

ONE NATION

How do traditional strands fit into this new progressive vision?





YOUNG
FABIANS



FABIAN
SOCIETY

The Young Fabians

The Young Fabians are the under-31's section of the Fabian Society, Britain's foremost centre-left think tank. Set up in 1960, we remain the only think tank run by and for young people.

Our membership numbers over 1,500 and includes young professionals, students, parliamentary researchers, political activists and academics. The Young Fabians promote policy debate through seminars, conferences, pamphlets, and online through our website and blog.

To find out more about the Young Fabians, visit www.youngfabians.org.uk.

The Fabian Society

The Fabian Society is Britain's leading left of centre think tank and political society, committed to creating the political ideas and policy debates which can shape the future of progressive politics.

Fabian publications, events and ideas reach and influence a wider audience than those of any comparable think tank. The Society is unique among think tanks in being a thriving, democratically constituted membership organisation, affiliated to the Labour Party but organisationally and editorially independent.

For more information, visit www.fabians.org.uk.

Fabian Society
61 Petty France
London SW1H 9EU
www.fabians.org.uk



First published September 2014

This paper, like all publications of the Fabian Society, represents not the collective views of the Society but only the views of the authors. This publication may not be reproduced without express permission of the Fabian Society.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data.

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

Young Fabians | 63

ISBN 978-0-7163-2063-0

Designed by Alex Adranghi



One Nation

How do traditional strands fit into
this new progressive vision?

Edited by **Felicity Slater, James Hallwood, Alex Adranghi, Ade Adeyemi**

Young Fabians | 63



Contents

Foreword Billy Hayes	3
Introduction Felicity Slater	4
1. Socialism & Capitalism: Progressive capitalism in the 21st century Callum Totton	6
2. Feminism: Hand in hand with One Nation Heather Vernon	13
3. Patriotism: Towards an inclusive nation Jack Eddy and Jim O'Connell	21
4. Environmentalism: A citizens' contract Lee Gregory and Tom Maisey	27
5. Internationalism: Making a new case Jessica Toale and Isaac Turner	31
Fabianism: Conclusion James Hallwood	36
About the authors and acknowledgements	43

FOREWORD

Billy Hayes

The Communication Workers' Union is very happy to once again work with the Young Fabians to support this publication. If "One Nation" is the lodestar that guides the Labour Party hopefully to victory in 2015, then we better think carefully about what that means in practice.

So I think this collection of essays is both timely and important. It is also an impressive demonstration of the imagination and energy of the Young Fabians, attributes that will be needed to rebuild and rebalance Britain.

The watchword for me in the "One Nation" debate is inclusivity. Do we work together and seek ways to encourage collaboration in pursuit of a common set of values - benefitting the many and supporting the idea of a fairer and just community? Or do we cede our plans and hopes - our futures - to the exclusive tendency, already emboldened and financially enriched in an unprecedented way, and with not the slightest intention of sharing the wealth and power they have accumulated?

In our own work, these values are reflected in campaigns for a postal service based on public service, not private profit, for universal access to high-speed, high quality broadband - things that build and nurture communities - and for decent employment standards for all.

In our own union, we recognise that investment in our young members is vital for our future survival. As an affiliate, we believe that the Labour Party should, must, do the same, so we value our relationships with Young Labour and Young Fabians and are pleased to work with you in forging a better future.

Billy Hayes
General Secretary
Communications Workers' Union

info@cwu.org @cwunews @BillyHayes_CWU

Introduction

Felicity Slater, Young Fabians Research Officer

“One Nation: a country for all, with everyone playing their part. A Britain we rebuild together.”
– Ed Miliband, speech to Labour party conference, 2013.

These were powerful words; this was what we had been building up to over three years of opposition: setting the narrative, the foundation stone of our every policy going into 2015 and into a Labour government.

Since October 2013, the party has produced large amounts of policy, all of which bears the ‘One Nation’ hallmark. Yet we felt that there was more meat to put on the bones on One Nation Labour itself. For all that policies on energy prices and childcare prove very popular, we recognised a need for to further develop Miliband’s One Nation idea, so as to create a narrative that could take us through a whole term in office, not just the first one hundred days.

As Young Fabians, we were excited by the One Nation idea and eager to contribute our own thoughts at this critical point in Labour’s ideological renewal. Somewhat fittingly, we decided to break with tradition: rather than run policy commissions, for this year’s research project we wanted to invite our members to explore One Nationism. We chose to focus on five different strands that are integral to contemporary Labour thinking: environmentalism, feminism, internationalism, patriotism, and socialism (and capitalism). These are by no means exhaustive, but afforded the opportunity to tackle what we felt to be the core ideological underpinnings of One Nation.

Following an open application process, we appointed a project chair and vice-chair for each of the five ‘isms’. Over the course of six months, between them they held 17 events across the country – from Manchester to London to Birmingham to Cardiff, in addition to various meetings with members to further debate and flesh out the ideas presented in the following chapters.

In chapter one, Callum Totten puts forward that “the left should once again become the champions of a property-owning democracy and thereby support both fairness and aspiration”.

Meanwhile, in chapter two, Heather Vernon advocates for One Nation Labour to place feminism at the heart of its decentralisation and redistribution agendas, “as a means of enacting social change that benefits us all”.

Chapter three, Jack Eddy argues for One Nation to develop an ‘inclusive patriotism’ that tackles issues from housing to healthcare “in the name of a better and prouder Britain”.

In chapter four, Lee Gregory argues that we must “rethink the role of the state and its relationship to the citizen” if environmentalism is to survive as a core tenet of One Nation Labour.

In chapter five, Jessica Toale argues for a renewed commitment to making internationalism relevant to the public, “highlighting the global dimension to local issues and contextualising our role in the world”.

This year’s Young Fabian chair, James Hallwood, concludes the pamphlet by drawing on each project’s contribution to define ‘Young Fabianism’.

My particular thanks go to our project chairs and vice-chairs, who have done an excellent job – organising, in their free time, some of the most engaging and thought-provoking discussions that I have attended all year. Also to Alex Adranghi for supporting as sub editor and producing the pamphlet, Ade Adeyemi for sub editing and to James Hallwood and the rest of the Young Fabians executive, for support throughout the whole course of the project.

Socialism & Capitalism: Progressive capitalism in the 21st century

Callum Totton

This essay attempts to set out the basis for a left political economy in the 21st century. Our task was to explore the meaning of socialism and capitalism as ideologies in modern politics.

In the space available we seek two objectives: to outline a set of values which can underpin the ideology of the modern left, and to provide illustrative policies that promote those values. It is a worthwhile enterprise to step back from the fray of electoral cycles and ask fundamental questions about the economy we are seeking to build.

Political economy is concerned with the moral and political values that underpin economic systems; on people's lived experience of economics rather than the detail of economic policy. Our political economy must respond to the challenges we face in the 21st century: an ageing society, increasing pressure on wages due to technological advances and international competition, and changes in the job market (rising self-employment and fewer 'jobs for life') to name just a few. These challenges demand us to constantly re-evaluate our economic goals.

Additionally, the recent financial crisis challenges us not only to reconsider our macroeconomic and regulatory policies, but also to consider the ideological lessons (e.g. what are the risks of building public services and welfare services based on the tax revenue?).

A vision of good capitalism

The vision we articulate in the rest of this essay is essentially capitalist. People looking for a modern articulation of socialism as an alternative to replace capitalism will not find it here. During this project, a number of people proposed that we should reject GDP as a measure of economic success. While we share certain concerns about the adequacy of GDP, we remain convinced that capitalism offers the best prospect for progressive politics and that the left must be on the side of those who aspire to be economically successful.

By articulating a vision of good capitalism we are implicitly accepting the thesis that different varieties of capitalism can exist¹, and that through political action we can develop a capitalism which fits with our values.

The values beneath good capitalism

The left has a deep tradition of revisionist thinking which argues that, although our ideology may change, our fundamental values remain constant. We agree with this, and therefore our starting point is to identify the values which are constant and offer an interpretation of these values for the 21st century. Labour MP and influential Fabian Anthony Crosland argued equality was the fundamental value which underpinned progressive ideologies². We agree with the importance placed on equality, however, it is important to understand how equality relates to other political values and our interpretation of equality.

Interpretations of equality have often focused on the debate between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome. In recent years the trend has been for the left to focus attention on social mobility, which is more closely linked equality of opportunity. However, key New Labour thinkers have also recognised that equality of opportunity is impossible to achieve if there are major inequalities in starting points within society³.

We believe a new interpretation of equality is required that moves beyond the outcome/opportunity debate, recognising the strengths and weaknesses in both arguments. To develop this new interpretation the left can draw upon three schools of thinking: relational egalitarianism, human capabilities, and neo-republicanism⁴.

- Relational egalitarians argue that our first priority should be to promote relationships of equality within society.^{5,6} We must create a society in which citizens feel like equals and can treat each other as such. Distributional and other policy implications must follow from this goal.
- The human capabilities approach was developed as an approach to understanding freedom^{7,8}. Its advocates emphasise the idea that freedom is not simply the absence of barriers, but must include the ability to perform a range of activities and have access to certain opportunities. The capabilities approach is closely linked to an increased focus on human capital.
- Neo-republicans also emphasise freedom as more than simply the absence of barriers; this

approach focuses on the need to give people control over their lives and to avoid relationships of ‘domination’^{9 10}. Increasingly, this school of thinking has focused on the domination that can occur in spheres beyond the state (e.g. the market).

Although they are not identical, these approaches overlap in certain ways and encourage us to reconsider the value of equality. They encourage us to focus on the importance of social relations and the significance of freedom in discussion of equality. These frameworks for interpreting equality also allow for the recognition of other progressive values, like solidarity, which is encompassed within relational egalitarianism through the shared emphasis on reducing social hierarchies and encouraging shared responsibility.

We have deliberately emphasised the overlaps, rather than the tensions between some of these values. The goal of an ideology is to articulate values in a non-contradictory programme that can inform policies and government. In the next section we will attempt to explain, with some illustrative examples, how these abstract theories can be turned into reality.

Developing a new political economy

Our current political economy is best categorised as neo-liberal. The defining features of a neo-liberal political economy are a drive to reduce taxes and the level of state involvement in the economy. In order to begin thinking about a left political economy in the 21st century, it is necessary to summarise the left’s responses to neo-liberalism in the 20th century.

In the first half of the century the left’s main ambition was nationalisation of industry, however, for the purposes of our discussion we set aside nationalisation because, except for certain public utilities (e.g. railways), there is little public appetite for nationalising significant parts of the economy. During the post-war ‘golden era’ of social democracy (roughly 1945-1970) an alternative approach prevailed, which was most closely associated with Tony Crosland. Crosland believed that the inherent weaknesses of capitalism had been tamed and that socialism should focus on taxation to fund generous social programmes like the welfare state. This became the tax and spend model that has been so closely associated with the left during the latter half of the 20th century. New Labour developed a third response, a variant on the tax and spend model, under which investment in the welfare state and in public services was financed by high levels of growth (rather than high tax rates). Indeed, New Labour combined public spending with a low taxation regime.

Beyond tax and spend

There are two major weaknesses in relying on welfare spending as an egalitarian response to neo-liberalism. Firstly, welfare can lead to dependency upon the state. This may appear to be accepting the right wing narrative on welfare, however, it is simply a fact to state that the majority of welfare recipients would face severe economic hardship if they did not receive support from the state (80% of working age welfare benefits are means-tested).¹¹

If we believe the left should be concerned with creating a society where citizens live in relations

of equality and without domination, then institutionalising this level of dependence should be of concern. Individuals who rely on benefits may feel a sense of failure because 'the norm' in society is to be self-sufficient. Additionally, because benefit payments are usually designed to offer a lower level of income benefit recipients may also become economically divided from other citizens. An even greater risk of social division arises from the way dependence is portrayed in the media. Recipients of benefits are often characterised as scroungers, creating a culture of them-and-us between benefit recipients and non-claimants. This characterisation is not based on reality, but nonetheless runs the risk of leading to real social divides that undermine our relational goals.

The second weakness of welfare systems is often a lack of resilience. There are two major threats that can substantially undermine a welfare system: the election of a government that does not support egalitarian policies, and an economic downturn, which reduces revenue and puts added pressure on welfare spending. The left must aim to create economic policies to promote equality that are not only effective but resilient beyond electoral cycles.

A focus on assets

We believe that an approach to political economy based on the predistribution agenda, and specifically focusing on the distribution of assets can offer the left the foundations of a new political economy^{12 13}.

Assets can include a whole range of goods from physical assets (like housing) to financial assets (such as shares in business or savings). Human capital is also vital in discussions of assets, though it falls beyond our scope to discuss human capital policies here.

We believe assets are a vital area for the left to focus on for a number of reasons. Firstly, the changing technological environment we are living in creates economic trends that could lead to a rise in the income from capital, and a reduction of income from labour¹⁴. If this trend continues it will not be sufficient for the left to just have income policies to promote equality.

Secondly, the left should be focusing its attention on assets because currently, asset inequalities are even larger than income inequalities - if we compare the 90th percentile to the 10th percentile there is a 4 times difference in income, but a 77 times difference in wealth^{xv}. The scale of asset inequality would not be of such concern if wealth was only a small part of the overall financial picture; however, the value of private assets has risen from over 200% of national income in 1950 to over 500% of national income in 2010¹⁵.

Thirdly, the left should be interested in assets because they offer a more resilient way to promote financial security. Assets can ensure you will not be left destitute if you lose your income, they enable you to take time out of work to retrain or change career, and they make you less vulnerable to predatory operations like payday lenders. If we support the worst off to build up a stock of assets, then we significantly improve their financial security.

Four ways to redistribute assets

Most discussions of wealth inequalities focus on proposals for wealth taxation. Wealth taxation is welcome as a route to ensuring that the growing income from capital does not reinforce existing inequalities. However, the true benefits of asset policies arise from promoting more equal access to assets, particularly for the worst off. Below we outline four approaches to improve access to assets.

1. Asset based welfare

These programmes differ from conventional welfare because the aid is intended to alter the recipient's financial situation permanently (it is not intended as temporary income replacement). A prime example is the Child Trust Fund established by New Labour - this policy gave every child a minimum of £500 in a savings account (up to £1000 for low-income families) accessible when they turn 18. The families were able to top-up the fund, so the policy also promoted saving.

Asset based welfare provides citizens with a stock of financial assets which can be used to launch a business venture, invest in education or training, or to acquire other forms of assets such as housing which offer long term security.

2. Home ownership

Housing represents the most significant assets which most people will ever own, therefore, any asset policy must consider housing. The left has recognised the need to build more homes, however, we must also consider innovative models to make home ownership more achievable.

We should make it easier for people to buy their property at a time and in a format which is convenient for them. Schemes such as part-buy, part-rent should be encouraged so that people can incrementally own their home, while simultaneously renting part (government could adjust developer's requirements to build a certain proportion of new homes as part-rent, part-buy).

3. Co-operative enterprises and employee ownership

Another model for promoting access to assets is the co-operative economic model, and other associated models which promote some degree of employee ownership. There are a range of employee ownership options from full employee co-operatives to limited employee share ownership¹⁶. These types of policies are advantageous in giving employees the opportunity to receive an income from capital in addition to their labour income.

4. Sovereign Wealth Funds (SWFs)

SWFs are publicly owned investment vehicles which invest state wealth in financial markets.

They offer a different approach to asset policy from the first three because SWFs do not distribute assets to individuals, instead they hold assets collectively on behalf of the community¹⁶. The extent to which SWFs support people to own assets of their own depends on the model. In Alaska the fund does enable individual citizens to develop a stock of assets by giving them a cash dividend each year.

Other models use the SWF to support traditional public services and welfare spending. This model is still advantageous in so far as it allows the public to receive the benefits of income from capital, but it does not directly support citizens to develop their own assets.

Conclusion

These policies offer just a sample of the types of approach that could be used to promote a more widespread ownership of assets. This essay has sought to construct a vision of what the left should be seeking to achieve in the 21st century. Our vision is informed by an articulation of progressive values that emphasises equality, specifically a relational view of equality, freedom (understood in terms of enhanced human capabilities and non-domination), and social solidarity. We believe these values encourage us to focus our attention on assets, due to their significant impact on life chances. Our central argument is that the left should once again become the champions of a property-owning democracy and thereby support both fairness and aspiration.^{17 18}

-
- [1] D. Soskice & P. Hall, *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*, Oxford University Press, 2001
- [2] C. A. R. Crosland, *The Future of Socialism*, Cape (London), 1956
- [3] A. Giddens & P. Diamond (eds.), *The New Egalitarianism*, Polity/Policy Network (London), 2005
- [4] N. Pearce, K. Lawton, G. Cooke, *The Condition of Britain: Strategies for Social Renewal*, IPPR (London), 2014
- [5] E. Anderson, "What is the point of equality?", *Ethics*, Vol.109:2, 1999
- [6] N. Pearce, "What should social democrats believe?", *Juncture*, Vol.20:2, 2013
- [7] A. Sen, *Development as freedom*, Oxford University Press, 2001
- [8] M. Nussbaum, *Creating capabilities*, Harvard University Press, 2011
- [9] I. Honohan, *Civic republicanism*, Routledge (Oxford), 2002
- [10] P. Pettit & J. L. Marti, *A Political Philosophy in Public Life: Civic Republicanism in Zapatero's Spain*, Princeton University Press, 2010
- [11] A. Hood & P. Johnson, "70th anniversary of the Beveridge report: where now for welfare?", *Institute for Fiscal Studies*, <http://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/6475>, 2012
- [12] J. Guinan, "Owning the problem: Why the left needs a democratic capital strategy", *Juncture*, Vol.21:1, 2014
- [13] S. White, "Ownership for all: The lost radicalism of the centre", in *Democratic wealth: Building a citizens' economy*, OpenDemocracy (London), 2014
- [14] T. Picketty, *Capital in the 21st century*, Harvard University Press, 2014
- [15] J. Hills et al. *Wealth in the UK: distribution, accumulation, and policy*, Oxford University Press, 2013
- [16] G. Smales, O. MacArthur, J. Bartholomeusz, J. Stewart, *Young Fabian Commission: Socialism and Capitalism in the 21st century - a collection of essays* (<http://tinyurl.com/YF-soc-cap>), 2014
- [17] O'Neill M. & Williamson T., *Property owning democracy: Rawls and beyond*, Blackwell (London), 2012
- [18] Meade J., *Efficiency, equality, and the ownership of property*, Allen & Unwin (London), 1964

Feminism: Hand in hand with One Nation

Heather Vernon

Over the past century, the feminist movement can claim considerable achievements in advancing women's position in society. While some of our other '-isms' are easily associated with the history and present rhetoric of Labour politics, this is less obvious with feminism. Historically, the intransigence and even hostility of organized labour towards first- and second-wave feminism meant it often operated outside the electoral sphere. This chapter seeks to reconnect to the heritage of early feminist Fabians¹, by suggesting how the contemporary Labour Party can best incorporate feminist ideas.

The practical achievements of feminism have always been undergirded by a firm theoretical foundation, built up by generations of feminist activists and thinkers. Two key principles from this body of thought - intersectionality, and the primacy of listening to women's lived experiences - will run as threads through this discussion of 'One Nation Feminism'. Two tenets of One Nation Labour where both these ideas are particularly resonant is the decentralisation agenda and the idea of 'predistribution'; in what follows, we will discuss how these concepts might be used to deliver feminist social change.

What can feminism bring to One Nation?

One Nation Labour asks us to imagine a country no longer 'divided by class, race, gender, income or [and] wealth', but rather one that unites, giving everyone an equal stake in prosper-

ity². Currently this is not the case: women are suffering disproportionately under this coalition government and are not feeling the benefits of recovery³. If we are to overcome the divisions that Miliband identifies, feminist thinking will be key as a means of both conceptualising the problem of inequality, and finding ways to address it.

Although we have seen a transformation in women's voting patterns in recent decades – from Conservative- to Labour-leaning – Labour should not take the female vote for granted. In fact, women are currently less likely to say they will vote at the next election and are more disaffected with politics and politicians in general. How, then, can we put women at the heart of Labour's agenda? Areas of feminist thinking that are not often discussed in policy-making circles may provide some solutions.

One of the biggest legacies of the feminist movement is the need to listen to the lived experiences of women. An example of this is the tradition of consciousness-raising, which emerged from second-wave feminism in the 1970s, and involved learning about the struggles of other women through respectful listening⁴. Listening, as a foundational principle of feminist action, should be at the heart of how the left approaches policy-making.

Building on this, other feminists have argued for concerted efforts to listen to the voices of the most marginalised and voiceless groups in society. The critical approach of 'intersectionality' – associated with third-wave feminism – pays special attention to how various forms of oppression can be intensified through ways they overlap; that being a black disabled woman creates different forms of discrimination than that experienced by people who are black, disabled or women⁵. The Labour Party can learn from this, given Labour's history of focusing primarily on class relations as the most important determinant of societal change. Whilst class politics will, of course, remain central to Labour thinking, emphasising how this intersects with gender, race and other aspects of identity offers a new way of thinking about old problems⁶.

Shifting Power from the Centre, Shifting Power to Women

One important dimension of One Nation Labour is the onus on decentralising power away from Whitehall⁷. In part, this is a response to the way 'socialist' politics has historically been accused of imposing top-down, state-led solutions to people's perceived problems. New Labour politics attempted to address this by moving away from centralised statist models, to offer people increased choice. One Nation ideas go further, aiming to give citizens "voice as well as choice"⁸. Examples include 'people-powered public services', which involve service users in the conception and delivery of public services, and increased power to regions to make infrastructure decisions⁹.

If One Nation Labour is to deliver on its oft-promised decentralisation agenda, it must include women and other under-represented groups. A socialism that relies too heavily on a state power predominantly constituted of the same type of person (overwhelmingly middle-class white men)¹⁰, is unlikely to understand or prioritise those who do not fit that mould. More equitable gender representation does not necessarily advance feminism per se, but it can create

the conditions where these ideas can flourish: to a greater extent, at least, than state institutions that closely resemble existing patriarchal power structures. In this vein, leading feminist bell hooks has argued that “giving civil rights within patriarchy has proved dangerous because it has led women to think that we are better off than we are, that the structures of domination are changing”¹¹.

Despite significant advances in gender representation, power still lies with the patriarchy¹². At the current rate of change, a girl born today would be drawing her pension before she sees equal representation in Parliament¹³. The number of ethnic minority and disabled women parliamentarians is pitifully low¹⁴; an intersectional analysis of specific oppressions faced by many disabled and ethnic minority women might explain why so few have overcome barriers to entering electoral politics. Representation is also poor at local government level, which One Nation decentralisation policies rely so heavily upon¹⁵.

Given the opportunity to start from scratch, few would advocate creating a democracy so unequal. Yet we do, increasingly, have opportunities to start from scratch, with many new institutions of local governance suggested by all political parties. Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) were established in 2011 for example. However, the opportunity was missed to make these gender equal from the outset, instead reflecting the wider distribution of power under patriarchy: there are currently 92 female board members across all LEPs (just 15% of board representation), with only three of these women holding the LEP Chair position¹⁶. New expressions of state power represent an opportunity for the balance of elected representatives to be constituted more equitably, and decentralisation must include proportionate numbers of women, including those of minority status, on the boards of regional banks, in clinical commissioning groups and as school standards directors.

For as long as women are underrepresented at an institutional level, it will be even more critical to reach beyond local politics and into communities through encouraging participatory democracy. One Nation Labour should heed the work of women across the country who are organising themselves at grassroots level. It is frequently women who take a leading role in building social solidarity through running residents’ groups and tenants’ associations for example. The range and diversity of explicitly feminist action taking place outside of electoral politics is too great to document here¹⁷. However, as Citizens UK’s Living Wage campaign demonstrates, diverse grassroots organisations working in concert, can actively shape the legislative agenda and so One Nation Labour should broaden their receptiveness to the demands of feminist campaigns¹⁸. Involvement in participatory democracy should be encouraged and nurtured by One Nation Labour.

Seeking the Prevention, not the Cure: Feminist Predistribution

Predistribution is an integral concept to One Nation Labour¹⁹. It is most often referred to in economic terms, as a way of rebalancing the relationship between state and markets. As Duncan O’Leary of think-tank Demos has suggested, “It may be an ugly word, but it’s a decent idea. Put simply, it means focusing more on decent wages and relying less on tax credits to reduce inequality”²⁰. It also focuses on high-quality public services, designed to eliminate inequalities

before they generate social problems. This idea is of particular importance to women who constitute almost two-thirds of low-paid workers²¹ and are suffering from a gender pay gap that is rising again after years of progress towards parity²².

A key mechanism for actualising a predistributive feminism must be 'responsible capitalism'. Of course our capitalism must be globally competitive, but businesses must be encouraged to prioritise gender equality from top to bottom. From the boardroom to the 'gender pay gap' and the living wage²³, gender inequality should be as integral as tax avoidance or price-fixing to One Nation Labour's promise to 'reform broken markets'²⁴.

These inequalities should be redressed by a clear focus on tackling the root causes of women's exclusion from the labour market. For example, we know that the disproportionate number of women in part-time and low-paid work is largely due to women's greater caring responsibilities²⁵. As Hacker argues, quality public services can counter inequality and reduce the burden on women for whom caring responsibilities often inhibit career progression²⁶.

All political parties have recognised the need for a stronger offer on childcare and the significant social and economic benefits to be gained from this²⁷. However, the left must resist a one-size-fits-all model which assumes that all women see caring responsibilities as a disadvantage. Instead, it should tackle this by genuinely listening to women: with an acknowledgement that women have different needs, and that families come in different shapes and sizes. Although much under-participation in the labour market is involuntary, many women want to care full-time for their children, and feel stigmatised by pressure to be working mothers; others are caring for elderly relatives, thereby relieving considerable burdens on the state, but not benefiting from childcare policies.

The left should consider the value of unpaid care and find ways to enable (overwhelmingly female) carers to feel like they are contributing to and benefiting from a One Nation economy. This means increasing opportunities for men to participate in caring activities. This is just one example (amongst many) of how men can also benefit from 'feminist' policies, by taking on caring responsibilities if they wish, rejecting the patriarchal paradigm of the man as head of the household and prime breadwinner²⁸. A one-size-fits-all model which assumes that all mothers are identical (and that all wish to return to work) fails to listen to the voices of women, or incorporate those voices into the policy-making process²⁹.

However, a wider conceptualization of 'predistribution', which moves away from Hacker's purely economic definition, could also provide a useful means of considering the apportioning of social and cultural capital in a patriarchal society. This means not only focusing on wages, but also looking at how cultural and attitudinal barriers prevent women from having an equal stake. For example, generations of feminists have explored the ways in which patriarchy raises young boys and girls to see the sexual objectification of women, and the use of violence by men to achieve power and success as the cultural norm³⁰. This leads to outcomes where violence against women continues to plague our society, and where feelings of disempowerment

amongst girls and young women have to be actively unlearned³¹. Feminist thought is crucial to this process, but it can also help lay the groundwork for a society where patriarchal culture is not the dominant social and attitudinal determinant.

Some of these cultural and attitudinal barriers are particularly pertinent to women who are experiencing multiple forms of oppression. This is because a purely economic model of redistribution fails to take into account the increased discrimination that is often directed towards women who are also of minority status, sometimes in more than one regard. Where we attempt to implement redistributive policies into business and public services, our approach must also draw on the key feminist concepts of intersectionality, taking into account the ways in which race, faith, sexuality and disability intersect to create intensified forms of oppression.

For example, the APPG on Race and Community's inquiry into ethnic minority female unemployment found that "Black, Pakistani and Bangladeshi women face specific barriers in the labour market which are not solely based on just their gender, or just their ethnicity. These women experience barriers because they are ethnic minority women." The report found that women with "ethnic sounding names" are around 30% less likely to be called for interviews than those with 'British sounding names' and were subject to stereotypical assumptions about their increased likelihood of stopping work after having children³². Minority ethnic groups are less likely than white groups to find Job Centre Plus helpful, with women interviewed highlighting a lack of adequate cultural understanding of their needs³³. Furthermore, LGBT people experience greater financial hardships through real-term pay cuts and in LGBT-specific services³⁴.

Labour is already showing encouraging signs of trying to tackle cultural and attitudinal problems at their roots, indeed in a way that could be described as redistributive. For example, a redistributive approach to equality might follow from compulsory sex and relationship advice in schools, a project which is currently being championed by Shadow Home Secretary Yvette Cooper MP, in tandem with the work of grassroots organisations. This would provide an evidence-based preventative solution to some expensive and socially damaging issues, such as teenage pregnancy, violence against women and rape culture³⁵. Rethinking 'redistribution' in this way could prove to be a useful means of bringing feminist ideas into the One Nation conversation.

Conclusion

This essay has only scratched the surface in terms of delineating the issues facing women today. Confronting these challenges demonstrates the central importance of feminism as a means of enacting social change that benefits us all. There are points where the broader One Nation project and feminist movement can go hand-in-hand; it is only by listening to women from all backgrounds, and nurturing their participation in a One Nation Britain, that this will be achieved.

[1] These achievements are too diverse to recapitulate here; good general histories of the feminist movement, however, include E. Freedman, *No Turning Back: The History of Feminism and the Future of Women* (Random House LLC, 2007), and M. LeGates, *In their Time: A History of Feminism in Western Society* (Routledge, 2012). For the pioneering contribution made the Fabian Women's Group, see K. L. Moore, *Feminist Influences on Socialism: The Fabian Women's Group, 1908-1914* (University of Georgia, 1985).

[2] E. Miliband (January 2013). *One Nation Labour: The Party of Change*, speech to the Fabian Society, London, [Online], retrieved from: <http://www.labour.org.uk/ed-miliband-speech-fabian-one-nation-labour-change> [Date Accessed: 10 August 2014].

[3] Although male unemployment has fallen, female unemployment has risen. 79% of the revenue raised and expenditure saved through changes to personal taxes and social security since 2010 will come from women. The Fawcett Society (2014). 'Budget 2014 – Fawcett's Immediate Response' [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.fawcettsociety.org.uk/latest/press-releases/budget-2014-fawcetts-immediate-response/> [Date Accessed: 10 August 2014]

[4] The foundational text here is K. Sarachild, *Consciousness Raising: A Radical Weapon* (self-published, 1978). An example of a post-second wave deployment of consciousness-raising strategies can be found in S. Batliwala, 'The Meaning of Women's Empowerment: New Concepts from Action', in *Population Policies Reconsidered: Health, Empowerment, and Rights*, ed. G. Sen, A. Germain, L. Chen. (Harvard University, 1994), pp. 127-38.

[5] An introduction to ideas about intersectionality is K. Crenshaw, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* (1991), pp. 1241-99.

[6] In an American context, a focus on intersectionality has already provided a strong framework for de-

signing politically effective strategies; for example, the NAACP's attempts to reform inequality in the US prison system. *Intersectionality and Beyond: Law, Power and the Politics of Location*, ed. E. Grabham, D. Cooper, J. Krishnadas, and D. Herman (Routledge, 2008).

[7] J. Cruddas (February 2014). Power and One Nation, speech to the New Local Government Network Annual Conference, London, retrieved from <http://www.nlgn.org.uk/public/2014/power-and-one-nation>

[8] E. Miliband, Hugo Young Lecture, London (February, 2014). Retrieved from <http://labourlist.org/2014/02/ed-milibands-hugo-young-lecture-full-text/>

[9] A. Adonis, Mending the Fractured Economy: Smarter state, better jobs - Final report of the Adonis Review, London, Policy Network paper, 2014.

[10] For example, 78% of Parliament's MPs are male, 96% of MPs are white, and more than 50% of MPs attended a fee paying school. House of Commons Library, A. Mellows-Facer (ed.), *Key Issues for the New Parliament 2010: House of Commons Library Research*, London, 2010.

[11] bell hooks, for example, writes: 'giving civil rights within patriarchy has proved dangerous because it has led women to think that we are better off than we are, that the structures of domination are changing.' b. hooks, *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics* (London, Pluto Press, 2000), p.114.

[12] Simply put, patriarchy describes a social system in which men hold the power, and women are largely excluded from it; for a more extensive discussion of the concept, see S.Walby, *Theorizing Patriarchy* (Basil Blackwell, 1990).

[13] Centre for Women and Democracy, *Sex and Power 2013: Who Runs Britain?* (Centre for Women and Democracy, 2013), p. 13.

[14] There are 10 ethnic minority women MPs who make up 1.5% of the House. J. Wood and R. Cracknell, *Ethnic Minorities in Politics, Government and Public Life* (London, House of Commons Library, 2013).

[15] 'The proportion of female councillors is greatest in London boroughs and metropolitan districts, yet even here women do not come close to serving on an equal basis with men. Their representation stands at 36% and 33% respectively. In the shire counties, women's representation stands at 25%. Local Government Association, *National Census of Local Authority Councillors 2010*, <http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/core/page.do?pageId=15003600>, Even at this low ebb, '[w]omen's representation at a local level is stagnating with virtually no change in the level of female councillors in the last ten years. At the same time, the number of female council leaders has dropped by 5%'. The Fawcett Society, '#Vote4Equality' (2014), retrieved from <http://www.fawcettsociety.org.uk/our-work/campaigns/vote4equality>

[16] Insight Public Affairs, *Clarity or Confusion? Local Enterprise Partnership at the Crossroads*, (September 2013), retrieved from <http://insightpublicaffairs.com/2013/09/insight-lep-report-clarity-or-confusion> [date accessed: 8 August 2014].

[17] Maslaha, UK Feminista and Mumsnet are just three organisations representing different sets of women's interests.

[18] The Living Wage Foundation, an initiative of Citizens UK, has topped up the salaries of tens of thousands of employees by £210 million since its establishment in 2001; see <http://www.livingwage.org.uk>

[19] The term was coined by Jacob Hacker, a Yale academic, in his essay 'The Institutional Foundations of Middle Class Democracy', *Priorities for a New Political Economy: Memos to the Left* (Policy Network, 6 May 2011).

- [20] Duncan O’Leary, Demos, ‘What does ‘predistribution’ mean?’ <<http://www.demos.co.uk/blog/whatdoespredistributionmean>
- [21] Resolution Foundation, *Beyond the Bottom Line: The Challenges and Opportunities of a Living Wage* (January 2013), retrieved from http://www.resolutionfoundation.org/media/media/downloads/Beyond_the_Bottom_Line_-_FINAL.pdf, p.22.
- [22] Office for National Statistics, *Statistical Bulletin, Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, 2013 Provisional Results* (December 2013), retrieved from <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/ashe/annual-survey-of-hours-and-earnings/2013-provisional-results/stb-ashe-statistical-bulletin-2013.html>
- [23] Low Pay Commission (2007) *National Minimum Wage Low Pay Commission Report 2007*, Figure 2.8, p32. Retrieved from http://www.lowpay.gov.uk/lowpay/report/pdf/6828-DTi-Low_Pay_Complete.pdf, cited in: UK Feminista, ‘Facts and Statistics on Gender Inequality’, <http://ukfeminista.org.uk/take-action/facts-and-statistics-on-gender-inequality/>, 2014
- [24] Quotas and transparency measures have both been mooted as possible solutions to these issues.
- [25] The average employment rate for mothers of children aged 3-5 is 64.3%. The UK is far behind at just 58.2%. B. Fauth, Z. Renton and E. Solomon, *National Children’s Bureau, Tackling Child Poverty and Promoting Children’s Well-Being: Lessons from Abroad*, February 2013, p.10.
- [26] ‘The Institutional Foundations of Middle Class Democracy’, *Priorities for a New Political Economy: Memos to the Left* (Policy Network, 6 May 2011).
- [27] S. Thompson and D. Ben-Galim, IPPR, *Childmind the Gap: Reforming Childcare to Support Mothers into Work*, February 2014, p.8./ ‘Financialisation of the Reproductive Sector’
- [28] Less than 1% of fathers took advantage of additional paternity leave offered by the coalition government. TUC analysis for 2011/12, press release, 16 June 2013, retrieved from <http://www.tuc.org.uk/workplace-issues/just-one-172-fathers-taking-additional-paternity-leave>
- [29] Mothers at Home Matter is an example of an organisation lobbying on this issue.
- [30] Important texts here include S. Barkty, *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression* (Routledge, 1990), and L. Mulvey, “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema” in *Screen* 16.3 (1975), pp. 6-18.
- [31] Laurie Penny’s *Unspeakable Things*, for example, is an example of a recent feminist work that deals at length with this struggle. *Unspeakable Things: Sex, Lies and Revolution* (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014).
- [32] Wood, M., et al., ‘A test for racial discrimination in recruitment practice in British cities,’ (2009), DWP Publication, retrieved from <https://workspace.imperial.ac.uk/staffdevelopment/public/docs/DW-POctober09summ.pdf>
- [33] Butler, V., ‘APPG on Race and Community: Ethnic Minority Female Unemployment: Black, Pakistani and Bangladeshi Women’, 2012, Runnymede Trust, retrieved from: <http://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/APPGfemaleunemploymentReport-2012.pdf>
- [34] M. Mitchell, K. Beninger, N. Rahim and S. Arthur, UNISON, NatCen – *Social research that works for society – Implications of austerity for LGBT people and services*, November 2013, retrieved from <http://www.natcen.ac.uk/media/205545/unison-lgbt-austerity-final-report.pdf>
- [35] “The international evidence-base... shows that the two measures for which there is the strongest evidence of impact on teenage pregnancy rates are: comprehensive information advice and support – from parents, schools and other professionals – combined with accessible, young people-friendly sexual and reproductive health (SRH) services.https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations/downloadable-Docs/4287_Teenage%20pregnancy%20strategy_aw8.pdf

Patriotism: Towards an inclusive nation

Jack Eddy and Jim O'Connell

Patriotism has taken on new political significance in recent years: the upcoming Scottish referendum holds at its core, the issues of identity and patriotism; the rise of UKIP and the on-going argument for an EU exit is similarly wrapped in the veneer of patriotism. A Scottish separation from the Union, or a 'British' exit from the European Union would have immense and far reaching implications, changing our country forever.

The creation of One Nation Labour by Labour Party leader Ed Miliband is at its heart, an attempt to reclaim patriotism for the Labour movement. It is with the discovery and definition of an "Inclusive Patriotism" for One Nation Labour that patriotism, and what it means to be a left-wing patriot, will be explained. This was the central aim of the Young Fabians Patriotism Project that informed the following.

Patriotism and the Labour Party

To quote the late US politician George McGovern, "the highest patriotism is not a blind acceptance of official policy, but a love of one's country deep enough to call her to a higher plain". It is in this sense trade union and Labour movements have often had the patriotic love of their country and its people as their *raison d'être*. Labour's central beliefs in equality, workers' rights, freedom of speech, tolerance and compassion for people are therefore, inherently patriotic.

Why then is Labour not clearly regarded as the party of the patriot? Responding to popular imperialism during the Boer Wars (which some famed left-intellectuals, like George Bernard Shaw, supported), for J.A. Hobson ‘jingoism’ and patriotism were inseparable terms. Whilst many would firmly reject Hobson’s stance, it does correctly highlight that, in the absence of a clear left-wing alternative, national sentiment can be negatively manipulated by right-wing elites.

Though the First World War – supported by the Labour party – strengthened national identity, its horrors made people more cautious of overt displays of nationalism. In the 1920s, left liberal types and Labour supporters frequently ascribed to explicitly internationalist, rather than nationalist ideas.

A significant change came in the 1930s as the left began expressing a different kind of patriotism based not on pride in the central state, but on a conscious embrace of Britain’s democratic traditions and institutions. It is partly due to this increasingly more comfortable attitude towards patriotism that the Labour movement was steadfast in its anti-appeasement stance to Nazi Germany (whereas the Tories were not until 1940). For inspired writer George Orwell, ‘Britishness’ was worthy of pride because Britain’s cultural institutions were not uniform or orchestrated, but plural and centred on the ongoing struggle for democracy. Orwell considered patriotism acceptable not when it was imposed or manipulated by the state, but when it represented a conscious, rational choice made on the basis of organic institutions.

And so, left-wing patriotism has often been quieter and focused upon action to bring about positive change. With the formation of the welfare state and the NHS – institutions that remain lynchpins of our heritage and sources of immense national pride to this day – the Attlee administration set the political tone in Britain for the next 30 years and established Labour’s patriotic credentials. Not by words or manipulation, but by positive and progressive action that enriched British culture and bettered the nation.

What Labour has promoted in the past is perhaps best described as a ‘civic patriotism’.

Thatcherism and the loss of cultural expression

The advent of Thatcherism pushed dialogue around patriotism progressively more towards the right. With the Labour Party in chaos, efficient Conservative propaganda manipulated patriotic sentiment in favour of the Tories. From here, ‘patriotism’ became increasingly associated with the Conservatives and extreme-right politics. Since Thatcherism, whilst the Conservative party has sold state owned institutions like the Post Office, mainstream ‘left’ has been apologetic, failing to assert what it is proud of.

This has been exacerbated by an increasing loss of cultural expression amongst the youth and the Labour Party’s difficulty engaging with expressions of identity. 20 years ago, the Red Wedge youth movement had been very successful as an avenue for the Party to engage with young people, so that British culture could be truly expressed. However, Thatcherite reforms to the

economy have reduced the civic and public spaces young people can express their identity. For instance, successful music artists are increasingly privately educated, which inevitably elicits a more conformist political or social outlook.

It is crucial for Labour to realise that the limiting of civic cultural space following Thatcherism is inherently anti-patriotic, as it limits expressions of identity and subsequently the development of a vibrant, pluralistic sense of Britishness. If it is committed to developing One Nation, Labour has to once again lean to actively develop spaces for individuals to express their identity through culture and the arts.

The Labour Party needs to embrace new organisational abilities to engage with, and help spread working class and non-privatised culture. It is for this reason that a programme similar to the Red Wedge youth movement is required today.

Modern Britain, UKIP and the Labour Party's relationship with patriotism

As it stands, it is not uncommon on the left for the term patriotism to be considered a mask for right-wing manipulation, rendering the left-wing patriot timid. Effectively, Labour has lost its ability to engage in that quiet 'civic patriotism' that defined politics for so long in post-war Britain.

Furthermore, there are sections of left-wing thinking that consider the concept of patriotism to be inherently limited, serving no intellectual purpose to the Labour movement. This section of the left is best described as internationalist. Rather than focusing on pride in a single nation, they look to the accomplishments of all humanity. This perspective – of a humanity without borders – has a great deal of validity. However, patriotism and pride in one's country is increasingly important in the political landscape.

On 22 May 2014, UKIP shocked the major parties by finishing first in the European elections in the UK. Whilst this was not reflected in the simultaneous local council elections, UKIP's rise has led to questions on patriotism, which the Labour Party has arguably struggled to deal with.

What is interesting is that UKIP's message on the EU is framed entirely by the issue of immigration. Due to this preoccupation, it is reasonable to conclude that UKIP's rise is not so much about legitimate protest over Europe, but more a question or even a misunderstanding of identity.

The importance of history

UKIP – whilst having some impact in Wales – can be viewed as a distinctly English problem. This is significant as there is a degree of exclusiveness to the nature of being English that does not apply to being British. This may be because being British has always been a civic identity, whereas there is an idea of to be English, referring to ethnic white Anglo-Saxons. This coincides with, and is fed by, the impression that ethnic minorities in England are a new phenomenon,

which plays in to the immigration rhetoric of groups like UKIP.

And yet, in the 2012 Olympic Games' opening ceremony, Britain witnessed the best definition of what being British means. Significantly, what made it both so momentous and so accurate was it was not 'multicultural', but more 'mono-cultural'. Its focus was on one culture that is greatly enriched by diverse ethnic and cultural influences, rather than separating these diversities into largely detached groupings – in so doing, it provided us with a narrative of modern Britain.

This coincides with the important work of the think-tank British Future, who found British history is considered the single most important thing British people felt pride in.

An exclusive attitude towards identity ignores the inherent historical plurality of Britain. Ethnic minorities of every race, creed and colour have been present in the UK for thousands of years, but that is not the popular perception, nor is it a part of the average school history curriculum. Until we have a proper historical narrative, issues around identity will continue to be a problem.

Perhaps because they represent national endeavours for independence and democracy, and avoid the more divisive aspects of British history – such as the slave trade – it is through great historical struggles, like the First and Second World Wars, that the greatest source of national pride is found. One way of approaching this problem of historical narrative is to reappraise these conflicts from the perspective of other ethnicities. For instance, Polish pilots played an immensely important part in the Battle of Britain; German and Austrian émigrés fought for the British against Nazism; Black, Muslim and Sikh soldiers, sailors and airmen were present and important in both world wars.

Understanding and defining a British and English history that is based around inclusiveness is crucial to the left beating back the UKIP surge, working towards the full integration of alienated and demonised groups (e.g. moderate Islam), as well as uncovering a popular and inclusive left-wing patriotism.

Local and national identities

In terms of local identity, there still exists the issue of definition through the existence of the 'other', "we are Liverpool, we're different from London," for example. This can be looked at in both a positive and negative way: the pre-existence of a siege mentality is intrinsic, as it is important to know who you are not – Yorkshire, not Lancashire; Norwich, not Ipswich for example.

That said, local identity also comes with enormous flexibility and pluralism. It is easy, and indeed common, to assimilate into a local identity even if you do not come from that area originally. Although this can produce some negative effects, like the reduction into stereotype or a local defensiveness, it is for this reason that local definition through rivalry with other localities is rarely taken to extremes and generally manifests as mild competition.

Likewise, there is also a great deal of importance to regional identity and regional character in the make-up of a national identity. Being a ‘northerner’ is a unifying identity, defined through numerous and recognisable characteristics. This ‘northern’ identity acts as a distinguishable brand, which northerners themselves can buy in to. However, regional identity affects and applies to different regions to different degrees – it is not a universal aspect of a British identity.

Patriotism is defined by the character and collective memory of a community. We view Britain through the prism of our local identity and it is through our communities that the larger British identity is found. With pride in the achievements and characteristics of a locality comes pride in Britain. Patriotism is as much local as it is national.

This can be taken further looking at the individual nations of Britain. According to the 2011 Census, pride in all the nationalities of the UK has increased, with Scottish pride growing the most. What proves interesting is although pride and identity in British nations share common attributes, all are different: in Northern Ireland, local identity is paramount above all, as it is generally less divisive; whilst Welsh identity is expressed more readily on a national scale through history and sports.

The argument of many nationalists in favour of an independent Scotland is simple: Scotland should be independent because its people have a strong identity, based on a sense of fairness and inclusiveness, which are expressed through local communities and institutions. However, this ignores a strong British identity, which many supporters of Union adhere to alongside their Scottish identity.

The nationalists’ insistence that independence would not result in the loss of Britishness has obliged the Scottish people to ask how an independent Scotland would look – for if you are allowed to identify as Scottish and/or British in both Union or independent Scotland, then the decision for independence must be based on materialistic considerations. Indeed, as in the rest of the UK, the existence of one identity does not preclude a British identity existing alongside it, serving as a unifying factor.

Defining an ‘inclusive patriotism’ for One Nation Labour

British identity is not defined by a set of values but by a feeling influenced by the individual, whose identity is shaped by the character of a community, region or even by another country. It is possible to hold more than one identity in addition to being British, without diminishing those identities. Each generation – be they migrant or British-born – adds something to the mix; what being British means is extrapolated from this. Where things have changed since the days of Orwell is not the pluralism that he described, but the nature of that pluralism – instead of a plurality inherent in Britain’s cultural institutions, it is a plurality inherent in the make-up of the British people.

The Labour Party must seek to deliver a vision of ‘inclusive patriotism’ that appeals to the individual nations and peoples’ of the United Kingdom, representing something more than the

simple manipulation of sentiment.

It is easier to talk about how we should all love our country than it is to deal with housing, education, healthcare, jobs and inequality. An inclusive patriotism should not be arbitrary or empty, but take on these issues in the name of a better and prouder Britain. Likewise, an inclusive patriotism should not turn away any individual or group that identifies as British, but accept them as key ingredients to what being British is.

An inclusive patriotism must adhere to the Labour tradition of creating, promoting and strengthening the institutions that make people proud of British culture, whilst recognising the innate historical and ever-changing pluralism of the people that make it. This requires both action and vision from the Labour Party, in order to fight for these institutions and to promote a correct, united and inclusive narrative of Britain.

Environmentalism: A citizens' contract

Lee Gregory and Tom Maisey

The future of the environment is as much a political problem than scientific one. Society has had some awareness of the significance of the environment upon our wellbeing in recent history, through incidents such as the cholera outbreaks in the early 1900s to the London smog in 1952. Since 1968 the environmental concerns has gone global through various summits and campaigns that have focused on how climate change, genetic modification, economic growth and human activity.

One Nation must re-think the social contract between citizens and state to take into account environmental issues, potentially generating new social protection arrangements. Guiding this revision however are two key concerns. The first matters of justice and equality and the second concern, an explicit recognition of the importance of local geography and community.

Overcoming these challenges requires a meaningful marriage of One Nation ideas with those of environmentalism. One Nation has not only sparked renewed political debate about the future of the party, but has also offered an opportunity to rethink environmental issues and their place within Labour's policies. As leading energy campaigner Guy Shrubshole has suggested, this is an opportunity to focus not only on renewables but also on the social changes necessary for sustainable living.

Social justice with the environment

A natural place to start is the One Nation emphasis of being an active part of a community, and helps build identities and means to citizenship. A cohesive community and a common national purpose is in part-dependent upon collective social contract with local geography. The Environment Agency reminds us, the most vulnerable and excluded in society lack access to green spaces, clean air and adequate housing, contributing to the hardships of ill health and economic deprivation. Thus, as with debates about the social and economic factors, environmental concerns must be built with equality and justice.

In health and education policy, we do not accept the inequalities that are generated by social circumstances or geographical location. Rather, we seek to ensure the outcome that all have good health and attain qualifications to the best of their abilities. Why should we treat the environment any differently?

We need to pursue policies that ensure equal access to green spaces, clean air and access to secure supplies of energy. This demands that we better understand how different lifestyles not only require different levels of carbon use, but also influence time and opportunities to access and use green spaces. Consequently, discussions of justice and resource distribution must start to actively consider environmental resources, exposing the inequalities in consumption, as has been done with things like wealth, income, life expectancy and educational attainment – by class, gender, ethnicity, etc.

This is important for any attempt to build One Nation because attachment to our local geography is not only an essential aspect of citizenship and promotion of civic pride, but clean, healthy environments that are essential to wellbeing. Environmentalism requires that we consider both access to, and responsible use of our environment. We need to reject the Policy Exchange suggestion that those near green spaces pay for the privilege; rather, we should aim to ensure that we fight for this as a right. It is the role of the state to tackle environmental inequalities, creating an environment where civic participation can thrive. This is in line with policies implemented for other forms of equality the left have long pursued.

The Dutch ecology professor Marten Scheffer recently coined the term “critical transitions” to explain how a minor change within an ecosystem, or in society, can push these complex systems over a tipping point and remove the system’s resilience. We only have finite resources and their use contributes to the increasing severity of environmental systems resilience. We need to account for what resources are left and also what is necessary to sustain society. One suggestion to arise was the need to develop concepts of high-, medium- and low-carbon intense activities. The intention here would be to determine the value of individual and organisational activities in terms of their position along this continuum, with the aim of placing greater value and incentives for activities at the lower end of the spectrum. Such an idea, would also need to reflect variations in lifestyle to ensure that social justice is met.

One Nation environmentalism needs to concern itself with rights for the rest of our ecosys-

tem such as animals and plants when considering environmental matters as well as basic human needs such as access to clean water and air, etc. This forms part of the state's offer to citizens when building One Nation: defining the context in which human wellbeing exists and is enhanced within an environmentally sustainable way.

The economic strategy

Establishing this context also requires rethinking the economy. The current economic structure is both fuelling inequality throughout society as well as damaging the environment. This is a failure on social, environmental and economic levels, forming part of the 'triple crisis' argued by the New Economics Foundation. Contemporary responses to the impending environmental crisis rest upon the idea of ecological modernisation, which is based upon two core assumptions. First, that science and technology are core solutions to environmental challenges. Second, the market must play a key role in transmitting ecological ideas and practices. The latter point relates to moves towards 'green jobs', and green consumerism internalising environmental costs and generating policy options for reducing them. Yet in accepting ecological modernisation, policy remains wedded to the pursuit of constant growth and profit-seeking. For the political right, such growth ensures that raising wealth will lead to greater prosperity for all citizens (the trickle down argument). Whilst for the left, these profits are to be redistributed to ensure all basic human needs are met. Yet this continued pursuit of growth will maintain the inequalities that fracture the forging of cohesive communities and continue to pay scant regard to environmental limits.

Alternatives to accumulation are to be found embedded in environmental thinking, associated with a series of social and economic changes that ensure environmental and human wellbeing. One suggestion to consider within the context building of One Nation is the idea of zero-growth advocated by the New Economics Foundation. Although this may be a point of contention to most, zero-growth does not imply that there is no growth. Rather that any growth that takes place must be neutral in environmental costs. The debate about justice and resource distribution must be embedded within any breakaway from the status quo, towards a sustainable approach to consumption and production, which respects environmental limits we must live in. Consequently, rather than just advocate for a reduction in carbon emissions and the promotion of renewable resources, environmental thinking demands that we reconsider the interrelationship between economic, social and environmental factors. The role of the state in this is twofold: to create greater equality between citizens and their geographical locations; and to promote sustainable forms of living, both through attachment to their community and associational activities.

Alternatives to work: Wedding social justice with the economy

Exploring locality led to discussion around the use of time banking as a form of local activism. Time banking is a form of community currency, which, like Local Exchange Trading Systems (LETS) and other similar currencies, seeks to promote new forms of production and exchange. The aims here are to create environmental sustainability and local economic

development. Time banking, however, is slightly different as it rewards citizens' volunteering time with credits. The key contribution that time banking can make to developing the idea of One Nation is that in promoting local participation and empowerment; illustrating important contributions individuals and communities can make to their own wellbeing outside of employment as well as the community's.

For example, The New Economics Foundation has argued for a reduction in the working week to 30 hours. Underpinning this argument is a number of environmental ideas. First, this helps move away from the need for continual growth. Second, it allows citizens to spend time in non-employment activities, which can overlap with new forms of consumption. Rather than spending free time shopping and driving damaging economic growth, time can be spent in local associational activities - such as time banking. Finally, this not only allows for a redistribution of employment towards the unemployed, but also provides a new argument for a living wage: providing financial security so that people are not pressured to work excessive hours to survive.

We must realise that the problems that a neo-liberal view of citizenship promotes - constant production and consumption that underpins the environmental challenges we are experiencing today and devastating consequences in the future.

Conclusion

Consequently, the integration of environmentalism into One Nation thinking requires that three key considerations need to be explicit in our policy development:

1. Rethinking notions of justice that promote developed and developing societies concerns about the environment and tackling broader inequalities to ensure all citizens are able to participate in civic life;
2. Zero-growth, which seeks to be sustainable and in tune with the environment;
3. Promoting activities that do not require money and are not carbon intensive; alternative forms of consumption, which do not feed growth but allow citizens to engage and flourish through a range of associational and civic activities in their own localities.

Embedding environmentalism into the idea of One Nation requires that we rethink the role of the state and its relationship to the citizen. To promote civic pride and local participation requires that the state creates a context where people have time and resources to engage in non-employment activities. This not only requires reducing the growing inequalities in society, but possibly also rethinking dominant ideas around employment in society.

One Nation environmentalism must not only be concerned with the changes that can be made to energy policy and housing policy to ensure diminishing carbon emissions and future energy security. This is vital but not the totality of environmental thinking. Rather, it needs to promote the politics of place, embedded within environmental thinking. This way, we can simultaneously achieve greater civic pride and participation whilst promoting sustainable social and economic interactions.

Internationalism: Making a new case

Jessica Toale and Isaac Turner

There has always been a strong tradition of internationalism within the Labour Party. This stems, at its heart, from a belief that we achieve more together than alone and that collectivism, solidarity and the struggle for social justice have always extended beyond our borders.

A commitment to this tradition has been challenged by austerity politics and the rise of right-wing Eurosceptics over the course of this Parliament. In fact, internationalism as a pillar of Labour tradition, at least at first, appears to conflict quite dramatically with the concept of One Nation, which is focused on addressing issues of identity, culture and economic well-being in the UK. The Labour Party currently lacks a coherent narrative of what One Nation internationalism looks like and sets out to achieve.

Despite this, internationalism is still relevant and has a role to play in making Labour's case to govern in the run up to the general election in 2015. By creating a strong, coherent narrative on Britain's place in the world that is relevant to the doorstep, internationalism can provide a robust underpinning to how Labour sees the world and our ability to address the real domestic concerns of the British people.

An internationalist perspective

There are no shortages of foreign policy and international issues affecting the UK – from the

crises in across the Middle East and Ukraine, EU reform, our military drawdown in Afghanistan, trade cooperation to deliberation of the future of global development policy at the UN - however, robust debate on these issues and Britain's place in the world beyond the reactive has largely taken a back seat to domestic issues.

The British public has become increasingly hostile towards issues which the Labour movement traditionally championed – for example, our commitment to the EU and the increase in our aid and development spending. One illustration of this is that arguably two of the most important pieces of planned legislation – the EU referendum and legislating for our overseas development assistance spending – are being put through as Private Members' Bills rather than afforded main Parliamentary time. It appears that the Government prefer debating international issues beyond the public's reach and so without proper scrutiny.

Across Europe, international issues are largely off the table for many Social Democratic Parties as these issues tend to raise negative rather than positive emotion. The financial crisis has also created a wider sense of malaise among public opinion about the efficacy of our governments to support the well-being of their people and our political and economic power in the face of the rise of new and emerging powers such as China, India and Brazil.

Despite this it is undeniable that we live in a highly interconnected and interdependent world. Many of the things that impact us domestically are influenced by factors outside of our borders. In this context we cannot help but work collectively to tackle issues like climate change, food, water and energy scarcity, economic stability, conflict and fragility and pandemic control.

The world is also increasingly multi-polar with power becoming more diffuse not only with the rise of new and emerging economic powers, but also with the entrance of new actors like individuals, communities, brands and other non-state actors that have the ability to shape and influence world events by harnessing the power of new technology such as the internet or social media.

These trends require a reformulation of how we approach governance. They make it even more relevant and urgent to address the challenges to internationalism head on and make the case for an internationalist approach to solving our domestic problems.

The challenge for Labour

In addition to general public malaise affecting international issues and politics, the Labour Party faces some distinct challenges in addressing international issues.

The Labour Party, which is traditionally associated with a more multilateralist and pro-EU approach, has suffered more acutely from the public backlash to widely perceived inefficiencies and ineffectiveness of response to global crises. The slow pace of progress on trade and climate talks, once assiduously pushed by Labour, and the inability of the international community to

end suffering and decide on effective action in situations across the Middle East has fostered a growing sense of dissatisfaction with the ability of the international community to work effectively to achieve meaningful change – and the power of the UK to influence these processes.

Across Europe, the left is suffering a crisis of identity and leadership. Many of the progressive issues that they once championed have become consensus. The problem is that this hard fought consensus is now under attack, and the rise in representation of far-right parties, poor media portrayal and operational inefficiencies are a signal that support for the European project is unravelling. Disappointingly, the EU debate in the UK is not about how we reform an institution to help it fulfil its purpose but simply the need for an in/out referendum at some arbitrary point in the future.

Labour also uniquely experiences the need to balance acting strongly in Britain's interests on an international stage with its values of equality, cooperation and social justice. The idea of an ethical foreign policy developed during the last Labour Government has become discredited as the public become increasingly aware of the conflict between espousing high level values and the realities of dealing with countries that do not share our values and often the need to promote the economic interests of the UK overseas.

It would be remiss not to mention the decision to go to war in Iraq and the continued impact that it has had on shaping public opinion and political debate. The legacy of Iraq has created a public sharply weary of intervention and which in some way associates any form of internationalism with intervention.

In the current context, it would be difficult for the Labour Party not to feel on the wrong side of public opinion on many international issues.

Communicating with a sceptical public

Public perception of the issues which affect the UK and the language used to communicate them is at the heart of the problem with internationalism. While in many ways we are an outward looking nation, and one of the most generous in responding to global humanitarian crises, most international issues tend to elicit strongly negative emotive reactions.

The very nature of many of the issues that require global coordination and action like climate change, international development and response to conflict are complex and presented in a way that is often disempowering to voters. Voters feel they can have no impact and therefore exhibit at best apathy and at worst hostility towards any action at a national level to address them. The public do not see international issues as relevant to their immediate everyday lives, and voters see globalisation and increased political union in the EU as a threat to their culture, society and economy rather than as an opportunity or positive force.

The key to a robustly internationalist approach is to make these issues relevant, highlighting the

global dimension to local issues and contextualising our role in the world.

Firstly, it is important to use language and examples which resonate with the lives of ordinary Britons. Voters tend not to think internationally, they care about their neighbourhoods and want to see change at a local level. We must help the public see that their local problems have global roots.

The environmental lobby has had a large degree of success in localising the language and point of agency used to raise awareness of the impacts of climate change. Realising that a narrative that stressed the importance of multilateral processes, wasn't working, environmental groups started using examples of how climate change was impacting local environments and what it was possible to do at a local level.

It would be interesting to explore whether there is scope to adopt this approach for other pressing international issues. Our jobs, energy bills, food bills and local environment are all profoundly impacted by factors beyond our borders, and this needs to be acknowledged and integrated across our narrative in order to sensitise the public to a more outward looking approach for solutions.

Secondly, it is important to talk about Britain in the world in terms of its successes and potential rather than its weaknesses or failures. Many people working in the international affairs world are acutely aware of the UK's fragile hold on power in a rapidly changing world; however, this is not an approach which inspires an already sceptical public.

A country's power is increasingly measured by its ability to inspire and attract citizens of other nations as well as its ability to hold strong at the negotiating table. The UK is an extremely attractive place to live, work and visit and this should be a source of pride for all people in the UK.

While we should be honest and conscious of being a medium-sized country in a world with a rapidly changing power balance, the UK is uniquely positioned for global influence and has large cultural capital which allows it to leverage disproportionate soft power through our association and often leading role within numerous multilateral organisations – we have a permanent seat on the UN Security Council, and are members of the EU, the Commonwealth, NATO, the G8 and G20 – this should not be undervalued.

We should also be robust about our ability to benefit and be successful from globalisation, the opportunities for job creation by proactive negotiation of bloc trade deals, and our ability to promote British values of responsibility, transparency and human rights in the global value chain.

Thirdly, it will be important to be honest about balancing our interests on a global stage. The world is complex and the public are often aware of the contradictions inherent in working to solve global issues – the tensions between our values and the realities of having to work with countries that do not share our values; the need to balance ethical and economic imperative.

But whilst there may be perceived conflict between putting Britain's interests first in order to look strong, and our values of tackling inequality, global solidarity, multilateralism and the need to make a difference overseas as well as in UK, they can be synonymous. We can only do this if we are strongly engaged, so it will be important to be clear about who we engage with, and why, to ensure public mandate and understanding.

Finally, in our hyperconnected world it will be imperative to stress that every person has a responsibility for the image of Britain in the world and empower them to be personal ambassadors for Britain. Internationalism has traditionally assumed nation-to-nation engagement but the new nexus of power being created amongst individuals and non-state actors creates a new layer of engagement and means they increasingly have the ability to shape world events.

Reigniting a Passion for Internationalism

Internationalism is certainly one of the more problematic pillars of Labour Party tradition, but the case for greater emphasis on an outward looking approach to our future security and prosperity is undisputable. The Party has an opportunity to differentiate itself from other parties: Building a more sophisticated understanding of the world and our future challenges, and communicating this in a way which is inspiring and relevant to voters on the doorstep.

A One Nation Internationalism is not just about having a line in reaction to the latest crisis but integrating an internationalist perspective across all issues that affect people's everyday lives and expressing an understanding of our place in the world across our narrative.

It is about better understanding people's perceptions of international influences and communicating the links that already exist in their lives. It is about working for the British public in the international arena, but also working towards a global order that works for all. It is about taking One Nation values that we aspire to in the UK to an international stage.

Only by embracing internationalism and making the case for an outward looking Britain can we hope to solve most of our domestic problems and truly make a difference to the lives of ordinary people in the UK. Only if we embrace internationalism can we deliver the One Nation Britain we envision. The Labour Party must be unashamed to make the case within the Party and to voters that international issues matter to our well-being.

Fabianism: Conclusion

James Hallwood

Educate, agitate, organise were the words that George Bernard Shaw said should mark the mission of the Fabian Society. Through pamphlets, discussions and debates, the Fabians have always been a home for socialist thought; somewhere where the fight for Labour has been one of ideas and ideology.

Side by side with the trade unions, the Fabians helped forge the Labour Party – two different traditions united in the desire for a better Britain. Fabianism lent intellectual rigour to the nascent Party offering big ideas like universal healthcare and a minimum wage.

Today, our Party needs that intellectual rigour and those big ideas again. To create a truly One Nation vision for Britain requires a renaissance in socialist thought – before and after the election in 2015.

With capitalism in crisis, Britain desperately needs a new economic and political model. It will not be enough to tinker at the edges, nor will a return to ‘Old’ or ‘New’ Labour be desirable or even possible. Times have changed and British socialism must show the ability to adapt and grow.

We must adjust to the current situation and offer more than just policies but also ideas and vision. The electorate cry out for more than public managers but feel disconnected with politics.

We must synthesise Tony Benn's analogy of 'signposts and weathervanes' by offering a politics that leads and listens.

As in 1900, 1945 and 1997, the Fabians are here to offer a forum for all strands of the Labour Movement to debate in and support the Party we helped create.

One Nationism and Fabianism

Sidney Webb, one of the founders of the Fabian Society, lived through the premiership of Benjamin Disraeli and the Tory's original attempt at One Nation. He died in time to see the election of Clement Attlee and the formation of a government that the early socialists could only have dreamt of.

Attlee offered a true One Nation vision that owed much to the Fabians. The NHS, the welfare state, de-colonisation – all had their roots in Fabian ideas. Today, Ed Miliband's own One Nation model continues to owe a debt to Fabianism.

“One Nation is both a radical and a conservative idea and that is why it works. It retrieves a tradition from within our nation history and through it generates greater solidarity and inclusion. Labour, in recent years, has shown a tremendous respect for diversity and pluralism.”¹

These are the words of Lord Glasman, broadly seen as the founder of Blue Labour, a key contributor to One Nationism and a sometime critic of the Fabian tradition – particularly our tendency to look to the central state.

But while Fabian purists (like me!) can defend the role of the state, Fabianism actually encapsulates much of what Glasman argues One Nationism is about.

Radical and Conservative

The Fabian Society was founded by men and women who strongly believed that radical ends could be achieved by conservative means. Like their radical continental comrades they envisaged a classless society but unlike them they cried for reform not revolution.

Fabian Leaflet 43 calls for citizens to “...strike the one blow that the law allows you” saying there is “There is no excuse for not voting” firmly advocating, as ever, the democratic socialism that Labour (Old, New and One Nation) subscribes to.

The very name of the Society stems from the belief that gradualism can achieve great aims. Looking back to the Romans they drew inspiration from Quintus Fabius Maximus whose Fabian military tactics defeated Hannibal where head-on battle could not.

Indeed, drawing from the past and conserving the best while looking to the future and chang-

ing the worst, has always marked Fabianism. Content with preserving culture, community and country – the Fabians drew from a long tradition of patriotic British socialism exemplified by Morris and the early Movement.

The journey started in 1884 paid off in 1945 and the social model it created saw consensus grow across political parties and across our continent for Attlee's model of government. Thatcher attempted to replace that consensus and as its heirs we must not only defend it but reinvigorate it for this new century.

Diversity and Pluralism

Where else can all shades of Labour opinion meet in collegiate discussion? What other forum can compare to the Fabian Society as a 'safe space' for ideas to flourish from all traditions of the Movement?

From its inception to the present day, Fabianism has welcomed and promoted the discussion and dispersion of ideas. There is a reason that every Labour leader has been a Fabian – from Michael Foot to Tony Blair – each of them has found a home in the Fabian Society.

While firmly affiliated to Labour as the first Socialist Society, the Fabians have a pluralist tradition within the Party and Articles 2 and 3 of its constitution offer an insight into why this has been such a key plank of Fabianism. In summary these are:

2) The Fabian Society consists of socialists. It therefore aims for a classless society, where a just distribution of wealth and power assures true equality of opportunity. It holds that society, through its democratic institutions, should determine the overall direction and distribution of economic activity, and seeks to promote where appropriate the social and co-operative ownership of economic resources. It argues for strong and accountable public institutions reflecting the values of public service to meet need. It believes in an active democracy, characterised by liberty, tolerance and respect for diversity. It aims at the implementation of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and seeks the creation of effective international institutions to uphold and promote world peace and sustainable development. It seeks to secure these ends by the methods of political democracy.

The Society, believing in equal citizenship in the fullest sense, is open to persons, irrespective of race, gender, sexual orientation, age or creed, who commit themselves to its aims and purposes and undertake to promote its work. Its activities shall be the furtherance of socialism and the education of the public on socialist lines by the holding of meetings, lectures, discussion groups and conferences, the promotion of research into political, economic and social problems, national and international, the publication of books, pamphlets and periodicals, and by any other appropriate methods. The Society shall be affiliated to the Labour Party.

3) The Society as a whole shall have no collective policy beyond what is implied in Rule 2; its

research shall be free and objective in its methods. No resolution of a political character expressing an opinion or calling for action, other than in relation to the running of the Society itself, shall be put forward in the name of the Society.

Indeed the One Nation model set out by Ed Miliband incorporates strands from all strands of the Party: Old, New, Blue and, naturally, the Fabians. Diversity in ideas, pluralist and collegiate in outlook, Fabianism has long offered the Labour Party a space to develop One Nation ideas that aren't neatly categorised into 'Left' and 'Right'.

Young Fabians and One Nation

The Fabian tradition belongs to all Fabians – be they 'old' or Young Fabians. We all stand on the shoulders of such giants as the Webbs, the Coles, Shaw and Wells and the numerous Fabians and Young Fabians who have gone before us.

But as younger members we also have our own approach to the development of ideas and a focus on member-led projects that encapsulate the thoughts of Labour's 'young thinkers'.

The Ideas Series that has culminated in this publication epitomises that Young Fabian approach – it was thought-up by the elected Executive but led by members who wanted to play their part in feeding into Labour's One Nation vision.

The rationale was to analyse One Nationism as an ism by looking at different isms that contribute to the overall model Labour must set-out in 2015 and beyond. Of course feeding into each project was the backdrop of Fabianism – the promotion of debate and the free flow of ideas, as well as the Fabian Society's own historic contributions to Labour thought.

When I look back at the isms explored I am conscious that each of them is timeless in the span of Labour history. Each was there at the start and is just as relevant today – however changed the context, however different the battles.

Socialism/Capitalism

The dynamic between socialism and capitalism is as relevant now as it was at the birth of the Movement. The Fabians like the trade unions, guild socialists, market socialists and others in the British tradition were never anti-market but they did demand that it worked for everyone.

Attlee's mixed economy was attacked by Thatcher's neo-liberal model – but with capitalism in crisis and the 's word' back on people's lips, now is the time for Labour to rebalance our economy, regulate and decide what role the state should play in Britain's development.

Feminism

Labour has a proud history of standing with women that stretches back to its formation. From Keir Hardie's commitment to equal suffrage to a forward-thinking George Lansbury who called for "...the very best man (or woman) we can find as Prime Minister"²

In the strong tradition of the early Fabian women – Beatrice Webb, Annie Besant and Margaret Cole – the Fabians and modern Labour Movement fight new battles for equality. Suffrage was not the end of the story but merely the beginning.

Patriotism

Key to the dreams of many early socialists, patriotism has played an essential part in the development of Britain's Labour Movement. The early Fabians were committed to the British state while Orwell praised 'the patriotism that runs like a connecting thread through almost all classes'³ rejecting middle class discomfort around it.

Patriotism, as opposed to nationalism, has long had a place in Labour thought. Whatever middle class discomfort remains, Labour and One Nationism seem to have re-embraced our patriotic socialist tradition – an emotional call for collectivism summed up by London 2012 but timeless in its appeal.

Environmentalism

Patriotism can combine land and people and few socialist expressions of this gentle love can equal Blake's vision of England's 'green and pleasant land' being ruined by 'dark satanic mills'.

Even then, the responsibility we have to our planet was understood by the Left. Now we know that the industrial revolution Blake scorned has led us to poisoning our soil and polluting our sky. A One Nation vision must look beyond borders and to a wider world facing environmental disaster.

Internationalism

Few words need sum up socialism's call to internationalism – but the song that unites socialists and social democrats the world over does it as eloquently now as it did when it was first sung:

*So comrades, come rally,
And the last fight let us face.
The Internationale,
Unites the human race.*

Our world faces many crises: The resurgence of a threat from Russia, turmoil in the Middle East, disease, famine and terror. One Nation should never mean looking inwards – it must be outward facing to deal with the challenges that Britain cannot deal with alone.

The Fight for One Nation

Our members have kicked off a discussion that hopes to show One Nation isn't just an electoral slogan for 2015 but a vision for government and a plan for Britain.

The collegiate work on this project has not just been between members but also between the Young Fabians and our comrades in the Communication Workers Union (CWU) who have supported our work.

At the birth of the Party as now, Fabians and trade unionists stand shoulder to shoulder in helping Labour to build a better Britain.

Winning in 2015 will be a challenge; governing shall present even more challenges. Ideas without a Labour victory are pointless but a Labour victory without ideas is baseless – we must seek to win for a reason, emboldened by our beliefs strong to save the best and change the worst in our society.

Many of you reading this will be, or will have been, Young Fabians. Never forget that youthful zeal to turn our ideas into reality, never doubt that the gradual march to progress can be achieved.

The introduction to the very first Fabian pamphlet reminds us of the need to bide our time. 130 years on, with 2015 on the horizon its words speak afresh to us, heed them well:

“For the right moment you must wait, as Fabius did most patiently, when warring against Hannibal, though many censured his delays; but when the time comes you must strike hard, as Fabius did, or your waiting will be in vain, and fruitless.”

Labour's One Nation vision needs doers and thinkers, door-knocking and debating. Victory in 2015 is the start only then can we begin to implement One Nationism.

-
- [1] Glasman, Different and Better: How One Nation can work for Labour, LabourList 13/11/2012
[2] Lansbury, My England, p138, 1934
[3] Orwell, The Lion and the Unicorn – Socialism and the English Genius,

About the Authors

Felicity Slater is Events and Partnerships Manager at the Fabian Society. Prior to this, she was Membership and Stakeholders Officer at Progress. She is an active member of the Fabian Women's Network and the Young Fabians. Outside of politics, she is a keen saxophonist.

Callum Totton has been a Young Fabian member for over three years. He studied history and politics, followed by a postgraduate degree in legal and political theory. He has previously worked for Debbie Abrahams MP and currently work in health policy for a professional body.

Heather Vernon is a Parliamentary Researcher for Ivan Lewis MP, Shadow Secretary of State for Northern Ireland. Heather taught in deprived areas of the West Midlands on the Teach First. She has worked at the NSPCC and co-authored a report about children's experiences online. Heather also has experience working at an international press agency, at think tank Demos and in corporate social responsibility. Heather studied Modern Languages at the University of Oxford and has previously lived in France and Germany.

Jack Eddy is from South Norfolk and an active member of the Labour party and the Young Fabians. He is the author of the "Rural Manifesto" proposal - which has just been endorsed by Ed Miliband - and is self-employed. He has a First class degree from the University of Hull and a Masters degree from the University of East Anglia.

Jim O'Connell is a teacher in east London and an active Labour member in Southwark. His family emigrated to the UK from New Zealand when he was young. He has written and published previously on issues around Education and Citizenship.

Lee Gregory is a Young Fabian member and a lecturer in Social Policy at the University of Birmingham, his research interests include poverty, public health, the mixed economy of welfare and alternative forms of welfare provision. He has also worked for various Labour Assembly Members at the National Assembly for Wales between 2005-2007 and 2009 - 2012.

Tom Maisey is a Politics and International Relations student at the University of Kent, going into my second year, and is a member of the Labour Party and Fabian Society.

Jessica Toale is an independent political and international development consultant. She is the former Head of Education and Communications at Article 25 and a former Political Advisor to the Shadow Secretary of State for International Development. Jessica has previously written on response to fragile and conflict affected states for the Fabian Society.

Isaac Turner is an undergraduate at University College, Durham, where he is reading Geography, Politics and Latin. Previously for the Young Fabians, he has contributed to Anticipations and was a lead of the Young Fabians Education Anatomy in 2013. Isaac is currently Durham University Labour Club's Living Wage Officer, and Exec Editor of the Durham Review of Books.

James Hallwood is the Chair of the Young Fabians and a keen advocate of One Nation patriotic socialism. James studied Ancient History at UCL and went on to complete an MSc in Public Policy. Currently working in public affairs for a health trade union, he is also a GMB shop steward and an active member of the Labour Party.

Acknowledgements

The editor would like to thank:

Alex Adranghi, Secretary of the Young Fabians for acting as managing editor and his extensive time sub editing and producing the publication.

Ade Adeyemi from the Young Fabians Executive for his substantial role as sub editor.

The rest of the Young Fabian executive for the time and support they have given to this project – particularly James Hallwood, Prasanna Kannan, Joel Mullan, Martin Edobor, Katharina Klebba and Vicki Butler.

The Young Fabians are also grateful to the organisations and individuals who have supported to the work of our series through speaking at events or providing support in other ways.

These include: John Macartney (Vice-Chair, Socialism and Capitalism), Paulina Jakubec (Vice-Chair, Feminism Project), Thomas Maisey (Vice Chair, Environmentalism), Patrick Diamond (Policy Network), Kirsty McNeill (ThembaHQ), Natan Doron (Fabian Society), Reni Eddo-Lodge, Lucy Powell MP, Jerome de Henau and Polly Trenow (Women's Budge Group), Alison McGovern, Claire McCarthy (Co-operative Party), Karen Kwong (50:50 Parliament), Roz Hardie (OBJECT), Sarah Green (EVAW), Sunder Kutwala and Matthew Rhodes (British Future), Ivana Bartoletti, Patrick Vernon, Hetty Wood (Merseyside Fabians), Christian Reilly, Annajoy David, Lise Butler, Dan Johnson (Scottish Fabians), Joe Jervis, Ash Dharmasingham, Chris Williamson MP, Jack McConnell, Pierre Kanuty (Parti Socialiste), Samuli Sinisalo (Social Democrat of Party of Finland), Mattia Guidi (LUISS Guido Carli), Melanie Smallman (SERA), Mark Drakeford AM, John Hallett (ACE), Julia Slay (NEF), Gabriel Smales, Ollie MacArthur, Jamie Stewart, and James Bartholomeusz, aye Lawton, Ed Cox, and Graeme Cooke (IPPR), Kitty Ussher (Tooley Street Research), Lord Roy Kennedy, Seema Malhotra MP, Charlotte Seymour and all other participants of our events series.

One Nation

How do traditional strands fit into this new progressive vision?

Edited by Felicity Slater

Labour stands at a crossroads. In just eight months, the party will go to the polls it is the favourite to win. For the first time in decades, the central question of what the party is for is in flux. In a series of linked essays, Young Fabians explore the central concept of “One Nation” through the prism of the “isms” that have defined the Labour movement, in order to further illuminate and expand upon Ed Miliband’s project.

“The Young Fabians have played a crucial role in developing new policies for the Labour Party. More than ever before their fresh ideas and clear thinking will be important to creating the politics of the new generation.”

- Rt Hon Ed Miliband MP, Leader of the Labour Party

ISBN 978-0-7163-2063-0

£5