

# 11 The Nordic welfare city – types and dimensions

*Magnus Linnarsson and Mats Hallenberg*

The municipal administration expanded greatly in cities and towns in the Nordic countries after 1850. The contributors to this book have argued that this expansion constituted the emergence of the Nordic welfare city: it was during this period that city councils wrestled with issues as diverse as how best to organize water distribution, improve housing conditions and support the local theatre scene and how to run the city's tramway system. These public services were introduced as a means to improve the well-being of a city's inhabitants. The expansion was also a response to deteriorated living conditions and impending social conflict.

This book argues that our understanding of the history of welfare systems and public services requires reassessment. The various contributions each demonstrate that social reforms and the expansion of public services were first carried out at the municipal level, pioneering the development of the modern welfare state. Cities and towns experimented with different welfare solutions, and the emergence of the welfare state was an extrapolation from these processes.<sup>1</sup> This perspective differs from the majority of previous research on the development of modern public services. Up until this point, the focus has most often been on the period after 1945 and on the national level and the welfare state.<sup>2</sup>

The approach argued for here is the opposite: the chronological focus must be shifted to consider the expansion of public services prior to 1945. The expansion was, furthermore, primarily a result of urban politics whereby specifically the period 1850–1940 represents a transition from an austere political agenda to a more expansive public policy. It was during this period that money and resources were invested in cities to improve living conditions and the welfare of the urban community.<sup>3</sup>

Using the concept of the welfare city, the aim of the book has been to explore a whole range of political agents and interactions, to show a different type of welfare than that which is more commonly surveyed on the national level. Let us therefore review the definition of the concept, as stated in the first chapter. There, the welfare city was defined 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' wellbeing'. The concept of welfare city thus captures the centrality of historical developments, as it emphasizes the importance of urban politics as a driving force for the organization of human welfare. Furthermore, it reveals the importance of urban origins for the development of the modern state and the origins of urban citizenship.<sup>4</sup>

The concept of the welfare city has not been used often in historical research. By and large, its use has been limited to descriptive purposes, such as reporting on the general development of public services at a local level.<sup>5</sup> This means that the welfare city has been more of a catchphrase than an analytical term applied with any theoretical rigor. It has, for example, been used analytically in architectural research, but only with regard to urban planning and urban life after 1945.<sup>6</sup> In this book, we have argued for a shift in chronological focus to an earlier period. We contend that the expansion of public services during the period 1850–1940 needs to be taken into account when analysing the expansion of welfare services. Moreover, the contributions in this book have clearly shown that the expansion of public services was driven by urban politicians and was thus an issue that created political conflicts.

The main objectives of the book have been threefold. The most important was to demonstrate that welfare systems and citizenship have urban origins and developed in cities before on the national level. This broadens our understanding of how and why local urban governments began to expand public services and what implications this had for the subsequent development of the welfare state. The development has been analysed using the Nordic countries as an empirical example. Consequently, the second goal was to put forward the Nordic countries as the focus of the study. As Magnus Linnarsson argued in Chapter 1, the Nordic countries represent a different path to the welfare city than the one usually recognized in previous research. Finally, a third important objective of the book was the conceptual and theoretical elaboration on the concept of the 'welfare city'. As demonstrated by the previous chapters, the concept can fruitfully be applied when studying Nordic cities and towns and how they launched reform policies to meet the social demands and the political issues of the time.

### **Contestation, negotiation and citizenship**

The expanding welfare city was a political vision, as well as a set of institutions and everyday practices. Historians have especially emphasized the importance of infrastructure in this process. The concept of the welfare city, however, comprises more than the expansion of infrastructural systems. Rather, infrastructure is only one example of institutions and practices that were established after 1850. The welfare city was built not only by infrastructure but also by health care, education, outdoor life and entertainment. This is, however, not just a categorization of different services in the city. These different institutions and practices formed arenas of negotiation within the welfare city and therefore within urban politics.

The concept of the welfare city thus comprises various analytical elements. One of them is the growth of political contestation and negations themselves. The urban political arena, particularly the city council, became more politicized during the period. This led to increased political debates about how urban public services should be organized and operated. An important dimension of this is the conflict between public and private management. This dichotomy is one of the most obvious political conflicts where local politicians expressly have different opinions. The contribution by Mats Hallenberg, for example, shows this in the case of the debates on tramways in Stockholm and Kristiania. Another example is Christina Reimann's chapter on theatres in Gothenburg.

The political conflict between public and private demonstrates how a particular service develops from a specific infrastructure into a public service. The implication of this is that the welfare city transformed various services into *public* services. Importantly, this was not restricted to infrastructure but includes social and cultural services as well. The welfare city, thus, proposed to improve living conditions for the urban community.<sup>7</sup> A consequence of this policy, however, was that controlling access became important: who should have the right to use these new public services? This points to another important arena of negotiation: the increased conflict between inclusion and exclusion. Some of the townspeople were entitled to use modern public services, and some were not. This sparked political debates on organization and equal access within the city. The latter points to another central theme of the welfare city: the question of urban citizenship.

Citizenship is a central element of the concept of the welfare city. In an era before national citizenship was institutionalized, belonging or not belonging to the city was central to people's lives. Marten Prak has identified citizenship as a bundle of social and political rights, manifested in everyday practices: to engage in the community and take part in public life.<sup>8</sup> The welfare city broadened urban citizenship to more people, making them part of the urban community. Central to this was the expansion of public services and the policy that made them accessible to the inhabitants. This created the 'welfare citizen' who had the right to benefit from these new services and could partake in the political life of the city.

The welfare city is thus a concept that merges various arenas of negotiations and comprehends the vision of municipal authorities to expand and improve public services. The vision stated that municipal authorities – politicians in city councils most of all – must assume responsibility for improving the living conditions of urban residents. The means and motifs for engaging in this process, however, varied between different cities and countries.

### **The origins and transformations of the Nordic welfare city**

Knut Dørum traces the emergence of the welfare state in Norway through the municipal reforms of the 1830s. The reforms derived from traditions of self-government and put the initiative and control firmly in the hands of the established

elites. Even among these elites, though, there were reformers who strived to promote the common good and invest in public services to improve everyday life for most citizens. Dørum identifies three generations of urban reformers: the bureaucrats who wanted to improve the urban environment from a humanitarian viewpoint, then the liberals who wanted the city to provide public services also for the less affluent citizens and finally the social democrats who demanded equal access and decent living conditions for workers and their families. From Dørum's perspective, the Norwegian cities were pioneers when it came to organizing various public services under strict municipal control.

While Dørum puts the political elites at the forefront of the struggle for urban welfare services, Mikkel Thelle highlights the important role of educated professionals in the municipal office of Copenhagen. The disastrous effects of the cholera pandemics put freshwater supply and sewerage at the top of the agenda for municipal reform in the mid-nineteenth century. Educated experts in science and medicine were employed by the city to explore the best ways to combat disease and provide better sanitary systems for the future. Thelle identifies the water system as key in the metabolic expansion of the welfare city and goes on to investigate the different stages of organizing the vital flow of water through the city. The focus on identifying and eliminating the roots of disease was eventually supplemented by public bathing halls, where less privileged residents could learn and adopt cleansing practices to make the city a healthier place. While the municipality invested in public services for health promotion, the more affluent citizens began to invest in modern apartments with private bathing rooms. In the post-war period, when private bathing rooms had become a mainstay for most citizens, the public bathing halls were transformed into places of recreation, sport and leisure.

Thelle's chapter provides a historical perspective on how the city of Copenhagen expanded the scope of welfare services from basic infrastructure, via the promotion of health and sanitary practices, to an active engagement in the pastime and well-being of the modern citizen. While Thelle bases his argument on Charlotte Lemanski's concept of infrastructural citizenship, he also shows that negotiations regarding urban welfare services came to extend far beyond infrastructure. This perspective is further explored by Henning Bro in his study of the summerhouse boom in Greater Copenhagen during the twentieth century. Bro convincingly demonstrates how the more affluent urban citizens ventured to establish their own holiday homes in the green outskirts of the Danish metropolis. This spatial extension of the welfare city eventually threatened to occupy most of the surrounding green and coastal areas. The process was at odds, however, with the ambitions of politicians at the national level, who wanted to dedicate open spaces in attractive areas for collective purposes: beach life, hiking and camping, as well as the protection of wildlife and forestry. In the end, the expansion of summerhouse villages was blocked by central and regional government agencies. The welfare city was denied the right to use the whole region of Zealand as a project area for the needs of its wealthier citizens.

Urban welfare politics may have started with technological infrastructure but they soon came to incorporate a whole range of practices and institutions that were framed as targets for municipal organization. Christina Reimann demonstrates how modern theatre and public entertainment became a matter of political contestation in Gothenburg in the early twentieth century. In Sweden's most important port city, commercial entrepreneurs competed for the public's affection by providing light entertainment in small venues. These shows mainly attracted workers, sailors and people from the lower middle classes but did not satisfy the cultural ambitions of the leading bourgeoisie. They wanted Gothenburg to be a part of the international cultural scene and demanded that the city council intervened to create a proper venue for modern, serious theatre. After various collaborations with private entrepreneurs proved futile, the city council eventually decided to build their own city theatre in the public square of Götaplatsen.

Providing urban citizens with improved conditions was essentially a municipal project, although it eventually came to involve a number of commercial actors and voluntary organizations that could provide financial resources or necessary expertise. As Mats Hallenberg's chapter demonstrates, urban services were also a target for big business interests. While politicians in Stockholm and Kristiania generally agreed that the tramways were a vital public service, they differed regarding the best way to secure that benefit for the greater public. Social democrats and liberals argued that municipal operation was necessary to guarantee the extension of transport services connecting all parts of the city. Conservatives opposed this view, insisting that private companies would provide better services and cheaper fares for all citizens. The connectedness of the Nordic capital cities thus became a matter of negotiation between city councils, private companies, opinion-makers – and, of course, the urban public.

Negotiations over how to expand and develop the welfare city eventually came to involve the state as well. Heiko Droste's chapter shows that the state generally played a passive role in the initial expansion of the welfare city. Central governments provided organizational and (sometimes) financial support, but they had neither the means nor the ambition to control the direction of municipal expansion. This would change, however, in the post-war period, when social-democratic governments launched a succession of political reforms in order to create universal welfare services for all citizens of the nation.

The Nordic welfare state thus superseded the welfare city, directing and regulating the scope and character of services that still had to be provided by municipal authorities. Droste identifies the post-war Swedish municipalities as a different type of welfare city: less autonomous, but still organizing vital public services that were increasingly required and financed by the emerging welfare state. His chapter also addresses the transformations of the twenty-first century. As public welfare institutions find themselves drained of both financial and political support, welfare services are increasingly allocated to private associations or philanthropic initiatives. This might lead to a third type of welfare city: one where the quality and scope of municipal services are actually diminishing, and

the task of improving the living conditions of urban citizens is referred to by various private and commercial agents.

The general process and successive expansion of public services under municipal control from the mid-nineteenth century and onwards is well known from the works of Marjatta Hietala, Pierre-Yves Saunier and others.<sup>9</sup> This book contributes to the discussion by qualifying the meaning and motives of this process from an actor-oriented perspective. Together, the chapters demonstrate that the development of the welfare city engaged a whole range of individuals and organizations: not only politicians and professionals but also commercial entrepreneurs, philanthropists, local activists and voices of public opinion. Importantly, the growing commitment from politicians and bureaucrats to improve the living conditions of the urban population had potentially emancipative effects: a growing number of city residents became part of the welfare city project, people from the working class as well as the urban poor. The ‘politics of inclusion’, however, often relied on patriarchal concerns and exclusive practices, as will be discussed further in the next section.

In her classic work on urban public services, Marjatta Hietala identifies three distinct phases in the expansion. European cities first invested in basic infrastructure, then in institutions for education and instruction and, at a later stage, in cultural and recreational services.<sup>10</sup> The chapters in this volume indicate that there was no strict chronology or progression of the welfare city in the Nordic context. Instead, the different types of services represented vital dimensions of the welfare city that may or may not be the subject of municipal intervention for the greater good and the well-being of the modern, urban citizen.

### **Inclusion and exclusion: the scope of urban citizenship**

The expansion of municipal services described in the previous section has been analysed as the institutional base for more inclusive social policies. The Nordic welfare city came to provide physical infrastructure, social services as well as cultural and recreational activities for the majority of urban citizens, not just for the wealthy. Technological innovations such as freshwater systems, gas and electricity were transformed into public services that could also be claimed by marginalized citizens on the outskirts of the modern city. This process was, however, highly contested, and the rights to urban citizenship were far from equally distributed. Welfare cities might pursue inclusive policies, but these practices inevitably had exclusionary dimensions as well.

Marjaana Niemi’s chapter demonstrates how Helsinki politicians placed the outskirts of the welfare city outside the scope of municipal intervention. These predominantly working-class suburbs were not objects of city planning, nor were they a natural target for the extension of public services. Rather, they were considered to exist on the outside of modernity, not worthy of the attention of the welfare city’s leaders. Niemi argues that Helsinki authorities saw a temporal

divide separating the city centre and suburbs in the periphery. While the urban core was defined as permanent, modern and full of potential for future reform, places such as Hermanni and Fredriksberg were considered temporary and less worthy of attention. The neighbourhood was only relevant for council politics as an outside area that might become a target for the expansion of the ‘proper’ city.

The suburbs on the urban fringe were initially not subject to council regulation or the provision of public services. For some of the inhabitants, this marginalization had distinct advantages. The less developed areas offered opportunities for those who could not afford to pay the rents demanded by landlords in the urban core. In places like these, people could build their own homes according to their own needs. Niemi argues that the fringes of the city in fact offered a promise of permanence for these people, a place to settle down and raise a family. Eventually, the lack of municipal services became an acute problem and the suburban dwellers began to voice their need for safe roads, electricity and schools for their children. After World War II, many of these suburbs acted collectively to gain incorporation into the municipality. Urban citizenship was, in this case, very much a bottom-up process.

Political reform came late to Helsinki, as attempts to introduce universal suffrage and strengthen urban self-government were thwarted by reactionary Russian rule after 1905. The city council remained an arena for the elites, while tensions rose between the affluent burghers and the less fortunate inhabitants of the capital city. Finland was plunged into Civil War in 1917, and Kati Katajisto addresses the importance of municipal politics in bridging the gap between the two opposing sides when peace was restored and universal suffrage was introduced in 1918. Katajisto maintains that while national politics were still framed by the intolerant view of the conservative government towards the left-wing parties, the city council of Helsinki became an arena for negotiation and reconciliation between the two sides.

The council debates served as a learning process for social democrats and left-wing representatives who were adapting to the process of organized democracy. The burghers reluctantly recognized the need for political compromise in order to tackle the mounting social problems of a divided city. The process included not only formal negotiations over finances and municipal government but also responses to demands for social inclusion from workers and other marginalized groups. Expanding the welfare city, offering schools and playgrounds for children and social aid to those most in need thus became the foundation of reconciliation. In this way, the Helsinki city council acted as a pioneer for political solutions that were only later adopted by the national government.

While Katajisto offers a generally positive view on the development of the welfare city as a means of extending urban citizenship, Mikkel Høghøj’s contribution on slum clearances in Copenhagen in the 1940s provides a more complicated picture. These clearances could be seen as a further extension of the welfare system, getting rid of derelict slum quarters in order to make room for

better housing and modern sanitary services for the less fortunate. The process began as a top-down initiative, where local officials investigated the living standard of the inhabitants of the Borbergade-Adlergade district in order to make them comply with health regulations or face being evicted. However, the housing inspections also provided the tenants with a platform to voice their complaints over deficient services, demanding access to better housing. Høghøj argues that the negotiations between tenants and landlords must be analysed as acts of infrastructural citizenship. The inhabitants of the notorious slum district could assert themselves as citizens with specific socio-material rights, claiming to be part of the welfare city.

Høghøj's chapter demonstrates how the housing inspections were both an instrument for disciplinary measures and an arena for social negotiation and protest. The municipal housing inspection was generally positive towards requests from working-class families with a steady income. Those who were deemed not worthy of public help, on the other hand, were denied the opportunity to move to modern apartments. Social inclusion was a limited option for marginalized groups, even in the modern welfare city. The general shortage of modern department flats during and after World War II, meanwhile, meant that the plans to tear down the Borbergade district had to be postponed on several occasions. When the Borbergade quarters were at last torn down to be replaced by modern apartment blocks in the late 1950s, the new flats were reserved for those who could afford to pay the rent. The last inhabitants of the urban slum district had to look for affordable accommodation elsewhere. In the end, they could not achieve the full benefits of urban infrastructural citizenship.

This urban citizenship could be negotiated directly not only by municipal officials and the inhabitants of the city but also through political confrontation in municipal and administrative institutions. Initially, the city councils were controlled by the urban elites, but from the late nineteenth century, local politicians became increasingly pressured by public opinion. Both Reimann and Hallenberg demonstrate how newspaper articles and public meetings came to infiltrate council debates. In Hallenberg's case, public opinion was generally framed as the voice of the less affluent residents of the Swedish capital, or of their peers in Kristiania. They repeatedly called for social inclusion in the form of better and cheaper tramway services, connecting working-class suburbs with the city centre. In Reimann's chapter on public theatres, it was instead the enlightened bourgeois press who demanded municipal support for establishing a modern theatre staging 'serious' productions. Taken together, both cases demonstrate how politicians not only became increasingly aware of public opinion but also acted on it in order to preserve their own positions.

The successive introduction of universal suffrage inevitably boosted the role of partisan politics, which meant that urban citizenship was negotiated more frequently in council debates by politicians representing the collective interests of different groups in the city. This might increase the risk for organizational

stalemates, as demonstrated by the prolonged debates on the municipalization of tramways in Stockholm and Kristiania. Political confrontation, however, could also produce effective compromises, as confirmed by Kati Katajisto's chapter on Helsinki after the Finnish Civil War. The welfare city itself was not contested: politicians from all quarters generally agreed on the fundamental importance of providing better services for the greater public. Politicians from different sides, however, had competing visions of the character and scope of the services and citizenship that should make up the welfare city.

### **Explaining the Nordic welfare city**

An important conclusion of this book is that the evolution of the welfare city was a process of several overlapping phases or dimensions. In contrast to Marjatta Hietala's three phases of urban services, we suggest that this development should be interpreted as a succession of different types of welfare cities with specific characteristics. These types are not necessarily sequential in time, but are to some extent overlapping and entangled, depending on political and social contexts. They do, however, draw on a basic, common chronology.<sup>11</sup>

From the mid-nineteenth century, municipal elites invested considerable public means to create freshwater and wastewater systems in order to improve sanitary conditions for the working poor as well as for themselves. *The patriarchal welfare city* introduced basic infrastructural services from above in order to preserve social order and the hegemony of the urban oligarchy. These measures, however, were generally framed in a disciplinary discourse, which insisted that the dangerous masses must be subjected to reform by their social betters. Political decisions were made by the traditional elite, who acted on behalf of the poor. The latter had no voice of their own, and the political ambition of the emerging welfare city was to maintain the status quo within the boundaries of the old order.

The patriarchal city eventually had to deal with the demands and needs of a rapidly increasing population. The growth of cities and towns as a result of industrialization exposed the deficiencies of the patriarchal order. As industrialization and urbanization proceeded, technological innovations encouraged commercial entrepreneurs to develop infrastructural systems further, improving everyday life through gas heating, electric lights and new means of urban transport. In *the economic welfare city*, these new types of public services were provided by business firms operating with the consent of the city council. The guiding principle for the economic welfare city was that all profit-generating enterprises should be handled by private businesses. Indeed, elite politicians were themselves often businessmen or stakeholders in urban enterprises, thus combining personal gain and the public good. Consequently, public services were expanded, but they were nevertheless mainly distributed to social elites and those who could pay for them.

Towards the turn of the century, rapid urban growth and a growing division between the municipal elites and the urban poor prompted politicians to

introduce limited social reform. Pressure from popular movements and the rising tide of popular opinion also contributed to a shift in policy. In *the social welfare city*, city councils acted to extend infrastructural and social services in order to improve the standard of living of the urban population at large. This was sometimes done by negotiating new arrangements with private enterprises, but in many cases, politicians took over operations and placed them under municipal control. Municipalization became the preferred means to guarantee that public services were more evenly distributed. This process was accelerated by political reform, as social democrats and liberals gained hold of council seats, eventually weakening the capacity of urban elites to rule cities according to their own needs. The social city thus articulated lines of political division reminiscent of modern political ideologies.

Although the major part of this book is restricted to the period 1850–1940, the chapters by Mikkel Høghøj and Heiko Droste suggest an approach for further analysis of welfare cities. Høghøj's investigation of slum clearances and housing inspections describes how the expansion of the welfare city after World War II was increasingly directed by demands formulated by the (Nordic) welfare state. National legislation was clearly influenced by urban policies, but state intervention also informed the practices and decisions of local authorities. Heiko Droste paints a more pessimistic picture, stating that local governments became increasingly circumscribed by state regulations and eventually lost much of their political agency. In *the universal welfare city*, city councils and urban administrators provided more welfare services for urban citizens than ever before. They did this on commission, however, as central governments demanded that national citizenship must supersede urban belonging and local rights.

Droste also hints at a new type of welfare city emerging by the end of the twentieth century, what we might call *the neoliberal welfare city*. As both state and municipal authorities struggled to keep up with demands for more effective welfare services, they welcomed private entrepreneurs to take over public services and reorganize them according to business logics. Droste discusses the prevalence of private welfare solutions in present-day Sweden and claims that the increasing reliance on various philanthropic and civil organizations in providing basic welfare services must be understood as a return to the economic and social welfare city of the early 1900s. While this argument clearly has merit, there is an important difference to be noted. In the period covered by this book, municipal services were expanded to include a larger number of urban citizens both with and without the cooperation of civil organizations and private enterprises. In the twenty-first century, public services are distributed more unevenly, favouring active and affluent citizens above those less equipped to navigate the diverse landscape of opportunities and rights. Urban citizenship is, in effect, becoming less universal and more localized as welfare services are reformulated as acts of personal preference.

Our proposed model of five types of welfare cities draws on results presented by other scholars. Geographers Simon Marvin and Stephen Graham have pointed

out the importance of urban technological networks that from the late nineteenth century were merged into communication grids, first on the municipal level and then on regional and national levels. This network of infrastructural services formed the basis for the expansion of welfare services in the twentieth-century welfare states. Marvin and Graham also point to the dismantling of public governance from the 1970s, when neo-liberal policies effectively challenged the universal welfare systems and achieved a ‘splintering’ of urban services into a number of private business operations.<sup>12</sup> Chris Otter suggests a similar tripartite schema for the expansion of welfare services in Europe, based on the expansion of water supply and waste removal: a liberal model, favouring private supply of infrastructural services, was superseded by a social model that favoured collective provision over private interests. This model reached its pinnacle after 1945 but was supplanted by a neo-liberal model from the 1970s that introduced multiple forms of privatization of infrastructural services.<sup>13</sup>

The model we have presented earlier covers the whole period from c. 1850 to the present, addressing municipal organization as well as political regimes. Importantly, we make a distinction between the patriarchal welfare city of the old elites and the expansion of urban services during the heyday of the economic (or liberal) welfare city of the late nineteenth century. Our model also points to the emergence of municipal public services in the early 1900s that preceded the expansion of the Nordic welfare states of the mid-twentieth century. Finally, we do recognize the decisive impact of neoliberal policies on the provision and organization of welfare services and infrastructure networks in the new millennium.

Simon Gunn has highlighted the transformative role of infrastructural systems on urban politics. Following an actor-network perspective, he argues that cities must be studied as networks and assemblages of different kinds of power where human perceptions are closely linked to material conditions. Historical change comes about through contingency, as the attempts by politicians to shape and control infrastructural systems often produce unintended consequences.<sup>14</sup> This book has tried to take this approach one step further, addressing cultural and recreational services as well as water, sanitation and transport. We also contend that it was not material infrastructure by itself, but rather the ongoing contestation and negotiation over a plethora of various welfare services that eventually contributed to a widening and strengthening of urban citizenship. The types of welfare cities suggested earlier thus represent different outcomes from the ongoing struggle over material and cultural networks, involving paupers as well as politicians and professional experts.

### **The future of the welfare city**

What will happen to urban citizenship and the welfare city in the future? The perspectives outlined earlier offer both hope and fear. We might see the re-emergence of civil society as a positive trend, emphasizing local needs rather

than universal claims. Even more so, there is a vision that local engagement might be rejuvenated to improve the character of services provided for all kinds of citizens. On the other hand, the tendency of local politicians to concentrate their efforts on better-off citizens, leaving a growing number of local residents outside the scope of public welfare services, comes with a risk. Urban citizenship may once again be defined according to social status and what part of the city you live in. Citizenship would then be qualified according to spatial as well as social divides.

Migration, violence and xenophobia offer formidable challenges for the welfare cities of tomorrow. In some of the Nordic countries, national governments have advocated more repressive measures in order to deal with the effects of criminality and social conflict. If this line of reasoning is fully pursued in urban politics, the effect might well be a post-modern version of the patriarchal welfare city where the elites combine digital surveillance and physical violence in order to discipline the urban poor. So far, these issues have mostly been addressed by national governments, which makes it hard to predict how or whether local politicians will follow.

The editors of this book believe that the welfare city still holds a promise to stand firm against particular demands and develop its capacity to integrate various groups of city residents into the larger community of urban citizens. Municipal self-identification can be transformed into a positive force when faced with external pressure. As David Moss has demonstrated for the case of Berlin, popular mobilization and environmental activism may show the way to urban reform and a re-vitalization of public services.<sup>15</sup> It remains to be seen what type of welfare city politicians and citizens of Nordic cities will imagine and build in the future.

## Notes

- 1 Søren Kolstrup, *Velfærdsstatens rødder: fra kommunesocialisme til folkepension* (København: Selskabet til Forskning i Arbejderbevægelsens Historie, 1996), 455; Pierre-Yves Saunier, "Global City. Take 2: A View From Urban History," in *Another Global City: Historical Explorations into the Transnational Municipal Moment, 1850–2000*, ed. Pierre-Yves Saunier and Shane Ewen (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 10.
- 2 The classic example is Gøsta Esping-Andersen, *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (Cambridge: Polity, 1990). See also Niels Finn Christiansen et al., eds., *The Nordic Model of Welfare: A Historical Reappraisal* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2006).
- 3 Robert J. Morris and Richard H. Trainor, eds., *Urban Governance: Britain and beyond since 1750* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000); Mikael Hård and Marcus Stippak, "Progressive Dreams: The German City in Britain and the United States," in *Urban Machinery: Inside Modern European Cities*, ed. Mikael Hård and Thomas J. Misa (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2008); Friedrich Lenger, *European Cities in the Modern Era, 1850–1914* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), chap. 2.

- 4 Tom Hulme, “Putting the City Back into Citizenship: Civics Education and Local Government in Britain, 1918–45,” *Twentieth Century British History* 26, no. 1 (2015): 26–51; Simon Gunn et al., “Cities, Infrastructure and the Making of Modern Citizenship: The View from North-West Europe since c. 1870,” *Urban History* (March 25, 2022): 1–19.
- 5 One example is Torbjörn Nilsson, ed., *Stockholm blir välfärdsstad: kommunalpolitik i huvudstaden efter 1945* (Stockholm: Stockholmia, 2011). The concept is also implicitly discussed in Juhani Lehto, “Different Cities in Different Welfare States,” in *Cities in Contemporary Europe*, ed. Arnaldo Bagnasco and Patrick Le Galès (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 112–30.
- 6 Niels Albertsen and Bülent Diken, “Welfare and the City,” *Nordic Journal of Architectural Research* 17, no. 2 (2004): 7–22.
- 7 See Ben W. Ansell and Johannes Lindvall, *Inward Conquest: The Political Origins of Modern Public Services* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 15–16.
- 8 Marten Prak, *Citizens without Nations: Urban Citizenship in Europe and the World, c. 1000–1789* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 5–8.
- 9 Marjatta Hietala, *Services and Urbanization at the Turn of the Century: The Diffusion of Innovations* (Helsinki: SHS, 1987). Pierre-Yves Saunier, “Global City. Take 2: A View From Urban History,” in *Another Global City: Historical Explorations into the Transnational Municipal Moment, 1850–2000*, ed. Pierre-Yves Saunier and Shane Ewen (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
- 10 Hietala, *Services and Urbanization*, 179, 401–3.
- 11 The inspiration for this model also comes from Rolf Torstendahl, “Technology in the Development of Society 1850–1980. Four Phases of Industrial Capitalism in Western Europe,” *History and Technology* 1, no. 2 (1984); Hossein Sheiban, *Den ekonomiska staden: stadsplanering i Stockholm under senare hälften av 1800-talet* (Arkiv: Lund, 2002).
- 12 Stephen Graham and Simon Marvin, *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition* (London: Routledge, 2001), 41–42.
- 13 Chris Otter, “Locating Matter. The Place of Materiality in Urban History,” in *Material Powers: Cultural Studies, History and the Material Turn*, ed. Tony Bennett and Patrick Joyce (London: Routledge, 2010), 46–51.
- 14 Simon Gunn, “Heterodoxies. New Approaches to Power and Agency in the Modern City,” in *New Approaches to Governance and Rule in Urban Europe*, ed. Simon Gunn and Tom Hulme (New York: Routledge, 2020), 259–64, 270–71.
- 15 Timothy Moss, *Remaking Berlin: A History of the City Through Infrastructure, 1920–2020* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2020).