

ORDINEA POLIȚIENEASCĂ. PUNEREA BAZELOR CERCETĂRILOR LEGATE DE IDEILE ACESTEI ORDINI ¹

Péter CIELESZKY

Doctorand, University of Public Service, Budapesta, Ungaria

e-mail: cieleszky.peter@uni-nke.hu

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7755-3410>

În prezentul studiu, scopul meu a fost de a contribui la fundamentarea teoretică a tinerei științe de aplicare a legii printr-o abordare neobișnuită. În această analiză bazată mai ales pe lucrări teoretice voi dezvolta acea premisă conform căreia definițiile conceptuale ale poliției și abordările actuale ale științei de aplicare a legii se bazează pe preconcepții istorice (experiențiale) și evolutive bine definite ale practicienilor disciplinei. În studiu, pe lângă unele definiții standard ale poliției, și prezentarea anumitor aspecte ale acestei cercetări științifice, ajung prin dezvoltarea premisei, pentru care abordarea normativă și critică a organelor de drept creează cadrul teoretic. În spatele determinării gândirii sistematice bazate pe preconcepție se află o cerere evolutivă inspirată de o necesitate apriori care acoperă epocile istorice, pe care am numit-o Ideea de ordine. Expresii ale acestuia, manifestate prin relații sociale din ce în ce mai complexe, apar împlinite într-un lanț istoric, a cărui cercetare este justificată.

Cuvinte-cheie: ordine, poliție, știință de aplicare a legii, psihologie evolutivă, legitimitate.

THE ORDER OF POLICING. LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS FOR RESEARCH ON THE IDEAS OF THIS ORDER

In this study my aim is to contribute to the theoretical foundation of young law enforcement science with an unusual approach. In this analysis based mostly on theoretical papers I will develop the premise that conceptual definitions of policing and current approaches to law enforcement science are based on well-defined historical (experiential) and evolutionary preconceptions of practitioners of the discipline. In the study in addition to some standard definitions of policing, and the presentation of certain aspects of this scientific research I get through the development of the premise, for which the normative and the critical approach of law enforcement creates the theoretical framework. Behind the determination of systematic thinking based on preconception lies an evolutionary demand inspired by a priori necessity spanning historical ages, which I named the Idea of order. Expressions of this, manifested through increasingly complex social relations, appear intertwined in a historical chain, the research of which is justified.

Keywords: order, policing, law enforcement science, evolutionary psychology, legitimacy.

¹ This work was carried out within the framework of the Project TKP2020-NKA-09, with the support of the National Research Development and Innovation Fund, and was funded by the Thematic Excellence Programme 2020.

ORDRE DE LA POLICE. LA MISE DES BASES DE RECHERCHES LIÉE AUX IDÉES DE CET ORDRE

Dans cette étude, mon objectif était de contribuer aux fondements théoriques de la jeune science de l'application de la loi par une approche inhabituelle. Dans cette analyse basée principalement sur des travaux théoriques, je développerai cette prémisse selon laquelle les définitions conceptuelles de la police et les approches actuelles de la science de l'application de la loi sont basées sur des idées préconçues historiques (expérientielles) et évolutives bien définies des praticiens de la discipline. Dans l'étude, en plus de certaines définitions standard de la police et de la présentation de certains aspects de cette recherche scientifique, elles passent par le développement de la prémisse, pour laquelle l'approche normative et critique des forces de l'ordre crée le cadre théorique. Derrière la détermination d'une pensée systématique basée sur la préconception se cache une exigence évolutionniste inspirée par une nécessité apriori couvrant les époques historiques, que nous avons appelée l'idée d'ordre. Ses expressions, manifestées par des relations sociales de plus en plus complexes, apparaissent imbriquées dans une chaîne historique dont la recherche est justifiée.

Mots-clés: ordre, police, science de l'application de la loi, psychologie évolutionniste, légitimité.

ПОЛИЦЕЙСКИЙ ПОРЯДОК. ЗАКЛАДКА ОСНОВ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ, СВЯЗАННЫХ С ИДЕЯМИ ДАННОГО ПОРЯДКА

В данном исследовании моей целью было внести свой вклад в теоретическое обоснование молодой науки о правоприменении с помощью необычного подхода. В представленном анализе, основанном главным образом на теоретических работах, я разовью предположение о том, что концептуальные определения полицейской деятельности и современные подходы к правоохранительной науке основаны на четко определенных исторических (эмпирических) и эволюционных предубеждениях практиков этой дисциплины. В исследовании, помимо некоторых стандартных определений полиции и изложения некоторых аспектов данного научного исследования, я прихожу к развитию мысли, теоретическую основу для которой создает нормативно-критический подход правоохранительных органов. За детерминацией систематического мышления, основанного на предвзятости, стоит эволюционное требование, вдохновленное априорной необходимостью, охватывающей исторические эпохи, которую я назвал Идеей Порядка. Ее проявления во все более сложных социальных отношениях, оказываются переплетенными в историческую цепь, исследование которой оправдано.

Ключевые слова: порядок, полицейская деятельность, правоохранительная наука, эволюционная психология, легитимность.

Introduction

In my study, by drawing on the accumulated knowledge of the relatively young policing science, I research the ideological roots of the concepts of order and their contents. Of course, it is not policing science that would have a unified vision of order, but rather those researchers who somehow define policing science, and then place it on a tableau of the ever-changing history of science. On a tableau where every attempt at definition is a kind of interpretation, a way of looking at, modelling and describing reality from a particular point of view - in this case, in the focus of interest from a young discipline.

In this interpretative framework, behind the diversity of approaches, many variations of conceptions on order can be discovered - often without expressing their content expressis verbis. For whether or not the definition of order or social order precedes the definition of the concepts of policing and policing science, the contemporary imprints of the researchers' thinking, but of thinking in general, are revealing and present recognisable patterns. Researchers report similar experiences of policing involvement in society. Referring to the turn of the millennium, they indicate that although this concept was already known at that time, sci-

entific thought was still lacking a valid definition, but there was „... *a latent, unexplained, unthought-through form*” [13, p. 280].

I cannot present all or even most of these approaches, a study of this length precludes the possibility of doing so. Nor do I undertake to judge the justification for this diversity, or even to attempt to justify a particular interpretation. However, I think it is important to highlight three points that could be seen as the starting point for this research.

1) Firstly, in the absence of clarification of the basic concepts, I find it difficult to describe the functioning of a conceptual structure, a model. Therefore, in this paper I will present some approaches related to the concept of order, as an introduction to a study that aims to address this topic in its entirety.

2) Secondly, I believe that the consequences of this diversity - the diversity of ideas about order - can also be seen, for example, in the now gradually fading but in many respects still topical debate on law and order versus policing, or in the positions that approach the origins, development and evolution of this discipline from different perspectives. I have a similar feeling when I come across certain issues of private security, or when I come across an interpretation of what is known as the privatisation or multilateralisation of security, etc. The variations in scientific approaches on the agenda and the natural debates that arise in this context can therefore in many cases be “derived” from, or point back to, the different preconceptions. To put it more simply: whoever thinks about order, constructs it around themselves, creates expectations in their own reality.

3) Thirdly, these images of order, on the one hand, characterise the age in which they appear, and by being intertwined with this particular age, reveal the man who thinks about order in a particular way. However, I will highlight two approaches related to modern definition. One is the influence of the historical context, the other is a much broader evolu-

tionary determination. The relationship between the two is worth a discussion in itself, but here I would like to refer to just one specific feature. I do not exclude that human thought ultimately rests on fundamental foundations and stands on their unchanging pedestal. However, it is also possible that these images change as generational experiences build on each other, for a number of reasons. These dimensions open up a broad horizon of scientific interests that reaches into other disciplines and far beyond my own competences. Nevertheless, certain aspects of it - especially as it relates to human ethology and evolutionary psychology - will have to be discussed in the following.

So my starting point is that the conceptions of order underlying the investigations related to the science of order are expressed through conceptual models that can be organized into conceptual nodes - to which the problems of the discipline can often be traced - and that these conceptions of order have an evolutionary determination. Elsewhere, I have argued that behind the determination of order-like thinking lies an evolutionary demand inspired by a priori necessity throughout history, which I have called the idea of order. And the expressions of this through increasingly complex social relations appear intertwined in a historical chain.

Consequently, since the subject of young policing science is policing itself, the police and police activity, as well as their organisational, functional, social and community-determined embeddedness, it is undoubtedly justified to ask the question of what preconceptions underlie the development of institutionalised policing, what sustainable mode of operation can become accepted in a given community, and what community and institutionally mediated concept of policing can make this acceptance legitimate. My research focuses on the latter feature, and relies in particular on the first and third of the findings taken as a starting point in this context.

In the present study, according to the rules of methodological analysis in law enforcement, I first examine the definition of law enforcement, and then I compare today's approaches to law enforcement with the well-defined historical (experiential) and evolutionary preconceptions of practitioners of the discipline. I am preparing this theoretical analysis of law enforcement based on the relevant work of internationally recognized scientific experts in the Hungarian field of study (Klára Kerezi, László András Pap, Géza Finszter, Zoltán Hautzinger, etc.). I hope that this theoretical methodological analysis enriches policing research and thinking in an unusual way, and helps to understand what preconceptions institutionalized policing can be based on, what sustainable mode of operation can become accepted and legitimate in a given community.

Definition of Policing Science

It is not the purpose of my study to discuss this definition in detail, but I would like to illustrate the traces of the expression of the often implicit conceptions of order indicated in the introduction by means of some authoritative approaches. In fact, these are not necessarily the easiest to understand in the narrow sense of these definitions. What is particularly telling, however, is how well the definitions that are more practical in their approach to the issue are distinguished, leaving little room for the broader theory that serves as a framework. Ilona Bodonyi formulated this distinction as follows *"police science is analytical-empirical on the one hand, [...] and normative on the other"* [2, p. 45].

An example of the former approach is a definition given by András Szabó in 2004, according to which *"Police sciences are interdependent, practical sciences that make the police procedure effective and efficient"* [18, p. 6]. Géza Finszter, in his entry in the Encyclopedia of Law and Order, refers to law enforcement as the branch of state and legal

sciences *"whose research object is the organization, operation and law of law enforcement"* [1, p. 480]. Géza Katona, in his definition dating back to 2004, emphasises the interdisciplinary nature of policing science, and identifies the subject of policing science which becomes fully embodied in the *"harmonisation of organisation, personnel and methods of law enforcement activity"* [8, p. 11-19].

Compared to the other definitions referred to above, Ilona Bodonyi's definition is more nuanced, and when she refers to the normative nature of policing science, she says that *"it has to go through various ethical, legal and other values to the concept of good policing and the optimisation of its work - to be able to formulate what police should be, what they can be and what they should not be"* [2, p. 45].

I could continue with the social science approach shared by Klára Kerezi and László András Pap [10, p. 67], or with László Korinek's classification of this discipline as a field between criminal and administrative science, with the proviso that the scientific control of some of its areas is still to be defined.

In terms of my topic, I agree with Zoltán Hautzinger's approach, which suggests further reflection on this topic, namely that it is worth reflecting on the question of whether we are really talking about a branch of law and order or a science that forms a separate discipline, which is associated with research methods and results of other sciences [7, p. 138]. This latter approach, by emphasising the normative character applied by Bodonyi as well as by Kerezi and Pap, opens up a broader horizon for an ethical and value-oriented approach to scientific research. The conceptions of order become more intelligible through such an approach.

On Certain Aspects of the Research on Policing Science

However, before starting to examine the conceptual issues of order and its historical and evolution-

ary layers, let us start from the ways in which the science of order approaches its object of research, and in fact it approaches its subject matter with the sensitivity indicated above. In other words, in what intellectual context can I situate my own research, which is an extension of these definitions and conveys a broader content than the above? At the same time, I would like to point out that, regardless of the “analytical-empirical” interest of the researcher, any research necessarily reaches the value problems of the normative approach in the appropriate depth. I wish to summarise my thoughts in this context in three points.

1) On 17 September 2003, András Szabó, a member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, submitted a proposal to Department IX of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences for the inclusion of policing science, his paper was entitled “*Policing Science Seeks to be Recognized*”. One of his many convincing arguments suggested a paradigm shift. He concluded that, from a methodological point of view, an interdisciplinary approach seemed to be the most obvious way of dealing with the disciplinary changes in jurisprudence to explain new phenomena.

However, paradoxically, while this approach has helped to understand new phenomena more fully - offering, for example, a new, more comprehensive understanding of security - it has in fact obscured or allowed to be less pronounced the fact that, in the background of change, distinct units of reality, separate qualities, have developed as entities that can be studied in their own right. Among these, one of the new entities was the reality of policing, which, according to the approach applied by Klára Kerezsi and László András Pap to policing science, should be explored through the main functions of policing and the types of policing activities, in order to meet the criteria of scientificity [10, p. 67].

The fact that law enforcement specialists were not slow to unravel the historical thread of the disci-

pline, both before and after its recognition, provided a solid background. The diversity of forms and the millennia-long history of human community organisation have been a popular field to be taken under research, even in disciplines seemingly far removed from the field of policing. At the same time, the unfolding discipline more and more often discovered the forerunners of its object of research among the historical elements of reality, and I need only to refer to János Sallai’s statement that there is a basic consensus among researchers that various forms of policing activity were already evident in antiquity [15, p. 5]. Regardless of the criticism that this approach is based on the mere presumption that antiquity legitimates or operates with a cheap analogy [12, p. 4], there is undoubtedly room for a historical identification of policing activity, even at the risk of such pitfalls. How else, in the absence of a more in-depth investigation, can a well-founded position be taken on the question of what, if changes in living conditions have created similar constellations for the development of this type or kind of activity in the past, can be seen as a forerunner of the phenomenon.

At the same time, it is important to emphasise that policing science, for understandable reasons, turns primarily towards the observation and research of elements of reality (entities) whose existence is tied to the formation of modern states, whose problems - for example, the contradiction between the principles of justice and utility mentioned by Géza Finszter, which can be embedded in the problem of the contradiction between freedom and security - exist essentially within the framework of the interpretation of the formation of modern states. Separated from such notions, they can only be explained in other contexts and/or concepts. This is one of the reasons why the detailed and precise elaboration of its conceptual apparatus, to which I will return in the third section, has become so important for policing science. It is, however, undoubtedly also a fact that

these historical antecedents are indirect and can be seen rather as an embedding of policing thinking in the history of ideas. As for the question related to the medium in which the unfolding of the reality of this discipline was conceived, I tend to see as the catalyst the impact of overseas social changes that unfolded with connotations and a particular initial interpretation on the continent, thinking in terms of a legal and administrative approach.

My first conclusion, therefore, is that the unfolding of a researchable reality and the need for scientific knowledge to turn towards it gave rise to policing science at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, which found a definite object for its research.

2) The critical approach to policing research is intrinsically linked to questions related to the social function of policing, its place in the state and the nature of policing power [4, p. 102]. In this sense, we could also use the adjective “reflexive”, since the object of research is policing itself and its operational environment. However, in the area of scientific interest where policing becomes a user of scientific results, the general and broader questions of policing are relegated to the background. The day-to-day problems of policing practice are more pronounced, such as research to identify best and most effective practices. Géza Finszter also distinguishes between these two aspects of research by naming a social need or research decision as the client in the former case, and the police force itself as the client in the latter [5, p. 431-432]. It also points out that while the primary beneficiary of applied research is the police, the critical approach ultimately satisfies a social need, which is more manifested in the researcher’s interest.

The same dichotomy is evident in the definition of the role of policing in society. A group of authors, Krémer-Molnár-Szakács-Valcsicsák, derives this attitude from the interaction of social problems and perceptions of social order, saying that this engagement “*includes social and political expectations*

that come from the civil world and the world of institutional power towards policing, but also includes expectations that come from occupational (professional) value choices” [13, p. 273].

Both investigative aspects have their place, role and specificities. The critical approach is concerned with how policing fits into the functioning of the civil democratic state - including the ways and variants in which it is institutionalised. The applied research approach, on the other hand, takes as its starting point the way it fits in, and seeks solutions to make it more efficient and effective. This resolves the apparent contradiction in which the two approaches may appear to be opposing. The difference is, of course, that while the former is less sensitive to questions of practice in the here and now, the latter is explicitly concerned with the problems of actual practice. Jürgen Stock’s thoughts partly explain this apparent contradiction “... *for politics, it is not primarily the creation of internal security that is important, but reactions to society’s public sense of security. The reason is very simple: in a society overshadowed by risk, people want to feel safe. It is therefore very important for politics not to create a deficit in society’s sense of security through the intrusion of science into the field of policing, because citizens need effective and rapid solutions in this area”* [17, p. 39].

On the other hand, I could illustrate the difference by using the terms effectiveness/efficiency and sustainability. For example, policing may be effective/efficient in the short term - for example, if there is a demonstrable reduction in crime as a result of a particular measure - but its sustainability is often questionable. For example, if the measures result in disproportionate infringement to rights, or only result in a displacement of crime etc., then in the longer term it becomes pointless to sustain such measures.

However, if the research is focused on how to reduce crime in a sustainable way, solutions that may result in disproportionate infringement or only ap-

parent results are out of the question. In such cases, policing looks at its own operating environment - ideally at the broadest spectrum - and first separates short-term measures that restore public confidence from medium- and long-term measures that seek to eliminate the cause of the problem rather than the cause of the problem. For example, it puts the relationship between law enforcement and society on a different footing, and seeks new incentives, going beyond the blind faith in the applicability of legitimate violence in all situations, or other false presumptions, see Finster's interpretation of the myth of secrecy or hierarchy [5, p. 387-389], in which it sometimes gets entangled.

The lack of this differentiated approach to problems has led to unfortunate historical experiences. Such is the heavy price of the practice of praising effectiveness and efficiency, but Géza Finszter also refers to this when he writes about the possibilities of these two aspects of research. "*It is also a very important realisation for the countries that have changed their regimes [...] that while applied research can be conducted to a high standard in authoritarian regimes [...] the freedom to express social criticism is only given in democracies*" [5, p. 432].

If we place this problem in a broader context - going beyond the specific historical determinants of the Eastern European countries - the social critique message also appeared in the overseas and Western European scientific thought of the 1960s. It was a response to the observation that the police had become impotent in the face of a rapid increase in crime. As Ferenc Krémer points out, the traditional understanding of the relationship between the state and its citizens was being called into question, and the forces, tools and methods of dealing with social problems in a policing context were being rethought and their evidence questioned [12, p. 5]. It is to these changes, moreover, that the researcher links the potential for the development of police science.

For policing science, it therefore seems essential to continue research that puts social needs first. I am convinced that this can create the intellectual environment in which the real results of policing science can unfold and its applied research can become embedded. It is also the way to resolve the contradictions that István Szikinger draws attention to in his reference to Skolnick's research [20, pg.8]. According to him, the basic problem of policing in democratic societies is the contradiction between the requirements of order, efficiency and police initiative and the rule of law [16, p. 6].

My second point is that young policing science is therefore facing a challenge which it is important to address in order to guarantee its scientific quality. This is to continue to build the theoretical foundations of this discipline, drawing also on the results of a critical approach.

3) Professor Finszter also draws attention to the need for a conceptual approach to policing when he points out in the introduction to one of his papers [6, pg.2-3] that: it is not possible to talk about policing science without defining it. Then, in explaining this, he indicates that police science is "*... the systematic body of knowledge [...] concerning policing...*", and, to remedy another definitional problem, he notes that by policing he means the area of public administration that has a legitimate monopoly of physical violence and protects public order and public safety from unlawful human conduct [6, p. 3]. The author could go on by expanding the meaning of the concepts of public administration, legitimate monopoly of physical violence or public order, public security, etc. If not here, he does so elsewhere. The conceptual approach is an inevitable starting point for research, since it is the way to present ideas in a standardised way, to make them understandable to others, and to build a model that represents, as far as possible, real relations.

From conceptual definitions, a pseudo-world

emerges, with deeper, layered meanings. For in definitional descriptions, the imprint of the conditions of existence of a given time is (also) preserved. Not only can we know what the person who communicated meant, but also what it meant in the period to which the communication referred. This is why Zoltán Hautzinger's historical approach is appropriate, when he notes that *"in contrast to the definition of policing, we find far fewer attempts to define police science in the beginning"* [7, p. 138] – despite the fact that the term itself was already used by 19th century thinkers. The reason for this, according to the author, was that the science of policing used to be applied exclusively to police officers and the police forces in general [7, p. 139], on the whole, therefore, was chained to the interpretative domain of tasks covered by the police forces. So we can say that it has not detached itself, it has not separated itself from the concept of policing. Later, however, this concept took on a deeper and broader meaning, and led many thinkers quoted in this paper to add new layers of meaning. Behind this change in meaning is, of course, a change in reality, in the conditions of life and existence, to which scientific thought has over time responded, flexibly filling in the content of certain concepts. *"... to understand the nature and development of a scientific concept, it is worth taking into account the many factors of the specific material and intellectual environment of the time, ranging from the recurring mechanisms of everyday life, through the social structure and interests, to the religious and philosophical views of the time* [14, p. 141].

It also follows from the above that concepts do not stand alone, in isolation. The grounding of the theory – i.e. making sense of it - is manifested in a model constructed with a conceptual web. The theory, in turn, seeks to describe reality. In a given age, concepts have a specific meaning and express the world they are created to describe according to

specific laws. And this meaning is expressed through a multi-layered medium of meaning. Semantic analysis is thus historically determined and can be completed by this synoptic vision.

My third point is that it is therefore worthwhile to start the research by exploring the concepts and the value they convey. To this end, as I have already pointed out above in connection with János Sallai's approach, the historical aspect necessarily goes back to the past, where appropriate.

The Place of Research on the Ideas of Order in Policing Science

Therefore, I return to my basic problem, since it is precisely the semantic and historical approach to the study of concepts that has drawn my attention to the question of the content of the unfolding conceptions of order that lie behind the many attempts to interpret policing and policing science - and many of the terms used in this field, such as law and order, public courage, public security, etc. Or, to put it another way: on what hidden or reflected conceptions of order are the conceptual definitions of policing and the current approaches to policing science today, here and now. Since these approaches are of course primarily relevant in the context of society (not in relation to other living and especially not inanimate nature), I will focus on the social aspects of order, i.e. on the features that indicate social order. Besides, it would be difficult not to mention the interpretations of order not directly examined here, so I must also make a minor and only indicative detour in this direction, as I have already indicated in the third point of the introduction. I feel it necessary to do so, even at the risk that for some people this is a cheap and unsubstantiated attempt at analogy. Before I go into this, however, I would like to make two comments. One is that the once fashionable etymologising tradition has its pitfalls, to which it is important to refer. Perhaps

the most important is the belief that the meaning of words is determined by their origin [21, p. 1]. There is no question, of course, that the origin of words is of paramount importance in unravelling their meaning, but the modifying/distorting effect of the change in the relations indicated above is a cautionary note. Therefore, in bringing the concept of order to the fore, I did not wish to highlight the striking similarity based on the identity of the word-forms, but to highlight the underlying concepts that give life to one of the basic conditions for the existence of human communities, which I have elsewhere called the idea of order.

My second comment is in fact another attempt to justify and answer the question of the practical relevance for policing science of research into the underlying conceptions of order that underlie policing. Why do we need to know who thinks what about (social) order, when, one could argue, law enforcement is a clear and unambiguous form of activity governed by the rule of law, and policing science, in its many definitions, focuses more on the practical side of law enforcement.

The above critical approach to policing science can also help to understand my motivation. Indeed, critical theories seek to understand the actual functioning of society and social institutions by investigating their origins, and from this they attempt to develop a historically grounded social theory. The ultimate aim is to promote the transformation of societies in order to guarantee a *“just, free and fair life”* [9, p. 274]. In this process, policing plays a decisive role, since the birth of modern policing is linked to modern states and its everyday life has been linked to the changes in the way of life that have been taking shape within this framework for several centuries. Thus, if the science of law and order focuses on knowledge of law and order, it is (also) inevitably linked today to the changing conditions of life and to the

guarantees that ensure the development and maintenance of a viable society. And this is also helped by normative approaches to police science, as I have already pointed out.

And the importance and practicality of this issue is illustrated by Concha’s idea, expressed almost a century ago in the context of policing. The essence of this is that, while law enforcement has a serious role to play in maintaining order in society, it is not the source of it. It assists and supports its maintenance, providing positive conditions [3, p. 75], and, of course, removes the obstacles to its assertion, if necessary, with the monopoly of legitimate violence. But *“there is an end to state and social order where it is built only on the special powers inherent in the police”* [11, p. 35-36] – a quote from Concha by László Korinek.

Lajos Szamel goes even further in his conclusions, which are also quoted by László Korinek in his study, and to which Professor Finszter also referred in the context of the validity of applied research: *“There is no significant difference between the socialist view and the views of the advocates of the civil rule of law in the assessment of the nature of policing and its place in the organisation of state administration [...] The essential difference between the socialist and the civil state policing is the type of social order they protect”* [19, p. 255-256], and, I might add, in how it does all this. This is pointed out very clearly in the Strategic Concept for the Transformation of the Police Occupational Culture, when it draws attention to the primacy of the choice between concepts of order in the question of how, since *“The status quo, the rules, the dominant values and the order of cooperation require very different professional attitudes and behaviours”* [13, p. 272]. Adding that the stakes of this choice are no less than the choice of the means of maintaining social order between a cooperative or a confrontational policing.

Conclusions

Research on the conceptions of order is therefore an important and primary task, because it allows conclusions to be drawn about the quality of social order. Thinking about order, regardless of the awareness of its content, reveals what a government understands by law and order, and where and how it defines its boundaries. This is true even if, in practice, the planning and organisation of policing activities does not usually begin with a discussion among decision-makers about what they understand by social order. On the other hand, how a community thinks about order is also revealing. Because it is at the intersection of these two that the dysfunctions that can usually result in an untoward change in the current state of affairs become apparent. And this is where researchers have an explicit responsibility to support decision-makers in taking the necessary action by identifying such adverse trends. For example, by pointing out that in the decades following regime change, policing was dominated by two concepts of order, and fundamentally lacked a mindset that supported the resolution of the diversity of people and norms in an order of cooperation [13, pg.278], and without this, policing activity in the future can be hardly viewed as legitimate.

As far as my personal motivation is concerned, I join those historians of science who argue that man and his environment cannot be understood “*solely on the basis of what we characterize as practical-materialistic motivation [...] but we must also take into account man’s anthropologically given cosmological orientation as a motivation that can be called idealistic*” [14, pg.4]. An integral part of this is research which, for example, helps to synthesise the whole body of scientific knowledge by exploring preconceptions of order, with particular reference to the young science of policing, to the theoretical underpinning of which I am thus trying to contribute.

Referenses

1. BODA, J. (Főszerk.) (2019). *Rendészettudományi Szaklexikon*. Dialóg Campus.
2. BODONYI, I. (2008). *A rendészettudomány kutatás-módszertana*. MA Jegyzet. Nemzeti Közszerzői Egyetem.
3. CONCHA, Gy. (1935). A rendőrség természete és állása szabad államban. In: *Hatvan év tudományos mozgalmi között. Concha Győző igazgató és tiszteleti tagnak összegyűjtött értekezései és bírálatai*. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
4. FINSZTER, G. (2020). A modern rendészet. A rendészettudomány hazai kísérletei. In: *Magyar Rendészet*, 20(3), 91–118. <https://doi.org/10.32577/mr.2020.3.6>
5. FINSZTER, G. (2018). *Rendészettan*. Dialóg Campus Kiadó.
6. FINSZTER, G., BODA, J., KEREZSI, K., KOVÁCS, G., SALLAI, J. & IMRE, M. (2016). A rendészettudományi kutatások elméleti megalapozása és főbb irányai. In: *Államtudományi Műhelytanulmányok*, (17) 1–24.
7. HAUTZINGER, Z. (2020). A rendészettudomány határtudományai. In: *Magyar Rendészet*, 20(3), 137–146. <https://doi.org/10.32577/mr.2020.3.8>
8. KATONA, G. (2003). A rendészet fogalma és tagozódása. In: *Magyar Rendészet* 3(3), 11–19.
9. KEREZSI, K. & NAGY, V. (2017). A rendészettudomány kritikai megközelítése. In BODA, J., FELKAI, L. & PATYI, A. (Eds.). In: *Ünnepi kötet a 70 éves Janza Frigyes tiszteletére* (pp. 273–282). Dialóg Campus Kiadó.
10. KEREZSI, K. & PAPA, A. L. (2015). Rendészet, tudomány, doktori iskola. In: *Magyar Rendészet* 15(4), 67–83.
11. KORINEK, L. (2015). Rendszerváltozás a belügyben. In: *Belügyi Szemle*, 63(1), 5–33. <https://doi.org/10.38146/BSZ.2015.1.1>
12. KRÉMER, F. (2019). Létezik-e rendészettudomány? Egy kritikai tudomány lehetősége és lehetetlensége. In: *Academia Education*. https://www.academia.edu/37593211/Letezik_e_rendeszettudomany
13. KRÉMER, F., MOLNÁR, K., SZAKÁCS, G. &

VALCSICSÁK, I. (2010). A rendészeti foglalkozási kultúra átalakítása – stratégiai koncepció. In: *Belügyi Szemle Kül-önszám*, 269–299.

14. ROPOLYI, L. & SZEGEDI, P. (Szerk.) (2000). *A tudományos gondolkodás története*. Eötvös Kiadó.

15. SALLAI, J. (2015). A magyar rendészettudomány etablációja. In: *Belügyi Szemle* 63(6), 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.38146/BSZ.2015.6.1>

16. SKOLNICK, J. H. (1975). *Justice Without Trial. Low Enforcement in Democratic Society*. Wiley and Sons.

17. STOCK, J. (2000). *Zum Stand der Polizeiwissen-*

schaft. In: *Polizeiliche Handlungslehre – Polizeiwissenschaft* (pp. 26–44). Sächsisches Dr.- und Verl.-Haus.

18. SZABÓ, A. (2003). A rendészettudomány meghatározása és értelmezése. In: *Magyar Rendészet*, 3(4), 6–10.

19. SZAMEL, L. (1972). *Magyar államigazgatási jog - Különös rész*. Tankönyvkiadó.

20. SZIKINGER, I. (1998). *Rendőrség a demokratikus jogállamban*. Sík Kiadó.

21. URL1: KICSI, S. A.: *Mi az etimológia. Nyelvtudomány*. <https://magyar-irodalom.elte.hu/ezredveg/0708-9/0708-94.html>

