

Collection
Études théoriques

no ET0906
The Janus Face of Urban
Governance in Denmark

John Andersen
John Pløger

Department of Environmental,
Social and Spatial Change
Roskilde University Center,
Denmark

KATARSIS Project

Copublication Roskilde University,
Denmark/CRISES

mai 2009



Cahiers du Centre de recherche sur les innovations sociales (CRISES)
Collection Études théoriques – no ET0906

«**The Janus Face of Urban Governance in DENMARK**»

John Andersen & John Pløger, Department of Environmental, Social and Spatial Change,
Roskilde University Center, Denmark

Katarsis Project – Copublication Roskilde University Center/CRISES

ISBN-10 : 2-89605-308-5
ISBN-13 : 978-2-89605-308-7
EAN : 9782896053087

Dépôt légal : 2009

Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec
Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Canada

PRÉSENTATION DU CRISES

Notre Centre de recherche sur les innovations sociales (CRISES) est une organisation interuniversitaire qui étudie et analyse principalement « les innovations et les transformations sociales ».

Une innovation sociale est une intervention initiée par des acteurs sociaux pour répondre à une aspiration, subvenir à un besoin, apporter une solution ou profiter d'une opportunité d'action afin de modifier des relations sociales, de transformer un cadre d'action ou de proposer de nouvelles orientations culturelles.

En se combinant, les innovations peuvent avoir à long terme une efficacité sociale qui dépasse le cadre du projet initial (entreprises, associations, etc.) et représenter un enjeu qui questionne les grands équilibres sociétaux. Elles deviennent alors une source de transformations sociales et peuvent contribuer à l'émergence de nouveaux modèles de développement.

Les chercheurs du CRISES étudient les innovations sociales à partir de trois axes complémentaires : le territoire, les conditions de vie et le travail et l'emploi.

Axe innovations sociales, développement et territoire

- Les membres de l'axe développement et territoire s'intéressent à la régulation, aux arrangements organisationnels et institutionnels, aux pratiques et stratégies d'acteurs socio-économiques qui ont une conséquence sur le développement des collectivités et des territoires. Ils étudient les entreprises et les organisations (privées, publiques, coopératives et associatives) ainsi que leurs interrelations, les réseaux d'acteurs, les systèmes d'innovation, les modalités de gouvernance et les stratégies qui contribuent au développement durable des collectivités et des territoires.

Axe innovations sociales et conditions de vie

- Les membres de l'axe conditions de vie repèrent et analysent des innovations sociales visant l'amélioration des conditions de vie, notamment en ce qui concerne la consommation, l'emploi du temps, l'environnement familial, l'insertion sur le marché du travail, l'habitat, les revenus, la santé et la sécurité des personnes. Ces innovations se situent, généralement, à la jonction des politiques publiques et des mouvements sociaux : services collectifs, pratiques de résistance, luttes populaires, nouvelles manières de produire et de consommer, etc.

Axes innovations sociales, travail et emploi

- Les membres de l'axe travail et emploi orientent leurs recherches vers l'organisation du travail, la régulation de l'emploi et la gouvernance des entreprises dans le secteur manufacturier, dans les services, dans la fonction publique et dans l'économie du savoir. Les travaux portent sur les dimensions organisationnelles et institutionnelles. Ils concernent tant les syndicats et les entreprises que les politiques publiques et s'intéressent à certaines thématiques comme les stratégies des acteurs, le partenariat, la gouvernance des entreprises, les nouveaux statuts d'emploi, le vieillissement au travail, l'équité en emploi et la formation.

LES ACTIVITÉS DU CRISES

En plus de la conduite de nombreux projets de recherche, l'accueil de stagiaires postdoctoraux, la formation des étudiants, le CRISES organise toute une série de séminaires et de colloques qui permettent le partage et la diffusion de connaissances nouvelles. Les cahiers de recherche, les rapports annuels et la programmation des activités peuvent être consultés à partir de notre site Internet à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.cris.es.uqam.ca>.

Denis Harrisson
Directeur



THE AUTHORS

John ANDERSEN is Professor at the Department of Environmental, Social and Spatial Change, Roskilde University Center, Denmark.

John PLØGER is Professor at the Department of Environmental, Social and Spatial Change, Roskilde University Center, Denmark.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
1. SOCIAL EXCLUSION, WELFARE REGIMES AND URBAN POLICY	3
2. THE DANISH WELFARE MODEL AFTER THE GOLDEN AGE	5
2.1. The new orientations – Policy responses at the national level	6
2.2. Critical thresholds.....	8
3. FRAMEWORK AND HISTORY OF THE DANISH PLANNING SYSTEM	11
3.1. Principles of planning, Urban policy, and UDP’s	11
3.1.1. Management of welfare expansion.....	11
3.1.2. Management of crisis	12
3.1.3. The dual character of planning and its ambivalences.....	14
4. THE CURRENT SITUATION IN DENMARK – TWO CASES	17
4.1. Case 1 : The present ambivalence of growth politics, urban planning and governance in Denmark	17
4.2. Case 2 : Housing regulations and housing policy as part of urban policy.....	19
4.3. Political ambivalences – summing up	20
5. NEW GOVERNMENT - NEW IDEOLOGY - NEW POLICY	23
5.1. Combatting dualism in urban policy – or how to empower welfare policies within a fragmented city.....	23
5.2. Challenging the Janus face of urban policy	24
5.3. Towards a new inclusive politics of difference	26
6. CONCLUSIVE REMARKS	29

7. THE JANUS FACE OF URBAN GOVERNANCE IN DENMARK	31
7.1. Danish urban policy and urban democracy can be characterised by a striking <i>duality</i> and tension between :	31
7.2. Political ambivalences – summing up	32
7.3. Conflicting agendas and lack of cross scale strategies and linkages	32
7.4. New government – New ideology – New policy	32
7.5. Combatting dualism in urban policy – or how to empower welfare policies within a fragmented city	33
 REFERENCES	 35

ABSTRACT

THE DUALISM OF URBAN GOVERNANCE IN DENMARK

The article argues that the present Danish urban policy and urban democracy can be characterised by a striking duality and tension between:

- (1) Participatory empowering welfare oriented community strategies, which targets deprived districts and neighbourhoods, which are based on notions of the Inclusive City. This trend is founded on priorities of radical democracy, social justice and inclusion and citizens empowerment.*
- (2) Neoelitist/corporative market driven strategic regional and global growth strategies, which are based on notions of the Entrepreneurial Globalized City and where urban policy becomes a question of facilitation of the “growth machine” and neoliberalised urban authoritarianism.*

The article discusses dilemmas for overcoming the growing tension between elitist neo-corporate growth regimes, which are in operation via “Quangoes” and closed elite networks, and community empowerment and welfare oriented policy in the age of globalisation. Taking the stand of community empowerment and welfare policy, the article conclusively discusses ways to shape a new inclusive politics of difference including using ‘positive selectivism’ as part of an empowerment strategy.

*John Andersen
John Pløger*

INTRODUCTION

The dual city, segregation and ghettorisation, is a well known problematic to urban politics and planning, but it's not until the early 1990's that they became key political issues in Denmark and especially in its capital Copenhagen. The degree of problems is questioned, but there is no doubt that some of the suburban neighborhoods and parts of inner city have a higher share of ethnic groups and social problems compared to the city as a whole and nationwide (Andersen & Aarø 1997, Andersen, 2005). In order to meet this challenge, the former Social Democratic (until 2001) government designed a cross-departmental committee that launched a 16-point program to handle with the problems defined (mostly related to ethnic integration). At that time some of the suburban municipalities around the city of Copenhagen successfully made the press to focus on their 'special' social problems in order to be one of the chosen areas for social regeneration that the government initiated to counteract the problems defined. The government initiative was some years later coupled with issues on local democracy, community empowerment and employment under the name 'kvarterloeft' (neighborhood regeneration).

We consider these developments as new traits in the ongoing welfare policy, that are about to create a new welfare-regime building not primarily on 'universalistic' welfare but far more directed towards a differentiated welfare. But what kind of differentiation? The article will argue that Denmark does not experience a pure neo-liberal market policy that increases segregation, but in some ways the continuation of a policy changes. The continuation (pathdependency) is partly caused by the fact that the neo-liberal government (since 2001) on one side cannot ignore voters defense of the welfare state, and partly because most parties have admitted that universal rights and policies are insensitive to the specific context of segregation processes and social problems. The outcome of current policies is however still most likely an increasing socio-economic division in society as such and especially in major cities, because different governments during the last two decades have developed a housing policy that concentrate ethnic groups and social problems in public housing (in fact a policy already initiated by the former Social Democratic regime). The article focuses on two examples of management of crisis, we are witnessing in Denmark these years, its dual character and ambivalences, exemplified by a parallel "City Entrepreneurial" (Harvey, 1993 and Jessop, 1998) and housing politics. We will, conclusively, make some arguments for how to develop a holistic 'inclusive' planning as the new strategy to secure the social welfare of marginalized groups in society.

1. SOCIAL EXCLUSION, WELFARE REGIMES AND URBAN POLICY

The relationship between Urban Policy (UP) and dynamics of social exclusion and polarization cannot be analyzed without taking the nature and efficiency of the general welfare regime into account. The reduction in welfare distribution and specific welfare goods is not argued to be a result of growth or market strategies, but related to municipals inefficiency and increased costs on certain welfare benefits such as the right to free hospital care and pension welfare. The possible negative impact of UP in terms of increased social polarization in part depends on the efficiency of integration and redistribution policies and regulations. However, the same type of UP strategy can have different impacts on social polarization and living conditions, depending on the type of welfare regime governing practice and the broader regulatory framework in which it is implemented.

Esping-Andersen's (1990) welfare regime typology suggests three worlds of Welfare Capitalism :

- The universalist social democratic regime, where social citizenship is institutionalized.
- The continental Bismarckian regime with an emphasis on compulsory social insurance schemes, and
- The liberal, Anglo-Saxon residual welfare state.

In the universalist/redistributive welfare regimes the relation between social class or market position and living conditions are modified, or, in Esping Andersen's terminology, to some extent de-commodified. The impacts of socio-economic change and urban policy e.g. on labor and housing markets are, therefore, modified or " filtered " by the operation of the welfare regime. In residual welfare regimes, where the " welfare state filter " or buffer between market position and living conditions is by definition weak, the impact of UPs on living conditions will be more direct.

In much of the debate about the welfare state in Denmark, the Social Democratic and social liberal forces argue that a strong universal welfare state is functional with reference to the stimulation of economic growth precisely because it " socializes " the social costs of socio-economic – including spatial – change. The welfare state makes long-term " sustainable growth " possible, because it creates a regulatory framework which to some degree tames the possible socio-economic polarization effects of market forces. It does so via (1) " the politics of social citizenship against the market " (e.g. free hospital-care) and (2) to a large extent supports the dynamics of market forces by ensuring and legitimizing the externalisation of social costs due to socio-economic changes, to the state organized welfare-regime, and thereby

reduces resistance at both firm and local political level. The prototype of this “ market taming and supporting ” logic is the Danish system for unemployment insurance for wage earners, which has given a legalized short term of notice of removing workforce at the plant level, because the level of unemployment benefits is relatively high. The *negotiated* balance between “ taming and stimulation ” of the market dynamics is the content of the concept of the Danish “ negotiated economy ” (Andersen og Hovgaard, 2003).

2. THE DANISH WELFARE MODEL AFTER THE GOLDEN AGE

As in most EU member states the battle for full employment was lost in the late seventies, and on the intellectual and political scene the welfare state project became much more defensive. The welfare state, which to some degree emancipated citizens from the forces of the market, was attacked by offensive neo-liberal and neo-conservative forces.

In 1982 a Conservative-Liberal coalition government came to power after decades of Social Democratic government, but the changes implemented were moderate and the overall welfare regime was still closest to the universalistic or Scandinavian type. In a comparative perspective the Danish case is an example of a relative stable regime (strong pathdependency), not least because unlike many other countries, the Danish labour market is still regulated by powerful trade unions. The problem of the “working poor” and unregulated illegal work is still relative marginal, since most sections of the labour market are unionised and regulated by minimum wages that have been kept at a – relatively speaking – high level in relation to living costs.

The most important *reorientations* in the Danish Welfare model in the 1990s of relevance for urban planning are :

- A strong emphasis on regional strategic growth policy concentrated in the Copenhagen Region, which embodies a new type of *state led entrepreneurialism*.
- Introduction (since the mid nineties) of experimental, *participative social action schemes* targeted for deprived urban districts.
- A strong emphasis on activation and education schemes for unemployed.

Before analysing the dualistic character of urban policy – participative social action programmes versus corporatist entrepreneurialism – some observations about the changing character of social exclusion and marginalisation.

All though Denmark in international comparisons is regarded as a relatively successful welfare model, a closer look at the social landscape shows increased *spatial* concentration of the less affluent, labour market, and excluded and marginalised groups. In particular, the City and Region of Copenhagen has crystallised this social divisions (National Urban Committee, 1993, Munk, 1998).

Since the mid nineties national unemployment has fallen from a 10-12 pct level to a 5-6 pct level, but this economic recovery (The Danish “Job Miracle”) has to a large extent bypassed

the deprived districts and their residents – in particular ethnic minorities. Therefore *socio-spatial* polarization has grown in a period of increased economic growth (Andersen and Hovgaard, 2003 and Andersen, 2005) – a fact which the National Social Housing Association has stressed very often. The political response to this development (since the mid nineties) has been a long-term social action programme targeted to “deprived” urban areas.

The ethnic, gender and age composition of long-term labour market exclusion has also shifted so that long term unemployment today is much more clearly concentrated among ethnic minorities and middle aged and elderly unskilled women and men. In particular, the latter social category, elderly unskilled men, seems to represent a new distinctive type of social exclusion (Andersen and Larsen, 1998), which policy makers and welfare institutions have not been able to respond to. Whereas women’s risk of economic impoverishment (in terms of lack of economic resources/financial poverty) is still slightly over-represented compared to men, the long-term unemployment is more or less the same for men and women. But the risk for “hard core social exclusion” in terms of alcoholism, the break down of every day life routines etc. is much greater for men.

One of several reasons for the change in the gender profile of social exclusion has to do with the (overlooked) fact that the most innovative politics of social integration were developed for and largely by women. Where a range of experimental social action programmes targeted marginalised women for example the successful daytime high schools, the innovations with regard to excluded men have been more or less absent.

2.1. The new orientations – Policy responses at the national level

Until 1993, urban policy has not in fact been defined as a distinct policy-field in Denmark. The design of the first multidimensional Urban Social Action Programme in 1993/94 was a manifestation of attempts to stimulate bottom-up empowerment orientation in deprived urban areas.

The programme was inspired by EU Poverty 3 (1989-1994), which emphasised experimental local action against social exclusion (it was the first time, in Denmark, that a large-scale urban programme was launched based on principles of multidimensional area-based action, participation [including participation of the Social Housing Associations]) and partnership. The programme quickly became an innovative and experimental part of public planning and welfare policy. It had elements of a “politics of positive selectivism” and “social mobilisation” approach. In the implementation, the National Urban Committee (“Byudvalget”) has, in the negotiations about project contracts with the Municipalities and

Housing Associations, insisted that citizen participation and empowerment orientation in the projects should be taken seriously.

All major parties supported the programme in parliament. One important background for this consensus in the Danish parliament was a long lasting and contradictory public discourse about social segregation and, in particular, about the emergence of “ ethnic ghettos ” in social housing estates. Social Democratic mayors in Municipalities with a large share of social housing estates argued in public, that the proportion of ethnic minorities had reached a level that posed major problems for the local welfare politics such as ghettoisation and conflicts. These mayors also accused the Liberal-Conservative Municipalities of being ‘ free riders ’ with regard to the inclusion of immigrants and other socially excluded people. In this climate, a vague consensus about ‘ something needs to be done ’ was gradually established in the Danish parliament, but the design of the content and institutional form of policy interventions was left to actors like the social housing associations, the Social Workers’ Union and civil servants in the ministries. Despite the ‘ negative ’ point of departure in the public discourse – the negative labelling of social housing estates with ethnic minorities as a ‘ burden ’ and some times with clear connotations of this burden being a ‘ Muslim underclass ’ – what happened in the practical policy design process was a transformation to a broader social inclusion problematique that recognised the need for government resources to handle the growing spatial inequalities in a more holistic (physical, social and cultural) manner. As can be observed in many policy areas from the nineties up until the present, the policy design players very often use ‘ communitarian rhetoric ’ as a tool to construct a temporary ‘ beyond left and right slippery consensus ’. This is done at the right time and place in order to give the policy field the image of being beyond ideological conflict. In the *practical* policymaking processes, where the crucial point first and foremost is to get money from the state budget, this can sometimes be an efficient strategy.

Compared with most other European countries, the formation of ethnic minority communities is a new phenomenon in Denmark, and the public discourse about the ethnic or “ ghetto problem ” in the nineties was the first of its kind in Denmark. The major reason for the willingness of the neoliberal and conservative forces to allocate additional resources to a range of regeneration and social action programmes in deprived areas, was that they saw the new urban policy as a way of handling ethnic tensions. The leftist parties acceptance of a new urban policy was based on the recognition of a growing spatial inequality that the state should allocate additional resources to solve these problems in a way, which empowered these communities. This new urban policy introduced a rhetoric of experimentation, participation and partnership linked to campaigns for Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) by creating a more inclusive market. In policy documents like “ The City of the Future ” (Ministry for Housing and Urban Affairs 1999) concepts like the “ Inclusive City ”, the “ Creative City ” and the “ Green City ” (which relate to the Agenda 21 movement) were introduced.

As we discuss in more detail later, the “ City of the Future ” document underlines that social, cultural and economic problems of deprived districts should be addressed in a multidimensional and coherent manner. It is explicitly acknowledged that long lasting multidimensional programmes are necessary due to a lack of coherent planning in the past and the long-term impact of socio-spatial concentration of unemployment and social exclusion. Partnerships with the local companies are suggested as tools to improve labour market integration of excluded groups (and the present neo-liberal government agrees). In practice, partnerships has so far only played a marginal role in the implementation of the programmes.

2.2. Critical thresholds

Callaghan argues that ‘ community participation ’ and ‘ empowerment ’ are increasingly expressed as the twin pillars of social policy interventions aimed at social inclusion and based upon synergetic partnerships between community groups, governmental bodies, statutory authorities and other organisational agents.

Despite some common elements in the political rhetoric – namely the communitarian inspired language of rights and duties, social cohesion, the active society, caring communities etc. – it is extremely important to distinguish between the political content and outcome of the inclusion orientation in different welfare regime contexts : (1) The neo-liberal/conservative welfare regime is a *retrenchment* context, and (2) the Social Democratic regime is tied to social citizenship and inclusion and welfare regime stability.

In the liberal regime, more “ government through community ” as Rose conceptualises it (Rose 1996) to some extent *replaces former citizenship rights and politics of redistribution*, and the regime emphasises the need of market influence on welfare services and reduction of welfare benefits as the way to force people to get work. In the Social Democratic regime, the basic architecture of the welfare regime is not transformed and hence politics of inclusion and empowerment – for example local empowerment projects – is viewed as “ added value ” to existing welfare policy. However, as we will argue in the following chapters, the new Danish urban policy was until 2002 (to a large extent) an example of what could be termed as a politics of *positive selectivism* with regard to combatting spatial inequality.

The new urban governance in Copenhagen, however, is a good example of the economic growth policy and the area based social and housing policies are not well orchestrated and integrated. Reasons could be that it’s a liberal-democratic municipal government always in conflict or the lack of a comprehensive urban development strategy. Anyway, instead of representing an inclusive phase, the growth and social housing policy manifest themselves as two separate phases of a new urban governance. So far no comprehensive evaluation on this

conflictual policy-strategy has been carried out, but there is evidence that the most successful part of the urban regeneration program is the ones based on community managed socio-cultural projects (citizen organized and steered projects) ((Fotel & Andersen 2003), whereas the efforts to create efficient partnerships with the business community on job creation is much less successful. In the following, the social and institutional struggles in the last decades that led to the present two-phased urban governance regime in Copenhagen will be outlined.

3. FRAMEWORK AND HISTORY OF THE DANISH PLANNING SYSTEM

3.1. Principles of planning, Urban policy, and UDP's

The present conflicts between neo-corporate and participatory planning principles in Denmark, is not alone the effect of a shift from welfare to market politics, and must be analysed within a broader historical and political administrative context, i.e. as a part of the Danish welfare regime and the specific policy tools implemented in promoting urban development.

3.1.1. *Management of welfare expansion*

The Danish welfare state rapidly developed mainly during the 1960-70s, and the 1970's became important reform years in Denmark. Reforms dramatically changed the whole political and administrative set up (Bogason 1995).

The most extensive reform was that of the municipalities, which was launched in 1970. The intention of the reform was to ensure viable administrative entities ; hence the total number of municipalities was reduced from 1 100 to 275, and the number of regional entities from 25 to 14. A two-tier local political-administrative system was implemented, with the intention to create a uniform and strengthened system of legal administration.

Furthermore, a complicated financial system of reimbursement between the state and the municipalities became gradually replaced by a system of general grants based on objective criteria. The system of general grants rests on the idea that expansive requirements and economic capacity are differentiated by structural factors, and that equalisation in the performance of the welfare services is needed. For the same reason a national system of financial redistribution between municipalities was implemented.

The meaning of the municipal reform was to create sustainable and neutral entities in the management of the welfare state. During the 1970's the regional and municipal levels took over many functions from the state and this process of decentralisation totally changed the division of duties between administrative levels, as well as it strengthened the political element in local decision-making.

The regional levels became responsible for hospitals, major roads, regional land use planning, environmental protection, and some cultural services. Municipalities were made responsible

for the delivery of services to citizens, including public services such as kindergartens, libraries, town planning and regulation, social services, leisure-time activities and primary schools.

With the primary assignment in the municipalities, a very ambitious system of sector planning was built up regarding health, education and social security, of course still integrated into or subordinated under central governmental or municipal objectives via orders, instructions and regulations.

Besides the sector planning system, a comprehensive system of physical planning was created from the late 1960's in three important steps (latest updated with the Planning Act from 1992). Planning was no longer seen as the objective and rational weighing of different means and ends, but recognised as a strong political field. For the same reason planning competence was moved from pure administrative bodies to political agencies with the principal thought of removing the existing hierarchical top-down process to a more democratic one (Gaardmand 1978 : 32).

The logic of the planning system however still is that national planning overrules regional planning, and regional planning overrules local planning. As an 'open' and 'bottom-up' oriented planning system, it is based on some specific policy mechanisms. To empower and to ensure local participation, considerations at the municipal levels are made prior to the planning of land use on the county level. And the considerations on county level are done prior to the planning at national level. Local plans within the municipalities can even be implemented without the confirmation from higher administrative levels. The system contains opportunities for public objections, protesting and for alternative ideas to grow, e.g. by having a public participation (named 'public hearing') lasting 4-6 weeks from plans are presented. All citizens and interests can during this time form public objections on proposals or new proposals for the further development of a plan.

3.1.2. Management of crisis

During the 1970's the planning system was organised in order to manage economic growth. Even though the international crisis hit Denmark profoundly in 1972-73, it was only considered as a matter of market fluctuations (e.g. Hansen, 1987). In the late 1970's the structural dimensions of an economical recession was a reality (especially on unemployment), and at the same time the political conjunctures changed. The Keynesian economy and the welfare distribution came under pressure, and the mode of government shifted from *the management of growth* to *management of crisis* approach. The political ambitions of doing

integrative, participatory planning were as an effect replaced by the accentuation of economic rationalism and budget efficiency.

In 1982 Social Democrats handed over power to a conservative/liberal coalition. The leading message from the new government became the need for adapting to new economic circumstances and hence a reduction of the public sector became a major political target. The new liberal government clearly stated that the main problem in society was not the growing unemployment rate, but the deficit on the balance of payment due to the deficit on public spending.

Privatisation was launched as a main policy-tool, and the government immediately appointed a 'privatisation committee'. But, the focus soon shifted from the privatisation rhetoric to the more soft accentuation on 'market-governance', 'freedom of choice' and 'new financial mechanisms' as means to change the public sector services from supply side to demand side, hence from politically regulated to user-regulated mechanisms. The mentioned catchwords were the most far-reaching elements in the new public management inspired "Modernisation-program", the government launched in 1983, which became a very important agenda for 1980s liberal-conservative governance (Bentzon 1988:26). Even though the program primarily was oriented towards the state sector, its general ambitions influenced the public sector as a whole.

The programme stated that the new economic governance at the state level was to be ensured by further decentralisation of competencies, responsibility and practices on the local levels (Bogason 1988:213f). This can be exemplified by the renewal of the local planning system in the 1980's, known as the experimental "free-municipality" initiative that began in 1985.

The intention of the free-municipality initiative was to further de-centralise political competence to local levels of decision-making in order to adapt local governance to local needs and problems, and thereby to increase local efficiency and cost-consciousness and better utilisation of resources. This experiment involves a very intense process of structural reorganisation *within* the municipalities from the late 1980's and during the 1990's (Ejersbo and Klausen 1997). New forms of organisation were facilitated, e.g. public-private partnership, and we saw a new emphasis on participatory elements such as a formalised strengthening of user influence.

On the other hand, The Home Office had to approve each free-municipal initiative to ensure that they did not conflict with general objectives, not the least the economic ones. In other words, the government made a far more direct link to every single municipality based on reports and budget information to the government than before, and this cut out the direct influence of local interest organisations on public management. Therefore the experiment can

also be seen as one example of the continuing promotion of stronger economic steering-mechanisms at state level.

As a matter of fact, the government made frequent selective interventions in the local economies, e.g. by reducing general grants and introducing economic punishment mechanisms against municipalities that did not manage to keep their spending. Because of the frequent government interference, a far more tensed relationship between the municipal political administrative levels and the government and between municipal sectors arose, and, of course, the planning horizon were shortened considerably or actually disappeared.

3.1.3. *The dual character of planning and its ambivalences*

The main considerations concerning restructuring the planning system in the 1960 and 1970's still followed basic principles of the 'Scandinavian Model'. The integrated national and regional planning system of the 1970's was thought as the path towards an economic, cultural and social equalization, where the ongoing growing level of welfare could be managed for the benefit for all the parts of society. The leading motives behind the plan-reforms of the 1970's were transparency of public affairs and decisions, citizen participation, and a 'bottom up' planning procedure. Planning should be holistic and welfare oriented linking economic governance with physical and social objectives, which is integrating social objectives and physical-economic issues in a coherent effort (Worm et.al 1984).

These goals were, however, during the 1980s, in part replaced by a new package, which consisted of :

- A much more strict top-down economic public management on all levels, and,
- Elements of increased participation/democratisation and decentralization were developed – first and foremost in 'soft' policy areas like kindergartens and schools.

However, as stated in section one, the neo-liberal wave in the 1980's did not in practice mean a fundamental break with the strong redistribute welfare model. Privatisation of basic public services never came to influence practical policy during the 1980s. There was, however, a certain political consensus on the necessity to put the brake's on public expenditure growth, which created hard pressure on the quality of municipal welfare in the poorest municipalities – including the capital of Denmark Copenhagen.

In the late eighties social liberal forces increased their political power on national level. New policy issues entered the political stage in Denmark, now centred on entrepreneurial/

Schumpeterian issues (Jessop 1998). In the late 1980's the liberal government negotiated labour market policy and entrepreneurial programmes with the Social Democratic party, e.g. on education and training programs for the unemployed. In this new climate and even with the Social Democrats back in power from 1992, the entrepreneurial focused path of Danish urban policy was born, and the dualistic path of development emerged.

Within this complex political context urban development policy (UDP) emerged. The UDP seemed to have two pillars, namely (1) the 'entrepreneurial city' planning, most notably the Orestad project (see below) and (2) a 'welfare city' policy, most notably the 'kvarterløft' project (see below). In time they were progressing paralleled, and rhetorically, at least in Copenhagen, argued to be intertwined strategies, but in reality they mainly became two distinct projects. This will be discussed further in the following.

4. THE CURRENT SITUATION IN DENMARK – TWO CASES

4.1. Case 1 : The present ambivalence of growth politics, urban planning and governance in Denmark

As discussed in the first section the Danish/Nordic Welfare State is known for its strong interventionism, and at the same time it is an example of promoting social citizenship and “socially balanced” development (Baldwin 1990). Presently there seems to be developed a tension, or may be a new relationship, between the welfare state and the role of the Danish planning system deriving from the mentioned shift from mainly welfare provision to growth planning at all levels (including effects on planning for cities weak groups). To make the arguments distinct, we first need a critical conceptualisation on the evolution of the Danish Welfare state and its socio-political and developing role, and secondly to describe its effects concerning co-operation on a holistic planning between the administrative levels.

Schmid (1995) argues that the common element in the evolution of the Welfare State is that it institutionalises the responsibility of social reproduction at a social level. But the genealogy of this process is very different in different countries and regimes. Unlike countries like France with a much more autonomous and centralised state apparatus, Schmid argues that the Scandinavian welfare system is much different. The fundamental characteristic of the Scandinavian model is that it has *developed “from below”*. The Danish welfare state politically grew out of social movement’s concrete practices and experiences, in particular those of the labour movement, but also those of insurance associations and NGO’s and other self-help initiatives. When the labour party, the Social Democratic party, came to power in the 1930’s, labour associations gradually became *integrated with the state*. This process was in fact already articulated by Social Democratic ruled municipalities from the beginning of the century and onwards, but by the time of Social Democratic governance labour representatives became a responsible and powerful part of the state bureaucracy (e.g. ‘three side’ negotiations between the government, capital and labour associations) (Schmid 1995 : 45). We may say that the civic associations ‘captured’ the state, gained power, because the government wanted to *link the welfare state to civil society*. Not only to empower municipalities to make own strategies and decisions, to empower civil society and communities self-regulating strength, but also in order to improve the relationship between citizens and bureaucracy and the cooperation between municipal sectors in order to create more holistic policies, reforms and plans.

The administrative reforms of the 1970’s had politically social integration as their leading motive, but placed the administrative responsibility of the welfare state at the local level. Intervention went local ! As pointed out earlier, this in practice meant – even though it is not a

fully adequate conclusion – that everything that reasonably could be administered locally is assigned to the local level. This responsibility makes room for political autonomy and economical manoeuvres, not least because municipalities in Denmark in principal have there own right to levy taxes, gives local decision-making a high degree of autonomy.¹

The building of a strong welfare *state* and the simultaneous high degree of local autonomy and interventive competence may, however, must be considered as an apparent paradox. But, as argued by Kolstrup (1996), the *combination* of a strong welfare state and high degree of local autonomy is actually *part of the success*. State interventionism and continuing processes of local self-determination do not necessarily work as opposites, but can be balanced via politically motivated objectives and the promotion of an open and participatory tradition of planning.²

While the planning strategy of the 1970's was oriented towards welfare objectives, decentralisation and equality, planning from the mid-1990s favours a *strategic growth perspective*. The strategic growth perspective is a planning method and way of governance that solely focus on extending cities growth potentials such as talent, knowledge, available innovative capital, R&D resources, incentives concerning building enterprises, business and financing. Municipal political leadership should be about the management of one's growth potentials, and the tools to reach these goals, it's believed, can be derived from the ideas on management in economic life. Contemporary aesthetic planning has become one of the major tasks to urban planning based on, municipalities hope, public-private corporate structures advocating the need for professionalism in planning and high aesthetic standards in architecture, functional cities, and high standard on technology capacities.

This turn represents a political turn, where cities now have to invest much more in the 'entrepreneurial city' strategy (Harvey, 1989). In Denmark of its manifestations is the Orestad "flagship project" in the Copenhagen region (Moulaert, Swyngedouw, Rodriguez 2003). However, in Denmark the entrepreneurial strategy was only one of the routes that planning took. The other route taken, namely the Urban Social Action programme, was different in focus, but not necessarily in goals.

¹ Compared to other European countries local authorities have a considerable freedom to decide what non-mandatory tasks they will undertake (e.g. Norton 1983).

² The 1980s was too the heyday of incremental planning theory (Dicken 1998). This stepp-by-step planning within possibilities available, suits the decentralisation of welfare politics and planning perfectly.

4.2. Case 2 : Housing regulations and housing policy as part of urban policy

One very often *overlooked* aspect in most comparative studies on welfare regimes is the role of *housing policy*.

The promotion of social housing and municipally owned housing was, from the beginning of the century, an important part of Social Democratic housing policy, and ‘ good affordable housing ’ was a crucial dimension to the post-war welfare planning policy. However, social housing in Denmark dates back to the beginning of the century where the first Social Democratic controlled municipalities supported and encouraged housing co-operatives, which became closely linked to the labour movement (Kolstrup, 1996). From the beginning, the idea was that the residents themselves should run the social housing co-operatives, and still this democratic structure is regarded as one of the strengths in the Danish housing-policy regime. Up to the seventies the Social Housing Movement and the national regulations concerning social housing were regarded as an important element in the welfare regime. Hereafter things changed gradually, and in the eighties the amounts of new-build social housing decreased. Furthermore, the combination of inflation and regulation of tax reduction for private ownership from the sixties and onwards, made the purchase of property very advantageous (Lind and Moeller, 1994). The result of these changes was that particularly in the eighties middle-income residents left the social housing sector, and the share of low-income residents increased.

The major change in the housing market over the last decades in Denmark has been a reduction in the share of rental housing from approximately 435,000 to 290,000 units (1970-1990) and a growth in private ownership. This is mainly due to changes in national regulations, where individual private ownership and private co-operative housing have been encouraged. Since the late seventies the law has stated that if private owners of rental blocks want to sell, they must first offer the tenants the possibility of collectively buying the apartment blocks. Many former tenants have therefore formed Co-operative Housing Associations, and the possibility of building co-operative housing associations (with tax-advantages) has reduced speculative investment capital in the housing market. However, over a longer period the price level of co-operative housing tends to be equated with private ownership apartments.

The most controversial issue in contemporary housing policy has however been about regulations of *the share of ethnic minorities* in social housing. Some municipalities have suggested maximum limits regulated by law. The National Urban Committee and researchers (e.g Dicken, 1998) have argued that a large share of minorities not in itself constitutes deprived areas, segregation or ghettos.

The most radical part of the mentioned *City of the Future* policy document made by the Social Democratic Minister of City & Housing deals with social segregation. Here it is stated that the separation of privately owned houses, co-operative housing and social housing in separate zones of the city should be avoided by proactive planning in the future. The planned mix of different types of housing, and hence different income groups, should be a guiding principle for ‘Future City’ zoning. This orientation has caused criticism from neo-liberal and conservative forces, since it prevent a market driven real estate market to be developed.³

The Social Housing Associations constantly argues that the social housing sector should be larger and attractive for parts of the middle class and not be the only part of the housing market, with social responsibility and obligations. They argue that the social responsibility for housing as a social right should be more equally shared between all parts of the housing market. The lack of access to social housing and rental apartments in the more affluent districts is one of the most important mechanisms, which over time creates segregation (Andersen, 2005). In the debate among planners and politicians, it is often argued that new regulations should ensure that in every municipality a share of the total housing stock should be social housing in order to avoid increased segregation in the housing market and society as such. A former Social Democratic Minister of Urban Affairs for instance suggested – and this created much political turbulens – that the richer municipalities should be forced by law to offer housing to refugees and socially excluded. In recent years the state distributes all new refugees are all over Denmark, which has meant that a more equal share between Municipalities. However this number to day is small due to the more and more strict immigration policy in Denmark, so little has changed in the total segregation picture.

4.3. Political ambivalences – summing up

Looking back, it is obvious that urban social movements are excluded from the new powerful growth policy networks. However it should be noted that the voice of community activists has re-entered the urban political scene since the mid nineties, not least because the state initiated the implementation of area based social action programmes in deprived districts. As said, inspired by former social renewal projects and by EU’s anti-poverty programmes (Andersen et.al, 1995), and the urban neighbourhood regeneration project named ‘kvarterløft’ is an good example.

Until now, the limits of these actions are their localist and socio-cultural orientation, and, as effect in some cases, de-politisation and de-powering citizens influence on urban politics

³ Another interesting discussion is about new developing “mixed ownership”: e.g. that residents in Social Housing Associations could be credited for individual investments in their apartment. The idea about mixed ownership is meant as a tool improve incentives for the more affluent residents to stay in Social Hosing Association in stead of moving to the private ownership.

and strategy development. For instance, structural socio-economic issues in these policies, and an articulation of initiatives within a broader social socio-economic revitalisation strategy, are often non-existent, despite the fact that the national programme pays significant rhetoric attention to the necessity of such linkages. Hence, an ambiguous duality can be identified between (a) the strategy for economic revitalisation dominated by neo-corporatist, elitist governance and (b) the area based programmes for deprived districts influenced by planning ideas of social mobilisation (Friedmann, 1987) and community empowerment (Craig & Mayo, 1995). This dualism was also manifest at the state level, where the 1990's shows a growing tension between the Ministry of Financial Affairs, which emphasises the entrepreneurial and market aspects of urban governance, on the one hand, and the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Housing on the other, because they emphasised the need for comprehensive urban policy concerned with social integration, local creativity and empowerment and the avoidance of socio-spatial polarisation on the other. The new neo-liberal government only extends the market strategies, but even then realising they need a minimum of welfare provision in order to avoid social disorder. The Danish case, summing up, indicates two lessons :

- The importance of political and institutional *empowerment of deprived districts*, which needs their own political and institutional platform in order to articulate their demands.
- The importance of an elected *regional government* to open up and challenge the power of autonomous closed elitist policy networks operating on the regional scale. In other words the old question about politics against the market becomes more and more crucial in the new age of globalisation.

The present situation is as such characterised by ambivalence and conflicting agendas. The two-faced urban policy and governance present consist on one hand of a Schumpeterian strategic growth policy, which sets the agenda at state, regional and municipal level, and on the other hand we have at district level a reinvention of participatory planning instruments supported by nationally funded social action programmes for the deprived urban areas. The *missing links* are, however, still those between the corporate growth and entrepreneurial strategy and the participatory programmes for social renewal in the deprived urban areas.

The present urban policy framework in Denmark can, consequently, best be described as ambivalent, but perhaps also possible innovative in the sense that the aim to link social, ecological, and economic objectives has now been more clearly articulated.

5. NEW GOVERNMENT – NEW IDEOLOGY – NEW POLICY

The classical Social Democratic urban planning was closely linked to social reform (Kolstrup, 1996). The power base was the alliance between relative homogenous socio-ideological formations, namely the working class, progressive sections of the middle classes, and radical public planners. The change in the national government at the end of 2001, where the Liberal and the Conservative Party came into power, has, however, completely changed the political climate and institutional framework for the Danish urban policy. In general, the new government has favoured/upgraded the entrepreneurial side of urban policy and downsized the holistic and social dimensions. At the institutional level, the change has been very dramatic. The new government for the first time in Danish history abolished urban politics as policy field and even closed down the newly established Ministry of Urban Affairs. The abolition was a clear signal about less emphasis of the social dimension of urban policy, and for instance housing renovation and physical planning was transferred to the Ministry of Business (“ Erhvervsministeriet ”) and the “ Kvarterløft ” programme was transferred (with some budget cuts as well) to the new Ministry of Integration.

Compared to the initial holistic social action programmes in deprived neighbourhoods, this was a clear signal about redefining and reducing the issues about social cohesion and integration in deprived neighbourhoods to a question about ethnic related tensions in these neighbourhoods. The signals from the government with regard to urban policy are, therefore, that urban policy is no longer a comprehensive holistic district policy field, but should be split into separate entrepreneurial issues and ethnic issues. This will most likely lead to a further widening of the gap between the two faces of urban policy.

5.1. Combatting dualism in urban policy – or how to empower welfare policies within a fragmented city

Adequate inclusive and empowering policy responses should be directed at combating the polarising mechanisms in central arenas, such as the labour market, the housing market, social services and education. Macro level policies must, however, due to the complex and multidimensional forms of present exclusion mechanisms with regard to class, gender, ethnicity and social geography be combined with policy responses at the meso and micro level.

From the empowerment and social inclusion angle, we identify the challenge as on the one hand developing holistic policy objectives (taking social, ecological, aesthetic and economic considerations into account) in order to secure that Urban Programmes are part of a coherent

inclusive (regional) socio-economic strategy. And on the other hand to (re)develop participatory policy instruments, which stimulates local participation/community empowerment and transparency of good practice and learning across the local, regional, national and transnational levels. In terms of governance, this includes efforts to include partners usually excluded from growth policy network – e.g. the third sector, social housing associations and agencies representing deprived neighbourhoods and socially excluded people.

From a social polarisation angle, the lack of collective action from the bottom is the major problem. The ability to organise collective action and political representation from the bottom (empowerment) – and therefore the presence of organised conflictual relationship and communicative ‘ agora ’ between the affluent and the less affluent – is a condition for reaching sustainable development : Social inclusion and integration is impossible without taking into account both social conflict and truly democratic dialog based on a willingness to seriously listening to and taking others interests and perspectives into consideration in order to achieve a more just and cohesive society. The *socially productive and transformative conflicts* can be defined as conflicts which encourage the social learning of collective and individual actors and hence reduce transactions costs and enhance social capital ; the norms and networks facilitating collective action for mutual benefit (Andersen and Siim, 2004).

Empowerment is not entirely a matter of political will and disposal of social capital. Economic and material resources do matter – and so do politics of redistribution to empower the least privileged to enhance their political inclusion and participation. Generally speaking, this could be supported by a *combination* of universalistic social citizenship rights and politics of ‘ positive selectivism ’ – including empowerment oriented urban social action programmes in deprived neighbourhoods. When they work well, they empower local actors and transform the public agencies in a more supportive direction and give rise to empowering or ‘ inclusive ’ localism. But without more far-reaching changes in the socio-economic regime, which can break the trend towards polarisation of the social geography, local empowerment strategies are likely to fail.

5.2. Challenging the Janus face of urban policy

A remaining challenge is the development of a holistic and participatory form of government and governance with emphasis both on sustainable growth and on the (re)distribution of the total set of living conditions. In Denmark, there were attempts to develop this type of planning in the late seventies and since the nineties these ideas have re-entered the political discourse in the language of inclusion, but so far without linkages to the neo-corporative entrepreneurial discourse.

The two faces of present urban policy are as discussed (1) the growth orientation and (2) local mobilisation. This local mobilisation seen as ambitions on local empowerment to some extent echoes the notion of deliberative democracy, but thought along the political priority of the growth-strategy. Anyway, the voices of community activists has re-entered the scene since the mid-nineties, not least due to the state initiated implementation of area based social action programmes (Andersen & Larsen 1995). However, the linkage of these programmes to a wider revitalisation strategy such as the city and regional entrepreneurial strategy is almost non-existent. This duality of economic and social growth strategies were challenged by the Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs promoting a more holistic urban policy in order to avoid a pure market driven urban policy development.⁴

From an empowerment and social inclusion perspective, a holistic policy is needed in order to secure a coherent inclusive (regional) socio-economic strategy. This, on the other hand requires a development of participatory policy instruments, which stimulates to local participation, meaning including partners usually excluded from growth policy networks in order to create a mutual learning process. We here think of the 'third sector', social housing associations and agencies representing the deprived areas and socially excluded people.

From a social polarisation angle, then, the main contemporary problem is the absence of collective action from 'the bottom'. The welfare society needs *socially productive and transformative conflicts*, that is, conflicts which encourage mutual understanding and social learning of collective and individual actors. Mutuality reduces transactions costs and enhances social capital, which is the norms and networks facilitating collective action for mutual benefit (Jordan, 1996). Our analysis from the social polarisation perspective, however, leads us to identify other challenges as well. These are :

- The need to develop holistic policy objectives (taking social, ecological, aesthetic and economic considerations into account) where urban development policies are part of a coherent regional socio-economic strategy.
- A (re)development of participatory planning and policy instruments, that can stimulate local participation/community empowerment, transparency, democratic practice and learning across local, regional, national and transnational levels. In terms of governance this includes efforts to include partners usually excluded from growth policy network – e.g. third sector, social housing associations and agencies representing deprived neighbourhoods.

⁴ At an administrative level, this policy follows from a politico-administrative fight, because the Ministry of Urban Affairs & Housing wanted to challenge the monolithic role of the Ministry of Financial Affairs, which had the dominant role in the design of the Entrepreneurial City strategy, including the flagship project of the Orestad. (Andersen, 2003 and Andersen and Hovgaard, 2003).

From the social inclusion angle, then, the challenge is to develop a holistic oriented participatory planning processes and adequate policy instruments, emphasising the total set of living conditions including housing, social services, employment, education and mental health. In Denmark there were attempts to develop this type of planning in the late seventies, and in leftist political and professional discourse these ideas still play a role. (Worm et.al. 1984).

The new urban governance, where decision-making power is transferred to relatively autonomous agencies such as public-private partnerships or informal negotiations between capital interests and municipalities, raises the question about the need for a more institutionalised agency or forum for an *alternative expertise* in the design and implementation process. An agency or forum at service to anyone, who wanted help with planning and policy questions. The logic of this argument is, if the need for particular types of ‘entrepreneurial governance’ cannot be avoided, the access to alternative knowledge networks or just transparent knowledge plus the need for representation and voices to actors outside the neo-elitist governance networks becomes crucial in order to avoid extreme asymmetrical relations of power in the policy process. This problematic in fact could and should be discussed in relation to the well-known problem of subsidiarity – the division of tasks and competence between local/district level, City, Region, State and EU levels but it isn’t.

5.3. Towards a new inclusive politics of difference

Instead of assuming an automatic trickle down effect of prosperity for mainstream society, both the national governments and the EU-institutions should demand mechanisms and objectives which stimulate inclusive and sustainable development strategies based on local forces. The EU-institutions and programmes should be the tool to define a set of conditions for financial support to regional and urban revitalisation programmes in order to be sure that urban development policies are part of a coherent regional socio-economic strategy.

The main targets should be :

- To identify the need for housing for low-income groups – and to develop a long term regional housing policy. This should be done in co-operation with NGOs representing the homeless and Social Housing Associations representing housing interests for low-income groups. The objective should be to avoid concentration of high-income groups in particular districts, homelessness and deprived ghettos in others. The principle of income and ethnic mixed residential areas should be a leading principle. This means that e.g. social housing projects should be given the highest priority in affluent municipalities, which otherwise tend to use housing policy as an instrument of social closure and thereby over time reinforce socio-spatial polarisation. Democracy and social citizenship in part built on the principle of social and cultural diversity in residential areas making possible face-to-face

relations and experiences with ‘ the other ’. If this increasingly becomes impossible the development of mutual distrust between social formations can escalate (Blakely and Snyder, 1997 ; Jordan 1996).

- To identify needs for adult education and job creation, and develop a long-term strategy for active labour market and educational policy, focusing on cities and municipalities unskilled and vulnerable segments. Such efforts include development of or strengthening of existing agencies to support job creation in service sector jobs on normal wage conditions, programmes of tailored active labour market policy, and support to third sector initiatives social enterprises, community groups and social co-operatives, which have or can develop their capacity to develop new types of jobs and socially meaningful life spaces.

We would call this the challenge of a New Inclusion Policy (NIP). This policy should furthermore meet democratic and organisational challenges to :

- Integrate actors representing interest at the bottom of the social ladder *and* foster coalitions between excluded groups and sections of working and middle classes, and,
- Enable actors to operate across different spatial and discursive-political levels. The forces of social polarisation operate across social, socio-economic, cultural and spatial scales, and hence the forces of inclusion cannot operate exclusively on local, regional or national levels.

Democratically this turn will however require a strategic double-look on current policies. For instance, the socially productive and transformative conflicts arising out of participatory, inclusive projects can be seen as conflicts that encourage social learning among the participants, probably reducing transaction costs as well as enhancing the social capital among participants, that is the norms and way of working within networks in actions for mutual benefits.

The Danish urban regeneration project ‘ kvarterløft ’ contains these kinds of unresolved dualism. On one side the projects were governed by a very detailed contract on aims, goals and means signed every year, and further implementation was based on the projects fulfilment of the previous years goals. On the other side this contract was a powerful mean to demand policies implemented that the municipality wasn’t too eager to implement.

The projects and policies tell us that several democratic forms must be in play all the time. The representative democracy is political needed to secure and develop the grounds of the welfare society (a real social just redistribution of welfare benefits), and the direct democracy is needed to empower local citizens political and institutional power of decisions and transformation that affects them. This work could be supported by a combination of universalistic citizens rights on welfare and a politics of ‘ *positive selectivism* ’ for instance

having projects favouring empowerment processes in deprived neighbourhoods. When such projects and strategies work well, they empower local actors and transform public agencies in a more supportive direction and give rise to the local empowerment of an ‘inclusive localism’. However, without a more far-reaching change of the contemporary growth-regime, which tends to lead to a polarisation of the city’s social geography, local empowerment will most likely fail, because too much conflicts on local matters de-inforces local cooperation.

Last, but not least, we also need an agonistic democracy that respects the strife for interests, values and visions and acknowledge and respect non-assimilative social difference and diversity (Pløger 2004, Hillier 2002), that is, as part of a democratic politics of difference.

6. CONCLUSIVE REMARKS

The new neo-liberal government has continued some aspects of the experiential urban regeneration program *kvarterloeft*, but the tendency is continuing polarisation, that is persistent development of high income and low income areas within the Copenhagen municipal. The comprehensive policy ambitions has disappeared and a fragmented policy has replaced it, and here the focus, as mentioned, is the regulation of ethnic groups through housing policies. This politics builds very much on a law & order thinking (discipline) and not on for instance a positive selectivism. Denmark very much needs a 'politics of recognition' (Fraser, 2003) in order to legitimate an identity politics in order to empower marginalised and powerless groups – in the framework of a strong universalistic, redistributive welfare state. Especially we are in need for a politics of recognition on identity politics, as a possible entrance gate to ethnic integration.

Local empowerment strategies need a strong national and local welfare state to support both a politics of recognition and redistribution. But it must be a communicative, listening and acknowledging state, because only trust and respect mobilises marginal voices. They need in part to work outside mainstream political power-structures and power-plays. They need to make results based on own participatory engagement and suggestions based on local communication, trust and inspiration, and they, in the end, also need a relation to municipal decisive politics and its structures to transform ideas and suggestions to projects.

These are some of the lessons given from the *kvarterloft* projects, and these lessons point at the need for a NIP. A combination of forms of planning, including the development of an agonistic democracy, may offer the most powerful means and possibilities for a new inclusive and empowering urban regeneration politics based on a politics of recognition linked to socio-economic justice and social citizenship rights.

7. DANISH URBAN POLICY AND URBAN DEMOCRACY

7.1. DANISH URBAN POLICY AND URBAN DEMOCRACY CAN BE CHARACTERISED BY A STRIKING *DUALITY* AND TENSION BETWEEN :

- (1) Participatory empowering welfare oriented community strategies, which targets deprived districts and neighbourhoods, which are based on notions of the *Inclusive City*. This trend is founded on priorities of welfare inclusion and citizens empowerment.
- (2) Neoliberalist/corporative market driven strategic regional and global growth strategies, which are based on notions of the *Entrepreneurial Globalized City* where the dominant rationality of urban policy is facilitation of the “ growth machine ”.

In international comparisons Denmark is regarded as a relatively successful welfare model, but the “ Danish Job Miracle ” has to a large extent bypassed the deprived districts (Andersen and Hovgaard, 2003 and Andersen, 2005) Hence *exclusion dynamics* in terms of ethnic and social segregation, collective stigmatization of these areas – and very often combined with lower quality of public services (in particular schools e.t.c.) came on the agenda since the eighties. The national response to this development came 1993 (where the Socialdemocrats were back in power) has been a long-term social action programme based on the principles of multidimensional area-based action, participation (including participation of the Social Housing Associations) and partnership. The programme quickly became an innovative and experimental part of public planning and welfare policy. It had elements of a “ politics of positive selectivism ” (targetting the multidimensional dynamics of exclusion in deprived urban areas) and “ social mobilisation ” approach. In the implementation, the National Urban Committee (“ Byudvalget ”) has, in the negotiations about project contracts with the Municipalities and Housing Associations, insisted that citizen participation and empowerment orientation in the projects should be taken seriously. Hence the *socially creative strategy* in the best cases part was the “ top-down ” facilitation of local holistic social action programmes, which empowered community activist and NGO’s and represented “ added value ” to existing welfare policy.

However the “ Entrepreneurial City ” growth policy and the area based social action programmes are *not* well orchestrated and integrated, but manifest themselves as two disconnected and contradictory parts of a new urban governance (Fotel & Andersen 2003).

7.2. Political ambivalences – summing up

Looking back to the urban policy scenes of the seventies it is obvious that urban social movements are excluded from the new powerful Entrepreneurial City elite networks. On the other hand the voice of community activists re-entered the urban political scene since the mid nineties, not least because the state initiated the implementation of area based social action programmes in deprived districts. Many former activist now found a platform in which they could use their local knowledge and participatory skills in a new setting (Andersen et.al, 1995).

Hence, an ambiguous duality can be identified between (a) the strategies for economic revitalisation dominated by neo-corporatist, elitist governance and (b) the area based programmes for deprived districts influenced by planning ideas of social mobilisation (Friedmann, 1987) and community empowerment (Craig & Mayo, 1995). This dualism was also manifest at the state level, where the 1990s showed a growing tension between the Ministry of Financial Affairs, which emphasises the entrepreneurial and market aspects of urban governance, on the one hand, and the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Housing on the other, because they emphasised the need for comprehensive urban policy concerned with social integration, local creativity and empowerment and the avoidance of socio-spatial polarisation on the other.

7.3. Conflicting agendas and lack of cross scale strategies and linkages

The two-faced urban policy and governance present consist on one hand of a Schumpeterian strategic growth policy, which sets the agenda at state, regional and municipal level, and on the other hand we have at district level a reinvention of participatory planning instruments supported by nationally funded social action programmes for the deprived urban areas. The *missing links* are, however, still those between the corporate growth and entrepreneurial strategy and the participatory programmes for social renewal in the deprived urban areas.

7.4. New government – New ideology – New policy

The change in the national government at the end of 2001, where the Liberal and the Conservative Party came into power, has, however, completely changed the political climate and institutional framework for the Danish urban policy. In general, the new government has favoured/upgraded the entrepreneurial side of urban policy and downsized the holistic and social dimensions. At the institutional level, the change has been very dramatic. The new government for the first time in Danish history abolished urban politics as policy field and

even closed down the newly established Ministry of Urban Affairs. The abolition was a clear signal about less emphasis of the social dimension of urban policy, and for instance housing renovation and physical planning was transferred to the Ministry of Business (“ Erhvervsministeriet ”) and the “ Kvarterløft ” programme was transferred (with some budget cuts as well) to the new Ministry of Integration.

Compared to the initial holistic social action programmes in deprived neighbourhoods, this was a clear signal about redefining and reducing the issues about social cohesion and integration in deprived neighbourhoods to a question about ethnic related tensions in these neighbourhoods. The signals from the government with regard to urban policy are, therefore, that urban policy is no longer a comprehensive holistic district policy field, but should be split into separate entrepreneurial issues and “ ethnic control ” issues. This will most likely lead to a further widening of the gap between the two faces of urban policy.

7.5. Combatting dualism in urban policy – or how to empower welfare policies within a fragmented city

Adequate inclusive and empowering policy responses should be directed at combating the polarising mechanisms in central arenas, such as the labour market, the housing market, social services and education. Macro level policies must, however, due to the complexity and multidimensional forms of present exclusion mechanisms with regard to class, gender, ethnicity and social geography be combined with policy responses at the meso and micro level.

REFERENCES

- ANDERSEN, J. et. al., 1995: Post- industrial solidarity – future challenges and Poverty III lessons. In N. Mortensen and G. Olofsson (eds.): Essays on Integration and Marginalization. Samfundslitteratur. København.
- ANDERSEN, Hans Skifter & AARØ, Thorkild, 1997: Det boligsociale Danmarkskort, Hørsholm, SBI-rapport 287.
- ANDERSEN, J., 2003: Gambling politics or successful entrepreneurialism ? – the Orestad in Copenhagen. In Moulart, F. Swyngedouw, E., and Rodriquez, A., (eds.) The Globalised City. *Oxford*. Oxford University Press.
- ANDERSEN, J and HOVGÅRD, G., 2003: *Welfare and Urban planning in transition – A Copenhagen Case Study*. Research Paper no 8/03. Department of Social Sciences. Roskilde University. <http://www.ssc.ruc.dk/workingpapers/>
- ANDERSEN, J. and SIIM, Birte, (eds.). 2004: The Politics of Inclusion and Empowerment. New York: Palgrave.
- ANDERSEN, Hans Thor., 2005: Storbyens ændrede socialgeografi – Storkøbenhavn i et nordvesteuropæisk perspektiv. Kulturgeografiske Skrifter bd. 15, Copenhagen : C.A. Reitzel.
- BALDWIN, Peter., 1990: The Politics of Social Solidarity. Class Bases of the European Welfare State 1875-1975, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- BOGASON, P., 1995: Forvaltning og Stat, System : Herning.
- BLAKELY, J. E. and SNYDER, M. G., 1997: Fortress America. Gated Communities in the United States. Brookings Lincoln.
- CALLAGAN, P., 2004: Community participation (CHECK) in Andersen, J. and Siim, Birte (eds.). 2004. The Politics of Inclusion and Empowerment. New York: Palgrave.
- CRAIG, G. and MAYO, (eds.) 1995: Community Empowerment. ZED Books.
- DICKEN, Bülent, 1998: Strangers, Ambivalence and Social Theory, Ashgate Publishing Ltd: Aldershot.
- ESPING-ANDERSEN, G., 1990: The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism. Polity Press. Cambridge.

- FOTEL, Trine N. & ANDERSEN, John, 2003: Social mobilisering og forhandlingsplanlægning – kvarterløfterfaringer fra Kgs. Enghave (Social mobilisation and negotiative planning), i Sehested, Karina (ed): *Bypolitik mellem hierarki og netværk*, København, Akademisk forlag (pp.69-94).
- FRASER, Nancy, 2003: *Den radikala fantasin. Mellan omfördelning och erkännande* (The Radical Fantasy. Between Redistribution and Recognition), Göteborg, Daidalos.
- FRIEDMAN, J., 1987: *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton. Princeton University Press.
- FRIEDMAN, J., 1992: *Empowerment. The Politics of Alternative Development*. Cambridge : Blackwell Publishers.
- GAARDMAND, Arne, 1978: *Planlægning under nye vilkår. Lands – og regionplanloven, kommuneplanloven*. Arkitektens forlag: Copenhagen.
- GAARDMAND, Arne, 1993: *Dansk byplanlægning 1938-1992*, Arkitektens forlag: København.
- GOUL-ANDERSEN, J., 1997: *Marginalisation, Citizenship and the Economy : The Capacities of the Universalist Welfare State in Denmark*. In *The Rationality of the Welfare State*, Eriksen and Loftager (ed). Scandinavian University Press.
- HARVEY, D., 1989: *From managerialism to Entrepreneurialism : the Transformation of Urban Governance in Late Capitalism*. In *Geografiska Annaler, series B : Human Geography*, 17 B,1.
- HILLIER, Jean, 2002: *The Shadows of Power*, London, Routledge.
- JESSOP, B., 1998: *Globalization, Entrepreneurial Cities and the Social Economy*. In Hamel, P., Lustiger-Thaler and Mayer, M. (eds). *Urban Movements in a global Environment*. Urban Studies Yearbook. Sage.
- JORDAN, B., 1996: *A theory of Poverty and Social Exclusion*. Cambridge. Polity Press.
- KOLSTRUP, S., 1996: *Velfærdstatens rødder*. Viborg, SFAH.
- Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, 1999: *The future City*.(Fremtidens By).
- MOULAERT, F., ERIK SWYNGEDOUW, E. and ARANTXA Rodriguez, A., (eds.) 2003: *The Globalized City*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- MUNK, A., 1998: *Succession and gentrification processes in older neighbourhoods* SBI-Report 305.
- National Urban Committee, 1993: *Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs*.

- PLØGER, John, 2004: Strife: Urban Planning and Agonism, *Planning Theory* Vol. 3(1), 71-92.
- ROSE, 1996: The Death of the Social? Re-figuring the Territory of Government. *Economy and Society*, 25.3.
- WORM, Kirsten et. al., 1984: Metoder til levevilkårsplanlægning med eksempler fra amter og kommuner. Rapport fra en arbejdsgruppe, der har drøftet levevilkårsdata til brug for regional og lokal planlægning. Miljøministeriet – Planstyrelsen.
- YOUNG, I. M., 1990: Justice and the Politics of Difference. Princeton.

REFERENCES (2)

- ANDERSEN, J. et. al., 1995: Post- industrial solidarity – future challenges and Poverty III lessons. In N. Mortensen and G. Olofsson (eds.): *Essays on Integration and Marginalization*. Samfundslitteratur. København
- ANDERSEN, J., 2003: Gambling politics or successful entrepreneurialism ? – the Orestad in Copenhagen. In Moulart, F. Swyngedouw, E., and Rodriguez, A., (eds.) *The Globalised City*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- ANDERSEN, J and HOVGÅRD, G., 2003: *Welfare and Urban planning in transition – A Copenhagen Case Study*. Research Paper no 8/03. Department of Social Sciences. Roskilde University. <http://www.ssc.ruc.dk/workingpapers/>
- ANDERSEN, J. and SIIM, Birte, (eds.) 2004: *The Politics of Inclusion and Empowerment*. New York : Palgrave.
- ANDERSEN, Hans Thor., 2005: Storbyens ændrede socialgeografi – Storkøbenhavn i et nordvesteuropæisk perspektiv. *Kulturgeografiske Skrifter* bd. 15, Copenhagen : C.A. Reitzel.
- CALLAGAN, P., 2004: Community participation (CHECK) in Andersen, J. and Siim, Birte (eds.). 2004. *The Politics of Inclusion and Empowerment*. New York : Palgrave.
- CRAIG, G. and MAYO, (eds.) 1995: *Community Empowerment*. ZED Books.
- FOTEL, Trine N. & ANDERSEN, John, 2003: Social mobilisering og forhandlingsplanlægning – kvarterløfterfaringer fra Kgs. Enghave (Social mobilisation and negotiative planning), i Sehested, Karina (ed): *Bypolitik mellem hierarki og netværk*, København, Akademisk forlag (pp.69-94).
- FRIEDMAN, J., 1987: *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton. Princeton University Press.

FRIEDMAN, J., 1992: *Empowerment. The Politics of Alternative Development*. Cambridge : Blackwell Publishers.

HARVEY, D., 1989: From managerialism to Entrepreneurialism : the Transformation of Urban Governance in Late Capitalism. In *Geografiska Annaler, series B : Human Geography*, 17 B,1.

HILLIER, Jean, 2002: *The Shadows of Power*, London, Routledge.

JESSOP, B., 1998: Globalization, Entrepreneurial Cities and the Social Economy. In Hamel, P., Lustiger-Thaler and Mayer, M. (eds). *Urban Movements in a global Environment*. Urban Studies Yearbook. Sage.

MOULAERT, F., Erik SWYNGEDOUW, E. and Arantxa RODRIGUEZ, A., (eds.). 2003: *The Globalized City*. Oxford, Oxford University Press..

National Urban Committee, 1993: Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs.

PLØGER, John, 2004: Strife: Urban Planning and Agonism, *Planning Theory* Vol. 3(1), 71-92.

YOUNG, I. M., 1990: *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton.