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Abstracts: This article examines the efforts of citizen associations to further develop democracy and strengthen civil society. It has been analyzed by scientific studies that associations that unite citizens can be generators of social trust or vice versa.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of understanding social capital, political culture, and the interaction between democracy and civil society is widely researched in both Western and Eastern scientific literature. American scientist T. Skochpol, in his arguments on the role of citizens and organizations in the formation of democracy, considers associations uniting citizens as a source of public pressure rather than a generator of social trust \cite{1}. According to the American researcher, the democratic political system is the result of conflicts between different social groups and authorities and society \cite{2}. Existing social and political disagreements force citizens to unite in order to influence the government to protect their interests \cite{3}. The elites, in turn, mobilize citizens united towards a common goal to exert political pressure. Civil society institutions and organizations institutionalize systems that influence power, empower marginalized groups to participate in political decision-making, and oppose unbridled government \cite{4}. T. Skochpol and his colleagues stated that civil associations are not considered separate organizations separated from the government only due to individual actions of citizens. According to them, the mass formation of political parties in the first half of the 20th century coincided with the development of civil unions. Government institutions and political parties have undoubtedly influenced the diversity, norms of behavior and strategies of civil society associations. Research shows that the process of electoral mobilization for national elections in the United States encourages citizens to join the activities of voluntary associations \cite{5}. Civil society organizations help to activate their members to carry out political actions and rights protection activities in certain conditions \cite{6}. The result of such activities is the registration of membership and the growth of organizations that include a wide range of citizens. The institution of equal and free elections has become an important factor in structuring conflicts and disagreements in society. In the 1950s and 1960s, elites shifted their emphasis on cooperation in favor of professional and human rights organizations focused on social service. As a result, the demand for large-scale volunteerism has decreased, which has led to a decrease in the level of public participation in civic associations. In our opinion, T. Skochpol's interpretation provides an opportunity to explain qualitative changes of civil society based on the preferences of the political elite. According to the logic of T. Skochpol, disputes give rise to citizens' activity, and their activity causes the creation of institutions, and institutions structure these disputes, ensure equal rights and protection of interests. Preferably, elites are mobilized through social groups or grassroots political parties and professional unions, or small lobbying and rights organizations..

Nancy Bermeo explains in her book that since the 1970s, civil society has been viewed as a positive component of democratic governance. The development of the concepts of interest groups, class associations and popular
organizations showed their ambiguous role [7]. Juan Lins, a scholar of political regime change, considers the relationship between the ruling elite and citizen organizations to be problematic, as a highly active civil society often leads to the instability of democratic governance [8]. First of all, the connection of political parties with labor movements, trade unions and religious organizations does not help the stable functioning of institutions, because the existing social conflicts acquire a political dimension. Political regime researchers such as Martin Lipset and Giovanni Sartori have also emphasized the role of political parties as important institutions that enable citizens to interact with the state to support democracy. The ability of civil society to structure social conflicts is of great importance, because an institutionalized, politically mobilized, divided society poses a threat to democracy [9].

Some studies show that the participation of citizens in public (non-profit) organizations does not affect the quality of political institutions, and in many cases it can be the opposite. Sherry Berman believes that political institutionalization determines at the national level whether public participation is used in civil (democratic) or noncivil practices [10]. Strong political institutions have the ability to eliminate and structure existing contradictions in society [11], they direct citizens to achieve long-term, not short-term, goals. Political stability and transparent rules of the game (rule of law and security of private property) guide citizens to perform tasks within the framework of the existing system. Such a lack of stability leads to civil society becoming an alternative to politics for citizens who are not satisfied with the current situation. A number of researchers agree that the results of citizen activism depend on the state’s ability to respond to public demands and the nature of the political community [12].

The theory of non-corporatism, which illuminates the interaction between interest groups and the state, has shown that the role of the state is one of the main ones in solving social conflicts, creating spaces for dialogues, and in the development of certain communities. In particular, the experience of the Scandinavian countries shows that the leading role of the state in resolving disputes between employers (business associations) and trade unions, taking into account the opinions of these two leading interest groups in the formation of political direction and reaching an agreement, helps to achieve stability in the development of society will give.

Philipp Schmitter defines the system of mutual action and representation of interests as a special ideal-typical agreement that makes decisions and provides communication between associatively organized interest groups of civil society and authorities [13]. Here, the concept of "civil society" is given a much wider definition, it is all associations in society, which are not part of the state economy, and thus include themselves in business systems and civil organizations. F. Schmitter prefers to describe non-corporatism as a system of interaction of interests. Because he doubts the ability of official associations to express the demands of their members, because he believes that this may not be a task of great importance for them [14].

Based on this interpretation, some researchers extend it to the system of political participation, in which citizens delegate their rights to the leaders of organized and centralized groups [15]. From this point of view, non-corporatist systems are representative bodies that use forms that substitute for the protection of their interests by political parties and parliament. Sometimes they associate the emergence of non-corporatist systems of mutual activity with the inability of political institutions (political parties and parliaments) to resolve social conflicts in society. Therefore, the government should always rely on the "most reliable" ways to reach an agreement [16]. One such way is used to create non-corporatist spaces.

F. Schmitter connects the systematic involvement of interest groups in the decision-making process at the national level with the development of capitalist society [17]. Consideration of the advantages of socio-economic interest groups in cross-activity as an object of research has left its mark on the methodology and basic principles of the theory of corporatism. The researcher’s interests include taxation and socio-economic policy in which the state shows interest. In addition, the agents of mutual action (activity) are often large business systems and trade unions, which have significant resources and can influence the state apparatus. Therefore, it is necessary to take into account the unique characteristics of non-profit organizations that can behave like interest groups, unite citizens towards a common goal, and influence the existing political path using certain methods. Scholars acknowledge that nonprofit groups have been seriously neglected in non-corporatist analyzes [18]. Annette Semmer in her scientific works points out that this concept can be very useful in some countries to illuminate the special interaction between
society and the state. In the case of Germany, large associations of non-profit organizations and citizens are integrated into the process of making and implementing political decisions, and we can see the importance of using this theory.

CONCLUSION:

It should be said that non-corporatism explains a special type of interaction between interest groups and the state, and shows that it has the ability to resolve and stabilize existing social conflicts. In the framework of such interactions, the state plays a decisive role in the formation of political direction, in which it limits the influence of interest groups only to recognized and significant associations. In certain circumstances, when it is impossible to reach an agreement without the intervention of the state, it allows taking into account the interests of the latter. Thus, negative-corporatism shows that the leading and regulatory role of the state is necessary for some communities in order to form a political agenda that takes into account the interests and interests of the main interest groups in society.
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