Fredrik Eriksson/Johan Eellend/Piotr Wawrzeniuk

The Mirror of Agrarian Modernity

Agrarian press in Estonia, Galicia and Sweden, 1890–1917

Introduction[1]

> 'The life of the farmer is hard, the costs are increasing and the incomes are plummeting. In these dire days, the agricultural journal wants to be a friend and a support, leading farmers the right way on the meandering path of modernity, teaching them to follow the demands of the times.'[2]

This declaration was printed in the first edition of the Estonian journal *Põllumees* (The Farmer) in 1895. It bears witness to the hard times which farmers were experiencing, and, at the same time, defined the role the agrarian journal would play. These words could have come from any Northern or Central European agrarian journal of the time. Around the turn of the century agriculture in Northern Europe suffered several crises due to harder competition from new producers, urbanization and crop failures. In most areas the answer was modernization, a process in which the agrarian press played a crucial role.[3] The purpose of this article is to explore and illustrate the differences, and similarities in agrarian societies through examining agrarian journals in Estonia, Austrian Galicia, and Sweden. The main focus is on exploring strategies for economic modernization in three different settings.

This study includes the Estonian journals: *Põllumees* (The Farmer) and *Põllutööleht* (The Agriculture Journal). The Galician journals are *Ekonomist* (Economist) and its illustrated appendix *Samopomich* (Self-Help). The Swedish journals are *Landtmannen* (*The Farmer*), the appendix *Landtmannens månadsbilaga* (The Farmers' Monthly Appendix) and *Tidskrift för Landtmän* (Journal for Farmers). In this text, Galicia is also identified as the Crownland signifying its position in the Austrian part of the Habsburg monarchy. East Slavic inhabitants of Galicia are referred to as Ruthenians rather than Ukrainians. The analysis is a traditional broadcaster/receiver study that enables one to describe different kinds of broadcasters/speakers and receivers/listeners from approximately 1880 to 1917. It is also a comparative study focusing on the themes rationality, modernity, and masculinity as described in the agrarian press. It is also important to point out the relationship between modernity/rationality, and concepts of modern citizenship, where masculinity is especially interesting.

Modernity and rationality are central concepts of this study, and the Norwegian economic-historian Francis Sejersted described modernization as a process of liberation, particularly from negative structures and poverty through science and secularization. The technical-economic liberation aimed at creating institutions and structures for

modernization. The liberation was also a process of differentiation, from a homogenous to a heterogeneous society. Finally, liberation also meant the consolidation of the nation state and the development of a democratic and common public sphere.[4]

Agrarian modernization is close to Sejersted's definition, as almost all arguments for agrarian modernity in journals aimed at liberating agriculture from ancient methods and the market trends. The article aims at discussing differences and similarities between the cases concerning modernization. Organization was often described as the way to liberation, together with technology and science. The processes of national consolidation often incorporated farmers as symbols and representations of the true nation and its people.[5]

Background

During the nineteenth century agricultural production changed drastically, due to an increase in both production and nativity. This process brought increased proletarization, changed patterns of landowning and land-distribution. Agriculture became part of an international trade system where trends affected both prices and production. Railroads and shipping changed the market as transportation became increasingly effective. The United States emerged as a major producer together with Australia and Russia. From the early nineteenth century science came to influence agriculture to a high degree.[6] Better crops, animal husbandry, breeding, fertilizers, and methods stimulated increased production.[7] Mechanization also increased and created more efficient forms of agriculture. 'New' products, like butter and cheese, became commodities on the international market and England was the foremost importer of Baltic products.[8] Therefore the dairy industry became one of the most important parts of modern agriculture. The managing of modern export farms demanded knowledge, and enlightenment through education and organization became crucial. In Sweden the County Agricultural Societies (*Hushållningssällskapen*) were founded during the first years of the 1800s with the purpose of developing agriculture on a regional level. The same is also true for the creation of the Royal Swedish Academy of Agriculture (*Lantbruksakademien*). Its purpose was to lead and coordinate agricultural development on the national level.[9] In Galicia and Estonia, small agricultural clubs and reading circles developed with the purpose of spreading new knowledge and methods to farmers. Another purpose of the aforementioned clubs was to educate and 'civilize' smallholders and serfs. The civilization project was at the same time a project of Westernization. However, it was not an appreciation of Western market capitalism as the clubs often promoted cooperative organization as a means to counter the market.

The agrarian ideal – the visions of the agrarian press

The independent farmer has had an almost mythical status in Scandinavian and Baltic history writing. The farm, soil, and forest have been described as the very foundations of society.[10] In the Swedish case there was also a direct link to the political system, as farmers after the Representation Reform of 1866/67, benefited from the electoral system.[11] The agrarian

press idealized agriculture by promoting a system based on rational and market adapted family farms. Through the owning of land and living in harmony with nature farmers were given a special responsibility for the foundations of the nation – local society.[12] The hard-working and firmly-rooted farmer was portrayed as the heart and soul of the nation, as opposed to decadent city dwellers, and the unsound, and rootless worker. The city was the market and therefore important for agriculture, but the cultural aspects of urbanization was seen as a threat to rural society. The very foundation of rational and modern agriculture was described through the terms education and organization. The press argued that if the farmers organized production through cooperatives, agriculture could be rationalized and the benefits of large production units could be obtained. In Central Europe and in the Baltic Sea region agrarianism grew to become strong, and Estonian and Galician agrarian journals often described cooperation as an alternative social model.[13] It was a vision that strongly conflicted with the liberal focus on the economy and the irresponsibility of Socialism. Through cooperation, farmers would be given modern, scientific knowledge and technology, which was otherwise difficult for the individual smallholder to obtain. Furthermore, organization also induced a standardization of regulations. This concerned everything from personal hygiene to bookkeeping and meeting techniques. Standards also concerned the responsibilities of the individual and the relations to the collective. The idealization of agriculture in Sweden, Estonia and Galicia was inspired by the Danish example, where organization had led to prosperous, modern and export-oriented agriculture. Denmark became the role model for agricultural development, also for the transition from grain production to animal husbandry and dairy production. All the journals included in this study also refer to German examples to underscore the advantages of a well-organized cooperative movement with direct connections to the political sphere. In Sweden this already existed, but in both Estonia, and Galicia it was portrayed as something to strive for.[14]

Sources

The Swedish source material consists of the journals *Landtmannen* (The Farmer), *Landtmannens månadsbilaga* (The Farmers' Monthly Appendix) and *Tidskrift för Landtmän* (Journal for Farmers). The last journal originated in Lund and was published between 1880 and 1917 with a yearly volume of around 800 pages. The editors were H. L. O. Winberg, N. Engström and M. Weibull, all with direct relations to leading agrarian and scientific circles. In general *Tidskrift för landtmän* was technical in its appearance and used a scientific language. The main audience for these journals were owners of large farms and estates. There were many other journals and newspapers but the ones studied here existed for longer periods of time. The other journals in general had the same concept of modernization but focused to a large extent on smallholders. *Landtmannen* was published in Linköping between 1890 and 1917, with more or less the same audience as *Tidskrift för landtmän*. The editor, Wilhelm Flach, also belonged to the scientific agricultural circles. He was charged with the explicit task of explaining scientific results, and giving advice concerning rational agriculture. The monthly appendix, however, turned to an audience of smallholders, through its use of uncomplicated language, which consequently led to the propagation of a romantic view on agriculture and the countryside. In the Swedish agrarian press,

traditional elites were quite common (estate owners etc.) along with the new, scientific elites. In general, the journals were politically neutral, but in fact had strong relations to conservatism, both ideologically and individually.[15] There were also many other Swedish agrarian journals promoting smallholder idealization.[16]

There had been a German agrarian press in existence in the Baltic provinces of the Russian Empire since the end of the eighteenth century. Its scientific ambitions were primarily directed towards the Baltic-German estates. Smallholders that were given the opportunity to purchase land in the 1860s instead had to rely on advice in the Estonian-speaking week-press. Agricultural development was usually seen from a national perspective and saw the independent farmer as the foundation of the nation. *Põllumees* (The Farmer) was published between 1895 and 1912 while *Põllutööleht* (The Agriculture Journal) was published between 1906 and 1918 as the first major Estonian agriculture journals. Both were influential, and businesses, organizations, as well as the Russian state, used them to inform those in rural provinces. One of the stipulations of Russian censorship laws included strict specialization in the journal's agricultural issues, even though social and cultural issues were also given attention to. Initially *Põllumees* was issued monthly, but from 1903 it became a weekly magazine. *Põllutööleht* was, from its inception, published weekly, and had monthly appendixes on handicraft, gardening, and cooperation. At its best the Estonian journals were circulated within 2000 copies, approximately a quarter of the editions compared to the cultural journals of the time. The subscribers were often agricultural clubs or villages, meaning that many people read each copy. The editor and founder of *Põllumees* was Henrik Laas, agricultural instructor and autodidact. The larger Estonian agricultural clubs financially supported *Põllumees*. But, *Põllumees* also relied heavily on the voluntary work of students, agronomists, and farmers. Initially the aim was to give basic advice to the 'new' independent farmers, and to persuade them to pursue animal husbandry instead of grain production. The growing strength of the cooperative movement, however, demanded a journal more focused on cooperatives. The answer was *Põllutööleht* published through the support of agronomists and agricultural clubs. The editor was Dr. Aleksandr Eisenschmidt, an economist. His work was crucial for the survival and influence of *Põllutööleht*.[17]

Both *Ekonomist* and *Samopomich* were published by the Crownland Auditing Union (*Kraievyi Soiuz Revizyinyi*, an organization that gathered a multitude of Ruthenian cooperatives) with financial support of other central Ruthenian organizations. The Union was tasked with conducting revisions of cooperatives, which, in turn were obliged to join the Union. Its ethnic profile was thoroughly Ruthenian. *Ekonomist* was founded in 1904 with the explicit aim of theoretically discussing cooperative organization. *Samopomich* was the illustrated appendix to *Ekonomist* and was published from 1909. It was directed at broader peasant groups, and could be purchased separately from the journal. In general, patriotic messages were mixed with concrete advice. The primary task was described as such: to examine the Ruthenian economic organization in Galicia and to explain how the national economy worked. Finally, the task was also to see to it that the 'national property' be used in the best manner. During several years, *Ekonomist* was not financially independent, but was subsidized by the Crownland Auditing Union. At the beginning of 1908, it had 430 subscribers, of whom 148 were cooperatives and organizations. It is safe to assume that many more actually read the journal, than the number of subscribers indicate. Frequently,

reading rooms with many members in the local community subscribed to journals that then could be read by several people, and read aloud to the illiterate. The journals influenced the reading room agenda and the very concept was to spread knowledge to the entire community.[18]

Rationality, modernity and masculinity – the agrarian press and modernization

The title summarizes the crux of the late nineteenth century agrarian discourses. Denmark was the example followed in the Baltic Sea region as well as in other parts of Europe. Danish agriculture was built on small modern export-oriented farms reaching the market through an extensive network of cooperatives. The Danish example was of main interest to the agrarian press. At the same time the general political discourse (between right and left) dominated the discussions on rationality and modernity. Changing the structure of agriculture could for example threaten the traditional self-image of many agrarians. Modern agriculture and popular culture could, for example, threaten traditional village life, but was at the same time unavoidable as economic survival hinged on economic prosperity.

'Strength through unity' – the image of cooperation in the agrarian press

The organizations that grew in Sweden, Estonia and Galicia during the late nineteenth century were heterogeneous, founded on different principles, and functioning on different social levels. Cooperatives often developed from reading-circles, temperance movements, and educational organizations. These became increasingly complex, and influenced local society and the daily life of farmers. In many cases cooperation was described as a new way to cope with the international market. One example of this cooperative vision of the market was developed by dairy consultant K. F. Lundin at the Separator Company in *Tidskrift för landtmän*. Cooperative dairies were generally described as technologically, scientifically and economically superior, and also as better organized than private companies.[19] This was also a common portrayal in Estonian and Galician journals, where milk separators and modern dairies often were depicted.[20]

In the Swedish case, Lundin portrayed private dairies (quite common in Sweden at the time) as non-functional, because they bought milk. This, in turn, led to price speculation, and a lack of quality, as farmers sold milk by volume, and not quality. Contrary to this, the cooperative system was promoted, where farmers were individually responsible for the quality of the milk they produced. Much of the inspiration concerning dairies in the Baltic Sea region came from Denmark. The organization models and statutes in most of the region were Danish. All journals in this study described travels to Denmark and examples from Danish agriculture, lauded as a realized utopia of hygienic and wealthy family farms. Denmark was also the producer of the rules, which concerned hygiene, animal fodder and inspections, which were enforced by Swedish and Estonian cooperatives. The focus on

cooperative dairies also yielded serious efforts to counter household production, primarily that of butter. 'Farm butter' was often produced by women, and was deemed to be a low-quality product that actually threatened production at cooperative dairies.[21]

Also illustrated in the agrarian press were numerous descriptions of meetings and statutes. These descriptions served several purposes, and put the individual farmer or organization into a broader perspective. The mentioning of names and the tacit belief that the reader was already well-acquainted with the discourse created an imaginary feeling of belonging. These descriptions served a pedagogic purpose through acknowledging well-kept organizations, and shaming unorganized groups. The purpose was to promote superior meeting culture in the bourgeois sense of the word. The interest shown by the journals for statutes came from a need to regulate the diverse organizations. It also reflected a zeitgeist where formal rules and laws were central in controlling society and its citizens. There was, however, a difference between the Swedish journals and the Estonian and Galician due to their character. The Swedish journal with their elite approach did not find the need to show how meetings were held.[22]

The period between 1890 and 1910 was characterized by an escalation in organization. This was portrayed as pure modernization, as farmers could improve their income and product quality through cooperatives. Purchase-organizations also became crucial in this process. In Sweden the national purchase-organization *Landtmännen* was created in 1905. Ideally, the cooperatives were created as grassroots organizations; however, most of the organizations in Sweden were top-down, oriented towards elites. The expressed purpose of *Landtmännen* was to combat trusts, but simultaneously function as an arena for ideological discussions, where both conservative and cooperative ideology could be pitched against each other. For example, at the annual meeting of 1907, a lecture on the topic 'The Swedish yeomen are arming against Socialism' was held. These types of right-wing patriarchal messages, a form of conservative modernization, were quite common in the Swedish agrarian press. Both *Landtmannen* and *Tidskrift för landtmän* discussed their fear of trade unions among farmhands and the spreading of Socialism across the countryside. For example, in 1905 strikes were described as 'violent acts' and 'dissolving'. It was believed that the Social structure of agriculture needed to be maintained as a defence against Socialism, anarchism, and cosmopolitanism, enforcing order, enlightenment, and stability. Farmers were believed to have a patriarchal responsibility for the workers as well as for the work of the family. Therefore there was no need for trade unions.[23]

The Ruthenian and Estonian journals described cooperation as the road to the economic emancipation of the underprivileged. The discourse was directed towards the old elites. The cooperative ideology was a first-rate weapon in the hands of the lower stratum of agrarian society, considered to be organic and ancient. The thought was that the pristine and equality-oriented cooperation, built on principles of common work and ownership for the common good had been replaced by regal and noble slave-corporations. Capitalism had later replaced the nobility as the foremost ruler of agrarian life. Therefore the journals put the development of cooperatives into an evolutionary perspective with the purpose of recreating a modern version of the primordial cooperatives.[24]

'The achievements of science must benefit the smallholders'

The question of science in agriculture was a common theme. There was always an important relationship between science and practice in agriculture. The modern farmer could use scientific results in his daily work, incorporating and modifying science for his own needs. The agrarian press had secured the role as the transmitter of scientific and concrete advice; the farmer, on the other hand, had to understand and implement the results.[25] The relationship between science and the agrarian press can be described as very intimate and reflected the discourses of scientific agriculture. One example of this was the interest in animal breeding shown by the press. Genetics was 'the modern science' of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. New breeds of cattle and new crops would be able to liberate agriculture from poverty. The practice of breeding animals easily transformed into the idea of fostering peasants into modern farmers and citizens.[26]

The separation between large and small farms was very important in the Swedish agrarian press. Sometimes the journals criticised the manors for investing too much in costly buildings that would stand for centuries. The concept was that the investments locked production into old methods. Manorial dairies were at times described as 'palace-like'. At the same time smallholders were deemed a bastion for harmful conservatism and old-fashioned methods.[27] The relationship between tradition and modernity in the agrarian press was problematic. Family farming had its virtues, namely that the 'Father' of the household had his own wife and daughters as workers. This meant that he could more easily control and supervise them, constituting a de facto reinforcement of the patriarchal dimension. The tension between upper and lower classes was not as strong in Estonia, as the manors were mostly discussed in the Baltic-German agrarian press. Tradition was not an issue for discourse in the Estonian press. Modernity was, instead, pitched to farmers as the only viable path for those who wanted to survive. Modernity can be found in how farmers were addressed: the farmers were the foundation of modern society, and there could be no looking back. The character of modernity was illustrated with repeated references to agrarian experiments, where results were promoted with exaggerated accuracy. Modernity, however, was almost always limited to the male sphere in agriculture, i.e. fieldwork with large animals. This was very clear in the Estonian journals in the division between a male (productive and modern) and a female sphere (supportive and traditional), and also quite common in the Swedish press. In Galicia, the importance of the female sphere of production was upgraded considerably due to a grand shift in agricultural production promoted by the cooperative movement. However, this process also brought calls for close supervision of the customary female. The ideal was the modern and rational man who could supervise the scientific and efficient farm. This notion of modern agrarian masculinity was an effect of the modern project, but at the same time supported a legacy of patriarchal concepts. Many of the conservative agrarians believed that modernization should only concern production while the social hierarchies should be maintained. Liberal reformers often linked production to social change.[28]

All the papers referenced in the study promote the idea that cooperative efforts should be scientific. For example, the modernization of Ruthenian agriculture focused on improving quality, but also aimed to influence and improve the habits and thoughts of farmers. It was necessary for Ruthenian farmers to abandon traditional thoughts in favour of efficient,

scientific methods, as conveyed by agricultural instructors. All the journals used fabled stories, poems etc. One example is the northern Swedish fertilizer poem from 1905, where the proper way to use fertilizers is described in poetic phrases. It was a way to teach smallholders modern agriculture.[29]

The modern smallholder, mainly in Estonia, was open for new ideas, used modern techniques on his farm, and bought supplies from the cooperative. He was promoted as a positive example to follow, and was contrasted with the conservative majority. In Ruthenian journals, one often wrote of 'enlightened' and 'dark' elements in agrarian society. Traditional concepts concerning envy (the evil eye) were ridiculed. Traditional village meetings, where the richest farmers acted as natural leaders were also thought to be old fashioned. In these cases cooperatives were upheld, by virtue of their liberating and democratic nature.[30] In Sweden, however, the converse was true, as the traditional aristocratic elites acted as central figures in agriculture. Sweden as opposed to Estonia and Galicia was an old nation meaning that there were old structures maintained in society. In Estonia and Galicia the national struggle meant the emancipation of the people, i.e. smallholders.

Modern, scientific and rational agriculture hinged on quite a small group of specialists. The agronomists were often trained in prestigious institutions and/or had practiced in Denmark or Germany (the main examples of modern agriculture). These groups were considered to be the forbearers of modernity. Together with ample descriptions from meetings and exhibitions, the specialists became the progenitors of rational agriculture. Agriculture exhibitions were important, as they allowed for farmers to come into contact with modern technology and science. Competitions were, above all, considered to be a vital tool for the promotion of quality. The language used to describe the exhibitions was almost always very positive. For example, the dairy exhibition at the agriculture meeting in Gävle 1901 was written about lyrically: it was modern, pleasant, roomy, airy, tasteful, brilliant, imposing, and remarkable. Conversely, an historic exhibition of dairy production was described as unhygienic, primitive, smelly, and old fashioned, at which upon sight, according to the writer, the visitors frowned.[31] This very vivid description of modernity was naturally employed to promote modern dairy production. The exhibition was also resplendent with signs and remarks, such as: 'Do not keep milk together with other foods.' The press strived to control and discipline both nature and agriculture. In Estonia, the press stressed that animals at exhibitions should not smell, since this made it harder for visitors to realize the importance of exemplary animal husbandry. The same notions existed in Galicia where the exhibition in Stryi was painstakingly described, with the purpose of stimulating and consolidating modernity.[32]

Education, orderliness, and control

Education was the very foundation for the press, with its mission of spreading the gospel of modernity. Denmark was referred to as the forerunner and there was a need for new and different kinds of educational methods. Ideas concerning education incorporated visions of the future and a need to retain the workforce in the countryside. A common Swedish notion was the need for a patriotic renaissance of both agriculture and the young. In Estonia the press often turned to these youth with concepts of education and responsibility. The

ideal for Estonian men, according to the press, was to attend agricultural schools and travel to see the world. The housewife, on the other hand, was to learn how to run a household and support the man in his labours. The question of education concerned both men and women, but there was a notable difference: men were to go abroad, or to certain universities, whereas women were to be educated close to home. Estonian journals argued vehemently against allowing women to travel to cities for education. They argued that there, instead of becoming good housewives, they would learn silly things like baking cakes and folding paper flowers.[33] In Sweden there was talk about light, feminine work as opposed to the healthy rural lifestyle.

In Sweden, patriarchal ideas concerning education were also to be found. The agrarian press believed that smallholders had to be incorporated into modern society. They were generally believed to be incapable of seeing anything outside their own egocentric sphere. Therefore they were not mature for political citizenship. Education was described as the 'natural' way to enforce the patriotic duty of the smallholders. With respects to this issue, there exists a nominal difference between Sweden and Estonia/Galicia. The Swedish agrarian press encompassed all kinds of farmers, whereas the Estonian/Galician press turned, more or less, only to smallholders. Therefore the Swedish press was more patriarchal, and attempts to 'nationalise' the smallholders were a frequent occurrence. In Sweden agriculture was often celebrated as the future of the nation (at least by certain groups). Agriculture also became a conservative ideological marker, and a cultural symbol for tradition. This was the dichotomy between tradition and modernity.

The project of rationality in agriculture also implied the need for the modernization of housework. This was often based in a traditional and hierarchical sphere. *Tidskrift för landtmän* reported in 1890 that the primary quality of the housewife was orderliness. The household needed to be clean and in symmetry; the daily work should be conducted according to a written diary, meals should be served at the same time every day, towels and sheets changed at defined intervals. The housewife was to have firm control over her staff, but need not be a tyrant. The work should be led under her strict and firm hand, but she should not lack kindness and patience. The scientific approach also included concepts of nutrition. In the Swedish agrarian press, the human body was described as a machine in need of fuel. A well-fed body was resistant to illness. Meat was the essential part of the diet: ancient Greeks and Romans owed their resiliency as warriors to a predominantly meat-based diet.[34] Threats to the rational, effective and controlled home were perceived to be: ignorance, laziness, and comfort.[35] There was a perceived need to control female labour, which also led to the control of the incomes of women. This was particularly valid for the important income from the sector with rising importance: dairy production.[36] In Galicia, the press wrote that women had to be drawn out from the darkness and led onto the road of modernity. Cooperatives and other 'enlightened' Ruthenian organizations would be working in vain if women and men who adhered to a customary world-view and ways of production would be left to their own doings.

The relationship between the sexes in the Swedish, Estonian, and Galician agrarian press followed traditional gender divisions, but modernization brought forth change, as the female tasks were the most modern and economically successful. In Estonia, dairy production was described as being reinvented and brought to the ignorant masses. The changing economic patterns resulted in an increased interest in dairy rationalization, and,

logically also led to masculinization.[37] In Galicia, the press believed that the female tasks (dairy production and animal husbandry) were too important to be left to women alone. There was a need to re-orientate agricultural production from grain to dairy production and cattle breeding (including petty cattle and poultry, customarily a female domain). The changing hierarchies and gender patterns meant that women in dairy production were often described as old-fashioned, dirty, unhygienic, irrational, and traditional. Such women would also be depicted as 'dark' and 'ignorant', and the logic was that this would also affect the cooperatives. Folk beliefs and customs concerning witchcraft and taboos concerning milk existed in Galicia as well.[38]

The agrarian press was tasked with delineating the ideal dairy industry. The primary objective was hygiene, which had strong ties to gender patterns as women were often described as unclean. Handling female labour thus became an important task for the modernizers, who decreed that barns should be clean, airy, ventilated, and filled with well-fed animals. Similarly, dairymaids should be clean, properly-dressed and milk at the designated time. In 1898, *Landtmannen* proposed a Danish example to come to terms with quality in milk production. Competent dairymaids were hard to find and manors often had to use 'full-grown' men to milk the cows. The solution proposed that owners hold a young and energetic man responsible for all dairy work. He should have his own household and live with the workers. This would, according to the article, bring interested and competent maids and farmhands. The solution apparently lay in enforcing a traditional form of social control and creating a patriarchal family. It was the young, efficient and rational man who could lead the farm work through patriarchy.[39] This strictly gendered understanding was common, but the Swedish press also mirrored other concepts. One example comes from Malmöhus County in 1883. The article reflects on the need to educate competent dairymen and dairymaids. Men and women received an almost identical education, both theoretically and practically. Women also received training on how to manage a steam engine, a contraption generally belonging to the male sphere. The only difference was that men did not receive training in reading/writing and counting, as this was only part of the female curriculum. Ideals and rules concerning the orderliness of both male and female students were omnipresent.[40] The criteria for the male courses at Alnarp in 1880 were: he should be over eighteen years old, well reputed, have good knowledge of Scripture, and no contagious diseases. This required certificates from both the priest and a doctor. Furthermore, a potential student was required to have good knowledge of Swedish, arithmetic, physics, political geography, and a basic knowledge of history.[41] The recognized need to foster the youth, in order that they remain in agriculture was a frequent issue. Of further importance were the adult education colleges, where education in history, geography, political science, singing and physical education were held, with the purpose of producing full-grown patriotic citizens. In Galicia, education was equally important. There was a distinct difference between the education given by instructors and the education given at agriculture schools for the youth, as it was directed to different age groups. Instructors teaching active smallholders often focused strictly on practical advice. Agricultural schools for the young, for example, the school for girls in Mylovaniie, implemented more theoretical instructions.

Agriculture, nation, and politics

The political aspects of agriculture were of importance in the Swedish case, and there were ample attempts to mobilize farmers against the left. There was, however, a broad spectrum of organizations – most of them were not political and only engaged in economic activities. At the same time, several political agrarian movements were founded, drawing their inspiration from Europe, particularly from Germany. The Swedish *Agrarförbundet* (Agrarian Union) was founded in 1895. It was often referred to in the agrarian press, but not always positively. Both Swedish journals meant that political agrarian organizations did not always benefit agriculture. Most importantly, the tariff question, threatened to divide the farmers. *Landtmannen* proposed a broad union of farmers with an aim to unite them. *Agrarförbundet* on the other hand, aimed at forming a broad organization, but was completely controlled by traditional agrarian and conservative elites. The ideology was to preserve the position of agriculture in society and to counter all forms of franchise reforms.[42] The link between conservatism and agriculture in Sweden was quite similar to the situation in Germany.[43]

The Ruthenian and Estonian cooperatives had a strong nationalist identity. The Ruthenian journals in principle held that Ruthenian peasants could not obtain basic civil liberties through the Polish cooperative movement (often active in same areas). There was always the perceived threat from the Poles to polonise the Ruthenian farmers. Polish was the administrative language and Polish culture was the unifying factor for the Polish 'agricultural circles' (*Kółka Rolnicze*). The Ruthenian journals were suspicious of the Polish authorities in the Crownland, believing that they only benefited Polish organizations and counteracted Ruthenian ones. Therefore the journals proposed that Ruthenians take matters into their own hands. Only through economic prosperity could Ruthenians in the Double Monarchy acquire the same political rights as other groups (for instance Czechs, Germans, and Poles). *Ekonomist* and *Samopomich* also questioned local organizations, especially the existence of 'foreign' and 'hostile' elements (Poles and Jews). While Poles were seen as the traditional overlords, the Jews were seen as the henchmen of the Poles or as scrupulous competitors. Both groups would sooner or later outfox the Ruthenians if within the framework of the same organization. The Russophiles (the minority that saw the Ruthenians in Galicia and in the Ukrainian lands under Tsarist rule as part of the Russian people) were also on their way out from the Ukrainophile cooperative structures. The overwhelming majority of the elite of the cooperative movement was strictly Ukrainophile, and believed that Ruthenians in Austria and the Russian Empire constituted an ethnic group linguistically and culturally distinct from Russians and other Slavic peoples. As the cooperatives were seen as a road between Capitalism and Socialism, the numbers of potential members decreased even further, as neither capitalists nor revolutionaries were welcome. Priests were frequently active in the formation of Ruthenian cooperatives and agricultural development, lending it a conservative tone. In Estonia, the national question was not as complicated as in Galicia. The journals could not campaign on nationalist ground due to the Russian censorship rules. The basic argument, however, that economic development was a precondition for political emancipation, was frequently expressed.[44] One thing that separates Sweden from the other cases is that the Swedish agrarian journals were slightly more conservative while Estonian and Galician journals were more agrarianist.[45]

The scientist and the farmer – broadcasters and receivers

In general, the agrarian press contained three different broadcasters: the scientist, the estate-owner, and the agitator. It is not always easy to differentiate between the three roles, and there was commonly a mix of roles. The scientist was characterized by a direct relationship to the scientific domain through universities or agrarian organizations. In Sweden there was also a link to traditional agrarian elites (officers and nobility). At the same time, the scientist was the core of an emerging elite with an academic habitus, as opposed to traditional hierarchies. The scientist mediated scientific theories to benefit the practices of the modern farmers. The articles of the scientist often illustrated the modernity and rationality of agricultural development. The editor of *Landtmannen*, Wilhelm Flach belonged to this category of scientific broadcasters. The enlightened farmer was the main audience and was most likely the owner of large- and middle-sized farms with potential for rational farming. They also had a basic education that allowed them to implement the modernity of the scientific articles. Another example was Ivan Petrushevych, a Ruthenian activist. He studied biology, history and political science at Heidelberg, Jena, and Prague. He had also worked several years at the prosperous British cooperative – Rochdale. He spread his vision of the Rochdale-model through *Ekonomist* and through his work in the organization *Narodna Torhovlia* (People's Trade).[46]

The estate-owner was another common broadcaster in the Swedish agrarian press and often applied a patriarchal, top-down perspective in relation to the development of small farms. Distinguishing estate-owners from scientists is not easy, since they often belonged to the same network. One example of the more traditional broadcasters was Vilhelm Nauckhoff, the Secretary of *Agrarförbundet*. He was also a cavalry officer and estate-owner with an expressed interest in horse breeding. The primary purpose of estate-owner's propaganda was to counter Socialism and trade unions. The estate-owners often stood for a conservative approach in Swedish agrarian press. In the Estonian and Galician journals the position of the estate-owners was completely different. There was an ethnic division in Estonia as the nobility was Baltic-German and the farmers were Estonian. The Baltic-German estates were often described as the direct opposite of modern Estonian family-farms. There were however estate-owners, like Count Gerg, who proposed modernization in both the Baltic-German and Estonian press. His vision was to unite the agrarian groups against urbanization, and not to maintain the patriarchal order. In Sweden, there were also progressive estate-owners in the agrarian press. Count Hugo Hamilton held many central positions in agriculture during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He was often referred to as the 'red count' due to his moderate-liberal approach. He was the chairman of the national purchase organization *Landtmännen* from its founding in 1905. The estate-owners in general spoke to the owners of large farms and other estate-owners. The language was often traditional, using phrases relating to social order and hierarchy. But estate-owners also often spoke to smallholders, using a patriarchal and romantic language.

In the Estonian and Ruthenian Galician journals, the agitator was a very common figure. The similarities to the scientist are many, but the agitator had to employ a more pedagogical language in order to reach to the entire peasantry with visions of, and advice on,

economic development and successful cooperative organization. Excellent examples were the editor of *Põllumees*, Henrik Laas and the Swedish dairy consultant K. F. Lundin. Both declared the need to rationalize and modernize dairy production. Their habitus often went outside the agrarian sphere and united theoretical knowledge and practical skills with a pedagogic language. The agitator often appeared in papers like *Landtmannens Månadsblad* with its decidedly romantic and patriotic approach. In both Estonian and Swedish journals there were several texts translated from the Finnish organization *Pellervo*. Articles and slogans like 'one for all and all for one' and 'nothing is mine but everything is ours' were strongly ideological. Cooperatives were described as a large family where nobody stood alone and friends could always be found in the cooperative. The principles of enlightenment held strong ground with Ruthenian editors. One example was Sydir Kuzyk, an agronomist from Kraków University. He was active in *Prosvita* and *Silskyi Hospodar*, organizations promoting cultural and agrarian enlightenment. He also initiated an experimental field under the protection of *Prosvita*. Another example was Andrei Zhuk from the Russian part of Ukraine, where he had served several years in prison for 'revolutionary activities'. After his prison term, he moved to the eastern part of Habsburg Galicia and promoted cooperative organization as a method to reshape society.[47]

Conclusion

To conclude, there were many similarities between Swedish, Estonian, and Galician agrarian journals. They all used similar kinds of arguments, same kind of language and debated cooperative organization much in the same way. The reason for this was that the agrarian press was part of an all-European agrarian context of modernization and rationalization. There was an extensive exchange of information, primarily through descriptions of travels. This meant that similar phenomenon occurred at the same time all over Europe and North America. An example of this was the great interest shown for Danish agricultural development in the agrarian press, and the Swedish and Estonian press periodically looked to Finland as a forerunner. The people behind the agrarian press also showed similarities. They had, more or less, the same education and background. In this case Sweden was somewhat different, because hierarchy held more weight in discourse. The variations between the journals can be attributed to different national contexts, something very obvious concerning Galicia, where cooperatives became tools for a national revival.

References

1 This article is the result of the comparative research project 'Agrarian Change and Ideological Formation' at Södertörn University funded by the Baltic Sea Foundation.

2 Põllumees (1895) 1.

3 Donald Marti, Agricultural Journalism and the Diffusion of Knowledge. The First Half-Century in America, in: Agricultural History (1989) 4, 28 f.

4 Francis Sejersted, Socialdemokratins tidsålder: Sverige och Norge under 1900-talet, Nora 2005, 3.

5 Sverker Sörlin, Bonden som ideal, in: Bo Larsson (ed.), Bonden i dikt och verklighet, Stockholm 1993, 22–36, here 22. Sigridur Mathiasdotthir/Ann-Catrin Östman, Möte mellan manligheter. Nationalism, bond-

eideal och (åter)skapande av de övre skiktens manlighetsideal, in: Göran Fredriksson (ed.), Könsmaktens förvandlingar. En vänbok till Anita Göransson, Göteborg 2003, 91–108 here 63 f.

6 Carl-Johan Gadd, Det svenska jordbrukets historia. Band 3: Den agrara revolutionen 1700–1870, Stockholm 2000; Mats Morell, Det svenska jordbrukets historia. Band 4: Jordbruket i industrisamhället 1870–1945. Stockholm 2001; Juhan Kahk/Enn Tarvel, An Economic History of the Baltic Countries, Stockholm 1997.

7 Erland Mårald, Jordens kretslopp. Lantbruket, staden och den kemiska vetenskapen 1840–1910, Umeå 2000, 225.

8 U. Toivo Raun, Modernization and the Estonians: 1860–1914, in: Arvids Ziedonis, jr/William L. Winter/Mardi Valgemäe (eds.), Baltic History: Papers presented at the third Conference on Baltic studies: Toronto 1972, Columbus/Ohio 1974, 135; Juhan Kahk, Uue põllumajanduse algus Eestis 1860–1880, in: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Toimetised: Ühiskonnateaduse (1984) 2, 105–123; Juhan Kahk, About the Birth of Modern life in Estonian village (an Attempt of methodological study of Problems of Periodization), Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Toimetised: Humanitaar- ja Sotsiaalteadused (1994) 3, 337.

9 Jan Stattin, Hushållningssällskapen och agrarsamhällets förändring: utveckling och verksamhet under 1800-talets första hälft, Uppsala 1980; Nils Edling, För modernäringens modernisering. Två studier av Kungl. Skogs- och Lantbruksakademiens tillkomst och tidiga historia, Stockholm 2003.

10 Nina Witoszek, Fugitives from Utopia: The Scandinavian Enlightenment reconsidered, in: Öystein Sørensen/Bo Stråth (eds.), The Cultural Construction of Norde, Oslo 1997, 72–89, here 72.

11 The Representation reform meant the enforcement of a two chamber parliament as opposed to the previous system of the four estates. In Sweden the farmers had their own estate and played a political role before any franchise reforms came into being.

12 Johan Eelland, Cultivating the Rural Citizen: Modernity, Agrarianism and Citizenship in Late Tsarist Estonia, Stockholm 2007, 75–80.

13 Eelland, Cultivating the Rural Citizen, see fn. 12, 197; Piotr Wawrzeniuk, Agents of 'True Emancipation'. Ukrainophile Ruthenian Cooperatives in Eastern Galicia 1880–1914, in: Id. (ed.), Societal Change and Ideological Formation among the Rural Population of the Baltic Area 1880–1939, Flemingsberg 2008, 95–101. See also Ray Abrahams/Juhan Kahk, Barons and Farmers. Continuity and Transformation in Rural Estonia (1816–1994), Göteborg 1994.

14 Piimatalituse koraldus Danimaal, in: Postimees (1899), 192 f.; Daani rahwa-majandusest, in: Põllumees (1899) 11; Daani Pimatalituse edenemisest, in: Põllumees (1904) 24; Põllumehe kiri Daanimaalt, in: Põllutööleht (1907) 14; and Postimees (1912) 112, Kuidas ühistegewuse-liikumisele Eestis alus pandi, in: Ühistegewusleht (1913), 3; B. Böggild, Om mjölkningen på herrgårdarne, in: Landtmannen (1898), Nr. 49; Leonard Holmström, Det danska folkets höga ståndpunkt inom mejeriväsendet och några reflexioner deröfver, in: Tidskrift för Landtmän (1892) 23; Wilhelm Flach, Landtbruks- och folkhögskolornas betydelse för utvecklingen af Danmarks landtbruk, in: Landtmannen (1897) 43. Concerning the Swedish articles, the numbers after the brackets is the issue of the journal. Each year is bound together and there is an index of the articles.

15 Fredrik Eriksson, Modernity, Rationality and Citizenship: Swedish Agrarian Organizations as Seen Through the Lens of the Agrarian Press ca. 1880–1917, in: Piotr Wawrzeniuk (ed.), Societal Change and Ideological Formation among the Rural Population of the Baltic Area 1880–1939, Flemingsberg 2008, 141–168, here 142–144.

16 For example: Per Jönson Rösiö was a smallholder idealist promoting visions of an agrarian society built on prosperous smallholders, in his journal *Svea* and his books *Revolt*. See also John Toler, Per Jönson Rösiö: the 'agrarian prophet'. A charismatic Leader's Attempt to Rejuvenate Small Agriculture and Create a Commitment to a Cultural Revolt against Industrialism in Sweden 1888–1928 (Stockholm Studies in History 47), Stockholm 1992. Another example was the editor John L. Saxon and his paper *Såningmannen* (The Sower). See Sven-Bertil Jansson, Den uppkäftige såningsmannen. John L. Saxon och hans tid, Stockholm 2005.

17 Eelland, Ruled Citizen, see fn. 12, 61; See also Epp Lauk, On the Development of Estonian Journalism from 1900 to 1914, in: Aleksander Loit (ed.), The Baltic Countries 1900–1914 (Studia Baltica Stockholmiensia 5), Stockholm 1990, 539–554; Epp Lauk/Peeter Vilhalemm/Svennik Höijer, Towards a Civic Society. The Baltic Media's Long Road to Freedom, Tartu 1993.

18 Wawrzeniuk, Change and Idealogical, see fn. 15, 100 f; John-Paul Himka, Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century, Houndmills 1988, 86–104.

19 K. F. Lundin, Är vårt mejeriväsende tillfredsställande och för framtiden betryggande, in: Tidskrift för Landtmän (1890), 17, 19, 21; K. F. Lundin, Om andelsmejerier, Stockholm 1890.

20 Eellend, Rural Citizen, see fn. 12, 207.
21 Olof Brandesten, Lantbrukarnas organisationer. Agrart och kooperativt 1830–1930, Stockholm 2005, 137–164.
22 Eellend, Rural Citizen, see fn. 12, 217 f.; H. L. O. Winberg, Landtbruksklubben i Stockholm, in: Tidskrift för Landtmän (1894), H. L. O. Winberg, Sveriges Agrarförbunds årsmöte, in: Tidskrift för Landtmän (1899) 2.
23 Eriksson, Swedish Agrarian Organization, see fn. 15, 151 f.
24 Inimese elu, in: Põllumees (1898) 1; Ostuühisus ja ühistegewusemõtte, in: Postimees (1901) 234, supplement; Põllumees ja teadus, in: Põllumees (1895) 6; and in: Põllumajandus (1910) 1; Ajaloo pildid, in: Linda (1898) 2.
25 H. L. O. Winberg, Något om konsten att läsa, in: Tidskrift för Landtmän (1882) 34.
26 Põllumees ja teadus, in: Põllumees (1895) 6; Laityrus silvestri (mets-seahernes), in: Põllumees (1895) 4; Metsaasjandus, in: Põllumees (1895) 3; Mis külimese juures tuleb tähele panna, in: Põllumees (1899) 3; Wiljapuude waenlased ja nende hävitamine, in: Põllumees (1897) 1; Puu koore mardikad ja abinõue nende wastu, in: Põllumees (1897) 9; Karjaloomade tõuud, in: Põllumees (1900) 1; See also Mathias Eidenbenz, 'Blut und Boden'. Zur Funktion und Geneses der Methaphern des Agrarianismus und Biologismus in der nationalsozialistischen Bauernpropaganda R. W. Darrés (Europäische Hochschulschriften 580, Reihe III), Bern 1897.
27 H. L. O. Winberg, Kan jordbruket på mindre egendomar i Sverige i allmänhet anses gå framåt?, in: Tidskrift för Landtmän (1881) 29. Editorial, Några framstående smärre svenska jordbruk, in: Landtmannens månadsbilaga (1903) 12; Editorial, Småbrukets betydelse, in: Landtmannens månadsbilaga (1908) 19; H. L. O. Winberg, Om landtmannabyggnader, in: Tidskrift för Landtmän (1883) 5.
28 Eellend, Ruled Citizen, see fn. 12, 79 f.; Eriksson, Swedish Agrarian Organization, see fn. 15, 156 f.; Wawrzeniuk, Societal Change, see fn. 15, 111–114.
29 Editorial, Från en småbrukarkurs i Norrbotten, in: Landtmannens månadsbilaga (1905) 2.
30 Ekonomist (1906) 12; Samopomich (1909) 2; Inimese elu, in: Põllumees (1898) 1; Koondamise ja parema koralduse poole, in: Ühistegewusleht (1909) 26; Editorial, Lantmannaföreningsväsendet, in: Praktiskt Lantbruk (1903) 19.
31 M. Weibull, Landtbruksmötet i Gefle, in: Tidskrift för Landtmän (1901) 32.
32 Ekonomist (1909) 10, in: Samopomich (1909), 9 f.
33 Tululised näpunäited perenaistele, in: Põllummees (1895) 6; Perenase kirjad perenaistele ja neidudelle, in: Majapidaja (1906), 1 f., 4; Armsad kaasõed!, in: Käsitööleht (1907) 1; Käsi- ja kodutöö osakond, in: Käsitööleht (1907) 5; Eesti Põllumeeste Seltside näitusel peetud wäike seletuskõne kodukäsitöö kohta, in: Käsitööleht (1907) 9; Eriksson, Swedish Agrarian Organization, see fn. 15, 159–162.
34 Editorial, För hushållet: Menniskans föda, in: Tidskrift för Landtmän (1890) 6, this article was a direct translation from a German original published in *Stütze der Hausfrau*.
35 Wilhelm Flach, Jordbruksundervisning för kvinnor, in: Landtmannen (1906) 14.
36 Lena Sommestad, Från mejerska till mejerist. En studie av mejeriyrkets maskuliniseringsprocess, Lund 1992; Bengt Ankarloo, Agriculture and Women's Work: Directions of Change in the West 1700–1900, in: Journal of Family History (1979) 4, 111–120; Kirsti Niskanen, Föreställningar om kön. Ett genusperspektiv på jordbrukets modernisering (Studies in Economic History 31), Stockholm 1998; Carolyn Sachs, The Invisible Farmers. Women in Agricultural Production, Totowa/New Jersey 1983; Ann-Catrin Östman, Mjölk och jord. Om kvinnlighet, manlighet och arbete i ett österbottniskt jordbrukssamhälle ca 1870–1940, Åbo 2000.
37 Samopomich (1909) 7; (1910) 7.
38 B. Böggild, Om mjölkningen på herrgårdarne, in: Landtmannen (1898) 49.
39 Editorial, Malmöhus löns hushållningssällskaps mejeriundervisningskurser, in: Tidskrift för Landtmän (1883) 37.
40 Editorial, Undervisningen i mejeriskötsel vid Alnarps landtbruksinstitutet, in: Tidskrift för Landtmän (1883) 46 and (1883) 47.
41 Eriksson, Swedish Agrarian Organization, see fn. 15, 149 f.; Fredrik Eriksson, Det reglerade undantaget. Högerns jordbrukspolitik 1904–2004, Stockholm 2004.
42 Hans-Jürgen Puhle, Agrarische Intressenpolitik und Preussischer Konservatismus im Wilhelmischen Reich (1893–1914). Ein Beitrag zur Analyse des Nationalismus in Deutschland am Beispiel des Bundes der Landwirte und Deutsche Konservativen Partei, Hannover 1966.
43 Samopomich (1909) 1; Mark Baker, Peasants, Power and Revolution in the Village. A Social History of Kharkiv Province 1914–1921, Cambridge/Mass. 2001; Ljuben Berov, The Idea of a Cooperative Society in

Eastern European Peasant Movements during the Interwar Period, in: Ferenc Glatz (ed.), Modern Age – Modern Historian. In Memoriam György Ránki, Budapest 1990, 265–286; Iaroslav Hrytsak, Ukrainska revolutsiia 1914–1923. Novi interpretatsii, in: Id. (ed.), Strasti za natsionalizmom. Istorychni esei, Kyiv 2004.

44 For discussions on Agrarianism see Georg M. Dimitrov, Agrarianism, in: Feliks Gross (ed.), European Ideologies. A Survey of 20th Century Political Ideas, New York 1948, 396–450; Henry Landsberger, Rural Protest. Peasant Movements and Social Change, New York 1973; Branko M. Peselj, Peasantism: It's Ideology and Achievements, in: C. E. Black (ed.), Challenge in East Europe, New Brunswick 1954, 109–131, here 102 f.

45 L. A. Pynda, Diiachi kooperatyvnoho rukhu Halychyny (1873–1939 rr.), Lviv 1995, 67.

46 Pynda, Diiachi kooperatyvnoho, see fn. 45, 57, 15.