

Joanna MARSZALEK-KAWA  
Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń

Danuta PLECKA  
University of Zielona Góra

## **Social Security as a Factor Contributing to the Evolution of the Political System in Poland after the Parliamentary Elections of 2015**

**Abstract:** The role and scope of the state's activities in the field of social security are quite often problematic. This is related both to the attitude of citizens and to the use of social slogans, particularly in election campaigns. One could say that the electoral struggle is a kind of race, in which the winner is the politician or party whose promises are best suited to their voters. In order to address social security, politicians manipulate economic data. But above all, the influence of electoral promises (usually narrowed down to matters of welfare) on the evolution of the political system is not considered, despite the fact that this influence is considerable and very often neglected, as exemplified by the situation in the Republic of Poland after 2015.

**Key words:** social security, political system, election, parliament, Poland

---

One of the common issues present in public debate is the role and scope of the activity of the state in the area of social security. This is connected both with citizens' attitudes and with the use of social slogans, especially in election campaigns. It might even be said that the battle for votes is a kind of race in which candidates try to outdo one another in the social promises made to voters, thanks to which a politician/party may succeed in the elections. Thus, when using the slogan of social security, politicians manipulate economic data and, more importantly, disregard the sphere of the influence of electoral promises concerning social issues (usually limited to social welfare) on the evolution of the political system. There is no doubt that this influence is significant and often ignored, an example of which is the Republic of Poland after 2015.

Social security is defined as any legal and organizational activities undertaken both on the national and international level which "are aimed

at ensuring that people, families and social groups enjoy a specific living standard and are not marginalized and socially excluded.” It is an indispensable element of electoral efforts taken by all actors of the political game (Leszczyński, 2011, pp. 57–59). It is usually the state that is considered the institution responsible for the sphere of social security. Such an approach seems to be oversimplified, though. What is more, the issue is used for promoting the electoral program of a specific political actor. We may thus risk the thesis that the sphere of social security has become an election tool which is mainly applied to persuade voters to support a given group or candidate. It should be emphasized, however, that adopting such a narrow attitude to the problem hampers the growth of society. It must be remembered that citizens also play a significant role in the development of social security. Therefore, in order to achieve the established social goals, responsibility should be shared between the government and citizens. Otherwise, people will become helpless and will express their claims to the authorities, thereby losing their ability to cope with hardships: job loss, natural disasters, etc. At the same time, “inability in dealing with life” may lead to over-reliance on social welfare and, consequently (due to excessive burdens), may make the state withdraw from the sphere of pro-social activity.

However, it is neither misjudgment nor a simple manipulation by politicians. The existing body of literature on internal and national security often reduces their social dimension to social welfare and the related tasks of the state. Thus, it ignores other significant aspects of social security, such as social capital, which encompasses qualifications, knowledge, skills, etc. What is no less important is the sphere of community security, seen in the context of social capital and the culture of social trust, civic activity and other elements associated with it, such as the ability to cooperate not only in crisis situations or the ability to shape civil society, which in turn contributes to a high degree of the consolidation of democracy. This does not mean that problems embedded in the conventional sphere of welfare security do not refer to its social dimension. It must be emphasized that although they are a significant component of social security, they only supplement its development and community aspects (Leszczyński, 2011, p. 59).

It seems justifiable to state that it is not possible to manage welfare security effectively without the contribution of developmental elements, such as, for example, human capital. This capital, however, does not have much shaping potential if the society lacks the dimension of community security, whose integral part is social capital.

There is no doubt that social security has a significant influence on the sphere of economic voting. As is well known, “the theory of economic voting was developed as a tool for describing a mechanism according to which the state of the economy, monitored by economic indicators, is a predictor of electoral support for those responsible for the economy, i.e. the government” (Markowski, Czeńnik, Kotnarowski, 2015, p. 120). While we accept the validity of this theory, we must point out that the elites’ policy concerning economic issues affects society in the long-term. This is why its implications are often not directly associated with the decisions made by the ruling party in the current term, but become evident in the next term (Turska-Kawa, 2015, p. 234).

At the same time, economic problems, ignored and marginalized by some and used as an element of manipulation in election campaigns by others, to a large degree determine the quality of social security – paying no heed to the aspects of development and community, they significantly affect the welfare sphere, which remains to be managed by the state. Thus, we may risk the statement (as banal as it may seem) that the larger the scope of electoral promises concerning the area of social security, the more likely it is for a party to win the election. However, this statement (and sometimes a conviction) might entail certain problems.

The main one among them is the fact that economic voting is considered to be a sign of rational electoral behavior, which means that voters have knowledge of the economy and can reliably evaluate the state of the economy and electoral promises. This is quite an optimistic view of citizens’ competence with regard to the sphere of business, because, as Agnieszka Turska-Kawa rightly remarks, “economic issues are difficult areas – understanding them and relating them to other aspects of the social functioning of an individual requires people to have a certain level of competence, knowledge and insight into the social and economic reality” (Turska-Kawa, 2015, p. 212).

At the same time, it is assumed that voters are not whimsical when it comes to their economic choices and do not yield to opinions discrediting the actual achievements of the government in the economic sphere. As Radosław Markowski, Mikołaj Czeńnik and Michał Kotnarowski point out, it is an ideal version of economic choice, verified by empirical research. They indicate that “citizens may misperceive policy results and/or they may be wrong in their evaluation of political accountability. Incompetent, inexperienced or simply misinformed voters may punish politicians and parties which do not really deserve it” (Czeńnik, 2007, p. 120).

As a result, we observe that the authorities show disrespect to citizens' economic aspirations, and that instead of a "qualitative exchange of information signals between the elites and the masses, we witness politicians adapting to the superficial fancies of the public" (Cześniak, 2007, p. 120).

The situation presented above occurred in the campaign before the elections to the parliament of the Republic of Poland in 2015. We observed that the issue of social security had been trivialized and limited to the sphere of the state's responsibility for implementing it. What is more, as an implication of the above, political parties totally ignored the community perspective in their electoral manifestoes and largely reduced making references to the sphere connected with human capital. Thus, during the election campaign, parties responded to "social needs" and proposed a superficial "change," referring only to the abovementioned "fancies" and "whims," taking no account of the capabilities of individuals, communities, and, finally, of the state. At the same time, it must be emphasized that it is a consequence of the lack of the economic competence of Polish society, which tends to increase due to, quite paradoxically, political parties' use of populist slogans and their lack of interest in the development of social capital and economic culture in Poland.

In this context, there is no denying that social electoral promises can be crucial for potential changes in the political system after an election has been won. According to Andrew Heywood, "the political system consists of linkages between what are viewed as outputs [e.g. the government's policy] and inputs, i.e. demands and supports from the general public" (Heywood, 2009, pp. 30–31). This is why, as Simon Hix noted, the political system is characterized by four main components: a stable and clearly defined system of institutions for collective decision-making and a set of principles governing the interconnections of these institutions and their internal structure; citizens and social groups satisfy their social needs through the political system in a direct way or through such organs as lobby groups and political parties; collective decisions in a political system have a significant impact on the distribution of resources, and social and political values in the system; and, finally, there is constant interaction between the results of political processes and new expectations regarding the system, new decisions, etc. (Hix, 2010, pp. 28–29). It should be noted that it is a continuation of theories proposed by Gabriela Almond (*Comparative Political Systems*) and David Easton (*An Approach to the Study of Political Systems*), who were first to establish the

formal framework for defining and analyzing political systems (in 1956 and 1957, respectively) (Hix, 2010, pp. 28–29).

A similar research perspective was adopted by Andrzej Antoszewski and Ryszard Herbut, who believe that the category of a political system is not only the basis for theoretical deliberations. It is also one of the tasks of empirical political science, which studies, among others, “in what institutional framework the battle for power is fought, how this power is exercised and limited, and according to what principles those in power are held politically accountable. [...] The research focuses on the following issues: electoral systems, institutions of the legislative and executive branches, political parties and party systems, and political behaviors” (Antoszewski, Herbut, 2007, pp. 9–10).

It must also be pointed out, as Mariusz Gulczyński emphasizes, that the following three basic research areas may be distinguished within the category of a political system: a set of the elements of the system, i.e. all institutions having political functions and mutually related; the “surroundings” of the system, i.e. its sociological context – the phenomenon of the division of the society into groups, their mutual relations, forms of political activity; all relationships between a political system and its surroundings (Gulczyński, 2004, p. 38).

This overview of the definitions of a political system – as brief as it is (due to the requirements concerning the research problem under discussion) – allows us to identify mutual relations between the institutions of the system (for example, political parties, the government, the parliament, etc.) and the society. It should be added, as Niclas Luhmann notes, that, first of all, politics faces challenges resulting from the previously carried out policies, but one cannot forget that “all those that benefit from welfare security and who are taken care of by politicians cannot be expected to be constantly happy, grateful and politically loyal” (Luhmann, 1994, p. 22).

This is why it is so important to have democratic institutions permanently rooted in citizens’ minds, so that no social electoral promises could lead to the devastation of the political regime. The process of the development of democratic political institutions in Poland after 1989 had several stages. Andrzej Antoszewski, having analyzed the course of transformations, distinguished four periods:

- I – normative semi-presidential during Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski’s presidency (July 19, 1989 –December 30, 1989 – President of the People’s Republic of Poland; December 31, 1989–December 22, 1990 – President of the Republic of Poland);

- II – normative and actual presidential system during Lech Wałęsa's presidency (December 22, 1990–December 22, 1995);
- III – limited semi-presidential system after the “small Constitution” entered into force (The Constitutional Act of October 17, 1992) (December 8, 1992);
- IV – evolution towards a parliamentary system after the presidential election of 1995 (1<sup>st</sup> round: November 5, 1995, 2<sup>nd</sup> round: November 19, 1995) (Antoszewski, 1997, pp. 59–60; see also: Godlewski, 2005, p. 132).

As far as the distinction of the above stages is concerned, it should be indicated that the course of transformation was determined by three principal goals. Firstly, the political elites aimed to introduce a democratic, pluralistic political system through forming an infrastructure for multi-party political competition.<sup>1</sup> Secondly, the constitutional, institutional and procedural foundations for the development of participatory democracy were to be established (Mołdawa, 2007, p. 29).

This concept was reflected in the provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland of April 2, 1997. In chapter I, entitled *The Republic*, the following principles of the system are stipulated (it should be added that other articles of the fundamental law, especially those included in chapter II, also refer to these principles): the republican form of government, a democratic state ruled by law, sovereignty of the nation, the separation and balance of powers, political pluralism, political representation, a bicameral legislature, the mutual independence of the State and churches and other religious organizations, the freedom and rights of persons and citizens, the independence of the judiciary and judges, social market economy, economic freedom, and the protection of property (Skrzydło, 2002, p. 57; see also: Zięba-Zalucka, 1998, p. 9). The Republic ensures the implementation of the idea of self-government and the functioning of free, independent media. Equally importantly, the fundamental law also institutes civilian oversight of the armed forces (Żebrowski, 2006, p. 139).

Article 1 of the Constitution stipulates that “the Republic of Poland shall be the common good of all its citizens.” As Mirosław Karpiuk rightly notes, this constitutional principle attaches particular importance to the “directive of the protection of national security.” According to the

---

<sup>1</sup> For more details on the electoral system in Poland, see, for example: Glajcar, 2016, pp. 344–382.

researcher, the survival of the country and rescuing the nation is pragmatically prior to other functions of the state as it determines the possibility of exercising them. Therefore, the state should protect the interests of citizens as long as it does not stand in contradiction to the social interest” (Karpiuk, 2012, p. 32).

According to Art. 2 of the binding Constitution, “the Republic of Poland is a democratic state ruled by law,<sup>2</sup> and implementing the principles of social justice.” Seymour Martin Lipset defines democracy as a political system which, on the basis of constitutional procedures, ensures the cyclical rotation of people in power, and which guarantees the existence of a wide, social mechanism securing influence on the decision-making process through selecting from among candidates for political positions (Lipset, 1995, p. 48).

As was mentioned earlier, the Constitution of Poland defines relations between the parliament, the government (Glajcar, 2015, p. 558), and the president in a way typical of the parliamentary-cabinet system. According to Maria Kruk-Jaroszowa, the system adopted in the Polish fundamental law, “along with elements alien to the classical parliamentary system<sup>3</sup> [...], takes its origin from the roots of parliamentary democracy and the parliamentary system” (Sarnecki, 2009, p. 286).

Parliamentary democracy is one of the kinds of the power of the people in which the government leader and his/her cabinet is dependent on parliament’s trust. One of its features is also the separation of the head of state and the head of government, and close links between the executive and legislative branches. Drawing on the concepts of the science of law concerning the issue of parliamentary government, we must emphasize that the parliamentary system of government has been to a large degree shaped by parliament’s function of scrutiny.

As Hans Kelsen rightly said, “a judgment about parliamentarism defines the democratic system of a state” (Pajdała, 2001, p. 59). Parliaments are the most important elements of democratic systems. It is they that are vested with the power to establish commonly binding legal norms.

---

<sup>2</sup> For more details see: Ryszka, 2002, pp. 119–123.

<sup>3</sup> What can be seen as a certain departure from the classical form of the parliamentary-cabinet model are the constitutional regulations according to which the president, as the head of state, is elected by the nation in universal elections. Thus, he or she has direct legitimacy, which, however, does not correlate with the scope of his/her powers. In parliamentary systems, the president is usually elected by the parliament itself or deputies take part in the election procedure. See also: Gulczyński, Zaradny, 2000, p. 142.

At present, the constitutional practice in democratic countries shows that – regardless of the regime – the executive organs, especially the government, have gained more powers with regard to the state's policy directions, including the exercise of the legislative function.<sup>4</sup>

The political system adopted in Poland, in accordance with the binding constitutional regulations, may be defined as rationalized parliamentarism,<sup>5</sup> in which the parliament's support is of fundamental importance. In other words, as long as the Sejm of the RP approves of the activity of the Council of Ministers, rationalizing elements will remain almost imperceptible. The rationalization of the parliamentary system consists in initiating some mechanisms of enhancing the scope of powers of the Council of Ministers and of the prime minister when there is insufficient support for the government in the parliament. This is when the instruments used for preventing the cabinet from being dismissed are applied (e.g. the institution of the constructive vote of no confidence, which serves the strengthening of the position of the government and prime minister, the introduction of deadlines and larger majorities in the procedure of a vote of no confidence).<sup>6</sup> To define a system governed by the articles of the Polish fundamental law, Marian Grzybowski uses the term *mixed system*. In his view, the Constitution of the RP combines the predominant elements of a rationalized parliamentary system with a strong position of the prime minister, adding some “borrowings” from the semi-presidential system (Grzybowski, 2012, p. 134).

In the system of parliamentary government adopted by the Polish fundamental law, there are two pillars: the parliament and the government, which are mutually related institutionally. In a democratic state ruled by law, constitutionally defined authorities function in the system of checks and balances. The Constitution grants each of them some specific areas of competence. It also has some instruments for influencing the activity of the other decision-making authorities. In accordance with the regulations which form the basis of the parliamentary-cabinet system, the law allows for a certain area of mutual relationships, influences and overlapping competences, especially between the executive and legislative branches. The Sejm of the RP, apart from the leading role it plays in exercising the lawmaking function, may apply the mechanisms of scrutiny over the government's activity.

<sup>4</sup> For more details see: Marszałek-Kawa, 2012, pp. 323–380.

<sup>5</sup> For more details on the political regime see: Lisicka, 2002, pp. 27–50.

<sup>6</sup> See also: Gulczyński, Zaradny, 2000, p. 143.



Under Article 95(2) of the fundamental law, “the Sejm shall exercise control over the activities of the Council of Ministers within the scope specified by the provisions of the Constitution and statutes.” Thus, the Sejm of the RP scrutinizes the organs of the executive directly and indirectly in the name of the sovereign. The article quoted above makes a reference to Article 10 of the fundamental law. It must be once again emphasized here that both houses of parliament closely cooperate with each other when exercising the legislative function. The Constitution granted the Sejm the exclusive power of scrutiny over the government’s work. The Senate of the RP was excluded from this sphere of activity. Thus, although both houses have an equal position, such distribution of powers clearly shows the leading role of the Sejm. As has been stressed in the doctrine of the constitutional law, the Constitution of 1997 stipulated that the Senate and the Sejm were equal chambers, although the former did not enjoy the same rights as the latter (non-absolute bicameralism, asymmetric bicameralism) (Kruk, 2008, p. 24).

There is a “fragile culture of constitutionalism” in Poland. According to Ryszard Piotrowski, this opinion is confirmed by the quite common view that “the letter of the law takes precedence over its spirit.” In line with such an approach to constitutional principles, politicians quite frequently propose changes in the constitutional sphere, but their attempts have a short-term perspective (Piotrowski, 2009, pp. 21–24, 53; Chruściak, 2009, pp. 131–133) and have a clearly lexical and declarative character. The representatives of the Polish political elites submit some typically practical proposals concerning the modernization of the fundamental law. They are driven by opportunistic motives and act out of self-interest, wanting to make political capital. It has little to do with real plans, which could lead to future amendments of the fundamental law. It should be added here that constitutionalists share a view that “even if all politicians’ proposals to amend the Constitution were adopted, they would not undermine the original foundations of the fundamental law, as they only cover quite a random part of the constitutional matter.” Ryszard Chruściak believes that this confirms the permanence of the binding Constitution (2009, pp. 127–130).

The declarations concerning changes in the Constitution were also part of the parliamentary election campaign in 2015. This issue was particularly raised by two political formations: Law and Justice and Kukiz’15. The proposed changes differed in scope, but the representatives of both parties were aware that they could succeed only if they won a “constitu-

tional majority” in the parliament. It should be pointed out that neither Law and Justice nor Kukiz’15 were willing to form a parliamentary and cabinet coalition, while they clearly emphasized their readiness to cooperate in the area of fundamental constitutional changes.

The instrument that Law and Justice used in the election campaign was the issue of welfare security. In their public appearances, politicians of this party obviously addressed the problem of social security as well, but, as it was mentioned before, they actually focused on the sphere of welfare security. The fact that their election campaign was based on the slogans such as “500+” (a child benefit program), “mieszkanie+” (a program of State assistance for people buying flats), “pomoc dla frankowiczów” (regulations to help people who took out mortgage loans in Swiss francs), lowering the retirement age or getting rid of junior high schools, meant that emphasis was placed on material and social factors. At the same time, issues related to changes in the Constitution were presented in the campaign as “constitutional abstractions concerning the elites” (Janicki, Władyka, 2017, p. 13). The focus on welfare issues and raising the living standard of “ordinary Polish men and women” led to ignoring the constitutional sphere, which was seen as an auxiliary component in the functioning of the state.<sup>7</sup>

Thus, Law and Justice managed to win the support of the “average citizen,” i.e. one that has fairly low civil competence and one, who, despite subjectively enjoying a much higher living standard, does not objectively belong to the richest people in the society. This group of citizens usually sees the elites in power as those who are responsible for their “low” standard of living and take the right to demand that their situation should be improved through the active efforts of the state in the economic and social spheres. As was pointed out earlier, people belonging to this group do not know much about the principles of economics, so they accept promises concerning the economic sphere and they force politicians to make such promises many a time.<sup>8</sup>

What we observe here is a kind of feedback, according to the rule of “entering,” “processing” and “exiting” the political system (Laska, Nocoń, 2005, p. 124). The implementation of electoral welfare promises made by Law and Justice in this case was connected both with the

---

<sup>7</sup> The authors ignore here the issue of Smolensk crash, quite strongly emphasized in the campaign, as it has nothing to do with the research problem in our deliberations.

<sup>8</sup> For example, through political pressure in the form of manifestations.

election game and with the optimistic view of the state of the global economy, which definitely underpinned the party's electoral declarations. At the same time, the fact that voters focused on welfare issues made them divert their attention from the introduction of changes in the political system. This does not mean, however, that they completely lost interest in government policy. We might risk the statement that, following decisions concerning changes in the political system of the country (the Constitutional Court, changes in the judiciary), we observed an increase in the level of distrust in the society, which has become key to the development of citizens' political competence. It should be added here that the culture of distrust in the society does not have to be a factor that negatively affects the quality of social security, thus influencing the level of the consolidation of democracy. Quite the contrary, it may have a positive impact on the phenomena indicated above. Thus, the fact that actors of the election game focus on welfare issues (from the whole portfolio of social security) may also positively influence these phenomena.

Contrary to the opinions that are quite widely held in Poland, distrust in the society was and still is a determinant of social development in two dimensions: liberal and democratic (Rosanvallón, 2008, p. 15). Liberal distrust is aimed, as Rosanvallón argues, at "establishing poor authorities and the institutionalization of suspiciousness" (Rosanvallón, 2008, p. 10). Thus, liberal distrust helps to form power in a way that would prevent authoritarianism. This type of distrust in the society was one of the motives behind Montesquieu's concept of the separation of powers (Montesquieu, 1758, chapter XI, chapter IV). Thus, in this case, distrust first of all refers to being skeptical about the authorities, even those elected in universal elections, "by the will of the nation."

What is more important for our deliberations, however, is the other type of distrust in the society, i.e. democratic distrust, the essence of which is "to make sure that the elected authorities keep their promises and to find resources for maintaining the original requirements concerning service for the common good" (Rosanvallón, 2008, p. 11). This may be organized in a number of ways – through the social oversight of the authorities, piling up obstacles (e.g. strikes and protests), or appealing to judicial power (e.g. through a class action for not keeping electoral promises). This form of distrust in the society is referred to as a new kind of democracy – counter-democracy, which acquires the form of organized distrust (Rosanvallón, 2008, p. 11).

For some political scientists, e.g. Rosanvallon quoted above or Iwan Krastew, the culture of distrust forms the foundation of modern democracies. It is a consequence of the erosion of three spheres of the activity of the individual and society: scientific, economic and sociological. The complication of these fields of activity (as mentioned earlier) leads to a decrease in social trust, but, at the same time, it reduces its importance in social and individual life. Thus, we are beginning to live and function in a culture of distrust in the society, which is paradoxically conducive to the development of democracy, or counter-democracy, as Rosanvallon calls it. However, if it is to acquire real dimensions, i.e. citizens' distrust, it must become participatory, not only in its traditional aspect, but also in the unconventional form, which is often ignored when different ways of civic participation are analyzed. While we observe people's growing unwillingness to take part in elections, both in the world and in Poland, we should also emphasize that different forms of democratic influence, such as strikes, protests and petition signing, are becoming increasingly popular. In principle, it is these forms of participation that show the importance of distrust in the society. That is why it is difficult to disagree with the statements that the "passive citizen is a mythical figure," and that "while electoral democracy has been undoubtedly eroded, the democracies of expression, implication and intervention have developed and strengthened" (Rosanvallon, 2008, p. 19).

Therefore, what seemed to be the easiest way of gaining power – appealing to a part of social security – its welfare aspect – may become the beginning of the end of the winners of the last elections. If a party cannot keep its electoral promises, even if this happens due to objective reasons, a citizen who is poorly educated in the field of economy will assess the authorities for what they have failed to do.

After a few months since Law and Justice came to power, we find numerous examples of the above. Economic electoral promises have not been reflected in the decisions and actions of the ruling majority in Poland. On the other hand, its activity in the political sphere (changes concerning the Constitutional Court, mass media, civil service, etc.) has led to the erosion of democratic trust and has significantly contributed to the strengthening of social capital, the expression of which are unconventional kinds of participation in the form of social protests. While we agree with those scholars who assert that Polish people have poor economic competence, and thus often vote for the parties that offered the "best welfare package" in the election campaign, we also have to point

out that welfare proposals and the promises that the state will show more involvement in implementing them, have not made the society give up its freedoms and democratic rights. Thus, quite paradoxically, the part of the election manifesto which contributed to Law and Justice's success may also become the cause of its defeat in the next election.

There are two premises to support this thesis. Firstly, the condition of the finances of the state, which does not allow any forms of "distribution" and pandering to the economic "whims" of voters. Secondly, the steps made in the political sphere unambiguously show that election promises first of all served to "hide" political and cultural proposals. It was a very simple form of electoral manipulation, which, from a short-term perspective, must be deemed unsuccessful. It has led to the creation of networks that became the foundation of social capital which stood up for democracy. Thus, contrary to the expectations of political actors, "pre-election bread and circuses" served in the campaign before the parliamentary elections will be the basis for holding the authorities accountable. Putting emphasis only on the role of the state in shaping social security may be counter-effective.

### Bibliography

- Antoszewski A. (1997), *Forma rządu*, in: *Demokracje Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej w perspektywie porównawczej*, eds. A. Antoszewski, R. Herbut, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław.
- Antoszewski A., Herbut R. (eds.) (2007), *Systemy polityczne współczesnej Europy*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Chruściak R. (2009), *Prace konstytucyjne w latach 1997–2007*, Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warszawa.
- Cześniak M. (2007), *Partycypacja wyborcza w Polsce. Perspektywa porównawcza*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa.
- Głajcar R. (2015), *Demokratyczny reżim polityczny. Relacje między legislatywą i egzekutywą w III Rzeczypospolitej*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, Katowice.
- Głajcar R. (2016), *Polska*, in: *Niedemokratyczne wymiary demokratycznych wyborów*, ed. J. Szymanek, Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warszawa.
- Godlewski T. (2005), *Polski system polityczny. Instytucje – procedury – obywatele*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń.
- Grzybowski M. (2012), *System rządów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej: charakterystyka i diagnoza wątpliwości. Uwagi wprowadzające*, "Przegląd Prawa Konstytucyjnego", no. 1 (19).

- Gulczyński M. (2004), *Panorama systemów politycznych świata*, Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warszawa.
- Gulczyński M. Zaradny R. (2000), *System polityczny Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Wyższa Szkoła Zarządzania i Finansów, Wrocław.
- Heywood A. (2009), *Politologia*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Hix S. (2010), *System polityczny Unii Europejskiej*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Janicki M., Władyka W. (2017), *500 plus demokracja*, "Polityka", no. 38.
- Karpiuk M. (2012), *Zasady ustroju politycznego państwa w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, in: *Zasady ustroju politycznego państwa*, eds. M. Bożek, M. Karpiuk, J. Kostrubiec, K. Walczuk, Polskie Wydawnictwo Prawnicze Juris, Poznań.
- Kruk M. (2008), *Funkcja kontrolna Sejmu RP*, Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warszawa.
- Laska A., Nocoń J. (2005), *Teoria polityki: wprowadzenie*, Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej TWP, Warszawa.
- Leszczyński M. (2011), *Bezpieczeństwo społeczne Polaków wobec wyzwań XXI wieku*, Difin, Warszawa.
- Lipset S. M. (1995), *Homo politicus. Społeczne podstawy polityki*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Lisicka H. (2002), *Ewolucja reżimu politycznego w Polsce po 1989 r.*, in: *Demokratyzacja w III Rzeczypospolitej*, ed. A. Antoszewski, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław.
- Luhmann N. (1994), *Teoria polityczna państwa bezpieczeństwa socjalnego*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Markowski R., Czeźnik M., Kotnarowski M. (2015), *Demokracja, gospodarka, polityka. Perspektywa polskiego wyborcy*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa.
- Marszałek-Kawa J. (2012), *Pozycja ustrojowa i funkcje Sejmu Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej po akcesji do Unii Europejskiej*, Elipsa, Warszawa.
- Mołdawa T. (2007), *The Constitution of the Republic of Poland*, in: *The Political System of Poland*, ed. S. Sulowski, Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa, Warszawa.
- Montesquieu (1758), *The Spirit of Laws*, London.
- Pajdała H. (2001), *Komisje w parlamencie współczesnym*, Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warszawa.
- Piotrowski R. (2009), *Spory o konstytucję Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, in: *Demokracja w Polsce 2007–2009*, eds. L. Kolarska-Bobińska, J. Kucharczyk, Fundacja Instytut Spraw Publicznych, Warszawa.
- Rosanvallón P. (2008), *Counter-Democracy. Politics in an Age of Distrust*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ryszka F. (2002), *Historia – polityka – prawo. Wybór studiów*, t. II, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń.
- Sarnecki P. (2009), „Parlamentaryzacja” systemów rządowych w Polsce, Finlandii i Chorwacji w świetle przekształceń konstytucyjnych w tych krajach, in: *Insty-*

- tucje prawa konstytucyjnego w dobie integracji europejskiej*, eds. J. Wawrzyński, M. Laskowska, Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warszawa.
- Skrzydło W. (2002), *Ustrój polityczny RP w świetle konstytucji z 1997 r.*, Kantor Wydawniczy Zakamycze, Kraków.
- The Constitutional Act of 17 October 1992 on the mutual relations between the legislative and executive institutions of the Republic of Poland and on local self-government, Journal of Laws 1992, no. 84, item 426; amended: 1995, no. 38, item 184 and no. 150, item 729; 1996, no. 106, item 488, <http://libr.sejm.gov.pl/tek01/txt/kpol/1992a.html>.
- Turska-Kawa A. (2015), *Determinanty chwiejności wyborczej*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, Katowice.
- Zięba-Załucka H. (ed.) (1998), *Prawo konstytucyjne. Wybrane zagadnienia*, Fosze, Rzeszów.
- Żebrowski W. (2006), *Drogi porządkowania polskiej demokracji. Zagadnienia wybrane*, in: *Transformacje systemowe w Polsce i krajach postkomunistycznych. Studia i rozprawy*, ed. M. Chałubiński, Akademia Humanistyczna im. Aleksandra Gieysztor, Pułtusk.

---

## **Bezpieczeństwo społeczne jako czynnik ewolucji systemu politycznego w Polsce po wyborach parlamentarnych w 2015 roku**

### **Streszczenie**

W debacie publicznej dość często występującym problemem jest rola i zakres działań państwa w obszarze bezpieczeństwa społecznego. Związane to jest zarówno z postawą obywateli, jak i wykorzystywaniem hasel społecznych, szczególnie w kampaniach wyborczych. Można wręcz powiedzieć, że w trakcie walki wyborczej następuje pewnego rodzaju wyścig polegający na tym, które obietnice socjalne trafią do przekonania wyborców, dzięki czemu polityk/partia polityczna osiągnie sukces wyborczy. Tym samym, odwołując się do hasła bezpieczeństwa społecznego, manipuluje się danymi ekonomicznymi, ale przede wszystkim pozostawia się poza sferą refleksji wpływ obietnic wyborczych ze sfery społecznej (zazwyczaj zawężanej do socjalnej) na ewolucję systemu politycznego. Niewątpliwie jest on znaczny i bardzo często lekceważony, czego przykładem może być Rzeczpospolita Polska po 2015 roku.

**Słowa kluczowe:** polityka społeczna, system polityczny, wybory, parlament, Polska

