#### Table A1: Data sources and descriptive statistics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Source | Number of observations | Minimum | Average | Maximum |
| Social rental housing rate, % | own calculations, including interpolation | 3,050 | 0 | 19.7 | 83.1 |
| Growth of real per-capita GDP, % | Maddison Project Database (https://www.rug.nl/ggdc/historicaldevelopment/maddison/releases/maddison-project-database-2020) | 8,901 | -94.8 | 2.1 | 100.8 |
| Population size, million persons | Maddison Project Database (https://www.rug.nl/ggdc/historicaldevelopment/maddison/releases/maddison-project-database-2020) | 9,821 | 0.1 | 37.5 | 1,385.4 |
| Completed dwellings-to-population ratio, dwellings per 1000 persons | (Kohl 2020) | 3,353 | 0.02 | 5.7 | 30.6 |
| Population-to-housing stock ratio, persons per dwelling | (Cui and Kohl 2022) | 2,117 | 1.7 | 3.4 | 12.3 |
| Social expenditure-to-GDP ratio, % | OECD (https://stats.oecd.org/) | 2,738 | 0 | 10.8 | 31.9 |
| Long-term interest rate, % | Macrohistory database and OECD | 2,795 | -0.3 | 6.3 | 209.6 |
| Public debt-to-GDP ratio | Macrohistory database | 6,708 | 0 | 51.8 | 1624 |
| Left-right head of government (3 values: left, center, and right) | (Brambor and Lindvall 2018) | 3,594 | -1 | 0.2 | 1 |
| Rental control index (0, if there is no rent control, 1, if rent control is very strong and omnipresent) | (Kholodilin 2020) | 13,786 | 0 | 0.5 | 1 |
| First generation of rent control (if rents are set by special bodies and are frozen) | (Kholodilin 2020) | 13,786 | 0 | 0.5 | 1 |
| Second generation of rent control (if rent increases not exceeding inflation rate are allowed) | (Kholodilin 2020) | 13,786 | 0 | 0.1 | 1 |
| Rental market regulation index (simple average of rent control and tenure security indices) | (Kholodilin 2020) | 13,786 | 0 | 0.4 | 0.9 |

#### Table A2: Country-specific definition and sources

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Country | Definition | Source |
| Australia | Public authorities, co-operatives, community and church organizations | Census data |
| Austria | Local authorities, other public bodies, housing associations | Census data (Häuser- und Wohnungszählungen) |
| Belgium | Public authorities, eligible housing association | Census data (recensement), Statbel |
| Bulgaria | Public authorities | 1) 1975, 1985, and 1992: Boyan Zahariev, Dyliana Giteva, and Ilko Yordanov (2014) TENLAW: Tenancy Law and Housing Policy in Multi-level Europe. National Report for Bulgaria, p. 17; 2) 1995-2019: Communication per e-mail with Boyana Ivanova of National Statistical Institute of Bulgaria |
| Canada | Eligible social housing under CMCH programs excluding entrepreneurial, rent assistance and On-reserve | Suttor, Greg (2016). Still Renovating: A History of Canadian Social Housing Policy, McGill Queens Press, p. XXX; Social and Affordable Housing Survey (Canada) |
| Denmark | Non-profit, state and municipal rentals | Jensen, L. 2013. Varför så olika? Nordisk bostadspolitik i jämförande historiskt ljus. In Danmark – lokal boendedemokrati och nationell korporatism, eds. B. Bengtsson, E. Annaniassen, L. Jensen, H. Ruonavaara & J.R. Sveinsson, 49-117. Malmö, Égalité. |
| England and Wales | Local authorities, housing associations, other public authorities | Holmans, A.E. (2005). Historical Statistics of Housing in Britain, Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research, p. 130 and 133; Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (Great Britain) |
| Finland | State-supported rentals | Ruonavaara, H. 2006. Finland – den dualistiska bostadsregimen och jakten på det sociala. Malmö, Égalité. |
| France | Municipal, cooperative rental (HLM) | Housing surveys (Enquête de logement) |
| Whole Germany and West Germany  East Germany | Public authorities, co-operatives, publicly subsidized providers  State and cooperative rentals | Census data (Gebäude und Wohnungszählungen) + Allbus-survey data (post 1984)  Census data of the GDR + Allbus-survey data post-1990 |
| Hungary | Nationalized rental housing under communism | Census 1990  Központi Statisztikai Hivatal - Summary tables (STADAT) - Time series of annual data - Housing and public utilities |
| Iceland | Municipal rental housing (Félagsbústaðir in Reykjavik) | Rannsóknarnefnd Alþingis 2013, Skýrsla rannsóknarnefndar Alþingis um Íbúðalánasjóð o.fl., Reykjavik |
| Ireland | Local authorities, voluntary bodies | Census data; Norris, Michelle (2016). Property, Family and the Irish Welfare State, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, p. 128 |
| Japan | Local governments, urban renaissance agencies, public corporations | Housing and Land Survey (Japan) |
| Nether-  lands | Housing associations, local authorities | Census data; Statistics Netherlands, Haffner et al. (2009). Bridging the gap between social and market rented housing in six European countries?, IOS Press, p. 207. |
| Norway | Local authorities | Stamsø, Mary Ann (2014). Norway, in Crook, Tony/Kemp, Peter A. (Ed.). Private Rental Housing. Comparative Perspectives, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 125-147, p. 129 |
| Poland | Local authorities | 1) In 1995-2018: Personal e-mail communication with Jakub Bellok from Główny Urząd Statystyczny; 2) in 1988: Census 1988 "Warunki mieszkaniowe: Polska / [oprac. pod kier. Bronisławy Ratajczak] ; Główny Urząd Statystyczny. [Departament Spisów i Badań Masowych]." Tab. 2(12), p. 55; 3) in 1978: Census 1978 "Warunki mieszkaniowe. Z. 200/I. Polska. Warszawa : GUS, 1980", Tab. 3.3; in 1970: Census 1970 "Zasoby i warunki mieszkaniowe : Polska : wyniki ostateczne. Z. nr 19, Mieszkania i budynki / Główny Urząd Statystyczny. Biuro Spisów." Tab. 9, p. 110; 5) in 1960: Census 1960 "Mieszkania, budynki mieszkalne : Polska : Spis Powszechny z dnia 6 grudnia 1960 r. : wyniki ostateczne / Główny Urząd Statystyczny Polskiej Rzeczypospolitej Ludowej", Tab. 20, p. 26 or p. XXXII. |
| Scotland | Local authorities, housing associations | Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (Great Britain) |
| Serbia | Non-private dwellings | Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia |
| Slovenia | Public authorities | Erna Miklič (Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia*)* |
| Slovakia | Non-private and non-co-operative ownership; 2011: Local authorities | Statistial Office of the Slovak Republic |
| Sweden | Non-profit rentals | Bengtsson, B. 2006. Sverige - kommunal allmännytta och korporativa särintressen. Malmö, Égalité. |
| Soviet Republics | Share of state (государственный) and municipal (муниципальный) housing stock, before 1980s urban averages | 1) SSSR. 1982. Narodnoe hozyaystvo, 1922-1982. Moscow; 2) Azerbaijan - State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan; 3) Belarus - Belstat; 4) Estonia - Statistics Estonia; 5) Georgia - National Statistics Office of Georgia; 6) Kazakhstan - Agency of Kazakhstan of Statistics; 7) Kyrgyzstan - National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic; 8) Latvia - Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia; 9) Moldova - National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova; 10) Russia - Rosstat; 11) Ukraine - Ukrstat. |
| Spain | Subsidized rent units | Donner, Christian (2000). Wohnungspolitiken in der Europäischen Union: Theorie und Praxis, p. 275; National Statistics Institute (Spain) |
| Switzer-  land | Public authorities, co-operatives (private providers are missing) | Census data; Federal Statistical Office (Switzerland); Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Statistik und Volkswirtschaft (Ed.) (1955). Handbuch der Volkswirtschaft, Band 2, Benteli-Verlag Bern, p. 634. |
| USA | Public authorities, government subsidized | American Housing Survey (USA) |

##### Australia

Whereas by the end of the nineteenth century, a (thin) majority of Australians resided in market rented housing which was often precarious and dominated by private landlords and finance institutions, homeowners were already in the lead by the 1920s. The ideal of owner occupation was visible in the first social housing initiatives as well, most of which consisted of forms of social homeownership. Government support for social rental housing emerged — as in other non-European English-speaking countries — during the 1930s in the wake of the housing shortage caused by the Great Depression. The Housing Trust of the South Australian Government in 1937 marked the introduction of national public housing systems. But it is the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement of 1945 that is commonly associated with the beginning of the golden era of social housing. Decent housing, provided by public authorities and often of mediocre quality, was mostly built for modest-income workers (in employment), while the poorest were left to market rentals (Hayward 1996). Legislation and the ideal of homeownership ensured that public housing has never grown beyond a residual role. Public housing was never intended as an alternative to homeownership but rather as a second-best option for low-income families. High levels of public housing expansion were further prevented by the 1956 Commonwealth State Housing Agreement, which encouraged the sale of public housing as a means of promoting homeownership. Since the 1960s, the distribution between tenures has been fairly stable by international standards, with homeownership accounting for about 70 percent (Hulse 2014). Nevertheless, financialization, deregulation, as well as a shift from supply to demand subsidies led to residualization since the 1980s. Social housing fell by a quarter to about 4 percent and has been increasingly allocated to the poor. At the same time, private renting rose from 20 percent to 25 percent. However, since the Financial Crisis 2008–2009, housing policy has regained in importance. Social rented rental in Australia is mainly provided by public authorities, although in recent decades community or non-profit organizations have increasingly emerged (Yates 2013).

##### Austria

In the nineteenth century, philanthropic groups and employers built the first housing for the working class, and the first building cooperatives were founded (Fuchs and Mickel 2008). Eventually, at the beginning of the 20th century, early social housing acts were passed.[[1]](#footnote-1) Furthermore, in the wake of the crisis of World War I, public authorities intervened in the housing market. However, the first major support of public social housing originated from initiatives at the municipal level (Bauer 1993). After winning the elections in Vienna, the Social Democrats built thousands of public housing properties as part of a local housing promotion program which constituted a key element of the welfare program of Red Vienna’s municipal socialism in 1918–1934 (Reinprecht 2014). After World War II, a new era of federal housing promotion was initiated. The postwar period saw the start of large-scale housing programs as an important pillar of the emerging national welfare state. Given the destruction caused by the war, initially priority was given to quantitative reconstruction. Between 1948 and 1954, the legal foundations were laid for the promotion of both owner-occupied homes and social rented housing (*Bundes-Wohn- und Siedlungsfonds* in 1948e, *Wohnhaus-Wiederaufbaufonds* in 1948, *Wohnbaufördergesetz* in 1954). Independent non-profit organizations such as housing cooperatives and associations became key providers of social housing. In the 1950s, the share of public authorities in the construction of new social housing was around one-third, but it declined over time. From 1968 and increasingly from the 1980s onward, housing policy was increasingly regionalized and deregulated, and market-based solutions gained in importance. In the early 2000s, following trends in other countries, housing policy was liberalized under the right-wing government and public-private partnerships began to gain in importance. However, in Austria, housing assistance continues to be an important pillar of the welfare state. In the 2010s, about four out of five new dwellings were still supported directly or indirectly by public subsidies. The social housing sector accounts for more than half of all rented housing (Donner 2000; Reinprecht 2014).

##### *Belgium*

Since the nineteenth century, Belgium’s housing policy has been strongly oriented toward the promotion of homeownership and has favored the construction of single-family houses in rural and semi-urban areas and decentralized residential development (Smets 1977). Liberal-conservative policies in favor of homeownership have been much more powerful in Belgium than social-democratic policies in favor of social housing (Puissant 2008). During the nineteenth century, employers and philanthropic groups as well as some municipalities built the first workers’ housing units on a small scale. Housing policy at the state level emerged with the Housing Act of 1889,[[2]](#footnote-2) which mainly aimed to promote homeownership for the working class (de Meulder 1988). The 1919 Act increased intervention in the housing market with the creation of the *Société nationale des habitants et logements à bon marché* (SNHLBM), which supported not only homeownership but also the construction of low-income housing.[[3]](#footnote-3) The social housing units were mainly built and managed by local authorities, cooperatives, and private organizations. However, as early as 1922, state support was strongly reduced and priority was once again given to homeownership (Van den Eeckhout 1992). After the turmoil of World War II, governmental support was again directed toward single-family owner-occupied dwellings. Furthermore, starting in 1949, the SNHLBM was reactivated to promote social housing. However, housing shortages among the poorest remained unresolved (Puissant 2008). In the 1970s and 1980s, Belgium’s housing policy was restructured and federalized. The economic crisis during the 1980s led to a severe housing crisis. As a consequence, support for social housing was strongly reduced, giving rise to the emergence and institutionalization of grassroots organizations such as social rental agencies as new leaders of social housing initiatives (De Decker 2002).

##### Canada

The development of housing policy in Canada followed trends in the United States (Harris 2000). During the Great Depression, the Dominion Housing Act of 1935 was the first major housing legislation, but it was only with the 1938 National Housing Act that funding for social housing was introduced. In 1945, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) — the key organization for housing policy in Canada — was established and began to encourage private developers to construct low-rental housing. Furthermore, the National Housing Act of 1949 initiated joint federal-provincial programs to construct public housing units that were usually managed by local authorities (CMHC 2011). But, as in the United States, housing policy was largely market-oriented and favored access to homeownership; social rented housing remained residual. Until the 1960s most assistance was directed toward homeowners and private developers and only a very few social housing units were built (Purdy and Kwak 2007). However, alongside the rise of the welfare state, support for social housing increased. The 1964 National Housing Act amendments marked a major turning point, initiating a prime period of social housing that lasted three decades. Social housing expanded tenfold and reached almost 10 percent of new construction. Another important turning point was represented by the National Housing Act of 1973, which brought a shift away from public housing developed by provincial agencies to the support of non-profit operators such as community groups, cooperatives, and municipalities. Furthermore, whereas Canadian housing programs were strongly financed and shaped by the federal government, provincial and municipal governments began to take a more active role in housing during the 1970s (Bacher 1993; Suttor 2016). The mid-1990s brought the end of the heyday of social housing. In 1993 the federal government withdrew from supporting new social housing projects and, in 1996, it transferred the management and funding of existing social housing to the provinces. Since the 2000s there has been a re-engagement, but new social housing construction remains modest (Suttor 2016).

##### *Denmark*

Until WWI, the early origins of Danish housing policies had a small-house and self-help orientation (Bro 2008): an 1850 law on agrarian credit for small farmers, the Working Building Association of 1865 for cooperative cottage constructions, and a wave of building societies with state support in the 1900s (Hyldtoft 1992). From the interwar years onwards (1922) state subsidies also went to housing associations, organized as the *Boligselskabernes Landsforening* from 1919 (Jensen 2013), which provided for collective units not for market sale and protected against conversions. In addition, there were local government housing associations providing public rentals (Jensen 2013, 79), which emerged during WWI. Following WWII, social housing became a core pillar of the welfare state (Vestergaard and Scanlon 2014). The majority of state housing finance went to housing associations — private and autonomous collectively owned organizations which were publicly subsidized and regulated — and to a small extent to municipalities, while a sizable minority went to single-family house subsidies as socialized homeownership. Subsidies also went partly to private rental construction (Jensen 2013, 84). Subsidies shifted from direct loans to state loan guarantees in 1958 and took a strong homeownership turn in the 1960s (Esping-Andersen 1985). From the 1980s, social housing came under economic stress and under repeated attacks from conservative privatization attempts, while the traditional strong ties to the social democratic party became more strenuous. Whereas social housing has continued to grow in recent decades, trends toward residualization have been observable. (Bengtsson and Jensen 2020).

##### England and Wales

Early industrialization and urbanization marked England’s housing market. By the mid-nineteenth century, more than half the population lived in urban areas and housing had become a central social issue. Urban housing was characterized by overcrowded dwellings of poor quality. Although national legislation had evolved since the 1840s, the impact of state intervention as well as early initiatives by employers, philanthropic groups, and municipalities remained very limited. Nineteenth-century housing was dominated by the private rental sector (Pooley 1992). World War I marked a turning point toward stronger regulation and housing for the affluent working class improved during the interwar period. Whereas homeownership expanded due to increasing living standards and affordability as well as private sector interests and ideology, the 1919 Housing Act introduced subsidies from central government to local authorities to build municipal housing, which became established as the dominant form of British social housing. The share of private rental housing decreased but remained the most important form of housing (Pooley 1992; Malpass 2005). After the destruction of World War II reconstruction was the main focus and housing was characterized by strong state intervention. Housing policy was shaped at the state level but implemented by the municipalities. In the immediate postwar period, local authorities dominated housing construction. During the 1950s, social housing — mainly built by municipalities and, from the 1960s, to a small but increasing proportion by housing associations — continued to grow but at a slower rate than homeownership, which was provided by private enterprises and favored by housing policies. Overall, the share of the private rental market, which remained subject to various controls, declined sharply in the postwar period. (Donner 2000). The coming to power of the Conservative government under Margaret Thatcher in 1979 led to a another turning point in housing policy. Less state involvement and more market-oriented solutions became the main priorities. Residential investment programs were scaled back and local authorities were encouraged to sell off council housing. The “Right to Buy” (1980) incentivized the purchase of public housing by tenants. Subsequently, owner occupation became the main form of tenure. The share of council housing dropped significantly and public housing has been residualized (Balchin 1996; Malpass 2005).

##### *Finland*

Finnish social reformers followed general European trends in backing a first law supporting workers housing projects financially in 1898 (Ruonavaara 2006, 288). In the interwar years, the policy of state credits for municipal housing companies, non-profit, and individual housebuilders was continued to combat shortages, peaking in the foundation of a state housing mortgage bank in 1927 (Ruonavaara 2006, 289). Finnish housing policy has had a strong homeownership focus, from early on in favor of farmers or rural settlers (Ruonavaara 1999). In 1925, the shared-ownership-company law was passed which, however, did not develop into state-supported cooperatives as in other Nordic countries. The state temporarily supported non-profit housing between 1920 and 1926 to cope with the housing crisis (Ruonavaara 2006), but then returned to loans-to-homebuyers programs. Starting in 1944, public loans could also go to non-profits and municipalities to support public rental construction through the state mortgage bank Aravas, preparing the ground for postwar social housing constructions. In the postwar reconstruction the public-rental share in Avara-supported construction peaked at 39 percent in the late 1960s (Ruonavaara 2006, 308), while rentals have become the prevailing recipient of total state subsidies. Since the 1980s, direct building subsidies were gradually replaced by tax incentives and social housing was re-directed to lower-income groups and became somewhat stigmatized (Ruonavaara 2006, 321).

##### *France*

After some housing philanthropy by employers and under Napoleon III since the 1830s and 1850s, the *loi Siegfried* of 1894 followed the Belgian model (Guerrand 1987; Topalov 1987),[[4]](#footnote-4) followed by the *loi Strauss* 1906 and *loi Ribot* 1908.[[5]](#footnote-5) These first housing laws aimed at social homeownership, i.e., state credit help to move into homeownership (Frouard 2012), but equally provided cooperative and private builders for rentals with state subsidies. The 1912 *loi Bonnevay* also allowed municipalities and provinces to establish public bodies for state construction of public rentals. In the interwar years, the 1928 *loi Loucheur* extended the homeownership program to the middle classes (Stébé 1998).[[6]](#footnote-6) The post-WWII housing policy changed the name of the previous public rentals with lowered rent (*habitations bon marché, HBM*) to the current term “HLM” (*habitation à loyer modéré*), public housing with moderate rents, which was meant to address a broad strata of the population. During the peak years of state construction from the 1950s until the 1970s about one-quarter of public housing was in social homeownership programs, the remainder being public rentals (Stébé 1998). These were considerably cut back in the Barre reforms 1977 (Bourdieu 2000) and afterwards (Zittoun 2001), when indirect subsidies increasingly exceeded direct ones (Pollard 2011). A special levy on salaries in 1952 furthermore institutionalized a special circuit of employers’ housing, the so-called 1 percent *logement* contribution, and private rental construction was subsidized through fiscal exemptions in the postwar years (Effosse 2003). By determining social housing, we follow the broad HLM definition which refers to public rentals that can be offered by an array of different institutional carriers, both public, cooperative, and private. French direct subsidy schemes tend to proliferate, with every government adding a temporary layer to existing ones. Social housing receives a number of different subsidies next to the direct ones, such as an partial exemption from VAT and land taxation, advantageous interest rates at the state savings bank (CDC), while social tenants can file for housing allowances (Driant 2009, 74). Over time, state expenses for social housing have been reduced in favor of support for homeownership and the private rental sector (Mouillart 1995). Yet, French social housing still accounts for about one-fifth of the housing stock, often situated on the outskirts of cities and, despite universalist ambitions even guaranteed by an “opposable right” to housing since 1990 (and again 2007), it attracts more lower-income groups (Scanlon and Whitehead 2011).

##### *Germany (West, total)*

The implicit beginning of German social housing policy is the 1889 social insurance law which allowed parts of the accumulated funds to be invested in non-profit housing for the benefit of the insured workingmen.[[7]](#footnote-7) This was extended to cover the newly insured employees in 1911 (Wilke 2020). While there was philanthropic, employers, state employee, municipal housing and some individual state laws before 1918 (von Saldern 1979; Krabbe 1984; Kholodilin 2017), it was not until then that the much postponed first Prussian and then national housing law was implemented (Niethammer 1988). In the Weimar years, the *Hauszinssteuer* regime linked below-market state credit financed by a special tax to the construction of social rentals and social homeownership by specialized non-profit associations.[[8]](#footnote-8) With the housing laws of the post-WWII era (1950, 1956), social housing was not only public rental and social homeownership tied to non-profit housing companies and cooperatives, but also included units privately constructed with state aid whose rents were set below market during the mortgage maturation period (Schulz 1994). After the duration of the state aid was over, the social dwellings could be let without limitations to everybody at market rents. With the collapse of the largest and union-owned non-profit housing association *Neue Heimat* in the 1980s, the abolition of tax privileges for the non-profits in 1990, and the sale of municipally owned social housing stock in the 2000s, some classical pillars of social housing provision were eroded. From the 1980s until 2006, the federal level retreated from public housing competencies almost completely such that public housing numbers are the sum of state-level constructions and micro survey data are a more reliable time series measurement of how many social housing units still make up the stock. The numbers are, however, in line with political inquiries about the social housing state of affairs (Bundestag 2012).

##### Germany (East)

The East-German housing model largely followed the Soviet model: a relatively large share of private price-controlled rentals was augmented by state housing and state-company controlled cooperatives (Topfstedt 1999; Buck 2004). Standardized panel construction of public or cooperative rentals made up a growing majority of the new production, with a small owner-occupier stream emerging in the 1970s. If below-market rent is the criterion for public housing, then only the small homeownership sector (about 21 percent in 1989) was not public (Destatis 1994). In the less narrow definition used here, we leave out the private rental sector and only count public or cooperative rentals. After reunification, the GDR was the only post-Soviet state to *not* completely privatize its formerly public stock such that the East-German social housing stock remained above Western levels. We approximate the social housing levels on East-German territory after 1990 by drawing on micro survey data.

##### Greece

Until World War I, the Greek housing market was characterized by *laissez-faire* policies, unplanned development, speculative construction, and self-built housing. Despite precarious conditions and overcrowding, public, philanthropic, or employer initiatives toward workers’ housing remained almost totally absent. World War I led to more active state involvement, restructuring programs and, most importantly, the refugee settlement in 1922 following the military defeat in Asia Minor. Land was redistributed to new farmers and peasant-proprietors, new settlements were created, and “ruralization” took place. In urban areas, segregation increased with locating refugees outside the inner cities and the state supporting the bourgeois cooperative movement. However, after World War II, *laissez-faire* housing policies characterized by non-intervention were largely re-established (Leontidou 1992). Planning laws had little impact, and housing was characterized by small-scale land ownership, (often illegal) self-building, and high homeownership rates ranging from 70 to 80 percent. In 1954, the *Organismis Ergatikis Katoikas* OEK was founded, which granted assistance and loans for homeownership. In 1976, the *Dimosia Epicheirisi Poledomias Stegasis* DEPOS was established, which built a few social housing units per year. However, until 1989, hardly any public social housing existed, and the sector remains insignificant until today. Private rental housing was subject to rent restrictions, which were abolished in 1996 (Donner 2000). Since the 2000s, Greek housing policy has changed significantly due to European integration and the Financial Crisis, liberalization and financialization, and housing conditions have worsened (Siatitsa, Maloutas, and Balampanidis 2020).

##### Ireland

Despite having been part of the United Kingdom, Ireland remained an agricultural country into the 20th century. Poverty was widespread and housing conditions were precarious in rural and urban areas (Allen 1992). Early Irish housing policy was shaped by its ties to Great Britain (Fraser 1996). But, as (Norris 2016) argues, land reforms in the last third of the nineteenth century marked the beginning of a distinctive Irish property-based welfare system with significant redistribution of land and homeownership at its core and which was based on familiaristic ideology and strongly influenced by rural society, religion, and nationalism. By 1870, the majority of farmland was owned by a few British-oriented protestant landlords. In the following decades, various land laws (1870, 1881, 1903, and 1907) brought about a substantial transfer to tenant farmers, creating a large class of landowning peasants. Furthermore, the 1880ssaw the beginning of an early and strong promotion of social housing for the rural working class (1881 Land Act). On the other hand, support for urban social housing was not introduced until 1908, and initiatives by employers and philanthropic associations remained modest. The main providers of social housing have been local authorities (Allen 1992). Norris (2016) considers the years after the independence of Ireland in 1922 as the beginning of a “socialized homeownership system” that gave broad classes of the population access to homeownership. Support for owner occupation was further expanded after World War II and the share of homeownership developed into one of the highest in Western Europe. Simultaneously, at the expense of the private rental market, the 1930s to the mid-1950s represented the heyday of social rented housing, whose share peaked in 1961 at 18.6 percent. This proportion was nevertheless rather low by European standards. This was largely due to the Laborers’ Act of 1936, which made the sale of rural social housing to former tenants far below market price an important instrument for promoting homeownership. The crisis since the 1970s marked a turning point in housing policy and led to deterioration of the socialized homeownership regime in the late 1980s (Norris 2016). Further development was characterized by marketization and financialization. During the Celtic tiger boom between 1991 and 2006, the private rental market returned strongly, whereas construction of owner-occupied and social housing decreased. Furthermore, housing associations became increasingly significant providers alongside local authorities (Redmond and Norris 2007).

##### Japan

In Japan, the governmental support of social housing started relatively late in the context of “modernization,” economic growth, and strong residential construction following World War II. The first law regulating state help was the Public Housing Act No. 193 of 1951 that authorized local governments to construct public rental houses for low-income people and supported them by providing subsidies both to build and maintain these houses (Hirayama and Ronald 2007).[[9]](#footnote-9) The act constituted one of three pillars of housing policy introduced by the Japanese government after World War II to address the severe housing shortage. Homeownership promotion was the first and most important pillar, which was introduced by the Government Housing Loan Corporation Act of 1950 and the granting of long-term loans with low interest rates.[[10]](#footnote-10) The third pillar was introduced by the Japan Housing Corporation Act of 1955 and the establishment of the Japan Housing Corporation which developed affordable housing in large cities.[[11]](#footnote-11) Japanese housing provision schemes followed their own development path, being embedded in the broader project to stabilize the economy and family structures and only partially paralleling Western models. Companies played an important role alongside state authorities by providing access to both owner-occupied and rental dwellings for numerous employees. Overall, homeownership promotion reigned, whereas social rented housing remained residual, being marginalized by the mixed housing welfare of both public policy which favored middle class homeownership and the private welfare provision of the large companies. By 1971, public rented housing accounted for 4.9 percent and rented company housing for 6.4 percent (Mori 2017). Since the economic crisis of the 1990s, the destabilization of broad middle classes, and the cut back of public subsidies, the once strong links between economic growth, family welfare, and housing policy have been weakened. Alongside this, in the wake of deregulation and market liberalization, the importance of public and company housing declined significantly (Hirayama and Ronald 2007). Since the mid-1990s, the neoliberal policy turn brought about a sequence of transformations and reorganizations in the Japanese social housing system aiming for expanding the market-based housing. The Japan Housing Corporation was gradually reorganized into a semi-public agency, Urban Renaissance (UR) in 2004. The abolition of the Government Housing Loan Corporation (GHLC) in 2007 became a watershed in the history of postwar housing policy. With the enactment of the 2007 Housing Safety Net Law, the historically marginalized social rented housing sector for low-income groups has been further residualized. One of the most recent examples of regional devolution in public housing was the pre-Olympic urban renewal in Tokyo in 2016 conducted by Tokyo Metropolitan Government (TMG) in cooperation with private sector (Mori 2017).

##### Spain

Spain’s first social housing activity, as elaborated by the *Instituto de reformas sociales* in the 1900s, resembled the Belgian and French examples of state-supported help for self-help social homeownership of workers: the first law on the “casas baratas” of 1911 allows state credit institutions to give out favorable mortgages for these projects (Correa 2003).[[12]](#footnote-12) This also includes the construction of social-Catholic associations for homeownership of middle classes with state help. It was prolonged in a law of 1939 which also provided for rental housing by public developers, cooperatives or municipalities. The subsequent housing laws rather continue subsidy schemes for private developers in their construction of owner-occupier units for the (lower) middle classes in horizontal homeownership, such as Franco’s 1939 law on “viviendas protegidas”, the 1944 law on “viviendas bonificadas,” and the 1954 law on “viviendas de renta limitada” (Vaz 2013).[[13]](#footnote-13) Generous bonus systems for private developers of owner-occupied flats contrast with less generous ones for public developers of limited public rentals. Post-Francoist legislation since 1978 regionalized housing policy, but autonomous regions often struggled in fulfilling this role (Cortés Alcalá 1995). Large subsidy schemes were still oriented toward homeownership promotion, and they were often driven by cyclical rather than housing policy objectives. Whereas social rental housing (most important in Madrid) accounted for only a very small share of subsidies (“vivienda de protección”), the government intervened heavily in the private rental market through rent regulation. This resulted in a sharp decline in the market rental sector from about 50 percent in 1950 to about 10 percent in 2010 (Pareja-Eastaway and Sánchez-Martínez 2014; Alberdi 2014). Spain, where real estate used to account for a large share of GDP, was hit hard by the Financial Crisis in terms of both housing and the economy. Since then, Spain’s conception of social housing as social homeownership rather than social renting has been increasingly questioned. New bottom-up organizations have emerged, but the very small social rented sector is still dominated by local and regional authorities (Pareja-Eastaway and Sánchez-Martínez 2017).

##### Iceland

The first law on Workers’ Dwellings was passed in 1929 in the wake of a first social democratic moment and was a social-homeownership program (Sveinsson 2000).[[14]](#footnote-14) During WWII, the municipality of Reykjavik started to eliminate unhealthy housing and create a small municipal housing stock, which did not start to grow until the 1970s when a social housing plan included the construction of 1,000 public rental flats. In the 1980s, housing associations received the same state credit rights to build social housing as municipalities (Rannsóknarnefnd-Alþingis 2013). Most of it was constructed in Reykjavik, where, in 1997, the city of Reykjavik founded its own social housing company, Félagsbústaðir. Whereas social homeownership units have accumulated into a sizable part of the housing stock (6–7 percent in peak years of the 1990s), public municipal rentals are still a minor phenomenon (Sveinsson 2006).

##### Netherlands

The private rental market and miserable housing conditions characterized the urbanization of the nineteenth-century Netherlands. During this period, the first few social housing units were built by employers, local authorities and philanthropic associations. The Housing Act of 1901 marked the beginning of state intervention.[[15]](#footnote-15) The legislation introduced a variety of instruments to improve the quality of housing as well as subsidies for non-profit housing. Eligible beneficiaries were local authorities and so-called housing associations. The latter were private institutions under the supervision of public authorities. The impact remained limited for the time being, but after World War I, social housing construction became dominant for a short period due to large subsidies for non-profit housing. However, as a result of the economic crises, contributions were again sharply reduced from the mid-1920s (Prak and Priemus 1992). It was only after World War II that social housing was again supported in large quantities. Postwar housing policy centered on the construction of social housing, often large-scale projects. There were subsidy arrangements for both the social and the market sector, but the housing associations were the main beneficiaries of the subsidies. Furthermore, rents have been regulated in the wake of World War I, again since the 1940s, and still are today. Postwar policy gave rise to the heyday of social rented housing, whose shares increased strongly until the mid-1970s. Starting from this period, the share of social housing stagnated and finally declined, especially from the 1990s onward. Homeownership and market solutions gained in importance, decentralization and deregulation took place, and subsidies were reduced and finally abolished in 1995. During the 2000s, the share of social housing has continued to decline (Haffner et al. 2009; Beekers 2012).

##### *Norway*

First housing policies existed on the municipal level in Oslo or Bergen and the interwar years saw the origins of both owner-cooperative and municipal public rental housing (Annaniassen 2006). The first housing law in 1910 only concerned Oslo and led to considerable construction activity by the municipally owned housing company (Annaniassen 2006, 209). In the interwar years, the locally supported cooperative organizations became the main housing initiative (Sørvoll 2014). Other than a small rural housing bank set up in 1915, it was not until the setting up of the Norwegian state housing bank in 1946 that the federal government started subsidizing housing construction on a large scale, mainly directed at cooperative constructions. Contrary to Sweden, Norwegian housing policy took the path of subsidizing cooperative housing — a form of homeownership — as the dominant state-supported tenure, with public rentals only as a residual category (Sørvoll 2014), not even figuring in public tenure statistics, which is why we have to rely on first survey data since 1970. Cooperative members themselves increasingly felt like owners, with membership share prices approximating market prices since the 1970s (Annaniassen 2006, 235), which is why they remain outside of our social housing definition. In the 2000s, the government reactivated the non-commercial municipal rental sector in light of rising mortgage costs and house prices (Annaniassen 2006, 251).

##### *Poland*

In Poland, a foundation for the public support of social housing was laid down soon after independence, in the Act on the establishment of the State Housing Fund (*Państwowy Fundusz Mieszkaniowy*) of August 1, 1919. Its objective was to support the construction of small, cheap, and sanitary housing for “poor people, mainly for war invalids, for widows and orphans of fallen soldiers, and for poor working and clerical families with numerous offspring.” Furthermore, the Act of April 29, 1925 on the expansion of cities and the ordinance of the President of the Republic of Poland of April 22, 1927 on the expansion of cities imposed on city boards the obligation to improve housing relations, primarily by building small apartments for medium and low-income families (Korzeniewski 2009). Prior to 1960, the data on housing stock were only available for the urban areas. Moreover, the official statistics covered only buildings, but not dwellings. During the Socialist era, the housing stock was made up of five components: municipal dwellings (*mieszkania w budynkach rad narodowych*), housing cooperatives (*s*[*półdzielnia budownictwa mieszkaniowego*)](http://sbm.wolomin.pl/), other socialized units (*pozostałych jednostek uspołecznionych*), private persons (*osób prywatnych*), and other units (*innych jednostek*). Although the official statistics included the housing cooperatives in the socialized housing stock, they cannot really be treated as state property. Even at the highpoint of the Socialist period, private dwellings dominated: For example, in 1970, their share in the total number of dwellings exceeded 57 percent. They were immediately followed by the municipal dwellings that accounted for more than 22 percent, and then by other socialized units (about 13 percent), and housing cooperatives (less than 7 percent). After the fall of the Socialist system, the state housing stock was first transferred to the local government (*gminy*) and then to a large extent privatized by selling the dwellings to their tenants (Lux 2001). The housing stock remaining in the hands of local government thus represents the social housing. The rents there are set as a percentage of the replacement value of dwellings (Lux 2001, p. 199). In 1995, a new form of social housing operator was established — these are social housing associations (*Towaryszystwa Budownictwa Spolecznego*) that are responsible for the construction and operation of new housing dwellings (Lux 2001). The social housing sector is categorized into two groups: narrowly defined social housing that is focused on households in the 1st and 2nd income deciles and affordable housing catering for the needs of households in the 3rd and 7th income deciles (Czischke and van Bortel 2018).

##### Scotland

Scotland’s close connection with England led to early industrialization and urbanization. Scottish urban formation was characterized by — unlike in the rest of the UK — high rise tenements of four to five stories and by overcrowded, insanitary, and small dwellings. As in other countries, by the end of the nineteenth century housing reports were addressing the disastrous conditions and demands for housing improvements grew. There were initiatives from philanthropic associations, cooperatives, building societies, employers, and local authorities for low-income housing since the nineteenth century and housing had become an important electoral issue for the Labour Party before 1914. However, by 1913 private landlords still reigned and social housing was insignificant. As elsewhere, it was World War I that had a catalytic effect in a period of social unrest. In 1919, a council housing program was introduced and during the interwar period — in reverse ratio to England — seven out of ten new dwellings were built by local authorities. Furthermore, rent controls were more stringent than in England (Rodger 1992). World War II brought an end to the housing programs. However, the Labour government, triumphant in the elections, reintroduced a large housing program in 1945. By the late 1960s, local authorities and housing associations provided around half of all dwellings and social housing had become the dominant form of housing in Scotland (Rodger 1992; Robertson and Serpa 2014). The heyday of new social housing construction ended during the financial crises in the late 1960s and the 1970s due to cutbacks in public expenditure. Since the 1980s the social housing stock has declined dramatically. Housing policy was undergoing a major turnaround. The “Right to Buy” for former tenants of council housing reduced the stock owned by local authorities and the Conservative government began to promote housing associations as an alternative to public housing. At the same time, owner occupation increased rapidly as a result of council housing sales and easier access to mortgage finance (Robertson and Serpa 2014). Since the 2000s and in the wake of austerity policies after the Financial Crisis social housing became further residualized, whereas the private rented sector underwent a strong reemergence. Today, council housing, housing associations, and private landlords have a similar share of the housing market, while nearly two-thirds of all housing is homeownership (Gibb 2021).

##### Singapore

In most of the developed Western countries, the term “public housing” refers to “subsidized rental housing provided by the government to low-income households who are unable to afford minimum standard housing at market rental rates” (Phang 2018, 27). In Singapore’s local terminology, social housing refers to subsidized rental housing provided by the Housing and Development Board (HDB). This form of public housing in Singapore can be traced back to the formation of the Singapore Improvement Trust (SIT) in 1927 by the British colonial administration. The SIT’s primary function was aimed at infrastructure and general improvement projects such as the construction of back lanes. It was not until 1932 that the SIT was mandated to build houses for renting to low-income families. In 1936, the SIT started the first public housing scheme at Tiong Bahru, which marked a significant transition in governmental efforts from onsite improvement schemes to more comprehensive public housing schemes (UN-Habitat 2020, 3). After the Second World War, the SIT began to focus on public housing provision in response to the worsening postwar housing shortage, completing 20,907 units between 1947 and 1995, which housed 9 percent of the population by the end of 1959 (UN-Habitat 2020, 4). In 1959, Singapore achieved self-government with the People’s Action Party (PAP) in power. Under the Housing and Development Act 1959, the SIT was replaced by the HDB in February 1960, which initially focused on providing rental housing to the low-income group. Through effective implementation of the First and Second Five-Year Building Programs between 1960 and 1970, the HDB had completed 120,669 dwelling units, housing 34.6 percent of the total population (HDB 1970). However, the model of public housing soon started to change when the Minister for National Development launched a Homeownership for the People Scheme in 1964 as a national agenda to encourage Singapore citizens to purchase residential flats on a 99-year leasehold basis (HDB 1964). After the reform of the Central Provident Fund (CPF) in 1968, a “closed circuit” of public housing funding and consumption took shape through making it possible to withdraw part of the compulsory social security savings for mortgage financing (Beng-Haut 1997, 22). For over half a century, the homeownership project continued in various forms and reshaped the structure of the public housing system in Singapore completely. The share of homeownership HDB flats skyrocketed from 6.7 percent in 1967 to 94 percent in 2018, while the percentage of the population living in HDB public housing kept growing from 25.9 percent in 1967 (Statistics 1978, 8), which peaked at 87 percent in the early 1990s and has been stabilized around 80 percent since 2018 (Statistics 2019, 143). The great success of public housing also contributed to GDP expansion and relatively low-price inflation in Singapore (Ho 2021, 24-25). Though overshadowed by the owner-occupied public housing, HDB rental flats still constitute a crucial component of Singapore's public housing system to secure housing provision for low-income persons (UN-Habitat 2020, 11).

##### *Sweden*

Swedish housing policy started as a single-family house movement and law of 1905 in favor of bringing particularly rural workers into more stable ownership to prevent emigration and the lowering of birth rates (Strömberg 1992). This same natalist family-home focus was confirmed in another law of 1935 (Bengtsson 2006, 129). Already in the interwar years owner-cooperatives (bostadsrätt) and municipal public rental housing developed within national legislative frameworks (Bengtsson 2006). After WWII, state support for municipal rentals became a key pillar of Swedish housing policy, even more so than cooperative housing and at the deliberate cost of the private rental sector (Sørvoll 2014). The 1935 order in favor of houses for families with many children (*Barnrikehussatsningen*) had also already established the basic organizational unit of future means-tested public rental housing provision, known as *allmännyttiga bostadsföretag* (non-profit housing company), which the 1947 law “*bostadsförsörjningslag*” institutionalized, which is what we take as the definition for social housing for Sweden.[[16]](#footnote-16) This path was reinforced in the postwar period by the famous million-homes program of 1965–1974. Housing became a social right and was universally provided to citizens, with citizens unable to pay private rents being provided with rentals by governments subletting to them from public or private housing companies (Bengtsson 2001). Since 2011, Sweden had to cut subsidies to public housing companies in order to comply with EU competition directives, creating a level playing field for private and public companies (Bengtsson 2013). While some municipal housing units were sold to sitting tenants, the sector overall proved rather resilient and continuous without formal means-testing (Blackwell and Bengtsson 2021), but *de-facto* becoming more selective in choosing tenants and hence residualizing despite a universalistic housing discourse (Grander 2017).

##### Switzerland

In the nineteenth century, employers and philanthropic associations built first workers’ housing, and by the end of the century there were the first attempts to promote municipal housing and housing cooperatives (Walter 1994). During World War I, the federal government made its first major intervention in the housing market and from 1919 onward it supported private and social housing construction. These subsidies led to the first boom in social rental housing, with non-profit housing cooperatives becoming the most important providers. Federal measures were fully dismantled by the mid-1920s. Although some cantons and municipalities continued supporting social housing on their own, local subsidies were suppressed in the early 1930s amid the Great Depression. (Kurz 1993; Zitelmann 2018). The outbreak of World War II led to renewed federal interventions and in 1942 the federal state launched a housing program to support private and social housing. At its peak, two-thirds of new construction were subsidized. The federal funding led to the second heyday of cooperative housing construction. However, in 1950, the prolongation of housing subsidies was rejected by the electorate at the ballot box. With the end of federal support, the majority of cantons and municipalities likewise reduced subsidies. From 1958 onward, housing construction was again supported by the federal authorities with moderate subsidies. But the private rental market dominated the housing construction boom of the postwar era. Both social housing and support for homeownership remained weak (Müller 2021). The Housing Act of 1974 represented a turning point.[[17]](#footnote-17) The legislation reinforced market-oriented solutions and introduced a federal homeownership promotion program, while (modest) support for private and social rental housing was continued (Cuennet, Favarger, and Thalmann 2002). In 2001, federal subsidies under the 1974 Act were discontinued. Regional subsidy programs still exist, and since the 2010s various successful local political initiatives have been submitted. But overall, support for social housing remains residual.

##### USA

Despite some philanthropic ventures, the creation of a few wartime housing units during World War I, and the allocation of some public funds to housing construction in the early 1930s, public housing did not take form until President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal legislation that introduced major interventions in the depressed housing market (Purdy and Kwak 2007). The United States Housing Act of 1937 established the United States Housing Authority and a decentralized subsidy scheme. Federal funds were transferred to local authorities, which were required to plan, construct, manage, and maintain public housing projects (Radford 1996). Housing legislation initiated in the 1930s further expanded after WWII. Public housing programs were continued in the postwar period (Housing Act of 1949, Housing and Redevelopment Acts of 1965 and 1968), and from 1954 private operators were also supported, to provide housing for low-income households (Szylvian 2018). However, social housing remained residual, interventions centered on homeownership. Legislation encouraged speculative housing construction and suburbanization, and reinforced religious, social, ethnic, and racial segregation. The policies were fundamentally aimed at promoting white middle class homeownership, while comprehensive social housing construction was successfully combated by the private housing industry (Jackson 1987). From the 1960s and especially the 1970s, there was a shift toward public-private partnerships. Tax credits and housing vouchers largely replaced public housing programs by promoting private developers (The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHCT) 1986, HOPE VI 1992). These developments, which continue to this day, were accompanied by a deterioration in public housing (Hunt 2018).

##### USSR

In 1918, the communist government of Russia started to expropriate private housing stock into state or municipal ownership.[[18]](#footnote-18) According to some estimates, by the end of that year about 25 percent of the housing stock was nationalized (Belousov V. and Larin 1930). In the 1920s, cooperative ownership became another ownership form. Moreover, the housing stock the state-owned enterprises provided to their employees played a major role. The concentration of housing in the hands of both the government and state-owned enterprises permitted the authorities to exert strict control over e citizens, threatening homelessness for deviating behavior at the workplace (Meerovich 2005). In the USSR, the official statistics typically measured housing in terms of square meters of the total surface. Therefore, all estimates of the ownership structure of the housing stock prior to 1991 are based on the ratios of surfaces. For this reason, the indicator of social housing in the former Soviet republics here is defined as the surface of all public housing to the total housing stock in square meters. Compared to the estimates for other countries, which are based on the number of dwellings, the estimates for the republics of the former USSR can undervalue the extent social housing because the surface of public dwellings on average can be smaller than that of the private dwellings. Moreover, until 1980, only the data on the urban housing stock are available. The general trend from 1918 through 1991 was toward the increasing share of the public housing stock. The Baltics did not pass interwar housing laws, Estonia excepted in 1922 (Norkus, Morkevičius, and Markevičiūtė 2021). After World War II, there was a partial revival of the private housing sector, since the government aiming at the rapid reconstruction of a heavily war damaged housing stock stimulated any efforts in this direction. The easiest and fastest way was the construction of single-family houses by private persons using any building materials they could find, including debris from the bombed-out buildings. However, in 1959, a large-scale construction of the public multi-family houses started that led to a rapid increase in the proportion of public housing.[[19]](#footnote-19) A radical change came in 1991 when, in the framework of the total liberalization of the economy, it was decided to privatize state-owned housing.[[20]](#footnote-20) The privatization was carried out virtually for free. Therefore, within the space of several years millions of Russian citizens privatized the public dwellings in which they had previously lived as tenants. On the positive side, this allowed them to become homeowners having real estate. On the negative side, many of them became owners of single rooms and not even entire apartments due to the existence of a widespread phenomenon of the so-called *kommunalki*, that is, apartments shared by several (in extreme cases by dozens) families. Moreover, both the land under the building, the building itself, and some not-yet-privatized dwellings and rooms remained state property, thus complicating the issues related to the maintenance and refurbishment of the building. Currently, social housing in Russia is considered to be entirely the responsibility of the state. There are no privately-owned social dwellings. Under the so-called contracts of social rental (*sotsial’nyi naym*), specific categories of the population (low-income households living in the poor-quality housing) are eligible to be included in the special waiting lists and to eventually obtain state-owned premises.[[21]](#footnote-21)
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