Name of the recording: Andrzej Pogłódek, PhD - Constitutional regulations related to social control of public administration.
Duration of the recording: 0:36:37

(ns) - inaudible fragment
italics - uncertain spelling of a word, phonetic notation
... - an interrupted thought, an interrupted statement
☺ – laugh

Thank you for this kind introduction. Andrzej Pogłódek, as announced. Indeed, I have a subject comprising, among others, a right of access to public information. Although the subject itself is longer. That is, constitutional social regulations and control of public administration, legal and comparative aspects. I will say at the outset that I have limited the legal and comparative aspects, for reasons of time, to European countries only. Although it is true, and here I encourage some research, that more provisions on, precisely those directly referring to the control of public administration, the right of access to information, on petitions and potentially other measures, sometimes exist in non-European countries. This is not surprising, of course, since it actually arises from what I am about to say in more detail. When was the constitution drafted? The later the constitution was drafted, the more uncertainly, though not always, there will be more of these regulations, a certain evolution, an expansion of the scope of the regulations. The older the constitution is, the fewer regulations of this kind will probably occur. Obviously, it is known that any constitution can be amended, so something could be added. The order that you have been given as a framework is that there will be political foundations at the beginning. Then there will be things that appeared first. Namely, certain guarantees for the openness of the work of representative bodies. Since it seems crucial to control that we know at all what they are doing there in these representative bodies, where this law is developed. Of course, assuming that it is the representative bodies that mainly adopt the law, rather than the executive authorities. And, of course, representative bodies, but usually the constitutions will only refer to parliaments. Then there is the issue of the obligation to announce this law which has been established. Since if we were to control something, that is, at least at an elementary level, some kind of legalism, we need to know what it is. The law must be promulgated. It means, to what extent these different constitutions refer to the obligation to promulgate the law... to what extent in detail, and to what extent they simply ignore it for various reasons. Then, there is the old law, i.e.the right of petition. The reason is that the petition, in addition to proposing something, can undoubtedly also serve as a control. In its Medieval origins, it was very often used simply to act as a whistleblower to a monarch notifying that a sheriff or some of his officials behaved improperly, violating certain citizens' rights. It was signalled or reported, as some would say, to the monarch. Then at the end we have an access to public information. I have captured it collectively as an access to public information. Although the truth is that there are few constitutions, really few, that separately refer to the access to public information in general. And in detail... they also guarantee access to environmental information, yes they do. However, this is a rare phenomenon. We will also talk about it. Although it would seem that from a certain perspective, it will probably be very interesting. As far as these systems are concerned, in my opinion, there will actually be three main foundations. So, in fact, we have a democratic state, we have a common welfare. And that is one aspect. And we obviously face the issue of the nation’s sovereignty. So that this society can control... we say that it controls the society, the control is social. So, there must be some kind of relation towards this state,

otherwise these relations will set up themselves, if we used to say in the past where most of these mechanisms did not exist... there was only, in a sense, the right of petition, where subjects occurred. So the power was external to them. Now the citizens control the authority exercising the function of power on their behalf. This is... such is the doctrinal approach to the sovereignty of a nation, that all these various authorities exercise power on behalf of the citizens, somehow replacing those citizens. They do what citizens do not do directly, what is entrusted to them, assigned. However, it belongs to the citizens. Some countries claim that this power belongs to their citizens and some have a slightly different wording. It seems significant for the understanding of such control. For it is not true that the power belongs to the citizens, so in theory we only have delegations. It is just indicating the source. That citizens are the source of this power. The indication of the source may show something else. It is simply that they used to be somewhere originally for legitimacy, but they do not have it permanently. It is a bit like the old legitimacy that originated from the God. It was also the case that nobody claimed that power belongs to a god. Only the God is the source of power. Consequently, the God justifies why someone exercises that power. And personally, he himself can never exercise that power. We have this ... and a major part of the state has this version that the people are not only the source of power but the power also belongs to them and are they exercise it through these representatives. Therefore, those representatives exercising power on their behalf can be controlled whether they do it well. There is, admittedly, the subject of self-government, as a more specific subject. In fact, there is still discussion on direct power in the hands of citizens, which would perhaps shift a little bit of the emphasis from what I mentioned to other control mechanisms. But, let's say that we will stick to those that are in place, because those others already appear much less frequently. Still the constitutions refer to things like a local referendum, such as the institution of appeals. They occur there, especially in newer constitutions ... it is less common, it is so direct. Indeed, the highest form of control is a possibility of dismissing someone. And in addition, it is effective in this situation. When it comes to ... this sovereignty of the nation, it is ... (ns) a democratic state. Why do I claim that the source of social ... legitimacy of this social control can be found in countries that clearly do not declare that, the principle that a country is a democratic state, and why not that it is a state governed by the rule of law? This is because, in simple terms, the rule of law does not have to be a democratic state at all. There is no significant relationship here. That is why the principle of democratism is important, since it reinforces this control and the right of citizens to have knowledge about their country. Actively. It develops regulations. And, of course, the common welfare. Why the common welfare? Although this common welfare ... it is in the constitutions, in fact, quite endemic, one could say. Actually, in Latin America with a particular focus on Central America and there is also Poland. Poland is somehow distinct in this respect but I think it is a very good background. If we treat the state as the common welfare, we want it to work well, so, as a certain non-theorist said, not a political theorist but a political practitioner, then trust, of course, but check, the control is the basis for trust. And I think that this is probably what many mechanisms of this kind have in common here. That the citizen trusts anyway but prefers to see how and what they do. Is this certainly for this common welfare, is it rational? So I think that these three principles can legitimise this issue perfectly. And then, historically, we obviously faced some development of these mechanisms. This is in the period, let's say... somewhere before the 18th century. That is more or less the case. Well, it would be difficult to say that there was some developed social control of the administration or authorities exercising power, since there was a different concept of power, a different way its operation. Of course,

the petitions existed. The truth is that these petitions existed not only in the Anglo-Saxon world, they were called like that. However, all sorts of petitions, addresses to the monarch, supplications and the presentation of certain demands existed almost everywhere. In all these monarchic countries, we are faced with something like this, that some social groups appealed to the monarch... whether with the proposals to introduce something, the complaints against officials or the complaints against something, pointing to irregularities. There was more of this control. In some of these monarchic countries, such as Poland, Hungary and also Great Britain... Great Britain a little later. Poland and Hungary were quicker to grant the bodies representing these nobles the right to submit something like this or to some kind of control of royal officials. So it is like so old. And it seems to me that the right of petition is the oldest. It can also be used for control purposes. To signal some needs. Then there are... two important issues, of course, i.e. the question of openness of the meetings of these various representative bodies and the obligation to promulgate the law. What was the problem with this openness of meetings? Until a certain point, it was not everywhere that the parliaments were operating. It means, they acted as state assemblies in the Middle Ages. And that is where you could actually come, like the early Slavonic or early Germanic rally. But then it disappears somewhere in most countries. Besides, no one has formulated this principle of openness directly. As if it was because someone came in, so he could listen. He was somewhere around there. And in the 18th century, it begins, yes. It was precisely the openness of discussions in the parliament that was proposed as an important form of control by citizens. And this is actually enshrined in most of the constitutions that have been developed since the 18th century. They guaranteed it. Of course, by allowing exceptions to this. Who called for these exceptions? Exceptions were usually demanded by the monarch. Since the monarch did not want to, this Parliament... it was a forum where this very authority could be criticised and controlled. And it was publicised. What is more, these nineteenth-century constitutions often guaranteed that reports of parliamentary sessions were also printed in newspapers. And that they could have been printed. Meanwhile, there was a criticism of power, a criticism of the monarch. Consequently, the monarchs had very often sought this (ns) conservative groups to abolish the openness of parliamentary sessions. This was the case in the Congress Kingdom of Poland, where these deliberations were open at first. But there was criticism of King Alexander in Polish conditions, King Alexander II. In Russia, it was Tsar Alexander I. In connection with ... he said at some point there that the parliamentary sessions would always be secret, obviously, except for opening and closing. Since he was the only one to say it there, no one would criticise it there. There was simply the opposition. The situation was similar in many other countries. In France... we had the revolution in 1830. One of the reasons for this was that the King, then Charles X, simply introduced the secrecy of parliamentary sessions as a rule. We are free here to criticise various authorities and bodies. Of course, the Member of Parliament had immunity protecting him against any kind of repression. And here, this openness to us... and this openness, actually, as a guarantee has survived until today. We will come to that. It is guaranteed in virtually all constitutions. Although, in fact, exceptions to it are rare nowadays, these constitutions regulate it in an interesting way. A little bit differently than in our country. And the obligation to promulgate the law is similar. So, in fact, in order for us to know what power we have to control, what it should actually do, what it may do, we need to know the law. At this point, it is interesting to note that constitutions, like the openness of the work of representative bodies, refer to the parliament and they usually refer to the Acts of law. In historical terms, they also refer to the fact that the Act of law must simply be promulgated. Very few constitutions, like Andorra's contemporary constitution, contain a

FUNDUSZ SPRAWIEDLIWOŚCI
Sfinansowano ze środków Funduszu Sprawiedliwości, którego dysponentem jest Minister Sprawiedliwości.
MINISTERSTWO SPRAWIEDLIWOŚCI
www.ms.gov.pl

guarantee of openness of legal norms in general. Of course, it also contains further details in the specific section on acts of law, where it is indicated where it is promulgated and so on. In most constitutions, however, no guarantee can be found that all legislation will be promulgated and published. After all, even in Poland we have unpublished acts of internal law. Sometimes they can be significant. Of the simplest examples, until recently, i.e. until 2018... after all, the whole procedure for electing the first President of the Supreme Court was contained in an unpublished internal act of the Supreme Court. It does not mean that it was secret because it was not. It was possible to apply for it. But it was not published. This was undoubtedly a constitutional matter, after all, it was significant. There are many such situations in numerous countries, even more than in Poland, where certain things are regulated by some unpublished internal act. And it is the citizen who must find out about its existence at all, so that he or she can refer to it somehow, draw something from it or examine it. Thus, as if a guarantee of quality... this Andorra guarantee of quality of all legal standards seems important. In any case, we have a fairly far-reaching openness and the obligation to publish various types of acts, which is the aftermath ... just like in our region. Since it is a feature of the whole region, of historical experience. The fact that in the period before 1989, 1990, 1991, depending on the State, a considerable number of acts of law represented simply acts of internal law, unpublished. The so-called 'duplicator' law. The citizen was unable to read it. It was only when the citizen had a contact with something, it suddenly turned out that there was law in force in that case, that there was a circular, there was some kind of instruction somewhere that regulated something. Sometimes even contrary to the law, since of course there was no *hierarchy*, the act of law was promulgated. It existed in all the countries of the region. Therefore, all the states in the region have far-reaching guarantees that different types of legal standards should be published. Just as they all have a far-reaching scope of the act of law in our region, for example, or acts that are undoubtedly subject to publication, such as regulations. Similarly, all these guarantees of vacatio legis. It is simply the result of certain historical experience. But that was also a problem for many years. After all, this is still a problem. Since there are certain acts that are internal and various kinds of authorities do not always want to make such an act available very easily. Once someone finds out about its existence, of course. Sometimes, however, it does affect citizens' rights. These are the kinds of things that have traditionally appeared. The access to public information as such, appeared only after the Second World War. Somewhere in Sweden it appeared in the Act on the Freedom of Printing for the first time. This Act on the Freedom of Printing is, in fact, the act of law. I have the constitution here. So I will explain straight away why Sweden will be mentioned, if it (ns) has it in the constitution. The thing is that Sweden simply has several acts of constitutional importance in place. So it is precisely that act of law simply has constitutional significance in its entirety. The regulation is very detailed. Including the definition of the concept of a memo, whether or not it is made available. This is a defined concept.

- And what about the internal document?

They also have defined it. Well, Since this is the act of law, indeed. It has only been given constitutional status because of its importance. After all, this is only after the Second World War. The environment appears even later. And the environment appears very often, omitting Finland, for example, in our region, the post-Soviet area. The reasons are quite easy to explain. The Finish, well, let's say that some concern for the environment has been decisive first and foremost. But the answer as to why something like this is somewhere in the former Yugoslavia, or why it appears, say, in Turkmenistan or Kazakhstan, is recognised separately, or in Russia,

FUNDUSZ SPRAWIEDLIWOŚCI
Sfinansowano ze środków Funduszu Sprawiedliwości, którego dysponentem jest Minister Sprawiedliwości.
MINISTERSTWO SPRAWIEDLIWOŚCI
www.ms.gov.pl

well ... we will rather explain it by the fact that over the decades of the forced industrialisation of these countries ... this had indeed been done. People did not specially care for this environment and the environmental losses... and the potential damage to people. Therefore, as if citizens who learned by experience, these authorities, particularly in the Constitution, guaranteed themselves a separate right of access to up-to-date and complete information on the state of the environment and the impact on people. In fact, we have this in Poland too. Poland is also one of the few countries to have this solution in place. So, here we have this kind of thing, as a historical thing in terms of evolution. How to explain before we have a detailed discussion that someone has something... someone does not have something. Here, of course, Tomek has partially told the truth, yes he has. That some things are obvious to some people and therefore they do not declare them. That is essentially the case. Nor do we declare, let us say, a ban on slavery in the constitution, a ban on serfdom. This does not, of course, mean that you can have a slave in Poland, or keep someone enslaved. This will not be included. It is as if it is not included in the constitution. This rule is so well established that it is omitted. There are constitutions that continue to mention this. We only have this in the international agreements that we had ratified. That is the difference here. So, of course, a part of the answer is that there is just... someone has a very well-developed statutory regulation in this area. He no longer perceives any need to include this in the constitution, which was adopted much earlier. Let's say, for example, Norway. No one will say that in Norway, citizens do not have access to public information and do not know what is happening in the country and cannot check it. They can check a lot of things there. Including the tax returns of neighbours, really. This is open, after all. So there is very far-reaching openness. So is the transparency of the entire wage system. Although the Constitution says nothing about this at all. It is silent, passed in the 19th century. Who in the 19th century was to come up with such things? It had just appeared. Similarly in Denmark. Denmark makes no mention at all... of anything like that. And it is certainly there. After all, access to public information is not mentioned by France, not mentioned by Germany. This is also the time when the constitution was adopted. And we will have no doubt that this is where it is really guaranteed, there are effective mechanisms to safeguard this right. And what is more, perhaps even this control by the citizens, this social control is even more developed and established. There will be no doubt, despite the lack of it. So that... and that is the part. The second answer is, why someone has it and someone else does not have it in place? Since in a moment we will move on to who has and who does not have it. The fact is, of course, that we have what I mentioned, i.e. the moment when the constitution was adopted. The constitutional matter is certainly clear to us. It grows over time. New things appear that were not there before, and nobody thought about them at all, to be included in the constitution. Meanwhile, certain things are now standard. This can even be seen in the Polish Constitution. It was adopted in 1997. As for 1997, it was very modern. Since it contains access to public information and, separately, the environment and petitions, and this openness. In fact, everything. But if we look at it, and at what other constitutions contain, adopted today. Not even to look there anymore. Because someone will say they are incomparable. They will search in Africa, somewhere in Latin America. But we have the Hungarian constitution. The Hungarian constitution contains provisions that were not considered here, yes it does. It refers to genetically modified organisms, it refers to the right to water. It contains this, yes it does. It refers to... more. It refers to cloning, and it prohibits it anyway. But it refers to it. There is some kind of reference in this regard. No one has included that. It arises from another comparison. We just happened to be... and that is not very common. Because, of course, sometimes we have the opposite process. That

once, a thing that was very obvious, and was therefore not included in the constitution or very generally, ceases to be obvious. Therefore it starts to be included in the constitution. This is still a separate answer as to why something is included somewhere and something else is not. Sometimes things that are not obvious in the specific area are included in the constitution. Therefore, either the legislator or the lawmaker considers more specifically that something may be at risk in terms of its understanding. Therefore, it is worth writing this down, since it will strengthen our adherence to something or a guarantee that it will be, after all, in addition to all these rights... since it is in the post-Soviet space that it can be explained by the fact that they appear broadly. From a different point of view, for example, there is the question of how the constitutions used to define the marriage. They simply stated that the marriage existed. That's it. That is what the law defined. It was not specified between who and who, since it was clear there. Now everyone adds wording. Or they deliberately fail to do so. When someone has already passed a resolution and wants to settle this one way, he or she would simply consciously add that. In the past, no one would ever add anything at all. This is partly the case. That is also the answer to the appearance of something. Why does something appear in the constitutional law here? And, obviously, the fact that something appears is not always a sign that we have made some progress and noticed something. Since it may also mean that something that we treated as obvious is exposed to the risk. Because, if in a given country, for example, no one had ever guaranteed access to public information constitutionally and that access was available and then suddenly they write it down, it means that they were probably motivated to write it down due to the fact that practical restrictions appeared. Someone for some reason started to overreact to this, which prompted them to respond. The reasons may be absolutely different. As far as these things are concerned... it means, we have this openness of discussions of the representative bodies. It is in the European circle that it exists everywhere except Bosnia and Herzegovina, Denmark, San Marino and Iceland. I mean, guaranteed at constitutional level, of course. Since at a practical level, it exists there, too. However, the regulation of this issue itself is interesting. I mean. Most of the constitutions are limited to telling us that the sessions of the parliament (name included) are simply public. And that is the end of the regulation. They are open. No reference is made to restrictions. No reference is made to when this openness can be excluded. The constitution simply states the fact. In practice, in those countries, transparency is sometimes, of course, excluded by regulations that generally simply restrict the activity of various authorities. By means of a general clause. Others do it differently. They recognise that the sessions are public. Since this is important for citizens. However, there may be limitations. They only entrust the introduction of the restrictions to the parliament itself, recognising that this is a part of the parliament's autonomy. It decides for itself. The situation varies. From the majority vote, for example, in Belgium, two-thirds of the votes. And these two-thirds of the votes are usually cast in our region, where these two-thirds are required in Macedonia, for example. Then we have these two-thirds ... where do we have them? Two-thirds in Croatia, Romania. So... it also has its reasons that someone somewhere just needs two-thirds. It means, it protects against the abuse of the secrecy by the majority in the Parliament. It is known that in most countries, two-thirds of them already require some agreement with at least a part of the opposition. Other countries have slightly different arrangements. They obviously assume that there is openness. However, they indicate when it can be excluded, for what reasons. And they leave it to be regulated either by the parliament itself or, of course, if not the parliament, then somewhere in the act of law. On the other hand, we have countries which tell us that there is openness, the act of law would determine the exceptions. In fact, they entrust it to the legislator,

without defining what it is supposed to be guided by. What it is supposed to be guided by, and what is the priority here, results from the reconstruction of the entire provisions of the Constitution, yes it does. Of course, one should not cross these borders in most of these countries. Obviously, again, not in all countries. There will be courts, whether constitutional or administrative. Parliament is rather constitutional. Although it depends on the state. And this is how the issue of openness looks like. In practice, the openness of the sessions... interestingly, constitutionally... I have reviewed the whole Europe. But, in any case, I have not found an example of how openness can be extended and how this openness does not apply... there was no explicit provision that applies only to the parliament. Only somewhere else in the section devoted to self-government. Some constitutions have very extensive sections on self-government or federal states. There should be a provision to guarantee the openness of meetings of representative bodies in local authorities. It would seem important to guarantee it there too. There is also a representative body. It also comes from the elections. Like the equivalent of the parliament. You know, this was not written down in the past, because it simply did not exist. We do not write down things that are not there, somewhere in the 19th century. And here it turns out that the legislators failed to react. And please note that in Polish conditions, for example, there were problems with the openness of work in municipalities. For example, the municipal committees, sometimes the sessions themselves. It was only a few years ago that the obligation to broadcast both the sessions and the committee meetings was introduced. Not all municipalities guaranteed the right of presence to their citizens, or tried to limit it. We had local authorities in Poland, where it was more difficult to enter a collegiate body at a meeting than if someone entered the Sejm, for example. You could enter the Sejm on the day of the session. It was necessary to register in advance, it’s obvious. But one could sit there in those boxes upstairs and watch the session. This is also an element of openness. However, this is not always the case in local governments. Although nowadays this is obviously becoming a standard. It is like being forced. However, the constitution itself directly ignores this issue. We have to derive it from a number of norms. That it is the inhabitants who form this community of self-government, that the basis of the state is openness, that openness is important for democracy. Therefore, also at the local level... well, because it is particularly interesting. That is where citizens have the greatest opportunity to get an idea of these matters. The distance is also closer for them. Because not everyone will go to the Sejm in Warsaw to observe the session there. To watch the MPs from the top floor. Anyway, the gallery would not accommodate all those willing to participate. Such is the case with this right of petition. I will still look here to see if anyone has... the right to openness of Parliamentary sessions. Does anyone here just have any original solutions? As far as I remember, they do not. But I might have missed it. Yes. Two-thirds of the votes. Yes, some of them do. Estonia has exemptions when it cannot be secret either. In general, openness is, of course, the basis since it is 2/3. However, there are exemptions when it simply has to be secret. Some [countries] have rules stating when it can be secret. So I guess there is nothing very original here if they do not have it. No one perhaps. I think there will be more original solutions for petitions. I will analyse it. Yes. Here, these are very standard things. France is still required to publish Parliamentary reports. Of course, those that are public. Just like Monaco. It is also quite original. In addition to the openness of the work itself, we can publish reports on that work. What is more, there is even evidence that they have been prescribing this since the 19th century. Since there is not much that can be published, it is still pointed out that no one can be simply punished for publishing the transcript of Parliamentary sessions or the minutes. It is so obvious that one could have been punished at some point in the past, if it had to be added

that you certainly cannot do something like that there. But that is endemic to France, Monaco. Monaco has the Parliament that is quite weak. But... so façade-like. A very strong prince. But that guarantee is there, it exists. The law promulgation is very interesting. Since, in principle... again, the duty to promulgate the law is usually found in the parts devoted to parliaments, where it is mentioned what the parliament passes. There is a requirement that it must be announced in some kind of official journal, in the official gazette... in some official newspaper. Different names are used. But it refers to acts of law. Again, the constitutions will ignore whether or not anything else should be announced. Even international agreements, for example, if they are not ratified in the form of the act of law. And let's usually remember that... very often in many countries, as in Poland, it is only in the case of certain international agreements that we have the consent to ratification. But this is the consent to ratification, instead of ratification of the agreement. Rather, the states that ratify agreements in the form of the act of law are the exception. That this is a parliamentary competence. Ratification of international agreements. At least some. So here, there may be some... if we look at the purely constitutional, practical limitation. Again, in addition to the aforementioned Andorra ... because these Asian countries have already been mentioned here, as the non-recognised countries. For example, there is now the famous Nagorno-Karabakh. They, in turn, sometimes guarantee the announcement of everything. They have the provision that each law can be applied only if it has been duly promulgated. And acts of law that have not been duly promulgated shall not be applicable. However, this is again a regional specific feature. The question is, of course, to what extent they comply with this? Is it that they have written something down, we announce everything and we have to announce everything and comply with it? Or is it the case in practice that they do not comply with it? As far as Nagorno-Karabakh is concerned, from my personal experience with it, these are things that they do not announce to the end. Because I have even written a book about it. It is finished, it is under publication now. Indeed, there was a problem with certain things. It was not announced. In fact, I obtained from them, that is to say, I asked them to send out a kind of public information. They sent it, yes. But these were acts... there was even a law regulating martial law, probably. Valid. I have realised that the announcement is invalid. Well, you had to write to them. So there are these... they replied. As South Ossetia, for example, once replied to me, the same thing. I asked them for the text of the first Constitution. It could not be found anywhere except for the knowledge that it existed. So I have found, well, I will write to them there. They probably have their first constitution. They were looking for it for a long time. They quickly wrote me back that there were some problems, since it was known that there was a war with Georgia and that the Georgians were there... the parliament was burnt down and that text went missing somewhere. In any case, they sent me a scanned one month after the first e-mail that they finally found where it was. A copy was retained. It was sent . They have made an effort. I will say that I have a good experience. Even with such entities. That they are there... although sometimes I do not think that everything is announced in logistic terms. It is treated as subordinate law somewhere there. And some states announce a lot of things. Even typically internal. And it is so much... because, ladies and gentlemen, this is... the paradox is that, because of the infraction of legal acts, if all of them are announced, for example, internally, then the citizen may get lost. Well, because if we post everything that is... and internal acts, some kind of recommendations... everything is in his hands. Just one thing ... in these matters, this and that applies. And there we suddenly have some different laws. Sometimes it is a recommendation, sometimes a guide, a circular and an instruction. And he is looking for himself there, he will get acquainted. Everything is available. It is the citizen who can get lost paradoxically. Then,

as if he had the main one at the beginning. So, of course, that may also be a tactic. And this is a tactic that the Russian authorities use very often. If someone enters the website of any Russian office, there are a lot of things published there. Such internal acts. And you can just get lost. They are additionally mixed up with each other. A legal act is mixed with a methodical recommendation or even a manual on how to use something. Or with a children's cartoon. Suddenly, such educational material for children included. Recently, I have looked at the Ministry of Defence website of the department ... on counteracting corruption. And there were various acts. There was one, for example, which referred to the issue what positions are particularly vulnerable to corruption. These are the positions that people are most concerned about. It was specified which were these. Later on, there was something about the methodological recommendations. In between, there was ta children's cartoon, corruption yesterday, today and tomorrow. There is also one act related to this corruption. I think it claims that it is impossible to combat corruption, despite a whole list of acts. If there was to be some future for corruption, despite all this. But it is also possible to get lost in it... omit something. Someone will point out that they have published. That's the way it works... and here someone did not notice it. That is also a certain tactic. And it is worth realising that not always publishing everything is intended to really enable citizens to control and obtain information. Sometimes it can simply serve to mislead citizens. We give them so much that they will just get lost. After all, some Polish authorities also use the answer, yes. They give enough so that the citizen there will simply give up on his own when he sees how much they have given him. That is the case with this promulgation, with the publication of the law. Although, without doubt, this is important to us.

END

FUNDUSZ SPRAWIEDLIWOŚCI
Sfinansowano ze środków Funduszu Sprawiedliwości, którego dysponentem jest Minister Sprawiedliwości.
MINISTERSTWO SPRAWIEDLIWOŚCI
www.ms.gov.pl