

JOURNAL OF SECURITY AND SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

ISSN 2029-7017 print/ISSN 2029-7025 online

2016 September Volume 6 Number 1

[http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2016.6.1\(14\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2016.6.1(14))

PERSONAL SECURITY AND SOCIAL CARE: A COMPARISON OF GERMANY AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC

Jiří Bílý ¹, Zuzana Horváthová ²

¹*The High School of European and Regional Studies, Žižkova 5, České Budějovice, Czech Republic*

²*The Metropolitan University Prague, Učňovská 100/1, 9 Prgue,*

E-mails: ¹bily@vsers.cz; ²horvathova@mup.cz

Received 10 February 2016; accepted 26 June 2016

Abstract. This paper focuses on personal security and social care issues in the two EU countries: Germany and the Czech Republic. It is obvious that the Czech legislator strove for a comprehensive and complete Codification. However, it is doubtful whether such a density is really necessary or whether the worldwide trend for the simplification of international private law is not missed. In contrast to this stands the German law, which is limited to a large extent to principles and avoids detail regulations. Exceptions are made only in the case of consumer rights and the registered life partnership. However these two institutes are particularly regulation needy, since they are not yet common in every country. The social care cannot be seen only as the responsibility of regional authorities or the state and its law. The elderly, children, homeless, living in municipalities, are entitled to expect that their municipality will be fully aware of their problems and needs. The municipality, really state is responsible for all its citizens, and issues involving the social care will be at the forefront in several decades as a result of recent demographic indicators. This fact is also closely related to the responsible legal system supporting development of in-home social care services and quality of social workers at the state level and its law. Both codifications are coherent and effective. However the Czech legislator should think at least about an implementation of the consumer protection. Not at least because the consumers protection is one of the social policies of the European Union.

Keywords: obligation, security, collisions, law harmonization, international private law, social care, Czech Republic, Germany

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Bílý, J.; Horváthová, Z. 2016. Personal security and social care: a comparison of Germany and the Czech Republic, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* 6(1): 179–186.

DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2016.6.1\(14\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2016.6.1(14))

JEL Classifications: I31

1. Introduction

The concept of globalization has arguably been used more often than any other label to describe a central development of the current age. Globalization brings with it many threats, including attacks on personal security (Tumalavičius et al. 2016; Tsaurkubule 2016; Novickytė et al. 2016; Dubauskas 2016; Belás et al. 2016; Grinevica et al. 2016; Raudeliūnienė et al. 2016; Prause 2016; Fuschi, Tvaronavičienė 2016). After the nineteenth-century preoccupation with industrialization and the twentieth-century focus on modernization and development, the discourse on globalization has taken on the contemporary role of describing in a singular term the master pattern of recent and ongoing societal developments coupled with the sustainable development and growth. Formally understood to include structures and processes of increased interdependence across the boundaries of national and otherwise delineated borders, globalization has entered the lexicon of social science only recently, but it has been adopted and applied in theory and research with accelerated speed over the past two decades.

Because of the jurisdictional framing of legal systems, scholars of Czech law had until the advent of the globalization approach developed research traditions that transcended the boundaries of national and local manifestations of law only in the forms of comparative and international studies. Although also transcending the boundaries of Czech manifestations of law, comparative legal perspectives and the field of international law are not to be confused with globalization studies of Czech law. Comparative studies of Czech law analyze the differences and similarities that exist between the legal systems of different nations and other locales, whereas international law refers to the whole of law that is created by intergovernmental agreements among states of European Union in the form of bilateral and multilateral treaties. Comparative and international studies of law affirm the boundaries and jurisdictional restrictions associated with Czech national legal systems, whereas a globalization perspective takes into account the extent to which legal developments transcend such boundaries through the linkages that exist across space. The globalization of law presents a special challenge to Czech scholarship on law because the degree of interlinking between national or otherwise local and global or otherwise border - transcending structures and processes has steadily been increasing in recent years. What then does jurisdictional sovereignty mean in the global village?

The globalization of law poses a number of theoretical and empirical challenges. At the most general level, it changes the level of analysis from relations among citizens and between citizens and the state to the level of the interrelations among states on a horizontal plane, in terms of conflict of cooperation, as well as on a vertical plane as relations among states also affect citizens, especially when they cross nation-bound borders, such as in the case of immigration and tourism. Because globalization by definition transcends spatial boundaries, there is no clearly demarcated locale to the study of the matter. Globalization occurs everywhere or at least in multiple places at once, posing formidable problems to conventional sociological conceptions of research design and subject selection. Because of the peculiar form globalization takes, studies on the global dimensions of Czech law must not only contemplate the movement of law in the direction of one, but also investigate how these global processes and structures in turn impact local and national developments of law. Globalization studies methodologically therefore always imply a comparative approach in which the cases are selected, not on the basis of criteria chosen for theoretical reasons by the researcher, but on the basis of actual interlinkages that exist among them. The collection of international statistical and other relevant empirical information is a special methodological concern.

This article is concerned with the different regulations of the private international law in the Czech Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. The fact that both legal systems are based on the same law-historical roots, but took in the past 50 years fundamentally different developments, is mostly interesting. While the Federal Republic of Germany in the European Union developed a according to the free market oriented society system, a perfectly new society system should be established in the Czech Republic. Regarding the European law the legal systems of the states of the European Union are based on the same legal principles. In this the European harmonisation process accomplishes an interesting way because it integrates different legal systems, not only the ones of every single member state. The main difficulty is to deal with the different legal traditions within the European Union as are mainly the continental legal system and the Anglo-American legal system. But in the last years were also included different states from Central and Eastern Europe which took a clearly different development in the past 50 years, than the members before joining the Union on Mai 1st 2004. As one of those the Czech Republic before went through a substantial transformation, not least of all because of the focus on the full membership in the EU. Nonetheless there are several acts and regulations which still have major differences, especially if they origin in the years between 1945 and 1989.

2. Analysis of development

The term of private international law. The term of international private law is misleading. Even if it indicates the international character of the law, it's not, it is national law (Von Hofmann, B., Thorn, K., 2005). It is also no private law in a classical way; it not directly concerned with private law but contains only collision law (Neuhaus, P., 1976). The private international law is always part of the national legal system and is concerned about which national stipulations are to be used on a certain case with an international component. This means

the respective legal relations and living conditions. In Germany the private international Law is defined in article 3 paragraph 1 EGBGB (Palandt, M., 2006). In the Czech Republic it is defined in § 1 of the Act about the International Private and Procedural Law.

Historical development. When in the antique the first legal system evolved, there was no private international law. Everyone remained subordinated to his personal legal system, thus the legal system he was born and living in. Legal systems at that time were e.g. the Roman *ius civile proprium*, *lex salica*, or *lex burgundionum*. In Rome additionally was developed the *ius gentium* for foreigners and relations of Romans with foreigners. After the collapse of the Roman Empire a so called atomisation of the law took place in Europe. Each principal developed his own laws for his own territory (statute theory). With the upcoming of trade in the 11th and 12th century at first in Italy the evolved problem of which legal system was applicable for supra-regional contacts. The law school established in Bologna (Tocco, Accursius, Bartolus, Baldus) developed in the 12th century first attempts of a uniform private international law valid in all of Europe. The crucial advantage of this start-up was that it was developed „extra national“, because by lawyers from all over Europe and because of that it had a high acceptance. Thus in fact a uniform private international law was developed.

In the time of Savignys (1779 to 1861) the lawyers still proceeded on this universal base: always the same, international law system should be applicable, independent of the place, circumstances and judge, who would have to use this legal system. For this reason were developed international coordinated and determined competence and law distributions e.g. *lex rei sitae* or *mobilia sequuntur personam*. Many of the principles of the law of that time were taken up to most codifications of the private international law (Kropholler, J., 1993). In the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century the law development was seized by an increasing „nationalization“. The national states converted political views into their national legal systems and set off thereby every now and then the legal systems of their neighbours. The private international law could survive only by the fact that it was essentially limited to formal application rules and no material contents. In the meantime the historical roots and advances are once again coming into force e.g. in the European Union or by the Hague conference.

After World War Two the international private law was shaped by different developments of the two political systems. While the western part of Europe and concomitantly the western part of the Federal Republic of Germany developed their private international law on commonly known roots and principles, the eastern part of Europe tried to create a totally new legal system. Both blocks concentrated particularly on the development within the own territories. Nonetheless after the collapse of the eastern economic system the states of Central and Eastern Europe turned back to their historical roots.

German International Private Law. The German Private International Law is since the Reform Act about Obligation Law dated January 1st 2002 mainly part of the EGBGB (Carl, I., Franke, H., Ghassabeh, A., Hanke, F., 2005). All substantial circumstances are regulated in the Articles 3 to 46 EGBGB. Besides there are still some special legal stipulations, e.g. article 91 and following of the Bills of Exchange Act, which play however a less important role because they are concerned with very specific matters. Furthermore it is to be noted that international conventions, as far as they were implemented into the domestic legal system are to be used primarily. In this assignment I concentrate on the stipulations in the EGBGB as the main source for International Private Law in the German Legal System. The articles 3 to 46 of the EGBGB are divided into six sections, which will be investigated separately in the following sections.

Reference (articles 3 to 6 EGBGB). The section about the private international law is introduced as follows: “For circumstances with a connection to the legal system of a foreign country stipulate the following regulations which legal system is to be used (private international law)”. Because of the wording can be assumed that the regulations of the EGBGB are complete and terminal. In particular as far as the European law is concerned. Only in special, extraordinary cases are to be found special arrangements outside of the EGBGB. Thus in the conclusion it is also guaranteed that the private international law is not to be used in cases originating only within the country. The reference article 3 paragraph 2 EGBGB is also very important because it positions international-law contracts, as far as they are directly applicable, above the national legal system. Article 4

EGBGB defines when and how is to be referred to a foreign legal system. In case of a back-reference on the German law by a foreign legal stipulation, a further (back) reference will not happen (paragraph 1 sentence 2 EGBGB). Finally the German legal system is mandatory, if the application of the foreign legal system is not compatible with substantial principles of the German legal system (article 6 EGBGB).

Stipulations about natural persons and legal transactions (articles 7 to 12 EGBGB). In this section subjects of the International Private Law are defined. Mostly the Principle of the Country of Origin (article 7 EGBGB) applies. Nevertheless in special, individual cases the agreements and permits by the German civil registry office are necessary. Contracts are closed according to the legal system, which seems to be the base for the greater part of the subject matter of the contract. This applies particularly to the respective formal requirements (article 11 EGBGB).

Family law (articles 13 to 24 EGBGB). In the family law refers to the principle of the Country of Origin. Only in the case if this is impossible, the German legal system is applicable (article 13 EGBGB). Nevertheless a marriage in Germany must fulfil the valid German formal requirements. The legal system regarding the property can be selected by the partners according to the regulation of the article 15 EGBGB. An special but nonetheless special stipulation in the German law is the article 16 EGBGB, which refers to the stipulations about marriage in the Civil Code (book 4, articles 1297 to 1921). Divorces are likewise subject to German formal requirements, like e.g. the obligation to let a court decide about the divorce (article 17 EGBGB). The later inserted article 17b EGBGB stipulates the so called “Registered Life Partnership”. In this case the Principle of the Country of Origin applies also, whereby this depends on the fact if and how the life partnership is stipulated and allowed in the given country. The German stipulation refers to the Life Partnership Act. According to paragraph 4 the foreign stipulations do not reach farther than the ones of the German Civil Code.

Law of succession (articles 25 to 26 EGBGB). The law of succession is regulated according to the state in which the testator belonged in the moment of death. Last-willing orders must correspond to the requirements in form specified in article 26 EGBGB.

Obligations law (articles 27 to 42 EGBGB). The longest section is concerned with the obligations law. It is divided a section for contractual and one for except-contractual obligations. In accordance with article 27 EGBGB the principle of the free choice of the applicable legal system is stipulated. The parties involved are held to choose a legal system. Only if the parties didn't agree on an applicable legal system according to article 28 EGBGB the law which seems to have the closest connections with the subject matter of the agreement will be used. In paragraph 2 the assumption is set up that the closest connection exists, in cases in which the achievement will be received. Most remarkable is the influence of the European law, since the articles 29 and 29a EGBGB were inserted with special stipulations for consumer contracts, which are a characteristic of the European law (Carl, I., Franke, H., Ghassabeh, A., Hanke, F., 2005). In particular in article 29a paragraph 4 EGBGB is referred to the some European guidelines. The non-contractual obligations are stipulated in the articles 38 to 42 EGBGB. The regulation covers unjustified enrichment (article 38 EGBGB), agency without necessity (article 39 EGBGB) and tortious law (article 40 EGBGB) Property law (articles 43 to 46 EGBGB). In the case of property law the legal system of the state is applicable in which the property is situated (article 43 paragraph 1 EGBGB). On the other hand in individual cases side the law system of that state is to be used, to which the property has the closest connection (article 46 EGBGB). Thus it is always at first to be examined whether a special relationship exists and whether the principle of article 43 EGBGB is to be used. For large movable properties, like airplanes, ships and trains article 45 EGBGB stipulates special rules.

Czech Codification. The basis of the Czech Codification is formed by the Act about the International Private and Procedural Law dated 01.04.1964 in its current form (hereafter only ZMPS). As already to be seen on the year of its coming into force; the Act was made in the “communist time “.It is remarkable that the Act still uses the communist terminology, however this does not change the material content of the act. E.g. thus even if the law speaks of “Czechoslovakia”, the Czech republic alongside with the Slovak Republic as the legal successors are meant so in the end the terminologies has no practical relevance. Beyond that there were some significant

changes of the law in the past years and in the years of the harmonization with the European law.

Introduction (articles 1 and 2 ZMPS). The Act is introduced by the specification on which legal systems the civil law, family law, industrial law and other law systems with international connection depend on, as well as which legal status foreigners have and how the Czech legal organs have to deal with these relations. Besides it is specified that international contracts have priority. The definition of the Private International Law is thus reduced to the statement of “fields of law with foreign connections”. Part I: Collision regulations and the legal status of foreigners (articles 3 to 36 ZMPS). In the section over collision regulations for the respective right areas in detail regulations are made and specified legal status by foreigners. First section: Collision regulations (articles 3 to 31 ZMPS). For every single person generally is applicable the legal system of his home country, except this *act puts something else into action (article 3 ZMPS)*. As far as nothing is fixed applies the legal system with the most connection to the specific topic, unless it is a matter of formal conditions for effectiveness, which apply the legal system of the state where they come into effect.

Property law (articles 5 to 8 ZMPS). The property law and in particular the real estate law depends on the legal system of the state the property is located in. As far as the legal status of a property is determined over a register, it depends of the state in which the register is located.

Obligation Law (articles 9 to 15 ZMPS) The obligation law stipulates that the parties can agree on the legal system which will be used (article 9 ZMPS). If the involved parties did not agree upon a legal system, will the law with the most connection to the subject matter will be applied (article 10 paragraph 1 ZMPS). In the second paragraph the article 10 ZMPS enumerates types of contract and defines the legal system to be used. In detail this are the following contract types:

- Sales contract
- Real estate contracts
- Transport contracts
- Insurance contracts
- Order and instruction
- Representation
- Mutual bilateral contracts

Other contracts depend on the legal system of the country, in which the contracting parties have their domicile. As far as this is not possible according to the legal system of the country the contract was closed in the Czech Republic. Stipulations about Contracts concerned with insurance law make a substantial part of this section (articles 10a to 11e ZMPS). Also detailed definitions for different types of insurances with several possible events are mentioned. The section closes with regulations about periods of limitation and payment of damages (articles 13 and 15 ZMPS). Labour law (article 16 ZMPS) The most important principle of the labour law is that always the legal system of the state in which the labour is accomplished is to be applied. In case of a temporary employment abroad, applies the legal system of the one state, in which the adjusting organization has currently its seat. In the 2nd paragraph are special stipulations and rules for employees of railway companies or transport enterprises. The applicable law in airplanes and ships depend on where they are registered (Abrahám, J., Horváthová, Z., 2005). Law of succession (articles 17 and 18 ZMPS). In accordance with article 17 ZMPS the legal system of the one state applies, whose nationality the deceased had. This, in accordance with article 18 paragraph 1 ZMPS, applies also to whether he got a last will and testament. However article 18 paragraph 1 ZMPS stipulates that the formal questions of the creation of the testament depends on the legal system of the state, in which the deceased had his domicile. Family law (articles 19 to 31 ZMPS) This section is occupied with the family relations of the married partners to each other (articles 19 to 22 ZMPS), and of parents to their children (articles 23 to 27 ZMPS), as well as their support (articles 28 to 31 ZMPS). Regarding the family law the basic principle is that the legal system of the state applies in which the involved persons have their residence. This applies to marriage, divorce and explanation of the ineffectiveness of a marriage (articles 19 and 22 ZMPS) and in particular also to the financial regulations (article 20 ZMPS). However, again for the formal act itself, the law of the place of residence applies.

In case of parenthood the statements of the Czech law apply if the child is born in Czechoslovakia. The same applies in case of requirements on child maintenance and the acknowledgment of the paternity.

Second section: The Legal status of foreigners (articles 32 to 33 ZMPS). If nothing else is agreed on, foreigners have the same rights and obligations as citizens of the Czech Republic regarding their personal and vested titles (article 32 paragraph 1 ZMPS). As far as citizens of Czechoslovakia are treated worse in another state, this can lead to restrictions. The same is stipulated for legal entities. A double or missing nationality is regulated in article 33 ZMPS. Thus the legal system of Czechoslovakia applies, if the person has this nationality. In other cases the recent (thus the latter) nationality applies. Regarding persons without a nationality the legal system of their last domicile applies and only if these have none or nothing can be determined the Czech legal system. Third section: Common regulations (articles 32 to 36 ZMPS). There are some common regulations; in particular if in the other state are several different legal system valid. As far as a regulation continues to refer back to the Czech law, then it must not be referred back. Finally the Czech laws must not be avoided by the use of foreign law, especially if the foreign regulations offend the public order of Czechoslovakia. Part II: International procedural law (articles 37 to 70 ZMPS). The procedural law is stipulated in detail in the ZMPS. The second part is divided into four sections:

- 1. Competences of Czechoslovakian judicial organs (articles 37 to 47 ZMPS)
- 2. Procedural specifications (articles 48 to 62 ZMPS)
- 3. Acknowledgment and enforcement of foreign decisions (articles 63 to 68 ZMPS)
- 4. Special regulations for the acknowledgment and enforcement of certain foreign decisions (articles 68a to 68c ZMPS)

Part III: Final clauses (articles 69 to 70 ZMPS). The Act replaces the Act 48/1948 and is effective since April 1st 1964.

3. Comparisons and discussions

Co-operation in case of civil law within the European Union includes among others the harmonization of the collision rules. Thus is to be assumed that already now, and the legal systems are as far as possible harmonized. This assumption seems to be right. Comparing the two implementations, at first is to be realized that the Czech legislator created a single one Act concerned with the International Private Law. In contrast the German legislator regulated the International Private Law in a separate section of the EGBGB. The reason for this decision is to be seen in the fact that the collision rules of the International Private Law are treated only as “supporting rules” (Palandt, M., 2006). Regarding the structure of the two acts a clear difference is obvious: The German act includes at the most collision regulations. In the Czech ZMPS the collision regulations are only one single part of the whole act, a further part is concerned with international procedural law. The international procedural law is not codified in Germany but is included into the general rules of procedure the “Zivilprozessordnung” (code of civil procedure) (Carl, I., Franke, H., Ghassabeh, A., Hanke, F., 2005). Thus a comparison of the regulations may only be performed in the part concerned with the collision regulations.

The two acts begin with the definitions of international private law, which does not differ. Also the general references are analogue, especially in both laws is stipulated that after a back reference from foreign law no further reference takes action. Both acts respect the main principle of the International Private Law that contracts are closed in accordance with the legal system, which the main subject matter of the contract is, and is stipulated in both acts likewise, although in different places throughout the codes. Subsequently, the fields of law are in detail stipulated. In succession law and property law are no remarkable differences, the acts stipulates all circumstances similarly. In case of the family law are some contents like marriage, divorce, child shank also equivalently stipulated. However a substantial difference consists in the fact that in the Czech legal system everything is stipulated very in detail. In contrast the German regulations are very briefly. Nonetheless the EGBGB in this connection refers constantly to the BGB (Palandt, M., 2006) and the general system of the family law. As a result thus are no major differences. At last were taken up to the EGBGB stipulations about the registered life partnership. The registered life partnership in Germany is treated in many cases equally to the marriage,

since this is however not in every other country, the German legislator decided to stipulate this expressively. An appropriate regulation is missing in the Czech law. The stipulations about different industries are only mentioned in the Czech ZMPS. The German collision law concerning the industrial law was stipulated directly within the Labour Code. The obligation law takes the largest part in both acts. This is however not surprising, since in practice this concerns the most. Both act repeat the general rule that the legal system can be chosen or depends on the core matter of the legal relation. The Czech legal system begins with an enumeration of types of contracts; every contract is discussed in detail. At this the ZMPS is very exact. On the other hand the consumer contracts which are stipulated in detail in the German EGBGB are missing completely. Nonetheless the case of the application of both acts are no major differences.

Conclusions

As suggested by Czech scholars of law, at last four theories can be identified in the globalization of Czech law literature related to personal security. First are two competing theories that focus on it primarily as an economic reality. To this camp belongs the famous perspective of world systems theory that is associated with the work of scholars. Primarily focused on the worldwide diffusion of the capitalist market from the core of world society to its periphery, this perspective attributes relatively little attention to law because, in line with a general left-wing orientation, it assumes that global law is not sufficiently institutionalized to play a significant role in the mechanisms that drive the world system. Instead, the focus is on economic developments that are controlled by multinational companies and states (for instance, the present spread of neoliberal capitalism under direction of the right-wing orientation. Contrasting with this perspective is an approach of Czech law and economic development that, in the wake of the fall of communism in Eastern Europe, emphasizes the role played by private actors in building a new global order by reliance on the law as an instrument of change, specifically in the form of deregulation. The logic behind this theory is that laws of economic liberation and stimulation produce economic growth across nations. The Czech law and economic development perspective relies on a Weberian approach to bring out the central role played by law in shaping global economic processes. As an extension of sociology's long-standing tradition of work on the relation between law and economy, Czech scholarship in this area has especially focused on the formation of new global governance regimes, typically involving a variety of public and private agencies that are set up in response to the regulatory deficit that is created because the global spread of the market far exceeds the range of the regulatory mechanisms that are in place at the level of national states. Research in the theory of law from this perspective has focused on global developments in the regulation of business practices, such as bankruptcy reform. A second set of theories on globalization and law, which is likewise divided between a conflict-theoretical and a consensually oriented perspective, focuses on globalization primarily in cultural terms. First, postcolonial theories conceive of the globalization of law in terms of a hegemonic spread of the rule of law that reproduces a juxtaposition between the so-called civilized and uncivilized world. The universality and transferability of modern systems of European law are argued to rest on claims of a global modernization discourse that continues to give premium to centre-European of law despite the creation of new demarcations lines such as between (the rich and civilized) North and (the poor and as yet uncivilized) South. Europe unlike its economic counterpart in world systems theory, postcolonial perspectives are less interested in the sources of global law and instead focus on the impact of the transfer of the logic of European law into the periphery. Second, a contrasting cultural perspective is offered by world polity theorists who argue that the evolution of modern legal systems across the world is characterized by a strong convergence that indicates the formation of a world polity, which (in line with neo-institutionalist theory) functions as a reservoir of cognitive schemes. The schemes of the world polity include conceptions of sovereignty and universalistic principles that are transmitted into different national legal systems through the activities of international governmental and nongovernmental organizations oriented at enforcing compliance with global normative standards. Theoretical work on the diffusion of laws banning female genital cutting provides an interesting case in the world polity approach.

References

- Abrahám, J. (2009). Komparativní ekonomika (Comparative economics) EU. Praha: MAC. 2009. ISBN 978-80-86783-34-5.
- Abrahám, J., Horváthová, Z. (2010). Labour market and social cohesion within the European Union, *Politické vedy*, 13, 118 - 129.
- Belás, J.; Korauš, M.; Kombo, F.; Korauš, A. 2016. Electronic banking security and customer satisfaction and in commercial banks, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* 5(3): 411-422. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2016.5.3\(9\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2016.5.3(9))
- Carl, I., Franke, H., Ghassabeh, A., Hanke, F. (2005). Examenskurs: IPR, IZVR, EuR, Hamburg.
- Dubauskas, G. (2016). The management of public finance literacy for sustainable economic environment, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* 5(3): 403-409. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2015.5.3\(8\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2015.5.3(8))
- Dubský, Z. (2013). Visegrad Cooperation in Military and Security Areas. In: Marušiak, Juraj, aj. Is Visegrad Still. Bratislava: VEDA, Publishing House of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 2013, pp. 56-71. 204 p. ISBN 978-80-224-1319-0. Chapter 3.
- Fuschi, D. L.; Tvaronavičienė, M. (2016). A network based business partnership model for SMEs management, *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues* 3(3): 282-289. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2016.3.3\(5\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2016.3.3(5))
- Grinevica, L.; Rivza, B.; Rivza, P. (2016). Scenarios for reducing youth unemployment and promoting sustainability in the regions of Latvia, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* 5(3): 437-449. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2016.5.3\(11\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2016.5.3(11))
- Kropholler, J. (1993). Der Einfluss des Haager Übereinkommens auf die deutsche IPR Kodifikation, *RabelsZ* 57 (1993), 207 - 223.
- Mirvald, M. (2013). Is Adam Smith's Idea of Harmony between Individual Self-Interest and Social Interest Consistent with the Reality of Today? In: LÖSTER, Tomáš, Pavelka, Tomáš (ed.). *The 7th International Days of Statistics and Economics*. [online] Praha: Melantrium. s. 1007-1011. ISBN 978-80-86175-87-4.
- Neuhaus, P. (1976). Die Grundbegriffe des internationalen Privatrechts, 2. Auflage.
- Novickytė, L.; Rabikauskaitė, V.; Pedroja, G. 2016. Social security issues: II pillar pension funds' performance in Lithuania, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* 5(3): 329-354. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2015.5.3\(3\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2015.5.3(3))
- Palandt, M. (2006). Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch Kommentar, 65. Auflage, München.
- Prause, G. (2016). E-Residency: a business platform for Industry 4.0?, *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues* 3(3): 216-227. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2016.3.3\(1\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2016.3.3(1))
- Raudeliūnienė, J.; Stadnik, B.; Kindarytė, R. (2016). Knowledge appliance process: theoretical and practical evaluation aspects, *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues* 3(4): 368-379. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2016.3.4\(5\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2016.3.4(5))
- Tsaurkubule, Z. (2016). Towards sustainable development: changing the model of social policy in Latvia, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* 5(4): 575-588. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2016.5.4\(10\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2016.5.4(10))
- Tumalavičius, V.; Ivančiks, J.; Karpishchenko, O. (2016). Issues of society security: public safety under globalisation conditions in Lithuania, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* 5(4): 545-570. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2016.5.4\(9\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2016.5.4(9))
- Von Hofmann, B., Thorn, K. (2005). Internationales Privatrecht - einschließlich der Grundzüge des internationalen Zivilrechts, 8. Auflage, München.