

**Civil society in transition:
The East German third sector ten years after unification**

Civil Society Working Paper 15

Helmut K. Anheier, Eckhard Priller and Annette Zimmer

December 2000

Abstract

This paper examines two competing views that have been put forward about the East German third sector. One view sees the third sector in East Germany as an expression of civil society, rooted in an emerging democratic culture, and based on a broadening social participation. According to the other view, the East German third sector is largely an extension of West German organisations that, in the process of “peaceful colonisation,” created “organisational shells” without a corresponding “embeddedness” in local society. The paper suggests that the way the policy of subsidiarity has been implemented in Germany may help account for such competing interpretations: subsidiarity has created tendencies toward a bipartite third sector, with each part differing in size, scope and financial structure. One part is relatively well funded and state-supported, the other characterized by small organisations and membership orientation. The unification process has amplified these tendencies, which, in the context of public austerity budgets, are having repercussions on the system of financing non-profit organisations as a whole. Thus, compared to other countries in Central and Eastern Europe the emerging third sector in East Germany is unique.

Acknowledgements

This is an English version of a paper which appeared in German: Zimmer, A., Priller, E., and Anheier, H. (1997): Der Nonprofit-Sektor in den neuen Bundesländern: Kontinuität, Neuanfang oder Kopie. *Zeitschrift für öffentliche und gemeinwirtschaftliche Unternehmen*, 20(1), 58-75.

About the Authors

Helmut Anheier is Director, Centre for Civil Society, London School of Economics and Political Science; Eckhard Priller is at the Social Science Research Center, Berlin; and Annette Zimmer is Professor of Social Policy and Comparative Politics at the Institute for Political Science, University of Münster, Germany.

Helmut K. Anheier: Email: H.Anheier@lse.ac.uk; Tel: +44 (0)20 7955 7360; Fax: +44 (0)20 7955 6039

Eckhard Priller: Email: Priller@medea.wz-berlin.de; Tel: +49 (0)30 25491 362; Fax: +49 (0)30 25491 360

Annette Zimmer: Email: Zimmeran@uni-muenster.de; Tel: +49 (0)251 296 924; Fax: +49 (0) 251 832 9356

Correspondence should be addressed to Dr Helmut K. Anheier, Centre for Civil Society, LSE, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, United Kingdom.

**Civil society in transition:
The East German third sector ten years after unification**

Helmut K. Anheier, Eckhard Priller and Annette Zimmer

CONTENTS

1 Introduction	1
2 Competing views	1
3 Emerging civil society, growing third sector	2
4 Lack of civic engagement	4
5 Institution transfer	4
6 A paradox?	6
7 Conclusion	9

Civil society in transition: The East German third sector ten years after unification

Helmut K. Anheier, Eckhard Priller and Annette Zimmer

1 Introduction

In recent years, the development of the third sector in the former Eastern Block countries has attracted special attention by policy-makers and analysts alike. Has the sector become an integral part of civil society, or is it still functioning as a proxy of state institutions (Anheier and Seibel, 2000; Lehmbruch, 1994)? A decade after the crumbling of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), these two questions are still being discussed (Wollmann, 1995; Seibel, 1997): On the one hand, the “pacifist revolution,” the grass-roots movement of 1989, and the booming of new non-profit organisations in the early 1990s are taken as evidence of the high acceptance and “embeddedness” at local levels (Benzler, 1995). On the other hand, the development of the East German third sector is primarily attributed to a massive institutional transfer of West German non-profit organisations into East Germany. According to this view, the third sector in East Germany, merely a blueprint of the West German model, has not become “embedded” in the civil society of the new states or *Länder* (Lehmbruch, 1994; Seibel, 1997).

2 Competing views

In the former GDR, a third sector did not exist independently of the ruling state ideology. However, closely related to “mass social organisations” (*gesellschaftliche Massenorganisationen*) were many member-serving clubs that fulfilled functions similar to those of non-profit organisations in market economies, particularly in the fields of welfare, social services, sports, culture and recreation. Those organisations provided goods and services for their members as well as for a limited public (Anheier and Priller, 1991). The same holds true for quite a number of clubs funded and run by state-owned enterprises.

After the breakdown of the Socialist Unity Party (SED) and the East German regime, local activists used their newly-won freedom, and clubs and voluntary organisations mushroomed particularly in those fields which had not previously been tolerated by state ideology. Cases in point are activities associated with the new social movements such as environmental groups, pacifist groups and solidarity groups. Based on this initial crop of voluntary associations, East Germany has been able to build an institutional infrastructure capable of supporting and stabilising a local civil society independent of the state. According to this argument, the third sector in the new *Länder* is not only based primarily on member-serving organisations and clubs in the fields of recreation, sports and culture, but also on advocacy groups principally pursuing political objectives.

According to the competing view, the third sector in former East Germany is predominantly shaped by West German organisations that have extended their scope of activity into “Eastern territory.” Supporters of this

argument make several points. First, due to the long years of dictatorship, East Germans have no experience in self-organisation and volunteering. Second, the central associations of the West German third sector have taken advantage of unification to expand their business activities. The Federal Government supported the implicit strategy of so-called “peaceful colonisation” for political and financial reasons in order to smooth the integration of the new *Länder* into the Federal Republic. Particularly in the fields of health and social services, a significant amount of public money has been transferred to West German non-profit organisations for setting up infrastructure and for providing services in the new *Länder* (Olk, 1996).

Interestingly, empirical evidence exists to back up either of these two seemingly contradictory theses. Whereas data taken from the Johns Hopkins Comparative Non-profit Sector Project (Anheier et al, 1997) seem to suggest that the third sector in East Germany is an integral part of civil society, polls and population surveys reveal a low profile of civic culture in East Germany (Priller, 1994, 1997; Seibel, 1997). Whereas some surveys indicate a lower degree of financial state-dependency among East German non-profit organisations when compared to the West (Anheier et al, 1997), other studies emphasise the dominant position of West German non-profit organisations in the former GDR (Angerhausen et al, 1995).

3 Emerging civil society, growing third sector

Can the term third sector be used in the context of the former GDR (Anheier and Priller, 1991, p. 80)? There is no simple answer to this question. Even though the constitution of the GDR guaranteed its citizens the freedom to associate, all organisations—political parties, trade unions or voluntary organisations—had to submit to SED supremacy. Consequently, local organisations had to join one of the “mass social organisations” such as the Free German Youth (FDJ), with 2.3 million members, the *Kulturbund* cultural association, with 260,000 members, or the *Demokratischer Frauenbund* (Democratic Women’s Association) with 1.5 million members (Priller, 1997).

There were about 90 such “mass social organisations” in the former GDR, representing the character and objectives of the socialist system, and playing an important role in disseminating the ideology of the ruling SED. On a limited scale however, those organisations also functioned as mediators for various types of interest groups. At the same time, they, along with the system of state-owned enterprises, offered social services and leisure activities. For example, they ran kindergartens and day nurseries, and provided facilities for sports and cultural activities. In their daily routines, however, these clubs operated much like non-profit organisations: there were volunteers, and the organisations themselves were supported by dues and private donations as well as by funds from the government. In other words, in the former GDR, particularly at the local level, there were *de facto* non-profit organisations, but no third sector as such existed that was independent from state control and party ideology.

With the breakdown of SED rule, both the context and the basic conditions of these organisations, clubs and groups changed radically. Some were legally transformed into registered association, others reorganised or

dissolved. Importantly, the transformation of “old” state-controlled quasi-non-profit entities into a “new” private legal form coincided with the founding of many non-profit organisations of many kinds to create a veritable “association boom” (see Hürtgen et al, 1994; Heinemann and Schubert, 1994). This burgeoning of associations is reflected in the number of associations registered with the local county courts (table 1). Many of these new associations, however, were small and financially weak (Baur et al, 1995; Jaide and Hille, 1992). After an initial spurt in 1990 and 1991, the number of new creations leveled off and seemed to stabilise somewhat. Only in Berlin, which now includes both parts of the city, has the number of new associations increased, in large part due to the fact that many national associations establish Berlin offices to operate in the new capital.

Table 1: New entries in selected registers of associations, 1990-1998

Register of associations (Location of county court)	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998
A. Länder Capitals					
Berlin*	509	1 566	1 122	867	911**
Dresden	1 237	209	495	195	213
Erfurt	536	141	155	127	103
Magdeburg	554	139	146	91	88
Potsdam	469	248	220	138	n/a
Schwerin	287	178	76	85	68
B. Other (1 industrial region, 2 rural areas):					
Görlitz	284	21	44	25	n/a
Malchin	81	22	29	10	n/a
Teterow	54	8	15	13	7

*Includes some West Berlin-based associations; ** 1997

Source: Register of Associations 1990-1998

Results of the representative survey of non-profit organisations in 1992 portray a sector embedded in the civil society of the new *Länder* (Priller, 1997). In the fields of culture, sports and recreation, most public institutions have been replaced by non-profit organisations. Smaller organisations with limited financial resources now dominate the sector. Their main source of income is membership dues, with public money playing only a minor role. Exclusively volunteers run the majority of the organisations.

The results of a similar survey carried out five years later, in 1997, display a clear picture of an increasingly confident sector dominated by clubs and member-serving organisations (Priller and Zimmer, 1999). Nearly nine (88%) out of ten organisations see themselves as the “social glue that hold society together,” three quarters (73%) feel that their importance will increase in the future, and 70% expect that their responsibilities are likely to increase in the future. In other words, the large majority of those surveyed attribute an important role to their organisations. Of course, while they may not be optimistic about public sector funding and financial matters more generally, East German non-profit organisations seem to have carved out important political and social space for themselves.

In economic terms, the growth of the third sector in East Germany is indeed impressive. In 1990, the third sector in West Germany was with 3.9% of total employment in relative terms nearly four times larger in relative terms than its East German counterpart. By 1995, the difference had all but disappeared: the third sector in both East and West Germany accounts for 4.9% of total employment (Priller et al, 1999)!

Moreover, Priller (1999) estimates that the associational density in East Germany is with 650 associations per 100,000 population at about the same level as in West Germany; at the same time, however, membership rates in East Germany continue to be lower, particularly in local sports clubs (West: 27% / East: 12%) and other cultural and recreational associations (22% versus 14%). What is more, membership rates in East Germany have not changed much since 1990, with the exception of union membership, which declined from 46% of the adult population to 13% by 1998 (Priller, 1999). Moreover, compared to West Germany, there are very fewer associations in small towns and in the countryside (Priller, 1994, p. 351). Particularly in the countryside, voluntary organisations and clubs are struggling with an eroding membership base (Heinemann and Schubert 1994:82), leading some analysts like Seibel (1997) to view the development of civil society in East Germany rather sceptically, comparing the situation to state created communities such as the Potempkian villages in traditional Russia constructed on the ruins of state socialism.

4 Lack of civic engagement

Thus, according to the findings of regular population surveys, the level of participation in social activities in East Germany is still below that of the West. For example, the percentage of people who are members in at least one voluntary organisation is 50 percent in the old, but only 26 percent in the new *Länder* (Zimmer, 1996a, pp. 92-113). The bad economic situation and the development of the labour market are considered responsible for this trend. In the former GDR most women were members of a trade union, where membership was frequently linked to social service provision such as childcare. Since post-1990 unemployment figures are higher among women than among men, the participation rate of women in trade-union related voluntary associations has declined dramatically, pushing overall membership rates downward. Compared to the Western part of the country, East Germans are far less engaged in volunteering. In 1994 only nine percent of East Germans volunteered at least once a month, while the corresponding figure for West Germany is over 15 percent (Priller, 1997).

Seen against these data, the third sector in East Germany seems based on a weak foundation. A low degree of social engagement at local levels is aggravated by the advantages that West German non-profit organisations have enjoyed in the process of unification, as will become clear when we look at the massive institutional transfer from West to East.

5 Institution transfer

Apart from a few exceptions, the legal and institutional system of the Federal Republic was transferred to the former GDR. This included the principle of subsidiarity, which underlies the country's social welfare

legislation (Anheier, 1992). The principle of subsidiarity, grounded in Catholic social thought, assumes that the state should only undertake direct responsibility in social issues if smaller entities, such as voluntary organisations or the family, cannot adequately meet local demand.

The principle of subsidiarity assigns fundamental importance to the third sector, while at the same time guaranteeing it public support, both politically and financially. Since World War II, the principle of subsidiarity has become the cornerstone of the German welfare state: social services are not primarily provided by state institutions but by non-profit organisations (Anheier, 1992, 1997; Zimmer, 1999). Therefore, the principle of subsidiarity describes a special form of third-party government: About 70 percent of the German third sector is financed by public money (Anheier, 1997; Salamon and Anheier, 1997). In other words, the principle of subsidiarity ensures state support of the third sector in Germany.

Apart from the supply of goods and services, the private-public partnership guided by the principle of subsidiarity also includes agenda setting and policy formulation. The German third sector is highly structured and vertically integrated. Significantly, almost every non-profit organisation in Germany is a member of a “peak” association (*Dachverband*), i.e., nationally representative bodies like the Catholic *Caritas*, the Protestant *Diakonie*, the Workers’ Welfare Association, the Red Cross, or the German Sports Association (*Deutsche Sportverband*), with several million members (Heinemann and Schubert, 1994). These peak associations form the “nodes of the policy network” that characterise the neo-corporatist way of policy-making and implementation in Germany, whereby state, private interests, and public administration are linked at various, overlapping levels (Katzenstein, 1987, p. 35).

The peak associations of the German third sector are not only politically important, they are also “big business”. This is especially true for the welfare associations in the fields of health and social services, which together run more than 80,000 institutions with over 900,000 employees (Rauschenbach and Schilling, 1995, pp. 330, 336). For the welfare associations unification offered a good chance to enlarge their “business” and to expand activities into the territory of the former GDR. The lobbying of the West German welfare associations was very successful, as political forces from East Germany played only a small role in the process of unification. Moreover, the drafting of the unification treaty was highly centralised and carried out exclusively under the control of the Department of the Interior of the Federal Government in Bonn. The unification treaty in Articles 32, 35 and 39 explicitly confirms the principle of subsidiarity for the fields of health and social services.

Legitimised by the principle of subsidiarity, Federal government funds were provided for the organisation and consolidation of the third sector in the new *Länder* during the post-unification period. Non-profit organisations active in the fields of health and social services received the biggest portion of the funds. In accordance with the unification treaty, they also received public money to build new infrastructure (Sozialpolitische Rundschau 385, 1995). At the same time, so-called “ABM jobs” (*Arbeitsbeschaffungsmaßnahmen*), which are heavily subsidised by funds from the Federal Employment Agency, were provided as an alternative to unemployment. Particularly

in the fields of health and social services employment in NPOs was almost exclusively based on ABM, thus guaranteeing a smooth transformation from state to private nonprofit-employment.

The institutional transfer of the West German system of organizing and funding non-profit organisations to East Germany has found many critical voices (Olk, 1996; Wiesenthal et al, 1992; Tangemann, 1995). Thanks to extensive public funding, they argue, the welfare associations, headquartered in the West, have successfully expanded their market as suppliers of health and social services into the new *Länder*. The population of the new *Länder*, they suggest, does not regard these institutions as independent non-profit organisations, but as public or quasi-public institutions. This perception may account for the low profile of voluntarism and donations in East Germany.

Furthermore, the two biggest welfare associations - *Diakonie* and *Caritas* - are church-affiliated institutions. In contrast to West Germany, where Catholics and Protestants combined account for about 80 percent of the population, only one quarter of the East German population are church members. In fact, East Germany is the most “secular” region of the Western world, at least in terms of religious affiliation. For critics, the public support of *Diakonie* and *Caritas* in East Germany is seen as a “peaceful colonisation” in an effort to “re-christianise” a secular society. Thus, according to this line of argument, the third sector in East Germany is not a vital part of civil society, but, on the contrary, a creation of the West German political elite that has been exported to the new *Länder*.

6 A paradox?

We seem confronted with a paradox: on the one hand, the third sector in East Germany is dominated by large organisations financed predominantly, and in many instances exclusively, by public money. On the other hand, the majority of non-profit organisations in the new *Länder* are small associations financed primarily by membership dues and very government support.

The peculiarity and intricate dynamic of the German situation is further highlighted by a brief comparison with other post-socialist countries in the region, particularly to neighbouring Poland and the Czech Republic but also to Hungary—countries with similar levels of economic development and relatively stable transition periods (see also Anheier and Seibel, 1997)

In terms of *economic size*, we observe that the East German third sector is well above that of other countries in the region. The non-profit share of 4.9% of total employment in East Germany is much higher than in the Czech Republic with 1.7% (Fric et al, 1999), Hungary with 1.3% (Sebesteny et al, 1999) and Poland with 1% (Les et al, 1999). Growth rates, too, seem higher in East Germany, although only in the case of Hungary can we compare the economic size of the sector over time. While the Hungarian third sector expanded by more than one-third (37%) between 1990 and 1995 (Sebesteny et al, 1999), the East German figures are with a jump from 1% to 4.9% of total employment over ten times as much.

Volunteering levels among the three countries are highest in Poland with 16% of the adult population reporting to have volunteered in the last year; followed by the Czech Republic (10%), East Germany (9%), and Hungary (7%). Thus, in terms of size, the East German third sector stands out in its relative economic weight and higher growth; yet it is similar to the other countries in terms of civic participation, as indicated by the relatively low levels of volunteering.

Differences are most pronounced, however, in terms of the third sector's revenue structure in these four countries. Whereas East German non-profit organisations rely on government support for the majority of their income, the Czech share of government funding is 40% (Fric et al, 1999), and about one-quarter (26%) in Hungary (Sebesteny et al, 1999). No comparable figures are available for Poland, but preliminary results suggest low levels of government support for third sector organisations (Les et al 1999).

Taken together, these data indicate the unique position of the East German third sector: while it shares with the other countries relatively low levels of volunteering, it stands out in terms of size, both absolutely and relatively. Importantly, it does so in large measure because of substantial amounts of government funding support its development and operations—a revenue source much less available to organisations in Czech Republic, Hungary or Poland.

The answer to the peculiarity of the East German third sector compared to other post-communist countries lies in the policy-specific interpretation of the subsidiarity principle in Germany. According to West German law in place until 1995, only associations part of, or linked to, a network of publicly recognized welfare associations had a right to public funding guaranteed by law. This, however, applied only to the fields of health and social services, where the principle of subsidiarity is fully implemented, whereas in sports, culture and recreation the principle does not apply. Non-profit organisations active in those fields are eligible for public funds, but state support is not guaranteed by law, and awarded on a more competitive basis instead.

Due to the way the subsidiarity principle has been applied in Germany, the third sector in East and West Germany is divided into two parts. Those non-profit organisations active in the fields of health and social services that are affiliated with the welfare associations are thoroughly integrated into the system of state funding that is the economic bedrock of that portion of the third sector. This part of the third sector is highly state-dependent. The situation is different for associations in the fields of sports, culture and recreation, advocacy and environment; they are predominantly member-serving organisations. Well embedded in civil society, and primarily financed by membership dues, they receive much less government support in the form of grants and subsidies. Numerically, these voluntary organisations make up the majority of the sector in terms of number of entities, with their number estimated at about 250,000 (Zimmer, 1996a). However, from an economic point of view, taking into account the number of employees and volume of expenses, such associations have far less impact than non-profit organisations active in the fields of health and social services (Anheier, 1997).

These differences in the scope and the implementation of the subsidiarity principle are the result of historical developments. The current interpretation of the origins of the principle of subsidiarity goes back to the 1920's. At that time, German society was highly divided along ideological and religious lines. In the field of social policy, these factions were both bridged and institutionalised by the state: Accepting the two church-related welfare associations as partners with the state in social policy-making and implementation, the Catholic *Caritas* and the Protestant *Diakonie* were transformed into functional equivalents of public sector institutions (Seibel, 1997; Zimmer, 1996b).

In Germany, private-public partnership in the fields of health and social services, guided by the principle of subsidiarity, differs fundamentally from the notion of charity in the United Kingdom (Kendall and Knapp, 1996) and the concept of third party government in the United States (Salamon and Anheier, 1997). Competition among non-profit organisations in Germany has been almost unknown, with changes introduced in 1995 as part of the long-term care insurance system. The welfare associations work in highly segmented markets, their fields of activity mutually agreed upon with the state. Moreover, the welfare associations are highly integrated into the state planning system, forming an integral part of the German welfare state.

This particular interpretation of the principle of subsidiarity has been transferred to the new *Länder*. Public support of the welfare associations has been confirmed by law, whereas public assistance to voluntary organisations is not obligatory. Moreover, the third sector was granted an important role in the transformation process, and the Federal government explicitly supported the establishment and consolidation of the sector with special programs.

The church-related welfare associations *Caritas* and *Diakonie* have profited most from the transfer of resources into the new *Länder*. In the former GDR, they had been tolerated rather than supported. Yet within a short period of time, *Diakonie* and *Caritas* changed from marginal organisations into the most important service providers of the emerging "welfare industry" in East Germany. The West German headquarters of *Diakonie* and *Caritas* have forcefully promoted this process. Their political clout has increased as well: their leadership has entered politics, frequently promoting moral virtues and Christian thought. However, keeping in mind that *Caritas* and *Diakonie* operate in a very secular society, their presence represents a culturally external element in East Germany (Angerhausen et al, 1995).

Unlike *Diakonie* and *Caritas*, the *Volkssolidarität*, a genuine welfare organisation of the former GDR without any counterpart in West Germany and the Red Cross had a more difficult time adjusting to the new political and social environment after unification. The local population, at first largely rejected the *Volkssolidarität* burdened with leaders burdened with an SED past. Nevertheless, *Volkssolidarität* and the Red Cross successfully managed to democratize and establish a new image. Both organisations have become fairly established social service providers (Tangemann, 1995).

Whereas some traditional organisations like *Volkssolidarität* appear to be successfully adapting, some West German organisations, along with newer organisations founded during the early period of transformation are having severe difficulties adjusting to the new situation. The AWO (*Arbeiterwohlfahrt*), the West German welfare association closely affiliated with the SPD (Social Democratic Party), as well as the *Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund* are cases in point. The social democratic orientation of these organisations is not widely shared among the local population. Lacking any local roots and not being backed by the population, the *Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund* has developed into a strictly service providing organisation, primarily in the field of rescue service. AWO has been trying to follow this path, however, up until now AWO has been less successful compared to the *Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund*. Particularly in smaller towns, AWO hardly manages to survive (Olk, 1996). The same holds true for the majority of nonprofit service providers immediately established after the breakdown of the GDR which similar to AWO are struggling with serious problems. Characterized as “empty shells” (Wiesenthal et al, 1992), some may be forced to cease their activities in the near future. Two examples are the *Arbeitslosenverband* (Unemployed People’s Association) and the *Unabhängiger Frauenverband* (Independent Women’s Association) (Zimmer and Priller, 1996), while the *Behindertenverband* (Handicapped People’s Association), a coalition of various relatively independent local groups and initiatives (Schulz, 1995), might be able to survive.

However, even those NPOs, which have successfully managed to adjust to the new environment, are increasingly facing financial problems due to the fact that federal support of the transformation process has been terminated. Particularly, the ABM-job programmes largely funded by the federal government’s labor administration have come to an end. In reaction to this situation, those non-profit organisations which are active in welfare have started to adopt new fund-raising and management techniques, frequently modeled after those in the United States and the United Kingdom. By gradually giving up their specific identities and by shedding their underlying ideological and religious orientations, *Volkssolidarität*, *Diakonie* and *Caritas* are becoming more and more alike (Angerhausen et al, 1995; Rauschenbach et al, 1995).

Similar to the situation in West Germany, the emerging sector in East Germany is divided into two parts: While there are societal embedded organisations in the areas of recreation, sports and culture, there is a segment of the sector consisting of organisations active in the fields of welfare and health service which are becoming more and more business-like leaving behind the ideological roots of the past.

7 Conclusion

Two controversial points of view have been posited by researchers and policy-makers about the third sector in former East Germany since the crumbling of the Berlin Wall and the breakdown of the SED a decade ago. According to the “institutional transfer” position, there is no East German third sector that is independent from West German resources and expertise. While some evidence seems to support this view, there is also evidence pointing to a very different conclusion. According to the latter view, the newly won freedom to associate has

been used effectively. The rapid expansion in the number of voluntary organisations is taken as striking proof of the diversity as well as the “embeddedness” of the sector in East German society.

In cities like Berlin, Leipzig and Dresden environmental, peace and advocacy groups have grown out of the citizens’ movements of 1989 that helped topple the SED regime. Yet, they have not become a general driving force in politics in the new *Länder*. Well established as service providers and voluntary organisations, the groups have given up their political grassroots orientation. Nevertheless, they are active sponsors of local initiatives and related activities that form a vital part of civil society (Rucht, 1995, p. 12; Blattert et al, 1994; Rink, 1995).

We suggest that the specific interpretation of the principle of subsidiarity is at the core of these contrasting positions. In the fields of health and social services the principle is powerfully at work. Non-profit organisations active in those fields are in practice semi-public institutions rather than private organisations. In sports, culture, recreation and advocacy, the subsidiarity principle is less prominent. Therefore, sports clubs, socio-cultural initiatives and environmental groups are membership-oriented, society-centered private organisations. This holds true for East Germany as well as for West Germany.

Having achieved parity with West Germany, the East German non-profit sector is nonetheless facing a major challenge: due to the expiration of major Federal funding programs, most third sector organisations are facing severe financial problems. Indeed, 68% of East German non-profit organisations as opposed to 48% of West German association view their dependence on public funding as highly problematic (Priller, 1999). Given current and future public austerity budgets, we may expect particularly those non-profit organisations in the East which are active in the welfare related fields becoming more and more business-like.

Similarly, taken together, the findings of various population surveys suggest that membership rates for particular population groups are not only expanding or contracting overall; more importantly, they point our attention to the a fundamental restructuring of the associational landscape in East Germany—trends which affect various population segments in different ways, and which are linked to political factors (freedom of association, emergence of new interest) as well as to economic issues such as unemployment.

Against this background, there is reason to expect the East German and the West German third sector to become more alike and more dissimilar at the same time: On the one hand, there is the massive institutional transfer of the West German model into an economic environment and a political culture for which it may well have been ill-suited, particular under prevailing conditions of public austerity. On the other hand, we are witnessing the emergence of an East German third sector whose organisations are more dynamic, more modern than their West German counterparts, which remain entrenched in an increasingly outdated cognitive maps and policy frameworks. As we have seen, the contradictory views that policy-makers and analysts have put forward when examining the East German third sector may well be an indication for this very process.

References

- Angerhausen, S., Backhaus-Maul, H., and Schiebel, M. (1995). Zwischen neuen Herausforderungen und nachwirkenden Traditionen: Aufgaben- und Leistungsverständnis von Wohlfahrtsverbänden in den neuen Bundesländern. In T. Rauschenbach, C. Sachße and T. Olk (eds), *Von der Wertegemeinschaft zum Dienstleistungsunternehmen. Jugend- und Wohlfahrtsverbände im Umbruch*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt.
- Anheier, H. K. (1992). An Elaborate Network: Profiling the Third Sector in Germany. In B. Gidron, R. Kramer and L. M. Salamon (eds), *Government and the Third sector: Emerging Relationships in Welfare States*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Anheier, H. K. (1997). Der Dritte Sektor in Zahlen: Ein sozialökonomischen Porträt. In H. K. Anheier, E. Priller, W. Seibel and A. Zimmer (eds), *Der Dritte Sektor in Deutschland*, Sigma, Berlin.
- Anheier, H. K., and Priller, E. (1991). The Non-Profit Sector in East Germany: Before and After Unification. *VOLUNTAS*, 2(1), 78-94.
- Anheier, H. K., Priller, E., Seibel, W., and Zimmer, A. (eds) (1997). *Der Dritte Sektor in Deutschland*, Sigma, Berlin.
- Anheier, H. K., and Seibel, W. (1997). The Nonprofit Sector and the Transformation of Societies: A Comparative Analysis of East Germany, Poland and Hungary". In W. W. Powell and E. Clemens (eds), *Public Goods and Private Action*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Anheier, H. K., and Seibel, W. (forthcoming, 2000). *The Nonprofit sector in Germany*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Baur, J., Koch, U., and Telschow, S. (1995). *Sportvereine im Übergang: die Vereinslandschaft in Ostdeutschland*, Meyer & Meyer Verlag, Aachen.
- Benzler, S. (1995). Chancen der Zivilgesellschaft in den neuen Bundesländern. In S. Benzler, U. Bullmann and D. Eißel (eds), *Deutschland-Ost vor Ort: Anfänge der lokalen Politik in den neuen Bundesländern*, Leske+Budrich, Opladen.
- Blattert, B., Rink, D., and Rucht, D. (1994). Von den Oppositionsgruppen der DDR zu den neuen sozialen Bewegungen in Ostdeutschland? *Politische Vierteljahresschrift*, 36(3), 397-422.
- Fric, P., Goulli, R., Toepler, S., and Salamon, L. M. (1999). Czech Republic. In L. M. Salamon, H. K. Anheier, R. List, S. Toepler and W. Sokolowski (eds), *Global Civil Society: Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector*, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Heinemann, K., and Schubert, M. (1994). *Der Sportverein*, Verlag Klaus Hofmann, Schorndorf.
- Hürtgen, R. et al. (1994). Sozialpolitische Interessenvermittlungsstrukturen im Transformationsprozeß in den regionalen Zentren Frankfurt (Oder) und Jena. In Naßmacher, H., Niedermayer, O. and Wollmann, H. (eds), *Politische Strukturen im Umbruch*, Leske+Budrich, Opladen.
- Jaide, W., and Hille, B. (eds) (1992). *Jugend und Sport in den neuen Bundesländern*, Leske+Budrich, Opladen.
- Katzenstein, P. J. (1987). *Policy and Politics in West Germany. The Growth of the Semisovereign State*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Kendall, J., and Knapp, M. (1996). *The Voluntary Sector in the United Kingdom*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Lehmbruch, G. (1994). Institutionen, Interessen und sektorale Variationen in der Transformationsdynamik der politischen Ökonomie Ostdeutschlands. *Journal für Sozialforschung*, 34(1), 21-44.
- Les, E., Nalecz, S., Wagnanski, J. J., Toepler, S., and Salamon, L. M. (1999). Poland. In L. M. Salamon, H. K. Anheier, R. List, S. Toepler and W. Sokolowski (eds), *Global Civil Society: Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector*, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Olk, T. (1996). Wohlfahrtsverbände im Transformationsprozeß Ostdeutschlands. In Kollmorgen, R., Reißig, R. and Weiß, J. (eds), *Sozialer Wandel und Akteure in Ostdeutschland*, Leske+Budrich, Opladen.
- Priller, E. (1994). Demokratieentwicklung und gesellschaftliche Mitwirkung. In I. Kurz-Scherf and G. Winkler (eds), *Sozialreport 1994: Daten und Fakten zur sozialen Lage in den neuen Bundesländern*, Verlag am Turm, Bonn.
- Priller, E. (1997). Der Dritte Sektor in den neuen Bundesländern: Eine sozialökonomische Analyse. In H. K. Anheier, E. Priller, W. Seibel and A. Zimmer (eds), *Der Dritte Sektor in Deutschland*, Sigma, Berlin.
- Priller, E. (1999). *Der Dritte Sektor in Ostdeutschland. Kolloquium anläßlich des 65. Geburtstags von Horst Berger*, Berlin.
- Priller, E., and Zimmer, A. (1999). Ende der Mitgliederorganisationen? Laufen den NPOs die Mitglieder davon? In D. Witt, E.-B. Blümle, R. Schauer and H. K. Anheier (eds), *Ehrenamt und Modernisierungsdruck in Nonprofit-Organisationen*, Gabler, Wiesbaden.

- Priller, E., Zimmer, A., and Anheier, H. K. (1999). Der Dritte Sektor in Deutschland. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* B9/99. 12-21.
- Rauschenbach, T., Sachße, C., and Olk, T. (eds) (1995). *Von der Wertegemeinschaft zum Dienstleistungsunternehmen. Jugend- und Wohlfahrtsverbände im Umbruch*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt.
- Rauschenbach, T., and Schilling, M. (1995). Die Dienstleistenden. In T. Rauschenbach, C. Sachße and T. Olk (eds.), *Von der Wertegemeinschaft zum Dienstleistungsunternehmen. Jugend- und Wohlfahrtsverbände im Umbruch*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt.
- Rink, D. (1995). Neue Bewegungen im Osten? Zur Entwicklung im ostdeutschen Bewegungs-sektor nach dem Ende der Bürgerbewegungen. *Forschungsjournal Neue Soziale Bewegungen*, Heft 4, 20-26.
- Rucht, D. (1995). Deutsche Vereinigung und Demokratisierung. Zum Scheitern der Bürgerbewegungen. *Forschungsjournal Neue Soziale Bewegungen*, Heft 4, 12-19.
- Salamon, L. M., and Anheier, H. K. (1997). The Third Route: Social Service Provision in the United States and Germany. In W. W. Powell and E. Clemens (eds), *Public Goods and Private Action*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Schulz, M. (1995). *Für Selbstbestimmung und Würde: die Metamorphose des Behindertenverbandes der DDR zum Allgemeinen Behindertenverband in Deutschland*. Max-Planck-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften e.V., AGr Transformationsprozesse in den neuen Bundesländern an der Humboldt-Universität (Hrsg.), (Arbeitspapiere AG TRAP; 95/1), Berlin.
- Sebesteny, I., Kuti, É., Toepler, S., and Salamon, L. M. (1999). Hungary. In L. M. Salamon, H. K. Anheier, R. List, S. Toepler and W. Sokolowski (eds), *Global Civil Society: Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector*, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Seibel, W. (1997). Erfolgreich gescheiterter Institutionentransfer: Eine politische Analyse des Dritten Sektors in den neuen Bundesländern. In H. K. Anheier, E. Priller, W. Seibel and A. Zimmer (eds), *Der Dritte Sektor in Deutschland*, Sigma, Berlin.
- Sozialpolitische Rundschau (1995). No 385/1995, Presse und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung, Berlin.
- Tangemann, M. (1995). *Intermediäre Organisationen im deutsch-deutschen Einigungsprozeß*, Hartung-Gorre Verlag, Konstanz.
- Wiesenthal, H., Ettl, W., and Bialas, C. (1992). *Interessenverbände im Transformationsprozeß: zur Repräsentations- und Steuerungsfähigkeit des Verbändesystems der neuen Bundesländer*, Max-Planck-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften e.V., AGr Transformationsprozesse in den neuen Bundesländern an der Humboldt-Universität (Hrsg.), (Arbeitspapiere AG TRAP; 92/3), Berlin.
- Zimmer, A. (1996a). *Vereine - Basiselement der Demokratie*, Leske+Budrich, Opladen.
- Zimmer, A. (1996b). New Public Management und Nonprofit-Sektor in der Bundesrepublik. *Zeitschrift für Sozialreform*, 42(5), 285-305.
- Zimmer, A. (1997). Private-Public Partnerships: Staat und Dritter Sektor in Deutschland. In H. K. Anheier, E. Priller, W. Seibel and A. Zimmer (eds), *Der Dritte Sektor in Deutschland*, Sigma, Berlin.
- Zimmer, A. (1999). Staatsfunktionen und öffentliche Ausgaben. In T. Ellwein and E. Holtmann (eds), *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Politische Vierteljahresschrift*, Sonderheft 30, Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen.
- Zimmer, A., and Priller, E. (1996). Intermediäre Organisationen in den neuen Bundesländern. Der Nonprofit-Sektor in Ostdeutschland. In Kommission für die Erforschung des sozialen und politischen Wandels in den neuen Bundesländern (KSPW), *Berichtsgruppe III: Politische Interessenvermittlung, Kommunal- und Verwaltungspolitik*, Mimeo, Halle/Konstanz.
- Zimmer, A., Priller, E., and Anheier, H. (1997): Der Nonprofit-Sektor in den neuen Bundesländern: Kontinuität, Neuanfang oder Kopie. In: *Zeitschrift für öffentliche und gemeinwirtschaftliche Unternehmen*, 20 (1), 58-75.