

## **Section 10 - Studi regionali e politiche locali (Regional studies and local policies)**

***Chairs: Mattia Casula, Patrizia Messina***

*Elenco e descrizione di tutti i panels*

### **Panel 10.7 The new security policies around Europe: what's changing, what works, what doesn't, (and why).**

From the 1970s onwards, in the political market of the "full-grown democracies", security has become an "obsession" that citizens have increasingly demanded to their elected representatives. In particular, what they have asked is more guarantees of personal safety, protection against terrorism, and a reduction of fear and insecurity. On the political offer side, several policy platforms have been developed to meet that demand at all tiers of government. More recently, this has resulted in an expansion in the security policies of many European countries.

Security or crime prevention policies have been expanded in their reach and object of intervention. For example, aside the traditional goal of pre-empting the commission of crime, security and crime prevention policies have included goals that have usually pertained to other legal systems, such as the reduction of fear and insecurity, the enhancement of people's quality of life, and immigration – which are goals that have usually pertained to other legal systems, including the one of social policy. As a result of this process of expansion, in many EU member states also the object of crime prevention policies has been extended: not only (strictu sensu) criminal behaviour or conduct that is punished by the criminal law, but also sub-criminal forms of conduct, such as disorderly, uncivil, anti-social behaviour, have been subject to crime prevention initiatives. Concretely, what accounts as "incivilities", "nuisance", "antisocial behaviour" or "disorder" is usually predicated at the local level, and have tended to include seriously harmful conduct (e.g., vandalism) as well as relatively harmless behaviour (e.g., the presence in public spaces of "unwanted" people, including the homeless, migrants, young people, and sex workers).

Crime prevention has also rested on the devolution of crime prevention powers to other subjects than the agencies of formal control (or law enforcers, such as the police), which are the ones that have traditionally been entrusted with crime prevention functions. Local authorities, communities and even individuals have all been attributed competences in the field of security. Their ways of doing or managing the prevention and fighting of crime have included the establishment of partnerships at the local level, and the signing of security pacts or security contracts involving a different set of institutional actors. These new ways of doing crime prevention as reflected in "new security policies" – such as nodal governance, multi-agency partnership and coordination, "governing by contract" – have attracted a great deal of attention in scientific circles. However, they have relatively been under-addressed in political science and public policy analysis, and seldom been analysed through an interdisciplinary perspective.

In present times of economic hardship and penal populism, this panel focuses on the rapid evolution, complexities and effects of these "new security policies" in Italy as well in other

European countries. The panel invites contributions that critically analyse/evaluate national and local security policies (their adoption, implementation, output, and impact on individuals, social groups, statistics on crime), and the link between austerity/economic cycles/measures, fear of crime and crime control.

More specifically, but not exclusively, the papers in this panel will need to address the following questions:

- Which policy instruments have been used by national governments for governing crime and disorder at the local level?
- Have different policy instruments produced different effects at the local level in terms of efficacy?
- How have security policies been implemented in practice and with which effects?
- How do context-specific factors mediate in the implementation of security policies at the local level?
- How strong is local grassroots support of, and/or resistance to, national security policy?
  
- How do (urban) security policies managed "by contract" or partnership work in practice? Are they effective?
- How do economic factors correlate with fear of crime and determine security policies at the national and local levels?
- Are redistribution of law enforcement functions among central or peripheral institutions related to fewer funds allocated for law enforcement activities by the governments, or can all of these variables be considered as dependent on factors of an ideological nature?
- What works, what doesn't, (and why,) about old and new security policies?

The panel welcomes papers addressing the questions above, which rely on quantitative, qualitative and/or mixed methods. Contributions are encouraged from Europe, and from an interdisciplinary perspective including, but not restricted to, political science/public policy analysis, criminology, sociology, international relations, security studies, economics, and urban and planning studies. Single-case studies or cross-case comparisons are equally encouraged. Papers can be submitted in either English or Italian.

*Chairs: Marco Calaresu, Anna Di Ronco*