

OLOF PALME'S ADDRESS TO THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY CONGRESS,
SEPTEMBER 25, 1978

ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

An important point of departure for our efforts to increase economic democracy in Sweden is that fundamental question dealt with in detail in yesterday's debate: How are we to safeguard the right to work and bring about conditions in which people's will to work - the most vital asset our nation possesses - can be transformed into productive and meaningful activities.

The background facts of this problem are of the utmost gravity.

During the last few years, the threat to full employment has been the dominating experience of the industrialized nations. For many years now between 15 and 20 million persons have been unemployed in these countries. This has meant social regression. This has meant that human resources have been wasted and that opportunities for improving the lot of man have been squandered. In many fields it has meant reduced ambitions in the direction of what we consider to be of the utmost importance - the right to work.

Experience shows, too, that capitalism is no longer the main-spring of economic growth it once was. As insecurity grows and the necessity of long-term planning and investment for the future increases, capitalism responds by reducing investment and engaging in short-term speculation. Speculation, in particular, has been intensified in all countries.

At the same time the gulf between what people are demanding and what capitalism is able to provide is growing ever wider. The demands being made can, I think, be summarized as follows: People are demanding full employment, decent economic conditions and a satisfactory and safe place to work in. They are saying that they themselves must be allowed to take part in decisions bearing on economic development. They are calling for security at a time when technological and economic change is rapid.

However, people are finding that capitalism is leading them in quite another direction. They are finding that unemployment is on the increase. They are finding that powerful forces threaten to carve their various jobs asunder and make them even more monotonous. They are finding that financial and economic power is becoming more concentrated and that decisions of increasing magnitude are being made further and further afield, often in international centres of power in foreign countries. They are finding a lack of security, brought about by aimless, socially unacceptable change.

Surveys of the attitude of Swedish employees have confirmed that this is an outlook shared generally. Almost all Swedish wage-earners consider the threat of unemployment to be real; and more than half of them consider it to be dangerously large. We also know that job quality and the working environment are becoming more and more important by comparison with wages and consumer potential. There is certainly some connection between these experiences and the fact that people are conscious of the tie between a great deal of negative factors in the society they live in - such as unemploy-

ment, inflation and pollution - and capitalism as an economic system.

In Swedish society today there is a strong awareness that capitalism can never be the answer to the question of how the society tomorrow is to be able to provide jobs for all, to improve the quality of people's lives, to guarantee a country's citizens a right to participate in decision-making and to create a society bearing the stamp of democratic cooperation between free people.

I think, too, it would be correct to say that this awareness of the limited capabilities of capitalism finds its counterpart in a growing realization that the non-Socialist parties, intimately allied as they are to the capitalist system, are incapable of providing any solution to these problems, problems which are of crucial importance to man. This realization has certainly been made the stronger by what we have been through during the last two years, for in their election campaign the bourgeois parties made promises suggesting essentially that they had the solution to these problems. It was possible, they claimed, to create 400 000 new jobs, to obtain the resources for costly reforms, to avoid structural problems, to increase social security and achieve a soundly-balanced, developing economy by slipping the leash of capitalism, while at the same time reducing the degree of public control and wage-earner participation which we Social Democrats considered to be of such importance.

This bourgeois tendency towards over-simplified solutions and greater freedom for capitalism crash-landed as soon as it was tried in the field of practical politics. Reforms were not forthcoming, employment in industry sank, nationalization was carried out all along the line - above all, where losses were incurred by owners of capital - the gulfs dividing society widened, the regional balance grew worse and people grew increasingly uneasy.

It is for this reason that we Social Democrats are able today, with greater emphasis and greater credibility than ever before, to assert that the problems facing mankind will not be solved by capitalism, as advocated by the non-Socialist groups.

But, just as the bourgeois parties are unable to unravel these problems by allowing capitalism free reign, it is also impossible to solve them simply by replacing capitalism by some other standard-type, stock solution. Those economic systems which have grown up in places where this has been attempted do not encourage imitation.

This means, too, that the underlying question forming the basis of our party programme is more important than ever today. This is, by what means may we, in terms of practical politics, combine sound economic development with continued social progress and the growth of a society in which democracy has replaced the concentration of economic power to a few hands only?

The way towards achieving this, as outlined in our party programme, is that every person shall be guaranteed the right as a citizen, a wage-earner or consumer to a say in what is to be produced and how it is to be distributed, in the means by which production is brought about and in the conditions under which work is to be done. This is to be achieved in that the citizens of this country will be actively involved in the work of drawing up a planned national economy aiming at making the best use of the country's resources. This is to be achieved in that wage-earners will be guaranteed the right to make decisions

bearing on the companies and the places they work in, the right to participate in the building of company capital assets and the right to share in the administration of joint saving schemes. And it is to be achieved in that consumers will be granted greater powers over producers and manufacturers.

This, basically, is the policy defined by the party programme. There are two comments I would like to make while on this subject.

First, it becomes clear that economic democracy cannot be achieved through the application of a preplanned programme, the details of which are fixed once and for all from the very beginning.

Instead, the ways ahead are many, and each part complements the other while yet bearing in itself the seeds of future conflict, a thing too often forgotten in the general debate on the subject. However, the problems involved are clear and can easily be specified. Examples are how we are to achieve a balance between wage-earner and public control or between comprehensive planning and decentralized decision-making.

This requires both an open mind and an ability to adapt the various ways to progress to the demands of reality. In my address during the debate included on the programme of the last congress, I expressed this as follows: "In theory at least, technocratical models designed apparently to provide a single, all-embracing solution to all social problems do offer some advantages. But the dreadful experience of certain other countries of the world has shown us how these work in practice. In democracies, however, it has proved useful to build a system founded on balancing counterweights which are in themselves a guarantee for respect and tolerance and which allow wide scope for initiative and diversity."

The situation as we have it today does not present any great problem of balance - we are at the beginning of a long process of democratization. Our present economic system is characterized by far-reaching centralization as well as by an inefficient aimlessness, both of which are effective barriers to our chances of getting anything out of our work, out of our skills and abilities, out of our stake in the future.

Centralization results in nothing being made of the experience gained by either blue-collar or white-collar workers. When power is concentrated in the hands of only a few, the result is that many decisions are a lot worse than if they had originated among the broad ranks of the employees and had been formed by them. Lack of planning and poor coordination mean that the united efforts of the wage-earners will produce less good results than might have been the case.

It is therefore a simple task for us to find good grounds for more efficient planning, and then to draw up the general guide-lines for this work at the same time as providing for a greater say for workers and employees on a decentralized basis. Democratization of this type calls for us to do away with the present concentration of economic power to a few private individuals only and replace it by forms of decisionmaking and codetermination which, through greater opportunities for wage-earners and society at large to exercise control, will lead to greater efficiency in the business community.

On the other hand, it is impossible for us today to point to the exact forms economic democracy will take in the future, since by then our international surroundings and the economic and scientific conditions governing our system of economic democracy will probably be quite different from today's.

The second comment I would like to make is as follows. Economic democracy can only be made to develop and progress if the great majority of people can be inspired to initiative, if they can feel involved. This will only be possible if there is an immediate link between the actions we take and what people consider to be the vital issues of everyday life. And this in turn will only be possible if people feel that what we do is able to improve their day-to-day round, is able to make work meaningful and improve the working environment, is able to create hope for the future, counteract the adverse regional balance and stand up to the threat to our environment.

Taken together, these two statements can be seen as an expression of our adherence to traditional Social Democrat reform politics. They relate closely to the themes of many of the previous debates of the labour movement.

In my introductory speech to this congress I referred to the Social Democrat congress held in 1932. Then, too, the congress was held in the shadow of a severe economic crisis. Then as now Sweden was led by a non-Socialist government lacking in ideas and the ability to get down to the real problems of the crisis. But the Social Democrats had drawn up a programme suggesting tangible means of reducing unemployment, of creating real, productive work and of starting the economy expanding. It was thanks to this type of practical, concrete policy that Social Democracy broke through the parliamentary barrier and laid the foundations for more than 40 years of government.

What was being discussed at that time was the programme put forward by the labour movement to counteract the economic crisis. Was this to be founded on gradual nationalization or increased planning on a national scale to solve the day-to-day problems of unemployment and poverty? Wigforss, speaking in the general debate, said among other things: "We could take over Boliden in the first year, we could build a great shoe factory in the second, we could found a state-owned commercial bank in the third, we could take over the entire forestry industry in the fourth, and so on. But remember, this is not going to jerk our economic sector out of the free market and the chaos reigning there ..."

What Wigforss was seeking for, and to which he himself contributed largely, was a Social Democrat programme with the ability to intervene directly in the economic process, a programme which would give rise to work and progress, which would change the daily life of Swedish people, a programme which would not put Social Democracy in the role of an astutely knowledgeable but yet passive spectator to the disastrous developments brought about by capitalism.

This basic concentration on reform is also the hallmark of the party programme adopted by the Party congress in 1975. Three years ago when this programme was adopted, economic democracy was set up as our number-one objective; and here our definitions were strongly influenced by the views expressed by Wigforss during the 1932 congress. Our striving towards the amalgamation of a planned national economy with industrial democracy which so characterized the whole programme was, in fact, more reminiscent of the philosophy of Wigforss

than the programme adopted in 1944 which he himself helped to draw up. However, it would lead me too far from the present subject to go into details of the amalgamation of the views expressed in the debates held during the 20s and 30s on the two parallel ways to progress open to the labour movement.

Let me now say a few words on the experience gained over the last few years in the course of our work towards economic democracy, a planned overall economy and job democracy.

We advocate a planned national economy as a means of using democratic means to draw up a comprehensive policy for the nation, the aims of which include bringing about regional balance and fair distribution of resources and income, allocating sufficient resources to investment and getting on top of the various threats to the environment.

However, in many of the fields in which our aim is to solve the day-to-day problems of the Swedish people development has, under the guidance of the bourgeois parties, been backwards. The most surprising aspect of this - in view of the message drummed out by the leading government party when it was in opposition - is the increasing regional imbalance.

Here, and in all other fields indicated in the party programme, continued efforts by the Social Democrats are therefore a necessity. In many ways, the area which is currently of the greatest importance is probably the planning required for our future industrial development.

In my opinion, the basic principles by which we should be guided in our work can be stated as follows:

- Today, a tiny percentage of Swedish companies are behind the greater part of our industrial output. Within each company there exists a framework on which long-term planning is based. At the same time, however, it is quite clear that the willingness and ability required for cooperation among these firms is far too small. This has, for instance, prevented coordination of the motor industry or the pharmaceutical industry. It has prevented successful exports on a market where the sale of largescale installations involving individual units coming from several different branches of industry is becoming more and more important. Better coordination under democratic forms can only be realized if the community takes the initiative and participates vigorously.

- The course of development of Swedish industry is of crucial importance for the major employee groups. One important lesson of the structural changes which has taken place over the last few decades is that the employees themselves, represented by their various trade union organizations, have become aware of the problems involved and are demanding that long-term solutions be found.

This provides, too, an interesting illustration of the present complaint that the trade unions have come to be in a position of exaggerated importance. Now, what are the facts if we look at practical experience? It was not exactly the Board of Directors who stepped forward and warned us about what was going to happen at Facit - it was the union. Nor did the Eriksberg directors come forward to issue a warning that something was afoot - again, it was the union. We can see roughly the same thing happening over and over

again if we look back at what we have witnessed during every major industrial crisis. Those who first became alert to the situation and realized that something was about to happen, who sounded the alarm and demanded that something be done, were members of the local union branch acting through their national organizations.

The simple fact provides the best possible proof that the bourgeois parties are wrong in complaining that the trade unions are starting to interfere and lack essential competence and insight. The underlying philosophy of the trade unions is that it is of the utmost importance to work towards the best of one's workmates, and this ideal makes them highly sensitive. It is for this reason that the future development of Swedish industry must take a form which is socially acceptable to the wage-earner. And it is for this reason that the wage-earner himself must be given a greater say in this development.

- A planned national economy must not bring with it coercive measures, detailed planning and bureaucracy. An important objective here is to mobilize and make the best use of all the resources afforded by the Swedish economic sector. This will primarily involve professional skills, competence and experience gained in all departments of an enterprise, in companies large and small, and will be made feasible by people who are all strongly interdependent. Our goal is to free these resources from the bonds in which capitalism has tied them. It is the very opposite of coercion and bureaucracy. This is intimately bound up with our attitude towards on-the-job democracy.

The most important field for reform during the seventies so far has been the improvement of working life and conditions, and many reforms were pushed through as the result of close cooperation between the politicians and the unions. Ideologically speaking, the underlying principles here were that work carried out, not mere ownership, entitles a person to participate in the activities of a company. A person who devotes the whole of his working life to a company must thus be allowed to take part in its decisions.

By pushing through legislation we were able to improve job security, better the position of the shop stewards and give employees greater rights in determining conditions at work. By passing the Codetermination Act we were able to bring the Swedish Employers' Association's (SAF's) use of paragraph 32 to a halt and pave the way towards developments of extreme long-term importance.

It is often claimed that the Codetermination Act resulted merely in a cumbersome means of calling meeting after meeting. Here I would like to issue a warning, however, for nobody ever believed that we would be able to revolutionize job democracy within the space of a few years only. Nobody ever claimed that we would be able to discover the most efficient formula for real employee participation at the very outset.

In fact, in spite of attacks from the right, in spite of the difficulties encountered in coming to an agreement with SAF, in spite of the grave economic problems we faced during those years, it is my opinion that the short period which has elapsed since we passed the Act has on the whole been a success.

The right to codetermination at work should be extended continuously. The next step should be towards increased representation on company Boards as

recommended by the Party Executive.

Economic democracy assumes a right to influence capital and the role it plays in our economic development. In Sweden, ownership of capital and major enterprises is perhaps more highly concentrated than in any other industrialized nation. Our goal must be to break down this concentration of power in private individuals, to replace the economic might now wielded by a handful of persons by a democratically-based system of popular participation in those decisions in the economic sector which shape the course of our economic future. We therefore propose to introduce wage-earners' investment funds.

At the Congress of the Swedish Trade Union Confederation held in 1976, three goals were given as being those at which it was agreed that the investment funds were to aim. Firstly, they were seen as offering support to a loyal wages policy; secondly they were to counteract concentrations of private capital, and with it the power resulting from self-financed industries; and thirdly, through joint-ownership, they were to increase the degree of codetermination in industry, which had itself chiefly resulted from reforms in the labour laws.

In a report submitted in February of this year by a work group appointed by the Party and the Trade Union Confederation, a further goal was added to the three previously decided upon. This was that investment funds were to promote joint saving and build up capital for productive investments. The Party Executive recommends that the congress approve these four goals as being the objectives of the wage-earners' investment funds.

Coming to the question of what form these funds are actually to take, we find there are two major problems remaining to be solved. The first is, how will we be able to create means of capital formation during the eighties without the new saving schemes and investments simply leading to even higher concentrations of wealth and power in private hands? Developments must, in fact, go in the opposite direction - wage-earners and public bodies must be given a greater say in deciding where investments are to be made and how the economic sector is to be constructed in the future.

An important step in the development towards democratic participation in Swedish economic life must therefore be that in the future the capital required by commerce and industry will be accumulated essentially through collective saving schemes and that we will all share in the administration of these schemes and their conversion to productive investments.

Collective capital accumulation, particularly since the introduction of the general supplementary pensions scheme, ATP, has been seen to play an important part both in the democratization of our economic life and in distribution policies.

This form of saving has vanished completely under the present Government. It has now sunk to nothing from a level of Skr 16 000 million a few years back. This is a form of haemophilia whose consequences we have so far been unable to appreciate clearly. It is a development giving cause for concern not only as seen from the general social economic perspective of tomorrow, but because it has weakened economic democracy in Sweden and caused a tremendous drain on the resources of the collective sector.

Where is the money for the large-scale investments in industry which will become necessary during the eighties to come from? Some people perhaps think that it can be taken from the profits made by owners of shares. However, the greater part of company profits is today ploughed-back into industry, meaning that the cash profit distributed to shareholders is so small that it is almost insignificant in this context. Shareholders may, indeed, exercise considerable influence over companies, but the income they actually receive from shares is not as great as it is often thought to be.

In the final analysis it is the employees themselves from whom the resources required for future investments must be taken. This means that in the short term wage-earners must be prepared to sacrifice a little of what they would otherwise have used for private consumption. In return they will receive better job security, and, thanks to the development towards an improved economy, will in the long term get back what they had previously postponed in terms of improved standards of living.

The Party Executive recommends that the proposal for a new form of collective saving scheme, the "development funds" suggested in the report submitted by the work group, be adopted in principle. The detailed task of deciding how these funds are to be formed, how large they are to be and how they will operate can then be allowed to continue.

The second major problem facing us is how we will be able to bring about democracy inside the companies themselves and halt today's one-sided domination of the management of major enterprises and their decisions on investment, production and company development by private owner interests. The effects of strategic moves made by big-business companies are felt, too, far outside the walls of the company itself. They dictate the economic conditions of whole areas and regions, of the whole of Sweden in fact - 28 major companies alone today account for 76 per cent of Sweden's total exports. Their importance, as indicated by these figures, is thus considerable.

Both preparatory work carried out hitherto and the general debate in which the Swedish people are taking such an active part indicate that employee participation, based on some form of part-ownership in businesses, will be necessary if the concentration of power to the hands of a few is to be done away with. Certain basic principles pointing to ways in which participation can be made feasible have also become clear during the course of this work. These principles are as follows. Firstly, employee-ownership is to be put on a collective basis; secondly, employee-ownership is to be based on the right of an employee to a share in the company's profits and the capital it accumulates; and thirdly, participation is to be both on a general, overall scale and firmly established on a more limited, local level. The Party Executive now recommends that these principles be adopted by the congress.

On the other hand, the initial stages of this work have not yet progressed so far as to allow us to submit a tangible proposal developed in all its details as to how these problems are to be solved. At least three questions must be tackled before a fully-fledged proposal can be submitted.

The proposal put forward by the work group formed jointly by the Party and the Trade Union Confederation recommends that employee-ownership be based on company profits - a given percentage of a firm's annual profit would be transferred to wage-earners' investment funds in the form of shares, which would imply ownership in the firm and entitle the holders to a vote in its management.

The purpose of this profit-sharing scheme is twofold. Firstly, it is intended to back up our solidarity in wages policy, and secondly, it strives towards a greater degree of participation for employees. A solidarity in wages policy requires that profit-sharing be concentrated to the most profitable companies. Co-determination, on the other hand, requires that employee participation, which is one of the aims of the profit-sharing idea, be fairly evenly distributed among all types of company. Even employees working in companies whose profit is little or nothing must be granted the right to codetermination.

Therefore, a solution must be found in which the requirements of both a loyal wages policy and loyal codetermination are reasonably satisfied.

Yet another problem is how the concept of profit used in these schemes is to be defined. Since the concept of profit is of crucial importance in any profit-sharing system, a great deal of work must be done on the technical and legal implications of the definition on which the wage-earners' investment funds are to be based. So far, no such work has been carried out.

A third problem, again to which no solution was suggested in the group's report, is how profit-sharing is to work in multinational companies active and making profits not only in Sweden but abroad as well. In this case the problem is not only that these companies are able to transfer both profit and capital across international boundaries, but also that of how profits engendered by company employees working in another country are to be treated in any profit-sharing scheme involving the company's employees in Sweden.

Since most major Swedish firms may be placed in the multinational category, it is of vital importance that these questions be solved before a concrete, ready worked out proposal on investment funds is submitted for consideration.

It is therefore for purely factual reasons that there is a need for more work to be done on how the investment funds are actually to be formed. At the same time it is self-evident that reforms on this scale will require solutions enjoying the general backing of wage-earners collectively. The labour movement has reacted enthusiastically towards employees' investment funds. The Party Executive laid itself open to the criticism of being far too enthusiastic when, in February last, it advanced on all fronts, calling meetings with the press and organizing conferences on a proposal the detailed problems of which remained largely unsolved. I readily agree that such criticism is not without foundation. Many misunderstood our intentions and thought we had made more progress than was actually the case. Our chief ambition in doing this, however, was, at an early stage, to initiate a broad, general discussion within the labour movement on the subject of capital accumulation and economic democracy. And in this we succeeded.

Bearing these facts in mind, the Party Executive suggests that the congress establish a programme for future work on wage-earners' investment funds, work to be carried out on the basis of those underlying objectives and principles for such funds agreed to by the congress. This programme should be so formed as to allow a proposal for the detailed construction of wage-earners' investment funds to be submitted to the Party congress to be held in 1981. Since the Trade Union Confederation is also to hold a congress in that year, the two supreme policy-making organs of the labour movement would be able to state their attitudes to the proposal at approximately the same time.

It has been stated that this decision is simply a means of postponing or protracting a solution to the problems of wage-earners' investment funds. I myself find this difficult to accept, and, indeed, I would go so far as to say it is wrong. Today, a mere two years have gone by since the Trade Union Congress resolved in principle to work towards the establishment of these funds. The government commission inquiring into this question under the leadership of Hjalmar Mehr has been at work for about the same time and at present is heavily engaged in its task.

In fact, the programme we suggest here implies speeding up inquires and research in this vital and complex field. If a proposal is to be submitted in time for the Trade Union and Party congresses to be held in 1981, it means that we have in reality about two years in which to draw it up. This programme is, too, in agreement with the working programme adopted by Hjalmar Mehr and the government commission, whose intention it is to have finished the work by the end of 1980 or the beginning of 1981.

This is a question of great magnitude and implies sweeping consequences for the whole of Swedish society. By attempting to find a carefully worked-out, enduring solution able to withstand the hard test of reality we are shouldering a colossal responsibility. We cannot afford to go wrong. It is therefore of the utmost significance that the Party Executive and the National Executive of the Swedish Confederation of Trade Unions are both in complete agreement as regards the basic principles to be applied and the schedule for the organization of the work.

The reason that we are accepting such a tight schedule in spite of this is that there are exceptional grounds for the labour movement to solve the problems of the wage-earners' investment funds as a whole within the shortest time possible. Capital accumulation will be a question of momentous importance in the Swedish democracy of the eighties. We must create new forms of saving for new investments, which will only be possible with the participation of the employees themselves, and an essential requirement of this will be the development of economic democracy. Employees must be allowed codetermination and have a share in ownership equivalent to the degree to which they contribute to Sweden's economic development. It is for this reason that the problems associated with capital accumulation and the wage-earners' investment funds are so intimately related.

In fact, I think it would be a simple matter to answer the question "Why are wage-earners' investment funds necessary?" The answer would be: "Listen to yesterday's debate at the Party congress!" Because what was it all about? It was about jobs - in place after place, region after region, trade after trade. One Party representative after another stood up here and said "We must be given resources to create new jobs. We must be granted the right to participation and codetermination so we ourselves can have a say in the conditions under which the new jobs are to be done."

This is the message, simple as it is, of the debate on the investment funds. Anyone who sometimes thinks that what we are suggesting is perhaps some extreme left-wing sleight-of-hand must remember that these problems are intimately bound up in the everyday life of Sweden, in people's demands for jobs and their right to decide for themselves their conditions of employment.

Here I would also like to add one thing, and that is that we must approach

the problem with caution and humility. It is a question fraught with difficulties, and hitherto no other country has yet succeeded in solving all its technical, theoretical and practical problems. But personally, I am convinced that a constructive solution to the investment fund problem will be of vital importance to the favourable development of Sweden during the eighties and nineties, both economic and social.

We must therefore be cautious but at the same time remember that our position is strong. We must not let ourselves be frightened by the reactionary propaganda spread about by the Employers' Association and others, for they have no other alternative but this. All they have to fight for is the retention of their traditional privileges, and that won't get them far in the struggle for people. Their type of propaganda is, in fact, to our advantage if we can only stick firmly to the simple fact that, basically, the question involved is people's right to work and their right to determine the course of their future together.

At our last congress we told each other that we had now reached the third stage in the development of Social Democracy as described by Per Albin Hansson in his wellknown political model - first come political democracy, then social democracy, the economic democracy.

At present we are engaged in the detailed planning of an overall planned economy, in remodelling the conditions of working life, in paving the way towards collective capital accumulation and employee participation, exactly as we predicted we would and stated as our goal. This is exciting, stimulating work, but above all important in the development of our society. And it will remain one of the chief tasks of the labour movement.

While on this subject, let me make a couple of brief comments.

Firstly, there is no one way to economic democracy. There is no single reform, no single measure we can point to and say "once we have done this we will have achieved economic democracy, perhaps even socialism". We will have to try many ways forwards all at the same time, we will have to feel our way to progress, we will have to learn from experience and from reality - the ability to do this is the strength of the Social Democrats.

Secondly, we are and shall remain an open labour movement, and therefore we must allow ourselves time to discuss the various ways ahead with the greatest of care, so that the decisions we make will really be based on the will of the people. We will bring about economic democracy if the Swedish people decide to come together in a spirit of common solidarity and loyalty to form their future together. But this decision must spring from their active conviction and, preferably, enthusiasm as well.

This will allow us to tackle the task described by Wigforss in these words: "To prove that it is possible to combine an aspiration for justice and equality, methodical planning and efficiency with all those aspects of civil rights and freedom which are rightly considered in Western democracies to be absolutely indispensable. In working towards this free, socialist state, Social Democracy sees a future and a salvation ..."

