



**Gaydamaka Viktoriya Aleksandrovna,**  
Postgraduate Student  
of the European Union Law Department,  
Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University,  
Ukraine, Kharkiv  
e-mail: v.o.gaydamaka@gmail.com  
ORCID 0000-0002-1137-6500

doi: 10.21564/2414–990x.150.208955  
UDC 340.12:061.1ЄC:304.4

## EUROPEAN SOCIAL MODEL: A NEW PARADIGM OF SOCIAL STATE DEVELOPMENT

*The social state is one of the key principles of the constitutional system of modern states. Although the issue of social statehood has been the subject of many interdisciplinary studies, it still remains relevant and causes scientific discussions both as a result of periodic revision of paradigms of state development as such and as a result of rapid globalization and regional integration. The decline of the social state has been repeatedly predicted. In this regard, it should be noted that in the process of discussing the state of the social state development should distinguish crisis myths from crisis realities, to identify probable trajectories of its development.*

*The article is aimed at drawing researchers' attention to the transformation of the process of functioning of the welfare state in the context of European integration. It is undeniable that the economics of the EU member states are now almost out of the control of national governments, while the social consequences of this process – unemployment, migration – remain the subject of legal regulation of national states. Together with domestic and foreign researchers, the authors raise the topical question: will the introduction of the European social model lead to changes or even to the abolition of national models of social policy? Is social policy a priority of the European Union and to what extent does it depend on the EU's economic situation? Are the functions of the welfare state changing in the context of the country's membership in the European Union? Does the state retain its sovereignty by delegating its key functions to the EU? What are the consequences for individuals of changing the paradigm of the welfare state in an innovative economy conditions?*

**Keywords:** welfare state; social state; social policy; innovative economy; typology; new paradigm; European Social Model; European Union; European integration; sovereignty.

**Гайдамака В. О.**, аспірантка кафедри права Європейського Союзу, Національний юридичний університет імені Ярослава Мудрого, Україна, м. Харків.  
e-mail: v.o.gaydamaka@gmail.com ; ORCID 0000-0002-1137-6500

### **Європейська соціальна модель: нова парадигма розвитку соціальної держави**

*Соціальна держава є одним з ключових принципів конституційного устрою сучасних держав. Хоча проблематика соціальної державності була предметом багатьох міждисциплінарних досліджень, вона досі залишається актуальною і викликає жваві наукові дискусії як внаслідок*

періодичного перегляду парадигм розвитку держави як такої, так і внаслідок стрімкого розвитку процесів глобалізації і регіональної інтеграції. Занепад соціальної держави передрікали неодноразово. У цьому зв'язку слід зазначити, що в процесі обговорення стану розвитку соціальної держави слід відрізняти кризові міфи від кризових реальій, виявляти ймовірні траєкторії її розвитку.

Стаття покликана звернути увагу дослідників на трансформацію процесу функціонування соціальної держави в умовах європейської інтеграції. Беззаперечним є той факт, що економіки держав-членів ЄС на сьогодні майже вийшли з-під контролю національних урядів, тоді як соціальні наслідки цього процесу – безробіття, міграція – залишаються предметом правового регулювання національних держав. Разом з вітчизняними й зарубіжними дослідниками авторка порушує актуальне питання: чи призведе до змін або навіть скасування національних моделей соціальної політики запровадження європейської соціальної моделі? Чи є соціальна політика пріоритетом Європейського Союзу і наскільки вона залежить від економічного стану ЄС? Чи зазнають змін функції соціальної держави в умовах членства країни в Європейському Союзі? Чи зберігає свій суверенітет держава, делегуючи для реалізації ЄС свої ключові функції? Які наслідки для індивідів має зміна парадигми соціальної держави в умовах інноваційної економіки?

**Ключові слова:** соціальна держава; соціальна політика; інноваційна економіка; типологія; нова парадигма; Європейська соціальна модель; Європейський Союз; європейська інтеграція; суверенітет.

**Problem setting.** The adoption at the constitutional level of the principle of social statehood is a phenomenon of state and legal life in Western Europe, which was embodied in the theory and practice of constitutional law after World War II and has since successfully spread to countries from different regions of the world which recognize and translate the values of democratic and legal state.

The idea of social statehood and its implementation in practice has always had influential opponents, and therefore caused lively discussions [81]. The question on the crisis state of the social state arises every time when there is a financial, economic, demographic or migration crisis of regional or global scale. At the present stage of development, the viability of the welfare state is questioned due to its inconsistency with the requirements of the economy of the XXI century. A new reason for discussing the viability of the welfare state was provided by the processes of globalization and regional integration in Europe, which led to the formation of a supranational by its nature European Union. The mentioned processes have led to changes in the institutional system of the welfare state, in the approaches to the implementation of its functions. As a result, scientists began a discussion about a new paradigm of the welfare state in the context of the country's membership in the EU. This, in its turn, necessitates the definition of ways of the functions of the welfare state modification, which to some extent are determined by ethnocultural and historical features of the state, its belonging to a particular model of the welfare state.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** The problem of the functioning of the welfare state in the context of European integration is given considerable attention in the works by primarily European lawyers and political scientists E. Goodyear-Grant, B. Greve, A. Hemerijck, E. Huber, R. Johnston, W. Kymlicka, J. Myles, J. Stephens. Among domestic lawyers, the study of this problem was initiated by V. I. Salo, whose ideas were developed in the works by I. V. Yakovyuk,

O. S. Golovashchenko, A. E. Krakovska, and others. However, it should be noted that the scientific developments of the mentioned authors do not give a comprehensive vision of the functioning of national models of the welfare state in the formation of the European social model within the European Union as a supranational integration association.

Statement of the article objective. The article is aimed at further developing new approaches to the organization and functioning of national models of the welfare state in the formation of the European social model, as well as at determining the legal basis for cooperation between the European Union and national governments in social policy developing and implementing.

***Presentation of the main body of the article.***

**The welfare state as a political and legal phenomenon.** Although the theory of the welfare state gained official recognition in Europe after being enshrined in the constitutions of France (1946) and Germany (1949), the question of determining its content remains unresolved, as the social sciences (politicalology, philosophy, sociology, law and economic sciences) traditionally pay attention to various aspects of this phenomenon.

Consolidation of the welfare state as a principle of the constitutional order presupposes its consideration primarily as a legal category in interconnection with other principles (democratic and legal state, inviolability of human and citizen rights and freedoms). In this case, we agree with I. Yakoviyk, who proposes to understand the welfare state as a constitutional principle, the observance of which requires the state to recognize each person as the highest social value, to provide social assistance to individuals in difficult situations in order to ensure a decent standard of living, to redistribute economic benefits in accordance with the principle of social justice and to see their purpose in ensuring civil peace and harmony in society [80, p. 99]. It should be emphasized that the social state is one of the elements of the modern concept of statehood, which is closely related to the principles of democratic and legal statehood, as well as market economy, as evidenced by the implementation of various models of social market economy (researchers distinguish liberal, Scandinavian and corporate models, which are being implemented in countries with highly developed economics, and Mediterranean and transitional models, which are found in less developed countries and countries with transitional economy) [49; 69], the content of which is determined by a number of factors [53]. It should be noted that the functioning of the welfare state in conjunction with the social market economics is an important element of the concept of sustainable development, which combines social, ecological and economical aspects [34]. At the same time, such interdependence does not exclude the conflict between the welfare state and the market economics, which can be resolved only politically on the basis of a certain compromise.

However, the vast majority of definitions found in scientific sources are based on the interpretation of the welfare state as a political phenomenon and is associated with the social policy of the state, which is not – or at least is not only – the result

of socio-economic changes in society but also the result of political struggle [65, p. 6], in which the measures redistributing public goods by the state are a significant lever while struggling for the voters' sympathy. In this case, the reduction in costs associated with the adjustment of social policy gives grounds to take a different approaches to its definition, as well as to discuss both the fact of the possibility of curtailing social policy, as well as the limits of such curtailment. It still is due to such understanding of the welfare state the question of numerous regional (Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon, continental, South European, etc.) and national models of the welfare state, and in fact – social policy arise [20; 19; 4].

The question of what a welfare state means, which is understood as a certain policy, differs from the approach to the interpretation of the welfare state, which is based on the social justice principle. Both approaches are equally relevant and important, but they are not identical. Accordingly, while debating on the growth or collapse of the possibilities of the welfare state, it should be clarified what we mean by the welfare state, because studies based on different approaches to defining this phenomenon give different results that are not correct be compared [28, p. 7]. However, as the concept of welfare state «stretches» there is a need to apply a of a welfare state multifaceted concept [57].

As a result, it should be noted that there is no a priori optimal definition of the welfare state. Rather, there is the problem of applying one or another definition of the welfare state, according to the context in which it is discussed.

**Models of social policy of the state.** It should be recognized that there is no single ideal condition of development of the state and society, and hence a single goal of development is absent too. Accordingly, the idea of «social quality», which is embedded in the social nature of mankind (people seek to participate in the social, economical and cultural life of different communities, in conditions increasing their well-being and individual potential [7]), according to European scholars, should be one of the tools in the hands of politicians<sup>1</sup> to measure social and economical progress. The normative dimension is used to determine an acceptable level of social quality in a particular country or region. As for institutional changes and processes, social quality does not give preference to any particular way of ensuring it.

Discussions around the welfare state are to some extent determined by the existence of numerous models of social policy implemented by certain countries. It is quite problematic to establish the affiliation of a particular country to a particular model of social policy, because the creation of a synchronous typology of the modern welfare state is a rather complex scientific problem.

---

<sup>1</sup> Researchers note that the reduction of socio-economic rights often depends on the specific configuration of the political system of the state. There are cases when left-wing governments are more successful than right-wing governments in the policy of such rights reducing [2]. In some countries, the social partners, in particular trade unions, pensioners' associations, etc., play an important role in reforms coordination («social pacts»), which result in a social assistance reduction. In general, it should be recognized that the question of the preconditions for concluding such «social pacts» the social partners' role in this process has been little studied, especially in comparative context [13].

Esping-Andersen's typology is still the most popular [20]. Esping-Andersen presents a typology of 18 Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development welfare states based upon three principles: de commodification (the extent to which an individual's welfare is reliant upon the market, particularly in terms of pensions, unemployment benefit and sickness insurance), social stratification (the role of welfare states in maintaining or breaking down social stratification) and the private – public mix (the relative roles of the state, the family, the voluntary sector and the market in welfare provision). The operationalization of these principles leads to the division of welfare states into three ideal regime types: Liberal, Conservative and Social Democratic [6]. Although this typology has many supporters, but at the same time it has many opponents [58], in particular these critics increased the number of variables needed to explain welfare state development, including: Religion, Institutional veto points, the feminist movement and war. At the beginning of the XXI century there were also discussions about how correctly to apply this typologization to the post-socialist countries of Eastern and Southern Europe, as well as the countries of the Asia-Pacific region?

It should be recognized that in general the problem of the policy of the welfare state typologization remains insufficiently developed by domestic legal science. First of all, this is explained by the fact that the welfare state as a political and legal phenomenon became the subject of researches by domestic authors only in the late twentieth – early twenty-first century [64]. If a somewhat schematic analysis of the problem of welfare state policy models classification by Ukrainian authors at the turn of the XX–XXI centuries can be explained by the acute shortage of translated foreign literature on these issues, but the subsequent replication of reviews of only the most well-known foreign approaches to the problem of welfare state policy typologization is difficult to justify [33; 63]. In recent decades, on the basis of Esping-Andersen's classification (which can be considered a classic) many new classifications have emerged [47; 50] which, in fact, can be considered as attempts to its further differentiation.

It should be mentioned that no modern country fully corresponds to any of the models of the welfare state models described in the literature, regardless of which classification is be used, because:

– state social policy is not constant, but undergoes permanent changes due to both objective (economical and migration crises, pandemic, etc.)<sup>1</sup> and subjective (periodic variability of persons in power and adhere to different values, profess

---

<sup>1</sup> The state's social policy is periodically adjusted according to reducing the role of old social risks of the standard industrial life cycle (income disruptions due to illness, unemployment, retirement and other problems) and the emergence of new ones (it is about reducing the role of male breadwinner in the family, socio-demographic changes have reduced the family's ability to provide care and support for its members (there will be a decrease in the part of working population from 61% to 51%), there are changes in the labor market, there is a significant increase in the number of elderly people (during 2015–2060 there will be an increase in life expectancy among men from 77.6 to 84 years, and for women – from 83.1 to 89.1) and migrants, etc.) [5].

different social and political philosophy and implement different economical programs, political populism in the run-up to the presidential and parliamentary elections) factors;

– welfare states are not created and do not function in a mode of national isolation in the future, but are under the constant influence of transnational economical, political and cultural interdependence [42]; in the context of a regional, and especially of global economical crisis, it does not matter how effective the policy of an individual state [67] is, as it was clearly demonstrated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

**European Social Model (ESM) or the social dimension of a united Europe.**

The selective Europeanization of state functions within the EU has led to a situation where for a long time not only the idea of extending integration to the social sphere was not accepted, but also policies were implemented that in some way hindered the functioning of social statehood in member states. This is due to the fact that the European Union was and will remain primarily an economical project. As a result, from the very beginning of integration, there has been a constitutional asymmetry between policies aimed at ensuring market efficiency and policies that promote equality and social protection. As a result, welfare states in the EU were legally and economically constrained by the requirements of liberalization and competition legislation. European social policy, which was originally (since the 1970s) subordinated to these requirements (European Parliament resolution on the White Paper on European social policy: 'A way forward for the Union' (1994) emphasized that the ECM is based on social market economy [59]), politically complicated the national models of social policy functioning<sup>1</sup>, which differ not only by levels of economical development, but, what is more important, by their normatively established social standards and institutional structures [61, p. 645–648].

The situation began to change after the signing of the Single European Act (1987) [62], after which the EU's social policy was recognized as one of the key instruments of integration, as it was established that the success of the Single Internal Market depends on the social dimension<sup>2</sup>. It may be explained by the fact

---

<sup>1</sup> As it is well known, eurozone member states have lost the ability to issue money on their own, devalue or revolve currency, change refinancing rates according to the current economic situation in the country, and European legal constraints have significantly reduced the ability of national governments to influence employment and economic growth. Single Internal Market creation, within which the space of four freedoms operates, in particular freedom of free movement, creates for some Member States the problem of the influx of migrants and, consequently, an excessive budget burden. Accordingly, some EU Member States are tempted to influence the influx of migrants by lowering national social standards. It should also be noted that compliance with the economic criteria for EU membership, as well as membership in the EU Economic and Monetary Union, creates problems for the functioning of the welfare state, which are forced to pursue austerity saving policies.

<sup>2</sup> It took the EU leadership thirty years to reach the conclusion, which was reached in 1956 by French Prime Minister Guy Mollet, supported by French industry, that the harmonization of social norms and fiscal burdens should be a prerequisite for industrial markets integration.

that the community formed within the European Communities began to represent itself as a new-type socio-political civilization, based on European democracies, socially oriented market economy, legal and social state [73, p. 12; 51]. Subsequently, the introduction and development of the SEA was considered in the context of political legitimization and institutionalization of the EU as a supranational model of governance [38, p. 239].

The lack of a clear definition of the European social model<sup>1</sup> (hereinafter – ESM) and the theoretical depth of the «social» component in it [75] is due to the strong attraction of EU economic policy to neoliberalism [15, p. 2]. This explains why doubts are periodically expressed about the legitimacy of social integration: its opponents consider the ECM a «challenged ideal» [76], a political rather than a scientific construction that can only be applied to «old» EU Member States [75, p. 218].

The first legal definition of the European social model we find in the White Paper on European social policy: 'A way forward for the Union' prepared by the European Commission in 1994 [21]. This document gives the most abstract vision of the ESM – it is interpreted through a system of common values of member states, namely: democracy, personal freedoms, market economics, economical and social welfare, social cohesion, collective bargaining, high standard of living, social dialogue, opportunities equality for all, adequate social provision and solidarity with people in difficult life situations.

Other approaches to defining the European social model can be found in the literature, emphasizing that the ESM is a transnational phenomenon; a dynamic, evolving European project is a tool for modernization / adaptation to changing economic conditions; a tool for unity and the European identity formation; a system of general views and principles on various social issues and their importance for EU development; a set of rules and methods of the EU and Member States; disclosure of its content through the purpose: achieving full employment, adequate social protection and equality; the potential mechanism of «collective protection» of the existing architecture of social regulation in the Member States in the face of external pressure aimed at violating the workers' right at the national level and others [38; 36; 61; 72].

Clarification of the ESM content and its development in practice is complicated by the existence within the EU of various national regimes, institutions and social standards. Nevertheless, in the EU member states, especially in the «old» member states, there are several common approaches that can be considered their common achievement (and their implementation in each country may have its own features), due to which they will differ from social countries from other regions of the world. Thus, to the common approaches of the ESM some authors include: significant basic social provision for all citizens, relatively egalitarian income distribution, agreed wage agreements, etc. [22].

---

<sup>1</sup> The ESM is often considered for granted, and therefore does not need to be clarified.

It should be noted that the process of the European social model forming would be much easier and faster if the founding fathers of the European Communities in 1956 and the governments of the other five founding states<sup>1</sup> accepted the proposal of French Prime Minister Guy Mollet, supported by French industrialists, that the harmonization of social norms and fiscal burdens should be a prerequisite for the integration of industrial markets<sup>2</sup>. We should agree, that in this case, the social policies of the six founding states, which were variations of the European model of Bismarck's social provision, would be much easier to harmonize than substantively and structurally heterogeneous social policies of fifteen states<sup>3</sup> when the idea of ESM implementation emerged [61, p. 646]. Social standards and the level of social protection that is acceptable to some countries obviously cannot be provided by other EU Member States.

In addition, it should be borne in mind that the development of the European integration process until 1973 exclusively within continental Europe led to a situation when the social policies of the Member States and the European Communities as a whole were closely linked to a combined socio-Christian democratic understanding of the the state's and the market's roles in promoting economic growth, full employment, adequate wages, employment and social protection policy outside the employment sphere [10], which complicated its reconciling with the British social policy after its accession.

The fact is that there was a certain symbiosis of capitalism models, systems of general welfare and industrial relations, primarily determined by national conditions, social and economic structures, which through their intertwining give a form of inertia to their development that prevents radical structural changes during the second half of the twentieth century in the EU. As a result, under the pressure of globalization there is not destruction, but a gradual hybridization of national capitalism models, systems of general welfare and production relations [8, p. 14–15].

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be borne in mind that the ability to develop and implement social policy and provide public services in ways which reflect the socio-economic and cultural interests of society, from the end of the XIX century was seen as a reflection of the role and social purpose of the state. Accordingly, national governments zealously protected sovereign powers, which consisted in the right to decide on their own compromises concerning the requirements of such contradictory values as justice, freedom and responsibility [10].

<sup>2</sup> The European Coal and Steel Community, as the first step on the path to European integration, was a kind of experiment in functional integration introduction. Member States agreed to cede their sovereignty in specific areas of social life by transferring control over them to the supranational level, as the ECSC's competence was limited to the coal and steel industries. However, this approach was rejected in 1956, when integration became a general economic project – the creation of the European Economic Community.

<sup>3</sup> The ideas of neoliberalism and individualism already in the 1970s caused the erosion of the continental social model, resulting in the following decades in the differences between the social policies of the EU member states only deepened.

Table 1. Schematic view of five ‘models’ of welfare in the EU up to the 1990s/early 2000s [10]

<b>Model (Examples)</b>	<b>Welfare system characteristics</b>
<b>Bismarckian</b> (Germany, France)	Contributory-based benefits and services, dependant on employment and occupations; emphasis on maintaining income at vulnerable times (old age, unemployment); emphasis on supporting families with children. <b>Influenced by</b> Christian Democratic & social democratic politics, strong organised economic interests.
<b>Social Democratic</b> (Sweden, Denmark)	Rights-based benefits and services at high levels; oriented toward promoting equality and full employment for all; individualised tax/benefits; policies to promote gender equality. <b>Influenced by</b> dominant Social Democratic politics and organised economic interests, protestant traditions of individualism
<b>Southern</b> (Italy, Spain)	Contributory-based benefits, with mixed contributory/universal services; dualised system offering high benefits to some occupations, especially public sector, and very little to precariously employed and low-skilled; strong dependence on families for financial and social support. <b>Influenced by:</b> histories of rightist authoritarian rule, deep left/right political cleavages, and popular but fragmented left parties; organised but occupationally fragmented economic interests, especially trade unions.
<b>Liberal</b> (UK)	Means-tested benefits; low levels of contributory benefits; universal services; oriented to safety-net provision. <b>Influenced by</b> protestant and liberal traditions of state; liberal and individualist rightist politics; limited social democracy; weak organisation of economic interests.
<b>Postcommunist</b> (Poland, Czech Republic)	Contributory-based benefits, paid at very low levels, with very limited and low-level ‘safety-net’ provision; strong emphasis on private (pensions/health) and family (care) provision; support to families and for gender equality varies. <b>Influenced by</b> 1990s ‘shock’ transition from state socialist to liberal political economies; weak organisation of economic interests except for specific occupations; Christian Democratic and national conservative elements; relatively strong liberal politics and weak social democracy (except Czech Republic).

The successful functioning of the ESM largely depends on the implementation of the principles of convergence (EU member states' economical and social equalization) and harmonization of national social protection systems [51, p. 20]. EU enlargement has led to a conflict between «old» and «new» EU members over competition in the labor market, which has been much more exacerbated by the migration crisis. Social dumping of legal migrants from central and western Europe (CWE) countries and migrants from outside the EU undermines the financial capacity of the welfare state in the richest member states of the Union. In 2008, the European Parliament was forced to adopt a special Resolution calling on national governments to work together to limit social dumping between EU Member States [12].

The European Union has limited legal and institutional capacity to directly influence on the social policies of the Member States, and especially on those which are outside the eurozone. The ESM provides for the coordination of the social policy of the Member States. Avoidance of harmonization of living and working conditions is determined by the lack of a common vision of ways to bridge the significant gap between the social standards of the Member States. It is not in the interests of more developed Member States to set lower standards at EU level<sup>1</sup> or to recognize their national standards as pan-European. In the latter case, it will shift the financial burden on donor countries to bring the social standards of less developed Member States up to the European level.

Formally, one of the possible ways to deepen social sphere integration could be a mechanism of «deepened cooperation» (a manifestation of the method of differentiated integration), in which a group of EU member states with roughly similar institutions of the welfare state suffering from similar social problems would move from coordination of its social policy to its social legislation harmonization. It is obvious that a joint decision within a homogeneous group of welfare states is more likely than for all Member States. However, although this mechanism of cooperation is provided for in the founding treaties, the Member States are somewhat prejudiced against it and are in no hurry to use it.

It should be noted that the European social model is a phenomenon that is sensitive to both external (financial crisis (2008), Brexit) and internal (migration crisis (2015), pandemic COVID-19 (2020)) challenges, and therefore it is in the process of continuous improvement [1; 32]. As evidenced by the joint proclamation by the European Parliament, the Council and the EU Commission in November 2017 of the European Pillar of Social Rights, which is aimed at helping the EU and its Member States to respond more effectively to current and future social challenges, to restore the confidence of Union citizens [71].

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, the social policy models of Denmark and the Netherlands are more advanced than in most EU Member States, at least in the field of labor law. However, the flexibility of EU social policy since the early 2000s does not mean that the Danish or Dutch approaches have been adopted by the rest of the Member States. Moreover, as a result of such flexibility, standard employment contracts have deteriorated in some Member States, with the result that they guarantee fewer social rights and provide less protection for employment [27, p. 682].

***The welfare state crisis in an innovative economics conditions.*** A natural consequence of globalization development is the intensification of economical competition. As a consequence, national governments and the EU as a whole are forced to make significant efforts to build and develop an innovative economics as a prerequisite for ensuring the global competitiveness of the united European economics [77]. Scientists and politicians have developed the concept of «competition state» [24] or «Schumpeterian workfare state» [39; 54] in the late XX – early XXI century, which were considered in the context of the evolution of the welfare state. «Competition state» was a kind of combination of prosperity and competitiveness ideas, inherent for the Scandinavian models of the state. The transition to a «competition state» could be accompanied by a radical change of old institutions and filling them with new functions, as well as without such changes (welfare state institutions are modified to serve as a «competition state»), as it was in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. But no matter how this transition took place, «competition state» was not a variation of «welfare state» and was not even associated with a national sovereign state. While the welfare state fosters a sense of national identity, solidarity through a policy of cultural and ethnic homogenization, and the forced assimilation of minorities, the “competition state” is indifferent to identity, it is based on pragmatic unification, and encourages social, cultural, and ethnic diversity as a production resource. The content of the «competition state» is being revealed through the institutional improvement of the global mechanism of business distribution, the neoliberal reforms implementation [24].

The concept of innovative economics is a certain way a logical continuation of the idea of «competition state». It should be noted that most politicians and scientists are not fully aware of the consequences of implementing the ambitious goals of the Europe 2020 Strategy [14], in particular the development of the EU as an «innovation union». Today, researches in the areas of innovation and prosperity are mostly developed autonomously, as it is believed that they are not interconnected. In fact, although the factors connected with the innovative economics and the welfare state usually operate at different levels, they are still interdependent [23].

There is no unanimity among scholars in assessing how social security programs will affect the functioning of the innovative economy and vice versa. While some authors emphasize the negative effects of social security programs on economic growth [18], others argue that increased spending on social needs may play a hidden role in fostering innovations and economic growth (yes, it is believed that happy people are more open to new ideas, and therefore have a better chance to make creative cognitive choices) [44]. However, most such studies were conducted in the late XX – early XXI century. There are almost no modern studies of the interaction between the welfare state and the innovative economy.

Among those authors who still touch on this problem, there is an assumption that the welfare state is in crisis in an innovative economics conditions. The “explosion” of new technologies in the field of artificial intelligence, robotics, digital

technologies and biotechnology, etc., will inevitably lead to the replacement of low and medium skilled workers by machines driven by a much smaller number of highly skilled workers. Thus, there is a danger that a side effect of the development of an innovative economics will be an unprecedented level of unemployment (few jobs are protected from technological innovation) and social inequality, which will pose a real threat of broad and acute social and political conflict that will undermine not only social but and the democratic and legal state grounds (individuals begin to be perceived mainly as consumers, rather than as citizens who have the right to influence on the political process [56, p. 416]).

The question arises, is there any alternative to the opposition of the innovative economics and the welfare state? Thus, an example of the possibility of their interests reconciling demonstrates the «northern» model, in particular the Finnish one (model of «productive welfare»), as its national subspecies, in which the emphasis shifts from traditional social protection measures to social investment direction, which contribute to economic competitiveness increasing [35, p. 34]. The construction of an information society in which special emphasis is placed on increasing competitiveness and on an innovative economics has become a political meta-object of Finland's national development strategy at the beginning of the XXI century [56]. In the Finnish model, there is a desire to combine technological and economical success with social justice and equality - it is still the approach that has become the key to the «Finnish miracle» [9]. One of the main axioms of this model is the thesis according to which social policy should be subordinated to the needs of economical policy. As a result, government spending may increase within the limits of economic growth. At the same time, the growth of expenditures on social programs should not pose a threat to the competitiveness of the national economics, in particular its export component. As a result, the part of government spending in GDP remains lower than in other welfare states belonging to the «northern» model, and always involves a narrowing of social functions in an economic downturn or crisis [45].

According to Manuel Castells and Pekka Himanen, Finland has succeeded in creating a «virtuous cycle» of information society and an inclusive welfare state: the informational society and the inclusive welfare state do not exclude but support each other and can develop simultaneously: economical growth provides opportunities to finance social services and the welfare state, promotes the emergence of educated people, skilled labor and social protection, which in its turn is a prerequisite for further innovation and growth of the innovative economics [55; 56, p. 401]. It is clear that this model does not remove all the contradictions, but demonstrates the alternative development way of the welfare state in the XXI century.

***Postcoronavirus world: what future awaits the welfare state?*** The COVID-19 pandemic has already been compared to the fall of the Berlin Wall in terms of its impact on national, regional and global processes. Rejection of established models of life, social isolation and the principle of solidarity rejection, rapid growth of unemployment and underemployment, resulting in growing poverty and social inequality, transformation of society structure, which, in its turn, undermines the

stability of a democratic, social, legal state; destruction of global and regional markets; detection of lack of governments' and international organizations' competence – these and many other consequences will lead to political and socio-economic changes of varying severity and complexity, the course of which today is even difficult to predict. The COVID-19 pandemic proved the inconsistency of neoliberal ideology with the requirements of the time, changed the balance between the market and the state in favor of the latter, provoked a new wave of nationalism, which is especially dangerous for the European integration process.

The EU's main contribution to overcoming the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic has been:

- adoption by the European Commission of the Temporary Framework [66], which allows Member States to use the full flexibility provided by state aid rules to support the economy in the context of the COVID-19 outbreak;

- “Coronavirus Response Investment Initiative” implementation [16], which involves raising up to € 37 billion to support national health systems, SMEs, labor markets and other vulnerable parts of the economics;

- adoption of a temporary initiative Support mitigating Unemployment Risks in Emergency [70], aimed at protecting jobs and workers affected by the COVID-19 outbreak;

- creation of a strategic reserve of medical equipment to help EU countries in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic [17].

However, the main burden of fighting the coronavirus has fallen on national governments, which are taking emergency measures to overcome the crisis. The European Union has shown helplessness in preventing and overcoming national selfishness. It turned out that the supranational level of power represented by the EU is not suitable for combating a pandemic: it does not have the authority to coordinate national health systems, to impose a state of emergency, to block cities, to close educational institutions and to perform other necessary steps, as well as not empowered to close borders between Member States (border control was restored by 12 of the 26 Schengen member states). All these and many other necessary steps are being taken by national governments. It is highly likely that governments may be tempted to retain the powers acquired during the pandemic when the crisis is over.

Although the vast majority of experts discuss the economic and political consequences of a pandemic, the social consequences will be no less significant, they, according to some authors, will significantly strengthen the role of the welfare state (the constitutional principle of the welfare state society acquires high significance in crisis conditions because its adherence contributes to society stabilization and mitigation of negative consequences for people), revision of its models, the content of social policy, as decades of neoliberal politics have led to inequality in social services provision, in social protection and employment system, in food security. The health sector is clearly undergoing the greatest changes (in some developed countries there was no basic health infrastructure for the treatment of the seriously ill [48]), as a result of which the European Union together with other countries of the region will

be forced to revise “Health 2020: a European policy framework supporting action across government and society for health and well-being” [31] (2012) and “Health 2020. A European policy framework and strategy for the 21st century” [30] (2013).

**Conclusion.** European integration, the natural result of which the European Union was, contributes to the enrichment and filling the concept of «welfare state» with new content. The European Union, in the legal nature of which the supranational component is strongly reflected, seeks to preserve the so-called European traditions and to preserve the civilizational values that have been formed within Western Europe over the centuries. At the same time, the European integration course has created a fundamental asymmetry between the policy aimed at establishing and effective functioning of the free market and the policy that embodies the welfare state values. At the level of Member States, both types of policy, after the constitutional consolidation of the principle of the welfare state, are in political competition at the same level – the constitutional one. At EU level, these two types of policy have become asymmetric, as the Union’s economic policy has been rapidly Europeanized, while policy within welfare state has long remained the prerogative of national governments. As a result, the welfare state has been «constitutionally» limited by the primacy of European law norms, the priority of which is to ensure economic integration, the Single Market, Economic and Monetary Union functioning, and significantly limiting its financial capabilities. This situation has necessitated the Europeanization of social policy, a manifestation of which is the European social model adoption. The development of the ESM is a European project, as well as a tool to ensure the unity of Europeans, as well as a mean of further legitimizing the European institutions of power. However, the ESM development is politically hampered by the diversity of national social policy models in practice.

The European Union uses the open method of coordination in the process of its social policy developing and implementing. The mentioned method contributes to the common goals and indicators promotion, by usage of comparative assessments of the effectiveness of national social policies. At the same time, it leaves it to the Member States to choose effective policies at national level.

#### References

1. Ainhoa Lasa Lypez, Jone I. Elizondo Urrestarazu. (2016). The Transcendental Construction of the Social Dimension of the European Union: The Challenges of the EU Social Model During and After the Crisis. *Democratic Legitimacy in the European Union and Global Governance*. Palgrave Macmillan, 239–258. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-41381-5\_11.
2. Allan, J.P., Scruggs, L. (2004). Political Partisanship and Welfare State Reform in Advanced Industrial Societies. *American Journal of Political Science*, 48(3), 493–512.
3. Amsterdam Declaration on Social Quality of Europe. URL: <https://socialquality.org/about-iasq/amsterdam-declaration-of-1997/>.
4. Art, W., Gelissen, J. (2002). Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism or More? A State-of-the-Art Report. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12(2), 137–58.
5. Baldwin, P. (1996). Can We Define a European Welfare State Model? In: Greve, B. (Eds) *Comparative Welfare Systems: The Scandinavian Model in a Period of Change*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 29–43.

6. Bamba, C. (2007). Going beyond The three worlds of welfare capitalism: regime theory and public health research. *Journal Epidemiol Community Health*, 61(12), 1098–1102. doi: 10.1136/jech.2007.064295.
7. Beck, W., van der Masesn, L. and Walker, A. (1998). *The Social Quality of Europe*, Bristol, Policy Press.
8. Blanke, T., Hoffmann, J. (2008). Towards a European social model: preconditions, difficulties and prospects of a European social policy. *International Journal of Public Policy*, 1/2. doi: 10.1504/ijpp.2008.017124.
9. Brenner, M. (2003). The Scandinavian Challenge: The Future of Advanced Welfare States in the Knowledge Economy. *Acta Sociologica*, 46:2, 132–149.
10. Carmel, E., Papadopoulou, T. (2016). Detached, Hostile, Adaptable and Liberalising: The Chameleon Qualities of the UK's Relationship with EU Social Policy. *The Political Quarterly*, 2, 228–237. doi: 10.1111/1467-923X.12263.
11. Cerny, P.G. (2010). The Competition State Today: From Raison d'État to Raison du Monde. *Policy Studies*, 31 (1), 5–21.
12. Challenges to collective agreements in the EU European Parliament resolution of 22 October 2008 on challenges to collective agreements in the EU (2008/2085(INI)). *Official Journal of the European Union C 15E. 21.1.2010*, 50–58.
13. Clasen, J., Siegel, N.A. (eds) (2007). *Investigating Welfare State Change: The Dependent Variable Problem in Comparative Analysis*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
14. Communication from the Commission Europe 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. URL: <http://ec.europa.eu/eu2020/pdf/COMPLET%20EN%20BARROSO%20%20%2007%20-%20Europe%202020%20-%20EN%20version.pdf>.
15. Corbett, S., Walker, A.C. (2018). Between neoliberalism and nationalist populism: What role for the 'European Social Model' and social quality in post-Brexit Europe? *Social Policy and Society*, 1, 93–106. doi:10.1017/S1474746418000349.
16. Coronavirus Response Investment Initiative. URL: [https://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/en/newsroom/coronavirus-response/](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/newsroom/coronavirus-response/).
17. COVID-19: Commission creates first ever rescEU stockpile of medical equipment. URL: [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip\\_20\\_476](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_20_476).
18. Ding, H. (2014). Economic growth and welfare state: A debate of econometrics. *Journal of Social Science for Policy Implications*, 2(2), 165–196.
19. Emmenegger, P., Kvis, J., Marx, P., Petersen, K. (2015). Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism: The making of a classic. *Journal of European Social Policy*, vol. 25(1), 3–13. doi: 10.1177/0958928714556966.
20. Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Oxford: Polity Press.
21. European Social Policy - A Way Forward for the Union. A White Paper. Part A. COM (94) 333 final, 27 July 1994. URL: [http://aei.pitt.edu/1118/1/social\\_policy\\_white\\_paper\\_COM\\_94\\_333\\_A.pdf](http://aei.pitt.edu/1118/1/social_policy_white_paper_COM_94_333_A.pdf).
22. Ferrera, M., Hemerijck, A., Phodes, M. (2000). *The Future of Social Europe. Recasting Workand Welfare in the New Economy*. Report prepared for the Portuguese Presidency of the European Union. Oeiras: Celta Editora.
23. Franz, H.-W., Hochgerner, J., Howaldt, J. (2012). *Challenge social innovation: potentials for business, social entrepreneurship, welfare and civil society*. Berlin, New York: Springer.
24. Genschel, P., Seelkopf, L. (2014). *The Competition State*. URL: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271444192\\_The\\_Competition\\_State](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271444192_The_Competition_State).
25. Golovashenko, O.S., Okladna, M.G. (2015). Yevropejskij socialnij prostir: problemi formuvannya. *Yuridichnij naukovij elektronnij zhurnal*, 3, 12–14 [in Ukrainian].
26. Goodyear-Grant, E., Johnston, R., Kymlicka, W., Myles, J. (2018). *Federalism and the Welfare State in a Multicultural World*. McGill-Queen's University Press. doi: 10.2307/j.ctvdtpjc7.
27. Grahl, J., Teague, P. (2013). Reconstructing the eurozone: the role of EU social policy. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 3, 677–692. doi: 10.1093/cje/bet011.

28. Green-Pedersen, C. (2004). The Dependent Variable Problem within the Study of Welfare State Retrenchment: Defining the problem and looking for solutions. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, vol. 6, issue 1. doi: 10.1080/1387698042000222763.

29. Hall, P. (2015). Varieties of capitalism. In R. Scott & S. Kosslyn (Eds.). *Emerging trends in the social and behavioral sciences*, 1–15. Wiley Online: John Wiley & Sons.

30. Health 2020. A European policy framework and strategy for the 21st century (2013). URL: <http://www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/health-2020.-a-european-policy-framework-and-strategy-for-the-21st-century-2013>.

31. Health 2020: a European policy framework supporting action across government and society for health and well-being. URL: <http://www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/health-2020.-a-european-policy-framework-supporting-action-across-government-and-society-for-health-and-well-being>.

32. Hermann, Ch. (2016). Crisis, structural reform and the dismantling of the European Social Model(s). *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 1, 51–68. doi: URL: 10.1177/0143831x14555708.

33. Homa, N.M. (2013). Novi pidhodi do rozuminnya modelej socialnoyi derzhavi. *Derzhava i pravo. Yuridichni i politichni nauki*, issue 60, 455–461 [in Ukrainian].

34. Hrysenko, M., Priyatelchuk, O., Shvorak, L. (2019). Modeling of state socio-economic systems in the countries of the European region. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 3, 452–463. doi: 10.21511/ppm.17(3).2019.36.

35. Hudson, J., Kühner, S. (2009). Towards productive welfare? A comparative analysis of 23 OECD countries. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 19 (1), 34–46. doi: 10.1177/0958928708098522.

36. Hyman, R. (2005). Trade Unions and the Politics of the European Social Model. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 1, 9–40. doi: 10.1177/0143831x05049401.

37. Immergut, E.M. (1992). *Health Politics: Interests and Institutions in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

38. Jepsen, M., Pascual, A.S. (2005). The European Social Model: an exercise in deconstruction. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 3, 231–245. doi: 10.1177/0958928705054087.

39. Jessop, B. (1994). Post-Fordism and the State. in *Ash Amin (ed), Post-Fordism, A Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell, 251–79.

40. Jessop, B. (1993). Towards a Schumpeterian Workfare State? Preliminary Remarks on Post-Fordist Political Economy. *Journal Studies in Political Economy. A Socialist Review*, vol. 40, issue 1, 7–39. doi: 10.1080/19187033.1993.11675409.

41. Kersbergen, Van K. (1995). *Social Capitalism: A Study of Christian Democracy and the Welfare State*. London: Routledge.

42. Kettunen, P. The transnational construction of national challenges – the ambiguous Nordic model of welfare and competitiveness. *Kettunen P., Petersen K. (2011). Beyond Welfare State Models: Transnational Historical Perspectives on Social Policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Pub, 16–40.

43. Kittel, B. (2002). EMU, EU Enlargement and the European Social Model: Trends, Challenges, and Questions. MPIfG Working Paper 02/1, Cologne. URL: <http://www.mpi-fg-koeln.mpg.de/pu/workpap/wp02-1.htm>.

44. Koo, J., Choi, Y.J., Park, I. (2019). Innovation and welfare: the marriage of an unlikely couple. *Policy and Society*. doi: 10.1080/14494035.2019.1641380.

45. Kosonen, P. (1993). The Finnish Model and the Welfare State in Crisis Helsinki: Renvall Institute, University of Helsinki. *Sarja: Renvall Institute Publications*, 5, 45–66. URL: <https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10224/3560/kosonen.pdf;sequence=1>.

46. Krakovska, A.Ye. (2009). Socialna funkciya v sistemi funkcij suchasnoyi derzhavi: teoretiko-pravovi problemi doslidzhennya. *Derzhava i pravo*, issue 44, 117–124 [in Ukrainian].

47. Kraus, M. (2000). Social Security and Redistributive Effects in European Social Transfer Systems. ZEW Discussion Paper 00-40. Mannheim.

48. Lapavistas, C. This Crisis Has Exposed the Absurdities of Neoliberalism. That Doesn't Mean It'll Destroy It. URL: <https://jacobinmag.com/2020/03/coronavirus-pandemic-great-recession-neoliberalism>.

49. Nicholls, A.J. (2000). Freedom with responsibility: the social market economy in Germany, 1918-1963. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198208525.001.0001.
50. Obinger, H., Wagschal, U. (1998). Drei Welten des Wohlfahrtsstaates? Das Stratifizierungskonzept in der clusteranalytischen Überprüfung. Welten des Wohlfahrtskapitalismus: Der Sozialstaat in vergleichender Perspektiv e. S. Lessenich and I. Ostner. Frankfurt/M., Campus, 109–136.
51. Okladna, M.G., Yakovyuk, I.V. (2016). Social Policy of the European Union: formation and development. Kharkiv: «Oberig» (Scientific reports series Vol. 19) [in Ukrainian].
52. Pankevich, O.Z. (2003). Socialna derzhava: ponyattya ta zagalnoteoretichna charakteristika. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Lviv [in Ukrainian].
53. Peacock, A., Willgerodt, H. (1989). German Neo-Liberals and the Social Market Economy. Palgrave MacMillan. doi: 10.1007/978-1-349-20148-8.
54. Peck, J., Tickell, A. (1995). Training and Enterprise Councils: Schumpeterian Workfare State, or What? *Environment and Planning, A 27(9)*, 1361–1396. doi: 10.1068/a271361.
55. Pelkonen, A. (2004). Questioning the Finnish model – Forms of Public Engagement in Building the Finnish Information Society. Stage (Science, Technology and Governance in Europe). Discussion Paper 5. URL: [http://www.lincompany.kz/pdf/Finland/5\\_ICTFinlandcase\\_final2004.pdf](http://www.lincompany.kz/pdf/Finland/5_ICTFinlandcase_final2004.pdf).
56. Pelkonen, A. (2008). Reconsidering the Finnish Model – Information Society Policy and Modes of Governance. *TRAMES, 12(62/57)*. 4, 400–420. doi: 10.3176/tr.2008.4.03.
57. Pierson, P. (2001). Coping with Permanent Austerity: Welfare State Restructuring in Affluent Democracies. Paul Pierson (Ed.). *The New Politics of the Welfare State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 410–56.
58. Powell, M. (2015). A Re-Specification of the Welfare State: Conceptual Issues in the Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism. *Social Policies and Society, 14:2*, 247–258. doi: 10.1017/S1474746414000529.
59. Resolution on the White Paper on European Social Policy – A way forward for the Union. URL: <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/316b5e42-4af3-41d6-9c4e-528c3d458896>.
60. Salo, V.I. (2007). Vnutrishni funkciyi derzhavi v umovah chlenstva v Yevropejskomu Soyuzi. *Candidate's thesis*. Kharkiv [in Ukrainian].
61. Scharpf, F.W. (2002). The European Social Model: Coping with the Challenges of Diversity. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 4*, 645–670. doi:10.1111/1468-5965.00392.
62. Single European Act. (1987). *Official Journal of the European Communities*. No L 169/1.
63. Skovronskij, D.M. (2016) Suchasni modeli socialnoyi derzhavi. *Visnik Nacionalnogo universitetu «Lvivska politehnika»*, 850, 264–271 [in Ukrainian].
64. Skripnyuk, O.V. (2000). Socialna, pravova derzhava v Ukrayini: problemi teorii i praktiki. Do 10-richchya nezalezhnosti Ukrayini. Kiyiv: In-t derzhavi i prava im. V. M. Koreckogo NAN Ukrayini [in Ukrainian].
65. Starke, P. (2006). The Politics of Welfare State Retrenchment: A Literature Review. *Social Policy & Administration, 40:1*, 104–120.
66. State aid: Commission adopts Temporary Framework to enable Member States to further support the economy in the COVID-19 outbreak. URL: [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP\\_20\\_496](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_20_496).
67. Strange, S. (1997). The future of global capitalism; or, will divergence persist forever? *Crouch C. and Streeck W. (eds), Political Economy of Modern Capitalism. Mapping Convergence and Diversity*. London: Sage Publications, 182–92.
68. Streeck, Wolfgang (1998). Industrielle Beziehungen in einer internationalisierten Wirtschaft. in *Ulrich Beck (ed), Politik der Globalisierung*, Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Suhrkamp, 169–202.
69. Stukalo, N., Simakhova, A. (2018). Global parameters of social economy clustering. *Problems and Perspectives in Management, 1*, 36–47. doi:10.21511/ppm.16(1).2018.04.

70. Temporary Support mitigating Unemployment Risks in Emergency. URL: [https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/economic-and-fiscal-policy-coordination/eu-financial-assistance/loan-programmes/sure\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/economic-and-fiscal-policy-coordination/eu-financial-assistance/loan-programmes/sure_en)

71. The European Pillar of Social Rights in 20 principles/ URL: [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/priorities/deeper-and-fairer-economic-and-monetary-union/european-pillar-social-rights/european-pillar-social-rights-20-principles\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/priorities/deeper-and-fairer-economic-and-monetary-union/european-pillar-social-rights/european-pillar-social-rights-20-principles_en).

72. Vaughan-Whitehead, D. (2003). *EU Enlargement versus Social Europe? The Uncertain Future of the European Social Mode*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

73. Vobruba, G. (2001). *Coping with Drastic Social Change: Europe and the US in Comparison*. Beck W., Maesen L. J. G. van der, Thomése F. and Walker A. (eds). *Social Quality: a Vision for Europe*. The Hague, London, Boston: Kluwer Law International.

74. Walker, A., Maesen, L. van der (2003). *Social Quality and Quality of Life*. Paper for ESPANET Conference, Copenhagen 13–15. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4020-2903-5\_2.

75. Walker, A. (2009). The social quality approach: bridging Asia and Europe. *Development and Society*, 38(2), 209–235.

76. Whyman, P.B., Baimbridge, M., and Mullen, A. (2012). *The Political Economy of the European Social Model*, Abingdon: Routledge.

77. Yakovyuk, I.V. (2014). *Innovacijna strategiya YeS: uroki dlya Ukrajini*. *Pravo ta innovacijne suspilstvo: elektronne vidannya, issue 2(3)* [in Ukrainian].

78. Yakovyuk, I.V. (2013). *Pravovi osnovi yevropejskoyi integraciyi: zagalnoteoretichnij analiz*. Kharkiv: Pravo [in Ukrainian].

79. Yakovyuk, I.V. (2004). *Realizaciya socialnoyi funkciyi derzhavi v umovah yevropejskoyi integraciyi*. *Derzhavne budivnictvo ta misceve samovryaduvannya: zbirnik naukovih prac, issue 7*. Kharkiv: Pravo, 40–48 [in Ukrainian].

80. Yakovyuk, I.V. (2000). *Socialna derzhava: pitannya teorii i shlyahi yiyi stanovlennya*. *Candidate's thesis*. Kharkiv [in Ukrainian].

81. Yakovyuk, I.V. (2001). *Viniknennya ta rozvitok koncepciyi socialnoyi derzhavi*. *Visnik Akademiyi pravovih nauk Ukrajini*, 2, 25–34 [in Ukrainian].

**Гайдамака В. А.**, аспирантка кафедри права Європейського Союзу, Національний юридический університет імені Ярослава Мудрого, Україна, г. Харків.  
e-mail: v.o.gaydamaka@gmail.com ; ORCID 0000-0002-1137-6500

### **Європейська соціальна модель: нова парадигма розвитку соціального государства**

*Соціальне государство являється одним из ключевих принципів конституційного строю сучасних государств. Хоча проблематика соціальної государственности була предметом багатьох міждисциплінарних досліджень, вона до сих пор остається актуальною і викликає очікувані наукові дискусії як в результаті періодического перегляду парадигм розвитку государств як такого, так і в результаті стрімительного розвитку процесів глобалізації і регіональної інтеграції. Упадок соціального государства предрекали неоднократно. В цій зв'язі слідует відзначити, що в процесі обговорення становища розвитку соціального государства слідует відличать кризисні міфи від кризисних реалій, виявлять можливі траєкторії її розвитку.*

*Стаття призвана обратити увагу дослідників на трансформацію процесу функціонування соціального государства в умовах європейської інтеграції. Несомненим являється той факт, що економіки государств-членів ЄС на сьогодні почти вийшли из-под контролю національних правительств, тогди як соціальні наслідки цього процесу – безробіття, міграція – остаються предметом правового регулювання національних правительств. Вмесіт с вітчизняними і зарубіжними дослідниками автори піднімають актуальні питання: приведе ли к зміненням или даже відміні національних моделей соціальної політики створення Європейської соціальної моделі? Являється ли соціальна політика пріоритетом Європейс-*

кого Союза и насколько она зависит от экономического состояния ЕС? Изменяются ли функции социального государства в условиях членства страны в Европейском Союзе? Сохраняет ли свой суверенитет государство, делегируя ЕС реализацию своих ключевых функций? Какие последствия для индивидов имеет изменение парадигмы социального государства в условиях инновационной экономики?

**Ключевые слова:** социальное государство; социальная политика; инновационная экономика; типология; новая парадигма; Европейская социальная модель; Европейский Союз; европейская интеграция; суверенитет.

**Рекомендоване цитування:** Gaydamaka V. O. European social model: a new paradigm of social state development. *Проблеми законності*. 2020. Вип. 150. С. 313–331. doi: <https://doi.org/10.21564/2414-990x.150.208955>.

**Suggested Citation:** Gaydamaka, V.O. (2020). European social model: a new paradigm of social state development. *Problemy zakonnosti – Problems of Legality, issue 150, 313–331*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.21564/2414-990x.150.208955>.

*Надійшла до редколегії 28.07.2020 р.*