DEVELOPMENT OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL NON-COMMERCIAL ORGANIZATIONS IN GERMANY

Toshtemirova Xamida Nurullo qizi
2nd year master's student of University of Journalism and Mass Communications of Uzbekistan,
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
Scientific supervisor: Khikmatov Fatkhulla Khabibullaevich
doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Political Sciences
University of Journalism and Mass Communications of Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The article reflects the advantages of the non-governmental and non-commercial organizations in Germany, offering a conceptual analysis and some factors in the way they relate to the nonprofit sector in the context of the major characteristics of German society.

***Key words**: Non-governmental organizations, government, Germany, interest groups, political parties, nonprofit sector.*

АННОТАЦИЯ

Статья отражает преимущества неправительственных и некоммерческих организаций в Германии, предлагая концептуальный анализ и некоторые факторы их отношения к некоммерческому сектору в контексте основных характеристик немецкого общества.

***Ключевые слова:** Неправительственные организации, правительство, Германия, группы интересов, политические партии, некоммерческий сектор.*

INTRODUCTION

Currently, in many countries, various district reforms are being carried out in order to improve the social, political and economic situation of the state. In particular, The non-governmental and non-commercial organizations in countries are also a system aimed at improving the life of the population.

The definition of NGOs is an important question-as much for policy matters related to towards NGOs as for research. The fact that many international organizations in the past decades came under increasing pressure to widen the public participation in the form of consultation with NGOs makes a number of reasonable definitions available. Since NGOs to some extent are dependent on the funding of those international organizations, they work with (and sometimes they work against); for the international organizations or governments a reasonable working definition of NGOs was inevitable.[1]

Nowadays, NGOs, frequently due to the lack of private financial resources and support from the Government, tend to use project-based funding to fulfil society needs. NGO is a non-profit organization, independent from any governmental institution, based on voluntary activities in order to benefit community or it's certain groups, and its goals are not seeking for political power or exceptionally realization of religious goals.[2]

In Germany, NPOs, which are generally officially registered non-governmental organizations. Many of them go back more than 100 years of history. The modern German law on Public Organizations is based on encouraging and support for the activities of NPOs. Its recent amendments are intended to make it easier to carry out voluntary pro bono work. The recent amendments aim to facilitate the performance of voluntary pro bono work, because issues related primarily to the regulation of labor relations and the obligations of NPOs are not always easy to resolve.

The main part and its contents: The Role of NGOs in Political Decision-Making in Germany

To have a deeper understanding of the actual influence of NGOs, it is important to see their activity in the respective political system. While some predictions of the theory hold worldwide, like the better possibilities for small and homogenous interests (here NGOs) to organize, their activity is also shaped by the structural factors. In Germany, four channels of influence can be considered, namely, the influence of NGOs through co-operative federalism, through the election system, through the instruments of 'consensus democracy' and through outright lobbying. A first glance at the political system of Germany shows that the federal structure of Germany is of utmost importance for the understanding of NGO influence. The governing system of Germany consist of different administrative levels, namely; the federal government (Bundesregierung), the state government (Landesregierung), sub-state entities in the bigger states (Bezirksregierung with limited, mostly administrative function), the district level (Kreise and kreisefreie Stadte) and the local level (Stadt and Gemeinde). Especially the autonomy of the states and local authorities is the founding principle of Germany, as enshrined

in the constitution. Additionally, today many decisions are made on the supranational European level of governance.[3]

The other element in the German political structure important for the influence of NGOs is the election system and its influence on citizens' participation. As

mentioned above, the main component of the voting system is proportional representation. This vests the political parties with considerable power by deciding the voting lists they

decide. The voting list, contrary to the voting district, gives the parties the leeway for including outsiders who are not deeply rooted in one political voting district in the bid to gain a seat in Parliament. To some degree this gives the leeway for including outsiders, including members of NGOs, to exert influence. Especially for the large parties, candidates on the top of voting lists almost automatically gain the parliamentary seats, thus enabling the of minority parties gain the seats.[4]

In general terms, the nonprofit sector in Germany, how it developed and how it is conceptualized, is a history of why "state" and "society," "public" and "private" are not a zero sum. It shows that the dichotomy "association-centered" versus "state-centered" societies can be quite misleading. In Germany, the public and the private nonprofit sector developed sometimes in open conflict with each other, but often in a mutually reenforcing manner. In this sense, the structural/operational definition allows for a refined conceptual treatment of the interaction between government, public sector and nonprofit sector.[5]

List of Non-governmental organizations in Germany

There are 483 Non-governmental organizations in Germany as of December 1, 2024; which is an 2.53% increase from 2023. Of these locations, 475 Non-governmental organizations which is 98.34% of all Non-governmental organizations in Germany are single-owner operations, while the remaining 8 which is 1.66% are part of larger brands. The top three states with the most Non-governmental organizations are Berlin with 113 Non-governmental organizations, North Rhine-Westphalia with 97 Non-governmental organizations, Bavaria with 76 Non-governmental organizations. Average age of Non-governmental organizations in Germany is 5 years and 2 months.

Non-governmental organizations are also establishing a strong digital presence across various platforms: 95 have LinkedIn profiles, 258 have Facebook Pages, 215 are active on Instagram, 155 have X (formerly Twitter) handles, 12 are on TikTok, and 157 have YouTube channels. About 408 Non-governmental organizations have their own website and the remaining 75 don’t have their own website.[6]

In Germany, after the defeat of the democratic movement, the bureaucratic government of the Kaiserreich produced an authoritarian industrial society. As a

consequence, the central government determined social policy, and the German welfare state was established. In the long tradition of the union of churches and state, the conception of voluntary welfare was government-oriented or state-oriented. Voluntary associations functioned as non-governmental branches of the federal government's social welfare administration.

It was no accident that German voluntary welfare associations in the second half of the nineteenth century were also an outlet for the successful middle class (for a parallel in the United States, see McCarthy, 1982). Afraid of strikes, insurrections and civil disobedience, and with the purpose of creating the 'New Reich' of a united and strong Christian German nation, they strengthened their alliance with the central political power and the armed forces. The coalition of Protestants and central government was also committed to opposition against foreign countries and 'domestic enemies such as Jews and the Roman Catholic Church.

When the German Reich was created in 1871, the conflict between Bismarck and the Roman Catholic Church led to a struggle over the clerical control of education, and turned into a general attack on the independence of the Catholic Church. In a special sense, the KuIturkarnpf was a conflict between the central government and voluntary non-governmental activities on the role of voluntarism, and on responsibility in social affairs. Another major campaign against voluntary projects was Bismarck's legislation responding to the developing labour movement. In 1872, a law prohibited all Social Democratic, Socialist, or Communist societies and publications. [7]

To regulate cooperation at the local level, the German Association for Poor Relief and Charity -- the later German Verein for Private and Public Welfare -- was established in 1881 (Tennstedt, 1981a). The Verein was a 'narrow circle of personalities inspired with the necessity of a reform of poor relief' (Polligkeit, 1930, reprinted 1961,p.347). The clerical and government members of the Verein were engaged in spreading the Elberfelder System, a local system of private-public cooperation to enforce the principles of honorary office, individualisation and decentralisation (Sacht~e and Tennstedt, 1980).

During and after World War I, new umbrella organisations were established in Germany. Additionally, many youth organisations were established, which historically formed an individual branch alongside the German welfare associations (Bauer, 1990b). Excluded from the inner cirde of the established voluntary welfare associations, many proletarian and Communist organisations arose, such as the

International Workers" Assistance organisation, the Red Assistance organisation, and the Working Group of Socio-Political Organisations.

On 4 December 1926, the Protestant Innere Mission, the Catholic Caritas Federation, the Christian Workers' Relief Association, the German Red Cross, the Non-Denominational Welfare Association, and the Central Office of German Jews joined the League of Voluntary Welfare. They became 'publicly recognised' by the federal government. By this act, the labour movement's voluntary welfare organisations were excluded from government support and privileges, such as tax exemption. Another entitlement of 'public legitimation' was the governmental concession to carry out a nationwide fund-raising drive named the German Winter Relief Organisation.

The government's policy of 'public legitimation' was a tool to control social politics at the local level. While Social Democrats and labour unions demanded a local social welfare system, central government supported the established voluntary forces, especially clerical interests, to gain more influence at the local level by providing social services such as kindergartens, hospitals, reformatories, old people's homes, and so on.

In Germany, the situation after World War II called on welfare associations to organise emergency relief and assist the distressed population. The National Socialist Nation's Welfare Association and the German Red Cross were banned by the Allies. The Christian churches were supported by Western, especially American, relief organisations. Christian welfare associations were reorganised, and gradually the Weimar voluntary welfare system was rebuilt in the western sectors of Germany. With the exception of the Red Cross, the Communist welfare organisations and the Christian Workers' Relief Organisation, all traditional voluntary welfare associations were reassembled when the Federal Republic of Germany was founded in 1949. When West Germany became a NATO member in the 1950s, the German Red Cross was also established (see Bauer, 1986b). During the post-war period of economic reconstruction in West Germany, the role of voluntary welfare associations and their relationship to the federal government's social policy were reorganised on the model of the Weimar welfare state. [8]

According to the Association of German Foundations, today there are over 20,000 foundations in Germany to date, with an annual growth rate of about 4 per cent. According to a report published recently, more than one third of foundations in Germany were established within the last 10 years (Priller … Waitkus, 2013). The situation in the United Kingdom (UK) differs in various respects, one of which is that

more UK foundations are grant-making and organise their own projects than in Germany (Anheier, 2005), a contrast which is at least partly a result of different state funding models (Anheier & Daly, 2007, pp.18–19).

Before it is outline how new media has changed philanthropy, and community foundations in the UK and Germany in particular, it is necessary to take a closer look at how the scale and structure of the community foundation sector in the United Kingdom and Germany has developed over the last decades. Despite their overall similarities, differences between community foundations in the United Kingdom and Germany exist. For example, while community foundations in the United Kingdom tend to be established at a county level, community foundations in Germany tend to be created at a city level. Therefore, the financial asset size of community foundations in Germany is often much smaller compared with the asset size of community foundations in the UK. This stark contrast in asset size is also noticeable when comparing community foundations in other parts of the world. For example, the average grant making per community foundation is much higher in North America ($5,534,909) than in Europe ($269,646).

The number of individuals using the internet has risen in recent years and the number of people using social media platforms has increased substantially too. The number of social media users grew from nearly one billion users in 2010 to about 2.34 billion users in 2016, with an estimate of 2.95 billion active social media users by 2020 (EMarketer, 2017). Besides the fact that more people use social media platforms, they also spend a considerable amount of time using them. While users spent a daily average of 96 minutes on social media platforms in 2012, they already spent 118 minutes in 2016, an increase of nearly a quarter within four years (Statista, 2017).

As of April 2017, Facebook is the social network used most often worldwide. With almost two billion users, one in four people worldwide is using Facebook (see figure 2.4). The second most commonly used platform is YouTube, the video platform now owned by Google (Alphabet), with about one billion active users. WhatsApp, as well as Facebook Messenger, WeChat and QQ are messenger applications. Other popular networks such as Instagram, a popular social network now owned by Facebook, focuses on visuals, as do Tumblr and Pinterest. The share of internet users visiting social networking sites in the United Kingdom and Germany is 64 per cent and 41 per cent respectively (We Are Social, 2017). In the United Kingdom the social media platforms used most often in September 2017 were Facebook (71%), YouTube (52%), and Twitter (33%) (eMarketer, 2018). For Germany, the numbers are slightly different, as they are measured over a period of

one year (June 2017–2018), however, they show that internet users in Germany most frequently use Facebook (61.28%) followed by Pinterest (21.61%), and YouTube (6.83%) (StatCounter, 2018). With 4.49 per cent, Twitter only comes fourth. [9]

Moreover, the new social movements are influenced by the very same institutional andideological traditions of the German nonprofit sector in general. On one hand, the political myth of a state-free associateonalism as the locus of "true" democracy -- or Basis demokratie (basic democracy) -- was revitalized. On the other hand, through a new political party, the Grüne (Greens),parts of the movement became loosely linked to the "regular" party system. Other self-help groups that emerged as part of the new social movements became associated with one of the several large welfare associations (see below).According to Vilmar and Runge (1986), the estimated 35,000 self-help groups in the mid-1980s fall into six main fields of activity: unemployment, training, and employee-managed enterprises (40%); handicapped and health problems (28.7%); homeless, homosexuals, ethnic minorities, and delinquency (15.4%); the disadvantaged (11.9%); leisure, education and culture(2.9%); and neighborhood initiatives (1.3%). Thus, self-help groups contributed primarily to ease employment and health-related problems. Major Types of Organizations in the Nonprofit Sector Figure 1 offers a schematic representation of the principal types of organizations in the nonprofit sector. These types are the building blocks for the major systems that may either form conceptual equivalents or components to what we below will define as the German nonprofit sector: associations, public benefit organizations, communal economy, and organizations with no commercial character. The German legal system distinguishes between member-based and nonmember-based institutions. Among member-based forms, we separate private law associations (like a sports club) and public law cooperatives (a local savings and loan association)from commercial-law bodies, businesses and cooperatives (partnerships, limited liability companies, stock corporations), from public law corporations like some professional and business associations(notary chambers, chambers of commerce), and from some religious organizations. On the other side, among the nonmember-based forms, we separate foundations and trusts as endowed institutions from public law corporations as operating agencies such as universities, schools, public insurance funds, the Federal Post, and most radio and television stations. It is important to keep in mind that the notion of a nonprofit organization cuts across all the different types of legal institutions that German associational and corporate law treats as separate. Thus, the nonprofit sector includes organizations that vary greatly in terms of legal personality (public versus private),

taxation(commercial versus noncommercial), or financial structure (stock corporations versus tax-financed institutions versus endowments).[10]

Like in other countries, the different legal, tax, national accounting, social science and "street" usages produce a complex terminology. Each term focuses on a particular subset of nonprofits, and significant overlaps exist among the organizations included and excluded. But there are also important differences which reflect specific historical developments and how they, in turn, shaped the nonprofit sector. We will sketch these historical developments and describe how they influence both the nonprofit sector itself and they ways the sector is conceptualized and defined.

These factors are closely related to different principles which emerged in the complex course of the last two centuries of German history:

• the principle of self-administration or self-governance, originating from the 19th century conflict between state and citizens, allowed parts of the nonprofit sector to emerge and develop in an autocratic society, where the freedom of association had only partially been granted;

• the principle of subsidiarity, originally related to secular-religious frictions and fully developed after World War II, assigns priority to nonprofit over public provision of social services; this created a set of six nonprofit conglomerates ranking among the largest nonprofit organizations worldwide;

• the principle of Gemeinwirtschaft (communal economics), based on the search for an alternative to both capitalism and socialism, led to the cooperative movement and the establishment of mutual associations in the banking and housing industries.

In contrast to other European countries, the latent tension between the aristocratic and autocratic state on the one hand, and the emergent middle class, its political aspirations and associations, never lead to ultimate rupture, despite serious conflicts during the 19th century. Although the early associational initiatives in the 18th century were anti-status quo -- since their explicit purpose was to assemble people regardless of rank within the feudal order -- early cooperation between the state and associations soon developed. This was particularly the case when the interest of the feudal state and bourgeois coincided, e.g., in the areas of education, free trade and economic development (Nipperdey, 1976). Especially in Prussia, where the state became the main engine of modernization, an increasingly stable and more widely applied pattern of cooperation provided the seed for what was to become a major aspect of the nonprofit sector in Germany. The German nonprofit sector did not develop in antithesis to the state, but in interaction with it. This pattern led to the development of characteristic types of organizations that are located and understood in German society in ways different from what is implied in de Tocqueville's

dichotomy of state-centered versus association-centered society -- a dichotomy that does not apply to the German situation.[11]

Still more important, however, was the institutional form under which the legislation was administered, which until today has remained the model of collective risk protection in Germany. Again, self-government became the institutional mechanism to achieve two objectives at the same time: to maintain political control through a system of quasi-public service administration, and to integrate parts of the populations that might otherwise pose a threat to political legitimacy and stability. Social insurance corporations were independent bodies with boards of directors composed by representatives of the employers and the employees. Nonetheless, the self-administration was and still is subject to close state supervision and control. It is a repeated pattern of loose coupling between the state and quasi-independent agencies, a kind of state-controlled autonomy within a triangular setting: two sides with more or less antagonistic interests, plus the state as the neutral intermediator (Lehmbruch, 1982). This was to become the classic model of neo-corporatism as a pattern of German politics in general and of government-nonprofit relationships in particular (Seibel, 1990) [12]

It is important to note that the mere addition of NGOs does not necessarily lead to more political participation or higher economic efficiency. It would be necessary to make a clear distinction of responsibility between the state and interest groups, and this necessity is heightened in labour market, where wages are currently bargained autonomously. It is the third party (the state or, more precisely, the taxpayers) that has to bear the cost of higher unemployment in this context. The ordo-liberal idea of the 1930s and 1940s, where the founding fathers of Germany's Social Maket Economy enshrined the principles of freedom and responsibility on the cornerstones of a free society, showed be taken seriously. [13]

Furthermore, There are less NGOs, operating in Germany – according to Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, there are several thousand of NGOs working in the field of development – associations, action groups, federations, working groups, solidarity groups, twinning arrangements, foundations and development-policy networks. Also analyzing the number of NGO's permanent employees in Germany, it can be stated that it differs from other countries– the greater number (40%) of NGOs has 20 and more employees, 28% of them work with the help of around 10-20 members and 26% have 6-10 workers. [14]

The 19th century again saw in Germany the flourishing of political and social interest groups. The liberation wars against Napoleon led to the rise of students' corporations (Burschenschaften), fighting for the right of political freedom and

national unity. In the Biedermeier period (1820s to 1840s), the retreat of citizens from the illiberal states, nevertheless brought the flourishing of many cultural associations. The process of urbanization in the wake of industrial revolution, the political ramifications of the 'culture war' between the Prussian state and the catholic state, and the 'anti-socialist laws' led to the organization of two large groups, the Catholics and the worker class, in a variety of cultural and social organizations, many of which can be classified as NGOs in the modern sense, including the operational NGOs (for example, charities like the Kolping associations for journeymen) and advocacy groups (for example, the 'catheder socialists', a group of economics professors advocating social reforms).

All these groups not only played important role in the integration of the highly diversified states (Lander) into the new, unified Germany, but also achieved the integration of a number of minority groups caused by labour migration, for example the Poles in the Ruhr area.

The development of Western Germany after World War I1 was a completely different matter. Here, the new founding idea of ordoliberalism saw the state as providing a framework, in which voluntary actions by individuals and organizations could be carried out in a largely independent fashion (Privatrechtsgesellschaft). Private associations were seen as important supplements to the state. Following the principle of subsidiarity, the realm of the state should be restricted to those actions, which private associations and individuals fail to address. While this was the theory, the rise of associations in reality, especially in the field of social welfare, did not impede the parallel rise of the state in welfare matters. Indeed, the form of consensus democracy developed in Western Germany after World War 11, acilitating the growth of state and semi-public or private associations working in the field. Large self-help groups and associations with often enormous political powers and legal protection became the determinant for the 'Rhenanian model of capitalism' (Rheinischer Kapitalismus). In the 1970s however, the integrating power of traditional political parties, political organizations and welfare organizations was too weak to incorporate some of the newly arising groups, leading to a new wave of NGO development.~ First, they were often locally restricted and had mostly an environmental focus. 'Citizens' initiatives' (Burgerinitiativen) were negligible, often comprising no more than a dozen activists, and acted often according to the NIMBY principle. In the 1980s, however, they were integrated in larger groups, ultimately leading to the creation of an environmentalist party becoming a new power factor in German politics, integrating many of the so-called new social movements. The environmentalist concern as well as the peace movement had become large

movements challenging the established political system, until they were absorbed in the existing party structure. The rise of associations and interest groups, be they profit-oriented or NGOs, reduced the dynamism of the German economy by making decision-making more cumbersome and, drifting into the protection of special interests. Compromise became the ideal of German politics, most obviously in labour and social welfare issues. This led to social and political stability, as manifested in the lower number of strike days in Germany than its neighbouring states, and to a much reduced adjustment capacity of the economy and institutional sclerosis, most clearly in the labour market.

Today, Germany is known for the proliferation of NGO. Large organizations set their eyes on labour and welfare issues, political, cultural, environmental and leisure concerns. For the largest ones, in the field of social welfare, the definition as NGO, GO or semi-public organization is not easy. While non-profit oriented (for example, the large charities like Caritas or Arbeiterwohlfahrt), they provide thousands of jobs, ultimately paid for to a large extent by the tax payer.

As organizations, they resemble closely the large bureaucracies in administration they deal with. In Eastern Germany, after German unification the system of associations and NGOs is very similar. However, especially on the local level, the integrative power (for example, of church sponsored groups or the Red cross), which in Western Germany is large, is rather weak. Especially for young people, this leads to dis-orientation and a lack of value-oriented socialization, and often is attributed to the factors leading to relatively stronger political youth extremism in Eastern Germany.

New tasks for NGOs in Germany arise with new challenges confronting the society, where the state is obviously no longer able to grapple with them. This in voke a number of questions to be addressed in relation to the aging society, education, and social work. Short-term orientation in political engagement by the youth renders stable, permanent activities rather exceptional. New forms of ‘event politics’, as demonstrated by the notorious ATTAC, an anti-globalization network, are preferred among the youth. For charities, it becomes more and more difficult to find people willing to work for honorary posts (Ehrenamt). At the top, however, the large bureaucratic charities offer highly paid jobs, which encourage it, members to lobby for permanent protection and rents by the state. [15]

All interest groups, business organizations, trade unions or NGOs alike, have to cope with the problem of free-riding, because the impact of interest groups takes on to some extent, the characteristics of a public good, non-rivalry in consumption and non-e~cludability.~ Free riding can most easily be overcome in the case of small,

homogenous groups, where outsiders are easily identifiable. Large, heterogenous groups can, albeit some degree of difficulty, overcome the organizational rationality trap. Therefore, small groups like business firms generally prevail over large, heterogenous groups like taxpayers or consumers, when it comes to lobbying efforts, say, for the protection of markets. This is what Olson calls the 'logic of collective action'. It provides a more realistic and sobering view on the activity of interest groups. If only small, homogenous groups can effectively be organized, then the NGOs represented in a country not necessarily present the 'silent majority' of non-organized interests and indeed the influence of NGOs might be detrimental. [16]

For the regulation of businesses, which is often the goal of NGOs for those with consumer or environmentalist concern, public choice also found an amazing pattern, namely the advantages of regulated industries, which always meant an element of protection from the domestic intruders or foreign outsiders. In fact, public choice theoreticians argued, industry regulation was captured by the industries themselves, - as meant by it being called the 'capture theory of regulation' (see Stigler 1971 and 1972 and Winston/ Crandall 1994). Again, for the activity of NGOs this means that competition instead of additional regulation might be the solution to industry problems. This is especially true in relation to the large number of global NGOs which have recently discussed the effects of globalization and financial integration upon the welfare of people. Regulation rather is captured by a multitude of local and regional financial interests, which reduces the efficiency of markets and ultimately the development chances of people.

A brief review of theoretical models shows that the impact of interest groups, here, NGOs, cannot be said to be unequivocally beneficial for political systems. Much depends on the possibility of interest groups to engage in rent-seeking activities, leading to inefficiencies by re-distribution.8 Especially, the accumulation of interest group activities, which might, to a certain degree, be helpful to accumulate social capital ('trust') and smooth political decision making, might also lead to a gradual sclerosis of economic systems (for the example of Europe, see Seliger 2001).

The last influence channel of NGOs is outright lobbying, which exists in Germany and all other democratic states. The theoretical hypothesis that lobbying groups are represented asymmetrically came to hold true of the reality of lobbying in Germany. The result is that small, homogeneous and determined NGOs (for example, for specific environmental concerns) are given unproportionately large power in the political process to the detriment of consumers at large. [17]

CONCLUSION.

The role of NGOs in Germany can be said to have grown in number after the founding of the Western German state in 1949. Nurtured in a particular historical legacy, the associations set their footholds for steady growth and some of them have deviated to border on the semipublic nature, where they can no longer claim themselves to be NGOs in the true sense. NGOs are credited with their role in overcoming the dilemma of society produced by National Socialist dictatorship and in giving people the opportunity to shape their new identity. NGO's contribution to a new, coherent political structure cannot be overemphasized. However, there influence also gradually reduced the margin(sphere?) of freedom in the political system and made Germany a highly sclerotic giant in the heart of Europe. Market inflexibility, most importantly in the labour market, is the result of unrestrained interest groups.

It is important to note that the mere addition of NGOs does not necessarily lead to more political participation or higher economic efficiency. It would be necessary to make a clear distinction of responsibility between the state and interest groups, and this necessity is heightened in labour market, where wages are currently bargained autonomously. It is the third party (the state or, more precisely, the taxpayers) that has to bear the cost of higher unemployment in this context. The ordo-liberal idea of the 1930s and 1940s, where the founding fathers of Germany's Social Maket Economy enshrined the principles of freedom and responsibility on the cornerstones of a free society, showed be taken seriously. [18]

REFERENCES

1. From Civic Organization to NGOs in Germany: an Interest Group Analysis International Area Review Volume 6 , Number 1, Spring 2003 pp. 53-54.
2. PM World Journal Vol. 4, Issue 7 – July 2015 www.pmworldjournal.net
The importance of project management methodologies Tools in Non-Governmental Organizations: Case Study of Lithuania and Germany by Meda Keleckaite and Evelina Meilene pp. 30-32
3. From Civic Organization to NGOs in Germany: an Interest Group Analysis International Area Review Volume 6 , Number 1, Spring 2003 pp. 62-63.
4. From Civic Organization to NGOs in Germany: an Interest Group Analysis International Area Review Volume 6 , Number 1, Spring 2003 pp. 65.
5. Defining the Nonprofit Sector: Germany, Anheier and Seibel pp. 28.
6. https://rentechdigital.com/smartscraper/business-report-details/list-of-non-governmental-organizations-in-germany

7. Voluntary welfare associations in Germany and the United States: theses on the historical development of intermediary systems. Rudolph Bauer pp. 102-103
8. Voluntary welfare associations in Germany and the United States: theses on the historical development of intermediary systems. Rudolph Bauer pp. 105-108
9. Mediatization, Marketization and Non-profits: A Comparative Case Study of Community Foundations in the UK and Germany. Tobias Bürger Doctor of Philosophy School of Arts and Cultures February 2019 pp. 25-27
10. Defining the Nonprofit Sector: Germany, Anheier and Seibel pp. 9.
11. Defining the Nonprofit Sector: Germany, Anheier and Seibel pp. 1-3.
12. Defining the Nonprofit Sector: Germany, Anheier and Seibel pp. 5.
13. From Civic Organization to NGOs in Germany: an Interest Group Analysis International Area Review Volume 6 , Number 1, Spring 2003 pp. 68.
14. The importance of project management methodologies Tools in Non-Governmental Organizations: Case Study of Lithuania and Germany by Meda Keleckaite and Evelina Meilene pp. 6.
15. From Civic Organization to NGOs in Germany: an Interest Group Analysis International Area Review Volume 6 , Number 1, Spring 2003 pp. 56-59.
16. From Civic Organization to NGOs in Germany: an Interest Group Analysis International Area Review Volume 6 , Number 1, Spring 2003 pp. 61-62
17. From Civic Organization to NGOs in Germany: an Interest Group Analysis International Area Review Volume 6 , Number 1, Spring 2003 pp. 53-54.
18. From Civic Organization to NGOs in Germany: an Interest Group Analysis International Area Review Volume 6 , Number 1, Spring 2003 pp. 67- 68.