

**ANDRÁS TEKE**

**Current theoretical and practical questions of security, law enforcement/policing and migration research**  
*(Dilemmas of a Hungarian researcher)*

**Introduction**

Security, law enforcement/policing and migration research have a special place in scientific and professional research. “Security science” and “police science” are already established, now the term “migration science” has been published in some papers. However, despite the scientific definition, the given topics cannot be described as monodisciplinary.

There is no consensus-based definition of security/safety or of policing, and there is a debate about the “location” and role of law enforcement/policing. It can also be said that there is no “uniform” definition of migration.

A particular science (study) has its own methodology. In many cases, this implies “technical knowledge”. The use of authentic and validated methods is the authentic practice of science. The cultivation of science at a given time depends on the self-determination, past, present, traditions and socio-political environment of a given science. It is therefore important to recognise what views, paradigms, expectations and objectives determine the application of research methods. If we talk about methodology in general, it should include methodics as well.

In the course of the scientific activity one can isolate

- 1) the process of scientific recognition,
- 2) the paradigms and methods of research,
- 3) the characteristic and determining methodology of measurement,
- 4) the conditionality of the conduct of experiments (methodology).

This is accompanied by

### 5) critical thinking.

Scientific thinking is based on “confirmability” and “refutability.” Scientific evidence of allegation is based on certain criteria, with only few scientific claims that would not have been refuted. This does not mean that there are no irrefutable allegations. Evidence found later supports or refutes a previous theory. The timeliness of social security/safety, policing and migration theories can also be examined within the framework of this process, which in itself raises serious dilemmas.

It should be emphasised that there is a discrepancy between scientific and everyday thinking, which often makes it difficult to understand the essence of the processes. (This can be complicated by the media acting as an “interpreter”.) In this field it is important to interpret and apply logic, induction and deduction. The representation of scientific knowledge can usually be classified as determinism or reductionism. (Vulgarisation is also common.)

Unfortunately, in many cases, false explanations are not uncommon, used in order to produce scientific results at all costs. The above, of course, has an impact on hypotheses, as well as on the foundation of new theories. All scientific-professional researches can be categorised on the basis of both theoretical and practical aspects.

Measurement data and observations can usually be quantified. (Note: in many cases, the method of quantification also has a deterministic effect on the result.) The available data and information can be divided into two distinct groups. One is quantitative, the other is the qualitative research group, based mainly on observation and organisation of non-numerical experiences. The quantitative group operates with series of data, the qualitative is more descriptive. The two methods are not mutually exclusive, but are complementary to each other. Scientific research may be distorted if one attempts to “quantify” qualitative results at all costs. On the one hand, security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration can be described quantitatively (numerical data), but social contexts are not always quanti-

fiable. The survival of paradigms may interfere with the relationship between the two methodological groups. If we look at strategies for obtaining data, information and knowledge, we get a heterogeneous picture both at national and international level.

The basic methods of research utilise different measuring instruments. The measurement itself seems simple. Delimit what you want to measure, select one or more measuring instruments, and organise and interpret the data obtained. This could result in statistics. The phenomena associated with society to be measured are constantly changing and moving. The “mass” to be measured changes, the conditions and the relationship system vary, so the method and result of comparability will not always be reliable. The size of the cluster and sampling also do matter. The above is usually based on a model. The model also plays a major role in measuring what we really wanted. It is also important that there is no confusion between the results obtained and the real processes. That is why it is important to know the validable methods of measurement of the phenomenon or process to be investigated. In scientific research, well-received questions, doubts play an important role. The answers can be obtained by observation and creating circumstances during which changes and events can be identified. This is the experiment. An experiment is a delicate matter, because you need to know how long you can interfere with the processes so that they do not change as a result of the intervention. Modelling is also important for experiments. The most fundamental factors of research and experimentation are questions related to research, the identification of hypotheses, dependent and independent variables, implementation of control and the selection of control groups (if necessary). The realisation and credible implementation of the above do not guarantee the effectiveness of scientific research alone if it is not accompanied by critical thinking.

Treating “received” results as irrefutable facts can be a basic source of error. The essence of critical thinking is that all facts, data and information in relation to the subject and environment of the research must be reviewed and interpreted over and over again. This means examining the sources. This introduction outlines an ideal state, but what is reality? If you think

about the above, dilemmas may emerge in relation to theory and practice. The “dilemmas” compiled from the author’s writings published in the Pécsi Határőr Tudományos Közlemények<sup>1</sup> between 2008 and 2020 are presented here but not in the order of importance.

## **Dilemmas**

The term dilemma itself refers to forced choices in difficult situations, between at least two (or more) equally bad or good options. Dilemmas are also based on the fact that theories, approaches

- 1) explain and/or describe things, phenomena (especially afterwards);
- 2) they seek seemingly causal mechanisms, in which the cause is not always clear;
- 3) mix the “subject” and “object”, which makes it unclear who the real actors and real objects in the process are;
- 4) theories often involve “cost-benefit calculation” even if it is not applicable, or can be interpreted at several levels;
- 5) decisions on security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration management are highly differentiated;
- 6) the problem and relationship between spontaneity and organisation in process management are not always clarified;
- 7) theoretical exclusivity strongly predominates in the approaches;
- 8) empirical results do not always coincide with theories, and adjustment is not always a priority;
- 9) the methodology, conditions and compatibility of the environment are not always relevant;
- 10) measurements cannot always be reproduced due to changing conditions;
- 11) forecasts cannot always be based on previous theories and experience;

---

<sup>1</sup> Review of Border Guard Scientific Studies, Vol. IX-XXII.

- 12) theories usually cover only one segment of the total volume and therefore contradictions between theories are common;
- 13) there is a lack of comprehensive and/or integrated and, as a main problem, abiding theories and models;
- 14) integrated approaches are hampered by the heterogeneity of databases and (also) by interest-motivated processes;
- 15) in many cases individual theories spend more energy to refute each other than to solve problems.

One could obviously come up with further points. In terms of security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration management, the role of hierarchical bureaucratic organisations and institutions is crucial. This role is derived from the functional designation. The way these organisations and institutions relate to scientific professional research is therefore an essential issue. In many cases, this system of relations can also be decisive in the “extraction” of scientific values.

### ***Undetermined determination***

There are many definitions of security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration. However, there is still no unified, consensual solution. (The situation is similar for other concepts, e.g. human rights, human development and human security.) The above concepts are considered self-evident in important political, international documents, laws and scientific-professional essays. International organisations also use these concepts self-evidently. Even arguments are based on them. In many cases, non-consensual definitions can later play a role as a political and even legal argument. If someone with power and interest-based influence applies the term, the original meaning may be distorted. It is often difficult to determine which definition is relevant, which is applicable and which is not.

### ***An in-depth outlook***

Despite its big volume, the literature related to security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration is rather intra-twined. Although many people write about them in many ways, they usually refer to certain (identifiable) author-researcher circles and documents, often in a way that makes it difficult to trace them. It is often difficult to “trace” the original and real essence of the underlying reference and the basis itself. In essays about the theories and models of security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration, it is common to refer to “someone that said something” about them. The repeated and varied arrangement of these references is fundamentally the backbone of the “professional” literature. In addition, the emphasis is reorganised from time to time. This also generates a loop-trap, because in many cases the precedents also do determine the scope researchers are allowed to manoeuvre in.

### **Priority of events**

Another approach is referring to events, conventions, decisions, conferences, book releases, statements by someone, by institutions, by an organisation. It also starts a chain of references. References to political declarations and international acts often give a modified picture concerning the real interpretation of security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration. Politics tends to use any (pre-)concept as a reference, and justify their choice by the original justification for the very same concept. The interpretation of theories, models, policies and strategies, programmes and initiatives is also heterogeneous. Theories and models interpret and describe processes, phenomena, while policies and strategies represent management, in other words the essence of the practical side. Often, these appear mixed together.

### ***Process and systematic approach***

Everyone talks about it, and it is often referred to in writings, but the product often does not reflect it. The process features a beginning, a middle and an end, stages can be identified, the process itself can be described. This is different for hierarchical bureaucratic organisations. There are regulations, working documents that regulate certain areas, but not the whole process. That is why the descriptive analysis of processes in security/safety, policing and migration management areas is limited. The limitations of the system approach can also be attributed to the above. Any change to the system affects the operation of the entire system. Ignorance of the approach also affects the distortion of the relationship between “the whole and the part”.

### ***Interpretation of decision levels***

Often, in the context of security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration management, ideas are formulated in a theoretical way, or in general. In practical application, it is important to display decision and application levels. Nationally, there are

- 1) central,
- 2) regional or territorial, and
- 3) local levels.

They can also be called

- 1) strategic,
- 2) tactical and
- 3) operational or executive levels.

Organisations and institutions with the appropriate authorisations are associated to them. In the functioning of the EU, the so-called operational level, which directly implements the strategy, is “wedged in” between the

strategic and tactical levels. On national level it appears at the local level. There is therefore a shift in consistency between EU and national decision-making and implementation levels. An EU operation takes place in the states at the local level, whose authorisations are not compatible with it. Similar issues may arise in the application of Frontex and other EU agencies in a national context. If the researcher fails to see the synchronisation or asynchrony of the decision and execution levels, he may draw false conclusions.

### *Divergence of designations*

The EU mass-produces “strategic” labelled and differently named documents (e.g., their programme is a match for a strategy, their strategy is more like an action plan, etc.). These documents are not always properly integrated into the existing document system and into processes. Sometimes certain processes are “conspicuously” not completed as another “strategic” document emerges. In many cases, the classical logic of strategic thinking is violated. Document hierarchy does not always prevail. There is no horizontal consultation. There is a general policy, there are professional policies and sectoral policies. Policies are converted into concepts that form the basis of strategies, and there is a plethora of strategies. The strategies are implemented via action plans, which are broken down into programmes and projects. The projects are based on individual measures. This also implies a clear document hierarchy. This is what the names should be adapted to. For example, the name of the Stockholm programme intended to be a strategy may be misleading. A pact or declaration might be of strategic importance, but it is not a strategy if it actually does not meet the formal and contentual strategic criteria. Ignoring the above may lead to erroneous conclusions.



### ***Authentic translation or misconstruction?***

A problematic factor is the translation of foreign language material, especially English, into Eastern and Central European languages. Since the texts on security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration are mainly published in English, it is important to translate them into their native language. In essence, Anglo-Saxon thinking and mentality characterise the writings related to security/safety, policing and migration. This has also been included in the communication of international organisations, and this way of thinking is not always easy to integrate into the European continental or sovereign state point of view. There are several expressions in English whose meaning is not only slightly different from that of in other languages. For example, in many cases this has not been and is not taken into account in Hungarian translations, so the original idea is often distorted, which can be misinterpreted.

### ***Assessment of organisational operations***

Organisations with a hierarchical structure are difficult to assess in the same way. In certain situations, the existence and functioning of the hierarchy may be detrimental.

- 1) The management of organisations concentrates on keeping the system operational, and the "connecting" relations between the elements often seem more important for the functioning of "the whole";
- 2) When you concentrate on the elements of hierarchical organisations, the substance of the elements becomes more important;
- 3) The high number of the elements of the hierarchical system and the links between them might exceed the limits of predictability, making the systems rigid and difficult to manage, and also making them difficult to assess.

This also influences the perception of security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration management.

### ***Result vs. output, efficiency vs. effectiveness***

Assessing a system or a process results in a kind of value judgment. This may vary depending on the nature of the investigation. It can be considered a result if the target has been achieved or a positive shift has been made from the original state. Result is not the same as output. An output can be identified without an identifiable result, for example, if a document has been published, a decision has been made, even if the consequences are not measurable. Efficiency is generally approached from an economic perspective, in a cost vs. return or investment vs. benefit relation. In social processes, this is difficult or impossible to measure, or a longer period of time must be taken into account. Efficiency can also be interpreted as the minimum possible cost or the best possible result in achieving the desired target. Effectiveness (efficacy) is based on the measurement of the actual results. This is the mechanism of consequence. In the case of security/safety, law enforcement/policing, migration management, result, output, efficiency and effectiveness can only be interpreted by using a process and system approach. Output and efficiency in terms of results are difficult to convert into a measurement unit in social processes.

### ***Analysis, synthesis, adaptation and integration***

When approaching issues, enforcing the concept proves to be important. Applying good practices is fundamental. The basic conditions for analysis, synthesis, adaptation and integration are the reliable, primary data-based, credible and up-to-date integrated databases. The lack of this prevents meaningful progress. Many researchers consider adaptation vulgarly and as a simple cloning. They do not take into account environmental, system operating factors. Integration does not mean coexistence, but operating as a whole. Therefore, the method of the analysis, the degree of differentiation

and selection during the synthesis and how much attention is paid to the organisational, activity and environmental alignment of the elements do matter. In this context, in the world of globalisation the spread of so-called standard products, services, technologies and models becomes naturally dominant. This affects not only consumption and habits, but also people's way of thinking. While managing security/safety, policing and migration, the processes may include non-integrated elements as well. Sometimes managerial and marketing techniques not typical for hierarchic organisations might be applied. These do support current politics, but the effectiveness of solutions cannot always be justified.

### ***Perspective and considerations for the examination***

The accepted phenomenon in scientific and professional research is the application of dimensions, aspects, components, relations, levels, etc. as considerations. If something is interpreted differently by a professional, a scientist, a politician and an average person, it is not easy to explore the nature of a particular system of relations. Sometimes the dominance of the prevailing approach hinders the practical implementation of full-scale, actor-oriented approaches. Approaching the problem can therefore be very complex, but can also be narrowed down to a handpicked element. In addition to the above-mentioned elements, there is also a reference to focus, priority and the "centre of gravity" etc. Will it result in a valid answer, if we examine a certain dimension from a certain point of view, focused on certain handpicked details of certain elements, set in a certain timespan, along certain priorities? This dilemma also highlights the interpretation of the relationship between the part and the whole.

### ***Mechanisms and consequences of causal chains***

In the global world, processes are complex, resulting in specific cause-consequence chains. In these chains, a consequence might additionally act as a cause as well, even more than once. One should always investigate

whether what has been tackled is a “cause” or a “consequence”. Understanding and interpreting this exceeds the limits of traditional thinking. Einstein’s much quoted saying fits well here: “*We cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them.*”

Scientific research usually does not examine the whole “chain”, only individual segments of it and draws conclusions from it. This poses a threat to understanding real processes.

### ***Problem approach and hierarchy***

The leaders of hierarchical organisations prefer “instant” scientific or perceived scientific results, those used to justify a subsequent “scientific” decision or to simplify the problem. At the same time, scientific decision-making is usually seen by hierarchical organisations as a distraction. If scientific methods are applied in hierarchical organisations, three directions can be observed: (1) “how” to quickly solve the task or problem, how responsibility can be shared, what “creative” tools and methods can be involved in the search for solutions; (2) “what” should be done (hierarchy does not like this, because by the time it is answered, it is usually too late); (3) focusing on “why”, which often requires a scientific explanation to support self-justification. In hierarchical organisations, the “freedom” of science is effectively counterweighed by the rigorous rules and short-term expectations of the leadership.

### ***Researches based on primary and secondary data***

A scientific research can be based on primary or secondary data. The specialties in security/safety, policing and migration areas are either distinct or not available. Secondary data is existing data recorded by others for their own research. This is where the paradoxical situations arise for the three areas mentioned earlier. Sometimes “specified” researches are based on existing, derived secondary data of other researches, which makes the actual results of the research questionable.

### ***Formal conditions***

In an organisational environment dealing with security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration issues, scientific research can work only within a hierarchical framework. If such research is ordered at all, it is usually linked to daily work or current (political) problems. Existing organisational elements with scientific functions are operated under different classifications and competences within each organisation. They are regulated by job descriptions. These elements might become disturbing, as they might concern issues that are considered sensitive by the top management. Scientific research is partially driven by the informal flow of information based on informal relationships, which assumes a functioning network-approach. Sometimes it is hindered by formal regulations. Scientific researches are traditionally classified as basic, applied and development (action) researches. Each has its own *raison d'être* and function, and they might be based on one another. It would be necessary to regularly review the results of previous basic researches, however, the need to do so is generally not a motivating force.

### ***Forced choices within a closed system***

The institutional systems of security/safety, policing and migration management remain closed, despite their declared openness. This is reflected in the links between organisational and professional cultures. Despite the need for integrated operation, the dominance of a narrowed-down approach is still present, which limits the application of the process and system approach.

According to Russian mathematician V.P. Maslov,<sup>2</sup> “*The existence of a solution of an ill-posed problem is equivalent to the convergence of a regularization process.*” This is also reflected in the pursuit of a solution at all costs, which represents the competition for resources within the organisation. Decisions are usually affected by the lack of, or only limited knowledge of the possible solutions.

### ***Scientific works for extraordinary, crisis or unique situations***

It is interesting to note that a significant part of researches and writings on security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration do not examine the “normal situation”, but rather the issues related to crisis or extraordinary phenomena. They draw general conclusions on the latter, which are also considered to be applicable to the “normal situation.” (Applying conclusions, gained by examining non-normal situations is disputable itself in normal situations.) Examining unique situations without taking their context into consideration is another phenomenon, whereas unique situations should not be generalised, either.) Examining normal situations on scientific level is “unwanted” and unmotivated, as “professionals” consider their area to be “regulated enough” or “as good as it can possibly be”. Extraordinary situations require a different method. Emergency management usually results in only a temporary release of tension, as they lead to further questions to be answered and further issues to be solved.

---

<sup>2</sup> The existence of a solution of an ill-posed problem is equivalent to the convergence of a regularisation process.

Source: [http://www.mathnet.ru/php/archive.phtml?wshow=paper&jrnid=rm&paperid=5640&option\\_lang=eng\\_](http://www.mathnet.ru/php/archive.phtml?wshow=paper&jrnid=rm&paperid=5640&option_lang=eng_)

Accessed: 02.06.2011

***The victors always want to fight the next war based on the experience of the previous war***

The idea applies to science as well. However, in the ever-changing world, what used to be learned from the past, we now have to learn from the thoroughly analysed present and the assumed future. The pursuit of continuity may be an organisational value, but it does not necessarily support progress. The recognition of current and expected trends and orientating towards the future should be preferred.

***Dealing with real-time or unstructured data on organisational level***

As a result of technical developments, it has become possible to ensure real-time information flow also for security/safety, policing and migration management activities. There is real-time (online) and non-real-time (offline) data and information flow, depending on whether the parties are “connected” to the communication channels.

Due to the efficient usage of systematically organised tools, geodata of relevant security/safety, policing and migration events and activities is available. Scientific researches, however, gain only limited access to it, they only have access to past-time data about events that have already taken place.

***Complex or integrated?***

We often use the terms “integrated” and “complex” for all two categories indicated in this chapter. Integration means fitting, merging previously separate parts into a greater whole, in which a (new) network of relations defines the way of operation. The basis of integration is the realistic/effective interconnection of the modules that carry out the tasks of certain elements, processes and sub-levels independently. (Obviously, the test criteria should take these into account.) “Complex” and “integrated” are not synonyms. Complex means complicated, but it also means the pursuit of completeness,

everything related to the subject, without leaving anything out. (A complex system is complete.) The term integration assumes a functional approach, which is relevant for the proper functioning of the system. The term complex does not properly express the essence of integration. System operation is truly integrated when there is no need for separate (event-tracking) data/information transmission and (manual) control between different sub-systems/modules.

***Expectations, demands and satisfaction: what researches usually lack***

In addition to the usual institutional-activity approach in the investigation of security/safety, policing and migration management, there are a number of components that are not “taken into account”. It is appropriate to examine how needs and demands, the utilisation of security and police services and the consistency between the needs of security and police services come into effect, if at all. Answers are needed about how the appropriateness of management, economical efficiency, technical and technological quality, strategies and objectives, risk and change management and the satisfaction of stakeholders are addressed. Furthermore, how equal opportunities, equity, accessibility and the coordination of activities are achieved, and what scientific and technical quality supports all that. The principle of “good and well” should also be applied in the areas of security/safety, policing and migration management, by means of an effective, high-quality decision making mechanism and high-quality enforcement, along with appropriate ethics.

***Interpretation of “hazard interpretation”***

Currently, there is neither an internationally accepted standard for the interpretation of hazards, nor is the concept of hazard defined in a consensual way in the literature. Law enforcers tend to make a comparison between law interpretation and hazard interpretation. The first step in applying the law is to establish the facts. In the case of hazard interpretation, this is the



identification of the hazard. In the case of the application of the law, the next step is to interpret the relevant legislation. In the case of hazards, it is important to decide what the hazard means in itself and how it might affect the processes and systems. The third step in the application of the law is to make a decision. In the case of hazards, this stage is similar, but the decision differs in its content, as it should contain the necessary actions to be taken, too, provided that institutional mechanisms do not approach it differently (prejudication). Similarly to regulations, hazards can be interpreted along multiple approaches, but interpretation should always comply with the particular value, ethical, legal, social and cultural framework and the principles of process and system approach. However, the interpretations of hazard and safety are different categories.

### *The “embeddedness” of thinking*

In the case of paradigms, the “business as usual” approach survives generations even if the user is not even aware of the original starting point and the changes that have taken place since then. Researchers and organisations involved in security/safety, policing and migration management usually think the “DRM” (determined, reducing and mechanistic) way, and “time-tested” solutions are paradigmatically preferred, regardless of the nature of the problem, which is a barrier to changes. Furthermore, the horizontal separation between sectors, disciplines and institutions is still present. The basic reason for this is thinking along tasks and institutions and statistics and criminal policy. The way of thinking also affects the willingness of adapting external influences, including scientific results. One of the characteristics of hierarchical bureaucratic organisations is the preference for linear thinking. This way of thinking is vertical, based on regulations. We should note that current regulations are based on a specific technical, technological and scientific environment, and it takes a long time to change them, except when a suddenly emerged need or interest forces them to be

overwritten. The linear way of thinking aims to find a solution based on already existing capabilities and experiences (see 2.18).

### ***Influenced by cultures and identities***

Security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration management are determined by political, professional and organisational cultures their top managers represent. (The same applies to scientific researchers.) The attitude of individuals who cultivate it towards society, their occupation, their vocation and their peers is culture-specific. It is crucial to understand the way they are viewed as professionals by society, politics, and their narrow or wide environment. Identity determines the possible directions of scientific research, predestines its intra-twining, and reveals its professional limitations.

Organisational culture is also reflected in the thinking and behaviour of the members of the organisation. It is based on the expectations of the management and the values shared and followed by the employees. Political culture is always determined by the specific history and characteristics of the particular country. Political cultures have been shaped by the same factors that resulted in the dominance of the political system. The political system barely tolerates conflicts, it is barely able to arrive at compromises, which also affects scientific activity. If a political culture prefers current politics, realistic politics are overshadowed.

The relationship of cultures, identity and science is a structured question to be answered, a hint, a need for clarification about our role, when objectives and the ways to achieve them are theoretically set.

### ***Reliability of data***

Without authentic, valid and compatible databases, confusion might emerge. During the ten-year period between censuses vital demographics data is scarce. There is no unified registration of the movements of persons

András Teke: Current theoretical and practical questions of security, law enforcement/policing and migration research (Dilemmas of a Hungarian researcher)

between countries. Categories, classifications, accessibilities and actualisation are different, sometimes even within a single country. The ability and capacity of unstable states to provide information is also limited. In the name of political correctness, important data cannot be accessed, and without them, correct conclusions cannot be drawn.

### *Drifting between sciences*

In the context of security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration research, there is a need and opportunity for interdisciplinary space. We can talk about monodisciplinary, intradisciplinary, multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, crossdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research.

The combination of the above may result in the creation of a new eclectic discipline, or in an originally independent discipline partially disappearing or losing its professional identity over time. In this context a number of ethical, philosophical and compatibility issues may arise, which do not fit within the framework of this study. The problem also concerns how interdisciplinarity and inter-organisationality can be distinguished. For example, an actual consequence of “crossing over” is the mixing of law enforcement/policing and military terminology and the non-professional-specific character of approaching the problems. In terms of security/safety, law enforcement/policing and migration, monodisciplinary approaches are not realistic.

### **Conclusion**

The issues referred to as dilemmas in chapter 2 are not of equal weight, nor do they always fall into the same categories. However, their existence influences processes, thinking, decisions, scientific research and the reception of its results. These are valid dilemmas at present, but have also been valid for the last forty years. They are connected to global processes. In the

late 1980s major changes took place in the world, described as “mega-trends”<sup>3</sup>.

In 1982, John Naisbitt identified 10 of these trends regarding the USA:

- 1) Transition from the industrial to the information society;
- 2) instead of technical pressure, advanced technology and relationships;
- 3) from national economy to world economy;
- 4) from short-term thinking to a long-term perspective;
- 5) centralisation or decentralisation;
- 6) from institutional assistance to self-help and self-care;
- 7) from representative democracy to participatory democracy;
- 8) from hierarchy to networks;
- 9) North vs. South conflict;
- 10) from “either-or” to a number of alternatives.

According to Naisbitt, we live in a society of events, and the heat of the current events make us forget about realising connections, which is particularly dangerous in the global and digital world.

Four decades have passed since the publication of this book, but these trends seem to continue to live on. Events are usually consequences and there are “many” of them, which determines how they should be handled. Recognising and identifying actual processes can reduce dilemmas and provide the opportunity to answer new, important questions.

---

<sup>3</sup> Naisbitt, John: Megatrends. Ten New Directions Transforming Our Lives Warner Books, New York 1982© 290; Hungarian translation: John Naisbitt – Megaterendek. Országos Műszaki Információs Központ és Könyvtár.