

## **Old, New, Borrowed and Blue – Christian Socialism and the Labour Tradition**

Paul Bickley

*This article surveys the diverse contributions of Christianity and the churches to the emergence of the labour movement and the Labour Party. It contrasts two central traditions of labour thinking – firstly the statist tradition of Fabianism and liberal social democracy, culminating in Tony Blair’s New Labour project, and secondly the cooperativist and mutualist tradition that has often been marginalised in the Party. The insights and practices of three main streams of Christian Socialism – deriving from Nonconformity, Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism – suggest that Christianity’s contribution to the Labour Party today should be to work for a revival and renewal of the second tradition.*

### **Introduction**

The Labour Party has historically pursued a non-doctrinaire form of socialism, seeking to be ‘a broad movement on behalf of the bottom dog’ (as G. D. H. Cole put it). In spite of Marx’s claims that religion was the ‘opiate of the masses’ and Christian Socialism ‘the holy water with which the priest consecrates the heart-burnings of the aristocrat’, Christian thinkers, activists and intellectual traditions have been important in the development of the Labour Party. In particular Catholic Social Teaching, Anglican Christian Socialism and the biblical radicalism of early Labour leaders have shaped Labour imagination, ideas, practices and language.

While these Christian Socialist traditions have remained remarkably consistent, they have been marginalised on the increasingly secular left (after all, Labour is the party that coined the phrase ‘we don’t do God’). They have, nonetheless, stubbornly refused to go away. The task of this essay is to narrate some of the historical connections between faith and Labour’s politics.<sup>1</sup> While Christian Socialism has been seen to be a marginal voice in the Party, which has been dominantly Fabian and liberal social democratic in nature, the Labour Party is now looking to ancient Christian traditions to negotiate contemporary political challenges.

### **Working Labour out: Crosland’s *The Future of Socialism***

The modern Labour Party is the inheritor of a mish-mash of different intellectual and political traditions. This poses a problem for anyone who wants to identify its genealogy or establish the importance of a particular set of ideas. It is also a problem for those who want to discern its proper direction now, since most of these traditions have their roots in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and do not necessarily speak to the contemporary context. Labour politics is an ongoing project, constantly moving and reframing itself against political, economic and electoral challenges.

In the Labour tradition, this instinct for constant recalibration bears the name ‘revisionism’. One of its greatest and most influential proponents was Anthony Crosland, a Labour MP who occupied various ministerial positions, including Foreign Secretary, in post-war Labour governments. In 1956 he published an influential book, *The Future of Socialism*, that, in the light of Labour’s significant achievements in office, sought to reframe the Party’s agenda.<sup>2</sup>

Crosland's motives were laudable, his analysis incisive and his efforts to wrestle his party into facing a changing context prodigious. But he was clear that the Party needed to set down its diverse, confusing, and often contradictory ideological baggage to focus, clear-eyed, on the task in hand:

It is surely time, then, to stop searching for fresh inspiration in the old orthodoxies, and thumbing over the classic texts as though they could give oracular guidance for the future. The first need now, in R. H. Tawney's words, 'is to treat sanctified formulae with judicious irreverence and to start by deciding what precisely is the end in view'.<sup>3</sup>

In short, what is the Labour Party *for*?

Crosland felt that once the ends are identified, then the Labour Party ought to be more willing to pursue them by means other than, for example, collective ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange. He therefore laid the groundwork for the entirely non-socialist development of a liberal social democratic Labour Party built on a broad concern for social welfare, a belief in equality and a classless society, and an ideal of fraternity and cooperation. In other words, he was the intellectual grandfather of New Labour.

Any member of the Labour Party, Christian or otherwise, should have sympathy with Crosland's aims. He wanted to put the well-being of people, and the social change required to deliver it, before party dogmas. But now New Labour has evaporated under the heat of economic and social crises, a massive election defeat and a wide loss of confidence in Labour. The liberal social democracy inspired by Crosland has run out of legs and run out of money. So although we may have sympathy with Crosland's aims, with the benefit of hindsight we might conclude that there were some classic texts in which he – or those that followed him, or those that pursued similar courses in other social democratic parties internationally – ought to have sought inspiration, and that those texts might have helped clarify what precisely is the end in view.

Labour's problems – no matter what the outcome on 7 May 2015 – are neither temporary or local, but emerge from an approach to political economy that assumed there could (indeed must) be a peace with a hitherto suspect, and now finance-dominated, capitalism. The terms of the peace would be that the 'filthy rich' would pay their taxes.<sup>4</sup> The state became a merely a tax collector and guarantor of public services, though those public services could be delivered by any willing provider.

With hindsight, we now know that this is not really how it worked out, and that the peace has come at a price of economic crisis, the 'double whammy' of significant state support of vulnerable financial institutions just when the economic downturn caused a significant fall in tax receipts, and therefore significant austerity. Additionally, many of the characteristics of capitalism that Crosland had assumed consigned to history – such as extreme inequality or the possibility of destitution – have now returned. In short, the state, markets and civil society are facing new challenges in the twenty-first century. *Semper reformanda est* – a reforming movement must always reform.

That is why Christian Socialism remains important. Like the scribes of the Kingdom that Jesus spoke about in Matthew 13:52, anyone interested in meeting the challenges of an uncertain twenty-first century must 'bring out of his treasure what is new *and* what is old'.

### **Three Christian Socialisms**

Christian Socialism did count as one among the twelve doctrines identified by Crosland, although notably it merited for him much less attention than others, such as Fabianism, Marxism and Guild Socialism.

The aims of the Christian Socialist bore a close resemblance to those of Owenism, though of course the inspiration was different – in the one case a Benthamite belief in universal happiness, in the other a concern with Christian ethics. But for both the essential evil was the competitive pursuit of private gain, and the objective a cooperative society of communal ownership, in which

mutual love and brotherhood would replace the selfish antagonisms inevitably bred by competitive capitalism.<sup>5</sup>

Frankly, much more can be said than this. The influence of Christian thought and individuals on the Labour Party is complicated and subtle, especially when trying to take into account the fact that the labour movement has been much more than ideas, sentiments or 'progressive' values. It has also been widely recognised that a key part of the influence of the churches and Christian Socialism was not ideas but modes of organisation and even economic practices. We can do for Christian Socialism what Crosland did for socialism as a whole, identifying the many and various Christian traditions which have in different ways connected to Labour politics.

What follows is a somewhat truncated account of the major historical Christian influences on the Labour Party. For the sake of clarity, those influences can be placed into three distinct camps or traditions. These developed (and declined) at different times, had different theological and practical strengths and different weaknesses, and had varying degrees of impact on Labour politics.

#### *The Nonconformist tradition*

This was a biblical radicalism espousing the establishment of the Kingdom of God, fused with political and union activism, tempered by the practices of Sunday school, temperance society and chapel. Their mood, sentiment and language was richly religious – the ILP, said Philip Snowden, derived its inspiration more from the Sermon on the Mount than the teachings of economists (figures in this tradition were often strongly pacifist). But what the Labour Party owes to (for example) Methodism is less theology than the art of organising and leadership. Historians have observed that old Labour leaders were 'trained in the administrative habits of Methodism, equally accustomed to declamation and conference'.<sup>6</sup> During a period of time living in Bacup in Lancashire, Beatrice Webb remarked on the way in which the chapel and its forms prepared the community for democracy and for self-government. There was a well-attested membership overlap between chapel and Labour branch meeting in many communities.

Keir Hardie, Arthur Henderson and Ramsay MacDonald stand within this tradition (although the last of these was actually an Anglican). It provided, therefore, something of Labour's moral mood music in the early part of the twentieth century, although of course other tunes were also played. In spite of the explicit – even evangelical – nature of the biblical rhetoric, there was a sense that this religiosity soon slipped its ecclesial and theological moorings (in no small part, no doubt, because figures like Hardie often saw churches as defenders of the status quo), resulting either in a loss of personal faith or a kind of theological syncretism. Socialism and Christianity were simply seen as the same thing – socialism, very often, being presented as the true instantiation of Christianity – most notably in the short-lived Labour Church movement.

#### *The Anglican Christian socialist tradition*

Anglican Christian Socialism was initially a much more cerebral and ecclesial engagement than its Nonconformist counterpart, and one which pre-dates the formation of the Labour Party as such. The father of Anglican Christian Socialism F. D. Maurice was, after all, a theologian, and his engagement was built around a critique of competition as 'the selfish principle', a 'monstrous and anarchical condition' and a 'struggle to get for oneself and prevent anyone else from getting'. Human brotherhood was not just a possibility, but an ontological reality, which simply ought to be reflected in industrial practice – hence the early advocacy of cooperatives. Early leading lights were not political activists but churchmen, though they did seek a practical, if limited, application for their ideas through cooperatives and educational institutions.

This strand had little direct influence on the development of labour politics as such (even in its Anglo-Catholic developments around the turn of the century), though such influence is greater if you include R. H. Tawney in its lineage. Arguably, its greater impact was as a cultural force – summoning the Anglican Church and society at large to its social responsibilities. There is, however, a distinction to be made between – or perhaps a spectrum to be drawn across – the theological prioritisation of and engagement with the issues which are of concern to the political left (poverty, inequality) on the one hand,

and formal co-belligerence with the Labour Party on the other. Anglican Christian socialism, with the exception of Tawney, has tended to veer towards the former rather than the latter – perhaps betraying uneasiness at the prospect of identifying, still less lobbying for, specific social policies which might cohere with the politics of the Kingdom but could not be directly mandated by Scripture

It is a tradition, however, which lives on in the interventions of the Church of England in contemporary politics. In *Christianity and the Social Order*<sup>7</sup> William Temple insisted that ‘Every citizen should have sufficient income to make a home and bring up his children properly’, and during the current election campaign Church of England bishops have been campaigning in support of a Living Wage.<sup>8</sup>

#### *The Roman Catholic tradition*

Roman Catholicism is unique in having a coherent, consistent and authoritative body of social and political reflection in Catholic Social Teaching. Historically this was highly sympathetic to the plight of working men and women, though explicitly hostile to socialism and, indeed, socialists.<sup>9</sup> It is worth remembering that *Rerum Novarum*, the title of Pope Leo XIII’s ground-breaking 1891 social encyclical, means ‘on the new things’ or ‘on the revolution’. The encyclical, however, is intended to diffuse the mood for revolution, defending the interests of both labour and capital in the context of an organic notion of the ‘common good’. While this provided some succour to the labour movement, the document is uncompromising in its defence of private property. The publication of Pope Benedict XVI’s 2009 social encyclical *Caritas in Veritate* has evoked a resurgence of interest in Roman Catholic Social Teaching amongst some Labour thinkers, eager to find a language and framework with which to critique the excesses of market capitalism after the 2008 crash. The grammar of the common good dominates theological engagement,<sup>10</sup> and has clear secular analogues in Labour Party campaigning, such as in its invocation of the (originally conservative) idea of ‘One Nation’.

Of course, on a practical level, the disadvantaged social and economic position of Catholic communities is what made them a key part of Labour’s base, particularly in Scotland and the North West of England – and to an extent, this still prevails. Nonetheless, the Catholic Church in the UK has clashed repeatedly with the leadership of the Labour Party throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, on issues as diverse as birth control, Catholic education and even the Maltese constitution. It is also notable that there has been relatively little Roman Catholic leadership of the Labour Party (unless one counts Tony Blair, who only converted after leaving office).

There are other strands which I have not been able to consider here, such as the Presbyterian sensibilities of John Smith, Gordon Brown and Douglas Alexander, or the alleged influence of Quaker philosopher John Macmurray on Tony Blair. Nor has this article discussed the work of Christian Socialist societies like the important Christian Socialist Movement, now Christians on the Left, the forum for active Christian Labour members. There may also be newer connections that are as yet unobserved by historians and sociologists. For example, I would hazard a guess that a substantial proportion of members in the constituency Labour Party to which I belong are also members of Black Majority churches. Yet I hope I have said enough to show that Christianity has played a significant, and in earlier times a deeply formative, role in the character and evolution of the Party.

After nearly 200 years of engagement and a wide variety of connections and engagements, what might Christian Socialism have to offer in terms of meeting contemporary political challenges?

#### **Labour’s divided brain**

In his book *The Master and His Emissary*, psychiatrist and author Iain McGilchrist argues that the different characteristics of our right and left brain hemispheres affect not just our personal interaction with the world but also the development of culture and society. The left hemisphere, he says, is detail orientated, while the right is whole orientated. The left hemisphere is the emissary of the right, but has seized control, and culture is increasingly dominated by precise categorical thinking at the expense of an awareness of wider connections, possibilities and problems.<sup>11</sup>

This is, at least, an illuminating analogy for the development of the Labour Party in the course of its history. Those traditions which are perceived to be spiritual, moral or ethical – including Christian Socialism – are seen to be subsidiary, passé or in other ways irrelevant. This is played out directly not so much in different accounts of Labour's objectives but more in accounts of the appropriate means to socialism.

Political historian W. H. Greenleaf presents two strands in the British left. The first – and the dominant tradition – is the one which, following the Fabians Sydney and Beatrice Webb, sees socialism as capable of being imposed from above. Seeing itself as a 'science of society', it emphasised evidential rigour, careful analysis and organised and effective bureaucracy. Its objective was an efficient society, and the problem was not so much the immorality of capitalism but its wastefulness. As Greenleaf observes, after the first flushes of electoral success, the Labour Party was challenged to develop mood and critique into political programme. Greenleaf writes:

The Webbian influence was thus so notable because, at the time when the Labour Party was looking for an intellectual lead, there was ready to hand a complete and relevant body of ideas, well-founded in research, elaborately explored, and fully worked out in terms of the detailed institutional and policy aspects of the process of social change envisaged.<sup>12</sup>

It was also marked, however, by a decidedly un-democratic instinct. Agency belonged to the expert, the scientist, the master-bureaucrat (witness the Webb's involvement in the establishment of the London School of Economics). The Fabian emphasis on systems and processes, arguably, blinded them to the aspirations, opinions and desires of working men and women – they were far less interested in the empowerment of working people than they were in their worthwhile occupation in some part of the machine which was society.

There is, of course, a risk in a kind of a caricature of Fabianism. It had a diverse membership and a diverse range of ideas. Membership of the Fabian Society was *de rigueur* for leading members of the Labour Party, including those that would dissent from the Fabian worldview – G. D. H. Cole and R. H. Tawney, among others. It would also be wrong to say that faith was entirely absent from this part of the Labour movement. Beatrice Webb, though not an observant Christian, was influenced by the religiosity of her relatives and thought that religious feeling could be a powerful motivating force. In 1890, before they were married, Beatrice (then Potter) wrote to Sydney:

We *must* rouse some new form of deep religious feeling. Think what a force [of] religious feeling has been directed to ineffectual and unworthy ends – think what a force that power of self-subordination to an idea might become – even among commonplace persons – if directed to rationally conceived social ends – how it might transfigure society.<sup>13</sup>

Equally, a new consciousness of sin, she said elsewhere, might be aroused in 'men of property and men of intellect' to create 'a growing uneasiness, amounting to a conviction, that the industrial organization, which had yielded rent, interest and profits on a stupendous scale, had failed to provide a decent livelihood and tolerable conditions for a majority of the inhabitants of Great Britain'. However, the religion in question was a generic religion of humanity, not much more than a goad to conscience – social objectives and political means must be established 'rationally'. Any other account of socialism is at best secondary and decorative.

The devil resides in the detail – too much of what seemed rational to the Webbs or others in the Fabian movement now looks positively evil. They gave a glowing assessment of Stalin's Russia in their books *Soviet Communism: A New Civilisation?* and *The Truth About Soviet Russia*. Critics have found this version of socialism cold and bureaucratic, to the point of moral blindness.

The second strand in the British left, in contrast, sees socialism emerging from below – from the already existing familial, social, economic and religious institutions and practices. With the appropriate support and encouragement, these could reconfigure a society dominated by the interests of capital. They include

cooperatives, trades unions and guilds and Owenite communities. As A. J. Penty put it, socialism in this mode was primarily a ‘moral revolt... among those who are outraged by the corruption and injustice of our industrial system’.<sup>14</sup>

In contrast to the Fabian approach, with which it was clearly in tension, it was less concerned with the management of society than with its regeneration. In fact, the superintending state might just as often stand in the way of the kind of ethical reform that society really required. In some ways, this strand seems like only a vaguely secularised Christianity. Bruce Glaiser, Chairman of the Independent Labour Party, wrote in his book *The Meaning of Socialism* that

Socialism is more closely related to religious rather than political propagandism. It is from the prophets, apostles, and saints, the religious mystics and heretics, rather than from statesmen, economists or political reformers that the Socialist movement derives the examples and ideal that inspire its noble enthusiasm.<sup>15</sup>

If this expression of socialism feels unfamiliar and foreign, it is because it failed to do what the Fabian approach did so successfully. In all its forms, from guilds to cooperatives to utopian communities, its left-hemisphere critics suggested that it lacked a suitable theory of social change. The argument is question-begging, however, since it already defined social change as that which is achievable by the state at a national level. But socialists in this second, more muted, tradition were more ambiguous in their view of how the state could be used to realise their vision, since what was at stake was not simply a structurally reformed society but also a spiritually and morally reformed one. That is not the same as being impracticable or ‘utopian’; indeed, the statist strand was in itself deeply utopian. Practical steps could be taken at a state level, but they must be judged in the context of wider goods: increasing democratic involvement in the workplace, tax measures to abolish inherited inequalities, meeting basic welfare needs without diminishing the potential for personal responsibility and freedom and wider access to better education (as with R. H. Tawney’s campaigning for educational reform, culminating in the Education Act of 1944).

The issues come into focus around the role of the state and its relationship to other forms of authority – the family, religious institutions, and so on. For someone like Tawney, or for Catholic Social Teaching, the state can be as distant and inhumane as the forces of capital. This has obvious implications for the kind of politics that Christians on the left might espouse. Space ought to be left for the lived reality of human existence where we work out and experience ‘the good’ collectively and relationally – as members of families, congregations, and workplaces.

This division between statist and non-statist socialisms can be presented in an overly neat way. And it is true that many Christian members of the Labour Party, both now and in the past, can be found in the ‘statist’ camp. The simple biblical radicalism of men like Hardie or Snowden was largely unencumbered by extended reflection on theological niceties. The shortest route to change was ‘organising a new society through the state’, as Snowden simply put it. However, the more theological a commitment to socialism was, the more likely it was to recognise that the heart of the matter was the heart – human freedom, values, aspirations, motivations and failings.

Christian Socialism, in essence, has provided and should continue to provide a holistic ‘socialism’ which encompasses not just the changes that can be realised at a national and societal level but also those which must be realised in cultural values and mores. The field of play is not just the state, but also our places of work, the economy and the market.

### **Christian Socialism - next left?**

Both Christians and Labour leaders can be confident that the churches and authentic labour politics will continue to find common cause. At a general and conceptual level it is clear that all ‘progressive’ politics rests on an act of moral imagination about human dignity and fraternity, a moral critique of the human effects of the domination of the interests of capital over humanity, and the idea that society can be placed on a path of improvement. As Luke Bretherton notes, quoting Derrida, there is ‘some unavowed

theologeme' at work in many of these assumptions.<sup>16</sup> Jürgen Habermas has argued that Europe's Judaic and Christian heritage is the primary source of 'universalistic egalitarianism' – the belief in the innate dignity of each human being – and secular philosophers like Slavoj Žižek and Alain Badiou are now in the business of 'retrieving' the Apostle Paul, not because they 'share Paul's core belief in the resurrection of Christ' but because they 'regard his project as centrally important for contemporary political life and reflection'.<sup>17</sup> Of course, this is not to say that there are not other important intellectual traditions in play, or to attempt to force a false connection between the Gospel and particular political parties. The idea, however, that there is something that is deeply wrong in human relationships and that society should be remade, leans on a particular view of humanity and human society which has one of its most important sources in the Christian tradition.

However, the fact that there is common cause does not mean that churches and Christians, inside or outside the Labour Party, should underwrite any and every turn of 'progressive politics'. Although there are different strands and emphases within Christian Socialism, I would suggest that they tend to view socialism as a transfer of power – political or economic – from capital to state, with suspicion. They are conscious, with Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, that 'the line separating good and evil passes not through states, nor between classes, nor between political parties either – but right through every human heart – and through all human hearts'.<sup>18</sup>

Under Blair, for good or ill (probably good *and* ill), Crosland's revisionism reached its furthest point. Being Labour meant holding to a too vague set of loose progressive values which could be realised through almost any means, including – especially even – by embracing the 'dynamism' of markets. The power of global capital simply had to be accepted, leaving a hole at the centre of Labour where politics used to be. The Labour Party rendered itself unable to do its job.

There are signs that leading members of the party have recognised that they must have more to offer than that, though no doubt there are others who hope for a quick return to power through 'a dodgy one-nil away win', as Jon Cruddas MP often puts it. Even in that case, public spending constraints will force a reconsideration of what Labour is for and how it can go about getting there – tax and spend is neither a winning electoral case nor practically feasible. Yet this crisis for the social democratic state is one that should not be wasted by the Labour Party. It is a chance to retrieve valuable traditions which have been lost to it.

Some parts of the Labour Party that have indeed been searching for intellectual renewal after 2010 have found themselves looking again to its Christian traditions, particularly Catholic Social Teaching, for the intellectual resources which can undergird a critique and engagement with the market economy. Catholic Social Teaching is one of the motifs of Blue Labour – a post-liberal movement within the Party which, while not exclusively Christian, draws extensively on Christian thinking from theologians such as John Milbank. Meanwhile, religiously-influenced broad based community organising (such as Citizens UK) has inspired a return to a more relational and faith-friendly form of politics. The movement has received some attention outside the Westminster bubble, and has proved an encouragement to Christian members of the party who had hitherto been increasingly disenchanted by the desiccated secular liberal politics of the first decade of the twenty-first century. Perhaps here lie the seeds of renewal that the labour movement needs.

## Suggested Further Reading

- Paul Bickley, *Building Jerusalem? Christianity and the Labour Party* (Bible Society/KLICE, 2010).
- Luke Bretherton, *Resurrecting Democracy: Faith, Citizenship and the Politics of a Common Life* (Cambridge University Press, 2014).
- Anthony Crosland, *The Future of Socialism* (Constable, 2006).
- Graham Dale, *God's Politicians: The Christian Contribution to 100 years of Labour* (HarperCollins, 2001).
- Ian Geary and Adrian Pabst, eds, *Blue Labour: Forging a New Politics* (I.B. Tauris, 2015).
- WH Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition. Volume Two: The Ideological Heritage* (Routledge, 1983).
- Henry Pelling, *Origins of the Labour Party* (Oxford University Press, 1965).

Paul Bickley is the Director of Political Programme at Theos. With a background working in Parliament and public affairs, he holds an MLitt from the School of Divinity at the University of St Andrews. He is author of *Building Jerusalem? Christianity and the Labour Party* (Bible Society/KLICE, 2010).

- 
- <sup>1</sup> In this essay, I distinguish between the Labour Party (capitalised) and the labour movement (lower case).
- <sup>2</sup> Anthony Crosland, *The Future of Socialism* (Constable, 2006).
- <sup>3</sup> Anthony Crosland, *The Future of Socialism* (Constable, 2006), 71.
- <sup>4</sup> In 1998 the Labour strategist Peter Mandelson reportedly said that he was ‘intensely relaxed about people getting filthy rich as long as they pay their taxes’.
- <sup>5</sup> Anthony Crosland, *The Future of Socialism* (Constable, 2006), 54.
- <sup>6</sup> G. M. Young, *Victorian England: Portrait of an Age* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Oxford University Press, 1964), 170.
- <sup>7</sup> William Temple, *Christianity and Social Order* (Shephard-Walwyn/SPCK, 1976).
- <sup>8</sup> See, e.g. John Sentamu, ed., *On Rock or Sand? Firm foundations for Britain's future* (SPCK 2015), in which Sentamu invokes the legacy of Temple. See also Malcolm Brown, ed., *Anglican Social Theology: Renewing the Vision Today* (Church House Publishing, 2014), which contains both defences and critiques of the Temple tradition.
- <sup>9</sup> ‘To remedy these wrongs the socialists, working on the poor man's envy of the rich, are striving to do away with private property, and contend that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or by municipal bodies. They hold that by thus transferring property from private individuals to the community, the present mischievous state of things will be set to rights, inasmuch as each citizen will then get his fair share of whatever there is to enjoy. But their contentions are so clearly powerless to end the controversy that were they carried into effect the working man himself would be among the first to suffer. They are, moreover, emphatically unjust, for they would rob the lawful possessor, distort the functions of the State, and create utter confusion in the community’, Paragraph 4, *Rerum Novarum*, [http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_15051891\\_rerum-novarum.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum.html).
- <sup>10</sup> See, e.g., Nicholas Sagovsky and Peter McGrail, eds, *Together for the Common Good: Towards a National Conversation* (SCM 2015).
- <sup>11</sup> Iain McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary* (Yale University Press, 2010).
- <sup>12</sup> W. H. Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition. Volume Two: The Ideological Heritage* (Routledge, 1983), 390.
- <sup>13</sup> Norman Mackenzie, ed., *The Letters of Sidney and Beatrice Webb. Volume I: Apprenticeships 1873-1892* (Cambridge University Press, 2008), 173.
- <sup>14</sup> Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition*, 412.
- <sup>15</sup> Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition*, 414.
- <sup>16</sup> (Cambridge University Press, 2014), 220.
- <sup>17</sup> John D. Caputo and Linda Martin Alcoff, *St. Paul Among the Philosophers* (Indiana University Press, 2009), 2.
- <sup>18</sup> Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago, 1918-56: An Experiment in Literary Investigation* (Random House, 2003), 312.