

A Politics-of-Naming Analysis of Public Safety and Order in Ukrainian Police and Security Legislation

Olena Salmanova^{1*}, Oleksandr Prokudin², Oleksii Botnarenko³, Vasyl Varivoda⁴, Alla Pyshna⁵, Alla Pohrebniak⁶, Volodymyr Ivantsov⁷

¹²³⁶⁷Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs, Ukraina

⁴National Academy of Internal Affairs, Ukraina

⁵Odesa State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraina

* Corresponding author: Olena Salmanova, salmanova69@gmail.com

Article History

Received: 2025-08-26

Revised: 2026-03-19

Accepted: 2026-06-01

Published: 2026-06-20

Keywords

martial law, national security, police legislation, politics of naming, public order, public safety

Citation: Salmanova, O., Prokudin, O., Botnarenko, O., Varivoda, V., Pyshna, A., Pohrebniak, A., & Ivantsov, V. (2026). A Politics-of-Naming Analysis of Public Safety and Order in Ukrainian Police and Security Legislation. *Ascarya: Journal of Islamic Science, Culture, and Social Studies*, 6(1), 24-44. <https://doi.org/10.53754/g9heq645>.



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Published as an open-access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

Rapid reforms in Ukraine's security and defence sectors, driven by Russian aggression and martial law, have expanded police roles and highlighted the need for clear public safety legislation. This study examines the usage of Ukrainian terms—publichna and hromadska—in police and security laws, assessing whether their plurality serves political-legal functions or is due to non-strategic drafting. A hybrid framework was used, including politics-of-naming diagnostics and doctrinal-functional analysis, to identify strategic term usage. A diachronic comparison of the original and amended texts was conducted using Rada records. The core corpus includes the Laws on the National Police (2015), National Guard (2014), National Security (2018), Code of Administrative Offences (1984), Martial Law (2015), and MIA Order No. 706 (2018). Mapping, diachronic verification, and functional testing were used to classify the occurrences of these terms. The results show structured plurality: publichna is focused on Police Law, while hromadska is prevalent in national security, the National Guard, administrative offenses, and martial law legislation, with intra-police-law mixing in Articles 23(1)(27) and 45(3). Three strategic loci were found: definitional asymmetry (hromadska is defined in the National Security Law, publichna is operational in the Police Law), intra-act register switching for group violations, and a diachronic shift under Law No. 1702-IX (effective January 1, 2022) replacing earlier terms with hromadska in Martial Law. The non-strategic remainder reflects referential convergence, offence classification, and subordinate doctrine, including de-escalatory crowd management under the Scandinavian model. The study concludes that full terminological unification would erase doctrinal information; instead, it supports targeted consolidation for non-strategic convergence (via a single amendment to Article 1(1)(3) of the National Security Law) and statutory acknowledgment of differential effects where naming is strategically significant, a need heightened by wartime police power expansion and accountability demands.

DOI: . <https://doi.org/10.53754/g9heq645>

 OPEN ACCES  Check for updates

Public Interest Statement

This study thoroughly examines terminological plurality in Ukrainian police and security legislation, specifically the parallel use of the cognate terms "publichna" and "hromadska" to clearly define public safety and order. Amid rapid security sector reforms and martial law, this linguistic duality complicates legal clarity. Using a hybrid methodological framework involving a "politics-of-naming" diagnostic and doctrinal-functional analysis, the present research categorizes these occurrences as either strategic political choices or non-strategic drafting. The findings reveal a structured plurality: strategic loci require explicit statutory acknowledgment



of their differential effects, whereas non-strategic convergence necessitates targeted legislative consolidation processes rather than wholesale terminological unification.

Introduction

At the present stage of the development of a democratic, law-based society, rapid changes are taking place in many areas of state activity, including the work of the National Police, which is an integral part of Ukraine's security and defence. Given the ongoing armed aggression of the Russian Federation, the organization of police activities concerning public safety and order is particularly relevant ([Buhaichuk, 2025](#); [Bezpalova, 2022](#)). Comparative experience drawn from democratic states confirms that civil society cannot function and develop outside the legal relations between its members; this presupposes the activity of qualified state apparatus officials capable of effectively performing their functions. Therefore, the improvement of the public-administration mechanism should be directed toward ensuring the rights, freedoms, and legitimate interests of all persons under the jurisdiction of Ukraine.

Understanding the police as a service entity oriented towards the interests of citizens reflects a fundamental shift: the principal purpose of the police is to serve and protect citizens and society, which in turn requires qualitative changes in police practice. The adoption of the Law of Ukraine "On the National Police" in 2015 was a key step in reforming the country's law enforcement system. One of the principal innovations of this law is the reorientation of police work towards the provision of services, including the effective maintenance of public safety and order. Ensuring public safety and order is one of the police's central tasks, as enshrined in Article 2 of the Law.

A consistent further step in this trajectory was the adoption by the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine of Order No. 706 of August 23, 2018, which approved the Concept of Introducing the Scandinavian Model of Ensuring Public Safety and Order during Mass Events in the Activities of Bodies and Subdivisions of the National Police of Ukraine ([Ulianov et al., 2021](#)). A clear theoretical and practical understanding of how to ensure public safety and order, including through the Scandinavian model, is therefore an essential condition for fulfilling the tasks assigned to the police and building an effective system for the management and coordination of police units.

The relevance of this revision is sharpened by the legal regime of martial law in Ukraine. Martial law expands certain police powers to support territorial defence, enables the temporary restriction of specified constitutional rights within the limits of necessity and proportionality, and reorganizes operational command into unified structures coordinated with the Armed Forces and relevant civil-military administrations ([Drahan, 2024](#); [Kostiuk et al., 2023](#); [Romanenko, 2024](#)). These changes do not displace the underlying mandate of the National Police; they reframe the legal and operational environment within which that mandate is exercised and sharpen the need for conceptual clarity in the categories used to describe it.

Against this background, this study advances both a methodological and substantive proposition, with the methodological proposition framing the substantive proposition. Methodologically, we argue that the parallel use of cognate categorical units in the Ukrainian legislation is heterogeneous and inconsistent. In some loci, it constitutes a politics of naming in the precise sense developed by Mahmood [Mamdani \(2007\)](#): a categorical choice that carries political-legal effects beyond its descriptive function, performs institutional or normative boundary work, or records a deliberate diachronic replacement of one register by another. In other loci, parallel use is a non-strategic legislative practice in which cognate categories are operationally connected through referential norms or shared procedural architecture. Accordingly, we adopt a hybrid analytical framework: politics-of-naming-as-diagnostic for the strategic loci and doctrinal-functional analysis for the non-strategic remainder. The hybrid is not a compromise between two rival frameworks; it is a recognition that legal terminological pluralism can do, and not do, political work in different parts of a single corpus, and that the analytical lens must be calibrated to the kind of work being performed in each part of the corpus.

The amended core corpus is organized around two distinct Ukrainian registers: публічна (publichna, "public"), concentrated in the Law on the National Police and its operational instruments, and громадська (hromadska, "civic-public"), distributed across the Law on the National Guard, the Law on National Security, the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences, and the Law on the Legal Regime of Martial Law. The diagnostic identifies three strategic loci within this distribution: the definitional asymmetry between hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (defined in Article 1(1)(3) of the Law on National Security) and publichna bezpeka i poriadok (undefined in the Police Law that operationally anchors it); the intra-Police-Law mixing of registers in Articles 23(1)(27) and 45(3); and the documented diachronic shift in the Law on the Legal Regime of Martial Law under Law No. 1702-IX, which came into force on January 1, 2022. For the non-strategic remainder, where cognate categories are operationally connected, the appropriate consolidation is targeted, as proposed by [Chyshko \(2024\)](#) and adapted in Section 5.3 to the asymmetry identified in the corpus, achieved through a single targeted statutory amendment rather than a wholesale revision of more than five thousand acts in the field. For strategic loci, consolidation under a unified term would erase the

doctrinal information encoded in asymmetry, intra-police mixing, and diachronic shift; what is required is an explicit statutory acknowledgement of the differential operational effects, not their semantic flattening.

Literature Review

2.1. Literature Review

Ukrainian doctrinal literature on the categorical question of public and civic safety and order has developed over more than a decade and now includes contributions from terminological criticism, doctrinal-functional analysis and wartime scholarship.

[Panova \(2019\)](#) provides the most comprehensive account of the scale of the problem, demonstrating that the regulatory acts whose provisions determine the conditions for legality and order in the state — of which there are more than five thousand — use cognate safety and order categories simultaneously, generating terminological confusion that obscures any comprehensive view of the system for ensuring public order. [Denysova \(2022\)](#) further notes that no regulatory document officially interprets the concept of public safety and order in general and that the Football Match Law contains a statutory definition in the limited context of football-match governance. However, in the present article, that act is not treated as part of the core corpus because its definitions are event-specific; it is relevant only as a supplementary definitional comparator, not as a general doctrinal source for Ukrainian police and security legislation.

Among the earliest sustained interventions is the work of [Zozulia and Dovhan \(2015\)](#), who criticized the introduction of the publichna register in the Law on the National Police on the grounds that the term was deployed repeatedly without an explicit statutory definition, while the Constitution of Ukraine and the existing administrative-legal corpus continued to use hromadska for safety and order. They argued that the terminological replacement was conducted too quickly and without adequate conceptual grounding, generating tension with the established normative architecture. Accordingly, Zozulia and Dovhan proposed two alternatives: a return to the older terminology or the retention of the new term, subject to the formulation of a clear legal definition and its integration into the legislative corpus.

[Kostiuk and Biloshytskyi \(2022\)](#) extended this critique by demonstrating that the terminological conflict is not confined to a single act but is distributed across various legal and administrative instruments. Combining doctrinal reading with input from policing practitioners, they show that the parallel use of publichna and hromadska terminology generates uncertainty in law enforcement practice, including in proceedings where the lawfulness of police action is contested on the basis of mismatched terminology between the police law and administrative offense rules. Their principal recommendation is the unification and standardization of terminology across the regulatory frameworks.

[Chyshko \(2024\)](#) advances a distinct position, recommending not full unification but conceptual coordination between publichna and hromadska. According to Chyshko, public order and public safety are broader categories, whereas hromadska order and hromadska safety are narrower, as they refer to particular groups of citizens or interests within the state. In this view, terminological pluralism is not necessarily an error to be eliminated; it can be read as a hierarchical relationship among categories. Chyshko's contribution is foundational for the position of differentiated coexistence within the corpus, which the present article preserves, with adaptation, for the non-strategic remainder. [Tykhonova \(2022\)](#) operates close to Chyshko's position but registers a continuing legal collision: she treats public safety and order as broader concepts that are more consonant with the requirements of the modern state, with a tendency to absorb the hromadska category, while acknowledging that the simultaneous use of both terms without a clear definitional boundary perpetuates the normative conflict rather than resolving it.

Implementation-oriented studies have examined how terminological pluralism is applied in regulatory practice. [Pikh \(2019\)](#) attends to the regulatory application of the formulation public security and order in contemporary Ukrainian conditions, showing that the formulation is contested not only at the level of theory but also in its uneven deployment across the regulatory instruments that ground the work of the security bureaucracy. [Maivorov \(2020\)](#) connects the terminological problem to the tasks and normative status of the National Police, arguing that the absence of legal definitions of public order and public safety impairs the law's legibility and weakens the clarity of police functions. This study links the terminological conflict to the National Police's institutional design.

A further line of work concerns the conceptual content of contested categories. [Yevdokimenko \(2021\)](#) specifically addresses the conceptual definiteness of hromadska safety and its differentiation from public safety and order, showing that even at the level of core definitions, the Ukrainian literature has not achieved consensus. [Herasymchuk \(2022\)](#) focuses on public order as an object of administrative regulation and shows that the term entered Ukrainian legislation not only through domestic legislative change but also through comparative legal studies and the influence

of European administrative-legal terminology. [Vaida and Holenko \(2021\)](#) extend the debate to the broader categorical apparatus of Ukrainian legislation, including the relations among law enforcement, public order or security, and public security; their contribution helps situate the naming conflict not as an isolated issue but as part of a broader reorganisation of administrative and security legal language.

[Isaienko \(2021\)](#) and [Afonin and Boksgorn \(2022\)](#) note, in addition, that the concepts of “public safety” and “public security” may legitimately be identified given their proximity in content, while the absence of a single categorical apparatus persists at the legislative level. [Chyshko \(2019\)](#) shifts the analysis from the police to the National Guard, showing that the terminological problem affects the distribution of competencies across security institutions in Ukraine. The principal argument is the need for a single standard, or at least a uniform approach, to ensure safety and order and avoid contradictions between the Law on the National Guard and the Law on the National Police. This study is significant because it demonstrates that terminological pluralism is cross-institutional and not an internal problem of the police alone.

Wartime scholarship has extended these debates to the conditions imposed by the legal regime of martial law in Ukraine. [Melnyk \(2023\)](#) discusses the state military administration during martial law and argues that the categories public safety and public order are deployed to organise a much wider range of administrative activity during wartime, while the conceptual differentiation among them remains unclear; war does not resolve the terminological conflict but amplifies its consequences. [Afonin and Boksgorn \(2022\)](#) and [Sereda, Khatniuk, and Spodynskyi \(2023\)](#) place the role of the National Police during martial law at the center of their analyses, affirming the importance of police functions in ensuring safety and order in wartime. However, the available literature suggests that the expansion of police functions has not been accompanied by a definitive resolution of the terminological conflict between publicna and hromadska registers.

[Matselyk \(2024\)](#) introduced the rule-of-law dimension, treating public order and safety as evaluative concepts whose use intensifies in the context of coercive actions during wartime. Their contribution is to show that the definitional problem affects not only legislative techniques but also the protection of rights and the limits on official discretion. [Rybytska \(2024\)](#) connects public safety to one of the domains of national security under martial law, treating public safety and hromadska safety as interchangeable terms and proposing the strengthening of the legal definition, along with the explicit specification of the actors responsible for ensuring it.

At a more general level, the works of [Artykutsa \(2021\)](#), [Radyshevska \(2020\)](#), and [Drakokhrust and Martsenko \(2024\)](#) show that the problem of legal terminology in Ukraine extends beyond police-related issues alone. These works place the variability of terms, the influence of translation from European legal language, and the need for standardization as part of a broader transformation of Ukrainian law. They function in the present article as a theoretical background that helps explain why the conflict between publicna and hromadska may have emerged and persisted.

The literature converges on the recognition that terminological pluralism is a genuine and persistent problem but diverges on the appropriate response. The dominant position has been some form of unification or hierarchical consolidation, following [Chyshko \(2024\)](#). However, this literature has not distinguished the loci where parallel categorical use performs identifiable political work — in the sense developed by the politics-of-naming framework — from those where cognate categories are operationally connected through referential norms or shared procedural architecture. Nor has the literature engaged systematically with the diachronic dimension of the corpus, in which categorical formulations are distributed across acts and replaced or modified across successive amendments. The present article addresses both gaps: it preserves the consolidation approach for the non-strategic remainder, on the model adapted from [Chyshko \(2024\)](#), while introducing a politics-of-naming diagnostic to identify the strategic loci where consolidation alone would erase the doctrinal information encoded in the Ukrainian corpus.

2.2. Theoretical framework

The article’s analytical apparatus draws on two resources from recent critical scholarship on conflict, terminology, and the state: The principal resource is Mahmood [Mamdani’s \(2007\)](#) account of the politics of naming, developed in the context of the Darfur conflict and the disputed designation of the violence there as “genocide,” “civil war,” or “insurgency.” According to Mamdani, the choice among such designations is never a neutral act of description: each designation activates a distinct legal-humanitarian regime, addresses a distinct international audience, and authorizes a distinct repertoire of responses. Therefore, naming is a political action performed by state and non-state actors who have stakes in the regime that each name activates. The framework was developed to analyze the state and international classification of armed violence. The present article extends it into a different setting — doctrinal analysis of legal terminological pluralism within a national legislative corpus — by treating Mamdani’s general claims about the political work of naming as analytically portable, while not transposing the case-specific features of the Darfur context.

The second resource is [Kalyvas' \(2006\)](#) account in *The Logic of Violence in Civil War* of the relationship between a master cleavage and the local, often non-ideological violence that nests within it. Kalyvas' framework supports an analytical move that is essential to our hybrid: distinguishing the loci where categorical choice is itself a feature of the master cleavage — strategic, ideologically charged, performed by actors with identifiable interests — from the loci where categorical choice is a local feature of legislative practice without strategic stakes. We do not transpose Kalyvas' framework wholesale to a setting (Ukrainian doctrinal legislation) for which it was not designed; we use it conceptually, as a reminder that a single corpus can contain heterogeneous kinds of categorical occurrences, only some of which carry political significance.

These frameworks are motivated by legal terminological pluralism in Ukrainian police legislation, which is heterogeneous, and the appropriate analytical lens must be calibrated to the type of pluralism being considered in each case. The amended core corpus is organized around two Ukrainian registers: *publichna* and *hromadska*, with a documented diachronic shift in their use across successive amendments. Where categorical choice is strategic in Mamdani's sense, the politics-of-naming lens is appropriate; where it is non-strategic, doctrinal-functional analysis is appropriate. This study explicitly articulates this hybrid and its diachronic application to the Ukrainian corpus.

Materials and Methods

This study employs a doctrinal and analytical research design rather than an empirical one. Its objective is to determine whether the parallel use of cognate categorical terms in Ukrainian police and security legislation performs identifiable political-legal work or reflects non-strategic legislative drafting. The design accordingly combines two analytical lenses—a politics-of-naming diagnostic and a doctrinal-functional analysis—and applies them across a defined corpus of Ukrainian primary legislation, read in both its original and amended versions against the official Rada record of amendments.

The framework is a combination in which each lens is applied to the locus for which it is suited. Politics-of-naming-as-diagnostic identifies loci where the assumption of functional equivalence among parallel categories is unwarranted because state actors have an identifiable stake in differential framing, where the framing performs institutional or normative boundary work, or where a documented diachronic shift records the deliberate replacement of one register with another. Doctrinal-functional analysis takes the remainder — the loci where the parallel use generates the same legal effects through referential norms or shared operational architecture — and asks whether the categorical choice is operationally consequential or whether it is a difference of register without a difference in legal effect. The combination is governed by a single analytical principle: legal categories earn their place by what they do, but what they do includes — in some loci — performing political work that a purely operational reading would miss. Functional analysis without the diagnostic step risks erasing the political work that the corpus actually performs; the politics-of-naming lens without the functional remainder risks over-reading every parallel usage as strategic when much of it is structurally connected by referential norms to a shared operational architecture.

The corpus consists of Ukrainian primary legislation in which the contested categorical formulations appear, together with the principal subordinate act that operationalizes them. The diachronic frame applied here is original-promulgation versus current-as-amended, with amended versions read against the official Rada record of amendments. The acts examined, all read in their amended versions, are as follows: Law of Ukraine “On the National Police” (Law No. 580-VIII of July 2, 2015), with particular attention to Articles 1, 2, 10, 16, 18, 23, 26, 30, 36, and 45; and the Law of Ukraine “On the National Guard of Ukraine” (Law No. 876-VII of March 13, 2014), with particular attention to Articles 1, 2, 12, 13, and 17; and Law of Ukraine “On National Security of Ukraine” (Law No. 2469-VIII of June 21, 2018), with particular attention to Articles 1, 18, 25, 27, and 29, and the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences (Law No. 8073-X of December 7, 1984), with particular attention to Chapter 14 and Article 173; and the Law of Ukraine “On the Legal Regime of Martial Law” (Law No. 389-VIII of May 12, 2015), with particular attention to Articles 3, 4, and 15, including the text-wide amendment under Law No. 1702-IX (in force from January 1, 2022) and Order of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine No. 706 of August 23, 2018 (Scandinavian model concept). Where amendments to these Acts have changed or replaced the categorical formulations, the change is recorded and analyzed as a diachronic finding rather than treated as background information. The primary corpus is supplemented by the body of Ukrainian legal scholarship that has addressed the categorical question ([Chyshko, 2024](#); [Panova, 2019](#); [Yena, 2023](#); [Denysova, 2022](#); [Afonin & Boksgorn, 2022](#); [Isaienko, 2021](#); [Kryshchenko, 2020](#); [Barba, 2018](#); [Fatkhutdinov, 2015](#)), which is read as a record of positions to be tested rather than as an authoritative source of law.

The analysis was conducted in five steps. The first is mapping. For each act in the amended core corpus we identify which categorical formulations — *publichna bezpeka i poriadok* (public safety/security and order), *hromadska bezpeka i poriadok* (civic-public security and order), and the cognate single-noun units *hromadska bezpeka*, *publichna bezpeka*, *hromadskyi poriadok*, and *publichnyi poriadok* — appear, where in the act they appear, and in what syntactic

context (definition, task allocation, power grant, accountability rule, referential norm). The mapping yielded the inventory shown in [Table 1](#) (Results).

The second step is diachronic verification. For each occurrence identified in the mapping, the official Rada amendment record was examined to determine whether the formulation in the current amended version differed from that in the original promulgation, and if so, when, by which amendment, and with what stated purpose. Diachronic shifts — the substitution of one categorical formulation for another, the replacement of a single-noun unit with a compound, or text-wide replacement across a single act — are registered as findings. The text-wide amendment of the Law on the Legal Regime of Martial Law under Law No. 1702-IX, in force from January 1, 2022, is the principal documented diachronic shift in the corpus and is treated as such in the Results section.

The third step is the strategic-versus-non-strategic diagnostic, which operationalizes [Mamdani's \(2007\)](#) framework for the corpus. According to Mamdani, naming in legal-political language is a political action: the choice among categorical alternatives carries consequences beyond its descriptive function, serves identifiable interests, and inscribes substantive conceptions that an alternative framing would not. We translate this general account into four diagnostic questions to be asked of each mapped occurrence and diachronic shift:

- a) Does the choice of categorical formulation have political-legal effects beyond its descriptive function? That is, does it activate, foreclose, or distinguish particular legal-institutional responses?
- b) Are there identifiable actors — institutions, professional classes, drafting traditions — whose interests align with this particular framing rather than its cognate alternative?
- c) Does framing perform boundary work between institutions, missions, or normative regimes that the operational architecture does not carry out?
- d) Does the framing inscribe a substantive conception — institutional, historical, or ideological — that the cognate formulation would not carry?

If the answer to one or more of these questions is yes, we register the occurrence (or diachronic shift) as a strategic locus and apply the politics of naming. If the answer was no across all four questions, we registered the occurrence as a non-strategic locus and passed it to the fourth step.

The fourth step is the functional-operational test, which is applied to non-strategic loci. For each occurrence, we ask what legal effects the categorical choice triggers: what powers are conferred, what procedures are activated, what accountability mechanisms are engaged, and which actors are mobilized. The paradigmatic instance of functional convergence under divergent terminology is Article 13(1) of the Law on the National Guard, which uses *hromadska bezpeka i poriadok* but, by referential norm, activates the police-measures architecture defined in the Law on the National Police in terms of *publiczna bezpeka i poriadok*. Where two categories operate as triggers for the same set of effects, they are registered as functionally equivalent; where they trigger different effects, they are registered as functionally distinct, and the locus of differentiation is identified.

The fifth step is the differential synthesis. For non-strategic loci, where parallel use generates equivalent legal effects through referential norms or shared operational architecture, the appropriate response is targeted legislative consolidation: the relationship between cognate categorical units is made explicit in the text of the law, and the legislative work required is concentrated at a single point rather than dispersed across the corpus of law. For strategic loci — those returning positive on the politics-of-naming diagnostic, including the documented diachronic shift in the Law on the Legal Regime of Martial Law under Law No. 1702-IX — the appropriate response is not consolidation but explicit statutory acknowledgement of the differential operational and political work performed by the parallel categories. Hierarchical consolidation of strategic loci would erase the political work being performed, and explicit acknowledgement of non-strategic equivalence would inflate ordinary legislative drift into apparent political contestation. The direction of any consolidation — which category is treated as the broader and which as the component — is itself a finding of the analysis rather than a presupposition: in the amended core corpus, *hromadska bezpeka i poriadok* is the only categorical unit with an express general statutory definition (Law on National Security, Article 1(1)(3)), while *publiczna bezpeka i poriadok* is operationally anchored without an express definition in the Police Law.

This study was doctrinal and analytical in nature. The diagnostic step is interpretive: the inference that a given categorical choice is strategic rests on the documentary record of inter-agency coordination, the institutional locations of the laws in which the framings appear, and the broader pattern of legislative practice in Ukraine. Whether the proposed hybrid would reduce confusion among practitioners or whether the persistence of parallel categories has measurable effects on enforcement decisions remains an appropriate question for a separate empirical study.

Results

The findings are presented in three subsections: the inventory of provisions deploying the contested categorical formulations, the doctrinal status and operational meaning of the categorical units in question, and the patterns observable in their differential use across the corpus, including the diachronic trajectory marked by Law No. 1702-IX (in force from January 1, 2022).

Inventory of provisions in the amended core corpus

Examination of the amended versions of the core corpus identifies the provisions reproduced in [Table 1](#) as loci where the contested categorical formulations appear in the law. The inventory follows the official Rada versions of the Police Law, National Guard Law, Law on National Security, Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences, Law on the Legal Regime of Martial Law, and Ministry of Internal Affairs Order No. 706 of August 23, 2018. The corpus is centred on two Ukrainian registers: publiczna and hromadska. Both registers may be rendered in English as “public”; however, the Ukrainian distinction is preserved because it is both doctrinally and operationally significant.

Table 1. Inventory of provisions deploying contested categorical formulations in the amended core corpus.

Act	Article	Subject matter of the provision	Categorical formulation
Law of Ukraine “On the National Police” No. 580-VIII of 2 July 2015, as amended	Art. 1(1)	Statutory definition of the National Police of Ukraine as a central executive body serving society	publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order)
Law No. 580-VIII, as amended	Art. 2(1)(1)	Statutory tasks/functions of the police	publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order)
Law No. 580-VIII, as amended	Art. 10(2)	Public information on police activity in the field of rights protection, crime control, and public safety/order	publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order)
Law No. 580-VIII, as amended	Art. 16(1)(1)	Formation of state policy in the police sphere by the Minister of Internal Affairs	publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order)
Law No. 580-VIII, as amended	Art. 18(2)	Duty of police officers to respond to events threatening personal or public safety/security	osobysta chy publiczna bezpeka (personal or public safety/security)
Law No. 580-VIII, as amended	Art. 23(1)(4)	Measures to eliminate threats to life, health, and public safety/security arising from offences	publiczna bezpeka (public safety/security)
Law No. 580-VIII, as amended	Art. 23(1)(10)	Police measures in streets, squares, parks, stadiums, transport nodes, and other public places	publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order)
Law No. 580-VIII, as amended	Art. 23(1)(27)	Police measures during compulsory enforcement of judicial and other decisions; wartime refusal where police are engaged in stopping group violations or mass disorder	publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order); hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)

Act	Article	Subject matter of the provision	Categorical formulation
Law No. 580-VIII, as amended	Art. 26(1)(6)	Police information resources concerning offences, events, emergencies, and threats	osobysta chy publiczna bezpeka (personal or public safety/security)
Law No. 580-VIII, as amended	Art. 30(2)	Police preventive and coercive measures for preventing threats or stopping violations	publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order)
Law No. 580-VIII, as amended	Art. 36(1)-(2)	Requirement to leave a place and restriction of access or movement	publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order)
Law No. 580-VIII, as amended	Art. 45(1)	Use of special means by police	publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order)
Law No. 580-VIII, as amended	Art. 45(3)	Use of special means to stop group violations or mass disorder	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law of Ukraine "On the National Guard of Ukraine" No. 876-VII of 13 March 2014, as amended	Art. 1(1)	Statutory definition and mission of the National Guard of Ukraine	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order); hromadska bezpeka (civic-public security)
Law No. 876-VII, as amended	Art. 2(1)(2)	Function of protecting civic-public security and order	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law No. 876-VII, as amended	Art. 2(1)(3)	Participation in ensuring security and protecting order during assemblies and mass events	hromadska bezpeka (civic-public security); hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law No. 876-VII, as amended	Art. 2(2)	Organisation of National Guard service for public order protection and public security	hromadskyi poriadok (civic-public order); hromadska bezpeka (civic-public security)
Law No. 876-VII, as amended	Art. 12(1)(2)	Duties of the National Guard during assemblies, street marches, demonstrations, and mass events	hromadska bezpeka (civic-public security); hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law No. 876-VII, as amended	Art. 12(1)(7)	Protection of security and order during official visits and protected events	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law No. 876-VII, as amended	Art. 13(1)(1)	Authority of National Guard servicemen to apply preventive and coercive police measures by reference to the Police Law	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)

Act	Article	Subject matter of the provision	Categorical formulation
Law No. 876-VII, as amended	Art. 17(1)(2)	Use of special means against resistance to lawful actions in security/order and crime-control duties	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order); hromadska bezpeka (civic-public security)
Law No. 876-VII, as amended	Art. 17(1)(7)	Use of special means to stop mass disorder and group violations	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law No. 876-VII, as amended	Art. 17(3)	Decision-making authority for the use of special means during service in a unit/group	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law of Ukraine "On National Security of Ukraine" No. 2469-VIII of 21 June 2018, as amended	Art. 1(1)(3)	Statutory definition of civic-public security and order	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law No. 2469-VIII, as amended	Art. 18(1)(1)	MIA policy sphere: rights protection, crime control, civic-public security, legal order, and police services	hromadska bezpeka i pravoporiadok (civic-public security and legal order)
Law No. 2469-VIII, as amended	Art. 18(4)	Functional description of the National Police within the security and defence sector	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law No. 2469-VIII, as amended	Art. 18(5)	Functional description of the National Guard	hromadskyi poriadok (civic-public order); hromadska bezpeka (civic-public security)
Law No. 2469-VIII, as amended	Art. 25(3)	Long-term planning documents in the security and defence sector	hromadska bezpeka (civic-public security)
Law No. 2469-VIII, as amended	Art. 27	Comprehensive review of the security and defence sector	hromadska bezpeka (civic-public security)
Law No. 2469-VIII, as amended	Art. 29	Strategy of civic-public security and civil protection	hromadska bezpeka (civic-public security)
Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences No. 8073-X of 7 December 1984, as amended	Chapter 14 heading	Administrative offences encroaching on public order and public security	hromadskyi poriadok i hromadska bezpeka (civic-public order and civic-public security)
Code No. 8073-X, as amended	Art. 173	Petty hooliganism as conduct disturbing public order and citizens' peace	hromadskyi poriadok (civic-public order)

Act	Article	Subject matter of the provision	Categorical formulation
Law of Ukraine “On the Legal Regime of Martial Law” No. 389-VIII of 12 May 2015, as amended	Text-wide amendment note under Law No. 1702-IX	Replacement of older formulations such as “public order,” “public order and safety,” and “public order and security”	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law No. 389-VIII, as amended	Art. 3(2)	Binding orders and directives of military command under martial law	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law No. 389-VIII, as amended	Art. 4(1)	Establishment of military administrations under martial law	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law No. 389-VIII, as amended	Art. 4(4), 4(7)	District/regional military administrations and coordination of their activity	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Law No. 389-VIII, as amended	Art. 15(2)(30), Art. 15(3)(9)	Powers of military administrations to hear reports on legality, crime control, and public security/order	hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)
Ministry of Internal Affairs Order No. 706 of 23 August 2018	Concept / title	Concept for introducing the Scandinavian model into National Police activity during mass events	publiczna bezpeka ta poriadok (public safety/security and order)

[Table 1](#) shows that the Police Law uses publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order) in its definitional, functional, and operational provisions — Articles 1, 2, 10, 16, 23, 30, 36, and 45 — while at the same time deploying hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order) in specific operational contexts inside the same act, namely Articles 23(1)(27) and 45(3) concerning group violations and mass disorder respectively. Second, the National Guard Law uses hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order) systematically; the official Rada record further notes a text-wide amendment of the Martial Law Law under Law No. 1702-IX, in force from January 1, 2022, replaced earlier formulations such as “public order,” “public order and safety,” and “public order and security” with hromadska bezpeka i poriadok. The Law on National Security defines hromadska bezpeka i poriadok in Article 1(1)(3); the Martial Law Law uses the same compound formulation in Articles 3 and 4 and in the amendment note under Law No. 1702-IX.

4.2. Definition status and operational meaning

[Table 2](#) presents the doctrinal status of each category in the corpus analyzed. The single categorical unit with an express general statutory definition in the core corpus is hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order), defined in Article 1(1)(3) of the Law on National Security. The cognate compound publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order) carries no formal statutory definition in the core corpus, but its operational meaning is firmly anchored in the Police Law through its use in the statutory definition of the police, the statutory tasks of the police, Article 30 architecture of police measures, and the regulation of access restrictions and special means. The remaining categorical units operate as components or classification categories without independent definitions of their own.

Table 2. Definition status and operational meaning of the contested categorical units

Categorical unit	Defining act	Doctrinal status	Definition / operational meaning
publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order)	There is no express statutory definition in the core corpus; it is operationally anchored in the Law on the National Police No. 580-VIII and MIA Order No. 706.	Operational police-law category	The police-law category refers to the maintenance of safety, security, and order in the sphere of police service, including the prevention of threats, protection of persons and public places, police preventive/coercive measures, restriction of access or movement, and the use of special means.
publiczna bezpeka (public safety/security)	No express statutory definition in the core corpus; operationally anchored in Police Law, Articles 18, 23, and 26.	Operational component category	A narrower component of the police-law register refers to threats to personal or public safety or security, especially concerning offences, emergencies, information resources, and preventive police responses.
osobista czy publiczna bezpeka (personal or public safety/security)	No express statutory definition in the core corpus; used in the Police Law.	Operational risk-response category	A police response category covering events or information resources that concern threats to individual safety/security or public safety/security.
publiczny poriadok (public order)	No explicit general definition in the core corpus.	Marginal / derivative category	Not developed as an independent, defined category in the core corpus of the study. The Police Law generally uses the compound publiczna bezpeka i poriadok rather than defining publiczny poriadok separately.
hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order)	Law of Ukraine "On National Security of Ukraine" No. 2469-VIII, Art. 1(1)(3).	Statutorily defined general category	Protection of the vital interests of society and individuals, human and citizen rights and freedoms, ensured as a priority task of security forces, other state bodies, local self-government bodies, their officials, and the public through coordinated measures to realize and protect national interests from threats.
hromadska bezpeka (civic-public security)	No standalone general definition in the core corpus; used in the National Guard Law, National Security Law, Code of Administrative Offences, and Martial Law.	Operational component category	A component of the broader hromadska (civic-public) register, referring to the protection of public/civic security in the security sector, National Guard, administrative offences, and emergency governance settings.

Categorical unit	Defining act	Doctrinal status	Definition / operational meaning
hromadskyi poriadok (civic-public order)	No standalone general definition in the core corpus; used in the National Guard Law, the Code of Administrative Offences, and the National Security Law.	Operational component category	A public/civic order-maintenance category is used, especially in administrative offense classification and institutional security/order provisions.
hromadskyi poriadok i hromadska bezpeka (civic-public order and civic-public security)	Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences, Chapter 14.	Classification category, not a formal definition	A compound category used to classify administrative offences that encroach upon civic-public order and civic-public security.
hromadska bezpeka i pravoporiadok (civic-public security and legal order)	Law on National Security, especially Article 18(1)(1), which concerns the Ministry of Internal Affairs.	Adjacent security-sector category	A related formulation links public civic security to legal order. It should not be collapsed into hromadska bezpeka i poriadok because pravoporiadok (legal order) carries a more specific law-and-order meaning.
pravoporiadok (legal order)	No standalone definition of the core corpus provisions is provided.	Adjacent legal-order category	The concept of a broader legal order appears in security sector provisions and National Guard-related descriptions. It is relevant as an adjacent term but should not be treated as identical to poriadok (order).

Patterns in the differential use of cognate categorical pairs

[Table 3](#) presents the patterns observable in the differential use of categorical units across the amended corpus. These patterns cannot be reduced to a civil/military axis between the Police Law and the National Guard Law. The amended corpus shows a more complex structure: the publichna register is concentrated in police law and police operational materials, while the hromadska register appears across National Guard, national security, administrative offense, and martial law legislation, with internal mixing within the Police Law itself.

Table 3. Patterns in the differential use of cognate categorical pairs

Pattern	Loci in the corpus	Doctrinal characterisation
Police-law publichna register	Law on the National Police, especially Articles 1, 2, 10, 16, 23, 30, 36, and 45; MIA Order No. 706	The publichna (public) register is concentrated in reform-era police legislation and operational-policing instruments. It frames police service, police tasks, public-place policing, preventive/coercive measures, access restrictions, and special means through publichna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order).
Security-law hromadska register	Law on the National Guard, Arts. 1, 2, 12, 13, and 17; Law on National Security, Arts. 1 and	The Hromadska (civic-public) register provides a broader vocabulary of civic-public security and order across the National Guard, national

Pattern	Loci in the corpus	Doctrinal characterisation
	18; Code of Administrative Offences, Chapter 14; Martial Law Law, Arts. 3, 4, and 15	security, administrative offenses and emergency governance legislation.
Definitional asymmetry	Law on National Security Art. 1(1)(3) defines hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order); Police Law uses publiczna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order) without defining it	The amended core corpus is asymmetrical: the hromadska (civic-public) compound category receives a general statutory definition in national security legislation, whereas the publiczna (public) compound category operates mainly as an undefined police law term of art.
Intra-police mixing of registers	Police Law Art. 23(1)(27) and Art. 45(3)	The Police Law is not purely publiczna (public). In specific operational contexts, especially group violations, mass disorder, and wartime priority settings, it also uses hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order).
Referential convergence of operational powers	National Guard Law Art. 13(1)(1), which authorises National Guard servicemen to apply preventive and coercive police measures by reference to the Police Law	Terminological differentiation does not produce wholly separate operational regimes. The National Guard's hromadska (civic-public) framing is operationally connected to the Police Law's architecture of preventive and coercive measures.
Emergency-governance extension	Martial Law Law Art. 3(2), Art. 4, and Art. 15, read together with Police Law, National Guard Law, and National Security Law	Martial law extends the relevance of hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order) into emergency governance. The wartime setting amplifies existing security and order categories rather than creating separate wartime terminologies.
Offence-classification function	Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences, Chapter 14	The Code uses hromadskyi poriadok i hromadska bezpeka (civic-public order and civic-public security) as an offence-classification category. This shows that the Hromadska (civic-public) register structures not only institutional powers but also the classification of administrative wrongdoing.
Operational implementation through subordinate instrument	MIA Order No. 706 of 23 August 2018	MIA Order No. 706 translates the publiczna (public) police-law vocabulary into operational doctrine for mass-event policing through the Scandinavian model of publiczna bezpeka ta poriadok (public safety/security and order).

Two findings emerge from the patterns shown in [Table 3](#). First, the text-wide amendment of the Martial Law Law under Law No. 1702-IX, in force from January 1, 2022, deliberately replaced older formulations — “public order,” “public order and safety,” and “public order and security” — with hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order). The replacement was documented in the official Rada amendment note and predated the imposition of

martial law on February 24, 2022, by less than two months. Second, the amended corpus is organized around the publichna register of police-law operational materials and the hromadska register of security sector, National Guard, administrative offence, and emergency governance materials. The Police Law itself uses the hromadska register in specific operational contexts of group violations and mass disorder; the National Guard Law connects to the Police Law's architecture of police measures through referential norms. The corpus is therefore neither a simple binary nor a clean partition but a structured plurality with consistent intra-corpus exceptions.

Discussion

Heterogeneity of terminological pluralism: register distribution and diachronic activity

Examination of the amended core corpus reveals a structure of terminological pluralism organized around two distinct Ukrainian registers: publichna, concentrated in the Law on the National Police and its operational instruments, and hromadska, distributed across the Law on the National Guard, the Law on National Security, the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences, and the Law on the Legal Regime of Martial Law. Both registers may be rendered in English as “public”; however, the Ukrainian distinction is doctrinally and operationally consequential and is thus preserved.

Two features of the corpus distinguish it from the homogeneous picture suggested in the earlier literature. First, the registers were not partitioned by institutions. The Police Law, although predominantly in the publichna register, deploys hromadska in specific operational contexts — group violations, mass disorder — within Articles 23(1)(27) and 45(3); intra-institutional mixing is part of the corpus, not a deviation from it. Second, the corpus is diachronically active and dynamic. The text-wide amendment of the Law on the Legal Regime of Martial Law under Law No. 1702-IX, in force from January 1, 2022, replaces older formulations — “public order,” “public order and safety,” “public order and security” — with hromadska bezpeka i poriadok. The replacement is documented in the official Rada amendment record and predates the imposition of martial law on 24 February 2022 by less than two months. Thus, the corpus combines a stable register distribution with at least one documented moment of deliberate, categorical change.

This finding has several methodological implications for future studies. A purely functional reading treats parallel registers as equivalent and prescribes consolidation by default. A purely politics-of-naming reading interprets every parallel use as a residue of strategic categorical work. Neither extreme is adequate for a corpus that simultaneously contains both types of loci. The hybrid framework adopted here applies the politics-of-naming diagnostic to identify loci where the parallel persistence carries strategic markers — definitional asymmetry, deliberate diachronic replacement, and intra-institutional mixing of registers — and applies doctrinal-functional analysis to the remainder, where the cognate categories are operationally connected through referential norms or shared procedural architecture. This combination is not a compromise but a recognition that the corpus contains multiple registers, intra-institutional mixing, and at least one documented diachronic shift, none of which can be addressed by a single analytical lens.

This finding aligns with [Mamdani's \(2007\)](#) original observation that categorical choices in legal-political language are rarely neutral. Mamdani's framework was developed through the analysis of state and international classification of armed violence, where the politics of naming operated principally through the discursive practices of identifiable state actors. The Ukrainian case shows that the framework retains analytical purchase in a different register: the structural availability of cognate registers across a legislative corpus and the documented moments at which one register is deliberately substituted for another can perform analogous political work even when no single speech act is at stake. Therefore, this study's contribution is to extend the politics of naming from speech-act analysis to the textual register of legislation, while supplementing it with the diachronic dimension that legislative corpora characteristically display.

Strategic and non-strategic patterns in the differential use of cognate categories

The application of the politics-of-naming diagnostic to the patterns reported in [Table 3](#) yields different answers. Three loci return strategic markers under the diagnostic and require treatment as sites where parallel categorical use performs political or doctrinal work: definitional asymmetry, intra-Police-Law mixing, and Law No. 1702-IX diachronic shift in Martial Law. Two patterns mark the structural distribution of the registers across the corpus and operate as the background against which strategic loci can be read. The remaining patterns concern operational implementation, classification, or coordination and return as non-strategic on the diagnostic, although they remain operationally consequential.

The first strategic pattern is the definitional asymmetry between the two registers. The Law on National Security defines hromadska bezpeka i poriadok in Article 1(1)(3); the Law on the National Police uses publichna bezpeka i poriadok as a term of art across its definitional, functional, and operational provisions without giving it a corresponding statutory definition. A defined category anchored in security sector legislation sits alongside an

undefined operational category anchored in the police service legislation. The asymmetry directs interpretive resources towards the security sector framing whenever the categorical relationship between the two must be specified, while leaving the police service framing as a working term whose meaning must be inferred from the context. The diagnostic registers this as a politically active configuration: a defined and an undefined cognate are not interchangeable resources, and the question of which body of doctrine is mobilized when the cognates intersect is settled, in practice, by the asymmetry of the definition.

The second strategic pattern is the intra-Police-Law mixing of registers in Articles 23(1)(27) and 45(3). The Police Law's general use of *publichna* in its definitional, functional, and operational provisions is broken into two specific operational settings — group violations and mass disorder — where the Law shifts to *hromadska bezpeka i poriadok*. This shift is doctrinally consequential because it places the operational settings of group violations and mass disorder under the same register as the National Guard's statutory mandate and security sector framing in the Law on National Security. The categorical alignment performs boundary work between routine policing, on the one hand, and the policing of mass disorder events, on the other. It is not erased by hierarchical consolidation, and any consolidation that does not register the shift as significant would suppress doctrinal information that the legislator has chosen to encode in the text.

The third strategic pattern is the documented diachronic shift in the Law on the Legal Regime of Martial Law under Law No. 1702-IX. The amendment, in force from January 1, 2022, replaces older formulations across the Act with *hromadska bezpeka i poriadok*. The diagnostic registers this as the clearest available instance of identifiable actor stake: a deliberate replacement of one register by another, documented in the Rada amendment record, with the stated purpose of harmonizing emergency governance terminology. The fact that the replacement predates the imposition of martial law on February 24, 2022, by less than two months sharpens its diagnostic significance. This shift exemplifies precisely the political work that the politics of naming describes: the choice of one register over its cognate, recorded in the legislative archive, with operational and doctrinal consequences that follow from the choice rather than from any change in the underlying powers.

Two further patterns from [Table 3](#) — the police-law *publichna* register and the security-law *hromadska* register — mark the structural distribution of the registers across the corpus. They are not, in themselves, strategic loci on the diagnostic; they are the background against which the three strategic patterns described above are differentiated. Their importance for the analysis is that they identify where the two registers are at home, and consequently where their intersection, asymmetry, or replacement — the strategic loci — carries diagnostic weight.

Non-strategic patterns concern the operational implementation and coordination of the registers. The referential convergence of operational powers, exemplified by Article 13(1) of the National Guard Law, is the paradigmatic non-strategic locus: the National Guard's *hromadska* framing is operationally connected, by referential norm, to the Police Law's *publichna* architecture of preventive and coercive measures, and the categorical labels diverge, while the operational consequences converge. The emergency governance extension under Martial Law connects the wartime regime to the existing distribution of registers without introducing a separate wartime terminology. The offence-classification function of Chapter 14 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences uses the *hromadska* register to organize administrative wrongdoing without performing strategic categorical work. MIA Order No. 706 of 2018 operationally implements a *publichna* register for mass event policing using the Scandinavian model. These loci are operationally consequential but do not carry diagnostic markers for strategic or categorical use.

These findings support the differentiated responses. The strategic loci — definitional asymmetry, intra-police mixing, and Law No. 1702-IX diachronic shift is not addressed by hierarchical consolidation alone. A statute that simply subordinates one register to the other, without further specification, would erase the doctrinal information encoded in asymmetry, intrapolice mixing, and deliberate diachronic replacement. For these loci, what is required is the converse of consolidation: explicit statutory acknowledgement of the differential work performed by the parallel categories, together with stipulation of the conditions under which each framing applies. The legislative interventions that follow from the diagnostic for the strategic loci are therefore additive, adding clarity where there is ambiguity rather than being reductive.

The non-strategic remainder: doctrinal-functional consolidation

For the loci that the diagnostic of Section 5.2 returns as non-strategic — referential convergence under Article 13(1)(1) of the National Guard Law, the emergency-governance extension of existing categories, the offence-classification function of Chapter 14 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences, and the operational implementation of the Scandinavian model under MIA Order No. 706 — the appropriate response is doctrinal-functional consolidation. Consolidation does not require the wholesale revision of thousands of acts in which cognate safety and order

categories appear. It requires a targeted statutory provision that makes the relationship between the publichna and hromadska registers explicit at the point where their operational effects converge.

The central difficulty is not the mere coexistence of these two cognate terms. It is the absence of a clear statutory rule explaining how publichna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order), operationally anchored in the Police Law, relates to hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order), defined in the Law on National Security and used across National Guard, administrative offense, and emergency governance legislation. In non-strategic loci, these terms often activate the same operational structure. Article 13(1)(1) of the National Guard Law is the clearest example: the source provision uses the hromadska register, while the preventive and coercive measures it activates are those structured by the Police Law, where the publichna register predominates.

This is the point at which [Chyshko's \(2024\)](#) proposal for conceptual coordination remains useful, provided that it is adapted to the amended corpus. The solution is not to transform earlier English renderings into separate legal categories. The Ukrainian category at issue is hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order). Nor is the solution to flatten every occurrence into a single term for all languages. In the non-strategic remainder, the task is narrower: to clarify that where the National Guard Law, the Code of Administrative Offences, or martial law provisions use the hromadska register to trigger powers, procedures, or responsibilities that are implemented through the Police Law, the relationship between the registers is one of operational connection rather than conflict.

Therefore, a targeted amendment could be placed in the Law on National Security or the Police Law. It should be stated that publichna bezpeka i poriadok (public safety/security and order), when used in police legislation, denotes the police service and operational implementation of the broader field of hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order), without displacing the latter where security sector, National Guard, administrative-offence, or emergency-governance legislation uses it. Such wording would preserve the definitional asymmetry identified in the corpus while reducing interpretive uncertainty in provisions where the legal effects converge.

Therefore, the proposed consolidation method is limited in its functionality. It does not erase the strategic loci identified in Section 5.2: the definitional asymmetry, the intra-Police-Law use of hromadska bezpeka i poriadok (civic-public security and order) in group-violation and mass-disorder contexts, or the diachronic replacement in the Martial Law Law under Law No. 1702-IX. These loci require explicit statutory acknowledgement of differential work. In contrast, the nonstrategic remainder requires a coordination rule. This distinction allows the article to preserve the information encoded by the corpus while offering a practical route for legislative clarity.

The Scandinavian model and proactive crowd management

The Scandinavian model of ensuring public safety and order during peaceful assemblies of citizens was incorporated into the activity of police officers in Ukraine in 2018, when the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine issued Order No. 706 of 23 August 2018, “On approval of the Concept of Introducing in the Activities of Bodies and Subdivisions of the National Police of Ukraine of the Scandinavian Model of Ensuring Public Safety and Order during Mass Events.” The Concept’s principal aim is to replace the older reactive model of conduct in ensuring public safety and order during mass events with a new proactive model applicable to all types of mass events. The basic principles of the Scandinavian model — knowledge, facilitation, communication, and differentiation — guide every level and throughout the duration of any mass event.

Implementing the Scandinavian model in the activities of police bodies and subdivisions enables a system of management and coordination of police forces that is genuinely effective, allowing existing conflicts and crises to be resolved at an early stage and avoiding the need to deploy more physically prepared special police units. Current legislation authorizes the police to use force only when other measures are insufficient to ensure public safety. The proactive approach is at the heart of the model, as it maximally advances the democratic principle of police activity in conducting mass events. The model also includes a careful study of crowd psychology at mass events. After a mass event ends, the police continue to fulfil their duties to ensure public safety and order until the participants have dispersed completely, maintaining surveillance and ensuring that a large concentration of persons leaves the event area within a short period. Continuing communication with the organizers and a structured debrief after the event, that is, the transfer of information on the management of the situation to the territorial police units to ensure a continuing presence at the scene, are integral to this model.

Public safety and order and the concept of “mass events,” are closely related. This relationship is partly based on the hypothesis that crowds inherently pose a threat to others, which has significantly influenced how crowds are policed. Where the source of offences is taken to be solely the crowd, and not the interaction between the crowd and the police, the possibility that conflict can develop because of inappropriate police action is ignored, with the consequence that this possibility is not used as a basis for developing strategies, tactics, or methods that could minimize it. Attention

is then focused on how to contain the crowd and protect property and people from unlawful action. The Scandinavian model corrects this orientation by attending to interaction effects and privileging communication and de-escalation in the process of conflict resolution.

The wartime context and adjustments to police powers

The legal regime of martial law, in force in Ukraine since February 24, 2022, in response to the full-scale armed aggression of the Russian Federation, has reshaped the operational environment within which the National Police exercises its mandate without altering the substance of that mandate ([Ablamskyi et al., 2023](#); [Sokurenko et al., 2024](#)). Police powers during this period were expanded by reference to the Law of Ukraine “On the Legal Regime of Martial Law” and to the body of governmental and presidential acts that operationalize it: enhanced identity checks, control of movement, enforcement of curfews, protection of critical infrastructure, and participation in territorial-defence measures. The temporary restriction of specified constitutional rights — freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and certain dimensions of privacy — must remain within the scope and duration prescribed by law and must conform to the principles of necessity and proportionality.

Inter-agency coordination is reorganized accordingly. In peacetime, the leadership of public-order arrangements rests with civilian authorities, with the National Police carrying the primary responsibility for public order and internal security, supported by local administrations and other security bodies within their statutory mandates. Under martial law, operational leadership shifts towards military administrations and military-civil administrations: the police are subordinated, for the duration of the regime, to unified command structures, while retaining their statutory responsibility for law enforcement and public-safety tasks. Memoranda of understanding, governmental decrees, and operational protocols regulate information sharing and joint operations among the police, Armed Forces of Ukraine, intelligence services, and local authorities.

Procedural and reporting arrangements were also adjusted accordingly. The intake of civilian complaints and incident reports has been expanded through dedicated hotlines, secure online portals, and mobile applications, allowing for remote submission, time-stamped logging, and routing to relevant operational units. The registry of operational data has been extended to capture incidents involving the use of force, arrests, curfew enforcement, checkpoint interactions, and property damage in a standardized manner. The recorded metadata included the date, time, location, units involved, type of intervention and outcome. Procedural standardization across hotlines, digital submissions, and internal logs supports cross-referencing for internal review, external oversight, and post-event evaluation, and is a precondition for the meaningful exercise of accountability mechanisms in wartime conditions.

Accountability for policing was maintained throughout the study. Internal investigations are conducted by the relevant subdivision of the National Police, drawing on officer statements, operational logs, video evidence, and medical records, and producing internal investigation reports that assess procedural compliance and identify deviations. External oversight is provided by independent bodies, particularly the Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights (the Ombudsman), civil society organizations, and courts, whose findings inform corrective action. Civilian complaints are formally registered and, when substantiated, are used for further internal or external investigations. Where violations are confirmed, officers may face disciplinary measures ranging from warnings and suspension to dismissal or criminal proceedings. The resulting disciplinary rulings and judgments record the imposed sanctions and procedural rationale, and the body of investigative recommendations feeds into revisions of operational procedures, training, and the use of force protocols.

None of these adjustments alters the constitutional and statutory limits within which police operate. Together, they reinforce the article’s broader argument: the wartime context makes the need for a clear conceptual apparatus more urgent, not less so. Where police powers are expanded, where *publichna bezpeka i poriadok* (public safety/security and order) and *hromadska bezpeka i poriadok* (civic-public security and order) operate in close proximity, and where coordination with military bodies brings the National Guard’s statutory categories into contact with those of the National Police, terminological precision is a precondition for both lawful operations and post-fact accountability.

Conclusion

The analysis of the amended core corpus of Ukrainian police, security, and emergency governance legislation yielded three findings that directly address this study’s research question. First, the corpus is organized around two distinct Ukrainian registers: *publichna* (public), concentrated in the Law on the National Police and its operational instruments, and *hromadska* (civic-public), distributed across the Law on the National Guard, the Law on National Security, the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences, and the Law on the Legal Regime of Martial Law. Second, the politics-of-naming diagnostic identifies three strategic loci within this distribution: the definitional asymmetry between *hromadska bezpeka i poriadok* (defined in Article 1(1)(3) of the Law on National Security) and *publichna bezpeka i poriadok* (undefined in the Police Law that operationally anchors it); the intra-Police-Law mixing of registers

in Articles 23(1)(27) and 45(3); and the text-wide diachronic shift in the Martial Law Law under Law No. 1702-IX. Third, the remaining loci are non-strategic but operationally consequential because they connect registers through referential norms, offence classifications, emergency governance, or subordinate operational doctrine.

These findings answer the research question by demonstrating that legal terminological pluralism in Ukrainian police legislation is heterogeneous and that the appropriate analytical and legislative responses must be calibrated to the locus at hand. The contribution of this study is to extend the politics-of-naming framework, originally developed for the state and international classification of armed violence, into the textual and diachronic register of national legislation, where it operates not through the speech acts of identifiable state actors but through the structural distribution of cognate registers, definitional asymmetries, and documented amendment moments. The contribution to legislative practice is the differentiated response that follows from the diagnostic: targeted consolidation for the non-strategic remainder, achieved through a single amendment to Article 1(1)(3) of the Law on National Security, as set out in Section 5.3, and explicit statutory acknowledgement, for the three strategic loci, of the differential operational and political work that the parallel categories perform. The two responses are complementary, not alternative, and together they offer a path forward for the categorical question that Ukrainian doctrinal scholarship has been engaging with since the early 2000s, with stakes that the wartime context has sharpened rather than diminished.

The analysis is doctrinal in nature, relying on the official Rada record of the amended core corpus and the published Ukrainian scholarly literature. It does not assess the practical interpretation of parallel categorical use by police officers or citizens, nor does it evaluate whether the proposed legislative interventions would alleviate confusion among practitioners. The diachronic dimension is anchored in a single major shift (Law No. 1702-IX) and does not exhaust the amendment history of the body. Future research could extend the diachronic analysis to additional amendment moments and additional corpus members, empirically test whether the proposed consolidation reduces interpretive disputes in adjudication and law enforcement practice, and examine the relationship between the publicna/hromadska register distinction in the police legislation corpus and the broader patterns of Ukrainian administrative-legal terminology. For policymakers, the findings argue for a shift away from wholesale terminological revision and towards targeted, diagnostically informed legislative interventions, a shift whose stakes are sharpened, not lessened, by the operational pressures of the wartime period.

Author Contributions: Conceptualisation, Olena Salmanova and Oleksandr Prokudin; methodology, Oleksii Botnarenko; software, Vasyl Varivoda; validation, Alla Pyshna, Alla Pohrebniak, and Vasyl Varivoda; formal analysis, Volodymyr Ivantsov and Oleksii Botnarenko; investigation, Oleksii Botnarenko and Oleksandr Prokudin; resources, Alla Pyshna and Alla Pohrebniak; data curation, Oleksii Botnarenko; writing — original draft preparation, Olena Salmanova and Oleksandr Prokudin; writing — review and editing, Vasyl Varivoda and Volodymyr Ivantsov; visualisation, Alla Pyshna and Oleksii Botnarenko; supervision, Alla Pohrebniak; project administration, Olena Salmanova. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research did not receive any external funding.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Declaration of Generative AI: The author(s) declare the use of AI-assisted technologies (Paperpal and Google Gemini) solely for the purpose of language editing and structural refinement to improve the manuscript's readability. The author(s) have carefully reviewed all edited text and hold full responsibility for the integrity, accuracy, and originality of the final published work.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Ablamskyi, S., Denakpon L.R. Tchobo, Romaniuk, V., Šimić G., & Ilchyshyn N. (2023). Assessing the Responsibilities of the International Criminal Court in the Investigation of War Crimes in Ukraine. *Novum Jus.*, 2(17), 353-374. <https://doi.org/10.14718/NovumJus.2023.17.2.14>
2. Afonin, D. S., & Boksgorn, A. V. (2022). Features of ensuring public safety and order by the National Police of Ukraine in martial law. *South Ukrainian Law Journal*, 1–2, 224–230. <https://doi.org/10.32850/sulj.2022.1-2.39>
3. Artykutsa, N. V. (2019). Legal terminology in Ukraine: modern state, main strands and perspectives. *Terminological Bulletin*, 5, 6–17.

4. Barba, V. Ye. (2018). The concept of public safety and order as an object of interaction between territorial units of the National Police and local self-government bodies. *South Ukrainian Law Journal*, 4(1), 32–36.
5. Burbyka, M. M., Klochko, A. N., & Reznik, O. N. (2016). Coordinating activity of the prosecutor's office in the sphere of criminality prevention of Ukraine. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education*, 11(18), 11931–11941.
6. Bezpalova, O. I. (2022). Priority areas of police bodies' activity in ensuring the citizens' rights in the conditions of martial law legal regime in Ukraine. *Law and Safety*, 3(86), 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.32631/pb.2022.3.01>
7. Buhaichuk, K. L. (2025). Activities of the National Police of Ukraine during martial law as a factor for ensuring national security and European integration of the state. *Law and Safety*, 98(3), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.32631/pb.2025.3.01>
8. Chyshko, K. O. (2019). Law enforcement activity of the National Guard of Ukraine on ensuring public security and order: Problems and ways of their solution. *Law and Safety*, 73(2), 58–62. <https://doi.org/10.32631/pb.2019.2.09>
9. Chyshko, K. O. (2024). Correlation of the terms “social order” and “public order,” “social security” and “public safety.” *Bulletin of Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs*, 105(2, Part 1), 93–102. <https://doi.org/10.32631/v.2024.2.09>
10. Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 810/98 (22 June 1998). On measures to implement the Concept of Administrative Reform in Ukraine. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/810/98#Text>
11. Denysova, A. V. (2022). Ensuring public safety and order by the National Police of Ukraine during mass events. *Juridical Scientific and Electronic Journal*, 7, 580–582. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0374/2022-7/140>
12. Drakokhrust, T., & Martsenko, N. (2024). Preserving clarity: Sustaining and updating legal terminology in Ukraine. *Glossa Iuridica*, 11(1–2), 29–41. <https://doi.org/10.55194/GI.2024.1-2.2>
13. Drahan, O. V. (2024). On the powers of the National Police of Ukraine under martial law. *Analytical and Comparative Jurisprudence*, 1, 375–379. <https://doi.org/10.24144/2788-6018.2024.01.66>
14. Fatkhutdinov, V. G. (2015). Community vs public in the mirror of legal hermeneutics. *Kherson State University Herald. Series “Legal Sciences,”* 4(1), 45–50.
15. Herasymchuk, R. V. (2022). The concept of public order as an object of administrative and legal regulation. *Bulletin of Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs*, 98(3), 115–120. <https://doi.org/10.32631/v.2022.3.10>
16. Isaienko, I. V. (2021). The place and role of the National Police in prevention of offences in the sphere of public order and public security. *State and Regions. Series: Law*, 4, 224–228. <https://doi.org/10.32782/1813-338x-2021.4.36>
17. Ivanova, A., & Samoilenko, O. (2015). What should the Ukrainian police be like, or problems of our lawmaking. *Kharkiv Human Rights Group*. <http://www.khpg.org/index.php?id=1426747523>
18. Kalyvas, S. N. (2006). *The logic of violence in civil war*. Cambridge University Press.
19. Kostiuk, V., & Biloshytskyi, O. (2022). Terminological conflicts in the application of the terms “public (civic) security and order.” *Law Journal of the National Academy of Internal Affairs*, 12(4), 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.56215/04221204.49>
20. Koval, L. V. (2001). *Administratyvne pravo*. In I. M. Dziuba, A. I. Zhukovsky, M. H. Zhelezniak et al. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Modern Ukraine (Vol. 1)*. NASU Institute of Encyclopedic Research. <https://esu.com.ua/article-42671>
21. Kostiuk, V. L., Lytvyn, V. V., Mozol, V. V., Shapovalova, A. O., & Serbyn, R. A. (2023). Organisation of the activities of the National Police of Ukraine to ensure public security and order under martial law. *National Academy of Internal Affairs*.
22. Kryshchenko, A. (2020). Regarding the definition of “public safety and order.” *Scientific Journal of the National Academy of Internal Affairs*, 1(102), 206–213.

23. Law of Ukraine No. 580-VIII (2 July 2015). On the National Police. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/580-19#Text>
24. Maiorov, V. V. (2019). Problematic issues of administrative and legal regulation of the tasks of the National Police of Ukraine in modern conditions. *Juridical Bulletin*, 3(28), Part 2, 81–85. [https://doi.org/10.32837/pyuv.v2i3\(28\).363](https://doi.org/10.32837/pyuv.v2i3(28).363)
25. Mamdani, M. (2007, 8 March). The politics of naming: Genocide, civil war, insurgency. *London Review of Books*, 29(5), 5–8.
26. Matselyk, T. O., & Matselyk, M. O. (2023). Administrative activity of law enforcement bodies while ensuring public order and security during martial law: Through the prism of the rule of law. *Irpın Legal Chronicle: Scientific Journal*, 4(13), 46–55. [https://doi.org/10.33244/2617-4154.4\(13\).2023.46-55](https://doi.org/10.33244/2617-4154.4(13).2023.46-55)
27. Melnyk, S. M. (2023). Administrative and legal forms of ensuring public safety and public order by state military administrations of Ukraine under the conditions of the legal regime of martial law. *Analytical and Comparative Jurisprudence*, 1, 370–373. <https://doi.org/10.24144/2788-6018.2023.01.62>
28. Moskalchuk, Yu. H. (2020). The system of checks and balances as an effective means of achieving cooperation in the work of the legislative, executive and judicial bodies in Ukraine. *Public Management and Administration in Ukraine*, 16, 19–23. <https://doi.org/10.32843/2663-52402020-16-3>
29. Panova, O. O. (2015). Terms of interior in the field of public order and security. *Scientific Bulletin of the Academy of Municipal Administration. Series “Law,”* 1, 182–188.
30. Panova, O. O. (2019). Ensuring public safety in Ukraine: administrative and legal aspect [Doctoral thesis]. Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs / Sumy State University, Sumy.
31. Panova, O. O., & Karas, O. V. (2015). Features of jurisdiction and plenary powers of organs of National Police of Ukraine in the field of providing public safety. *Analytical and Comparative Jurisprudence*, 5, 213–215.
32. Parkhomenko-Kutsevil, O., & Stelmakh, A. (2023). Modern mechanisms for ensuring public safety in wartime conditions. *Public Administration: Concepts, Paradigm, Development, Improvement*, 6, 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2786-6246-2023-6-141-150>
33. Pikh, N. S. (2019). Features of regulatory application of the term “public security and order” in Ukraine nowadays. *Scientific Notes of V. I. Vernadsky Taurida National University. Series: Public Administration*, 30(69)(5), 96–104. <https://doi.org/10.32838/2663-6468/2019.5/17>
34. Radyshevska, O. R. (2020). Impact of the terminology of European administrative law on updating the terminology of Ukrainian administrative law: Philological and legal aspects. *Civitas et Lex*, 3(27), 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.31648/cecl.5302>
35. Rybytska, O. M. (2024). Ensuring public security as one of the spheres of national security during martial law. *Scientific Bulletin of Lviv State University of Internal Affairs. Legal Series*, 2, 50–57. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2311-8040/2024-2-8>
36. Romanenko, I. V. (2024). Current issues of the application of administrative coercion measures in the conditions of the legal regime of martial state. *Actual Problems of Native Jurisprudence*, 3, 151–157. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2408-9257-2024-3-23>
37. Sereda, V. V., Khatniuk, Yu. A., & Spodynskyi, O. O. (2023). Peculiarities of ensuring public safety and public order by bodies (subdivisions) of the National Police during martial law. *Juridical Bulletin*, 28, 115–121. <https://doi.org/10.32850/LB2414-4207.2023.28.16>
38. Shevchyshen, A. V. (2019). Problems of proving by the prosecution at pre-trial investigation of corruption offences in the field of official activity and professional activity related to rendering public services [Doctoral thesis]. Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs / Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.
39. Sokurenko, V., Levchenko, K., & Ablamskyi, S., Pereira de Lima Jr, O., Šimić, G., & Romaniuk, V. (2024). The legal regime of the martial state in Ukraine and its impact on the conduct of pre-trial investigation: new challenges and their overcoming. *Via Inveniendi Et Iudicandi*, 2(19), 92–111. <https://doi.org/10.15332/19090528.10671>

40. Tsyhanov, O., Chumachenko, I., Panova, I., & Golub, M. (2020). Public policy in the sphere of activity of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine: approaches to determining the essence and content. *Amazonia Investiga*, 9(28), 159–165. <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2020.28.04.19>
41. Tykhonova, D. S. (2022). The meaning and concept of public safety and order. *Bulletin of Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs*, 99(4), 191–197. <https://doi.org/10.32631/v.2022.4.16>
42. Ulianov, O. I., Nikolayev, O. T., & Bakhchevan, Ye. F. (2021). Introduction of the Scandinavian model of public safety and order during mass events in the activities of the National Police of Ukraine. *Ukrainian Polyceistics: Theory, Legislation, Practice*, 1(1), 123–131.
43. Vaida, T. S., & Holenko, N. M. (2021). Peculiarities of using the categories “law and order,” “public order/security,” and “public security” in Ukrainian legislation. *Juridical Bulletin*, 18, 26–37.
44. Vinichuk, M. V. (2024). Challenges and threats to the national security of Ukraine in the context of the strengthening of the destabilising influence of war factors. *Materials of the All-Ukrainian Scientific and Pedagogical Advanced Training Course “National Security: Threats and Challenges”* (1 April – 12 May 2024), pp. 38–39. Lviv–Toruń: Liha-Press.
45. Yena, V. Y. (2023). The concept of public security and order as a subject of interaction between entities performing tasks to provide public security and order in Ukraine. *Bulletin of Criminological Association of Ukraine*, 2(29), 585–594. <https://doi.org/10.32631/vca.2023.2.52>
46. Yevdokimenko, S. A. (2021). Current state of determining public safety and its differentiation with the legal category of public security and order. *European Perspectives*, 2, 175–180. <https://doi.org/10.32782/EP.2021.2.28>
47. Zahumenna, Y. (2021). Public security in classical ancient Greek political and legal thought (teachings of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle). *ScienceRise: Juridical Science*, 4(18), 15–22. <https://doi.org/10.15587/2523-4153.2021.249316>
48. Zahumenna, Y. O. (2022). Public security in the pre-classical political and legal thought of ancient Greece. *Law and Safety*, 1(84), 133–142. <https://doi.org/10.32631/pb.2022.1.14>
49. Zozulia, I. V., & Dovhan, O. I. (2015). The Law of Ukraine “On the National Police”: Public or civic security? *Forum of Law*, 5, 85–92. http://nbuv.gov.ua/j-pdf/FP_index.htm_2015_5_16.pdf