



THE REFORMATION OF WELFARE

THE NEW FAITH OF THE
LABOUR MARKET

**TOM BOLAND
AND RAY GRIFFIN**



THE REFORMATION OF WELFARE

The New Faith of the Labour Market

Tom Boland and Ray Griffin



First published in Great Britain in 2021 by

Bristol University Press
University of Bristol
1-9 Old Park Hill
Bristol
BS2 8BB
UK
t: +44 (0)117 954 5940
e: bup-info@bristol.ac.uk

Details of international sales and distribution partners are available at
bristoluniversitypress.co.uk

© Bristol University Press 2021

The digital PDF versions of Chapters 1 and 3 are available Open Access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.0>) which permits reproduction and distribution for non-commercial use without further permission provided the original work is attributed.

The work of the last author was supported by the HECAT project, funded within the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation Horizon 2020, under grant number 870702.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-5292-1132-0 hardcover

ISBN 978-1-5292-1135-1 ePub

ISBN 978-1-5292-1134-4 ePdf

The right of Tom Boland and Ray Griffin to be identified as authors of this work has been asserted by them in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved: no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of Bristol University Press.

Every reasonable effort has been made to obtain permission to reproduce copyrighted material. If, however, anyone knows of an oversight, please contact the publisher.

The statements and opinions contained within this publication are solely those of the authors and not of the University of Bristol or Bristol University Press. The University of Bristol and Bristol University Press disclaim responsibility for any injury to persons or property resulting from any material published in this publication.

Bristol University Press works to counter discrimination on grounds of gender, race, disability, age and sexuality.

Cover design: blu inc, Bristol

Front cover image: Cadeau (The Gift). Museum: © Man Ray Trust.

Album/Alamy Stock Photo.

Bristol University Press uses environmentally responsible print partners.

Printed in Great Britain by CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY



In memory of Paddy O'Carroll,
1937–2015

Reform: Policies and the Polity

Welfare policy reform is widely researched, but culturally unexplored. In public policy and political science, welfare policy reform is a cacophony of research and recommendations, plans and evaluations, cross-country comparisons and longitudinal studies, all tied to particular places and times, with perennial problems in want of solutions. Such work involves complex compromises between competing imperatives, and what is actionable by a government in the policy mix is invariably a tried and trusted upcycling of existing approaches. Our book is not a contribution to policy, nor a critique of contemporary welfare policy as neoliberal or paternalist, important as such work is, nor is this chapter a history of policy reform. Rather, our ambition is to explore how the idea and practice of ‘reform’ encodes a distinctive theological inheritance, *inter alia*.

Broadly we argue that considering welfare policy as a ‘governmentalizing’ power, with an assemblage of definitions which classify individuals as unemployed (Boland and Griffin, 2015), explains much of how welfare policy works, but does not explore its whys and wherefores – or what it means. In this chapter we explore the deeper formulation of problems that foreshadow their solution, as a theological impulse to reformat people and the polity at large.

Welfare is broadly an anti-revolutionary construct (Ewald, 2020), an insurance against unrest that guarantees the state’s existence, maintenance and adaptation. This idea follows in the footsteps of Machiavelli’s originality as a prophet of policymaking with a deep understanding of instrumental, managerialist political thinking, and his general concern for political continuity through internal stability (Berlin, 1974). In his lesser known *Florentine Histories*, he dispassionately considers the Ciompi Revolt, an insurrection of the lowest stratum of Florentine working classes (1378), which led to revolution, the

overthrow of the elite and instituting of a radical democracy. Machiavelli departed from the historical orthodoxy of Bracciolini, who suggested the insurrection was God's wrath on the city, and Bruni who had little sympathy for the violent criminals or for treating the revolt as a political movement (Winters, 2012). Machiavelli retells the story as a lesson: an excess of poverty can spill over into political violence which can even topple the Medici dynasty for a while, something every leader must keep under a keen eye.

From medieval peasant rebellions met by dispensations for the poor, to post-war opportunities for reconstruction, the state frequently prescribes welfare as a salve to inequality and suffering, without systemic change. This is evident in the post-1968 era which saw the final evisceration of the radical left after the supposedly 'history-ending' coup de grâce of 1989. Creative destruction, chaos, the ex nihilo impulse to rise up and revolt are irreconcilable with policy reform. Although the birth of the welfare state in the post-war era is often presented as a new perpetual settlement, it is an amalgam of older concepts from the 'poor law' pensions, old age and child care, universal healthcare, poverty alleviation schemes and income protection that are assembled together. Importantly, it is also an explicit gesture towards rapprochement in Europe, an armistice to the continent's repeated state of fratricidal war. Welfare is a salve to moderate rather than address inequality (Pickett and Wilkinson, 2009; Piketty, 2020), to do enough to keep people off the streets, and welfare is thus most compelling when those with wealth and power fear for their position and lives, and welfare recedes when they are comfortable.

Revolution is animated by ideologies that announce their ambitions. The current intense epoch of welfare reform (Esping-Andersen, 2002) has rippled out from the Scandinavian shift towards more activation, taking hold in the USA under Regan and Clinton, Germany in the Hartz reforms, France under Sarkozy, and Britain from Thatcher, Blair and Cameron. Yet, these reforms are just as political as revolutions, seeking to transform society in line with ideal horizons: not a revolutionary apocalypse, but an earthly 'City of God' where individuals are tested, judged and reformed.

To ground these diagnoses of welfare reform, we will examine specific welfare reforms, from crisis, through politics, to policy, concentrating on the recent EU Youth Guarantee. Later we argue that welfare processes put the unemployed through trials, in an attempt to transform them. But first, we must clarify the matter of reformation.

Reformers

Famously, Esping-Andersen (1990) divided ‘worlds of welfare’ into three, based on their current disposition: conservative systems of Spain, Italy and France; Social Democratic states like Germany and Scandinavia; and Liberal systems such as the UK, US, Netherlands and Australia. The root of this commonly accepted taxonomy, in our analysis, is buried in Catholic, Lutheran and Calvinist religious histories that reside in the cultural heritage of these nation states and still persists. Church and community-based charity endure in Mediterranean countries, whereas state-based entitlements and public works appeared in Lutheran states, and harsher regimes for the poor appeared in Calvinist states. ‘Indeed, Calvinists simultaneously asserted that poverty was predestined and that the poor are responsible for their plight’ (Kahl, 2005: 117). Strikingly it is the Calvinist reforming instinct that has come to dominate the global policy imagination, lying beneath the ‘punitive turn’ in welfare policy (Wacquant, 2009). Although such sharp distinctions may be exaggerated, there is a broad relationship between national religion and the development of the welfare state.

The term ‘reformation’ evokes the Protestant Reformation of 1517, Luther, Calvin, Knox and a host of puritans who split from the Roman Church into a series of reformed churches. However, ‘reform’ has a much longer history in theology – most obviously in the ‘reformatio’ of Pope Gregory VII (1073–85), but also throughout the fifteenth century with Christian scholars such as Desiderius Erasmus, John Colet and Thomas More and others. Indeed, since before the fall of Rome, the church has continuously engaged in self-reform through synods, meetings and debates, despite the aura of dogmatic continuity which it exudes. More importantly, the church continuously works to reform its flock, the *ecclesia*, the people, by preaching, monastic rules, sacraments of confession and the care for and regulation of the poor. These two dimensions of reform – of the institution by the institution *and* of the lives of the flock – are the twin foci of this chapter.

However, the urge towards reformation is not simply Calvinist, nor exclusively Protestant, but suffuses the Christian and Jewish tradition. Indeed, the transformation from the pantheon of gods of Egyptian, Greek and pre-Christian Rome, from polytheism to monotheism, is also a transformation of the interests of God in reforming man’s conduct. Ancient Israelite prophecy – from Amos, Isaiah and Ezekiel to Jeremiah – was not just an excoriating critique of society but also a demand for reform, of rulers, priests and ordinary people. In a

similar vein, St. Paul's many epistles to early Christian communities, Corinthians, Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, Ephesians and so forth are expressions of faith in the miracle of the crucifixion and resurrection, but also practical instructions for how to organize and administer the church community, directions as to how to live a good life. Thus, the impulse to reform appears to emerge from the 'world-image' of Judaism and Christianity: life as a trial of redemption set by God for the chosen people or each person.

There is a central tension between the urge to reform and revolt in these texts; ancient prophets proclaim that the final judgement is fast approaching, which has inspired millenarian religions and revolutionary movements from medieval to modern times (Cohn, 1993). By contrast, the letters of St. Paul promise the second coming, but warn individuals against resisting authority and condemn libertinism. Each letter, whether to a specific community of believers or the whole world – the ecumene – dampens down any revolutionary sentiment and calls for a disciplined life.

While contemporary scholarship broadly recognizes the influence of theological ideas on contemporary political culture, by contrast, the policy machinery of 'reform' is considered 'apolitical', as though state interventions were a purely scientific, disinterested, evidence-based governance of society in order to optimize individual and collective life – and always in balance with individual choice. Within this chapter, we will attempt not only to re-historicize the impulse to reform as firmly theological, but also to demonstrate that it is manifestly political.

The politics of history

Sequential history is ill-suited to consider the welfare state or the concept of unemployment, as its boundaries oscillate between the abstract category and the individual experience, key moments dissipate into mundane revisions, and rapid recent reorganization antecedes research quickly. By contrast our genealogical approach begins in the present at the contemporary scene of welfare activation and then casts backwards scouring for important precursors and discontinuities. Evidently, most histories of welfare and unemployment also tend to be histories of politics, identifying strands of ideology, usually the enduring struggle between liberalism and socialism. Of course, all history writing is political, a contribution to contemporary debates, and many contemporary writers are open about their allegiances and generally announce their 'critical history' as a revelation of the forces at work in the past and present. By contrast, our attempt here is not

to unmask the historical workings of ideological forces, for instance, neoliberal ideology or state control, but to recognize the presence and persistence of religious ideas in shaping the institutions of today.

Starting in the present poses its own problems, because any moment in time in policy has its own minutiae – the rate of unemployment, existing welfare provisions, international labour markets, political and geopolitical demands, currents in policymaking and so forth. Yet, contemporary social policy is also relatively stable, with decades of near consensus that unemployment and welfare are problems which should be addressed by Active Labour Market Policies (ALMPs). These are government programmes that intervene in the labour market to help unemployed people find work. Many ALMPs are work-first policy interventions to increase ‘labour market participation’ – either by providing jobseekers with employability-orientated training or education or by forcing them to seek work actively and accept any job offers by the threat of cuts to their welfare entitlements. ALMPs reform in two ways, intervening in individual lives to reform conduct, but equally intervening in existing, ‘passive’ welfare institutions that rendered the unemployed ‘welfare dependent’.

Starting with ALMPs is not to neglect critics or ignore revolutionary alternatives, such as the idea of universal basic income – curiously popular across left and right. However, within the circles which actually contribute to the formation of policy and therefore shape the lives of individuals, ALMPs are dominant; the question which matters is how to design and implement these policies, not whether or not these are the right policies. Recent unemployment crises such as the global financial crisis and the COVID-19 pandemic have deepened the reformists’ commitment to ALMPs, suggesting that the concept of welfare as anti-revolutionary technology of society becomes more visible when the economy experiences difficulty.

Standard histories trace ALMPs to post-war Scandinavia, particularly in the 1950’s Swedish Rehn-Meidner policies, where extensive social provision was popular and activation policies were seen as important means of ‘social inclusion’. The idea that welfare reform plays an important role in preventing ‘labour market exclusion’ is still current. These policies were adopted by the US, with a considerably harsher emphasis on conditionality, then spread to Australia, the UK and became adopted by the OECD in the 1990s, becoming EU-wide policy by the end of the century. Notable examples include welfare reforms under Blair’s Labour Party, the Hartz reforms in Germany, the erosion of the rights-based French welfare state under Sarkozy (Hansen, 2019). Since then ALMPs have spread and diversified; for instance,

conditional-cash-transfers, particularly in Mexico and Brazil, whereby welfare benefits depend on individuals complying with norms around health or education (Peck and Theodore, 2016). The social policy process of ALMPs involves designing measures to reform individuals, assessing whether this has been effective and then returning to the policy drawing board for further reform. Both individuals and state policies must be optimized continuously, through whatever means, and today algorithmic targeting of interventions and ‘nudge’ methods from behavioural economics are increasingly deployed to hone the effectiveness of interventions (Friedli and Stearn, 2015; Desiere and Struyven, 2021).

Welfare reforms assume the provision of welfare entitlements; the logic of ALMPs assumes there is something passive that needs to be ‘activated’. These policies clearly emerge in response to the provision of universal state-funded benefits to the unemployed, outside of systems of contributory ‘social insurance’, what is today termed the welfare state. The persuasiveness of ALMPs, particularly in America, is underpinned by the critique of the welfare state articulated by Von Hayek even as the Beveridge report was being published in 1942 and popularized by Milton Friedman in the post-war period. Amid these various neoliberal critics attempting to ‘dismantle the welfare state’ – as the standard left-wing critique phrase goes – there are perhaps a very few who are in favour of eliminating actual welfare payments. Primarily, ALMPs accept that welfare payments are necessary supports to a volatile economy and unpredictable labour market. Thus there is a tension inherent within ALMPs, between providing monetary support and extracting jobseeking behaviour to support ‘labour market participation’. Paradoxically, it is only through the provision of support which is made conditional on behaviour – turning up to meetings, making a CV, applying for jobs, retraining – that welfare offices can exert influence over the unemployed.

While Hayek and Friedman criticized the welfare state drawing on classical liberalism – that it interfered with the individual right to choose and the responsibility to face the consequences – more academic discourses have been instrumental in ushering in ALMPs, obviously from economics, but perhaps surprisingly from sociology. This is most evident in US critics who demand welfare reform in the sense of reforming the welfare state because it supposedly creates perverse incentives to refuse work: the welfare trap or the poverty trap. Simultaneously, welfare recipients are also morally condemned as having low ambitions or poor understanding of the rewards of work, but they are nonetheless presumed to be strategic actors. For instance,

Charles Murray (2006) suggests that some young men ‘prefer’ doles to work, or that some women use pregnancy as a strategy to assure welfare support. More recently in the UK Andrew Dunn (2014) described the ‘choosiness’ of welfare recipients who would not accept simply any work whatsoever, echoing the political discourse of generations of Conservative Party politicians, but most importantly Ian Duncan Smith and David Cameron, architects of welfare reforms which introduced harsh conditionality and activation, leading to unprecedented levels of sanctions (Watts and Fitzpatrick, 2018; Dwyer, 2019).

A key figure here is Lawrence Mead (1986, 1993, 1997), a prominent politically active researcher whose well-argued yet polemical books became welfare policy in the United States and beyond. His work offered a more polished political rationale for the work-first reform of his precursors Charles Murray and George Gilder. Echoing American president Reagan, Mead argued in the *New Politics of Poverty* that the old economic questions the welfare state addressed were obsolete, replaced by the new problem of the ‘dependency of the poor’: individuals enfeebled by the post-war welfare state. Supposedly ‘government’ was the problem and the absence of a work ethic amongst the poor threatened the legitimacy of all anti-poverty programmes (Mead, 1997). The reforms Mead sought were authoritarian work-first policies underwritten by punitive sanctions to jolt people into any form of paid employment however menial, dirty or low paid as a necessary prerequisite for escaping poverty (Wacquant, 2009). Mead came to these views from his experience as a policy advisor on welfare issues for the Nixon administration, and he appeals to evidence based in social policy, but also political polling. The combination of a scientific approach to data and clinical disdain for the subject of his surveillance is particularly evident in his practical experiments in Wisconsin and New York. Simultaneously he articulates a zealous personal commitment to identifying the welfare state as a political failure and poverty as an individualized moral failing.

Strikingly, right-wing critics of welfare have begun to adapt the vocabularies of the left-wing to their own purposes, talking of ‘learned dependency’ or the ‘culture of poverty’. These ideas can be critically described as ‘psy-science’ or pop-psychology (Friedli and Stearn, 2015), but even more uncomfortably, they are recognizably sociological. Indeed, Mead’s phrases ‘underclass’ and ‘non-working poor’ focus welfare politics around a problem of *conduct* habituated by social conditions. For Mead, the growth of the welfare state simply multiplies problems because it corrupts people’s work ethic, making them dependent upon the generosity of others, supposedly leading to

a downward spiral of indigence, incompetence and even criminality. Thus, rather than simply rearranging the system of incentives – making work pay and so on – these reformers envisage a system which totally transforms people: “*In progressive-era politics the issue was government control of the economy; in dependency politics it is government supervision of behaviour*” (Mead, 1993: 112, italics in original). In particular, Mead envisages the state managing the young, intervening in cases of passivity and weakness. Furthermore, he positions the left as defending the ‘status quo’ of the welfare state, while the right ‘ushers in a new political age’ (Mead, 1993: 114). Strikingly, this echoes Jeremiah, condemning the present and harking back to an imagined past (Bercovitch, 2012).

While ALMP is a neologism, this tension between giving support and demanding compliance with economic and social norms has a long history. Roosevelt’s speech introducing comprehensive welfare in the face of the 1930s depression explicitly addresses the fear of welfare dependency. The end of the Great War in Europe in 1919 necessitated direct welfare payments, wholly funded by the state, regardless of the ‘social-insurance’ principle; during the 1920s these temporary emergency measures proved hard to withdraw, and the 1920s saw multiple attempts to introduce time limits and conditionality until the Great Depression led to the 1934 Unemployment Act made more or less temporary provisions permanent (Fraser, 1992). Before the war, policy wrestled with abolishing the Poor Laws and associated institutional workhouses for the destitute through the introduction of Bismarkian social insurance and labour exchanges. Indeed the debates that surrounded the introduction and multiple reforms of the Poor Laws, particularly the Poor Law reforms in 1834, all addressed the politics of universal welfare and individualizing conditionality and behavioural reform.

Much research explores the governance structures, policy formation and evaluation of ALMPs in different countries (de Graaf et al, 2011). For their proponents, ALMPs are a given, considered as effectively the only option in an austere economic context to expand interventions into the lives of the unemployed, as passive benefits are not considered viable (Bonoli, 2013). Following critics of welfare, ALMPs pose the ‘problem’ of unemployment in terms of the individual – requiring training on the ‘supply side’ of the market if not explicitly blaming claimants (Bacchi, 2015). Evocatively, activation policies have been equated to a ‘trampoline’ rather than the ‘safety net’ of older modes of welfare (Giddens, 2013). Critics of activation policies abound, and allege that not only do they push individuals into precarious work, impose cruel psychological punishment and stigmatize individuals,

but they also are ineffective at reducing unemployment, especially for youths (Leschke et al, 2019; Tyler, 2020).

Our interest is not focused on contributing to these debates about the effect or efficacy of these ALMPs. Of course, the outcomes of these policies matter immensely – ‘by their fruits you shall know them’ (Matthew, 7:20). But here we argue that it is not enough to know a system by its fruits; instead we have to understand how these policies and systems think. So, from our bird’s-eye view of history we descend to the thickets of policy, to examine the contemporary EU-wide *Youth Guarantee*, the ALMP which sought to heal the last crisis, whose diagnosis and remedy for unemployment will no doubt be prescribed again in the near future.

Back to the future

Formally adopted by the Council on 22 April 2013, the Youth Guarantee (YG) aspires to offer good apprenticeships, training, education or employment opportunities to all unemployed young people within four months of their leaving employment or education. The guarantee is a strange hybrid of the modern and the archaic: archaic in its formulation as a promise from the sovereign power, and modern in that it manifests upon implementation as a pragmatic platform of various improvised or ad hoc local structures and technical ALMPs. YG is a modification to ALMPs in four distinctive ways: it offers a guarantee (Bussi and Geyer, 2013), it imposes a metricized objective on the state (Besamusca et al, 2013; Bussi and Geyer, 2013), including long-form human capital development as well as immediate employability responses to unemployment and economic inactivity, and finally, though incompletely, it transforms the national problem of youth unemployment into a continental issue that cannot be solved by national economies.

YG’s radicalism is a reaction to high levels of youth unemployment – cresting 23 percent across the EU, but as high as 58 percent in Greece and 55 percent in Spain – and the fear that an entire generation of Europeans was being left behind or permanently scarred which if left unaddressed might endanger the European model (Scarpetta et al, 2010). Parallel to ALMPs the concept of a Youth Guarantee had emerged in Scandinavian countries, but in the 1990s, targeted at marginal groups of youths who might suffer ‘labour market exclusion’, quite distinct from the case of mass youth unemployment across the EU. Crucially, these YGs are ALMPs as they focus on ‘activating’ the individual, promoting labour market participation rather than

directly creating jobs or instituting job-sharing. Whether work-first or oriented to ‘building human capital’, these policies are all oriented to getting individuals to work, turning them into jobseekers, making them participate in the economy.

Mass unemployment resulted from the great financial crash of 2007–8, and the ensuing recession was marked by austerity policies across Europe especially (Coulter and Nagle, 2015; Springer, 2016). Remarkably, despite general cuts to spending, states increased investment in activation policies during this period. As job losses during recessions take longer to recover than economic growth and capital investment, international institutions took the initiative by focusing on employment. Supported by the UN, the International Labour Organization (ILO) promoted a ‘Global Jobs Pact’ in 2009 – which offered specific policy recommendations alongside rhetorical declarations: ‘The world must do better ... The world should look different after a crisis’. The ‘relevant stakeholders’ for this policy included states, businesses, unions, politicians and citizens, envisaged as acting in unison to achieve a common goal. Importantly, while commitments were made towards protecting the vulnerable, equalizing access to jobs and environmental sustainability, the policy also recommends the use of activation policy and the extension of Personal Employment Services – a mixture of measures which certainly includes monitoring, compulsion and sanctions. The cooperative amalgam of stakeholders consulted does not include the unemployed, who are targets of activation.

The YG was trumpeted as a great success by Jean-Claude Juncker as president of the European Commission in his ‘State of the Union’ speech in 2016. The missionary fervour for employment is palpable: “I cannot and will not accept that Europe is and remains the continent of youth unemployment. I cannot and will not accept that the millennials, Generation Y, might be the first generation in seventy years to be poorer than their parents” (Juncker, 2016). However, while youth unemployment certainly fell during this period, statistical assessments by the OECD and the ILO highlight that this probably would have happened anyway, given that unemployment fell overall for all age groups – making the Youth Guarantee ‘economic deadweight’, state expenditure wasted on things that would happen anyway in the economy (see Eichhorst and Rinne, 2017; Escudero and Mourelo, 2017). What the policy did do was institutionalize activation more strongly, by extending it to youth via early intervention, rather than waiting for the twelve-months threshold which marks long-term unemployment. Early intervention, algorithmic profiling, monitored

job searching, threats and implementations of sanction become routine: these are the actual labour market activities which are generated in the aftermath of political rhetoric. Even after ILO statistical analyses suggested that activation may be ineffective and that sanctions may have negative impacts on job quality or even push people out of the labour market, the policy continues, an interminable attempt to restore ‘full employment’, harking back nostalgically to the past as a prescription for the future.

This is not to suggest that the YG had no effect or that it was ‘irrational’ in the sense of being an ineffective ideological project. Certainly, ALMPs do impact individual lives, forcing people into more extensive jobseeking, training and self-scrutiny, forcing them to accept unsatisfactory or unfeasible work and even imposing sanctions on them – with negative consequences. However, our aim here is not to decry this ‘irrationality’ but to understand this particular form of ‘governmental rationality’, how the state imagines its citizens and the economy more broadly.

The YG is inspired by the policy term NEET – ‘Not in Employment, Education or Training’ – coined by Istance et al (1994) to describe young people in Glamorgan, Wales, who had failed to get a footing in the labour market. Echoed in the media, this term became common parlance and a key organizing concern of research and policy around young people, a problem to be tackled by individuals through responsible self-management, at the state level through Government action to responsabilize young citizens (Wrigley, 2017), and at the supra-national level most manifestly in the EU YG but also in the UN Secretary General’s Envoy on youth 2015 focus on youth unemployment.

NEET adds to a longer discourse wherein young people are considered as a troublesome population, fragile or already damaged, who need guidance through the inherent vulnerability of the complicated transition into adulthood in the labour market (Furlong and Cartmel, 2007). Effectively, the transformation of children through education and training into participants in the labour market and good workers is rendered a governmental concern (Roberts, 2004). Healthy labour markets, elsewhere or in the past, real or imagined, supposedly had a linear and seamless transition into industrial apprenticeships, employment training schemes with paternalistic employers who set people on a course for a job for life (Willis, 1977). A phalanx of youth activation schemes – in the UK, the Youth Opportunities Programme (YOP), Youth Training Scheme (YTS), Youth Training (YT) and Restart Programmes – emerged in response to the decline of such

employers, in the form of the state standing in, albeit without the offer of secure meaningful employment, and thus resulting in undirected training (Furlong and Cartmel, 2007: 41–4). The form of gendered work envisaged or, perhaps more accurately, imagined or dreamed up in these schemes was aggressive, masculine and unpredictable (Simmons et al, 2014; Roberts, 2018).

Like the negative definition of unemployment – not in work, but available for and seeking work – NEET refers to what the individual is not: not in work, not in education, not in training, defining youth as incomplete or even failing individuals. The construction of NEET relates any alternative use of time to paid employment (Batsleer, 2008: 34). NEET exists as an acceptable policy term for ‘chav’ (Jones, 2012), a key term in the fabric of moral underclass discourse (Levitas, 2005) associated with delinquency, anti-social behaviour, crime, early or chaotic parenthood and dangerous political questions (Wrigley, 2017), referring to people who need to be held accountable, controlled and subjected to intervention so that they learn the hard lessons of responsibility (Gillies, 2016). Indeed, Istance et al’s (1994) Welsh study, which became New Labour’s policy, explores the transformation of ‘status zero’ people into NEET. This, in turn, reflects a subtle but over time meaningful transformation in the understanding of the good character of young people outside of education, employment and training (Gillies, 2016).

How can we see the wood for the trees here?

All discussions of welfare policy are interminable; there are innumerable thickets of studies and data, an apparent superfluity of data. Yet across this diversity there is continuity, most obviously in the idealization of work and full employment. Beyond this, the idea of a free and ‘functional’ labour market is crucial, implying social mobility, flexibility and so forth. Occasionally, ‘reducing labour market rigidities’ is emphasized which in practice involves curbing trade unions or deregulating employment law. However, the targets of ALMPs are the unemployed, like the problematic figure of the NEET, considered as raw material to be reshaped, reformed and even redeemed. Long-term unemployment is considered to lead to ‘subjective deterioration’, ‘therefore, it is essential to intervene early, at the beginning of the unemployment spell’ (Fuentes, 2007: 14). Taken from an EU-level briefing on unemployment – addressing the existence and experience of literally millions of people – a singular remedy is offered: ‘Benefit recipients are expected to engage in monitored job-search activities and improve their employability “in exchange” for receiving benefits’ (Fuentes, 2007: 10). Whereas this recommendation appeared polemical

in the works of Mead and Murray, by now it has effectively become ‘evidence-based policy’, a matter of statecraft and careful management of individual lives.

There are several components to these policies: they react to crises or problems, provide diagnoses of society and individuals and suggest remedies or reforms. Both individuals and institutions are considered capable of transformation, which gradually renders them more perfect – a highly political project.

The politics of policy

Broadly, politics and policy are concerned with the same matters, yet approach them differently. The former is concerned with values and aspirations, contestation and struggle, transforming society through legitimized leadership. The latter is concerned with evidence and data, compromises and collaboration, optimizing individual lives and social institutions through careful tinkering. Indeed, while policy shapes lives immensely, more people are aware of political discourse about welfare than the actual content of the YG or other ALMPs.

Policy is formed, within its own set of logics, by objective, rational evidence, a tradition nestled in the British empiricism of Bacon, Locke, Berkley and Hume. Policy requires impeccable evidence as a precursor to understanding the problem at hand. Over centuries of ‘governmentality’, states have increasingly collected data about their citizens, particularly the unemployed, numbers and trends which inform policy (Foucault, 2007). Yet, the original and literal meaning of data is *a thing given* from the natural world, a gift that entangles us in cycles of generosity and reciprocity (Ingold, 2011). Contemporary social policy aspires to be ‘evidence-based’ science and therefore eschews this entanglement as data must be extracted clinically without contaminating the field. This usually means numerical data that is severed from context, meaning and the web of social relations, which means this data is extracted rather than given. Indeed, these disciplines of knowledge are modes of truth production that depend on state power.

The limits of state power to govern society and the economy by sovereign fiat were manifest in the violent wars and utopian impulses that generated revolutionary political regimes. An accommodation of sorts emerged in various approaches to welfare capitalism (Esping-Andersen, 1990) of Nordic social democracy, European conservatism and the neoliberal anglosphere. Since the 1970s, as with many policy domains, a common approach to welfare has emerged across Europe

and beyond (Lind and Møller, 2006). The homogenization and pasteurization of national social policies around activation (Van Berkel and Møller, 2002) has reduced the sense of alternatives, the possibility of doing things differently (Fisher, 2009).

Over the course of the 1970s, the golden age of welfare capitalism ended, ushering in the start of the end of welfare diversity and innovation. The continual process of opening up markets to competition, in particular the logic of recrafting supply chains to areas of location-specific advantage, lead to the rapid collapse of entire, labour-intensive sectors of national economies in many industrialized countries. Against this backdrop, from the 1980s capital asserted itself politically with the rise of the New Right in many countries (Hall, 1988), evoking a doctrine of a minimalist, 'night watchmen' approach to government (Nozick, 1974), albeit one that was destined to repeatedly fail. Similarly, the welfare state was critiqued as an overly ambitious failure: perhaps it liberated society from extreme poverty, but at the price of permanent subjugation, thereby robbing individuals of their autonomy and sense of personal progress and potential (Ewald, 2020).

In short, the welfare state was portrayed as a machine for fabricating rights without demanding responsibility; it deprived individuals of the need to act responsibly, while sharing their risks with multitudinous others. Furthermore, critics argued that welfare was increasingly unaffordable; there were limits to financial solidarity in society, to what the economy would support, particularly against the backdrop of preserving nationally competitive economies with globally mobile capital (Hansen, 2019). These political sensibilities led to welfare being curtailed, as governments introduced ALMPs to push the unemployed into work, particularly focusing on making even unattractive work pay, reducing welfare traps, and using cynical insights from behavioural economics to govern the vulnerable through sanctions and workfare (Tyler and Slater, 2018).

Supposedly, 'it is easier to imagine an end to the world than an end to capitalism', a quote attributed to both Fredric Jameson and Slavoj Žižek (Fisher, 2009). This is usually understood to be a call to arms, for revolutionary action. Clearly, the 'end of history' pronounced prematurely by Fukuyama in 1989 is a post-revolutionary process of endless reform. Yet, the urge towards reform is historically entangled with the demand for revolutionary transformation.

Sceptics often rhetorically describe ideals as 'utopias', and within a Western context these are often 'millenarian', in the Judeo-Christian orientation towards the apocalyptic end of the world. Such 'end-time' visions are close to socialist dreams of revolution – an eschatological

vision of sudden total transformation, whereas ALMPs and the YG are more incremental and mundane goals, horizons to be pursued relentlessly. Interestingly, millennial hopes within the Christian tradition equally can refer to the anticipation of a ‘thousand-year reign’ of a near perfect ‘heaven on earth’. Such an ‘intra-mundane eschatology’ means the attempt to establish a perfect or pure society – traditionally in the form of the *ecclesia*, but now in the form of a perfectly free and open market (Schwarzkopf, 2020). In this sense, contemporary reform of welfare through activation pursues the horizon of a perfect labour market: a place where consensual actors with perfect information make decisions and enter into contracts continuously. This modern ‘city of God’ entails continuous tests of each individual, who makes choices and develops themselves continuously in a constant pilgrimage of ‘self-realization’.

The political horizons of ALMPs, the quest for full employment and flexible labour markets, are clearly non-revolutionary, or presumes that the necessary revolutions have already occurred. They carry the hope that governmental activation will shape individuals to better participate in society so that they develop their ‘inner’ potentials and talents; as per Adam Smith’s vision of economic man: ‘Every man lives by exchanging or becomes to some measure a merchant and the society itself grows to be what is properly a commercial society’ (Smith, 2003: 31). Government seeks to produce a properly commercial society where there is relatively perfect information and choice so that individuals can sell their labour actively; it hopes to create an integrated society through collective and individualized responsibility for economic activity and the provision of institutional supports for human capital. Everyone will work, in multiple jobs and contracts, and be investors, shareholders and consumers in a perfect market which generates optimal outcomes for all. Rather than prophesizing the imminent arrival of the apocalypse, it preaches a good life, personal redemption, salvation – perpetual reform.

These political horizons have an ambition parallel to the church: the salvation of souls. Within ALMPs, salvation is by way of work; work is a vitamin that has behavioural, psychological and cultural goods (Warr, 1987), but work is also imbued with so much more inexplicable meaning. In Foucault’s formulation of pastoral power, the pastor exercises careful jurisdiction over the bodies and souls of his flock to assure their salvation, and in return members of the flock each must comply and thus the pastorate operates through salvation, obedience and truth-telling. The duty of the pastor is the salvation of the entire flock, so that the overall system is being saved when an individual is

saved, as per the parable of the lost sheep (Matthew 18:12–14 and Luke 15:3–7).

Agamben in *The Coming Community* extends that articulation of the cycle of revelation, obedience and salvation. Following Kafka he suggests that ‘innermost character of salvation is that we are saved only at the point when we no longer want to be’ (Agamben, 1993: 102). In this theological formulation, the unemployed jobseeker is understandably ambivalent about being the target of the state’s efforts at salvation, ambivalent about accepting an identity that is both excluded and parasitic. In this reading, ALMPs aspire to save the system by insisting on the salvation of individuals.

Reformation as transformation

Theology and theory intersect and intertwine; the history of ideas constitutes the range of possibility for our thought. Inescapably, the psychological, social or human sciences are a product of history like any other discourses and are entangled with theological modes of thought. This is not to deny their efficacy – economics, sociology, psychology, political science and so forth are powerful, and not only in the production of truth, but in the creation of institutions – not least the welfare state and ALMPs. Yet, these modes of thinking do not reflect the natural internal workings of the brain but cultural legacies. This is not to say that they are ideological blinkers; rather than constraining the potential of our thinking, they constitute the possibility of our thought. Without this heritage of discourses – not a dogma but an internally diverse tapestry of ideas in constant tension – we would think very differently.

The key theoretical tenet of Western thinking is the idea of reform, in the sense that individuals can be reformed – they have fallen into sin and error in theological terms, or into ideology in contemporary parlance, part of the machinery of oppression and ideology, yet they can be redeemed, saved, transformed. Governmental and pastoral power require obedience, demand confessions and promise salvation (Foucault, 2005). Encoded here is a balance between two models of individuality – on the one hand the idea of an innate character, and on the other the shaping of the self through circumstances or culture. Within this model, being ‘reformed’ is redemption, salvation or liberation, but not a total metamorphosis, as something of the individual persists, described as the ‘core/real/authentic self’ in modern times or the soul in religion (Taylor, 1989). Reforming the self is in part a matter of discipline – governing the ‘conduct of conduct’ in Foucault’s

studies of the minutiae of institutions, but it goes beyond modifying behaviour to a distinctive transformation of the self.

In early theological models there are two main metaphorical models of subjective transformation – *epistrophe* and *metanoia* (Hadot, 1953). *Epistrophe* meant awakening or enlightenment, drawn from philosophical models of self-mastery through knowledge. *Metanoia* meant a transformation through purification, effectively suffering through the death of one part of the self, to be reborn as a better person. Clearly, within modern culture reformations are not simple modifications, not just adding to the self, but a painful transformation through suffering, related to knowing the truth about the world but also the truth of the self. Enigmatically, the means of transforming oneself is telling the truth about the self, yet the price of this truth is also personal transformation. The genealogical conjunction of Greek philosophy and Hellenic spiritual exercises as translated unto the early Christian monasteries is still crucial to modern thinking about individuality. ‘This notion of conversions, of the return to the self, of the turning to oneself ... is one of the most important technologies of the self the West has known’ (Foucault, 2005: 208). Turning ‘inwards’, scrutinizing the self, yet transforming that self are practices which suffuse our culture, from self-help to active labour market policies.

The key biblical example of conversion is Saint Paul. As a sinner, Saul is blinded by light on the road to Damascus as the Lord speaks directly to him, and after three days of prayer, he regains his sight: ‘The scales fell from his eyes’, after which he leads the spread of the early Christian church, as a proponent and symbol of conversion. Saul is both changed into Paul and unchanged with the same body and memories. Conversion is a form of suffering, reflected in his blindness, relieved by his eventual baptism. The Lord clearly chooses him, making him a ‘vessel’, making him ‘suffer for my sake’ – yet not just to be changed, but to take on a mission of action within the world, preaching the word. Told again at intervals (Acts 22, 26), the story presents a model of an overwhelming and difficult experience of encountering the divine, leading to a defining break in personal identity, the start of a new life.

Evidently metaphors abound around the reformation of the self – awakening, blindness, contrasts of dark and light, being purified or purged, freedom and slavery, dying and being born again. These metaphors are replaced by more technical-sounding terms in modernity, from academic and popular psychology: ‘self-transformation’, ‘self-work’, ‘changing your internal dialogue’, ‘discovering your true identity’. These comingle in biblical accounts of transformation; for instance the prophet Ezekiel describes the ‘heart of stone’ being

replaced by the ‘true heart’ (Ezekiel 36: 26). To be converted is not just to acquire new beliefs but to be personally transformed:

The hour has come for you to wake up from your slumber, for our salvation is nearer now than when we first believed. The night is nearly over; the day has drawn near. So let us lay aside the deeds of darkness and put on the armor of light. (Romans 12:11–12)

Do not lie to one another, for you have taken off the old self with its habits and have put on the new self. (Collosians 3:9)

This proliferation of metaphors implies that conversion was a subjective internal experience which was difficult to narrate. Judith Butler’s work on subject formation similarly describes the modern idea of the new self emerging from the old as a paradox: the impossibility of a ‘self-inaugurating agency’ (Butler, 1997: 16). Furthermore, it could be suggested that the process of conversion is itself constitutively produced by descriptions of it – the model of Paul, the metaphors of conversion – these inspire narratives of self-transformation which become self-fulfilling. These parables and their modern echoes imagine the individual in Western culture as malleable, open to endless transformations and reformations by governmental power that assesses, judges and imposes changes upon its subjects. Crucially though, transformations cannot be entirely enforced from the outside but require the self to work upon itself.

Perhaps the most famous account of conversion is Augustine’s *Confessions*. Before Rousseau’s *Confessions* (1782), this was hitherto the most extensive autobiography, and exemplifies the retrospective inquiry into one’s own self which permeates contemporary society. For Augustine, the sins of the flesh were particularly troubling, and *Confessions* recalls his lusts and desires repeatedly. These are represented as poor choices, made in full knowledge of immorality, both intuitively grasped and as articulated by his pious mother. Yet Augustine also offers an account of sin as socialization: ‘For the rule of sin is the force of habit, by which the mind is swept along and held fast, even against its own will, yet deservedly, because it fell into the habit of its own accord’ (Augustine, 1961: 8:3, p 165). Everyone is continuously tempted to sin, and transgressing becomes a habit, harder and harder to resist, and even warps the mind, developing hypocrisy and ignorance. Here sin is not just transgression but a morally culpable form of socialization or self-formation. Yet, within the self the possibility of choosing differently always resides, indestructibly: ‘One thing lifted me up into the light of your day. It was that I knew that I had a

will, as surely as I knew there was life in me. When I chose' (Augustine, 1961: 7:1, p 136). Like Descartes, who was only sure he has a mind, a millennium beforehand Augustine was sure of his will, and therefore of his responsibility. Resonant with the prophets or the epistles, individual choice is always affirmed, even facing an omnipotent God.

How is conversion achieved? In part it is a matter of turning around, as in the contemporary cliché 'turn your life around'. To 'convert' etymologically means to turn around, which resonates with the Greek word *periagoge*, which Plato used to describe those who turned away from illusion to face reality in the famous cave allegory. This metaphor is certainly used by Augustine: 'O Lord, you were turning me around to look at myself.' (Augustine, 1961: 8:7, p 169), or in contemporary parlance, 'take a good look at yourself'.

Confessions is a paradigm of confession, in that Augustine relentlessly examines his own life and experiences, his conduct and choices, and admits to culpability for all the sins and errors within it. From the opening pages the narration depicts a high emotional intensity, representing a repentant sinner who considers their salvation recent, tenuous and precious. After narrating youthful robbery, debauchery and heresy, eventually Augustine is 'converted', an event marked by difficulty, struggle and self-sacrifice: 'My inner self was a house divided against itself. ... I was beside myself with madness that would bring me sanity. I was dying a death that would bring me life' (Augustine, 1961: 8:8, p 171). The self is metaphorically split in two here, the sinner and the soul longing for salvation. Part of the self must be excised in order to redeem the whole: sinful habits, tastes for iniquities, indulgence in heretical errors. These sinful tendencies are cast aside – shriven, in later medieval language. Yet, paradoxically, they are also retained, as part of a narrative; even sins renounced must be remembered, as admitting culpability is crucial to redemption. For Augustine, confession must be continuous, not a single ritual of purification, even though conversion is a definitive event in life; yet given mankind's fallen nature, sin will recur, and to pretend otherwise leads only to pride – another sin.

Even after this moment of conversion, the *Confessio* is quite relentlessly self-excoriating, which reflects Augustine's ethos of continuous self-analysis, confession and reformation: 'Day after day without ceasing these temptations put us to the test, O Lord. The Human Tongue is a furnace in which the temper of our souls is daily tried' (Augustine, 1961: 10, p 37). Thus, the singular act of conversion, confirmed by a ritual of baptism, becomes transformed into a continuous struggle with temptation. It is a continuous test, and here again the human tongue is central, the 'truth' told about oneself forms the self decisively.

Notably, this reformation of the self is transformative, but requires chronic work: ‘Salvation then is an activity, the subject’s constant action on themselves’ (Foucault, 2005: 184). Of course, there are many differences from contemporary society – particularly belief in supernatural forces, absolute moral commandments, the immortality of the soul and so forth – but there are also key continuities: first, the self can be reformed and redeemed, but only through difficulty and suffering. Second, this transformation involves a sort of turning; away from the world or against the self, rejecting previous poor conduct or behaviour acquired by habit – socialization in modern parlance. Thirdly, some outside force prompts this conversion, whether it is divine intervention, extreme experiences or the words of others in preaching or confession. Fourthly, the individual is transformed by telling the truth about themselves, usually to others, yet simultaneously, the price of knowing the truth is also a transformation of the self.

Beyond the religious resonances of salvation and conversion, the underlying idea here is that individuals are malleable – shaped like clay in biblical accounts, socialized by circumstance and environment in sociology. Indeed, even ‘high theories’ such as Foucault’s maintain this ontology: that the subject can be transformed, externally by governmental intervention and internally by what he describes as ‘techniques of self’ (Foucault, 1988). Whatever moral or political value is placed upon particular transformations of the individual, the idea that the self can be reformed is the central model; it is a powerful idea which makes it possible to analyze different societies as shaping individuals – basically the key idea of the human sciences. For critics, this is sociology’s ‘heart of darkness’, because it makes academic disciplines complicit in state and corporate projects of transforming society – many of which are morally dubious (Bauman, 1989). Equally, this idea of reformation also makes it possible and worthwhile to invest time and effort in educating and enlightening individuals, empowering them, which may sound patronizing or even colonizing, yet it is the warrant for universal education as much as for ALMPs. Indeed, the idea that individuals are partially products of their society and capable of change also informs an ethic of forgiveness, always holding out the possibility of redemption. Yet, rather than supporting individuals unconditionally, modern welfare gives an endless series of second chances at the same test – of finding work in the labour market – but implicitly of reforming the self.

Antecedent to our contemporary idea of socialization as a mixture of individual choice and social structure are theological ideas: choice and free will are central to individual salvation in Christianity – even

though God is presumed to be omnipotent and to have created the world according to a divine plan, each individual is responsible for themselves: ‘For God will reward every person according to what he has done’ (Romans, 2.6) – or as expressed by the prophet Ezekiel centuries earlier in Judaism. This balance between individual choice and divine will is reflected in centuries of philosophical hairsplitting between ‘free will and determinism’ or more recently ‘structure and agency’ or ‘power and resistance’. All of these imply the possibility of reform, both in the sense that the individual is shaped by their environment and culture and that they have the individual capacity to make choices and better themselves: ‘For the rule of sin is the force of habit, by which the mind is swept along and held fast, even against its own will, yet deservedly, because it fell into the habit of its own accord’ (Augustine, 1961: 9:3, p 165). Thus, the work of transforming or reforming the self is interminable, but it cannot take place without individual involvement – as expressed earlier by the classical theologian St. Augustine and repeated in the ‘great medieval synthesis’ of Thomas Aquinas: ‘God indeed causes the things we do but not without our acting, for he works in every will and nature’ (Aquinas, 1961: 660). Rather than a theological dogma which requires faith in mystery, this theology is a theory of human existence, with a tension between circumstances and choice, which informs how we think today – in sociological theory, in everyday life and within governmental policymaking, which seeks to reform individuals. Dystopian visions of states that attempt to create people like machines through social engineering miss the point that contemporary governance inherits pastoral power – which holds individual choice sacrosanct. Thus, no-one is reformed from outside, but must participate in their own transformation; within liberal governmentality, ‘freedom is something which is constantly produced’ (Foucault, 2008: 65).

These seemingly abstract theories inform welfare institutions by providing explanatory schemes of how individual characters may be changed and redeemed by governmental interventions, such as ALMPs. Among these there are those which attempt to govern using incentives and the threat of sanctions or ‘sticks and carrots’, which assume that individuals are calculating economic agents. This train of thought goes back through Charles Murray’s insistence on economic self-responsibility to Jeremy Bentham’s utilitarianism which insisted that all individuals follow their self-interest, and attempt to minimize pain and maximize pleasure (see [Chapter 5](#)). This economic ‘science’ has a narrow conception of human nature – treating people like donkeys by using sticks and carrots – and attempts to transform behaviour by

‘making work pay’ and making welfare ungenerous and dependent on labour market engagement.

Tests and trials

Transformation of subjects is at the heart of governmentality and pastoral power (Foucault, 1981): the attempt to redeem and reform individuals through subtle interventions, from exerting pressure, through the processes of welfare claiming, to discourses which incite and entice them to be good jobseekers. Detailed studies of the ‘micro-physics of power’ in welfare offices suggest that there are a myriad of different elements, from required meetings to monitored job searches, compulsory participation in training, one-to-one case officer meetings, psychometric assessment and so forth (Brodkin and Marsden, 2013). Simultaneously, welfare recipients are also engaged in the labour market – beyond the reach of the welfare office – but judged on their performance within it, assigned more training or coaching depending on their experiences. Thus, the broad mode of transforming individuals that emerges here is that individuals are tested, they are subjected to certain trials, put to the test until they succeed, and repeated failure only leads to further tests.

Tests are central to modernity in a number of ways: most clearly, the market process of liberal economies ‘tests’ the value of goods and services, verifying their value in the form of price (Foucault, 2008). Such market tests are also used to scrutinize governmental action – interventions are only justified if they produce actual benefits in economy or society. Thus, welfare policies have testing built in, they are designed to be assessable, even attempting to create scientific experiments, for instance, by randomized selection or by ensuring a representative sample, and even creating a ‘control group’, that is, a sample of the population upon whom no intervention is made, thereby creating a baseline against which the effect of interventions is measured (Peck and Theodore, 2016). Indeed, Boltanski (2011) argues that modern institutions, particularly those involved in education and employment, continuously test and assess individuals, so that the task of sociology is ‘to describe the social world *as the scene of a trial*’ (Boltanski, 2011: 25, emphasis in original). Notably, this phenomenon predominates in modernity; not that ‘traditional’ society was a static world of unchanging custom and uncontested status, but modernity has made life itself into a trial.

This is a distinctly religious interpretation of life: ‘Every Christian will be called upon to regard life as nothing but a test’ (Foucault, 2005: 446).

An individual career is interpreted as a test or a trial, wherein suffering and difficulty serve to purify the self and allow jobseekers to learn about themselves. Without challenges, supposedly, no one can know the truth of their character. Equally, society learns about itself by undergoing crises and challenges; it becomes stronger by responding, learning about itself and transforming itself: 'My Christian brothers, you should be happy when you have all kinds of tests. You know these prove your faith. It helps you not to give up. The man who does not give up when tests come is happy' (James 1:2). Thus, adversity and challenges are to be welcomed as edifying, to be endured faithfully. Here, to 'prove your faith' both means to demonstrate belief but also to strengthen or refine, like iron proved in the furnace. Again, personal choice is central – the individual determination not to give up in the face of tests – and yet these tests are also interpreted as 'godsend', as is the strength to endure them; a paradoxical coupling of free will and a providential order: 'God keeps his promise and he will not allow you to be tested beyond your power to remain firm; at the time you are put to the test, he will give you the strength to endure it, and so provide you with a way out' (1 Corinthians 10:12–13). For the faithful, there is no test which cannot be endured, no suffering which cannot be rendered edifying, and moreover, these tests serve to reveal the true character of individuals. Now, everyone must endure something like the 'trials of Job'.

Again, this is a cultural interpretation of life, or a discourse which produces the objects of which it speaks. Clearly, how suffering is interpreted is central to religious thought, as argued by Nietzsche's polemic against Christian sanctification of suffering, and in Weber's more nuanced exploration of world religions as specifically creating new interpretations of suffering. Beyond the broad brushstrokes of theology, each individual is directed to interpret their own suffering in specific ways: 'Suffering is actually a test that is recognized lived and practiced as such by the subject.' (Foucault, 2005: 443). For instance, there are subtle differences between Roman stoics, who took all apparent evil as a source of education to prepare the self for life through the exercise of rational self-control, and Christians, who take suffering as a test which proves their faith and purifies their sinful tendencies.

So what? All of this may seem like 'mere' culture, a set of strange beliefs about experiences and selfhood and society. However, beyond being an intellectual philosophy, these ideas are institutionalized, most especially in the institutions of the welfare office and ALMPs, and policy gestures such as the YG. State institutions, from schools to policy think tanks, presume that people are malleable, formed by

their circumstances, but capable of making choices, which serve to transform them alongside the exercise of pastoral power, with 'its zeal, devotion and endless application' (Foucault, 2007: 127). Our society is set up to test people, from education to workplaces, and how they respond to and react to these trials is supposed to reveal the 'true' character of the individual. In times of trouble – for instance, unemployment – individuals are not just supported, but subjected to further trials, whereby they must show their mettle, because transformation or redemption is neither automatic nor a foregone possibility – there are an infinite number of second chances. In effect, states take the place of providence, both in that they offer charitable assistance to the destitute, but more importantly in that they array a series of opportunities for choices and self-reformation for anyone and everyone. And increasingly, support is contingent on compliance with reformation and transformation.

What emerges here is not only the model of the individual as malleable clay, to be tested and transformed, but by extension, a version of government modelled on the divine. Implicitly, the state must be involved in judging individuals, particularly the unemployed. Whereas the Epistle of James exhorts its readers, 'Do not criticize one another. ... Who are you to judge?' (James 4:11–12) – phrases which resonate today: the welfare state takes on this role, perhaps not quite a 'stigma machine' (Tyler, 2020), but at the very least a 'judgement machine'.

Contemporary processes of welfare activation impose secular adaptations of pastoral power upon the unemployed, first by requiring that they establish membership of society – the ecclesia – through a name, a birth cert, a PPS number, but more importantly in an oath expressing their commitment to the work cult by swearing that they are lacking, available for and actively seeking work. Effectively, that they are willing to undergo tests, both that of the welfare office and the labour market. Beyond this, the unemployed must tell the truth about themselves, they must account for their lives and choices in interviews. These proceed on the assumption that the individual is responsible for their situation through their choices and behaviour, that these stem from their inner characteristics, and that there is some form of personal deficiency – low educational attainment, poor work ethic, pickiness or even criminal tendencies – or sloth, pride and avarice in religious terms. Individuals are encouraged to identify their weaknesses and flaws for the purposes of self-improvement and personal transformation, by reforming or even redeeming their character.

Conclusion

Contemporary states attempt to incarnate something akin to the ‘City of God’ in its welfare institutions, to ‘immanentise the eschaton’ in Voegelin’s terms (1969). Endless tests and trials, help, advice and opportunities for self-transformation are offered. Rather than escape, there is no end to the work of reformation; even to the stubborn and recalcitrant or backsliding, endless second chances are offered. Perhaps forgiveness is offered, but only at the price of penance and reformation. For the unemployed there are few alternatives to the model of life as a trial of self-transformation. Within this model, the state also deliberately administers suffering of various sorts, from pressure through scrutiny, to threats, to actually implementing welfare cuts, with the obvious impact of poverty, hunger, anxiety and the possibility of debt, homelessness or suicide. These dangers are justified because suffering is implicitly the only route towards transformation; if the jobseeker fails the ‘labour market test’ by being unable to secure work in a competitive world, then welfare provides alternatives – career days, confidence training, work-readiness courses, all a series of trials oriented towards self-work, conversions from passive unemployment unto active jobseeking. These ‘providential’ offerings may be inadequate to actually create a job or genuinely build a CV, yet their purpose is to maintain the possibility that the individual can be redeemed.

Effectively, the truth of an individual, their worth and character, are considered as revealed by tests and trials – occasions which offer the possibility of transformation but also impose reform, demanding faith in the self and the labour market. And while these are only discourses, they effectively work, not necessarily to create jobs or transform people through training, but by imposing an interpretation of life in the labour market.

References

- Agamben, G. (1993) *The Coming Community*, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Agamben, G. (1998) *Homo Sacer*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G. (2011) *The Kingdom and the Glory: For a Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G. (2018) *The Sacrament of Language*, Oxford: Wiley & Sons.
- Agnew, J.C. (1986) *Worlds Apart: The Market and the Theatre in Anglo-American Thought, 1550–1750*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alexander, J. (2004) ‘Cultural Pragmatics: Social Performance between Ritual and Strategy’, *Sociological Theory*, 22(4), 527–73.
- Allen, A. (2017) *The End of Progress: Decolonising Critical Theory*, Columbia: Columbia University Press.
- Allen, K. (2012) ‘The model pupil who faked the test: social policy in the Irish crisis’, *Critical Social Policy*, 32(3): 422–39.
- Althusser, L. (1971) ‘Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (notes towards an investigation)’ in L. Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays*, London: NLG.
- Anderson, E. (2019) *Private Government: How Employers Rule Our Lives (And Why We Don’t Talk about It)*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Aquinas, T. (1998) *Selected Writings*, London: Penguin.
- Arendt, H. (1989) *The Human Condition*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Augustine, S. (1961) *Confessions*, London: Penguin.
- Bacchi, C. (2015) ‘The turn to problematization: political implications of contrasting interpretive and poststructural adaptations’, *Open Journal of Political Science*, 5: 1–12.
- Baehr, P. and Gordon, D. (2012) ‘Unmasking and disclosure as sociological practices: contrasting modes for understanding religious and other beliefs’, *Journal of Sociology*, 48(4): 380–96.

- Barbier, J. (2004) 'Activation policies: a comparative perspective', in A.S. Pascual (ed) *Are Activation Models Converging in Europe? The European Employment Strategy for Young People*, Brussels: ETUI, pp 47–83.
- Bardwick, J. (1993) *Danger in the Comfort Zone: From Boardroom to Mailroom – How to Break the Entitlement Habit That's Killing American Business*, New York: Amacom Press.
- Bataille, G. (1998) *Essential Writings*, London: Sage.
- Batsleer, J.R. (2008) *Informal Learning in Youth Work*, Los Angeles: Sage.
- Bauman, Z. (1989) *Modernity and the Holocaust*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Baxandall, P. (2004) *Constructing Unemployment: The Politics of Joblessness in East and West*, Aldershot: Gower Publishing, Ltd.
- Beatty, R. (1989) *The Perfect Cover Letter*, New York: Wiley.
- Beder, S. (2000) *Selling the Work Ethic: From Puritan Pulpit to Corporate PR*, New York: Scribe Publications.
- Beer, D. (2019) *The Quirks of Digital Culture*, London: Emerald Books.
- Benjamin, W. [1921] (1996) *Selected Writings* (Vol. 1), Harvard: Belknap Press.
- Bentham, J. (2010) *The Works of Jeremy Bentham, Vol. 8*, New York: Gale, Making of Modern Law.
- Berlin, I. (1974) 'The divorce between the sciences and the humanities', *Salmagundi*, 27: 9–39.
- Besamusca, J., Stănescu, I. and Vauhkonen, J. (2013) *The European Youth Guarantee: A Reality Check*, Brussels: FEPS.
- Beveridge, W. (1909) *Unemployment: A Problem of Industry*, London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Bercovitch, S. (2012) *The American Jeremiad*, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Block, J. (2002) *101 Best Resumes to Sell Yourself*, New York: McGraw Hill.
- Boer, R. (2013) 'Revolution in the event: the problem of Kairos', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 30(2): 116–34.
- Boland, T. (2019) *The Spectacle of Critique: From Philosophy to Cacophony*, London: Routledge.
- Boland, T. and Griffin, R. (eds) (2015) *The Sociology of Unemployment*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Boland, T. and Griffin, R. (2016) 'Making sacrifices: how the ungenerous gifts of social welfare constitute the unemployed as scapegoats', *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory*, 17(2): 174–91.
- Boland, T. and Griffin, R. (2018) 'The purgatorial ethic and the spirit of welfare', *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 18(2): 87–103.

- Bolles, R. (1970) *What Color Is Your Parachute?*, New York: Ten Speed Press.
- Boltanski, L. (2011) *On Critique: Towards a Sociology of Emancipation*, London: Polity Press.
- Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, E. (2005) *The New Spirit of Capitalism*, London: Verso.
- Boltanski, L. and Thévenot, L. (2006) *On Justification: Economies of Worth*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bonoli, G. (2013) *The Origins of Active Social Policy: Labour Market and Childcare Policies in a Comparative Perspective*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bright, J. and Earl, J. (2000) *Brilliant CV: What Employers Want to See and How to Say It*, London: Prentice Hall.
- Brodkin, E. and Marston, G. (2013) *Work and the Welfare State: Street-Level Organizations and Workfare Politics*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Bunyan, J. [1678] (1965) *The Pilgrim's Progress*, London: Penguin.
- Burnett, J. (2002) *Idle Hands: The Experience of Unemployment 1790–1990*, London: Routledge.
- Bussi, M. and Geyer, L. (2013) *Youth Guarantees and Recent Developments on Measures against Youth Unemployment: A Mapping Exercise*, Brussels: European Trade Union Institute.
- Butler, J. (1997) *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Butler, J. (1999) *Gender Trouble*, London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2001) 'Giving an account of oneself', *Diacritics*, 31(4): 22–40.
- Butterworth, P., Leach, L.S., Strazdins, L., Olesen, S.C., Rodgers, B. and Broom, D.H. (2011) 'The psychosocial quality of work determines whether employment has benefits for mental health: results from a longitudinal national household panel survey', *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 68(11): 806–12.
- Callon, M. (1998) 'Introduction: the embeddedness of economic markets in economics', *The Sociological Review*, 46(1): 1–57.
- Campbell, C. (1988) *The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Consumerism*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Card, D., Kluge, J. and Weber, A. (2015) *What Works? A Meta-Analysis of Recent Active Labor Market Program Evaluations* (IZA Discussion Paper no. 9236), Bonn: IZA.

- Carey, J. (1987) 'Time, space and the otherworld', *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium*, 7: 1–27.
- Chaucer, G. [1387] (2002) *The Canterbury Tales* (ed. D. Coote), Hertfordshire: Wordsworth editions.
- Cohn, N. (1971) *The Pursuit of the Millennium*, London: Paladin.
- Cohn, N. (1993) *Cosmos, Chaos, and the World to Come: The Ancient Roots of Apocalyptic Faith*, London: Yale University Press.
- Cole, M. (2007) 'Re-thinking unemployment: a challenge to the legacy of Jahoda et al', *Sociology*, 41(6): 1133–49.
- Cole, M. (2008) 'Sociology contra government? The contest for the meaning of unemployment in UK policy debates', *Work, Employment and Society*, 22(1): 27–43.
- Coleman, S. (1996) 'Words as things: language, aesthetics and the objectification of protestant evangelicalism', *Journal of Material Culture*, 1(1): 107–28.
- Coleman, S. and Eade, J. (2004) *Reframing Pilgrimage: Cultures in Motion*, London: Routledge.
- Coote, A. and Franklin, J. (eds) (2013) *Time on Our Side: Why We All Need a Shorter Working Week*, London: NEF.
- Coulter, C. and Nagle, A. (eds) (2015) *Ireland Under Austerity: Neoliberal Crisis, Neoliberal Solutions*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Council of the European Union (2013) 'Council recommendation of 22 April 2013 on establishing a youth guarantee', *Official Journal of the European Union*, 56: 1.
- Cox, H. (2016) *The Market as God*, Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Daguerre, A. (2007) *Active Labour Market Policies and Welfare Reform: Europe and the US in Comparative Perspective*, New York: Springer.
- Dante, A. [1320] (1969) *The Divine Comedy: II – Purgatory*, reprint, London: Penguin.
- Davies, G. (2000) *Religion in Modern Europe: A Memory Mutates*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dawkins, R. (1976) *The Selfish Gene*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dean, J. (2020) *The Good Glow: Charity and the Symbolic Power of Doing Good*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Dean, M. (1995) 'Governing the unemployed self in an active society', *Economy and Society*, 24(4): 559–83.
- Dean, M. (2010) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, London: Sage.
- Dean, M. (2012) 'Governmentality meets theology: "The king reigns, but he does not govern"', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 29(3): 145–58.
- Dean, M. (2013) *The Signature of Power*, London: Routledge.

- Dean M. (2017) 'Political acclamation, social media and the public mood', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 20(3): 417–34.
- Dean, M. (2019) 'What is economic theology? A new governmental–political paradigm?', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 36(3): 3–26.
- Deleuze, G. (1994) *Difference and Repetition*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Demazière, D. (2020) 'Job search success among the formerly-unemployed: paradoxically, a matter of self-discipline', *Critical Policy Studies*, DOI:10.1080/19460171.2020.1746372.
- Desiere, S. and Struyven, L. (2021) 'Using artificial intelligence to classify jobseekers: the accuracy–equity trade-off', *Journal of Social Policy*, 50(2): 367–85.
- DeSwaan, A. (1988) *In Care of the State: Health Care, Education and Welfare in Europe and the USA in the Modern Era*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Devereux, E. and Power, M. (2019) 'Fake news? A critical analysis of the “Welfare Cheats, Cheat Us All” campaign in Ireland', *Critical Discourse Studies*, 16(3): 347–62.
- Dingeldey, I. (2007) 'Between workfare and enablement – the different paths to transformation of the welfare state: a comparative analysis of activating labour market policies', *European Journal of Political Research*, 46(6): 823–51.
- DSP [Department of Social Protection] (2012) *Pathways to Work*, Dublin: DSP.
- Dubisch, J. (1996) 'Anthropology as pilgrimage', *Etnofoor*, 9(2): 66–77.
- Dunn, A. (2014) *Rethinking Unemployment and the Work Ethic: Beyond the 'Quasi-Titmuss' Paradigm*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Durkheim, E. (1995) *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, New York: The Free Press.
- DWP [Department for Work and Pensions] (2018) *Jobseeker's Allowance: Back to Work Scheme [JSABWS1] Guide*, Department of Work and Pensions: London.
- Dwyer, P. (ed) (2019) *Dealing with Welfare Conditionality: Implementation and Effects*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Dwyer, P. and Wright, S. (2014) 'Universal credit, ubiquitous conditionality and its implications for social citizenship', *The Journal of Poverty and Social Justice*, 22(1): 27.
- Edgell, S. (2012) *The Sociology of Work*, London: Sage.
- Edling, N. (ed) (2019) *The Changing Meanings of the Welfare State: Histories of a Key Concept in the Nordic Countries*, New York: Berghahn Books.
- Ehrler, F. (2012) 'New public governance and activation', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 32(5/6): 327–39.

- Eichhorst, W. and Rinne, U. (2017) *The European Youth Guarantee: A Preliminary Assessment and Broader Conceptual Implications*, (IZA Policy Paper, no. 128), Bonn: Institute of Labor Economics.
- Escudero, V. and Mourelo, E.L. (2017) 'The European Youth Guarantee: a systematic review of its implementation across countries', (Working Paper, 21), International Labour Organization: Research Department, Geneva.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2002) 'Towards the good society, once again?', in G. Esping-Andersen (ed) *Why We Need a New Welfare State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 1–25.
- Ewald, F. (2020) *The Birth of Solidarity: The History of the French Welfare State*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Fenn, R. (1995) *The Persistence of Purgatory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fisher, M. (2009) *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative?*, Alresford: Zer0 Books.
- Fletcher, D.R. (2011) 'Welfare reform, Jobcentre Plus and the street-level bureaucracy: towards inconsistent and discriminatory welfare for severely disadvantaged groups?', *Social Policy and Society*, 10(4): 445–58.
- Fletcher, D.R. (2015) 'Workfare – a blast from the past? Contemporary work conditionality for the unemployed in historical perspective', *Social Policy and Society*, 14(3): 329–39.
- Fletcher, D.R. and Flint, J. (2018) 'Welfare conditionality and social marginality: the folly of the tutelary state?', *Critical Social Policy*, 38(4): 771–91.
- Fletcher, D.R. and Wright, S. (2018) 'A hand up or a slap down? Criminalising benefit claimants in Britain via strategies of surveillance, sanctions and deterrence', *Critical Social Policy*, 38(2): 323–44.
- Folkers, A. (2016) 'Daring the truth: Foucault, parrhesia and the Genealogy of Critique', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 33(1): 3–28.
- Foucault, M. (1966) *Les mots et les choses*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1976) *The History of Sexuality* (Vol. I), London: Random House LLC.
- Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, New York: Random House LLC.
- Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, New York: Vintage.

- Foucault, M. (1981) 'Omnes et singulatim: towards a criticism of 'Political Reason'', in S.M. McMurrin (ed) *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press, pp 223–54.
- Foucault, M. (1984) 'The subject and power', *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4): 777–95.
- Foucault, M. (1988) *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1993) 'About the beginning of the hermeneutics of the self: two lectures at Dartmouth', *Political Theory*, 21(2): 198–227.
- Foucault, M. (1997) 'What is critique?' in S. Lotringer and L. Hochroth (eds) *The Politics of Truth*, New York: Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, M. (2000) 'Lives of infamous men', in: *Power, Truth, Strategy*. McArthur Press, pp 76–92.
- Foucault, M. (2003) *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976* (Vol. 1), London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (2005) *The Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1981–1982*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (2006) *Psychiatric Power: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1973–1974*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (2007) *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979*, New York: Picador.
- Foucault, M. (2008) *The Birth of Bio-Politics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (2011) *The Courage of Truth: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1983–1984*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (2014a) *The Government of the Living: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1979–1980*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (2014b) *Wrong-Doing, Truth-Telling: The Function of Avowal in Justice*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Frankl, V. (2006) *Man's Search for Meaning*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Fraser, D. (1992) *The Evolution of the British Welfare State: A History of Social Policy since the Industrial Revolution*, London: Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Fraser, N. and Gordon, L. (1994) 'A genealogy of dependency: tracing a keyword of the US welfare state', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 19(2): 309–36.
- Frayne, D. (2019) *The Work Cure: Critical Essays on Work and Wellness*, London: PCCS Books.
- Friedli, L. and Stearn, R. (2015) 'Positive affect as coercive strategy: conditionality, activation and the role of psychology in UK government workfare programmes', *Medical Humanities*, 41: 40–7.

- Friedman, S. and Laurison, D. (2019) *The Class Ceiling: Why It Pays to Be Privileged*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Frisby, D. (2013) *Fragments of Modernity: Theories of Modernity in the Work of Simmel, Kracauer and Benjamin*, London: Routledge.
- Fuentes, A. (2007) *Improving Employment Prospects in the Slovak Republic*, Paris: OECD.
- Fukuyama, F. (1989) 'The end of history?', *The National Interest*, 16: 3–18.
- Furlong, A. and Cartmel, F. (2007) *Young People and Social Change: New Perspectives* (2nd edn), Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.
- Gaffney, S. and Millar, M. (2019) 'Rational skivers or desperate strivers? The problematisation of fraud in the Irish social protection system', *Critical Social Policy*, 40(1): 69–88.
- Gallie, D. and Paugam, S. (eds) (2000) *Welfare Regimes and the Experience of Unemployment in Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gershon, I. (2017) *Down and Out in the New Economy*, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Gershon, I. (2019) 'Hailing the US job-seeker: origins and neoliberal uses of job applications', *Culture, Theory and Critique*, 60(1): 84–97.
- Giddens, A. (2013) *The Third Way and Its Critics*, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gide, C. [1889] cited in Donzelot, J. (1993) 'The promotion of the social' in Gane, M. and Johnson, T. (eds) *Foucault's New Domains*, London: Routledge, pp 106–38.
- Gillies, V. (2016) *Pushed to the Edge: Inclusion and Behaviour Support in Schools*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Girard, R. (1977) *Violence and the Sacred*, Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Girard, R. (1987) *Job, the Victim of his People*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1990) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, London: Penguin.
- Graeber, D. (2011) *Debt: The First 5000 Years*, New York: Melville House.
- Graeber, D. (2018) *Bullshit Jobs*, London: Verso.
- Gragnotati, M. (2005) *Experiencing the Afterlife: Soul and Body in Dante and Medieval Culture*, Boston: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Great Britain, Cabinet Office, Social Exclusion Unit (1999) *Bridging the Gap: New Opportunities for 16–18 Year Olds Not in Education, Employment or Training*, London: Stationery Office.
- Greenwood, W. (1933) *Love on the Dole*, London: Cape.

- Greer, I. (2016) 'Welfare reform, precarity and the re-commodification of labour', *Work, Employment and Society*, 30(1): 162–73.
- Greer, I., Schulte, L. and Symon, G. (2018) 'Creaming and parking in marketized employment services: an Anglo-German comparison', *Human Relations*, 71(11): 1427–53.
- Grey, C. (1997) 'Career as a project of the self and labour process discipline', *Sociology*, 28(2): 479–97.
- Grover, C. (2012) "'Personalised conditionality": observations on active proletarianisation in late modern Britain', *Capital & Class*, 36(2): 283–301.
- Grover, C. (2019) 'Violent proletarianisation: social murder, the reserve army of labour and social security "austerity" in Britain', *Critical Social Policy*, 39(3): 335–55.
- Habermas, J. (2008) *Between Naturalism and Religion: Philosophical Essays*, Oxford: Polity Press.
- Hadot, P. (1953) 'Epistrophè et metanoia dans l'histoire de la philosophie', in *Proceedings of the XIth International Congress of Philosophy* (Vol. 12), Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, pp 31–6.
- Hakim, C. (1994) *We Are All Self-Employed: The New Social Contract for Working in a Changed World*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Hall, S. (1988) *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcher and the Crisis of the Left*, London: Verso.
- Handley, K. (2018) 'Anticipatory socialization and the construction of the employable graduate: a critical analysis of employers' graduate careers websites', *Work, Employment and Society*, 32(2): 239–56.
- Hansen, K. and Hansen, R. (1990) *Dynamic Cover Letters*, Berkeley: Ten Speed Press.
- Hansen, M.P. (2016) 'Non-normative critique: Foucault and pragmatic sociology as tactical re-politicization', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 19(1): 127–45.
- Hansen, M. (2019) *The Moral Economy of Activation: Ideas, Politics and Policies*, Bristol, Policy Press.
- Harvey, D. (2010) *The Enigma of Capital*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hayek, F. (2001) *The Road to Serfdom*, London: Penguin.
- Heidenreich, M. and Rice, D. (2016) *Integrating Social and Employment Policies in Europe: Active Inclusion and Challenges for Local Welfare Governance*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Heron, N. (2018) *Liturgical Power: Between Economic and Political Theology*, New York: Fordham University Press.
- Hick, R. (2017) 'Enter the Troika: the politics of social security during Ireland's bailout', *Journal of Social Policy*, 47(1): 1–20.

- Hien, J. (2019) 'The religious foundations of the European crisis', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 57: 185–204.
- Hochschild, A. (2003) *The Managed Heart*, London: University of California Press.
- Holland, T. (2019) *Dominion: The Making of the Western Mind*, London: Hachette UK.
- Horvath, A. (2013) *Modernism and Charisma*, Oxford: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Horvath, A. and Szokolczai, A. (2019) *Walking into the Void: A Historic Sociological and Political Anthropology of Walking*, London: Routledge.
- Humpage, L.V. (2015) *Policy Change, Public Attitudes and Social Citizenship: Does Neoliberalism Matter?*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Humpage, L. (2019) 'Innovation and improved social outcomes? "Payment for outcomes" in social services in New Zealand', *New Zealand Sociology*, 34(2): 149–74.
- Ingham, C. (1994) *Life Without Work: A Time for Change, Growth and Personal Transformation*, London: Thorsons.
- Ingold, T. (2011) *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*, London: Taylor & Francis.
- Istance, D., Rees, G. and Williamson, H. (1994) *Young People Not in Education, Training or Employment in South Glamorgan*, Cardiff: South Glamorgan Training and Enterprise Council.
- Jahoda, M. (1982) *Employment and Unemployment: A Social–Psychological Analysis* (Vol. 1), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jahoda, M. and Zeisel, H. (2002) *Marienthal: The Sociography of an Unemployed Community*, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Janoski, T. (1990) *The Political Economy of Unemployment: Active Labor Market Policy in West Germany and the United States*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jensen, T. and Tyler, I. (2015) "'Benefits broods': the cultural and political crafting of anti-welfare commonsense", *Critical Social Policy*, 35(4): 470–91.
- Jessop, B. (2019) 'Ordoliberalism and neoliberalization: governing through order or disorder', *Critical Sociology*, 45(7–8): 967–81.
- Jobcentre Plus (2010) *Find Your Way Back to Work: JobKit, Practical Advice and Help When Applying for Jobs*, London: Department of Work and Pensions.
- Johnson, J. (1993) *The Job Application Handbook*, Oxford: How To Books.
- Jones, O. (2012) *Chavs: The Demonization of the Working Class*, London: Verso.
- Jordan, J.D. (2018) 'Welfare grunTERS and workfare monsters? An empirical review of the operation of two UK "Work Programme" centres', *Journal of Social Policy*, 47(3): 583–601.

- Jung, C.G. [1952] (2010) *Answer to Job*, reprint, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Juncker, J.C. (2016) *State of the Union Address 2016: Towards a Better Europe – A Europe that Protects, Empowers and Defends*, Strasborg.
- Kagge, E. (2019) *Walking: One Step at a Time*, New York: Knopf/Doubleday.
- Kahl, S. (2005) ‘The religious roots of modern poverty policy: Catholic, Lutheran and Reformed Protestant traditions compared’, *European Journal of Sociology*, 46: 91–126.
- Keohane, K. and Kuhling, C. (2015) *The Domestic, Moral and Political Economies of Post-Celtic Tiger Ireland: What Rough Beast?*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Koch, M. and Bucha, M. (2017) *Postgrowth and Wellbeing: Challenges to Sustainable Welfare*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Koopman, C. (2013) *Genealogy as Critique: Foucault and the Problems of Modernity*, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Koopman, C. (2019) *How We Became Our Data: A Genealogy of the Informational Person*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Kotsko, A. (2018) *Neoliberalism’s Demons: On the Political Theology of Late Capital*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Laanani, M., Ghosn, W., Jouglu, E. and Rey, G. (2015) ‘Impact of unemployment variations on suicide mortality in Western European countries (2000–2010)’, *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 69(2): 103–9.
- Lane, C. (2012) *A Company of One: Insecurity, Independence, and the New World of White-Collar Unemployment*, Cornell: Cornell University Press.
- Lane, C. and Kwon, J. (2016) *The Anthropology of Unemployment: New Perspectives on Work and Its Absence*, Cornell: Cornell University Press.
- Larsen, F. and Mailand, M. (2007) ‘Danish activation policy: the role of the normative foundation, the institutional set-up and other drivers’, *Reshaping Welfare States and Activation Regimes in Europe*, 54: 99–127.
- Lassalle, F. (1862) ‘On the essence of constitutions’, speech delivered in Berlin, 25–31.
- Latour, B. (1990) ‘Technology is society made durable’, *The Sociological Review*, 1: 103–31.
- Latour, B. (1993) *We Have Never Been Modern*, London: Harvester.
- Latour, B. (2009) *Reassembling the Social*, London: Polity Press.
- Latour, B. and Woolgar, S. (1986) *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Le Goff, J. (1984) *The Invention of Purgatory*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Le Goff, J. (2009) *The Birth of Europe*, Oxford: Wiley.

- Leschke, J., Russell, H., Smith, M. and Villa, P. (2019) 'Stressed economies, distressed policies, and distraught young people: European policies and outcomes from a youth perspective', in J. O'Reilly, J. Leschke, R. Ortlieb, M. Seeleib-Kaiser and P. Villa (eds) *Youth Labor in Transition: Inequalities, Mobility, and Policies in Europe*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp 104–31.
- Leshem, D. (2016) *The Origins of Neoliberalism: Modeling the Economy from Jesus to Foucault*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Levitas, R. (2005) *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour*, New York: Springer.
- Lind, J. and Møller, I.H. (2006) 'Activation for what purpose? Lessons from Denmark', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 26(1–2): 5–19.
- Linebaugh, P. and Rediker, M. (2000) *The Many-Headed Hydra: The Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*, London: Verso.
- Lødemel, I. and Trickey, H. (2001) *An Offer You Can't Refuse – Workfare in International Perspective*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Loewenberg, F.M. (1994) 'On the development of philanthropic institutions in ancient Judaism: provisions for poor travelers', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23(3): 193–207.
- Loewenberg, F.M. (1995) 'Financing philanthropic institutions in biblical and Talmudic times', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 24(4): 307–20.
- Lynch, M. (2000) 'Against reflexivity as an academic virtue and source of privileged knowledge', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 17(3): 26–54.
- Macdonald, R., Shildrick, T. and Furlong, A. (2014) 'In search of "intergenerational cultures of worklessness": hunting the Yeti and shooting zombies', *Critical Social Policy*, 34(2): 199–220.
- Macfarlane, A. (1988) *The Origins of English Individualism*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Marquis, N. (2016) 'Performance et authenticité, changement individuel et changement collectif: une perspective sociologique sur quelques paradoxes apparents du développement personnel', *Communication Management*, 13(1): 47–62.
- Maslow, A. (1998) *Maslow on Management*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Maslow, A. (2000) *The Maslow Business Reader*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mauss, M. (2000) *The Gift*, with an introduction by Mary Douglas, London: Routledge.
- Mauss, M. (2003) *On Prayer: Text and Commentary*, Oxford: Berghahn Books.

- McCloskey, D. (2004) 'Avarice, prudence, and the bourgeois virtues', in C.T. Mathewes and W. Schweiker (eds) *Having: Property and Possession in Religious and Social Life*, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, pp 312–36.
- McDonald, C. and Marston, G. (2005) 'Workfare as welfare: governing unemployment in the advanced liberal state', *Critical Social Policy*, 25(3): 374–401.
- McGloin, C. and Georgeou, N. (2016) "'Looks good on your CV": the sociology of voluntourism recruitment in higher education', *Journal of Sociology*, 52(2): 403–17.
- McGuinness, S., Kelly, E. and Walsh, J.R. (2014) 'Predicting the probability of long-term unemployment in Ireland using administrative data', *Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI) Research Series*, 51: 1–29, ESRI: Dublin.
- McGuinness, S., O'Connell, P.J. and Kelly, E. (2011) *Carrots Without Sticks: The Impacts of Job Search Assistance in a Regime with Minimal Monitoring and Sanctions* (ESRI Working Paper No. 409), Dublin: ESRI.
- Mead, L. (1986) *Beyond Entitlement: The Social Obligations of Citizenship*, New York: Free Press.
- Mead, L. (1993) *The New Politics of Poverty: The Non-Working Poor in America*, New York: Basic Books.
- Mead, L. (1997) *The New Paternalism: Supervisory Approaches to Poverty*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.
- Michielse, H. and Van Krieken, R. (1990) 'Policing the poor: J.L. Vives and the sixteenth century origins of modern social administration', *Social Service Review*, 64(1): 1–21.
- Miller, P. and Rose, N. (2013) 'Governing economic life', in M. Gane, and T. Johnson (eds) *Foucault's New Domains*, London: Routledge.
- Minas, R., Wright, S. and Van Berkel, R. (2012) 'Decentralization and centralization governing the activation of social assistance recipients in Europe', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 32(5–6): 286–98.
- Mollat, M. (1986) *The Poor in the Middle Ages: An Essay in Social History*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Moran, R. (2016) *The Thing About Work: Showing Up and Other Important Matters*, London: Routledge.
- Murphy, M.P. (2016) 'Low road or high road? The post-crisis trajectory of Irish activation', *Critical Social Policy*, 36(3): 432–52.
- Murray, C. (2006) *In Our Hands: A Plan to Replace the Welfare State*, Washington, DC: AEI Press.
- Negri, A. (2009) *The Labor of Job: The Biblical Text as a Parable of Human Labor*, Durham: Duke University Press.

- Nietzsche, F. [1887] (1998) *On the Genealogy of Morals: A Polemic*, Reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. [1882] (2001) *The Gay Science*, reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nozick, R. (1974) *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, New York: Basic Books.
- O’Neill, M. and Roberts, J. (2019) *Walking Methods: Research on the Move*, London: Routledge.
- O’Callaghan, C. (2009) *Surviving the Axe: The Irish Guide to Handling Redundancy and Finding a New Job*, Dublin: Liberty.
- O’Carroll, J.P. (1987) ‘Strokes, cute hoors and sneaking regarders: the influence of local culture on Irish political style’, *Irish Political Studies*, 2(1): 77–92.
- O’Connell, P. J., McGuinness, S., Kelly, E. and Walsh, J.R. (2009) *National Profiling of the Unemployed in Ireland*, Dublin: ESRI.
- OECD (2019) *The Future of Work: OECD Employment Outlook 2019*, Paris: OECD.
- Offe, C. (1984) *Contradictions of the Welfare State*, Massachusetts: Cambridge MIT.
- Orwell, G. [1937] (2001) *The Road to Wigan Pier*, reprint, London: Penguin.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2009) ‘The virtual geographies of social networks: a comparative analysis of Facebook, LinkedIn and ASmallWorld’, *New Media & Society*, 11(1–2): 199–220.
- Pecchenino, R. (2011) ‘Preferences, choice, goal attainment, satisfaction: that’s life?’, *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 40(3): 237–41.
- Pecchenino, R. (2015) ‘Have we cause for despair?’, *Journal of Behavioural and Experimental Economics*, 58(3): 56–62.
- Peck, J. and Theodore, N. (2016) *Fast Policy: Experimental Statecraft at the Thresholds of Neo-liberalism*, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Peck, J. (1996) *Workplace: The Social Regulation of Labour Markets*, New York: Guilford Press.
- Petersen, A. (2011) ‘Authentic self-realization and depression’, *International Sociology*, 26(1): 5–24.
- Piketty, T. (2020) *Capital and Ideology*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Pleasants, N. (2019) ‘Free will, determinism and the “problem” of structure and agency in the social sciences’, *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 49(1): 3–30.
- Polanyi, K. (2001) *The Great Transformation*, London: Beacon Press.
- Popken, R. (1999) ‘The pedagogical dissemination of a genre: the resume in American business discourse textbooks, 1914–1939’, *Journal of Composition Theory*, 19(1): 91–116.

- Purser, G. and Hennigan, P. (2018) 'Disciples and dreamers: job readiness and the making of the US working class', *Dialect Anthropology*, 42: 149–61.
- Quinon, M. (1996) 'Welfare', *World Wide Words* [online], available from: <http://www.worldwidewords.org/topicalwords/tw-wel1.htm>, accessed: 23 May 2020.
- Rifkin, J. (1985) *The End of Work*, New York: Putnam.
- Roberts, K. (2004) 'School-to-work transitions: why the United Kingdom's educational ladders always fail to connect', *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 14(3): 203–16.
- Roberts, S. (2018) *Young Working-Class Men in Transition*, London: Routledge.
- Robinson, J. (1964) *Economic Philosophy*, reprint, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Rogers, R. (2004) 'Ethical techniques of the self and the "good jobseeker"', in H. Dean (ed) *The Ethics of Welfare: Human Rights, Dependency and Responsibility*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp 155–72.
- Rosa, H. (2019) *Resonance: A Sociology of Our Relationship to the World*, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rose, N. (1989) 'The enterprising self', in P. Heelas and P. Morris (eds) *The Values of the Enterprise Culture: The Moral Debate*, London: Routledge, pp 141–63.
- Rose, N. (1996) *Inventing Our Selves*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sahlins, M. (1972) *Stone Age Economics*, Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.
- Scarpetta, S., Sonnet, A. and Manfredi, T. (2010) 'Rising youth unemployment during the crisis: how to prevent negative long-term consequences on a generation?', *OECD Social, Employment and Migration Papers*, 106: Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development; Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs.
- Schwarzkopf, S. (2011) 'The political theology of consumer sovereignty: towards an ontology of consumer society', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 28(3): 106–29.
- Schwarzkopf, S. (2012) 'The market order as metaphysical loot: theology and the contested legitimacy of consumer capitalism', *Organization*, 19(3): 281–97.
- Schwarzkopf, S. (ed) (2020) *The Routledge Handbook of Economic Theology*, London: Routledge.
- Scott, J. (2017) *Against the Grain: A Deep History of the Earliest States*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Serrano Pascual, A. and Magnusson, L. (eds) (2007) *Reshaping Welfare States and Activation Regimes in Europe*, Brussels: Peter Lang.
- Sewell, W.H. (1992) 'A theory of structure: duality, agency and transformation', *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(1): 1–29.
- Sewell, W.H. (1996) 'Historical events as transformations of structures: inventing revolution at the Bastille', *Theory and Society*, 25(6): 841–81.
- Sharone, O. (2013) *Flawed System/Flawed Self: Job Searching and Unemployment Experiences*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sharone, O. (2017) 'LinkedIn or LinkedOut? How social networking sites are reshaping the labor market', in S.P. Vallas (ed) *Emerging Conceptions of Work, Management and the Labor Market* (Research in the Sociology of Work, Vol. 30), Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited, pp 1–31.
- Shildrick, T. and MacDonald, R. (2012) *Poverty and Insecurity: Life in Low-Pay, No-Pay Britain*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Shildrick, T. and MacDonald, R. (2013) 'Poverty talk: how people experiencing poverty deny their poverty and why they blame "the poor"', *The Sociological Review*, 61(2): 285–303.
- Simmons, R., Thompson, R., Tabrizi, G. and Nartey, A. (2014) *Engaging Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training: The Case for a Youth Resolution*, London: University and College Union.
- Singh, D. (2018) *Divine Currency: The Theological Power of Money in the West*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Skeggs, B. (2004) *Class, Self, Culture*, London: Sage.
- Slok, C. (2020) 'Guilt' in S. Schwarzkopf (ed) *The Routledge Handbook of Economic Theology*, London: Routledge, pp 72–80.
- Smith, A. (2003) *The Wealth of Nations*, London: Penguin.
- Sørensen, B.M., Spoelstra, S., Höpfl, H. and Critchley, S. (2012) 'Theology and organization', *Organization*, 19(3): 267–79.
- Spivack, B. (1958) *Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil: The History of a Metaphor in Relation to His Major Villains*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Springer, S. (2016) *The Discourse of Neo-liberalism: An Anatomy of a Powerful Idea*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Standing, G. (2011) *Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Standing, G. (2015) *Basic Income, and How We Can Make It Happen*, London: Pelican.
- Stark, R. (2006) *The Victory of Reason: How Christianity Led to Freedom, Capitalism, and Western Success*, London: Random House Incorporated.
- Steinbeck, J. (1975) *The Grapes of Wrath*, London: Pan Books.

- Stimilli, E. (2017) *The Debt of the Living: Ascesis and Capitalism*, New York: SUNY Press.
- Stimilli, E. (2019) 'Debt economy and faith: philosophy in the Age of Terror', *Diacritics*, 47(2): 4–21.
- Szokolczai, A. (2013) *Comedy and the Public Sphere: The Re-birth of Theatre as Comedy and the Genealogy of the Modern Public Arena*, London: Routledge.
- Szokolczai, A. (2018) 'Neoclassical economics as a logic of subversion', in C.F. Roman, A. Horváth and G.G. Germain (eds) *Divinization and Technology*, London: Routledge, pp 165–86.
- Szokolczai, A. and Thomassen, B. (2019) *From Anthropology to Social Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, F.W. (1919) *Principles of Scientific Management*, London: Harper & Brothers.
- Taylor, C. (1989) *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Taylor, M.C. (2008) *Confidence Games: Money and Markets in a World without Redemption*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thomassen, B. (2013) *Liminality and the Modern*, London: Ashgate.
- Thompson, E.P. (1967) 'Time-work discipline and Industrial Capitalism', *Past and Present*, 38: 56–97.
- Throness, L. (2008) *A Protestant Purgatory: Theological Origins of the Penitentiary Act, 1779*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Tilley, L. (2012) "'The bioarchaeology of care": The Archaeological Record (Special Issue)', *New Directions in Bioarchaeology*, 12(3): 39–41.
- Titmuss, R. (1970) *The Gift Relationship: From Human Blood to Social Policy*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- Turner, E. and Turner, V. (2011) *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Turner, V. (1969) *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*, London: Routledge.
- Tyler, I. (2015) 'Classificatory struggles: class, culture and inequality in neoliberal times', *The Sociological Review*, 63(2): 493–511.
- Tyler, I. (2020) *Stigma: The Machinery of Inequality*, London: Zed Books.
- Tyler, I. and Slater, T. (2018) 'Rethinking the sociology of stigma', *The Sociological Review*, 66(4): 721–43.
- Underberg, N.M. and Zorn, E. (2013) *Digital Ethnography: Anthropology, Narrative, and New Media*, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Urciuoli, B. (2008) 'Skills and selves in the new workplace', *American Ethnologist*, 35: 211–28.

- Vallas, S. and Cummins, E. (2015) 'Personal branding and identity norms in the popular business press: enterprise culture in an age of precarity', *Organization Studies*, 36(3): 293–319.
- Vallas, S. and Christin, A. (2018) 'Work and identity in an era of precarious employment: how workers respond to "personal branding" discourse', *Work and Occupations*, 45(1): 3–37.
- van Berkel, R. and Møller, I.H. (eds) (2002) 'The concept of activation', in R. Van Berkel and I.H. Møller (eds) *Active Social Policies in the EU: Inclusion Through Participation?*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp 45–71.
- van Berkel, R., de Graaf, W. and Sirovátka, T. (2011) *The Governance of Active Welfare States*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- van Dijck, J. (2013) "'You have one identity": performing the self on Facebook and LinkedIn', *Media, Culture & Society*, 35(2): 199–215.
- Van Maanen, J. (2006) 'Ethnography then and now', *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 1(1): 13–21.
- Van Oort, M. (2015) 'Making the neoliberal precariat: two faces of job-searching in Minneapolis', *Ethnography*, 16(1): 74–94.
- Varoufakis, Y. (2016) *And the Weak Suffer What They Must?: Europe, Austerity and the Threat to Global Stability*, New York: Random House.
- Voegelin, E. (1969) *The New Science of Politics: An Introduction*, London: Aldwyn Press Ltd.
- Voegelin, E. (1997) *Science, Politics and Gnosticism: Two Essays*, Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing.
- Wacquant, L. (2009) *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Walls, J. (2002) *Purgatory: The Logic of Total Transformation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walters, W. (2000) *Unemployment and Government: Genealogies of the Social*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Warr, P. (1987) *Work, Unemployment and Mental Health*, London: Clarendon Press.
- Watts, B. and Fitzpatrick, S. (2018) *Welfare Conditionality*, London: Routledge.
- Webb, D. (2007) *Pilgrimage in Medieval England*, New York: Hambledon Continuum.
- Weber, M. (1991) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, London: Routledge.
- Weber, M. (1930) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, reprint, London: Routledge, 1992.
- Wee, L. and Brooks, M. (2010) 'Personal branding and the commodification of reflexivity', *Cultural Sociology*, 4(1): 45–62.

- Weeks, K. (2011) *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Anti-Work Politics and Post-Work Imaginaries*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Weil, S. [1952] (2003) *The Need for Roots: Prelude to a Declaration of Duties Towards Mankind*, reprint, London: Routledge.
- Weinrich, H. (2008) *On Borrowed Time: The Art and Economy of Living with Deadlines*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Weishaupt, T. (2010) 'A silent revolution? New management ideas and the reinvention of European public employment services', *Socio-Economic Review*, 8(3): 461–86.
- Whelan, J. (2020) 'We have our dignity, yeah? Scrutiny under suspicion: experiences of welfare conditionality in the Irish social protection system', *Social Policy & Administration*, 55(1): 34–50.
- Wilkinson, R.G. and Pickett, K.E. (2009) 'Income inequality and social dysfunction', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35: 493–511.
- Willis, E. (2008) 'The invention of purgatory: contributions to abstract time in capitalism', *Sociology*, 44(3): 249–64.
- Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Winter, Y. (2012) 'Plebeian politics', *Political Theory*, 40 (6): 736–66.
- Wood, E.M. (1999) *The Origin of Capitalism*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Wright, S. (2016) 'Conceptualising the active welfare subject: welfare reform in discourse, policy and lived experience', *Policy & Politics*, 44(2): 235–52.
- Wrigley, L. (2017) 'From "NEET" to "unknown": who is responsible for young people not in education, employment and training', *Youth and Policy: The Journal of Critical Analysis*, available from: <https://www.youthandpolicy.org/articles/from-neet-to-unknown/>, accessed: 13 January 2021
- Wrong, D.H. (1961) 'The oversocialized conception of man in modern sociology', *American Sociological Review*, 26(2): 183–93.
- Yate, M. (2015) *Ultimate CV: Over 100 Winning CVs to Help You Get the Interview and the Job*, London: Kogan Page.
- Zuboff, S. (2019) *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*, New York: Public Affairs.

“This immensely creative book provokes insights on the salvation rituals of jobseeking on nearly every page. It stands as an outstanding contribution to the theological genealogy of government and economy.”

Mitchell Dean, Copenhagen Business School

“Is work the path to salvation? One might imagine so given workfare’s sustained political appeal despite its modest, even negative, effects. This original book takes a long view of religious history to bring provocative new insights to old policy debates.”

Evelyn Brodtkin, University of Chicago

Tom Boland is Senior Lecturer in Sociology at University College Cork.

Ray Griffin is Lecturer in Strategic Management at Waterford Institute of Technology.

Western culture has ‘faith’ in the labour market as a test of the worth of each individual. For those who are out of work, welfare is now less of a support than a means of purification and redemption. Continuously reformed by the left and right in politics, the contemporary welfare state attempts to transform the unemployed into active jobseekers, punishing non-compliance.

Drawing on ideas from economic theology, this provocative book uncovers deep-rooted religious concepts and shows how they continue to influence contemporary views of work and unemployment: Jobcentres resemble purgatory where the unemployed attempt to redeem themselves, jobseeking is a form of pilgrimage in hope of salvation, and the economy appears as providence, whereby trials and tribulations test each individual. This book will be essential reading for those interested in the sociology and anthropology of modern economic life.

Chapters 1 and 3 are available Open Access via OAPEN under CC-BY-NC-ND licence.



@BrisUniPress

BristolUniversityPress
bristoluniversitypress.co.uk

ISBN 978-1-5292-1133-7



9 781529 211337