

THE
EBOR
LECTURES



Dr Kathy Galloway

Wednesday 19th March 2014

*'The naked emperor: challenging
the ideology of deficiency'*

The Morality of Austerity

It's a privilege to be speaking to you today. I have been introduced as the Head of Christian Aid in Scotland, but I wish to be clear that I am not speaking on behalf of Christian Aid, nor do I represent them in this address. Though much of what I say has been shaped and influenced by my work with Christian Aid, and with the Iona Community and Church Action on Poverty, the views here are my own and I am solely responsible for them.

The nightmare of scarcity: Joseph

When I was a small child, under five years old, I lived in the country. And I remember being told in Sunday School the story of Joseph and the famine in Egypt, and the seven thin cows coming out of the Nile and swallowing up the seven fat cows, and being quite sure that skinny, starved cows were going to come up out of the placid River Nith in Scotland and eat up the fat cows in **my** meadow. We are enculturated. We interpret from where we are.

That was my first encounter with Joseph, most-loved and most hated son and brother in his coat of many colours, sold into slavery in Egypt, object of desire, interpreter of dreams, and chief minister of the Pharaoh. Joseph was one of the great Old Testament heroes of my Presbyterian childhood formation. It was many years before, thanks to Walter Brueggemann¹ I saw another, less heroic dimension of his story, one of immense power and hunger and economics and monopoly. Pharaoh is the embodiment of that power, or rather we might say superpower; his land of Egypt is the breadbasket of the ancient world. The book of Genesis tells us it is where people from the surrounding countries go when there is famine in their lands. But the leader of the superpower has nightmares – when he is asleep and unguarded, the most powerful man in his world has dreams full of horror and portent.

Desperate to understand his dreaming, as a last resort, he summons an unknown Israelite from prison. Joseph, the interpreter, immediately recognises that the one with everything dreams of scarcity, of lack. These are dreams of famine. Hearing and receiving the interpretation, Pharaoh sets out to turn his nightmare into policy. He asks for a plan of action, and Joseph nominates himself as food czar. The royal policy is to accomplish a food monopoly; then, as now, food is a weapon and tool of control. Genesis 47 describes this nightmare policy. All the Egyptian people, having no food of their own in the famine which had indeed come upon Egypt, come to Joseph, now a high-ranking government official, who has stockpiled vast amounts of food in the good years, and they pay their money in exchange for food. The centralised government of Pharaoh becomes even richer. In the second year of famine, the peasants come again and ask for food. This time, Joseph, on behalf of Pharaoh, takes their cattle, their means of livelihood. In the third year, the peasants still need food. But now they have no money and no livestock. This year, they surrender their freedom in exchange for food. They do it willingly, for they are desperate. This is how Genesis 47 puts it.

Shall we die before your eyes, both we and our land. Buy us and our land in exchange for food. We with our land will become slaves to Pharaoh; just give us seed, so that we may live and not die, and that the land may not become desolate.

So Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh. All the Egyptians sold their fields, because the famine was severe upon them; and the land became Pharaoh's. As for the people, he made slaves of them from one end of Egypt to the other.....

And the people said to Joseph: you have saved our lives; may it please my Lord, we will be slaves to Pharaoh.

Joseph's service to the Pharaoh was very profitable for him and for his own people. They did well in the land of Egypt. But now we are into the book of Exodus, and now a new king arose over Egypt who did not know Joseph. The Israelites in their turn were oppressed and enslaved, ultimate victims of the system of fearful monopoly. This imperial system is one of raw and ruthless exploitation, always pressing cheap labour for more production. The scene is set for the story of a great contest between the urge to control-the manipulation of the economy in the interest of a concentration of wealth and power for the few at the expense of the many- and the power of emancipation that is linked to the God of the Exodus. The practice of exploitation, fear and suffering produces a dramatic turn away from aggressive centralised power and a food monopoly. For the sake of the common good, it was necessary to depart the anxiety system that produces nightmares of scarcity!

The nightmare of scarcity: The Great Famine

When I was a bit older-perhaps eleven or twelve- I learned in school about the Great Famine in 19th century Ireland. This was in a Scottish context; an explanation of why so many Irish people had immigrated into the West of Scotland, with far-reaching consequences for a very predominantly Protestant country. I learned about the hostility of many of the native population to these economic migrants, who they accused of pushing down wages (being so desperate, they would work for very low rates), or simply of taking their jobs. I learned about the sectarian religious conflicts that arose between Scottish Protestants and Irish Catholics, and which, in tribal forms, still persist today as a scar upon Scotland. I learned about the horrors of the famine itself, of children eating grass, of families dying in ditches, and was left in no doubt about its catastrophic nature. About a million people died of starvation or epidemic diseases between 1846-1851; another two million emigrated in little more than a decade. The retelling of this tragic story in 1960s Edinburgh was by no means unsympathetic.

But I was not taught that during all the years of the famine, grain was being both exported and imported in large quantities, and that, from 1847, there was enough food in Ireland to prevent this mass starvation if only it had been properly distributed. What began as a natural disaster caused by potato blight, very soon became an artificial famine. But Ireland was at this time, as

you will remember, ruled by a British government, part of what was then the richest country in the world, the Egypt of its day, you might say. Why did the government not do more to alleviate the plight of its own subjects? There was no war in the country, a reasonable infrastructure of roads and canals, no great distances to traverse, a strong bureaucracy of civil servants -all difficulties prevalent in contemporary famines.

There were ideological factors which prevented the British political elite and middle-classes from taking the kind of relief actions that were perfectly possible. The first was economic. The new Whig government, led by Lord John Russell, espoused the economic orthodoxy of the day in their laissez-faire belief that the market would provide and there should be as little government interference as possible. To stop the food exports, they believed, would be an unacceptable policy alternative. They then halted government food and relief works, leaving hundreds of thousands without work, money or food.

The second factor was to be found in the Protestant evangelical belief in divine Providence. There was a widespread belief among the British middle and upper-middle classes that the famine was a divine judgment against the inefficient and corrupt Irish agricultural system. Since the hand of God was perceived to be revealed in the unfettered workings of the market economy, it was considered positively evil to interfere with its proper functioning. So Sir Charles Trevelyan, the British civil servant who was in charge of the administration of government relief to the victims of the Irish Famine, limited the Government's actual relief because he thought "the judgment of God sent the calamity to teach the Irish a lesson" and he described the famine as 'a direct stroke of an all-wise and all-merciful providence.' The fact that the Irish agricultural system had largely evolved as a result of deeply unjust land laws and denial of tenant rights was loftily overlooked. And this attribution to God of what was very evidently in the interest of British policy-makers allowed the mass evictions that led to the radical restructuring of Irish rural society into the more preferred capitalistic model.

The third factor in the failure of Britain to prevent a million of its subjects starving to death was what has come to be known as 'moralism'-the notion that the fundamental defects from which the Irish suffered were moral rather than financial. Educated Britons of this era saw serious defects in the Irish 'national character'-disorder or violence, filth, laziness, and worst of all, a lack of self-reliance. The Irish had to be taught to stand on their own feet and to unlearn their dependence on government. This deep-dyed and well-documented ethnic prejudice and cultural stereotyping had the general effect of prompting British ministers, civil servants, and politicians to view and to treat the Catholic Irish as something less than fully human.

Such prejudices encouraged the spread of 'famine fatigue' in Britain at an early stage, and they dulled or even extinguished the active sympathies that might have sustained political will - the will to combat the gross oppression of mass evictions, to alleviate the immense suffering associated with reliance on the poor-law system, and to grapple with the moral indefensibility of mass death in the midst of an absolute sufficiency of food.² In 19th century Ireland, food was a weapon and tool of control.²



The nightmare of scarcity: Enough Food for Everyone IF

Last year, Christian Aid along with over a hundred other agencies, organisations and churches, was part of a campaign on global hunger. It was called **Enough Food for Everyone IF**. Some of you may have been involved in it. This was its message:

Hunger is the greatest scandal of our age. It kills more people than AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis combined. One in eight people on our planet are hungry. Two million children die each year because of malnutrition. Yet we produce enough food to feed everyone. The problem is not a shortage of food. There are deep inequalities and rigged rules in the food system that mean the hungry do not get the food they need to live.

There is Enough Food for Everyone....

- IF we stop poor farmers being forced off their land, and use the available agricultural land to grow food for people, not biofuels for cars.
- IF governments keep their promises on aid, invest to stop children dying from malnutrition and help the poorest people feed themselves through investment in small farmers.
- If governments stop big companies dodging tax in poor countries, so that millions of people can free themselves from hunger.
- IF we force governments and investors to be honest and open about the deals they make in the poorest countries that stop people getting enough food. We want our leaders to act on the four big issues that stop everyone getting enough food. Aid IF we give enough aid to stop children dying from hunger, and help the poorest people feed themselves. Tax IF we stop big companies dodging taxes in poor countries, so that millions of people can free themselves of hunger. Land IF we stop poor farmers being forced off their land, and use crops to feed people, not fuel cars. Transparency IF we force governments and big corporations to be honest and open about the actions they take that stop people getting enough food. We want our leaders to act on the four big issues that stop everyone getting enough food. Aid IF we give enough aid to stop children dying from hunger, and help the poorest people feed themselves. Tax IF we stop big companies dodging taxes in poor countries, so that millions of people can free themselves of hunger. Land IF we stop poor farmers being forced off their land, and use crops to feed

people, not fuel cars. Transparency IF we force governments and big corporations to be honest and open about the actions they take that stop people getting enough food.

Once again, across the globe, food is a weapon and tool of control

The Age of Austerity

It is not my intention to suggest an equivalence between these three terrible experiences of hunger and the so-called 'Age of Austerity'; though we may once again be beginning to see food being used as a weapon and a tool of control. But certain ideologies, and the processes and practices they drive, have a habit of turning up again and again over centuries and continents. In particular, I'm interested in what might be called the ideology of deficiency.

But first I'd like to explore a little what we actually mean when we talk about 'austerity'. The word comes from the Latin for *dry, harsh or stern*. My dictionaries offer a number of alternative meanings for austere. They include:

- Harsh, stern, forbidding (referring to manners or moral conditions)
- Severely simple (referring to mode of life)
- Severe, sparing, chaste (referring to literary style)

They also include:

- Frugal, lean
- Rigorous, exacting, searching, plain
- Self-disciplined or ascetic
- Reduced availability of luxuries and consumer goods

I have to confess that I do not find all of these meanings entirely unappealing. I am, after all, a Scottish Presbyterian from a country of wild terrain and harsh weather, for whom, in some interpretations, the word 'austere' might have been coined. For sure, the landscapes that speak strongest to my heart are those which many find stern or forbidding—the treeless hills of the Southern Uplands, the bogs and moors of the Ross of Mull, the hard and empty grandeur of the Scottish northwest, the windswept, storm-tossed islands of Shetland. These are austere landscapes, yet they are also beautiful. But for many, they would be defined by what they lack—lushness, productivity, utility, shelter, civilisation.



The Age of Austerity has also been framed for us as lack; in this context as a lack of money, shown by high levels of personal and public debt, and by unsustainable budget deficits. The solution to the problem of this apparent lack of money, this deficiency, is framed for us as cuts, the reduction of public services and welfare payments. People will have to make do with less, they will have to be more frugal, and they will need to live a more severely simple lifestyle. If they are reluctant or unable to do this voluntarily, there will be sanctions; they may lose their social security payments; they may lose their homes. The public services which have enabled the very young, the very old, the sick and disabled, the unemployed, struggling families, to access at least a few of the freedoms that many of us take for granted—mobility, support in times of crisis, recourse to the justice and legal systems, affordable housing—will all be reduced and in some instances stripped away altogether. Austerity indeed.

All in this together?

But just as in ancient Egypt, as in 19th century Ireland, as in the places of famine today, this lack, this deficiency, is not altogether what it seems. In reality, this is still one of the richest countries in the world. It's just that the wealth is located in particular places. The London Stock Exchange has had a boom year, the stock market is soaring and the FTSE 100 had its highest day for fourteen years a couple of weeks ago, having risen 12% in 2013. Salaries and bonuses for directors and senior managers in the City have soared away, with a knock-on effect on corporate management expectation. The top tax rate has been cut by 5%.

Banks too have benefitted from £375 billion in quantitative easing over the last seven years, on the basis of making credit available for small and medium businesses. However, much of this money has been used to rescue the balance sheets of the banks, catastrophically depleted by the reckless and sometimes criminal investment banking that led to the financial crisis in the first place. In August 2012, the Bank of England issued a report stating that its quantitative easing policies had benefited mainly the wealthy. For example, the report said that the QE program had boosted the value of stocks and bonds by 26%, or about \$970 billion. About 40% of those gains went to the richest 5% of British households.³ One economist wrote that QE “is fundamentally a regressive redistribution program that has been boosting wealth for those already engaged in the financial sector or those who already own homes, but passing little along to the rest of the economy. It is a primary driver of income inequality.”⁴

Richard Murphy spoke at length in the last lecture about the vast wealth held in tax havens, much on behalf of British corporations and individuals, so I will not elaborate on that, except to say that the losses sustained by the British economy pale into insignificance compared to the impact that tax evasion and tax avoidance have on the economies of the world's poorest countries. And of course, there is the wealth held by individual citizens in Britain—in property, land, pensions and many other kinds of assets. But we know that this is very unequally distributed – more than 60% of household wealth is held by the richest 20% of the population, while the poorest 20% hold less than 1% of household wealth—and the inequality is getting greater, returning to levels not seen since Queen Victoria was on the throne.⁵

Now public services-water, health, education, transport, infrastructure, law enforcement, emergency services, defence, social services and many more- are used by the vast majority of the UK population; by most of us apart from the very richest whose wealth can insulate them from the public domain. But it is the poorest 20% which contains the people bearing the brunt of the cuts to public services and welfare payments- the young, the very old, the sick and disabled, the unemployed, struggling families. So let us be very clear that the Age of Austerity in its harshest manifestation is being experienced by the people who already own less than 1% of the nation's wealth. Does that seem fair to you? What kind of morality does it suggest? And how has this been made to be acceptable, as opinion polls are always telling us it is to a large part of the population?

A totalising system

Let us revisit the factors that played such a malevolent role in the Irish famine. First there is the belief in market forces. But with a critical nationwide shortage of decent, affordable housing, market forces are doing nothing to house the people who need it most-indeed, they are exacerbating the problem. Nor did market forces operate for the common good in the financial crisis. 'By the end of October 2008, governments across the world had committed \$7 trillion dollars of public money to secure risky assets, underwrite threatened savings and recapitalize failing banks. In doing so, governments rewarded those who had taken huge risks for personal gain and in the process destabilized the global economy. It was a classic case of socialization of losses and privatization of gain. This bailout effectively shifted debt from banks to nation states, and the impacts have been felt globally. But the worst impacts are on the poor in developing countries, who are vulnerable because they are poor – they mostly don't have savings or social security programmes to fall back on. As a direct result of the crisis, an extra 120 million people will be living on less than \$2 a day and global unemployment will rise to an estimated 240 million people. This is the highest figure on record, with disproportionately damaging effects on women. World Bank researchers estimate that the crisis will cause an additional 30,000-50,000 infant death in sub-Saharan Africa alone.'⁶

So here is another question. Do we believe, as many of our predecessors in the 19th century did, that this might be the will of God? Or, if not the will of God, then, as Richard Murphy suggested, that the Washington Consensus enjoys the status of a secular faith, and that we are therefore deficient devotees if we question it? Or might we be more inclined to agree with Glenn Tindler that '*Christians are and have been deeply suspicious of the maxim that the invisible hand of the market is always to be trusted in preference to the visible hand of government. Such a maxim has a look of idolatry. The principle that only God, and never a human institution, should be relied on absolutely suggests a far more flexible and pragmatic approach to the issue.*'⁷

But the ideology of deficiency can be seen most clearly in the notion that the poor are to blame for their own poverty - and hence indirectly for our country's economic problems- and that therefore it is only fitting that they should, out of their 1% of household wealth, pay to solve them. The British government and media have invested considerable time and



resources in seeking to persuade the public that it is the fundamental moral defects of those living in poverty that is the cause of their situation. This has been done first of all by **individualising** the causes of poverty - this is an issue of morally deficient individuals – without any reference to the structural and systemic factors which in a neoliberal economy make poverty not only inevitable but essential. Then those living in poverty-perhaps we could say the 20% living on 1% of household wealth-have been subjected to a brutal **collective** cultural stereotyping, re-designated as the underclass, as feral, living in so-called 'sink estates', attending 'bog-standard' comprehensives; thus millions of people are deemed morally deficient, regardless of circumstance, in what has all the characteristics of a propaganda war on the poor-one might even call it a class war!

This is as ludicrous as suggesting that because some bankers are clearly corrupt- fixing interest rates, operating cartels, mis-selling useless products –all bankers are corrupt. Or that all police are racist, all journalists think themselves above the law and all politicians fiddle their expenses just because some do. We have recognised that there are systemic and structural and institutional flaws at work in all of these. Only the poor continue to be easy and powerless targets.

So relentless has this been that even the perpetrators, aware of rising criticism, particularly in churches, are beginning to go on the defensive. *Contemporary Reflections on Unemployment and Future of Work*,⁸ published by the Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and the Humber offers a different perspective on that icon of the war on the poor, 'hardworking families', and why, considering such things as globalisation, a two-tier labour market, the transfer of economic risk by employers onto low-skilled workers through casualization and zero-hours contracts, the extreme regionalisation of job opportunities, still the main reason for unemployment or underemployment is not laziness but too many people for too few jobs.

The Joint Public Issues Team, on behalf of the Baptist Union of Great Britain, the Methodist Church, the Church of Scotland and the United Reformed Church, have produced a report entitled, '*The lies we tell ourselves; ending comfortable myths about poverty*'.⁹ It tests six myths about poor people in the UK and against serious evidence.

- They are lazy and don't want to work
- They are addicted to drink and drugs
- They are not really poor-they just don't manage their money properly
- They are on the fiddle
- They have an easy life
- They caused the deficit

Pretty much what was said about the Irish in the 19th century really. The African-American



writer Alice Walker offers her own critique of the ideology of deficiency.

First they said we were savages. But we knew how well we had treated them, and knew we were not savages.

Then, they said we were immoral. But we knew minimal clothing did not equal immoral.

Nest, they said our race was inferior. But we knew our mothers, and knew that our race was not inferior.

After that, they said we were a backward people. But we knew our fathers, and knew we were not backward.

So then they said we were obstructing progress. But we knew the rhythm of our days, and knew we were not obstructing progress.

Eventually, they said the truth is that you eat too much and your villages take up too much of the land. But we knew that we and our children were starving, and our villages were burned to the ground. So we knew we were not eating too much, or taking up too much of the land.

Finally, they had to agree with us.

They said; you are right. It is not your savagery or immorality or your racial inferiority or your people's backwardness or your obstructing of progress or your appetite or your infestation of the land that is at fault. No. What is at fault is your existence itself.¹⁰

The loser must deserve to lose. Otherwise we must question the game itself – and who wants to do that when you're the winner? This too is a policy rooted in nightmare, threadbare in its evidentiary basis, naked in its uses of power. The exploitative system of Pharaoh believed that it always needed more and was always entitled to more-more bricks, more control, more territory, more oil- until it had everything. Our immediate experience of the kingdom of scarcity is our entitled consumerism in which there is always a hope for more, in which we imagine that something more will make us safer, happier, more comfortable... Every day, we are being inducted into an anxiety system, an ideology of deficiency, that produces nightmares of scarcity, a totalising system which is immense in its impact upon us.

In his splendid essay titled simply 'Austerity'¹¹ Tony Judt revisits another Age of Austerity-the immediate post-war years in Britain. Differentiating between austerity and poverty, he remembers that rationing and subsidies meant that the bare necessities of life were accessible to all, with free milk and orange juice for the children. He describes how 'the family might have fallen on hard times, but we were all in it together. It was this togetherness that made tolerable the characteristic shortages and greyness of post-war Britain. ...the rich kept a prudently low profile. There was little evidence in these years of conspicuous consumption. Everyone looked the same and lived remarkably similar lives.' I think it's fair to suggest that the lives of people living on social security, or on the minimum wage or basic pension are still today characterised by shortages and greyness-that was certainly my experience for the short time I did it. But most of us don't now live like that. Our average income may have fallen by around £1700 a household in real terms since 2002 (and there are always problems about averages).

But even in 2002, for the majority in this country, our lives were not markedly austere or deprived; not compared to those living below the poverty threshold in Britain and certainly not compared to the poor of the global south.

And what counted as conspicuous consumption in the 1950s would be considered normal behaviour today; our economy has, pretty much since deregulation, been driven by consumer spending on our homes, our cars, our holidays, our appearance, our possessions, and often by consumer credit. Our growth economy encourages this in every possible way, and so people in the poorest 20% are continuously reminded that they are also failures in their achievement of the good life. We know that public service and welfare cuts fall particularly hard on women—we also know that marketing and advertising aimed at women is hugely based on convincing them of their deficiencies. Here's a young woman journalist writing about other young women:

*The women of my acquaintance... are anything but fearless. Many of them are very, very frightened. They're scared that, by graduating at the wrong time, they've missed out on the career that they wanted. They're worried that they will never be able to pay back their student loans or their overdrafts, or that they're ugly, or fat, or worthless. They're scared that their benefits will be taken away, or that they'll never move out of their parents' house. Some have struggled with eating disorders, depression or severe anxiety. Many have regular panic attacks. All worry about their appearance: that they're the wrong size; that their hair isn't long enough, their teeth aren't white enough, and their stomachs aren't flat enough.*¹²

I can't help feeling that this is a very good description indeed of an anxiety system, an ideology of deficiency that produces nightmares of scarcity, a totalising system which is immense in its impact upon us. Women's bodies, their sense of worth, their rights and freedoms, are so often the ground on which ideologies of control, monopoly and oppression have been played out.

In his essay, Tony Judt suggests that austerity in post-war Britain was not just an economic condition, but that it aspired to be a public ethos, exemplified in its moral seriousness by Clement Atlee, the greatest reformer in modern British history. He claims that the opposite of austerity is not prosperity but *luxe et volupte*, luxury and pleasure. 'We have substituted endless commerce for public purpose—the togetherness of consumption—and expect no higher aspirations from our leaders. If we want better rulers, we must learn to ask more from them and less for ourselves. A little austerity might be in order.'

The story of abundance

And nowhere is this truer than in relation to climate change and our carbon footprint. In this context, we are certainly all in it together—though not, of course, in our ability to mitigate the effect of extreme weather events, or to adapt to their consequences; in this too, the poorest are most disadvantaged. But ultimately there is no haven which can protect us all from the changes threatening our habitat. Taking as a moral starting point the great

commandment to love God with our whole being, and our neighbour as ourselves, or even its secular equivalent of 'do no harm', we might think that the austerity required is from the 1% who have been estimated to use 10,000 times more carbon than the average citizen.¹³ In this scenario, it is the poorest who, without necessarily intending it, display the greatest public ethos. Indeed, we will all require to live more ascetic, self-disciplined, austere lives if we are to avoid bringing catastrophe on our grandchildren. So we will need to search a bit harder, get a bit more of a grip on our panicky self-absorption, and look for the beauty in the simplicity of austerity. This should not be impossible for people of faith!

Biblically, escape from slavery in Egypt, Moses' dream of departure from what Brueggemann calls the zone of strategically designed suffering, led into the wilderness. This was a new environment of risky faith and the Israelites did not take long to regret their departure from the place of guaranteed food, even though it was a slave diet. The story of grace, of bread from heaven, was one of absolute strangeness, like nothing they knew. This bread could not be stored or monopolised; it went bad if you tried to stockpile surpluses. Yet the wilderness, they discovered, could be a place of viable life, made so by the generosity of God. The bread in the wilderness was a divine gesture of enormous abundance. It broke the grip of Pharaoh's food monopoly because it was enough for all but not more. It broke the pattern of violence that is rooted in a fear of scarcity. In the Bible, the feast at which all are included breaks the system of fear and anxiety and sets free the truth of generosity.

In the gospel, the divine gift of abundance in the wilderness, renewed in Isaiah as abundance in exile, is represented as an abundance that will not go bad and perish but will live for ever. The ideology of anxious and fearful scarcity that is used to control and divide people from one another, that pretends it always needs more and is entitled to more, has always contested with God's offer of abundance, of a world in which there is enough for everyone's need, just not for everyone's greed. But the Eucharist, Christ's self-offering, is liturgical resistance, the great extravagant drama of the way in which the gospel of abundance overrides the claim of scarcity and invites to the common good. The story of abundance persists among us, offering us life in all its fullness, beyond ourselves, for the sake of the world. We have to keep telling the story, because we're worth it-all of us.

© Kathy Galloway

1. Walter Brueggemann: Journey to the Common Good, Westminster John Knox Press, 2010
2. Jim Donnelly, http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/british/victorians/famine_01.shtml
3. Larry Elliott, The Guardian, 23rd August 2012
4. Anthony Randazzo, The Reason Foundation, www.reason.com, 13th September 2012
5. www.inequalitybriefing.org, October 2013, based on data from the Office of National Sta-



tistics

6. David McNair, from 'Prosperity Lost', address given in Grace Church London. 2011
7. Glenn Tinder, The Political Meaning of Christianity, Louisiana State University Press, 1989
8. 'Contemporary Reflections on Unemployment and Future of Work', Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and the Humber, 2013
9. 'The lies we tell ourselves; ending comfortable myths about poverty' Joint Public Issues Team, on behalf of the Baptist Union of Great Britain, the Methodist Church, the Church of Scotland and the United Reformed Church, 2013
10. Alice Walker, 'First they said' in 'Horses Make a Landscape Look More Beautiful', Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich Inc, 1984
11. Tony Judt, 'Austerity' in 'The Memory Chalet', William Heinemann 2010
12. Rhiannon Lucy Cosslett, The Guardian, 17th August 2012
13. The Cost of Inequality, Oxfam Media Briefing 18th January 2013

Copyright: Ebor Lectures

Please do not use or reproduce any part of this lecture

THE
EBOR
LECTURES



Jointly organised by:



www.yorkminster.org



www.yorksja.ac.uk



www.theologyinthecommunity.org.uk



www.crc-online.org.uk



www.carmelite.org



www.methodist.org.uk