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ABSTRACT

This article aims to analyse the changes in migration regimes in Sweden over the period 1739–1982. We have chosen to divide this into four periods where each is characterized as a specific regime: the pre-industrial period (1739–1860), the laissez faire period (1860–1932), the rising ambitions period (1932–1951) and the Rehn-Meidner period (1951–1982). These four periods reveal different approaches held by the state regarding labour migration and housing. During the pre-industrial period, rules and regulations hindered mobility and aimed to keep the labour force in agriculture. During the laissez faire period, migration increased, but construction and housing was largely left to the market. During the rising ambitions period, a laissez faire approach was maintained towards migration, but both the government and non-profit organizations became increasingly involved in housing. During the Rehn-Meidner period, internal migration was stimulated, and in the course of ten years, one million homes were built with government support. The differences between the periods are not clear-cut. There were dual and contradictory ideas and policies during each period. This duality provides an important theoretical starting point for this study. Other significant starting points are the long-term perspective taken and the idea that these periods can be analysed as regimes.

Introduction: a long-term perspective on labour, migration and housing

The discourse on labour, migration and housing in Sweden has changed radically during recent centuries. Up until the second half of the 19th century, the geographical mobility of the Swedish population was severely limited. Undeveloped communication and information dissemination systems contributed to this, but an important factor behind this limited mobility was the prevailing form of legislation. In contrast, new ideas on labour market policy and on geographical mobility, implemented in the 1950s, asserted that encouraging internal migration and general mobility (both geographic and professional) could serve to deliver both low inflation and low unemployment rates. Thus, during the time period investigated in this paper, different migration regimes have either emphasized or hindered geographical mobility.²

This article aims to analyse the changes in migration regimes in Sweden over an extended period, and how these were connected to housing regimes. The research questions are as follows:
• What tools have been used by government actors to prevent or to stimulate migration?
• How have migration and housing regimes changed over time?

We have chosen to divide the time span studied into four periods, which we name as follows: the pre-industrial period (1739–1860), the laissez faire period (1860–1932), the period of rising ambitions (1932–1951) and the Rehn-Meidner period (1951–1982). These four periods show different approaches by the Swedish government in relation to migration and housing.

As will be elaborated below, during the pre-industrial period, rules and regulations endeavoured to hinder mobility and keep the labour force in agriculture. During the laissez faire period, many actors were critical of migration at an ideological level, but the legislative practices of the time did little to hinder migration, but neither did they encourage housing construction. During the period of rising ambitions, a range of measures were taken to improve housing, but little was done to either facilitate or hinder migration. In the Rehn-Meidner period, internal migration (from the forest counties to the expanding urban areas) was stimulated. Large-scale residential areas were developed in the suburbs and one million apartments were built between 1965–1975.

However, the policies during these different periods were not clear-cut. In each period, there were dual and contradictory ideas and policies. During the pre-industrial period, the Crown used the Servant Act to encourage young people to move away from their parental homes, but on the other hand, it also strictly regulated the movement of servants through imposing restrictions on both geographical movement and changes in employment. During the laissez faire period, the government tried to discourage migration from the countryside to cities and other countries, but the measures were mild and focused on providing incentives to stay. However, during that period, Sweden experienced an enormous wave of migration to other countries and also a total restructuring of the rural-urban balance. During the rising ambitions period, the government had high ambitions for providing good housing for all, but it made only small and selective contributions, largely depending on the private sector for the needed construction. During the Rehn-Meidner period, in parallel with a policy facilitating moving, another policy was directed towards regionalization and the support of the less affluent forest counties.3

This duality is an important theoretical starting point for this study. Other important starting points are the long-term perspective taken and the idea that these periods can be analysed as regimes.

**Theoretical starting points: long-term perspectives, regimes and duality**

When comparing historical regimes, it is necessary to use a long-term perspective, and the use of a long-term perspective is a topic of discussion within the discipline of History. Jo Guldi and David Armitage contend, in their *The History Manifesto*, that historians have become too short-term oriented and that we need to return to the concept of *longue durée* proposed by Fernand Braudel.4 Guldi and Armitage argue that to solve contemporary societal problems, such as climate change and inequality, we need a long-term perspective. Hence, although the scope of any article is inevitably limiting, we will try to cover a long period of time. The reason for this is to show that regimes are not given but depend on material circumstances and economic structures – both things that change slowly over time.
However, the long-term perspective is hardly new. Although Braudel was a strong proponent of the long-term perspective, it was also used by Karl Marx in his historical materialism analysis and later by Eric Hobsbawm in his analysis of long-term political change. Within economic history, the long-term perspective is often used, for example, when analysing structural change or inequality. Further, within the discipline of History, the trend towards global history is combined with a renewed interest in la longue durée. An area of growing interest over the last couple of years has been the study of financial crises. In This Time Is Different, Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff compare financial crises over eight centuries and sixty-six countries. They find interesting similarities between the crises as well as in the public debate surrounding the crises.

What is a regime? Inspired by political scientist Clarence Stone, we understand a regime as a network of rules, societal discourses, and implementation of governance. Stone argues that it is the informal arrangements that surround and complement the formal rules set by decision makers that hold a regime together. In this study, our focus is more on the policy and ideas that lead to formal arrangements of varying types. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that discourses on migration and mobility (involving a range of actors who construct the discourse), institutions and governance are all important to the outcomes.

Regimes vary between countries; they also vary within countries over time. How and why a country ends up under a certain regime at a particular time depends on the material conditions, the geography and institutional arrangements, changing discursive and ideological trends, and also on the historical legacy that gives a country a path dependency that can be difficult to break or change. The further a society travels along a particular path, the higher the cost of returning to the origin or of making a radical change in policy orientation. However, change does occur. As will be described in this article, changes in migration and housing regimes are gradual and are influenced both by changes in material conditions, for example the needs of the labour market, as well as by changes in ideology. In many cases, path dependency tends to delay change for some time.

Some of its material conditions and institutional arrangements have made Sweden a special case in international comparisons. Due to Sweden’s clear and early focus on large industrial companies, major industrialists gained positions of greater power in Sweden than in many other countries. The Fordist production system played a major role in Sweden, and the large industrial companies’ demands for labour came to play a major role in Swedish labour migration policy. However, this study focuses on comparing regimes over a longer period of time. We argue that understanding past regimes provides greater understanding of the tendencies in our own time. For example, contemporary international labour market mobility can be questioned from different positions: From a nationalistic perspective, where the idea of a homogeneous nation state is the ideal, international labour mobility threatens this homogeneity. From a trade union perspective, labour migration puts pressure on wages by increasing wage competition. A comparison of regimes from different periods may reveal that the contemporary regime is not a ‘natural’ given but is formed from ideas and is analogous to other regimes in history.

As mentioned previously, the regimes are not clear cut. Within each regime, contradictory ideas, interests and policies exist. The outcome of these different ideas and policies, that is which idea should play the hegemonic role in the regime, depends on the power relations during each period. The power relations determine which decisions can be made and who will make them. Thus, each regime contains conflicting interests.
This is what we refer to as the ‘duality’ of the regimes, and we analyse the processes of change as dialectical and not as a result of simple causality.\textsuperscript{14} In the following, we will investigate the four periods in relation to the two research questions, focusing on the migration and housing regimes.

**Something about method and sources**

When studying policy and ideas in Sweden, we find the Government investigations [SOU] to be good sources of information. They are often very thorough and reveal the thinking and arguments behind the laws that are later implemented. However, the system of SOU was only introduced in 1922. There were Government committees before 1922, but the early reports are generally less informative.\textsuperscript{15} During our early, pre-industrial period, we therefore turn directly to the laws, although we also discuss the relationship between law and practice and examples of societal debates where possible.

The Government governs by laws and not by investigation reports, and we have therefore added references to the laws where we find that this is needed. There are, of course, also other documents of importance, for example Congress documents, Government Agencies’ reports, official statistics and secondary sources (i.e. books and articles), all of which have been important sources of the work undertaken for this article.

**The pre-industrial period (1739–1860)**

In the pre-industrial rural setting, housing, mobility and labour were all connected to land. No independent policy for housing was issued, but the question was rather what piece of land people could gain access to in order to put up a house or a cottage.

The way of life in terms of housing also indicated the person’s place in the labour market. A farmer was a proper farmer if he had access to land and a house on that land. A servant, on the other hand, was characterized by his or her lack of an independent place to live, and he or she was legally and physically connected to the farmer’s house. A crofter lived in his own house, but it was located on the land of a farmer or another landowning person, and the crofter had to pay part of the rent by working on the landowner’s land. A cottager lived on the margins of a village, often in a small cottage on common land, and supported him- or herself with casual work of varying kinds.\textsuperscript{16} These different categories of people were also restricted in different ways in relation to their mobility. Although these features were also prevalent before 1739, this year has been chosen as the start of this analysis since the Servant Act, issued in 1739, defined the details of mobility restrictions considerably compared to previous laws. The 1730s also saw the start of a widespread debate among intellectuals about the scientific handling of agriculture, and the formation of the Royal Swedish Academy of Science, also in 1739, provided a focal point for the discussion of such issues.\textsuperscript{17}

**The distribution of labour – the Servant Acts and the principle of “laga försvar”**

The most specific part of the servant system was the principle of *laga försvar* (legal/orderly protection), which involved compulsory year-long service for landless people who were neither soldiers nor held positions as artisans. Although there were some exceptions, the
idea behind this regulation was that casual work should be counteracted and that everyone should belong to a household. Thus, the principle of laga försvar addressed both the organization of the labour market and the control of a potentially unruly part of the population. A concern that people were disinclined to take up positions as servants, preferring to find casual work, informed many of the regulations included in the Servant Act. Another factor was the perception that the population in the country was generally low, and in particular, there was a lack of servants. The possibility of servants moving was restricted in many ways, the most obvious being that they were only allowed to change employers, and thus to move, once a year.¹⁸

To ensure that the allocation of the scarce resource of servants was experienced as fair amongst masters, each farm was allowed a maximum number of servants between the years 1686 and 1789. For a shorter period, this regulation also included the farmers’ own children, who were not allowed to stay on the farm but were forced to serve in another household after a certain age.¹⁹ In the Servant Act of 1739, servants living in sparsely populated areas were denied the right to move to other regions, the only exceptions being marriage or the inheritance of a farm. Notably, servants were allowed to move away to find work in times of crop failure, but once times became better, they had to move back. In the Act issued in 1805, servants were divided into two groups – ‘approved’ and ‘less approved’ – and the latter were not allowed to move between counties. This rule was abandoned in 1823.²⁰ Previous research has tried to explain the wording of the laws as mirroring changes in supply and demand of labour, or they have dismissed the importance of the laws by assuming that the detailed regulations cannot have been followed. However, although enforcement cannot be assumed to be perfectly in line with these detailed laws, several recent studies drawing on court cases have found that the Servant Acts and vagrancy laws were rather powerful tools for controlling mobility and labour organization.²¹ This prompts a focus on the wording of the laws.

Taken together, the Servant Acts were tools that both obligated young people to move out of their parental homes and simultaneously, circumscribed people’s possibility of moving in order to find work. The control of the population and the allocation of scarce labour resources were the main driving forces behind these seemingly contradictory regulations.

**Pre-industrial housing policy – conflicts over the division of farms**

The European marriage pattern meant that young people spent 10–20 years as servants before getting married and establishing a new household at the age of 25–30.²² It meant that people postponed marriage until the couple had the possibility of acquiring a farm, and late marriages meant that population increase was slow. One attempt to increase the population involved the recommendation that servants should be married; however, this did not make any significant difference until the second half of the 19th century.²³ In 1762, the Crown stated that farmers and landowners were allowed to build cottages on their land for their married servants. This was motivated by a wish to promote earlier marriages among landless people. In 1770, another ordinance stated that married and ‘permanently settled’ people would be exempt from compulsory service.²⁴

Another attempt to increase the population involved dividing farms into smaller portions (hemmansklyvning), thereby making more households landed. This was strictly regulated until a new regulation was passed in 1747, which increased farmers’ right to
divide their farms. However, until the commercialization of landholdings became more generally accepted in the mid-19th century, the Crown continued to issue a steady stream of regulations. Division of farms meant that more farms were available, and therefore, there were more possibilities for landless people to acquire a farm, get married, and contribute to the overarching goal of population increase. However, this division of farms increased the risk of farm units becoming too small to cover the needs of a family and too small to be able to pay taxes, while also decreasing the number of people available to work as servants.

The division of farms has been studied at the local level in different parts of Sweden, showing rather large differences between various local economies. Many scholars have questioned the conclusions drawn by Nils Wohlin in his extensive study of the Swedish policy on land division in 1912, in which he interpreted the division of farms as being impoverishing. However, less research has been undertaken to explore state regulations concerning the division of farms as tools for regulating mobility, or the discursive aspects of controlling the population and the labour force by controlling farm sizes. It seems clear that this pre-industrial housing policy – the rules regulating the division of farms – had implications for mobility as well as for the organization of labour.

The fear of migration

According to the dominant mercantilist view of national wealth, emigration will severely harm a country since it involves losing its inhabitants to other nations. In the mercantilist paradigm, the economy is considered a zero-sum game where the only way to increase production is to add more production factors (and conversely, not to lose production factors to another place). Restrictions on movement may not only be explained by the mercantilist paradigm, but also by aspects of power. Economic historian Christer Lundh analyses aspects of power by using Hirschman’s theoretical concepts ‘voice’ and ‘exit’. If workers are prevented from ‘voting with their feet’, wages can be kept to a minimum and they lose one of the few power tools they have. Losing opportunities for mobility (exit) also reduces the possibility of protest.

During the 18th century, a growing belief in the scientific handling of production forces rather than in religious faith popularized public debates among learned men, and one area of debate was a question posed by the newly established Royal Swedish Academy of Science. In 1763, the Academy asked the most well-reputed writers of the time to answer the question: ‘Why do so many people emigrate every year, and what statutes could be used to prevent this?’ This question caused more engagement than was usually the case with the Academy’s questions, and the debate continued in scientific journals for quite some time. None of the writers questioned that emigration was a serious problem with far-reaching consequences, but a conflict between the mercantilist and the rising liberal view can be seen in the answers, although the mercantilists still dominated. In short, the prevailing view was that even harsher regulations concerning mobility were needed to prevent emigration. The opposing view proposed that if people, and especially the servants who were at the centre of the debate, were given the right to earn a living wherever they could find an opportunity, they would not be forced to leave their fatherland. One suggestion made in the debate was that internal migration should be permitted to a greater extent, especially for the highly restricted landless and the
unmarried population. For example, the liberal Anders Chydenius said that if a young man or woman was allowed to move around the country to find a place to live and a decent, freely chosen occupation, that person would never be drawn to emigration. But, if committed by the legal administration to serve for all of their time, they would be longing to escape.\textsuperscript{32} Others feared that without strict legislation, the roads would be full of vagrants, moving around in dreary wandering without the hope of ever finding a solid place to stay.\textsuperscript{33} Seen from this perspective, emigration was a natural progression from allowing internal migration.

As shown in the previous section, a number of different laws and rules tried to hinder people from moving, but at the same time, they also forced people out of their parental homes. Other aspects of the connection between occupation and housing made people move around, both voluntarily and involuntarily. One such connection was the year-long service contract. Servants, with the exception of those in Stockholm, were only allowed to move once a year, on a specified date.\textsuperscript{34} On the one hand, this created a situation in which servants were immobile – the whole year around they stayed in the same place. On the other hand, this rule created an opportunity that needed to be seized once a year, and the majority of servants moved every year. This was the ‘exit’ option discussed theoretically above, which pre-industrial servants could use as a way to find a better place – and the yearly change of employer was understood and feared as a means for servants to make greater demands. The main characteristic of a faithful servant, as described in popular literature, was that he or she stayed for many years and did not use his or her right to move as a threat.\textsuperscript{35} The Royal Patriotic Society awarded medals to servants who had stayed for many years, and many local and national initiatives were taken to promote faithfulness in servants – that is, servants who did not use their ‘exit’ option.\textsuperscript{36}

\textit{Counting pre-industrial migration}

The majority of servants moved every year, as discussed above, and only a minority stayed for more than two years with the same employer and thus, in the same place.\textsuperscript{37} However, servants were not the only group that moved during pre-industrial times. The old view of a permanently settled peasantry has been proven largely wrong by later research, which has shown a predominance of people moving short distances. To study gross migration within a parish is extremely time-consuming and net population changes veil most of the actual moving that people were engaged in. There is a ‘modernization bias’ in much of the research into pre-industrial migration, which states that it was urbanization, modernization and industrialization that made people move more than ever during the 19th century, while it seems that it was the distances moved that increased rather than the number of moves.\textsuperscript{38} The difference between various rural groups concerning the possibility of transferring farms within families has also received recent attention.\textsuperscript{39} However, an important difference compared to the 20th century, analysed below, is that it was less common for migration to lead to new occupations and totally different environments. In the pre-industrial period, the most common movement was servants changing employers, peasants changing farms, crofters changing cottages – all of which probably meant that life looked fairly similar after the move.

Emigration aroused fears among the intellectual elite, but the real number of emigrants was small during the 18th century. By the time the Royal Swedish Academy of
Science posed its question about emigration, the newly established Department of Statistics (Tabellverket) had calculated that the yearly loss of people through emigration was 8 000 persons. However, both during that time and also in later research, this number has been proven wrong and is said to have been under 1 000, although the exact number is not possible to pinpoint. However, the fear of emigration did affect the regulations.40

Hindering mobility was seen as a way to increase the workforce, but mobility was also necessary to create a labour force. In order to control the population and to promote the distribution of people between different parts of the pre-industrial labour market, the Crown engaged in the control of mobility. The debate during the time was largely negative in relation to mobility, and especially the mobility of the lower strata of the population, and many regulations worked to curtail it. Nevertheless, mobility was also needed to uphold social position, and it was a normal feature of pre-industrial society.

**Change in the mid-19th century: industrialization**

The legislation concerning mobility and labour changed gradually during the mid-19th century. For example, the Servant Act was liberalized in 1833, the need for permanent residence before being eligible for help through the poor laws was abandoned in 1847, and internal passports were removed during the 1860s. Other major changes were the abandonment of the guilds in 1846 and the freedom of trade in 1864. The reasons for these changes were not only industrialization but also the spread of liberal ideas. Industry needed labour, and strict regulations on movement reduced the labour supply. Furthermore, a sharp population increase during the period 1750–1850 (i.e. the first demographic transition) contributed to the institutional changes. The idea behind the Servant Acts was to secure labour where it was needed, but with the sharp increase in the population, the problem was rather the opposite: there was now a surplus of labour in the countryside and a need for labour in the urban areas. Moreover, industrialization created technical prerequisites for the railway and newspapers, which further supported mobility. Newspapers allowed employers to advertise for employees, while the railway decreased the costs of migration. This led to the integration of local labour markets.41

In the mid-19th century, the Swedish labour market changed from a strictly regulated labour market (in tune with mercantilist principles) to one that was laissez faire. This liberalized regime simplified labour recruitment, as well as geographical and social mobility.42 Who gained from the new labour market regime? The industrialists, of course, because an increasing labour demand could now be met by mobile labour and urbanization. To some extent, the growing working class may have also gained in the long run, even though the power relations were in favour of the industrialists. However, if we go back to Hirschman’s voice-exit terminology, the working class now gained the exit tool, which also gave them access to the voice tool.43 The most obvious example of voice was the Swedish labour movement, which gained increasing organizational strength during this period.

**The laissez faire period (1860–1932)**

The discussion about the negative effects of emigration was resumed during the migration waves of the 1860s and 1880s as people moved to the United States on a mass scale. Unemployment was seen as the major reason for people emigrating, and although some
restrictions on migration were introduced, they were seemingly ineffective. One way of stemming migration was through ‘internal colonization’, and several parliamentary committees made proposals to encourage Swedish workers and peasants to cultivate new lands in Sweden’s hinterland and northern areas rather than emigrate to the United States. One of the proposals involved the sale of smaller land lots from the state’s land holdings in northern Sweden.

Internal migration to the cities, leading to rapid urbanization, was another problem at this time as large groups of unemployed people gathered in the urban areas hoping for pay and working conditions that were better than those offered in agriculture. With the liberalization of the Servant Act and the removal of the internal passport in the 1860s, the juridical restrictions on mobility were greatly relaxed. However, restrictions on what was deemed idle and undocumented mobility continued. Forced labour as a punishment for unemployment was not new, but the 1885 vagrancy law specifically targeted unemployed people, making them subject to forced labour in workhouses. The Servant Acts and the vagrancy laws had overlapping objectives, in that both aimed to ensure the availability of labour through forcing people and by controlling the potentially unruly portion of the population. However, the Servant Acts addressed a large section of the population and regulated the relationships between masters and servants such that accusations and punishment for vagrancy applied only to those not compliant with the principle of *laga försvaret*. In contrast, the vagrancy laws were more repressive and were directed towards control rather than the organization of a work force. It was claimed that the workhouses were institutions of rehabilitation, but this claim was already highly contested in the 1890s, with the law being deemed a ‘class law’. Hence, the changes in legislation can be seen as a step away from a regime that controlled migration with the goal of providing labour for the agricultural sector. The new legislation was to a large extent directed towards the poorest and most vulnerable inhabitants, such as the Roma people and migratory groups such as the ‘tattare’.

**The own home movement**

As legislative restrictions on mobility were removed, people were able to move to the expanding cities with their industries. However, at the discursive level, emigration and migration to cities were still described negatively. An important and active political organization at this time was the National Association Against Emigration. Apart from propaganda against emigration, they were active in the formation of the Own-Home Association, in 1892. The association advocated the construction of small houses for people living in rural areas as a way of discouraging migration and encouraging internal colonization. Major victories for the organization were the initiation of home ownership loans in 1904, the state-run National Own-Home Fund in 1906, and the Own-Home property company in 1907. These measures strengthened the state’s housing policy and gave it completely new tools. The reasons were largely ideological: there was a strong positive appreciation of rural housing in a rural environment as being healthy and sound, and the architecture of the model houses that were constructed was shaped by nationalist fantasies. The construction of ‘own homes’ grew into a popular movement, and the Own-Home Association grew, both in membership and activity. State subsidies available through the Own-Home Movement were expanded in the 1920s, and more and more people were able to acquire their own single-family house. In the 1920s, many of the homes were built in the countryside, while...
many other building activities also took place outside of the cities. However, during the 1930s, residential areas on the outskirts of the major cities were increasingly expanded with many of them were built as ‘own homes’ (inspired by British Garden Cities), for example in Enskede and Bromma, areas that were at that time on the outskirts of Stockholm. Although not many houses were built through the Own-Homes Movement, it was one of very few active state interventions at the turn of the century and in the years after World War I, and as such, was an ideologically important part of the housing regime.

The Own-Home Movement can be seen as a reaction to two types of migration: migration to other countries, especially the United States, and migration from the countryside to the cities. Initially, an element in state policy favoured internal colonization and subsistence agriculture, but after World War I, the focus moved to small-scale housing in urban areas. By this time, migration abroad had diminished and housing construction was mainly driven by social demand. This can be seen as an example of ‘path dependency’ where the state continued to use the instrument of subsidies so people could own homes, even though the original aim of preventing emigration and stimulating migration to northern areas had changed.

The laissez-faire regime of migration

Two factors played important roles both during the period 1860–1932 and in the subsequent period 1932–1951, and for this reason, this section will extend a bit beyond the periodization. The first factor was the industrialization that began during the second half of the 19th century and was centralized in the larger cities and medium-sized urban areas. The second factor was the urbanization process, which in the course of a few decades, relocated the majority of the Swedish population to the urban areas. Figure 1 shows the population living in rural and urban areas 1800–1964, illustrating the huge increase in the urban population, which assimilated the population growth of the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

![Figure 1. Urban and rural population from 1800 to 1964.](image-url)
As Figure 1 shows, in the second half of the 19th century there were already more urban women than urban men, and this imbalance increased during the first half of the 20th century. However, during the 19th century there were also more women than men in the countryside. This changed around 1920, and from then on rural men outnumbered rural women. The changes in the urban-rural gender gap coincided with changes in the labour market, in education as well as in women’s civil rights. First, industrialization opened new possibilities for women on the labour market. For example, the textile industry employed mainly women, and the expanding cities created new opportunities in the services sector, in the offices of the expanding companies and as household servants. Mats Greiff claims that the big Swedish companies, SKF and Kockums, had a deliberate strategy of employing young women in their offices. The rural labour market also changed, with men taking over the traditionally female allocated tasks of stock breeding and cheese-making, while other female tasks connected to the rural household, such as churning, weaving and sewing, became less important due to industrialization. Hence, the labour market created both push and pull factors for women, and especially for younger women, to leave the countryside for the city.

Secondly, in 1905, lower secondary education (realskolan) was opened to girls and in 1927, upper secondary education (högre allmänna läroverket) was also opened to girls. After WWII, female participation in secondary education increased. As has been pointed out, education seems to increase migration in at least two ways. Students move to study, and people with higher education tend to see more opportunities and therefore move more.

Thirdly, women’s civil rights changed. In 1921, married women became legal subjects on the same terms as men (a right given to unmarried women in 1884) and the same year, women voted for the first time in general elections.

The increase in urban population affected the three major cities in Sweden. Malmö and Gothenburg grew quickly, although not as fast as Stockholm (see Figure 2). Apart from the previously described intervention providing subsidies to own homes, the state did little to either hamper or encourage the urbanization process, and the regime of migration can, at this time, be described as laissez faire.

Figure 2. Population in Malmö, Gothenburg, and Stockholm from 1870 to 1940.
Migration to the cities and the need for urban housing were met by a large boom in the construction industry, for example, in Stockholm in the 1880s and in Malmö around 1900. In the case of Gothenburg, many new houses were built around the expanding shipyards at Hisingen. Again, this development was only to a minor degree subject to government intervention.

**The laissez-faire regime of housing construction**

Although lacking in detail, Figure 3 gives a crude measure of the building activities in the three major cities, which amounted to 41–58% of the total building activities in Sweden during the first half of the 20th century.

Most of the houses were built by private enterprises and with a strong element of profit maximization. The construction projects created many jobs but were also sensitive to economic recessions.

Figure 4 provides a more detailed picture and indicates the number of units (kitchens or rooms) built in Stockholm relative to population growth (or loss) for the period 1880 to 1945. During the 1880s, the first years of the 1900s and the latter part of the 1920s, the building industry was booming in Stockholm, and many new houses and apartments were built. However, there were also large fluctuations, and very few houses were built during 1892–1893 or 1918–1922, and there was a sharp decline in 1932–1933. Migration to Stockholm was generally high throughout the period, but with sharp reductions in 1891–1892, 1901, 1917–1925, and 1932–1934. The figure gives the impression that migration and housing construction have a causal relationship, but in reality, they both correlate with the business cycle. The lack of political initiative and planning instruments made the process highly dependent on corporate decisions.

Not included in the diagrams are the large slum dwellings on the outskirts of the larger Swedish towns, such as Liljansskogen and Långbro in Stockholm, or Kirseberg in Malmö.

Hence, the general regime for both housing and migration can be described as laissez faire. Urbanization created an extensive housing shortage and put pressure on cities to supply

---

**Figure 3.** Apartments built in Stockholm, Gothenburg, and Malmö from 1902 to 1940.
housing. The first Social Democratic government, led by Hjalmar Branting, presented a comprehensive programme for housing construction in 1920, which aimed to build 40,000 housing units in five years. However, the economic recession reduced migration to the major cities, and the programme was never implemented. Although there were great ambitions for a more active state policy at the end of the 1920s, only five per cent of housing construction in the urban areas was partially financed by state secondary credit. Instead, government decision makers relied on private enterprise to improve housing standards.

**Rising ambitions period (1932–1951)**

The starting point chosen for this period is 1932 when the Social Democratic Party came to power, a position it was to keep, with minor interruptions, until 1976. The 1930s included one of the major shifts in Swedish politics, with multi-layer processes codified in a crisis agreement between the Social Democratic Party and the Farmers’ Party in 1933, and the Saltsjöbaden agreement between the employers’ organization and the trade union in 1938. The former has been described as a ‘historical compromise’ in politics and the latter as a ‘class compromise’. However, they do not seem to have significantly affected the migration regime, and only to a minor extent, the housing regime.

During the 1930s, as the Social Democratic government became more stable, the housing policy was becoming increasingly ambitious and government intervention increased. Some of the interventions were motivated by Keynesian employment policies, for example, state initiatives on loans for housing construction in the cities in 1933. However, housing was also part of a more comprehensive family policy following the debate on Alva and Gunnar Myrdal’s book *Crisis in the Population Issue (Kris i befolkningsfrågan)*, which resulted in the establishment of the state-controlled Mortgage Agency in 1934 and housing loans in 1935 as well as the introduction of rent discounts for poor families with many children. Special efforts were also directed to the countryside following the publication of Lubbe Nordström’s book, *Lortsverige*, which made visible the desperate need for better housing in the rural areas.
Launched in 1932, the committee working on the government report on housing played a key role in the delivery of many of the reforms and eventually delivered their concluding report in 1945. The concluding report underscored the importance of state involvement in housing construction and administration and advocated the creation of municipally-owned public housing. However, during the 1930s, the state initiatives were selective and targeted specific groups with particular needs. The period saw a significant increase in ambition in the state housing policy, but less of actual housing construction. The proportion of houses built by private enterprise continued to be high during the 1930s.

The 1945 government report on housing described the housing policy after 1932 (which was an important part of the report) as a distinctive change away from short-sighted measures directed at solving crisis situations. According to the government report, the policy after 1932 was directed towards planned measures that aimed to raise the standard of living for the population as a whole. However, even though the government’s ambitions were lofty, they did not result in a significant increase in building activities.

**Municipal involvement and non-profit housing construction**

Arising from the more ambitious housing policy were the 1931 City Planning Act and the 1932 Building Act. The government’s intent was made clear: it was the municipalities who should take the initiative in community development and planning issues, and not individual landowners or private enterprise. These initiatives were received with enthusiasm at the local level. In Stockholm, for example, housing policy was now solely focused on the construction of multi-family houses in the suburbs rather than the previous concentration on neighbourhoods in the inner city and Own-Home construction on the outskirts. In Stockholm, the public housing companies Stockholmshem and Familjebostäder were founded in the first half of the 1930s, the latter initially aiming to provide homes for poor families with many children.

Another important emerging non-profit actor was the cooperative movement connected to the Social Democratic labour movement. It was formed at a national level in 1923 and was centred on the HSB (The Savings and Construction Association of the Tenants). From modest ambitions in the 1920s, the organization grew and was responsible for 10–15% of housing construction in the cities during the 1930s and up to 20–25% after World War II. However, the impact of the cooperative housing movement was not restricted to building houses; the movement also raised the standard of the apartments – enthusiastically embracing modern architectural ideas and equipping the homes they built for working class people with running water, indoor toilets, and central heating. Other forms of non-profit building projects were also active during the period, such as foundations, municipal housing projects, and industrial companies that built housing for their employees. Hence, there were an abundance of non-profit actors who were active in housing construction. Although these projects constituted a significant percentage of the houses built after World War I, when private housing companies stopped building due to the crisis, they did not achieve any significant numbers, as shown in Figure 5. The building of own homes is included in the category ‘Foundations, organizations, cooperatives’ in Figure 5, which increased dramatically towards the end of the period.
Although the ambitions for state intervention were high in relation to raising the standard of living, they were low in relation to making people move to a specific place. The migration regime at this time could be seen as a continuation of the laissez faire regime of the previous period. No significant measures to either encourage or hinder mobility were taken by the national government now. The government report on housing in 1945 underscores the importance of not forcing people to move in order to find work.\(^{80}\)

The population in the metropolitan areas continued to grow rapidly during the period (as shown in Figures 1 and 2), which was now considered economically advantageous for the municipalities. In the smaller towns, efforts were made to facilitate inward migration – through social housing targeting specific groups, multi-family housing, and investment in single-family housing – as it was considered important to have a growing population.\(^{81}\)

On the discursive level, the city was depicted less as a threat and more as a promise of a more rational and modern society. Modernism was influential in architectural inspiration, greatly influencing housing development, but the intellectual change was far more wide-ranging. Consensus was achieved between the labour movement and the central capital owners on the benefits of technological development, progress and rationalization. The Stockholm Exhibition was organized in 1930, an exhibition of architecture that featured the breakthrough of modernism in Scandinavia (in Sweden, known as the ‘functionalist’ movement). The vision of the exhibition went far beyond the aesthetic, promising future cities without housing shortages, with rational and healthy housing for all.\(^{82}\) The change is also visible in the literature and culture of the time.\(^{83}\) Hence, even though the government did not have a policy for encouraging migration, at an ideological level there was a shift.

During the period, societal power structures changed significantly, as the Social Democratic labour movement rose to governmental power. However, these changes did not change the migration regime during the 1930s. Although there was a more positive attitude towards the city and urbanization, the period can be regarded as a continuation from the previous period.
of the laissez-faire regime regarding migration. The government report on housing of 1945 underscores the importance of not forcing people to move in order to find work.\textsuperscript{84} Government involvement in housing increased during this period. So also did the construction activities of non-profit actors. However, during the 1930s, the housing regime was characterized by special solutions for particular groups, while the bulk of houses were constructed by private housing companies. The housing regime was used as a Keynesian stimulus policy, where the state invests in housing construction for labour market reasons, but the main reason for building the houses is to improve the living conditions of the working class in both urban and rural areas.

**The Rehn-Meidner period (1951–1982)**

From the end of World War II to the mid-1970s, Sweden faced a structural excess demand for labour. This was the result of demographic development, but it was also caused by a high, aggregated external demand for manufactured products. Between the end of World War II and OPEC I in 1974, Sweden faced continuous growth in its industrial production.\textsuperscript{85} This was not unique to Sweden but reflected the general development in Western Europe. However, as Sweden was not affected by the war, its production facilities were unharmed and its postwar boom took off to a flying start. Under these circumstances, it was important to allocate labour to where it was needed (i.e. to expanding areas of the economy). Higher mobility, both geographical and occupational, is one way to increase the efficiency of the labour force. It was in this context that Gösta Rehn’s and Rudolf Meidner’s ideas developed. The Rehn-Meidner model offered a solution where low inflation could be possible in combination with full employment. The key components of the model were (1) a generally restrictive demand policy, (2) a solidaristic wage policy, (3) mobility-stimulating measures (enhanced mediation service, labour market training, and direct relocation stimuli), and (4) selective employment stimulation.\textsuperscript{86}

In addition, Sweden received 625.000 labour migrants between 1945 and 1970, most of them from neighbouring Nordic countries (especially Finland) but many from Yugoslavia, Greece, Italy and a number of other countries.\textsuperscript{87}

**Migration regime during the Rehn-Meidner period**

The Rehn-Meidner model was presented in a coherent programme to the LO (the Swedish Trade Union Confederation) congress in 1951. The need for mobility-stimulating measures was clearly emphasized:

> [Measures] must also consist of promoting voluntary migration to companies, professions and towns where the conditions for expansion are greater. Much greater weight than it has been thought so far should be put on relocation stimuli, dedicated to directing the workflows where they are most needed.\textsuperscript{88}

The Rehn-Meidner model became official government policy in 1957, and thoughts of mobility were widely disseminated in government policy from the late 1950s to (at least) the 1980s. The policy aimed to increase residential mobility and included the mobility-stimulating measures that led to the introduction of different types of relocation and
mobility stimuli in the late 1950s. The family allowance was introduced in 1958 to cover the direct costs of double occupancy. It was removed in 1977.

In 1959, a start-up allowance was introduced. This was aimed at full-time unemployed people who intended to move to a new city. The contribution was intended to cover costs incurred at the start of the move, and the amount varied depending on whether the recipient moved with or without a family. The contribution was taxable until 1982. In 1987, the rules for the start-up allowance changed. The new rules included only applicants with qualified vocational training who were offered work in their profession in an eligible place (i.e. locations outside of Stockholm, Gothenburg, and Malmö) and who worked in an industry with labour shortages. The new rules meant that, in reality, the start-up allowance was abolished.89

The travel allowance was a non-refundable contribution given to jobseekers to cover travel expenses to employment elsewhere. Before 1957 the travel allowance had restrictive regulations. When the labour market policy turned towards mobility in 1957, the restrictiveness of the regulations decreased. This led to an increase in scope and increased costs for the state.90

During certain periods, allowances have targeted specific geographical areas, mainly to encourage movement towards the northern areas. In 1962, an equipment subsidy was introduced that was aimed at the unemployed in Norrbotten County. Moreover, in 1965, a trial period was initiated for the redemption of residential property in the counties of Västernorrland, Jämtland, Västerbotten, and Norrbotten. The rules made it possible for jobseekers to sell their homes even in areas where there was no demand. In 1968, redemption operations were extended to the redemption of tenant-owner rights (bostadsrättslägenheter) even in counties other than in the north if there were special reasons, and in 1971, redemption of owner-occupied houses became a permanent measure.91

Table 1 shows the average cost of mobility contributions in the late 1950s and early 1960s. As the table shows, the sums increase sharply over time; nevertheless, SOU 1965:9 says that it was ‘clear that the number of people who received a mobility contribution constituted a relatively small and marginal group’, which the investigation considered to be a problem. The investigation claimed that the amounts and the regulations were not sufficient to encourage people to move:

Taking into account all conversion costs, there would be a more generous contribution, which would primarily be paid for relocation from places and areas with permanent employment problems.93

The investigation therefore considered it was warranted to further expand the system with economic transfer contributions while also making the system adaptable to different labour market situations and coordinating it with other measures. Furthermore, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget year</th>
<th>Family allowance (TSEK)</th>
<th>Start-up allowance (TSEK)</th>
<th>Travelling allowance (TSEK)</th>
<th>Equipment allowance (TSEK)</th>
<th>Total (TSEK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959/60</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>2,102</td>
<td>915</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960/61</td>
<td>2,492</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961/62</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>2,292</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962/63</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>2,912</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>9,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963/64</td>
<td>4,557</td>
<td>9,538</td>
<td>6,071</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td>23,502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
investigation proposed strengthening the family allowances and start-up allowances, as well as making the contributions non-taxable.\textsuperscript{94}

In the late 1960s, the mobility contributions increased. Figure 6 shows how mobility grants developed during the period 1959/60–1994/95. The sum shows the total amount, deflated with the CPI.

The Rehn-Meidner paradigm meant that labour market policy also touched on other areas, including housing policy. In the government’s official investigations (SOU 1965:9), not only mobility-stimulating efforts but also housing policy and the issue of redemption of own homes were discussed in separate chapters. The investigation indicated that housing played an important role in adapting labour to new locations. Furthermore, the investigation stated that about 95% of all newly created housing was procured by government loans and that the state thus had the opportunity to influence the location of new construction. Housing policy was highly government-regulated at the time. The housing sector was heavily subsidized with government loans and interest rate guarantees, but the government also regulated pricing for the sale of both condominiums and single-family homes.

The investigation emphasized the necessity of providing housing on expanding sites and that the scarcity of housing prevented families from moving to these places:

If, with prospects for success, we are to pursue a policy that promotes labour market transitions free from unreasonable strains when relocating workers and their families, housing issues must be able to be resolved more effectively than has been the case until now. Other measures to facilitate the adaptation of labour seem insignificant if the housing, that is the prerequisite for a longer-term solution to the conversion problem, cannot be obtained.\textsuperscript{96}

The investigation claimed that housing construction at the expanding centres had to increase and that this could be done through cooperation between labour and housing authorities when the allocation of loan terms was determined. However, it was clear that the total amount of newly created housing had to increase.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
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\caption{Total costs for mobility grants (geographical mobility) 1959/60–1982/83. Fixed prices, 1959/60 years’ prices. Deflated by CPI.\textsuperscript{95}}
\end{figure}
In summary, the era of the 1950s was characterized by Rehn-Meidner’s thoughts on mobility. Different types of grant were introduced to encourage people to move from the sparsely populated areas to the expanding centres. It is, however, difficult to comment on the effect that this policy had on labour market migration from the rural areas to the urban areas and how the causality worked. That is, was it the regime that created the migration or the migration that created the regime? In terms of the latter, one can, from a dialectic perspective, consider that when industry needs workers in the cities, cities are considered ‘good’ (instead of ‘bad’, which was the case in previous regimes when the workforce was needed in the countryside). This partition into either ‘good’ or ‘bad’ in the discourses of different regimes is an important reason for analysing regimes and not only policy. Further, a regime is a system that holds everything together, and the Rehn-Meidner model was introduced in a period that has been called ‘the Golden Years’. During this period, industry was running at full capacity and there was an excessive demand for labour in the expanding regions. Housing policy also played a role in the mobility policy. In order for migration to be possible, housing was obviously required in the expanding centres, but it was also important that those who moved from the rural areas could sell their houses, which the state redemption of own homes facilitated.

The mobility policy influenced by Rehn-Meidner coincided with high levels of long-range internal migration (across county borders) during the 1960s. Figure 7 shows domestic migration across county borders during 1968–2016. From relatively high levels in the 1960s and 1970s, the long-range migrations dropped in the early 1980s. One explanation may be a counter-movement to the migration policy, which developed in the 1970s. The Centre Party was the primary political driving force behind this counter-movement, and it submitted several motions to the Riksdag (Swedish parliament) to change the mobility grants. However, there may also be other explanations, deriving from economic realities. In the second half of the 1970s, Sweden, together with many other Western European countries, entered an industrial structural crisis, and labour demands in the industrial sector dropped.

![Figure 7. Internal migration across county borders from 1968 to 2016.](image-url)
Housing construction regime under Rehn-Meidner: The Million Programme

The increased geographical mobility during the 1960s and the early 1970s coincided with the Million Programme – a central, state housing policy committed to building a million homes over the ten-year period 1965 to 1975. The Million Programme was presented for the first time at the Social Democratic Party Congress in 1964. The argument was partly social policy – there was too much poor housing and high-density housing – but an important argument was housing shortage in the expanding areas:

In many places, the home seekers are far more than we can offer housing. Housing shortage is a social problem that we must solve to meet people’s demands for freedom of choice and mobility, and to be able to shape their lives according to their own values. … Relocations to urban areas continue. There are more old-aged people. Increasingly, single people of different ages want their own homes and can pay for them. Demand for larger housing is increasing. We need to quickly repair old, poor residential areas.100

Furthermore, the congress document states that ‘housing must be built where the workplaces are’ and that it is important to focus the building primarily on areas with housing shortages. In concrete terms, this meant that by introducing the Million Programme, the Social Democratic Party continued to support the predominant migration policy of the time. The expanding centres lacked housing, and this would be remedied by a major construction effort aimed at these areas.

The Million Programme started in 1965 and continued until 1975. One million homes were built. Of these, about one third were single-family houses, one third were low houses (i.e. three-storey houses) houses, and one third were in large-scale high-rise buildings. Figure 8 shows the number of completed multi-family and single-family houses. As it appears, the Million Programme led to that residential production reached a peak during the period covered by the programme. However, housing production was also, evidently,

Figure 8. Number of completed multi-family and single-family houses.101
very high before the programme. During the period 1950–1965, housing construction was significantly higher than it was in the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s (with the exception of the late 1980s and early 1990s).

**Duality: resistance and regional subsidies**

As discussed in the introduction, a regime is not ‘clear cut’, but there are different dialectic streams and movements, that is, every regime has its own duality. There was also resistance against the mobility policy of this time. The Centre Party was the most critical, but criticism also came from the Social Democrats. In 1959, parliamentary members from both the Social Democratic Party and the Centre Party submitted motions on localization policy, and this resulted in the appointment of a committee. The committee proposed the introduction of regional subsidies, starting in 1965, and these subsidies were increased in amount during the latter half of the 1960s. Firms in the forest counties were allowed to apply for the subsidies, and both new and existing organizations were eligible. The payments peaked in the first half of the 1970s. According to Molinder et al., this indicates that state intervention in Sweden during the postwar period was far less clear-cut than previously thought. The state policy was not the blueprint mobility labour market policy that it has often been portrayed as. This will be discussed more later.

Conclusively, the regime in the period from the 1950s until the beginning of the 1980s had a different view of migration, than the regimes in the earlier periods, not least in terms of government policy. With mobility subsidies and the Million Programme, the state made it easier for people to move.

**Concluding discussion**

From our review of four periods in Swedish history, we find that the four regimes affected migration and housing in different ways. The four periods we investigated represent different regimes where differing approaches were normalized by the state. The pre-industrial period (1739–1860) was marked by strong legal limitations on migration through the Servant Acts and through regulations regarding transfer of farms, leading to restrictions on geographical mobility and, at the same time, to forced migration. By regulating the mobility of the rural workforce, the Crown tried to ensure sufficient labour for landowners in the agricultural sector while controlling the landless population. Thus, moving was a privilege given only to those ‘deserving’ it and it placed demands on landless people to take up positions as servants. Regulations concerning mobility and housing aimed to increase the population while also creating stable household units.

During the laissez-faire period (1860–1932), which saw mass emigration to the United States and to other countries together with clear urbanization, migration was regarded negatively. The reason was that population loss was seen as weakening the country, while to many, the city was perceived negatively. State and municipal involvement in housing policy was low and was largely restricted to providing positive incentives for people to stay in the countryside (e.g. by subsidizing home ownership loans). This was combined with idealization of small-scale housing in a rural environment, which is in stark contrast to the large-scale housing complexes that characterized later housing policy under the
Million Programme. However ideologically important, the Own-Home Movement only contributed to a small portion of the houses built during this period, and the demands of the urbanization boom were met by private enterprise, which was largely unregulated.

During the rising ambitions period (1932–1953), state intervention noticeably increased; however, reforms at this time essentially offered specific solutions for particularly vulnerable groups, and there seems to have been no coherent ideology (like the one that later marked the 1950s). Housing policy was used as a Keynesian stimulus, where the state invested in housing construction for labour market reasons. During this period, the state developed a more positive attitude towards the city, and also towards urbanization, but there was no state policy to promote or hinder migration. Hence, the migration regime at this time can be seen as a continuation of the laissez faire regime of the previous period, despite the shift in the prevailing ideology.

The fourth period we studied, the Rehn-Meidner period, was characterized by active state policy to encourage people to move. The migration policy was shaped by a major ideological framework – which we have termed the Rehn-Meidner model – in which occupational and geographical mobility were important components. Various migration grants were introduced, and between 1965 and 1975, the Million Programme was implemented to reduce housing shortages in the expanding areas. Some municipalities also used redemption of housing as a political tool to facilitate relocation.

In the course of these four periods, we have seen how different tools were used. During the pre-industrial time, legislation was the main tool used to control mobility. During the laissez-faire period, home loans were used as a carrot to counter migration. During the rising ambitions period, housing policy involved various forms of state aid, but as mentioned, this was mainly focused on specific groups. During the Rehn-Meidner period, an active stimulus policy (a moving allowance) was used a tool to encourage people to move. Increased migration gave rise to housing shortages, and the Million Programme was initiated to meet these needs in 1964.¹⁰⁴

However, none of the periods studied had clear-cut consensus on their regimes. Each period carried contradictions and resistance, which we call duality. This duality is in many ways dialectic in the sense that it carries an expression of a power struggle, but it also implies a dialectic relation between ideas and economic realities. For example, in the pre-industrial period, the Servant Acts were a tool that both demanded that young people move out of their parental home and restricted people from moving to find work. Further, even though geographic mobility was highly restricted, people moved anyway, often due to economic necessity. During the period 1860–1932, many of the legal restrictions on migration were lifted, and rural workers moved to the cities to find work in the expanding industries. However, discursively, the city was still depicted in negative terms. In the period 1932–1953, the hegemonic discourse on the city changed in a far more positive direction, but the legal and economic framework surrounding migration remained largely unaltered, in this article described as a laissez faire regime. The Rehn-Meidner period is considered a period of migration. Now the prevailing ideas (i.e. the Rehn-Meidner model), policy and economic realities all coincided. However, there was also resistance during this period, mostly from the rural based Centre Party with their ideas of helping the whole country to thrive. A policy supporting a new regional subsidies programme was launched, and this can also be interpreted as creating a duality during this period.
How has migration influenced the housing regimes? In all four periods, there seems to be some level of influence, but it is not always straight forward. In the pre-industrial period, new housing constellations were constructed to increase the rural population and thereby, potentially, prevent migration, but the major policy measure used was legislation. In the laissez-faire period, migration to the United States or to the urban areas was a reality of the late 19th century and the early 20th century. The Own-Home policy was a response to this reality, intended to create incentives for the population to stay in the countryside. However, as shown, these initiatives were weak and did not have any serious impact on the housing situation.

One could argue that a liberal laissez faire policy that aimed to increase housing construction through the market, is also a policy. This may, of course, be true, but the point is that Government policy during this period was different from that in either the previous or future periods. In the rising ambitions period, own home-construction and a wide range of other initiatives were used to improve living conditions in the socially deprived urban areas. Housing issues were deemed important and were subject to a number of investigations and policy initiatives, but the number of houses built as a result of active Government policy at this time was low. During the Rehn-Meidner period, migration to expanding areas led to housing shortages, and the Million Programme was a response to this. Hence, only in the Rehn-Meidner period was a connection between migration and the housing regime active Government policy, such that it can be described as a major influence; although migration did influence ambitions for a housing policy during the rising ambitions period.

The major results of our investigation, as presented in this article, are threefold: 1. Migration regimes were adapted to meet the needs of the dominant economic sector – agriculture at the beginning of the period and industry at the end – with a long intermediary period between. 2. The relationship between economic development and juridical/ideological/discursive frameworks cannot be reduced to a simple causality but must be understood dialectically. This is exemplified by how, during both the laissez faire and rising ambitions periods, changes in ideology were important factors affecting the timing and the policy measures used to prevent or promote migration. 3. There is a connection between migration and housing regimes, but this connection is far stronger in the later part of the period investigated.
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