

The Governing of Shopkeepers in Sweden: The Shop Opening Hours Discussions, 1904–1991

Åsa-Karin ENGSTRAND

Department of Social and Welfare Studies and Department of Management and Engineering, Linköping University, Sweden

This article analyses how shopkeepers were governed in the Swedish shop opening hours discussion between 1904 and 1991. The article examines how different “problematisations”, i.e., the questioning of governing, lead to particular regimes of practices. These regimes were made visible with particular techniques (mainly inquiries performed by experts) and were informed by various forms of knowledge, i.e. social and welfare issues in the 1904–1919 period, welfare and consumerism in the 1930–1948 period, welfare, efficiency, rationalisation and large-scale benefits in the 1955–1966 period, consumerism and large-scale benefits during the 1970s, and in the final period (1980s–1990s), freedom of the market. These different forms of knowledge came to determine the very existence of shopkeepers but also consumers. The article demonstrates how the problematisations, forms of knowledge and regimes were interlinked and exhibited change as well as continuity over time. However, the regimes are highly contingent, which means that they can be resisted. The perspective of governmentality allows to reflect on consumers as governing subjects. Consumers’ late evening and Sunday shopping practices contribute to the governing of both consumers and shopkeepers alike.

Key words: shopkeepers, forms of knowledge, regimes of practice, governmentality, shop opening hours, Sweden

Introduction

We live in a time when scholars, media and politicians are obsessed with small businesses as creators of new jobs and growth. Scase and Goffee argue that this became a prevailing conception in Western economies in the 1980s (Scase and Goffee, 1987). Contemporary literature on small-business and entrepreneurship tells us that perceptions of small business have changed from inefficient units to engines for economic growth (Audretsch and Beckmann, 2007). Alternative voices to the inefficiency discourse are described as “few and far between” (Audretsch and Beckmann, 2007: 38).

However, this narrative of a historical shift raises the question of whether these perceptions are applied to all kinds of small business, irrespectively of industries. Can a history of small business really be reduced to an account of “bad then-good now”? Arguably, small firms have been conceptualised differently throughout history. If we focus on one specific type of small business, the shopkeepers, we find that, for example, Adam Smith argued that “some political writers” had prejudices against shopkeepers and tradesmen, “without foundation”. He saw these firms as harmless, there was thus no need for taxing them or restricting their numbers, because they could never multiply in any way that would “hurt the publick” (Smith, 1937, cited in Phillips, 1979: 331–332). For a more recent account, Alexander and Phillips show that the perceptions of the British shopkeeper as “inefficient” was questioned during the 1930s (Alexander and Phillips, 2006).

However, more knowledge about how “truths” are produced about small business in general and shopkeepers in particular can be achieved by introducing the perspective of governmentality. This approach is inspired by Foucault’s history of knowledge: “how men govern by the production of truth” (Foucault, 1991, cited in Gunn, 2000: 708). Thus, the aim of this article is to show how shopkeepers were governed during the twentieth century in Sweden. More specifically, I analyse this governing in the discussions of shop opening hours between 1904 and 1991. Rather than, for example, researching unions’ or consumer attitudes towards free shopping hours (Gråbacke, 2000; Grünhagen, Grove and Gentry, 2003), deregulation as part of a social-democratic policy (Hjelm, 2006), or economic effects of shop opening hours (Gradus, 1996), I would like to analyse what Dean calls *problematizations*, i.e. how governing in the form of free or regulated shop opening hours was called into question. These problematizations were made on the basis of particular *regimes of practices*, with particular techniques and language. Additionally, I analyse how these regimes were informed by various *forms of knowledge* and *expertise* (Dean, 1999). Governing is not solely an activity that takes place in Government, but also among agencies and authorities, and in local government, among those I call “the experts”. These “experts” and their forms of knowledge play an important part in our understanding of how (de)regulation could take place. The problematizations and forms of knowledge are expressed by members of parliament, retail experts, and representatives of unions and retail associations. In identifying problems and proposing solutions, they also defined shopkeepers, their duties, rights and needs. I also show how these shopkeepers were expected to act in certain instances. However, shopkeepers were not governed in isolation, but their duties, rights and so on were related to the consumer

and the retail worker. Thus, to tell a story of the governing of shopkeepers is also to tell a story of governing of consumers and retail workers.

Others have emphasised the importance of taking into account the broader economic, political and social environment when researching retail history. Benson and Ugolini argue that historians ought to consider “the impact of legislative and regulatory activity” (Benson and Ugolini, 2003: 10). Alexander and Phillips point out that the independent shopkeeper in Britain was incorporated into discussions of governmental intervention in retail regulation, economies of scale and monopolistic practices (Alexander and Phillips, 2006).

Dean, following the work of Deleuze, emphasises visibility and the technical aspect of government (Dean, 1999). These two dimensions are closely interlinked with the use of sources. The Swedish government uses public inquiries as a technique for problem-solving. In the beginning of the twentieth century officials in the authorities, for example in the Swedish National Board of Health and Welfare (*Socialstyrelsen*) conducted shop opening hour inquiries. During the 1930s, the inquiry committees consisted of representatives from the Shopkeepers’ Association, the Commercial Employees’ Union, and Parliament. This continued to be the case in the 1948, 1955, 1965, 1971 and 1977 inquiries. During the 1980s, many public inquiries in general were conducted by a single person. The 1991 shop hour inquiry led by the managing director of the Swedish Pharmaceutical Company is an example of such an inquiry. The inquiries are often, but not always, followed by a government bill, which is sometimes debated in Parliament. The public inquiries are sometimes followed by a motion to Parliament. Thus, I have also used this source material when I found it relevant.¹

I must comment on the use of different concepts. In Swedish, a number of concepts were used at different times to describe traders. At the beginning of the century, the Swedish word *butikägare*, which is synonymous in English with shopkeeper, was used. The term *minuthandlare* was also used (retail trader), *innehavare av småbutiker* (owner of small shops), *små företag* (small businesses), and *köpmän* (merchant, trader). In the 1950s the concept of *småföretag* (small businesses), but also *affärsinnehavare* (shopkeeper) was more usual. In the mid 1960s two words, *närhetsbutik* and *servicebutik*, were used for the same thing in English, a convenience store. I have chosen the concept *shopkeeper* for those words signifying the owner

¹ This article is partly based on a comprehensive study of the shop hour discussions; see Engstrand, 2007.

of small shops and the concept convenience store for both *närhetsbutik* and *servicebutik*.

The article is outlined as follows. I analyse how shopkeepers and consumers were governed during five periods, each marked by official inquiries. In the first period, 1904–1919, demands for regulation from shopkeepers reached members of Parliament and successive regulations were introduced. In the second period, 1930–1948, demands for consumer needs were raised but were compared to care for shopkeepers and workers, thus leading to the keeping of the regulation. The third period, 1955–1966, was marked by an increasing acknowledgement of consumer needs and a successive deregulation by the introduction of a local exemption system. The fourth period, the 1970s, included the introduction of free shop opening hours in 1971 and successive inquiries as to the benefits of this free system. The fifth period, the 1980s and 1990s, is characterised by retaining free shop opening hours. The article ends with some concluding remarks.

Freedom or caring: the introduction of Sunday and seven o'clock closing 1904–1919

Around the turn of the twentieth century, the “social issue” had become increasingly important. In 1890, the Confederation of Trade Unions (*Land-sorganisationen*, LO) was founded, followed by the Confederation of Employers (*Svenska arbetsgivareföreningen*, SAF) in 1902. In 1906, SAF acknowledged workers’ rights to form unions and LO acknowledged the right of employers to direct and distribute work (Schön, 2000). Demands for social reforms came from both social-democrats and liberals and the social policy took a new direction – towards an increased public responsibility for individuals’ welfare and state insurances (Schön, 2000).

Requirements for the regulation of free shop opening hours should be seen in this context; contemporary economist Sven Brisman argued that “economic liberalism is dead and everybody agrees that society must intervene” (Brisman, 1916: 264). We can see this development as a change from *laissez-faire* to social liberalism.

In 1904, the Liberal MP Mr. Karlsson in the second chamber, argued in a motion that employees in a number of professions had received the benefit of a working day, which lay within “reasonable limits”. However, a problem was that shopkeepers and retail workers still, in many cases, endured “excessively long working hours”. It seemed impossible to achieve shorter working hours on a voluntary basis. Mr. Karlsson referred to the opinions from different shopkeeper organisations and the practices in Norway, Germany and England (Karlsson, 1904). Both shopkeepers and retail

workers were the focus. Mr. Karlsson argued that the retail worker asked himself why he must continue to work when the industrial worker had gone home several hours earlier (Karlsson, 1904). The long working hours were also problematic in relation to leisure time: The shopkeeper had to do the book-keeping at night and he could spend barely any time of the day with his family (Karlsson, 1904).

The Committee on the Law discussed whether the government really had a responsibility to intervene to reduce the problems caused by the release of free competition (The Committee on the Law, 1904). The Committee proposed an inquiry into municipal law to determine closing hours (The Committee on the Law, 1904). In the subsequent parliamentary debate in the first chamber, the Right-wing MP Mr. Hasselrot questioned the Committee's proposal (Parliamentary Debate in first chamber, 1904). The Right-wing MP Mr. Trygger raised the freedom aspect and he believed they should legislate with great caution: "Individuals should be given freedom, and legislation should only apply when there is a real need. Otherwise, society will be so entangled by law, that all activities wane and the individual ultimately does not know where he should go" (Parliamentary Debate in first chamber, 1904: 15).

The concept of freedom was also the focus of the second chamber debate. The Liberal MP Mr. Persson complained that legislations were generally becoming more common (Parliamentary Debate in second chamber, 1904). However, Right-wing MP Mr. Fahlbeck argued that shopkeepers wanted more regulated closing hours, because they were subject to severe and unfair competition, and additionally because they cared about their assistants (Parliamentary Debate in first chamber, 1904). Mr. Sandqvist, member of the Protectionist Party, said that the government was required to correct wrongs. When free trade was introduced in 1864, competition was released and had become unstoppable (Parliamentary Debate in first chamber, 1904). Mr. Leman, a member of the Right-wing Minority Party, claimed that although he had always previously opposed the protection laws and had been accused of representing the most extreme Manchester theories, he was now defending a protection law. One reason that he had changed his mind was that the issue was not a struggle between employers and employees, but that this was a regulation that the employers themselves wanted (Parliamentary Debate in first chamber, 1904). Mr. Wieselgren of the Right-wing Minority Party indicated that there was something "ruthless", something "too much in the style of the old Manchester theory", arguing that just because one shopkeeper wanted extended opening hours to increase profits, then this "intense work" should be followed by every-

body else (Parliamentary Debate in first chamber, 1904: 19). However, the Committee of the Law's proposal was rejected. In 1906, the Committee made the same statement as in 1904, but no actions were taken until 1909 when the Right-wing Minister of Justice, Mr. Petersson, defined freedom as a problem, arguing: “[t]he current freedom to keep shops open at any time involves inconveniences for shop keepers as well as their assistants, both considering rest and opportunities for intellectual education and amusement [...]” (Government Bill, 1909: 10).

Minister Petersson emphasised shopkeepers' claims for limiting working hours. Many of these shopkeepers had no assistants, and were thus in even greater need of rest and recreation (Government Bill, 1909).

Thus, in 1909, the first shop opening hours legislation act came into being. However, the legislation was only valid in larger cities and communities, on condition that municipal authorities had decided to limit shopping hours and that this decision had been settled by the county administrative board. Shop opening hours were settled from 7 am to 8 pm within this decentralised system. Shops selling “important” basic foodstuffs were exempted, and could stay open between 6 am and 9 pm (Hjelm, 2006).

In 1912, Minister of Justice, Mr. Sandström (liberal), argued that there was a lack of coherence between the organisation of retail on weekdays and on Sundays and holidays. The 1909 act regulated shop opening hours on weekdays, but there was no equivalent regulation for Sundays and holidays, besides the direct ban on opening for “bazaars or similar shops” on these days between 6 am and 9 pm, as stated in the Criminal Code. Local authorities had no possibilities to restrict opening hours before or after these hours, and thus shops that were opened at night were common, as well as shops open between 9 and 12 pm on Sundays. Moreover, shops not defined as “bazaars or similar shops” were not covered except by a general prohibition of the Criminal Code to “conduct such work as could be deferred” (Government Bill, 1912: 5). The act was thus changed, making it possible for municipalities to ban Sunday opening (Government Bill, 1912).

In 1914, Liberal MP, Mr. Ljunggren, argued that this change had limited effects and called for an inquiry (Ljunggren, 1914). The Board of Health and Welfare (founded in 1912) became responsible for the inquiry and reported in 1918 that the employees' wishes for complete Sunday time off were so important and motivated that it could not avoid meeting them (The Board of Health and Welfare, 1918). The Board argued that there was a need to “adapt the shop hour closing legislation to the demands of the times besides social protective legislation”. Considerations should be taken with regard to universal validity and efficiency. The Board also argued that

the current economic crisis should ease the impact of the opening hours legislation (The Board of Health and Welfare, 1918).

Thus, there was a new act in 1919, in which opening hours were determined to be from 8 am to 7 pm, the so-called “seven o’clock closing”. A general rule of being closed on Sundays and holidays was also introduced. The Minister of Public Administration, Liberal Mr. Schotte, argued that there was no real public need for free Sunday shopping. However, the act allowed exemptions for shops that sold milk, fresh fruit and flowers. These shops could be open between 7 am and 8 pm on weekdays and between 7 and 10 am on Sundays and holidays (Government Bill, 1919).

To sum up this first period, we see that shopkeepers defined free shop opening hours as a problem; these concerns were acknowledged by politicians in Parliament and later also by the National Board of Health and Welfare. The ways, or “techniques”, to solve the problem involved motions to Parliament and inquiries into the issue. The knowledge of the “social issue” led to a problematisation of laissez-faire thought and paved ways for solutions in the form of regulation. Interestingly, we can see similarities to the debate in Britain at the same time; Winstanley describes British shopkeepers as being “far from committed to free competition” and having “no qualms about calling upon the state to restrict the freedom of the individual, even the self-employed, when it suited their interests” (Winstanley, 1983: 99). Demands for regulations from shopkeepers can be seen as a form of self-government. This is consistent with what Dean calls “practices of the self”. “The self” should not only be viewed as an individual, but also as a group. Thus, practices of the self can be instruments in the pursuit of political, social and economic goals, as well as a means of resistance to forms of government (Dean, 1999: 13).

Still caring: welfarism 1930–1948

The 1930 working hours act determined the normal working hours at 48 hours per week. However, assistants in grocery shops, barbers’ shops or baths were excluded. In 1939, a specific working hours act for retail was introduced. The seven o’clock closing was kept with some exceptions. It was a unified act, although local governments could restrict but not extend opening hours. Kiosks were developed alongside the act and became a quite favoured sales format, with closing time at 10 pm. Both acts were provisional until 1942. The new retail act also encompassed small retailers with only one employee. The “seven o’clock closing” was kept but, in practice, the general closing time was six o’clock. This practice was the result of local agreements between shopkeepers and retailers. The reason

for the time being set at seven was that the consumers were interested in being able to shop after their working day. The 1942 act was replaced in 1945 and in 1948 with no major changes.

In 1944, the Social Democratic Party launched its post-war programme involving an economic policy based on ideas of growth, efficiency and rationalisation. During this time, Keynesian control of demand in the economy had been established as the road to full employment. In the programme, there were very few references to firm size. It was, however, emphasised that government had to support industry; “especially small businesses need government support to find new markets abroad” (Sveriges socialdemokratiska arbetareparti, 1944: 8). There was sharp criticism here of lack of efficiency in business, but this critique was not aimed at small business as such, but at the private-capitalistic form of production in general. Labour and other means of production were not fully used, private monopolies deprived the broad layers a part of the compensation for their efforts in production, and production management was irrationally divided. However, the perception of the rationalization of these companies was fragmented, because it also included the idea of “an intensive and scientifically performed rationalisation within companies”. The aim was to achieve rationalisation of the entire economy, rather than of individual companies (Sveriges socialdemokratiska arbetareparti, 1944).

In 1944, the so-called Myrdal Commission developed the issues raised in this programme (Public Inquiry, 1944). The Commission argued that the government stimulated mobility in the labour market and an effective capital market in order to rationalise business. This policy caused a large debate and there was huge criticism from the opposition parties involving the notion of “a planned economy”. The Social Democratic policy was perceived as a threat to the market economy’s efficiency and a way towards socialisation of business, and consequently, as a threat to democracy. According to Schön, these ideas were inspired by von Hayek’s book *The Road to Serfdom*, published in 1944 (Schön, 2000). In the wake of this debate, the Social Democratic Party published a small leaflet called *Växtutrymme åt småföretagen! (Make space for small businesses!)*. The party argued that it wanted to use all possible means to maintain turnover within production and retail at the maximum, which the supply of labour and material means of production allowed. This approach was the same as demanding the real preconditions of small business to grow and expand (Sveriges socialdemokratiska arbetareparti, 1946). Previously, the party argued, it had clearly declared its conviction of the great democratic values associated with small business (Sveriges socialdemokratiska arbetareparti, 1946). If

the party had been averse to small business, this should have been traced in the actual development of small businesses, since the party had been a dominant power in Swedish politics for a long time. However, during this period, small business had undergone great expansion. In the future, it was reasonable to expect quick development of society's measures of support for small businesses in retail, industry and craft (Sveriges socialdemokratiska arbetareparti, 1946).

In the instructions to the 1947 Shop Hour Inquiry, the Minister of Interior, Social Democrat Mr. Mossberg, referred to the fact that "it sometimes had been argued" that the shop hour regulation should be abolished because the general legislation on working hours had made it redundant. Additionally, the regulation was perceived as "inconvenient" for "the public". However, Mr. Mossberg continued, an abolishment was not possible. Although working hours were regulated in another way, other social requirements and business interests demanded retaining of the regulation: "I refer, in particular, to the necessity of securing reasonable leisure time for the shopkeepers and to accomplish, broadly speaking, similar competitive conditions between companies" (Public Inquiry, 1948: 15).

However, at the same time, Mossberg emphasised that current regulations involved difficulties for the gainfully employed to do their shopping: "Special attention should be given to gainfully employed housewives. It should be stressed that the current labour shortage requires no obstacles against married women's gainful employment" (Public Inquiry, 1948: 15).

Thus, certain modifications could be made in the law in order to satisfy the public interest (Public Inquiry, 1948: 15). The Committee of Inquiry consisted of an assistant director of the National Board of Health and Welfare, representatives of the Shopkeeper's Association, the Commercial Employees Union, the Cooperative Association and two MPs. The investigators argued that a change in the shopping hours issue made it possible for women to participate in the labour market in general. The need, however, was not based only on the needs of gainfully employed women, but also on the need for milk: "The experts have strongly emphasised that, especially during the summer months, the public, and primarily families with children, has a strong interest in dairy shops being open on Sundays. According to the experts, all possible measures must be taken to satisfy the public's need for fresh milk on Sundays" (Public Inquiry, 1948: 118).

However, other quests for prosperity became decisive and the investigators argued that there was still a need for a regulation that secured reasonable leisure time for shopkeepers and their families, guaranteed workers reasonably scheduled working time and to accomplish equality in competi-

tive conditions, just as the minister had argued in the instructions (Public Inquiry, 1948). Both Mr. Mossberg and the investigators suggested, however, that even if the regulation was to be maintained, negotiations should take place immediately between representatives of the public, the shopkeepers and the workers in order to: “achieve shopping hours that are as satisfying as possible, from the public’s point of view” (Government Bill, 1948: 1).

It was suggested in the following bill that the current time-limited regulation should be replaced by a new law suggesting a limitation of local government rights’ to limit shop opening hours. Shopkeepers should always have the right to keep open to 7 pm once a week (Government Bill, 1948). The Parliamentary debate concerned the development of kiosks, because the Bill had proposed an increase in the varieties of goods sold in kiosks. This jeopardized the regulation, since local authorities could deviate from opening hours in kiosks. An M.P argued that the distribution of goods tended to be frittered away on a number of “primitive kiosks”. Clearly, there was a need for centralisation, which would lower expenditures and cut the cost of consumer goods (Parliamentary Debate in second chamber, 1948). Despite various objections, the bill passed.

In this period from the 1930s and onwards, we enter what can be called a period of “welfarism” (Dean, 1999: 54), and this period is a brilliant example of the workings of governmentality, as a particular regime of government expresses a concern for every individual and the population as a whole. This means involving health, welfare, prosperity and happiness (Dean, 1999). Female consumers were identified as being important. They had difficulties in combining paid work and shopping. There slowly emerged an interest in what Alexander and Phillips describe as “the centrality of the consumer public” (Alexander and Phillips, 2006: 82). Thus, in a sense, there was still a quest for “bettering the quality of family life”, for example, when extended opening hours were interlinked with the need for fresh milk. However, the shopkeepers’ and retail workers’ needs were still considered most important, and it took some time before there was a change of these perceptions.

Efficiency and rationalisation 1955–1966

In 1953, there was a new law on competition, which paved the way for rationalisation of commodity trading through the ban on the gross price system.² The gross price system had developed during the 1930s and 1940s and implied that each producer decided the price of a good in the shops. If

² Sw. *bruttoprissystemet*

shopkeepers did not follow these price settings, there would be a delivery boycott. A specific committee, consisting of representatives of industry and single companies, controlled prices. The new law on competition implied that preconditions for rationalising distribution were improved (Svensson, 1998).

In the same year, the Minister of Trade, Social Democrat Mr. John Ericsson, summoned a Distribution Committee. The reason for this was that the debate about retail rationalisation had become “increasingly lively” and had spread from a specific circle of experts to spheres where retail issues had not been discussed previously. Trade unions, for example, had paid attention to diverse problems in retail (Public Inquiry, 1955). The Committee’s purpose was to penetrate the major issues related to the rationalisation of goods’ trade. Price and performance were key concepts. Performance included shop opening hours, for example, which “were considered to be too tight by many consumers” (Public Inquiry, 1955: 34). The inquiry body consisted of a number of directors, economists and MPs. The investigators had had hearings with representatives of manufacturers, wholesale dealers, unions, and women’s organisations. They had visited a number of companies and had consulted with other experts and companies (Public Inquiry, 1955).

In general, the Inquiry concluded that in a comparative perspective, Swedish retail had experienced quite good development concerning organisation, modern packing technology and the proliferation of self-service. However, the investigators identified a problem; the very existence of a large number of small shops [firms] with low turnover showed that there were significant possibilities for rationalisation (Public Inquiry, 1955). These small shops “lived longer than was desirable” (Public Inquiry, 1955: 28). Society could not refrain from reacting against the waste of productive resources and the Inquiry argued that it was self-evident that a continuous development towards larger transactions and larger units within retail were prerequisites for rationalisation at large within the distribution system (Public Inquiry, 1955). Large businesses were perceived as “more efficient”, and small shops were saved by a low cost level, for example “inexpensive family labour” and “shopkeepers’ modest claims on returns” (Public Inquiry, 1955: 29). However, the perception of the small business was not entirely negative. They were also perceived as being able to assert themselves well against the large businesses, through their greater adaptation skills, and less expensive administration. Small and large companies were seen as complementing each other and there was no evidence that a certain size would be optimal in every circumstance (Public Inquiry, 1955).

However, the Inquiry argued that the primary objective of efficiency and rational operations should be achieved through competition. The starting-point was that the price mechanism was seen as a bearer of correct cost information. Goods should therefore be priced according to the performance carried out by retailers in their efforts to bring the goods closer to the consumer. The Inquiry proposed eight actions, for example the establishment of a permanent body that would study price development and price differences, increased funding for research and, what was most important for this study, changes in the shop opening hours regulations. The rights of local authorities to prevent longer shop opening hours should be restricted (Public Inquiry, 1955). It also suggested that shops should be allowed to be open until 9 pm once a week.

These rights had been used extensively, and thus most shops closed at 6 pm rather than at 7 pm. The strong position of the labour market parties and the enlargement of social security had made the shop opening act redundant, since working hours for employees were regulated in a satisfactory way. The keeping of the act had been motivated by accomplishing similar conditions of competition between different retailers. However, the shop opening hours regulation was not an issue that concerned only shopkeepers and their employees, but also important consumer interests (Public Inquiry, 1955). The Committee argued that it fully understood shopkeepers' expressed misgivings that a deregulation would entail difficulties for small shops. However, these opinions should not prevent the fulfilling of important consumer interests (Public Inquiry, 1955). If some non-competitive businesses went out of business because of a change in shop opening hours, this could contribute to the rationalisation of the retail structure (Public Inquiry, 1955).

Still, the investigators were not unanimous. For example, one member of the Committee argued that the notion of "satisfying competition" was not defined, and consumers' influence underestimated (Public Inquiry, 1955). Another member argued that there was an inconsistency in the arguments; on the one hand, Swedish retail had not performed badly in a comparative perspective, while on the other, there were needs for rationalisation and savings, due to the large number of small businesses. Additionally, there was no evidence for an optimal firm size (Public Inquiry, 1955). As far as shop opening hours were concerned, two participants argued that nothing had happened during the short period of time since the current act had been adopted that justified longer opening hours. Rather, the growth of the self-service system had made it possible for consumers to spend a shorter time in shops (Public Inquiry, 1955). However, the following Government Bill

proposed that shops should be allowed to be opened to 9 pm once a week (Government Bill, 1956).

In 1957, the government decided to implement a successive shortening of working hours from 48 to 45 hours. The 45-hour-week was implemented on the whole labour market in 1960. In 1962, the Minister of Interior, Social Democrat Mr. Johansson, appointed a new inquiry into shop opening hours, *Affärstidsutredningen*. He argued that one problem was that retail workers did not benefit from the shortening of working time (Saturdays off). Other structural developments in retail, such as the growth of department stores both in number and in size, the increase in self-service, the packaging industry, and the development of refrigerators and freezing technologies had led to bulk purchasing on few occasions. In view of these developments, it was considered important to investigate the shop opening hours act (Public Inquiry, 1965). The Inquiry board consisted of a manager from the National Board of Health and Welfare, representatives of the Shopkeepers Association, the Commercial Employees' Union and the Cooperative Association, as well as MPs. According to Swedish historian Hjelm, the Inquiry's work was accompanied by a debate in the media on the demands for free shop opening hours. The regulation became synonymous with the notion of "Red tape Sweden"³ (Hjelm, 2006: 284). The investigators concluded that the current opening hours seemed to correspond quite well with the consumers' wishes and needs. However, these wishes were perceived as being held back by "deep-rooted habits" (Public Inquiry, 1965: 115). As people got more choices, they would know more specifically what they "really wanted" (Public Inquiry, 1965: 115).

The investigators concluded that the number of shops was declining each year. The increased purchasing power had not benefited all shops. Many town and city buildings in the centres had been cleared, which had led to many small shops closing. The general development had resulted in larger units. High personnel costs had led to rationalisation, in the forms of self-service, for example (Public Inquiry, 1965: 70–72). The investigators were mainly concerned with the significance of the shop hour act for retail's possibilities to develop into rational and economically sustainable business with free competition (Public Inquiry, 1965). Some people were concerned about many shops going out of business, which would lead to deteriorating service for consumers. The structural changes occurring within retail, primarily during the previous decade, implied the direction in which the development was going. The changes did not only depend on population relocations but also on necessary rationalisation (Public Inquiry, 1965).

³ Sw. *Krångel-Sverige*

This was when the concept of the convenience store emerged. The investigators identified five usual functions for the convenience store. First, it was a complement to larger stores. Second, it satisfied customers' need for convenience. Third, it was important in case the supermarket customer had forgotten something or if he did not want to go far in case of rain. Fourth, it played an important role for customers that had received guests unexpectedly or needed an impulse buy for another reason. Last, it was important for older people, invalids and sick people (Public Inquiry, 1965).

The shop opening hours act was not considered "smooth enough" to allow retail to develop rationally. However, the act's inhibiting effects must not be exaggerated. It was acknowledged that structural changes happened independently of the act. If the act remained unchanged, it would most likely contribute to the fact that "some less financially stable shops, that would otherwise succumb to competition, would survive [...] in the longer perspective it could not be in society's interest to retain legislation that maintained less competitive businesses" (Public Inquiry, 1965: 126).

At the same time, the act had had some favourable effects and abolishment could lead to unhealthy competition. Less responsible retailers could keep open late in the evenings on pure speculation and the quality of goods and standard of premises could suffer by increased personnel costs. However, such "experiments" were assumed to be of a temporary nature (Public Inquiry, 1965).

However, it was also in the interests of the consumers that the convenience shops survived, otherwise service would deteriorate. Additionally, there was a need to protect the shopkeepers from working hours that were too long (Public Inquiry, 1965). Thus, although the reasoning seemed to be moving in the direction of proposing deregulation, the protection of shopkeepers, together with workers' need for leisure, retained the regulations, although with some alterations: shops should be allowed to keep open between 8 and 8 and local governments could grant an extension but not a limitation of these hours. The duration of these regulations was five years (Public Inquiry, 1965; Government Bill, 1966).

In the Parliament, the shopkeepers' conditions were highlighted and the MPs, Mr. Nilsson and Mr. Carlsson of the Centre Party, regretted that the proposed regulation favoured stores and chains and a policy of shop wipe-out (Nilsson and Carlsson, 1966). On the other hand, two Conservative Party MPs, Mr. Wallmark and Mr. Hansson, argued that the shopkeepers' particular problems should not be "over-emphasised" (Wallmark and Hansson, 1966).

During this third period, changes emerged, as when the Distribution Committee and the Shop Hour Inquiry, paid more attention to the retail

industry's *efficiency*. Comparatively, Swedish retail was conceptualised as "modern", "in a good state of development" with new organisational structures and technologies. The problem was the large number of small shops. The development towards larger units was depicted as inevitable; these units were simply "more efficient". Small shops were saved only by a low cost level. However, perceptions of small shopkeepers were not entirely negative. They were also regarded as "highly adaptive". Small and large businesses were seen to complement each other.

The 1960 Inquiry also stressed the importance of *rationalisation*. Now the "convenience store" entered the discussion: a store that signified the essence of flexibility in time and space, available when and where the customer needed and wanted it to be. The consumer in need for these convenience stores was no longer only a woman but also old people, the disabled and sick people. The act was perceived as helping less competitive business, although abolition could lead to speculating in late openings. However, long working hours for shopkeepers were still regarded as a problem. To solve this problem, a local exception system was therefore introduced, an exception system that was soon to be questioned.

Consumerism: the introduction of free shopping hours

In 1969, the Minister of Commerce, Social Democrat Mr. Lange, stated in the instructions to the new Shop Hour Inquiry that experiences from the freer regulations and the following developments should provide a better guide to the trial. He also argued that reasons had been put forward by consumers, suggesting that shopping hours should be entirely free. Against this, the experts should put the inconveniences likely to arise for business employees and small business owners. The experts should also take into account the ongoing rapid development of goods' trade, the features of the relevant part of the labour market and the experience gained from the shop hours act (Public Inquiry, 1971).

The Committee sent questionnaires to various organisations to collect information about what they thought about the regulations. Representatives of the major department store chains wanted to abolish regulation, e.g., the Swedish Consumer Cooperation, Nordiska Kompaniet-Turitz, Åhlén & Holm and some of the major grocery companies. Two large supermarket chains, Wessels and IKEA, did not directly favour abolition but seemed essentially to recommend freer regulation. The Grocery Association and ICA (a joint grocery organisation for individual retailers with joint purchases and brand name) were more hesitant. Among the advocates for continued regulation were representatives of specialized trade; the Paint Shop

Association, the Shoe Shop Association, the Radio Shop Association, the Watchmakers' and the Opticians' Associations (Public Inquiry, 1971).

Those who favoured deregulation argued that the structure should be designed "rationally, economically" and in accordance with the "real wishes" of consumers. The act was said to stop the development of convenience stores in housing areas (Public Inquiry, 1971). IKEA argued that it did not have any need to keep open longer on weekdays than was now allowed by the act. However, it was considered very important that the opening hours on Saturdays were not restricted in a different way to other weekdays. The company had noticed a widespread public interest in Sunday opening (Public Inquiry, 1971). ICA argued that it could hardly be denied that a freer regulation or implementation of opening hours could result in increased difficulties for convenience stores to reach satisfying sales volume and thus reasonable profit. Possibilities for increased evening and Sunday trade in larger stores would probably attract consumers away from the regular shops. At the same time, many consumer groups could interpret further dropping off of convenience stores as deteriorated service. However, prolonged evening opening could increase support for convenience stores, because purchases would be carried out at these stores when coming home after the working day (Public Inquiry, 1971).

Those who favoured continued regulation argued that it was particularly important not to allow Sunday opening. Sunday opening could easily become an issue of prestige, and if one single shop started to keep open longer, others would follow. This would lead to longer working days for small shopkeepers. On the other hand, the current system with local exemptions was not good either (Public Inquiry, 1971).

As far as specialized trade was concerned, prolonged opening hours would not really cause concerns. Only if specialized trade was kept in its traditional form could it experience difficulties. The quality of the location constituted a prerequisite for extended opening hours. Regarding the threat from supermarkets, these were assumed to remain "pretty marginal phenomena", localised primarily in the larger cities. It was unlikely that a deregulation would accelerate a general structural transformation (Public Inquiry, 1971).

The investigators argued that there were still a number of shopkeepers who were without any other assistants than family members, and occasional employees. One of the motives for the regulations was to look after the interests of these retailers and their assistants. If regulation was abolished, these retailers would have the opportunity to keep open around the clock. This, however, was quite unlikely. However, it was possible that someone

would be “tempted to better his standard by prolonging opening hours, at the expense of his leisure time”. There was a risk that the retailer underestimated the value of his own work effort and kept open, although a normal estimation of work effort would prove to be non-profitable. The possibility that some retailers would more or less desperately keep their businesses open was not unthinkable. However, the situation was such that the number of shopkeepers had been reduced so that quantitatively the problem was not of the same significance as before (Public Inquiry, 1971).

Compared to other countries, Swedish retail was conceptualised as “highly rationalised”, perhaps “the most advanced in the world”. The general policies to strengthen employees’ positions had now made room for consumer political goals (Public Inquiry, 1971). These perceptions, in combination with perceptions of a badly functioning exemption system and an increased number of “gainfully employed married women” who needed deregulated shop opening hours, led to the suggestion that regulation should be abolished. The Inquiry pointed out that consumer needs stood against workers’ and shopkeepers’ needs. However, the investigators stated that it was not reasonable to allow these “quite limited groups’ interests [...] stand in the way of development” (Public Inquiry, 1971: 108).

The Minister of Trade, Social Democrat Mr. Feldt, did not propose any bill but reported to the Parliament that the government had found “predominant reasons” for an abolishment of the regulation of shop opening hours. In connection with the deregulation, the Minister of Trade recommended that a specific committee, *Affärstidsnämnden*, should investigate the consequences three years later (The Committee on Industry and Trade, 1971).

Affärstidsnämnden’s work did not result in a public inquiry as had the others before it. In a report, *Affärstidsnämnden* recommended a re-regulation of shop hours, because permanent employment had decreased and because only a limited number of consumers had declared that they could not do their shopping on weekdays. Three members made a reservation, arguing that the increased frequency of Sunday opening was an expression of the consumers’ influence on the shops to have the most suitable opening hours for the consumers (*Affärstidsnämnden*, 1975).

In 1975, Social Democrat Mr. Feldt was now the Minister of Commerce. He argued in the instructions to the 1975 Shop Hour Committee that the issues that had arisen during the 1970 Committee’s work, namely the consequences of free shopping hours, was so essential and so difficult to quantify, that there were grounds to abolish the regulation only on a trial basis and until further notice. The Parliament shared the view that “substantial benefits” could be expected to occur as a result of free shopping

hours, but no major disadvantages. Parliament, however, found it prudent to appoint a special committee. The Committee should become an effective tool for detecting and finding evidence of negative consequences (Public Inquiry, 1977). In 1974, the Parliament stated that after the 1975 Committee had submitted its statement, an investigation should analyze the Committee's material. Therefore, the Minister called in specific experts (Public Inquiry, 1977). These experts consisted of a general director, a chairman of the Commercial Employees Union, four MPs, a local government commissioner, two managing directors, and a departmental manager. Five other directors were called in as additional expertise.

The Minister stated that the question of whether free shopping hours would continue to apply or whether any form of regulation to be introduced should be based on the experience of free shopping hour applications and its effects. A starting-point for these assessments and trials should be *Af-färstidsnämnden's* investigative material. Further investigations should only be performed exceptionally (Public Inquiry, 1977).

The 1977, the Inquiry group admitted that some individual shopkeepers had had to increase their opening hours markedly. However, the possible protection against a too heavy workload caused by the opening hours had to be weighed against the shopkeepers' own wishes to maintain a free market (Public Inquiry, 1977). Despite the overall impression that the Inquiry was in favour of deregulated shop opening hours, the investigators in effect disagreed. Five participants recommended a re-regulation; four participants recommended deregulated opening hours and one participant suggested deregulated opening hours on weekdays, but regulations on Sundays. Those advocating that shop opening hours should remain unrestricted proposed effective supervision of the opening hours as well as of the work situation of the employees and the availability of retail goods services for consumers. This supervision should be exercised by an independent board, consisting of representatives of the consumers, employees and employers, and should report to the Government in the event that the development should prove injurious to any or all of these interests, or to that of the general public (Public Inquiry, 1977). However, the inquiry did not result in any political measures at the time. A few motions demanded re-regulation, but these were postponed to the 1980 Parliamentary session (Jönsson et al., 1977; Palme et al., 1979; Börjesson, 1979).

During the 1970s, a discussion on the benefits of large versus small businesses emerged in the U.S and in Western Europe. In Britain, economists and politicians agreed that the creation of large-scale units of production and administration was necessary, primarily because of efficiencies of

scale. Small businesses were generally regarded as inefficient and unproductive and as obstacles to growth, because they were considered incapable of taking full advantage of advances in new technology and sophisticated management systems (Scase and Goffee, 1987). However, there was also acknowledgment of the importance of small businesses. In 1969, a Committee was set up in Britain to collect information about the place of small firms as a basis for recommendations about future policy towards them. Prior to the appointment of this Committee, there had never been a comprehensive study, official or otherwise, of the small-firm sector in the UK (Bolton, 1971). The Committee concluded: “We had no doubt from the first that the future prosperity of the small firm sector was an important matter; its sheer size and ubiquity are sufficient to ensure that” (Bolton, 1971: xix). The report from the Committee has later been referred to as the Bolton Report, and has come to signify a conceptual turn of small businesses. In Sweden, too, during the 1970s, the ability of large companies to create employment was questioned. Great hopes were pinned instead on small businesses (Landström and Johannisson, 2001). Although small businesses were discussed and researched more during the 1970s, it seems as if the real breakthrough was during the 1980s, to which we now turn.

Bureaucracy and freedom: the 1980s and 1990s

Johannisson and Lindmark describe the 1980s as the “small business decade” (Johannisson and Lindmark, 1996: 12). Scase and Goffee talk about the popularity of an entrepreneurship discourse in Britain (Scase and Goffee, 1987). Mumby-Croft and Berman Brown argue that the 1980s were characterised by a “culture of enterprise” and a “consumer boom” (Mumby-Croft and Berman Brown, 2006). Additionally, it seems as if these discourses coincided with a changed perception of the public sector, emphasising smaller government, less government expenditure, less bureaucracy and de-regulation (see for example, Hood, 1991).

Not surprisingly, the new Swedish Liberal government came to problematise what it defined as “hassle and unnecessary bureaucracy” (Government Bill, 1979: 2). The Committee on Industry and Trade discussed the before-mentioned motions in connection to this bill, rejecting any kind of shop hour regulation. In a press release, the Minister of Commerce, Mr. Cars, argued that a majority of the consultation bodies (of the 1977 Inquiry) had recommended deregulated shop opening hours. The deregulation was advantageous to consumers “having two jobs” and “working shifts”. It was also perceived that the quest for gender equality was simplified through deregulated shop opening hours (The Committee on Industry and Trade, 1980).

In the Parliamentary debate, the consumer's privileged position was further expounded. Liberal MP, Mr. Andersson, argued that consumers should decide rather than "bureaucrats". To reintroduce regulations was perceived as taking a large step backwards and it would be a hard blow against "gainfully employed women, gender equality, and consumers' free choice". The employees were defined as "those who would not otherwise join working life" (Parliamentary Debate, 1980: 165–166). Another MP, Mrs. Oskarsson from the Centre Party, argued it concerned people who did not have the possibility of getting permanent employment, "e.g. women who cannot find work within a reasonable distance from their place of residence" (Parliamentary Debate, 1980: 177). Opposing arguments focused on the need for Sunday time off (Parliamentary Debate, 1980).

In the 1982 election, the Social-Democratic Party regained government power and considered instigating a new inquiry. But in 1984, a press release announced that the deregulated opening hours would be maintained. The arguments were yet again based on the consumers' needs: "many consumers want to do their shopping late at nights and during the weekends". The value of part-time work was again referred to: "free shop opening hours have created new work opportunities mainly through part-time work at night and during weekends. Thus, many families have gained a valuable addition to their economy" (The Committee of Industry and Trade, 1984: 13).

In the debate, convenience stores were perceived as a "valuable complement" for many consumers, and as offering jobs to many retail workers (Parliamentary Debate, 1984). A member of the Right-wing Party argued that increasingly, more people had understood that retailing did not exist first and foremost for the employees but for the customers/consumers, who were also workers and who needed "flexibility": "Flexible shop opening hours have facilitated [shopping] for many gainfully employed, who have difficulties to shop at traditional shop opening hours. Many families are working two jobs, and shift work" (Parliamentary Debate, 1984: 163–164).

During the end of the 1980s, "freedom of choice" became an important topic. One Liberal MP, Mrs. Orring, argued that "already Adam Smith [!] had established that the meaning and goal of all production was consumption". Thus, the interests of the producers should only be considered if they promoted consumers' interests (Orring, 1988). The idea of the family as consumer was brought to the fore as well as the notion of "stress": "Our society is marked by stress and many people experience that shopping must be carried out under the pressure of time. It is therefore important to have shops and stores opened in the evenings and at weekends to ensure that the family can shop together in peace and quiet" (Norberg, 1988).

The struggle between free and regulated hours was however not entirely over. In 1988, the Minister of Public Administration, Social Democrat Mr. Johansson, pointed out that since “significant changes” regarding the structure of retail and opening hours had occurred since the last inquiry, there was a need for a renewed inspection of the effects of deregulated shop opening hours (Public Inquiry, 1991, Appendix). Liberal MP, Mr. Cars, argued, however, that it was “hostile to the consumers” to investigate the shop opening hours. He argued that from a “liberal point of view it is obvious that retail should have the freedom to let people shop whenever they want. Politicians should not get involved in the issue of deregulated shop opening hours” (Dagens Industri, 1989). A conservative politician, Mr. Bildt, argued that it was “we as consumers” and not politicians or unionists that should decide on the appropriateness of Sunday shopping (TT Nyhetsbanken, 1990).

Eventually, there was an inquiry in 1989 led by the managing director of Apoteket,⁴ who had also participated in the shop opening hours inquiries in the mid- 1970s. The investigator concluded that after the introduction of free shop opening hours, a significant increase in the proportion of shops open on Sundays had been registered. Approximately 80 percent of all department stores and hypermarkets were now open on Sundays, compared to 22 percent in 1972. For supermarkets, the corresponding proportions were estimated at 54 and 6 percent respectively. One of the factors that explained the increased proportion of supermarkets was the rapid growth of local convenience stores. The very emergence of these stores had been facilitated by the introduction of free shop opening hours. For branches other than food-stuffs, the largest proportion applied to furniture outlets. With the increase of stores open on Sundays, there was a decrease in the total number of supermarkets, department stores and hypermarkets, from approximately 10,000 to 8,500. Department stores and smaller supermarkets had suffered reductions in their previous shares of the market (Public Inquiry, 1991). The investigator argued that the attitude of the enterprises towards free shop opening hours was chiefly correlated with the factors branch and size. Department stores generally demonstrated a considerably more positive attitude than enterprises within other branches of the retail trade (Public Inquiry, 1991).

The investigator concluded that if one shared the view that opening hours were to be determined as a result of interaction between consumers and producers, there was no reason for not letting the market determine

⁴ The state-owned pharmaceutical company.

opening hours. Thus, the opening hours would ultimately be determined by the demand of the consumers (Public Inquiry, 1991). The investigator also argued in a press release that a majority of consumers supported free shop opening hours (TT Nyhetsbanken, 1991).

According to the media, the results of the questionnaire presented by the Inquiry showed that nearly nine out of ten consumers thought that opening until 8 pm on weekdays was enough, and two out of three argued that shops could be closed on most Sundays. There was no large support for deregulated shop opening hours among shopkeepers either. The investigator commented on this information: “These numbers only show that a majority *does not shop* late at night or on Sundays. The important thing is that a majority of the Swedish people *oppose* regulations” (TT Nyhetsbanken, 1991 /emphasis added/).

In the Parliamentary debate, one MP concluded that the results of the Inquiry finally put an end to certain proponents of regulations “unjustified interference” in the market economy. The Social Democrats were criticised for their efforts to reintroduce regulations. This demand for regulations was a typical example of a “totally unnecessary interference from politicians regarding matters concerning only shops and customers” (Parliamentary Debate, 1991: 82). Furthermore, the Liberal MP Ms. Norberg argued that retailers should decide their own shop opening hours. Additionally, the customer should decide when they should do their shopping (Parliamentary Debate, 1991: 84). During the autumn of 1991, the issue of shop opening hours was finally dropped.

In this last period, the concept of “freedom” voiced at the beginning of the century returned. The problem now was “bureaucracy”, of which regulation constituted an example. The Social-Democratic government set up an inquiry that concluded that the free shop opening hours were not a problem. A major reason for this decision was that the market and the consumer should decide, rather than politicians. So, instead of governing the market, the government now governed through the market. Dean makes a similar distinction in his establishment of liberalism as a form of government “through” rather than “of” the economy (Dean, 1999: 114). Arguably, the experts’ knowledge was not informed by the contemporary small business discourse. The acknowledged needs of consumers and freedom of the market were prioritised.

Concluding remarks

In this article, I have given an account on the governing of shopkeepers in Sweden during the 20th century. The discursive struggle over shopping

hours' regulations in public inquiries and parliamentary sources constituted the empirical material.

The article points to the importance of showing that the past is not so different from today in certain respects (Dean, 1999). There has always been an effort to govern in the best interests of the population, although with different groups of the population in mind, depending on the translation of experts' problematisations. In this article I have shown how problematisations, various forms of knowledge and regimes of practices are interlinked. At the beginning of the century, economic liberalism in the form of free shop opening hours were problematised (cf. Dean 1999: 53), because it resulted in, for example, long working hours for shopkeepers. As opening hours were gradually regulated, this practice was also problematised; it led to difficulties for women in combining employment and shopping and to the fact that too many inefficient small shops survived. Problematisations at the beginning of the 1970s expressed concern that the shop opening act hindered the development of small retailers, that the exemption system functioned badly and, consequently, that married women could not combine employment and shopping in a satisfactory way. Towards the end of the 1970s and onwards, "bureaucracy" was problematised.

The problematisations resulted in particular regimes of practices and these regimes were made visible with particular techniques (mainly inquiries performed by experts). The problematisations were also informed by various forms of knowledge, i.e., social and welfare issues in the first period (1904–1919), welfare and consumerism in the second period (1930–1948), welfare, efficiency, rationalisation, and large-scale benefits in the third period (1955–1966), consumerism and large-scale benefits during the 1970s, and in the final period (1980s–1990s), freedom of the market. These different forms of knowledge came to determine the very existence of shopkeepers but also consumers.

The perspective of governmentality applied in this article illustrates not only the operations of regimes, but also their contingent character: they can be resisted. The governmentality perspective allows us to reflect on consumers as governing subjects. Consumers' late evening and Sunday shopping practices contribute to the governing of both consumers and shopkeepers alike.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the Department of Management and Engineering, Linköping University, for providing assistance for this research. I also want to thank two reviewers for valuable suggestions on improvement.

REFERENCES

- Affärstidsnämnden (1975). *Resultat av tre års prövotid med fria affärstider*. Stockholm: Affärstidsnämnden.
- Alexander, Andrew and Phillips, Simon (2006). “Fair play for the small man’: Perspectives on the Contribution of the Independent Shopkeeper 1930–c.1945”, *Business History*, 48 (1): 69–89.
- Audretsch, David B. and Beckmann, Iris A. M. (2007). “From Small Business to Entrepreneurship Policy”, in: David B. Audretsch, Isabel Grilo and A. Roy Turik (eds.). *Handbook of Research on Entrepreneurship Policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 36–53.
- Benson, John and Ugolini, Laura (2003). “Introduction. Historians and the nation of shopkeepers”, in: John Benson and Laura Ugolini (eds). *A Nation of Shopkeepers. Five Centuries of British Retailing*. London: I.B. Taurig, pp. 1–24.
- Bolton, John (ed.) (1971). *Small Firms: Report of the Committee of Inquiry on Small Firms*. London: Cmnd 4811.
- Brisman, Sven (1916). *Nationalekonomi*. Stockholm: Norstedt.
- Börjesson, Fritz (1979). “Om affärstidsreglering. Motion nr 1481”, in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1978/79. 3 saml, band D7*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Dagens Industri (Newspaper) (1989). “Låt folk handla när de vill”, 13 April.
- Dean, Mitchell (1999). *Governmentality. Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.
- Engstrand, Åsa-Karin (2007). *I tid och otid med marknaden. Kampen om affärstiderna i ett historiskt perspektiv*. Växjö: Växjö universitet, Arbetsliv i omvandling no.13.
- Government Bill (1909). “Till Riksdagens med förslag till lag om förbud mot handels idkande å söckendag utöfver viss tid”, nr. 95, in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll. 1 saml, 1 afd, 5 band*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Government Bill (1912). “Förslag till lag innefattande ändring i vissa delar af lagen den 5 juni 1909 om förbud mot handels idkande å söckendag utöfver viss tid”, nr. 60, in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll. 1 saml, 3 band*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Government Bill (1919). “Med förslag till lag om begränsning av tiden för idkande av handel och viss annan rörelse”, nr. 143, in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll. 1 saml, 6 band*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Government Bill (1948). “Till riksdagen med förslag till butikstängningslag”, nr. 248, in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll. 1 saml, 15 band*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Government Bill (1956). “Med förslag till lag om ändring i butikstängningslagen”, nr. 162, in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll. 1 saml, band 13*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Government Bill (1966). “Med förslag till affärstidslag”, nr. 144, in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll. 1 saml, höstsessionen*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Government Bill (1979). “Om åtgärder mot krångel och onödig byråkrati m.m.”, nr. 111, in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1978/79. 1 saml, band B17*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.

- Gradus, Raymond (1996). "The Economic Effects of Extending Shop Opening Hours", *Journal of Economics*, 64 (3): 247–263.
- Grünhagen, Marko, Grove, Stephen J. and Gentry, James W. (2003). "The dynamics of store hour changes and consumption behavior: Results of a longitudinal study of consumer attitudes toward Saturday shopping in Germany", *European Journal of Marketing*, 37 (11-12): 1801–1817.
- Gråbacke, Carina (2000). *Mötet med marknaden. Tre fackförbunds agerande under perioden 1945–1976*. Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.
- Gunn, Simon (2000). "From hegemony to governmentality: Changing conceptions of power in social history", *Journal of Social History*, Spring: 705–720.
- Hjelm, Jonny (2006). *Hundra år med Handels*. Stockholm: Handelsanställdas förbund.
- Hood, Christopher (1991). "A Public Management for All Seasons?", *Public Administration*, Spring: 3–19.
- Johannisson, Bengt and Lindmark, Leif (1996). "Det mångfasetterade företaget", in: Bengt Johannisson and Leif Lindmark (eds). *Företag, Företagare, Företagsamhet*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, pp. 11–33.
- Jönsson, Hans et al. (1977). "Återinförande av affärstidslagen. Motion nr 395", in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1976/77. 3 saml*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Karlsson, Karl Gustav (1904). "Om skrivelse till Kung.Maj:t angående lagstadgad stängningstid för handelsbutiker m.m. Motion nr 4 i andra kammaren", in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll. 1 saml, 2 afd, 2 band*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Landström, Hans and Johannisson, Bengt (2001). "Theoretical foundations of Swedish entrepreneurship and small-business research", *Scandinavian Journal of Management Research*, 17: 225–248.
- Ljunggren, August (1914). "Angående ändring av 1 eller 2§ i lagen om förbud mot handels idkande under vissa tider av dygnet. Motion nr 38, första kammaren", in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll. 3 saml*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Mumby-Croft, Roger and Berman Brown, Reva (2006). "SMEs, Growth and Entrepreneurship: The Steady Rise and Precipitous Fall of Seaking", *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 15 (2): 205–217.
- Nilsson, Ferdinand and Carlsson, Erik (1966). "I anledning av Kungl. Maj:ts proposition nr 144 med förslag till affärstidslag. Motion nr. 789 i första kammaren", in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll. 3-4 saml*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Norberg, Gudrun et al. (1988). "Om detaljhandeln. Motion N333", in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1987/88. 3 saml*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Orring, Ulla et al. (1988). "Om konsumentpolitiken. Motion L727", in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1987/88. 3 saml, band D5*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Palme, Olof et al. (1979). "Om affärstidsreglering. Motion nr. 1506", in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1978/79. 3 saml, band D6*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Parliamentary Debate (1980). "Affärstidsreglering", nr. 157, in: *Riksdagens protokoll 1979/80. Band A 12*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Parliamentary Debate (1984). "Affärstidsreglering", nr. 134, in: *Riksdagens protokoll 1983/84. Band A9*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.

- Parliamentary Debate (1991). “Näringsrättslig reglering”, nr. 92, in: *Riksdagens protokoll 1990/91. Band A8*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Parliamentary Debate in first chamber (1904). “Ifrågasatta lagbestämmelser om stängningstid för handelsbodas m.m.”, nr. 23, in: *Riksdagens protokoll. 1 band*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Parliamentary Debate in second chamber (1904). “Om lagstadgad stängningstid för handelsbutiker m.m.”, nr. 22, in: *Riksdagens protokoll. 1 band*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Parliamentary Debate in second chamber (1948). “Förslag till butikstängningslag”, nr. 30, in: *Riksdagens protokoll. 4 band*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Phillips, Joseph D. (1979). “The theory of small enterprise: Smith, Mill, Marshall, and Marx”, *Explorations in Economic History*, 16: 331–340.
- Public Inquiry (1944). *Framställningar och utlåtanden från Kommissionen för ekonomisk krigsplanering*, Stockholm, Statens offentliga utredningar, nr. 57.
- Public Inquiry (1948). *Betänkande med förslag till ändrad butikstängningslagstiftning avgivet av 1947 års butikstängningsakkunniga*, Stockholm, Statens offentliga utredningar, nr. 3.
- Public Inquiry (1955). *Pris och prestation i handeln*, Stockholm, Statens offentliga utredningar, nr. 16.
- Public Inquiry (1965). *Affärstiderna*, Stockholm, Statens offentliga utredningar, nr. 38.
- Public Inquiry (1971). *Fri affärstid*, Stockholm, Statens offentliga utredningar, nr. 33.
- Public Inquiry (1977). *Affärstiderna*, Stockholm, Statens offentliga utredningar, nr. 72.
- Public Inquiry (1991). *Affärstiderna*, Stockholm, Statens offentliga utredningar, nr. 10.
- Scase, Richard and Goffee, Robert (1987). *The Real World of the Small Business Owner*. London: Routledge.
- Schön, Lennart (2000). *En modern svensk ekonomisk historia*. Stockholm: SNS.
- Svensson, Tomas (1998). *Dagligvarudistributionens strukturovandling*. Linköping: Linköpings universitet.
- Sveriges socialdemokratiska arbetareparti (1944). *Arbetarrörelsens efterkrigsprogram. De 27 punkterna med motivering*. Stockholm: SAP.
- Sveriges socialdemokratiska arbetareparti (1946). *Växtutrymme åt småföretagen!* Stockholm: SAP.
- The Board of Health and Welfare (Socialstyrelsen) (1918). *Underdånigt utlåtande med förslag till lag om begränsning av tiden för öppethållande av handelsbodas jämte vissa andra företag*. Stockholm: Socialstyrelsen.
- The Committee on Industry and Trade (Näringsutskottet) (1971). “I anledning av motioner angående affärstidslagstiftningen”, nr. 53, appendix 2, in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll. 17 saml, band E14*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- The Committee on Industry and Trade (1980). “Med anledning av viss del av proposition 1978/79:111 om åtgärder mot krångel och onödig byråkrati m.m. samt motioner om affärstidsreglering”, nr. 62, in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1979/80. 17 saml, band E14*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.

- The Committee on Industry and Trade (1984). "Om affärstidsreglering", nr. 27, in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll 1983/84. 17 saml, band E4*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- The Committee on the Law (Lagutskottet) (1904). "Utlåtande, i anledning af väckta motioner om lagstadgad stängningstid för handelsbutiker m.m.", nr. 20, in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll. 7 saml*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- TT Nyhetsbanken (News Agency) (1990). "Bildt: Sluta vackla om affärstiderna", 13 September.
- TT Nyhetsbanken (News Agency) (1991). "Affärstidsutredaren: fria affärstider pressar priserna", 19 February.
- Wallmark, Gunnar and Hansson, Gustaf Henry (1966). "I anledning av Kungl. Maj:ts proposition nr 144, med förslag till affärstidslag. Motion nr 791 i första kammaren", in: *Bihang till riksdagens protokoll. Höstsessionen. 3 saml, band C33*. Stockholm: Riksdagstrycket.
- Winstanley, Michael J. (1983). *The Shopkeeper's World, 1830–1914*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Vladanje vlasnicima trgovina u Švedskoj: rasprave o radnom vremenu trgovina od 1904. do 1991.

Åsa-Karin ENGSTRAND

Odjel za društvene znanosti i studij socijalnog rada i Odjel za ekonomski i industrijski razvoj, Linköpingško sveučilište, Švedska

U članku se analizira način na koji se vladalo vlasnicima malih trgovina tijekom švedske rasprave o radnom vremenu trgovina između 1904. i 1991. godine. Razmatra se kako različita "problematiziranja", tj. podvrgavanje vladanja sumnji, dovede do različitih režima praksi. Te su režime vidljivima učinile posebne tehnike (uglavnom zahtjevi stručnjaka), a koristile su im različite vrste znanja, tj. društvena i socijalna pitanja u razdoblju 1904–1919., socijalna pitanja i potrošaštvo u razdoblju 1930–1948., socijalna pitanja, učinkovitost, racionalizaciju i razmjerno velike potpore u razdoblju 1955–1966., potrošaštvo i razmjerno velike potpore tijekom 1970-ih te u posljednjem razdoblju (1980-e–1990-e), slobodno tržište. Ti različiti oblici znanja odredili su sam oblik opstanka vlasnika malih trgovina, ali i potrošača. U članku se pokazuje kako su problematizacije, oblici znanja i režimi bili međusobno povezani te da su tijekom vremena pokazali i mijenu i stalnost. No, režimi su vrlo kontingentni, što znači da im se može i oduprijeti. Perspektiva vladalaštva omogućuje da se o potrošačima misli kao vladajućim subjektima. Praksa kasnovječernih i nedjeljnih kupovina pridonosi vladanju kako potrošača tako i vlasnika trgovina.

Ključne riječi: vlasnici trgovina, oblici znanja, režimi praksi, vladalaštvo, radno vrijeme trgovina, Švedska