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1. Introduction

"The tension between planning and democratization is an old problem. In this paper, the question of the relationship between planning and democratization is examined in the context of the Netherlands. In the 1920s and 1930s, the Social Democratic Party (Social-Democratic Labour Party: SDLP) was founded in 1894, with the foundation of the party. In 1948, the party became the Social Democratic Party (Social-Democratic Labour Party: SDLP)."
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of the SDAP to a reforming party. In 1937, Labour underwent an ideological race—lifted by digestion of the concept of class-struggle from the programme of its programme of principles.

In fact, this function was taken over by the state. A planning government should bring socialism closer to reality by changing the economic foundations of society. In its declaration of principles, Labour rejected explicitly the notion "that the state should abstain from all economic interference" (Vorink, 1945, 133). Besides Labour would not promote the interests of the working class only; henceforth the national interests and the interests of the working and middle classes as a whole became its target. With this, Dutch social democracy had completed its ideological metamorphosis from a class movement into a national party.

After the Second World War, the transformation of social democracy was rounded off organizationally. In 1946, the SDAP merged into the Partij van de Arbeid (Labour Party; PvdA) together with radical liberals and progressive christians. The new social democratic formation clung to the idea of the regulating state and a planned organization of production, just like its predecessor. After a newly liberated abstraction, Labour resumed its role of the government for a dozen years. The renewal of its programme, just like its predecessor, was rooted in the traditions of the new social democrat with radical liberals and progressive christians. The new social democracy was founded on the principles of J.K. Galbraith. In its programme, the party depicted the ideas of J.K. Galbraith, in its programme, the party depicted the ideas of J.K. Galbraith, in its programme, the party depicted the ideas of J.K. Galbraith, in its programme, the party depicted the ideas of J.K. Galbraith, in its programme, the party depicted the ideas of J.K. Galbraith, in its programme, the party depicted the ideas of J.K. Galbraith.
Of course the tasks allotted to the state were expanded in agreement with the shift in emphasis of prosperity to well-being. Henceforth, its intervening functions not only confined to the socio-economic domain but also steering the political domain of the state was labelled as social liberalism. 

Labour focussed on the state itself. At the beginning of the seventies Labour seized the opportunity and took part in the government headed by D. Uyl. This participation formed not only an outlet for the accumulated etatist libido however, but also a profound re-activation of the state function. But growing etatism may well be seen as an inherent part of the relative moderation of the state. In fact New Left stimulated the revival of the traditional Old Left instrument of the planning state, although an important current within New Left held more libertarian ideas (Lucardie, 1986, 304).

This process of growing etatism was strengthened by the so-called 'defamiliarization' of Dutch society. In which the 'Red Family' - the organizational complex of PvdA, trade unions and other allied movements - fell apart (Tromp, 1988, 145). In order to compensate for the resultant waning of social influence, Labour focussed on the state itself. At the beginning of the seventies Labour seized the opportunity and took part in the government headed by D. Uyl. This participation formed not only an outlet for the accumulated etatist libido however, but also a profound re-activation of the state function. But growing etatism may well be seen as an inherent part of the relative moderation of the state. In fact New Left stimulated the revival of the traditional Old Left instrument of the planning state, although an important current within New Left held more libertarian ideas (Lucardie, 1986, 304).
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In this period of relative moderation the state was labelled as social liberalism. 
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This undeclared reliance on the state was widespread. Possible dangers of too much planning for democracy were waved aside. The process of decision making was renewed, however, did not promise a way out of this dilemma. In the eighties, when the social democratic views on the state came under fire, this Achilles' heel in Labour's rudimentary theory of the state was one of the first elements to be criticized.

In 1979, in the midst of a persistent economic crisis, the party executive devoted its attention to the reforming capacities of the state. In a working paper about economy, it took leave of a passive government which wants to oil the hinges of the market mechanism with rough measures only (Beschrijvingsbrief, 1979, 8). Instead, it was taken for granted that social and economic relations are changeable and therefore "liable for political steering" (id., 15). In order to accomplish this selective economic growth aimed at a qualitative improvement of the standard of living and more jobs, a higher degree of planning was required. Political steering was imbued with an regulatory state on nearly every level. Comparative to the old declaration of 1959, excessive government intervention was demanded in order to accomplish a mode of production which was in accordance with social democratic views on the state. Every social sector, compared to the old declaration of 1959, was given a more prominent role in the decision making and government intervention was increased and that it resulted in democratization of the community on economic power formation. In practice, however, this coalition of the old government apparatus with rough measures only, resulted in a government that has not been able to create a qualitative improvement of the standard of living and more jobs. Workers' self-management in enterprises and in the public sector was suggested beside an increase of direct influence of citizens on government policy. This time however it was noted that the relation between democratization on the one hand and extended state intervention on the other could become strained. The outcome might be that the distance between citizen and government will increase and that it will not result in democratization in practice (Beginselprogramma 1977, 29). The declaration, however, did not propose a way out of this dilemma. In the eighties, when the social democratic views on the state came under fire, this Achilles' heel in Labour's rudimentary theory of the state was one of the first elements to be criticized.

In 1979, in the midst of a persistent economic crisis, the party executive devoted its attention to the reforming capacities of the state. In a working paper about economy, it took leave of a passive government which wants to oil the hinges of the market mechanism with rough measures only (Beschrijvingsbrief, 1979, 8). Instead, it was taken for granted that social and economic relations are changeable and therefore "liable for political steering" (id., 15). In order to accomplish selective economic growth aimed at a qualitative improvement of the standard of living and more jobs, a "decentralized and democratic process of decision making" was required, which had to be approved by parliament - tasks were transferred to the public sector and party initiative for the private sector. In development was to be left out, which would be binding upon the economic system. An expectation of planning with the demand for "deepening and widening of democracy", which should enable the community to get hold again of the fabric of society.

The renewed declaration of principles of 1977 still valid at present - was served with the same sauce. For the first time since 1937, Labour inserted explicitly the notion of class struggle in its principles again.
In 1982, Kalma stepped up the effort by publishing the "Struggle for the Welfare State" (which appeared in the party's theoretical journal, Socialism and Democracy). The conflict between the party's traditional model of planning and the welfare state was highlighted as a key issue. The desire to maintain control over the welfare state, combined with the need to address problems such as the lack of public accountability, led to a reevaluation of the party's role.

The illusion of the 'democratic state' first began to dissipate at the party congress of 1979, when the call for a more democratic and participatory state was raised. This was seen as a challenge to the party's traditional role as the main planner and controller. The party's leader, Den Uyl, spoke of the need for a "socialist state" in which the role of the state was to promote social equality and freedom, rather than simply to plan and control.

However, the disappointing results of the national and regional elections of 1981 and 1982, along with the failure of the party's alliance with the Christian Democrats, contributed to a shift in the party's rhetoric. The "new reality" of the welfare state led to a reevaluation of the party's role and a recognition of the need for a more democratic and participatory state.

The "Weerwerk" (a research office within the party) took a leading role in criticizing the previous model of planning. The party's traditional role as planner had been criticized and rejected, as it was seen as a "pre-eminently etatistic party" that concentrated too much on the state as a vehicle for social reform.

The party had become a "moneymaking and opaque bureaucracy," and the party had to face the reality of the welfare state's limitations. The party's traditional recipes for more regulation and expansion of the public sector were recognized as insufficient.

The party had to turn towards a "neuerealisierung" (new realism), which was characterized by a greater emphasis on public participation and accountability. The party had to recognize the limitations of its previous model of planning and the need for a more democratic and participatory state.

The party had to recognize that the previous model of planning was no longer valid, and that the state had to be reformed to promote social equality and freedom. The party had to recognize the limitations of its previous model of planning and the need for a more democratic and participatory state.
the report was announced as a "political grenade" by the director of the WBS. It was stated that Labour was facing an "almost Copernican revolution in its thought about state and democracy ever since the twenties" (Kalma, 1982, 8). For safety's sake some critical comments were added, in which Kalma's sweeping statements were qualified. This essay which reflected influence of French political thinkers like A. Touraine, centred around the question if a strong planning state equipped with large executive powers is consonant with a free, democratic society. According to Kalma the answer is no. In plain terms he advocated that Labour should drop all overexcited pretensions of a 'steerable' society. Of course, the state was indispensable for democracy. But its fundamental task was not to guide society slowly but surely in a certain direction, but to regulate social conflict - the essence of democracy in Kalma's eyes. Kalma pointed out that this concept of democracy - which is situated exclusively in politics - has been done for ages. Labour should situate it in society. In Kalma's view, a democratic system gives formal room to the expression of social conflict and tries to solve these conflicts. A. Labour should not bar itself on the assumption of an ultimate harmony between state and society, but accept the everlasting tension between these two phenomena - a contradiction of an expected equilibrium of the state" (Kalma, 1982, 51). The state is "the instrument to which society gives itself as an illusion, a contradiction - the essence of democracy, which is made for a social state who fulfills the democratic function of the state. The state is the instrument of the social democracy - which has produced a specific society. Kalma recommended that on the one hand the state would leave more things to society (social democracy) and on the other hand should try to frame the conditions on which a democratic society could function. Here he followed in the footsteps of the Dutch sociologist Schuyt, who had pleaded for a "horizontal co-ordination within society (action, debate, negotiation) instead of a vertical co-ordination between state and society (legislation, central planning)". Kalma recommended this "turned-down withering away of the state" (Kalma, 1982, 51) however is a "totalitarian" mistake. The state is a means of power, but the state is a means to an end. Kalma argued that the state should look at the interests of economy and social democracy - which is called the "democratic state" (Kalma, 1982, 18). Kalma recommended that the social conflict should be resolved by collective action within society (action, debate, negotiation), not by legislation between state and society.
grip, society encloses the state as an octopus in a democracy” (Kalma. 1984, 185). Democracy and centralization were irreconcilable, hence a state within a democratic system had to be ‘weak’ where it came to its executive. ‘steering’ tasks.

Apart from these theoretical points, Kalma pointed out also other defects in the state concept of Labour. In the first place, it was based on a too simple representation of society. In reality, society was far too complicated and opaque to be mastered by any social democratic planning. The state should abandon this claim and take a more mediative position.

Kalma’s solution. He advocated an ‘autonomous state’, where the role of the government was made possible by social associations. But that the state had to share its powers with other societal forces and organizations was not possible by the authority of the government alone. Hence, the state should recognize that social progress was still valid in this sense.

Democratic planning was a better necessity according to Labour’s leaders: Mangema’s Planning for Freedom was still valid in this

Although no pronounced consensus was reached about the scope of the state within society in the party debate, the concept of planning was past its prime somewhat in the middle of the eighties. Parallel to this, the social factor made its come-back within social democratic thought. In the election platform of 1986, Labour stated explicitly that one could not construct society from blue-prints. Planning still belonged to the set of instruments with which Labour wanted to get at the economic crisis, but at the same time it was stated that the government should not regulate more than necessary and feasible, because initiatives of social forces are indispensable to the transition from planned economy to a market economy. The state was pressed by widely divergent social interests, which were impossible to reconcile altogether. Therefore, society was far too complicated and opaque to be mastered by any social democratic planning. In order to master economic crisis, the state had to develop the mixture of freedom and authority adequate to the politics of the time. Kalma’s solution was not possible by the authority of the government alone. Hence, the state should recognize that social progress was still valid in this sense.

Planning was past its prime somewhat in the middle of the eighties. Parallel to this, the social factor made its come-back within social democratic thought. In the election platform of 1986, Labour stated explicitly that one could not construct society from blue-prints. Planning still belonged to the set of instruments with which Labour wanted to get at the economic crisis, but at the same time it was stated that the government should not regulate more than necessary and feasible, because initiatives of social forces are an indispensable engine for social development” (De toekomst, 1986, 4). Compared to Weerwerk, the proposals in this programme were significantly more modest.
The immediate cause for this trust was the democratic parties. The
reform in QUICK was the immediate cause for this trust. However, the
Democratic parties still considered the status quo.

In 1978, the role of the state as an instrument of social guidance, the
paradox concerning the state before the Second World War and its present
crisis was addressed. (Schuivende panelen, 1978, 59).

The changes referred to were environmental, political, technological, cultural,
and marked by a new orientation of economy and culture. The
"Schuivende panelen" (Schuivende panelen) provided explicit recognition to the
paradox concerning the genesis of the social democratic theory. In the
thirties, social changes led to the discovery of the
essential place of the state as a mechanism of social guidance. The
present changes together do limit the alertness and guiding capacity of this same
mechanism of coordination. However, social changes have led to the discovery of the
intermediary level between state and intermediary. In this individualized society,
Labour's task was once more to organize solidarity in order to prevent the
economic and cultural isolation of specific groups. The changed situation required a
new concept of state: the so-called 'responsible state'. The state
should not withdraw - as neo-conservatives proposed - but
should take over as the so-called 'responsible state'. The state
should move into a more 'flexible' form of government. In general, the
state should provide more organization to organizations which operate on
their own.

The party commission considered the social intermediary level between state and
intermediary to be a cornerstone of politics, according to
Schuivende panelen, the component state was trimmed as a consequence.
The components were over-represented to these intermediary levels.
In the organizational arena, the social democrat parties sympathized with the
party commission's call for a "responsible state". The party commission
emphasized the decision-making power of co-ordination and renewal. The present changes together do limit the
intermediary level between state and intermediary. In this
individualized society, Labour's task was once more to
organize solidarity in order to prevent the
economic and cultural isolation of specific groups. The changed situation required a
new concept of state: the so-called 'responsible state'. The state
should not 'retire' - as was proposed by neo-conservatives - but
turn into a more 'flexible' form of government. In general, the
state should provide more organization to organizations which operate on
their own.
The debate on the role of the state and the market continued to be a central issue within the Labour Party. The party's manifesto, "Om de kwaliteit van de toekomst" (For the Quality of the Future), was published in 1989. It emphasized the need for active government intervention to ensure social solidarity and protect vulnerable interests. The manifesto argued that the market alone was insufficient to ensure social stability and that the state had a role to play in balancing the interests of various groups.

The party's program was influenced by the recommendations of the Schuiversche panelen, which advocated a more participatory and inclusive approach to policy-making. The panel's report, "De democratische politiek van morgen" (The Democratic Politics of Tomorrow), was published in 1987 and called for greater involvement of citizens in the political process.

Despite these changes, the party executive continued to emphasize the importance of an active government role in ensuring social stability and economic growth. The 1989 election platform reflected this approach, advocating for a "modest" state role that was both limited and responsible.

Overall, the Labour Party's approach to the role of the state and the market remained a central issue within the party, with debates around the appropriate balance between the two continuing into the 1990s.
Although the socialist ideal did not play a prominent role in
the election platform, views were expressed by
certain leaders that were picked up by the party's top. As opposed to
socialist ideas we're expected to become different were denounced. However, his option was about
the market mechanism of the market mechanism as the only
autonomous functioning mechanism. The free market is fundamental

certainly necessary precondition to democracy, "to
capitalism, which is regarded as a "part-of-society not sufficient", but
capitalism, which is regarded as a prerequisite of a rational government on
by politics only, the negative as of the draft now on the part
focusing on the control of planning, an attempt now on the part
focusing on the control of democracy, and planning. Instead of
the destruction of democracy and democracy, which Kalma played again the theme of
accomplishing a new compromise between capital and workers'

To Kama's mind, the crisis of Labour was for the greater
part the result of the fact that it still chased this ideal. Because of its
"still... the socialist
totalism. Labour expected too much of participation in
government (Socialisme, 1988, 159). Besides, it prevented social

democracy from realizing how much was established already of this
democracy. Because of its "well... situation for a reality different,
because of the "well... situation for a reality different.

Labour had to admit that it was more than "organized liberalism"
as Bernstein had called it in 1899, and continue on this road.

9. A farewell to socialist utopia

After this process of reappraisal of the interrelationship
between state and society had resulted in a partial "de-
etatization" of Labour—at least for the time being—
the moment had
arrived to examine the underlying stimulus of Labour's
predilection for the state. Again, the brunt was borne by Kalma.

In Socialistie put in practice (Socialisme, 1988) he
embroidered on the theme of the
democratization.

Stated that social democracy should not intend to enact
approaching the German social democratic leader brandt had
appoinitialed to the German social democratic leader brandt had
had
reconceived by calling
the state, and reducing the time of the state's
production for the state. As in the pre-planning of the
state—part of Labour's
electoralization of Labour—was at least the time during the
moment
between state and society had resulted in a partial, at
least
the
the election platform a few months later, which—unlike the

Happiness, "the election platform a few months later, which—unlike the
Although the former deterministic inclination did not return, the
social democratic theory became a quantitatively negotiable
within society. The role of the central state was rather modest in
the period of neo-conservative politics aimed at economic recovery. At
the end of this period of neo-conservative policies and social
conservatism, the concept of the new social democratic and social
democrats' key-word of the new
government was formed between
Kok and his predecessor, the concept of "social renewal". In
November 1989, a coalition was formed between

Watchword in Kok's plea was the "practical reforming
disposition."

In essence, this voluntaristic, etatist era lasted until
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state had to adopt more a waiting attitude.

In this period of reflection, Labour started to shake off its ideal of a socialist society. Utopian notions were regarded out of date of a socialist society. Labour notions were regarded out of date. Labour became alienated from the thoughts of 18th century Enlighenment and the French Revolution, because of the renunciation of the tenet of man's perfectibility by Labour. The social democratic positive image of man will be questioned inevitably. As a consequence, Labour might draw closer to the anthropological anthropology of man as envisaged to all evil by Hobbes, the Homo homini lupus. Perhaps this final step will be taken in the social democratic positive image of man with the renunciation of the faith in the 'malleable society'.

Announced recently by the party executive, revision of the Programme of Principles of 1977, which was...
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