

UDC: 616.98:578.834]:614.4(4-672EU)
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22182/spm.7842022.1>
Review article

Serbian Political Thought
No. 4/2022, Year XXIX,
Vol. 78
pp. 07-24

Ewa Bujwid-Kurek*

Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland

Karolina Rybak

Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland

THE PANDEMIC WORLD OF COVID-19 IN EUROPE: POLITOLOGICAL REFLECTION ON STATE OF EXCEPTION IN SELECTED COUNTRIES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF SOCIAL POLICY MODELS

Abstract

The state of exception is implemented to protect the security of citizens and public order. During that time the human rights become limited in favor of public authorities. In the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, only some countries in Europe have declared a state of exception. It is worth to consider what caused this decision. The aim of this article is therefore to determine whether and to what extent a specific model of social policy dominating in the state had an impact on the steps taken to combat the COVID-19 pandemic, and above all whether it determined the implementation of a state of exception. The concept created and developed by many researchers, among the others Bogusław Jagusiak became the background for the considerations. He classified and defined the existing forms of social policy, putting them in the framework of models. The starting point for this research was the typology proposed by Gøst Esping-Andersen. This concept has been developed and the following models have been distinguished: Nordic, Anglo-Saxon, Continental, Mediterranean and Post-Communist. According to the above distinction, five countries that that represent a

* E-mail: ewa.bujwid-kurek@uj.edu.pl

specific model of social policy to the greatest extent will be selected. For the Nordic, Anglo-Saxon, Continental, Mediterranean and Post-Communist models, these will be Sweden, Great Britain, Germany, Italy and Poland. Then they will be subjected to comparative studies in relation to the issues described above.

Keywords: Covid-19, state of emergency, social policy models, Sweden, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Poland

INTRODUCTION

The pandemic of Covid-19 is a time full of specific challenges that most of the world's governments had to face instantly. Some of them took the measures that had been available in the constitutions of those countries by declaring state of emergency, whereas the others announced restrictions based only on state of epidemic. Different models of social policy were applied among those countries, including these where dominate Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon, Continental, Mediterranean or Post-Communist models.

An interesting research question is how does the dominating model of social policy influence the anti-pandemic measures, and does it cause the declaration of a state of emergency? Such states are usually declared in case of great danger. State of emergency is one of the options of extraordinary laws that are announced to ensure safety of citizens of the state, protect state's regime and maintain social order. During the state of emergency the proportions between laws of individuals and state powers change in favor of the second ones. Not all of the governments declared state of emergency due to COVID-19 pandemic. Some of them decided to announce the state of epidemic which is system implemented locally as a remedy for the risk of spreading epidemic. It is obvious that with such extraordinary legal regime goes the limitation of individual rights. Such phenomenon may be called as *crawling authoritarianism* (Norris 2021).

The theoretical model on which the analysis in this article will be based is the concept that appears very often in the literature on the subject and was quoted, among others, by Bogusław Jagusiak, who defined and classified the forms of social policy, putting them in the framework of models (Jagusiak 2015). It is important to note that the inspiration for this classification was the tripartite typology of social policy models proposed by the Danish sociologist Gøst Esping-Andersen (1990, 26-29). Jagusiak extended this concept by distinguishing five basic models: Continental,

Anglo-Saxon, Nordic, Mediterranean and Post-communist. According to the above, the analysis will cover five countries that represent a specific model of social policy to the greatest extent. For Nordic, Anglo-Saxon, Continental, Mediterranean and Post-Communist models, these will be Sweden, Great Britain, Germany, Italy and Poland respectively. Two research methods were used for the analysis: comparative and case study.

EXTENDED TYPOLOGY OF SOCIAL POLICY MODELS

Scandinavian model: Sweden

Sweden is the main representative of the countries belonging to the social democratic welfare state. The Swedish model can be described in a few points. First and foremost, it is characterized by an extensive social safety based on free education and health care, financed by taxes, ease of doing business, high level of democracy, free trade combined with collective risk-sharing, low market regulation, low levels of corruption, partnership between employers, trade unions and government where social partners negotiate between themselves the conditions of the workplaces (Andersen et al. 2007).

The philosophy and values of the Swedish model are based on maintaining equality and universal access to social services. Women do not give up motherhood and still participate in labor market. The Swedish family policy implements the model of combining work and family responsibilities, addressed to both partners (dual earner). Sweden's fertility rate is one of the highest in Europe (Golinowska 2018).

Sweden and other countries with the Nordic model of social policy are among the countries that are placed very high in the Ranking of Happiness. According to the data for 2016-2018, Sweden came seventh, followed by Switzerland, The Netherlands, Iceland, Norway, and Finland only, so again mostly Scandinavian-based countries with a solid welfare system, promoting equality (Conley 2022).

However, the Scandinavian model is very often criticized. There are some weaknesses, which allow both citizens and institutions to make use of the system contrary to its objectives. Manifestations of this are frauds, the development of the black market on the one hand, and the growing social tolerance for these phenomena on the other. It is also believed that the social security system, transfer payments on the one hand, and taxes on the other, contribute to the deepening of difficulties on the labor market and to an increase of unemployment. Income security has

raised expectations for amount of wages level and reduced the propensity to work. *Welfare state* was such a catchy slogan and a policy based on it very popular and attractive to many countries. Now this model experiences serious difficulties and is therefore increasingly questioned. The welfare state is believed to be the source of ineffective bureaucracy in economic life, limiting the freedom of enterprises and individuals (Mitręga 1996, 128-130).

Anglo-Saxon model: Great Britain

This system is dominated by socio-political traditions derived from the Poor Act (that highlighted the distinction between worthy and unworthy recipients of social benefits) and the Beveridge Report (it contained the rules that put focus on a high employment combined with very low contributions and minimal basic security for society as a whole) (Kraus and Geisen 2005, 81).

In Great Britain, the social policy model is based on a flat-rate income security, accompanied by an underdeveloped legal system. There is central financing of benefits and only the most deprived persons are entitled to receive government support. System is based on market mechanisms. There is a focus on encouraging private companies to provide social services. Employment protection is not high (Golinowska 2018). The labor market can be described as flexible, and the dominant principle is *easy to hire and fire*. It should be emphasized that in Great Britain non-wage labor costs are relatively low and unemployment benefits are relatively average. Trade unions do not play a significant role (Tendera-Właszczuk 2009, 132).

The school system in Great Britain was and still is an exemplary model for many countries in the world, including the socialist countries. What should draw the attention of all reformers, however, are the resources directed to him; both intellectual, human resources and financial outlays. In Great Britain there are a lot of funds spent on schools not only by public entities but also by and households (Golinowska 2018).

Continental model: Germany

Germany is seen as an example of a welfare state. Its roots are connected with the policy pursued by Chancellor Otto von Bismarck. He was the initiator of the introduction of the first social rights, which, although they already appeared in medieval Germany, only in his times were covered by most professional groups (Baran 2012, 199-201).

The German model of social policy is characterized by the fact that the welfare state is a kind of social contract made between the government and citizens, based on the assumption that the state provides assistance, which citizens not only accept, but also expect, and thus the majority services and benefits is in the nature of entitlements. There is also a strong relationship between social rights and the status of employment - in principle, the possibility of using basic social benefits is closely related to participation in the labor market, which is tantamount to the need to have the status of an employee, for people who do not have it, support is optional. Labor costs are relatively high and to a large extent result from high retirement and pension benefits (Baran 2012, 199-201).

In German education, attention is still being paid to linking education with the labor market. In vocational education, the model of dual education is used, in which learning is conducted simultaneously with practical classes in workplaces. This helps to prepare students for work and helps enterprises to maintain a good organizational and competence level of employees (Golinowska 2018, 70).

Mediterranean model: Italy

The Italian welfare state has not developed a typical welfare system. Its local structures are poor and operate on modest benefits. The family continues to hold a strong position in the Italian social safety. However, it turned out that even a culturally strong family like the Italian one is in fact weak without adequate public support. Despite the relatively low participation of women in the labor market, fewer and fewer children are born (Italy has one of the lowest fertility rates in Europe) and care services are obtained in the *gray area*. The Italian labor market is largely powered by immigrants. This country has turned from a traditional emigration country to a host country. As a result, there is greater consent for a more flexible labor market to develop, especially for the younger generation. Good health status indicators are achieved with less public effort due to the beneficial effects of the Mediterranean diet and warm climate, as well as a lifestyle that is freer than, for example, in the countries of Northern Europe. At the same time, as a result of the deepening disproportion in the demographic structure resulting from low fertility, the promotion of health for the elderly has been more clearly present on the political agenda for several years as a method of reducing financial burdens in health care (Golinowska 2018, 80-81).

Post-communist model: Poland

It is very difficult to classify Central and Eastern European countries into the models of social policy discussed above. This is due to the fact that for several decades the social and economic system was totally different from those that dominated in Western Europe. For this reason, it cannot be related to the classic welfare state. Therefore, in the scientific literature, a post-communist (also often called post-socialist) model of social policy has been distinguished.

In Polish Post-communist model of economy a poor ability to generate a high employment rate and a high level of average wages appears (Książopolski 2011, 29). Poland is one of the countries where the strategy aimed at the development of labor resources, human capital and the creation of job places did not have the proper priority. The review of goals and actions taken as a part of labor market reforms in other countries and in the EU recommendations (primarily as part of the employment strategy) clearly shows that some actions in Poland were “against the flow” of the mainstream postulates. Here are some of them:

- Failure to undertake a program of reconciling work and family responsibilities,
- Applying relatively generous social protection to people who leave the labor market permanently: the disabled and people laid off in the pre-retirement age - stimulating these groups to be passive,
- Lack of real promotion and support for entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs,
- No promotion of the principle that work is always more profitable than using social benefits, both by employers and the state,
- Acceptance of emigration as a way to alleviate the imbalance in the labor market, despite the loss of human capital (Golinowska 2018, 116-117).

In Poland, there are still a wide scale of the *gray area* of employment. Despite various ways on the part of the state to include this area of activity in the formal labor market, there are many factors supporting this phenomenon. This applies to both very poor people with low employability (limited social ties, lack of qualifications and health disorders) as well as people with high qualifications, usually free professions, who carry out some of their assignments informally (Książopolski 2011, 30).

STATE OF EMERGENCY IN THE CONSTITUTIONS OF SELECTED COUNTRIES

Many states have envisaged emergency situations in their constitutions in which standard governance is not possible. They differ in the gradability of the severity of these states. Since states of emergency interfere with issues as crucial as individual rights, their principles are usually enshrined in constitutions. They are introduced only for a certain period of time. This is to reduce the temptation of the rulers to abuse power.

There are no regulations regarding the state of emergency or a state of natural disaster in the Swedish Constitution. The only codified mechanism is that the Riksdag can be convened in the event of war (Konstytucja Szwecji 1991, 41-45).

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in turn, is a state that has not based its system on a constitution in the formal and legal sense, i.e. on regulations of the highest legal force, adopted in a specific manner and codified in the constitution. Hence, there is no mention of a state of emergency here (Khakee 2009, 26).

Italy is among the countries with an average level of codification of states of emergency. The constitution does not contain any declarations regarding the possibility of declaring martial law or extraordinary conditions. The only passages in this Act refer to who is responsible for declaring a state of war (Konstytucja Republiki Włoskiej 1947).

Germany is one of the countries with a high level of codification of the states of emergency. At the federal and provincial level, as many as six types of states of emergency are envisaged: 1) defense, 2) tensions, 3) threats to freedom and democracy, 4) extraordinary measures to restore order or public safety; 5) state of threat to the overall economic balance, 6) state of natural disaster. Perhaps it is related to the fact that Germany experienced authoritarianism very much in the 21st century, hence such detailed regulations at the constitutional level (Walecka and Wojtas 2021, 2-3).

Among the surveyed countries, Poland is also the country with the highest level of codification of states of emergency (Chapter XI of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland of April 2, 1997). There are three kinds of such states: martial law - introduced in the event of an external threat, state exceptional - introduced in the event of an internal threat and a state of natural disaster - introduced in the event of an emergency caused by the actions of the forces of nature (Prokop 2022).

COVID-19 FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF SOCIAL POLICY MODELS: COMPARATIVE STUDIES

Sweden

Sweden did not introduce a state of emergency because such a possibility does not arise from the country's constitution. Moreover, no specific restrictions have even been introduced. When in March 2020 many countries in Europe, including Denmark and Norway, decided to lockdown, Sweden issued recommendations to care for hygiene, avoid social contact and limit movement. Educational establishments have not been closed. According to research conducted by the Institute of Global Health Innovation, Sweden is one of the last places in the Stringency Index Range, which informs about the strictness of the restrictions introduced in individual countries. In Italy or Spain, this index was 95, while in Sweden only 52 (Institute of Global Health Innovation 2021, 4).

The lack of decisive action to stop the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic in Sweden may seem surprising, given the country's social policy model and the high level of interventionism. Here it is worth referring to the example of Denmark, where a similar model is also in force. The country adopted a different public health policy during the COVID-19 pandemic. Denmark closed its borders and schools very early. According to statistics, the Danish levels of trust in the government and the ability of the health authorities to lead the country through the COVID-19 crisis were significantly higher than Swedish ones. The actions of Danish government were accepted by 70% of the citizens while only 57% of Swedes were enthusiastic of what their government was doing (Hassing Nielsen and Lindvall 2021).

Great Britain

The basic act determining the scope of civil rights during the COVID-19 pandemic in England was the Health Protection (Coronavirus Restrictions) (England) Regulations 2020. This regulation was issued on March 26, 2020, and entered into force on the same day. Similar regulations have been adopted for Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. The history of these regulations, although relatively short, is nevertheless complicated - they have been amended and replaced many times. In the United Kingdom, as in other countries around the world, there has been an interference of authorities with civil rights. This mainly referred to the

restrictions on movement. During the state of emergency, citizens were obliged to stay at home and leave their place of residence only in specified circumstances. The organization of collective events or gatherings in public was also banned, and businesses and premises, including schools were closed (Moulin-Stožek 2021).

In Great Britain, as in other countries, interference with civil rights sometimes took place without a clear legal basis. For example, according to the parliamentary report on the COVID-19 pandemic, there were cases where law enforcement agencies without a legal basis made allegations of violating the principle of social distancing in England, despite the fact that such requirement was not introduced in England, but was only introduced in Wales (UK Parliament 2022).

It must be said that the UK government's policy to counter the pandemic was unstable from the beginning. The initial reluctance to introduce any restrictions put Great Britain among the countries with a high level of infected citizens. After the introduction of the restrictions, it turned out that they were unclear even to law enforcement agencies and frequently changed, which violated the principle of legal certainty and security, as well as the trust of citizens in the government (UK Parliament 2022). Doubts as to the legitimacy of the introduced restrictions and their effectiveness are expressed by the society, for example, through the constant loss of trust in Boris Johnson's office. Currently it equals 33%, in December there was a decrease of trust to government by three percentage points (Bartkiewicz 2022).

Germany

In Germany the state of emergency was not introduced in the whole country, and the basic act on which the federal level was based was the Infektionsschutzgesetzes. Germany is a federal state, however, individual federal states were also decisive in terms of possible restrictions on social and economic functioning. The only state in which a state of disaster was declared was Bavaria and the city of Halle in Saxony-Anhalt. Common to all federal states were restrictions on quarantine, ban on trade, ban on organizing meetings, and restricting the possibility of religious practice (Syryt 2021). According to research conducted by the Institute of Global Health Innovation, in the Stringency Index Range, which informs about the severity of the restrictions introduced in individual countries, Germany was ranked 81. This means that the restrictions were stricter there than, for example, in Great Britain (71) or Sweden (52), but greater than in Italy or Spain (95) (Institute of Global Health Innovation 2021, 4).

Restrictions on rights and freedom during the COVID-19 pandemic in Germany, while based on formal grounds, were also widely discussed as to their compliance with the law. However, all complaints submitted to the institutions were rejected. This was due to a very precisely defined legal order, which the authorities had done before the outbreak of the pandemic. In this way, the decisions made by the authorities did not leave much room for discussion. However, attention was drawn to a similar mechanism of issuing decisions that took place, for example, in Poland – decisions were made through issuing executive acts to acts and regulations. This manner of acting of public authorities does not build the individual's trust in the state. Frequent changes to the law violate the principle of legal certainty and security (Institute of Global Health Innovation 2021, 4).

In Germany, only 27% of the society was against the introduction of restrictions on the social and economic functioning of the country. At the same time, 66% of the society expressed confidence in the actions taken by the government. Compared to other countries, this is a positive result and means that German society expresses its confidence in the existing legal order even in crisis situations.

Italy

As mentioned in the previous section, the Italian Constitution does not contain indications regarding possible states of emergency. All decisions made regarding restrictions on civil liberties in the fight against the COVID-19 pandemic were implemented by means of decrees. Italy immediately introduced a lockdown, limited sporting events and closed borders. There were also significant restrictions on visits to prisons, which sparked riots in many prisons across the country (Reuters 2020).

The restrictions introduced in Italy limited civil liberties to a very high degree compared to the other countries. As mentioned, according to the research of the Institute of Global Health Innovation, the introduced restrictions were assigned a rank of 95, while in Sweden 52 (Institute of Global Health Innovation 2021).

For a long time, the public has expressed concern about the far-reaching restriction of civil rights in Italy by Prime Minister Mario Draghi. At the end of 2021, even a conference was held in Palermo. It was called *From democracy to dictatorship, the role of memory*, which aimed to draw attention to the above-mentioned problem. Participants in the debate compared the COVID-19 regulations in Italy to the oppressive policies of totalitarian states in the 1930s. The outrage centers on Draghi's

vaccination laws. They are one of the strictest in Europe. All employees in Italy must have a digital health passport confirming vaccination or a negative test result every two days. This means enormous costs, in the order of one tenth of the average salary. Citizens who refuse vaccinations and tests are suspended from work without pay (Słomski 2022).

Constitutionalists express concern about the practice of ruling by decrees and the practice of silencing the dissenting views. Mario Draghi makes his own decisions from the very beginning. It does not even consult the parties when determining the composition of its government, choosing ministers with the consent of the president. While the official state of emergency, which was declared by the government on January 31, 2020, cannot be extended beyond two years, the government is already signaling that it intends to extend it, which would likely mean the declaration of a new, different state of emergency (Słomski 2022).

How is the society reacting to the situation related to the restriction of civil liberties? Just over half of the population (55%) support the measures the government is using to fight the pandemic. At the same time, Italians are a nation that is more prone to limitations in functioning than other European countries (European Parliament 2020). Only 17% are against restricting civil liberties. The least accepted remedy, according to Italians, is a surveillance application to help fight the pandemic. For 40% of respondents claim that it restricts freedom too much (Kriesi 2020). Thus, it can be concluded that despite the voices that appear in the media about the excessive limitation of civil liberties and the abuse of his position by Prime Minister Mario Draghi, the society at least partially accepts this state of affairs and even supports it.

Poland

The pandemic resulted in many restrictions and changes in the functioning of the judiciary. In the case of Poland, it emphasized many of the problems that existed before the pandemic. These include canceled hearings, which will probably result in an extension of the duration of court proceedings in the future, the lack of information on how to contact the courts in the time of a pandemic, which undoubtedly hindered citizens' access to court, limiting the openness of external court proceedings (both in common and administrative courts), which made it impossible or significantly hindered social control over the administration of justice. The effects of these phenomena will probably be felt in the future, especially in case of the rights and freedoms of specific people. One of the group of people particularly affected by the period of the pandemic

and the introduction of restrictions, were residents of nursing homes. There are 80,000 of them in Poland. They were almost completely cut off from the world. Also, the support provided to nursing homes by the public authorities was not sufficient. The key change in access to education, caused by the coronavirus pandemic, was the implementation of the education process using distance learning methods and techniques (Dz. U. z 2020).

Under no circumstances can a pandemic situation constitute an excuse for the government to limit civil rights and freedoms. However, in Poland at that time, various types of activities that threatened the broadly defined freedom of expression could be observed, for example: prohibition of informing about the situation in the health service (employees deciding to disclose such information were severely affected, including dismissals,). Also, the government, referring to the current epidemiological situation, committed disproportionate and unjustified restrictions on the constitutional freedom to obtain information, introducing solutions that led to the discriminatory treatment of some people was not avoided, which significantly increased the risk of worsening of the situation of people who are exposed to discrimination, marginalization and exclusion.

It is also noticed that the COVID-19 epidemic particularly affected persons deprived of their liberty (pre-trial detention centers, prisons, psychiatric hospitals, correctional facilities, nursing homes), and restrictions implemented aimed at reducing the prison population were by no means uncommon. At the same time, the greatest concern is the statistics on pre-trial detention, which as the most severe preventive measure was used even more often than before the pandemic, reaching the estimated peak in September 2020 (9,466 people temporarily detained in September against 8,535 in January 2020) (Dz. U. z 2020). In the context of the deliberations, the restrictions introduced by the Government of the Republic of Poland regarding the freedom of economic activity during the COVID-19 pandemic are particularly important. The first restrictions on the activities of entrepreneurs, which, incidentally, violate the essence of the freedom of economic activity appeared as early as March 2020. The Council of Ministers went beyond the powers granted in the statutory authorization (Dz.U.poz.566 2020).

It is worth noting that some restrictions on economic freedom, related to the current pandemic situation, with respect to some enterprises in Poland have taken the form of a complete ban on activities, e.g. conducting activities aimed at improving physical condition, running swimming pools, water parks, etc. hotel and restaurant industry or other

industries with broadly understood tourism (Helsińska Fundacja Praw Człowieka 2021). By introducing restrictions on economic freedom, numerous legal irregularities were committed - starting from the use of a legal act of an inappropriate rank for this purpose, through the enactment of a statutory authorization that does not meet constitutional requirements, and the Council of Ministers exceeding the powers conferred by the said authorization, to the violation of the essence of freedom by some regulations.

The fact that the Council of Ministers did not introduce a state of a natural disaster should be assessed negatively, as it considered the necessary measures to be taken, which, as a last resort, took place anyway. Such a decision raises serious suspicions that it could have been caused by the intention to restrict citizens from pursuing claims for damages against the state (Pecyna 2020, 35). One of the reasons may also be the presidential elections in Poland, which are to be held in the election calendar. It should be emphasized that the public authority in Poland, fully consciously, despite the existing threats, resigned from the legal instruments appropriate to the states of emergency described in the Constitution of the Republic of Poland (Trociuk 2021, 11), and yet, as already mentioned, the state of epidemic announced in the country as a threat to the proper functioning of the society in fully corresponds to the natural disaster described in Article 232 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland (Florczak-Wątor 2020, 20).

In Poland, the pandemic was simultaneous to the crisis of the rule of law that had lasted for over 5 years and intensified its symptoms. As in previous years, there are cases of violations of the Constitution, as well as many activities that have adapted the law to the political will. As a result of the crisis of the rule of law, the control exercised by the Constitutional Tribunal became completely ineffective, and the Constitutional Tribunal itself remained a tool in the hands of the rulers (Kalisz, Szulecka and Wolny 2021).

A large part of the provisions adopted under the so-called anti-crisis shields was processed at an accelerated pace and without proper public consultations. In some cases, the adoption of regulatory data was used to change the provisions not related to counteracting the pandemic, e.g. part of the Election Code was changed in this way. The lack of a declaration of a natural disaster also affected important democratic processes, such as the presidential elections in Poland in 2020 - the set date was the result of a political agreement. The deepening crisis of the rule of law in Poland is evidenced by changes in the law, which deepened the existing threat to the independence of judges. Authorities whose

independence is essential for the functioning of the entire judiciary are becoming more and more dependent on political will (Kalisz, Szulecka and Wolny 2021).

Failure to declare a state of a natural disaster in Poland results in the fact that restrictions on the rights of an individual necessary to combat the COVID-19 pandemic are possible only if the requirements under Article 31 (3) of the Polish Constitution are met. Otherwise, the introduced legal regulations in the field of limitations of the freedoms and rights of an individual should be considered unconstitutional (Węgrzyn 2021, 157). It should be emphasized that no provision of the Act on Combating Infectious Diseases authorizes the Minister of Health, or any other minister or even the Council of Ministers, to introduce restrictions that limit fundamental rights, such as human rights (Olszówka and Dyda 2020, 453).

All actions taken by the government during the pandemic crisis were reflected in the statistics on the satisfaction of the society with the actions taken by the government. According to a Kantar survey conducted at the end of April 2020, 40% of Poles expressed satisfaction with the measures taken by the authorities to fight COVID-19. However, compared to other countries, this does not seem to be a high percentage. For comparison: in Italy 55% of the population was satisfied, in Germany 66%, and in Sweden 67% (European Parliament 2020, 44). However, it is not known how the statistics would develop, given the strong resistance of the society to possible restrictions on civil liberties. As many as 47% of the society was against taking such measures (European Parliament 2020, 77). It is not known, however, whether the respondents referred to the restrictions, which took place at that time, or whether they were completely against any bans, even taking into account the state of emergency provided for by the Constitution.

SUMMARY

To sum up the analysis results, the dominant model in each state has no impact on the actions taken by the authorities in order to prevent from the spread of COVID-19 pandemic. There is no clear connection between the social and economic rules on which system is based on and approach to such extraordinary situation. The cases of Sweden and Denmark show that despite the same social policy model, the anti-pandemic procedures were completely different. It seems that Sweden as a country that represents Scandinavian model of social policy, where citizen is in the center of care from the government side should act more

strictly in relation to the pandemic limitations. It turned out that it was not the case. Totally different approach was taken by Norway, where limitations were implemented. On the other hand in case of Spain and Italy that represent Mediterranean model many similarities have been found.

Actions taken by the governments regarding pandemic were even independent on the fact if state of emergency has been mentioned in the constitution. In many states there was such regulation, but they did not take the opportunity to implement it. In some there were nothing about state of emergency in constitution, but many of limitations and even state of emergency were implemented by additional laws.

We should look for the source of government decisions first and foremost in political reasons that were different in all states.

REFERENCES

- Andersen T. M., Holmström B., Honkapohja S., Korkman S., Söderström H. T. and Vartiainen J. 2007. *The Nordic Model. Embracing globalization and sharing risks*. Helsinki: The Research Institute of the Finnish Economy.
- Baran P. 2012. Niemiecki model polityki społecznej na tle regulacji Unii Europejskiej. *Rocznik Integracji Europejskiej*, nr. 6. Poznan: Uniwersytet Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.
- Bartkiewicz A. 2022. "Wielka Brytania: Partia Johnsona traci prowadzenie w sondażu": <https://www.rp.pl/polityka/art19185531-wielka-brytania-partia-johnsona-traci-prowadzenie-w-sondazu>, 03.02.2022.
- Conley J. 2022. "Social Democratic Nations Rank Happiest on Global Index (Again). US Ranking Falls (Again)": www.commondreams.org, 02.02.2022.
- Dz. U. z 2020 r., poz. 964.
- Esping-Andersen G. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- European Parliament. 2020. *Uncertainty/EU, Hope. Public opinion in times of COVID-19*. Brussels: European Parliament.
- Florczak-Wątor M. 2021. Niekonstytucyjność ograniczeń praw i wolności jednostki wprowadzonych w związku z epidemią COVID-19 jako przesłanka odpowiedzialności odszkodowawczej państwa. *Państwo i Prawo* 2020/12.

- Golinowska G. 2018. *Modele polityki społecznej w Polsce i Europie*. Warszawa: Fundacja im. Stefana Batorego.
- Hassing Nielsen J. and Lindvall J. 2021. Trust in government in Sweden and Denmark during the COVID-19 epidemic. *West European Politics* 44(5-6).
- Helsińska Fundacja Praw Człowieka. 2021. *Prawa człowieka w dobie pandemii*: <https://www.hfhr.pl/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Prawa-czlowieka-w-dobie-pandemii.pdf>, 02.02.2022.
- Institute of Global Health Innovation. 2021. *COVID-19 behaviours in Sweden*: https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/institute-of-global-health-innovation/Sweden_ICL-YouGov-Covid-19-Behaviour-Tracker_20200429_NT_vF.pdf, 02.02.2022.
- Jagusiak B. 2015. *Bezpieczeństwo socjalne współczesnego państwa*. Warszawa: Difin.
- Kalisz M., Szulecka M. and Wolny M., *Pandemia. Kryzys praworządności. Wyzwania dla praw człowieka*: <https://archiwumosiatsynskiego.pl/archiwum/raport-hfpc-za-2020-rok-pandemia-kryzys-praworzadnosci-wyzwa>, 10.02.2022.
- Khakee S. 2009. *Securing Democracy? A Comparative Analysis of Emergency Powers in Europe*. Geneva: Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance.
- Konstytucja Republiki Włoskiej z dnia 27 grudnia 1947 r.
- Konstytucja Szwecji, Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warszawa 1991, p. 41-45.
- Kraus K. and Geisen T. 2005. *Państwo socjalne w Europie. Historia. Rozwój. Perspektywy*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK.
- Kriesi H. 2020. *They're in this together ... Italians pose little opposition to COVID-19 measures*: <https://euideas.eui.eu/2020/04/22/theyre-in-this-together-italians-pose-little-opposition-to-covid-19-measures/>, 20.02.2022.
- Księżopolski M. 2011. Dokąd zmierza polityka społeczna w Polsce?. *Problemy Polityki Społecznej* 16/2011.
- Mitrega D. 1996. Czy nadal państwo dobrobytu - zagrożenia i wyzwania dla modelu szwedzkiego. In: E. Okoń-Horodyńska (ed.), *Socjalne aspekty społecznej gospodarki rynkowej*. Katowice: Akademia Ekonomiczna im. Karola Adameckiego.
- Moulin- Stożek M. 2021. Ograniczenia praw i wolności w okresie pandemii COVID-19 w Zjednoczonym Królestwie Wielkiej Brytanii i Irlandii Północnej. In: Dobrzeński K., Przywora B.

- (ed.), *Ograniczenia praw i wolności w okresie pandemii COVID-19 na tle porównawczym. Pierwsze doświadczenie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IWS.
- Norris J. 2021. The creeping authoritarianism of the Covid-19 restrictions. *The Spectator*: <https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/the-creeping-authoritarianism-of-the-covid-19-restrictions>, 28.04.2022.
- Olszówka M. and Dyda K. 2020. Analiza konstytucyjności ograniczeń w korzystaniu z wolności religii podczas pandemii koronawirusa w Polsce. *Studia z Prawa Wyznaniowego*, Tom 23-2020.
- Pecyna M. 2020. Odpowiedzialność odszkodowawcza Skarbu Państwa za ograniczenia praw i wolności w czasie pandemii COVID-19. *Państwo i Prawo*, 12/2020.
- Prokop K. 2020. Stany nadzwyczajne w Konstytucji RP. *Infos6(272)*: [https://orka.sejm.gov.pl/WydBAS.nsf/0/1712A881D37E7305C125856500581D33/\\$file/Infos_272.pdf](https://orka.sejm.gov.pl/WydBAS.nsf/0/1712A881D37E7305C125856500581D33/$file/Infos_272.pdf), 23.04.2022.
- Reuters. 2020. Death toll rises from Italy's coronavirus prison: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-italy-prisons-idUSKBN20X2DG>, Reuters, 20.02.2022.
- Rozporządzenie Rady Ministrów z dnia 31 marca 2020 r. w sprawie ustanowienia określonych ograniczeń, nakazów i zakazów w związku z wystąpieniem stanu epidemii (Dz.U.poz.566).
- Słomski D. 2022 We Włoszech tworzy się ruch oporu wobec premiera Draghi'ego. Porównują go do dyktatora: <https://www.money.pl/gospodarka/we-wloszech-tworzy-sie-ruch-oporu-wobec-premiera-draghiego-porownuja-go-do-dyktatora-6709638009539168a.html>, 03.02.2022.
- Syryt A. 2021. Ograniczenia praw i wolności w okresie pandemii COVID-19 w Republice Federalnej Niemiec. In: Dobrzeńiecki K., Przywora B. (ed.), *Ograniczenia praw i wolności w okresie pandemii COVID-19 na tle porównawczym. Pierwsze doświadczenie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IWS.
- Tendera-Właszczuk H. 2009. *Bariery integracji Unii Europejskiej*. Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Ekonomiczne.
- Trociuk S. 2021. *Prawa i wolności w stanie pandemii*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.

- UK Parliament, *The Government's Response to COVID-19. Human rights Implications*: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/jt5801/jtselect/jtrights/265/26506.htm>, 20.04.2022.
- Walecka K. and Wojtas K. 2021. *Lockdown demokracji w czasach pandemii COVID-19*. Warszawa: Instytut Nauk o Polityce i Administracji UKSW.
- Węgrzyn J. 2021. Realizacja normy programowej wynikającej z art.68 ust.4 Konstytucji RP w stanie pandemii COVID-19 (uwagi ogólne). *Przegląd Prawa Konstytucyjnego* 3(61)/2021.

* The manuscript was received on May 19, 2022, and the paper was accepted for publishing on October 10, 2022.