

Social Progress: A Universal and Orientational Value for Vietnam in the Era of National Rise

Cao Minh Công ^{1*} , Bùi Thị Thanh Huyền ²

¹ Dean, Faculty of Political Theory, University of Procuracy, VIỆT NAM

² University of Procuracy, VIỆT NAM; Email: thanhbuiyengcd@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author: caominhcong77@gmail.com

Citation: Công, C., M. and Huyền, B. T. T. (2025). Social Progress: A Universal and Orientational Value for Vietnam in the Era of National Rise, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(2), 462-468. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i2.1619>

Published: November 11, 2025

ABSTRACT

Social progress, as a philosophical concept, refers to all processes involving movement from a lower to a higher level, toward greater qualitative perfection. It is a developmental trend characterized by the transition from lower to higher stages, from the less complete to the more complete. Social progress is always situated in relation to social regression. In many cases, the terms social progress and social development are used interchangeably. Social progress is also a fundamental criterion reflecting the quality of national development, which is not confined to economic indicators but also encompasses democracy, freedom, justice, human rights, social welfare, and environmental protection.

Keywords: Social progress; Social development; Dynamic social progress in Vietnam's new era; Social progress and globalization; Value system

INTRODUCTION

The Era of National Rise implies a strong, decisive, determined, and positive movement—marked by effort, self-reliance, internal strength, and confidence—to overcome challenges, transcend limitations, realize aspirations, reach goals, and achieve great accomplishments. More than that, for Vietnam, this new era—the Era of National Rise—is one of development, prosperity, democracy, justice, and the rule of law. Human beings occupy the central position in all progress: citizens enjoy a prosperous and happy life, are supported in their development and enrichment, and increasingly contribute to global peace, stability, development, human happiness, and universal civilization.

Social progress is a philosophical concept that refers to movement and development from a lower to a higher level, from less complete to increasingly complete. It is not merely economic development but also reflects the quality of human life, the degree of social justice, respect for human rights, human dignity, freedom, democracy, as well as environmental protection and sustainability. Social progress is the driving force that arouses national pride, the spirit of autonomy, self-confidence, self-reliance, resilience, patriotism, and the aspiration for national development; it tightly combines national strength with the strength of the times.

Social progress is closely related to development, but it is not identical to development. Development does not necessarily mean progress, for if development increases injustice, destroys the environment, or leads to moral decline, it cannot be called progress. In today's context of international integration, social progress is both a goal and a driving force, as well as a measure of the status and reputation of each nation on the international stage.

Social progress is a fundamental criterion reflecting the quality of national development, not confined to economic indicators but also encompassing justice, human rights, social welfare, and environmental protection. Alongside these, social progress is associated with other universal values such as democracy, freedom, justice, equality, human rights, tolerance, and peace, which are recognized by the international community as the foundation for social progress. In this paper, we focus on analyzing the concept and basic criteria of social progress, thereby proposing some lessons for Vietnam in perceiving and applying the values of social progress in the new era.

THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL PROGRESS AS A PHILOSOPHICAL ISSUE

As with many other issues of life, the development of humankind contains numerous paradoxes; in any given economic era, we can always find its reverse side. In the context of modern society, such paradoxes may encompass many aspects of life, from technology and the economy to human relations: the paradox between economic growth and social justice; between wealth and poverty; happiness and unhappiness; the widening scope of international integration and the preservation of national identity; prosperity and inequality; connectivity and loneliness. The problem is that as socio-economic development advances, phenomena such as ecological imbalance, arms races, great-power hegemony, ethnic conflicts, regional wars, resource exhaustion, and the erosion of humanity emerge with increasing severity and intensity. Cao Minh Cong observes:

“For a long time, people have overemphasized, or exclusively emphasized, economic growth, which has revealed its downsides: environmental destruction, resource depletion, moral degradation, social inequality... These are the causes that negatively affect social development and social progress.” (Cao 2000: 1).

Even today, many people are overly confident, believing that economic and material growth alone constitutes social progress. Meanwhile, Nguyen Phong, in his adapted work *Return from the Land of Snow*, noted:

“Most people assess the level of a nation’s development through material standards and assume that civilization and progress must be built upon powerful military forces or a society with abundant material conveniences... but in fact such a society is already on the path of decline.” (Nguyen 2016: 85).

So, does a more civilized life mean that people are truly happier and more at peace? Science and technology bring material and spiritual benefits, but are human beings genuinely happy?

“Is humankind today progressing or degenerating? Does science truly bring happiness to people? Why is it that the more civilized society becomes, the more suffering individuals feel; the more advanced nations become, the more dissatisfaction people experience?” (Nguyen 2016).

How, then, is social progress manifested? By what qualities is social progress determined? What are its standards? These questions belong to a broader subject—universal human values—requiring nations and peoples to theorize and apply them in formulating national development strategies. For Vietnam today, this is both a demand of practical life—ensuring conformity with global development trends—and a response to the legitimate aspirations of the people for democracy (Do 2005: 37), freedom (Dinh 2004: 28), justice, equality, human rights, tolerance, and peace.

To understand the essence of the concept of progress, it must be examined in relation to development. The concept of development refers to all processes involving movement from a lower to a higher stage. It is not only a characteristic of natural processes but also commonly used in analyzing various fields of social life. “In such cases, development sometimes also means having achieved progress.” (Ho 2012: 65). However, not all development in society constitutes progress. Nor can all sets of development criteria be universally acknowledged as progress. Most prevailing conceptions in Vietnam and in international scholarship agree that progress represents only a stage—the higher stage—of development (Ho 2012: 65).

Thus, the concept of social progress, as both a philosophical and historical category, has been understood and interpreted differently across historical periods. It is discussed only within society, in the system of human relations, requiring interdisciplinary and cross-cultural approaches, free from prejudice or narrow ethnic and religious boundaries, and oriented toward common, universal standards of progressive law, human rights, and citizenship.

To speak of social progress is to speak of the reign of reason, fairness, opportunities for individual human development, democracy, and humanistic values that resist arbitrariness, tyranny, and inhumane actions. Ho Sy Quy emphasized:

“It is undeniable that social progress can be considered a concept within sciences such as sociology, economics, and political science, or even within interdisciplinary sciences. It would be unreasonable to deny that each specialized discipline, and even each research perspective, has the right to propose its own standards of social progress. The real issue, of course, lies in how objective and reasonable those standards are within concrete historical and social conditions.” (Ho 2012: 66).

In recent decades, diverse communities around the world—despite differences in economic, political, cultural, and social conditions—have accepted and applied common sets of standards introduced by international

organizations to assess their level of development. The Human Development Index (HDI), proposed by UNDP, is one of the most common measures. Progress in economy, healthcare, and living standards may not represent the ultimate goals of national development strategies, yet these criteria have universal value. Their recognition indicates that despite differing conditions, nations and peoples still share common benchmarks characteristic of social progress.

The development of human history has witnessed diverse perspectives, but to understand the concept of social progress, it must always be placed in relation to social regression. Ancient history already shows this: Hesiod, often mentioned alongside Homer in Aristotle's and Heraclitus's works, introduced the theory of social movement as moral decline. Greek mythology described five ages: the Golden Age (the most virtuous), followed by the Silver Age, the Bronze Age, the Age of Heroes, and finally the Iron Age. From the Iron Age onward, society increasingly degenerated in terms of moral standards, especially honesty. Most frighteningly, the Iron Age, considered Hesiod's contemporary age, was described as one in which humans became enemies of one another. Thus, Hesiod's notion of social progress was, in reality, a conception of social regression—the dark side of social progress.

At the dawn of human society in ancient Eastern civilizations, one of the most pressing concerns was social community and its progress. Yet not everyone placed hope or trust in social advancement. Confucianism was no exception; it viewed social movement as a regression in morality, reflecting a loss of trust in society. The ideals of the “sage kings” and “ancient saints” were considered moral exemplars, with society's inevitable direction being to emulate these models, return to rectitude, and uphold the cardinal virtues and moral codes.

The notion of social progress truly emerged during the Renaissance. Yet even earlier, thinkers had long reflected on the direction of historical movement, the future of humankind, and the meaning of social life. From the Renaissance onward, social progress was posed as a social issue tied to the bourgeoisie and capitalism, encapsulated in the values of liberty–equality–fraternity. The question was: in which direction would society develop? Would the future be better than the past? The earliest modern theories of social progress, as understood today, appeared during the period of primitive capitalist accumulation and the maturation of the bourgeoisie, which represented and symbolized social progress at the time. Thinkers such as J. Vico, with his theory of the “cycle of history”; C. Helvétius, with his analysis of the complex dynamics of social development in *De l'esprit*; O. Comte, who based on mathematics and his “social physics” (sociology), argued that human intellectual evolution determined the course of social development; and M. Weber, who in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* highlighted the role of tradition, religion, and morality as sources of virtuous human qualities shaping the face of society—particularly capitalist European society.

“What were the origins of the Western economic form called capitalism, and what significance did it have for human cultural life?... As a mechanism for the formation of capitalism, social progress may be seen as the rationalization and intellectualization of society.” (Nguyen 2012: 49).

Marxism's conception of social progress absorbed and critically inherited these earlier ideas. Marx and Engels asserted: “Men make their own history, but they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves; rather under circumstances directly encountered, given, and transmitted from the past... economic conditions are ultimately decisive and form the red thread running through the entire process of development...” (Marx & Engels 1999: 272–273). They further argued that: “The free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.” (Marx & Engels 1999: 628). Accordingly, social progress is the continuous forward movement of human society, where the new arises within and upon the old, yet surpasses it qualitatively; in this lies the essence of human existence.

Social progress is an objective trend full of contradictions, and contradiction itself is the source and internal driving force of progress:

“In our age, everything seems pregnant with its contrary. Machinery, gifted with the wonderful power of shortening labor and rendering it more productive, brings starvation and overwork. The sources of wealth, newly discovered, become sources of want. The victories of science seem purchased by the loss of character. As mankind masters nature, man seems to become enslaved to other men or to his own vileness.” (Marx & Engels 1993: 10).

Contradiction is inherent in development and social progress. The contradiction between economic growth and social justice is a typical example:

“Economic growth and social justice are inseparably related in the process of simultaneously pursuing both objectives. Yet in our country many contradictions arise; properly perceiving and addressing them will create a powerful driving force for sustainable development and social stability.” (Cao 2000: 45).

Thus, society has no other path to development and progress than by moving forward through contradictions. Particularly, social contradictions play a decisive role: “Without antagonism, there is no progress. This is the law that civilization has followed to this day...” (Marx & Engels 1995: 136).

According to Marx and Engels, the history of human society is a lawful process oriented toward progress, one that necessarily passes from one socio-economic formation to another, higher and more advanced:

“In broad outline, the Asiatic, ancient, feudal, and modern bourgeois modes of production may be designated as progressive epochs in the economic formation of society.” (Marx & Engels 1993: 553).

Marx and Engels’ theory of socio-economic formations affirms the objective criterion for distinguishing one stage of human social development from another. It identifies the general features and recurring patterns across nations in the course of human history. This serves as the worldview and methodological basis for examining social progress in specific historical conditions: the progressive character of any social phenomenon can only be reasonably assessed when situated within a particular socio-economic formation. Hence, the objective conditions of history are not limited to contemporary factors but also include economic, cultural, scientific, and technological elements created by earlier generations:

“Men make their own circumstances, but under already existing conditions... Each historical epoch finds existing a certain material result, a sum of productive forces, a relation of individuals to nature and to one another, which has been handed down by the preceding epoch.” (Marx & Engels 1995: 54–55).

Social progress, therefore, must be understood in concrete historical conditions tied to the actual context of each society. Just as “every step forward in organic development is also a step backward, for it strengthens one-sided development while eliminating the possibility of varied development” (Marx & Engels 1994: 819), in social life Marx and Engels warned:

“In general, it is not advisable to understand the concept of progress in the usual abstract sense.” (Marx & Engels 1993: 889); social progress should not be imagined as a simple, linear process. While commonly perceived as unidirectional, history reveals that social progress is nonlinear. Even today, debates continue on what standards should define social progress, particularly in the face of environmental crises, civil wars, poverty, and ethnic conflicts. What, then, should be the standard of progress in such a turbulent world? From this perspective, social progress entails a nonlinear movement that inherently contains regression within itself. Social progress, opposed to social regression, does not necessarily unfold cyclically; ultimately, it accommodates temporary setbacks, yet its overall trajectory remains forward, where the new emerges from the old in a qualitatively superior form. Society, as a complex system with many constituent factors, cannot be judged by a single universal standard of progress. The task of philosophy is to identify such universal criteria within this complexity. The standards of social progress are not purely objective, for they must be realized through the subjective lens of human agency and social laws.

3. Standards of Social Progress

According to the Social Progress Imperative (SPI), contemporary thought holds that social progress consists of three groups of criteria: basic human needs, the foundations of well-being, and opportunities for personal development. The universal values of social progress include: human rights and human dignity (UDHR); social justice and gender equality (Nguyen 2000: 15); sustainable development (SDGs); and transparency and effective governance. Accompanying this system of criteria are a series of indicators to measure social progress (Tran et al. 2021: 2): the Social Progress Index (SPI), the Human Development Index (HDI), and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG Indicators). Yet even these remain incomplete and somewhat one-sided. The Social Progress Index was introduced in a context where social and environmental issues have become increasingly important and pressing. To address shortcomings, the research group led by Tran Quang Tuyen proposed an important index to meet most requirements and contribute to solving the problem of measuring progress based on national development goals:

“The SPI was developed and implemented in less than a decade, yet it has already attracted notable attention from countries around the world. Some main contributions of this study include: (i) introducing and clarifying the most important aspects of the SPI; (ii) positioning the SPI globally; (iii) assessing the suitability of the SPI in the context of Vietnam; and (iv) examining its impact on key aspects of human-centered development.” (Tran et al. 2021: 3–4).

In the historical development of human society, a number of universal standards of social progress can also be identified, including:

+ Ethical standards: These were particularly emphasized in the ancient East and West, and in the early modern era. Moral standards are two-sided: subjective, class-based, national, or cultural in character. Yet, when rational within a given context, they are indispensable. A society without ethical standards as its pillars faces severe consequences. Thus, ethics form an essential standard of social progress.

+ Rational standards: Highly valued by Enlightenment philosophers in France and Germany, rationality was regarded as supreme, linking social progress to social development. The emphasis was on knowledge, science, and rational (theoretical) thinking as the basis for orienting development. Friedrich Engels wrote: “A nation which ceases to develop theoretical thought is doomed to decay at once and to lose all significance in the world’s history.” (Marx & Engels 1994: 489).

+ Legal standards: Society must adhere to legal norms, which exist for human progress and include ensuring human rights, rule of law, fairness, transparency, and effective governance. A rule-of-law state places people at the

center, aims at the comprehensive development of every individual and society as a whole, and protects the legitimate rights and interests of citizens.

+ Standards of freedom/tolerance: Individual freedoms—freedom of speech, thought, and action—must be tied to responsibility and community interests; they include respect for difference, alongside gratitude, loyalty, and national dignity.

For Hegel, freedom is the freedom of spirit; the development of spirit lies in the awareness of freedom. Social progress, measured by freedom, includes individual rights, freedom of expression, freedom of thought, and freedom of action, always accompanied by responsibility, respect for the law, and the prohibition against harming the interests of others and the community.

Such standards are often recognized as universal standards of social progress. At the philosophical level, Marxism sought to identify the standard of social progress in the relationship between social consciousness and social being—specifically, in the succession of one socio-economic formation by another, more advanced one. This is the supreme standard of social progress: the replacement of one socio-economic formation by a higher stage, as a necessary historical trend, aimed at humanity's development and happiness.

Research into social progress as a universal human value—whether approached philosophically or interdisciplinarily—does not stop at the question “What is social progress?” but goes further, asking “What are its standards?” Ho Sy Quy stresses:

“We cannot evade the issue of what measures must be taken to assess whether a society can be considered progressive; in other words, the problem of the standards of social progress.” (Ho 2012: 84).

Since social progress is always a matter of values, any standards inevitably contain subjective elements. These are closely tied to the perspectives, policies, and strategies of states and social organizations in evaluating social phenomena and processes. Each community, association, political party, or nation may define its own standards, criteria, and measurement tools to pursue progress.

Social progress is both relative and historical; therefore, social phenomena that are considered progressive, no matter by which standards, are never entirely absolute: what is regarded as progress at this moment, in this place, may at another moment, in another place, be considered not progressive. What plays the role of absolute progress in one aspect may, in another aspect, not be progress. It is impossible and impermissible to have, or to absolutize, the standards and criteria of social progress for every circumstance and for all different subjects. The standards of social progress are always historical and concrete, attached to each specific level of socio-historical development of a given society and a given social phenomenon.

This relativity, however, does not imply that social progress lacks objectivity. On the contrary, objectivity arises from the very object of evaluation. Thus, universal standards of social progress, in philosophical terms, are always qualitative benchmarks for assessing social processes. Concrete quantitative indicators serve as references for determining these universal standards, though they cannot by themselves be decisive.

Marx and Engels affirmed that the essence of progress lies in the succession of socio-economic formations. They assessed human development above all in material production—the fundamental activity of human society—as the basis for judging progress. In essence, they revealed humanity's social character through modes of production:

“What distinguishes different economic epochs is not what is produced but how it is produced, with what means of labor... As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are coincides with their production, both with what they produce and how they produce. What individuals are depends on the material conditions of their production.” (Marx & Engels 1995: 30).

The way people produce determines the level of their development. Human beings have as their intrinsic purpose the rich unfolding of their own essence. The highest standard of social progress is thus: “The free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.” (Marx & Engels 1995: 628). With this, the free development of human beings stands as the most universal measure of social progress and its supreme criterion.

ORIENTATION FOR VIETNAM IN UNDERSTANDING AND APPLYING THE VALUES OF SOCIAL PROGRESS

Growth, development, and sustainable development—no matter how broadly they are defined—are not the ultimate goal of social progress. Social progress belongs to the “national value system” (Nguyen 2012: 65) and serves as an analytical tool and theoretical foundation for the State of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in formulating social development policies. At the same time, the true purpose of social progress must be human development, as Marx and Engels conceived it: the free development of each individual within the free development of all. This is the measure of the level of social progress and the supreme standard of social progress. Accordingly, in the context of the Era of National Rise, Vietnam must:

+ Perfect social policies: Aim toward inclusive and equitable development, with priority given to disadvantaged groups. Particular attention must be paid to ensuring that citizens' rights are codified into law, respected, protected, and practically effective. Guarantee coherence between general law and special provisions. The institutionalization of specific rights must be based on the concrete socio-economic conditions of the country and must be appropriate to each stage of development.

Continue to implement synchronously, comprehensively, and effectively programs and policies on infrastructure, socio-economic development, poverty reduction, improvement of social services, and preservation of cultural values in ethnic minority regions, so as to secure economic rights for all people, realize social justice, and gradually reduce the wealth gap between regions and ethnic groups. Special policies are required to bring about comprehensive transformation in the political, economic, and cultural life of the people, with greater attention paid to the spiritual foundations of social life, and to implement policies serving sustainable development.

+ Strengthen education, healthcare, and culture: Regard these as the foundations of social progress. This requires that human development be truly holistic: Education must nurture intellect, knowledge, and skills, enabling individuals to master their lives, to innovate, and to contribute to socio-economic development. A sound education not only transmits book knowledge but also cultivates critical thinking, soft skills, and the practice of civic responsibility and ethics. Healthcare must protect both physical and mental well-being, ensuring that citizens possess the strength and clarity of mind to study, work, and contribute. Health is the most precious asset, the prerequisite for realizing human potential. Culture must foster personality, ethics, and a healthy lifestyle, creating a civilized, united, and compassionate society. Culture is the spiritual foundation of society and the driving force that inspires people to live with ideals, responsibility, and an orientation toward noble values.

+ Protect the ecological environment and respond to climate change: Closely link this with the human development strategy, taking human beings as the measure of social progress. Raise public awareness and strengthen the responsibility of functional agencies in environmental protection, encourage green lifestyles, sustainable consumption, plastic waste reduction, and waste sorting at the source. Improve policies and laws on environmental protection, especially in resource exploitation, and in the treatment of industrial and domestic waste, establishing a coherent, effective, and efficient legal framework for environmental protection, while strictly sanctioning polluting behaviors. On the one hand, accelerate the green transition and the circular economy, shifting the growth model from linear economy (production–consumption–disposal) to circular economy. This helps maximize resource use, minimize pollution, and foster environmentally friendly industries as an objective necessity in Vietnam today. On the other hand, invest in infrastructure and technology, with priority given to green infrastructure such as environmentally friendly public transport and energy-efficient buildings; invest in science and technology to find more creative and effective solutions for pollution control and climate change response. Facilitate the participation of social organizations, businesses, and communities in environmental protection. Cooperation among the state, enterprises, and the people is the key to achieving sustainable progress.

+ Promote digital transformation, innovation, and the development of AI for public good—of the people, by the people, and for the people. This requires building national digital infrastructure and data, investing in technology platforms, 5G and 6G networks, cloud computing, and large, secure, and accessible data centers, thereby improving public governance capacity and transparency in the service of people. AI for public benefit should help solve social issues such as earlier disease diagnosis (AI in healthcare), optimization of public transport, disaster forecasting, and personalized learning for students. It is essential to establish standards and ethical codes for AI, ensuring that algorithms are unbiased, that privacy is not violated, and that AI systems remain explainable. Particular attention must be paid to enhancing digital capacity for citizens, creating a suitable legal and policy environment, prioritizing legal frameworks for data management, privacy, and cybersecurity to protect users while fostering innovation. Human beings must be the central focus—from improving citizens' digital capacity to building a trustworthy legal environment. This aligns with the objectives set forth by the Communist Party of Vietnam:

“By 2030, on the centenary of the Party's founding: Vietnam will be a developing country with modern industry and upper-middle income. By 2045, on the centenary of the founding of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, now the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Vietnam will have become a developed, high-income country.” (CPV 2021: 337).

Realizing these objectives is, in essence, the embodiment of social progress in Vietnam during the Era of National Rise: a breakthrough in development, the building of a prosperous, democratic, just, civilized, and happy society; catching up with, advancing alongside, and standing shoulder to shoulder with the world's great powers; and ensuring that all citizens develop comprehensively and enjoy a prosperous, free, happy, and civilized life.

CONCLUSION

Social progress, as a philosophical concept, refers to all processes involving movement from a lower to a higher level, toward greater qualitative perfection, characterized by the transition from lower to higher stages, from the less complete to the more complete. Social progress has a universal standard; it is both the goal and the driving force of social development. Vietnam has many opportunities for breakthrough if it can creatively apply these universal values. A harmonious combination of economic growth with improvements in quality of life, environmental protection, promotion of fairness, and transparency will provide a solid foundation for Vietnam to become a sustainably developed nation, deeply integrated while preserving its national identity. The true destination of social progress is human development—the free development of each individual within the free development of all. This is the measure of the level of social progress and the supreme standard of social progress.

REFERENCES

- Cao, M. C. (2000). Perceptions of the contradiction between economic growth and social justice in Vietnam today. Undergraduate thesis, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Social Sciences and Humanities – VNU Hanoi.
- Do, S. (Ed.) (2005). Democracy and development. *Journal of Social Sciences Information*, 11(274), 37–44.
- Dinh, N. T. (2004). On freedom as a category of social philosophy. *Journal of Philosophy*, 2(153), 28–35.
- Ho, S. Q. (2012). Social progress: Some issues of development models in East Asia and Southeast Asia. Hanoi: Knowledge Publishing House.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1993). *Collected Works* (Vol. 12). Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1994). *Collected Works* (Vol. 20). Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1995). *Collected Works* (Vol. 4). Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1999). *Collected Works* (Vol. 39). Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
- Nguyen, Ph. (2016). *Return from the land of snow* (adapted). Ho Chi Minh City: Ho Chi Minh City Publishing House.
- Nguyen, T. K. (2000). Critique of feminist theory. *Journal of Social Sciences Information*, 9(213), 15–21.
- Nguyen, H. H. (2012). The relationship between culture and social progress in the philosophy of F. Bacon. *Journal of Philosophy*, 9(136), 49–55.
- Nguyen, H. H. (2012). The “value system” as an analytical tool – theoretical foundation of the Swedish Democratic Party. *Journal of Philosophy*, 1(248), 65–73.
- Nguyen, Ph. (2016). *Return from the land of snow*. Ho Chi Minh City: Ho Chi Minh City Publishing House.
- Tran, Q. T., et al. (2021). The Social Progress Index and the goals of developing a socialist-oriented market economy in Vietnam. *Journal of Economics and Development*, 284 (February), 2–10.
- Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV). (2021). Documents of the 13th National Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam (Vol. 2). Hanoi: National Political Publishing House “Truth.”