Document A

One evening, many years later, when Philip was paying a visit to Claire and Stefano in Lucca, she told him about the events of that day, and said: ‘And then, when I was driving home, I started to think about the pub bombings and how they’d messed up Lois’s life, of course, because of what happened to her when she was in The Tavern in the Town with Malcolm that night, but not just hers, how they’d messed up Miriam’s, as well, indirectly, because of what she saw happening at Longbridge and what that made them do to her, and how that means that they also messed up my life, because for years I couldn’t really think straight or get on with anything because of wondering what had happened to Miriam, and in a way they’d also messed up Patrick’s, because he ended up obsessing over Miriam too, to compensate for something, to compensate for the pain we’d put him through by splitting up when he was little. And I started thinking of all the other families, all the other people, whose lives must have been touched by that event, and how you could go mad trying to trace the thing back to its source, trying to point the finger of blame at someone, you know, going right back to the beginnings of the Irish problem, until you end up saying something like, Is Oliver Cromwell to blame for the fact that Lois had to spend so many years in hospital? Or is he to blame for the fact that Miriam was killed? And in a way, you know, although it’s a terrible thing to say, the Birmingham bombing was a small atrocity if you look at it statistically, compared to Lockerbie, or compared to the Bali bombings, or compared to September the eleventh, or compared to the number of civilians who died in the 2003 Iraq war. So what would happen if you tried to explain all those deaths, all those messed-up lives, tried to trace those events back to the source? Would you go mad? I mean, is it a mad thing to try and do, or is it really the only sane thing to try and do, to face up to the fact that in big ways and small ways perfectly ordinary, perfectly innocent people continually have their lives fucked up by forces outside their control, whether they’re historical events or just the shitty luck of stepping outside your house on a day a drunk driver goes past at seventy miles an hour, but even then you can start blaming the culture, the culture that’s told him it’s cool to drive at seventy miles an hour or the culture that’s turned him into an alcoholic, and like I said maybe that’s the sane thing to try and do, to stop shrugging our shoulders and just saying “Life is random” or “These things happen”, because when you get right down to it *everything* has a cause. Everything that one human being does to another is the result of a human decision that’s been taken some time in the past, either by that person or by somebody else, twenty or thirty or two hundred or
two thousand years ago or maybe just last Wednesday.

And Philip said: ‘Are you pissed, or something, Claire? Because I’ve never heard you talk so much rubbish.’

To which Claire said: ‘I have drunk about two-thirds of this very excellent bottle of Bardolino in the last half hour, that’s true.’

Philip said: ‘At the end of the day, if someone you love has been a victim of terrorism—has been killed in a terrorist attack, let’s say—it makes no difference to them whether the terrorist has done it because he’s psychotic or because he feels his country or his religion or something has been hard done by. The fact is that the person you love is dead and the person who did it is the person who planted the bomb or flew the aeroplane or whatever. You don’t care about their motives. They shouldn’t have done it. Roy Slater killed your sister because he was an evil man. Sorry to be so blunt about it, but that’s that.’

Claire said: ‘Yes, but it wouldn’t have happened if it wasn’t for the pub bombings.’

Philip said: ‘Maybe not to that person, at that time. But he would have found other reasons for doing it to somebody else. And whatever became of him, by the way?’

Claire said: ‘It was weird, I had no curiosity about Slater, after that. It was as if I’d been bled dry of all those feelings. Patrick made some inquiries, a couple of years later. Found out that he’d died a while ago. Died in prison. Emphysema.’

Philip said: ‘That’s funny. Patrick never mentioned doing that.’

Claire said: ‘What that day in Norfolk made me realize—this is all I’m saying—is that there are patterns. You have to look hard for them but when you see them you can cut your way through all the chaos and randomness and coincidence and follow the path back to its source and say, “Ah, that’s where it started.”’

Philip said: ‘You’d be crazy to do that. There are individuals. There are bad individuals—it’s as simple as that—and they’re the people you have to watch out for, and even if there are reasons for the way they behave, nine times out of ten they’re not to do with history, and not to do with culture. It’s to do with psychology and human relationships. Other people have made them the way they are. Parents, most of the time.’

Claire said: ‘So then you have to ask what made the parents the way they were.’

Philip said: ‘But that’s impossible! Then you’ll just keep going further and further back and there’ll be no end to it.’

Claire said: ‘No, not impossible. Difficult, yes. Very difficult. But that’s what we have to do.’

Stefano came out on to the balcony. He was carrying a bottle of red wine from which he refilled both of their glasses.

Claire said: ‘Smells fantastic in there. How long’s it going to be?’

Stefano said: ‘Another half an hour or so. You can’t rush risotto.’

He went back inside. Claire and Philip sipped their wine, and the mournful late sunlight of a September evening threw long shadows and burnished the ancient stones of the piazza beneath them.

Philip said: ‘People have to accept responsibility for themselves, that’s all. Look at Harding. Maybe he was damaged by his parents, I don’t know. But lots of people are damaged by their parents and end up living more or less harmful lives. He
chose to become the person he became.’
Claire said: ‘You never really told me what happened when you went to meet
him.’
Philip said: ‘I’ll tell you now.’
Document B

The overall aim of third way politics should be to help citizens pilot their way through the major revolutions of our time: globalization, transformations in personal life and our relationship to nature. Third way politics should take a positive attitude towards globalization—but, crucially, only as a phenomenon ranging much more widely than the global marketplace. Social democrats need to contest economic and cultural protectionism, the territory of the far right, which sees globalization as a threat to national integrity and traditional values. Economic globalization plainly can have destructive effects upon local self-sufficiency. Yet protectionism is neither sensible nor desirable. Even if it could be made to work, it would create a world of selfish and probably warring economic blocs. Third way politics should not identify globalization with a blanket endorsement of free trade. Free trade can be an engine of economic development, but given the socially and culturally destructive power of markets, its wider consequences need always to be scrutinized.

Third way politics should preserve a core concern with social justice, while accepting that the range of questions which escape the left/right divide is greater than before. Equality and individual freedom may conflict, but egalitarian measures also often increase the range of freedoms open to individuals. Freedom to social democrats should mean autonomy of action, which in turn demands the involvement of the wider social community. Having abandoned collectivism, third way politics looks for a new relationship between the individual and the community, a redefinition of rights and obligations.

One might suggest as a prime motto for the new politics, no rights without responsibilities. Government has a whole cluster of responsibilities for its citizens and others, including the protection of the vulnerable. Old-style social democracy, however, was inclined to treat rights as unconditional claims. With expanding individualism should come an extension of individual obligations. Unemployment benefits, for example, should carry the obligation to look actively for work, and it is up to governments to ensure that welfare systems do not discourage active search. As an ethical principle, ‘no rights without responsibilities’ must apply not only to welfare recipients, but to everyone. It is highly important for social democrats to stress this, because otherwise the precept can be held to apply only to the poor or to the needy—as tends to be the case with the political right.

A second precept, in today’s society, should be no authority without democracy. The right has always looked to traditional symbols as the prime means of justifying authority, whether in the nation, government, the family or other institutions. Right-wing thinkers and politicians argue that without tradition, and traditional forms of deference, authority crumbles—people lose the ability to differentiate between right and wrong. Consequently democracy can never be more than partial. Social democrats should oppose this view. In a society where tradition
and custom are losing their hold, the only route to the establishing of authority is via
democracy. The new individualism doesn’t inevitably corrode authority, but demands
it be recast on an active or participatory basis.

Other issues with which third way politics is concerned do not belong to the
framework of emancipatory politics, or only partially concern such a framework.
They include responses to globalization, scientific and technological change, and our
relationship to the natural world. The questions to be asked here are not about social
justice, but about how we should live after the decline of tradition and custom, how to
recreate social solidarity and how to react to ecological problems. In response to these
questions, strong emphasis has to be given to cosmopolitan values, and to what might
be called philosophic conservatism. In an era of ecological risk, modernization cannot
be purely linear and certainly cannot be simply equated with economic growth.

The issue of modernization is a basic one for the new politics. Ecological
modernization is one version, but there are others too. Tony Blair’s speeches, for
example, are peppered with talk of modernization. What should modernization be
taken to mean? One thing it means, obviously, is the modernizing of social democracy
itself—the breaking away from classical social democratic positions. As an agenda of
a wider kind, however, a modernizing strategy can work only if social democrats have
a sophisticated understanding of the concept.

Modernization that is ecologically sensitive is not about ‘more and more
modernity’, but is conscious of the problems and limitations of modernizing
processes. It is alive to the need to re-establish continuity and develop social cohesion
in a world of erratic transformation, where the intrinsically unpredictable energies of
scientific and technological innovation play such an important role.
Document C
Gilbert & George, *The Alcoholic*, 16 black and white photographs, total 94 x 78 in., 1978