CORE VALUES OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

A comparative analysis of the PES member parties’ ideological statements

Crises of social democracy have been almost cyclically announced in modern history. Each of them has been respectively described as serious and grave, which may in that sense be a cause for doubt: why the contemporarily recognized crisis of social democracy would indeed be the most profound one. The reason to believe in such diagnoses is that the current predicament would be nestled in the foundations of a multilayer global crisis of economy and politics. Hence defining a vision that can adequately answer to the challenges of a new century is not only a matter of survival of social democracy this time, but rather a question of establishment of a new order that would have the capacity to replace the collapsed post-war.

The success of a renewal process depends on in how far social democracy will be able to emancipate itself from outdated myths and images about itself. Regaining credibility neither depends on renouncing ideological betrayals that were the costs of governing nor on pledging the return to historical values. It seems clear, if one acknowledges that the times of core electorates are gone, the turnouts in subsequent elections are falling and the motivation that brings Occupy Movements or Indignados onto the streets is of atypical character. Therefore it is imperative that the process from the beginning is based on a new understanding of the sense of politics and the role of political parties, as also that it reaches beyond the perspective of the next electoral success.

1 FEPS – Foundation for European Progressive Studies was established towards the end of 2007 on the bases of the European regulations for political foundations. It is closed, but independent from PES – Party of European Socialists. With seat in Brussels, it gathers nowadays 80 members, 41 of which are social democratic thinks tanks and foundations from the EU member states. FEPS work (research and activities) is organised within 4 main pillars: Next Left, European society, sustainable economy and global solidarity. Among regular publications there are books of the Next Left Series, as also “Queries” – FEPS Scientific Magazine and “Fresh Thinking” – FEPS popular magazine.

FEPS Next Left Research Programme was established in June 2009 in order to offer pan-European framework for reflection on the state and future of social democracy. Throughout the three years, the programme gathered an impressive number of outstanding academics, politicians and experts (both through European and national based debates), whose reflections together with FEPS concluded research provided material for successful Next Left book series and several issues of “Queries”. The initiative is held with kind support of Renner Institut and Dr. Alfred Gusenbauer former Chancellor of Austria remains programme’s chair.

2 This article is based on the FEPS study by A. Skrzypek “A comparative analyses of core values of PES member parties and the ideological evolution within the PES” that had been completed within the FEPS Next Left Research Programme and was published in “Next Left vol. IV – Progressive Values for the 211 century”, E.Stetter, K.Duffek, A.Skrzypek (eds.), FEPS Belgium 2011
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Social democracy in Europe must therefore move ahead from the conviction that it is still capable to fulfill its original mission of ensuring social peace, through enabling and guaranteeing settlements between capital and working class. Instead it must propose a modern pan-European social contract that is based on progressive values, pursuing which people universally understand as basic obligations. In order to do so, it must reach a new interpretation of those core values and the relations among them – so that they become meaningful concepts which would allow again a distinction between left and right.

Based on the empirical study “A comparative analyses of core values of PES member parties and the ideological evolution within the PES” this particular article aims at assessing the state of the ideological consciousness among social democratic parties in Europe. The original research was completed in the context of searching answers on how to renew social democracy in times of multilevel crisis of democracy and calamity of its building elements, such as legitimacy of political representation, and provides a panorama of the values that are recognized as core values and their respective interpretations. The complete study contrasts the findings from the national level with the European level. For the purpose of this article the part which solely deals with the programmatic evolution of the Party of European Socialists from 1992 to 2009 has been excluded. Here the focus lies on the comparative analyses of PES member parties and their respective programmes and should provide a selection of interesting guidelines, which once formulated may pave the path for social democracy into a new century.

Specifying a definition for values

The empirical study is based on respective PES member parties and their own considered crucial and fundamental documents, defining their ideological convictions. The primary challenge in identifying relevant sources in these diverse documents is the fact that values are extremely complex notions. What is more, the types of documents between the parties differentiate. Diverse definitions of what this term precisely entails can be found in different scientific disciplines, however one universally agreed upon conception seems to be missing – a theoretical limbo. This leads to a certain impenetrability of what “a (core) value” is and how it differentiates from for example a policy principle. Furthermore, in the context of political sciences even a sound characterization is not enough to encompass the certain density of the notion of values. This is especially
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8 The question of the identity is a prominent one also because of other reasons. Though it is going beyond the scope of this particular study, it bridges with the issue of progressive response towards changing society. Some authors suggest that determining the question of identity will shape the 21st century politics as much as defining the category of class did back in 19th century. Many authors underline that values should be considered in the context that that are formulated in. Abramson and Inglehart highlight that the understanding what values are have changed together with cultural shift from materialism (economic and physical security) towards post-materialist (a greater emphasis on freedom, self expression and quality of life.) The consequences of this shift are visible in the erosion of the previous social class identification and hence voting, which naturally also heavily influences what used to be the line of cleavage between left and right. Together with an appearance of the new policy issues, rising level of education and awareness, more participation of media in a public life there is a need for new answers.
9 E. Wesley Hall, What is value?, The International Library of Philosophy, Routledge London 2000 (based on the original text published in 1952)
10 Sh. Schwartz, Basic Human Values, paper for the conference on Quality and Comparability Measures for Constructs in Comparative Research: Methods and Applications, Bolzano, Italy in June 10 – 13, 2009
11 D. Graeber, Towards an anthropological theory of values : the false coin of our own dreams, Palgrave New York 2001
problematic in cases when researchers aim to bring through their studies a classification of values that are left and which are right. There are of course thinkers who doubt nowadays if such a distinction is even possible to be made. But if one would assume such a distinction to be proven it is imperative to include in the methodology a definition of system of values. This focus on the liaisons among the values imposes a need to interpret the interconnections that altogether create the backbone of an ideology of the party in question.

According to Ralph L. Keeney values are what we care about. Therefore, he concludes that they should be the driving force for our decision-making. Keeney suggests that the values should in fact be the reason why people spend time thinking and bothering to decide, as he claims that the value-focused thinking consists essentially of two activities: deciding what you want and then figuring out how to get it. Keeney is positive that this kind of thinking is in fact constraints-free, as it is reflecting on ambitions and desires which do not need to be self-centered, but may be about what one wants to do for others, for a group, for a society. On the other hand, Clyde Kluckhohn claimed that a value is a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of action. Worth to underline is the cognitive element; it introduces a distinction between values and subjective quantities, such as feelings, emotions, and needs. Kluckhohn believed that identifying a value is a long-term process. He claimed that it can only become desirable for an individual, once it is interiorized and integrated into a personal system. Therefore actions undertaken can be only explained as value oriented or constraint.

In the broad variety of the available definitions, it was necessary to aim at an own usable one. The proposals for them in the empirical study “A comparative analysis of core values of PES member parties and the ideological evolution within the PES” are as follows:

- **Core value** is an ideal that constitutes a pillar of a vision that a group (in this case political party) seeks to implement. Values are motivations and determinants of actions. Their understanding is presupposed by the socio-political context. Though their overall sense is eternal, their interpretation alters to make them understandable and identifiable with in the modern times.

- **Core values** complement each other, coexisting as a system of values. The ways they derive from one another is distinctive for the group that upholds them.
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12 T.Judt, Ill fares the Land, Penguin London 2010, pages 2 - 3
13 Sh.Schwartz, Basic Human Values, paper for the conference on the Quality and Comparability Measures for Constructs in Comparative Research: Methods and Applications; Bolzano, Italy in June 10-13, 2009.
14 R.L. Keeney, research professor at Duke University [http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/faculty_research/faculty_directory/keeney/](http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/faculty_research/faculty_directory/keeney/)
15 R.L. Keeney, Value focused Thinking. A path to creative Decision-making, Harvard 1992, page 3
16 Ibidem, page 3
17 Clyde Kluckhohn (1905-1960), was an American anthropologist and social theorist, best known for his long-term ethnographic work among the Navajo and his contributions to the development of theory of culture within American anthropology.
19 Cognitive refers to the process of thought. It can be used in several contexts. It allows viewing individual behavior linking it with processing information, making analyses and developing a concept, which then steers the individual minds, groups and hence may also the organizations. Gaining knowledge, recognizing new items and hence applying it, changes the preferences. Such process can be completed consciously or unconsciously.
- Principles originate from the core values and ensure the bridge between them and the code of conduct. They are the points of transposition of the ideals into (more) concrete policy guidelines.

- Vision is an idea of how things (the world) are and at same time an indispensable projection of what things (the world) should be. The relation between values and vision is of mutual influence. They are a sort of map, an agenda for thoughts and actions.

- Paradigm is an intellectually developed entity, which includes scientific law, theory application and instrumentation together. Paradigms are inspired by visions. Generally, a successful vision of society is developed in parallel with a corresponding paradigm. The difference is that vision can survive and thrive on its own internal logic, while paradigm encompasses empirically provable theories and hypothesis.¹¹

The terms as described above constitute the methodological basis for this article and are further elaborated in the mentioned empirical study.

**Classification of core value statements**

**2.1. Declaration, political program, electoral manifesto and statute**

The title of the FEPS study “Progressive Values in the 21st century” implied that the focus should remain on the modern, contemporary documents – hence the ones that nowadays indicate what system of values a party in question recognizes and wishes to follow. This eliminated almost all the historical (founding) declarations, with an exception of two: PS BE (for which the original “Charter of Quadregnon” from 1894 remains valid till today as the party’s declaration of principles) and PASOK (of which core values are enumerated in the founding declaration of 1974). The materials gathered showed that PES member parties vary in the ways they proclaim, interpret and translate into actions their core values. Some of the parties chose to adopt Declarations of Values (or as it could be translated directly from German Constitutional Programmes), the others enumerate the values in electoral manifestos. In several cases the values remain an ideological preamble only, while in some other they are translated into more or less concrete principles or were deeply rooted in the Party statutes. Hence there is no universal pan-European model. Table 1 exposes this diversity.²² ²³

Table 1 shows that it is possible to classify the respective parties’ documents that refer to the notion of values into four categories; category 1 encompasses all the texts that are named as declarations (of values or
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²¹ Ibidem, pp. 230 - 243
²² From the table it is apparent that there are some PES member parties that are not included in this particular study. Those are: EDEK (Cyprus), MSZDP (Hungary), PS (Italy), DS (Italy), UP (Poland) and SMER (Slovakia). The reason for that is an issue of availability of the materials. Collecting all the data, ensuring translation and authorization of the translation has been in itself an occupation of several months. It is only the so called Nordic countries that (next to those of whom English is native language) provide the core documents on their websites in English. In light of this point, author would like to once again thank all the colleagues from the respective PES member parties and colleagues from FEPS Team for their extraordinary help in identifying, finding and translating the documents – without which this study would not be possible.
²³ Even though in comparison with the initial FEPS study most of the tables have been removed in order to enable decisive shortening of the paper, this one has been left – as it also provides a certain registry of the sources gathered.
principles), but also fundamental programmes. These fundamental programmes are different from the regular programmes (which constitute here category 2). They focus specifically on values and eventually include their transposition into policy principles – while the programmes placed in the second category refer more to concrete policy schemes and concrete contemporary political reality. Category 3 embraces the electoral manifestos, which some of the parties chose as a format to present the values they believe in and from that ideological base draw the strategy for the subsequent legislative period. Category 4, on the other hand, consists of the party’s constitutions and statutes, in which values are anchored.

Table 1: Classification PES member parties core value documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Declaration of Values</th>
<th>Political Programme</th>
<th>Electoral Manifesto</th>
<th>Constitution / Statutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPÖ</td>
<td>Grundsatzprogramm&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt; (1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP.a</td>
<td>Beginsverklaring (2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS BE</td>
<td>La Charte de Quadregnon&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;, (1894)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČSSD</td>
<td>Střednědoby program&lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt; (1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialdemokraterne</td>
<td>Hånden på hjertet&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt; (2004, 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDE</td>
<td>SDE Program (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Towards a world of social justice&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt; (1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS FR</td>
<td>Déclaration de principes&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt; (2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Grundsatzprogramm (2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASOK</td>
<td>Founding Declaration (1974)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSZP</td>
<td>Progress – security – democracy (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILP</td>
<td>Constitution of the Labour Party&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt; (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSDSP</td>
<td>LSDSP short programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSDP</td>
<td>The Local Communities’ Policy Programme&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt; (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSAP</td>
<td>Grundsatzprogramm&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt; (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>Statute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PvdA</td>
<td>Beginselmanifest&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt; (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>New solidarity. The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<sup>24</sup> SPÖ, Das Grundsatzprogramm, www.spoe.at

<sup>25</sup> 1893: la Charte de Quadregnon; www.ps.be

<sup>26</sup> www.cssd.cz/dokumenty

<sup>27</sup> http://s-dialog.dk

<sup>28</sup> http://www.sosialdemokraatit.fi/en/node/2492

<sup>29</sup> http://www.parti-socialiste.fr/fr-ps/nos-valeurs

<sup>30</sup> http://www.labour.ie/party/constitution and http://www.labour.ie/principles/

<sup>31</sup> Lietuvos Socialdemokratų Partijos 2011 metų rinkimų į vietos savivaldybes programos nuostatos.


<sup>33</sup> Beginselmanifest – Partij van de Arbeid; Vastgesteld door het congres van de Partij van de Arbeid, 29 januari 2005. www.pvda.nl
With a certain degree of generalization, one can say that a Declaration of values is mostly used by PES member parties from the central-western Europe (plus the two southern from Greece and Portugal, and two from the north – namely from Denmark and Finland). Political programmes and electoral manifesto are most frequently chosen by the parties from central-eastern and eastern-southern Europe (and additionally plus two northern – Norwegian and Swedish). Statutes seem to have suited countries from so called Anglo-Saxon tradition, as also Sweden, Spain and Romania. An important disclaimer concerning this category is that the parties classified in the categories 1-3 naturally also refer to the values in their respective statutes – only that in their cases it is not the only (the core) document as far as their ideology is concerned.

2.2. Ex ante or ex post renewal process?

The introduction suggests a new interpretation of values is needed to make them tangible concepts for the 21st century and poses the legitimate question how long the proclamations of values remain valid. Returning to table 1, in case of the documents of category 3 and 4, the longevity is determined either by the length of legislature or by the period between the respective party’s congresses (which may alter the statute or also adopt the new one). In case of categories 1 and 2, the situation is more complicated. Replacing one declaration via the other is in most cases a long lasting process. It begins with a decision that there is a need for change, for renewal and it usually involves several rounds of consultations. Two (PvdA and SPD) out of the
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36 Declaração de princípios; www.ps.pt/declaracao-de-principios
37 Odgovornost za spremembe, Alternativni vladni program Socialnih demokratow 2008-2012
38 Estatutos, PSOE Congreso federal; 04, 05 y 06|07|08. PSOE la fuerza del cambio. www.psoe.es
twenty six analyzed parties included a description on how the declaration was drafted, amended and adopted in the text itself. These two outlines give a sense of how historically eminent each of those processes was.

The Fundamental Programme of SPD was approved by the party’s Congress that was held in October 2007 in Hamburg. The process that led to this programme’s adoption took 8 years and had been launched at the SPD Congress in Berlin in 1999. Within the Programme, there is reference to the motivation that guided the party while setting up the process: once SPD had taken over the government after many years in the opposition, it felt that a fundamental review of principles was simply necessary. It seems unusual, as regularly the renewal is being called at place after the lost elections. In this specific case, the task was therefore not to reinvent, but to revise accordingly to the new challenges that the values should give responses to. The ambitious goal was to set the standards for both the SPD and for the society, which could apply while making political choices in 21st century. In order to achieve that, SPD decided that the process should be an open one, involving all the members and becoming an initiative places in the heart of social debates.

PvdA, on the other hand, adopted its “Declaration of Principles” at its Congress in Delft on 29th January 2005. The work over it began in 2003, when the PvdA established “Declaration of Principles’ Commission”41. The Commission presented the initial results on 1st May 2004. All the party members were entitled to comment and propose amendments, which were then a base for the text revision and its second version was introduced in August 2009. Next, the party sections could comment on it, and changes were commonly worked on by the Commission and the party board, who together presented the third draft for adoption in November 2004.

In this context, it is worth mentioning that there are also parties who currently work over their profound renewals including; SPD, Labour Party UK and Swedish SAP42. The process in the Labour Party is held under the motto “Refounding Labour – a party for the new generation”. In the foreword to the document, drafted by Peter Hain (Chair of the National Policy Forum), LP Leader Ed Miliband refers to the years of Labour in the government and the electoral loss of 2010 as an incentive for change. He outlines the objective of the process as to repair, restore and reform the party and make it fit for the new fights. The document is publicly available and everyone can submit comments on various themes enlisted in the paper (until 24th June 2012). SAP officially adopted its guidelines for the party renewal process at the extraordinary Congress held in March 2011. The document is entitled “A Sweden for tomorrow” and includes a number of criteria to review the party’s organization. It is underlined in the document that SAP needs to be strengthened as an organization ad regain its full force as the broad progressive party in Swedish politics on a firm footing as a popular movement. This requires becoming more open, the change of attitude of party and its representatives and finding new ways of showing interest and meeting people. It is re-emphasized that the members are the party.

Looking at the examples and regardless of their timing, it is clear that a process of drafting a declaration is an extremely demanding one. First of all, it requires that there is a strong motivation to renew. It must be a relevant reason that not only the party elites, but above all the members and the citizens (potential

41 Composed of: Wouter Bos / Ruud Koole (Presidents), Mark Bovens, René Cuperus, Guusje ter Horst, Bertus Mulder, Monika Sie Dhian Ho and Coen Teulings.
42 The study was completed before the leadership changes in January 2012.
supporters and sympathizers) can refer to. Secondly, the process calls for legitimacy. It depends on one hand on the strength of the mandate of the people in charge of the developments hold, on the other on credibility reconfirmed in the different stages of the process. Thirdly, there must be enough time to ensure that is a thorough one and that everyone gets a chance to contribute, which is the only way to ensure members’ identification and feeling of ownership. The efforts and the time that are consumed are additional elements that induce respect for the final outcome and discourage those, who would eventually wish to quickly reopen the process or would dare its outcome trying to replace it with another document without strong rooting.

2.3. Inspiring vision and technical explanation

The different parties’ texts vary in length. Declarations (self-standing, preambles or sections of the statutes) are usually the shortest. The briefest of them is the one of the PS BE, only two pages (1894). Throughout the years parties might have started favoring extended documents and there can be number of hypothesis to explain this tendency. It seems probable that it is related to a growing complexity of politics and is caused by providing credible (hence well argued) responses to all possible issues. That seems to be in accordance to development of the political party system, in which contemporary stage parties became “catch-all” movements. As it may be judged pejoratively, some of the parties try to counterbalance this impression that they aim at providing answers to all the issues – for example LSAP writes that we do not have the questions to all the answers. Though several of the texts provide fairly detailed descriptions, it is worth emphasizing that all the social democratic parties pledge same time openness and reject any form of dogma. Concluding here, it appears is that a balance must be retrieved in between inspiring vision and the technical explanation.

The fundamental programmes are longer than the declarations, reaching in between 7 pages (LSAP) to 78 (SPD). These documents usually include an ideological preamble (can be the same as the declaration), enlist values providing their definitions (including indication on how these values are to be translated into principles), political choices and the respective parties’ own organizational arrangements. The translation of the values into actual policies is regarded by the parties as the test of their credibility. The importance of the notions of trust, credibility and legitimacy is evident, as they are frequently repeated in the different texts – by MSZP, SDE, SAP. In some of the cases political responsibility becomes even elevated to the rank of a value and some of the parties additionally provide their understanding of what politics (a values-based politics) is about (such a definition can be found for example in the text of LSAP).

Naturally, the longest documents are the electoral manifestos. They are in fact the detailed agendas for a government, which the parties would hope to form in the result of the elections. The most expanded is the electoral manifesto of SLD (217 pages), however the shorter one by DNA (70 pages) is by no mean less thorough-going. The later one provides a very interesting framework, in which descriptions of the challenges are followed by responses in bullet points, among which a clear reference to core values is made. This format
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43 This observation is relevant in the light of introductory comments concerning multilayer crisis of democracy.
appears to constitute an attractive way in which parties can manifest their knowledge about contemporary challenges and their values-based proposals on how to solve them.

Last, but not least, the framework in which values are placed predetermines if they are described as certain ideals or if they are outlined in opposition to the values that social democrats associate with their political opponents. The tendency is that values explained in an electoral manifesto are presented as the alternatives (see the manifestos of MSZP, SLD\(^44\)). Contrary to that, if they are for example pillars of a party statute or a constitution, they are described as certain ideals that even perhaps could not be compared to anything else. Majority of the parties chose to explain their values as pure notions and they don’t weigh them against others. Perhaps this also reflects the trend that some parties articulate — namely to expose positive character of the socialist policies (see LSAP) or the belief that democracy is and will always remain a matter of pluralism and diversity (SP.a, for example, states that democracy presupposes multiparty system.)

2.4. Role of people and society

Some parties relate the interpretations and applicability of values to the people and society (mostly the case of Central and Western European social democracy), the others to the shape and functions of a constitutional state (which is especially the case for the parties from the Central and Eastern Europe, but also of the Nordic ones). A salient reflection in the light of those elaborations is the issue of how the parties envisage people both as individuals, as also as society members. Assuming from the history of the movement, one could expect references to certain groups that the message is directed to as it was the case of the working class. These expectations will be disappointed. The core values, the principles and the policies based on them are addressed to the people in general\(^45\). The concept of workers and class struggle disappeared from the texts, with some few exceptions (such as Irish Labour Party)\(^46\). At the same time, there are many references to notions such as everyone is of the same value; every person is responsible for his life. This may provide partial explanation why the links between parties and core electorates are no longer there, or at least no longer that strong. Once parties have evolved to be “catch-all” ones\(^47\) on one hand, and on the other processes such as individualization weakened overall groups’ (classes) identifications, it is hard to expect that one certain group would also exclusively relate to them.

2.5. Role of historical heritage

For social democracy its’ tradition is an important construct of its identity. It was historical circumstances that led to emergence of the movement (clearly reflected in the declaration by PASOK) and it is history that social democracy feels obliged to make. It can be summarized that for the social democrats tradition, mission and vision always come together. Majority of the parties express it, while referring to the

\(^44\) However in its fundamental programme, SPD portrays itself also as an alternative to conservatives and liberals, being an exception from the rule formed here.

\(^45\) Even if some of the parties may indirect reference – i.e. PS Fr sees itself as a party “anchored in the world of labour”.

\(^46\) The author consciously refrains from discussing the theory of classes and its contemporary meaning at this point.

\(^47\) In politics, a catch-all party is a political party seeking to attract people with diverse viewpoints and does not require adherence to some ideology as a criterion for membership.
historical circumstances in which they have been operating and their own evolutions in the parties’ programmes. This is directly connected with the core philosophical base that the movement originates from – namely historical materialism.

The first reflection upon analyzing the texts enlisted in table 1 is that the parties refer to themselves as *historical actors*. They claim this characteristic after over a century and a half of struggle for a better world that would emerge based on the implementation of their core values. The emotional attachment to the past (as one could describe the articulation of pride) shows that they feel part of the certain set up (political stage, institutional system etc.). This is a source of strength, once understood as a tradition to rise from. On the other hand it may also be a sort of an entrapment, that quickly can be turned to a pejorative characteristics of social democracy having grown into an *establishment* and hence losing its characteristics of a critical movement, which always stands in an opposition to what is unjust. In order to keep these balances the statements such as the ones by SP.a or DNA are very important communicates.

Furthermore, it seems that the parties refer mostly to their internal history (as singular parties), to the history of the movement overall or to major historical turning points (such as French Revolution, that majority of the parties see as origins of theirs). Some parties refer to a universal historical heritage (Parti Socialiste). The element that is commonly missing in all the examined cases is a reference to a common European history and the social democratic achievements throughout the process of the European Union’s unification. This may help explaining at least partially how this in fact is possible that the conservatives claim the prevailing role in uniting Europe.

There are discrepancies among the parties as far as references to philosophical base. There are those, who refer to antiquity (SDP), to enlightenment (SAP) and enlightened rationalism (SLD), as also humanism (PS FR, PSD, BSP, DNA). On the other hand, there are also the parties referring to Christianity (SPD, SDP), Free Church Movements (SAP) and to Judaism (SPD), while others make it a matter of principle to express their devotion to secularism (PS FR) or even secularism and anti-clericalism (LSAP). It seems from these observations that a debate on religious heritage has been a sort of a grey area. Taking into account the societal debate in Europe on one hand, and political (such as around preamble to the EU “Constitutional Treaty”) on the other, one may assume that it remains a sort of a potential source of internal tensions. *Potential*, as SPÖ in their fundamental programme states, that religion and socialism are not in an opposition – through which a Marxist quotation that *religion is opium for masses* is being rejected.

An interesting tendency also has appeared in the documents from the parties of the Central and Eastern Europe, especially SLD and PSD. Those two parties seem to have dealt with the burden of their post-communist past. Instead, they link with those early moments of the history, when they played a significant role and which can be of an inspiration. Both refer to the over century long history of socialism and the achievements of the movements’ member in the past, especially in the context of the struggle for freedom and democracy. The way they bring forward their historical contributions may be compared to the one applied by SPD, while speaking about i.e. the DDR era. SLD makes a very strong point in its document, stating that *it is only the voters who decide, how much it can allow itself*. It is a response of a new generation to what the previous
one (of 1990s) was claiming, namely that social democracy can allow itself less due to its communist past in the region. Both the declarations are a clear sign that the parties want to be seen as modern and European, as the ones which coped with the specter and are ready to move ahead.

2.6. Self-portrait: modern and open

Equally important to the grand mission of the parties, is how they seek to implement it and what principles will guide their organizational work to enable them to fulfill their ambitions. In almost all the texts, certain self-portraits of the parties can be found. There is no party within the PES family that would describe itself contemporarily as a revolutionary. All have opted for democratic socialism which also reflects the commitment to democracy and elaborating solutions jointly in a society. Several emphasize their commitment to the reformatory stream (such as SAP, LSAP, PS PT etc.). Very often it is being enumerated that this or another decision has been taken by socialist and social democratic parties. As this line of divergence within the PES family seems to have extincted, the question to be posed if in fact the new, shared understanding of democratic socialist could be a concept for which alliances could be built with more centre or more leftist parties.

The parties see themselves as actors of political and legal system. There is a strong attachment to a democratic institutional order. Several parties mention their republican character. The strongest statement comes from SAP, who principally continues its struggle for eradicating monarchy in Sweden – unlike PvdA on the other hand, which accept that there is a Queen (or King) of the Netherlands, as long as it remains clear that their functions are purely representative ones.

A number of parties write about their attachment to respectively international (SI) and European (PES) organizations. Sometimes the notification is of an organizational nature and relates to the membership in these associations (ILP, LSDSP, SLD, PSD, and PS FR). And sometimes it appears rather as a general reference of being a part of those (SPD, LSAP, PvdA, LP UK). It is impossible to formulate a rule what factors it depends on if the parties decide to directly or indirectly relate to the international / European structures. Nevertheless it still remains a valid point of debate, why the relation with the transnational level it is being mentioned only sporadically.48

Furthermore, there are two features that the social democratic parties seem to be particularly attached to. The first one is the characteristic of openness, and the second one is modernity. The first attribute refers to how the parties wish to be seen as modern political actors. It is widely concluded that the party system is undergoing an evolution, through which the traditional ways of organizing a political party as a mass-one are being challenged. New opening, which should attract individuals on one hand, and on the other enable new strategic alliances introduces the need to reinvent oneself as a movement. For some parties reopening the party is a step in a struggle for an open society and hence for the preservation of democracy (MSZP, SD

---

48 On one hand it seems odd in the times of globalization, on the other it sadly does not seem to fully embrace the conclusions of the pre-last PES reform of 2001. [The PES Congress in Berlin in 2011 decided, among the others, that member parties will include reference to their PES membership in their statutes. The reform did not embrace any other documents, however it could be presumed to be a logical consequence that the statutory changes of such a nature are also reflected in the core documents.]
Slovenia). For some parties that would also mean making the party a popular one (LSAP). Modernity is a quality through if a party has the ability to readapt itself to modern times and hence also bring along with governing progress and modernization for all (see MSZP). Being historical hence credible on one hand, and being modern hence able to operate in contemporary realities are in the light of the self-portraits actually two compatible features.

In most of the texts the self-portraits of the parties are included on the fringe of the explanation on what the core values are and how they are up to be interpreted. A significant exception is the document of PS FR, which in fact in 50% (12 articles) is composed of the explanatory pledge of values and in 50% (12 articles) description of a the party itself – what it is and what it aim at being. As this is a very original, unusual composition.

2.7. Ideological mission for a new society

Following the operational definitions from chapter 1, the relation between core values and vision is of a mutual influence. Vision remains an idea about how the world is and same time is a projection of what things should be about. This understanding connects with a term ideology. In the light of the declarative texts, the ideological mission of social democracy is first and foremost to ensure change. The notion of change or its relative synonyms (such as development, establishment of a new..., transformation), they appear in almost all the documents. It indicates therefore two characteristics of social democracy.

First of all, it shows that progressives are in opposition to the status quo. This relates to a critical evaluation of the reality and ambition to improve it substantially. The interesting question to pose here is therefore how to balance between the strong attachments to institutional traditions that make social democracy a part of contemporary political establishment and the historical inspiration that laid fundamentals and remains core of the movement’s ideology – namely remaining in an opposition to a system and all in it that is unfair, unjust. In a larger context this particular question returns always during all the renewal debates, especially in the context of evaluation of the past “left” governmental policies.

Secondly, there is an overall emphasis on the concept of process. Framing it properly seems to be equally relevant as achieving the goals themselves. To give an example, LSAP states that already a process is a goal. Some of the parties describe the process of bringing change therefore in details. Nevertheless, the

49 In the original text of the FEPS study, all the 12 articles are quoted – however for the sake of this shortened version, it has been downsized here. The PS FR aims at being: republican party; secular party; reformist party; party of feminism; party of humanism; party of decentralisation; party devoted to social justice; party that places education and culture among values; European party; internationalist party; popular party anchored in the world of labour; democratic party; party organising left alliance.

50 Analyzing the PS Fr detailed description above, one comes to three conclusions. The first one is that it may be important for a political party to anchor the values in a concrete operational guide for its organization. This transpositions the values from the level of ideal, laboratory prototypes into tangible directives – and hence facilitates it for respective members to get a better understanding of these. The second one is an observation that a grand vision may in fact require explanation of what kind of tools are to be used to realize it. Hence the process if its realization begins with putting the party into a shape in which it is to be capable to fulfill the mission. This imposes compatibility of the proposals in macro and micro scale, and obeys the logic that one must start a programme of change from oneself. Finally, this also shows a tendency that a vision for the future that parties put forward should also include a vision for what kind of party it wants to become.

51 Within the FEPS Next Left Focus Group, the notion of “progress” has widely been discussed. It was agreed that it should not be taken for granted that “progress” has the same positive connotation for all – and that in fact the civilisation’s developments bring new threats and new social exclusions. This discussion is to be continued within the FEPS Next Left, however is consciously not deliberated upon here.
approach varies on what elementary components of the process are. Some parties insist on ensuring involvement of citizens as a precondition for the process to be a democratic and hence legitimate (SPÖ, ČSSD, SDP, SPD). Detailed analyses of how a principle of openness is being realized could be also seen as measurements on how democratic they themselves are. It could show the balance between strong leadership (that people require) and inclusive constant consultations around policies.

The mission statements indicate what a vision of a different society, which social democrats wish to establish, is. Explicitly or not, all the parties share a view that this new society should emerge as build on the core values. What is interesting in this positioning is that the contemporary enemy of social democracy seems to therefore be all that contradicts those values, rather than a specific class that it would embark on struggle against. There are of course exceptions to that rule: MSZP underlines its fight against extremism; PASOK expressing its hostility towards oligarchy, PS BE contests capitalism. The two out of three however emerge from the specific circumstances in which the documents were written – in case of MSZP the political electoral ones, and in case of PASOK the historical ones accompanying the party’s establishment.

Generally, the ultimate mission is therefore to struggle for a new society. There are several features that this new society should encompass: better, free, equal / egalitarian; solidarity; fair and cohesive; safe; caring; prosperous; harmoniously developing; humane; in which all can lead decent life; peaceful; open; modern; civil; democratic. These characteristics form certain objectives that have to be then ensured via adequate policies. The new society is a matter of realization of a vision deriving from the core values and emphasis clearly no longer stays related to the issue of social classes and struggle among them.

A new society will have to exist in a specific set up. The components of that, which reappear in the different texts relate to welfare state and welfare policies, as also democracy. Several parties bridge the vision of new society with responses to European and global issues (BSP, ČSSD, SPD, ILP, LSDSP, MLP, DNA, and SAP). Though these references are direct, there is no clarity if and how the vision of a new society would apply on supra-national levels. This certain vacuum could be perhaps overcome by anchoring European and international issues within the core convictions and policies instead of making them parts of fringe chapters of respective documents.

Referring to the new society, parties seem to share a concern that all should enjoy both rights and responsibilities. The interesting shift is from a discourse about right and duties, to rights and responsibilities, which could in a way be seen as an evolution from the debates on the left from 1990s and the first decade of the 21st century. Though duties and responsibilities may sound similar, they in fact imply different things.

---

52 This is an especially interesting aspect in the context of the introduction to this paper. This links the research on core progressive values and deliberations on the eventual pan-European social contract. The later one remains a research theme for this year within the FEPS Next Left Research Programme.

53 Which remains coherent with the deliberations on contextualist approach from the introduction.

54 Duty relates to an issue of owing something and in its Latin origins even more directly to a debt. Having a duty translates into a moral commitment that should result in an action, going beyond feeling or mere recognition. Duty does involve also sacrifice of immediate self-interests. Accordingly to Cicero, there were four different sources of duty: a result of being human; result of one’s particular place in life (family, country, job etc.); result of one’s character; and one’s own moral expectations for oneself. There have been of course also many philosophers, who rejected a concept of sense of duty.

55 Responsibility on the other hand, can be both collective and individual. Collective responsibility is a concept or a doctrine, according to which individuals are to be held responsible for other people’s actions by tolerating, ignoring or harboring them, not necessarily actively.
The question that arises is therefore what sort of motivation social democrats expect people to be guided by, while contributing to society. Should that be a sense of owing and personal moral expectations towards oneself (and hence duty), or shall that be an issue of ethically predefined obligations that relate to a person’s free will? Should the mutual contributions be imposed by execution of a social contract or should they be anticipated as coming due to the nature of the emancipated people? Analyzing the respective text it is impossible to deliver at this point one determining answer. To give examples of differences: SPÖ speaks about making people co-responsible for politics; ČSSD refers to human reciprocity; SD claims that it is citizenship that show itself with rights and duties; SDE touches upon dualism of personal freedom and social responsibility; for SDP it is a matter of justice to uphold balance between responsibilities and rights as a basic condition to fulfill social contract; LSAP distinguishes in between duties and responsibilities; for PSOE democracy is a matter of responsibility (in case of internal one – is a matter of responsibility of the party’s members); PSD stands for rights and duties of all; SD Slovenia argues that everyone shares responsibility for common good; and SAP perceives rights and duties as a matter of solidarity, hence responsibility. These few selected examples prove that parties perceive the notions of both duties and responsibilities in many diverse ways. It is possible that one of the keys to new social contracts lays in redefining these terms both in relation to a society, but also in relation to the parties and politicians.56

In the previous paragraphs, it was indicated that the ideological mission of social democracy assumes creating a new society in a certain policy framework. There are three parties that see their mission rather as tangible multi-pillar strategy that encompasses57: vision for a new society; democracy and role of state; economy and welfare. These are: SDP58, PvdA59 and LP UK60, which relevant texts show therefore an interesting, more “down-to-Earth” approach.

### Identifying core values

#### 3.1. The notion of core values

The utilitarian aspect of the study on core values translates into a question on why core values are needed and how they can be used. Table 2 shows the complexity of the answer.

---

56 Popular agreement on how responsibilities / duties should be shared and what part of them it is up to the politicians to take and fulfill, could also facilitate establishing new popular evaluation criteria – and subsequently make politics more credible and more legitimate.

57 In the initial FEPS study all three examples were quoted fully.

58 For SDP there are three core elements: a fair society, a supportive state and sustainable future.

59 For PvdA there are 7 core elements: Right to decent life; Solidarity and togetherness; Governing close to the people (subsidiarity); Multifaceted democratic constitutional state; Freedom as right; Selective and sustainable growth; Community as a choice.

60 LP enumerates 4 principles on the basis of which it ‘seeks people’s trust to govern’ : dynamic economy; just society; open democracy; healthy environment.

61 During the discussions within the Next Left Focus Group it has been broadly debated that very often the core values documents remain irrelevant and unknown for the regular party members.
### Table 2: Core values and system of values by PES member parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enumerated Core Values</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Explanation / Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPÖ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Freedom, Equality, Justice, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP.a</td>
<td>Values are not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Be</td>
<td>Values are not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Liberty, Democracy, Equality, Social Justice, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČSSD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Freedom, Justice, Education, Participation, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD DK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Liberty, Equality, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freedom, Justice, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freedom, Equality, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS FR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Emancipation, Justice, Equality, Solidarity, Sustainable development, Progress, Democracy, Labour, Peace, Internationalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freedom, Justice, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASOK</td>
<td>Values are not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSZP</td>
<td>Values are not listed</td>
<td>MSZP believes that the above mentioned reopening must be based on common understanding of values by the party and eventual partners. They must involve answers on new means of combating discrimination, unfair privileges, humiliation, stigmatization and vulnerability of people. Reopening of the party should strengthen it in a fight for an open society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

62 The circumstances that blurred the picture additionally and which were already touched upon in section 2.1 are connected with the fact that parties indicate what they values are in many different ways: referring to them directly or indirectly; enlisting them with or without explanations; finally being indifferent in perception what a value is and what i.e. policy principles are.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enumerated Core Values</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Explanation / Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILP 4</td>
<td>Freedom Equality Community Democracy</td>
<td>Labour Party believes that the role of principles is to serve as a compass for the social transformation, which can be achieved through a political action that will lead to establishment of more equal, safe, caring, prosperous, fair society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSDSP Values are not listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSDP Values are not listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSAP 4 Freedom Justice Solidarity Security</td>
<td>The role of the Grundsatzprogramm is to give a clear orientation and to re-emphasise that LSAP seeks work, welfare and quality of live for all. LSAP wants a society in which all feel well and secured, in which circumstances they may develop their personally. The society without privileges, which obeys democratic principles is the one that should be, accordingly to the LSAP, be build on the base of 4 core values: freedom, justice, solidarity and security. Those four are complementary and interconnected, as only their compatible implementation can ensure for everyone a life of self-fulfillment. These four are modern and valid. The document ends with the interpretation on what LSAP understands to be politics. The text reads: Politics is not to be imagined without dialogue, confrontation of opinions and convincing others. We will therefore continue to listen to our co-citizens, seek together with them answers and try to convince them to us. LSAP wants active democracy, with the right of citizens to access information and share opinions, as also to take part in the decision-making processes (beyond elections only). In the elaborations they touch upon trustworthiness and reliability of socialist policies, as also the positive character of them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP Values are not listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PvdA 5 Freedom Democracy Fairness Sustainability Solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA 3 Freedom Equal Opportunities New Solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD 3 Freedom Equality Brotherhood</td>
<td>The Left is a guardian of 3 core values: freedom, equality and brotherhood. These three are, in its understanding the core of a democratic state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS PT 3 Freedom/Liberty Equality Solidarity</td>
<td>In the Declaration Ideologically the party identifies itself with the humanist traditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD 5 (principles) Liberty Social Justice Equity Equality Solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD SL 4 Equality Freedom Fairness Solidarity</td>
<td>The role of values is that they should be seen as cornerstones of a new agreement (new Deal for Slovenia).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEOE 3 Freedom Equality Solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP 3 Liberty Equality Solidarity</td>
<td>The values are naturally inter-related. Freedom and equality are a matter both of individual rights as well as of collective solutions (...) The human being is a creature who develops and grows in co-operation with other people and much of what is important to the welfare of the individual can only be created together with others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP UK 3 Freedom Solidarity Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the PES member parties (20 out of 27) provide a list of their core values\textsuperscript{62}. The number of values enlisted varies. There are 10 parties which recognize 3 values. 4 others put forward 4 values and subsequently 4 pledge as many as 5 values. One party (PS FR) proclaims 10. Freedom (or liberty), equality and solidarity (or brotherhood) remain the central values of all the lists. The majority of the parties also underline that the core values are interlinked, equally important and altogether constitute a system of values. The way they are interrelated and used (while explaining reality and proposing alternatives) makes them different to any other system. This allows showing divergence among different ideologies. Exemplification can be found in the preamble of SPD Grundsatzprogramm (in which a comparison with other ideologies is offered) or in respective manifestos.

Five different reasons that parties use to legitimize a need to recognize and struggle for the implementation of core values can be extracted. First of all, there are historical reasons. The core values are what preserves the identity of a movement and what enables it to bridge between its respectable past and hopeful future (SDP, PS FR). Secondly, it is a matter of parties’ own guidelines in functioning and in decision making (PS Fr, PS PT). As such, they serve therefore as a compass for an organization and for individuals. Both the first and the second reason are about coherence and strength of a party itself. Thirdly, core values should be a base on which society is built and in reference to which people make their choices (SPÖ, SAP). Fourthly, they should serve as a core of the welfare state (SP.a). Fifthly, they should be a base on which democracy and democratic state is constructed (SPD, SLD). The last three reasons appear as an obligation for the core values to be translated into ideological mission. Altogether, these 5 reasons clearly need to be shared within the party, if the process of drafting and adopting any document including values is to be a legitimate and meaningful.

3.2. Freedom, liberty and emancipation

The interpretation of singular values depends heavily on how they are related with the others. It is stated by the majority of parties explicitly that the values are equal in their ranks and derive from one another. Nevertheless in the list of values in table 2 one may observe a tendency that the concept of freedom (liberty, emancipation)\textsuperscript{64} is most frequently placed on the top of the list. There are two classifications that can be proposed to organize results of the analyses of the term freedom in the light of the respective parties’ texts. Firstly, there are three main points of reference to which freedom is being defined in the respective parties’ texts: as an abstract philosophical concept, in relation to an individual and in relation to a society. Secondly,

\textsuperscript{62}The author chose to use the terminology of core values, however the adjectives used in the introductory texts may vary: basic, principle, fundamental. While core perhaps puts more emphasis on the notion of “in the centre”, fundamental would indicate more towards an idea that they are basis for anything else. In either way it is not a semantic issue of a great relevance.

\textsuperscript{64}There are potential linguistic differences that this study would not be able to explore further due to limitations mentioned already in the previous sections. They are connected with an observation that in gathered material it happens that the terms: freedom, emancipation and liberty are being used in parallel in the respective parties’ texts (with exception of PS Be, in which manifesto both freedom and emancipation constitute two different core values). This could suggest that either they are synonyms or either that usage of some indicates a potential ideological evolution. To be able to come any closer to one of the two hypotheses, it is useful to search the literal meaning of the three terms. Contrasting all three, one can conclude that these three terms are very close, but they are yet not exactly synonyms in the light of their dictionary explanation. The question is therefore if they are used by the respective parties as in the same sense or indicate primacy of one of the definition’s characteristics. At this point it must nevertheless remain unresolved. For the sake of conclusive comparison, they will be treated as of similar notions and they will further be looked into on the bases of the table included below.
there are two spheres in which freedom is being considered: political and socio-economic. Both the classifications need further exploration to expose the main common and differentiation points among the ways parties define freedom.

As an abstract philosophical concept, freedom is being named as a universal value (BSP); right and eventually human right (SPÖ, SD DK, SPD, PvdA, PS PT); question of enabling all to develop freely (SDE, DNA); a goal of socialist action and a cornerstone of the socialist movement (PS FR, PASOK). Adjectives that accompany freedom within those texts are: responsible, socially responsible, equal. This reflects the logic of rights and responsibilities. Indeed, it is a matter of justice that all enjoy “equal freedoms” (SP.a, BSP, SPD etc.), but benefiting personally from them means also accepting the social responsibility they bring along and are inseparable from (SPÔ, BSP, SDP, LSAP). This is a solid link that shapes the relations between an individual and a society.

In relation to individuals, freedom is first and foremost an issue of self-determination (SPÖ, SDE, BSP, SD SK, SPD, LSAP, SAP). Following metaphysical determinism, in order to be able to choose freely, there must be certain conditions ensured. The political and socio-economic aspects will be further elaborated below; however at this point it seems to be worthy to draw attention to two features that social democracy assumes is at place while speaking about individual self-determination. The first one is that all the individuals are willing to choose and pursue certain ambitions and develop talents (SD DK, SPD, ILP) that would lead them to self-fulfillment (DNA). Second one is that education prepares them to realize their dreams and to make the choices. The ethical assessment will additionally derive from humanism (SDE). Herewith social democracy appears to be positive about human nature.

Another important notion that some of the programmes bring along are the issues of respect (tolerance) and dignity. Social democrats emphasize that people are and will remain different (SD DK, LSAP, PSD, SAP, LP UK). As long as their choices do not harm others (SPD, DNA, PSOE), any decision they take (accordingly to their system of believes) should remain respected. The concepts of respect in a context of individual, personalized rights are still relatively new features of the social democratic programmes – though it is already relatively well spread. It is possible to assume that this thread will be further developed, also in order to reply to the growing individualization of European societies. Additionally the combination between responsible freedom, respect and social responsibility surely creates a solid base on which social democracy can explain its vision for the future of more and more diverse (multicultural) society. In some of the texts it also serves as an explanation on why the minorities are to be protected.

Society plays a crucial role in contextualizing the concept of freedom in the progressive ideology. Guaranteeing of freedoms for individuals predetermines how free the society in itself is (SPÖ, SDE). Said in another way, society will never be free – unless all men and women within it are (ILP). At the same time it is a society (or a community) that is in fact the liberator (see SPD, SD SK, DNA). Community can provide greater freedoms, than individuals may achieve alone (DNA, SAP). The goal remains therefore a free, cohesive and

---

65 To explore further the concept of “equal freedoms” in contemporary philosophy, it is worth referring to J. Rawls and his A Theory of Justice (revised in 1999).
fraternal society (PS PT) of completely emancipated people (PS FR) to which a path leads through certain arrangements that enable emancipation (and here undoubtedly state and its policies play a crucial role).

In the context of this first classification, it is possible to make two over-reaching conclusions. The first of them is that social democracy follows rather the logic of metaphysical determinism, assuming that certain conditions must be ensured in order for individuals and for societies to enjoy freedom. The exception in this rationale is a conviction that independently of them, all the individuals possess dreams and are ready to choose ethically ways of their realization. The second is related to the specific understanding of liberties. In the spirit of social contract, progressives promote the view that individual freedom and social responsibility are interconnected. There is a difference in how much parties emphasize on the fringe of that diverse character of contemporary societies and how much it links with individualized matters such as respect.

The second of the two proposed classifications, breaks the constituting elements of freedom into two aspects: political and socio-economic. Within the first one, freedom is defined by some parties as an opposition to dictatorship and authoritarian systems (SPÖ), from fascism (PS PT), colonialism (PS PT), totalitarianism (PS PT), from domination of elites (ČSSD), freedom from external oppression (ILP), extremism (PSD), racism (PSD), chauvinism (PSD) or ethnic separatism (PSD). Generally one can say that the parties from the countries that in their modern history suffered from either occupation or oppression of a non-democratic system are likely to insist on defining freedom in opposition to those. Renouncing all these as contradictory to freedom makes also the link between this particular value and democratic system really apparent.

There are certain constructive elements of freedom interpreted through a political classification. Freedom translates into: pluralism; active and passive electoral rights; freedom of association; freedom of participation, freedom of belief and consciousness; freedom of expression; freedom of strike; freedom of media; and free judiciary. Though different parties make respectively more or less detailed lists of the components of political freedom, there are relatively not many discrepancies in the content of the lists. Some, that appear, can easily be explained by a contemporary political context such as in the case of SLD the reference to “right of privacy and freedom from invigilation by secret services” is rooted in the practices of their political opponents. Where the line of divergence could eventually be found is on the issue of principles that derive from the interpretation of freedom of consciousness and belief. Some parties draw from it a demand for secularism and separation of the state and church (LSAP, SLD), others emphasize the aspect of mutual respect of churches and peaceful coexistence (SAP). Theoretically the sense remains similar; however the conclusions in fact frame two different messages. One should however underline that this particular issue gains more importance for the parties originating from states, where church has played a vital role in its modern history. Another specific item that appears in several documents is freedom of expression understood as an issue of protection and preservation of the national heritage, culture and language.

The differences can also be observed among the parties where political or socio-economic aspects play a bigger role while defining freedom. It may seem that the tendency to focus primarily (however not exclusively) on political freedoms is more of a trend among the parties from Central and Eastern Europe (with addition of PS PT). The explanation of that may be derived from on one hand still recent experiences from the
non-democratic regimes (before 1989), as also on still present struggles and fragility of democratic settlements. This perhaps would indicate that those parties would be perhaps more attached to the notion of liberty, while the others to the cause of freedom.

Historically speaking, freedom in socio-economic understanding originates from a demand that the usage of means of productions should be free and free of change (which understanding can be retrieved in the PS BE document). In the spirit of determinism, social democratic parties share an assessment that material and social preconditions predefine freedom. Ensuring freedom therefore translates into freeing people from poverty, hunger, shameful dependencies, fear etc. It means ensuring material security and creating chances through redistribution system. This logic links freedom directly with the concepts of decent work and decent life, issues of well-being and altogether question of welfare state.

Socio-economic emancipation and political liberation should, as many (though not all) parties state, progress simultaneously. This conclusion represents a shift from traditional historical socialist view according to which the material conditions will ensure subsequent political freedom. This is what may be a point of reflection in the renewal. Striking an adequate balance between individual freedoms and social responsibilities on one hand and between political and socio-economical interpretations of freedoms on the other can be the key to providing answers to what a modern vision of both democracy and welfare state should encompass. Not less, the question of freedom from fear otherwise also described in the documents as security could also facilitate finding an answer on how to gain credibility for an alternative (a change) in times of general insecurity, fears and pessimism.

3.3. Equality

The concept of equality is placed by a number of national parties as second among the core values. Even though in the contemporary discourse more and more indicate that equality has to be the leading progressive value in the 21st century. As in case of freedom, also equality is being interpreted in various ways and with reference to several social concepts. Among them, worth exploring contemporarily are: universalism, constrained and unconstrained vision of equality; equal opportunities and equal outcomes; equality of autonomy; equity; and egalitarianism. These different terms are being used in the various

---

66 Generalizing, the term could be brought to: the same and for all. This pure sense is reflected in the legal interpretation, according to which equality before law signifies that all are equal and hence poses the same rights, with no discrimination and no privilege allowed.

67 It refers to a concept that applies to all persons and / or all the things for all times and in all situations. Its precise definitions vary, however the interesting angle for this study is that universalism explained on the grounds of philosophy is connected with the Age of Enlightenment (to which several parties related) and idea of a social contract.

68 Accordingly to the logic of constrained vision, equality translates into equal treatment to all. Contradictory to that, in the spirit of unconstrained vision everyone is different. Noticing that induces therefore affirmative action, which aims at ensuring the most adequate support for all, accordingly to individual’s specific needs.

69 Equal opportunities remain related to the notion of equal outcomes. This is a concept based on expectation that everyone should be able to find themselves in the same position (as far as wealth, knowledge etc.) is concerned. This is what the redistribution mechanisms are based on. There is surely a dispute if equal opportunities are not sufficient and the notion of equality of outcome should not be dropped.

70 An interesting thread in the debate on equality was brought in by Amartya Sen, who proposed a term of equality of autonomy. In short, this idea is a pledge that an ability and means to choose a life course should be as equally as possible spread across a society. In its sense, it puts emphasis on the question of empowerment rather than on simplistic understanding of equal chances.

71 Equity is an idea. It explains the relational satisfaction in terms of perception of fair and unfair distribution of resources. Equity may be a term used for comparing contributions and outcomes, and in that way be related to an issue of justice. It was broadly elaborated by John Stacey Adams in 1963.
contexts by the national parties and they also constitute the main aspects of deliberations on equality within the pan-European debate on the renewal of social democracy.

Several parties recognize equality as a unique feature of social democracy (SP.a), the ideal social democracy seeks (PS FR) and the sense of the centennial struggle of social democrats against privileges and discrimination (ČSSD). It is related to the heritage, as it reflects identification with the principles of humanism (PSD), as it is an expression of a belief that everyone is of an equal value (SP.a, SD DK, SAP). For some it is a matter of a European Standard (SLD). Even though (as signalized above) it currently is being discussed if equality should become the prior value, such an approach is not reflected in any of the respective parties’ positions at this point. Equality is being seen rather consequently in the context of other values, being frequently describes as precondition of freedom (which is especially strongly reflected among the Nordic parties, SD DK, DNA, SAP) and inseparable from it (PS FR).

For some parties equality is connected with equity. Examples of that are PS PT or PSD, which enumerate among their core values both equality and equity. In the texts of other parties, the word equity is not explicatively used, however they relate to either equality of rights and duties (SP.a, SDP, PSD, SD SL, and LP UK). There are also parties, which restrict themselves to speak about equal opportunities and equal rights only, seeing guaranteeing of them as already a translation of justice (ČSSD, SD DK, DNA, and PS PT). The conclusion to draw is that the notion of reciprocity is placed by the member parties in the framework of different core values (freedom, equality, solidarity, justice etc.) The differences, if to speak about the duties and when, remain however still relatively substantial among the parties.

Equality is described by the parties as a goal and/or as a mean. The core aim (which relates to the ideological mission) is an equal society, in which individuals enjoy equal rights and opportunities (SP.a, SDP). In that sense equality is rather an outcome of the social democratic actions. The critical approach to this ideal is raised by for example ČSSD, that raises an objection to egalitarianism and equity of income differences. The differences in income are perceived by that party as a matter of justice in relation to different efforts being made by different individuals. Also DNA touches upon the issue, however from a different angle. DNA states that all must benefit [from welfare state], and not just those who fell between the track. It seems that the issue of relation between equality as an outcome and equality as opportunities could become an interesting point for a further debate, especially in the light of the theories quoted in the introduction to this section.

As far as the process is concerned, there are two ways of perceiving equal opportunities that are reflected in the parties’ respective documents. The first of the three includes parties, which focus on seeing equal opportunities as a matter of equal treatment. It is not exclusive that those parties do not see a need for a special support for those less fortunate or to fight against discrimination. It is rather a question on where they put emphasis. Their logic is hence more connected with constrained thinking. Examples of such parties are SPÖ, MLP, PS PT, PSOE. The second category embraces those parties, which give an emphasis to the context. They

72 Egalitarianism is a trend that favors equality, placing emphasis on the fact that the concept of equality contains equity of quality. It means that everyone must be treated the same, regardless of race, origin etc, as also all human beings are equal and worth same.
73 Similar concern is shared by SPD under the theme "justice".
believe, as SP.a, ČSSD, SD DK, DNA, and SAP; that equal chances are not the same as equal rights – once people start from different points which predetermine in what extent they can use the opportunities. These parties would place themselves rather therefore on the side of unconstrained thinking.

Some parties express their open criticism to the notion of equal opportunities. SP.a introduces an interesting distinction between opportunities and chances, in the light of which opportunities mean less than chances, as chances imply not only enabling a possibility, but also enabling individual to use it – through a fight against discrimination. The parties vary in terms of how explicit they are about the affirmative action, specific measures for groups or individuals. Some parties unambiguously point out that equal opportunities must be offered at all stages of life (ČSSD).

Equality may be defined in relation to a society, in relation to a group and in relation to an individual. Starting from the last one, several parties recognize diversity of individuals (SPÖ, SP.a, SD SK, DNA etc.) It is being advocated that diversity is a societal strength and hence shall be met with respect, that would on one side drive the fight against discrimination, on the other it would enable all to me members of a community and society (SD SK writes explicatively that “nobody should be left alone”). The second relation mostly touches upon multiculturalism and coexistence of the different ethnic groups (however in some cases also the issue of religions, churches, political believes). The answer proposed to that is equality realized through: no privileges for one culture above another (SP.a), fight against discrimination (PS PT), targeted integration (SD DK), ensuring equal rights and duties (DNA). The third relation is between equality and a society. It is a joint effort of individuals and society that ensures opportunities (through for example welfare state) and from which deal enabling progress both society and individuals benefit (SP.a, ILP, DNA).

Last but not least, an important concept that plays a role in the social democratic texts is the issue of gender equality. This very particular kind of equality is enumerated more frequently than any other. It is a consequence of the century struggle of women movements for universal suffrage, which are to a large extend connected with social democratic parties. There are differences in-between the parties on how they express their commitment to this struggle. For certain parties it falls under the category of actions that aim at combating all forms of discrimination (SPÖ, DNA, PS PT). Certain parties refer to the issue as the one of gender equality (BSP, DNA, PS PT), others as equality of men and women (SP.a, ČSSD, SDE, SDP), and yet others advocate more for women rights (SD SK, SLD, PSD). This differentiation is interesting, as it shows approaches to the same objective of equality and also may be an explanation on why there are different associations with the terms suffrage and feminism; within the social democratic movement.

3.4. Just distribution of welfare and labour

Justice76 is included in 14 out of all the 26 analyzed texts. Among the parties, which enlist values in a certain order, it is placed between second and fourth position. Defining this notion seems particularly difficult,
due to its complexity and strong cultural rooting\textsuperscript{75}. The parties use both the terms of \textit{justice} and \textit{social justice}\textsuperscript{76}, however one can also speak about \textit{distributive justice}\textsuperscript{77}. There are two parties (SPD and LSAP), which opted for naming explicitly \textit{justice}, but not mentioning directly \textit{equality} among the enumerated core values. For them, it is \textit{justice} that establishes all people to be \textit{equal}, ensuring \textit{equal opportunities} and guides the struggle against \textit{inequalities} and \textit{emancipation}. Hence perhaps \textit{justice} could be seen as broader concept, which in a better way reflects also the complementary character of the relation between \textit{equality} and \textit{freedom}.

Overall, the majority of the parties link \textit{justice} with the value of \textit{equality}. According to them \textit{justice} establishes all to be equal (SPÖ, BSP, LSDP, LSAP). What is perhaps a small difference within definitions of \textit{equality} in relation to a individual is the focus on \textit{dignity} – to life in which all should have rights. This notion appears commonly in the context of remarks about the diversity in a society and differences among individuals, and can prove a tendency of social democrats to speak more on \textit{social justice}.

Relating to \textit{distributive justice} one can find three notions: welfare, political rights and progress. Within the first category, parties advocate for a \textit{fair} distribution of chances, services and material goods (SPÖ, SPD, LSDP, LSAP). Within the second, they touch upon the issue of participation and representation, as also demand eradication of a divided (class-based) society (SPÖ, SPD). The third one follows the logic that progress is an outcome of an effort of all and hence everyone should be able to share its benefits. Characteristically for social democracy, there are two particular demands. On one side, \textit{justice} requires standing on the side of the weaker and imposes that they are especially supported. On the other, those who have succeeded and in consequence earn more must make even a greater effort and contribute more.

This last two points bridge directly to the second question, namely \textit{between whom} there is a distribution. In the light of the earlier quoted debate on \textit{rights and responsibilities}, one can at this point make an assessment the answer may only seem a simple one (justice is about fair (re)distribution among all, especially among those who are in need). The ongoing debates on renewal of social democracy and the pressure that welfare state finds itself under, they show a growing demand on explanation how to balance a demand for an explanation of expectations between the extraordinary support for those requiring it and enabling their contributions to an overall progress on the other. This and the answer to the third question “\textit{what is proper distribution?}” still remain unresolved themes since the ideological debates since the 1990s.

Finally, \textit{justice} in the understanding of many social democrats refers: equal opportunities on the labour market (SPÖ, SPD), fighting unemployment (BSP, LSDP). The difference in between these two approaches is perhaps also a contextual one and depends on if the priority is to fight unemployment or struggle for full employment. For some it is a matter of \textit{justice} that all have the same right to work and hence to get a (well-paid) job (LSDP, LSAP, PSD). This particular interpretation may come as a significant reference point for all the current post-crisis debates.


\textsuperscript{76} \textit{Social justice} is in fact an idea of creating a society that is based on equality and solidarity, that understands and values human rights and that recognizes dignity of every human being.

\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Distributive justice} is a term that stands for a proper allocation of wealth, power, reward, respect etc. among different people.
John Rawls advocated that justice can in fact be seen as *fairness*. To better sense the distinction, the synonyms of *fair* would include: just, equitable, impartial, unbiased, objective, and dispassionate. These adjectives emphasize neutrality in judgment. There are two parties that used the notion of *fairness* in their texts: LSDSP (in parallel also speaks about social justice) and SD SL. The first of them relates *fairness* with fiscal policy and medical care; the second with competitiveness.

Furthermore, it has been argued that *work and labour* may be values in themselves. In the context of some of the respective parties’ texts such a hypothesis may perhaps appear defendable, if to use the definition formulated in the introduction (that *value* is an ideal that constitutes pillar of a vision of a respective party, being same time this party motivation and determining its actions). This is especially the case, when the reference is made to decent work that enables emancipation, life in dignity for individuals and progress for a society (SP,a, PS FR, and BSP). At the same time however, others would rather counter argue that everyone should have a *right* to work (which derives from *equality*) and hence more than a value, it is a principle in designing adequate policies (PASOK, SDP).

Even though majority of the parties refer to *welfare* indicating the just redistributive framework on interactions between the state and society, there are few parties (majority of which are those from Northern Europe) that are inclined to enumerate *welfare* or *well-being* as a value. It could be argued that as it describes something ideal and dear, and hence indeed mobilizing for action. The term of *welfare* is connected for social democrats with a concept of state, which plays an active role, promoting and protecting both social and economic well-being. This concept derives from the core values of *equality* and *solidarity*, and especially from the angles of *equal opportunities, equity and redistribution, public responsibility for ensuring decent life for all*. That is why welfare system is perhaps not seen as much a value on its own, but rather an arrangement within a social contract that enables to build a welfare society. Its building pillar, *well-being*, is however described by some as a right of every person (SDE). It can be created as a result of a common effort (SDE, SDP, and LSDSP) and once established will be a society that thanks to application of values in practice (such as equality and solidarity) overcome difficulties (such as tensions of a diverse society). The concept is easily translatable into concrete policy guidelines, which derive from the values, namely: public services or progressive taxation as a mean to ensure them.

### 3.5. Communities of solidarity

*Solidarity* is the notion that throughout the course of the years replaced the notion of *brotherhood*. Social democracy recognizes *solidarity* as its traditional, historical core (universal) value (BSP, SD SK, LSAP, DNA) – which in fact usually is enlisted on the third position. *Solidarity* originates from *solidarity among the workers*.

---


79 In Wikipedia, the term is also defined as provision of well-being and social support without stigma of charity.

80 *Well-being* therefore is a concept that evaluates standard of life. It can embrace number of indicators, among them degree of freedom people enjoy, respect for human rights, but also i.e. happiness. Even though the last one is relatively hard to measure, it reappears more and more frequently in a contemporary political discourse. It may be indicative of changing focus and exposing especially the element of well-being in the concept of welfare nowadays.

81 The term *solidarity* originates from sociology and refers to the degree and type of social integration, shown by a society or a group towards the others. It can be described as unity that produces or is based on community of interests.
(PS BE, LSAP). It was also *solidarity made social changes possible* (quote from LSAP, but see also BSP, SPD, DNA). *Solidarity* is an expression of a belief that united people can achieve more (LP UK, DNA), it has grown on the foundations of togetherness and shared destiny (PvdA). *Solidarity* predefines the rules on the bases of which a cohesive and inclusive society is built (PS PT, SAP) and indicates the way on which values of *freedom* and *equality* can be realized (SD DK, SDP). *Solidarity* means readiness to take responsibility for a community (SPÖ, SD SI) and for the other citizens (ČSSD, SPD, SD DK, DNA). Therefore it is an issue of mutual respect (SDP), readiness to care and help one another (SPÖ, SPD, SLD) and therefore in encompassed by *social responsibility* (ČSSD, SDE, DNA, and SAP). Specifically, for the members of the movement it translates into the realization of social democratic principles (SPÖ, SP.a, PS BE, and PSOE). Consequently, there are two features that require underlining: *solidarity* according to social democrats is an issue of defining relations among one another (both individuals, as also between individuals and society). It proves why a community is needed for all to be able to progress (SD DK). As such it is an answer to *egoism* (LSDSP, SAP). It appeals to a sense of responsibility, and hence encourages to action. There are few components characteristic for the way social democracy comprehends *solidarity*. They can be divided into two categories: those which refer to solidarity with whom; and those which encompass state and transnational arrangement.

Within the first category, *solidarity* can be: among people, with certain individuals and with certain groups. Solidarity among people refers to the circumstances, in which they share a certain identity. This has been traditionally the case of workers (PS BE, MSZP). What is interesting to state here is that in none of the texts a notion of *comradeship* can be found. Another example of solidarity among people is *solidarity among generations*. It is frequently underlined and pledged for in number of the respective parties’ texts (SP.a, ČSSD, SD DK, SPD, LSAP, and DNA). It mirrors the fact that social democrats wish to use *intergenerational solidarity* as a value, on the bases of which one can give a convincing answer to demographic challenges and define choices that affect future (SDP, DNA and MLP is linked to *intergenerational solidarity* as also the connection with *sustainable development*). Drawing a conclusion here, it could be said that solidarity is a way for the parties to speak about overcoming societal problems in order to ensure a better future for all. Therefore *solidarity* is with all those, who need support (DNA) and in particular with certain groups (please see as an example the list provided by ČSSD or SP.a). *Solidarity* becomes in that sense a set of ideas on how to overcome the divisions and steer towards more cohesive society. There seem to be however situations, which require difficult choices in positioning. Example can be migration and the complexity of PvdA’s standpoint may reflect that.

Within the second category, *solidarity* refers to state and transnational arrangements. State (directly or indirectly) is expected to ensure that the *solidarity* is perceived as *practical instrument in advancing towards more just life circumstances* (SPÖ). Therefore *solidarity* guides the principles on the bases of which labour market, education or public services should be organized. Interconnecting *solidarity* and the basic sense of (welfare) state, which link is present in majority of the documents allows concluding that social democracy believes that the state is there first and foremost to serve the society and its members.

*Solidarity* that refers to the *transnational arrangements* appears in the texts as *international solidarity*. The historical understanding of international solidarity can be traced through the words of the PS BE
declaration, which explains that *emancipation of workers is not a national, but international matter*. Currently
the logic may have changed and *international solidarity* is more of an ideological response to the circumstances
of globalization and growing interdependence of both states and societies (BSP). *International solidarity*
ensheathed all the people (SPÖ, LSAP) and may be reflected in policy principles and in institutional demands.
In terms of the policy principles, they derive from *solidarity with people*, who suffer from hunger, poverty,
oppression, wars, natural disasters (SD DK, SDP). In terms of intuitional demands it can be shaped as solidarity
between the more and less developed countries (SP.a, LSAP). The aim of *international solidarity* remains to
to ensure peace, stability and sustainable development for all.

*Community* is a term that most would associate with a group of interacting people, who possibly live in
a close proximity and are to share common values\(^{82}\). Despite that in the light of these definitions it is rather a
certain idea than a fundamental value, *community* is being name as the third core value in the Constitution of
the Irish Labour Party. It is a unique position. ILP does not enumerate *solidarity* as a core value, but
instead refers to *community*. One could ask if that signifies a potential direction of ideological evolution. The
definition, which the party provides, encompasses level of individuals, their immediate surroundings, but also
the global level. Through a notion of *sense of community* it indicates the framework in which relations between
a human and the world around should be built, and hence provides an interesting explanation on social
democratic position on issues such as: individualization, globalization and global interdependence. In this light
the terms *respect*\(^{83}\) and *dignity*\(^{84}\) are being more and more frequently mentioned. There are two parties, who
refer to those two terms as to core values: SP.a and ČSSD. On the margin it is worth adding that these two
notions also appeared in the recent electoral Manifesto of the PES (2009). It can be another sign of a shift in
attention from the dominant thinking from the angle of the collective towards a new mainstreaming
conceptualization that begins from an individual in a community.

*Sustainable development*\(^{85}\) as a term owes much of its popularity to the work of the Brundtland
Commission \(^{86}\). The context of the UN definition could suggest perceiving *sustainable development* as a principle
deriving from solidarity - however certain parties (BSP, ČSSD, SDE, PS FR and LSDSP) estimate its importance
however higher, recognizing in it not only a principle but a core value. Social democrats supplement the UN
term with three contexts in which *sustainable development* should be additionally considered. The first one is a
matter of individual and collective rights and interests. The second one is the link between humanism and

---

\(^{82}\) There are many definitions (deriving from sociology, psychology, anthropology and social philosophy), which bridge with concepts such as: social networks, social capital, and sense of community.

\(^{83}\) Respect stands for a positive feeling (towards a person or entity) and for a specific action (a conduct that represents this esteem). It can derive from ethics or can be also an expression of regard towards certain valued qualities.

\(^{84}\) Dignity can be used in a context of moral, ethical and naturally political discussions. It is an acknowledgement that all poses same, innate right to respect and ethical treatment. The term derives from teachings of Enlightenment.

\(^{85}\) Accordingly to the definition that was adopted in this Commission’s report sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet their own needs. It contains within it two concepts: (1) the concept of needs, in particular the essential needs of the world’s poor, to which overriding priority should be given; and (2) the idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment’s ability to meet present and future needs.

\(^{86}\) Brundtland Commission, formally World Commission on Environment and Development was convened in 1983 by a resolution 36/161 of the UN. It was established to address growing concern “about the accelerating deterioration of the human environment and natural resources as the consequences of that deterioration for economic and social development.” Its Chair, Gro Harlem Brundtland, born 1939, is a Norwegian social democratic politician, who served as Prime Minister of Norway in 1981, 1986-89 and 1990-1996.
culture and the issue of environment. Finally, the third one is a matter of responsibility – which foremost derives from intergenerational solidarity.

### 3.6. Democracy and participation

Social democracy indicates in its name its attachment to the democratic form of government. For four among the studied parties (BSP, SDP, PS FR, ILP) democracy is a value – namely not only a political system, but in fact an aspiration, an ideal to seek. As far as the other parties are concerned, their respective definitions may vary, as far as emphasis on certain descriptive elements is concerned\(^{87}\). Democracy can be described as a supreme model, but also as a process that leads to achieving it. These two categories are not contradictory, but complementary – as a process of democratization is and will remain a constant one (SPÖ, PS FR, DNA, PS PT, SAP). It is through democracy that the frameworks of democracy are being decided and it is a common responsibility to protect and develop it. Hence democracy is a fundamental concept, without implementing each realization of other core values is not possible (ČSSD, SD SK, PS FR, DNA, PS PT), however on that it is worth noticing that parties highlight differences from among the core values for which democracy is indispensable. Decent existence is only possible in democratic constitutional state (PvdA). Democracy is also a precondition for progress (MLP). Next to being a frame, it also can be seen as a universal right (SD DK). Finally, democracy is the only political system in which socialism and its values are recognized; hence they are both in fact inseparable (PS FR, PS PT) and it is democracy that predefines the nature of the socialist actions (PS FR).

Democracy must apply to all the spheres of society (SPÖ, PS PT), and it must characterize society as a whole (SAP). While exploring the details of the definitions given by the parties, it is possible to observe that the term democracy is being described either in relation to an institutional setting or to the actors, who play a role in democratic system. As well, as positively, it may also be defined as an opposition to: totalitarianism (PS PT); any restrictions on democracy (MSZP), extremism (MSZP), usage of force and violence in attempt to achieve political goals (ILP), corruption (SDE, ILP), and any power abuse (SD SL), arbitrariness (PvdA), racism (SD SL). It is noticeable that while naming the contradictions to democracy, parties are heavily influenced by the experiences from the recent respective histories of their countries.

Explaining the meaning of democracy in the context of institutional setting, all the parties more or less explicitly link it with the respect for the rule of law. There is a tendency that can be observed, which is that this focus is more exposed in the documents of the parties from the Central and Eastern Europe. They more frequently and more unequivocally refer to it, as also to the democratic constitutional order they are part of (BSP, ČSSD, SDE, and SLD). To recapitulate, it is not a question of a divergence (as all the parties clearly share this principle), but rather an issue of political and historical circumstances those particular parties operate in (which is on one side still fresh memory of pre-1989 times; and on the other still fragile democracy, troubled with political turmoil after every election).

In the context of institutional settings, parties believe in representative democracy that subordinates political power under public scrutiny, accountability and control (ČSSD, SD DK, ILP, PvdA, SAP, LP UK). Some\(^{87}\) This reflects that also on the ground of political sciences there are different ways of describing it.
parties (SDE) emphasize additionally that duties of public office should be executed accordingly to high moral standards. For a number of parties political ethics is directly related to the question of ensuring trust in politics as such, and in political parties and politicians in particular. The decisions in democracy are taken accordingly to the rule of majority (ČSSD, SD DK, DNA) with protection of minorities (SPÖ, SD DK, DNA). There are certain preconditions that must be ensured for democracy to be realized. The lists of those preconditions given by the parties usually correspond with one another. The enumerations are given especially by the two Nordic parties (SD DK and DNA) and they encompass: right to vote (DNA, but also SPÖ), free elections (SD DK, DNA), respect for human rights (SD DK, DNA), right to assemble (SD DK), right to participate in a political work (SD DK), right to participate in work of professional organizations (SD DK). SPÖ same time supplies with a detailed description of electoral rules, demanding that they are general, free, equal and that everyone should be entitled to cast an undisclosed vote. Several parties provide further characteristics of a democratic system, with the basic consensus that a democratic framework lies in a constitutional state. Vast majority of the parties favour a republic. Parties advocate that the parliamentary system is a core pillar of democracy (SPÖ, PvdA), in which there must be a balance of power in between institutions (SDE, PvdA).

Descriptions of institutional system are part of a discussion on what kind of state social democracy seeks to build. The most detailed description is given in the constitution of ILP, for which party, just to remind, democracy remains one of the core values. ILP believes in a positive role of state, which should be responsive, active and dynamic. State is in fact in charge of the creation of wealth, hence for ensuring responsible management and fair, effective distribution of the resources. This links with a demand to organize, supervise and constantly improve public sector and its services. Furthermore, it is expected that democracy will encompass all the levels of governance (SDP, ILP). This may connect with a demand for decentralization and strengthening local government (PASOK).

The demand that democracy must be obeyed on all the levels (local, regional, national, European, international) is repeated by several parties. Transposition of power onto European and international levels is a natural cause of globalization, in which process interdependencies in between the states are growing and power of single states is decreasing. The transnational level is the one, on which a response to new challenges, such as climate and demographic changes can be formulated (SPD). There are two methods that parties use to describe these two levels of democracy – either how they should be constructed or what purpose they should serve. In the first of the two, parties touch upon democratic legitimization of the international institutions (SP.a, SD DK, and SAP). Among the prerogatives they indicate that they should exercise the legitimate, democratic control over the capital (SDP), as it is democracy that should state terms for (global) economy (SAP). In the same pillars, the demands for democratization of Europe falls (SP.a, SD DK). The second of the methods describe the aims that come along with the global struggle for democracy among them: ensuring human rights for all (PASOK), peace, eliminating terror, death penalty, tortures (SPÖ). An observation that can be made is that parties tend to be more detailed and concrete in explaining the term democracy in the context of the national state, than in the light of European or institutional arrangements. It seems also that the entire
institutional debate of the EU, which dominated the first years of the new century, is not substantially reflected in the respective parties’ programmes.

Next to the institutional context, parties also interpret democracy in relation to the actors that play significant roles in this system. This is commonly derived from the logic that democracy is a matter of rights and duties (responsibilities) of those, who create, sustain and develop it through their own action within it. There are four categories of actors that can be extracted as the ones; parties refer to in their respective texts: individual citizens, NGOs, media and political parties.

Even though the representative democracy makes some in charge of leadership and decision making process, it is still citizens that through election share responsibility for the political choices (SPÖ, SD DK). Participation is their right (SDP), but also reflects a responsibility for the way matters are decided (SPD, PASOK). Some parties underline that it is a citizens’ duty (DNA). It varies among the parties on how much attention they pay to the “duty” dimension of citizenship. Active participation links with the belief that was already described in the section above, that the decentralization and empowerment of local levels is an effective way of involving citizens. This must however be interconnected with the transposition of democracy onto higher levels in the spirit of a concept that PvdA named multifaceted democracy. Finally, though generally parties do not explore the questions around rights and duties of citizens of foreign origin, a contradictory example of that is SPÖ, who demands that they are integrated in political life, as also in labour and social policies.

Social democratic parties recognize a profound meaning of the civil society and its organizations (SDE). Their role is about, among others: awareness raising (SPÖ), building political will within the society (SPÖ). Civil dialogue is an important tool of engagement (SDP). Hardly any reference can be found in those respective sections to the trade unions, despite the fact that some of them touch upon the issue of democracy in the world of labour (SPÖ) and that democracy means that individuals can influence economy (SD DK, SAP). There is no further indication on any eventual alliance between civil society and political parties; however they share responsibility for fulfillment of certain tasks.

Media are in service to public (SD DK) and hence charge of providing people with relevant information. This is a basic requirement of democracy. Pluralism of media (SD DK), that reflects freedom of speech and free information (SAP), is a guarantee that an objective choice can be made by citizens. Therefore it is also relevant that they are not monopolized and remain under diverse ownership (ILP). SAP underlines in their text that it is the public (non-commercial) media that are responsible for spread of knowledge and education.

Additionally, education plays a crucial role in emancipating, enabling and encouraging citizens to take part in democratic processes. It directly relates to the principles of equal opportunities for all. It is especially three Nordic parties (SD DK, DNA, SAP), who put an extraordinary emphasis on this matter. Access to knowledge, insight skills and cognitive competences predefines abilities of people to participate in politics (DNA). Therefore, educational system must equip people with skills to be able to search for and critically analyze different pieces of information (SD DK, DNA). Civic education must take place among all the groups and on all the stages of one’s life (SAP). This way of understanding one of the roles of education and the
interdependency between education and democracy, provokes a thought that an internal party education, which has been a tradition of socialist movement, perhaps could enjoy review.

Last but not least, several political parties also describe role of political parties in democracy, which presupposes multi party system (SAP). Political movements are also responsible for awareness rising and for encouraging participation (SDP), but also for mobilizing voters (SDE). Politicians and any elected structure should always be accountable to people (SD DK, DNA). Nowadays there is a lack of trust in politics and politicians and social democracy especially has a mission to reverse that trend (SDP).

3.7. Humanism and secularism

*Humanism* could appear as a way of thinking, than a value in itself. Several parties name humanism as their heritage in which also their contemporary beliefs are anchored in (PS FR, PSD, BSP, and DNA). Nevertheless some do refer to it as their core value – and the texts of BSP, ČSSD and SDP are examples of it. It is worth underlining that among them SDP referring to it explicitly as the 5th among the core values they recognize. Contemporary humanism embraces two notions that can be of a great importance for social democracy in the 21st century. The first of them, being an attention to reason, can be easily linked with the policies that progressives advocate for on the bases of their core values, such as for example education. Seen from that angle, education is not only a question of empowerment of individuals, but a way of creating a common, societal ethics – and as such gives also strong bridge to the role progressives expect education to play in the context of modern democracy. The second one is optimism. This is a characteristic that is difficult to embrace by the progressive movement, which has in its convention historical criticism and in its mission struggle against all the injustice. It is being noted recently that European social democracy (and progressive movements worldwide) is less and less related to the conception of hope, rather being seen as those, whose policies one should refer to in case of trouble (poverty, unemployment etc.) It is being replied that it is difficult to bring along optimism, once fighting for preservation of the social system in the era of crisis. Perhaps a solution to that could be indeed a humanist belief in people.

*Secularism* refers to separation between state (governmental institutions) and religion (religious churches and dignitaries). It has been mentioned already, as it appears in the respective parties’ texts both regarding the heritage, self portrait of the parties and also in the subsequent sections. There are parties for

---

88 *Humanism* is frequently defined as an approach, usually in studies (especially social sciences) and / or philosophy. It focuses on human values and concerns, affirming in general human nature. Certain definitions distinguish between secular and religious humanisms. Modern humanists (such as Corliss Lamont) argue that humanity must seek for truth through reason and best observable proofs. They stipulate that the decisions on right and wrong should be based on individual and common goods. Contemporary humanism also embraces qualified optimism about people, believing that human nature is not impure or perfect, however people can live up to the ideals if they are helped by others and by the society.

89 Traditionally *humanism* brings attention to individuals. It presupposes the understanding that everyone is of the same great value. Therefore also all are entitled to same human rights, to life in dignity and to self-determination. Emphasis on the human nature is suggested to be a necessity in order to ensure adequate place of humanity in the modern, progressing world.

90 Campaign of President Obama is a clear exception here.

91 This means that there is no religion recognized as a state one; and that the religious convictions of all the officials of government, legislative and judiciary remain their private matters. Same time, in a number of definitions secularism puts emphasis that everyone should enjoy freedom of beliefs and worship. As such then secularism could be linked with two values that social democrats recognize as their core ones: freedom and equality (in a sense of equality of all the people regardless of their philosophical convictions). In understanding of some, secularism may also appear linked to anti-clericalism, which stands for a historical movement that opposes religious institutional power and influence (real or alleged) in all aspects of public and political life.
which it is a value or a principle. LSAP and PS FR refer to secularism as the principle; however it is effectively only PASOK that name secularism as a value. As the previous sections prove, there are certain differences among the respective approaches of those parties, which promote secularism. For example, for LSAP secularism is directly connected with anti-clericalism 92.

### 3.8. Security, Peace and Internationalism

Security stands for protection against danger, which can be understood in many different contexts. It is being recognized only by LSAP as one of the party’s 4 core values. There are two observations that should be made in the context of LSAP statement and the ongoing debates on renewal of social democracy. First of all, 21st century has so far become a century of insecurity. The terrorist attacks of 9/11, the subsequent phases and dimensions of global crisis induce an overwhelming feeling of fear among the European and world populations. Reference to security and making it a core value may be a way to answer to those. Secondly, the LSAP interpretations show implications of security as a value mirrored in policy principles that shall be obeyed regarding new challenges – such as evolution, new technologies, bio technology etc. This is an inspiring example of how the meaning of certain concepts gets modified, while being placed in a modern reality. As such it constitutes a positive argument for a need of constant renewal and constant readjustments.

There has been an extensive elaboration on the question of international solidarity. It was summarized that its aim was, among others, establishment of peace, stability and sustainable development. Concluding from that, peace in fact would appear rather as a certain world order rather than a core value. It would follow then the dry dictionary interpretations, according to which peace is a state of harmony characterized by lack of a violent conflict (war). Regardless of this, there is a need to recognize that the tendency to see peace as one of the core values exist within social democracy. It may be strengthened especially on European grounds, where it is believed that the EU is in fact a community built upon common values of which peace is one. Three of the parties, among the group whose texts were analyzed, refer to peace as a value (BSP, PASOK, PS FR) – explaining it as a certain ideal and enumerating conditions that must be fulfilled towards establishing and preserving it.

PS Fr in its elaborations refers additionally to internationalism. This can be understood as a principle for a complex, multifaceted, global action, that based on cooperation among actors is to lead to a world of peace, balance, human rights, social justice and democracy. For PS FR it also is the key to solving issues such as migration. This makes PS FR place migration in itself rather as a global scale matter than an exclusively a domestic one. This is important to point out, as there is no one definite way of approaching this issue and in the future it may become a point of further divergence among the parties.

Social democracy emphasizes its internationalist character. This is perhaps why it is very rare that it is being linked with notions such as patriotism 93, sovereignty 94, national identity and national culture 95. These

---

92 Due to the European history, positions on religion, religious freedoms and place of church in public life are commonly associated (though not related explicatively) with Christian church (Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant). Nevertheless, this debate is not yet related to the question of Islam – even though it plays such an important role in all the contemporary debate on migration and changing societies.

93 Patriotism signifies devotion to one’s country and compatriots.

94 Sovereignty of a state gives that state a supreme, independent authority over its territory. It links with self-determination, which is a principle of international law according to which nations have a right to decide in sovereignty about their political status.
four more often are attributed to the right wing. This generalization may however not be legitimized, neither from the perspective of the actual definitions, nor from what can be read and what is echoed in the respective parties’ statements. There are two parties, for which patriotism is a value – BSP and MSZP. Sovereignty (popular and national) is named as a value by PASOK. Finally, national culture is a value for SDE. Furthermore, all these terms appear in the different parties’ texts: SPÖ, BSP, SP.a, ČSSD, SD DK, SDE, PS FR, PASOK, MSZP, ILP, MLP, PS PT, PSD. They may be associated with different particular issues. To exemplify that in the context of culture a bit more, for example language’s preservation is of a crucial importance to ILP and MLP; national identity is very relevant for SPÖ and SDE. SP.a, SDP and PS FR agree that this culture sets the limit to standards. PSD underlines the magnitude of national interest, integrity and sovereignty. The attachment to patriotism and sovereignty, to the features of culture, is commonly strong among parties from the countries, which suffered from occupation, oppressive regimes and from foreign rule. These experiences are relatively fresh for the states from the Southern Europe, and very vivid for the states from the Central and Eastern one. Firm support for one’s state can also be translated into notions such as welfare state and hence made directly link with social democratic agenda.\textsuperscript{96}

3.9. Progress and progressives

For two parties (PS FR and MSZP) progress constitutes a value. It is worth examining the idea carefully, especially that in modern times social democrats frequently refer to themselves as progressives\textsuperscript{97}. It can serve on one hand to show a difference from conservatives, on the other also indicating the modernization of the movement and its openness. PS FR underlines that it is a fundamental value, as it is a sign of improvement of all life conditions. The precondition, that achieving progress requires cooperation among people and that its benefit should be shared among the people qualifies it as a societal concept. From that perspective the eventual evolution from the labeling social democratic into progressive may be also seen as an indication that social democracy is ready to embark on a new mission, aim of which is no longer redistribution of the means of production but rather of shares of civilization’s evolution. Progress is also frequently related to openness, which parties aim at seeing as their self-characteristic. In that sense progressivism could also mean emphasis on inclusiveness of the movement, which for example PS PT explains as an ambition to remain open to diversity, initiative, innovation and progress.

Conclusion

This article was completed as a summary of the results of a yearlong empirical study, completed within the framework of FEPS Next Left Research Programme and initially published in the FEPS Next Left Book Series

\textsuperscript{95} Culture has several definitions – but in this particular context would mean set of shared attitudes, values, goal and practices that characterize a group or an institution.

\textsuperscript{96} Realizing those, one could say that there is a certain vacuum that exists in between the national parties’ programmes and the European level in that dimension. This void should perhaps be filled in with some new concepts, also opening the door for eventual European identity and European patriotism building. This may be the turning point for proposals from the renewal debates, such as cosmopolitan social democracy.

\textsuperscript{97} For more threads of this debate please see: A.Gusenbauer, Making progress a meaningful concept, [in:] Queries – FEPS Scientific Magazine; Next Left: Social Progress for 21\textsuperscript{st} century, FEPS 2011, http://www.feps-europe.eu/uploads/queries/2011_07/#11
Volume 4: “Progressive values for the 21st century”. The content of the initial study was composed of three main pillars. The first of them included methodological deliberations. They were essential in order to select and categorise the sources. The second pillar entailed a comparative analysis of the respective PES member parties’ ideological texts, while the third one contrasts its findings with the observations on the programmatic evolution of the PES from 1992 to 2009.

Focus in this article is on the second part of the study and shows a great diversity among the European social democratic parties as far as tradition of formulating core values is concerned. There is a dissimilarity of formats in which parties express their core value convictions i.e. declaration, political program, electoral manifesto or statute, as also in what extend they are translated from universal (frequently abstract) ideas into tangible policy principles or organisational rules. In the context of pan-European debate on the renewal of social democracy there are three conclusions to be made here: First of all, the ideological debate should always be embedded in an open and participatory renewal process. This is imperative if a renewal is to be legitimate and credible, and hence successful. Secondly, translation of the system of core values into tangible policies, striking a balance between a new inspiring vision and technical implication to ensure values-based politics, is needed while effecting on that may help overcoming the democratic crisis at hand. Thirdly, relevance of core values equals significance of the process that leads to identifying and adopting them, to project modernisation and openness. Only if the process is providing opportunities for everyone to contribute, a feeling of identity and ownership can be created. It may require extended time and several ‘debate rounds’, but it will be necessary for allowing historical reflections and to ensure a joint ideological mission for a new society.

This article provides a detailed comparison of the core values, as enlisted and interpreted by the PES member parties. There are few observations that deserve exposing among the conclusions. First of all, majority of the parties place the values in a national context. The international and European contexts are mostly absent, and if present – added as supplementary elements. As long as this is the case, it will be hard to imagine a true revival of internationalist spirit or acceleration of European identities both among and within the parties. Secondly, it seems clear that the values in their traditional interpretations may no longer be sufficient base for an overall social contract. There is a need to think differently on core values - and discrepancies among the parties – while new proposals provide fruitful soil for a good pan-European debate. Thirdly, the study exposes the vulnerability of social democracy in providing straight forward answers for challenges that traditionally are not seen as fundamental challenges to social democracy. Finally, in the light of the documents analysed, it seems that social democracy is overall in search for its own place and mission. There are many questions, which are of historical importance and which make the ongoing renewal process so significant. Social democracy’s tradition is definitely rich enough to build upon, but new values-based answers have to be given on what kind of society it wants to build and how it wants to strive for it. The revitalisation power also lies within the movement and its forgotten traditions – such as belief in humanism, which in its optimistic nature can restore social democracy as the feasible political alternative for the future.
### Annex 1 – Political Parties

Table 3: PES member parties and abbreviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPÖ</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Sozialdemokratische Partei Österreichs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP.a</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Socialistische Partij Anders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Be</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Parti Socialiste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSP</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bulgarska Sotsialisticheska Partiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČSSD</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Česká strana sociálné demokratická</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD DK</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Socialdemokraterne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDE</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Suomen Sosialdemokraattinen Puolue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS FR</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Parti Socialiste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASOK</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Panellinio Sosialistiko Kinima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSZP</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Magyar Szocialista Párt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILP</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Labour Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSDSP</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvijas Socialdemokratiska Strandnieku Partija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSDP</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lietuvos Socialdemokratu Partija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSAP</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Lëtzeburger sozialistesch Aarbechterpartei (LSAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Partit Laburista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PvdA</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Partij Van De Arbeid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Det Norske Arbeiderparti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Sojusz Lewicy Demokratycznej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS PT</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Partido Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Partidul Social Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD SL</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Socialni Demokрати</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOE</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Partido Socialista Obrero Español</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sveriges Socialdemokratiska Arbetareparti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Labour Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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