

Published in:

***Urbanizing Nature: Actors and Agency (Dis)Connecting Cities and Nature Since 1500.* Edited by Tim Soens, Dieter Schott, Michael Toyka-Seid and Bert De Munck (Routledge 2019), 65-86.**

<https://www.routledge.com/Urbanizing-Nature-Actors-and-Agency-DisConnecting-Cities-and-Nature-Since/Soens-Schott-Toyka-Seid-Munck/p/book/9780367662509>

Marjaana Niemi

A place in its own right: the rural-urban fringe of Helsinki from the early nineteenth century to the present

The rural-urban fringe has often been perceived as a zone in transition: a space torn between its rural past and its urban future – a *phase* rather than a *place*. Spatial planning has played an important part in consolidating the perception. The primary aim of planning has been to create single-purpose spaces, and therefore the fringe with its fragmented urban and rural characteristics has come to be seen as a transient stage: ‘just something between town and country, with no intrinsic characteristics of its own’ (Gallent, Andersson and Bianconi 2006, 76–78; Qviström 2007). Furthermore, in current discussions it is frequently claimed that twenty-first-century fringe areas with their airports, motorway interchanges and shopping centres are devoid of historically determined identity – and therefore correspond to what the anthropologist Marc Augé has identified as ‘non-places’ (Gallent, Andersson and Bianconi 2006, 78; Augé 2008, 77–83).

Scholars working in the fields of political science, geography, landscape studies and planning have recently taken an intense interest in questions concerning the rural-urban fringe, notably in providing more profound accounts of the phenomenon. Most scholars working on the theme have examined the fringe in the present-day context, and those few who have looked at the historical development have usually focused on the last 60–70 years (e.g. Gallent 2006; Klausen & Røe 2012; Qviström 2013). However, the rural-urban fringe is not a recent phenomenon. As David Thomas (1990) has stated, ‘Like the poor, the rural-urban fringe we have always had with us.’

In this chapter I will examine the development of urban fringe areas in Helsinki from the early nineteenth century to the present and, through this case study, also discuss some aspects of the phenomenon more generally in the context of Finland and Sweden. Some features of rural-urban fringe are universal, and found everywhere, yet some others are specific to natural conditions and other local factors, such as the pace and scale of urbanisation and the nature of local government powers and obligations. The Nordic countries urbanised late compared to Western Europe, and middle-class suburban migration did not begin in earnest until the 1950s (Hall 1991, 248–253; Niemi 2007, 30). Municipal governments in the Nordic countries have been relatively strong, both politically and functionally, and many municipalities have been important landowners and therefore well placed to control urban development, at least as long as it was confined to the city limits. The development of regional planning, on the other hand, has been slow and fraught with problems (Hall 1991, 254–256; Sundman 1991, 87–89; Wollman 2004, 647).

The aim of the chapter is to look at how the inner urban fringe was defined and how its future development was envisaged and planned as Helsinki underwent urbanisation, industrialisation and deindustrialisation. Although the fringe areas have served important functions, municipal authorities have usually viewed irregular suburban and peri-urban development critically, as something that threatens to ‘destroy a preferred land use’ (Crankshaw 2009, 219). The fringe areas have been expected to adapt to the changing needs of the city, thus the first key question here concerns how the Helsinki authorities sought to retain this adaptability. As the fringe is understood here as both a territorial entity and the experience and perception of that entity, the question has many interrelated dimensions. The focus is on the actions and non-actions of the Helsinki authorities to control the development of the fringe, but also on the impact of these actions on the perceptions of the fringe areas. To what extent and in what ways did the authorities succeed in upholding the idea that the communities and buildings in the fringe areas were ephemeral arrangements in place only until plans for more permanent transformations were approved and implemented? To what extent did they seek and manage to define meadows, fields and forests on the fringe as ‘undeveloped land’ – and not, for example, as ‘nature’, as something of value and worth preserving?

Whatever plans the municipal authorities may have had for the future development of the city, the pace and precise direction of urban growth has always been difficult to predict, and therefore

many fringe areas have been left in a 'state of waiting' for years, even for decades. The second key question concerns what was happening on the inner urban fringe 'in the meantime', when the ambitious visions and plans were left in abeyance and the development of the areas was indefinitely delayed. In particular the aim is to examine how the interplay between different actors and the interaction between plans and everyday life changed the fringe areas while they awaited a future transformation. A key to understanding the particular and unique nature of the fringe areas is to examine them as ostensibly short-lived places which have survived for a period of time and which are lying somewhere along the continuum from ephemeral to transient and then all the way to permanent (Qviström & Salzman 2006).

The municipal government has had an important role in defining the present and future of the Helsinki inner fringe, while central government has exerted influence through legislation and regulation, but they have never been the only actors in the process. The concept of urban governance is utilised here to gain better insight into how different actors have participated in defining the fringe. Urban governance is not confined to the actions of municipal government but also includes the interaction between different spheres of urban activity: central and municipal government, private agents such as landowners and property developers, and various actors in 'civil society' (Morris 2000). Furthermore, the scope of urban governance is here extended to include nonhuman agency. 'City' and 'nature' are both seen as active agents in the creation of the urban fringe. 'City' claims spaces from 'nature', and 'nature' in turn claims back spaces that humans had once conquered (Loughran 2016; Kowarik 2005).

Most sources addressing the fringe areas have been produced by appointed and elected municipal officials, civil servants and the experts on whom they have relied, and therefore their views are obviously well represented in the analysis. To build a more comprehensive picture of the urban fringe, not only as a phase but also as a place in its own right, I have used a variety of other sources such as newspapers and memoirs. Through the memoirs of people who lived on the fringe of Helsinki, it is possible to capture not only their personal but also their collective history, because our personal memories – as Aleida Assmann puts it – 'include much more than what we, as individuals, have ourselves experienced' (Assmann 2006, 211).

Urban fringe before industrialisation

In early modern Sweden, the ambitions and aspirations to enhance urban development far exceeded the resources available. This was true throughout the Kingdom of Sweden, but especially in its eastern part, the area now known as Finland. The Crown hoped that towns would become the economic engines of the state – as happened in many other European countries – and laboured with determination to found new towns and help them thrive, or at least to survive. Measured against the excessively optimistic expectations, the results were disappointing: nearly all towns in Sweden remained small and unimposing until the nineteenth century (Lilja 1995, 50–76; Sandberg 2001, 47–52). Helsinki, too, was among the disappointments. It was established as a trading town in 1550 by King Gustav Vasa of Sweden and removed to a new site in 1640 to improve its chances of success, but until the early nineteenth century its progress was slow, and often interrupted by fires, wars and epidemics (Hietala and Helminen 2009, 9–20).

In spite of failing to achieve the desired results, the efforts to promote urban development had some far-reaching effects. They went a long way to define what a proper town should look like and to shape the relationship between a town and its fringe. Most early modern Swedish towns had no chance to survive on trade and the handicraft industry alone and therefore the state, as part of its policies to promote urban growth, ended up subsidising urban agriculture. When a king of Sweden founded a town, he also provided the necessary land, including large areas of pasture, arable land and woodlands. This tradition divided towns into two parts: one was the town proper, built according to a town plan and where plots were sold for private use, while the other was the common land situated outside the planned area and owned jointly by all burghers. Towns were not allowed to sell the agricultural or pasture land so donated without state permission but they were able to lease plots to private individuals (Perälä 1983, 30; Björklund 2010, 61–71).

What further accentuated the division of the towns into different parts was the ambitious approach taken to actual town building. By raising building standards, the Crown sought to transform modest settlements into proper towns which would be more respectable in appearance and less susceptible to fire. This aspiration was evident as early as 1571, when the Swedish King, Johan III, decreed (Hall 1997, 96) ‘that all those who are, if not exactly rich at least of reasonable wealth, should build in brick, if they desire to be inhabitants of the town; those others who have not the intention, the possibility or the means for such houses, should

live apart.’ However, the prohibitions issued against wooden buildings usually fell on deaf ears, especially in provincial towns. The turn came gradually in the nineteenth century when the centres of the major towns were increasingly built in brick – and there were few places where the change was as dramatic as in Helsinki (Hall 1991, 282).

Russia wrested Finland from Sweden during the Napoleonic Wars in 1809. Finland was annexed to the Russian Empire as an autonomous grand duchy with a separate Finnish central administration, and Helsinki, a backwater market town of a few thousand inhabitants, was made the capital. The transformation from a tiny wooden town to a prestigious capital city was carried out under the leadership of the military engineer J. A. Ehrenström and the Berlin-born architect C. L. Engel. What emerged on Ehrenström’s drawing board in 1817 was a city where wide streets and park-like boulevards were laid out on a geometric grid plan. Within the next 30 years most of Ehrenström’s plan was blasted into the rocky terrain, and the streets were lined with monumental buildings designed by Engel: administrative buildings, churches, university buildings, army barracks, hospitals and a few private residences (Klinge 2012).

Creating a monumental city from scratch had its challenges. The English novelist Charles Dickens (1842, 139–140) visited Washington DC in the 1840s and described the city as having ‘streets, mile-long, that only want houses, roads, and inhabitants; public buildings that need but a public to be complete...’. The same could have been said of Helsinki. Thinking back to Helsinki during the 1830s and 1840s, the Finnish journalist Zachris Topelius (1885) wrote that only a small minority of the Helsinki dwellers could afford to build houses that blended harmoniously with the imposing public buildings. There were gaps and incomplete developments in the monumental core of the city and even in the nearby ‘suburban areas’, where wooden houses were allowed and where some of the wealthy families chose to live.

The poor often gravitated outside the zoned urban area. The inner urban fringe, which the municipal authorities saw as a land bank for the future, offered them the best – or in many cases the only – opportunity to find an affordable place to live. Fishermen built their shacks in the coastal areas south of the city, whereas many poor widows lived just east of the city, on the rocky hillsides of Katajanokka, eking out an existence by renting out rooms or running illegal drinking dens. Carters and factory workers lived in the areas west of the city, where the sugar and tobacco factories were also located. At first the poor built their hovels without permission, but from the 1820s onwards the city’s administrative court leased plots of land outside the zoned

area to town-dwellers too poor to live in the centre. This policy was officially approved by the central government in the 1850s (*HKT 1876*, 105; Waris 1932, 7–9).

Both ‘transience’ and ‘permanence’ were evident in the inner fringe areas. The municipal authorities highlighted the transience of these communities by indicating in various ways that these areas had no characteristics of a real (urban) place. First, shantytowns did not usually appear on city maps: the tendency was to represent them as uninhabited rocky and forest terrain (in grey and green) or as vacant and awaiting development (white). Second, unlike the city centre, the fringe settlements followed the contours of the terrain, and third, most of the fringe areas were not integrated into the street network or with the urban services. When one came to the border of the planned area, cobbled streets lit with lanterns gave way to muddy paths where one stumbled around in pitch-black darkness at night, and in midwinter also in daytime (Tanner 1966, 159; Savolainen 2017, 270–273). However, some change was already under way in the 1840s. While emphasising the ‘impermanence’ of the fringe, the city’s administrative court took measures that paved the way for the integration of these areas into the town plan. The court expected the tenants – especially if their plots were close to the urban core or along the main thoroughfares – to fence off their plots, get the plans of their houses approved, level the street in front of their houses and plant broad-leaved trees to replace lean pines which had been the predominant trees in the area (*HKT 1876*, 105; Lehto 1989, 17). Thus the tenants cleared land for ‘urban’ living, and in the process many of them began to see their ‘temporary’ houses as a ‘permanent’ way of life and were eager to buy their plots. The city administration still viewed the neighbourhoods as spontaneous settlements and remained reluctant to sell.

In addition to the poor, many early manufacturers sought inexpensive sites outside the centre, and especially sites near rivers and seashores. Waterways provided factories with hydropower and water for the production processes, but also with easy ways of disposing of waste (Åström 1956, 176). Most of the Russian army barracks as well as certain functions that the urban community preferred to keep out of sight and out of mind – the county prison, the mental asylum and the cemetery – were also relegated to the edge of the city. Despite the shantytowns, industrial buildings and institutions that sprang up on the outskirts of Helsinki, large areas of pasture and arable land remained within the city limits. Part of this land was leased to private individuals, while the rest served as common grazing land. A clear indication of the importance of animal husbandry in the early nineteenth century was that the city of Helsinki still had a shepherd on its payroll (Wiherheimo and Rein 1950, 264–270). However, the question of which

type of food production was acceptable in cities was already a subject of debate. The townspeople in Helsinki were encouraged to give up growing rye, oats and barley and concentrate on more ‘urban’ products: vegetables, spices, hemp, flax, hops as well as tobacco and dye plants (Yrjänä 2013, 22–24).

Fringe of an industrialising city

As in all the Nordic countries, industrialisation started relatively late in Finland, with the real breakthrough taking place during the last decades of the nineteenth century. The growth of Helsinki and other major towns in Finland accelerated in the 1870s and 1880s, and new town plans were drawn up to expand the zoned areas (Clark 2009, 227, 231–232). In Helsinki, a plan to expand the city proper to the poor neighbourhoods east, south and west of the centre was approved in the mid-1870s. Transferring the plan from paper to the actual ground was started by levelling the rocky terrain a few streets at a time. Although the process eventually made the areas almost unrecognisable, some traces of the earlier development were preserved. The existing plot divisions were often used in drawing up the plan (*HKT 1876*, 90–92, 105–108; Schulman 2009, 54–58), and the past was also evident in street and place names. The street dissecting the area was named Korkeavuorenkatu (High Mountain Street) and the western part of the area was called Punavuori (Red Mountain).

Acknowledging that many working-class tenants had invested their life savings in their plots, the City Council decided to give them first refusal and ten years’ time to pay. Those unable to buy their plots had to vacate the site when the city saw fit to sell it (*HKT 1876*, 105–108). The planning of these inner fringe areas and the new housing developments that followed – elegant apartment buildings designed mainly for middle-class residents – kept a large part of the lower classes on the move in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. They moved first toward the west, where old neighbourhoods escaped redevelopment for a longer time, and then increasingly to the northern fringe of the city (*HKT 1884*, 2–3). The north was the natural direction for expansion, since the centre of Helsinki was located on a narrow peninsula surrounded by the sea to the west, south and east. Workshops, factories and workers’ housing spread from the city along the roads and railway lines, first to areas within the city limits, but as time passed, increasingly to more remote areas.

Although the boundary between the core and the fringe remained blurred, there was no doubt about its importance. In the 1870s and 1880s, when the roles and responsibilities of city governments were expanding, making a clear demarcation between the two spheres was an effective way to curb spending. One principle the Helsinki policy-makers came to accept, although they did not always act on it at once, was that in the zoned areas the city government provided basic infrastructure services. The state and plot owners may have contributed to the costs of the services, but the responsibility for providing them rested with the city administration. In addition to paving and lighting the streets, the city was expected to connect the streets to the piped water supply and sewage system (*HKT 1875–1878*, 8–21, 131–136, 165–178, 360–368; *1884*, 2–3). The central areas were seen as orderly urban spaces or in the process of becoming so: an unbroken urban fabric with buildings adjacent to each other and connected to the same infrastructure networks. Between the buildings there were streets, squares and parks in which artefacts, infrastructure systems and humans all increasingly had their own places (*HKT 1876–1878*, 131–136, 359–360; *1884*, 21; Buiter 2008, 142).

The areas outside the zoned urban core, whether inside or outside the city limits, were often the antithesis of orderly urban space. As in the past, the municipal authorities viewed the fringe primarily as an extension of the city. It was a land reserve for potential future development and an ideal place for activities which, although important, were unwelcome in the city proper (*HKT 1884*, 2–3). Regarding fringe areas within the municipal boundaries, the city as the landowner had power to determine the use of the land, and it used that power actively to preserve a ‘temporary’ and even ‘disordered’ character of the areas until the growth of the city made it necessary to plan these areas properly. Open meadows, fields and forested areas were sprinkled with ‘temporary’ settlements: scattered upper- and middle-class villas, workers’ houses, workshops and factories, all built on rented land owned by the city and usually without access to the infrastructure services (Waris 1932; HKK 1977).

Especially in working-class areas – in Helsinki and in many other Nordic cities – maintaining ‘temporariness’ remained a commonly used strategy until the 1910s (Hall 1997, 98). As Sven-Erik Åström (1957, 262) has argued, ‘...the “better” districts were planned in advance and the working-class districts in retrospect’. A prime example of an area where the Helsinki administration sought to maintain ‘temporariness’ was Kallio (literally ‘rock’), a working-class district just north of the city centre and in the vicinity of the industrial area of Sörnäinen. In the 1870s working-class people had begun to move into the area and to settle in houses scattered

over the rocky landscape. When it became obvious that more houses were needed, the city authorities determined the future location and alignment of streets, divided the land into plots, but, instead of selling the plots, they leased them out cheaply, at rates only 25–30 per cent of those paid in the zoned areas. The city administration did not level the terrain, nor did it provide the area with municipal services, but little was demanded of the tenants, either. They built their wooden houses with no need to adhere to any strict building regulations, thereby creating a neighbourhood prone to fires and epidemics (Waris 1932, 190–194).

The distinction made by the authorities between the ‘temporary’ fringe areas and the city proper, built on the idea of ‘permanence’, was not relevant to all. Many working-class families moved regularly within the fringe, but also between the fringe and the urban core, and therefore for them the fringe was just as much ‘a place’ as were the core areas (Waris 1932, 219–223). The distinction was also contested by some industrialists and important public institutions, such as the state railway company. While many industrial enterprises and institutions were on the edge of the city geographically, they were very much part of the city socially and politically, and eager to be connected to the infrastructure networks. Securing a water supply, for example, was of utmost importance to them, as groundwater was scarce in the rocky terrain of Helsinki. The industrialists in particular pressed the city administration to extend the municipal water system to the fringe areas, and if unsuccessful in their efforts, they often installed the water pipeline to their property at their own expense. Extending water supply and sewerage to factories paved the way for providing the services to the nearby working-class areas, where the installation of hydrants and filling in of wells were, however, received with mixed reactions. According to male writers, women in particular insisted on using the well water because it ‘made better coffee than the municipal water’ (Tanner 1966, 165; Åström 1956, 197–204).

In their memoirs, working-class people living in Kallio and other inner fringe areas describe their environment: the haphazardly placed houses and the muddy streets that had no names. ‘Temporary’ green and open spaces – vacant lots, rocks, meadows, fields and forests – were an integral part of their everyday lives. They were popular places where children and young people played and socialised. Working-class women, many of whom earned extra income by doing laundry for wealthier families, used the rocks to dry washing. Some fields and meadows were still rented out to farmers, and in the forests people picked wild mushrooms and berries. (Salmela-Järvinen 1965, 49; Salmela-Järvinen 1966, 70; Tanner 1966, 148–149). These spaces were not officially acknowledged as ‘nature’ or a valuable resource, but some of them became

‘permanent’ features of their areas. For example, in Kallio some of these spaces survived the twentieth-century development booms which laid low all the wooden houses around them.

While the fringe was usually seen as a land bank for urban growth, some green areas, such as the islands of the Helsinki Archipelago, were set aside to be preserved as ‘nature’. Since the eighteenth century many of these islands had been under military control, but the rest had been owned either by the City of Helsinki or private individuals, and used for various purposes: farming, grazing, shipbuilding and storing flammable materials (Kumela 1979). In the late nineteenth century, when the city was growing fast, the islands were increasingly seen as an ideal place for recreation. Many wealthy families rented or bought a summer place in the archipelago, while the working-class people made day trips to islands by steamboats and rowing boats. The municipal authorities encouraged working-class people to spend their free time in the archipelago and especially in People’s Parks founded on two forested islands in the 1880s. In these parks an idealistic vision of nature was put on display in contrived landscapes, in museums and in the zoo (Koskivaara 1968, 79–83; Knapas 1980).

Some of the city’s woodlands on the inner fringe were also considered to have value as ‘nature’. The Forest Act of 1886 required cities to ensure that woodlands were maintained but what really caused the Helsinki dwellers to comprehend the value of their woodlands was the devastating storm of 1890 that felled thousands of trees in the city (*Päivälehti* 30 Aug. 1890). The city administration employed a forester, in addition to the forest rangers it already had on its payroll, and started planting new woodlands to replace those lost in the storm. The city administration planted indigenous trees such as pines, spruces and birches, but also trees that were rare in Finland and therefore considered more valuable and ‘urban’, such as larches and elms. Some of them did not survive the cold climate, but many did. The replanted urban forests shaped by both cultural and natural processes gave their own particular character (still visible today) to many inner fringe areas in Helsinki (Lehti 1989, 32–49).

While there was general agreement on the value of the islands and forests, there was no consensus on the appropriate relationship between humans and (other) nature. For example, many people still had a very pragmatic attitude to killing animals. Väinö Tanner, the first Social Democratic prime minister, recorded in his memoirs how in the 1880s he and other working-class boys were often sent out to buy blood in the slaughterhouse on the edge of the city. While there, they watched animals being slaughtered and they even drank warm blood (Tanner 1966,

145–146). Some middle-class people beginning to take an interest in nature conservation were shocked by the ‘rural’ and ‘foreign’ ways of treating animals and plants. Workers coming from the countryside and Russian soldiers were especially blamed for vandalism: killing animals, trampling plants and stealing trees (Palmgren 1913). In the early twentieth century, attitudes towards animals became more sympathetic, and campaigns were developed to increase the populations of swans, ducks and squirrels in the city. The change, however, was contradictory: while ducks were protected, pigeons were increasingly seen as a nuisance (Koskivaara 1968, 205–206; Haapanen 2001).

Towards Greater Helsinki: the fringe outside the city limits

The alternative of living outside city limits became increasingly attractive to many at the turn of the twentieth century. Urban policy-makers in Finland had underestimated the challenges posed by the rapid urbanisation and invested insufficient effort into creating opportunities for the development of affordable housing. Some entrepreneurs recognised a business opportunity in the growing demand for cheap housing and, following the example of their Swedish counterparts, founded property development companies to meet the demand. The companies acquired large areas of farming land outside the cities, parcelled them out and marketed the parcels as residential plots. Consequently, a significant proportion of urban growth in Finland at the time took place outside the city boundaries, often on privately-owned land and therefore beyond the reach of municipal control (Harvia 1918, 48–49; Perälä 1983, 35–36).

Some of the new communities attracted upper- and middle-class families favouring a more rural milieu, but the vast majority of those who moved to the new suburbs were low-income citydwellers or migrants flooding into cities. The Helsinki authorities estimated in the early twentieth century that 80–90 percent of the suburban residents living outside the city boundaries were working-class people, and in some other Finnish cities the figure was even higher (*HKV 1912*:76, 3–4; Harvia 1936, 80–81). The diversity of places referred to as ‘suburbs’ in early twentieth-century Europe clearly stretched the concept so far that it lost some of its usefulness. While in Britain the long-standing negative connotation of suburbs was reversed in the nineteenth century, as middle-class people left the urban core for the convenience of the fringes (McManus and Ethington 2007, 320), in Finland the negative connotation largely persisted.

Although most of the suburbs outside Helsinki were mere semi-rural villages with few or no amenities, they had much to offer to working-class people. There were no building codes to regulate the construction of houses, building materials were cheap, small-scale farming and gardening provided food for the table, and the atmosphere was often reminiscent of the countryside where many suburban residents had grown up (Harvia 1936, 57–58). Indeed, the memoirs of those who lived in the fringe communities show that hybrid places where urban and rural interacted often came closest to their idea of stable life. For many of them, the fringe suburbs were the place where they settled down as married couples and where they built their first ‘permanent’ homes. In their new neighbourhoods they ‘watched wheat ripple in the wind’ and sensed ‘the fresh scent of the coniferous forest’ while at the same time enjoying their suburban gardens with apple trees and experiencing the ‘pulse of the city’ (Salmela-Järvinen 1966, 67; Tuglas 1986, 298; Harvia 1936, 57–58, 80–81). The interaction of cultural and natural processes in the irregular suburbs created a new kind of nature.

As soon as the Helsinki authorities became aware of the accelerating suburban growth and the role played by the private landowners and property developers in the process, they expressed their concern about the situation (*HKV* 1892:12 and 15). However, that was often all they did. Under the legislation valid until 1926, cities were not allowed to annex privately owned land, and so in order to annex property adjacent to the city boundaries, the city had to first acquire ownership. Consequently, only few annexations took place in Finnish cities at the turn of the century (Perälä 1983, 37–40).

The most obvious reason for the critical attitude towards irregular suburbs was the perceived threat to the health and public order of the city. The residents of these communities often relied on polluted wells for drinking water and lacked both sewerage and paved streets. Many of them kept pigs and chickens in their yards, much to the annoyance of the Helsinki authorities, who had made progress in restricting the keeping of livestock within the city. The fact that there was little or no policing in the suburbs was believed to result in a culture of excessive drinking and violence (*Tidskrift för Hälsovård* 1892, 109–110; *HKT* 1905 II, 48; *HKV* 1912:52). Another reason why the irregular communities were seen as a problem was the irreversibility of many changes. ‘Temporary’ solutions often achieved an unwelcome ‘permanence’. The authorities were acutely aware that in the long-term informal settlements inhibited the effective planning of the future development of the city, and therefore were keen to discourage the settlements at

an early stage. They preferred to ‘colonise’ fields and forests, not settlements created by ‘the speculators’ (*HKV 1912:52*).

Some of the concerns harboured by the municipal authorities were groundless. As regards sanitary conditions, the difference between the fringe neighbourhoods within and outside the city was often small. People living outside the city had to do without the municipal services, but those living inside could not always rely on their availability, either. Regarding the property developers, the situation was not as black-and-white as presented by the authorities (Harvia 1936). The founders of the property development companies were often sincerely concerned about urban problems, and therefore many companies started their operations with the best of the intentions. A good example is the company Puistokylä Oy, which acquired over 1,000 hectares of land near Helsinki. By applying garden city principles, the company sought to create a community that would bring together working-class people, farmers and small enterprises. However, such plans proved too ambitious. Picturesque curved streets were abandoned in favour of a straightforward grid pattern, the services promised by the company never materialised and in the absence of building control, all the builders simply did what seemed best to them (Piilonen 1996, 6–51).

Although the new suburbs did not always meet the expectations, they kept on growing. The success of the property developers led to a situation where the city found itself squeezed between the sea and the ‘speculators’. At the urgent instigation of leading municipal officials, the city of Helsinki followed the example set by Copenhagen and Stockholm and embarked on a land acquisition process in order to become yet again ‘master in its own house’. The pace was first slow as the policy-makers were still coming to terms with the idea, but after a few missed opportunities, the majority of councillors acquiesced, and the First World War, with falling prices for land, indirectly provided further impetus (*HKT 1907*, 105–108; *1917*, 11; *HKV 1912:52*; Brunila and af Schultén 1955, 35–49).

In the spring of 1917, the City Council bought 1,450 hectares of land outside the city limits for a price equivalent to one quarter of the city’s annual budget. This acquisition, together with further purchases in 1918 and 1919, greatly facilitated the controlled development of the city. The first priority in the land purchasing policy was to acquire ownership of those areas where suburbs had been built with little regard for order and safety. In these areas the parcelling out of land was discontinued and, if the city did not need the land immediately, it was ‘temporarily’

rented out as agricultural land. Another motive behind the policy was to provide building land and hydropower sites (rapids) for industrial activities, and thereby secure the future of Helsinki as an industrial city. The large forests, on the other hand, seemed at that time to have little value in the eyes of the authorities, although they were popular places for informal recreation (*HKV 1917*:18; Lehti 1989; Yrjänä 2013, 51–68).

What also prompted the municipal decision-makers to act was the realisation that they were about to lose the initiative in urban planning. In 1908, a new municipal planning authority, the Town Planning Committee, had started its work, but the Committee had formidable competitors, especially in the 1910s. In spite of the war-related difficulties, some property developers were still actively involved in determining how the fringe should be developed. For example, the biggest of the companies in the Helsinki area, M. G. Stenius Oy, had the most prominent Finnish architect, Eliel Saarinen, among its shareholders and commissioned him to design suburban areas immediately outside the city boundaries (Saarinen 1915). A few years later, Saarinen published the *Pro Helsingfors* plan (Jung & Saarinen 1918): a proposal for a master plan for the entire Helsinki region. Saarinen envisaged a new monumental centre for Helsinki, which was now the capital of a newly independent Finland, but he also planned a ring of satellite centres. The spacious suburbia was to be structured by railway lines and various types of green spaces: forests, fields and parks, and especially the Central Park stretching all the way from the centre of the city to the rural areas (Nikula 1988, 23–30; Niemi 2016, 249–254). Although the *Pro Helsingfors* plan was never officially adopted, it left behind it a powerful legacy, and many of its elements were incorporated into subsequent plans. For example, Saarinen envisaged one of the most notorious irregular suburbs, Pasila, as the second centre of Helsinki. In the following few paragraphs, I will briefly discuss over a century-long process of transforming Pasila into the second centre: a process characterised by long-lasting ‘temporary’ arrangements.

From Pigtown to Helsinki Nord: Ambitious plans and every-day life in Pasila

In the early years of the twentieth century, Wooden-Pasila was a small settlement just outside the city limits, three kilometres north of the city centre and within walking distance of the industrial work places in eastern Helsinki. The neighbourhood consisted of 1,500 residents living in wooden houses built on rugged pine covered hills. The houses varied in size, ranging

from single-family homes to low-rise tenements, and each had its own character and style. The municipal authorities saw Pasila as a kind of ‘Klondike’, notorious for its near-lawless frontier life, with inadequate planning and poor sanitation as well as excessive drinking and brawling, and the main daily newspaper emphasised the ‘un-urban’ nature of Pasila by calling it Pigtown (*Helsingin Sanomat* 4 Aug. 1905; Kervinen 1998, 75–76). Those who lived in Pasila often lamented the lack of services, but at the same time they felt that the negative reputation of their suburb was unfairly perpetuated by outsiders (*Työmies* 18 Jul. 1902; 20 Jul. 1907).

Pasila was not the only problem suburb near Helsinki, but it was too close to be ignored. The City Council decided to buy up the area, and it was annexed to the city in 1912. After the annexation, the city administration provided the area with piped water and sewerage, and improved the streets. The intention, however, was to do the very minimum (*HKT 1913*, 48–49, 71; Harvia 1936, 21–22; Kervinen 1998, 79). For the Helsinki policy-makers, Wooden-Pasila was a suburb without a future. As soon as the new plans were completed, the old Pasila would fade into oblivion.

In his *Pro Helsingfors* plan, the architect Eliel Saarinen complied with the wishes of the Helsinki authorities. Saarinen (Jung & Saarinen 1918) suggested that the main railway station be moved to Pasila, which would become the key transport node of the city. Though not officially approved at the time, the idea of Pasila as Helsinki Nord gained ground (Mäkinen 2004). The expectations of urban growth, however, proved excessively optimistic and the plans to build new Pasila were left in abeyance for 60 years, almost a human lifetime. Meanwhile the ‘temporary’ Wooden-Pasila carried on (almost) as before: children grew up and adults grew old, ground leases were renewed and the original grey houses were painted in brighter colours. The environment, too, changed almost beyond recognition. Many residents had vegetable patches in their gardens but they also planted flowers, bushes and trees, and in consequence the rugged pine covered hills gradually turned into a green oasis. In the 1950s, four decades after the predicted end of Wooden-Pasila, the neighbourhood of 3,000 people enjoyed its heyday. It remained a working-class community, with most of the residents being relatively poor, but it was in many ways a lively, close-knit community (Kervinen 1998, 79–82; Auvinen 2015).

Rapid urbanisation in the 1960s marked the beginning of the end for Pasila. In order to have the land available for use when needed, the Helsinki city administration reduced the lease period of the plots to five years. This decision created so much uncertainty that only few property

owners were willing to invest in keeping up the place. The buildings and infrastructure deteriorated, and many residents, especially young people and families, left to find homes elsewhere. Pasila gradually became a makeshift first home for poor people coming to the city and a neighbourhood of elderly people who refused to move from their homes. Houses, gardens and streets, which for many residents had been ‘permanent’ places, reverted to being ‘ephemeral’ arrangements. In the early 1970s the city administration started to terminate plot leases, and at the same time, little by little, ‘nature’ reclaimed the area. Weeds and shrubs grew out of cracks in the buildings and took over gardens which were no longer tended. The deterioration of the built environment and the spread of the natural environment made it relatively easy for the city administration to legitimise the demolition of Pasila. The irregular suburb had not been a ‘real’ urban place to begin with and in the 1970s it was even less so (*Helsingin Sanomat* 2 July 1974; 28 Sep. 1974; Kervinen 1998. 80–82)

A new town plan for the area was approved in 1979, and the wooden neighbourhood was quickly replaced with a modern residential and office area, Western Pasila, with blocks of flats, streets, tramcars and ‘urban’ parks. Eastern Pasila, the new administrative centre of the Helsinki with central and city government offices and apartment blocks, had been built during the 1970s. The last part of the process of developing Pasila as the second centre is still ongoing. The development of Central and Northern Pasila has started and will continue until 2040, when Pasila will be home to 30,000 people and 50,000 jobs (HK 2017).

The ideal place to live: the fragmented fringe of the forest suburbs

The City of Helsinki had acquired large expanses of land from the surrounding areas between the 1910s and 1930s, and the policy culminated in the purchase of one of the most active property development companies, M. G. Stenius Oy, in 1938 (*HKT 1938*, 205). The official annexation of the acquired areas was initially delayed due to legal obstacles and later because of the Second World War, but in 1946 the annexation finally occurred, increasing the area of Helsinki from 29 to 165 square kilometres. These reforms enabled the city of Helsinki to become ‘master in its own house’ and hold that position for a foreseeable future. The city owned around the half of its land area – and the 1932 Town Planning Act further empowered the municipal authorities to make plans for privately-owned land (Sundman 1991).

Integrating the city and the annexed areas into a functioning system that would work well was a difficult task in the exceptional post-war conditions. What further complicated the task was the accelerating urbanisation. The population of Helsinki increased from 360,000 in 1950 to 520,000 in 1970, and the two neighbouring municipalities – Espoo and Vantaa – likewise grew fast and by 1970 had a total population of 270,000. At the same time, the living standard rose and both middle- and working-class families increasingly looked for more spacious homes. Following the idea presented by Eliel Saarinen in 1918 and the example set by many Swedish cities, Helsinki and the neighbouring municipalities adopted decentralisation as a key strategy for meeting the high housing demand in the 1950s and 1960s (Schulman 2009).

The process of decentralisation was from the outset ambitious. One of the earliest suburbs built in the Helsinki region after the war, Tapiola, was praised both nationally and internationally for its qualities: well-kept parks that transformed subtly to more natural landscape, the Modernist buildings designed by prominent Finnish architects and the ambitious goal of creating a socially mixed neighbourhood (Tuomi 2003). Tapiola owed its name to Tapio, the ancient god of the forest in Finnish mythology, and was located ‘in the middle of nowhere’, in the rural municipality of Espoo, some ten kilometres from the centre of Helsinki. Those who moved to Tapiola in the 1950s remember the seclusion of the place: the bus route from Helsinki to Tapiola ran through ‘dark, dense forests’ (Astikainen, Heiskanen & Kaikkonen 1997, 22)

Following the inspiration of Tapiola, several new suburbs were built within the municipal boundaries of Helsinki in the 1950s and early 1960s. In this process, public images of and attitudes towards the fringe suburbs changed from fairly negative to predominantly positive, at least temporarily. The new suburbs were located literally in old-growth forests which had not been held in high regard in the interwar years but which now were seen as nothing less than an ideal place to live. Politicians, municipal officials and the media emphasised that children especially needed direct contact with nature and could not achieve their full potential in the ‘asphalt jungles’ of the inner city (Niemi 2006, 210–211). The new suburbs were not only surrounded by forests but patches of forest were often preserved even between buildings, which ranged from tower blocks to vertical apartment buildings and terraced houses. The facades of the buildings were as simple as possible to allow ‘nature’ to take care of the embellishment (Ekelund 1940; Tuomi 2003). Furthermore, trees and shrubs between buildings were not only something to be enjoyed outdoors; owing to large windows there was a spatial continuum

between the exterior and interior spaces, and therefore ‘nature’ could also be enjoyed from indoors (Niemi 2006).

Tapiola and the forest suburbs built in the 1950s and early 1960s were praised as a new national landscape of a modern, urbanised Finland; a landscape reflecting the Romantic notion that the Finns – even when living in cities – were uniquely tied to the nature of their country (Niemi 2017). The ideas implemented in these suburbs were expected to spread across the fringe areas surrounding Helsinki and other Finnish cities. In the mid-1960s, however, attitudes changed and the forest suburbs were increasingly criticised for ‘anti-urban romanticism’. The criticism did not stop the building of more suburbs; on the contrary, they sprang up at an accelerating rate in the late 1960s and 1970s. What changed, however, was the spatial structure of the suburbs. Informally located streets and buildings were abandoned in favour of grid plans to create a more ‘urban’ feel on the fringe. The city of Helsinki was again relatively slow to develop new residential areas, and therefore the strongest suburban development took place outside the boundaries of Helsinki. The neighbouring municipalities, eager to attract new residents and industries, speeded up housing production by making land development contracts with private construction companies. As a result of the co-operation, a number of large suburban estates dominated by prefabricated multi-storey apartment blocks were built in the middle of forests and fields of the Helsinki region. Tucked between these estates were low-rise residential areas as well as industrial estates (Sundman 1991, 94–99).

Although the suburbs were now built on the idea of ‘permanence’, most of them were in a fundamental way ‘temporary’ and ‘unfinished’. They were still building sites when the residents began to move in, and many of them remained ‘unfinished’ and ‘improvised’ for a long time. Visions and plans for the suburbs often included workplaces and kindergartens as well as shops, libraries, playgrounds and pubs, but many of these activities, services and cultural amenities were either provided only after a considerable delay or not at all (Sundman 1991, 98–99; Niemi 2006, 212–213). As the leisure facilities in particular were often limited, the residents made the most of the natural environment around them. Children saw woodlands, beaches, sand quarries and derelict buildings as places to explore and opportunities for imaginative play. Teenagers, too, spent their free time in woodlands and on beaches, enjoying the greater freedoms these environments afforded, and adults enjoyed the surrounding nature by walking, jogging and walking their dogs. In so doing, the residents recreated a new kind of nature. For example, species that had low resistance to trampling gradually disappeared in the suburbs,

whereas those tolerating such disturbance flourished. Indeed, the large suburban estates, low-rise residential areas and industrial estates – the areas between urban and intensively cultivated agricultural areas – provided essential habitats for many species (Asikainen 2014).

If the suburbs were ‘unfinished’ and ‘temporary’, the same can be said of suburbia as a whole. The lack of overall coordination, the disputes between Helsinki and other municipalities, and the rivalry between the construction companies created a highly fragmented fringe area: fragmented patches of urban fabric broken by swathes of forest, fields, vacant land and limited access motorways. In some international comparisons, the fringe of the Helsinki region appeared to be among the most fragmented urban areas (EEA 2006, 13).

The twenty-first century: Revisiting the old fringe

The past few decades have witnessed a gradual reversion to the dense, continuous urban fabric prevalent before the rise of the automobile. The city of Helsinki and to some extent also the neighbouring municipalities have pursued a policy of urban consolidation, encouraging growth in areas with existing infrastructure and reducing the development along the rural-urban fringe. The change has been uneven as a result of the disparate and conflicting interests of the cities in the Helsinki Metropolitan Region, but the trend has been clear. The policy has been justified as a strategy indispensable to improve the accessibility of services and to mitigate climate change (Maijala & Sairinen 2008; Helsingin Seutu 2010).

The compact city ideal, together with difficulties in regional planning, have caused the city of Helsinki to concentrate more on the development of the ‘fringe within the city’. The focus has first been on underused land areas in or near the urban core. A prime example is the heart of the Kamppi area, which in the nineteenth century was occupied by Russian army barracks and parade grounds. The area remained a kind of periphery in the middle of the city – a gap in the urban fabric – until the early twentieth-first century, when a redevelopment project finally absorbed the area into the central business district of Helsinki. Another example are the old industrial estates and harbour areas, which lost their original function in the late twentieth century. Many of these have been or are in the process of being redeveloped for housing. Finally, a third example are the islands which for long were under military control. They lost their military significance in the course of the twentieth century, if not before, and many of

them were gradually reclaimed by nature. In the twenty-first century, these islands have been opened to the public as recreational areas combining cultural and natural heritage.

Conclusion

In Helsinki, as in many other Nordic cities, the difference between the urban core and its fringe areas became more pronounced during the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century. While the centre of the city became gradually more ‘permanent’, with more enduring buildings and infrastructure, in the inner fringe areas the accelerating urbanisation heightened the sense of ‘temporariness’. The Helsinki authorities, for their part, reinforced the process. They imposed an increasing number of building, fire and public health regulations on the zoned areas, while at the same time actively seeking to retain ‘informality’ on the outskirts of the city. Shantytowns and irregular working-class areas were ‘temporary’ arrangements providing housing for low-income groups until demolished to make room for the expanding city. Agricultural land and forest areas near the city centre – with the exception of a few islands and woodlands – were seen as ‘undeveloped’ land. These areas served the needs of the city proper, functioning as a ‘temporary’ source of urban food and industrial materials as well as places for informal recreation until surveyors, road workers and builders started integrating them into the urban core. The authorities sought to keep their options open so that when the time came to finalise the formal plans and implement them, they could take advantage of what they then perceived to be the best opportunity.

In practice, it was not always easy to maintain ‘temporariness’. The city of Helsinki was an important landowner and therefore well placed to control development in the fringe areas, especially in the nineteenth century and between 1920s and 1960s, but there were many other actors and factors at work. Even in informal settlements located near the urban core and specifically intended to be ‘temporary’, some ‘permanent’ changes were often inevitable. The interaction between the inhabitants and their environment shaped the places through small transformations which, accumulating over time, resulted in significant alterations. A little further away, private landowners and property development companies together with home builders created ‘permanent’ urban structures in the middle of fields and forests. The neighbouring municipalities became active in the 1960s and 1970s. The simultaneity of very different time experiences and the particular interaction of the cultural and natural processes

have made the fringe a unique place, different from both the urban core and the intensively cultivated agricultural areas. While the fringe as a whole has been in a state of change, many parts of it have become ‘permanent’ or at least acquired a feeling of ‘permanence’.

References

Official publications of the City of Helsinki

HK (2017), *Uutta Helsinkiä: Pasila*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupunginkanslia
<http://www.uuttahelsinki.fi/fi/pasila> (Accessed 10.10. 2017).

HKK (1977), *Meilahden huvila-alue*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupungin kaupunkisuunnitteluvirasto.

HKT (1875–1938), *Kertomus Helsingin kaupungin kunnallishallinnosta* (Annual Reports of the Helsinki City Administration). Helsinki: Helsingin kaupungin tilastotoimisto.

HKV (1892–1917), *Helsingin kaupunginvaltuuston painetut asiakirjat* (Published Documents of the Helsinki City Council). Helsinki: Helsingin kaupunginvaltuusto.

Newspapers

Päivälehti / Helsingin Sanomat
Tidskrift för Hälsovård
Työmies

Asikainen, E. (2014), Lähiöluonnon muotoutuminen ja lähiön ekologian logiikat Tampereen Hervannassa, *Terra* 127: 1, 3–19.

Astikainen, R., Heiskanen R. and Kaikkonen, R. (1997), *Elämää lähiössä*. Helsinki: Helsingin Sanomat.

Assmann, Adeila (2006), *Der lange Schatten der Vergangenheit: Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik*. München: C. H. Beck.

Åström S.-E. (1956), ‘Kaupunkiyhteiskunta murrosvaiheessa’, *Helsingin kaupungin historia IV:2*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupunki, 7–333.

Åström, S.-E. (1957), *Samhällsplanering och regionsbildning i kejsartidens Helsingfors: Studier i stadens inre differentiering, 1810–1910*. Helsinki: Helsingfors stad.

Augé, M. (2008), *Non-places: An Introduction to Supermodernity*. Second edition. London: Verso.

- Auvinen, J. (2015), *Puu-Pasila. Idylli rautatien varrella*. Helsinki: Kustantaja Laaksonen.
- Björklund, A. (2010), *Historical Urban Agriculture: Food Production and Access to Land in Swedish Towns before 1900*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Brunila B. and af Schultén, M. (1955), 'Asemakaava ja rakennustaide', *Helsingin kaupungin historia IV:1*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupunki, 7–104.
- Buiter, H. (2008), 'Constructing Dutch streets: a melting pot of European technologies', in M. Hård and T. J. Misa (eds), *Urban Machinery: Inside Modern European Cities*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 141–162.
- Clark, P. (2009), *European Cities and Towns 400–2000*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crankshaw, N. (2009), 'Plowing or mowing? Rural sprawl in Nelson County, Kentucky'. *Landscape journal* 28, 218–234.
- Dickens, C. (1842), *American Notes for General Circulation*. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz.
- EEA (2006), *Urban Sprawl in Europe – The Ignored Challenge*. EEA Report 2006:10. Copenhagen, European Environment Agency.
- Ekelund, H. (1940), 'Kerrostaloasunnot', *Suomen Kunnallislehti*, Nr.9.
- Gallent, N. (2006), 'The rural-urban fringe: a new priority for planning policy?', *Planning, Practice & Research* 21, No. 3, 383–393.
- Gallent, N., Andersson, J. and Bianconi, M. (2006), *Planning on the Edge: The Context for Planning at the Rural-Urban Fringe*. London: Routledge.
- Haapanen, E. (2001), 'Villisorsista pullasorsiksi. Eläinten kotiutumisesta kaupunkiin', in S. Laakkonen, S. Laurila, P. Kansanen and H. Schulman (eds.), *Näkökulmia Helsingin ympäristöhistoriaan*. Helsinki: City of Helsinki, 110–123.
- Hall, T. (1991), 'Concluding remarks: is there a Nordic planning tradition?', in T. Hall (ed.), *Planning and Urban Growth in the Nordic Countries*. London: E & FN Spon, 281–294.
- Hall, T. (1997), *Planning Europe's Capital Cities: An Aspects of Nineteenth Century Urban Development*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Harvia, Y. (1918), 'Kaupunkikuntien tonttipolitiikasta', in *Suomen ensimmäinen yleinen asuntokongressi. Pöytäkirja*. Helsinki, Yhdistys yleishyödyllisen rakennustoiminnan edistämiseksi, 48–73.
- Harvia, Y. (1936), *Helsingin esikaupunkiliitos. Päämietintö*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupunki.
- Helsingin Seutu (2010), *Greater Helsinki Vision 2050*.
http://www.hel2.fi/helsinginseutu/FINAL_GreaterHelsinki_200x200mm_english_03-09-2010_LOW.pdf

- Hietala, M. and Helminen, M. (2009), 'Helsinki since 1550', in M. Hietala, M. Helminen and M. Lahtinen (eds), *Helsinki: Historic Town Atlas*. Helsinki: City of Helsinki, 8–47.
- Jung B. & Saarinen E. (1918): *Pro Helsingfors: Ett förslag till stadsplan för Stor-Helsingfors utarbetat av Eliel Saarinen m.fl.* Helsinki: Pro Helsingfors.
- Kervinen, H. (1998), 'Puu-Pasila – Kylä kaupungin laidalla', in H. Schulman and M. Sundman (eds.), *Pasila. Helsingin uusi keskus*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskus, 75–82.
- Klausen, J. E. and Røe, P. G. (2012), 'Governance and change on the urban fringe', *Urban Research and Practice* 5, Issue 1, 1–5.
- Klinge, M. (2012), *Pääkaupunki: Helsinki ja Suomen valtio, 1808–1863*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Knapas, M. T. (1980), *Korkeasaari ja Seurasaari: Helsinkiläisten ensimmäiset kansanpuistot*. Helsinki: Helsinki-seura.
- Koskivaara, L. (1968), *Kun Helsinki oli nuori ja pieni. Muistikuvia poikavuosilta*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Kowarik, I. (2005), 'Wild urban woodlands: towards a conceptual framework', in Kowarik I. and Körner S. (eds), *Wild Urban Woodlands*. Berlin: Springer, 1–32.
- Kumela, M. (1979), 'Helsingin saarten historiaa', in *Narinkka 1977–78*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupunginmuseo.
- Lilja, S. (1995), 'Small towns in the periphery: population and economy of small towns in Sweden and Finland during the early modern period', in P. Clark (ed.) *Small towns in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 50–76.
- Lehto, L. (1989), *Elämää helsinkiläismetsissä: Helsingin kaupunginmetsänhoidon syntyhistoriaa*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupunginmuseo.
- Loughran, K. (2016), 'Imbricated spaces: the high line, urban parks, and the cultural meaning of city and nature', *Sociological theory* 34 (4), 311–334.
- Maijala O. and Sairinen R. (2008), 'Promoting sustainable urban form: implementing urban consolidating policies around the Helsinki Metropolitan Region', in M. Jenks, D. Kozak and P. Takkanon (eds), *World Cities and Urban Form*. London: Routledge.
- Mäkinen, M. K. (2004), 'Helsinki Nord', in R. Martinsen (ed.), *Herää Helsinki! Kaupunkisuunnittelu kaaoksessa*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupunkisuunnitteluseura, 9–14.
- McManus R. and Ethington P.J. (2007), 'Suburbs in transition: new approaches to suburban history', *Urban history* 34, Issue 2, 317–337.
- Morris, R. J. (2000), 'Governance: two centuries of urban growth', in R. J. Morris and R. H. Trainor, *Urban Governance: Britain and Beyond Since 1750*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1–14.

- Niemi, M. (2006), 'Politicians, professionals and "publics": Conflicts over green space in Helsinki, c. 1950–2000', in Clark, P. (ed.) *The European City and Green Space – London, Stockholm, Helsinki, and St Petersburg, 1850–2000*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 207–228.
- Niemi, M. (2007), *Public Health and Municipal Policy Making: Britain and Sweden 1900–1940*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Niemi, M (2016), 'Kaupunkisuunnittelijat ilman rajoja. Eliel Saarinen luomassa kansallisia, kansainvälisiä kaupunkeja', in I. Sulkunen, M. Niemi, S. Katajala-Peltomaa (eds.), *Usko, tiede ja historiankirjoitus – suomalaisia maailmankuvia keskiajalta 1900-luvulle*. Helsinki, SKS, 237–266.
- Niemi, M (2017), 'Epilogue: how green is your city? Transnational and local perspectives on urban green spaces', in P. Clark, M. Niemi and C. Nolin (eds), *Green Landscapes in the European City, 1750–2010*. London: Routledge, 212–218.
- Nikula, R. (1988), 'Bertel Jung modernin kaupunkisuunnittelun käynnistäjänä', in *Bertel Jung suukaupungin hahmottajana*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupunginsuunnitteluvirasto.
- Palmgren, R. (1913), 'Helsingfors-traktens fågelfauna', *Acta Societatis pro Fauna et Flora Fennica* 38 (2), 219–220.
- Perälä, T. (1983), 'Kaupunkien aluepolitiikka ja esikaupunkiliitokset 1875–1918', in *Suomen kaupunkilaitoksen historia 2*. Helsinki: Suomen kaupunkiliitto, 29–48.
- Piilonen, J. (1995), "'Vantaan puistokaupunki". Ulkomaiset esikuvat ja niiden sovellutus', in *Helsingin pitäjä/ Helsinge 1996*. Vantaa: Vantaan kaupungin museo, 6–51.
- Qviström, M. and Saltzman, K. (2006) 'Exploring landscape dynamics at the edge of the city: spatial plans and everyday places at the inner urban fringe of Malmö, Sweden', *Landscape Research* 31, No. 1, 21–41.
- Qviström, M. (2007), 'Landscapes out of order: studying the inner urban fringe beyond the rural-urban divide', *Geografiska Annaler*, 89 B, 3: 269–282.
- Qviström, M. (2013), 'Searching for an open future: planning history as a means of peri-urban landscape analysis', *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 56: Issue 10, 1549–1569.
- Saarinen, E. (1915), *Munkkiniemi–Haaga ja Suur-Helsinki: Tutkimuksia ja ehdotuksia kaupunkijärjestelyn alalta*. Helsinki: M. G. Stenius.
- Salmela-Järvinen, M. (1965), *Kun se parasta on ollut. Lapsuuden muistelmat*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Salmela-Järvinen, M. (1966), *Alas lyötiin vanha maailma. Muistikuvia ja näkymiä vuosilta 1906–1918*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Sandberg R. (2001), 'Town and country in Sweden 1450–1650', in S. R. Epstein (ed.), *Town and Country in Europe, 1300–1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Savolainen, P. (2017), *Teksteistä rakennettu kaupunki. Julkinen ja yksityinen tila turkulaisessa kielenkäytössä ja arkielämässä 1740–1810*. Turku: Sigillum.
- Schulman, H. (2009), ‘Settlement, growth, structure and land use’, in M. Hietala, M. Helminen and M. Lahtinen (eds), *Helsinki: Historic Town Atlas*. Helsinki: City of Helsinki, 48–73.
- Sundman, M. (1991), ‘Urban planning in Finland after 1850’, in T. Hall (ed.), *Planning and Urban Growth in the Nordic Countries*. London: E & FN Spon, 60–115.
- Tanner, V. (1966), *Näin Helsingin kasvavan*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Thomas, D. (1990), ‘The edge of the city’, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers. New Series* 15, 131–138.
- Topelius Z. (1885), ‘För femtio år sedan’, *Finland*, 4 Jul. 1885.
- Tuglas, F. (1986), *Muistelmat vuosilta 1895–1910*. Helsinki, SKS.
- Tuomi, T. (2003), ‘Tapiola – garden city’, in T. Tuomi (ed.), *Tapiola: Life and Architecture*. Espoo: Housing Foundation & City of Espoo, 7–31.
- Waris, H. (1932), *Työläisyhteiskunnan syntyminen Helsingin Pitkänsillan pohjoispuolelle I*. Helsinki: SHS.
- Wiherheimo O. and Rein G. (1951), ‘Kunnalliselämä’, *Helsingin kaupungin historia III:2* Helsinki: Helsingin kaupunki, 255–353.
- Wollmann, H. (2004), ‘Local government reforms in Great Britain, Sweden, Germany and France’, *Local Government Studies* 30, No. 4, 639–665.
- Yrjänä, J., (2013), *Maata näkyvissä: Helsingin maanhankinnan viisi vuosisataa*. Helsinki, Helsingin kaupungin kiinteistövirasto.