

CRIME PROBLEMS OF URBANIZATION AND INDUSTRIALIZATION IN BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

DR. JOSEPH VIGH

the professor of criminology at the Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest, Hungary

Crime of towns, especially that of cities has common features all over the world, nevertheless, it has such specific characteristics that derive from divers economic and cultural conditions of existence, their tendencies of development and finally from the inhabitants' outlook and way of life. To understand the crime problems of the Hungarian towns we have to keep in view the fact that before World War II. Hungary was – compared to Western European countries – an economically underdeveloped country living primarily by agriculture.

For example in 1941 only 25.4 per cent of the working population was employed in industry and 48.7 per cent worked in agriculture. In 1941. 38.7 per cent of the population lived in the towns and of this 18,5% were Budapest residents.

Budapest, the capital of industrial character, considerably rose above the predominantly agricultural country towns in Hungary. The population of the largest country towns did not even amount to 100 thousand, and 30–40 thousand inhabitants lived in the majority of the towns. At this time Budapest had 1 711 106 inhabitants.

After World War II. with the stabilization of the new socialist system large-scale industrialization began in Hungary. The development of heavy industry, the transformation of the fundamental differences existing between the village and the town were planned as social targets.

As a result of the thirty years of progress Hungary has become a developed industrial country with a mechanized largescale agriculture. The ratio of the working population in industry is close to 50 per cent (jan. 1st, 1981 it was 47.9) while in the agriculture it is only 14.4 per cent.

47 per cent of the population of the country lives in the villages and 53 per cent in the towns. There is no essential difference between the in come of the employes in the towns and that of the villages. In accordance with this their way of life (availability of public services, the service industries, household aequipment) does not differe essentially either. The existing inequalities show a declining tendency.

I think that the above mentioned data on the socio- economic development of our country helps explain why crime is such as it is in Hungary.

Urban crime necessarily reflects the development which has taken place at a rapid pace in Hungary. In the mirror of this change we seek for an answer to three fundamental questions of urban crime, namely:

1. What is urban crime like?
2. How does the process of urbanizations influence the development of crime?
3. Does urbanization inevitably increase criminality?

1. *Urban crime*

In Hungary the annual number of recorded crimes over approximately the last decade is between 120 and 130 thousand. It means that criminality counted per 10 thousand inhabitants is between 110 and 120. (The population of the country amounts to about 11 million.) Comparing these data to similar ones of other countries it can be stated that *the position of crime in our country is more favourable than in many others*. Despite this, crime is a great problem in our country, especially in our towns. More than half of the population (53%) lives in the towns and about two-third (65.8%) of criminal offences are committed here.

The criminality of the towns is explicitly illustrated by Table 1, which shows the distribution of criminal offences according to the place of the commission over the 10 years up to 1978. (The statistical data end in 1978 because the changes of the new Penal Code coming into force July 1st, 1979 raise problems in comparison.)

Table 1.

Regional distribution of criminal offences according to the place of commission (%)

	Budapest	Country towns	Villages	Abroad	Total
1969	29.7	32.8	36.4	1.1	100.0
1970	28.9	34.2	36.6	0.3	100.0
1971	27.6	35.5	36.5	0.4	100.0
1972	27.2	37.1	35.3	0.4	100.0
1973	27.0	36.5	36.1	0.7	100.0
1974	25.4	36.6	37.3	0.7	100.0
1975	26.1	37.7	35.8	0.4	100.0
1976	25.0	39.3	35.4	0.3	100.0
1977	26.2	38.9	34.4	0.5	100.0
1978	25.6	40.2	33.6	0.6	100.0

The data show a clear cut increase in the ratio of criminal offences committed in the towns that necessarily implies the decrease of crime in the villages. The capital has a particular position among the towns. The rate of commission decreased 4.1 per cent between 1969 and 1978. This means that crime of the country towns is gaining larger and larger ground in total crime.

Table 2.

The number of criminal offences
(Counted per 10.000 inhabitants)

	Budapest	Country towns	Villages	Total
1969	163.7	136.2	71.7	107.7
1970	182.4	156.9	78.6	118.5
1971	167.8	188.4	79.4	119.3
1972	178.5	166.4	79.4	112.1
1973	177.5	157.3	81.7	114.6
1974	147.2	135.9	75.5	107.6
1975	162.6	142.9	80.5	115.0
1976	165.1	156.8	87.2	122.4
1977	164.8	136.9	81.3	116.3
1978	164.1	142.9	83.2	118.8

The divergent tendencies of the rates according to the place of commission denote, above all, the structural change of crime, their shift in proportion; they do not inevitably involve the rise or fall of criminality. The actual change of crime can be read from table

The data of the table reflect that national proportions of criminal offences have not considerably changed over the last ten years and crime has remained at stable levels with minor deviations. As distinguished from this, a certain rising tendency manifests itself in village crime and in accordance with it some fall is noticeable in urban crime, especially since the beginning of the seventies. To put it in other words, it means that *the difference between urban and village crime is decreasing*, even if it can hardly be felt at present. However, a very important tendency, *the tendency of equalization of urban and village crime* becomes apparent from the statistical data. If the statement that the difference of living conditions, and circumstances of life between the town and the village is diminishing is correct, then it must be true that this process necessarily leads to closing the gap between the criminality of the two types of settlement.

The equalization of urban and village crime seems to be a long process and does not follow parallel with the levelling of living conditions. If the extent of the proportions of criminal offences is compared, the first thing to catch the eye is that the crime of the capital is about double that of villages and an essential difference can be seen between the crime of the country towns and that of the villages. For example in 1978 the crime of the country towns exceeded village crime by 73%.

The great difference between the crime of the two types of settlement is due to various circumstances. Without enumerating all of them I would like to refer to the most relevant ones, namely:

1. the disparity of the circumstances that derives from objective living and working conditions making the commission of criminal offences possible;

2. The diverse ways of life that manifest themselves in traditions, cultural situations and in the forms and possibilities of entertainment: and lastly

3. those differences that appear in the demographic factors (age compositions, marital condition, migration).

The main characteristic feature of crime according to the structure of the criminal offences is that more than half of them constitute offences against property. Consequently, the trend of the crime of some settlement is determined by the rise or fall of the number of offences against property. The higher rate of urban crime—according to the statistical supply of data—springs, above all, precisely from the higher ratio of offences against property. For example in 1976 the number of offences against property was 104.2 (counted per 10 thousand inhabitants) in Budapest, while the country mean was only 62.1. Despite this, the rate of the criminality of the violent offences and holliganism nature was 12.9 in Budapest but 14.2 in the provinces in the same year. The existing differences between offences against property come out even more sharply between the country towns and the villages. In 1976 the average criminality against property was 94.8 in the country towns and only 42.3 in the villages.

Crime committed against property in the capital exceeds “only” by 68% the mean index of the provinces, while that of the villages is exceeded by 124% by the country towns.

Criminological research works on this subject (see: András Szabó: Correlations of socio-economic development and juvenile delinquency. *Állam- és Jogtudomány*, Budapest, 1969; Dr. József Gödöny: Social development and the trend of crime, *Jogtudományi Közlöny*, 1971. No 6.) prove that in Hungary crime in general, but especially against property is conspicuous primarily not in the poorest regions of the country but rather in those areas where great quantities of national and personal property are concentrated. These areas exercise greater attraction on crime, or perhaps it would be better to say, on criminals which seems to be natural within our circumstance (11 million inhabitants in 93 thousand km²).

It is also natural, however, that in places where property is concentrated there is more often a chance to appropriate it because of the lack or laxity of safe-keeping or supervision. From this point of view the towns with its economic conditions like industry, trade, traffic, transportation, service etc. implies more favourable conditions for crime than the village of mainly agricultural character having traditionally better controlling possibilities.

The increased industrialization of the towns and the presence of the tertiary sector mostly parallel with it (commercial, transport, employment, and public service) claim and gather more and more relatively unskilled labour in loosely structured circumstances.

Similarly, the statistical data give evidence that the significant share of the offences in the towns are committed by not townspeople but by transients, people from the provinces who are employed in the towns.

For example in 1980 119 offenders were arrested in Budapest accused of robbery. From among them only 40 per cent are Budapest residents, 30 per cent were living temporarily in hostels in Budapest, and 30% were from the provinces. But a survey covering the whole country can be obtained in this respect if the data are arranged in groups according to the place of residence of criminals. For example the following distribution can be compiled for 1974.

Table 3.

The distribution of criminals according to residence in 1974 (%)

	Budapest	Country towns	Villages	Abroad	Total
Population	18.5	28.5	53.0	—	100.0
Criminals	19.1	31.4	48.6	0.9	100.0
Criminal offences	25.4	36.6	37.3	0.7	100.0

The table clearly reflects that *the distribution of criminals much rather follows the distribution of the population according to residence than that of the criminal offences*. The ratio of criminals in the villages remains under the rate of the population by some percentage but rises above it in the country towns and in Budapest. The difference expressed in percentages indicates the increased criminality of the towns as regards criminals as well.

Urban crime shows itself closely related to the extent, the nature and the pace of the development of the towns. The criminality of Hungarian towns reflects a peculiar aspect of the distribution of the population. It is a characteristic feature of the size of the Hungarian towns that—apart from Budapest—the number of the inhabitants of not a single towns goes above 200 thousand. From among 100 towns there are only 5 where the number of the inhabitant is above 100 thousand. This means that the majority of the towns are small or medium sized. The criminality according to the number of the inhabitants of a towns is illustrated by Table 4.

Table 4.

The number of recorded criminal offences according to group of towns from 1972 — to 1978
(Counted per 10.000 inhabitants)

Number of inhabitants	Criminality
— 15,000	120.93
15,001 — 20,000	146.37
20,001 — 30,000	138.74
30,001 — 50,000	141.42
50,001 — 150,000	156.63
100,0001 —	148.06
Budapest	156.41

The growth of criminality parallel with the increase of the number of inhabitants of the towns can be stated as a tendency in accordance with the data of the table. Though certain deviations can be seen in for example, those towns which have 15–20 thousand inhabitant sor which number 50–100 thousand, they do not contradict the rising tendency. The striking criminality of these two categories can be explained above all by their speedy development. It is mainly the new towns being established by large industrial investments and the chief towns of the countries developing at a quick pace which belong to these two groups.

Similarly, another tendency is noticeable between the degree of the increase of the number of the inhabitants and the development of criminality. See Table 5.

Table 5.

The number of recorded offences according to groups of towns from 1974 to 1976
(Counted per 10.000 inhabitants)

The degree of the increase* of the number of inhabitants	Criminality
– 1.0	107.74
1.1 – 5.0	130.86
5.1 – 10.0	154.17
10.1 – 15.0	150.39
15.1 – 20.0	171.12
20.1 –	166.45

* excluding Budapest

The data persuasively prove that the degree of the development and the quick increase of the number of inhabitants imply the growth of criminality. Naturally, it is not the number of the inhabitants of the town or its quick increase itself which result in the growth of criminality but those socio-economic processes and ways of life that can be traced there.

It can be very often read or heard that industrialization, the highly developed state of industry, is closely related to crime. The Hungarian regional statistics makes it possible to compare the grouping of towns according to occupational type with their criminality. See Table 6.

The grouping of twons that served as a basis for the table was carried out in compliance with the occupational proportion belonging to industry, agriculture and the so called tertiary sector. (The tertiary sector includes transport, trade, the mass media, service industries etc. that is to say, everything that does not belong industry including the building industry and agriculture.)

Exemining the quality of the towns according to the occupational type (industrial, agricultural and tertiary) we can state, that criminality is lowest in towns of agricultural character. These are followed by the towns of industrial character, and then by those where the tertiary sector (transport, trade, traffic, services) prevails—according to the occupational

Table 6.

The number of recorded criminal offences according to groups of towns from 1972 to 1978
(Per 10,000 inhabitants)

Occupational type*	Criminality
Wholly industrial	136.57
Largely industrial	136.86
Mixed (industrial, tertiary, agriculture)	164.52
Industrial and agricultural	125.60
Mixed (tertiary predominant)	177.53
Mixed, (agricultural predominant)	96.14
Mixed, (industrial predominant)	166.44
Largely agricultural	133.34

* excluding Budapest

form — or is of great importance and where the greatest ratio of criminality can be found. I think these data obviously show that it is *not the industrial institutions and their employess that are the most affected areas but those of transport, traffic, services and trade*. Naturally, a significant tertiary sector is necessarily a part of the great industrial units but it is not the only function of the industry and it is reasonable to deal with it separately.

Towns where it is not industry as a form of occupation that prevails can be often found at the head of the ranking list. The crime of such towns reaches ten times the towns with the lowest criminality.

2. Urbanization and crime

We have outlined in the foregoing the main characteristics of crime in Hungarian towns. In this part we would like to present some thought about the process leading to the present structure and criminality of towns. Perhaps it is useful to repeat that before World War II, in the last years of capitalist development, nearly 38 per cent of the population lived in the towns. Nowadays, this ratio is 53 per cent, that is to say, more than half of the population. This significant shift in proportions is not essentially the consequence of a previously considered and projected urbanization policy but an inevitable concomitant of an intensive policy of industrialization. As a result of this, during the past three decades the ratio of industrial workers has doubled, that of agricultural ones has decreased to one-third and the proportion of townspeople increased by as much as 50 per cent. This vast social regrouping implies mobility on a large scale. At the initial stage, in particular, at the beginning of the fifties, during the "heroic" age of industrialization, attention and planning were focused on industrialization. Laying the foundation for Danube Ironworks, the aluminium metallurgy (of Várpalota), the extension and modernization of the coal mines (of Óroszlány, Komló and Tatabánya) and setting up industrial plants and above all heat power stations for them were started in

these years. The number of inhabitants of these settlements increased by as much as 10–20 thousand during some years. The population from all parts of the country began to migrate to the new industrial centres where favourable wages and badly organized living conditions were waiting for the mostly unskilled former agricultural workers on a large scale. The protection of property, the settling of newcomers and their spare-time activities were organized insufficiently.

In such circumstances crime, and crime against property in particular, grew in unheard of proportions in these regions. In addition to this, the disorganized economic and social life due to the war did not become stable as required even on a countrywide scale.

There was a special structural character of the population during the initial period of the development of the new industrial projects aimed at advancing heavy industry, and the industrial towns attached to them. More than two-thirds of annual growth of the population of the new settlements was constituted by the newcomers. The rate of migration began to fall only after the establishment of the settlement. The composition of the population just because of the vast migration became quite unfavourable from the point of view of crime. There was a much higher proportion than the national average of such groups as men, young adults, the divorced, the childless, unskilled and semiskilled workers, "migrants" not under the discipline of labour, people watching for the opportunity to commit a crime against property – in the new and old towns becoming rapidly industrialized. However, these criteria relate to higher criminality, but in this case they were in relation to the commission of criminal offences in a concentrated and increased degree.

The large-scale internal migration and the problems of adaptation implied by it create favourable circumstances for the crime.

I would like to present the data of Dunaújváros (the town of iron-work) as an example of the crime of the new towns. (See the Table 7)

The process proceeded from the initiation of the great industrial investment to the development of the normal and satisfactorily controlled town-life is mirrored thoroughly by crime data.

The crime of Dunaújváros, like the crime of the whole country, has remained at constant levels over the last 10 years. (The town was built around a village numbered 4,000 inhabitants. At present this town has more than 60 000 inhabitant. In 1978, Dunaújváros took the 25th place from among 86 towns in the ranking list according to the criminality of the towns. The crime of the other new industrial towns is rather below than above the national average. For example Várpalota lies in 47th and Ajka in 74th place nowadays.)

In general, due to the socio-economic development, the newly established or quite rapidly developing towns are found at the head of the list of criminality. Two industrial centres, Leninváros and Százhalombatta, being built to refine petroleum and beginning their work at the beginning of the seventies, serve as prominent examples of this. The crime index of Leninváros is illustrated by Table 8.

Table 7.

Criminality of Dunaújváros

	Criminal offences against property	Counted per 10.000 inhabitants
1949
1950
1951	2,300	1,277
1952	3,098	1,549
1953	2,969	1,237
1954	1,466	564
1955	900	333
1956	765	269
1957	745	258
1958	621	212
1959	764	258
1960	762	248
1961	469	134
1962	752	201
1963	634	161
1970	544	120
1971	473	103
1972	463	98
1973	457	94
1974	628	125
1975	516	103
1976	638	122
1977	579	96
1978	639	105

(The source of data of crimes against property from 1951 to 1963 is: Dr. Horváth János: Criminological position of Dunaújváros as a new socialist towns. *Belügyi Szemle*, 1965. Nor. 1.)

Table 8.

Criminality of Leninváros

	The number of the criminal offences	Criminal offences per 10.000 inhabitants
1969	95	91.8
1970	151	153.5
1971	143	168.7
1972	171	185.9
1973	172	173.7
1974	227	218.3
1975	251	220.2
1976	293	242.2
1977	224	177.9
1978	285	201.1

According to the data of the table the number of the committed offences tripled over ten years, which is the consequence, above all, of the growth of the number of the inhabitants. This is proved by the data on criminality which increased, "only" as much as 160 per cent. Criminality does not deviate essentially from the similar proportion of the capital, (see Table 2). These rates underline that building up the integrated chemical factory, and parallel with it, establishing Leninváros did not take place in the same manner as in Danube Ironworks or in Dunaújváros. Nowadays, industrialization and urbanization are founded on abundant experience and though these quite important and significant social processes raise crime, it is in an essentially smaller degree than previously.

It appears from the demographical data that the share of inhabitants of the capital shows a slow, declining tendency. The restrictions of migration to the capital, the resettlements of certain industrial works and on the other hand the largescale development of country towns lead to the setting up of the most dangerous crime centres in certain country towns. For example the localization of the ratio of recidivists according to the size towns is very significant.

See Table 9.

Table 9.*

Ratio of offenders
mean of 1972-1978

Number of inhabitants	Total	First offender	Recidivists
Villages	100.00	69.43	30.57
- 15,000	100.00	70.59	29.41
15,001 - 20,000	100.00	66.54	33.48
20,001 - 30,000	100.00	67.08	32.92
50,001 - 50,000	100.00	67.59	32.41
40,001 - 100,000	100.00	67.35	32.65
100,000 -	100.00	67.89	32.20
Budapest	100.00	68.70	31.30
National	100.00	68.70	31.30
Country towns	100.00	67.57	32.43
Towns together	100.00	67.98	32.02

(* Tables 4,5, 6, and 9 were compiled by Gábor David for his monograph entitled "The dynamics and structure of crime".)

The data indicate that the ratio of recidivists is highest in the country towns and not in the capital at present. Smaller towns where the number of the inhabitants is between 15,000 and 30,000 stand out from among them.

The rise of the criminality of the country towns is confirmed by other research, as well. (See: Katalin Gönczöl: The classification of recidivist). According to this research the recidivists who specialize in criminal offences against property give preference to city life, that is to say, life in Budapest or cities in the country. In contrast to this, the habitual violent offenders can be found in greatest numbers in small or medium sized towns.

The rise of the criminality of the country towns is supported by István Taubers's investigation of the milieu of the social strata in disadvantageous situations according to which those offences who belong to this circle commit criminal acts most frequently in the country towns although the majority of them live in the villages.

We have already referred to the convergent tendency of the living standard of the towns and the village as a consequence of our socio-economic development. At present the type of settlement no longer actually involves an essential difference in living standards. This does not mean that there is no inequality in the living standards of individual people. This is natural too, because the distribution according to the quality and the quantity of labour necessarily brings about differences in living standards. There have always been differences, lower and higher categories. The core of the question is what the living standards of the lower categories are like, what needs they have and to what degree they can be filled. The large scale process of industrialization and urbanization creates really the possibility of comfortable living standards for greater and greater numbers of people.

However, these possibilities can be realized with difficulty in the majority of the families with more dependants than persons with earned income. That is, allowances and social allocations given to the dependants do not compensate for the missing income. Those who have a large family and don't have high professional training belong, in the first place, to this category. This social stratum in a disadvantageous situation can with difficulty rise to the standard of culture and knowledge which would provide through the quality of labour more favourable living conditions. Consequently, this social stratum supplies, above all, the replacement of unskilled labour for economic life and it is found everywhere at starting great investment and industrial establishments. That is why their number is relatively high in rapidly developing towns, at first as commuting workers or temporary inhabitants and later a part of them as settled ones.

A further essential characteristic feature of the social stratum in a disadvantageous situation is that it lives under difficult housing conditions. The state building of flats can not meet entirely the increased demand for flats. However the wages—especially where there are several dependents—do not make it possible to build a private house or flat.

It should be noted that the social consciousness of this stratum reveals some distortion in many respects. Its respect for the law, keeping the discipline of labour and, eagerness to learn are at a considerably low level. In contrast to this, it indulges in anti-social forms of behaviour and entertainment and often has its own moral standards. The three decades of socialist development have not been able enough to change its consciousness and personality in conformity with the social requirements.

As a consequence of this and other factors there is a thin layer of society, especially in country towns, that is relatively in close connection to crime at present.

3. *The perspective of urban crime*

It follows from the foregoing that the difference of the types of the settlement is going to remain for a long time even if with a declining tendency and it is probable that differences parallel with it manifest themselves in the field of crime as well. Due to large scale urbanization the question — even today — is not only raised in terms of the characteristics of the crime of the towns as opposed to the village, but of certain of towns as well. The types of towns can be determined by the number of the inhabitants or the kinds of occupation or according to other criteria that link up with higher or lower criminality. As it appears from certain features of the past thirty years' development of Hungarian towns, crime has been present in an increased degree where an intensive industrialization or towns development at a rapid pace has been going on. But we have perceived that the industrialization and urbanization of the last decade have been carried out more methodically, keeping much rather in view the requirements of building or developing the town and so they are not followed by a striking rise in crime. The relative rise is compensated by the fall of crime of other settlements with high criminality before.

The question of whether urbanization inevitably raises crime or not in a country can be answered in the negative. To the further question, however, of whether the establishment of new towns and the large scale development of old ones imply the rise of local crime or not, it can be replied that is was so according to Hungarian experience, but theoretically it is conceivable that it will not be so in the future. It depends on how successful the realization of the targets of urbanization is in order that even at an early stage the living conditions of the inhabitants it should not involve more or stronger "criminogenic" factors than the towns of the country in general. I am not unaware that it is much easier to put into words such and similar claims and statements than to realize them. In my opinion the realization depends considerably on the nature of the intellectual and financial capacity of a country which can be or is intended to be, applied for crime prevention. How much can be applied is quite as much the function of the internal economic life as the shaping of the international conditions. However, how much is intended to be applied within the bounds of the actual possibilities depends upon how the leaders in power size up the situation.

СВЯЗЬ УРБАНИЗАЦИИ И ИНДУСТРАЛИЗАЦИИ С ПРЕСТУПНОСТЬЮ В ВЕНГРИИ

д-р ЙОЖЕФ ВИГ

профессор криминологии Университета им. Этвеша

(Рецюме)

Размеры преступности в городах и селах и в Венгрии существенно различаются. Доля преступности в столице, в Будапеште, вдвое больше преступности сел. Вследствие общественного развития образ жизни и жизненные условия городов и сел показывают приближающиеся тенденции. В соответствии с этим количества преступлений в двух различных формах населенных пунктов приближаются друг к другу. Индустриализация и урбанизация влекли за собой повышение преступности. В наши дни преступность особенно провинциальных городов является значительной. Большая часть рецидивистов здесь стягивается, и неустроенная охрана имущества, сопряженная с быстрым темпом развития индустрии и городов тоже привлекает сюда случайных рабочих, не желающих работать.

По мере того, как становятся все более планомерными и обоснованными урбанизация и развитие городов и повышается забота о трудящихся, так понижается доля преступности на этих территориях.

**BEZIEHUNGEN ZWISCHEN DER KRIMINALITÄT UND DER
URBANISIERUNG BZW. INDUSTRIALISIERUNG**

von

DR. JÓZSEF VIGH

(Zusammenfassung)

Auch in Ungarn besteht zwischen der Kriminalität der Städte und der Gemeinden ein wesentlicher Unterschied. Das Kriminalitätsverhältnis in der Hauptstadt Budapest ist das zweifache der Kriminalitätsproportionen in den Gemeinden. Infolge der gesellschaftlichen Entwicklung zeigen die Lebensform und die Lebensbedingungen in den Städten und Gemeinden eine sich einander nähernde Tendenz. Dem entsprechend nähert sich auch die Kriminalität in den zwei verschiedenen Siedlungsformen. Die Industrialisierung und die Urbanisierung zogen den Anstieg der Kriminalität nach sich. In unseren Tagen ist besonders die Kriminalität in den Provinzstädten bedeutend. Der große Teil der Rückfälligen sammelt sich hier und auch der mit der schnellen Industrie- und Städteentwicklung zusammenhängende, unregelmäßige Vermögensschutz in den Städten zieht die nicht gern arbeitenden Gelegenheitsarbeiter an.

In dem Maße, wie die Industrialisierung und Entwicklung der Städte planmäßiger und sorgfältiger wird, wie sich die Sorge für die dort arbeitenden Menschen erhöht, in dem Maße vermindert sich auf diesem Gebiet die Proportion der Kriminalität.