp Agricultural Institute in Skåne was aimed exclusively at men, and any future student had to be: over 18 years of age, well reputed (“frejdad”), have good religious knowledge, and be free of any contagious diseases. A priest and a doctor should attest to this. Again, the older version of individual standing and mo-
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81 “Studenter till jordbruket”, Landtmannens månadsblad, 1913:2.  
rality was important. Furthermore, the student had to have full knowledge of the Swedish language (spelling and grammar), know arithmetic, physical and political geography, and the first six books of Euclides. The board could, however, accept students without the former education if the student demonstrated exceptional practical skills in agriculture.\(^\text{84}\)

The tension between science and practice also existed in the discussions on education. It was said that the modern farmer needed another kind of education to meet the new situation. In the discourse presented, there were threads of the organic view of society, since the sons of farmers had physical strength and were used to working hard. The sons of gentlemen ("herremän") were not, but both groups were needed to work together in a modern society. The general idea was that young farmers needed both education and hard work.\(^\text{85}\)

Education had a direct ideological connection to citizenship in several ways. The idea was that schooling should increase the student’s knowledge of humanistic disciplines. History, geography, political science, singing, and gymnastics were deemed as fostering ("uppföstrande") and patriotic. The other side of the coin was the professional training, since “no one could be a good citizen without professional skills”. The purpose was to educate good citizens and able farmers.\(^\text{86}\) The final remark was that the first priority in the education of young farmers was to create a feeling of spiritual and national awareness. From this, a willingness to learn and to educate would develop.

The discussion concerning education for smallholders had many different angles, as adult colleges and farm schools were seen as having different responsibilities. The former gave the young freeholder education for his role as a citizen, while the latter gave him the professional skills of a farmer. The problem was that education was more directed towards the running of large farms, not at smallholders. Therefore, many smallholders only took specific courses arranged locally. The real problem, according to the article, was that these courses did not include any education for the citizen.\(^\text{87}\)

Denmark was also the prime example concerning adult education. It was described as being free from state influence, apart from the fact that the state had to make the farmer aware of his own interests. Danish development was described as the results of awareness and the energetic, hard work of individual farmers. The spirit of Grundtvig was the foundation of an enlightened way to prosperity. The article used a semi-religious language, where salvation and awakening created by the spoken word was important. The teachers were described as preachers with the sole destiny of inspiring the desire to learn in the hearts of the young. The most important aspect of education was

\(^{86}\) "Landbruksundervisningen i Norrland", \textit{Tidskrift för landtmän}, 1901:1.
\(^{87}\) "Landtmannens utbildning", \textit{Tidskrift för landtmän}, 1904:41.
to promote a patriotic spirit, thereby promoting a will to learn, develop, and create.\textsuperscript{88} Apart from the patriotic spirit, it was seen as necessary that children acquired an education and enjoyed a firm upbringing. This would make them into useful and thinking members of society. Book learning was important, together with individual thinking and writing.\textsuperscript{89}

Patriotism was to be enforced through elementary schools, since people had to be fostered in a new way to enable them to fulfil their patriotic duty. The problem was described as a lack of moral standards and roughness of the youth which in turn led to a lack of civic responsibility. Therefore the elementary schools should invoke the spirit of agriculture, described as the healthiest and noblest of all trades, and as the very foundation of society.\textsuperscript{90}

\section*{Citizenship and Cooperation}

Citizenship is not always an easily identifiable category, and it is obvious that there were different interpretations concerning citizenship. In general the agrarian press did not discuss it per se, but it can be found in discussions concerning education and smallholders. The word “frejd” (well reputed) belonged to an older tradition and at the same time more liberal notions often appeared in the press.

However, the formation of organizations incorporated several different kinds of notions that can be linked to citizenship proper, since membership in an organization demanded different definitions of responsibility involving demands put on potential members, codes of conduct, and rules concerning voting.

\section*{Cooperative Inclusion and Exclusion}

Many different types of organizations were being created in the 1890s: dairy organizations, cooperatives, and other forms were among the most common. As mentioned above, cooperative dairy production was seen as more rational than other forms of dairy production. The cooperative ideals infused the debate concerning private dairies (seen as non-functional).\textsuperscript{91}

\textsuperscript{88} Holmström, Leonard, "Det danska folkets höga ståndpunkt inom mejeriväsendet och några reflexioner deröfver", \textit{Tidskrift för landtmän}, 1892:23. See also "Landbruks- och folkhögskolornas betydelse för utvecklingen af Danmarks landbruk.", \textit{Landtmannen}, 1897:43.

\textsuperscript{89} "Med uppfostran...", \textit{Landtmannens månadsblad}, 1915:22.

\textsuperscript{90} "Jordbruket och folkskolan", \textit{Landtmannen}, 1906:45. See also Tigerschiöld, Hugo, "Småbruksrörelsen och folkskolan", \textit{Landtmannen}, 1907:12.

\textsuperscript{91} The writer in this case was the omnipresent K. F. Lundin. "Är vårt mejeriväsende tillfredsställande och för framtiden betryggande?", \textit{Tidskrift för landtmän}, 1890:17, 19 and 21.
The question of smallholders versus large farmers was also ever-present in the discussions concerning cooperatives. The general idea was that smallholders and small farms needed cooperation more than others. It was only through cooperatives that smallholders could make full use of their products. Agriculture as such could only survive if smallholders worked together and received all of the benefits of large farms, but without their hazards. The Monthly Appendix used many examples from Finland, and regularly translated and published texts from Pellervo. Much of the Finnish material pertained to ideological issues, and came in the form of exclamations. For example, one article was full of concepts like “one for all and all for one”. Ideas concerning ownership were also addressed in the same manner “nothing is mine or yours, but everything is ours”. The cooperative movement was described as a large family: no one stood alone, but there were always friends in the cooperative.

Denmark was the positive example of rational cooperative dairies, and it was from Denmark that initial regulations for cooperative dairies came. Model regulations, for example, were published in 1890 (directly translated from Danish). Anyone was allowed to become a member after being suggested and accepted by the board. The new member had to take on part of the cooperative credit, and also pay money into the common reserve fund. The basis of membership was related to the number of cows (1-4 cows equalled 1 vote, 5-9 equalled 2 votes and more than 10 cows equalled 3 votes).

Quality was the most essential part of the regulations, and members had to deliver clean, sound, and undiluted milk. Quality problems had to be dealt with before any delivery, and the rules for fodder and its composition had to be upheld. Finally, no member could stop the board from inspecting member farms. The model regulations did not contain any reference to landowning, and it does not seem that tenant farmers were prohibited from entering. The central stratification came from the number of cows. This was a kind of informal social control leading to a willingness to deliver high-quality milk.

There were, however, other forms of model regulations taken from Sweden. None contained explicit definitions for potential members, but voting procedures were connected to landowning as well as to the membership fee. For every 10 acres the member received one vote, and for every 10 acres the member paid a fee. Tenant farmers were free to join and the same rules con-
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92 Insulander, Erik, "Kooperationen och småbrukarne.", Landtmannens månadsbilsaga, 1904:2. Cooperation was also described as a way of countering the strong competition in agriculture. "Landmän, sammanslutet eder!", Landtmannens månadsbilsaga, 1905:3.
93 "En för alla och alla för en.", Landtmannens månadsbilsaga, 1905:4. Peculiarly enough this article was a translation from an English version of a text from Pellervo.
cerning quality, mentioned above, applied to them. “Unity gives strength” was the principle.95

The law governing economic organizations came into action in January 1897, and was an important factor for agrarian organizations. Before this time, there were no clear laws defining the workings of cooperatives. This did not mean that cooperative dairies and agrarian organizations did not exist; quite the contrary. The 1890s was the formative period concerning cooperative dairies in Sweden. In 1895 there were 256 cooperative dairies in the southern parts of the country. In Skåne there were 94 cooperative dairies (all founded between 1890–1895).96

The running of cooperative dairies entailed many different relations between members, but also between the cooperative and employees. The dairyman and dairymaids were in charge of the day-to-day running of the dairy, and also in charge of the dairy-shop. The direct selling of products was hard to control, according to the article, and the dairyman was only controlled by his own conscience.97

Cooperative organizations also created other kinds of relationships between agrarian groups. There was a connection between “new” agrarian elites and cooperative dairies. This was shown in discussions concerning the need for stronger and more efficient organizations involving cooperatives. Meetings were held in Skåne during 1892 and 1893, described in the agrarian press. These give an insight into how new and educated groups defined their profession. The discussions concerned the forming of an interest organisation for cooperative dairies in the south of Sweden, as well as to how the supply of milk should be structured. Among the representatives there are no clearly identifiable members of the traditional elites, but this does not mean that there were none. However, it is evident that the number of titles concerning economic organization, i.e. director and consultant, were increasing, while the participation of noblemen had diminished. This was also the case concerning the Association for Cooperative Dairies (Föreningen för andelsmejerier).98

95 Lundin, K. F., "Är vårt mejeriväsende tillfredsställande och för framtiden betryggande?", Tidskrift för landtmän, 1890:28. The question of quality was discussed at length by Holmström, Leonard, "Om andelsmejerier och mjölkens betalande efter fetthalten samt kornas rationella utfodring för uppnåande af hög fetthalt i mjölken", Tidskrift för landtmän, 1892:33 and 34. N. Landberg, "Andelsmejerisystemet", Tidskrift för landtmän, 1890:36. Landberg was a dairy consultant.
96 Melin, Yngve, "Några iakttagelser och önskningsmål på mejeriområdet", Tidskrift för landtmän, 1896, p. 320. Melin was a dairy consultant.
97 "Våra andelsmejeriers organisation", Tidskrift för landtmän, 1903:1. In a following article, technical solutions to the problem were presented. "Våra andelsmejeriers kassakontroll", Tidskrift för landtmän, 1903:45.
Purchase-organizations

Purchase-organizations were among the first and most important developments on the agricultural scene. These types of organizations had existed for some time, but it was around the turn of the century that larger regional organizations and later a national organization were created, inspired by Germany.

One aspect was that many purchase-organizations were created in relation to other cooperative organizations. For example, it was common that members of a cooperative dairy, or a cooperative mill also created a purchase-organization. These were presented as an important part in creating modern, rational, and efficient agriculture. The farmer needed quality products (fertilizers, fodder etc) to be able to produce quality products. Another benefit was that smaller farmers could enjoy lower prices. The general problem was that estate-owners and large farmers could get lower prices by buying in bulk. Railway freight costs were also cheaper when buying in bulk. Smallholders could not attain these benefits without organization. In a series of articles from 1903, several different purchase-organizations were described. The Consumption Association of Skaraborg (Skaraborgs läns konsumtionsförening) had existed since 1896 and held a semi-official position, since board members were appointed by the County Agricultural Society. The reason was said to safeguard the reputation of the organization and profits were redistributed to the members in relation to how much each had bought during the year. Members could be either individuals or organizations. The agrarian press argued that purchase-organizations were very important, as merchants could be bypassed using unity and direct links to producers. The best system was cooperative, where the member acquired shares in relation to the size of the farms. Private limited companies required more capital, and did not attract smallholders. Tradesmen were often described as capitalists only interested in profit, as opposed to farmers. The suggestion was that small local organizations would be created, and that the board should know every individual member. In turn, the local organizations would create regional organizations.

The process went quickly, and in May 1905, interested parties met in Stockholm to discuss how a national organization should be created. The ideological foundation was described as self-defence, since Swedish producers of fertilizer refused to trade with the regional purchase-organizations. The Farmers (Landtmänn) was founded as an umbrella organization, with membership only for large organizations, and initially there were several different kinds. Although the larger organizations were important, the major-

99 "Hvad betydelse hafva inköpsföreningar och huru böra de organiseras?", Tidskrift för landtmän, 1903:36.
100 Leufvén, G., "Om inköpsföreningar och deras organisation", Tidskrift för landtmän, 1903:40, 42 and 43. Leufvén was a Swedish agronomist.
ity of the individual members were actually smallholders. The founding organizations were the cooperatives: Farmers’ Central Organisation of Skåne (Skånska landtmännens centralförening), Farmers’ Central Organisation of Södermanland (Sörmländska landtmännens centralförening), the Consumption Organisation of Skaraborg County (Skaraborgs läns konsumtionsförening), the Farmers’ Union of Västernorrland County (Västernorrlands läns landtmannaförbund), and the Central Purchase Organisation of Halland County (Hallands läns centralinköpsförening). Limited companies were also members: Farmers’ Union in Gefle Ltd. (Aktiebolaget landtmannaförbundet i Gefle) and Farmers of Blekinge Ltd. (Aktiebolaget Blekinge landtmän). Although there were anti-capitalist ideas in the creation of the organization, the traditional elites were represented on the board, many with strong links to business and industry. The chairman was Count Hugo Hamilton, followed by Baron J. Bennet, estate-owners Edvard Beijer and G. Sederholm, directors Tor Bergqvist and Henry Hvid, and finally county-agronomist E.O. Arenander.

Firstly, it was an economic association with the expressed purpose of fighting Swedish trusts. According to The Farmers, the fertilizer trust had the expressed purpose of countering the founding of agrarian organizations, through maintaining higher prices for them. Secondly, it was an arena for ideological discussion, where all forms of cooperative ideals were discussed. For example, at the first yearly meeting in February 1906, discussions were held concerning cooperative butcheries and state sponsored storage facilities for grain. Thirdly, it was a political force that could obtain state support for different kinds of investments. This was in large part due to the fact that the board members were mostly political figures (mainly conservative). For example, at the yearly meeting in 1907 a lecture was held on the topic “Swedish yeomen arming against socialism” (“Sveriges allmoge beväpnar sig mot socialismen”).

Before the creation of the national organization there had been a period of quick and comprehensive regional organization. Apparently there was a need to structure how the members bought supplies through the organizations, and also the exact nature of them. For instance, there were strong rules concerning how and when payments should be done. It was also forbidden for the purchase-organizations to deal in coffee, sugar and other supplies.

In 1904 Farmers’ Central Organisation of Skåne was created with the purpose of buying agricultural supplies, organizing the selling of agricultural products, and working for the economic good of the members. The members

101 Swedish historian Rydén writes that 60 percent of the members were smallholders. Rydén, “Att åka snålkjuts är icke hederligt”, p. 70.
could be either organizations in which members together had at least 200 hectares, or individuals with more than 200 hectares of arable land. The membership fee was 5 kronor/hectare. These were the initial proposals, but in the regulations which passed, the 200-hectare limit had disappeared.\textsuperscript{105} The probable reason for relaxed entrance demands was a will to incorporate more or less all of the farmers in the region.

In April 1905 Farmers’ Central Organisation of Södermanland was created at a meeting under the chairmanship of county governor Erik Gustaf Boström (former Prime Minister) using the same regulations as in Skåne. In an article describing the formation, it was clearly stated that there was a rift between large farmers and smallholders. The large farmers were not that interested in participating in the organization, as they had less economic incentives. The writer stated that large farmers had to step out of their isolation and participate for the common good, and that the smallholders were risking just as much as an estate-owner.\textsuperscript{106}

Conclusions

The agrarian press was one of several important vehicles for agricultural change and modernization. In general, the press did not discuss citizenship, albeit discourses were visible primarily concerning education and smallholders. One reason for this was the Swedish political system and the character of the press. The system allowed farmers access to the political sphere through the general liberal notions concerning citizenship. The other reason was that the agrarian press focused on farmers and estate-owners, groups who already had political access. Discussing smallholders, it is obvious that the press as such held patriarchal beliefs concerning the need to educate and “nationalize” smallholders. They had to become good patriots through education (amongst other things in citizenship) with the outspoken idea that they had to be saved from socialism. At the same time there seems to be a separation between different kinds of schooling. Education for the citizen was separated from professional education. Articles directed towards smallholders focused mainly on promoting a specific agrarian culture of modernization. The existence of strong and prevalent agrarian discourses, portraying rural life as superior to city life, was integral in the discussions concerning citizenship and smallholders. One factor might be that elite groups saw smallholders as potential allies against the growing working classes.

There are indications that citizenship as such was discussed with a specific agrarian touch. Landowning was extremely important, since it created

\textsuperscript{105} “Förslag till stadgar för Skånska Landtmännens Centralförening” and ”Stadgar för Skånska Landtmännens Centralförening”, enclosed Landtmannen, 1904:4.

\textsuperscript{106} Insulander, Erik, ”Sörmlandska Landtmännens Centralförening”, Landtmannen, 1905:15.
autonomy, something that in turn affected membership in cooperatives and citizenship. It was the autonomous man that could take responsibility for debts and membership payments. Ownership or control were the identifying markers for voting procedures within agrarian organizations.

Agrarianism and conservatism were important ideologies in the societal discourse concerning franchise and agriculture. The very negative views on franchise of the Agrarian League actually defined their idea of citizenship. Concepts of hierarchy and masculinity imbued the conservative-agrarian notion of citizenship. Landowning and farming created responsible men: firmly rooted, traditional, patriarchal, strong, and able to participate in the decision-making process. They were educated, professional, rational, and modern. Smallholders, on the other hand, were often seen as egocentric and conservative, only interested in their own farms.

One important thing is that the agrarian press mainly addressed large farmers, and it therefore was quite elitist. There were, however, other examples of papers and groups addressed specifically to smallholders. Apart from Rösiö, mentioned earlier, John L. Saxon’s paper The Sower (Såningsmannen) was a proponent for cooperative and emancipatory ideals. He was a strong proponent of adult education colleges. At the same time, he encompassed the common agrarian ideal of viewing urbanization as an unnatural state. Another example was Anders Larsson-Killian, who wrote poems and worked for adult education. His work had a very romantic touch in portraying the hard-working smallholders. He combined romantic descriptions of nature with advice on how to use fertilizers.