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The second half of the nineteenth century brought major improvements in living conditions and the welfare of urban communities in Europe. Starting mid-century, cities across the continent and in the British Isles started to invest money and resources in the city itself, which was a radical shift compared with a previous austere policy. New infrastructures, such as sewage systems, transportation and hospitals, were built, and various social reforms were implemented. Local authorities and politicians gradually came to shoulder a greater responsibility for the well-being of urban citizens. In order to accomplish this feat, an increasing number of urban public services were instituted, particularly between 1850 and 1940. These public services were the result of both political strife and a growing sense of social responsibility.

The introduction of modern public services has traditionally been explained as having been promoted by reforms through the state. In a Western European context, the apogee of this historical development was the modern welfare state, perhaps best represented by the social democratic model in the Scandinavian countries after 1945, epitomized in the works of Gøsta Esping-Andersen. The Nordic countries have attracted great interest in international research and there is general agreement that together they comprise a joint model for the organization of the welfare state, often referred to as the Nordic welfare model.

As a consequence, the historiography of modern public services and modern welfare systems has had a strong focus on the state, and scholars have identified welfare politics with the national government. When urban politics and municipalities have been studied, they have generally been seen as extensions of the central state, albeit with an awareness that there are variations between different areas in Europe. By and large, national politics and political agents on the national level have been put forward as the most important drivers in the development of welfare systems. This explanation is, however, only partial. Two important aspects are neglected, thus requiring us to revise our understanding of the history of welfare systems and public services.

First, and most importantly, we must shift our focus to the local level, to the city, the place where this expansion took place. Historians must ask what the
role of the city was in the development of modern public services and welfare systems. Second, although a major part of previous scholarship has focused on the period after 1945, the focus should be on the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as this was the decisive period when public services were expanded and institutionalized.

Consequently, this book argues for a shift in perspective – from the ‘welfare state’ to the ‘welfare city’. As an analytical concept, the welfare city captures a central facet of this historical development, as it emphasizes the importance of urban areas, and urbanity itself, as driving forces for the organization and institutionalization of human welfare. This claim draws on recent scholarship that has argued for the significance of urban origins in the development of the modern state and the emergence of citizenship going back to the early modern period. The key conclusion from this body of research is that citizenship is not only a state project; rather, at the turn of the twentieth century, it was significantly shaped by urban politics. The analytical framework of the welfare city thus places urban politics before national politics, in order to explain how and why public services and welfare systems developed.

The main themes and objectives of this book are threefold. First, as stated earlier, it advances the claim that welfare systems and citizenship have urban origins and developed in cities before they were taken up at the national level. This emphasizes local politics and urban development as important variables in the development of modern society. In comparison with previous scholarship on the welfare state, this perspective calls for a new chronological focus, as well as new explanations. These also necessitate new questions, such as how welfare was regarded from the viewpoint of the city, what it included and what its main contributions to urban life were. Such a perspective emphasizes other political agents and has the potential to show a different type of welfare than is typically observed at the national level.

Second, the book places the Nordic countries at the centre of the analysis. The Nordic region is underexplored when it comes to the urban development of welfare services and the expansion of citizenship in Europe. Most previous research has focused on the familiar cases of France, Britain and Germany, but the Nordic example holds special relevance for exploring the welfare city. Industrialization, and subsequent modernization, arrived relatively late to the region. Hypothetically, the Nordic countries could use knowledge and examples from continental Europe when implementing welfare reforms at the turn of the century. This would imply a different path to the welfare city than the one usually recognized in scholarship.

Third, the book makes a conceptual and theoretical contribution to the concept of the ‘welfare city’. The use of the concept has generally been confined to descriptive purposes, or limited to periods after 1945. An example of the latter is its use within architectural research. Niels Albertsen and Bülent Diken define the welfare city as confined to urban built environments and urban life after 1945.
The concept is also discussed implicitly by Juhani Letho in his analysis of cities within the welfare state. Both examples, however, emphasize the state’s influence on the city. The aim here is the opposite: to put the city before the state and to emphasize an earlier period in time. The book also aims to further develop the theory of the welfare city. The various chapters will show how the concept can be used when studying how Nordic cities launched reform policies to meet the social demands and political issues of the time.

The concept of welfare and the welfare city

The contributions in this book share a broad definition of the concept of ‘welfare’ and a similarly broad characterization of what is regarded as a ‘public service’. There is good reason for using expanded definitions. Throughout history, the welfare of the populace has had a key legitimizing function for the powers that be: all areas of government that upheld legitimacy, state or urban, were by extension part of a welfare system. This aligns with the research of sociologist Barrington Moore Jr., who has argued that the material welfare of the people has always been one of any given authority’s most important tasks. According to Moore, however, the precise nature of these tasks, and how to uphold them, has varied between cultures and over time.

The authors in this volume expand on Moore’s description by incorporating non-material services into the definition of urban welfare. Thus, the following chapters contain various examples of welfare and public services that include not only infrastructure and housing projects but also health care, education, outdoor life and entertainment. Such a broad definition enables an interpretation of the whole range of changes in urban politics and in the management of cities, specifically during the period 1850–1940. Another benefit of including a variety of services is that it captures the wide range of political problems that municipal leadership was confronted with.

One trait typical of municipal administration in this period was the expansion of urban politics and the establishment of an urban political domain. Compared with the very limited management of cities and towns during the early modern period, changes in the 1800s were all-inclusive, and local administrators started to take an interest in many aspects of citizens’ everyday lives, including the physical appearance of the city. This draws on the work of Ben Ansell and Johannes Lindvall, who define public services as services that ‘shape and transform people’. Ansell and Lindvall connect public services to social improvement and a quest to enhance the living conditions of the citizens.

This broad definition of welfare and public services helps to define the concept of the welfare city itself. Henceforward, the welfare city is understood as the political vision of municipal authorities to expand and improve public services. It highlights a political shift that occurred when municipal leadership abandoned parsimony in favour of investment in citizens’ well-being. This includes not
only material forms of services such as tramways and hospitals but also social services such as education and health care. The welfare city is thus a concept that encapsulates social, economic and cultural transformations in the welfare of urban communities.

Political problems of the past have inspired this definition, but it also takes its cue from ongoing debates where the concept of the welfare city is used to discuss how present-day cities and urban communities can lead the way in reforming social and environmental policy when national governments fail. This means addressing segregation and economic inequality, as well as promoting a sustainable urban environment. There is a growing amount of scholarly literature discussing the necessary changes in public policy matters. A historical perspective, however, is often lacking. This book, which discusses how Nordic cities launched reform policies to meet the social and environmental issues of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, is an important contribution to this discussion.

Consequently, this book presents a new approach to the study of welfare cities in the Nordic countries since 1850. From then on, local politicians abandoned the traditional ideal of financial austerity in order to tackle the political and social problems in their cities. This approach draws on scholarship that has uncovered ways in which urban areas were in fact the drivers of societal change at that time. This was partly the politics of necessity, as urban areas all over Europe witnessed increased political and social conflict. Still, the crucial reforms were decided by local politicians, thus making a strong case for the importance of studying urban politics.

This book, moreover, presents a wider approach to welfare studies, discussing expanding public services, social housing policies, new urban leisure areas and popular entertainment as tools for promoting social inclusion and urban citizenship. It also addresses the legitimacy and durability of urban government in times of social conflict. Taken together, the various chapters discuss interpretations of welfare politics that expand the traditional focus on health care, education and social services, as they also focus on the arena of urban politics.

Furthermore, the three great processes of increased urbanization, continued industrialization and a final breakthrough for capitalism and a market-oriented business merged during the nineteenth century. Together, these processes created tensions in urban communities as more and more people competed for jobs and sustenance. To handle both social conflict and deteriorated living conditions, local politicians were forced to take action. For example, sanitary measures had to be implemented to accommodate more inhabitants in the city, and infrastructure had to be built to regulate water and electricity, as well as to transport workers to and from the factories. Thus, the welfare city entered the picture.

This introductory chapter serves two purposes. First, it introduces and discusses the municipal changes that took place in Europe from 1850 onwards and briefly describes the changes in the Nordic countries specifically. This serves to
place the welfare city, as defined earlier, in its historical and historiographical context. As previously mentioned, the main argument of this book is that urban welfare reforms predated, and anticipated, reforms on a national level, hence putting the emergence of the welfare city before that of the welfare state. Therefore, the contributing chapters in the book all elaborate on various aspects of the Nordic welfare city since 1850. The second purpose of this introduction is to briefly introduce the individual chapters, setting the scene for an analysis of the Nordic welfare city in this period, to which the book returns in the concluding chapter on types and dimensions.

**Municipal intervention and reforms in the nineteenth century**

From the middle of the nineteenth century, like their counterparts on the continent and in Britain, the political leaders of the cities in the Nordic countries were faced with the task of managing the rising challenges of an expanding city. In this period, Europe experienced a renaissance where both the idea of the city as a politically autonomous community and demands for municipal reforms were articulated. The Nordic countries gradually introduced municipal self-government, and municipal authorities increasingly gained control over local affairs.  

The position of local urban government within a national institutional framework became common in Europe and the Nordic countries in the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century. In Norway and Denmark, municipal legislation was already introduced in 1837, which was subsequently revised in Denmark in 1869. Sweden implemented a municipal reform in 1862, and Finland followed with their initial reforms in 1863. The Nordic countries gradually reformed municipal self-government, following a pan-European trajectory that coincided with rapid population growth and a liberalization of trade and commerce. Pierre-Yves Saunier has described it as a first wave of municipalization and the introduction of a ‘municipal condition’. In this case, the Nordic region is of particular interest due to its obscurity in earlier research, as well as to the general perception of it as a homogeneous political and social region. The question is how extensive the reforms of the welfare city in Nordic cities and towns were, and whether there are any specific Nordic traits in this development. These themes will be explored by the authors in this book.

One of the most important features of the municipal condition was the establishment of city councils, a new institution in the mid-1800s. This was a representative body that gradually replaced older forms of urban governance, such as magistrates, and old institutions, such as boards of aldermen and the like. Although it was new, it was largely based on these older organizational forms and they often existed in parallel for many years. The members of the city council were typically elected by the freemen of the city; nevertheless, it should not be mistaken for a democratic body. Rather, eligible members of the council consisted of the wealthiest male citizens, such as merchants, manufacturers and
landowners. Over time, it also came to include emerging professional groups such as lawyers and local administrators. Consequently, the council became the most important political arena for competition and conflict between the established elites within a city or town. This development was similar across Europe, and the Nordic countries followed a path where political participation in urban politics increased over time. At the same time, the municipal government experienced steady growth as the local administration expanded, and the previous small-sized civic bureaucracy was replaced with a more professional organization.

From this point onwards, the municipalities and the local politicians played a crucial role in creating a stronger public sector. Rapid urbanization triggered social problems that led local politicians to engage in improving conditions for the working poor. A distinct feature of urban politics in the nineteenth century was, however, an aversion to increased taxation. The ruling elites consisted predominantly of the wealthiest property owners, what John Garrard has called an ‘urban squirearchy’. These urban politicians combined traits from early modern modes of ruling with their positions in the new industrialized economy, influenced by *laissez-faire* ideas. They were hostile to all kinds of spending on behalf of the city, as well as raising any taxes in order to acquire the money to do so. This established an understanding of the city itself as an institution where taxes should be minimized, and parsimony towards public spending became the order of urban politics.

This meant that proposals for public investment increasingly led to political disputes and even outright conflict. As a consequence, several potential improvements, such as sanitary and social reforms for city residents, were severely delayed. One famous example is Hamburg, as Richard Evans has shown, where a ruling patrician class of property owners tenaciously resisted the construction and expansion of a water filtration system in the city, arguing that it would be too expensive. A filtration system would likely have reduced the effects of the cholera epidemic that struck Hamburg in 1892 and killed more than 8,600 people.

The dominance of austerity and parsimony, however, gradually changed in the second half of the nineteenth century. The reason was foremost water, the Hamburg cholera tragedy being a case in point. Starting in Britain already in the 1840s, boosted by sanitary science, more and more local authorities invested in freshwater infrastructure and implemented new regulations on public services in general. This process marked a shift in urban politics, as the initiative came to rest in the hands of the public authorities instead of private companies. The expansion and construction of waterworks are good examples of the kind of change that occurred when new types of public services were introduced. Throughout Europe, private companies had pioneered the expansion of urban infrastructure, typically in the form of water, electricity and gas. In many European cities, waterworks were built by private companies; they were perceived as profitable businesses by their owners. Widespread dissatisfaction with how they ran these businesses, though, soon led many local governments to take over. One example is Glasgow, which, as Hamish Fraser has shown, was one of the
first British cities to use municipal authority to improve social conditions. Widespread frustration amongst Glaswegian politicians concerning the two private water companies’ running of the waterworks led to a majority of the city council supporting a purchase of the companies.28

The building and operation of infrastructural systems thus encompass both contestation and resistance, as well as political conflict. In his study of Berlin, Timothy Moss emphasizes that infrastructure is politics.29 Likewise, Andreas Marklund and Mogens Rüdiger have claimed that infrastructure is a historical construction: partly technical, but also consisting of people and their relationship to the technology.30 Consequently, urban historians have recently focused on the history of urban infrastructure in a broader sense, talking about an ‘infrastructural turn’ and analysing the relationship between infrastructure, welfare and public services.31 This is a reaction against what Stefan Höhne has called the peripheral position of infrastructure within urban theory.32 Building on this research, scholars have claimed that the future nationalization of urban public services and infrastructure made the welfare state possible, as it was deduced from the development on the municipal level. Hence, the welfare city preceded the welfare state.

Freshwater supply and sewage were amongst the first problems to be addressed by local authorities. Both were closely connected and hotly debated all over Europe. Inadequate sewage systems were one of the main causes of disease and deteriorating health in the urban areas of Europe in the 1800s. The introduction of water-borne sewage systems was, however, a costly investment for local politicians. Even if cities started to spend more money on public infrastructure, a more general expansion of the sewage systems did not take place until the end of the century.33 Another example of a health-improving measure was the construction of market halls for selling food. As it was argued in, among other places, Stockholm, the market halls were one way to increase the standard of hygiene around food sales, but it was also, as shown by Jenny Lee, a manifestation of a growing concern for the consuming public.34 Yet another example of such measures was the relocation of slaughterhouses from city centres to the outskirts of the city, decreasing the number of animals in the city.35

The broad expansion of modern sewage systems, as well as the availability of fresh water, was a trans-European development, whereby the urban centres of Europe learned from each other. In Copenhagen, for example, the water supply system was expanded as a response to the growth of the city, and inspiration was drawn from London, Berlin and Paris.36 In Stockholm, likewise, experts from England were consulted when the first waterwork was planned and eventually started its operation in 1861.37 Scholars studying these processes in the Nordic countries have demonstrated how networks of professionals promoted the spread of new technology and administrative know-how.38

Beginning in the 1850s, a shift in the relationship between political bodies and private enterprise unfolded in Europe, escalating not only extensive investments in infrastructure systems such as sanitation, public transport and electrification
but also the regulation of their operation. These changes, however, were not limited to physical infrastructure: they also included social reforms such as education and health care. A paradoxical consequence of this shift was that it benefitted not only the public interest but also the industrialists. In their not-unusual position as both local politicians and entrepreneurs, they became more and more entangled in local affairs. One example of this, as shown by Martin Daunton and other British historians, is when political leaders started regulating prices on utility goods such as gas, coal and energy. In general terms, this shift can be described as the end of classic *laissez-faire* capitalism and the dawn of an era where state and municipal interventions into private business operations became the order of the day, in many cases based on arguments defending the common interest of the citizens.

The process from private to public has been explained as a result of the growing role of the state at the expense of the market. This book takes a different approach. The contributors do recognize that the state has been an important agent for centralization and the management of public services. Putting too
much emphasis on the state level, however, skews the chronology of the historical development of both public services as institutions, as well as the notion of an increasing responsibility towards one’s fellow citizens. The shift from private to public management of these services first took place in an urban context, as local governments and municipal authorities worked to address the social and practical problems of increased urbanization in the nineteenth century.

Modernity is somewhat connected to the expansion of the city in the decades surrounding 1900. In Germany, municipal authorities strove to create a modern city. The path forward was to embrace modern technologies, regulate business and expand the influence of local administration. This programme was forcefully implemented in German cities and became known as ‘municipal socialism’, a concrete political programme where local civil servants controlled and planned urban growth and expansion. The various parts of this programme differed from city to city, of course; however, its major trait was the ambition to establish better living conditions for the inhabitants of the city by utilizing the power and resources of municipal administration.

The municipal socialism of turn-of-the-century Germany followed the previous development in Britain. As the example of the Glasgow waterwork shows, British cities and towns had already begun to reform their municipal social policies and take over what was seen as important municipal infrastructure in the 1850s. Besides Glasgow, municipal socialism was also strong in Birmingham. Other European examples include Belgium, a centre for the municipal socialist movement after the turn of the century; the movement also later became influential in Spain, until the outbreak of the Civil War.

The advance of local authorities inevitably politicized urban government. The label itself, ‘municipal socialism’, denotes a policy in opposition to conservative values and ideas. Consequently, parts of the programme of municipal socialism were already associated with the emerging socialist movement by its contemporaries. One example of this is the prominence of municipal action within the socialist movement in Paris in 1900. At the fifth international socialist congress, the question of whether socialists should take up positions within local administration was debated. The congress eventually agreed upon a resolution that participation in local government was a legitimate strategy in the struggle for a socialist society.

By implementing municipal socialism, German cities and towns were the role models for urban reformers of the day. City planners, engineers and architects were inspired by municipal governments in Germany, and several municipal exhibitions were held in German cities in the early 1910s. Drawing on previous municipal takeovers in Britain, German municipal socialists continued to resent private interest in what were perceived to be municipal activities. They claimed that private initiatives in certain areas, such as street cleaning and waste collection, would only serve the self-interest of the entrepreneur. Instead, they asserted the superiority of public ownership, as it would guarantee access for
everyone and efficient operation for all inhabitants in the city. These arguments were echoed in the Nordic countries. In Sweden, for example, these claims led to a shift in politics where effective operation of public services became linked to public management.

The trend towards public organization was transnational in character. From the mid-nineteenth century, as emphasized by Pierre-Yves Saunier, municipal urban governments became part of structures and organizational frameworks that facilitated transnational activities. The leaders of Nordic cities were part of this process and followed the development in other parts of Europe closely. The Danish historian Søren Kolstrup has shown how municipal socialism, combined with social democratic political dominance, was one important part of the emergence of the Danish welfare state. According to Kolstrup, at the turn of the twentieth century, cities and towns in Denmark experimented with different welfare solutions that were later picked up by the state. Likewise, Saunier has labelled these processes as ‘municipal experiments’. Similarly to Kolstrup, he claims that the emergence of the welfare state was an extrapolation from these urban contexts. In other words, social reforms were first carried out at the municipal level, pioneering the development of the modern welfare state.

There are many potential explanations for the shift towards municipalization and the expansion of public services. They do differ, however, depending on context and period in time. Municipal socialism, for example, has been used to explain developments at the turn of the twentieth century, but the shift towards municipalization had started earlier. As Robert Millward has shown, municipal socialism as an ideology is not enough to explain changes in the management and regulation of public services from the 1850s onwards. Instead, Millward emphasizes the importance of rights of way for the building of large infrastructure and the eventual possibility for municipalities to make money off of various services. Yet another explanation is the consequences of World War I. Local authorities were forced to take responsibility for basic needs such as housing, food and sanitation, for refugees and locals alike both during and after the war. The war thus expanded the activities of local governments, as they became the primary suppliers of public services.

The contributions in this book discuss different facets of the emergence of the welfare city. They all, however, ground themselves in the notion that general patterns are the result of local solutions. Using empirical evidence from the Nordic countries, they provide new interpretations of the expansion of public services and the establishment of the welfare city. Knowledge about this process is important, not only for our historical understanding of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century but also for contemporary discussions about today’s welfare cities and how to create more sustainable and socially inclusive urban communities. More than a hundred years ago, politicians in Nordic cities succeeded in realizing an expansive social policy in spite of severe financial constraints. This book claims that the mechanisms fuelling this process may hold important clues for the reformulation of public interest in the twenty-first century.
Nordic welfare cities in a changing world

The book consists of nine chapters that analyse various parts of the Nordic welfare city. In the first chapter, Mikkel Thelle addresses the question of urban citizenship, using the example of water in Copenhagen from c. 1850 to the post-war period. In 1859, the city established a municipal water system. In the decades that followed, access to water became a welfare service provided by the city, first in municipal bathing halls, but then in private homes as well. Thus, in his chapter, Thelle explores the development of urban welfare citizenship through the example of water. This process represents a negotiation between various interests in the city, as urban water involves rights and duties for the citizens, a phenomenon that could be called infrastructured citizenship.

The municipalization process in Norway is surveyed in the next chapter. Knut Dørum argues that Norwegian cities and towns in the period 1850–1920 had specific traits that facilitated the development of the welfare city. These Norwegian communities had a long tradition of collective ownership and organization of common affairs. They also had a socioeconomic structure different from their Nordic neighbours. Dørum shows how, together with an early introduction of municipal reforms (1837), the cities in Norway were among the first to enforce real municipal government. This process, however, also led to conflicts between the reformers and conservatives from the old elite.

Alongside hard infrastructure such as tramways and waterpipes, the welfare city also comprised leisure welfare services. Using the example of theatre, Christina Reimann shows how the question of access to cultural infrastructure was a central theme in the making of the welfare city. In the city of Gothenburg in Sweden, the different theatres, both private and public, were an important part of the growing urban society, and as such, they became part of public debate. Reimann shows the role of the theatres in creating a new popular culture and, therefore, expands the perception of what, and whom, the welfare city should include. The theatres were part of a negotiation of urban citizenship as they developed into a public cultural infrastructure.

In her chapter, Marjaana Niemi grapples with the expansion of suburbs in Helsinki in the late 1800s. As a response to rigid and slow urban planning, the inhabitants of Helsinki took to the fringes of the city. A new urban space was created on the unregulated land areas outside the city centre, including housing, workshops and factories. As Niemi shows, these suburban areas had limited access to the expanding welfare services of the city itself. The example of Hermanni and Fredriksberg demonstrates that municipal authorities considered these areas to be temporary places with negligible need for regulation. Instead, they were perceived as a future resource for the expansion of the welfare city.

A typical conflict within urban politics at the turn of the twentieth century was the clash between public and private management of public services. This is surveyed in Mats Hallenberg’s chapter on tramways in Stockholm and Kristiania c. 1900. Tramways represented modernity and had been established in the
second half of the 1800s. The tramway also, however, represented a business opportunity, and private entrepreneurs were often the ones who built and operated the tramlines. Hallenberg analyses two debates in the city councils where the question of municipal takeover was discussed. The debates show that the tramways were indeed perceived as a public service and an important part of the welfare city. Social democrats and conservatives, however, had very different views on how these services should be organized.

The connection between local and national politics is in focus in the chapter by Kati Katajisto. The welfare city expanded in tandem with the nation-state, and in the case of Helsinki after the Finnish Civil War (1918), this was even more evident. Katajisto shows how the municipal council in Helsinki was absolutely necessary and central to the process of reconstruction and reconciliation after the war. Municipal democracy enabled debates over questions such as inclusion, welfare and equity. The debates thus contributed to the creation of the welfare city, based on negotiations and democratic values.

The next chapter returns to the perspective of infrastructural citizenship, this time in the first half of the twentieth century. Mikkel Høghøj studies the so-called slum areas of Copenhagen. These areas, located in the central parts of the city, became the subject of redevelopment plans in the 1940s. These plans gave the authorities of Copenhagen the mandate to evict tenants perceived as having doubtful behavioural standards. Part of this process was the introduction of housing inspections. Høghøj shows how this gave the inhabitants in slum areas a position to bargain with the city regarding the shortcomings of the public services there. These negotiations offered a possibility for the occupants to become citizens of the emerging welfare city.

Staying in Copenhagen, the next chapter draws on the consequences of increased time for leisure activities following industrialization. In Copenhagen, the aristocracy had established holiday homes on the coast outside of the city since the early modern period. In the first half of the twentieth century, it became possible for ordinary people to acquire holiday homes. The welfare city thus expanded beyond the city limits. In his chapter, Henning Bro surveys the conflicts surrounding these holiday villages. Holiday homes became a contested political issue, pitting homeowners against those who argued for free access to the coastal line. Bro shows how the city of Copenhagen and the national government, after a prolonged conflict, secured access to important areas of the coast for the less-affluent citizens, hence enlarging the scope of the welfare city.

In the last chapter of the book, the chronological focus changes. Taking a macro perspective on Sweden, Heiko Droste follows the expanding welfare city from the turn of the twentieth century until today. Droste presents a typology that includes three different types of welfare cities. The first is the expanding welfare city at the turn of the century, the second type emerges after World War II when welfare at the local level was organized and managed on behalf of the state and the third type, which emerged in the 1990s, again involves municipal, religious and social institutions as part of local communities. In his chapter, Droste shows
how the emerging welfare state intervened in welfare city policies and eventually integrated them in the post-war Swedish welfare state. The concept of the welfare city thus remains a valid tool for analysing the relationships between local and national governments in the twenty-first century.

Finally, the book concludes with a chapter by Mats Hallenberg and Magnus Linnarsson. Here, the interpretations in the various chapters are put together, and an analysis of the Nordic welfare city is discussed. The chapter also proposes a typology of the Nordic welfare city.
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