

## Immigrant Policy Developing in Copenhagen and Ishøj in the 1970s

Jønsson, Heidi Vad

*Published in:*  
Scandinavian Journal of History

*DOI:*  
10.1080/03468755.2013.826078

*Publication date:*  
2013

*Document version:*  
Submitted manuscript

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Jønsson, H. V. (2013). Immigrant Policy Developing in Copenhagen and Ishøj in the 1970s. *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 38(5), 590-611. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2013.826078>

Go to publication entry in University of Southern Denmark's Research Portal

### Terms of use

This work is brought to you by the University of Southern Denmark.  
Unless otherwise specified it has been shared according to the terms for self-archiving.  
If no other license is stated, these terms apply:

- You may download this work for personal use only.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying this open access version

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details and we will investigate your claim.  
Please direct all enquiries to [puresupport@bib.sdu.dk](mailto:puresupport@bib.sdu.dk)

This article was downloaded by: [University of Southern Denmark]

On: 08 November 2013, At: 00:23

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



## Scandinavian Journal of History

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/shis20>

### Immigrant Policy Developing in Copenhagen and Ishøj in the 1970s

Heidi Vad Jønsson<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Centre for Welfare State Research, University of Southern Denmark, Campusvej 55, DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark

Published online: 24 Sep 2013.

To cite this article: Heidi Vad Jønsson , Scandinavian Journal of History (2013): Immigrant Policy Developing in Copenhagen and Ishøj in the 1970s, Scandinavian Journal of History, DOI: 10.1080/03468755.2013.826078

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2013.826078>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

## Heidi Vad Jønsson

# IMMIGRANT POLICY DEVELOPING IN COPENHAGEN AND ISHØJ IN THE 1970S

*This article analyses the development of municipal immigrant policies in Denmark in the 1970s through a case study of two municipalities, Copenhagen and Ishøj. The two municipalities encountered immigration in the earliest phase of Danish integration policy. In this period, national policies were limited and immigrants' integration was primarily a municipal responsibility. As a result, the two municipalities had the opportunity and obligation to develop their own local solutions to the problems caused by migration during this period. The cases illustrate two trajectories in municipal policy-making. Copenhagen followed the national tendency to include guest workers and immigrants in the existing administrative body of the municipality and the welfare system, whereas Ishøj chose a different path with a coherent municipal immigrant policy. Through this case study of city-level policy-making in Denmark, this article contributes to research on municipal policy-making as well as research on the development of immigrant and integration policy.*

**Keywords** immigrant policy, welfare state, Denmark, Copenhagen, Ishøj

### Introduction

Over the past four decades, integration and immigration have become increasingly contested and debated issues in most Western countries. Migration of non-European Union (EU) foreign citizens into Europe has been singled out both as a social problem and as a possible solution to demographic challenges to European welfare states.<sup>1</sup> Debates and academic analyses have focused on politics and policy-making at the national level. This approach has recently been challenged by researchers who argue that 'policies are conceived at the national level, but problems are felt at the local level'.<sup>2</sup> This article acknowledges these arguments and seeks to analyse municipal policy-making in the area of immigrant policy during the 1970s. Decision-making at the local level is important, and the municipalities have been key actors in the formulation of the social-policy aspects of immigrant policies.

Compared to other countries, Danish municipalities are quite autonomous.<sup>3</sup> Within the Danish welfare-state system, municipalities have been able to create their own policy solutions to local challenges as long as these solutions are formulated in accordance with the national welfare political framework. Furthermore, in terms of immigration, Denmark is characterized by a long period without national policies.<sup>4</sup> In the 1970s, the

integration of guest workers and immigrants was primarily a municipal responsibility. The Social Democratic government stressed this in 1980, when Minister of Interior Henning Rasmussen, describing the government's immigration policy stated that 'the compilation of public efforts should be implemented only in those places where the [integration] policies are to be upheld; that is, above all, in the municipalities'.<sup>5</sup> This tendency to stress municipalities' responsibility for integration of immigrants was maintained in the following years, with the consequence that municipalities had both the opportunity and the obligation to solve problems connected to migration.

How did Danish municipalities respond to this challenge? Did they create coherent integration policies, or were immigrants' problems dealt with in the local administration bodies? Or were immigrants simply included in general political debates without extensive politicization? The scope of this article is to analyse the policies developed on the municipal level during the 1970s. My focus is on two municipalities – the capital city of Copenhagen and the suburban municipality of Ishøj – both of which had an early and high level of immigrant citizens. A general tendency in the Danish case is that municipalities with many immigrants are also so-called 'Social Democratic municipalities'. Indeed, both Copenhagen and Ishøj were dominated by Social Democratic City Council members and mayors during the 1970s. The two municipalities, while certainly not typical Danish municipalities, can nevertheless be considered as pioneering cases. This article includes a qualitative analysis of immigrant-policy development in Copenhagen and Ishøj in the 1970s.

### Municipal policy-making

City-level policy-making has gained increased attention in recent years. On the one hand, researchers have argued that a bottom-up approach shows how key features of the welfare state have municipal 'roots'. In his pioneering book, *Velfærdsstatens Rødder* (The roots of the welfare state), Søren Kolstrup shows that a handful of Social Democratic municipalities were pioneers in the creation of those social systems and welfare institutions that became core elements of the welfare state.<sup>6</sup> The theoretical outcome of Kolstrup's research is that municipalities constitute a space of innovation and that analysing municipal policy-making brings about a better understanding of how new institutions are created. On the other hand, mainstream research in Danish integration policy has portrayed immigration policy as a point of conflict between (Social Democratic) municipalities and parliamentary politicians.<sup>7</sup> Studies of media debates, parliamentary debates and discourse analysis on the national level tend to depict some municipalities as critical of immigrants and as opponents of a humanistic immigration and refugee policy. This article combines the two positions by analysing policy development from a local level in the two Social Democratic municipalities of Ishøj and Copenhagen.

This approach finds support in more recent Dutch research on immigration and policy-making. J.W. Duyvendak and P.W.A. Scholten, in their analysis of integration policy frames in The Netherlands, have concluded that: 'When it comes to policy practices on the local level it is contested [ . . . ] whether these policy practices are actually driven by a normative multicultural model or by more pragmatic concerns of "keeping things together"'.<sup>8</sup> Rinus Penninx has argued that local integration policies are more effective than national policies, since localities usually create better political-opportunity structures than the national political system.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, Penninx argues that 'local

policymakers have a better understanding of the key problems and are more inclined to opt for pragmatic solutions'.<sup>10</sup> In addition, the local level creates better political-opportunity structures than the national level, while in cities where national policies have been absent tend to create a demand for national subventions as well as national guidelines, even as they assert local autonomy.<sup>11</sup>

Discussing the development of Danish integration policy at the local level, Martin Bak Jørgensen has analysed integration policies in four Danish municipalities. Jørgensen argues that 'ideas diffused from outside the national context can inform local level policy-making; and that policies are situated within and adjusted to the broader cultural economy and city branding as part of competition between cities'.<sup>12</sup> Jørgensen's research is concentrated on the period after 1998 (the passing of the Danish Integration Act) when a national framework for local integration policies had already been established and during the period when the governing majority shifted from the Social Democrats to the Liberals (from 2001). In this period, Jørgensen argues that the decentralization which marked the decade after 2001 has created a 'fairly large room for interpretation and implementation'.<sup>13</sup> By 2001, a national integration policy had been established, but this is a rather new tendency. In this article, I argue that Danish developments prior to 1998 are of interest because Denmark had developed a very comprehensive welfare-state system, but without any sort of comprehensive integration policy throughout the 1970s and 1980s.<sup>14</sup> Instead, early Danish integration policy was characterized by a tendency to include guest workers and immigrants in the existing system. This period has been labelled the 'period of non-policy' to suggest that these decades, despite being marked by extensive debates, produced very few institutional changes.<sup>15</sup> The municipalities had the possibility and the responsibility to meet challenges connected to immigration. In this article, it is these solutions and political decisions that are the centre of attention.

## Two cases: Copenhagen and Ishøj

The focus is on local immigration policies in two municipalities: Copenhagen and Ishøj. Compared to the remaining 273 Danish municipalities (since the reorganization in 1970), Copenhagen and Ishøj can be considered as both critical and pioneering cases when it comes to immigration issues. In the late 1960s, Copenhagen was the primary destination for most of the guest workers coming to Denmark, most of whom came from Yugoslavia, Turkey and Pakistan. In 1978 approximately 30% (28,929) of foreigners in Denmark lived in Copenhagen.<sup>16</sup> Ishøj is a very small municipality and one of the so-called new, smaller satellite towns 20 km south of Copenhagen (population 16,437 in 1975). In the early 1970s, the number of Ishøj's inhabitants with immigrant backgrounds exceeded 10% of the total population in the locality, and Ishøj became the Danish municipality with the highest percentage of immigrants.<sup>17</sup> Since both cases are characterized as being among the first Danish 'immigrant municipalities', they constitute a logical site of policy innovation and pioneering.

Politically, both municipalities were traditionally Social Democratic and characterized by a notable Social Democratic representation in the political organs as well as the political leadership (mayor). Both municipalities have been characterized by strong welfare institutions and a high level of social services. However, the two cases differ in respect to size and attention. Copenhagen is the capital of Denmark (729,357 inhabitants

in 1975) whereas Ishøj is much smaller. Ishøj also has a much shorter history than Copenhagen, which since the early 20th century had been a welfare pioneer. From the 1970s, however, Ishøj became the centre of national attention, largely due to its immigration issues. In the public and parliamentary debates, Ishøj's mayor Per Madsen was a quite outspoken critic of the national immigration policy (or rather the lack of it).<sup>18</sup> Copenhagen politicians, despite the city's large population of immigrants, were much more silent in this debate.

In the following analysis, the different local reactions to immigration are analysed. Two trajectories for political strategies are present. Municipalities could either opt for pragmatic, ad hoc solutions to acute problems or develop ideologically founded policies, which would also entail attempts to alter national problem-framing and national policies (a bottom-up effect), possibly leading to a nationalization of local challenges.

In the sections below, a brief outline of Danish immigrant policy is followed by an analysis of policy developments in Copenhagen and Ishøj during the 1970s.

### Guest workers in the 1960s

The late 1960s were a period of economic boom in all Western countries, and to meet the need for mainly unskilled labour, guest workers entered Western Europe in large numbers.<sup>19</sup> This was also the case in Denmark and from 1967 to 1973 as guest workers from mainly Yugoslavia, Turkey and Pakistan entered the Danish labour market.<sup>20</sup>

At the same time, the Danish welfare state was in its so-called golden years. From the late 1950s to 1973, the welfare state expanded, as more and more aspects of society became part of the public sphere.<sup>21</sup> The newly arrived workers encountered a society with high equality ambitions, universal social rights and a highly unionized labour force.<sup>22</sup> Soon after the opening to migrant workers, the so-called 'guest-worker issue' became a theme in parliamentary debates. From an early stage, the main question was how the universal welfare state could and should deal with problems connected to immigration. The main problems included language barriers, discrimination on the labour and housing markets, the need for leisure-time activities, and so on. In order to understand the character and possible solutions to these challenges, the Elkær-Hansen Commission was appointed by the Minister of Labour in 1969. The commission's remit included both the entry-related political issues as well as immigrant-policy implications, including guest workers' social problems and adaptation to Danish society.<sup>23</sup>

In spite of some administrative changes and attempts to solve specific problems, critics at the time claimed: 'Denmark does not have a genuine immigrant policy'.<sup>24</sup> This critique was true to the extent that only a tentative immigrant political statement had been presented in Parliament, and at this early stage, the guest-worker or immigrant policy was to a great extent an example of policy as problem-solving and not policy as ideological visions.<sup>25</sup> The national policies presented by the changing governments were characterized by ad hoc solutions to guest workers' social problems.<sup>26</sup> This was also the case after the oil crisis hit Denmark in the autumn of 1973, and Denmark followed the European pattern by closing its borders to foreign labour.<sup>27</sup> As was also the case in other Western countries, the introduction of a prohibition on labour importation affected only the entry of new guest workers. Immigration continued through family reunification.<sup>28</sup> This led to a change in the political discussions, so that during the 1970s, immigrants came to be viewed as a social problem. The social problems connected to

immigrants were discussed both the media and in Parliament, but in the 1970s this national politicization did not lead to any reforms.<sup>29</sup> Immigrants were included in the welfare-state system, and the most visible institutional change was the employment of a guest-worker staff consultant in the Ministry for Social Affairs.<sup>30</sup>

The tendency was that the immigrants were to utilize the same system, in the same manner, as Danish citizens, mainly to ensure equality and avoid stigmatization. Similar cases should be processed similarly. The idea that immigrants experienced other types of difficulties or barriers than did Danish citizens was acknowledged, but this did not lead to political reforms.<sup>31</sup> In this connection, Diane Sainsbury has argued that in the Nordic Countries the group of people entitled to social benefits changed due to increased immigration. The system gradually changed from entitlement based on nationality to entitlement based on residence, thus making it possible to include immigrants in the existing social-welfare system.<sup>32</sup> This tendency also marked the Danish development, but as Sainsbury has argued, the 1970s were marked by the fact that ‘the Danes embarked on formulating a foreign workers policy [ . . . ] not a settlement policy. Nor did the Danes decouple immigrant policy from immigration policy’. As a result, ‘this issue frame undermined the development of a comprehensive immigrant policy’.<sup>33</sup>

Inclusion of immigrants in the system without clarifying or solving the challenges connected to immigration (such as increased pressure on the housing market and immigrants’ difficulties entering the labour market in an economy recession) left room for other political actors – at the municipal level – to set the agenda, propose solutions and promote visions for the early Danish integration policy.

### **Guest workers and immigrants in Copenhagen**

In the late 1960s, the newly arrived guest workers made their mark on the political debate in the City Council in Copenhagen. Guest workers were becoming a part of the city picture, and problems connected with their residence became an issue in the municipal debate. But what really was the problem? This was pinpointed by Knud Brørup (the Socialist Peoples’ Party) during a meeting of the Copenhagen municipal council May 1969:

A low-paid proletariat of foreigners is being created in Denmark. No one takes care of these foreigners. They are becoming a pariah caste and an easy victim for all of those shady persons who are attempting to exploit them. [ . . . ] My request, therefore, is an appeal to the City Administration’s [social service] department<sup>34</sup> to take initiatives in this area, so that Copenhagen can stand out as an example of what could be done to bring the chaotic situation to an end.<sup>35</sup>

The new workers were linguistically handicapped and not able to communicate with the Danish-speaking population. The result was that guest workers were a highly vulnerable group, while the general housing shortage in the city and the fact that guest workers were searching for the cheapest possible housing meant that many ended up in the slum areas of Copenhagen.

Knud Brørup’s request gave rise to some debate in the Municipal Council. Not least because this was the first time that the guest-worker issue had entered the political arena. In his response, the vice-mayor for social affairs,<sup>36</sup> Børge H. Jensen (Social

Democrat) argued that the city was dealing with two types of foreigners. One group consisted of 'loose birds, who see a chance to prey on a society which from their point of view is some kind of El Dorado, where it is possible to live high on prostitutes, porn production, drug dealing and other shady businesses';<sup>37</sup> the other included the so-called 'serious guest workers', and this group experienced different levels of discrimination. Some restaurants in Copenhagen had refused serve meals to non-Danish-looking people because guest workers apparently bought only a single cup of coffee and spent long hours talking loudly and taking up space.<sup>38</sup> These and other cases of what at the time was referred to as 'racist reactions' influenced the debate on guest workers in the municipality, but also made it clear that initiatives to improve the conditions for the 'serious guest workers' were required.

From a municipal perspective, such problems were best solved on the national level through a national immigrant policy. However, such a policy was lacking during this early period.<sup>39</sup> The first guest-worker commission, the Elkær-Hansen Commission, was appointed one month later (in June 1969) and the identification of guest-worker problems and challenges as well as possible solutions was still being debated nationally. It was not entirely clear, what 'the guest-worker problem' entailed.

Even though it was evident that the new workers were in a vulnerable position, the general understanding was that the foreign workers were in Denmark only on a temporary basis. This idea about temporality constituted the dominant policy framework in Denmark. This created a new situation in Danish welfare policy. On the one hand, the universal welfare state aimed at social integration, reducing inequality, and so on. In this connection, the welfare system presented a solution to certain temporary problems. In the case of unemployment or sickness, for example, the Danish national welfare system provided a high level of security. On the other hand, this system was created to serve a 'permanent' population and was based on a social contract between generations, between the employed and unemployed, between the healthy and the sick.<sup>40</sup> Guest workers, with their temporary residence and temporary problems thus became a new social group in the welfare state. As a consequence, Danish policy-makers were hesitant to form policies in terms of national guidelines with specific means and goals. If guest workers were supposed to repatriate once the economic boom came to an end, there was no good reason to create a coherent national integration policy.<sup>41</sup> The inclusion of guest workers in society was, after all, linked to their temporary status on the labour market.<sup>42</sup> In this optic, the newly arrived guests deserve hospitality, but not necessarily full-scale welfare.

This policy framework also coloured the political debate on the municipal level in the early 1970s. At the municipal level as well as in Parliament, the Socialist People's Party argued for a coherent immigrant policy. Guest workers were to be included in the working class through an active immigrant policy that included housing, employment, language and education as well as social measures. These initiatives should be financed through state funding and especially by the employers.<sup>43</sup> The Conservative Party represented the interests of employers, who had become dependent on the temporary workers, but the Conservatives argued for a municipal coordination of the various initiatives, which could solve problems for this specific group of workers who were envisioned to remain in Denmark and Copenhagen on a temporary basis. The temporality aspect was quite outspoken among the employers, maybe most clearly in an often-quoted article in their magazine, *Dansk Arbejdsgiver* (The Danish employer), where the



head of the employers' organization, Jens Fisker, underscored that 'the guest workers are especially welcome. First and foremost because this reserve does not cost anything, in contrast to a reserve of unemployed or housewives. If we do not need the labour, it can just be deported'.<sup>44</sup>

Even if these mechanisms of supply and demand could be effective, the Left as well as the Social Democrats and the Trade Union Federation (LO) could not accept guest workers becoming a new underclass in society, nor would they tolerate a situation where the foreign workers could end up undercutting the wages of Danish workers. The socialist parties suggested a coherent immigrant policy whereas the Social Democrats maintained their long-term alliance with the welfare state, the key aspects of which were equality and solidarity, but with freedom from the market (de-commodification).<sup>45</sup>

The political debate in the City Council echoed the parliamentary debate, where the lines were drawn primarily between the left-wing parties, the Social Democrats and the Conservatives. Nevertheless, the discussions in the City Council leave an impression of profound disagreement, even though some tentative attempts were made to solve guest workers' immediate challenges. The ideological disputes did not necessarily stand in the way of solving acute problems. In the 1970s and early 1980s, the main themes debated in the City Council were housing, language, schools and leisure-time activities.<sup>46</sup>

### **Avedøre Holme: ad hoc solutions to urgent problems**

The housing shortage in Copenhagen was highly problematic for many people living in Copenhagen, and the problem greatly affected the guest workers. Some of them had fallen into the hands of slumlords, while others had been housed by their employers in barracks or rebuilt ships, as was the case in the large Burmeister & Wain shipyard.<sup>47</sup> For the municipalities, this was a difficult situation because the housing shortage affected a broad part of the population in Copenhagen. Finding housing for guest workers and immigrants would not help all Copenhagensers. A possible solution to the housing situation came from the Elkær-Hansen Commission, with the Avedøre-Holme project.<sup>48</sup> The idea was to build a rather large number of temporary huts which could provide accommodation for the newly arrived guest workers for a limited time period. Municipalities situated around Avedøre Holme were to pay part of the costs, and in 1970 the Avedøre Holme Project was debated in the Copenhagen Municipal Council. The left-wing councillors argued that employers had created this problem through labour importation and therefore they should pay for the housing project. On the other side were the Social Democrats, the Conservatives as well as the Liberals, who could see some positive effects of the Avedøre Holme Project. It was by no means regarded as an ideal solution by any of the represented parties, but it was nevertheless seen as a pragmatic solution to the immediate housing shortage and the accompanying social challenges.<sup>49</sup>

In spite of the mixed opinions, the municipal board decided to support the project, mainly because the other municipalities in the Copenhagen metropolitan area had accepted the proposal, but also because this could temporarily solve this compelling problem.<sup>50</sup> In the end, the project turned out to be out-dated even before it was finished, because the so-called small immigrant stop was introduced in 1971 thereby limiting the number of new guest workers.<sup>51</sup> Changes on the labour market and in the Danish economy simply outran the project, but it illustrates that profound disagreements within the municipal council did not hinder local pragmatism.

### **Immigrant families, leisure-time activities and language training**

The housing problem was not just a question of finding suitable accommodation for temporary guest workers or newly arrived foreigners. From the late 1960s, the housing issue was also connected to other aspects of the welfare state, including the social and family sector.

Even though the first immigrants consisted mainly of male industrial workers who were either unmarried or had left their families back in their home countries, some of the early guest workers had also brought their families with them. These families, who are almost invisible in the national debates, were part of the discussion at the city level. In 1969, Mayor Børge H. Jensen informed councillors about language training for immigrant families provided by the family-counselling office. Guest-worker families were gradually becoming a topic within the local administration.<sup>52</sup> The main challenge for those in the social-welfare department was how to provide good homes for the guest-workers' children and how to make their adaptation to Danish as smooth as possible.<sup>53</sup>

In Copenhagen, a dual immigration tendency, including both temporality and permanence, posed a new problem for the caseworkers in the social-service administration, who were confronted with a new set of challenges. The general problems in the city became even more explicit, when dealing with guest-worker families.<sup>54</sup> However, the problems and challenges continued to be dealt with within the local administrations, and no coherent policy was passed in the municipal board. Debates in the City Council followed the national trend of commenting on guest-workers' problems and then attempting to solve them within the existing institutional framework. This tendency is evident not only when looking at the housing issues and family counselling, but also when it comes to leisure-time activities for guest workers.

The city provided financial support to a variety of guest-worker organizations, but the initiative to create leisure-time activities for this group came from non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or was based on private initiatives such as the Yugoslav Club and other ethnic/national organizations.<sup>55</sup> The same was not the case, however, for children. For this group, the social administration and the family-counselling service organized youth-club activities in the Copenhagen barracks-neighbourhood of Vognmandsmarken as a part of a social-political strategy.<sup>56</sup> Also in this case, Copenhagen followed the national tendency to include migrants in the existing welfare systems.

Another option was to create a new institution within the existing framework, hereby acknowledging that administering guest-workers' cases called for specialized knowledge. This track was not followed by the public sector in the city. Instead a private organization, People to People, pushed this alternative approach. This organization had an office for guest-worker counselling in the city and provided specialized social counselling and case work for guest workers. Part of the work was carried out in cooperation with the family-counselling and municipal administration, because People to People possessed specialized knowledge within this field.<sup>57</sup> The existence of this organization, while it did not have a major effect, can nevertheless be seen as an attempt to push for a different policy framework than the one prevailing at the time.

### **Introductory classes for immigrant children**

The most visible reaction to the arrival of immigrant families in Copenhagen was the creation of introductory classes for foreign pupils in those schools with comparably high

concentrations of non-Danish children. This system, also known as the Erik Odder System, was developed in Copenhagen in the early 1970s in a school close to the Vognmandsmarken neighbourhood. In essence, this system consisted of creating small, preferably ethnically based, classes where the pupils received instruction in their native language and the history of their country of origin, as well as a gradual introduction to the Danish language, history and society. Once the pupils were able to communicate in and understand Danish, they were gradually transferred to ordinary classes and by the end of the introduction period were able to attend the same courses as their Danish peers.<sup>58</sup> The introductory-class system had been developed, however, to comply with the special needs of non-Danish speaking pupils who were in Denmark on a permanent basis. It was not intended to deal with temporary residents.

This system became an important part of the early integration policy in two ways. First, other municipalities imported the system, which was viewed as a success in Copenhagen.<sup>59</sup> Second, the system was included in national policy-making and institutionalized in 1976, when the law on primary schools was revised.<sup>60</sup> What is somewhat peculiar in this context is that this system received very little attention in the public debate. Both locally and nationally, the system was imported, transferred or included without much debate. One possible reason for this can be the apparent success of the system. Another can be that other problems stood out as more acute: housing issues and the developing ghetto debate; high unemployment among immigrants; and the lack of Danish-language skills in this group combined with a rising anti-immigrant attitude in society. All of these issues dominated the political and public debates in the post oil-crisis period, and in this context, the introduction-class system in the schools was merely seen as an ad hoc solution to a compelling problem. Nevertheless, this case supports Kolstrup's findings that municipalities acted as spaces of innovation, thus confirming his bottom-up approach. In connection with primary school, Copenhagen presented a solution which was applicable at the national level.

### **The Vognmandsmarken controversy**

Housing policy remained unsolved and highly problematic in Copenhagen, and an effect of the lack of ability or opportunity to solve the housing problem was that immigrants came to settle in some of the slum areas in Copenhagen. Vognmandsmarken was a highly contested area, which became symptomatic for guest-workers' and immigrants' problems in the capital at this time.<sup>61</sup>

The area was marked by its stigma of poor quality, and in the Municipal Council, Vognmandsmarken was on several occasions pointed out as the 'bad example' and a tragic effect of lacking political actions in the field of housing policy. When discussing the Avedøre Holme Project in June 1970, the Liberal, Jens Jelsbak, pointed out that 'the foreigners who have experienced Vognmandsmarken will regard Avedøre as a much friendlier place'.<sup>62</sup> Ludvig Hansen, from the Danish Communist Party, agreed and continued the characteristic left-wing line by emphasizing that since guest workers had been invited to come and work in Denmark, the Danish political system was also obligated to provide suitable housing for them.<sup>63</sup> In this question, Communists and Liberals found common ground, and there was general agreement that the Vognmandsmarken area was a highly problematic neighbourhood and that this old slum area was also now turning into a guest-workers' ghetto. But the discussions did not lead to any definitive

solutions. Again in November 1971, Mayor Alfred Wassard Jørgensen (Conservative) stressed the importance of avoiding a repetition of ‘what we have seen in, for example, Vognmandsmarken, where guest workers in some cases live with small children, adult children and their parents-in-law, grandparents, etc.’.<sup>64</sup> Eighteen months later, Vognmandsmarken was still being described as a worst-case scenario, a tendency that continued in the years that followed (until Vognmandsmarken was completely torn down in 1979). This was the case both in the City Council and in the press, but the political effects were minimal.<sup>65</sup> Vognmandsmarken was not much different from other depressed areas ripe for development or condemnation. Slum areas were a general problem in the capital, but it became even more explicit when most of the inhabitants in an area were immigrants.

### Moving to the suburbs, Ishøj

Since the housing situation was more problematic in Copenhagen than elsewhere in Denmark at the time, guest workers began to move to outlying localities in the metropolitan area. Ishøj became the destination for a comparatively large number of new immigrants. To understand why Ishøj became the first choice for many guest workers, we need to take a brief look at the creation of this ‘new town’.<sup>66</sup>

Until the 1950s, Ishøj was a small village dominated by agriculture. In the years after the Second World War, many Danish cities expanded as an effect of continuous urbanization and people migrating from the countryside, seeking jobs and educational opportunities in the city. Copenhagen was no exception. The result was a severe housing shortage, combined with a large amount of old and out-dated apartment buildings. The situation led to political discussions on how to solve these acute problems. The solution was the so-called ‘Five-finger plan’ (*Femfingerplanen*). In the plan it was suggested that transportation ‘fingers’ were developed to connect the city and the surrounding areas. This was to enable the development of new towns in a circle around Copenhagen. The design and approval of a second urban-development plan for the area south of Copenhagen, the *Køgebugt Plan*, led to the creation of the new town Ishøj.<sup>67</sup>

The housing estate called ‘Ishøj fields’ (*Ishøj-Planen*) was the ‘crown jewel’ in the city plan. The shopping centre and city hall in the middle of the new town was surrounded by 53 blocks of flats and would become the core area of the city. A school, *Strandgårds skolen*, was built in connection with the apartment buildings, and within a few years an entirely urban centre saw the light of day. This way of creating new towns set its mark on the south-western parts of the metropolitan area (*Vestegnen*). The Five Finger Plan and *Køgebugtplanen* (including the expansion of public transportation from Copenhagen to the suburbs) combined with general excitement over large apartment buildings of high quality made its mark on city-development planning.<sup>68</sup> The architecture of *Ishøjplanen* was ‘high fashion’ in the late 1960s, and the area was internationally acknowledged for its good quality and high standard.<sup>69</sup> Furthermore, apartments in *Ishøj-Planen* were cheap and would ideally be the perfect home. In reality, *Ishøj-Planen* did not live up to the politicians’ expectations. This high-quality social-housing area was not as attractive as envisioned, and many of the apartments remained unoccupied for a long period of time.

In 1970 Ishøj’s Social Democratic mayor, Per Madsen, argued on TV against the Avedøre Holme Project and suggested that guest workers should move to Ishøj.<sup>70</sup> In

September 1972 the public-housing association AAB advertised the Ishøj apartments in a magazine for guest workers, *Fremmedarbejderbladet*, and in the following years immigrant families began to move to Ishøj.<sup>71</sup> The push factors for this development were, of course, the shortage of cheap rental housing in central Copenhagen. The pull factors included the advertisements directed explicitly at guest workers, but the low rents and low deposits for apartments compared to Copenhagen were also contributing factors.<sup>72</sup>

### Creating immigrant policies in Ishøj<sup>73</sup>

By 1974, approximately 1,400 people, mainly from Pakistan and Turkey, had settled in Ishøj.<sup>74</sup> The number of immigrants quickly rose to a much higher proportion than the national average, and during the 1970s, Ishøj municipality became known for its ethnically diverse population. This tendency became an issue in the local City Council (*Ishøj Byråd*) and the immediate reaction of Mayor Per Madsen was to appoint a working group which would analyse the entire immigrant question, focusing especially on education, social issues, leisure time, housing and work, as well as tax issues, including immigrants' payment of taxes and tax deductions (given for support of dependents in the home country).<sup>75</sup> At this point, Ishøj differed significantly from Copenhagen, since the Ishøj City Council reacted to the growing immigrant population by stressing the need for a mapping of problems followed by policy proposals that could resolve or otherwise manage the immigrants' social problems. This suggests that both national policy frameworks and policy development vary not only in connection with the two levels of governance (national and local), but also between localities.<sup>76</sup> In this connection, it is noteworthy that during this early phase of politicization, immigrants were perceived, both nationally and in Copenhagen, as 'guest workers'. In Ishøj, however, this same group began to be viewed as 'immigrants', underscoring the local political perception that they were not in Denmark – nor in Ishøj – on a temporary basis.<sup>77</sup> This perception proved correct.

By 1975, the Ishøj working group had completed its report, which included a thorough analysis of problems connected to the increased immigration. The primary focus was on the Pakistanis and Turks, as they were the largest groups in absolute numbers, and because the municipality sought to avoid over-concentration of these groups in public housing.<sup>78</sup> These early attempts to create new types of restrictions within the municipal setting were highly controversial, but it was also seen as a possible model for solving the 'ghettoization problem' in other municipalities in the following years.<sup>79</sup> In general, the working group played a key role in the politicization of immigrants. Two main issues were highlighted.

First, immigrants were now regarded as a unique group with specific problems, mainly concerning language. The immigrants' inability to communicate with the administrative body in the municipality meant that immigrants were unable to utilize the existing institutions. Misunderstandings and misinformation led to confusion among immigrants as well as for the local caseworkers. To solve this problem, the working group recommended setting up a counselling service for immigrants within the municipal administration and the employment of specialized case workers. This would both enable immigrants to use the municipal administration on equal terms with Danish citizens, while specialized counselling would also reduce the pressure on the caseworkers in the administrative units. Furthermore, immigrant children often needed special language training, which called for the local school to make an extra effort to ensure

that the children could attend extra Danish-language instruction. The working group also emphasized the need to include immigrants and especially their children in local associations (football clubs, and so on) so as to facilitate the inclusion of immigrants in the local community.<sup>80</sup>

Second, the working group as well as the local politicians, including the mayor, did not hesitate to point out immigrants as a social and economic challenge. The need for special education, special institutions to ensure equal access to social benefits and family patterns in immigrant families, where 'women stayed at home with the small children'<sup>81</sup> meant that the municipality experienced a 'double deficit': extra expenses for immigrant-related policies and reduced tax base due to high unemployment, family patterns and the 'maintenance contracts' by which immigrants could deduct taxable income for money sent to their families in their home countries. All these factors were costs of being a municipality with many immigrants. In this respect, the new system, based on block grants from the state instead of individual municipal refunds, led Ishøj to argue for including the number of immigrants as a parameter for funds when calculating and negotiating the annual block grants.<sup>82</sup> This argument was stressed by the first immigrant working group and further emphasized in the years that followed. In addition to claiming a higher state subsidy, Ishøj applied for and received funding from the European Economic Community (EEC) to be able to uphold and further develop initiatives which would enable good integration of immigrants.<sup>83</sup>

The creation of a municipal immigrant policy with specific means and goals based on inclusion, equal access and integration differs from ad hoc policy-making. The fact that guest workers were perceived as immigrants and regarded as a new social group with problems that differed from those of other social groups meant that Ishøj chose a different policy trajectory than Copenhagen. In Ishøj, ad hoc solutions to urgent problems were based upon a coherent immigrant policy rather than pragmatic solutions. This tendency to view immigrants' problems and challenges connected to migration from a holistic point of view marked the political decisions in this area. The housing policy was symptomatic of this tendency.

### **Housing policy in Ishøj: the 10% limit**

In order to foster a diversity of households in its housing stock, Ishøj introduced a controversial system whereby the number of immigrants in any housing block could not exceed 10%. This figure equalled the number of immigrants in the municipality in 1974.<sup>84</sup> This policy – allocating housing according to ethnic origin – became highly problematic in the years that followed, and the municipality was accused of racial discrimination by local politicians, journalists, parliamentarians and the immigrants who were denied housing.<sup>85</sup>

When the working group analysed immigrants' problems and the municipal challenges connected to immigration, the ethnic restriction on housing was one of the outcomes. Where did this quota policy come from? How did they come up with the 10% limit?

The answer lies in Sweden, since Sweden was a country of inspiration for the local policy-makers (politicians and local officials). For Ishøj, the city of Malmö (pop. 265,000 in 1970) set an example of how to coordinate the social counselling of immigrants. In November 1974, the Ishøj working group went on a study trip,

45 minutes by a catamaran, across the Øresund Strait, to Malmö. Here, the working group obtained ideas as to how the Danish municipalities might coordinate their activities. They looked with envy at their Swedish colleagues, who were much more experienced in handling immigrants and whose work was guided by the Swedish national immigrant policy.<sup>86</sup> Sweden, in this case Malmö, became the good example for the municipality, and the idea of the 10% limit principle was a Swedish import, this proportion being considered the proper number for ensuring successful integration. Furthermore, the validity of this principle was backed up by the Danish experts on immigration. For Ishøj, Ole Hammer, editor of *Fremmedarbejderbladet*, was consulted and following the conclusions of the working group, he confirmed that limiting the number of immigrants in a social-housing area might help solve the problems with developing ghettos.<sup>87</sup>

The ethnic-quota system was institutionalized in Ishøj in the mid-1970s, when Per Madsen and the City Council urged the housing associations to avoid renting apartments to immigrants in Ishøj in general and in certain areas in particular (especially in Ishøj-Planen).<sup>88</sup> Under this quota system non-Danish nationals would be excluded from being allocated a rental unit if there were already an immigrant family living in the same building (or stairway). This procedure was followed by the housing associations, which in rejecting ethnic applicants for a rental unit would use the phrase the ‘quota has been exhausted’.<sup>89</sup> This system gave rise to public and political debate and found its way to the ombudsman’s desk. After reviewing the case, however, the ombudsman concluded that the ethnic-quota system was legitimate due to ‘special and significant problems regarding a responsible integration of “guest workers” [ . . . ] and that the mayor’s request [ . . . ] was issued solely to solve these problems’.<sup>90</sup>

The legitimation of the ethnic-quota principle had consequences in the years to come. The so-called ‘dispersion policy’, which became a significant pillar of the policy debates of the 1980s, had its point of departure in these municipalities, where Ishøj became one of the frontrunners.<sup>91</sup> This was especially evident when a national working-group report on immigrants’ settlement patterns was published in 1986.<sup>92</sup>

It is noteworthy that these limitation principles – by which public housing was denied to migrants on the basis of their ethnic origin – were quite new in Denmark. The novelty in Ishøj was that immigrants were pointed out as a group, which along with other social groups, should not dominate the composition of tenants.

The ethnic-limitation principle included important aspects in connection with borders and entry into Denmark, since immigration was not only a question of entering Danish territory, but also being accorded entitlements of the municipalities and the Danish welfare state.

### Critical voices

When the Ishøj municipality encountered larger groups of immigrants in the 1970s, it was pointed out that immigrants were not guest workers, but rather a new social group, which was highly overrepresented in unemployment statistics, and that the group of immigrants consisted of a highly heterogeneous group of people, some of whom posed more challenges to the system than others. On several occasions, the Ishøj mayor, Per Madsen, argued that Turkish immigrants were the most problematic. Paternalistic family

patterns meant that women were isolated and unable to participate in the labour market. This was also the case for young girls, who were taken out of school when they entered puberty. In addition, it was argued that young girls were forced into arranged marriages, and that Turkish families 'imported' husbands and wives for their sons and daughters from Turkey. The effect of this import of spouses from the country of origin was increased immigration and a growing group of marginalized and isolated immigrant women. During the 1980s, these arguments about the oppression of women among migrant families, forced marriages, poor education opportunities for immigrant children in general and girls in particular, as well as exclusion from society were articulated and discursively constructed as a cultural and religious challenge.<sup>93</sup> By the late 1980s, Per Madsen, still mayor of Ishøj, argued on national TV that 'this is a cultural struggle and a religious struggle'.<sup>94</sup>

The arguments about cultural problems and migrants' culture being incompatible with Danish values on (gender) equality meant that Per Madsen and Ishøj municipality were ascribed a symbolic status as the core of immigrant-critical Social Democrats in the increasingly polarized Danish immigration debate.<sup>95</sup> This critique was reinforced by part of the more liberal press, which criticized Ishøj's quota system as discriminatory and as excluding immigrants from political and social participation. Niels Ufer, from the small but influential left-wing, intellectual newspaper *Information*, wrote a series of feature stories about immigrants' lives in Ishøj, arguing that the mayor and City Council, as well as the local administration and especially the immigrant office, were discriminatory against Ishøj's immigrant population.<sup>96</sup>

The strident political debate about immigrants and immigration, where right-wing parties voiced shrill protests against increased immigration, meant that Per Madsen's arguments about immigrants as a cultural challenge were perceived of as part of an anti-immigration discourse.<sup>97</sup> By the late 1980s, Per Madsen had become both a blunt immigrant-critical Social Democrat and a pioneer among Social Democratic local politicians who struggled to solve social-political problems both for and connected with immigrants.

In this new climate of debate, Ishøj remained a Social Democratic stronghold. It continued along the same path, arguing that both immigrants and society (the welfare state) were best served by a policy which followed the principle of ethnic limitations on housing. Furthermore, the arguments developed in Ishøj in the 1970s on the economic costs of immigration and the need for a specialized institutional structure in order to secure good integration were still pushed on the national agenda. On many occasions, Mayor Per Madsen argued for additional funding, for the dispersion of immigrants and a fairer economic distribution policy. At the same time, Per Madsen argued heavily for giving immigrants political rights (to vote), since this would create a political opportunity structure where the new citizens could actually gain genuine influence and become a part of society. From Per Madsen's perspective, immigrants should have the same rights and opportunities as the rest of the population, but the means for reaching this goal were highly controversial.

The 1980s were marked by a new climate for debating immigration as well as a culturalization of the integration discussions.<sup>98</sup> In this context, Per Madsen and other mayors in the Social Democratic suburban municipalities occupied the critical wing of the Social Democratic Party.<sup>99</sup> This tendency is most likely due to the fact that Per Madsen made some quite explicitly critical arguments about the clash of cultures



in different media.<sup>100</sup> Furthermore, it seems that the mayors and the more left-wing media, academics and the Social Democrats in Parliament did not speak the same language as the local mayors. The room for manoeuvre became smaller during this period.<sup>101</sup> Another contributing factor was that the City Council in Ishøj added fuel to the fire by arranging a symbolic ballot on the question 'Should we [the City Council] endeavour/recommend that more people of foreign extraction move to Ishøj?' The response of the voters was a pronounced 'No'. While the local referendum had no administrative effect, it was a clear signal to the national politicians that Ishøj wanted a halt to increased immigration to those municipalities with already high numbers of migrants. In 1991, the ethnic-quota system was declared illegal by the High Court. The case against Ishøj had been taken to court by the Ishøj Committee against Xenophobia (Ishøj-Kommitteén mod Fremmedhad), which had been established in opposition to the ethnic-quota policy.<sup>102</sup> The court found that since the Housing Act did not create any legal basis for the system, Ishøj's quota system violated the Act against Race Discrimination (Act no. 289, November 1971) the system in Ishøj was illegal.<sup>103</sup> The system that had been approved by the Ombudsman in 1976 was declared discriminatory in 1991.

### **Municipal policy-making between ideology, visions and pragmatism**

Copenhagen and Ishøj chose different strategies when migration became a theme in the sphere of the localities. The analysis of Copenhagen shows that even though the City Council recognized that immigration was a welfare-policy challenge and that problems in society were magnified through migrants' problems, the municipality tended to opt for pragmatic solutions. Copenhagen also shows examples of novelty and creating new systems (such as the introductory-class system), but these measures were the result of attempts to solve urgent problems within the social administrations. Copenhagen followed the national, parliamentary strategy of including migrants into existing institutions. The Copenhagen model was marked by attempts to solve the challenges through ad hoc solutions and creating new systems, and some of these systems were institutionalized nationally.

In Ishøj, a wholly new immigration policy was developed which included social rights and security, sought to provide the migrant population with equal opportunities, and aimed at putting immigrants on an equal footing with other citizens. The means for achieving these goals included an ethnic limit on the allocation of social-housing areas as a means of counteracting the creation of ethnic and social ghettos, a specialized immigrant-counselling service, and so on. The model created in Ishøj, therefore, was not characterized by ad hoc solutions or pragmatism. Instead, policy development was driven by early politicization, problem detection and the attempt to create equality and equal opportunities for all inhabitants. In this connection, cultural conflicts became highly problematic. In addition, the local politicians sought to place immigration and municipalities' problems and challenges on the national political agenda by arguing for a dispersion policy that would result in a scattered settlement pattern and limitations on entry, in return for a cohesive and inclusive integration system within the municipalities. The integration measures became highly problematic since problems in Ishøj could not be converted into national policies.

These two strategies for dealing with new challenges in municipalities are feasible explanations for the different outputs and results in the development of municipal integration policy. This suggests that policy-making should not only be studied in terms of local versus national comparisons but also across different municipalities. Furthermore, in the Danish context, municipal-level policy-making has played an important role in the development of Danish immigrant and integration policies in the latter half of the 20th century. While the decentralizing tendencies of the post-2001 period created a 'fairly large room for interpretation', the background for this decentralization must be found in the pioneering efforts of municipalities 30 years earlier. Viewing the findings here with more contemporary research, Danish integration and immigrant policy has had three main phases: a rather long phase from the 1970s to 1993, where municipalities conducted pragmatic problem-solving and pioneered new forms of administration; a following period of centralization and national integration-policy development (1993–1998/2001); and the present period of decentralization, where municipalities carry out their own form of interpretation and implementation.

## Notes

- 1 See for example Velfærdskommissionen, *Fremtidens Velfærd*.
- 2 Quoted from Jørgensen, 'The Divergent Logics,' 244. See also Penninx, 'Decentralizing Integration Policies'.
- 3 Blom-Hansen, *Fra sogn til Velfærdsproducent*, 31–2.
- 4 Sainsbury, *Welfare States*, 228–34; Jønsson and Petersen, 'Danmark,' 152.
- 5 Folketingstidende (1980–1981), 2267–8. The translation of quotations has been made by the author.
- 6 See Kolstrup, *Velfærdsstatens Rødder*.
- 7 Jørgensen, *Hvad sagde vi*, 195–7; Jensen, *De Fremmede*, 480–4.
- 8 Duyvendak and Scholten, 'Beyond the Dutch,' 332.
- 9 See for example Penninx et al., *Citizenship in European Cities*. This research is situated within citizenship research but also includes a local and comparative perspective and argues for analysing immigration and integration policies from a bottom-up approach, in terms of both local–national and community–locality.
- 10 Penninx, 'Decentralizing Integration Policies,' 10.
- 11 *Ibid.*, 9–11.
- 12 Jørgensen, 'The Divergent Logics,' 246–56.
- 13 *Ibid.*, 271.
- 14 See Christiansen and Petersen, 'The Dynamics of Social Solidarity'.
- 15 Brochmann and Hagelund, *Velfærdens Grenser*, 38, 327.
- 16 Andersen, *Gæstearbejder*, 47.
- 17 Udvalget vedrørende indvandreres bosætningsmønster, *Betænkning*, 35.
- 18 See Gaasholt and Tøgeby, *I Syv Sind*, 28–31.
- 19 Penninx and Roosblad, *Trade Unions*, 1–19.
- 20 For a detailed account of this, see Jønsson and Petersen, 'Danmark,' 139–47.
- 21 For an analysis of the development of the Danish welfare states, see Christiansen and Petersen, 'The Dynamics of Social Solidarity'; Petersen, *13 Historier*; Christiansen et al., *The Nordic Model of Welfare*; Ploug, Henriksen, and Kærgård, *Den Danske Velfærdsstats Historie*; Petersen, Petersen, and Christiansen, *Dansk Velfærdshistorie*, vol. 1–6.

- 22 It goes beyond this article to include a detailed account of the reaction of the trade unions and employers' organization. For analysis of this perspective, see Jørgense, *Hvad sagde vi*, 43–58; Tingkær, *Udenlandske Arbejdere*; Friis, 'Fremmed og Arbejder'.
- 23 Elkær-Hansen, *Betænkning*. See also Jønsson and Petersen: 'Danmark,' 139–62.
- 24 See Hjarnø, Lundbæk, and Skovmand, *Fremmedarbejderpolitik*.
- 25 For a theoretical debate about this distinction in connection with political parties and policy-making from this perspective, see Schumacher, *Modernize or Die*, 1–14.
- 26 Holm, *Folketinget og Udlændingepolitikken*, 143–56.
- 27 Penninx and Roosblad, *Trade Unions*, 4–12.
- 28 *Ibid.*, 5.
- 29 The newspaper debate has been analysed in Jensen, *De Fremmede*, 397–520. For discourse analysis of the parliamentary debates, see Jørgensen, *Hvad sagde vi*; Holm, *Folketinget og Udlændingepolitikken*.
- 30 Jønsson and Petersen, 'Immigrations- og Integrationspolitik,' 724–35.
- 31 A second commission, the Fanny Hartman Commission, had been appointed before the halt in immigration in 1973. The remit of this commission was to analyse immigrants' social problems, but the commission also ended up proposing that municipalities should create local immigrant offices or contact committees which would ease immigrants' adjustment and adaptation to Danish society. See Hartmann, *Betænkning*, 28.
- 32 Sainsbury, 'Immigrants' Social Rights,' 237–9.
- 33 Sainsbury, *Welfare States*, 228.
- 34 Formally known as 'the Third Department'.
- 35 Københavns Stadsarkiv (KS). Københavns Borgerrepræsentations Forhandlinger, 1 April 1969 – 31 March 1970. 29 May 1969, 666–7.
- 36 Vice-mayor for the social services (Third) department.
- 37 KS. Københavns Borgerrepræsentations Forhandlinger, 1 April 1969 – 31 March 1970. 29 May 1969, 672.
- 38 See Sørensen, *Velkommen Mustafa?*, 54–8.
- 39 As argued in the sections above, this was the result of a political decision to make immigrants' integration a municipal responsibility.
- 40 Migration researchers have argued that the homogenous populations in Europe, especially in the Nordic countries, have led to the creation of so-called universal welfare states. See Alesina and Glaeser, *Fighting Poverty*.
- 41 Holm, *Folketinget og Udlændingepolitikken*, 143–9; Jønsson and Petersen, 'Danmark,' 147–52.
- 42 This is also quite clear in Petersen, *Gæstarbejder i København*.
- 43 See KS. Københavns Borgerrepræsentations Forhandlinger, 13 November 1969, 2398–9.
- 44 Quoted from Jørgensen, *Hvad sagde vi*, 43.
- 45 KS. Københavns Borgerrepræsentations Forhandlinger, 13 November 1969. See also Esping-Andersen, *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*.
- 46 See KS. Københavns Borgerrepræsentations Forhandlinger 1971, 173–81 and 643–51; KS. Borgerrepræsentationens Forhandlinger, 1983, 268–76.
- 47 Lange, *Juvelen der blev til Skrot*, 76; Ejlersen, *Kraftcenter og Fristad*, 314. See also Sørensen, *Velkommen Mustafa?*, 10–19, 42–6.
- 48 Sørensen, *Velkommen Mustafa?*, 13.
- 49 KS. Københavns Borgerrepræsentations Forhandlinger, 18 June 1970, 1330–65.
- 50 *Ibid.*, 1356.

- 51 Jønsson and Petersen, 'Immigrations- og Integrationspolitik', 716–37.
- 52 KS. Københavns Borgerrepræsentations Forhandlinger, 29 May 1969, 673.
- 53 KS. Familievejledningens Avis 1968–76. no. 62.
- 54 Ibid.
- 55 KS. Københavns Borgerrepræsentations Forhandlinger, 17 December 1970, 2820–31.
- 56 KS. Københavns Borgerrepræsentations Forhandlinger, 8 February 1973, 988–9.
- 57 KS. Familievejledningens Avis 1968–76, no. 62.5.
- 58 Ibid., no. 63.4; see also Lokallhistorisk Arkiv, Ishøj Kommune (LA). 'Rapport om Torslunde-Ishøj Kommunes Indvandrere,' 24.
- 59 LA. Ishøj Kommune, *Indvanderrapport II*, 241ff.
- 60 Jønsson and Petersen, 'Danmark,' 159.
- 61 See Schwartz, *Reluctant Hosts*, 53–60; Mochizuki, *Ansigtet mod Kameraet*.
- 62 KS. Københavns Borgerrepræsentations Forhandlinger, 18 June 1970, 1353.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 KS. Københavns Borgerrepræsentations Forhandlinger, 11 November 1971, 645.
- 65 'Fremmedarbejderne i Vognmandsmarken følger sig bedraget,' *Akuelt*, 21 April 1977, 18.
- 66 For an account of the creation of the new town Ishøj, see Trier, *Ishøj*.
- 67 Trier, *Ishøj*.
- 68 See also Sørensen and Boje, *Fra Klondyke til moderne Velfærdskommune*, 146–52.
- 69 'Ishøj-planen'; *Arkitektur DK* 20, no. 1 (1976): 12.
- 70 Schierup, *På Kulturens Slagmark*, 45–50.
- 71 *Fremmedarbejderbladet*, 10 September 1972, 8.
- 72 Trier, *Ishøj*.
- 73 Minutes from the Ishøj City Council in are not transcribed. Since the protocols from City Council meetings include personal details, I was not permitted to review the protocols on my own. The relevant minutes have been provided by administrative officers at the Ishøj City Hall, Lene Jensen and Michelle Dina Gullestrup Nielsen. I owe great thanks to both of them for this work, and I am confident that all relevant minutes have been placed at my disposal.
- 74 These numbers are based on information from Ishøj Kommune, *Indvanderrapport II*. In the years that followed, the growing number of immigrants became a highly contested issue.
- 75 LA. Ishøj Kommune, 'Rapport om Torslunde-Ishøj Kommunes Indvandrere,' 2.
- 76 A more recent example of this tendency is presented in Jørgensen, 'The Divergent Logics'.
- 77 LA. Ishøj Kommune, 'Rapport om Torslunde-Ishøj Kommunes Indvandrere,' 3.
- 78 Ibid., 23.
- 79 See for example Ejernæs and Skytte, *Indvandrerprojektet Albertslund Kommune*. Vol. 3, *Integraton – kulturelle Udfordringer*, 10–11.
- 80 LA. Ishøj Kommune, 'Rapport om Torslunde-Ishøj Kommunes Indvandrere,' 25 and LA. Ishøj Kommune, *Indvanderrapport II*, 113–19.
- 81 LA. Ishøj Kommune, 'Rapport om Torslunde-Ishøj Kommunes Indvandrere,' 8–11.
- 82 Ibid., 55–7.
- 83 Ishøj Rådhus. Per Madsens borgmesterarkiv. Ansøgning om midler fra EEC (unregistered data).
- 84 LA. Ishøj Kommune, *Indvanderrapport II*, 45. This was discussed and problematized in the Social Democratic Party in the late 1980s. See Jønsson,

- 85 'Socialdemokratiets Indvandrerpolitik. Anker Jørgensens Formandsperiode'; Jønsson, 'Socialdemokratiets Indvandrerpolitik. Svend Aukens Formandsperiode'. In Ishøj, the *Komiteen mod fremmedhad* (The Committee Against Xenophobia) was formed and argued heavily against the 10% policy. Key actors in the committee were representatives from the left-wing, Socialistisk Folkeparti (The Socialist People's Party). See Ishøj Rådhus. Per Madsens borgmesterarkiv. Socialistisk Folkeparti, Ishøj, Byrådsgruppen. Meddelelse til pressen, 29 February 1988; Ishøj Rådhus. Ishøj Byråds Beslutningsprotokol, 1 March 1988. Blad 29.
- 86 Borevi, 'Sverige'.
- 87 LA. Ishøj Kommune, 'Rapport om Torslunde-Ishøj Kommunes Indvandrere,' 30–6.
- 88 LA. Ishøj Kommune, *Indvanderrapport II*, 45.
- 89 Østre Landsret. Udskrift af Østre Landsrets Dombog, 'Dom afsagt den 22. januar 1991'.
- 90 LA. Ishøj Kommune, *Indvanderrapport II*, 46. The statement from the ombudsman is printed in the same publication, 294–7. It is noteworthy that in the response from the ombudsman, the term 'guest worker' is used. The statement and correspondence regarding the ethnic-limitation principle can be found in Ishøj Rådhus, Per Madsens Borgmesterarkiv.
- 91 For an analysis of the Danish dispersal-policy debates, see DammSchultz-Nielsen, and Tranæs, *En Befolkning deler sig op?*
- 92 Udvalget vedrørende indvandreres bosætningsmønster, *Betænkning*.
- 93 See for example Annelise Pedersen, 'Ishøj-borgmetsers grove påstand: tyrkerne prygler deres kvinder,' *Ekstra Bladet*, 17 February 1989, 6–7. Ishøj and the blunt-speaking mayor also created headlines in the Swedish press: Per Sjögren, "Danmarks Botkyrka" stänger gränsen. Stopp för fler invandrare,' *Dagens Nyheter*, 1 October 1981.
- 94 The statement is included in a TV documentary: Danmarks Radio. DR2, 'Kampen om Indvandringen'.
- 95 Jensen, *De Fremmede*, 480–4; Sørensen, *Kulturmode / Kulturkonfrontation*, 34–8.
- 96 Ufer, *Set fra Ishøj*. The feature stories were printed in the newspaper in the late 1980s. See also Schierup, *På kulturens Slagmark*, 41–52.
- 97 See for example Jørgensen, *Hvad sagde vi*, 199–205.
- 98 See Jørgensen, *Hvad sagde vi*, 199–215. See also Sørensen, *Kulturmode / Kulturkonfrontation*.
- 99 Jønsson, 'Socialdemokratiets Indvandrerpolitik. Anker Jørgensens Formandsperiode'; Jønsson, 'Socialdemokratiets Indvandrerpolitik. Svend Aukens Formandsperiode'.
- 100 Per Madsen received letters from citizens who agreed with him. See Ishøj Rådhus, Per Madsens Borgmesterarkiv.
- 101 Jønsson, 'Socialdemokratiets Indvandrerpolitik. Anker Jørgensens Formandsperiode'; Jønsson, 'Socialdemokratiets Indvandrerpolitik. Svend Aukens Formandsperiode'.
- 102 Representatives from the Socialist People's Party argued heavily against the limitation policy. See for example Ishøj Rådhus, Per Madsens borgmesterarkiv, (unregistered data), 'Udskrift fra byrådets åbne møde den 1/3-1988'.
- 103 Østre Landsret. Udskrift af Østre Landsrets Dombog, 'Dom afsagt den 22. januar 1991', 10–11.

## References

### Primary sources

- Danmarks Radio (Danish Broadcasting Corporation)  
 DR2. 'Kampen om Indvandringen: Oprør på Vestegnen', Broadcast April 2012.
- Folketingstidende (The Official Report of Danish Parliamentary Proceedings)  
*Folketingets forhandlinger* 1970–1983.  
*Folketingets forhandlinger* 1991/1991.
- Ishøj Rådhus (Ishøj Town Hall), Ishøj  
 Per Madsens borgmesterarkiv (unregistered data).  
 Ishøj Byråds Beslutningsprotokol.
- Københavns Stadsarkiv (KS, Copenhagen City Archives), Copenhagen  
 Familievejledningens Avis 1968–76. Kontorchef Hans Reinhold Auring's arkiv (1965–1976).  
 Københavns Borgerrepræsentations Forhandlinger, 1969–1983.
- Lokalhistorisk Arkiv, Ishøj Kommune (LA, Archive of Local History, Ishøj Municipality), Ishøj.  
 Ishøj Kommune. *Indvandrerreport II*, 1978 (J.nr. 00.01P05).  
 Ishøj Kommune. 'Rapport om Torslunde-Ishøj Kommunes Indvandrere', 1975 (J.nr. 79-12).
- Østre Landsret (The High Court of Eastern Denmark), Copenhagen  
 Udskrift af Østre Landsrets Dombog. Dom afsagt den 22. januar 1991, 10–11.

### Secondary sources

- Alesina, Alberto, and Edward Glaeser. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe: A World of Difference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Andersen, Karen. *Gæstearbejder, Udlænding, Indvandrer, Dansker!* Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1979.
- Blom-Hansen, Jens. *Fra Sogn til Velfærdsproducent. Kommunestyret gennem fire Årtier*. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2012.
- Borevi, Karin. 'Sverige: Mångkulturalismens Flaggskepp i Norden'. In *Velferdens Grenser*, ed. Grete Brochmann and Anniken Hagelund, 41–130. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2010.
- Brochmann, Grete, and Anniken Hagelund, eds. *Velferdens Grenser. Innvandringspolitikk og Velferdsstat i Skandinavia 1945–2010*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2010.
- Christiansen, Niels Finn, and Klaus Petersen. 'The Dynamics of Social Solidarity. The Danish Welfare State 1900–2000'. *Scandinavian Journal of History* 26 (2001): 177–96.
- Christiansen, Niels Finn, Nils Edling, Per Haave, and Klaus Petersen, eds. *The Nordic Model of Welfare – A Historical Reappraisal*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2006.
- Damm, Anna Piil, Marie Louise Schultz-Nielsen, and Torben Tranæs, eds. *En Befolkning deler sig op?* Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 2006.
- Duyvendak, J. W., and P. W. A. Scholten. 'Beyond the Dutch "Multicultural Model". The Coproduction of Integration Policy Frames in The Netherlands'. *International Migration and Integration* 12 (2011): 331–48.
- Ejernæs, Morten, and Marianne Skytte. *Indvandrerprojektet Albertslund Kommune*. Vol. 3, *Integraton – kulturelle Udfordringer*. Albertslund: Albertslund Kommune, 1986.
- Ejlertsen, Torben. *Kraftcenter og Fristad*. Vol. 6, *Københavns historie*. Ed. Svend Cedergreen Bech, Erik Kjersgaard, and Jan Danielsen. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1980.

- Elkær-Hansen, Niels. *Betænkning om udenlandske arbejderes forhold i Danmark: afgivet af det af arbejdsministeriet den 17. juni 1969 nedsatte udvalg*. Copenhagen: Arbejdsministeriet, 1971.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.
- Friis, Malene. 'Fremmed og Arbejder. Fagbevægelsen og stat – 20 års Indvandrerpolitik'. *Årbog for Arbejderbevægelsens Historie* 20 (1990): 207–38.
- Gaasholt, Øystein, and Lise Tøgeby. *I Syv Sind: Danskernes Holdninger til Flygtninge og Indvandrere*. Aarhus: Politika, 1995.
- Hartmann, Fanny. *Betænkning om udenlandske Arbejderes sociale og samfundsmæssige Tilpasning her i landet. Afgivet af en af Socialministeriet nedsat Arbejdsgruppe*. Copenhagen: Socialministeriet, 1975.
- Hjørnø, Jan, Torben Lundbæk, and Sven Skovmand, eds. *Fremmedarbejderpolitik – En Bog om Fremmedarbejderproblematikken*. Copenhagen: Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke, 1973.
- Holm, Lærke K. *Folketinget og Udlændingepolitikken – Diskurser om Naturaliserede, Indvandrere og Flygtninge 1973–2002*. Aalborg: AMID, 2002.
- 'Ishøj-Planen, boligbebyggelse i Køge Bugt'. *Arkitektur DK* 20, no. 1 (1976): 12–19.
- Jensen, Bent. *De Fremmede i dansk Avisdebat fra 1870'erne til 1990'erne*. Copenhagen: Spektrum, 2000.
- Jønsson, Heidi Vad. 'Socialdemokratiets Indvandrerpolitik. Anker Jørgensens Formandsperiode 1979–1987'. *Arbejderhistorie* 1 (2013): 50–68.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Socialdemokratiets Indvandrerpolitik. Svend Auken's Formandsperiode 1987–1992'. *Arbejderhistorie* 2 (2013, forthcoming).
- Jønsson, Heidi Vad, and Klaus Petersen. 'Danmark: Den nationale velfærdsstat møder verden'. In *Velfærdens grænser*, ed. Grete Brochmann and Anniken Hagelund, 131–210. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Immigrations- og Integrationspolitik'. In *Dansk Velfærdshistorie*, vol. 4, ed. Jørn Henrik Petersen, Klaus Petersen, and Niels Finn Christiansen, 700–37. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2012.
- Jørgensen, Lars. *Hvad sagde vi – om de andre?* Roskilde: Roskilde Universitet, 2006.
- Jørgensen, Martin Bak. 'The Divergent Logics of Integration Policy-Making at National and City Level'. *International Migration Review* 46, no. 1 (2012): 244–78.
- Kolstrup, Søren. *Velfærdsstatens Rødder. Fra Kommunesocialisme til Folkepension*. Copenhagen: SFAH, 1996.
- Lange, Ole. *Juvelen der blev til Skrot. Kampen om B&W 1945–1996*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 2001.
- Mochizuki, Jiro. *Ansigtet mod Kameraet: Vognmandsmarken 1977–79*. Copenhagen: Københavns Bymuseum, 1980.
- Penninx, Rinus. 'Decentralizing Integration Policies. Managing Migration in Cities, Regions and Localities'. Policy Network Paper. 26 November 2009. [http://www.policy-network.net/publications\\_detail.aspx?ID=3450](http://www.policy-network.net/publications_detail.aspx?ID=3450) (accessed 13 August 2013).
- Penninx, Rinus, and Judith Roosblad, eds. *Trade Unions, Immigration, and Immigrants in Europe, 1960–1993*. New York: Berghahn, 2000.
- Penninx, Rinus, Karen Kraal, Marco Martiniello, and Steven Vertovec, eds. *Citizenship in European Cities. Immigrants, Local Policies and Integration Policies*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004.
- Petersen, Eggert. *Gæstearbejder i København*. Copenhagen: Mentalhygiejnisk Forskningsinstitut, 1970.

- Petersen, Jørn Henrik, Klaus Petersen, and Niels Finn Christiansen, eds. *Dansk Velfærdshistorie*. 6 vols. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2010–2014.
- Petersen, Klaus, ed. *13 Historier om den Danske Velfærdstat*. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2003.
- Ploug, Niels, Ingrid Henriksen, and Niels Kærgård, eds. *Den Danske Velfærdsstats Historie*. Copenhagen: SFI, 2004.
- Sainsbury, Diane. 'Immigrants' Social Rights in Comparative Perspective: Welfare Regimes, Forms of Immigration and Immigration Policy Regimes'. *Journal of European Social Policy* 16, no. 3 (2006): 229–44.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Welfare States and Immigrant Rights. The Politics of Inclusion and Exclusion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Schierup, Carl Ulrik. *På Kulturens Slagmark*. Esbjerg: Sydjysk Universitetsforlag, 1993.
- Schumacher, Gijs. *Modernize or Die*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universitet Amsterdam, 2011.
- Schwartz, Jonathan Mathew. *Reluctant Hosts: Denmark's Reception of Guest Workers*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1985.
- Sørensen, Jørgen Würtz. *Velkommen Mustafa? Debatten om gæstearbejderne og det danske samfund i starten af 1970'erne*. Aarhus: Center for Kulturforskning, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Kulturmode / Kulturkonfrontation. Tendenser i 80'ernes debat om danskerne og de fremmede*. Aarhus: Center for Kulturforskning, 1990.
- Sørensen, Karen Juul, and Per Boje. *Fra Klondyke til moderne Velfærds Kommune. Gladsaxes Politiske Historie 1900–2000*. Søborg: Gladsaxe Kommune, 2001.
- Tingkær, Kasper. *Udenlandske Arbejdere: en Parentes på det danske Arbejdsmarked: en Undersøgelse af DA's og LO's Holdning og Ageren i forhold til de udenlandske Arbejdere i Danmark 1964–1970*. M. A. diss., Syddansk Universitet, 2004.
- Trier, Else. *Ishøj – den Grønne Port til København: før og nu*. Ishøj: Ishøj Kommune, 1998.
- Udvalget vedrørende indvandreres bosætningsmønster. *Betænkning om Indvandrernes Bosætningsmønster*. Copenhagen: Indenrigsministeriet, 1986.
- Ufer, Niels. *Set fra Ishøj*. Copenhagen: Information, 1988.
- Velfærdskommissionen. *Fremtidens Velfærd – vores Valg*. Copenhagen: Finansministeriet, 2005.

---

**Heidi Vad Jønsson** is a postdoctoral fellow at the Centre for Welfare State Research, University of Southern Denmark. Her PhD dissertation was a study of various aspects of the Danish welfare state. Jønsson has published a number of articles, including (with K. Petersen) 'Denmark: A National Welfare State meets the World', in Brochmann and Hagelund, eds, *Immigration Policy and the Scandinavian Welfare State 1945–2010* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012) and 'In the Borderland of the Welfare State: Danish Integration Policy – the Early Years 1967–1983', in Suszycki, ed., *Welfare Citizenship and Welfare Nationalism* (Helsinki: Nordwel, 2011). Jønsson is co-editor of *Migrations and Welfare States. Policies, Discourses and Institutions* (Helsinki: Nordwel, 2013). Address: Centre for Welfare State Research, University of Southern Denmark, Campusvej 55, DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark. [email: hej@sdu.dk]

---