

Voluntarism

Promises of Proximity as Articulated by Changing Moral Elites

Sevelsted, Anders

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Published in:

Contributions to the History of Concepts

DOI:

[10.3167/choc.2020.150205](https://doi.org/10.3167/choc.2020.150205)

Publication date:

2020

License

Unspecified

Citation for published version (APA):

Sevelsted, A. (2020). Voluntarism: Promises of Proximity as Articulated by Changing Moral Elites. *Contributions to the History of Concepts*, 15(2), 80–104. <https://doi.org/10.3167/choc.2020.150205>

[Link to publication in CBS Research Portal](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us (research.lib@cbs.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 30. May. 2024



Voluntarism

Promises of Proximity as articulated by changing moral Elites

Anders Sevelsted

Abstract: The article analyzes the varied meanings historically associated with concepts of voluntarism in relation to social relief as they were articulated by changing moral elites in Denmark from the late nineteenth century until the present. Concepts of voluntarism have historically constituted “normative counterconcepts” that link voluntary practices to desired futures in opposition to alternative modes of organizing. The “proximity” of voluntarism vis-à-vis the “distance” of the state has always been a core meaning, but the concept has drifted across the political spectrum from its first articulation by nineteenth-century conservative Christians to its rediscovery by leftist social researchers in the late twentieth century. Paradoxically, the welfare state helped “proximity” become a core meaning, in contrast to its original social-conservative meaning emphasizing proximity *and* distance.

Keywords: voluntarism, social work, welfare state, conceptual history, counterconcepts, elites, moral elites

The article analyzes the concepts used to designate voluntary practices in relation to social work during three central periods in Denmark: the late nineteenth century, the 1930s, and the 1980s.

By analyzing the emergence and development of the concepts of *voluntarism*, it is possible to

establish a connection to the meanings attached to the voluntary practices as they emerged and developed in action. Danish pioneers of voluntary social work have not invoked ready-made voluntary principles, but rather shaped their practices through the concepts used to designate them: “deaconry,” “mission,” “philanthropy,” and “network” connect voluntary practices to different and possibly conflicting social imaginaries. While it is commonplace in social science to refer to voluntarism as a neutral practice belonging to a sector in society, a history of the development of voluntarism’s concepts reveals the changing visions of society in which these have been embedded. A new perspective is gained when we ask: what do we actually mean when we talk about voluntarism? What “past futures” have been lost or realized, and how may the concepts and practices of voluntarism may be reinvigorated today?

I will first introduce my conceptual history approach, arguing that concepts have a constraining function as they guide action through their encapsulation of past experiences, while they also serve as vehicles of change; as means of intervention in social reality by actors who wish to shape our understanding of societal developments. Here, normative counterconcepts are introduced as concepts that connote positive hopes of an alternative future in opposition or as alternatives to certain modernizing forces like bureaucratization or marketization. The second section situates the conceptual history approach in the literature, arguing that the approach is useful since it clarifies the historical “baggage” of voluntarism, since it does so over an extended period of time, and since it stresses the interventional character of conceptual change, and thus the role of collective actors.

I then proceed with the three central analytical sections. First, I describe how voluntarism emerged in conservative Christian circles in late nineteenth-century Denmark as a principle for organizing the active Lutheran congregation or general citizenry to care not only for the material,

but also the spiritual needs of the poor. Voluntarism was believed to be more “proximate” than public relief and more “distant” than individual benevolence. Several counterconcepts were invoked such as “deaconry” and “Home Mission” in opposition to the state, secular philanthropy, and socialism. Second, I show how the increased legitimacy of the state as a relief provider in the interwar period led voluntarism to become perceived as “too close” and designated the role of mere service provision. The concepts of voluntarism were in turn infused with democratic ideals and underpinned by a stronger ethics of conviction by its proponents: Voluntarism became even more “proximate” and no longer distant. Third, in the 1980s, voluntarism was then rediscovered across the political field as an answer to the welfare state’s perceived dual fiscal crisis and legitimacy crisis, and by left-leaning social researchers, who promoted the idea of an autonomous “third network” beyond the state; once again investing the concepts with utopian ambitions. Social researchers, however, quickly adopted a more sober view and developed the concept of “sector” to describe the voluntary associations as having certain advantages and disadvantages vis-à-vis the state as providers of welfare services.

The analysis thus shows a movement where (within the field of social provision) voluntary practices “traveled” conceptually from nineteenth-century Christian Conservatives to twentieth-century leftist social scientists. Both camps emphasized the “proximity” of voluntarism as opposed to the “distance” of public relief, while applying different counterconcepts to link the practice to oppositional visions of society. Both visions were tempered by a cooler use of the concept in social policy and science, respectively. Paradoxically, this practical-conceptual division of labor may be what has allowed “proximity” to become the counterconceptual core of voluntarism.

Situating the Conceptual History in the Literature

Research on voluntarism during the first two periods (late nineteenth century and interwar period) has primarily been carried out by social historians and church historians, while research on voluntarism and state in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, has been done primarily by social science researchers.

For the first two periods, three camps of researchers can be identified. First, the church historians who focus on either theological and revivalist perspectives or have carried out descriptive analyses of specific organizations.¹ Second, (and somewhat overlapping) social historians have studied organizations,² philanthropic ideas,³ and the adaption of church philanthropy to the emerging social state.⁴ Third, a Foucauldian camp has, on the one hand, analyzed the social reforms and charities in Copenhagen in the nineteenth century as a matter of increased surveillance and control and as an effort on the part of the bourgeoisie to discipline the city in their own image centered on the nuclear family and its “home.”⁵ On the other hand, Christian philanthropy has been interpreted as a “Christian-conservative discourse” response to the “dangerous worker” and the socialist scare.⁶ Here, the focus is on the rationalities through which the poor are constituted as so many “objects of intervention” (e.g. population versus individuals) and the strategic motives for intervention (strengthening the nation, fear of disease, socialism, etc.).

The literature on the late twentieth-century developments has a special position in this article, since it also constitutes an object of research. As will be clear in the third section of the analysis, this research rediscovered voluntary social work as a more proximate and flexible alternative to public relief, while also inquiring into the relations between state and voluntary “sectors.”⁷

The conceptual history approach to voluntarism adds to the literature in three respects. First, the aim of the conceptual history approach is to clarify: what do we actually mean when we talk about voluntarism? What past meanings are we inadvertently invoking, and what future possibilities are we opening up? How could the concept be appropriated and put to use in the present? This approach thus adds a new and stringent focus to the existing literature.

Second, the approach has a longer time perspective than most of the literature, making it possible to synthesize partial insights from diverse strands of literature on the three epochs in question.

Third, by focusing on “conceptual practices,” the contingency of historical situations and thus the importance of collective actors seeking to shape future practices is stressed. The actors emerge not as “philanthropy heroes” (the role that church and to some degree social historians have a tendency to cast them in), nor as instruments guided by the invisible hand of bourgeois ideals or abstract rationalities (slightly exaggerating the Foucauldian perspective), nor as a specific network or sector in society (as the social researchers would have it). Instead, conceptual history offers a position that is at the same time distant and proximate: analyzing at the level of conceptualized practices enables a situated understanding of the spaces of possibility that actors have sought to open by interpreting their activities in specific ways. Rather than proceeding purely descriptively, critically or praising, the reader is invited to see the futures past that have been realized or left behind. I will now expand on this.

Voluntarism as a Normative Counterconcept: Conceptual History Inspiration

Research in voluntarism has always been in the middle of a “terminological tempest.”⁸ Even so, voluntarism seems to be the most commonly used concept, and researchers today are concerned

with “voluntarism and the third sector” and “voluntary work,” an unpaid, non-compulsory, organized activity that benefits people other than oneself and close family in an array of fields ranging from sports to religion.⁹ In practice, however, the concept has always been contested and essentially a normative counterconcept akin to “civil society” and “community,” emerging historically in relation to major social changes.¹⁰ The concept of civil society has a long history¹¹ but became commonplace in the 1980s as a result of the Polish trade union Solidarność, non-violent revolt against the Communist regime, the “new social movements” in Western Europe and the United States, and the democratic revolutions in South America. Similarly, “community” in the United States has historically been used to express warm relations in a geographically or emotionally defined group in a society otherwise characterized by “cold” contractual or coercive relations. Both concepts express concern and hope: civil society and local communities are potentially at risk and in need of protection. At the same time, these concepts are promoted as alternative solutions to perceived social problems: anomie, political indifference, bureaucratization and marketization.

Voluntarism in its many conceptual guises shows similar counterconceptual qualities as it emerged in Denmark at the end of the nineteenth century: a distrust in the state as social provider, and a belief in a more proximate, but also more rational, solution to social problems. In order to outline the history of the counterconcepts associated with voluntarism, I will draw on some central insights from the Koselleckian conceptual history approach. Concepts in this tradition are both indicators of historical change as well as engines for making change happen. Conceptual history is a way of “seeing things their way,” of discovering the layers of meaning and experiences that have accumulated in a concept and of the uses that concepts have been put to historically. Concepts emerge on the basis of specific experiences in specific contexts and thus

carry with them the meaning of this context when used in a new context. Language has a certain inertia, which puts a strain on the language user's ability to describe new experiences within the existing vocabulary.¹² At the same time, concepts open new horizons of expectation, and conceptual interventions can serve to direct societal development and project possible alternative futures.¹³ Some concepts tend to merely register experiences, while others are constitutive of experience, or even create expectations for future states that have not been realized in history yet, so-called *Erwartungsbegriffe*.¹⁴ When I state that voluntarism and its semantic brethren emerged as normative counterconcepts, I mean that they exhibit some of the characteristics of a concept of expectation: they are utopian in that they propose possible futures akin to the temporal “-ism” concepts characteristic of modern ideologies, such as Republicanism, Marxism, and others.¹⁵ As we will see, voluntarism and related concepts did not emerge as strictly utopian concepts in the sense that they did not build on any past experiences, but rather as conservative or revivalist concepts in that they sought to revive past experiences and practices in opposition to present ways of organizing poor relief and social relief. Doing a conceptual history of voluntarism allows us to get a glimpse of the “futures past”; the inherent possibilities in reality that were successfully or unsuccessfully sought to be realized.

Voluntarism is, however, a complicated concept since it became commonplace mainly in relation to the critique of the welfare state by politicians and social researchers in the 1980s. However, the voluntary practices that the term seeks to designate emerged a hundred years earlier. Rather, then, than undertaking a history of the *word* voluntarism, what I seek to do is a history of the various concepts in the *semantic field* of voluntarism and the practices that have been associated with these concepts. This raises some methodological issues regarding the relation of concepts and practices. Normative counterconcepts, I contend, are interventions in

social reality in competition with alternative ways of conceptualizing this reality. Concepts stand in a non-reductive relation to social reality. In broad terms: while social and political concepts do not simply mirror reality, reality is not simply constructed by discourse either, and conceptual history is thus always also social history. This calls for paying attention to both semasiological and onomasiological dimensions of concepts: the various practices the concept has referred to, and the various concepts used to refer to the practice.¹⁶ This conceptual history is thus a history of the emergence of a social practice and the ways in which it has been conceptualized. What may to a third party look like the same practice, for example, groups of people doing social work on a voluntary basis, carries different connotations and expectations if this is called “philanthropy” or “diaconal work.” This is not so that the practice is only there through discourse, but discourse lends meaning to the practice and offers horizons of expectation. Further, the activity gains meaning through the various counterconcepts that signify the practice in opposition to other conceptualized practices. This is similar, but not identical, to the way asymmetrical concepts are applied, where mutual recognition is denied, such as Christian-Barbarian.¹⁷ The conceptual intervention in history is also an intervention in opposition to the way other groups designate and carry out their activity. The following investigation is consequently not simply an analysis of the content of voluntarism, but mainly of the counterconcepts used in opposition to competing projects and modes of organizing.

This conceptual history traces the changes in meaning of voluntarism in relation to social provision as articulated by what I propose to call a “moral elite,” namely the groups that at various points in time have had the ability to shape the content of the concept through their access to specialized knowledge and vocabularies, such as religion, political ideology, law, and science.¹⁸ The changing focus of the analysis reflects the changes in the moral elite that has taken

up the concept and imbued it with specific content. In the late nineteenth century, these groups consisted of Lutheran priests and revivalist laymen, while the interwar period saw the emergence of the social state and Social Democratic ideologists. The 1980s witnessed an increased role for social scientists in conceptualizing voluntary practices.

The first part focuses on the central priests and religious laymen involved in voluntary social work and poor relief mainly in Copenhagen at the end of the nineteenth century. A few references will be made to philosophers¹⁹ of the time to illustrate the breadth of the concept as well as the “other” of the counterconcepts of voluntarism. These religious leaders belonged to organizations that were not explicitly religious such as Christianshavns Understøttelsesforening²⁰ (1866) (a local social relief association), organizations working broadly within the national church such as the nursing school and nursing home Diakonissestiftelsen²¹ (1863), the Stefanus Association (1876)²², and “congregation care” organizations²³ (1886), as well as different strands of revivalist organizations such as the Copenhagen Home Mission²⁴ (1865) and the Church Foundation²⁵ (1896). These organizations had specific identities and different stances to social relief, but as is evident from the short biographies in the footnotes, many of the leaders had overlapping affiliations. A conceptual history allows the researcher to go beyond specific organizations and individuals and grasp the common or conflicting concepts that were invoked across the field. The sources consist of publically available texts: programmatic statements, lectures, books by prominent actors in the field, and protocols from religious public meetings on social issues (the so-called *Bethesda* meetings).²⁶ I also make use of secondary sources, for example, to identify the names of voluntary organizations that emerged at this time.

The second part, on the 1930s and beyond, concentrates on the priest-philanthropists as well as the new political opposition. As voluntarism was now more firmly institutionalized, the

source material is also less scattered, and the conceptual interventions more hierarchical. I thus in this section primarily rely on the public writings of leaders of social voluntary organizations²⁷ and political leaders, specifically the highly influential Social Democrat and minister of justice and social affairs, K. K. Steincke (1880–1963). The sources in the last section are texts by the researchers who pioneered the rediscovery of voluntarism in social science.

It is important to point to the differences in language communities and the challenge of translation, as voluntarism is a “thick concept” with many national variances in meaning and connotations. Just as the German *Gemeinschaft* connotes to different meanings than does “community” in the United States because of Germany’s violent history, so voluntarism or *volunteerism*, *Freiwilligentätigkeit* or *Ehrenamtlichkeit*, *frivillighed* (Danish) and *ideellt arbete* (“ideal work,” Swedish) have distinct connotations related to the developments in the three language areas. The following pages constitute a conceptual history primarily of the Danish *frivillighed* presented in English. While this may be problematic as not all nuances will translate, it may also counteract the tendency to “historical nationalism” as many inspirations to the European semi-periphery of Denmark came from the Anglophone and the Germanic areas.²⁸

The Emergence of Voluntarism: Proximity and Distance

From the constitution of 1849, voluntarism was increasingly invoked as a principle of organizing in contrast to the previous Absolutist regime. Voluntarism was discussed as a principle for organizing the army during the civil war of 1848–1851²⁹ and for organizing the church³⁰ and social security schemes, such as old age pension, sickness benefits, disability insurance, and so forth.

It is, however, in religious circles that most of the voluntary social support practices were developed, and thus here we find most concepts of voluntarism developed in relation to this field. Priest-entrepreneurs of both mainstream and revivalist varieties, the pioneers of Christian voluntary social work, saw voluntarism as a desirable future.³¹ The congregation was rediscovered as a source of social commitment, as witnessed in the many parish charities that emerged in Copenhagen from the 1880s. “Voluntary workers” were engaged as part of the social and missionary work,³² and the “Movement for the Building of Churches” (*Kirkesagsbevægelsen*) in 1890 called for the use of the voluntary principle as the central method of organizing.³³ “Voluntary” was also to be found in the name of a number of Christian organizations founded in these years: The voluntary boys’ brigade (*Frivilligt Drengesforbund*) and The Students’ Voluntary Movement that included the Christian Student Settlement.³⁴ The “religious principle of individuality and voluntarism” (*Det religiøse individualitets- og frivillighedsprincip*)³⁵ was invoked as a way for the congregation to organize its forces.³⁶

Semasiologically, then, the concepts *voluntarism* and *voluntary* referred to a new practice, a new principle for organizing social work. The concept, however, did not emerge in a vacuum, but as a principle of organizing invoked in direct opposition to the state—as part of and as a conservative response to a wider liberal movement.

Wide circles of the propertied male citizens, who had won the right to vote and be elected for office in the only seemingly peaceful revolution of 1848,³⁷ espoused ideals of self-organizing outside the control of a central administration still influenced by the “spirit” of absolutism. There was a strong consensus among the establishment that social relief should be based on the principle of “help to self-help.” This meant that public relief should have a deterring and disciplining effect and essentially be reserved for the “undeserving” poor, while the “deserving”

poor ought to be helped through voluntary associations.³⁸ While Liberals argued in Malthusian terms for the principle of free competition as natural and inevitable, Conservatives viewed this as merely a kind of egoism and stressed the duty of solidarity and the role of voluntary associations as well as the state in securing a harmonious society. Bishop H. L. Martensen used the term “ethical socialism” to characterize this type of conservative viewpoint.³⁹ The priests and religious laymen worked broadly within this type of conservatism. As will become clear, they stressed voluntarism more than state intervention. It was widely held that voluntarily organized benevolence that was both more “proximate” than public relief and more “distant” than individually given alms.⁴⁰

Philosophers argued that philanthropy was more rational than the arbitrarily given individual benevolence, while at the same time more personal than the humiliating relief handed out by state and municipal authorities.⁴¹ Philanthropy needed organization, since if it was merely governed by sympathy, it would be practiced on a whim. Consequently, it would be incidental who would receive help. Organized philanthropy would be able to help more systematically through greater knowledge of the recipient, whereby a sort of free bureaucracy or system of honorary positions could develop.⁴²

The entrepreneur-priests and revivalists likewise stressed the voluntary relief’s “personal systematism” and contrasted it to unsystematic alms and handouts on the one hand and to the state’s compulsory system on the other.⁴³ The state’s poor relief was perceived as having led to complacency and indifference in the general public, as the sense of obligation now only extended to paying one’s poor taxes.⁴⁴ Since the Reformation, too much initiative, it was claimed, had been left to the state, which was consequently called upon to solve every problem: the education of priests and the erection of churches, hospitals, and poor houses. A similar critique was

launched at the national church that had left it to the priests to worry about God's kingdom and care for the poor. Now it was time for priest and layman to take on these tasks together.⁴⁵

Voluntary practices were thus developed in opposition to state relief, but not primarily with the intention to reform the public system. Public support was secured by the constitution, and as such, it was a necessity that the public system should be "distant," that is, deterring and legally incapacitating, lest access would become too easy, leading to demoralization in the form of giving up the determination to be self-reliant.⁴⁶ The truly undeserving should feel the natural consequences of laziness, namely hunger, or be put to hard work if the public system were to feed them.⁴⁷

Similarly, voluntary relief should not simply consist of hand-outs, but be decided through close scrutiny of the recipients' situation, for example, through the use of home inspections, as was the practice in the benevolent society in the parish of Christianshavn, where the inspectors would scrutinize whether or not the poor had a legitimate claim or were feigning.⁴⁸ This intimate knowledge of poverty and the poor distinguished organized voluntarism from the public system that could only know poverty from "the outside," through statistics and formalities.⁴⁹

From the moment of their birth, voluntary principles were viewed as oppositional to the asymmetrically represented distant state bureaucracy: Built on active and personal commitment, voluntarism was thought able to strike the perfect balance between proximity and distance to those in need.

Counterconceptual Struggles: Religious Voluntarism Versus Philanthropy and Socialism

Even if there was a wide consensus at the time regarding the superiority of voluntarism as an organizing principle for social support vis-à-vis public relief and individual benevolence, there was also a struggle over how to conceptualize voluntary practices. Onomasiologically, to use the

conceptual historians' terminology, seemingly similar practices were designated in various ways as different future horizons were sought to be opened. "Voluntary" and its derivative forms were not simply used to describe one practice among others, but rather invoked asymmetrically to emphasize the advantages of voluntarism, and Protestant voluntarism in particular.

Testifying to the priests' embrace of the new principles of organizing of the liberal era, "voluntary" was used synonymously with "private" as in private charity (*privat Godgørenhed*), private relief organization (*privat understøttelsesvæsen*),⁵⁰ or "organized private benevolence" (*organiseret privat godgørenhed*).⁵¹ Many looked abroad for practical and conceptual inspirations for voluntary engagement: The Reformed UK, the Lutheran German Empire, and even Catholic France.⁵² Here, they found inspiration to revive half-forgotten Lutheran traditions for poor relief, such as the institution of "deaconry" (*diakoni*)⁵³ and to give new meaning to existing concepts. Inspired by the German *Innere Mission*, the term "Home Mission" (*Indre Mission*) in Copenhagen was given a new content to connote social work as well as strictly religious missionary work. This "mission of deeds" was especially contrasted by revivalist critics with a "mission of words."⁵⁴ Past futures were thus given new life in the present, and existing horizons of expectation expanded to include social voluntary practices. These conceptual innovations were in turn contrasted to other principles for organizing voluntarily: philanthropy and socialism.

The secular connotations of "philanthropy" made it an object of critique among priests and laymen. Philosophers defined philanthropy in secular terms as the "love of man."⁵⁵ Harald Høffding called for philanthropy to be emancipated from the thresholds of religion. Philanthropy, he thought, springs from a purely human sympathy and a recognition that what you have is not entirely your own, but is dependent on the generations that came before you and on society as a

whole. Religiously motivated benevolence, on the other hand, springs from the (here not only Catholic) motive of gaining access to heaven, it is limited by confessional boundaries, and it inevitably leads to hypocrisy.⁵⁶

The religious camp rebutted that a philanthropy that merely cares for man's material needs would fall short. Humane philanthropy that only offered earthly (*timelig*) help and material salvation was contrasted with Christian help that offered spiritual guidance and salvation for eternity.⁵⁷ Not only the material, but also the spiritual need of the poor was to be cared for.⁵⁸

The priests and revivalists further distinguished their own voluntary efforts from those of the socialists. The poor should be saved from a socialism that would either succumb to the "natural law" of inertia or evolve into a giant forced labor institution.⁵⁹ Revivalist priests referred to the "poison of socialism,"⁶⁰ the "Devil's socialism,"⁶¹ which was seen as promoting disbelief and pitting classes against each other rather than seeking social equality through a harmonious social body. There were divergent views among the religious leaders as to the relationship between societal "justice" and Christian "compassion." While some were inspired by John Ludlow's "Christian socialism" (the layman Harald Westergaard in particular), others insisted that the principle of compassion should always take precedence in Christian social work.⁶² Politically, these pioneers of voluntary practices were social conservatives. The workers and unskilled laborers in the city had a just cause, since the dissolution of the guilds had left them without protection.⁶³ The solution, however, was not revolution or direct political involvement, but rather material help and moral education, although the Christian socialists also envisioned priest-led workers' cooperatives.⁶⁴

Voluntarism as a principle of organizing was thus widely praised in the final decades of an increasingly liberal nineteenth century. Priests and religious laymen invoked the principle in

order to organize citizens and congregations around social tasks. In applying voluntary principles to social work, older Christian concepts such as “deaconry” and “home mission” were reinvigorated to connect the new expectations to the Christian tradition’s “past experiences.” While accepting the new liberal order and exploiting its possibilities for self-organizing, this moral elite showed a social-conservative concern for the victims of economic liberalization, and the various new concepts for religious social work were invested with expectations of a more efficient and moral poor relief. Distinct from individual benevolence and poor relief provided by the state, Christian relief for the poor would be able to strike the right balance between proximity and distance, between an overly individual relation with the poor and excessively formal state relief, both tending to undermine the morality of those in need. Christian relief based on voluntary principles would be able to maintain an individualized approach and in contrast to mere secular philanthropy would be able to care for the whole of man. As opposed to socialism, it would also secure a harmonious social body.

The Welfare State and Voluntarism: The 1933 Reform and Beyond

As social democracy rose to power and the state took over more social responsibilities, the concepts of voluntarism lost some of their counterconceptual potentials. The social reform of 1933 heralded an era in which the promises of voluntarism rang hollow. Conceptually, this meant a nuancing of the content to reflect the democratic and statist era, as well as a radicalization toward an ethics of conviction as voluntarism was relieved of the burden of judging the “deservingness” of recipients.

While voluntarism had been widely recognized as advantageous because of its combination of proximity and distance, which allowed for a rational and benevolent approach, it

was now increasingly seen as irrational, scattered, and demoralizing. The role of voluntarism in society was reevaluated at a time when the Social Democratic Party had become a governing party (first in 1924), and when the role of a new “workers’ culture” was a matter of intense debate between Marxist and reformist Social Democrats. K. K. Steincke (1880–1963), Social Democratic minister of justice (1924–1926, 1935–1939, 1950) and social affairs (1929–1935) was an influential voice in this debate on the reformist side. He did not believe in the laws of “scientific Marxism” that would supposedly bring about a new workers’ culture automatically. Rather, he adhered to a Christian and culturally conservative position. He believed that a new moral culture should be brought about by creating a social system that was rational and allowed the working class to achieve a moral superiority to the decadent bourgeoisie.⁶⁵ Steincke sought to bring about this more rational social system by way of the 1933 reform that systematized and centralized social services. Steincke was harsh in his criticism of private benevolence’s irrational compassion. He did not trust that privately organized benevolence was able to combine proximity and distance; it was rather entirely too close to provide a systematic and efficient solution to social problems.⁶⁶ Nonetheless, after negotiations with representatives of the Christian voluntary organizations, legislation passed with the 1933 reform recognized that “voluntary benevolent associations and institutions” (*frivillige velgørende Foreninger og Institutioner*) had a place in the public social system.⁶⁷ The role of benevolence would be limited to “special care” for the ill and disabled, instances of passing need, supplementing low income, providing help in kind rather than pecuniary help, and performing publicly funded tasks. In the eyes of the Social Democratic state administration, a rational public system and not religious voluntary organizations should educate the poor. Voluntary organizations were merely another kind of service provider.⁶⁸ They should only supplement the public system, be organized through

the municipalities, and be subject to public inspection when receiving public funding.⁶⁹ Whereas voluntarism in the previous century had been envisioned as the primary principle for provision of relief, it was now only to be used as an exception.

The expectations for voluntarism were tinted by the democratic and statist ideals of the era—also by religious philanthropic leaders. The central figure in Christian social work at this point, Alfred Th. Jørgensen, deployed “philanthropy” in 1939 as an overarching concept denoting social relief by voluntary groups and the state as well as secular and religious actors.⁷⁰ Voluntarism was the distinguishing mark of private philanthropy as it relied on voluntary forces (*frivillige kræfter*) and voluntary gifts (*frivillige gaver*): “Voluntarism is the strength and pride of private philanthropy” (*Frivilligheden er den private Filantropis Styrke og Smykke*).⁷¹ The strength of voluntarism as opposed to the public system was still its origin in individuals acting by their own volition. Jørgensen also continued to distance Christian philanthropy from secular philanthropy’s “natural compassion” targeting only “the good organism”, the personality, and the social body. In church philanthropy, natural compassion was strengthened by the love of one’s neighbor through God, and while it also aimed at creating good citizens, it had a higher aim: Jesus Christ as a personality ideal through which a spiritual force is conveyed to the sufferers. The two forms complemented each other in that civic philanthropy lacked spiritual force, while Christian philanthropy often lacked pecuniary means as well as knowledge of and influence on society.⁷²

Voluntarism’s decreased societal role meant that the concept was in a sense radicalized as Christian philanthropy was set free to pursue a “purer” form of relief. While Jørgensen believed that it remained important for philanthropists to do an individual assessment in order to be able to determine who was truly in need, only the outright swindler was not to be helped; the “lazy

worker” should be helped to find work.⁷³ Paradoxically, the rise of the social democratic state meant that Christian philanthropy could become more benevolent. While public philanthropy took care of the “distant” social justice, religious philanthropy could focus on the “proximity” of Christian love.

After 1945, the term “deaconry” was once again invoked explicitly in opposition to the use of “philanthropy.” “Philanthropy” was viewed by Jørgensen’s successor as leader of Cooperating Parish Charities as too generic. The Christian motive of neighborly love and the historical meaning of “deacon” as a servant should be emphasized, just as the connection between the gospel and deeds should be reestablished. This conceptual change was a way of distinguishing the social work of the church from that of the state as well as from new existentialist theological currents that emphasized individual faith rather than organized benevolence (Danish *Tidehverv*), but in all other respects, the content was the same: the dominant role of the state was recognized, and deaconry seen as a corrective based on personal commitment.⁷⁴

The social democratic era that the 1933 reform heralded meant a shift in the conditions for public legitimation. While the existential or spiritual dimension was still important in the eyes of benevolent Christians, this meant less in a public increasingly dominated by the secular Social Democrats and social liberals, and the experience of the Nazi-German occupation (1940–1945) finally established representative democracy as a universally acknowledged principle of government in Denmark. In 1956, leading religious philanthropist Westergaard Madsen went so far as to declare the welfare state a “God given arrangement” (*en Guds ordning*),⁷⁵ and he further referred to the so-called Beveridge report in stressing that through his sense of having a mission, the volunteer would inspire and elevate the democratic process.⁷⁶ In this way, Danish

voluntarism followed an international trend. In his report on voluntary action, W. H. Beveridge had made “the vigour and abundance of Voluntary Action outside one’s home . . . the distinguishing marks of a free society,” in contrast to a totalitarian society, where all such action is controlled by the state.⁷⁷ Beveridge shared this conviction with the liberal public intellectual from the United States Arthur Schlesinger, who in 1944, in his essay “Biography of a Nation of Joiners,” described the United States’ legacy of voluntary association in opposition to the totalitarian Axis powers.⁷⁸

Once a conservative-Christian counterconcept invested with expectations of differently organized poor relief, relying on a widely shared consensus on the beneficial role of privately organized benevolence as balancing proximity and distance in poor relief, voluntarism was now widely experienced as “too close” and designated a role as a service provider. Its proponents accepted the ancillary role; a role that in turn meant that the concept was infused with democratic ideals and a stronger ethics of conviction, where few would be denied help. This formed at the same time the initial steps toward a conceptual displacement where a “voluntary sector” would be shaped through the state’s legal recognition of voluntary benevolent organizations, a sector that builds on specific motives or inherent qualities in providing solutions to social problems. As I will show in the next section, this is the sector that is “discovered” decades later by the social sciences and politicians that seek to reinvigorate the welfare state.

The Rediscovery of Voluntarism in Politics and Public Sector Research in the 1970s

During the 1980s, history would repeat itself. As before, a wide political consensus embraced voluntary associations as closer to those in need and more flexible in their organization than the state. Once again, the moral elites—no longer the practitioner-priests, who had lost their central

social status, but the social scientists—imbued the concept with utopian hopes, but this time from the left rather than the right. And once again, these utopian hopes dwindled as voluntarism was assigned a role next to the state rather than ahead of it.

With the 1933 social reform, the historical clock had turned in favor of a centralized social system based on rights, and after World War II universal rights in various areas were introduced.⁷⁹ In the 1980s, however, several politicians and social science researchers came to see the rule based approach as an obstacle: social workers became bureaucrats and were unable to see the person behind the rules. The cool distance that Steincke had praised had now become a problem. Today, the Social Assistance Act of 1976 (*bistandsloven*) has gained symbolic status as the zenith and hubris of the generous Danish welfare state. The intention of the law was to reform the rights-based system by creating a more preventive, holistic, and needs-focused approach. This was done by increasing the discretion of the local authorities in authorizing social benefits so that the social system would be oriented toward the consequences of the rulings rather than solely their lawfulness—a kind of “generous means testing.” The role of case workers as the closest link to the client was strengthened and professionalized.⁸⁰ The reform was criticized from various camps almost from before its effectuation, and even by its own architects: it was too expensive, too ambitious, and had placed too much confidence in the social worker.⁸¹ The consensus that the existing social system was inadequate now emerged among politicians on both the left and the right as well as among public sector researchers. Tellingly, the OECD in 1980 hosted a conference with the ominous title “The Welfare State in Crisis.”⁸²

Once again, voluntarism was discovered as having the proximity and flexibility that the public system was not able to deliver. In Denmark, first the Social Democratic minister of social affairs, Ritt Bjerregaard, in 1981—and after her the conservative minister of social affairs, Palle

Simonsen in 1983—called for the involvement of local communities and voluntary organizations in social work. According to Bjerregaard, the current system had “encouraged isolation and loneliness,” and Simonsen stated that a continued expansion of the public system would lead to “alienation.”⁸³

Through a so-called contact committee, the state would now finance research on voluntary organizations and existing informal networks and support systems carried out by the Danish National Institute of Social Research (SFI). SFI was mainly tasked with researching social inequality and social policy and had played a central role in informing the expansion of the welfare system during the 1960s. On the backdrop of the perceived dual crisis of legitimacy and rising public expenses, SFI had itself started questioning this development in the 1970s.⁸⁴ Now, several reports were written in order to gain information on the dimensions, demography, and motivations of the volunteers and the voluntary organizations, as well as the interplay between informal and formal social assistance.⁸⁵

Two women, Merete Watt Boolsen and Ulla Habermann, pioneered the research in voluntarism in Denmark. Boolsen had done studies on the youth, social deviation, and narcotics use, while Habermann, with a background as a social worker and volunteer, had done case studies of voluntary organizations engaged in social work, as well as studies on “outreach” in public social work. This time, the inspiration for the elaborations on voluntarism came from the UK.⁸⁶ Again, in contrast to bureaucracy, voluntary associations’ flexibility and proximity were emphasized, for instance through their ability to be present after office hours. This time around, however, the associations’ advocacy role vis-à-vis the public system was added.⁸⁷

The conservatively laden concept of philanthropy was not applied by the researchers, who instead favored the left-leaning “network” concept. The voluntary network constituted a

“third network” next to the family and the state/public network.⁸⁸ “Network” was introduced in welfare research as a way of conceptualizing the varied social relations that enabled a person to overcome need. Not only the public support system, but also private relations—family, neighbors—and voluntary organizations could support people in need.⁸⁹ The idea of network organizing had its heyday in the 1980s where new forms of grass roots organizing and the new social movements developed. While the idea of voluntary involvement in social policy appealed broadly politically, network thinking was a thing of the political left. Habermann cited left-wing authors such as Herbert Marcuse in arguing for a larger involvement of the social network in social work, and further (by quoting a social worker) contrasted the social democratic and liberal-conservative idea of privatization with the left wing idea of a “counter-public” in which grassroots organizations focus on everyday life and the lifeworld and strive to free care work from the pacifying embrace of state institutions in order to self-organize.⁹⁰ The rediscovery of voluntarism and the informal resources echoed the Christian pioneers of the late nineteenth century insofar as the demoralizing effects of state involvement was emphasized and combined with an ambition to “enable” and foster a sense of autonomy. The networks approach was, however, embedded in a radical democratic project led not by the priest, but by the social worker, and supported not by the congregation, but by the wider network of neighbors and self-organizing groups.⁹¹

Habermann’s concept of the “third network” was mirrored by another conceptual displacement where voluntarism was not cast in the language of critical sociological theory, but in the language of mainstream social science as a “sector” with specific advantages and “failures.”⁹² Albeit reluctantly and explicating awareness of the problems of clear boundaries,⁹³ the idea of a sector was taken up as a way to describe its specific characteristics vis-à-vis the

welfare state. Kurt Klauudi Klausen was one of the pioneers in applying the term “voluntary sector,”⁹⁴ but did so within a Habermasian framework that cast the voluntary organizations as defenders of the lifeworld. A utopian role was thus still assigned to the sector. However, as the historical role of the sector became an object of research, a more temperate view emerged. The utopian hope that the voluntary sector would represent a counterweight to state colonization was now explicitly stated to be a myth, along with the idea that there once existed a voluntary sector unblemished by the state.⁹⁵ Klausen even used the phrase “reversed colonization” to indicate the influences of voluntary organizations on the state.⁹⁶ The temperate sector approach was to set the agenda for research in the 1990s and 2000s. Historical social science described the contingent relations between the state and the voluntary/third/nonprofit sector and provided periodizations, typologies, and developmental paths showing changing relations of consensus, conflict, dependence, and autonomy, as well as the voluntary organizations’ changing role as the welfare state developed.⁹⁷ The sector is now regularly monitored through surveys to establish if more or fewer people are volunteering, who the volunteers are, and what they volunteer for.⁹⁸ The theme of proximity and distance continues to be explored as voluntarism is said to constitute a specific “logic of proximity,”⁹⁹ and new technologies are seen to challenge conceptions of face-to-face interaction as central to voluntary practices.¹⁰⁰

History thus seems to repeat itself a hundred years after voluntarism was first put forward as a principle for social provision. Utopian hopes were again invested in the principle across the political spectrum, and in academia, the concept was rediscovered from a leftish position with the normative “network” counterconcept. This time, the concept cooled more quickly as it was tamed as part of a “sector” in society with a specific role vis-à-vis the state and as an autonomous field of study.

Conclusion

Voluntarism in the field of social work first emerged “in the shadow of the state,” as it were, as a novel principle and practice for organizing and a resource for collective action on the basis of a historically new situation where state-run poor relief was increasingly viewed as inadequate. It emerged through a host of normative counterconcepts—concepts used to infuse voluntary practices with expectations of a better society in contrast to other principles of organizing relief for the poor in the future. Such counterconcepts were first used by a moral elite consisting of conservative priests and revivalist laymen, using the associational freedoms of the liberal era: Christian traditions were revived through concepts such as “deaconry” and “mission” and explicitly contrasted to other principles of organizing to solve the social problem, such as secular philanthropy (unable to care for the whole of man), the “devil’s socialism” (destroying the social organism), and public relief (which was an inefficient, stigmatizing, and pacifying private initiative).

Throughout the following century, the theme of proximity and distance vis-à-vis the state would recur. The conservative Christian pioneers had discovered the congregation as an agent of social improvement and active engagement that in contrast to the state could strike the right balance between proximity and distance in social provision. During the middle of the twentieth century, as Social Democracy rose to power, voluntarism came to be viewed as entirely “too close” and irrational. While this development meant that the voluntary organizations lost their status as the core providers of social assistance, it also freed voluntarism from its “distancing” duties of discriminating between deserving and undeserving recipients. It was now free to be “very close”, to follow an ethics-of-conviction, and with the firm establishment of

parliamentarism after World War II, voluntarism was now even infused with a democratic spirit that it lacked entirely at its conservative Christian emergence. At the zenith of the Danish welfare state in the 1970s, the movement of the “spirit of voluntarism” would come full circle. From the early 1980s, the proximity of voluntarism was rediscovered and hailed by leftist social scientists, backed and funded by a broad political consensus that sought new solutions to social problems beyond the state, who saw in the “third network” a glimpse of utopia: a self-organizing society that defended the proximate lifeworld against the distant and pacifying state logic. State bureaucracy to this day seems to be the conceptual “other” of voluntarism—rather than secular “philanthropy” or the “Devil’s socialism” against which the conservative Christian pioneers saw voluntarism as a remedy.

While the utopian hopes invested in voluntarism as a panacea shifted politically from right to left between 1870 and 1970, another movement would repeat itself in much the same way in each of the two periods, namely the movement from “hot” utopian exhilaration to “cool” tempered evaluation. Just as the early “hot” hopes that voluntarism would strike the right balance between proximity and distance were tempered by the emergence of the early “cool” social state, so the leftist “hot” hopes of a self-organizing “third network” were tempered by the “cool” social science conceptualization of the “third sector”—a sector with certain characteristics and functions alongside, but not ahead of, the state.

“Proximity” is to this day widely regarded as the core of the concept of voluntarism in the field of social relief. Paradoxically, it seems that it is the welfare state that has allowed the concept to develop this “ethic-of-conviction” connotation, since it has relieved voluntarism of its distancing duties by assigning it an ancillary role. In a period of mobilization of voluntary forces for political purposes on the left and right, it remains to be seen if voluntarism will once again

become the central concept for expectations of a better future. Only future generations of conceptual historians will be able to tell which of the expectations connected to present voluntary practices will be realized or abandoned.

Anders Sevelsted is a historical sociologist concerned with the intersections of voluntarism and welfare state, elites and collective action. He is an Assistant Professor at the Copenhagen Business School, Dept. of Management, Politics, and Philosophy as well as a Postdoctoral Fellow at Lund University, School of Social Work. Email: ase.mpp@cbs.dk.

¹ Elith Olesen, *Diakonien i kirkens historie* [Deaconry in the History of the Church] (Frimodt, 1976); Elith Olesen, "Blev Harald Steins Program Gennemført?" [Was Harald Stein's Program implemented?], in *Årbog (Den Danske Diakonissestiftelse)* (Den Danske Diakonissestiftelse, 1964), 5–34; Elith Olesen, *De Frigjorte Og Trællefølket* [The Emancipated and the Slaves] (Frederiksberg: Forl. ANIS, 1996); Liselotte Malmgart, "*Ingen Skal Gå Sulten i Seng*" [No one should go to Bed hungry] (Valby: Samvirkende Menighedsplejer, 2002).

² Inger Lyngdrup Nørgård, "Beskyt de Værdige Fattige!" [Protect the Deserving Poor!] (Ph.D. diss., Syddansk Universitet, 2015); Tinne Vammen, "Ømme Punkter" [Sore Spots] *Den Jyske Historiker* 67 (1994): 17–37.

³ Nina Javette Koefoed, "Performing Male Political Citizenship: Local Philanthropy as an Arena for Practicing and Negotiating Citizenship in Late Nineteenth-Century Denmark," in *Gender in Urban Europe : Sites of Political Activity and Citizenship, 1750–1900*, ed. Krista Crowman, Nina Javette Koefoed, and Åsa Karlsson Sjögren, vol. 19 (New York: Routledge, 2014); Jørn Henrik Petersen, "Ti Mænd, Der Satte En Dagsorden" [Ten Men with an Agenda] *Kirkehistoriske Samlinger* (2016): 183–223.

⁴ Klaus Petersen, ed., *13 Historier Om Den Danske Velfærdsstat* [13 Stories about the Danish Welfare State] (Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2003); Jens Holger Schjørring, ed., *Velfærdsstat og kirke* (Copenhagen: Anis, 2005); Nils Gunder Hansen, Jørn Henrik Petersen, and Klaus Petersen, eds., *I Himlen Således Også På Jorden?* [As in Heaven, so on Earth] (Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2010); Jørn Henrik Petersen, Klaus Petersen, and Søren Kolstrup, “Autonomy, Cooperation or Colonization? Christian Philanthropy and State Welfare in Denmark,” *Journal of Church and State* 56, no. 1 (March 1, 2014): 81–104.

⁵ Karin Lützen, *Byen tæmmes* [Taming the City] (Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel, 1998); Karin Lützen, “Benevolent Societies and Homes in 19th-Century Copenhagen,” in *The Welfare State: Past, Present, Future*, ed. Henrik Jensen (Pisa: Edizione Plus, 2002).

⁶ Kaspar Villadsen, *Det sociale arbejdes genealogi* [A Genealogy of Social Work] (Hans Reitzel, 2007), 118.

⁷ Merete Watt Boolsen, *Frivillige i Socialt Arbejde* [Volunteers in Social Work] Rapport, 88:2 (Copenhagen: Socialforskningsinstituttet, 1988); Ulla Habermann, “En postmoderne helgen?” [A Post Modern Saint?] (Museum Tusulanum, 2007); Ulla Habermann, *Det Tredie Netværk* [The third Network] (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1990); Kurt Klaudi Klausen and Per Selle, eds., *Frivillig Organisering i Norden* [Voluntary Organizing in the Nordics] (Oslo: Jurist- og økonomiforbundets forlag, 1995); Kurt Klaudi Klausen, “Private Welfare Provision,” in *Welfare Administration in Denmark*, ed. Tim Knudsen (Copenhagen: Institute of Political Science, University of Copenhagen, 1991), 243–270; Kurt Klaudi Klausen, *Changes towards State and Market in the Voluntary Sector*, COS Forskningsrapport, 1988:3 (Copenhagen: Copenhagen School of Economics and Social Science 1988); Anders La Cour, *Frivillighedens Logik Og Dens Politik* [The Logic and Politics of Voluntarism] (Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur, 2014);

Elisabeth Toft Rasmussen and Inger Koch-Nielsen, eds., *Den Tredje Sektor under Forandring* [The transforming Third Sector], Socialforskningsinstituttet, 96:15 (Copenhagen: Socialforskningsinstituttet, 1996); Lars Skov Henriksen and Peter Bundesen, “The Moving Frontier in Denmark: Voluntary-State Relationships since 1850,” *Journal of Social Policy* 33, no. 4 (October 2004): 605–625; Lars Skov Henriksen, Steven Rathgeb Smith, and Annette Zimmer, “At the Eve of Convergence? Transformations of Social Service Provision in Denmark, Germany, and the United States,” *VOLUNTAS* 23, no. 2 (2012): 458–501.

⁸ Helmut K. Anheier and Martin Knapp, “Voluntas: An Editorial Statement,” *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 1, no. 1 (1990): 1–12, here 1.

⁹ Torben Fridberg and Lars Skov Henriksen, *Udviklingen i frivilligt arbejde 2004–2012* [Developments in Voluntary Work 2004-2012] (Copenhagen: SFI, 2014), 29, 38.

¹⁰ V. Heins, “Civil Society’s Barbarisms,” *European Journal of Social Theory* 7, no. 4 (November 1, 2004): 499–517. Hans Joas, “Gemeinschaft Und Demokratie in Den USA,” in *Gemeinschaft Und Gerechtigkeit* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1993), 49–62.

¹¹ Manfred Riedel, “Gesellschaft, Bürgerliche,” in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe; Historisches Lexikon Zur Politisch-Sozialen Sprache in Deutschland. Bd. 1: A–D*, ed. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Reinhart Koselleck (Stuttgart: Klett, 1975), 719–800.

¹² Reinhart Koselleck, “Linguistic Change and the History of Events,” *The Journal of Modern History* 61, no. 4 (1989): 657.

¹³ Reinhart Koselleck, ““Space of Experience” and “Horizon of Expectation”: Two Historical Categories,” in *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. Keith Tribe (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 255–276.

¹⁴ Reinhart Koselleck, “Die Geschichte der Begriffe und Begriffe der Geschichte,” in *Begriffsgeschichten: Studien zur Semantik und Pragmatik der politischen und sozialen Sprache* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2010), 68.

¹⁵ Reinhart Koselleck, “Die Verzeitlichung der Begriffe,” in *Begriffsgeschichten: Studien zur Semantik und Pragmatik der politischen und sozialen Sprache* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2010), 82; Jussi Kurunmäki and Jani Marjanen, “Isms, Ideologies and Setting the Agenda for Public Debate,” *Journal of Political Ideologies* 23, no. 3 (September 2, 2018): 256–282.

¹⁶ Reinhart Koselleck, “Begriffsgeschichte and Social History,” in *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. Keith Tribe (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 88.

¹⁷ Reinhart Koselleck, “The Historical-Political Semantics of Asymmetric Counterconcepts,” in *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. Keith Tribe (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 155–192.

¹⁸ Anders Ludvig Sevelsted, “Den Moralske Elite Og Velfærdens” [The Moral Elite and Welfare] *Årsskrift / Carlsbergfondet*, 2019, 64–67.

¹⁹ Harald Høffding (1843–1931), professor of philosophy, University of Copenhagen (1883–1915). Rasmus Nielsen (1809–1884), professor of philosophy, University of Copenhagen (1841–1883).

²⁰ Vilhelm Munck (1833–1913), priest, co-founder of Christianshavn’s Benevolent Society. J. C. Holck (1824–1899), priest, co-founder of Christianshavn’s Benevolent Society

²¹ Harald Stein, priest at Diakonissestiftelsen (1872–1880) and head of the Copenhagen Home Mission (1879–1886). Also associated: Vilhelm Munck, N. C. Dalhoff (see next footnote)

²² N. C. Dalhoff (1843–1927), board member of the Stefanus Association (from 1899), priest at Sct. Hans asylum for the insane and *Diakonissestiftelsen* (1880–1913).

²³ J. F. Hansen (1865–1905), priest, active in causes such as the congregation care movement, Sunday schools, bible reading classes, and erection of missionary chapels. Co-founder of the Church Foundation.

²⁴ H. Westergaard (1853–1936), revivalist, statistician, and political economist, was involved in a number of charities as well as the Copenhagen Home Mission. H. O. Lange (1821–1912), revivalist, Egyptologist, and librarian, active in a number of social initiatives related to the Home Mission circles. Also affiliated: Harald Stein (see above), J. F. Hansen (see above).

²⁵ Affiliated: Westergaard, Lange, Hansen.

²⁶ H. G. Saabye (1838–1919), active in the temperance cause discussions. Several of the other figures presented here, also took part in the Bethesda meetings.

²⁷ Alfred Th. Jørgensen (1874–1953): Theologian, leader of Cooperating Parish Charities (1902–1939), and active in what is now known as the Danish Church Relief (Folkekirkens Nødhjælp). Willy Westergaard Madsen (1907–1995) Priest, leading member of *The National Church's Philanthropic union* and leader of Cooperating Parish Charities after Jørgensen (1943–60).

²⁸ On issues related to translating historical concepts, see Margrit Pernau, “Whither Conceptual History? From National to Entangled Histories,” *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 7, no. 1 (January 1, 2012): 1–11.

²⁹ Rudi Thomsen f. 1918, *Den Almindelige Værnepligts Gennembrud i Danmark* [The Breakthrough of the Military Draft in Denmark] (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1949).

³⁰ In 1887, Danish Professor of philosophy Harald Høffding saw *Voluntarisme* (an Anglicism) as the future organization of the Danish church, where church and state would be separated further. Like the Anglican church, the Danish church would rely on “voluntary forces” (*frivillige kræfter*). Harald Høffding, *Etik* [Ethics] (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1887), 322.

³¹ For a review of these Christian philanthropists’ thoughts on poverty relief, see Petersen, “Ti Mænd, Der Satte En Dagsorden,” 183–223.

³² H. O. Lange, “Brev Af 20. 21. August 1887,” [Letter of August 20, 21, 1887] in *H.O. Lange: En Mindebog*, ed. P. Helweg Larsen (Copenhagen: P. Haase & Søn, 1955), 165–166.

³³ Julius Steen and Henrik Hoffmeyer, *Kirkelig Forening for Indre Mission I København 1865–1915* [The Home Mission’s Ecclesial Association 1865-1915] (Copenhagen: Bethesda, 1915), 86.

³⁴ Olesen, *De Frigjorte Og Trællefolket*, 271.

³⁵ Harald Stein, *Hvad Vil Den Indre Mission?* [What does the Home Mission want?] (1876; 3rd ed., Copenhagen: Indre Missions Boghandel, 1882), 17.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 12–14.

³⁷ Ove Korsgaard f. 1942, *Folk* [People], *Tænkepauser*, 7 (Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 2013), 31–33.

³⁸ Lützen, *Byen tæmmes*.

³⁹ Hans Martensen, *Socialisme Og Christendom* [Socialism and Christianity] (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1874).

⁴⁰ Henrik Gade Jensen, *Menneskekærlighedens værk* [A Thing of Human Love] (Copenhagen: Cepos, 2011), 49; Nørgård, “Beskyt de Værdige Fattige!”

-
- ⁴¹ Rasmus Nielsen, “Om Menneskekærlighed,” [On Human Love] in *Tidsskrift for Filantropi* 1, no. 1, 1877.
- ⁴² Høffding, *Etik*, 331–332.
- ⁴³ N. C. Dalhoff, *Gak Hen Og Gør Du Ligesaa!* [Go, and do thou likewise!] (Odense: Milo, 1900), 142–150; 192–194.
- ⁴⁴ Stein, *Hvad Vil Den Indre Mission?*, 157–158.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 12ff.
- ⁴⁶ J. C. Holck, *Om Godgjørenhed Og Frivilligt Fattigvæsen i Kjøbenhavn* [On Benevolence and Voluntary Poor Relief] (Copenhagen: Thaning & Appel, 1869), 9–10.
- ⁴⁷ Dalhoff, *Gak Hen Og Gør Du Ligesaa!*, 134–135.
- ⁴⁸ Vilhelm Munck, *Om Fattigdommen i Kjøbenhavn* [On Poverty in Copenhagen] (Copenhagen: Den Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1869), 68–69, 78–79.
- ⁴⁹ Christianshavns Understøttelsesforening, “Meddelelser Om Christianshavns Understøttelsesforening” [Announcements from the Benevolent Society of Christianshavn] 1866, 13.
- ⁵⁰ I. C. Holck, *Om Godgjørenhed Og Frivilligt Fattigvæsen I Kjøbenhavn*, 2–3.
- ⁵¹ Vilhelm Munck, *Om Fattigdommen I Kjøbenhavn*, 78.
- ⁵² Dalhoff, *Gak Hen Og Gør Du Ligesaa!*; Stein, *Hvad Vil Den Indre Mission?*
- ⁵³ Dalhoff, *Gak Hen Og Gør Du Ligesaa!*.
- ⁵⁴ Olesen, “Blev Harald Steins Program Gennemført?”
- ⁵⁵ Nielsen, “Om Menneskekærlighed” [On Human Love].
- ⁵⁶ Høffding, *Etik*, 323–31.

-
- ⁵⁷ Harald George Saabye, “Foredrag Ved Det Kirkelige Møde I Kjøbenhavn, Den 25de–27de Maj 1886,” [Lecture given at the Ecclesial Meeting in Copenhagen, 25-27 May 1886] in *Beretning Om Det Kirkelige Møde I Kjøbenhavn, Den 25de–27de Maj 1886*, ed. Johan Clausen (Copenhagen: Universitetsboghandler G. E. C. Gad, 1886), 51–61, here 58–59.
- ⁵⁸ Julius Friis Hansen, *De Nødlidende Og Folkekirken* [Suffering and the National Church] (Copenhagen: Konrad Jørgensens Forlag, 1888), 13f, 47f.
- ⁵⁹ Dalhoff, *Gak Hen Og Gør Du Ligesaa!*, 194.
- ⁶⁰ Stein, *Hvad Vil Den Indre Mission?*, 62.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 180.
- ⁶² Dalhoff, *Gak Hen Og Gør Du Ligesaa!*, 25.
- ⁶³ Stein, *Hvad Vil Den Indre Mission?*, 82; Harald Westergaard, “Foredrag Ved Det Kirkelige Møde I Kjøbenhavn, Den 25de–27de Maj 1886,” [Lecture given at the Ecclesial Meeting in Copenhagen, 25-27 May 1886] in *Beretning Om Det Kirkelige Møde I Kjøbenhavn, Den 25de–27de Maj 1886*, ed. Johan Clausen (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1886), 95–107, here 97.
- ⁶⁴ See Lars Schädler Andersen, *Balancekunstneren* [The Acrobat] (Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2012), 32–37; 271–274.
- ⁶⁵ K. K. Steincke, *Kulturbetragtninger* [Considerations on Culture] (Copenhagen: De socialdemokratiske diskussionsklubber og socialdemokratisk Ungdomsforbund, 1912); Carl Erik Bay, *Socialdemokratiets Stilling i Den Ideologiske Debat i Mellemkrigstiden* [The Position of the Social-Democratic Party in the Interwar ideological Debate] (Forlaget GMT, 1973), 18–40, 145–157; Anders Sevelsted, “Degeneration, Protestantism, and Social Democracy: The Case of Alcoholism and 'Illiberal' Policies and Practices in Denmark 1900–43,” *Social Science History* 43, no. 1 (2019): 87–111.

-
- ⁶⁶ K. K. Steincke, *Fremtidens Forsørgelsesvæsen* [The Future of the Public Relief System] (Copenhagen: Schultz, 1920), 45–49.
- ⁶⁷ Liselotte Malmgart, “Folkekirken Og Steincke” [The National Church and Steincke], in *Velfærdsstat Og Kirke*, ed. Jens Holger Schjørring and Jens Torkild Bak (Copenhagen: Anis, 2005), 53–67, here 58.
- ⁶⁸ K. K. Steincke, *Samarbejdet Mellem Den Offentlige Forsorg Og Den Frivillige Velgørelse* [Cooperation between Public relief and voluntary Charity] (Copenhagen: Folkekirkeligt Filantropisk Forbund, 1935), 5–7.
- ⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 12–14.
- ⁷⁰ Alfred Th. Jørgensen, *Filantropi* [Philanthropy] (Copenhagen: Lohse, 1939).
- ⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 65.
- ⁷² *Ibid.*, 65–70.
- ⁷³ *Ibid.*, 186.
- ⁷⁴ Malmgart, “*Ingen Skal Gå Sulten I Seng*”, 73–74.
- ⁷⁵ Liselotte Malmgart, “Frivillig Næstekærlighed Og Tvungen Velfærd” [Voluntary Neighborly Love and Forced Welfare] in *I Himlen Således Også På Jorden?*, ed. Nils Gunder Hansen, Jørn Henrik Petersen, and Klaus Petersen (Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2010), 57.
- ⁷⁶ Malmgart, “*Ingen Skal Gå Sulten I Seng*”, 63.
- ⁷⁷ William Beveridge, *Voluntary Action: A Report on Method of Social Advance*, The Works of William H. Beveridge, vol. 3 (London: Routledge, 1948), 10.
- ⁷⁸ Arthur M. Schlesinger, “Biography of a Nation of Joiners,” *The American Historical Review* 50, no. 1 (October 1944): 1–25, here 25.

⁷⁹ Søren Kolstrup, “Fra Kommunesocialisme Til Velfærdsstat I Danmark,” [From Municipal Socialism to Welfare State in Denmark] *Social Kritik* 9, no. 49 (1997): 9–49, here 12.

⁸⁰ See Niels Åkerstrøm Andersen, “The World as Will and Adaptation: The Interdiscursive Coupling of Citizens’ Contracts,” *Critical Discourse Studies* 5, no. 1 (2008): 4–11.

⁸¹ Bent Rold Andersen, *Two Essays on the Nordic Welfare State* (Copenhagen: Amtskommunernes og kommunernes forskningsinstitut, 1983); Bent Rold Andersen, “Rationality and Irrationality of the Nordic Welfare State,” *Daedalus* 113, no. 1 (1984): 109–139; Tim Knudsen, *Hvorfor Gik Det Galt Med Bistandsloven?* [Where did it go wrong with the law on Social Support?] (Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, 1985).

⁸² OECD, *The Welfare State in Crisis : An Account of the Conference on Social Policies in the 1980s : OECD, Paris, 20–23 October 1981 I. E. 1980* (Paris: OECD, 1981).

⁸³ Merete Watt Boolsen, *Frivillige I Socialt Arbejde*, 35; Ritt Bjerregaard, “Socialministerens Tale,” [The Social Minister’s Speech] in *Forsøg, Eksperimenter, Fornyelse, Nytænkning* (Copenhagen: Socialministeriet, 1981), 1–5, here 2. See also (Bjerregaard 1982). See (Villadsen 2007) for a Foucauldian perspective on this development.

⁸⁴ Gunnar Thorlund Jepsen, Gunnar Viby Mogensen, and Erik Jørgen Hansen, *Drømmen Om Velfærdssamfundet* [The Welfare Society Dream] (Copenhagen: Det danske Forlag, 1974).

⁸⁵ Boolsen, *Frivillige I Socialt Arbejde*; Ulla Habermann and Ingrid Parsby, *Myter Og Realiteter I Det Frivillige Sociale Arbejde* [Myth and Reality in Voluntary Social Work] (Copenhagen: Kontaktudvalget til det frivillige sociale arbejde, Socialministeriet, 1987); Mogens Kjær Jensen et al., *Sociale Netværk Og Socialpolitik* [Social Networks and Social Policy] (Copenhagen: SFI, 1987); Kirsten Just Jeppesen and Dorte Høeg, *Private Hjælpeorganisationer* [Private Aid Organizations] (Copenhagen: SFI, 1987).

⁸⁶ Georgina Brewis and Anjelica Finnegan, “Volunteering England,” *Contemporary British History* 26, no. 1 (2012): 119–128, here 121.

⁸⁷ Boolsen, *Frivillige I Socialt Arbejde*.

⁸⁸ Habermann, *Det Tredie Netværk*; Habermann and Parsby, *Myter Og Realiteter I Det Frivillige Sociale Arbejde*, 50.

⁸⁹ Habermann, *Det Tredie Netværk*, 29–30; Jensen et al., *Sociale Netværk Og Socialpolitik*, 56–58; Jepsen, Mogensen, and Hansen, *Drømmen Om Velfærdssamfundet*, 62.

⁹⁰ Habermann, *Det Tredie Netværk*, 28–29, 60–62.

⁹¹ In the United States, a similar development took place. Since the early 1970s, David Horton Smith had been inquiring into the possibilities of a future self-organized “voluntary society.” David H. Smith, “Major Analytical Topics of Voluntary Action Theory and Research: Version 2,” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 1, no. 1 (1972): 6–19.

⁹² L. M. Salamon, “Of Market Failure, Voluntary Failure, and Third-Party Government: Toward a Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State,” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 16, no. 1–2 (1987): 29–49.

⁹³ See e.g. Stein Kuhnle and Per Selle, eds., *Government and Voluntary Organizations: A Relational Perspective* (Aldershot: Avebury, 1992), 7.

⁹⁴ Kurt Klaudi Klausen, *Per Ardua Ad Astra*, Odense University Studies in History and Social Sciences, vol. 106 (Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag, 1988); Kurt Klaudi Klausen, *Changes towards State and Market in the Voluntary Sector* (Copenhagen: Copenhagen School of Economics and Social Science, 1988), 7.

⁹⁵ Klausen and Selle, *Frivillig Organisering I Norden*, 19–20.

⁹⁶ Kurt Klaudi Klausen, “Private Welfare Provision,” in *Welfare Administration in Denmark*, ed. Tim Knudsen (Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, 1991), 243–270.

⁹⁷ Klausen and Selle, *Frivillig Organisering I Norden*, 17–18; Bundesen, Henriksen, and Jørgensen, *Filantropi, Selvhjælp Og Interesseorganisering*, 24–28.

⁹⁸ Thomas P. Boje and Bjarne Ibsen, *Frivillighed Og Nonprofit I Danmark* [Voluntarism and Nonprofit in Denmark], Socialforskningsinstituttet 06:18 (Copenhagen: Socialforskningsinstituttet, 2006); Thomas Boje, Bjarne Ibsen, and Torben Fridberg, *Den frivillige sektor i Danmark* [The Voluntary Sector in Denmark] (Copenhagen: Socialforskningsinstituttet, 2006); Fridberg and Skov Henriksen, *Udviklingen i frivilligt arbejde 2004–2012*.

⁹⁹ La Cour, *Frivillighedens Logik Og Dens Politik*.

¹⁰⁰ Ane Grubb, “Vi Skal Bare Hjælpe Og Spise Chokoladekiks” [We are here to help and to eat Chocolate Chip Cookies], (Aalborg: Aalborg Universitetsforlag, 2016).