

FAITH IN POLITICS
RESTORING RECIPROCITY TO THE POLITY AND THE ECONOMY

ADRIAN PABST¹

Introduction: The crisis of liberalism

Not so long ago, the triumph of capitalism and democracy seemed so complete that it raised once more Hegel's spectre of the 'end of history' – the convergence towards a final form of human government that embodies the supposed universality of liberalism.² In the US this was perhaps best represented by the Reagan and Clinton administrations. In the UK the settlement inaugurated by Mrs Thatcher and extended by both New Labour and the Conservative-LibDem coalition seems to be its clearest expression.

But then the 2008 global financial crash and ongoing social unrest across Europe revealed the limitations of the two liberalisms that have dominated Western politics for the past half-century: the social-cultural liberalism of the left since the 1960s and the economic-political liberalism of the right since the 1980s. Both may have provided greater personal freedoms and individual opportunities, which are worth preserving. But both forms of liberalism can now also be seen as arrogant, atomistic and authoritarian all at once. For together they have served the purposes of the centralised bureaucratic state and the globalised free-market which have collusively brought about an unprecedented augmentation of power and concentration of wealth. In consequence, a new, rootless oligarchy now seeks to practise a manipulative populism while holding in contempt the genuine priorities of most people.³ In response we are seeing a wider populist backlash that is threatening to bring extremist parties to power – Front National in France, the Five-Star Movement in Italy, Syriza in Greece, the True Finns, etc.

At the heart of the liberal crisis is an economic system that is both economically unsustainable and ethically indefensible. Pope Francis put this best when he wrote in last year's Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Gadium* that

[h]uman beings are themselves considered consumer goods to be used and then discarded. We have created a "throw away" culture which is now spreading. It is no longer simply about exploitation and oppression, but something new. Exclusion ultimately has to do with what it means to be a part of the society in which we live; those excluded are no longer society's underside or its fringes or its disenfranchised – they are no longer even a part of it. The excluded are not the "exploited" but the outcast, the "leftovers".⁴

The dominant system does not even pretend to aim for higher purposes. It combines the nakedly honest pursuit of power and prosperity for the few with a legal license for semi-criminal and even outrightly criminal behaviour. Examples abound: first, selling subprime mortgages to vulnerable customers; secondly, rigging inter-bank lending rates; thirdly, charging usurious interest rates on payday loans and credit cards, etc.⁵ If 'greed is good', then we already face a 'dictatorship of relativism' (Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI) that simply dismisses solidarity and fraternity as an oppressive restriction on personal desire and subjective choice.

The post-liberalism I wish to outline here this evening breaks with the liberalism that has been dominant for the past fifty years or so. What is post-liberalism? In the sense in which I shall use it, post-liberalism seeks to fuse greater economic justice with social reciprocity by promoting both individual virtue and public honour. It rejects the double liberal impersonalism of commercial contract between strangers, and individual entitlement in relation to the bureaucratic machine. Instead of the mixture of contract without gift, plus the unilateral and poisoned gift from nowhere that is state welfare at its worst, it proposes gift-exchange or social reciprocity as the ultimate principle to govern *both* the economic and the political realms.⁶ This would transform politics and the economy away from abstract standards and values associated with the prevailing technocratic managerialism towards the dignity of the person and human flourishing within a common polity based on a shared *ethos* of work, saving, caring and honesty.

1. The Crisis of Liberalism

The last century in US and European politics might well be read in terms of the ever-increasing triumph of liberalism. After World War One, the 1920s inaugurated elite influence of an avant-

garde that for both good and ill eventually spread its libertarian revolt to mass culture, thereby often debasing its critical edge during the 1960s.⁷ Amid economic stagnation and a post-colonial hangover, the ‘embedded liberalism’ of the post-war consensus gave way to the ultra-liberalism of Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan that has defined politics and the economy since the 1980s.

Over the past fifty years, the left has advanced a social-cultural liberalism that promotes individual rights and equality of opportunity for self-expression, while the right has advocated an economic-political liberalism that champions the free market liberated from the constricting shackles of the bureaucratic state. Indeed, we have a ‘liberal right’ celebrating economic and political negative liberty, and a ‘liberal left’ celebrating cultural and sexual negative liberty.

In reality, of course, the two liberalisms have triumphed both at once and in secretly collusive harmony. Starting with Bill Clinton’s politics of the ‘new center’, both liberalisms converged – and with them the mainstream left and right. The result was a new meta-ideology masquerading as some kind of pragmatic centrism that merely masks its ideological commitment to limitless liberalisation and mindless modernisation. The notion of emancipation has thereby become debased to mean not simply liberation from unjust oppression, from the prejudiced social exclusion of certain groups and from arbitrary inequalities, but from almost all and every restriction on individual choice.

As the unleashing of choice always involves new restrictions of the choices of some by the choices of others, it quickly and contradictorily leads to new and often draconian restrictions on citizens’ freedoms. Thus ultra-liberalism results in a hysterical oscillation between release and control. This is because mere negative liberty lacks positive criteria for discriminating between what should be allowed and encouraged and what should not.

Tony Blair's 'third way' and David Cameron's 'compassionate conservatism' have extended this complicit consensus of the liberal left and the liberal right that has determined the centre ground of British politics since the 1990s. There are many parallels elsewhere – Gerhard Schröder and now Angela Merkel in Germany, Jospin, Sarkozy and now Hollande in France, Prodi, Berlusconi and now Renzi in Italy, etc.

As a number of post-liberal thinkers have argued, both the liberal right and the liberal left privileged blind progress (understood as growth in technology, wealth and private autonomy) over tradition and a sense of mutual obligation.⁸ The twin triumph of the two liberalisms has reinforced the continual convergence of the strong state and the free market. By celebrating individual choice and dismissing reciprocal responsibility, the liberal 'market-state' disembods the economy from society and at the same time re-embeds social relations in a transactional, economistic and utilitarian culture – as Karl Polanyi was first to argue in his seminal book *The Great Transformation* – published in 1944, the same year as Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom*.⁹

From this perspective, the post-war welfare state settlement and the neo-liberal market settlement represent two sides of the same coin, with the former already and fatally shifting the emphasis towards nationalisation while the latter accentuated privatisation. Both did so in the name of a more impersonal system of formal rights and contracts that subordinated interpersonal relationships to uniform transactions.¹⁰ In this manner, liberal law has the status of absolute authority that was always covertly an artefact of state and market power at the service of both bureaucratic control and commercial commodification. By venerating an increasingly positivistic, amoral and supposedly neutral law, liberalism has reduced politics to little more than managerial and technocratic bureaucracy – a neoliberal variant of the Communist nightmare that sought to replace 'the government of people' with 'the administration of things'.

In different ways, both settlements enshrined a liberal vision whereby society is governed by fusing the visible hand of the state with the invisible hand of the market at the expense of intermediary institutions and popular participation. To this end, liberalism has championed individual rights and commercial contracts that have not just taken precedence over social and cultural ties; they have undermined the civic bonds and interpersonal relationships that embody the trust and cooperation on which a vibrant democracy and a productive market economy depend.

Crucially, both settlements further fragmented mutual organisation and undermined the pursuit of reciprocal benefit based on contribution and reward. Together they produce our present reality, which is continually controlled by impossibly distant external forces rather than created through our own efforts – the efforts of labour, whether individual or through communities, groups and associations.¹¹

The failure of the post-war and the neo-liberal settlements is now plain for everyone to see: neither remote bureaucratic control nor commercial competition has worked for the mutual benefit of all; while when combined they have delivered disaster, producing a relentless centralisation of power and concentration of wealth that have combined to engender a new oligarchy. Nor is there any pragmatic justification for this new oligarchy. On the contrary, it has presided over economic breakdown that was later thinly disguised by a financial surge, which has blinded us to the need to regenerate manufacturing and better deploy our remarkable continued inventiveness.

In the wake of this manifest failure of the liberal consensus adhered to on all sides, it is clear that we should search for an alternative politics and a different social ethos. This would be not just about linking rights to responsibilities but also about solidarity (mutual assistance based on

personal need) and subsidiarity (decision-making at the most appropriate level that upholds the dignity of the person and promotes human well-being). In these ways, the real alternative to liberalism involves both greater economic egalitarianism and an updated social conservatism, supportive of loyalty and belonging to the family, community and locality without wanting to decree the precise nature of these social bonds in tight traditional terms.

Such paradoxical combinations are characteristic of the new ‘post-liberal’ politics – for which Red Tory and Blue Labour were crucial catalysts.¹² The post-liberalism, which I will develop in more detail in the third and fourth parts of my talk, seeks to fuse greater economic justice with social reciprocity by promoting both individual virtue and public honour; both the seeking of intrinsically worthwhile ends and the manifest appearance of doing so – exactly as justice must both be done and be seen to be done.

2. Liberal pessimism

But to understand more deeply what this new politics involves, it is necessary to attend closely to the intended sense of both ‘post’ and ‘liberal’. ‘Post-’ is different from ‘pre-’ and implies not that liberalism is all bad, but that it has inherent limits and problems. ‘Liberal’ may immediately suggest to many an easy-going and optimistic outlook. Yet to the contrary, at the core of a searching critique of liberalism lies the accusation that it is a far too gloomy political philosophy. For liberalism assumes that we are basically self-interested, fearful, greedy and egotistic creatures, unable to see beyond our own selfish needs and instincts. This is the founding assumption of the individualistic liberal creed, derived from Grotius, Hobbes and Locke in the seventeenth century.¹³

Such a position sounds, as it is, secular and materialistic. However, another important root of modern liberalism, traceable for example in Adam Smith, derives from Calvinistic and

Jansenistic theologies.¹⁴ For this theological outlook original sin is so extreme that human beings must be considered to be ‘totally depraved’ and incapable by nature of acting out of virtue to produce economic, social or political order. Instead, in a kind of proxy operation, divine providence must manipulate our egotistic wills and even our vices behind our backs, in such a way as to make will balance will and vice balance vice to produce a kind of economic and political harmony, even though this had never been originally intended by self-obsessed individuals.¹⁵ Here is the ideological root of Smith’s ‘hidden hand’.

In this way we can see how liberalism has been doubly promoted by both hedonists and puritans. Today the British Conservative Party, which has long since abandoned Toryism for liberalism, remains something of an uneasy alliance between these two different character traits, even if the puritans are fast losing ground.

However, neither label would exactly seem to apply to the *Guardian*-reader type granola-eating liberal, whom we more usually take today to define liberalism as such. Why does the fit appear so poor? The answer is that there is another, ‘romantic’ variant of liberalism that was invented in the late eighteenth century by Jean-Jacques Rousseau. He inverted Thomas Hobbes by arguing that the isolated, natural individual is ‘good’, lost in contemplative delight at the world around him, satisfied with simple pleasures and provisions. She is not yet egotistic, because that vice arises from rivalry and comparison. However, Rousseau took the latter to be endemic once the individual is placed in a social context. Accordingly he transferred pessimism about the individual into a new pessimism about human association. This encouraged scepticism about the role of corporate bodies beneath the level of the state: for it is only the state that can lead us to sacrifice all our petty rivalries for the sake of the common purpose or general will which will return to us, at a higher level, our natural isolated innocence.¹⁶

The problem with this vision is that the state will not really stand above the interests of faction and sectional intrigue. And meanwhile the concentration of all power in the centre will just as effectively undermine the immediate bonds of trust between people as does the operation of impersonal market forces. Recent British governments have apparently exulted in this erosion of trust because it tends to increase their power to control individuals both directly and *en masse*. Accordingly they have increased the power of the market, decreased the power of local government and voluntary associations, and permitted immigration without integration in such a way as tends to make the inhabitants of these islands more and more strangers to each other.

The invocation of Rousseau allows us more easily to locate the *Guardian* reader. While the *Financial Times* sort of 'right wing' liberal takes a basically gloomy view of the individual, the *Guardian* reader takes a basically gloomy view of society. This verdict of course seems to have things back to front. Isn't the political right suspicious of anything public and the political left unwilling to trust individual liberty very far?

But at the deepest level the contrast is the other way round: right-wing liberalism is so cynical about individual motivation that it entrusts social order to the public mechanism of the market and to an inflexible legal protection of property by the state. The liberal left, on the other hand, so distrusts shared tradition and consensus that it endlessly seeks to release chaotically-various individual desire from any sort of generally-shared requirements, which it always tends to view as arbitrary.

This is most of all shown by the 'new left', which ever since the 1960s has pursued a politics not of solidarity but of emancipation. Such a politics endlessly seeks to show that an overlooked 'exception' – of gender, sexuality, race, disability, religion or culture – does not and cannot conform to a shared norm and therefore that its specificity (regarded at once and incoherently as

arising both from given nature and pure preference) must be released. Equally, this politics misreads the necessity of hierarchically-organised care that is intrinsic to our temporality and variety of formation and talents, as unacceptable patriarchal domination. But by doing so it cannot promote an extreme libertarianism (crossed with and confused by multiculturalism) without at the same time reinforcing and assisting the cause of right-wing liberalism which it claims to oppose.¹⁷

In this instance, as in others, right and left liberals converge far more than they imagine. For in either case what is basically celebrated is random individual desire. And in either case human association or relationship is distrusted, since it is held that it is bound to be perversely motivated. The right holds that the remedy for warped relationships is the hidden hand of the marketplace; the left the manifest hand of the state. But in either case 'society' is bypassed and human beings are mediated indirectly, by a third pole standing over against them – the neo-liberal 'market-state'.¹⁸

3. Post-liberalism

The first point to make about post-liberalism is that it rejects the abstract, spatialised logic of left vs. right that the French Revolution has bequeathed to us. This is not to say that left and right are devoid of all meaning. Rather it is to suggest that we need to rethink politics in ways that allows for the paradoxical blend of older and arguably nobler traditions: a combination of honourable, virtuous elites with greater popular participation; a greater sense of cultural duty and hierarchy of value and honour, alongside much more real equality and genuine creative freedom in the economic and political realms.

If the shared ideological ground is to be redefined, there remains a clear need for a broad popular movement in shaping a politics of the common good – a movement that overcomes the binaries

that divide various countries and arguably the West as a whole: north *versus* south, east *versus* west, urban *versus* rural, native *versus* immigrant, religious *versus* secular.

This movement must situate itself beyond the usual liberal terms of reference of ‘the left’ and the ‘right, while at the same time working from within existing traditions. To put it simply, the future of political parties lies in reclaiming their own best inheritance. Our tradition is our future.

Realistically, by virtue of habit of mind and practice it is more likely in some countries that the left can add virtuous leadership to equality than that the right can add equality to virtuous leadership. The current right is so liberalised that it has altogether forgotten its older commitment to hierarchic honour and responsibility. But in other countries the reverse holds, and it is the left that is so much in the hands of an unadulterated liberalism that the right is best positioned to renew politics in the direction of virtue.

In more ideal terms, a long-term Christian legacy must encourage us in the view that virtue and honour can themselves be democratised – that all can come to share in human excellence, in many diverse ways and in ever-heightened degrees. Depending on the country, it is either the left or the right that has tended to take seriously the implications of this cultural inheritance.

In default of such left-inclined post-liberal movement, it is all too likely that quasi-fascist tendencies such as that represented by UKIP (and having parallels all the way across Europe) will increase their appeal and even eventually seize power, as they already have done in Hungary and elsewhere. For one might describe such movements as the crude, parodied versions of post-liberalism that nonetheless answer to some of the same exigencies: first, a popular revulsion against the success culture that operates at the expense of most people; second, against a narrow

and amoral definition of this same success; third, against cosmopolitan contempt for embedded identity and the need for security and belonging.

However, if neo-fascism is travestied post-liberalism, it does not at all follow that the latter is soft fascism. For to the contrary, neo-fascism tends merely to exaggerate in seemingly populist terms the very tendencies that it inchoately discerns and purportedly resists. Thus it characteristically combines the deregulated neo-liberal approach of Mayfair hedge-fund managers to business and taxation with elements of central state *dirigisme* and welfarism. Far from resisting the modern cult of the sovereign state, the amoralism of modern public life and corporate rootlessness, it rather seeks dishonestly to enlist popular support behind these things, in the name of an ethnocentric atavism. Such gross populism becomes the unwitting vehicle for the further growth of the nihilistic power of a dishonourable few: in Britain that means those City financiers who hope to escape European restriction of their global piracies.

Nothing could be more opposite to the post-liberal proposition of an ‘ethics of virtue’. The latter seeks to promote real individual and collective flourishing in an objectively valid sense, observant of natural equity, though always mediated, as it must be, by local inheritances and specificities.

Nor could nationalism and ethnocentrism stand in a greater contrast to the post-liberal drive to deconstruct monistic sovereignty and to share ‘ruling’ in every sense both within and across national frontiers. By comparison, not only is neo-fascism chauvinistic and amoral. It is also nostalgic in a bad sense, since it seeks only a retrieved and exaggerated version of recent modernity.

This can be seen as akin to the hopeless nostalgia of either the old left or the old right – the left-wing longing for merely statist and defensive, ‘protesting’ solutions, albeit with a much greater ability to achieve popular resonance. Or alternatively the right-wing desire for more market and more individual opportunities, albeit with a greater reach that benefits the poor too.

Post-liberalism much more genuinely breaks with such nostalgia because it is prepared to face up to the fact that both the left and the right have disastrously declined. Not just because they have not fought hard enough, but because elements of its analysis and story are simply not convincing.

The contemporary left cannot really account for the fact that two centuries of revolution and democracy have in the end scarcely dented the enormous inequality inherited from the deep past and bent in a new direction by capitalism, as the French economist Thomas Piketty has shown.¹⁹ For its part, the contemporary right forgets that the extension of global capitalism without local and vocational institutions has concentrated wealth and power in the hands of self-serving elite while at the same time relying on state welfare to compensate for market failure. A real accounting must much more directly link this failure to the dominance of liberalism, which is the very face of modernity as such, and has been the main concern of both right-wing reform and left-wing revolution for a very long time.

So if we are to be able to inspire a new movement that can resist the blandishments of right- and left-wing populism, we need a new narrative of the double failure of both the capitalist version of market economy and of monopolistic bureaucracy as in reality the single failure of pure liberalism.

In the final part of my talk, I hope to offer a vision based upon such a narrative that can help to initiate and inspire a new, broad, popular post-liberal movement, whatever form this might take. This vision is informed above all by Catholic social teaching, but also by the deepest legacy of the cooperative and the trade union movement as well as new forms of association such as London Citizens that overcome the old divide between the secular and the religious.²⁰

Faced with our current ideological and practical impotence, this vision does not hesitate if necessary to fuse the best insights of left-wing thinking with those of right-wing traditions – even Marx’s critique of capitalism on the one hand, and Edmund Burke’s rebuttal of the French Revolution on the other and. What binds all these elements together is the commitment to resist the dominance of abstractly utopian ideology and amoral sectional interests in public life.

Given the relative long-term failures of both the post-war welfare state and the neo-liberal market settlements, I argue for a new settlement that is centred on mutualisation – a reciprocalist model wherein both risk and benefit are always shared, and wherein reward is reconnected to real social contribution and shouldered responsibility. The body of thinking that underpins this is the tradition of civil economy, which was pioneered by Antonio Genovesi²¹ and which has been recently revived by Luigino Bruni and Stefano Zamagni.²² Central to this is the promotion of virtue and vocation across all sectors of the economy, the polity and society.

4. Politics of Virtue

Of these two dimensions, virtue is primary. First, virtue is democratic because its practice of is open to all, especially the supreme virtues of love, trust, hope, mercy, kindness, forgiveness and reconciliation which we have all in the West, whether avowedly Christians or not, inherited from the teachings of the gospels. But second it is also benignly non-democratic because the practice of virtue requires guidance through time by the already virtuous, skilled, generous and wise at

every level of society. Faced with largely self-serving elites that are corrupt and nihilistic, the West desperately needs honourable and much more widely distributed leaders who can lead by example in all walks of life. In so doing, they would reflect both the country's best traditions and the 'common decency' of the vast majority of people. Such a vision presents a particular challenge to mainstream parties across Europe and the US.

Simultaneously, we must try to craft a culture in which popular resistance to exploitation and oppression is always already connected with the virtuous competition for status and wealth. If the latter is unrelated to the achievement of social purpose, then it becomes a matter of shame and disgrace. In this way, although one is calling for greater generosity of spirit, one is not denying the prevalence of self-interest. It is just that this need not be crudely material and emptily spectacular in the way that is as much positively assumed by the neo-liberal right as it is negatively assumed by the old left.

So the key task is to integrate the negative need for protest with a positive shaping of the right exercise of power. And as part of the positive task mass organisation and a new ethos of social honour each need to be mediated by reshaped law-codes. Laws should encourage true market fairness, local participation and co-operation in excess of the interests of centralised nation-states, which are but liberal egos writ large. The word 'commonwealth' stands for all of this. In this way, reshaped legality is added to reshaped ethos and necessary resistance as a third component of a more viable post-liberal politics.

Thus only a new politics of participation, virtue and commonwealth can serve the country in times of crisis. The somewhat shared values of old conservatives and the original co-operative labour movements were honour, loyalty, courage, work, saving, caring, honesty, forbearance and social solidarity. These are the values we need now in order to rebuild trust and renew a sense of

virtue and vocation in the economy and in politics. The future of the West lies in reclaiming its noblest ideas and its most distinct inheritance, not in jettisoning particular traditions in the name of universal abstract progress. The post-liberal politics of virtue that I propose is an attempt to do just that.

In this way the politics of virtue does not involve inventing a model that is either foreign to individual countries or harks back to a past that is inexorably vanished. It is rather about restoring, replenishing and re-thinking long-standing traditions that have been sidelined and eroded and yet have never completely disappeared. The task is to weld languishing good traditions with a contemporary approach to ideas, institutions and policies. Thus far from being reactionary or nostalgic, the post-liberalism I argue for seeks to fuse the fight for greater economic and social justice with a renewed emphasis on those social relations and reciprocal arrangements that give people a sense that life is worth living and can provide them with fulfilment. It is about aligning the quest for wealth, personal fulfilment and influence with the pursuit of mutual benefit and moral goodness.

To be completely clear, this project is *not* about simply going back on the release of personal and economic freedom since the 1960s and the 1980s. There should never be any return to civil or social discrimination against minorities, and in general no return to nationalised control over the commanding heights of the economy. But ever-greater individual rights and economic contract alone cannot deliver security, prosperity and human flourishing for the many. That is why there is a need to invent or discover new, more participatory modes of self-restraint and responsibility, and of economic justice and shared wellbeing.

Conclusion

Their paradoxical labels are characteristic of the new post-liberal politics, which seeks to combine greater economic justice with a certain social conservatism. The former promotes more

popular participation and democracy in the economic realm, while the latter respects tradition and hierarchies of honour together with locality and interpersonal relationships that combine freedom with responsibility. Faced with the crisis of liberal ideology and institutions, post-liberalism is slowly moving to the fore and could potentially redefine the shared ideological ground of British politics, much as the post-war welfare settlement and the neo-liberal settlement have done in the past.

Over-ambitious? Perhaps, but worth trying, because our only other option is to try to compete in a global race to the bottom which we cannot win. This risks destroying our western values for the sake of an economic competition that we are likely to lose anyway. At the very least, it would be better to decline nobly and not ignominiously. Yet all my arguments suggest that in the long run nobility is more realistic than mere 'realism'. That is because nobility is about the sustaining of high quality and honourable ethos, which is much truer to the aspirational character of humanity than the debased materialism of realist ideology. Curiously, the return to the public good is the least unlikely of all the admittedly unlikely alternatives to our current dire plight.

¹ Dr Adrian Pabst, Senior Lecturer in Politics, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK; Email: A.Pabst@kent.ac.uk

² Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1992).

³ Ferdinand Mount, *The New Few; Or a Very British Oligarchy* (London: Simon & Schuster, 2012).

⁴ Pope Francis, *Evangelii Gaudium*, chap. 2.

⁵ Antonio Maria Costa, *The Checkmate Pendulum: From Fiction to Reality* (Amazon Book, 2014), available online at http://www.amazon.co.uk/Checkmate-Pendulum-Fiction-Reality-ebook/dp/B00OB8AM7I/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1415525660&sr=1-1&keywords=the+checkmate+pendulum

⁶ Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: the Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans W.D. Halls (New York: W.W. Norton, 2000); for a neo-Maussian perspective, see (amongst many others) Jacques T. Godbout with Alain Caillé, *The World of the Gift*, trans. Donald Winkler (Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998).

⁷ See Stuart A. Kallen, *The Roaring Twenties* (Independence, KY: Greenhaven Press, 2002).

⁸ See David Lammy, *Out of the Ashes: Britain after the riots*, rev. ed. (London: Guardian Books, 2012); David Goodhart, 'A post-liberal future?', *Demos Quarterly*, Issue # 1 (Winter 2013/14): 1-52, available online at <http://www.demos.co.uk/files/apostliberalfuture.pdf>

⁹ Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001 [orig. pub. 1944]).

¹⁰ John Milbank and Adrian Pabst, 'Post-liberal politics and the alternative of mutualising social security', in *The Future of Welfare*, ed. Nick Spencer (London: Theos, 2014), pp. 90-100, available online at <http://www.theosthinktank.co.uk/files/files/Reports/The%20future%20of%20welfare%20a%20theos%20collection%20combined.pdf>

¹¹ Maurice Glasman, *Unnecessary Suffering: Management, Markets and the Liquidation of Solidarity* (London: Verso, 1996).

¹² Glasman, *Unnecessary Suffering*; Phillip Blond, *Red Tory: How Left and Right Have Broken Britain and How We Can Fix it* (London: Faber and Faber, 2010); Phillip Blond and Maurice Glasman, 'Red Tory vs. Blue Labour', *Prospect*, Issue 169, 30 April 2010, <http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/magazine/the-prospect-debate-red-tory-vs-blue-labour/#.UjH8FxywIoU>

¹³ Jean-Claude Michéa, *L'empire du moindre mal. Essai sur la civilisation libérale* (Paris: Editions Climats, 2007), trans. *The Realm of Lesser Evil: An Essay on Liberal Civilisation*, tr. David Fernbach Cambridge: Polity, 2009); John Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006 [orig. pub. 1990]), pp. 9-47, 278-442.

¹⁴ Adrian Pabst, 'From Civil to Political Economy: Adam Smith's Theological Debt', in Paul Oslington (ed.), *Adam Smith as Theologian* (London: Routledge, 2011), pp. 106-24.

¹⁵ Serge Latouche, *L'Invention de l'économie* (Paris: Albin Michel, 2005) and Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory*, pp. 9-47.

¹⁶ Jeremiah Alberg, *A Reinterpretation of Rousseau: a Religious System* (London: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2007).

¹⁷ The most defining product of the New Left was 1960s student revolution: the ultimate Rousseauian gesture, which rejected even the temporal hierarchy of education (and in time reversible, as the taught can later teach). Since this hierarchy is unavoidable, all this has led to in the long run is students being treated as consumers whose right to complain obscures from them the reduction of their education to standardised process which supposedly guarantees their fitness to enter the labour market.

¹⁸ On the notion of 'market-state', see Philip Bobbitt, *The Shield of Achilles. War, Peace and the Course of History* (London: Penguin, 2003), pp. 213-42; Richard Robison (ed.), *The Neo-liberal Revolution: forging the market state* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); Adrian Pabst, 'The Crisis of Capitalist Democracy', *Telos*, No. 152 (Fall 2010): 44-67.

¹⁹ Thomas Piketty, *Le capital au XXI^e siècle* (Paris: Ed. Seuil 2013), trans. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, tr. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014).

²⁰ Austin Ivereigh, *Faithful Citizens. A Practical Guide to Catholic Social Teaching and Community Organising* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2010).

²¹ Antonio Genovesi, *Lezioni di commercio o sia di economia civile*, ed. F. Dal Degan (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2013); see also Adrian Pabst, 'Political Economy of Virtue: Genovesi's 'civil economy' alternative to modern economic thought', *International Review of Economics* 61 (December 2014), *forthcoming*.

²² Luigino Bruni and Stefano Zamagni, *Civil Economy: Efficiency, Equity, Public Happiness* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2007); Luigino Bruni, *The Wound and the Blessing: Economics, Relationships and Happiness*, trans. N. Michael Brennan (New York: New City Press, 2007); Stefano Zamagni, 'Catholic Social Teaching, Civil Economy, and the Spirit of Capitalism', in Daniel K. Finn (ed.), *The True Wealth of Nations. Catholic Social Thought and Economic Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 63-93; Luigino Bruni, *The Genesis and Ethos of the Market* (London: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2012).