DOI: 10.15201/hungeobull.71.1.4 Hungarian Geographical Bulletin **71** 2022 (1) 55–65.

The geographical scales of fear: spatiality of emotions, emotional spatialities

Mirjam SÁGI[1]

Abstract

A multi-scalar understanding of fear has not been completely absent from geographical theory, however, it has not been given the attention it deserves and definitely has not been utilised in empirical research to the extent it has explanatory power to our globalised world infused with fears. By a multi-scalar understanding I refer to geographical scale as social production or social construction following critical geographers, who see the relationship between these scales as non-hierarchical. This paper draws on and combines theoretical works understanding fear as a socially and politically produced *emotion* that is politically exploited – most often through Othering – and operates on multiple geographical scales. It is an everyday experience that is produced and made sense across the scales of the body, home, neighbourhood, city, nation, region, supranational unions, the global scale and beyond. This paper draws together three particular areas concerning fear related research; (1) it emphasises that fear is an emotion; but (2) it is deeply embedded in social, economic, political and spatial relations and often closely linked to – if not dependent on – Othering and marginalisation; and (3) fear is reproduced in a trans-scalar way at all geographical scales. By drawing together these three interlinked approaches to fear, on the one hand, this paper aims to contribute to the literature by demonstrating the way the "us" versus "them" nexus is reimagined at different scales according to political convenience. On the other, it hopes to inspire more research in the field of emotional geography in general and that of fear in particular in Hungary (and more broadly in the CEE region), where this sub-field has been underrepresented even though its great explanatory potentials.

Keywords: geographical scale, fear, emotion, multi-scalar understanding

Received December 2021, accepted March 2022

Introduction

Fear is a truly personal emotion which both reflects social relations and has influence on them. Most often, the consequences of fear take spatial forms. Fear has the power to modify spatial realities. Without a spatial dimension, fear would be nothing much but a feeling – a state of mind. (Koskela, H. 2010, 389).

A multi-scalar/trans-scalar understanding of fear has not been completely absent from geographical theory (Pain, R. 2009; Abu-Orf, H. 2013; Pavoni, A. and Tulumello, S. 2020; Tulumello, S. 2020), however, it has not been given the attention it deserves – not in the international literature, even less so in the Central and Eastern European region – and definitely has not been utilised in empirical research to the extent it has explanatory power to our globalised world infused with fears. By a multi-scalar understanding I refer to geographical scale as social production or social construction following critical geographers, who see the relationship between these scales as non-hierarchical (Smith, N. 1992; Delaney, D. and Leitner, H. 1997; Marston, S.A. 2000).

This paper primarily draws on and combines the theoretical works of critical theorists and feminist scholars in particular – including Liz Bondi, Rachel Pain, Leslie Kern, Hille Koskela –, which led me to understand fear as a socially and politically produced *emotion*

[1] ELKH CERS, Institute of Regional Studies, Great Plain Research Institute, Békéscsaba Research Group. Szabó Dezső u. 40–42. H-5600 Békéscsaba, Hungary. E-mail: sagi.mirjam@krtk.hu

that is politically exploited and operates on multiple geographical scales. Fear is an everyday (space-)experience that is produced and made sense at the scale of the body, home, neighbourhood, city, nation, region, supranational unions, at a global scale and beyond.

This review article provides with a theoretical frame for understanding the socio-spatial (re)production of fear across geographical scales and the way fear shapes and is shaped by space. To do so, this paper draws together three interconnected literatures in human geography that defines the structure of the following sections too. The first section, following the introduction, gives an insight into the literature on the *geographies of emotions, affects and feelings*, suggesting that it is important to be conscious about the fact that fear is an emotion (and/or an affect and/or a feeling) and research dealing with it should not ignore the complexities of the production and lived experience of emotions. The second, focuses on the tight connection between fear and 'Othering', while aiming to *conceptualise fear beyond an individual experience*, embedded in socio-political relations. Finally, the third section moves *towards a multi-scalar understanding of fear*. Here, the importance of a multi/trans-scalar understanding of fear is highlighted, while discussing the way the "us" versus "them" nexus is reimagined at different scales according to political convenience. With the latter hoping to contribute to the existing literature.

The present paper, thus, draws together a multi-scalar/trans-scalar, emotional, spatial, and political understandings of fear and suggests that familiar versus unknown or "us" versus "them" dichotomies are reimagined at all scales (private-public; home-out; domestic-foreign) and concerning discourses jump scale according to political interest. They do so through Othering, on the one hand, by utilising a perceived fear of the unknown and on the other hand, by the reproducing of the idea of imagined communities (Anderson, B. 1983).

Furthermore, this paper hopes to inspire more research in the field of emotional geography in general and that of fear in particular in Hungary (and more broadly in the CEE region), where this sub-field has been underrepresented. Such absence of emotional considerations is particularly concerning in a region, where emotions have played particularly important role in the legitimisation of decision-making, effecting socio-economic and spatial processes and everyday life.

Geographies of emotions, affects and feelings

The meaning of fear has been often taken for granted in (geographical) research, when addressing fear of crime, fear of violence, fear in public space and so on. However, fear as an emotion is a lot more complex than to ignore the processes behind its production (Davidson, J. *et al.* 2005). Following the affective or emotional turn in social sciences there has been an increasing interest in the international geographical literature too, to incorporate discourses on "affect", "emotion", "embodiment", "performance" and "practice" by primarily drawing on post-structuralist and feminist literature (Thrift, N. 1997; Anderson, K. and Smith, S.J. 2001; Davidson, J. and Milligan, C. 2004; Thrift, N.J. 2008). Affective or emotional geography is an interdisciplinary subfield of geographical understanding of the world focusing on "theoretical and substantive considerations of emotion, space, and society" (Thien, D. 2017, 1702). While the connection between emotions and space and place has appeared in philosophical discussions for a long time (Sartre, J.-P. 1962; Smith, M. *et al.* 2012), human geography had been reluctant to address such connection, which can be linked to its continues self-defence within the wider field of geography, where emotion (allegedly opposite of *reason*) is often judged as ambiguous and non-scientific (Bondi, L. 2009). Even so, primarily with the help of feminist and gender scholarship's critique of dichotomous thinking (about emotions/reason), 'emotional ways of knowing' has enriched geographical research (Bondi, L. 2009), humanistic and phenomenological approaches, with a particular focus on feminist, health, social, cultural, critical race, and other geographies (Thien, D. 2017).

Considering word limitations and the focus of this paper, the conflicting views on the use of the terms, 'emotion', 'affect' and 'feeling' will not be discussed here. However, drawing on Bondi's (2009) summary, the most general differentiation between these concepts is that (1) *affect* is a feeling/emotion prior to cognition and rationality and therefore it is hard if impossible to translate it into words. In general, it has been used by geographers to express the bodily/sensory/unconscious experience of space; (2) *emotion* is something more available to thought, definable, expressible; and (3) those interested in *feeling* are mostly concerned with the bodily sensation (e.g., touch) and perception. The distinction between these terms has also been challenged for a variety of reasons. Among others Simonsen, K. (2007) highlights one that is particularly relevant to this paper. She argues for a relational and multi-scalar understanding of emotions, focusing on the social practices in a system of interconnected geographical scales (Simonsen, K. 2007; Pain, R. 2009).

Emotional turn in geography can be linked to a number of particular, overlapping schools; phenomenology or humanistic geography, feminist geography, psycho-analytic and non-representational geography (Bondi, L. 2005; Smith, M. *et al.* 2009; Blazek, M. 2015). Humanistic geography – inspired by phenomenological and existential philosophy –, understands the lived world(s) as "perceived and produced through our emotionally laden activities", focusing on the "subjective dimensions of human life" and the way people experience love, fear, hate, and other feelings in relation to places and spaces (Smith, M. *et al.* 2009, 10–11). Humanistic geography, arguing for a more "holistic understanding of the human experience in the sense of subjectivity" in the 1970s played an instrumental role in reinstating the importance of *subjective* human experience of the world as a critique of the hegemonic *objectivist* approach to space "informed by the assumptions of neo-classical economics, in which human beings are assumed to behave as autonomous, economically rational actors" (Bondi, L. 2005, 435).

Feminist geography's critique of such dualism overlaps with the phenomenological understanding, but it takes it further, by drawing on post-structuralism, generalizing the critique of dichotomous approach (of geographical thought) to the understanding of the world in general. Beyond, problematizing binary oppositions – such as body/mind, masculinity/femininity, structure/agency, nature/culture, rationality/emotion, objective/subjective – it has highlighted that such pairs are always in a hierarchical relationship and always aligned with each other (Timár, J. 1993; Massey, D. 1994; Bondi, L. and Rose, D. 2003; Timár, J. 2005, 2018). Feminist geography aims to unsettle these aligned associations made between masculinity and objectivity – leading to the exclusion of emotions from the spaces identified as spaces of rationality and masculinity (i.e., spaces of production, work, politics, public space, city centre) – and between femininity and subjectivity – where spaces of emotions (i.e., spaces of reproduction, home, care) assumed to lack rationality (McDowell, L. 1983; Bondi, L. and Rose, D. 2003; Fenster, T. 2005; Kirmani, N. 2015). They argue that such alignment result "in oppressive gendered production of space" (by Rose, G. [1993] in Blazek, M. 2015, 1998). Additionally, feminist geography brings "a critical awareness of gendering emotions", most typically fear for that matter (Valentine, G. 1989; Koskela, H. and Pain, R. 2000; Smith, M. *et al.* 2009, 11).

Non-representational theory (NRT, later also referred to as more-than-representational theory [Lorimer, H. 2005]) argues that human geography has been bound up with the analysis of representation, neglecting practice and embodied experiences (Thrift, N. 1999; Thrift, N.J. 2008), in fact, according to NRT representation should not be the primary explanatory tool of the world. To put simply NRT is interested in "what people do and not in what people say they do" (Thrift, N. 1997; Bondi, L. 2005; Lorimer, H. 2005; Smith, M. *et al.* 2009, 12). As NRT seeks to challenge the dominance of cognition in epistemology, it has a preference of the term 'affect' over 'emotion'.

Bondi, L. (2005) complements these approaches by including a psychoanalytic perspective, highlighting the blurry border between individual subjectivity and social identities. Leading to the next section, psychoanalytic approach emphasises emotions' influence on both individual mental health as well as on socio-political cohesion that shapes "social relations through the mediation of the self's relations to those deemed 'other', drawing and redrawing boundaries between you and me, them and us via feelings of attraction, repulsion, and so on" (Smith, M. *et al.* 2009, 12). Such boundaries are reinforced through spatial formations – borders – defining (who/where is) within and without/outside.

Conceptualising fear beyond an individual experience from a geographical perspective

As the previous section concluded that emotions are more than individual experiences, this section highlights how fear – as an emotion – makes sense in its wider context. In fact, fear as a social problem has appeared in many subfields of geography, such as those linked to urban research, criminology, anthropology, gender studies, geo-informatics and so on (Koskela, H. 2010). As Koskela, H. (2010, 389) writes "as a research topic, fear is fascinating", because it is: individual, social, and spatial. Fear and fear of crime, in particular – Koskela, H. (2009, 335) argues – "is constantly modifying spatial realities" leading people to take different routes or staying at home when its dark outside. There have been several ways in which geographers and spatial theorist have approached fear. In fact, more often than being considered as an emotion, fear is researched as a by-product of criminal activities, terrorism, or lack of security. There are other ways in which these approaches can be categorised, but a chronological overview that provides insights into ideological differences as well is a helpful way to see how different schools have transformed over the time and the way they defined sources of danger (i.e., Others). In particular, Koskela, H. (2009, 2:335) identifies three overlapping traditions in the geography of fear. First is a *macro scale approach* linking back to the sociologists of the Chicago School of the 1920s–1930s without much emphasis on emotion. The primary focus of this tradition is on fear of crime and the way it can be mapped in order to paint a picture of more fearful areas, cities etc., using cognitive mapping and survey questionnaires. Such research has entered a new phase with technological and methodological development utilising geographic information systems (GIS), and big data sources, such as social media as tools. As Koskela, H. (2009, 335) notes "a characteristic of this tradition is that it recognizes space as a surface". Macro scale approaches, unintentionally, often contribute to the Othering of spaces.

The second category that Koskela identifies comprises of research that focuses on the *micro scale*. This can be more directly linked to the above mentioned humanistic, phenomenological, and earlier waves of the feminist approaches of the 1970s–1990s that are more interested in fear as experienced and the *way* it is aroused by "physical forms" and "social situations". Beside the above methods, it also uses (in depth) interviews as it aims to develop an understanding of space that is beyond a surface (Koskela, H. 2009) or a container. Early feminist research on fear, however, often ended up reinforcing dichotomies by reinforcing vulnerable women and perpetrator Others (Hall, A. 2010).

The third category, Koskela, H. (2009, 336) named as the *production of space approach* according to which "fear cannot be presented just as a combination of frightening physical structures and social situations but that the physical and social dimensions are fundamentally intertwined". Rather than being curious with mapping out spaces of fear, this approach goes beyond seeing fear as a "private problem of an individual" and is concerned with the power structure contributing to the social production of fear as an emotion (Fenster, T. 2005; Koskela, H.

2009). It is therefore pay close attention to the processes of 'Othering' and in fact argues that "if there was no Other there would be no reason to be afraid"; that said, "fear has an unholy alliance with prejudice, hate and anger" (Koskela, H. 2010, 390).

More recent studies have increasingly considered intersectional approaches leading to further unsettle dichotomous approaches to fear (i.e., white middle class women as victims and racialised Others as perpetrators) (Rodó-de-Zárate, M. and Baylina, M. 2018), as well as Sara Ahmed's notion of emotion as cultural practices, not as psychological states. In her interpretation, cultural politics of emotions produce "others" by defining which bodies belong within and which bodies should be marginalized through representation and (material) rhetoric (Ahmed, S. 2004).

Tulumello, S. (2015, 2020) also discusses representation in relation to fear, , but through the notion of the landscape of fear (or 'fearscape' – see also Rashmi, R. and Rai, A.K. 2019), based on cultural geography's discourse on landscape as the representation of nature/environment. He does so by drawing on the conceptualization of the landscape of fear by Tuan, Y. (1979) – "putting psychological states and tangible environments into dialogue" – and its development by Gold and Revill – highlighting the political nature behind (Gold, J.R. and Revill, G. 2003) – entwined with marginalisation and othering. Tulumello, S. (2020, 129) highlights the central role "distance" plays in the existence of landscape, writing that landscape "exists because of the distance between the observer and the observed". Similarly, fear exists through such distances; without actual experiences of violence the construction of dangerous Others happens as a consequence of imagery (representation) and results in the shaping of space (Tulumello, S. 2020). Tulumello argues for reducing such 'distance', as only by crossing socio-spatial borders, through proximity and by 'living the space' can one make sense to its frightfulness and potentially unlearn the fear associated with certain spaces. This account of fear, not only highlights that by the production of distance, the practice of Othering becomes easier, but also leads to the conceptualisation of fear as trans-scalar (Tulumello, S. 2020, 29).

Towards a multi-scalar understanding of fear

The previous sections have argued, first, that it is important to reflect on the emotional qualities of fear and, second, that fear as an emotion should be understood through social, political, economic, and spatial relations. This section places fear in a multi-scalar/trans-scalar frame by drawing on the existing literature and by beginning to unfold the arguments of the present paper; that is (1) familiar-Other dichotomies are reimagined at all scales (private-public, home-outside, domestic-foreign, etc.) to serve various political interests and (2) while fear associated with Others (and Other places) is socially and politically reinforced, being afraid of familiar people and places tend to be "tabooised" and seen irrational.

A more traditional, "methodological" approach to geographical scale understands geographical scales as a hierarchical system of cities, regions, countries etc. where each layer may provide with an aggregated average of social, economic, or political information, but they hide the difference and inequalities within (Latour, B. 1987; Berki, M. 2014). Driven from such limitation the concept of scale has been objected to theoretical reflections in human geography, now, for decades motivating debates across its subfields (for examole as discussed by Marston, S.A. *et al.* 2005), primarily focusing on the social production/construction of scale (Smith, N. 1992; Delaney, D. and Leitner, H. 1997; Marston, S.A. 2000). Research by Pain, R. (2009) has been fundamental to developing such non-hierarchical, multi-/trans-scalar understanding of fear and particularly important in highlighting the problematic nature of the idea that fear is produced at a larger – global, international, 'political' – scale, dripping "down into people's minds, bodies and everyday lives" as passive receivers (Pain,

R. 2009, 472). She makes this observation in relation to the geopolitics of fear that she argues – in a paradoxical way – lacks interest in emotion itself, reinforcing "a fixation with the global as the key scale for analysis" and "disempowering identities for its supposed subjects" (Pain, R. 2009, 472). Such shortfalls, however, have been addressed in subsequent research by Pain, R. and of others through research focusing geopolitics and/or planetary urbanism leading to a more emotional multi-/trans-scalar conceptualisation of fear that considers Othering as central to the production of fear (Abu-Orf, H. 2013; Pain, R. and Staeheli, L. 2014; Listerborn, C. 2015; Pain, R. 2015; Christian, J. *et al.* 2016; Pavoni, A. and Tulumello, S. 2020; Tulumello, S. 2020).

Hoping to achieve a trans-scalar (Tulumello, S. 2020) approach, thus, not falling into a hierarchical review of fear at different scales, the following paragraphs discuss the interconnected nature of re/production of fear from the scale of the body to the to the global scale considering the processes of 'Othering' as a central element. With relying on examples primarily from the Hungarian context the following paragraphs address the second goal of this paper that is to highlights the importance and relevance of a trans-scalar understanding of fear in the context of Hungary (and perhaps in the region in general).

Trans-scalar production of fear and the re/production of Othering across scales

Crossing the road due to the fear of passing by a stranger at night is beyond an individual instinctive reaction. It is a practice informed by one's understanding of their body in a given cultural, social, political and economic context. Drawing on Susan de Beauvoir's 'theory of the situation of the women' and Maurice Merleau-Ponty's 'theory of the lived body' Young, I.M. (1980, 144) in her paper, "Throwing like a girl: A phenomenology of feminine body comportment motility and spatiality" argues that a woman as a human existence (as a subject) understands her *objectification*, her 'Othered' status. Young identifies two main manifestations of this understanding; the lack of confidence and the fear of getting hurt, both of which girls acquire throughout their development/socialisation, through the learning process whereby "a girl comes to understand that she is a girl" (Young, I.M. 1980, 154).

While crossing the road to avoid passing by a – potentially gendered, classes, and/or racialised Other – stranger at night is seen normal, fear within one's home, among family has been marked by taboos, hysteria and/or shame. The romanticisation of home has been central to western culture and the idea that one's home would not provide with security, love and comfort has been long ignored along with the diverse meanings 'home' may entail (Blunt, A. 2005). It is so, as in the general imagery, harm comes from Others and happens in other spaces (Datta, A. 2016) beyond the borders of home. As this paper argues such borders define every scale, but with enlarged concepts of 'home'. A multi-scalar understanding of home (Blunt, A. *et al.* 2021) and of (domestic) violence in particular has been also discussed – in feminist geopolitics – in relation to global terrorism and the politics of fear emphasising that violence at home is overshadowed by the war on terror (Pain, R. 2014) and the securitization of public spaces. This has been conspicuously demonstrated, in the case of Hungary, for example, by its' reluctance to ratify the Istanbul Convention that stands against violence against women and domestic violence. The Istanbul Convention was left unsigned by the government following a debate in the European Parliament that managed to politicise the content of the Convention (Krizsán, A. and Roggeband, C. 2021). The argument against the ratification was that the Convention uses the "non-consensual and ambiguous term 'gender'" (Kováts, E. 2020, 91). This (non)action showcases the prioritisation of national politics over personal experience through an international policy used for national political goal.

As opposed to home, the scale of the city, and public spaces in particular have been considered as dangerous, violent and fear-

ful spaces (Pavoni, A. and Tulumello, S. 2020). This notion has been utilised in everyday and political discourse both to limit the movement of women and children as well as to justify penal/regulatory policies towards those considered as the source of danger, reinforcing (urban) fear as inherently gendered phenomena (Bondi, L. and Rose, D. 2003; Kern, L. 2007, 2010, 2020). In this context, urban Others (e.g., homeless people, Roma people, prostitutes) as perpetrators and white middle-class women as victims has been "a ubiquitous topos of public representation" even though it is known "that sexual violence is more often committed by acquaintances, (ex-)partners, or relatives" (Hall, A. 2010; Tulumello, S. 2020, 128). Mostly in western context such issues have been addressed through new forms of privatisations in urban planning to enable/empower women through planning and policies (Beebeejaun, Y. 2009). However, these practices (e.g., gated parks) are often in the favour of reinforcing traditional gender roles (Kern, L. 2010) as well as reinforcing other forms of differences and discriminations (Koskela, H. and Pain, R. 2000; Lawton, C.A. and Kallai, J. 2002; Phillips, D. 2006; Beebeejaun, Y. 2009; Koskela, H. 2010).

While homeless people are generally pictured as sources of fear in the context of urban violence, when the migration crisis of 2015 has hit Hungary, a discourse comparing the support given to refugees and local homeless by civil organisation has risen. Government related media outlets expressed their disapproval of helping (with food and warm clothes) refugees – deemed dangerous – as opposed to supporting 'our own' poor. Regarding the terror attacks and terrorism discourses of the early 21st century, Pain, R. (2009, 436) argues, that "the idea that governments are increasingly manufacturing, drawing upon and reproducing fear (at least, certain sorts of fears) has become the predominant focus of attention." This has been conspicuously demonstrated during the arrival and subsequently by the approach to non-white migrants (refugees) arriving at the Hungarian borders (Feischmidt, M. 2020), reproducing narratives that situate (white) western populations within the boundaries of the Homeland, and dangerous Others outside (Pain, R. 2009). However, whether the (Central and) Eastern European region is part of the club also shift from time to time or even more from discourse to discourse leading to the formation of a variety of supranational formations, the re-imagination of "imagined communities" (Anderson, B. 1983), and the liquidity and trans-scalar nature of 'home/land'. That is to say, such discourses "jump scale" (Smith, N. 1992) easily.

Regional level groupings, such as the union of the four Visegrad (V4) countries or the European Union, allow the definitions of different "us" and "them" narratives. As Lamour, C. (2021) argues in the case of the EU, but just as much relevant in the case of the V4 countries the link between populism and regionalism and related complex "economic power geometries" has reproduced and reinforces new forms of regionalism, "regional vison"; and has led to new forms of "uneven development, socio-spatial polarization and a transformation of solidarity regulations" (Lamour, C. 2021, 3).

Then there are fears that are beyond any forms of borders, organised around fears that are often so abstract and far from everyday personal experiences that can be generalised as much as they can develop meaning anywhere. Bondi, L. (2009) refers to these as "globalised fears", arguing that "local threats" were replaced/combined with "global threats" and similarly so, Koskela, H. (2010) argues that "local Others" were replaced – I would argue – or combined with "global Others". At least so, global Othering gained local meanings.

The multi-scalar nature of fear is further mediated by a variety of globalised sources of culture, information and knowledge, such as international news portals, social media, movies, and providers such as Netflix. That is to say, individual emotions not only reflect experiences re/produced at different scales, but also their media representation (Bondi, L. 2009).

In fact, media outlets have peculiar effects on blending together – and scaling up – fears determined at different scales. Even more, they contribute to the globalisation of fears where fear loses its "spatial and temporal" terms, becoming unpredictable and uncontrollable (Beck, U. 2002; Pain, R. 2009). Increasingly so in the cases of climate change, immigration flows or diseases such as the COVID-19.

Conclusions

The present paper combines and draws on the existing literature on multi-scalar/trans-scalar, emotional, spatial, and political understandings of fear (1) to contribute to the literature by highlighting the way the political production of fear can jump across scales, and (2) to highlight its relevance in the Hungarian (and Central and Eastern European) context.

I suggest that "familiar" versus "unknown" or "us" versus "them" dichotomies are reimagined at all scales (private-public; domestic-foreign) and concerning discourses jump scale according to political convenience. Such discourses jump scale by the constant definition and re-definition of Others and imagined communities. Fear associated with others and other spaces are socially and politically reinforced, while being afraid of familiar people or spaces is often 'tabooised' and seen irrational.

The affective/emotional turn in geography have greatly affected the discipline resulting in ground-breaking research and a more nuanced understanding of the world. There are greatly valuable and inspiring research in this field, many noted above. However, often there is an argument from researchers from the semi-periphery of Europe in particular that emotions are out of the horizon of this region because there are materialities that need faster fix. Studies (e.g., on the post-socialist transformation in CEE) have shown that there are views according to which just like there is no time to deal with gender equality (Timár, J. 1993), there is no time for emotions either. This paper, however, wants to point out that there *should be* time as emotions are not bourgeois mischiefs, or boredom of the western middle class. This paper argues that emotions structure political and economic systems at every scale, in fact emotions contributes to multi-scalar politics – both top-down (e.g., in the form of oppression) and bottom-up (in the form of resistance).

There is an important point that has not been highlighted in this paper so far that is the question of whose fears matter. As Pain, R. (2010, 471) writes there are "assumptions about the ways in which emotions originate, travel, and affect and [i]ronically, geographers have sometimes joined in the universalization of fear, applying it with a broad brush across a flat earth". This is another argument for more relevant research to be conducted in Hungary, Central and Eastern Europe and outside of the core countries in general. While in the Anglo-American world geographical research have immersed in emotions in the last decade, in Hungary barely any geographers have been inspired by the concepts of emotion, feeling and affect, at most tangentially (Czirfusz, M. 2014; Fabók, M. and Berki, M. 2018), in relation to tourism (Michalkó, G. and Rátz, T. 2008; Irimiás, A. *et al.* 2021), care migration (Németh, K. and Váradi, M.M. 2018), and the politics of commemoration (Erőss, Á. 2017). From outside of the discipline, probably the most relevant reading is a recently published book that approaches the geographies of affect through the analysis of contemporary literature and visual culture (Györke, Á. and Bülgözdi, I. 2020; Sági, M. 2021), but environmental psychologists have also actively engaged in understanding the relationship between emotions and space (Dúll, A. 2022), however, with less consideration of the production of space.

'Fear' has been somewhat more popular topic in human geography in Hungary (e.g., Molnár, A. 2012; Pődör, A. *et al.* 2016; Jakobi, Á. and Pődör, A. 2020), however, in most cases with little attention to its complexities either as an emotion or as a social construction, but rather as a consequence of crime. I believe that locally specific matters – such as debates over (the persistent relevance

of) post-socialist cities (Bodnár, J. 2001; Grubbauer, M. 2012; Csomós, G. *et al.* 2020; Fabula, Sz. *et al.* 2021) – would also benefit from further exploring non-hierarchical approaches to scale in general (e.g., Timár, J. 2004; Czirfusz, M. *et al.* 2018; Szalai, Á. *et al.* 2021) and in relation to emotion and fear in particular, while also providing with a comparative lens and new perspectives about existing knowledge elsewhere (Robinson, J. 2016) on the multi-scalar production of fear.

Acknowledgement: Project no. 138713 ("Marginalised space experience in the context of uneven geographical development") has been implemented with the support provided by the Ministry of Innovation and Technology of Hungary from the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund, financed under the K_21 funding scheme.

REFERENCES

Abu-Orf, H. 2013. Fear of difference: 'Space of risk' and anxiety in violent settings. *Planning Theory* 12. (2): 158–176.

Ahmed, S. 2004. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined Communities*. London, Verso.

Anderson, K. and Smith, S.J. 2001. Editorial: Emotional geographies. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 26. (1): 7–10.

Beck, U. 2002. The terrorist threat: World risk society revisited. *Theory, Culture & Society* 19. (4): 39–55.

Beebeejaun, Y. 2009. Making safer places: Gender and the right to the city. *Security Journal* 22. 219–229.

Berki, M. 2014. *Az egykori ipari területek funkcióváltásának példái Budapesten – A poszt-szocialista kontextus és a földrajzi lépték szerepe az átalakulásban* (Examples for the functional replacement of former industrial areas in case of Budapest – The role of post-socialist context and geographical scale in the transformation process). Doctoral dissertation. Budapest, ELTE Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem.

Blazek, M. 2015. Children's emotional geographies: Politics of difference and practices of engagement. In *Childrens's Spatialities. Studies in Childhood and Youth*. Eds.: Hackett, A., Procter, L. and Seymour, J., London, Palgrave Macmillan, 95–111.

Blunt, A. 2005. Cultural geography: Cultural geographies of home. *Progress in Human Geography* 29. (4): 505–515.

Blunt, A., Ebbensgaard, C.L. and Sheringham, O. 2021. The "living of time": Entangled temporalities of home and the city. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 46. (1): 149–162.

Bodnár, J. 2001. Posted: socialism, modernity, state. In *Fin de Millénaire Budapest. Metamorphoses of Urban Life.* Author: Bodnár, J., Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1–12.

Bondi, L. 2005. Making connections and thinking through emotions: Between geography and psychotherapy. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30. (4): 433–448.

Bondi, L. 2009. Emotional knowing. In *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*. Eds.: Kitchin, R. and Thrift, N., Amsterdam–Oxford, Elsevier, 446–452.

Bondi, L. and Rose, D. 2003. Constructing gender, constructing the urban: A review of Anglo-American feminist urban geography. *Gender, Place and Culture* 10. (3): 229–245.

Christian, J., Dowler, L. and Cuomo, D. 2016. Fear, feminist geopolitics and the hot and banal. *Political Geography* 54. 64–72.

Csomós, G., Farkas, J.Z. and Kovács, Z. 2020. Access to urban green spaces and environmental inequality in post-socialist cities. *Hungarian Geographical Bulletin* 69. (2): 191–207.

Czirfusz, M. 2014. Érzelmek a gazdaságföldrajzban: Fodor Ferenc vitája a Földrajzi Közleményekben (Emotions in economic geography: Ferenc Fodor's argument in Földrajzi Közlemények [Geographical Review]). In *Földrajz és Földtudomány az Eötvös Collegiumban.* Ed.: Győri, R., Budapest, Eötvös Collegium, 143–161.

Czirfusz, M., Jelinek, C. and Berki, M. 2018. Tér a marxista elméletekben (Space in the marxist theories). In *Kortárs térelméletek közép-kelet-európai kontextusban.* Ed.: Faragó, L., Budapest, Dialóg Campus Kiadó, 143–164.

Datta, A. 2016. Another rape? The persistence of public/private divides in sexual violence debates in India. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 6. (2): 173–177.

Davidson, J. and Milligan, C. 2004. Embodying emotion sensing space: introducing emotional geographies. *Social & Cultural Geography* 5. (4): 523–532.

Davidson, J., Bondi, L. and Smith, M. 2005. *Emotional Geographies*. Aldershot, Ashgate.

Delaney, D. and Leitner, H. 1997. The political construction of scale. *Political Geography* 16. (2): 93–97.

Dúll, A. 2022. A környezetpszichológiától az ember-környezet tranzakció tudományig – áttekintés az elmúlt (majdnem) 30 évről (From the environmental psychology to the people-environment transaction science – a survey about the last [nearly] 30 years). *Magyar Pszichológiai Szemle* 76. (3–4): 727–745.

Erőss, Á. 2017. Living memorial and frozen monuments: the role of social practice in memorial sites. *Urban Development Issues* 55. 19–32.

Fabók, M. and Berki, M. 2018. Új materialista relacionális térelméletek: a reprezentáción túl, a

szövevények hálójában (New materialist relational space theories: over the representation, in the network of labyrinths). In *Kortárs térelméletek közép-kelet-európai kontextusban*. Ed.: Faragó, L., Budapest, Dialóg Campus Kiadó, 325–348.

Fabula, Sz., Skovgaard Nielsen, R., Barberis, E., Boros, L., Hedegaard Winther, A. and Kovács, Z. 2021. Diversity and local business structure in European urban contexts. *Hungarian Geographical Bulletin* 70. (1): 65–80.

Feischmidt, M. 2020. Deployed fears and suspended solidarity along the migratory route in Europe. *Citizenship Studies* 24. (4): 441–456.

Fenster, T. 2005. The right to the gendered city: Different. *Journal of Gender Studies* 14. (3): 217–231.

Gold, J.R. and Revill, G. 2003. Exploring landscapes of fear: marginality, spectacle and surveillance. *Capital & Class* 27. (2): 27–50.

Grubbauer, M. 2012. Toward a more comprehensive notion of urban change: Linking post-socialist urbanism and urban theory. In *Chasing Warsaw. Socio-Material Dynamics of Urban Change since 1990.* Eds.: Grubbauer, M. and Kusiak, J., Frankfurt, Campus, 35–60.

Györke, Á. and Bülgözdi, I. (eds.) 2020. *Geographies of Affect in Contemporary Literature and Visual Culture: Central Europe and the West*. Leiden, Brill.

Hall, A. 2010. 'These people could be anyone': Fear, contempt (and empathy) in a British immigration removal centre. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36. (6): 881–898.

Irimiás, A., Mitev, A.Z. and Michalkó, G. 2021. Narrative transportation and travel: The mediating role of escapism and immersion. *Tourism Management Perspectives* 38. 100793.

Jakobi, Á. and Pődör, A. 2020. GIS-based statistical analysis of detecting fear of crime with digital sketch maps: A Hungarian multicity study. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information* 9. (4): 229.

Kern, L. 2007. Reshaping the boundaries of public and private life: Gender, condominium development, and the neoliberalization of urban living. *Urban Geography* 28. (7): 657–681.

Kern, L. 2010. Selling the 'scary city': Gendering freedom, fear and condominium development in the neoliberal city. *Social and Cultural Geography* 11. (3): 209–230.

Kern, L. 2020. *Feminist City : Claiming Space in a Man-made World*. N.Y. Brooklyn, Verso.

Kirmani, N. 2015. Fear and the city: Negotiating everyday life as a young Baloch man in Karachi. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 58. 732–755.

Koskela, H. 2000. 'The gaze without eyes': video-surveillance and the changing nature of urban space. *Progress in Human Geography* 24. (2): 243–265.

Koskela, H. 2009. Fear of crime. In *International Encyclopaedia of Human Geography*. Eds.: Kitchin, R. and Thrift, N., Amsterdam–Oxford, Elsevier, 334–339.

Koskela, H. 2010. Fear and its others. In *The SAGE Handbook of Social Geographies*. Eds.: Smith, S.J., Pain, R., Marston, S.A. and Jones III, J.P., Los Angeles–London, SAGE, 389–408.

Koskela, H. and Pain, R. 2000. Revisiting fear and place: women's fear of attack and the built environment. *Geoforum* 31. 269–280.

Kováts, E. 2020. Post-socialist conditions and the Orbán Government's gender politics between 2010 and 2019 in Hungary. In *Right-Wing Populism and Gender: European Perspectives and Beyond*. Eds.: Dietze, G. and Roth, J., Bielefeld, Transcript Verlag, 75–100.

Krizsán, A. and Roggeband, C. 2021. Opposing the Istanbul Convention: Actors, strategies and frames. In *Politicizing Gender and Democracy in the Context of the Istanbul Convention.* Eds.: Krizsán, A. and Roggeband, C., Cham, Springer International Publishing, 55–119.

Lamour, C. 2021. A radical-right populist definition of cross-national regionalism in Europe: Shaping power geometries at the regional scale beyond state borders. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 46. (1): 8–25.

Latour, B. 1987. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge, MASS, Harvard University Press.

Lawton, C.A. and Kallai, J. 2002. Gender differences in wayfinding strategies and anxiety about wayfinding: A cross-cultural comparison. *Sex Roles* 47. (9): 389–401.

Listerborn, C. 2015. Geographies of the veil: violent encounters in urban public spaces in Malmö, Sweden. *Social & Cultural Geography* 16. (1): 95–115.

Lorimer, H. 2005. Cultural geography: the busyness of being 'more-than-representational'. *Progress in Human Geography* 29. (1): 83–94.

Marston, S.A. 2000. The social construction of scale. *Progress in Human Geography* 24. (2): 219–242.

Marston, S.A., Jones III, J.P. and Woodward, K. 2005. Human geography without scale. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30. (4): 416–432.

Massey, D. 1994. *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

McDowell, L. 1983. Towards an understanding of the gender division of urban space. *Environment Planning D: Society and Space* 1. 59–73.

Michalkó, G. and Rátz, T. 2008. The role of the tourist milieu in the social construction of the tourist experience. *JOHAR* 3. (1): 22–32.

Molnár, A. 2012. A maszkulin és heteroszexuális köztér termelése: Elméleti háttér a társadalmi tértermelésnek a bűncselekményektől való félelem kontextusában történő oktatásához (The production of masculine and heterosexual public spaces. Theoretical background for the study of the social

construction of space in the context of fear of crime). *Tér és Társadalom* 26. (1): 26–40.

Németh, K. and Váradi, M.M. 2018. Development in the context of care migration from rural Hungary: An agency-based approach. *Szociológiai Szemle* 28. (4): 88–110.

Pain, R. 2009. Globalized fear? Towards an emotional geopolitics. *Progress in Human Geography* 33. (4): 466–486.

Pain, R. 2014. Everyday terrorism. *Progress in Human Geography* 38. (4): 531–550.

Pain, R. 2015. Intimate war. *Political Geography* 44. 64–73.

Pain, R. and Staeheli, L. 2014. Introduction: intimacy-geopolitics and violence. *Area* 46. (4): 344–347.

Pavoni, A. and Tulumello, S. 2020. What is urban violence? *Progress in Human Geography* 44. (1): 49–76.

Phillips, D. 2006. Parallel lives? Challenging discourses of British Muslim self-segregation. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24. 25–40.

Pődör, A., Révész, A., Rácskai, P. and Sasvár, Z. 2016. Measuring citizens' fear of crime using a web application: A case study. *GI Forum* 2. 123–133.

Rashmi, R. and Rai, A.K. 2019. Fear of victimization and women fearscapes: An exploratory study of Varanasi city, India. *International Journal of Advance and Innovative Research* 6. (1): 203–212.

Robinson, J. 2016. Thinking cities through elsewhere. *Progress in Human Geography* 40. (1): 3–29.

Rodó-de-Zárate, M. and Baylina, M. 2018. Intersectionality in feminist geographies. *Gender, Place & Culture* 25. (4): 547–553.

Sági, M. 2021. Györke, Á. and Bülgözdi, I. (eds.): Geographies of Affect in Contemporary Literature and Visual Culture: Central Europe and the West. A book review. *Hungarian Geographical Bulletin* 70. (2): 193–195.

Sartre, J.-P. 1962. *Sketch for a Theory of the Emotions*. Reprint 2002. London, Routledge.

Simonsen, K. 2007. Practice, spatiality and embodied emotions: An outline of a geography of practice. *Human Affairs* 17. (2): 168–181.

Smith, N. 1992. Contours of a spatialized politics: Homeless vehicles and the production of geographical scale. *Social Text* 33. 55–81.

Smith, M., Davidson, J., Cameron, L. and Bondi, L. 2009. Geography and emotion – emerging constellations. In *Emotion, Place, and Culture.* Eds.: Smith, M., Davidson, J., Cameron, L. and Bondi, L., Farnham, Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 1–18.

Smith, M., Davidson, J. and Henderson, V.L. 2012. Spiders, Sartre and 'magical geographies': The emotional transformation of space. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37. (1): 60–74.

Szalai, Á., Varró, K. and Fabula, Sz. 2021. Towards a multiscalar perspective on the prospects of 'the actually existing smart village' – a view from Hungary. *Hungarian Geographical Bulletin* 70. (2): 97–112.

Thien, D. 2017. Emotional geographies. In *The International Encyclopedia of Geography*. Eds.: Richardson, D., Castree, N., Goodchild, M.F., Kobayashi, A., Liu, W. and Marston, S.A., London, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 205–218.

Thrift, N. 1997. The still point: resistance, embodiment and dance. In *Geographies of Resistance.* Eds.: Pile, S. and Keith, M., London, Routledge,

Thrift, N. 1999. Steps to an ecology of place. In *Human Geography Today.* Eds.: Massey, D., Allen, J. and Sarre, P., Cambridge, Polity Press, 295–322.

Thrift, N.J. 2008. *Non-representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. London, Routledge.

Timár, J. 1993. A nők tanulmányozása a földrajzban, avagy: van-e létjogosultsága a feminista geográfiának Magyarországon? (Studying women in geography, or: does feminist geography have grounds in Hungary?) *Tér és Társadalom* 7. (1–2): 1–18.

Timár, J. 2004. Gendered urban policy-making: the role of geographical scale in women's participation in Hungarian local governments. In *Gendered Cities. Identities, Activities, Networks: A Life-course Approach.* Eds.: Cortesi, G., Cristaldi, F. and Droogleever, F., Roma, Societa Geografica Italiana, 227–243.

Timár, J. 2005. Gender and spatial inequalities in Hungary in the transition era. In *Hungarian Space and Places: Patterns of Transition.* Eds.: Barta, G., G. Fekete, É., Szörényiné Kukorelli, I. and Timár, J., Pécs, Centre for Regional Studies, 307–322.

Timár, J. 2018. A feminista és a marxista földrajz kapcsolata: összekötő és elválasztó diskurzusok a térről (Connection of feminist and marxist geography: connecting and dividing discourses about the space). In *Kortárs térelméletek közép-kelet-európai kontextusban.* Ed.: Faragó, L., Budapest, Dialóg Campus Kiadó, 187–203.

Tuan, Y. 1979. *Landscapes of Fear*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Tulumello, S. 2015. From "spaces of fear" to "fearscapes": Mapping for reframing theories about the spatialization of fear in urban space. *Space and Culture* 18. (3): 257–272.

Tulumello, S. 2020. Landscapes of fear. In *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography.* Vol. 8., 2nd edition. Ed.: Kobasayhi, A., Amsterdam–Oxford, Elsevier, 127–130.

Valentine, G. 1989. The geography of women's fear. *Area* 21. (4): 385–390.

Young, I.M. 1980. Throwing like a girl: A phenomenology of feminine body comportment motility and spatiality. *Human Studies* 3. (1): 137–156.