



Welcome to the Utopia Forums! [Register a new account](#)  
The current time is Fri Nov 13 20:34:07 PST 2020

[Utopia Talk / General Talk](#) / Drunk Guy

<p>smcgeek Member</p>	<p>Fri Oct 16 10:03:53 <a href="http://bit.ly/drunkguy">http://bit.ly/drunkguy</a> [warning, goes from funny to sad to uncomfortable]</p>
---------------------------	---

<p>www.nowecantsong.org Member</p>	<p>Fri Oct 16 10:06:52 <b>Social liberalism</b> From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia Jump to: navigation, search Part of the Politics series on <b>Liberalism</b> Development[show] History of liberal thought Contributions to liberal theory History of classical liberalism Ideas[show] Political liberalism Economic liberalism Political freedom Democratic capitalism Democratic education Individualism Laissez faire Liberal democracy Liberal neutrality Separation of church and state Market economy Open society Popular sovereignty Rights (individual) Schools[show] Classical liberalism Objectivism Conservative liberalism Â· Cultural liberalism Â· Green liberalism Liberal conservatism Â· Libertarianism Â· Market liberalism National Â· Neoliberalism Ordoliberalism Â· Paleoliberalism Â· Social liberalism Key figures[show] John Locke Adam Smith Thomas Jefferson Thomas Paine David Hume Baron de Montesquieu Immanuel Kant Jeremy Bentham John Stuart Mill Thomas Hill Green John Maynard Keynes Friedrich von Hayek Isaiah Berlin John Rawls Â· Robert Nozick Bertrand Russell Regional variants[show] Liberalism worldwide Liberalism in Europe Liberalism in the United States Liberalism by country Organisations[show] Liberal parties Liberal International International Federation of Liberal Youth (IFLRY) European Liberal Democrat and Reform Party (ELDR) Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE) European Liberal Youth (LYMEC) Council of Asian Liberals and Democrats (CALD) Africa Liberal Network (ALN) Liberal Network for Latin America (Relial)  Politics portal v â?c d â?c e</p>
--	---

Social liberalism, a reformulation of 19th century liberalism, rests on the view that unrestrained capitalism is a hindrance to true freedom. Instead of the negative freedom of classical liberalism, social liberals offered positive freedom that would allow individuals to prosper with public assistance in health, education and welfare.[1] This later included government intervention in the economy to provide full employment and protection of human rights. These policies were widely adopted and implemented in European and Western democracies, particularly following the Second World War.[2] Social liberal ideas and parties tend to be considered centrist[3][4] or centre-left.[5][6][7]

A reaction to social liberalism in the late 20th century, often called neoliberalism, led to monetarist economic policies and a reduction in government provision of services. However this did not mean a return to classical liberalism as governments continued to provide social services and retained control over economic policy.

Social liberalism is also sometimes called new liberalism[nb 1][8] (as it was originally termed) or modern liberalism,[9].

The Liberal International is the main international organisation of liberal parties, which include, among other liberal variants, social liberal parties. It affirms the following principles: human rights, free and fair elections and multiparty-democracy, social justice, tolerance, social market economy, free trade, environmental sustainability and a strong sense of international solidarity.[10] These ideals are described in further detail in the various manifestos of the LI.

Contents  
[hide]

- \* 1 Origins
  - o 1.1 United Kingdom
  - o 1.2 Europe
  - o 1.3 United States
- \* 2 Implementation
  - o 2.1 United Kingdom
  - o 2.2 Europe
  - o 2.3 United States
- \* 3 Comparisons with other political philosophies
  - o 3.1 Classical liberalism
  - o 3.2 Conservative liberalism
  - o 3.3 Neoliberalism
  - o 3.4 Social democracy
- \* 4 Europe
- \* 5 United States
- \* 6 Social liberal parties and organisations
- \* 7 Notable social liberal thinkers
- \* 8 Views of social liberals today
- \* 9 Further reading
- \* 10 Notes
- \* 11 References
- \* 12 See also

[edit] Origins  
[edit] United Kingdom  
L.T. Hobhouse

The downturn in economic growth brought on by a general depression at the end of the nineteenth century, a growing perception of the unprecedented levels of poverty, unemployment and relative deprivation present within modern industrial cities and the rise of corporate capital and organised labour challenged the principles of classical liberalism. The ideal of the self-made individual, who through hard work and talent could make his or her place in the world, seemed increasingly implausible. A major political reaction against the changes introduced by industrialisation and laissez-faire capitalism came from conservatives concerned about social balance, although socialism later became a more important force for reform. Some Victorian writers, including Dickens, Carlyle and Matthew Arnold, were also early influential critics of social injustice.[11] John Stuart Mill combined elements of the old liberalism and what would become known as the new liberalism. The new liberals tried to adapt the old language of liberalism to meet these circumstances, by defending a broader and more interventionist conception of the state. An equal right to liberty could not be established merely by ensuring that individuals did not physically interfere with each other and that the laws were impartially formulated and applied. More positive measures were required to ensure that every individual would have an equal chance of success.[12]

T.H. Green

In Britain, in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, a group of thinkers known as the New Liberals made a case against laissez-faire classical liberalism and in favor of state intervention in social, economic, and cultural life. The New Liberals, T.H. Green, L.T. Hobhouse, and John A. Hobson, saw individual liberty as something achievable only under favorable social and economic circumstances.[3]

In their view, the poverty, squalor, and ignorance in which many people lived made it impossible for freedom and individuality to flourish. New Liberals believed that these conditions could be ameliorated only through collective action coordinated by a strong welfare-oriented interventionist state.[13]

It was the Liberal governments of Henry Campbell-Bannerman and then H.H. Asquith in the 1900s that laid the foundations of the welfare state in the UK before the First World War (see Liberal reforms). The comprehensive welfare state built in the UK after the Second World War, although work of the Labour Party, was largely designed by two Liberals, John Maynard Keynes, who laid the economic foundations, and William Beveridge, who designed the welfare system.[3]

[edit] Europe

In late nineteenth century Germany, left-liberals established trade unions in order to help workers improve working conditions and improve economically. Leading left-liberals, including Lujo Brentano

and Max Weber, established the Social Policy Association in 1873 to promote social reform. The left-liberals main objectives were free speech, freedom of assembly, free trade, representative government, equal and secret suffrage, and protection of private property and they were strongly opposed to the welfare state, which they called State Socialism.  
Friedrich Naumann

Friedrich Naumann, who was an Association member, later established the National Social Union (1896) that attempted to combine bourgeois nationalism with proletarian socialism. They advocated, among other things, increased social welfare legislation, the right to strike and profit-sharing and "co-determination" in industry. Although the party was unable to win any seats and soon dissolved, the theories it developed would remain influential in German liberalism.

While some writers describe Germany's left-liberalism as social liberalism, others only apply the term to the policies of the National Social Union. The main left-liberal parties in Germany were the German Progress Party (Imperial Germany), the German Democratic Party (Weimar Germany), and the Free Democratic Party (modern Germany). The term left-liberal contrasts them with the more conservative liberals, in particular the right-wing of the National Liberal Party, which allied itself with the Conservatives.[14][15][16]

In France, social liberal theory was developed in the Third Republic by solidarist thinkers including Alfred Fouill e and Emile Durkheim, who were inspired by sociology and influenced radical politicians including L on Bourgeois. They emphasised that a greater division of labor had led to greater opportunity and individualism, but also a more complex interdependence. Arguing that this created a debt of the individual to society, they promoted progressive taxation to support public works and welfare schemes. However they saw the role of the state to co-ordinate rather than to manage and encouraged co-operative insurance schemes among individuals. Their main objective was to remove barriers to social mobility rather than create a welfare state.[17]  
[edit] United States

In the 1870s and 1880s, American the economists Richard Ely, John Bates Clark, and Henry Carter Adams, influenced both by evangelical Protestantism and socialism, were critical of conditions caused by industrial relations and sympathetic to labor unions, but none developed a systematic political philosophy, and later abandoned sympathy to socialism. Writing from the 1880s to 1930s, John Dewey, an educator influenced by Hobhouse and Green, advocated socialist means to achieve liberal goals. Some social liberal ideas were later incorporated into the New Deal.[18]  
[edit] Implementation  
[edit] United Kingdom  
Leaflet promoting the National Insurance Act 1911

The first implementation of social liberal policy was made by the Liberal Party in 1906-1914 and was called the Liberal reforms. The main elements were non-contributory old age pensions paid to low income persons over 75 years old, the National Insurance Act 1911 which provided health, sickness and unemployment insurance and was modelled on similar programs in Germany, and the establishment of Labour exchanges. This was accompanied by progressive income taxation, particularly in the People's Budget of 1909. The main reason for the reforms was that the old system of charity based on the Poor laws and supplemented by private charity, public co-operatives and private insurance companies was in crisis. Also, the Liberal Party caucus elected in 1906 contained more professionals including academics and journalists sympathetic to social liberalism and the large business owners had largely left the party for the Conservatives, which had become the clear party of business and commerce. The reforms were largely opposed by both business and trade unions. Liberals most identified with the reforms were the prime minister, H. H. Asquith, Winston Churchill and the civil servant William Beveridge. The Manchester Guardian was the main newspaper that published writings of social liberals.[19]  
[edit] Europe  
Alexander Ruestow

Alexander Ruestow, a German economist, first proposed the German version of economic social liberalism, which he later called "neoliberalism", at the Social Policy Association in 1932 as an alternative both to the conservative economics developed in Imperial Germany and to socialism. At the "Colloque Walter Lippman" in Paris in 1938, Ruestow met with the Austrian economists Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich von Hayek, the German economist William Roepke and others to determine how liberalism could be renewed. Ruestow advocated a strong state to enforce free markets and state intervention to correct market failure. However Mises argued that monopolies and cartels operated because of state intervention and protectionism, and said that the only legitimate role for the state was to abolish barriers to market entry. He viewed Ruestow's proposals as negating market freedom and saw them as similar to socialism.

Following the Second World War, "neoliberalism", now usually called "ordoliberalism" or the "Social Market Economy" was adopted by the West German government under Ludwig Erhard, who was the economics minister and later chancellor. Price controls were lifted and free markets were introduced. While these policies are credited with Germany's post-war economic recovery, the welfare state, which had been established under Bismarck, became increasingly costly.[20]

The post-war governments of other countries in Western Europe also followed social liberal policies. These policies were implemented primarily by Christian Democrats and Social Democrats, as Liberal parties in Europe declined in strength from their peak in the nineteenth century.[21]  
[edit] United States

American political discourse resisted this social turn in European liberalism. While economic policies of the New Deal appeared Keynesian, there was no revision of liberal theory in favor of greater state initiative. But because there was no effective socialist movement, New Deal policies appeared radical and were attacked by the Right. The separate development of modern liberalism in the United States is often attributed to American exceptionalism, which kept mainstream American ideology within a narrow range.[22]  
[edit] Comparisons with other political philosophies  
[edit] Classical liberalism

Classical liberalism believes in more provision of negative freedom than Social Liberals, and therefore

advocates more, or even complete, laissez-faire philosophies, compared to Social Liberalism. Social liberalism sees more of a role for the State in providing positive liberty for individuals.[23] They believe that lack of positive rights, such as economic opportunity, education, health-care, and so on can be considered to be threats to liberty.[8] Classical liberals, such as Robert Nozick, Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman,[24] reject social liberalism as a true liberalism. For these authors, government interfering in the market is destroying freedom and doing this to make people free is self-contradictory.[3] Some, such as Nozick, also consider the government to have no duty to intervene in society to aid the disadvantaged as this means taking wealth from others (as taxes) which harms their liberty, while Hayek and Friedman considered there to be a fairly limited role for government provision of a guaranteed minimum income (such as Friedman's support for a negative income tax). For the classic liberals, government interventions were only justified to provide a public good or to prevent absolute, but not relative, poverty.

Social liberalism moves in a different direction from classical liberalism in one significant way: it supports a commitment to lowering income inequality. The fundamental idea is that the excessive concentration of wealth and power constitute a threat to political freedom. Poverty and large wealth gaps are themselves threats to freedom because they tend to produce self-perpetuating oligarchies who buy up the political system. On the other side, democracy tends towards the dispersal of power, which means it safeguards liberty, according to social liberals.[25]  
[edit] Conservative liberalism

Both share the concern with the freedom of the individual, but while social liberalism is appropriate for describing some liberal parties that are left-of-center on economic issues and support a broad interpretation of democratic rights, conservative liberalism emphasises economic freedom and tends to be right of center. For example, conservative liberal parties, such as the Dutch People's Party for Freedom and Democracy and the German Free Democratic Party adopt an economically conservative agenda, advocating a minimal role for the state in the economy.[26] Some authors, like Merquior, also claim that conservative liberalism is based on the concept of negative liberty - ("where there is no law there is no transgression"), moral pluralism, progress, individualism, and accountable government, while social liberalism focuses both on the illegitimacy of a tyrannical government that uses prerogative power and on the social conditions that make such tyrannical government possible.[27]  
[edit] Neoliberalism

Social liberalism is very different from the ambiguous term neoliberalism, a name given to various proponents of the free markets and also to some conservative opponents of free markets, such as mercantilistic conservatives, in the late 20th century's global economy. Neoliberalism has been used to describe the liberal economic policies of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher.[3] As a body of thought, neoliberalism advocates positions contrary to many of those taken by social liberals.[28]  
[edit] Social democracy

The basic ideological difference between social liberalism and social democracy lies in the role of the State in relation to the individual. Social liberals value liberty, rights, freedoms, and private property as fundamental to individual happiness, and regard democracy as an instrument to maintain a society where each individual enjoys the greatest amount of liberty possible (subject to the Harm Principle). Hence, democracy and parliamentarianism are mere political systems which legitimise themselves only through the amount of liberty they promote, and are not valued per se. While the state does have an important role in ensuring positive liberty, social liberals tend to trust that individuals are usually capable in deciding their own affairs, and generally do not need deliberate steering towards happiness.

Social democracy, on the other hand, has its roots in socialism (especially in democratic socialism), and typically favours a more community-based view. While social democrats also value individual liberty, they do not believe that real liberty can be achieved for the majority without transforming the nature of the state itself. Having rejected the revolutionary approach of Marxism, and choosing to further their goals through the democratic process, social democrats nevertheless retain a strong skepticism towards capitalism, which they believe needs to be regulated or managed for the greater good. This focus on the greater good may, potentially, make social democrats more ready to step in and steer society in a direction that is deemed to be more equitable.

In practice, however, the differences between the two may be harder to perceive.[25] This is especially the case nowadays, as many social democratic parties have shifted towards the center and adopted Third Way politics.[29]  
[edit] Europe

While liberalism spread through Britain and America through the nineteenth century, it did not do so in continental Europe for the most part of the century, where ideas, from left and right, dominated most countries and eliminated liberal forms of government.[3] Liberalism, however, eventually triumphed later in Western Europe, with the rest of the continent following later. Most post-war governments of Western Europe pursued social liberal economic policies. However, the governments implementing these social liberal policies were not constituted by Liberal parties, despite liberal thinkers playing a major role devising them.[3]

Through most of the nineteenth century in European democracies like Britain, the main political divide was between two big groups: the Conservative parties represented the aristocracy and landed interest and Liberal parties represented the commercial middle classes. However, towards the end of the century, working classes gained greater representation and there was a realignment. Politics started to be polarised on those with property and those without property. Liberals tried to appeal to both groups, while Conservatives and Socialists concentrated on a specific group, absorbing liberal ideas and adopting them from time to time. In countries like Britain and Sweden it was social democratic governments that were responsible for implementing social liberal policies, while in West Germany and Italy it was center-right parties (generally Christian Democrats).[3]

Today in Europe, social liberal parties tend to be small- to medium-sized centre parties.[3][4] Examples of relatively successful European social liberal parties, which have been through the years part of government coalitions at the national or regional level are the Liberal Democrats in the UK, the Democratic Party in Luxemburg, the D66 in the Netherlands and the Danish Social Liberal Party. At the European level, social liberal parties generally are integrated in the ELDR Party, which is the 3rd biggest group at the European Parliament, and aggregates liberal parties (both social liberal parties and

conservative liberal parties) from all over Europe.[30]

"Social Liberal" has been used as a label by parties in order to differentiate themselves from conservative liberal and classical liberal parties, especially when there are two or more liberal parties in a country.

[edit] United States

Opinions of liberals in a 2005 Pew Research Center study.[31]

Main articles: Modern American liberalism and Political ideologies in the United States#Liberalism

In the United States, the party system wasn't developed based on strong ideological differences, for example, the Democrats of the South have traditionally been right wing, while northern Democrats are traditionally left wing, although particularly since the 1970s the Democrats in general have tended more to the left and Republicans to the right. Ideologically, all major US parties are Liberal and always have been. Essentially they follow classic liberalism, merging constitutionalism with free markets and centering the differences on the influences of social liberalism[3] and conservatism.

Social liberalism may also refer, as it usually does in North American media, simply to support for educational reform, civil rights, human rights, and civil liberties. In this sense, one could be socially liberal and economically conservative (often referred to as economic liberalism), as is the case with those called variously classical liberals, neoliberals, libertarians, and conservative liberals/liberal conservatives.

Presently, the agendas of European social liberals and modern American liberals tend to be very similar, with both taking a distinctly left-of-center stance on social issues, whilst taking a more centrist stance on economic issues.[32] Since the ideological center of the United States lies further to the right than that of Western Europe, policies considered centrist, or even right-wing, in Europe may be considered left-of-center in the U.S. Universal single-payer health care, for example, is considered a largely centrist policy in Europe but distinctly leftist in the U.S. Social democrats and socialists may also be labeled as "liberal" in the U.S. but constitute only a small minority of the American left. Liberals in the U.S. constitute roughly 19% to 26% of the population and form circa 46% of the Democratic base.[33]

Like European social liberals, most modern American liberals advocate cultural pluralism, diplomacy over military action, stem-cell research, the legalisation of same-sex marriage, secular government, environmental protection laws and access to abortion.

However, there are also some relevant differences. For example, American liberals tend to be rather divided on free trade agreements and organisations such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).[33] Also, while most liberals oppose increased military standing and the display of the Ten Commandments in public buildings, the Democratic party still has references to religion and God on its party documents,[34][35] something that goes against the clearly anti-clerical stance of social liberal parties worldwide.

[edit] Social liberal parties and organisations

Giving an exhaustive list of social liberal parties worldwide is difficult, largely because political organisations are not always ideologically pure. Party ideologies often change over time. However, the following parties and organisations are usually accepted by peers[nb 2] or scholars as following social liberalism as a core ideology.

- \* Australia: Australian Democrats[36]
- \* Belgium: Social Liberal Party[37]
- \* Bulgaria: National Movement for Stability and Progress[38]
- \* Canada: Liberal Party of Canada[39]
- \* Croatia: Istrian Democratic Assembly[40]
- \* Denmark: Danish Social Liberal Party[26][41][42][43]
- \* Estonia: Estonian Centre Party[40]
- \* Finland: Swedish People's Party[44]
- \* France: Left Radical Party[40][43]
- \* Honduras: Liberal Party of Honduras[45]
- \* Lithuania: New Union[40][46]
- \* Luxembourg: Democratic Party[41]
- \* Moldova: Moldova Noastră[47]
- \* Netherlands: Democrats 66[26][40][41]
- \* Norway: Liberal Party of Norway[40][48][49]
- \* Paraguay: Authentic Radical Liberal Party[50]
- \* Philippines: Liberal Party[51]
- \* Poland: Democratic Party[40]
- \* Portugal: Movimento Liberal Social[52]
- \* Russia: Russian Democratic Party "Yabloko"[40][53]
- \* Senegal: Senegalese Democratic Party[54]
- \* Slovenia: Liberal Democracy of Slovenia[7] and Zares[40]
- \* Sweden: Centre Party[40][55][56] and Liberal People's Party[40][56][57]
- \* Tunisia: Liberal Social Democratic Party[58]
- \* United Kingdom: Liberal Democrats[26][41][59]
- \* United States: Democratic Party[60]

[edit] Notable social liberal thinkers

This list presents some notable scholars and politicians which are generally considered as having made significant contributions to the evolution of social liberalism as a political ideology:

- \* Jeremy Bentham[3] (1748–1832)
- \* William Beveridge[3][61] (1879–1963)
- \* Lujo Brentano[9] (1844–1931)
- \* Bernard Bosanquet[62] (1848–1923)
- \* Woodrow Wilson[5] (1856-1924)
- \* John Dewey[3][5] (1859–1952)
- \* Emile Durkheim[27][63][64] (1858–1917)

- \* Thomas Hill Green[3][9][61][62][65] (1836â??1882)
- \* John Atkinson Hobson[3][61][62][65] (1858â??1940)
- \* John Stuart Mill[3][9][66][67] (1806â??1873)
- \* Friedrich Naumann[68][69][70] (1860â??1919)
- \* Leonard Trelawny Hobhouse[3][9][61][62][65] (1864â??1929)
- \* Gerhart von Schulze-Gavernitz[9] (1864â??1943)
- \* Hans Kelsen[5] (1881â??1973)
- \* John Maynard Keynes[3][5][61] (1883â??1946)
- \* Carlo Rosselli[67] (1899-1937)
- \* Bertil Ohlin[71][72] (1899â??1979)
- \* Piero Gobetti[67] (1901-1926)
- \* George Orwell[5] (1903-1950)
- \* Guido Calogero[67] (1904-1986)
- \* Isaiah Berlin[5] (1909â??1997)
- \* Norberto Bobbio[5][67] (1909â??2004)
- \* Miguel Reale[73][74] (1910â??2005)
- \* John Rawls[3][66][75][76] (1921â??2002)
- \* Don Chipp[36] (1925â??2006)
- \* Karl-Hermann Flach[77] (1929â??1973)
- \* Vlado Gotovac[78] (1930-2000)
- \* Richard Rorty [79] (1931â??2007)
- \* Ronald Dworkin[66][67][76] (\* 1931)
- \* Amartya Sen[28][66][80] (\* 1933)
- \* JosÃ© G. Merquior[5][81] (1941â??1991)
- \* Bruce Ackerman[66][76] (\* 1943)
- \* Martha Nussbaum[28] (\* 1947)
- \* Fernando Savater[28] (\* 1947)
- \* Dirk Verhofstadt[28] (\* 1955)

[edit] Views of social liberals today

- \* Centrist[3][4] or centre-left[5][6][7] views.
- \* The middle way, rejecting the left's dislike of free enterprise and the right's dislike of social provision.[3]
- \* Decentralised decision-making.[26]
- \* Internationalism.[26]
- \* (In Europe) A federal European Union.[26]
- \* Support more rights in areas like abortion, capital punishment, drugs, homosexuality, censorship and euthanasia.[82][83]

[edit] Further reading

- \* Green, Thomas Hill (2006), Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation, New Jersey: The Lawbook Exchange, ISBN 1584776145
- \* Rawls, John (2005), Political Liberalism, New York: Columbia University Press, ISBN 0231130899
- \* Rawls, John (2005), A Theory of Justice, Harvard: Harvard University Press, ISBN 0674017722
- \* Simhony, Avital; Weinstein, David (2001), The New Liberalism: Reconciling Liberty and Community, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, ISBN 0521794048
- \* Hobson, John Atkinson (2000), The Crisis of Liberalism: New Issues of Democracy, Delaware: Adamant Media Corporation, ISBN 1421227819
- \* Hobhouse, L. T. (1994), Liberalism and Other Writings, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, ISBN 0521437261
- \* Merquior, J.G. (1991), Liberalism Old and New, Cambridge: Twayne Publishers, ISBN 0805786279
- \* Mill, John Stuart (1989), 'On Liberty' and Other Writings, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, ISBN 0521379172

[edit] Notes

1. ^ Not to be confused with neoliberalism, a very different concept which has a similar name[1]
2. ^ Liberal International, ELDR, CALD, Africa Liberal Network, RELIAL or European Liberal Forum

[edit] References

1. ^ Contending Liberalisms in World Politics, James L. Richardson; Lynne Rienner (2001), (pp. 36-37)
2. ^ Fauks, Keith. Political Sociology: A Critical Introduction. Edinburgh University Press, 1999, page 73
3. ^ a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u Adams, Ian (2001), Political Ideology Today (Politics Today), Manchester: Manchester University Press, ISBN 0719060206
4. ^ a b c Slomp, Hans (2000). European Politics Into the Twenty-First Century: Integration and Division. Westport: Praeger. ISBN 0275968146.
5. ^ a b c d e f g h i j Liberalism in Modern Times: Essays in Honour of Jose G. Merquior. Budapest: Central European University Press. 1996. 185866053X.
6. ^ a b Hombach, Bodo (2000). The politics of the new centre. Wiley-Blackwell. ISBN 9780745624600. <http://eu.....ile/productCd-074562460X.html>.
7. ^ a b c Women's access to political power in post-communist Europe. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2003. ISBN 9780199246854. <http://www.oup.com/us/catalog/general/subject/?cp=25211&ci=9780199246854>.
8. ^ a b Shaver, Sheila (July 1997). "Liberalism, Gender and Social Policy" (PDF). EconPapers. <http://www.sprc.unsw.edu.au/dp/dp068.pdf>.
9. ^ a b c d e f Richardson, James L. (2001). Contending Liberalisms in World Politics: Ideology and Power. Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers. 155587939X.
10. ^ "The International - Liberalism". Liberal International. [http://www.liberal-international.org/editorial.asp?ia\\_id=508](http://www.liberal-international.org/editorial.asp?ia_id=508). Retrieved 2009-04-26.
11. ^ Contending Liberalisms in World Politics, James L. Richardson; Lynne Rienner (2001), (pp. 36-37) [2]
12. ^ Eatwell, Roger; Wright, Anthony (1999). Contemporary political ideologies. Continuum International Publishing Group. ISBN 9780826451736.
13. ^ The Routledge encyclopaedia of philosophy, p.599

14. ^ Contending liberalisms in world politics (2001) James L. Richardson, p. 37
15. ^ Liberal Democrats in the Weimar Republic: The History of the German Democratic Party and the German State Party (1985) Bruce B. Frye, p 10
16. ^ The Democratic Movement in Germany, 1789-1914 (1976) John L. Snell, p. 304-334
17. ^ Contemporary political ideologies (1999) Roger Eatwell, Anthony Wright, pp. 35-36
18. ^ Contending liberalisms in world politics (2001) James L. Richardson, pp. 38-41
19. ^ Democracy and Empire: Britain 1865-1914 (1985) by E.J. Feuchtwanger, pp. 273-317
20. ^ Oliver Marc Hartwich: Neoliberalism: The Genesis of a Political Swearword
21. ^ Political ideology today (2001), Ian Adams, p. 32
22. ^ Contending liberalisms in world politics: ideology and power (2001), James L. Richardson, pp. 38-41[3]
23. ^ McGowan, J. (2007). American Liberalism: An Interpretation for Our Time. Chapel Hill, NC: North Carolina University Press.
24. ^ "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits".  
<http://www.colorado.edu/studentgroups/libertarians/issues/friedman-soc-resp-business.html>.
25. ^ a b Van Horenbeeck, Olivier. "The overlap between social democracy and social liberalism - Anthony Giddens". *Liberales*. <http://www.liberales.be/cgi-bin/en/showframe.pl?interview&giddensoverlap>. Retrieved 2009-04-12.
26. ^ a b c d e f g Marks, Gary and Wilson, Carole (July 2000). "The Past in the Present: A Cleavage Theory of Party Response to European Integration" (PDF). *British Journal of Political Science* 30: 433â??459. doi:10.1017/S000712340000181. <http://www.utdallas.edu/~cjwilson/prof/BJPS00.pdf>.
27. ^ a b Merquior, J.G. (1991). *Liberalism Old and New*. Boston: Twayne Publishers. ISBN 0805786279.
28. ^ a b c d e Verhofstadt, Dirk, Liberalism is the best Cure for Poverty, <http://www.liberales.be/cgi-bin/en/showframe.pl?essay&verhofstadtucos>, retrieved 2008-08-17
29. ^ See, for example, "The overlap between social democracy and social liberalism".[4]
30. ^ (PDF) Who are the European Liberal Democrats?, ELDR Party, 2007,  
[http://www.eldr.org/images/upload2/en\\_all.pdf](http://www.eldr.org/images/upload2/en_all.pdf)
31. ^ "Pew Research Center, Spreadsheet, 2005 poll" (PDF). <http://people-press.org/reports/tables/242.pdf>. Retrieved 2007-07-13.
32. ^ Judis, B. J. (11 July, 2003). The trouble with Howard Dean. *Salon.com*.  
<http://dir.salon.com/story/news/feature/2003/07/11/dean/index.html>. Retrieved 2007-07-19.
33. ^ a b "Pew Research Center. (10 May, 2005). Beyond Red vs. Blue.". <http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?PageID=945>. Retrieved 2007-07-12.
34. ^ (PDF) Strong at Home, Respected in the World, Democratic Party, 2004,  
<http://www.democrats.org/pdfs/2004platform.pdf>, retrieved 2009-06-23
35. ^ (PDF) The Charter & The Bylaws of the Democratic Party of the United States of America, Democratic Party, 2005,  
[http://a9.g.akamai.net/7/9/8082/v001/democratic1.download.akamai.com/8082/pdfs/20060119\\_charter.pdf](http://a9.g.akamai.net/7/9/8082/v001/democratic1.download.akamai.com/8082/pdfs/20060119_charter.pdf),  
retrieved 2009-06-23
36. ^ a b "The Third Team: A brief history of the Australian Democrats after 30 years" (PDF). Australian Democrats. 2007. [http://www.democrats.org.au/docs/2007/4\\_History.pdf](http://www.democrats.org.au/docs/2007/4_History.pdf). Retrieved 2009-04-05.
37. ^ "Sociaal-liberalisme" (in Dutch). Social Liberal Party (Belgium). <http://www.s-lp.be/sociaal-liberalisme/>. Retrieved 2009-06-10.
38. ^ Alida, Rizova (2007-04). "The European Union is the best for the continent and for Bulgaria" (PDF). *Insight*. ELDR. <http://www.eldr.org/pdf/publications/journaux/eldr-2007-04.pdf>. Retrieved 2009-04-06.
39. ^ Johnson, David (2002). *Thinking government*. Peterborough: Broadview Press. ISBN 1-551-11319-8.
40. ^ a b c d e f g h i j k Wolfram, Nordsieck. "Parties and Elections in Europe". <http://www.parties-and-elections.de/>. Retrieved 2009-04-08.
41. ^ a b c d J. Kirchner, Emil (1988). *Liberal parties in Western Europe*. Avon: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-32394-0.
42. ^ Madsen, Tomas Bech (Autumn 2007). "Radicalis and Liberalis in Denmark" (PDF). *Journal of Liberal Democrat History*. [http://www.liberalhistory.org.uk/uploads/56\\_Autumn\\_2007.pdf](http://www.liberalhistory.org.uk/uploads/56_Autumn_2007.pdf).
43. ^ a b MÅller, Thorkild; Albrectsen, Anne-Birgitte (2002). "Facts About Det Radikale Venstre" (PDF). *Det Radikale Venstre*.  
<http://www.radikale.dk/afestning/Upload/Filer/FactsAboutTheDanishSocialLiberalParty.pdf>. Retrieved 2009-04-08.
44. ^ "The Swedish People's Party". Swedish People's Party. <http://www.sfp.fi/eng/>. Retrieved 2009-04-06.
45. ^ Goldman, Ralph (2002). *The Future Catches Up*. Bloomington: iUniverse. ISBN 0-595-22888-7.
46. ^ "Social liberals Lithuania celebrate the 10th anniversary". ELDR. Archived from the original on 2008-05-15. <http://eldr.org/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=1288#In7>. Retrieved 2009-04-06.
47. ^ "European Liberal Democrats call for more engagement with EU neighbours". ELDR. 2007-04-16. <http://eldr.org/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=1049>. Retrieved 2009-04-06.
48. ^ Wika, Franziska (2007-07-20). "Liberal â?? ikke liberalist" (in Norwegian). *Venstre*. <http://www.venstre.no/nordland/vefsn/artikkel/5298>. Retrieved 2009-04-06.
49. ^ "Venstre - The Liberal Party of Norway". *Venstre*. 2007-08-03. <http://www.venstre.no/print.php?article=981>. Retrieved 2009-04-06.
50. ^ Gastil, Raymond (2001). *Freedom in the World*. Piscataway: Transaction Publishers. ISBN 0-765-80101-9.
51. ^ "The Liberal Vision". Liberal Party of the Philippines.  
<http://www.liberalparty.ph/platform/vision.htm>. Retrieved 2009-04-06.
52. ^ "European Liberal Forum - Member Organisations". European Liberal Forum.  
[http://www.liberalforum.eu/index.php/about\\_members.html](http://www.liberalforum.eu/index.php/about_members.html). Retrieved 2009-04-08.
53. ^ Kulik, Anatoly; Pshizova, Susanna (2005). *Political parties in post-Soviet space: Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova, and the Baltics*. Greenwood Publishing Group. ISBN 9780275973445.
54. ^ Mamadou, Lamine (2007-11-16). "Statement of the delegation of the PDS" (PDF). PDS.  
<http://www.liberal-international.org/contentFiles/files/Lamine%20BA.pdf>. Retrieved 2009-04-06.
55. ^ "Annemie Neyts congratulates Folkpartiet and Centerpartiet in Sweden". ELDR. 2009-09-30. <http://eldr.org/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=892>. Retrieved 2009-04-06.
56. ^ a b "The Swedish parliament (Rigsdag)". Liberal Political Institute. <http://www.lpi-bg.org/?page=eu&ion=cnr&id=84&lng=en>. Retrieved 2009-04-08.
57. ^ "Folkpartiet: The Liberal Party of Sweden" (PDF). Folkpartiet. 2006.  
<http://www.folkpartiet.se/Pages/90075/Engelska.pdf>. Retrieved 2009-04-08.
58. ^ "Sister Parties". Liberal Democrats. <http://www.libdems.org.uk/international/sister-parties>. Retrieved 2009-04-08.
59. ^ Hargreaves, Jeremy (Autumn 2007). "The Liberal Democrats today" (PDF). *Journal of Liberal Democrat History*. [http://www.liberalhistory.org.uk/uploads/56\\_Autumn\\_2007.pdf](http://www.liberalhistory.org.uk/uploads/56_Autumn_2007.pdf).
60. ^ Society of American Historians, David (1991). *The Reader's companion to American history*.

- Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. ISBN 0-395-51372-3.
61. ^ a b c d e Meadowcroft, John (Autumn 2000). "The Origins of Community Politics" (PDF). *Journal of Liberal Democrat History*.  
[http://www.liberalhistory.org.uk/uploads/28\\_meadowcroft\\_the\\_origins\\_of\\_community\\_politics.pdf](http://www.liberalhistory.org.uk/uploads/28_meadowcroft_the_origins_of_community_politics.pdf).
62. ^ a b c d The new liberalism: reconciling liberty and community. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2001. ISBN 9780521794046. <http://www.cambridge.org/catalogue/catalogue.asp?isbn=0521794048>.
63. ^ Seidman, Steven (2004). *Contested knowledge: social theory today*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. ISBN 9780631226710.
64. ^ W. Russell, James (2006). *Double standard: social policy in Europe and the United States*. Rowman & Littlefield. ISBN 9780742546936.
65. ^ a b c "James Hobson". [http://www.liberal-international.org/editorial.asp?ia\\_id=682](http://www.liberal-international.org/editorial.asp?ia_id=682). Retrieved 2008-05-19.
66. ^ a b c d e Cardoso Rosas, João (2008). "Socialismo ou liberalismo social?". *DiarioEconomico.com*.  
<http://diarioeconomico.sapo.pt/edicao/diarioeconomico/opinion/columnistas/pt/desarrollo/1123500.html>. Retrieved 2008-05-21.
67. ^ a b c d e f Carlos Bresser-Pereira, Luiz (2003). *Building the Republican State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780199261185. <http://www.us.oup.com/us/catalog/general/?view=usa&cp=25347&ci=9780199261185>.
68. ^ Thompson, Alastair (2000). *Left Liberals, the State, and Popular Politics in Wilhelmine Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780198205432. <http://www.oup.com/us/catalog/general/?cp=24301&view=usa&ci=0198205430>.
69. ^ F. Biagini, Eugenio (2002). *Citizenship and Community: Liberals, Radicals and Collective Identities in the British Isles, 1865-1931*. Cambridge: Published by Cambridge University Press. p. 228. ISBN 9780521893602. <http://www.cambridge.org/catalogue/catalogue.asp?isbn=0521893602>.
70. ^ *Jews and Other Germans: Civil Society, Religious Diversity, and Urban Politics in Breslau, 1860-1925*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press. 2008. ISBN 9780299226947.
71. ^ Bertil Ohlin: a centennial celebration, 1899-1999. Cambridge: MIT Press. 2002. ISBN 9780262062282. <http://mitpress.mit.edu/catalog/item/default.asp?tttype=2&tid=8800>.
72. ^ Klausen, Jytte (2001). *War and Welfare: Europe and the United States, 1945 to the Present*. Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN 9780312238834.
73. ^ "Espa o Cultural Miguel Reale" (in Portuguese). *Jornal da Universidade de S o Paulo*. Universidade de S o Paulo. 2000. Archived from the original on 2007-08-25.  
<http://espacoculturalmiguelreale.blogspot.com/2007/08/entrevista-concedida-pelo-prof-reale-ao.html>. Retrieved 2009-04-05.
74. ^ Reale, Miguel (2000) (in Portuguese). *Crise do capitalismo e crise do Estado*. S o Paulo: Senac. ISBN 9788573591415.
75. ^ Watson, Graham (Spring 1998). "The Two Davids" (PDF). *Journal of Liberal Democrat History*.  
[http://www.liberalhistory.org.uk/uploads/18\\_watson\\_the\\_two\\_davids.pdf](http://www.liberalhistory.org.uk/uploads/18_watson_the_two_davids.pdf).
76. ^ a b c Vincent, Andrew (2007). *The Nature of Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780199297955.
77. ^ Flach, Karl-Hermann (1984). *Noch eine Chance f r die Liberalen*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer S. Verlag GmbH. ISBN 978-3100210012.
78. ^ Gotovac, Vlado (1996). In *Defence of Freedom: Zagreb 1971-1996*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska; Croatian PEN Centre. p. 11. ISBN 953-150-066-5.
79. ^ Rodriguez,  ngel Rivero (1993). "Liberalismo, democracia y pragmatismo" (PDF). *Isegor a* (8).  
[http://bddoc.csic.es:8080/basisbwdocs\\_rdisoc/rev0672/1993\\_8\\_49-64.pdf](http://bddoc.csic.es:8080/basisbwdocs_rdisoc/rev0672/1993_8_49-64.pdf).
80. ^ Fotopoulos, Takis (October 2004). "Why an Inclusive Democracy? The multidimensional crisis, globalisation and inclusive democracy". *The International Journal of INCLUSIVE DEMOCRACY 1* (1).  
[http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol1/vol1\\_no1\\_why.htm](http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol1/vol1_no1_why.htm). Retrieved 2008-05-21.
81. ^ Tosto, Milton (2005). *The meaning of liberalism in Brazil*. Lanham: Lexington Books. ISBN 9780739109861. <http://www.lexingtonbooks.com/Catalog/SingleBook.shtml?command=Search&db=^DB/CATALOG.db&eqSKUdata=0739109855>.
82. ^ Vaus, D. A. De (2002). *Analysing social science data*. SAGE. ISBN 9780761959380.
83. ^ Dorey, Peter (2006). *The Labour governments, 1964-1970*. Routledge. ISBN 9780714656199.

[edit] See also

- \* Social liberalism (United States)
- \* Classical liberalism

Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social\_liberalism"

Categories: Left-wing politics | Liberalism | Political ideologies | Political culture

<b>oompher</b> Member	Fri Oct 16 15:51:50 penis?
<b>McKobb</b> Member	Mon Oct 19 14:13:11 That guy's done.
<b>tumbleweed</b> the wanderer	Mon Oct 19 14:16:02 maybe the store just had really strong wind currents
<b>McKobb</b> Member	Mon Oct 19 14:17:15 lol
<b>Firestorm Phoenix</b> Member	Mon Oct 19 14:21:16 Afterward, he puked up his liver which then crawled away for it's own protection.

[show deleted posts](#)

Your Name:

Your Password:





Your Message:

Submit Reply

