

The Construction of Urban (In)Security: The Policies and NGOs' Discourses in Budapest and Milan

by *Tatiana Lysova and Laura Schmidt**

This paper examines the urban (in)security discourses generated by legislation and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in different European contexts: Budapest and Milan. The research has two main aims. Firstly, it seeks to highlight the differences and similarities in the discourses between the studied contexts. Secondly, as the previous research shows, legislation and NGOs generate diverse discourses on various social issues; therefore, it is essential to investigate whether there is such a difference in the discourse on urban (in)security. The findings demonstrate that while there is a general coherency in the construction of urban security, there are critical distinctions in the discourses on urban insecurity between and within the contexts. The differences between the contexts might be attributed to the specificities of neoliberalisation and the current socio-political situation in each city. The differences within the contexts might be ascribed to the nature of the involvement of NGOs in tackling urban insecurity.

Keywords: urban insecurity, crime prevention, urban policy, NGO, neoliberalism.

Introduction

Although the problem of urban insecurity is not new, it persists in European cities. As confirmed by numerous studies, city authorities undertake many efforts to tackle it, which result in increasing securitisation of cities and reducing crime rates. Simultaneously, the research shows that subjective insecurity and fear of crime remain stable or even increase in cities (Valera and Guàrdia 2014). Partially, this paradoxical situation is explained by an ever-expanding concept of urban insecurity and various global and local factors impacting the perception of insecurity in cities.

* University "Bicocca", Milan; University of Public Service, Budapest.

Given this paradox, urban insecurity might be treated as a social construct that tends to reproduce despite the changes in the objective reality (Valera and Guàrdia 2014). The discourses generated by various actors involved in tackling urban insecurity contribute to forming this construct (Crawford 2009). The previous research indicates that NGOs and legislation could generate opposing discourses on social problems (Colombo 2018; Göbl, Szalai 2015). However, there is a lack of research on whether and how legal and NGOs' discourses on the problem of urban insecurity differ.

Therefore, this paper's primary goal is to investigate how policies and the representatives of NGOs dealing with the problem of urban insecurity construct urban (in)security in their discourses in two European cities. The study aims to compare the phenomenon by analysing variations and commonalities between the two cities and, additionally, within them by researching legal and civil organisations' discourses.

This research is implemented in two cities: Budapest and Milan. They represent European post-Soviet and Southern cities, respectively, two understudied contexts in the existing scholarship on urban security (Baptista 2013). The cities were selected based on the maximum variation approach (Flyvbjerg 2006) as they differ in their socio-economic and political situation; however, the problem of urban insecurity is acute in both of them (Stefanizzi, Verdolini 2018).

The paper is structured in the following way. The first section examines how neoliberalism affects the ways of tackling urban insecurity and discourses on it. Then it discusses the peculiarities of neoliberalism in each city, contextualising the research. The research methodology is presented in the next section. The presentation of the main findings in Budapest opens a discussion on the study's empirical results, followed by an account of the findings in Milan. The paper concludes with deliberations on the main findings, focusing on the main similarities and differences between and within the studied contexts.

Neoliberalism and Urban Insecurity

In the 1980-1990s, European countries shifted from a previously dominant welfare state to a neoliberal regime. However, due to cultural, political, economic, and social variations between countries and within them, neoliberalisation has not been a straightforward and uniform process (Ong 2006). Therefore, it is important to discuss the impact of neoliberalism on urban insecurity discourse in general and in each studied context.

Neoliberal "Preventive Turn" and Urban Insecurity

Neoliberalism brought about a "preventive turn" (Garland 2001): a state should primarily aim at crime prevention, not crime repression, as it had been done under

“penal welfarism.” The preventive turn suggests that insecurity and crime should be tackled in two ways: social and situational. Social crime prevention seeks to improve the socio-economic conditions of a potential criminal and victim, while the situational approach focuses on reducing the possibility of crime through direct manipulations in the physical space (Garland, 1996). Nowadays, in most Western countries, a mixed approach to crime prevention dominates (Crawford 2009).

Additionally, more recently, participatory security and community involvement got into the spotlight as a crime prevention mode. Partially, the neoliberal logic of cutting state expenses might contribute to the responsabilisation of local actors in urban security and crime prevention (Crawford 2009). However, it should be pointed out that community involvement is not a new phenomenon in the literature on the topic, as, for example, the role of spontaneous surveillance is well-described (Jacobs 1961).

Along with the development of neoliberalism, such uncertainties as increasing migration flows, reduction of social protection programs, increasing labour precarity, and others entered into the public discourse on urban insecurity (Stefanizzi, Verdolini 2018). This widened discourse is also reflected in and generated by urban (in)security policies (Herbert, Brown 2006).

Budapest: a Post-Soviet City and Neoliberalism

In the 1980-1990s, Hungary transitioned from the Soviet regime to an open market, and it was the period of the introduction of neoliberal policies in the country. The neoliberalisation process has undergone some transformations with two main stages:

1. The 1990s - the beginning of the 2000s: «embedded neoliberalism». Its main feature is balancing social welfare protections and market liberalisation; however, such regimes are often unstable due to implementing two divergent political approaches (Bohle, Greskovits 2012). By 2010, the Hungarian government partially failed in this balancing when the centre-right political forces came to power (Stubbs, Lendvai-Bainton 2019).
2. 2010 - onwards: «authoritarian populism» (Rogers 2020) or «national-neoliberalism» (Ban et al. 2021). The former framework points out the efforts of the ruling Prime Minister and party to consolidate their power in the country, while the latter highlights a balance between neoliberal economic policies and policies prioritising national interests as defined by the political elite.

These specificities of Hungarian neoliberalisation and the coming to power of the populist forces have several implications for investigating the discourse on urban insecurity. Thus, according to Taşan-Kök (2004), the urban security policy discourse of Budapest tends to ignore local context, needs, and conditions as policies are drawn on “best practice” examples rather than being developed organically in or adapted to the city. Another reason for ignoring the current situation in the city is the dominance

of centre-right powers in Hungary that shift the focus in their discourses from the current issues to achieving the restoration of the “glorious past” of one of the capitals of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Akçali, Korkut 2015).

Along with it, irregular immigrants have appeared in the security discourse in Hungary, especially since the immigration crisis of 2015 (Göbl, Szalai 2015). In particular, the official discourse has been trying to establish a direct association between immigrants and social threats and dangers (increased crime rates, negative labour market consequences, etc.). However, even before 2015, there had been exclusionary discourse towards some ethnicities, primarily the Roma people, who have been consistently discriminated against in employment, housing, and other policies, despite being officially “colour-blind” (Keresztély et al. 2017).

The empirical studies focusing on local inhabitants show that the discourse on urban insecurity in Budapest revolves around crime and the visible presence of “others” in a broad sense. “Others” comprise all people who demonstrate deviancy in a neighbourhood: homeless, drug addicts, immigrants, and ethnic minorities (Barabás et al. 2018; Stefanizzi, Verdolini 2018).

Milan: a South European City and Neoliberalism

The literature suggests that a starting point for Italian neoliberalisation is the 1980-1990s, when the party system existing from the end of the Second World War (the First Republic) ended due to an extensive political investigation of corruption (Koff, Koff 2000). The literature characterises Italian neoliberalisation as selective, marked by the beginning and adaptation of institutional changes at the margins of and their gradual extension to the whole society (Ferragina, Arrigoni 2021). Therefore, it might strongly affect more vulnerable and marginalised social groups as institutional changes impact them in the first place.

The adaptation of neoliberalism has impacted the discourse on urban insecurity in Italy, too. If, before the 1990s, the official insecurity discourse had been built around the war against organised crime, in the 1990s, it shifted and expanded to broader public insecurity, street crime, and urban decay (Ricotta 2016). As a result, urban security legal discourse has expanded to traffic, migration, environment, and other urban policy issues.

Populism also influenced the new rhetoric on urban insecurity in the country by connecting “others” (migrants and various marginalised groups) with “dangers” (e.g., street crime) in their urban insecurity discourse (Bonfigli 2014). The situation became especially acute in 2008 with increased migration flows to Italy, which led to the introduction of several repressive measures (Hepworth 2012). One of them is the Security Package of 2008 which gave mayors the power to issue contingent and urgent by-laws for urban security reasons.

The research analysing the by-laws issued in Milan shows that there is a political division in constructing urban insecurity in the city (Verga 2016). While a right-wing mayor directly associated urban insecurity with street prostitution,

alcohol consumption, concentrated migrants' presence, and other issues (Verga 2016), left-wing mayors of Milan promote an integrating approach toward "others" (Bonfigli 2014).

Besides the political discourse, the media and NGOs have played an important role in forming the discourse on urban insecurity in Milan. While the media follows the populist discourse of constructing urban insecurity (Dal Lago, Palidda 2010), Catholic-oriented charities and volunteer organisations emphasise the importance of social acceptance and integration of vulnerable and marginal groups (Muehlebach 2013).

The empirical studies focusing on the Milanese population show that the discourse on urban insecurity includes crime (especially burglaries, robberies, and anti-social behaviour) and the presence in an area of inhabitation of "others" (Stefanizzi, Verdolini 2018).

Methodology

This research aims to answer the following question: how is the problem of urban insecurity constructed in the relevant legislation and by the NGOs directly involved in dealing with the issue in Budapest and Milan? Therefore, the empirical research consisted of the desk-based research of the legislation and semi-structured interviews with NGO representatives.

A complete list of laws, legal decrees, acts, regulations, programs, provisions, and ordinances dealing with urban (in)security in power by December 31, 2019, has been compiled to perform the document analysis. In total, 37 documents at the state, regional¹, and city (Milan and Budapest) levels were included in the study.

To study the construction of urban insecurity in the immediate context of its production, semi-structured interviews with non-governmental and voluntary organisations representatives were conducted. Following the literature on the involvement of the civil sector in dealing with urban insecurity (Grabosky 1992; Wo et al. 2016), NGOs include both voluntary and non-governmental organisations in this research. However, the current study accounts that voluntary organisations usually refer to the local level, while NGOs commonly refer to the international one.

The selection of NGOs was based on the classification of their involvement in tackling urban insecurity suggested in the literature (Grabosky 1992):

- open government policy dimension (legislation formulation, participatory planning, etc.);
- volunteer activities:

¹ In Italy only, for Lombardy region.

- neighbourhood watch: self-organisations of residents to be alert for and report suspicious activities in the neighbourhood;
- citizen patrols: patrolling public spaces with some minor crime control functions;
- mediation: the resolution of minor interpersonal conflicts in the neighbourhood;
- victim assistance: psychological and legal advice and other help to crime victims.

Additionally, to account for the local contexts, the NGOs were selected based on the problems identified in the legislation analysis. In total, eight semi-structured interviews were conducted (four in each city). The average interview length of an interview is one hour. In Budapest, the fieldwork was in spring 2020, and in Milan – in autumn 2020.

During the interviews, the following topics were discussed:

- the current security situation (as perceived by an interviewee) in the city and a specific neighbourhood (if an organisation operates in one neighbourhood);
- the main changes in the field of urban security during the last five-ten years;
- the perceived effectiveness of the current policies and interventions aimed at tackling urban insecurity;
- policies and actions they consider to be the most effective for tackling urban insecurity.

The collected legal and interview data were subjected to coding in NVivo 12 software and then to critical content analysis, focusing on the relationships between the codes (Bowen 2009).

Budapest: Discourses On Urban (In)Security

Legislation: Urban Security as a Strategic Goal

The analysis of legal definitions is useful for understanding the normative framework around urban security (Selmini 2005). The Hungarian law does not provide any unified definition of urban (in)security but discusses it in various documents. For example, Act CLXXXIX on Local Government, 2011, Section 13(17) states that the local government's task is to contribute to the public safety and security of the citizens living in the area and to public order maintenance in the municipality. The analysis of the Act indicates the adaptation of neoliberal logic in tackling urban insecurity. Thus, the majority of the suggested measures are preventive, and there is

the responsabilisation of local governments. However, it is worth mentioning that, in 2012, a new Fundamental Law of Hungary was enacted by the conservative government, diminishing local authorities' powers (Hoffman 2019).

The legislation analysis shows that state-level documents usually construct urban security through goal-setting. For example, the National Crime Prevention Strategy (2013-2023)² prioritises urban security, constructing it through achieving public order, security and safety of public places and citizens, and citizens' improved feeling of security in public places. The same construction of urban security can also be found in Act XXXIV on the Police (1994), Section 14.

As to urban insecurity, crime and delinquency, especially juvenile, are associated with it in the Strategy's discourse. The Strategy also mentions the presence of migrants among the factors aggravating the perception of insecurity. Such an approach can also be met in Act LXXX on Asylum (2007). In 2015, irregular migration was introduced as an urgent matter for the first time when adjustments were made to the Act, introducing the term crisis caused by mass immigration (chapter IX/A, Article 80/A).

At the level of Budapest, urban (in)security also appears mainly in some strategic documents. For example, the Budapest 2030 Long-Term Urban Development Concept (No. 767/2013 IV.24) discusses urban security as an integral part of the «optimisation of human services», constructing the phenomenon through public safety and the feeling of security of the local inhabitants, pointing out that the level of the feeling of security and trust in the police remain low in Budapest. Another document is the Thematic Development Programs of Budapest (2015), which connects urban insecurity with crime, drug selling, lack of trust in others and state institutes, intolerance, low living standards, social inequalities, and housing issues. The problems mentioned in the documents seem to be context specific, as the transition to an open market affected Hungarian society by aggravating anomie resulting in a low level of social trust (Barabás et al. 2018). Additionally, Tosics (2006) demonstrates that housing issues have induced social and spatial segregation and inequalities in Budapest since the Soviet times.

Summing up, the Hungarian and Budapest legislation discusses urban security usually in some strategic documents, that is, it should be achieved in the future. Through these goals, it is possible to reconstruct the discourse on urban insecurity in the city, which constructs the problem mainly through criminal activity and various social issues.

NGOs: Living “In Peace and Safety” in Budapest

The representatives of the grass-roots organisations coincided in their general estimation of Budapest as a secure city. According to them, it is possible due to declining crime statistics, a lack of organised crime, and visible signs of

² Adopted by the National Crime Prevention Council, Government Resolution No.1744/2013.

securitisation in the city. Additionally, the interviewees noted the increased presence of formal control realised by the police and video surveillance on the streets.

Despite acknowledging the decline in street crime, the representatives of NGOs constructed urban insecurity through mugging, stealing, car theft, and drug dealing. Additionally, the interviewees noted crime displacement from physical to virtual space (illustrated by the grandchilding³) as criminals explore new opportunities for crime committing. The representatives of NGOs also mentioned such visible signs of social and physical urban degradation as neglected urban areas, homelessness, and public drug consumption in their discourse on urban insecurity. According to Interviewee 3BV, the last issue has been an acute problem for the last several years due to the growing popularity and availability of synthetic drugs.

From the analysis of the interview data, it appears that Budapest can be divided into two parts in terms of urban security. The Buda side (located west of the Danube River) has a secure reputation, which is mainly due to the low crime and incivility rate. The Pest side (east of the Danube River) has several places with a robust reputation of being insecure. For instance, Interviewee 2BV mentioned that District VIII still has an insecure reputation which tends to reproduce, despite many improvements and interventions introduced by the municipality. On the other hand, Interviewee 1BV mentioned Hős utca as one of the most problematic streets of the city, where the municipality fails to solve problems. The street is constructed as insecure due to a lack of maintenance, extreme physical degradation, creating “inhuman conditions” there, and the high concentration of marginalised groups and ethnic minorities (Roma people).

This spatial division between secure and insecure parts reinforces the spatial and social segregation of Budapest existing since the Soviet time (Tosics 2006). As the interview analysis shows, wealthier people prefer to inhabit the Buda side of the city, which is more homogeneous in terms of population. A less affluent population usually settles on the Pest side.

Summing up, the representatives of NGOs’ discourse on urban insecurity is complex: it is constructed through such issues as criminal activity and its changing and adaptive nature, visible signs of social and physical degradation on the city streets, lack of proper maintenance of the city streets, and others. At the same time, the interviewees also connected various city-specific issues (intolerance towards any deviance, social and spatial segregation, and others) with the problem of urban insecurity in their discourse.

³ A phone-based cheating the elderly with the aim of money extortion: a criminal calls an older person saying that their child or grandchild (hence, the name) is in trouble (a car accident, injury, etc.) and they need money urgently. The criminal asks to send money to their bank account and then disappears.

Milan: Discourses On Urban (In)Security

Legislation: Urban Security as a Public Good

The analysis of the Italian legislation started with the legal definition of urban security. In the Decree *Public Safety and Urban Security: Definition and Areas of Application* (2008), urban security is defined as «a public good that should be protected through activities within the local communities aimed at defending the respect for the rules governing civil life for improvement of the living conditions in urban centres, civil coexistence, and social cohesion». The analysis of the text of the Decree indicates the neoliberal logic of urban security provision in Italy by redistributing security provision responsibility to the local level and prioritizing preventive measures.

Urban insecurity is constructed in the legal discourse mainly through ordinary (as opposed to organised) and predatory crime (for example, in the mentioned Decree of 2008 and Law 48/2017). However, some social issues also appear in the discourse on urban insecurity: social degradation, marginalisation, isolation, and others. In addition, incivilities (alcohol-induced violence, public or private assets damage) contribute to the legal urban insecurity discourse.

The analysis of other state-level documents indicates that immigration, especially the irregular one, is included in the legal discourse on urban insecurity in Italy as a factor aggravating it (Security Packages of 2008, 2010, 2017, and 2018). In 2010, the Security Integration Plan proposed an integrational and inclusive approach toward immigrants. Still, the Plan stated that the concentrated presence of foreigners might bring about insecurity to the local Italian population and the foreigners themselves.

At the level of the Lombardy region, the legislation provides for research on the territory to understand factors contributing to urban insecurity (Agreement for the Promotion of Integrated Security 2019). Additionally, various criminal phenomena appear in the legal discourse on urban insecurity at the regional level (for instance, in Lombardy Regional Law 6/2015).

The Milanese legislation constructs urban insecurity primarily through social issues and its subjective dimension. The local discourse on urban insecurity includes crime, urban decay, degradation, social marginalisation, lack of social solidarity, and vulnerability of some social groups (women, children, and youth) (for instance, Memoranda for Understanding Project *'Neighbourhood Control'* 2018).

As discussed earlier, politicians' left/right affiliation significantly shapes their policy discourse on urban insecurity. The current mayor of Milan, B. Sala (since 2016), is a centre-left politician who rarely addresses the topic of urban (in)security in mayoral provisions. The analysis of his ordinances on urban security shows that they are mainly issued in cases of special events (significant sports events, music concerts, etc.), the conduct of which requires increasing security measures.

To sum up, Italian legislation constructs urban insecurity as a complex phenomenon. On the one hand, the discourse on urban insecurity revolves around unorganised crime, incivilities, and urban physical degradation. On the other hand, the legal discourse on urban insecurity is based on and contributes to the stigmatisation of some social groups by drawing a connection between them and insecurity in Milan. Local legislation pays more attention to the social side of urban insecurity than the national one, which might be due to the political orientation of the current mayor of Milan.

NGOs: Displacement of Urban Insecurity to the Periphery of Milan

The representatives of NGOs characterised Milan as a secure city. Mainly, the interviewees attributed it to the visible presence of formal control (police forces) and neighbourhood watch in the streets and declining crime rates. Additionally, the NGO workers' discourse on urban security in Milan encompasses the vivacity of life in the city, highlighting the role of social, cultural, and educational activities in creating informal control and security in Milan.

Despite mentioning declining crime rates, the representatives of NGOs' discourse on urban insecurity revolved around violence, robberies, abusive occupation, and scams. In their opinion, these issues are inevitable in any large city. Incivilities (aggression, alcohol-induced misbehaviour, and baby-gangs⁴) also appeared in the discourse on urban insecurity in Milan.

The interviewee's discourse on crime was racialised to some extent as the representatives of the grass-root organisations drew a connection between crime and immigrants. Thus, Interviewees 2MV and 4MV suggested that immigrants might be more crime-prone due to experiencing economic hardship more frequently. Simultaneously, Interviewee 1MV pointed out that immigrants might have an even greater feeling of insecurity due to their stigmatisation and, as a result, attitude in society, including in institutional settings.

Visible signs of urban decay and degradation also contribute to the construction of urban insecurity in Milan. The interview analysis shows that this issue is especially acute in the city's periphery, constructed as an area of concentrated urban insecurity. Interviewee 4MV supposed that such a situation is due to «a will of the Municipality of Milan» to displace visible problems from the city centre to the periphery to make the centre more attractive. Additionally, the NGOs' representatives suggested that there is insufficient visible control in the periphery, which instils the perception of insecurity and feeling of abandonment.

As a result of this social and spatial stigmatisation, there is a tendency toward social and spatial segregation in Milan. Thus, the more affluent population tends to inhabit central neighbourhoods of the city, while less wealthy people live on the

⁴ An organised group of adolescents who usually commit petty crime or incivilities.

city's periphery. If various social groups coexist in one neighbourhood, physical signs of segregation (gated communities, CCTVs, etc.) usually appear there.

Lastly, the interviewees mentioned a lack of social cohesion as a factor contributing to urban insecurity. According to them, it happens due to possible difficulties with social integration and disaggregation of traditional social ties in large cities. Interviewee 3MV called it an «urban desert», which leads to indifference and a lack of help to others.

To summarise, it is evident that the NGOs' representatives accounted for the complex nature of urban insecurity, highlighting various city-specific problems. Although they constructed the phenomenon through crime and physical urban degradation, their discourse paid much attention to the social roots of urban insecurity.

Discussion and Conclusions

The article set out to understand similarities and differences in urban (in)security discourses generated by legislation and NGOs in two various contexts in Europe – Budapest and Milan. The study results indicate that the construction of urban security coincides in all the discourses and both contexts. More specifically, while legislation constructs urban security through public safety, public order, etc., the representatives of grass-root organisations build their discourse on urban security around declining crime rates, visible signs of securitisation and control, and safe public spaces. Therefore, there is coherency between the legal and NGOs' discourses in Budapest and Milan, highlighting the crucial role of public order and safety in creating urban security.

However, there are some principal differences in the discourses on urban insecurity within and between the two cities. These differences are firmly grounded in each city's context. Thus, although the legislation of both countries constructs urban insecurity through crime, incivilities, social and physical degradation, and exclusion of immigrants, the document analysis reveals some specificities in each context.

For instance, the Hungarian and Budapest policies mainly (with just a few exceptions) discuss urban security in strategic documents, shifting the focus from the current problems in the city to the goals the policies aim to achieve. It might be attributed to the specificities of neoliberalism development and the country's current political situation discussed in the literature (Akçali, Korkut 2015; Taşan-Kok 2004). Still, it should be mentioned that some documents highlight contextual problems resulting from the consequences of the transition period: lack of social trust and social and spatial segregation.

In contrast, the Italian and Milanese legislation connects urban insecurity with a variety of problems, highlighting the local nature of the phenomenon and paying much attention to the social side of urban insecurity at the local level. Additionally, the paper confirms the findings of Verga (2016) that there is a political division around the problem of urban insecurity in Milan: the centre-left government rarely

addresses urban insecurity directly. Therefore, the policies mainly aim to tackle various social issues, which might lead to increased security as a by-product.

Unlike the legal discourse, that of the grass-root organisations in both cities often discussed local problems that have both situational and social roots and emerge at a neighbourhood level. We attribute this difference to the involvement of NGOs in tackling urban insecurity in the immediate environment of its production. Additionally, the grass-root organisations participating in the research frequently deal with various social issues, which explains their attention to this side of urban insecurity. Therefore, this study suggests that NGOs and legislation can generate contrasting discourses on urban insecurity.

Still, the current study finds some principal differences between the cities in the NGOs' discourses. Although all the interviewees mentioned similar problems in their construction of urban insecurity (for example, a lack of formal and informal control, stigmatisation of some places and social groups, etc.), there are some variations which can be ascribed to the current economic, political, and social situation in each city.

For instance, while, in Budapest, there is a long history behind the stigmatisation of the Roma people, which also leads to the stigmatisation of places of their concentrated presence, in Milan, the stigmatisation mainly concerns immigrants, which is due to the exclusionary political and media discourses induced by increased immigration flows. Spatial stigmatisation has also various roots and is tackled differently in the cities: the Municipality of Budapest tries to alleviate it by making interventions in the problematic districts (although with some failures), while the local authorities of Milan reinforce it by displacing problems from the city centre to the periphery. Additionally, the research shows a difference in the explanations for the lack of trust in others and institutions. Thus, while in Budapest, it might be attributed to the societal consequences of the transition period, in Milan, it is mainly due to the conditions of urban life eroding traditional social ties.

Further research might be undertaken to investigate how these discourses impact, on the one hand, the implementation and further development or reformulation of policies and, on the other hand, actions undertaken by the NGOs. Such research would facilitate understanding how discourses influence practices in tackling urban insecurity.

References

- Akçali, E., Korkut, U. (2015), «Urban Transformation in Istanbul and Budapest: Neoliberal Governmentality in the EU's Semi-Periphery and its Limits», *Political Geography*, 46, pp. 76-88.
- Ban, C., Scheiring, G., Vasile, M. (2021), «The Political Economy of Rational-Neoliberalism», *European Politics and Society, Published Online*, Aug. 10, pp. 1-19.

- Baptista, I. (2013), «The Travels of Critiques of Neoliberalism: Urban Experiences from the “Borderlands”», *Urban Geography*, 34:5, pp. 590-611.
- Barabás, T.A., Koplányi, G., Szigeti, Á. (2018), «Insecurity Issues in Budapest, Hungary», in Barabás (ed.) (2018), *The Dimensions of Insecurity in Urban Areas: Research on the Roots of Unsafety and Fear of Crime in European Cities*, Budapest, National Institute of Criminology, pp. 119-144.
- Bohle, D., Greskovits, B. (2012), *Capitalist Diversity on Europe’s Periphery*, New York, Cornell Studies in Political Economy.
- Bonfigli, F. (2014), «Immigration and Public Security: The Implementation of Municipal Bylaws in Milan», *AmeriQuests*, 11:2, pp. 1-8.
- Bowen, G. (2009), «Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method», *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9:2, pp. 27-40.
- Colombo, M. (2018), «The Representation of the “European Refugee Crisis” in Italy: Domopolitics, Securitization, and Humanitarian Communication in Political and Media Discourses», *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*, 16:1-2, pp. 161-178.
- Crawford, A. (2009), «Situating Crime Prevention Policies in Comparative Perspective: Policy Travels, Transfer and Translation», in Crawford (ed.) (2009), *Crime Prevention Policies in Comparative Perspective*, Devon, Willan Publishing, pp. 1-37.
- Dal Lago, A., Palidda, S. (2010), «Introduction», in Dal Lago, Palidda (eds.) (2010), *Conflict, Security and the Reshaping of Society: The Civilization of War*, New York, Routledge, pp. 1-18.
- Edwards, A., Hughes, G., Lord, N. (2013), «Urban Security in Europe: Translating a Concept in Public Criminology», *European Journal of Criminology*, 10:3, pp. 260-283.
- Ferragina, E., Arrigoni, A. (2021), «Selective Neoliberalism: How Italy Went from Dualization to Liberalisation in Labour Market and Pension Reforms», *New Political Economy*, 26:6, pp. 964-984.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006), «Five Misunderstandings about Case-Study Research», *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12:2, pp. 219-245.
- Garland, D. (1996), «The Limits of the Sovereign State: Strategies of Crime Control in Contemporary Society», *The British Journal of Criminology*, 36:4, pp. 445-471.
- Garland, D. (2001), *The Culture of Control*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Göbl, G., Szalai, A. (2015), *Securitizing Migration in Contemporary Hungary*, Budapest, Central European University.
- Grabosky, P.N. (1992), «Law Enforcement and the Citizen: Non-Governmental Participants in Crime Prevention and Control», *Policing and Society*, 2:4, pp. 249-271.
- Hepworth, K. (2012), «Abject Citizens: Italian “Nomad Emergencies” and the Deportability of Romanian Roma», *Citizenship Studies*, 16:3-4, pp. 431-449.
- Herbert, S., Brown, E. (2006), «Conceptions of Space and Crime in the Punitive Neoliberal City», *Antipode*, 38:4, pp. 755-777.
- Hoffman, I. (2019), «Challenges of the Implementation of the European Charter of Local Self-Government in the Hungarian legislation», *Lex Localis - Journal of Local Self-Government*, 16:4, pp. 929-938.

- Jacobs, J. (1961), *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, New York, Vintage Books.
- Keresztély, K., Scott, J.W., Virág, T. (2017), «Roma Communities, Urban Development and Social Bordering in the Inner City of Budapest», *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40:7, pp. 1077-1095.
- Kóczé, A. (2018), «Race, Migration and Neoliberalism: Distorted Notions of Romani Migration in European Public Discourses», *Social Identities*, 24:4, pp. 459-473.
- Koff, S.Z., Koff, S.P. (2000), *Italy: From the 1st to the 2nd Republic*, London, Routledge.
- Muehlebach, A. (2013), «The Catholicization of Neoliberalism: On Love and Welfare in Lombardy, Italy», *American Anthropologist*, 115:3, pp. 452-465.
- Ong, A. (2006), *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*, Durham, Duke University Press.
- Ricotta, G. (2016), «Neoliberalism and Control Strategies: The Urban Security Policies in Italy», *The Open Journal of Sociopolitical Studies*, 9:2, pp. 543-566.
- Rogers, S. (2020), «Hungarian Authoritarian Populism: A Neo-Gramscian Perspective», *East European Politics*, 36:1, pp. 107-123.
- Rubin, H.J., Rubin, I.S. (2005), *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing the Data*, 2nd ed., Thousand Oaks, Sage.
- Selmini, R. (2005), «Towards Città sicure? Political Action and Institutional Conflict in Contemporary Preventive and Safety Policies in Italy», *Theoretical Criminology*, 9:3, pp. 307-323.
- Stefanizzi, S., Verdolini, V. (2018), «Bordered Communities: The Perception of Insecurity in Five European Cities», *Quality and Quantity*, 53:3, pp. 1165-1186.
- Stubbs, P., Lendvai-Bainton, N. (2019), «Authoritarian Neoliberalism, Radical Conservatism and Social Policy within the European Union: Croatia, Hungary and Poland», *Development and Change*, 51:2, pp. 540-560.
- Taşan-Kok, T. (2004), *Budapest, Istanbul, and Warsaw: Institutional and Spatial Change*, Delft, Eburon.
- Tosics, I. (2006), «Spatial Restructuring in Post-Socialist Budapest», in Tsenkova, Nedović-Budić (eds.) (2006), *The Urban Mosaic of Post-Socialist Europe. Space, Institutions and Policy*, Physica-Verlag, Springer, pp. 131-150.
- Valera, S., Guàrdia, J. (2014), «Perceived Insecurity and Fear of Crime in a City with Low-Crime Rates», *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 38, pp. 195-205.
- Verga, P.L. (2016), «Rhetoric in the Representation of a Multi-Ethnic Neighbourhood: The Case of Via Padova, Milan», *Antipode*, 48:4, 1080-1101.
- Wo, J.C., Hipp, J.R., Boessen, A. (2016), «Voluntary Organizations and Neighborhood Crime: A Dynamic Perspective», *Criminology*, 54:2, pp. 212-241.