

Social Democracy

Project Save the World Podcast / Talk Show Episode Number: 346

Panelists: Ed Broadbent

Host: Metta Spencer

Date Aired: 11 October 2021

Date Transcribed and Verified: 8 November 2021

Transcription: Otter.ai

Transcription Review and Edits: Adam Wynne

Synopsis: Ed Broadbent led the NDP for 15 years, then the government-funded institute Rights and Democracy and now the Broadbent Institute, which promotes social democracy.

Metta Spencer

Hi, I'm Metta Spencer. If you are a Canadian social democrat or NDP person, this is your day. You get to talk to or listen to your biggest hero: Ed Broadbent. And this is going to be a real treat for me because I have admired this man for many, many years. And now I get an hour with him. So, hang on there, we're going to have a conversation about social democracy. He's in Ottawa, I think. Is that where you live nowadays?

Ed Broadbent

Yes, indeed. That's where I am.

Metta Spencer

Well, good morning, Ed Broadbent. Hi.

Ed Broadbent

Good morning to you. It's a pleasure to be with you.

Metta Spencer

Let's have some conversation about social democracy. We already started a little while ago, when I said that I just been reading a Wikipedia article which only muddied the subject and tried to make a distinction between social democracy and democratic socialism, which I thought was bizarre. But you were going to try to clear my head and we ran out of time. So, start over, will you?

Ed Broadbent

Let me begin by saying I always used to use it when I was an active politician. I use the terms synonymously: democratic socialism or social democracy. But historically, some people quite plausibly in the way I talk now - academically - do make a distinction between social democracy and socialism. The distinction being social democracy has a role for the private sector in terms of market mechanisms, which socialism as such does not. And so that's a distinction. Both, I would emphasize are democratic in nature. But the one, as I say, has a clear role for the private sector. Maybe we'll get to elaborate on what that means in practice.

Metta Spencer

Are there parties, some of which call themselves Social Democrats and others say they're only Democratic Socialists? Are there real party differences or is this a matter of picking a certain kind of adjective?

Ed Broadbent

Largely, it's a matter of picking a certain kind of adjective now.

Metta Spencer

Okay. All right, then I don't think we need to labour the subject, because I find it tedious.

Ed Broadbent

Pretty boring, right?

Metta Spencer

But what isn't tedious is talking with you about your own life and your own career line. Because, of course, the first time I knew about you, you were the leader of the NDP and I was an acolyte. But I haven't been so engaged lately and nor have you. For how many years? You stepped down from that role when?

Ed Broadbent

In 1989. At the end of the year in 1989. After some 21 years in politics. 15 of which were as leader of the NDP.

Metta Spencer

All right. So, after that, at some point, you've had two post-career careers. In that you've been the leader of two different institutions and you probably have done other things that I don't know about, which I would like to hear about. But tell me... I'd like to explore these two roles or these two institutions.

Ed Broadbent

The first one was a creation of the Government of Canada: an institution that became known as Rights and Democracy. And it was set up following the recommendation of then all three

parties in the House of Commons: the Liberals, Conservatives, and New Democrats. A committee report that looked at violence in Central America in the 1980s provided a foundation for saying that the Government of Canada should create an institution that would operate at arm's length from the government and not controlled by the government. The mandate of which would be the promotion of the UN system of human rights abroad. So it had a mandate not for human rights within Canada, but for human rights activism abroad. So, the Covenant on Political and Civil Rights and the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights were to be promoted abroad and that institution was set up. And then if I may say so: it thrived. Not just while I was there, but after Warren Allmand - a very distinguished former cabinet minister in Pierre Trudeau's government. Warren Allmand succeeded me and there were a couple of other executive directors too. And the activity was very well recognized internationally, by activist groups all over the world and by UN agencies interested in the promotion of rights. Unfortunately, Stephen Harper shut it down. He was the first prime minister to actually interfere in the operation of the institution. Up to then, both liberal and conservative Prime Ministers kept their hands off and respected the integrity and independence of Rights and Democracy. But Mr. Harper chose, first of all, to appoint some people that were highly partisan and highly - and I choose my words with care - right-wing in terms of international politics. And this led to major clashes between the boards of directors and the staff of Rights and Democracy. And ultimately, what happened is that the Harper government shut it down because it basically couldn't tolerate an institution that was operating independently of the Government of Canada.

Metta Spencer

Well, let's consider what were some of those disputes. Was this that the Harper appointees favoured some right-wing governments that actually were not mindful of human rights or even were abusive themselves?

Ed Broadbent

The principle focus for the government - the Harper government - was on Israel and Middle East politics.

Metta Spencer

Oh boy.

Ed Broadbent

And what it objected to specifically was the recognition of the support of human rights groups that worked both within the Occupied Territories and within Israel itself. There were human rights groups - internationally recognized to be independent - that made criticism at different and various times both of certain Palestinian activities and of the activities of the Government of Israel. And the Harper government could not tolerate and would not tolerate any criticism of Israel. And it was tragic that this kind of focus of the Harper government, as I say: the first

Canadian government to actually interfere with the running of Rights and Democracy. This narrow and intolerant attitude by Mr. Harper led to conflict and then ultimately they decided to shut the institution down. Though I repeat, by then I had no direct connection at that point. But other people who succeeded me and a very lively activist staff had all obtained international recognition for very good work. But the Harper government, as I say, could not tolerate or would not tolerate independent activity in this when it came to Middle Eastern politics.

Metta Spencer

Let me go slightly off of topic because what you're reminding me of is the recent kerfuffle in Britain about Jeremy Corbyn's leadership of a group that was deemed anti-Semitic. I was astonished that left wing parties or whole movements or whole parties in a Western society could still be called something like anti-Semitic. But of course, I haven't lived in Britain. I have no idea what they're all about. Is this something that happens? I mean I had been dumbfounded. Who would call anybody anti-Semitic anymore?

Ed Broadbent

There are groups that are accused of it, but in the case of the British Labour Party - and I won't pretend to know in detail and want to emphasize that - but the accusation was that the then leader Mr. Corbyn failed to deal with certain members of the Labour Party who had indulged in anti-Semitic activity. Not that the Labour Party itself was, nor was it suggested that Mr. Corbyn was himself. He was criticized for the failure of leadership, if you like, for not dealing with accusations of anti-Semitism accurately. I would say you have this problem in almost any party in the Western world. There will be and can be elements of anti-Semitism or Islamophobia or whatever that occur with particular individuals. But we shouldn't make blanket claims about the parties or institutions that they happen to belong to.

Metta Spencer

We could veer off and talk about what's going on in the Green Party right now in Canada. A very similar thing, but I think that would be really going afield. Let's go back to where you were. You were telling me about the demise of the Rights and Democracy. What was the entire title of it?

Ed Broadbent

While the original title in legislation is one of those linguistic abominations and it was the International Center for Human Rights and Democratic Development. That's what it was when I became the Executive Director. That eventually became sensibly just called Rights and Democracy.

Metta Spencer

Okay. Now there are other similar organizations run by other western states, right?

Ed Broadbent

Not many. There are some that some Scandinavian governments have. But this was, at the time, a particularly important Canadian initiative. As I said, it was supported by all the parties in the House of Commons at the time and it was given, for example, if I can make a comparison with the United States: the US Congress has established a couple of entities that promote democracy abroad, but they are more closely and directly affiliated with either the Democratic Party or Republican Party in the US. And what was distinctive about the Canadian initiative, is that it was not to be associated with any political party as such, but was to have a mandate to promote the UN system of human rights and democratic development - as opposed to say, the American model, which is to promote a version of American democracy abroad. So, the Canadian government in its wisdom said: "Oh, let's have really international body here." And we were. We got accredited by the UN and we were recognized by governments. When I went as the Executive Director to Latin American countries or in South Asia, I was normally greeted by the Prime minister or President. Because on the one hand, we were a creation of the Government of Canada. So, I had that status. But on the other hand, our mandate was independent and not partisan and that came to be recognized, understood, and supported broadly abroad.

Metta Spencer

Well, I remember feeling very disappointed at the time. It was a big mess. But now, when did your own Broadbent Institute get founded and how did that come about?

Ed Broadbent

Well, just about 10 years ago. To be precise, it was an emanation of conversations with Jack Layton and other associates of mine. Near the end of Jack's life, some of us had for some time talked about the need for an institution that would be independent of the party in this context, but specifically social democratic. So, it would be clear in terms of the kind of political system we wanted to promote. I was asked by a number of senior staff people of Jack Layton at that time if I would lend my name to it and would I be it first active chairperson. And I agreed to that, because I thought it was a good idea to have such a body that would function independently of the party, but have social democratic values. So that's how it came into being.

Metta Spencer

Is it funded by the NDP or independently?

Ed Broadbent

Initially, money came from the NDP for the first year and its start up. But since then, it's been totally independent of the NDP in every regard. We're not, of course, hostile to the NDP no more than we're hostile to other parties. But we function as a social democratic [organization].

Metta Spencer

My guess is this... tell me if I'm wrong: The lines between a number of centrist to leftist parties globally are blurring now. That you can't just by looking at a platform guess whether a particular platform represents one party or another one necessarily. Is that fair to say?

Ed Broadbent

I actually think it is going in the other direction now.

Metta Spencer

Really?

Ed Broadbent

A few years ago, particularly in association with Tony Blair, as leader of the Labour Party and subsequently Prime Minister, moved his particular party to the right. Clearly in terms of its political behavior and accepting a high degree of marketization of life. Quite a conscious turning its back on social democratic views as they traditionally have been understood while there followed a period where the center left parties - like Labour or the German Social Democrats or the French Socialist Party - moved to the right or to the center. And then the distinctions between the parties became very blurred indeed. But I would argue that there's been a reemergence now of more clear classification of parties. Look at what's happening in the United States, for example. There is a clear and distinct ideological as well as programmatic distinction between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. There's much clearer differences between those two parties now than there were in a pre-Trump era and the pre-Biden era. Mr. Biden clearly has moved the democratic party or the Democratic Party moved him well to the left of where they were under Mr. Obama or even earlier presidents. The present leader and president of the Democratic party with him in the United States - Mr. Biden - has really reconstituted a kind of Rooseveltian activism. A positive view of the state that would intervene to produce greater equality in US society. So, that is making a distinction between parties in the US, not a blurring of them.

Ed Broadbent

Well, yes, but I wasn't meaning that the right wing and the center and left are all blurring together, but only that the center and the left are closer together. For example, in Germany now: I think they're quite confused about what they're going to have by way of a new government, because I guess the SPD won, but by hair's breadth. Right?

Ed Broadbent

Right.

Metta Spencer

As of this minute, maybe if I didn't look at the newspaper today, I would be wrong.

[both chuckle]

Metta Spencer

I would assume, of course, any centrist government for the Christian Democrats, for example, would have a hard time making any kind of coalition with the AfD. The Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) is clearly a right-wing party. You couldn't make a deal with those guys. But, for them to make a deal with the Greens, for example, or the SPD would be easy. Even the Christian Democrats and SPD and Greens could. Could that blur together?

Ed Broadbent

Yes. And Ms. Merkel has - and I say this as a social democrat about her as a Christian Democrat - provided a high degree of quite civilized and stabilizing government over Germany for the past 15 years. A remarkable accomplishment. And has done so very often - which does go back to your point - with the support in her government of the SPD. The man who is now leading the SPD and has a legitimate claim to be the next Chancellor was her Minister of Finance. He is now claiming with a great mandate of about 1.5% over the Christian Democrats, his right to form a government which is trying to do with - as I understand it - the Green Party and a more market oriented smaller party. But in Germany, your contention about the parties moving closer together, I think is accurate. And a number of people in the SPD have been critical of the leadership of the SPD for becoming too conservative. But we'll see what happens now.

Metta Spencer

You wouldn't expect very dramatic changes of policy? Well, in fact, what changes would you expect if the SPD were flying under its own colours entirely? What kinds of changes would you expect Germany to take from the Merkel government?

Ed Broadbent

Well, labour market policies, workers trade union rights, and a focus on employment prospects in general and inequality in the tax system. The SPD have talked about that as well. So, there would be - in those instances - moves, I think, by the SPD in a clear social democratic direction.

Metta Spencer

How different would you say these two wings of the Democratic Party are? I would assume that you would call - well, Bernie Sanders himself would call himself a socialist and so does Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and others. And yet, by and large, the project that they propose - the Green New Deal - I would say that Biden has bought into a lot of it.

Ed Broadbent

You're raising the question about the left wing of the Democratic Party and how different is it from the other parts of the party? Is that the question? Well, it is distinctly different, I think. The Bernie Sanders wing - if I can put it like that - is very much like the NDP actually, if you look at their program. And whether it's on the environment, whether it's dealing with inequality, you name it, it's a left social democratic agenda of very serious proportions that everybody in the US has acknowledged has really shifted the democratic party to the left and with great support of the American people. Overwhelmingly. The interesting discussion - just in the past few days before our discussion here - is the decision of Mr. Biden in choosing between the two branches of his party that are currently in some, you know, conflict over what kind of agenda they would support. He's come down on the side of the of the left wing of the Democratic Party. And correctly pointing out, I believe, that the things they are advocating are supported by the majority of Americans. And polling shows that. So, there are differences between the wings in the Democratic Party, as there are in most democratic parties. But here they can be more serious in conflict, because of the institutional structure of the American government and of the need to have so many senate votes and so many house votes. For example, they need every vote in the Senate that they can get to pass legislation and they're having trouble with some obstreperous so-called moderates that may deny them the agenda because of the 50-vote requirement. Well, because of these factors, the resolution of the differences between the wings of the Democratic Party are quite serious in their political consequences. So, one hopes, I hope, there's a man who, broadly speaking, is supported the democratic agenda. Mr. Biden, I hope he's successful in bringing the two wings of his party together.

Metta Spencer

Okay, now they would call their platform the Green New Deal, right? And there are in other countries similar platforms, proposals, and whole agendas for social change, which emphasize a lot of green, environmental, and climate change things. Compare that to the difference between the Green Party and the NDP in Canada. Would you call the Green New Deal comparable to the NDPs position on everything? Or how would it differ?

Ed Broadbent

I can't get into detail because I don't know the American details well enough to do that. But in broad principles, I can. I mean, the Green New Deal in the US and similar to the Green New Deal of the NDP here is to help for a just transition away from fossil fuels dependencies. In both countries, the progressive elements favour that kind of approach. It will break down in different details, as the different requirements of the two countries would necessitate. But philosophically, it's the same orientation. So, an American that was supporting the Green New Deal in the US and moved to Canada would be happily, I think, situated in the NDP and could well be happily and socially associated with the Green Party as well.

Metta Spencer

Okay, there's the question. How compatible are these two parties? And if they're so compatible, why aren't they merged?

Ed Broadbent

Well, I've felt that way for a long time. I didn't see - as unbiased as I'm not - the necessity of creating a new Green Party when the NDP was leading in environmental matters in the House of Commons for many years. So, I think it was unnecessary. But I respect those who wanted to put perhaps a greater emphasis on environmental policies than was the case in the NDP. But I think it was a mistake politically. I think the NDP had a broad ranging environmental policy, as well as being concerned about inequality, for example.

Metta Spencer

Inequality, for sure, that seems to be the real hallmark of any Social Democratic Party. I was pretty enthusiastically a NDPer for a long, long time. And then I got mad. I really have two different grievances with the party and that is, in fact, I'm indifferent. I'm not very active at all in that regard, because I wish the NDP - and in the US the Green New Deal people - would include militarism as a problem. I would like to see a cut back on military spending and diversion of that funding to all kinds of other social projects, including a high emphasis on climate change issues. That bothers me the most. And then the time I really got mad at Jack Layton was when he would not support the carbon tax which Stéphane Dion was proposing at the time. You know and the basis for it was, I think, that the NDP is so fervently committed to labour and labor doesn't want to lose jobs, so he wouldn't take any stand in favour of carbon tax. But, the most important thing that can be done for climate change is a good, strong carbon tax. So, I've harbored my grievances all these years and now I'm going to dump them all over you.

Ed Broadbent

I would agree with you on the carbon tax issue and the party is certainly, under its present leader, strongly supportive of the carbon tax and all its provincial elements, including the Ontario NDP. The British Columbia Government, I think, was the first provincial government to enter into an agreement with the federal government on a carbon tax. In any case, they support it. So, there's broad support for a carbon tax now. Maybe I managed to block out of my memory Jack's original position on the carbon tax. I quite honestly have forgot. I'm going to have to accept your word for this and check it out later. I'm sure you're not just misleading me, but I had forgotten that at one point. As you say, Jack opposed the carbon tax. You're quite sure of that, are you?

Metta Spencer

Oh, I wrote him a letter and scolded him and said I was quitting the party.

Ed Broadbent

That should have done it.

Metta Spencer

Well, he didn't apologize.

[both chuckle]

Metta Spencer

Okay, well, we have gone around in a circuitous direction to what you really most want to talk about. The general principles of social democracy. I assume you are the quintessential representative of social democratic thinking in Canada. So, what are your principles, sir?

Ed Broadbent

Well, we laid them out in the document that we adopted earlier this year. But if I can put it in broad terms there are two key elements, I believe, of any approach to a social democratic view of society. One is the abominable word decommodification; but it's a word with rather precise meaning. The main meaning is to take out of the market mechanism in our life in our society, the production of certain goods and services and make them a matter of rights, instead of a matter or substance that you buy in the marketplace. That is an absolutely crucial idea. For example, when Tommy Douglas was working so many decades ago in good ol' prairie Saskatchewan on the development of universal Medicare, he didn't say to himself: "Well, is it cheaper or is it more efficient?" Although it's important to have these qualities, he said: "Should human beings have this as a right? Should they have access to health care because they're human beings and citizens of Canada?" And not because they can buy it in the marketplace. And that is so crucial. I mean, if you look at the broad history of Canada, one of the first things to be commodified - and we never think of it in these terms - was high school education. In the 19th century, if you were going to educate your children beyond the elementary school level you would pay to go to some other institution to provide what we call high school level education today. Well, the decision was appropriately made by governments pretty soon to establish - as a universal right for kids growing up - access to high school education and not just elementary school. And that principle has been extended to health care. And we in the NDP, for example, have been leading the battle to extend it to pharmacare in our generation as a national program and we're, of course, first to advocate childcare. Low-cost provision by government of childcare facilities that are now being done, acknowledged by a Liberal government that has been promising to do it, mind you, for about 30 years. But the principle - I come back to that - is that you fight for these things, because they are rights of citizenship and you want to take them out of the market. Not necessarily because they're

cheaper, although they normally are if we provide it as a universal service - as we found out, for example, in the senior citizens' long-term care residences.

Metta Spencer

I want to come back to that. I remember reading a book you wrote some 15 years ago or so. The thing that I came away with, which impressed me most and I still remember, is that you were arguing that whenever you want to provide a new service for - probably the people who need it will be the poor in the society - the smart thing to do is not just to give a means test and offer it to the people who fit within the criteria of poverty or whatever need would entitle them to it, but rather to make it equally available to all citizens. And that is much more sustainable and it causes less divisiveness within the society.

Ed Broadbent

Yes.

Metta Spencer

I remember being very impressed by that argument. And I presume you still maintain that?

Ed Broadbent

Very much so. That's the reason behind those - whatever party they happen to be in and overwhelmingly they're in the NDP - people who advocate universal programs is for that reason. It's to build up solidarity, by all citizens that we all get that benefit. And then if, you know, people say: "Well, why should rich people have it?" Well, rich people have access to elementary schools, just like the rest of the kids in the neighborhood. And then they pay or ought to pay just proportionately more in their income taxes. The higher income you have, the greater should be your contribution to the common good. And that common good would include things like childcare, for example, in the future pharmacare, or the Canada Pension. These are benefits that should be available to all Canadians and paid for on the basis of capacity to pay. And so, that's a key idea, if I may say so, about social democracy. It's to launch into programs like that and to get them out of the market. So, growing up, we don't have to compete in the market for these things in our lives. We get them because they're provided by the state, but we all pay taxes into the state too. So, it's not a free ride, right? And the other the other aspect of social democracy that I think is key, is the notion of equality. Inequality is a big concern, especially in a market economy. By definition in the market economy, you're going to have inequalities and a serious social democratic government addresses these inequalities, primarily by the taxes so that those who have more will pay more of their share. And as is being talked about. Literally today yet another report was published - from the United Nations, I understand - which is showing how so many rich people around the world are managing to create tax havens where they ship their money off and they have it in these havens and don't pay any income tax on it. Well, that's got to change.

Metta Spencer

Absolutely it has to change. But also, I wonder, have you officially personally taken a position about wealth tax? Reading Piketty - 10 years ago or so - I was immediately impressed with the idea that that would be a big step forward to actually tax not only income, but even more to tax wealth, because the inequalities that have already been created are self-maintaining and even growing. Obviously, we know that the rich have gotten richer, even during the COVID epidemic.

Ed Broadbent

Yes, and by accumulation of wealth and not just income. And yes, we at the Broadbent Institute favour a wealth tax and I'm pleased to see that the New Democratic Party in the recent federal election, under Mr. Singh, has promoted the idea of a wealth tax as well. So that too would contribute to a society of greater equality. The other thing that I would stress about more equality being necessary is that the studies have shown that the more equality you have, the overall effect on society is better. Health outcomes, for example, are much better and more equally distributed if you have a reduced gap between people on the basis of income. Crime rates are lower in the more equal society you have. Almost every social indicator shows more positive outcomes the more equal the society is. So, the two key ideas of social democracy, among others, but the two key are: taking certain values out of the market - like health care - and providing them as rights; and secondly, to be concerned about inequality and use the power of government - democratic government and taxation - to reduce inequalities in our society,

Metta Spencer

I read some of the positions on your website under the heading of social democracy and they seem to have to deal with economic issues. One of them being long term care. And I noticed in today's paper, that there's again talk about changing the system. Now I have a friend - Pauline Rosenau - who was on this talk show last week. She was part of a study of long-term care or nursing home care in, I think, five or six different countries. So, it was a major study just not too long ago. And they found the non-profit nursing homes were much better by and large than the profit seeking ones. They actually took better care of people. Canada wasn't really all that much better - well, the US was the worst, as you might expect - but Canada was not at the top. I think Sweden was maybe at the top and some of the other countries that you would expect to be. But now, I believe your Institute and the website have proposed that long term care be part of Medicare, that it's just another right or entitlement which everybody would have. Now, I don't know how far the Canadian government has gone in that direction, I know that there's some kind of care available to everybody who's old and weak, but I don't know what kind of changes would be involved in simply making it an entitlement for everybody.

Ed Broadbent

Well, it would be a substantial bureaucratic change to implement it that way. But the wording is designed to show that it would become a right like Medicare. Like, you know, we now have access to any hospital treatment that we want regardless of your income. Similarly, we're saying there should be access to long term care residences on that basis. Now, that would mean by necessity that you have to create literally 1000s of new spaces across Canada to make that an operational right. But that's exactly what needs to be done. And it can't be done overnight. As you've indicated, studies have shown that not-for-profit, long-term care has better results, better outcomes for patients than as the profit-oriented model. So, we have to go into the direction of non-profit public facilities and that would take time to implement, but every aspect of our healthcare system has taken time to implement. And if we started on that now with an agenda, with so much in the federal expenditure each year, over time we can make that an effective right. And of course, in this domain, it should be a cost sharing arrangement of some kind with the provinces, just as existing health care funding is.

Metta Spencer

Yeah. Also, the paper I read today was talking about just plain, sort-of humanizing the experience of living in a long-term facility. That people now really don't have much choice of what time of day they're to eat or the what the menu is going to be or how to spend their time. They don't have enough help. This recommended that at least four hours a day of direct personal assistance be available to every person living in such a place. As well, as the residents being allowed to plan their own day and schedule, whether they want to move around and, you know, how they're going to spend their time and have a little bit more [freedom] and be treated as a home instead of a patient in a hospital.

Ed Broadbent

That sounds good to me. I may get there one day.

Metta Spencer

Well, you and me too. Any day now.

[both chuckle]

Metta Spencer

I do like that idea. So okay, and now, what do you foresee for the future of the Broadbent Institute? By the way, I see it as focusing very much on just Canada.

Ed Broadbent

That's true.

Metta Spencer

And also, very much on the economic end of things. I didn't see much about foreign policy or certainly about military policy.

Ed Broadbent

That's true, we have limited resources and we are trying to be sure we know what we're talking about. We've quite consciously stayed away from foreign policy, for example, as an institute. Of course, we'll take part as individuals in foreign policy debates and related matters. But as an institute, we've decided not to do that at this point, because of the limitations of resources and funding. We have to generate donations to keep ourselves in existence. And so, we've just drawn the line at certain kinds of activity.

Metta Spencer

When you talk about social democracy, would you say there is a general orientation with respect to international relations or is it just a question of how to allocate economic resources?

Ed Broadbent

No. I would say social democratic philosophy has as its basic, important *raison d'être* the pursuit of peace. A man that I was close to for a number of years was Willy Brandt who had been Chancellor of West Germany. He had a very distinguished reputation: an anti-Nazi career as a young man and then became Chancellor of West Germany. And he was known for his so called *Ostpolitik* which was an opening or trying to open relations between the West and the East, which at that time were divided between the Communist world and the non-Communist world. And he strove quite seriously - I know from talking to him and from observing them- to have built peace-making institutions globally. So, my own view is that social democracy in its essence really does want to work towards a peaceful world and with much less emphasis on spending on militarization. To get away from that as a philosophic goal there's no doubt about that in my view.

Metta Spencer

I think for a lot of peace organizations - I'm thinking, for example, of the International Peace Bureau, which I was engaged with on the Steering Committee a long-time ago and a number of them and Peace Magazine and our own Project Save the World, which is what I'm doing right now - the orientation has been more lately toward a broadening of the concept of what are the issues that have to be considered along with just the military. That is, I think, the connection with global warming, you can't ignore it. The connection to famine, the possibility of pandemics as we've seen. We talk about radioactive contamination and the risks of, you know, mining hazards and things like that or other kinds of exposure to radiation or radioactivity. And cyber risks. All of those are part of what we consider not just peace, but a broader agenda. I think really most of these issues need to be addressed comprehensively with a with a big platform with a lot of items on it.

Ed Broadbent

I would say you're absolutely right. I would agree with all of the above. For sure. I'm afraid I'm going to have to go.

Metta Spencer

Well, it's time anyway. We've used up our time pretty much and I have enjoyed very much the opportunity to talk to you.

Ed Broadbent

I've enjoyed it too. Good luck in your work.

Metta Spencer

Thank you so much. And in yours. Continue with your wonderful leadership.

Ed Broadbent

Thank you. Take care. Bye bye.