

Dk - DIALOG

This *Bulletin* is for the internal purposes of the *Democratic Club*.

Introductory Word

In this issue, you can find the important information from the Club's General Meeting together with our Central Committee and the Central Auditing Commission new members names and the result of the election of the Club's president.

You can taste here some information from the historical years of our country. While reading you can think about 100 years of Czechoslovakia that you may partly know both from your own experience and also from stories told in your family and from books and cultural events. In the October meeting of the Democratic club, the main topics were values of Czechoslovakia founders, democracy of the new state, the fate of October men. The development in Czechoslovakia after the second World War with the start of the communist totality was mentioned, too. More information on the 100 years of the Czechoslovakian anniversary can be found at <https://muzirijna.cz/en/>

In the English version of Dk-dialog, we publish mostly translations from the Czech issue, but also original contributions. We would be glad if these were more frequent: you are welcome on our pages.

Redaction, JN

II - Articles, Dk Activities

INFORMATION FROM THE IXTH GENERAL MEETING OF THE DEMOCRATIC CLUB

Report about the course of the General Meeting

The IXth General Meeting occurred on Sunday, November 25th, 2018 in Prague 2, Jungmannova street 17 (CEVRO Institute). The deliberation was conducted by Jitka Nováková. The session started with approving the programme. There were no guests at the meeting.

We received information about the members who had passed away since the VIIIth General Meeting and present participants honored them by a minute's silence. Members who had passed away (in alphabetical order): *Vladislav Beran, Zdeňka Beranová, Stanislav Berton (Australia), Zdeněk Borský, Branislav Geryk (Slovakia), Jaroslav Hanzlík, Jiří Homola (France), František Chládek (Switzerland), Janina Joźwiak (Poland), Erika Kocianová, Otakar Kovář, Milan Kučera, Karel Kukul (Switzerland), Zlata Lešková, Jan Melichar, Arkadij Melnimov (RF - Tatarstan), Ludvík Mucha, Viktor Mühlberger, Marta Popová, Miroslav Prokopec, Jaroslav Samek (Switzerland), Bohuslav Strauch, Pavel Svoboda, Vladimír Šust, Zdeněk Třasoň (USA), Jovanka Václavíčková.*

Then the General Meeting continued by election of necessary commissions: mandatory (colleagues (col.) Sládek, Wagner, Zapletal), electoral (col. Novák, Šešerínac, Vavřínka) and for draft resolution (col. Budil, Pavlík a Friedlaender). The meeting continued with the report of Club's president Ivo Budil, and of the chairman of Club's political committee Jan Friedlaender. Zdeněk Pavlík, one of Club's co-founders, spoke as a political consultant. We missed the financial report because of the fact that the Club's financial manager did not work and had not prepared the report. It has to be sorted.

Miroslav Novák presented the lecture „Original marxism and communist revizionism in the 20th century“.

The discussion continued during and after refreshments. The presented reports were approved in the following stage of the meeting. The electoral commission announced the result of election of the Club's Central Committee and of the Central Auditing Commission. Of 59 voting members, 16 were present. The presented draft resolution of the IXth General Meeting was accepted.

From contributions of participants

Ivo Budil informed on successful activities of the Club - regular meetings and political commission activities and the Club's bulletin. The Club has to improve its public relations management.

The president of the Club's Political Commission **Jan Friedlaender** summarized the work of the commission in the period of his illness and also mentioned some problems in its members communication.

The political consultant **Zdeněk Pavlík** promised to write down his memories of the first period of Club.

Results of election of the Central Committee and Central Auditing Commission

According to the report of mandatory and election commission the following members were elected (in alphabetical order; the figure is the number of votes):

to **Central Comittee**: Ivo Budil (46), Marie Bohatá (41), Jan Friedlaender (40), Zdeněk Kalvach (37), Petr Jirásek (36), Jiřina Kocourková (34), Edvard Outrata

(33), Soňa Chalupová (30), Daniel Hůle (27), Lukáš Kovanda (27) Jitka Nováková (26), Valentýn Plzák (26), Ivan Sládek (25), Branislav Bleha (24), Ondřej Wagner (24); **as alternates to Central Committee:** Jan Miller (24), Zdeněk Uhlíř (23), Petr Hlaváček (21), Josef Kandert (20), Ludmila Kaprasová (20). Note: with the three members who received the same figure, 24, we used the rule of the selection by lot. **to Central Auditing Commission:** Boris Burcin (38), Hubert Maxa (37), Ema Barešová (33), Tomáš Kučera (32), Ivan Vávra (32); **as alternates to Central Auditing Commission:** Jiří Vavřinka (28), Václav Kotyk (27).

The voting of the Dk president

The procedure of this voting at the first meeting of the Central Committee in January was not successful due to the procedural mistake. At the second meeting of the Central Committee on 7th of May 2019 Jitka Nováková was elected as the president of the Club, and Ivo Budil and Ondřej Wagner as its two vice-presidents.

Executive Council

At the second meeting of the new Central Committee, the composition of the Executive Council was approved: the Council consists of 5 members, Jitka Nováková as the president, Jan Müller, Ema Fr. Plzáková, Maria Polesová and Milan Zapletal as members.

Resolution of the IXth General Meeting of the Democratic Club (Dk)

General Meeting

I. approves the Report by the outgoing Dk Committee as presented by Ivo Budil, Jan Friedlaender and Zdeněk Pavlík, it takes due note of the Report by the Mandate and Election Committee;

II. assigns the Central Committee to deal, after preliminary consultation with the Executive Council and employing the Council, with the following problem areas:

- 1) to convoke a meeting of the newly elected Central Committee not later than at the end of January 2019;
- 2) until three months to ensure personally and administratively full financial management of Dk;
- 3) until three months to ensure full activity of the Central Auditing Commission;
- 4) to consider a regular new pronouncement of the fundamental Dk documents;
- 5) to continue with the Democratic Seminar and to expand the discussion on democracy and democratism and its quality factors employing the Seminar, in the cooperation with academic and other professional and friendly organizations;

- 6) to publish critical positions to important home and foreign news concerning democracy and its quality and development, employing its political commission;
- 7) to pay attention to the contents of the Dk-Dialog, its formal and professional level, to its distribution and supplies outside the Club, also on the Club's web pages;
- 8) to give rise to discussion and working groups on the web pages, e-mail communication and social networks.

III. recommends to the newly elected Central Committee to deal, according to the merits of the occasion, either using its own powers or, employing the Executive Council,

- 1) to maximize the efforts in development of the cooperation with friendly organizations, academic and scientific organizations and media and through the mediation of them to publicize ideals of democracy and the law state;
- 2) to maximize the systematic efforts in recruiting new members, especially among the youth, and willing to involve in the Club activities;
- 3) to consider employing the Club websites for addressing the public; to improve their quality;
- 4) to develop relations with international members and organizations and to spread information on the existence and activities of the Democratic club abroad.

IV. calls on all the Club members,

- 1) to contribute to the Club activities using the Dk-Dialog for their positions and memories concerning the problems and history of democracy and democratism;
- 2) try to co-operate with the public media and use their civil activities to contribute this way to a higher popularity of the Club and its activities and mission in the public;
- 3) to facilitate recruiting new members and rejuvenating the Club, by means of addressing the personalities with ideals of democracy that could join to the discussion on problems of democracy and democratism.

ANTONÍN ŠVEHLA, CO-CREATOR OF FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Antonín Švehla originated from an old peasant family in Hostivař, which is now part of the Prague 15 city district. He was born on 15th April 1873 in Hostivař on a family estate, at a time when Czech society, after the fall of the regime of so-called Bach absolutism and relatively liberal 1860s, was influenced by the constitutional arrangement of creation of Austria-Hungary, when Hungary was

granted greater national rights than the lands and nations of Cisleithania, including the Czechs.

The then Czech political leaders of the nation's association in the National (Old Czech) Party occupied a dominant position in the Landtag and Vienna, but in the late 1970s the importance of liberals, who were later referred to as Young Czechs, slowly began to increase. Antonín Švehla had just been born into this political climate, in a time of change and not only in the political field. It was a time of economic change, technical progress (photography, electricity, film), a time when religion (especially Catholic) was already losing public influence and emphasis was placed on individualism, economic liberalism and newly discovered national values that were to be fulfilled by realist politics. It was a time when democratic political parties, public associations (Sokol, Hlahol), banking institutions or credit unions, professional associations, etc. began to arise or develop.

Antonín Švehla was member of the Sokol movement, which was encouraging for him in his efforts to lay the “cornerstone” of national awareness and pride and became a model for his organizational activities.

Very soon in the party he showed not only rich thought equipment and unusual work energy, but also organizational skills. Already in 1901, he was elected into the committee of the Printing and Publishing Peasant Cooperative. It published an agrarian letter “Defence of Farmers” and Švehla became a real promoter of agrarian progressive ideas and one of the creators of the organizational structure of the movement. In 1902 he became a member of the board of the Cooperative and became its vice-chairman. A year later, he became the head of the printing cooperative. The field of journalism and promotion became a kind of basis for Švehla's later political and public activities. He wanted to build the Agrarian Party massively across the social composition. This is from where Švehla's motto: “Countryside as One Family” came. His ambitions and desire to bring the issue closer to the agrarian broader audience Švehla fulfilled on 29 March 1906, when the first issue of the journal "Countryside" was published.

His efforts for mass support for the agrarian party culminated in the so-called Land reform during the First Czechoslovak Republic.

In addition to his activities in politics and Sokol, he stood at the birth of the Agrarian Bank, the Institute of Small farmers, the National Museum of Agriculture and the Agrarian Green International.

He sought reconciliation between Austrian Czechs and Germans. Unfortunately, at the end of 1912, it wrecked. The tragic day became July 26, 1913, when the so-called Ann patents were issued, by which the Czech Landtag was dissolved and the Land Administrative Commission consisting exclusively of state officials was installed. Švehla, however, once again led the nationwide protest, and succeeded in the establishment of a permanent land committee. However, this was not purely an

action against Vienna. Švehla sought a compromise solution and showed interest in negotiations.

The situation slowly began to develop towards the so-called Great War, now known as the First World War. Before the outbreak, the situation in the Czech political camp was dismal and the parties were quarrelling, promoting their particular interests. Paradoxically, the First World War helped consolidate the Czech political scene. Domestic problems had given way to external circumstances.

Restrictions of constitutional rights and the functioning of constitutional institutions during exceptional war events led Czech political leaders to try to coordinate their public activities and conduct joint negotiations. The leaders of the political parties began to meet in the secretariat of the Agrarian Party in Hybernská Street. The meeting was led by Antonín Švehla. Until the departure of Professor T. G. Masaryk to Italy, they were attended by him and later, he was replaced by Dr. Přemysl Šámal, a member of the so-called Maffia. Later that year, the Czech Union was created, in which the Czech MPs of the Imperial Council were united. The members of the Union were primarily concerned with the national political struggle and the constitutional legal solution of the situation. There was also created the National Committee in Prague, which was made up of representatives of political parties. Antonín Švehla was undoubtedly responsible for creation of both organisations. Unfortunately, Švehla remained in the background. The Czech public accepted the establishment of both organizations very positively.

Since the spring of 1917, when the situation on the war front and in international affairs began to tilt to the detriment of the so-called central powers (Italy's departure, US entry into war), the emancipation movement for national rights and self-determination began to strengthen in the Austro-Hungarian lands. Antonín Švehla was not only a part of this national political wave, he was its architect. There was also a dose of Švehla's pragmatism, when he became aware that Austria would lose the war.

The party's press authority Countryside was at the forefront of the struggle for the so-called de-Austrianization of Czech politics. Let us turn to the events of 1918 and look at the functioning of the National Committee. This institution was a purely political unit and had no executive power. It consisted of 40 members, chaired by Dr. Karel Kramář and Švehla was vice-chairman in charge of the organizational agenda. This committee had local and district national committees in the countryside, but it was not at the head of these organizations; it only used them to reach the rural population. It was formally established at a meeting on 13 July, chaired by Švehla himself. Other organizational units of the apparatus, the commission, were created. They had contacts not only in Prague, but also in Vienna. Their creation broke up Maffia. The Emperor's Manifesto of October 16 was proclaimed for the Empire critical days on October 18, in the Manifesto the ruler

Charles of Habsburg offered to rebuild the empire into a federation of independent national states. However, the National Committee refused this and it was decided to send a National Committee delegation to Geneva for talks with foreign officials. Dr. Kramář became a member of the Geneva delegation. Švehla thus became the main representative of the National Committee and his closest associate was Dr. Alois Rašín. Other Czech self-determination representatives included Jiří Stříbrný, Dr. František Soukup, Dr. Vavro Šrobár and just Švehla with Dr. Rashin, who together formed the legendary "Men of 28 October".

The efforts of Czechoslovak patriots, representatives of domestic and foreign resistance (here still needs to be named Dr. Edvard Beneš) were crowned on 28 October 1918 by the declaration of independence of the Czechoslovak nation and state and the creation of a free and democratic Czechoslovakia, which gained the status of a republican establishment. It was, in the words of President TGM, "recompense for the White Mountain" and the Czech nation in association with the Slovaks gained independence. It started the time of hard work, the time of constitution of the new young republic, the time called in Peroutka's words "building the state".

Antonín Švehla (namely in the matter of gaining control of the War Grain Institute) had a considerable merit in the peaceful takeover of power.

Antonín Švehla became an informal leader of the "Men of 28 October". It was he who also ensured the calm course of the October events. In the revolutionary years 1918 - 1920 he was involved in efforts to form the Czechoslovak state as a democratic and pluralistic state.

In 1919 Antonín Švehla was elected chairman of the newly renamed so-called Republican Party of the Czechoslovak Countryside. At this time, he has been in the Kramář government for a year now as Minister of the Interior. From this position of authority, he de facto directed Czechoslovak politics. The coalition government ended and a new government was established on July 8, 1919, when Prime Minister Vlastimil Tusar entrusted Švehla again with the office of Minister of the Interior. It is necessary to mention Švehla's policy of these early years of Czechoslovakia, when he is engaged in the solution of land reform. The main reason was to calm the situation in the countryside, when in March 1919, by the establishment of the government of the Soviets in neighbouring Hungary, the Czechoslovak government saw a threat to the stability of the country. Raising the issue of land reform has succeeded in suppressing radicalization.

He often met Masaryk, where he welcomed him at his farm in Hostivař. They discussed culture, education or religion. Švehla was a good connoisseur of human nature and was basically a realist. Švehla's belief in democracy was firmly anchored in his personal beliefs, along with an appeal for responsibility and trust.

His experience and influence Švehla fully reviewed in his three governments, namely from 7 October 1922 to December 9, 1925 (the first Švehla's government), from 9 December 1925 to 18 March 1926 (second Švehla's government) and 12 October 1926 to February 1, 1929 (the so-called Lordly Coalition). His popularity allowed him to reach the highest statesmanship level. It was when he refused to run for president in 1927 and supported Tomas Garrigue Masaryk's candidacy.

After Švehla's departure in 1929, a successor was sought for a long time. Eventually, he recommended František Udržal who was appointed Prime Minister, and who had above-standard relations with the Castle and at the same time strong inter-party respect. Švehla never returned to active politics. In the fall of 1933, his health deteriorated and on 12 December 1933 he died and with his death ends an epoch of Czech history.

Pavel Černý, December 2018

ETHICS IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 30 YEARS AFTER THE FALL OF COMMUNISM IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC

Public administration executes public policy, which can be defined as a system of courses of action and decision-making by the government or other players that influences the life of society. A trustworthy, efficient, multi-tier government and administration (perceived as services rendered to society) increasingly influences the social climate, economic performance, and the quality of life of societies.

After 1989, government reformers did not regard public administration-related issues as urgent, and thus the transformation – so needed – has been given very low priority¹. This resulted in the state administration lagging considerably behind the growth of both the private and non-profit sectors. It suffered from considerable instability due to politicization and low professionalism and attractiveness compared with jobs in the private sector. Positive signs started to emerge in connection with the Czech Republic joining NATO in 1999 and the EU in 2004. Both organizations place their own requirements on all aspiring members. In particular, the EU requires not only maintaining standards of the rule of law, but also a strong and independent civil service. The country's initial willingness to comply with various preconditions has partly evaporated, especially regarding the so needed Civil Service Act. The government promised to introduce it in 2002, however, postponed its adoption until 2014 making the Czech Republic the last country in Europe (with the sole exception

¹

The only politically-significant issue was the creation of a territorial administration structure.

of Belarus) to finally pass this important legislation. Not even at that time did it meet the internationally-recognized requirements of good practice, particularly those concerning political independence and professionalism of administration. Moreover, it should be emphasized that the current amendments being enacted are further steps backwards with regard to the recommended principles of modern public administration.

The current system of governance in the Czech Republic still does not make full use of the main instruments and principles of good governance that should be implemented within the European Administrative Space. The institutional framework, as the essential tool of governance, consists of:

- the quality of legislation,
- the quality of administrative procedures for decision-making and coordination, balance of power, and communication with citizens and stakeholders,
- the quality of control mechanisms, public authority and accountability.

The above three factors establish the legal values and procedures that predetermine the behaviour of politicians, public officials, businesses, citizens and the society as a whole. They should also reflect the principles of good governance as applied both by the OECD and EU Member States including independence and impartiality, reliability, and predictability, transparency and accountability, technical and managerial competences, organizational capacity, human resource management, financial sustainability, and participation of citizens.

On reflection, the first attempt at the government level to lay down rules governing Czech public administration² and increasing its transparency can be seen in Government Resolution no. 270/2001 on the Ethical Code for Public Officials. The essence of the Code was to point out the necessary standards as well as to increase people's trust in public administration. However, no practical procedures were provided to monitor or enforce the observance of the Code. It is therefore unsurprising that no tangible effect could be observed from this good intent.

In 2012, i.e., 11 years later, the government adopted a new code, which was to become a model for ethical codes of public administration authorities. It consisted of a set of recommendations that, in the form of internal rules, should extend and specify the duties of public officials laid down in the existing legal regulations (not adding new ones). The recommendations covered the following areas: legality,

²

Public administration includes its central part and local governments. This article focuses on the central part governed by the Civil Service Act.

decision-making, professionalism, impartiality, promptness and efficiency, conflict of interest, corruption, management of entrusted public funds, confidentiality, public informing, public activities, representation, applicability, and enforceability. Although no analysis has been conducted regarding the impact of this initiative, it is clear that the formal approach adopted also in this case did not result in any visible positive change.

Apart from the legal aspects of public administration, its ethical aspects are also important. The lack of a set of basic values is a major weakness of the current institutional framework. Clearly, it will take more than the identification of such basic values; they must be operationalized in a suitable manner (an ethical code, education for ethical behaviour, specialized officers/offices to address ethical dilemmas, and the possibility of confidential reporting). Only this way can values serve in building ethical cultures within institutions serving the public.

It is generally accepted that public administration is increasingly important for a competitive economy. In international comparisons of public administration quality, published in OECD Government at a Glance reports³ (OECD 2017) and Competitiveness Reports (Schwab 2013-2018), the Czech Republic ranks in the last third of the EU/OECD states, and the situation is not much better concerning the goals set by the Czech government in the 2014-2020 Strategic Framework of Public Administration Development (Annual Reports by the Czech Ministry of the Interior in 2016 and 2017). According to a study on social efficiency of public administration (Bohatá et al. 2018a, 2018b), one of the weakest points is the prolonged insufficient attention paid to ethics and its implementation.

It has been repeatedly declared that the purpose of the Civil Service Act was to depoliticize, stabilize, and professionalize public administration. As mentioned above, the ambition of the original bill, prepared already in 2001, was not achieved by enacting it as Act no. 234/2014 Coll. Concerning explicit solutions to ethical questions, the Act anticipated an ethical code for public servants. In line with this anticipation, the Vice-Minister of the Interior issued Service Regulation no. 13/2015 laying down ethical rules for civil servants. This strongly legalistic document (likely drafted under time pressure due to the Act being enacted excessively late) has a structure similar to the code of 2012 and, notably, not even this code meets expectations. To list its weaknesses, it is overly legalistic, unbalanced, non-specific for individual hierarchical levels, and vague. Consequently, the code is currently under revision. It is encouraging that the working group in charge of this revision is consulting various stakeholders, including academics.

3

Published yearly since 2010

The ethical climate in the Czech public administration can be illustrated using some key results of an extensive survey (740 respondents) conducted in 2018 (Bohatá 2019). According to Czech public servants, values are of key importance. 83% of respondents agree with this view. However, only a narrow majority think that values are known in their organization. While an international survey in 29 OECD member-states conducted in 1999-2000 (OECD 2000) showed that the most frequent among values are impartiality (24 countries), legality (22 countries) and integrity (18), followed by transparency (14), efficiency (14), equality (11), responsibility (11), and justice (10), in the Czech Republic, the ranking is rather different. Officers, who were offered to make an ordered choice of 5 values from a list inspired by the above OECD survey, consider professionalism the most important (69%), but young officers value equality and justice more. This is then followed by integrity (56%) and, rather surprisingly, by responsibility (55%), and next by decency (49%), impartiality (46%), transparency (43%), justice (43%), and efficiency (34%). Values such as quality (27%) and equality (23%) are viewed as having little significance on average. Since, in continental Europe, equality is among the traditional values, this result can be interpreted as a return of the younger generation to the tradition. Surprisingly, relatively low importance is given to legality (18%), even if in the Czech Republic a very close relationship between ethics and law is generally perceived, with a prevailing legalistic approach to addressing ethical problems. The rule of law ranks first according to only 7% of respondents. Among the above set of values, innovativeness ranked last (9%).

The fact that debates on values are an exception in Czech public administration (only 9% of the respondents knew about such debates having taken place, with 44% saying there are no such debates and 47% not knowing) can be regarded as a negative. A positive fact, however, is the interest in such debates, found in 73% of the respondents, of whom 85% would like to attend them.

According to the majority opinion, ethics is complementary to law, representing stricter rules than those of the law setting the minimal requirements of society. This view is shared by 52% of respondents. The differences between men (62%) and women (47%) are noteworthy, and an even greater percentage (73%) is found among managers. However, the conviction that ethics stands for complying with both the letter and spirit of the law (41% of respondents, 35% men and 44% women) is significant in our view. Among higher-management officers, ethics is perceived as such by 24% of respondents. While 4% of respondents identify ethics with the letter of the law, 3% do not know how ethics could be characterized.

Ethical problems in public administration are perceived rather differently by men and women. While men consider the most serious problems to be the difficult definition and explanation of the public interest, formal fulfilment of tasks, and efforts to foster the views of the superior regardless of whether right or wrong, women point out the misuse of office and corrupt tendering. Agreement can be observed in views on advancing personal interests to the detriment of the public interest (one third of respondents think that this is a serious problem). Czech society is generally known as tolerant to conflict of interest, which is corroborated by this research as less than one quarter of respondents regard this problem as grave. On the other hand, 10% of public officers do not see any ethical problem in their work. Given the quite ambiguous perception of ethics, this result can be thought of as a sort of ethical ignorance.

Debates on ethical problems in organizations rarely occur. Only 21% of respondents gave a positive answer when asked whether a discussion takes place, while 41% said they did not know whether there were any. At higher levels, debates on ethics occur more frequently (42%), with this frequency dropping in line with lower management levels; only 19% of the rank-and-file employees say that active debates exist in their organization, while 44% are not informed about any debates occurring. Officers, however, do show interest in discussions of ethical problems (72% of respondents) at all management levels.

The development of an ethical climate in the workplace is perceived as improving by almost one half (46%) of the respondents, while over one third (38%) are of the opinion that it does not have a promising outlook. The concept of fostering general awareness of an ethical code by all employees in an organization and the existence of a person in charge of ethical issues has a positive influence on the perception of development in the right direction. Conversely, respondents' perception of the overall climate is influenced negatively by situations in which respondents would be forced to accept the ideas of their superiors regardless of whether this is right, followed by personal interests being prioritized to the detriment of the public interest, and by corrupt tendering for positions of higher public officers. When respondents indicate that ethical problems in the organization receive more attention than before, the development of an ethical climate in the workplace is perceived as positive. Over one half (53%) of respondents state they do not see any significant change in the approach to managing ethical issues, with only 31% admitting that ethical problems are being addressed more than before.

When facing ethical problems, the respondents mostly recall the previous experience of someone else in a similar situation, consult a lawyer, or refer to an ethical code.

Respondents aged 60+, and those who are guided by personal attitudes rather than by the rules of the internal environment, place more importance on their own previous experience. Pointing out ethical problems and engaging in discussion about them is mentioned most often as an instrument to strengthen ethics.

The survey results clearly confirm that a key factor is the behaviour of top management, which sends a clear signal about how seriously ethics is taken in the organization. The example set by a manager is decisively important for 78% of respondents and rather important for 20% of them. Next, the results clearly confirm the need for debates on ethical issues. The existence of debates was confirmed by 21% of respondents, with 41% having no awareness of them, and 37% believing that they do not take place at all.

Decision-making in public administration depends on both personal attitudes (51%) and the organizational culture (46%), while the remainder does not know. This targeted question was complemented by asking what most of the respondents' colleagues are guided by. The findings are interesting: 50% of colleagues are guided by the rules in force in the organization and its environment, 25% are guided by their own conviction about what is right, 13% are guided by the expectation of their environment, and 1% of colleagues honour ethical rules regardless of the consequences this may entail.

The survey results lead to a conclusion that, given the present conditions in the Czech Republic, open debates, education, and ethical leadership are the avenues to pursue. A significant shortcoming is the lack of ethical models at the highest levels of public administration, but it is comforting to note that there is considerable interest in debates and education on the part of officers. The time has come for these to take place on a larger scale. These instruments may be expected to increase ethical awareness and to develop moral competencies, thus improving the ethical literacy of officers on the one hand, and improving the ethical climate and organizational culture of public administration on the other.

References

Bohatá, M. 2019. Etika a integrita veřejné správy v České republice (Ethics and Integrity in Czech Public Administration. Scientific Papers of the University of Pardubice, No 3.

Bohata, M., Putnova, A., Cebakova, A., Rasticova, M., Bediova, M. (2018a). Social effectiveness of the Czech public administration. In Proceedings of the 12th International Conference Public Administration 2018. University of Pardubice, pp.8-17.

Bohata, M., Putnova, A., Rasticova, M., Bediova, M., Cebakova, A. (2018b). Social effectiveness of the Czech public administration through the eyes of the citizens. In Proceedings of the 12th International Conference Public Administration 2018. University of Pardubice, pp.18-27.

OECD. (2000). Trust in Government. Ethics Measures in OECD Countries. Available at <https://www.oecd.org/gov/ethics/48994450.pdf>. Accessed May 5, 2018.

OECD. (2017). Government at a Glance 2017. OECD Publishing, Paris. Available at https://doi.org/10.1787/gov_glance-2017-en. Accessed March 2, 2019.

Schwab, K. (eds.). (2013-108). Global competitiveness reports 2013-2018. World Economic Forum. Available at <https://www.weforum.org/reports>. Accessed July 11, 2019.

The Czech Ministry of the Interior. (2017). Annual report 2016. Available at <https://www.mvcr.cz/clanek/verejna-sprava-publikace.aspx>. Accessed November 12, 2018.

The Czech Ministry of the Interior. (2018). Annual report 2017. Available at <https://www.mvcr.cz/clanek/verejna-sprava-publikace.aspx>. Accessed November 12, 2018.

The Czech Ministry of the Interior. (2015). Service regulation no. 13/2015. Collection of service regulations of the Deputy Minister of the Interior for civil service, no. 15 (13).

Marie Bohatá, prosinec 2019

Announcement for Members who want to be (more) active

Everybody who wants to discuss Democratic Club activities, to bring new opinions and suggestions, let us know please as soon as possible at dklub@volny.cz, preferably by the end of the month, and we can inform you via e-mail on new prepared Positions and other topics and expect your feedback. And, moreover, we'll appreciate your feedback on our website, too.

Announcement concerning the Dk-Dialog Distribution (via e-mail)

Everybody who wants to receive the Dk-dialog via e-mail and who doesn't want to receive the printed copy, please inform us at the address dklub@volny.cz. It is possible to read it on the Club web site and to print it, too.

If you are getting this issue of Dk-Dialog by ordinary mail, this is because we do not have your e-mail address.

We would prefer to send you the next issue electronically only. Please, let us know your e-mail address. It is the more economic solution for the Club. Thank you for your understanding.

Activities of the Democratic Club

The Democratic Club has three main activities. We consider the **formulation of the official positions** aiming to affect political life and public opinion as the first one. These positions are distributed to representatives of political bodies (president,

ministries, members of parliament, and other high level officers), sent to mass media and published in Dk-Dialog for better orientation of members.

The regular monthly meeting of members (regularly up to now only in Prague) is the second activity, usually with an opening theme and the discussion concerning also other topics of democratic relevance. We could mention some of them occurring during the last period. Problems with Brexit and what it means for us (Ivo Kaplán), Beginnings of cooperative movements in Czech country and in the world (Lidmila Němcová), Switzerland - immigration and the society (Dana Seidlová), Heritage of the 28th October men and democratic values (Pavel Černý), "9" anniversaries (Valentýn Plzák).

The publishing of the Dk-Dialog newsletter is the third main activity, currently three times a year. Its English version is published irregularly. The study of democracy and democratism belongs among other non trivial activities. Information from the IXth General Meeting of the Democratic Club (from 25th November 2018) is published in this issue.

Appeal to Members living abroad (mail address)

We would be glad if you could acknowledge the receipt of the mail, e.g. by e-mail. We suppose the mail arrives unless it comes back, but we are not sure. Please, announce any change of your address to dkklub@volny.cz. If you announce your e-mail address, it would be very appreciated and useful. Thank you.

List of Dk members activities - where you can receive information:

dkklub@volny.cz

President Jitka Nováková

Vice-presidents Ivo Budil (PR), Ondřej Wagner (regular meetings)

Political commission Jan Friedlaender

Financial manager Ludmila Kaprasová

Mail secretary Ema F. Plzáková

Administrative secretary and South Bohemia Dk group Milan Zapletal

Dk members list Jan Müller

Dk members anniversary congratulations Mária Polesová

North Bohemia Dk group Petr Jirásek

Dk Website Petr Neugebauer, Ondřej Šimpach, Jitka Nováková

Did you know that...

...here you can find the **Festival of Democracy 2019**:

<https://www.forum2000.cz/en/projects/festival-of-democracy-2019>,

...**UN DPI NGO** can be found here: <https://outreach.un.org/ngorelations/>,

...in September 2019, there was a **statue, Lovehate**, in Beroun disclosed, in connection with partner cities:



Jitka Nováková, December 2019

* * *

Published by Democratic Club, Fr. Křížka 1, 170 00 Praha 7, Czech Republic

Tel. (recorder): +420 221 506 733; e-mail: dklub@volny.cz ;

Web site: <http://www.demokratickyklub.cz>

You can meet the Democratic Club actualities on Facebook and Twitter, too.

Account No: IBAN CZ 76 0800 0000 0019 2386 8339; SWIFT: GIBACZPX

Registered by the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic, No. 6795.

Editorial Board: Zdeněk Kalvach (chief editor), Jitka Nováková and Zdeněk Pavlík.

Translation: Jan Müller, Jitka Nováková, Zdeněk Pavlík; English language editing by Michael Shapiro.

Contributions to Dk-Dialog by individual authors need not express the Democratic Club views; these are expressed only in the official, numbered Democratic Club Positions.