

Democracy Backsliding as a Danger of Sustainable Development in the Post-Pandemic Period: Social and Legal aspects of Decision

Oleg Tkach^{1*}, Oleh Batrymenko¹, Dmytro Nelipa¹, and Mykola Khylyko¹

¹Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Philosophical Faculty, 01033, 60 Volodymyrska Street, Kyiv, Ukraine

Abstract. The article considers topical issues of the threat of collapse of democracy. Examples of the democracy collapse have shown the lack of free and fair elections in the world, which threatens the independence of the judiciary, restrictions on the right to freedom of speech, which limits the ability of the political opposition to challenge the government, to prosecute, to offer alternatives to the regime. The collapse of democracy in connection with the spread of COVID-19 is being considered, as the democratic spectrum has repeatedly resorted to excessive control, discriminatory restrictions on freedoms such as movement and assembly, and arbitrary or coercive coercion. Attention is drawn to the fact that the outbreak of coronavirus COVID-19 has led to the introduction in all countries of restrictions on the rights and freedoms of the individual in order to prevent the spread of this infectious disease, declared a global pandemic by the World Health Organization. Thus, the unusual nature of the COVID - 19 coronavirus pandemic poses numerous dilemmas to the public, governments, parliaments, the judiciary, law enforcement and many other actors when it comes to the need for effective protection of health and, ultimately, human life, as well as adherence to and ensuring the fundamental democratic principles of man and society. Keywords: democracy, democratic backsliding, political regime, political crisis.

Introduction

The inconsistency of the course of postcommunist transformations with the postulates of the transitological paradigm and its reflection is analyzed in the works of Valerie Bans [1], Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan [2]; the critique of the shortcomings of the transitological paradigm by Thomas Carozers was analyzed [3]. Deviations from democracy are defined in the concept of "double transition" in the work of Adam Przeworski "Democracy and the market. Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America" [4], the concept of "triple transition" in the work of Klaus Offe "Capitalism through a democratic project? The Democratic Theory of the Triple Transition in Central and Eastern Europe" [5], the concept of the "Quarter Transition" in Taras Kuzio's "Transition in the Post-Communist States: Triple or Quadruple" [6], the concept of the "fourth wave" of Michael

* Corresponding author: tio19@ukr.net

McFaul's political transitions in the Fourth the wave of democracy and dictatorship: uncoordinated transitions in the postcommunist world" [7], in the hypothesis of the third reverse wave.

It is undeniable that the effects and long-term consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic are still unclear. One thing is sure: the impact (mostly negative) of the coronavirus on human rights and freedoms is highly significant.

In this aspect, the socio-cultural dynamics of the world, which in current conditions has taken the form of social and legal turbulence, highlights the problem of finding a political organization that would suit the majority of the population, corresponds to fundamental democratic principles, not violates them. On the other hand, States are expected to anticipate appropriate threats, be proactive, and take any appropriate action in advance, applying the so-called "prevention principle".

The application of quarantine restrictions in the aspect of counteracting the spread of coronavirus has repeatedly attracted the attention of scientists. It does not seem necessary, possible and expedient to list everyone's surnames. However, we highlight those whose works are exciting in the study of the issue. Thus, in particular N.O. Vasyuk studied the role and powers of local public authorities in ensuring the sanitary and epidemic well-being of the population [8];

Regarding the problems of observance and restriction of fundamental human rights in the context of preventing the spread of COVID-19, Joseph J. Amon (2020) studied the issue of preventing the spread of COVID-19 among prisoners in the context of ensuring their right to medical care [9];

In terms of research, A.S. Frost's article "Pandemic COVID-19: Threats and Opportunities for Democracy" [10].

The monograph of O.V. Banchuk also seems to be scientifically valuable. "International practice of quarantine restrictions on the rights and freedoms of the individual", in which she analyzes in detail the international practice of quarantine restrictions on the rights and freedoms of the individual [11].

However, despite the diversity of views, there are currently no comprehensive and comprehensive studies that would allow us to determine the specifics of this phenomenon's impact on democracy. It should be noted that ensuring the proper implementation of fundamental human rights during the COVID-19 pandemic requires a more in-depth analysis of the theoretical provisions and legal framework for establishing and implementing guarantees and restrictions on civil and political human rights in preventing the spread of COVID-19 in Ukraine. And the shortcomings of the anti-epidemic measures introduced in this regard, identifying the causes, conditions, and specifics of the destruction of democracy in a pandemic and finding ways to reduce the negative impact of the pandemic on democratic foundations.

Thus, all of the above makes the study extremely relevant. Most studies of the state of modern democracy begin with the thesis that after the end of the Cold War, it seemed that democracy was spreading. The collapse of democracy can take place in several ways: because the process is often led by democratically elected leaders who use "gradual rather than revolutionary tactics"; the process of return is manifested through "slow, barely noticeable steps"; through covert authoritarianism to describe the practice of an authoritarian leader (or potential authoritarian leader) who uses "imaginary legitimate legal mechanisms for anti-democratic purposes, concealing anti-democratic practices under the guise of law"; rejection or insufficient level of adherence to democratic rules of the game, denial of the legitimacy of political opponents, tolerance or encouragement, willingness to restrict the freedoms of opponents, including the media; manipulation of defamation laws, election laws or laws on "terrorism" as tools for persecuting and discrediting political opponents; use of democratic rhetoric as a distraction from anti-democratic practices, as a

manifestation of hidden authoritarianism; through authoritarian political culture as a factor contributing to the retreat from democracy [5].

Methodology

Due to the nature of the topic, various methods were used. Data on the effects of the pandemic on democracy were collected and systematized using the induction method. Based on these collected data, the results and recommendations were developed using the deduction method. Thus, in particular, the systemic approach provided an opportunity to consider the phenomenon of democracy as a whole and concerning the pandemic. It is due to a systematic approach that the relationship between the negative impact of the pandemic on the democratic foundations of the state and society becomes logical. The institutional approach is used to study the structures through which the state's activities are aimed at protecting the population from the adverse effects of the pandemic. The structural-functional approach made it possible to consider anticoronavirus policy as unquestionable integrity, a system with a complex structure, each element of which has a specific purpose and performs specific functions aimed at combating threatening manifestations and trends. The sociological approach aimed to determine the socio-political factors of the pandemic, the dependence of the functioning of democracy on the impact of the pandemic, the conditionality of political processes, as well as the impact on democracy of other processes caused by the pandemic.

The aim of the study is to determine the causes of the collapse of democracy in modern conditions, to analyze the causal links of the erosion of democracy under the influence of the pandemic, as well as to find possible ways to counteract this negative phenomenon. Democracy backsliding as a danger of sustainable development in the Post-Pandemic Period: social and legal aspects of decision.

3 Results and Discussion

At the same time, these scientific works mostly concern only general issues of protecting the population from epidemic diseases, without considering the current legal regulations and the practice of preventing the spread of COVID-19 in Ukraine. And the problem of destroying the foundations of democracy in terms of preventing the spread of COVID-19 has not yet received adequate coverage in domestic and foreign scientific literature, given the relatively recent emergence and ongoing pandemic, as well as the constant review of measures against Ukraine and other countries.

The use by most countries of restrictions on civil rights and freedoms at the level of martial law or a state of emergency has a complex dialectical nature. On the one hand, quarantine measures are taken for the benefit and benefit of humans - as the most effective means to reduce the occurrence of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which causes COVID-19 in a significant number of people.

On the other hand, quarantine severely restricts people's rights and freedoms, restricts their ability to work, earn an income and meet their basic needs. According to a group of American and British scholars, Thieme Fetzner, Lucas Hensel, Jones Herml, and Christopher Roose, the measures taken "affect civil liberties, erode social capital, and cause economic insecurity."

Domestic and foreign scholars have paid attention to problematic legal issues of national security in the field of health care and the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens. Yes, V.M. Pashkov studied the legal characteristics and classification of threats in health care from the standpoint of commercial law [13]. V.V. Borsch

considered the national health care system as a structural element of the national security of Ukraine [14]. G.I. Rybak studied the improvement of the population's quality of life as a factor in ensuring national security. However, Ringach drew attention to public health as a factor of national security [15]. M. Feinberg, L. Niada-Avshalom and B. Toebes studied human rights in national security and public health [16]. W. Golder and G. Williams drew attention to human rights and national security in the fight against terrorism [17].

"How will the coronavirus change democracy and governance around the world?" Under this name, on April 6, 2020, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace published its forecast. In their study, authors Frances Z. Brown, Saskia Brechenmacher and Thomas Carothers give a generally negative outlook for the development of democracy around the world. Experts note that "the pandemic arose at a time when democracy was already in danger in many places, which in turn threatens to increase the backlog of democratization and authoritarian consolidation."

At the same time, the authors believe that in some cases, the effective response of the state can strengthen confidence in the government, and the inability to hold elections can lead to the necessary innovations in their administration.

Similar to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, COVID-19's assessment of democracy's impact is provided by Spanish scholar Francis Amat et al. In their study, the researchers describe the results of a survey conducted on March 20-28, 2020 in Spain. These results indicate an increase in the widespread demand of Spaniards for solid leadership, a willingness to renounce individual rights and freedoms and a sharp increase in support for technocratic and authoritarian rule [19, p. 24].

Isolation of previously unresolved issues. Despite intensive democratization at the turn of the century, the role of democracy has not become leading. Therefore, research needs such aspects as the influence of civil society on the preservation of democratic values, institutional transformation, increasing the influence of innovation forces.

The problem of the collapse of democracy has a special place, because there are theoretical and methodological challenges: first, despite the diverse literature, there is a lack of theories to explain the deviation, and secondly, there are theoretical debates, for example, on the causes of democratic transition, democracy consolidations that remain unresolved. The methodological challenge involves measuring regime change. Democratic decline is accompanied by the weakening of political institutions, the process of peaceful transfer of power, changes in important components of democracy, such as violations of rights and freedoms.

Researcher Frances Z. Brown highlights a number of negative consequences of the coronavirus pandemic for democracy, namely: Centralization of power. Illiberal leaders have the opportunity to take advantage of the crisis to weaken checks and balances and destroy accountability mechanisms, thereby consolidating their power. In Hungary, for example, a new law allows Prime Minister Viktor Orbán to run the government indefinitely, without any parliamentary scrutiny. Restrictions on fundamental human rights. One of the clear trends is increased control over the media under the guise of combating "misinformation" about the virus. The Egyptian government recently forced a reporter from The Guardian to leave the country after asking about the official number of coronavirus cases in Egypt. Strengthened state supervision. In Israel and South Korea, governments use the location of smartphones to track citizens who could potentially be carriers of the virus. In Hong Kong, newcomers must wear electronic bracelets to track the whereabouts of individuals. Restriction of protests. There is a risk that governments may use the current need to restrict public gatherings as an excuse to combat the wave of anti-government protests that have swept global politics over the past few years. For example, in Algeria, where last year's protests pushed the government for some political reforms, the government banned all protests, marches and demonstrations. "Interruptions" in elections.

The pandemic threatens to disrupt electoral processes around the world. The United States has already delayed several early state-level voting, and candidates have stopped campaigning. Several European countries, including Italy, northern Macedonia, Serbia, Spain and the United Kingdom, have postponed national or local elections. Imbalance of civil-military relations. Responding to a crisis can change the balance of power between military and civilian authorities. In many countries, from Iran and South Africa to Israel and Peru, the military has been called in to help counter the pandemic by stopping people and in other ways. Pressure on civil society. The government's introduction of pandemic emergencies is exacerbating the already significant trend of shrinking space for civil society in many parts of the world. Extreme restrictions on movement, information gathering and confidentiality do not work in favour of civil society organizations. Resumption of the discussion "authoritarianism against democracy". The pandemic will put strong pressure not only on government agencies in the most affected countries, especially health care systems, but also on many other important government functions, from education and food supply to law enforcement and border control. The acute public health situation, coupled with insufficient government capacity, weak institutions, limited access to information and low public confidence in leaders (and consequent reluctance to adhere to health directives), may resume the debate on the benefits of authoritarian approaches to crisis management.

In contrast, a survey of Western European public opinion by French researcher Andre Blair points to some positive developments in citizens' attitudes toward democratic institutions and procedures. Researchers point out that people understand the need for these severe social restrictions and are willing to follow the will of the governments that have decided to apply them, at least in the short term. Scholars attribute this fact to the probability of citizens' awareness of such difficult government decisions, the priority of which is the health of vulnerable people, rather than economic interests [19, p. 10-11].

In general, agreeing with the researchers' conclusions on the impact of the COVID-19 coronavirus pandemic on the functioning of democratic institutions, we must note that the pandemic is an emergency situation that requires maximum mobilization of resources of states, international organizations and the public to save lives and health, which is the first task of democracy. The restrictive measures taken are inherently contrary to key democratic ideals, such as freedom, human dignity, the right to privacy, and violate the fundamental principle of the rule of law.

It is safe to say that the measures taken pose a potential threat to typical democratic procedures, as well as to the rights and freedoms of citizens. However, whether these threats will become a reality, whether they will be applied in a discriminatory manner, whether the government will become more authoritarian and people less free, whether there will be more censorship and less civil rights depends on many factors. We believe that the critical issue to be monitored in the near future is how bans will be lifted in the quarantine easing process or whether government officials will try to keep them indefinitely, with the opportunity to use them to their advantage.

Along with the possible threats, we believe that the pandemic will create several positive opportunities for democracy, as paradoxical as it may sound. In particular, objective preconditions will force the state, the expert community, and the public to accelerate the introduction of innovation processes in democratic procedures and institutions.

In our opinion, the pandemic can give impetus to a new round of development of e-democracy institutions. By analogy with business, education, finance, which is a pandemic implement remote forms of work and provide remote access to customers to their services, the sphere of public policy will undergo similar transformations. Accordingly, governments must learn to communicate with each other and with citizens using modern information and communication technologies without losing efficiency and without increasing costs. Thus,

the COVID-19 coronavirus pandemic should provide an impetus for innovation in electoral technologies and voting processes, public access to administrative services, e-government and other democratic institutions.

Yascha Mounk, an adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins University and a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, described Democracy on the Defense as optimistic about the spread of democracy worldwide. However, this confident optimism was inappropriate. Looking back, it is clear that it was naive to expect democracy to spread to all parts of the world. The authoritarian turn of recent years reflects the shortcomings of democratic systems. But they omit an important part of the picture. The history of the past two decades - is not just a story of the weakness of democracy; it also determines authoritarian capacity. According to official statements, the democratization of the world is proclaimed one of the main goals of U.S. foreign policy, but these statements are seriously criticized. This direction of foreign policy is due to the popular theory of the democratic world in the United States, which is mentioned in the speeches of leaders of both dominant parties. In the above-mentioned article Yasha Munch defined that the United States seeks to restore the role of "leader of the free world." Biden and his team have announced their intention to convene a summit of democracies to support democracies in combating the threats of autocrats, which will signal the U.S. commitment to democratic values. The problem is that the two main goals of the effort (detering the influence of powerful autocracies and preventing collapse in key democracies) often contradict each other [20].

Therefore, the American researcher J. Munch determines that in the coming decades there should be a long struggle between democracy and autocracy. Since the 1990s, autocratic regimes have advanced in terms of economic performance and military power. Leaders have learned to use digital tools to subtly suppress opposition movements. They repulsed democratic campaigns, significantly increased international influence, this is not only a retreat from democracy, but a revival of authoritarian regimes [20].

The result of this competition has not been determined. To win, the United States and its democratic allies need to understand the importance of these historic moments, working together to defend global democracy in creative, bold ways, unlike in the past. They will also need to resolve the dilemma arising from the contradictions between the two main goals: on the one hand, to stop retreats in their ranks, on the other hand, to support a united front against authoritarian regimes such as those in China and Russia. Addressing this dilemma requires a skilful approach that preserves the possibility of cooperating with countries that have questionable democratic principles of good faith while maintaining a close partnership for indeed democratic allies. It will also mean abandoning the "promotion of democracy" in favour of "protecting democracy" for security purposes. Yasha Munch stressed that the step in preventing the revival of the authoritarian regime is the reform of two prominent institutions of the liberal international order: the E.U. and NATO. The Americans and Europeans who created these bodies believed that their own countries would never have the collapse of democracy. As a result of this approach, these organizations do not have easy means to suspend membership or expel a member whose behaviour has changed. This is particularly problematic for the E.U., which requires its members to sacrifice a degree of sovereignty to join the bloc. It is sometimes complicated for national politicians to explain this to their constituents. Most E.U. countries do not address transnational issues, such as climate change or the impact on world politics. Because these countries uphold democracy, the rule of law, and the renunciation of a degree of independence, allowing them to promote common democratic values. However, the increase in the number of authoritarian leaders in the E.U. (Hungary, etc.) undermines the legitimacy of the bloc. It is crucial to resolve this contradiction, and the E.U. is facing a legitimacy crisis that current institutions cannot resolve. This requires political capital, diplomatic pressure, legal, organizational rethinking.

In an article on the collapse of democracy in 2018, researchers L. Janetti (Licia Cianetti), James Dawson and Seán Hanley argued that the emergence of populist movements in Central and Eastern Europe, such as "Babiš ANO" in the Czech Republic, is "Potentially ambiguous phenomenon, formulating real social needs in political reform, putting the issue of effective governance in the spotlight" [21].

In a 2019 document presented by the International Association of Political Psychologists, Sean Rosenberg argues that right-wing populism exposes the vulnerability of democratic structures and that "democracy is likely to consume itself."

Researchers are determining the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the collapse of democracy. Many national governments have postponed or cancelled democratic elections at both the national and subnational levels due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which has identified gaps in democratic practices.

Thus, the local elections in the U.K. in 2020 were postponed for a year. At the beginning of the crisis, U.N. experts recommended appropriate measures to the government, which were "necessary and non-discriminatory" [24].

The collapse of democracy through a pandemic is a unique deviation from democracy associated with national crises. This happens when leaders impose authoritarian rules during a state of emergency, the crisis in the country, or remain in place after the situation improves. This happened in several countries during the coronavirus pandemic.

According to the V-Dem Institute, only 39% of all countries did not commit minor violations of democratic standards in response to Covid-19 [25].

Even though liberal democracy was defended and experienced an increase in the number of autocrats and authoritarian regimes in many parts of the world until the first death from the coronavirus in December 2019, the pandemic affected the collapse of democracy [26].

Given that COVID-19 spread worldwide in early 2020, the global decline in freedom has intensified [27].

The outbreak exposed the weaknesses of all components of democracy, from elections and the rule of law to extremely disproportionate restrictions on freedom of assembly and movement. Democracies and autocracies have had successes and failures in the fight against the virus itself, although citizens in authoritarian states have lacked the tools to confront them. After all, the changes caused by the pandemic have left many societies (with different regimes, incomes and demographics) in worse political situations, with more pronounced racial, ethnic and gender characteristics of inequality, vulnerable to long-term consequences. Transparency has been one of the most affected aspects of democratic governance. National and local officials in China have diligently blocked information about the outbreak, including through mass arrests of Internet users who shared the information.

In December, journalist Zhang Zhan was sentenced to four years in prison for reporting Wuhan as the initial epicenter. The Belarusian government has been actively downplaying the seriousness of the pandemic to the public, which has refused to take action, while the Iranian regime has concealed the real victims of the virus. Some repressive governments, including Turkmenistan and Nicaragua, have ignored reality and denied the presence of the pathogen in their territory. More open political systems have also experienced significant problems with transparent information.

At the presidential, state level, U.S. officials provided fictitious data and actively spread misinformation about the transmission and treatment of coronavirus, leading to confusion and politicization of what was to become a health issue. Similarly, Brazilian President Jair Bolsonaro has repeatedly promoted untested treatments that have cast doubt on the usefulness of masks and vaccines.

Governments have also deployed surveillance measures, which have often been of dubious value to public health and have a limited number of precautionary measures

against abuse. However, beyond their effects, in 2020, official responses to COVID-19 laid the groundwork for government excesses that could affect democracy. As in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, as the United States and many other countries dramatically expanded their oversight and restriction of the right to national security, the COVID-19 pandemic led to changes in regulations and problematic legislation that would be difficult to repeal once overcome. Virus. For example, emergency measures were taken in Hungary, which allowed the government to issue decrees, even though coronavirus cases were insignificant. Among other abuses of these new powers, the government withdrew financial aid from municipalities led by opposition parties. Motivation for better executive power and increasing the level of authority contributed to the gradual concentration of power of Prime Minister Viktor Orban [26].

In Algeria, President Abdelmadjid Tebboune took office due to tightly controlled elections after the authoritarian leader Abdelaziz Bouteflika, who resigned under public pressure, banned all mass activity and assembly. Even when other restrictions were eased in June, the ban on rallies remained, authorities stepped up arrests of pro-democracy activists. Many of the arrests were based on the April amendments to the Criminal Code. The amended code increased convictions for defamation and criminalized the dissemination of false information.

Indonesia has approached the military and other security forces as crucial players in the pandemic. Much military personnel have been assigned to leadership positions in the country as a COVID-19 task force, and the military has provided significant support for the development of ambulance hospitals and the provision of medical supply services.

The collapse of democracy occurs when the components of democracy are threatened, due to the lack of free and fair elections, rights to freedom of speech, associations; bureaucratic constraints of the government, for example, when there is a threat to the independence of the judiciary, which limits the ability of the political opposition to challenge the government, to demand responsibility, to offer alternatives to the regime.

A 2020 study using the World Values Survey found that proponents of cultural conservatism were the ideological group most open to authoritarian rule in Western democracies. In English-speaking Western democracies, which are "based on the protection" of relations, cultural conservatism and left-wing economic views, which supported authoritarian regimes, are combined.

Stephen Haggard and Robert Kaufmann identify three critical reasons for the collapse of democracy: "the effects of polarization; restructuring of party systems, which allows elected autocrats to gain legislative power; the gradual nature of the retreats, which divides the opposition, throws off-balance".

The COVID-19 crisis is an alarm signal, an urgent warning that freedoms are under threat. Democracy is now under threat, and people who care about it must show the will, discipline and solidarity to protect it. The freedom, health and dignity of people around the world are at stake. The essence of the public interest in a pandemic is the need to save people's lives and restore their health. In view of this, the legislature has the right to establish rules of conduct for all subjects of law, including those that restrict human rights and freedoms.

Democracy has suffered new losses in the fight against authoritarian supporters, shifting the international balance in favor of authoritarianism. Incumbent leaders are more likely to use force to remove opponents and settle accounts, ostensibly for health care, while activists, lacking effective international support, have faced severe sentences, torture or assassination in various circumstances, and a decline in global freedom. Waves of false information were generated. There was a misconception that democracy was declining because it could not solve people's problems and needs.

Prospects for further research of the scientific problem: a number of problems related to the process of obtaining administrative services by citizens remain unresolved, which should be addressed not only at the local but also at the national level. Therefore, the elimination of the above problems requires a comprehensive approach, namely: the adoption of new regulations and improve existing ones in order to simplify the procedure for obtaining administrative services; creation of remote workplaces and mobile offices in order to ensure the availability of administrative services for the population not only in large settlements, but also throughout Ukraine.

Conclusions

Democracy is not just a cherished ideal but a phenomenon that is the public administration system best suited to overcome the crisis of scale and complexity of COVID-19. Only through democracy can societies strengthen the social trust that allows them to continue to live in a crisis, maintain national resilience in the face of difficulties, resolve profound differences in society through full participation and dialogue, and maintain confidence that the return will be shared and the rights of all citizens will be respected and guaranteed.

The impact of the COVID-19 coronavirus pandemic on the functioning of democratic institutions shows that the pandemic is an emergency that requires maximum mobilization of state resources. A proper and effective anti-crisis policy of the state is essential for overcoming or at least reducing the negative impact of the pandemic on democracy. No less important is that the Ukrainian government must also actively care about security - much more than in those countries where there is no war. Especially since many citizens are vigilant to ensure that it does not make significant concessions to the enemy, and in a pandemic, their vigilance has only increased. In contrast to the selfish allegations of authoritarian propaganda, credible and information-based flows of strategic options, voluntary self-organization of civil society, and open interaction between government and society are all vital tools in the fight against a pandemic. Only with the help of democracy can an independent civil society be allowed to establish partnerships with state institutions. Only through democracy can society ensure a sustainable balance between competing needs and priorities - between fighting the spread of the virus and protecting people's civil and political rights in accordance with constitutional guarantees.

The consequences of the coronavirus pandemic's impact on democracy are centralization of power; restriction of fundamental human rights; enhanced state supervision; restriction of protests; "Interruptions" in elections; imbalance of civil-military relations; pressure on civil society; resumption of the discussion "authoritarianism against democracy". The pandemic crisis has stimulated the demand for the involvement and use of digital technologies in various spheres of society and the state.

Pandemic Crisis management involves assessing the appropriate duration of the quarantine regime, taking into account all identified risks and ensuring appropriate adaptation of crisis measures, in particular: creating a multilevel risk management system and improving strategic planning and analysis as essential elements of crisis management and decision-making. Rights and freedoms of citizens; providing society with the necessary support to prevent the irreversible negative consequences of a pandemic, etc. With the spread of COVID-19, the democratic spectrum has repeatedly resorted to excessive control, discriminatory restrictions on freedoms, such as movement and mass assembly, and arbitrary or coercive coercion to such restrictions.

References

1. V. Bunce, *World Politics*, **55(2)**, 167-192 (2003).
2. J. Linz. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 26, 1996).
3. Th. Carothers, *Journal of Democracy*, **13(1)**, 5–21 (2002).
4. A. Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America* (Cambridge, 1991).
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139172493>
5. C. Offe, *Social Research*, **71(3)** (2004).
6. T. Kuzio, *Politics*, **1(3)**, 168–177 (2001).
7. M. McFaul, *World Politics*, **54 (2)**, 212–244 (2002).
8. Н. О. Васюк, *Інвестиції: практика та досвід*, **20**, 89–93 (2010).
9. J. Amon, *Health and Human Rights Journal*. URL: <https://www.hhrjournal.org/2020/03/covid-19-and-detention-respecting-human-rights>.
10. А.С. Мороз, *Пандемія COVID-19: загрози та можливості для демократії*. URL: <https://dspace.nau.edu.ua/bitstream/NAU/43315/1/2020.05.01%20COVID-19.and.democracy.Moroz.pdf>
11. Банчук-Петросова О.В. *Міжнародна практика карантинних обмежень прав та свобод особи*. URL: http://pravoisuspilstvo.org.ua/archive/2020/5_2020/36.pdf
12. T. Fetzer, L. Hensel, J. Hermle, Ch. Roth, *arXiv Working Paper*. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.03848> (2020).
13. В.М. Пашков, *Підприємництво, господарство і право*, **12**, 134–137 (2007).
14. V.V. Vorshch, *Науковий вісник Ужгородського національного університету. Серія «Міжнародні економічні відносини та світове господарство»*, **23(1)**, 19–23 (2019).
15. Н.І. Рыбак, *Потенціал економіки країни: сучасний стан, розвиток та управління*, **6**, 44–45 (2016).
16. M. Feinberg, L. Toebes, *The International Journal of Human Rights*, **19(4)**, 383–387 (2015).
17. B. Golder, G. Williams, *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, **8 (01)**, 43–62 (2006).
18. F. Amat, A. Arenas, Albert Falcó-Gimeno, Jordi Muñoz, *Pandemics meet democracy: Experimental evidence from the COVID-19 crisis in Spain* (University of Barcelona, 2020) URL: <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/dkusw/> (2020).
19. Y. Mounk, *Democracy on the Defense*. *Foreign Affairs* (2021). URL: www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-02-16/democracy-defense
20. L. Cianetti; J. Dawson, *East European Politics*, **34 (3)**, 243–256 (2018).
21. S. Rosenberg. *Democracy Devouring Itself: The Rise of the Incompetent Citizen and the Appeal of Right-Wing Populism* (eScholarship, University of California, 2019).
22. *Democracy under Lockdown*, in Freedom House, 28 January (2021).
23. *English local elections postponed over coronavirus*, in BBC News, URL: <https://www.v-dem.net>. 13 March (2020).
24. *Pandemic Backsliding V-Dem*, URL: <https://www.v-dem.net>. (2021).
25. OHCHR. COVID-19. 2021: States should not abuse emergency measures to suppress human rights - UN experts. - Mode of access: <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=2572>

26. Democracy under Siege. Freedom in the world 2021. Highlights from Freedom House's annual report on political rights and civil liberties, [tps: // www . freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2021-02/FIW2021_World_02252021_FINAL-web-upload.pdf](https://www.freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2021-02/FIW2021_World_02252021_FINAL-web-upload.pdf). (2021).
27. World Values Survey. WVS Database, [https:// www. Worldvaluessurvey. \(2020\)](https://www.worldvaluessurvey.org).