

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

I. Introductory Word

In this issue, you can find the actual introductory word concerning the coronavirus pandemic.

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.

JN

Dear Colleagues,

I have no idea in what situation you will read the text. That is why I want to express my participation, above all, to all those who have been hit painfully by the viral epidemic, and also my sincere, albeit unfortunately only symbolic, support for those who are currently struggling against the infection in themselves or in their loved ones. May all this turn out well - although unfortunately the danger of victims is real. And at least symbolically, I all humanly sympathize with the suffering of people experiencing apocalyptic dying in the most severely affected areas of Italy, Spain, Korea, China, ruthlessly ravaged by the Kraken released by God knows from where.

We are experiencing events that we have not encountered yet, whose globally synchronized course and impact are unparalleled, and when they subside, we will find ourselves in another world. Humanly, of course, we are primarily interested in the fate of the ill, but politically, above all, the future world. Will it be better? worse? what kind of human and municipal (communal) everyday space will we have in it for

citizenship and influencing things, what degree of autonomy and responsibility? What and how we will manage to obtain and adjust, this we can only speculate today.

Until "yesterday", the stopping of the ship called "Colossus World" as we are experiencing today, was completely unimaginable. However, the "Colossus" is stopping and changes its course. Where to? Who knows. The economic impact will be huge - will we be punished for the Czech crown, should we survive it without the euro, or will we make money on it? Just like after the oil crisis in the 70s, modernization changes will be applied by leaps and bounds, innovations of entire systems - education, health, security, social control, the demographic picture of the world will change, there will be geopolitical and military security changes, perhaps we will experience wars between actors, differently weakened or slipped from collective controls. Personally, I hope that the Covid-19 experience will accelerate European integration with our participation, that there will be no European disintegration or our isolated apostasy. How will all this be reflected in the dimensions of our everyday life, in the local "commonality of mutual relations, in mutual understanding", which is the only space where democracy can be cultivated as a living form of politics, administration and self-government? What azimuths will the captains choose from?

Will they support the old-new humanistic concept based on the dignity and autonomy of man, specific people, the concept represented today by the Universal Declaration of (Natural) Human Rights, free from paralyzing excesses from declining irresponsibility and inconsistency? Will they choose the eusocial concept of subordination of man to the "Society", biological-economic reductionism, the biomodel of values and the biologization of the management of society, its biological structure, natality, mortality - after all, the incoming time was now foreshadowed by a biological event? Will they sail to the posthumanist future of cyborgs, genetically modulated products of assisted reproduction, modern Golems, artificial intelligence, robots, avatars in the middle of beautifully depopulated nature in an era of decimating epidemics? Will the new azimuth preserve large units of free movement of persons, goods, services, capital with effective central external security of foreign, security, monetary policy, with consistent respect to subsidiarity in other areas? Or will it be the azimuth of the archipelago of powerfully profiled and hopelessly abandoned actors of state and supranational commerciality, reissued into the struggle of all against all before the creation of social contract, subject to the law of the stronger, essentially social Darwinism and governed by situational bioethics willing to sacrifice anyone to higher suspicious interests? I would very much like it to be an instructively realistic humanistic azimuth towards the symbolic fraternally / sisterly world rule of all people of good will respecting the Higher Moral Principle, or

whatever they will call it, respecting the value of each person and their life and Rorty-empathic to the suffering of their neighbours, because "both you and I are of one blood," and the foundation of our community is the unity of mutual interactivity and interdependence of zoon politikon. Probably also this is the object of decision today in the turmoil and behind the veil of human tragedies of a gigantic pandemic changing the world and looming epochs.

All the more so we should be aware that diseases do not only affect individual people and their basic groups (families, communities), but also social systems, and we should adhere to the Roman legal principles of "learn to fear of yourself", restricting your power, your governance. No matter how great the biological threat of Covid-19 is, we should not overlook how erroneously a state of emergency has been declared in our country from the point of view of law and the constitution. How easily began the rule with declining cries of government officials into the microphone in the light of cameras without respecting the attributes of the legal validity of binding decisions, resolutions, laws legitimized by proper procedures. Otherwise, we may find ourselves in a paralyzed post-democracy with all the joyfully immediate strikes of informal action of governance with the applause of the crowd, but also with all the fatally negative consequences of the same — with immediate restriction of fundamental freedoms and rights indefinitely, with shallow general justification of a never-ending state of emergency and without functional, actionable political opposition. We have already been there and we know where it led and how to live in it!

But let us also try, in a time of forced restriction of activities, to cultivate, to subject ourselves to control. For example, instead of watching the TV screen with celebrities in masks and gloomy numbers in the background, fascinated by the coronavirus atmosphere and often unnecessarily nerve-wracking, we finally get to those books for which there was no time for years. So now we have it. Let's mix a balanced cocktail of light humour and contemplative theological, philosophical and contemplative wisdom. And let's not forget the well-loaded audiobooks, radio play recordings, performance recordings. In fact, we will mimic the origin of Boccaccio's Renaissance Decameron: during quarantine times (then plagues), people spent their time with racy stories. And what about respectable authors? For a start, for example, Cicero "On Duties", after the Bible the 2nd book that Gutenberg printed as a priority for the education of our civilization, Marcus Aurelius "Meditations", Seneca, Chesterton, Montaigne as the father of essayists, Karel Čapek - if you by any chance accidentally forgot one of them.

And one last thought: in addition to a lasting belief in democracy, civic responsibility, and a will to control the Power, let us also retain humanity. Let us

remain in the present danger, and especially in it, "human people." In the epidemic of today's scale, sooner or later the services, including social and health will definitely collapse - then it will depend immensely on the naturally supportive power of families, neighbourhoods, municipalities. The state and the regions will probably only be able to create a framework, supply and... limit, otherwise we are and will remain very dependent on each other. *So, let's strengthen the local community and reject segregation* – *by age and otherwise*.

Let's keep each other standing – by small services, mutual interest, by good word, the certainty of contact. And let's not destroy larger community – let's try dampen in other people the desire to denounce without reason people who reasonably in a deserted street walk without paper or textile mask (which is usually rather inefficient when used generally and without right performance), let's try to damp hysteria, hatred, ruthlessness, segregation. By all this, together with personal bravery and not the arithmetic of the elections is manifested, maintained or crumbled real democracy.

Let us keep our fingers crossed, let us maintain the "contactless community", Masaryk's understanding and wish sincerely peaceful passage through the rapids of Covid-19 to each other, to the Czech Republic, democracy and the "Colossus World" and wish a good world behind those rapids.

Zdeněk Kalvach, March 2020

II. THE DEMOCRATIC CLUB POSITION NO. 66

On the Safeguarding Generality of Elections to the Chamber of Deputies of the Parliament of the Czech Republic

As a result of the current situation, when the main problem of the society is overcoming the coronavirus pandemic, reports of the introduction of the possibility of voting by correspondence into the Parliament of the Czech Republic have completely disappeared. With regard to the approaching election date, there is a risk that the systematic violation of the principle of generality of elections will continue also in the future elections to the Parliament. Especially for citizens who are staying outside the territory of the Czech Republic on election day, the difficult accessibility of a polling place may be the cause of non-participation in elections and thus nonfulfilment of their right to elect their representatives. That is why we urge that the possibility of the vote by correspondence, which exists in all advanced democracies, should be enacted. Without this adjustment, we cannot talk about general elections.

In order to make the elections cheaper and also to prevent possible manipulations, we recommend that the elections be held in a single day with a sufficient number of hours, as is the case in practically all countries of the world. We consider the peculiarities that threaten the regularity of the elections as counterproductive.

In Prague, 6 June 2020

III. ARTICLES, DK ACTIVITIES

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION IN A CHANGING WORLD

The European integration project, which started after World War II, is very successful. At its inception, it set itself the primary goal of achieving lasting peace between the European powers by integrating the economies of European countries in such a way that war between these countries was unthinkable not only as regards values but also physically. The integration process has long achieved this goal, and today the European Union is an area where internal peace is guaranteed for its members and neighbours. There is no doubt also about success in achieving the secondary goal of ensuring growth and prosperity for its citizens by establishing a common market for goods, services, capital and labour, although much work remains to be done in this area. In my opinion, the tertiary goal of creating a community of values is also succeeding, although recent successes have been less deciding.

However, the integration of Europe is influenced by the changing international environment, in particular the continuing economic and information globalization and the related changes in the balance of power between the world powers. New generations in Europe and elsewhere in the world are creating new views of reality, based on their experience and ambitions that differ from those of older generations and aspirations. Last but not least, the side effects of the very successes of European integration are manifesting themselves as new problems.

Thus, the very fact that there has been no war in the area of integrated Europe for more than 70 years, and that its eyewitnesses are already disappearing, leads today's Europeans to believe that this situation is self-evident and that there is no need to worry about maintaining it. The nationalist and other hate speech that led to the wars years ago no longer arouses as much resistance in Europe as it did a few years ago. With this loss of experience with war comes the neglect of the common defence of the integrated Europe, both by impudently relying on the grace of God (or

rather the United States) and by ignoring the need to integrate defence. In this context, it is worth noting that even examples of wars in the vicinity of integrated Europe, such as the wars in the former Yugoslavia or the Soviet Union, where in all cases the influence of a united Europe was insufficient, did not change anything on it. And similar is the danger posed by the conflicts in the Middle East.

Economic (and information) globalization has been going on in the world since at least the middle of the 19th century, and throughout all that time it has been a major factor in the continued growth of world wealth. It is therefore also an important source of European prosperity. The integration process in Europe contributes to globalization both within the Union by creating a single market for goods, services, capital and labour, and externally by systematically supporting initiatives that have broken down trade barriers between countries in the past. Although the result is undoubtedly the accelerated growth of world wealth, and also phenomenal growth of technological innovation, this process brings with it a number of problems. Above all, this growth is uneven. The fact that some get richer and others get less and maybe not rich at all creates a differentiation between winners and losers. This affects the differences between rich and poor, a so-called scissors. At the same time, the picture that creates this development is different if we compare economies as a whole or, conversely, individuals within economies. While between economies poorer are gradually catching richer, creating a large new middle class in relatively underdeveloped countries and a radical decline in world poverty, the scissors are widening within economies, and in rich countries part of the middle class is failing, the rich get richer and the poor thrive far less. This changes the balance of forces between the powers on a global scale and at the same time increases tensions within individual economies. The worst in this sense are the poorer ones in rich countries, which still seem to be completely out of sight of the growth of total wealth. This leads to disillusionment and political consequences, to the emergence of new political parties and movements, and to the weakening of existing institutions and political elites, as well as to growing doubts about the correctness of the current political direction.

This development concerns not only the European Union, but basically the whole developed world, and is perhaps most pronounced in the USA. However, European developments are further complicated by the fact that some, in disappointment, turn against the European Union, from which the poor expected (whether rightly or not) to effectively prevent such developments within the Union. The fact that the Union was not properly prepared for this development damaged it, especially in the post-2008 economic crisis, in the eyes of its citizens, even though the Union's institutions and its members had managed the crisis very well.

The basic means for achieving the set goals of European integration is to strengthen the rule of law and justice, not the people. To this end, the European integration project has been creating a number of institutions and treaties since its inception, which together form a body of European law. The authors of the project deliberately avoided the models of traditional federations or confederations, so the result is unique, supposedly specifically tailored to current European needs. According to the original plan, the emerging Union was to be increasingly integrated as needed. This has created a structure where important decisions must have the support of both the Member States (i.e. the Council) and the citizens (i.e. Parliament), while the preparation of legislation and implementation and the monitoring of its implementation are entrusted to the Commission. This structure, which differs from federal models in that there is no fully political government, leaves the strongest position to the Council, i.e. the governments of the Member States, which reflects the balance of power in the Union and therefore works well. However, the authority of the Union in the eyes of its citizens is undermined by the fact that this model allows political government representatives at home, when it suits them, to pretend that the "dictates of Brussels" are taking place, when in fact all decisions (usually unanimous) must be approved by the Council, i.e. the representatives of all governments, including their own. The result is an unfair loss of legitimacy for such regulations in the eyes of deceived citizens. Moreover, the fact that in the elections to the Parliament citizens do not essentially decide on the composition and program of the government, as well as the distance of the Union's institutions, supports the mostly unsubstantiated notions about bureaucracy and cumbersomeness of the Brussels administration. In fact, the Brussels apparatus is very professional and far smaller than the bureaucracy of the Member States. However, it is true (and can be felt when a rapid response is needed) that where a decision must be made with the consent of all countries, the decision-making process is unacceptably long.

European integration creates space for the mobility of European Union citizens inside and outside of the Union. The dismantling of the physical borders between Europeans within Schengen, but also the ease of movement outside Schengen associated with both the common market within the EU and the breadth of globalization in most of the world, make a major contribution to spreading the idea of integration. The free movement of all, and especially young people, contributes significantly to mutual knowledge, which significantly helps the main goals of European integration (maintaining peace and thus security and prosperity). Mobility also successfully overcomes traditional barriers that have restricted Europeans' lifestyle choices in the past and enables education in an environment of different cultural influences, broadening participants' horizons and increasing efficiency in the economy and in other aspects of life. However, other benefits of integration show that general mobility also creates feelings of insecurity and cultural threat among many

Europeans. As meaningless as it may be economically and socially, the consequences of the free movement of persons have probably contributed to Britain's withdrawal from the European Union.

It is becoming clear that the European Union is facing a new task, namely to do something with itself. The engine of its success so far has been the idea of an "ever closer union", which must be constantly strived for. She was comparing herself to a bicycle that couldn't stop from the thread of falling. This cannot continue in the same form, even if some of its goals are not yet fully met; this is partly because its decisionmaking processes are proving to be too slow and sometimes administratively demanding in some important cases; and secondly, because there are different opinions about which direction to go next. At the same time, these differences of opinion express different historical experiences of individual countries or regions and cannot still be downplayed, as has been the case so far. However, the idea of the pessimists that the European Union will fall apart is no longer realistic, because repeated opinion polls in all EU countries show that, despite the criticism, leaving the Union is not the wish of the majority. After all, the negative example of Great Britain reinforces this feeling. In contrast, citizens on the European continent consider the European Union to be a permanent element of their environment, even though they are very critical in some details. By the way, this also applies to Czech Republic, which is perhaps the least pro-European in these surveys, but where it depends significantly on how exactly the question is asked. (If we ask if we like the EU, twothirds say no; but if we ask if we should leave the EU, the majority would be against it.)

The need to change the Union's mechanisms in some way following recent experience leads all those responsible to propose further changes, which are often contradictory. Most of them suffer from the fact that in such critical time, everyone is afraid of interfering with the basic treaties, and therefore they are looking for partial solutions that would circumvent this necessity. So far so good. We'll see if that would be enough.

I believe that the key to the change, with which everyone will agree, is to return to one principle of the European Union that is not much talked about today, i.e. the principle of subsidiarity, according to which each task should be tackled at that level (EU, national or local), where it can be addressed most effectively. However, it must be emphasized that this principle mandates not only that what can be better addressed at national or local level (as Eurosceptics rightly remind us) should not be addressed at EU level, but also not to address at national or local level that which can be better resolved at EU level (as pointed out by voters in countries whose governments are unable to cope with the situation). The problems associated with

migration are a good example of how the principle of subsidiarity is not consistently applied in practice.

Elections to the European Parliament are approaching, and it seems that, perhaps for the first time, views on the further development of the European Union will explicitly clash. This is a major step forward, which should increase interest in these elections and, in the coming years, stimulate an effective debate on the direction of the EU. The identification of common goals and their formulation should be the result of compromises, based on that discussion.

And I especially hope that the future of the EU will finally be seriously discussed in Czech Republic. What is our history, in comparison with other countries of the Union? Unfortunately, since our accession in 2004, Czech society has permanently and repeatedly pushed the problems of the European Union out of the political debate. As a result, our citizens appear to be highly Eurosceptic. This is, I think, the wrong conclusion, because, in fact our citizens, among those of all European countries, probably know the least about the Union. So, they are not Eurosceptics or Eurorealists, but Euro-ignorants. If we want the Czech Republic to effectively occupy the place it deserves, both in Europe and especially in this debate, it is therefore an important task for our politicians, as well as journalists and civil society organizations, to spread awareness about the European Union. This is one of our most important national interests.

Edvard Outrata, October 2018

29TH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE SOCIETY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES FROM 10 TO 12 JULY 2018 IN PRAGUE

The Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU), which celebrated its 60th anniversary this year [2018], came into being in the United States of America during the Cold War, primarily in order to maintain the continuity of Czech and Slovak thinking, research and arts in free conditions of foreign exile. Over the past decades, the representatives of the company have managed to create an extensive network comprising personalities of Czech and Slovak origin, and friends of the Czech and Slovak Republics practically throughout the whole democratic world.

Every two years, the Society of Arts and Sciences organizes the World Congress, which has moved onto the territory of the Czech and Slovak Republics after 1989. Participants in the past met in Prague, Bratislava, Košice, Plzeň, Olomouc, Tábor or České Budějovice. In 2018, the Metropolitan University Prague provided a platform for the congress. The mentioned meeting, which received patronage from

the President of the Senate of the Parliament of the Czech Republic, Milan Štěch, and the President of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, prof. RNDr. Eva Zažímalová, CSc., comprised professional and social part. The opening ceremony took place in the building of the Senate and adjacent Wallenstein Gardens, and a part of it was the announcement of annual awards by the Prague local group of *The Society of Arts and Sciences*. On Wednesday, July 11th, during a steamer cruise on the Vltava River, Pavlína Moskalyková, president of the *European Union Arts Foundation*, presented the 2018 European Union Arts Award to Vladimir Mišík and Lida Sander, chairwoman of the Los Angeles Society of Arts and Sciences.

During the plenary session which opened the academic part of the program at the Metropolitan University Prague, besides representatives of the US Embassy and Rector and Director of the Metropolitan University Prague, also Eliška Hašková Coolidge, Martin Palouš and Milada Polišenská appeared. Hugh Agnew, Paul Burik, and Gregory Ference, who, in their interesting contributions, dealt with the circumstances of the birth of the independent Czechoslovak Republic, were the first of more than sixty lecturers at the congress.

The symbolic and emotional peak of the congress was undoubtedly a plenary projection of the unique American documentary of the time about the Prague Spring, which was premiered only this summer in Los Angeles. Rudolf V. Perina, a student at the time, participated in the creation of the almost hour-long film. Rudolf was born in January 1945 in Tábor. In 1950, his parents emigrated to Switzerland, which they left the following year for the United States of America. After his studies, Rudolf V. Perina was employed at the US Department of State and worked as a diplomat in Ottawa, Moscow, Berlin, Brussels, Belgrade, and other destinations. He was thrilled by the idea that during the Prague Congress he would present a documentary about the Prague Spring, and he was looking forward to visiting his native country. Unfortunately, on June 13, 2018, he suddenly died in his home in Washington. Participants of the Congress honoured his memory with a minute of silence.

The 29th World Congress of the *Society of Arts and Sciences*, held from 10 to 12 July 2018 in Prague, documented by the number and level of the participants the viability of this organization, which proved its vitality and promising future also under changed historical conditions. Particularly pleasing was the significant participation of young people. At the end of the congress, the results of the election of the new leadership of the *Society of Arts and Sciences* were announced, first after the resignation of the former president of the SVU, Professor Igor Lukeš, in August 2017. The members of the Executive Board became Ivo Budil from Prague (President), Georges Eichler from Paris (Secretary General) Thomas Holbik from Boston (Treasurer), Hugh Agnew from Washington (Vice President for Academic and

Publishing Activities) and Michael Seng from Chicago (Vice President for Student Exchange Programs).

In July 2018, during the Prague meeting, there came a clear demonstration of the existence of a global community of Czechs, Slovaks and their intimates, who, through their insight, knowledge and skills can contribute to the development of freedom and democracy and the achievement of the continued prosperity of the Czech and Slovak Republics.

Ivo Budil, September 2018

FROM THE BOOK DEMOGRAPHY AND MIGRATION IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

Contents tells us more on the topics of the book:

Péter Tálas – Alex Etl: Introduction 7

Bernhard Riederer – Isabella Buber-Ennser – Raimund Haindorfer: Trends in Demography and Migration in Austria 9

Edit Lőrinczné Bencze: Trends in Demography and Migration in Croatia 29

Libor Frank: Trends in Demography and Migration in the Czech Republic 45

Péter Tálas: Demographic and Migration Trends in Hungary 65

Cătălina Todor: The Demographic Country Profile of Romania after 1989 – Challenges and Perspectives for Policy Makers 79

Tibor Ördögh: Trends in Demography and Migration in Serbia – The Art of Depopulation 115

György Lukács B: Demography and Migration in Slovenia since Gaining Independence 129

Branislav Bleha – Branislav Šprocha: Trends in Demography and Migration in Slovakia – From One of the Most Progressive to One of the Most Decreasing 143 Irina Pribytkova: Demography and Migration: The Case of Ukraine 157

Péter Tálas: The Security Policy Relevance of East-Central European Demographic and Migration Trends 177

The Authors of this Volume 193

Péter Tálas – Alex Etl Introduction

This volume aims to summarise the demographic and migration processes of nine Central and Eastern European countries (including Austria, the Czech Republic, Croatia, Hungary, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Slovakia and Ukraine) from the

collapse of the bipolar world order until 2018. The book is part of the ten volumes series, which was edited and coordinated by the Budapest based Centre for Strategic and Defence Studies and the National University of Public Service, within the PADOP-2.1.2-CCHOP-15-2016-00001 "Public Service Development Establishing Good Governance" project funding framework in an overarching research project "Strategic Analyses for Supporting Governmental Decision-making in the Field of Foreign and Security Policy". These ten volumes analysed comparatively the different security policy processes of Central and Eastern European countries concerning the fields of security perception; economic integration and interdependence; defence policy role in NATO and EU; foreign and security policy institutions and decisionmaking; regional cooperation; relations with the United States; relations with Russia; relations with Germany; relations with China as well as demography and migration that is introduced by this book. There is a general consensus among security policy experts that demographic processes, trends and characteristics decisively influence the strategic position and the security of a state. Central and Eastern European countries belong to a region, where demographic prospects are less and less favourable, while there are several demographic macro processes that have influenced them similarly (but not to the same degree) during the past 28 years. With regards to fertility, these are the trends in the decline in the ratio of women in childbearing age; the decline in the absolute number of abortions; and the advancing of maternal age. With regards to relationships, the most influential macro trends include the declining number of marriages; the increasing number of divorces and the increase of children born out of wedlock. Finally, each of the analysed countries had to experience the general ageing of their societies with a declining ratio of the youth and a significant increase of the average life expectancy. In parallel to the introduction of these most influential demographic processes, the chapters in this volume also aim to answer whether these processes affect the security as well as the security perceptions of the given societies; whether the societies and the political elites interpret them as security issues; and whether these countries prepared the proper plans and strategies to solve or at least to mitigate their problems? International migration became a global phenomenon for the second half of the 20th century and it also started to gain attention on the field of security studies in this period. The security studies literature analysed migration from two main aspects. Firstly, with regards to the security of the state, it emphasises that national sovereignty might be 8 Demography and Migration in Central and Eastern Europe challenged due to the loss of control over migration processes. Secondly, the framework of human security, and the security of the individual has become more and more influential on the field, especially owing to the increasing number of refugees. The 2015 migrant and refugee crisis in the European Union led to the emergence of a strong and divisive migration discourse that clearly characterised the phenomenon as a security issue. This was extremely visible

concerning the question of immigration which has become openly criticised and significantly restricted in most of the analysed countries. However, this volume also reveals, that besides immigration, the phenomena of emigration, brain drain and skill drain are also heavily affecting the analysed countries. For this reason, our goal was also to answer, whether these countries and their political elites are prepared to handle these issues? At the end we decided to analyse the two, seemingly different issues of demography and migration together, because of the convincing arguments that the complex demographic problems of the region can only be mitigated in the future through a comprehensive demographic policy that encourages childbirth, supports health preservation and builds on an effective migration policy as well. We suggest this book for security policy experts, demographers and students who are interested in Central and Eastern Europe and we do hope that this work will serve as a useful tool for further comparative research on the demographic and migration processes of the region.

Announcement of the book sent by Irina Pribitkova, December 2020

Prof. ZDENĚK PAVLÍK, co-founder of the Democratic Club, left us, at the age of almost 90 years, in December 2020. In our next issue, we'll have articles with his ideas inspiring us for next activities of the Democratic Club. We'll keep him in our memories.

IV. DID YOU KNOW THAT...

...Forum 2000 organized the 24th Festival of Democracy 2020 concerning responsibility and solidarity on-line;

https://www.forum2000.cz/en/projects/a-new-world-emerging-restoring-responsibility-and-solidarity

https://www.youtube.com/user/forum2000foundation



https://www.milionchvilek.cz/

Million Moments for Democracy organizes "changes for the year 2021" concerning Czech Republic elections;

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

Jitka Nováková, December 2020

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 (highly appreciated via email)

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 our newsletter on the Club website 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. Crisis of democracy, new challenges for freedom defending and seeking of way out (Benjamin Kuras, Alexander Tomský, Roman Joch) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hjw5Zl-ZvUA&feature=emb_err_woyt Antarctic and the Masaryk University activities there (Pavel Prošek), Milan Rastislav Štefánik heroic myth (Bohuslav Šalanda). Some topics were postponed because of the pandemic.

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.

Appeal to Members living abroad (mail address highly appreciated)

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

List of Dk members activities - where you can receive information: dklub@volnv.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 ...

North Bohemia Dk group Petr Jirásek

Dk Website Petr Neugebauer, Ondřej Šimpach, Jitka Nováková

Dk Facebook Václav Kotyk

Dk-Dialog Editorial Board in the colophon

* * *

Published by the Democratic Club, Gabčíkova 2362/10, 182 00 Prague 8, Czech Republic

E-mail: dklub@volny.cz;

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

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

NEWAccount No: 2201878820/2010 FIO bank

IBAN CZ23 2010 0000 0022 0187 8820 SWIFT/BIC FIOBCZPPXXX

Your Dk membership fee is 500 Czech crowns, the minimum is 100 CZK.

Have you paid for the last year already?

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

Editorial Board: Zdeněk Kalvach (chief editor), Jitka Nováková. Translation: Jan Müller, Jitka Nováková; 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.