ORCA – Online Research @ Cardiff

Postsecular geographies: theo-ethics, rapprochement and neoliberal governance in a faith-based drug programme

POST-PRINT VERSION

Andrew Williams, Cardiff University

Abstract

This paper explores the connections between emergent postsecularity and neoliberal forms of governance. The concept of the postsecular has been increasingly debated by human geographers seeking to understand the apparent paradox that, in late secularised societies, there seems to be a renewed visibility to religion in public life. Geographical scholarship has taken issue with broad-scale suggestions of a shift from a secular to a postsecular society, arguing instead for a grounded analysis of particular spaces where the religious and the secular are co-produced and open out new lines of hybridity. Building on Cloke and Beaumont's notion of rapprochement, this paper critically examines the practical dynamics of postsecular partnerships where diverse religious, secular and humanist voices accrete around mutual ethical concerns and crossover narratives. Using the illustration of a homeless centre and drug treatment service run by the Salvation Army in the UK, I show how the translation of a theo-ethics of caritas can open up political and ethical spaces that cut against the 'ethics' of neoliberal governmentality. These crossover narratives are shown to result in liminal spaces that negotiate and translate religious/secular belief. The conclusion offers two further avenues for postsecular approaches studying the changing geographies of secularity, theo-ethics and neoliberalism.

Introduction

Over recent years the notion of postsecularity has emerged across the humanities and social sciences both as a description of the social, cultural and political re-emergence or new visibility of religion in the public and urban sphere (Baker and Beaumont 2011), and as an analytical frame through which to re-examine the coproduction of religious and secular domains without the spatial and categorical assumptions of the secularisation thesis (see Olson et al. 2013). Geographers have taken issue with grand suggestions of an epochal shift from a secular to postsecular age (Habermas 2006; Taylor 2007), or that the postsecular indeed denotes a wholesale resurgence of religiosity or religious influence in the public realm (Berger 1999). Instead, the postsecular has been understood as a contextual process by which the 'hushed up' voice of religion in the public sphere (Cloke and Beaumont 2013; Eder 2006) is being heard again within particular spaces, resulting in a complex blurring of sacred–secular boundaries (Beaumont and Baker 2011). By attending to the geographies of postsecularity, then, emphasis shifts to the particular sites, spaces and practices where diverse religious, humanist and secular voices come together in a dialogic manner and enter into a learning and experimental process in which secular and religious mentalities can be reflexively transformed (Cloke and Beaumont 2013). Cloke (2010) argues many of these collaborative spaces of rapprochement are intimately tied to an intuitive response to neoliberal excess (Cloke 2011) which prompt religious and non-religious citizens to put aside possible moral or ideological differences in order to engage in common ethical and political praxis. Spaces of care, in particular – for homeless people, asylum seekers, victims of trafficking, victims of indebtedness and other socially excluded groups – have been shown to be key discursive and praxis arenas for postsecular rapprochement in the city (Cloke et al. 2010 2013b; Cloke and Beaumont 2013). It is here that religious, secular and humanitarian motivations appear to coalesce around mutual ethical concerns and crossover narratives.

However, current theorisation of postsecularity has outpaced empirical questions of the practical dynamics of postsecular rapprochement. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate how postsecularity actually works out in practice, and to critically examine its relationship to neoliberal governance. Discussion begins by reviewing the literature on postsecular rapprochement, theo-ethics, faith and neoliberalism. The paper then draws on the case of a homeless centre and drug treatment service run by the Salvation Army in the

UK. Here I illustrate how the centre is generally incorporated into a neoliberal apparatus, but is also constituted by a theo-ethics of hope, faith and love in such a way that provides pathways of resistance (Cloke 2010). The concept of theo-ethics, as developed by Cloke (2010 2011), refers to the significant theological shift in Western Christianity towards a more socially engaged faith that eschews previously conversion-oriented agendas in favour of an embodied enactment of the essences of belief, such as agape and caritas, among marginalised groups in contemporary society. Questions remain whether this term is applicable to other theological traditions. However, this paper focuses on Christian theo-ethical notions of agape and caritas, which understood in the cultural specificity of the Salvation Army case study, refer to God's unconditional love for the world, and a motivation to express the love of God in practical action for others, respectively. This paper examines the 'crossover' narratives that emerge through the translation of theo-ethics into the everyday geographies of the drug programme. These crossover narratives are shown to result in liminal spaces of rapprochement that negotiate and translate religious/secular belief, as well as inform a subversive agency in the face of neoliberal metrics of eligibility and responsibilisation. The paper concludes by developing the case for a more grounded analysis of the ways emergent postsecularity can offer pathways of resistance to neoliberalism.

Postsecularity, theo-ethics and neoliberal governance

The concept of postsecularity has been met with notable criticism by geographers, who have taken issue with its alleged newness (Ley 2011, xiii) and relevance (Kong 2010, 765; see also Wilford 2010), arguing it is simply an analytical framework whose empirical and theoretical concerns have long been addressed through existing conceptual vocabularies. As has been argued elsewhere (Williams et al. 2012), the presence of religion in public life and, indeed, collaborative spaces that cross inter-religious and religious/secular boundaries, are far from new. One must only think of the historic role religious narratives and organisations have played in social welfare (Prochaska 2006), counselling and psychotherapy (Bondi 2013), education and faith schools (see Dwyer and Parutis 2012; Watson 2013) and political activism (Marsh 2003; Smith 1996). However I want to argue that revisiting these spaces through the postsecular gaze has the capacity to reveal a more complex picture of assimilation and mutually reflexive transformation of secular and theological ideas than presented elsewhere

(see Bondi 2013). There are, however, three aspects of emergent postsecularity that underscore the significance of the contemporary empirical moment.

First, while it is the case that secular forms of society (Keynesian and neoliberal) have always variably been co-constituted through theo-ethics (see Asad 2003; Milbank and Oliver 2009), I would argue the form and intensity of these religious/secular crossovers have significantly changed through the realisation of radically plural societies in terms of religion, faith and belief (see Beaumont and Baker 2011; Molendijk et al. 2010). Academic understanding of the changing dynamics of these religio-secular entanglements has encompassed a wide range of empirical arenas and theoretical commitments. On the one hand, research has focused on the reconfiguration of established structures of secularity, and ideologies of secularism, as liberal democratic states enlist diverse religious groups to deliver social cohesion, representation and 'culturally appropriate' services (Beckford 2012; De Vries 2006; Habermas 2006). On the other hand, research has addressed the more individualised and subjectivist sea-change in practices of religious and spiritual belief (Heelas et al. 2005; Taylor 2007), whereby ethical value is increasingly constructed through amalgamations of secular, spiritual and religious frameworks (Bender and Taves 2012). More recently, research has highlighted the emergence of postsecularity in the discourses and practices of international development and humanitarianism (Ager and Ager 2011; Deneulin and Rakodi 2011; Kessler and Arkush 2008; Khanum 2012), as well as the growth of 'alternative' economic spaces linked to Islamic theoethics in global political-economic networks (Atia 2012; Pollard and Samers 2007). Furthermore, postsecularity has been shown to characterise the pluralistic sensibilities and horizontalist organisation of recent social movements – Occupy Wall Street, Taksim Gezi Park and the Arab Spring (see Barbato 2013; Dabashi 2012; Mavelli 2012) – all of which have been marked by an explicit 'crossing over' of religious and secular narratives, symbolism, practices and performances in public space. Each of these cases indicate not so much a differentiation of religion from supposed secular spheres of political, cultural and economic life (Wilford 2010); but instead, evidence how the mutually constitutive dynamics between religious and secular are becoming increasingly visible in the public domain and are creating liminal thirdspaces where these frameworks are fusing into a metaphysical composite (Baker and Beaumont 2011).

Second, the 'crossing-over' of religious and secular narratives in recent years has been equally visible in the realm of Western and European political philosophy. One aspect of this rapprochement between the religious and the secular, as mentioned above, concerns the critique of (post)Rawlsian ideologies of secularism which demarcate separate public (=secular) and private (=religious) spheres (see McLennan 2007). Following the deep ethnic, cultural and religious plurality in the contemporary democratic public sphere, a need has been recognised to develop mutual capacities to tolerate and translate religious and secular difference (Habermas 2006 2010). Rapprochement can also be seen in the way leading thinkers of material socialism have reengaged with theological horizons of faith and belief in order to visualise an appropriate ontology after secularism, and the associated stasis of an 'assertive political economy [which] risks complicity with an ontology of violence that champions self-centred individualism and standardizes the priority of force and counter-force' (Cloke and Beaumont 2013, 38). Critchley (2012), Derrida (1998), Eagleton (2009), Habermas (2010) and Žižek (2000), in admittedly divergent ways, have turned to Christian theo-ethics of otherness, grace, love and hope in order to develop a political subjectivity capable of energising the citizen-subject with hopeful sensibilities and lines of flight that cut against the paralysis of an empty nihilism associated with the contemporary political-economic predicament (also see Baker 2013a; Ward 2009).

Third, the propensity for postsecular collaboration has flourished in the landscape of neoliberal governance, as gaps left by shrinking public service provision and the contracting out of service delivery have been filled by faith-based organisations (FBOs) and other Third Sector organisations. Third sector involvements in welfare are often assumed to be co-opted by and attuned to the objectives and values of neoliberal conservatisms, so as to allow less expensive forms of government. More recently, however, the reconceptualisation of neoliberalism has offered the possibility of new interpretative frameworks (Featherstone et al. 2012; May and Cloke 2013; Springer 2014) in which analytical attention shifts to the actually existing struggles through which neoliberal processes and techniques are being negotiated, and onto the role of social agency in the reproduction and facilitation of neoliberal ideologies. In this way, third sector involvements have been reinterpreted in terms of their capacity to act as potential sites of resistance rather than acquiescence. Taking the case of welfare provision in the UK, there are at least three ways in which emergent

postsecular collaborations can be seen to embody pathways of resistance to neoliberalism (Cloke et al. 2013a).

(i) *In the types of services provided.* Postsecular partnerships commonly become active in order to meet the needs of people from whom the state has chosen to withdraw its support (for example, single homeless, undocumented migrants). The very existence of these welfare services represents a critique of the injustice of socio-economic and political policies of neoliberalism, and are motivated by and performed in the light of that critique.

(ii) *In the performance of care.* Even in the contracted arena of service delivery, the frontline performance of care within FBOs can often be understood as a site of subversion (Barnes and Prior 2009; Williams et al. 2012), reworking the intended technologies and subjectivities supposedly normalised in the regulatory frameworks of neoliberal governmentalities. This way, locally situated and ethically driven actions of staff can open up political spaces that challenge the more regressive aspects of neoliberal policy, contextually co-producing neoliberalism in ways that not only create different variegations but introduce completely new sets of logics and processes that cut against the 'ethics' of neoliberal metrics (see Williams et al. 2012).

(iii) *In prophetic politics and protest.* Postsecular rapprochements across the religious/secular divide have proliferated in recent years in areas of political campaigning/advocacy and protest. In the UK, prominent campaigning FBOs (such as Church Action on Poverty, Barnardo's and Housing Justice) and interfaith protest movements (such as Living Wage, Still Human Still Here and End Hunger Fast) have been active in mobilising public concern around counter-hegemonic rationalities of poverty, translating religious-secular discourses in ways that equip broad-based coalitions with a willingness to focus on ethical sympathies and actions, even if that means setting aside potential moral differences (Cloke et al. 2013a). Across a number of spaces – community-organising (Jamoul and Wills 2008), contemporary civil rights activism (Pattillo-McCoy 1998), trade unions mobilisation (Holgate 2013), contemporary social movements (Barbato 2012; Dabashi 2012; Mavelli 2012) – the boundaries of religion (=private) and secular

(=public) seem to be breaking down as diverse religious and nonreligious voices adopt collaborative pragmatism to work towards common ethical and political commitments.

In all of this, the ethical values and registers that underpin political praxis are crucial. Cloke's (2010) notion of theo-ethics is helpful here to highlight the role theological notions (of agape, caritas) play in shaping the behaviour of faith-motivated actors. The purpose of distinguishing between theological and humanitarian motivation is not to implicitly adjudicate their respective value to motivate actors. Rather it follows an emerging post-phenomenological approach to religion which focuses on conceptualising the lived embodiment of religion – the particular psychogeographies articulated, experienced and performatively brought into being through faith-motivated praxis (Dewsbury and Cloke 2009; Olson et al. 2013). Theoethics, then, offers a way of developing sensitivity for what makes sense for religious others, who largely attribute active agency to the divine, non-material and the supernatural. For the purposes of this paper, and the overt Christian frames of reference found in the Salvation Army case study, I want to argue three aspects of theo-ethics are important to note.

First, theo-ethics offers an analytical framework through which to analyse the complex ways ethical action is informed and energised by narratives, rituals and precepts drawn from religious experience and tradition. The language of theo-ethics should not be conflated with conventional notions of 'religious values' (Hackworth 2012), however. Rather theo-ethics, in a Christian context, specifies a move from propositional modes of belief and ecclesial practice, towards more performative theologies that incorporate tradition and immanence in the form of virtue ethics (see Cloke et al. 2012). Accordingly it can be argued theo-ethics offers a way to understand the changing nature of religious belief and praxis itself (cf. Kong 2010, 770) as elements of Christianity adapt to the demands of post-Christendom and explore new and different ways of faith expression.

Second, theo-ethics can denote a new and positive relation to difference by acknowledging the failure of traditional forms of Christian caritas and secular charity (Coles 1997) to recognise alterity. Under such codes, charity was offered to the 'other' in a way that, directly or indirectly, served to assimilate them into normalised roles and social expectations. Coles' (1997) idealised notion of a postsecular caritas, in contrast, entails a 'receptive generosity' – a desire to accept the 'specificity of the other and to be generous in that context of specificity

rather than in the context of the self' (Cloke et al. 2010, 57). This ethos of engagement rejects universalist reason, and its inherent efforts to convert the other into a set sense of rationality and respectability, preferring instead a more phenomenological appreciation of what is right in a particular context, blending virtue ethics with immanence (see Cloke et al. 2010, 57). In this sense, theo-ethics carries an excess beyond material logic and rationale and, in the case of agape for example, embodies the 'genuine openness to, and outpouring of, unconditional love towards and acceptance of the other' (May and Cloke 2013, 15). As government welfare policy escalates moralisation over the compliant deserving and the undeserving disobedient (Monaghan 2012), theo-ethics of agape and caritas find common ground with secular humanist ethics to engender powerful counter-narratives that challenge established social hierarchies.

Third, discursive constructions of theo-ethics are highly culturally variable and analysis needs to contextualise the lived enactment of theo-ethics within wider political, economic and social entanglements. In their study of how US churches welcoming undocumented immigrants come up against, and ultimately buy into, 'worldly' social boundaries of race and legal status, Ehrkamp and Nagel argue that:

> rather than a limitless, unconditional ideal, [a Christian ethic of] hospitality in practice entails conditionality and assertions of sovereignty over space, be it a home or a democratic state (Derrida 2000). (2014, 2)

Equally, Lancione's (2014) research into the moral discourses and affective atmospheres produced by practices of care in FBOs serving homeless people in Turin concludes that narratives of unconditional 'love for the poor' conceal the precarious, conditional and sometimes demeaning nature of assistance experienced by recipients of charity. Accordingly Lancione takes issue with the 'lack of critical engagement with what FBOs do', suggesting postsecular scholarship offers an 'a-critical acceptance of the "love for the poor"':

> Christian 'love' underpinning Christian FBOs' actions in the postsecular city, is assumed as good and the few empiricallybased case studies provided by this train of thought unconditionally depict it as such. (Lancione 2014, 3; original emphasis)

This argument seems to neglect a number of studies that provide a more critical account of FBO work (see Williams' (2013) critique of conservative evangelical rehab environments;

Cloke et al.'s (2013b) analysis of the contrasting political theologies of two FBO debt advice organisations in the UK; and Davelaar et al.'s (2013) account of the changing conservative and radical politics of the Society for Diaconal Social Work in the Netherlands). Nevertheless, it is important to heed Lancione's emphasis on the need for careful and critical assessment of how practices of care are produced through the interplay of materialities (bodies, architectures), emotions (fear, joy) and moral discourses (homelessness, stigmatisations). Clearly, notions of agape can be appropriated or tied to very different political projects. For instance, articulations of agape have been domesticated into a possessive individualism that upholds, even sacralises, a reckless capitalism based on a resentful politics of closure, repentance and individual responsibility (Connolly 2008; also see Hackworth's 2012 notion of 'religious neoliberalism'). Yet in other arenas the theo-ethics of agape have been shown to sponsor more progressive affirmations of unconditionality that challenge the moral values enshrined in neoliberal calculations of welfare (Williams et al. 2012). Understanding how different religious traditions embody and perform different theo-ethics across various geographic sites allows geographers to engage more critically with the intersections of belief, ethics and political agency (Sutherland 2014). However, the conceptual value of postsecularity represents more than a bland acceptance of religious diversity in the public sphere. Rather, it invites reflection more fully on the multiple epistemologies and ontologies at work within both religious and secular sources of ethical action, posing questions about the composition and practice of 'secular' ethical precepts that guide ethical action – humanitarianism, humanism, universalism, solidarity and equality (Smith 2000).

Discussion in this paper focuses on the practical outworking of theo-ethics of agape inside the trappings of neoliberal governance, and is drawn from a two-month ethnographic placement working in a Salvation Army run 'Lifehouse' and drug programme. My daily involvement in the centre entailed working alongside staff and residents on the detox and rehabilitation wing of the building. Alongside participant observation, documentary analysis and extensive conversations recorded in a fieldwork journal, taped interviews were conducted with 14 of the centre's staff and volunteers and six residents at different stages of the treatment programme.

The Salvation Army's Hope House: incorporated into neoliberal governance

Landscapes of addiction services have often been assumed to be characterised by a distinction between the deserving and undeserving client – usually founded on the willingness of the individual to 'work the programme' (Wilton and DeVerteuil 2006). Yet more recently, this distinction has become intensified in treatment organisations caught up in the neoliberal implementation of restrictive eligibility, targeted interventions and strict repercussions for 'non-compliance' (Mold and Berridge 2010; Monaghan 2012). FBOs have retained a longstanding presence in the sector in the UK, especially in the area of residential treatment, through the work of numerous localised organisations and through large-scale service providers, such as The Salvation Army. Founded in the East side of London in 1865 by William and Catherine Booth, The Salvation Army (hereafter TSA) set out as an evangelical missionary movement based on a quasi-military structure that promoted temperance and tied social assistance with an 'urgency to convert people to Christian ways of living' (Cloke et al. 2005, 389). Today TSA is a major service provider and campaigning body working in 126 countries in several areas, including: homelessness, human trafficking, food poverty, unemployment, elderly care, children and family support, missing person service and international development. In the UK and Ireland its activities are split between the so-called Corps (comprised of 800 church and community-based initiatives) and specific social service operations that constitute a significant provider of government-funded services related to homelessness, drug and alcohol addiction, and support for elderly and youth services. More recently the TSA has won contracts for supporting victims of human trafficking and became a partner on the Coalition government's Work Programme (see Williams 2012). In the area of drug services TSA provides six specialist detox and rehabilitation centres and 50 'Lifehouses' (emergency accommodation that provides skills training, counselling, group work and one-to-one support), and numerous day programmes and additional support services based in hundreds of Salvation Army churches and community centres.

Hope House (pseudonym) is a typical TSA Lifehouse providing entry-level emergency accommodation, and also offers specialist maintenance, medical-based detoxification and abstinence-based rehabilitation facilities for people with alcohol and drug problems. Located in a large English city, the 93-bed centre is funded directly by government through their Supporting People programme (see May et al. 2006), and works collaboratively with the local

authority Drug Strategy Team (DST), which is responsible for commissioning and overseeing drug services in the area. Incorporation into the financial and regulatory frameworks of this joined-up governance has changed the modus operandi of Hope House. Technologies of contractualism, audit and best value have meant Hope House regularly has to bid competitively for contracts – a practice that results in a degree of self-regulation, and (at least nominal) adherence to the desired philosophy and practices of funding commissioners. To maintain their rolling contract with local commissioners, Hope House has been involved in careful management of its organisation image, for example, by curtailing overt displays of unwanted proselytisation, both on an individual and organisational level.

However, this pragmatic posture needs to be understood alongside wider shifts in the practical theology adopted by TSA, moving away from a 'serve-you-to-convert-you' attitude that previously had made homeless service provision conditional on religious participation (see Snow and Anderson 1993; Walker 2001; Wallace 1965). Rather TSA have more recently moved to a theological ethos of unconditionality, seeking to offer services 'without strings' – that is, separated from participation in religious activities (see Cloke et al. 2007 2012).

The onset of greater professionalisation has resulted in changing staff profiles, as the emphasis on trained and accredited key workers and drug counsellors, and of combined equal opportunities legislation, has served to undermine the practicality of Christian staff. As a result, TSA Hope House and other similar government-funded FBOs have entered into partnerships with secular individuals and organisations, bringing a rich assortment of motivations, discourses of care and ways of working into a traditionally religious environment.

As part of government-funded regime, the previous approach of permitting direct access was realigned to a 'referral-only' policy, which restricted eligibility to clients who were already engaged with 'mainstream agencies' (social services, official City Council Outreach Teams, or recognised third sector agencies) and who could demonstrate a 'local connection' to the city (see May et al. 2006; May and Cloke 2013). Equally, funding requirements associated with Supporting People and Drug Strategy Team programmes have placed strict time limits on how long residents could stay in the Lifehouse (target 6 months) and on the drug programme (6 weeks preparation; 10–14 days detox; and maximum 16 weeks rehab). Staff working on the drug programme experienced the pressure of being caught up in ever tightening regulatory and financial frameworks:

Interviewer: What power do the DST have?

Mark: Everything. Without them we get no money and we shut down. [Pam comes into the room and prominently says 'They're the piper and we dance']. Before some guys we could extend their stay if they needed it. Now DST stipulate we can only support people for 12 weeks only. If they say 6 weeks only, then it will only be for 6 weeks. Supporting People are not so bad as long as they're in the know and they've got a care plan. They are not really interested … they [Supporting People] are unrealistic in their fixing of boundaries and targets. It feels like the client is not at the centre of the things we do. Community Care Assessments have changed the way we work completely. Before we were holistic [because we were] funded simply by Housing Benefit and the Drug Strategy Team. Now we are time bound and money oriented – you can see that in the case-conference – it feels like the client is not important. We need the money though.

When asked what autonomy the centre has to challenge or navigate their way around this, Pam, manager of the treatment programme responded:

You can't. We did put up a bit of fight with extending the stay [of some clients] but they wouldn't have any of it. They said 'no' [her voice parodied the Little Britain joke 'computer says no', displaying a frustration with the impersonal manner decisions are made about their clients, but also other individuals in care]. It's because they've probably got someone on their shoulder asking where is the money going. It's all about the figures to them [DST]. If you extend the stay for someone, it stops someone else coming onto treatment, they can go to their bosses and say there are this number of people in treatment.

Although staff recognised beneficial elements of professionalisation, for instance, in ensuring standardised quality of care in the area of dual diagnosis and mental health (Stephen, centre manager 12/1/10), there was concern that governmental technologies of audit, eligibility and shifting funding regimes institutionalised a procedural ethics of care (standardised care plans and short-term targeted interventions) that often failed to meet the complex and individual needs of clients. These policy regimes represent a mixture of treatment identities (Fraser and Valentine 2008) that discursively construct service-users through notions of 'stability' and

'chaotic user' based on neoliberal metrics of self-regulation and responsibilisation (Monaghan 2012). Part of professionalisation in Hope House, and other accredited emergency accommodation providers, has entailed adhering to a standardised licence agreement that sets out the responsibilities and requirements placed on residents (for instance, prohibitions of substances on site) and the level and programming of service provision. Technologies of contractual governance have become increasingly prevalent in welfare, health and crime policy, particularly in relation to drug use (Seddon 2010). The politics of contractual technologies instil a neoliberal problematisation of drug users as rational calculating risk-takers and choice-makers, in which non-compliance or failure to perform the behavioural expectations of the 'responsible service user', for whatever reason, become grounds for exclusion and other illiberal measures.

Such ordered environments found in drug treatment and 'rehabilitation' spaces have been understood through a lens of social control (Wilton and DeVerteuil 2006), normalising 'unruly' subjects into docile, obedient bodies (Bourgois 2000), or as 'technologies of the self' that instil neoliberal values of risk management, self-help and self-responsibility (Fairbanks 2009). Certainly, spaces of recovery are ambivalent political spaces where practices of care connect to moral, medical and therapeutic discourses of the drug-using subject, alongside regulatory architectures of surveillance (for instance, drug testing, CCTV, prohibitions and room searches) and the 'pedagogical' and 'empathetic authority' of keyworkers and peer support (see McDonald and Marston 2005 on case management in workfare). However, this paper offers a characterisation of treatment spaces that brings into view the neglected emotional and relational geographies of actors – staff, volunteers and residents – who inhabit and co-produce these regulatory spaces. Particular attention is given to how emergent forms of postsecularity, premised on the 'crossing over' of religious and non-religious ethics, offer the possibility of opening out ethical and political spaces that rework and challenge neoliberal metrics.

Emergent postsecularity

Hope House has attracted a diversity of religious and non-religious workers who share a commitment to 'do something' about addicted exclusion. Focusing exclusively on those staff

involved on the drug programme, my research encountered Salvationists, conservative evangelicals, Pentecostals, liberals, people of New Age and Buddhist faiths, agnostics and atheists of all ages and backgrounds (see Table I), who each brought their own idea of what constitutes good practice, healing, development and transformation, but sought to work together in order to practically care for residents.

Caution is needed here not to overemphasise the faith–secular binary in understanding the ethics of service involved – staff motivation crisscrossed vocational, professional, educational and therapeutic values (see Cloke et al. 2007). For instance, a number of staff – religious and non-religious – cited how personal histories of drug use led them to an empathetic identification with service-users:

> [I wanted to] help people who are going through the same problems as I did. (Mark, rehab counsellor 3/8/10)

> [Y]ou never just disclose your own history, I can empathise a lot with what some of the lads have been through because there are certain things in life I've done, choices I've made, so I'm able to see how Christ had come to me and gave me hope and freedom through stuff. (Stephen, centre manager 12/1/10)

Nevertheless, what came across from the research was that people tended to articulate motivation in relation to their respective religious, secular and humanist positionalities. Christian staff principally linked their motivation to 'an outworking of their faith' (Emily, administrator 15/9/10). Expression of faith ranged from various shades of evangelical theology – that is, the desire to communicate the Christian message and 'prayer with clients' (Joy, receptionist 15/9/10) – to a more postsecular caritas (Coles 1997) that respected differences in spiritual/ religious belief, and enacted a desire to serve the other unconditionally.

[TABLE 1 AROUND HERE]

Staff who self-identified as non-religious saw the decision to work for a Christian charity as largely pragmatic in nature, reflecting more of an acceptance of TSA as a practical device 'just to make a difference' (Neil, head of outreach 12/9/10) rather than any systematic approval of religious belief per se. Respondents affirmed that the Christian ethos of the TSA did not act as a barrier to their participation, pointing to the synergy between the outworkings of faith-based and secular ethics:

> [T]he values are pretty similar to my own, you don't have to be a Christian to be loving. (Sharon, rehab counsellor 5/8/10)

> I suppose we are all here because we're human, we [pause] care, the only thing we are here to do is help people get back on their own feet. (Dave, senior detox nurse 16/8/10)

> [I]t doesn't really matter what you believe, there's such a mixture of us anyway. I have my own reasons for working here, they have theirs. Christian, Muslim, Buddhist, or if you're simply just a human caring for another human, we all have something that drives you to do this work. I came here not because it's particularly Christian but because I could easily agree with its TSA ethos – caring for people, yep, helping the whole person, yep ... in my opinion, it's [the centre] not overly religious in the end of the day, we're not evangelical. (Tasha, rehab counsellor 16/8/10)

Different religious or humanist motivations were seen to discursively frame phenomenological and embodied responses to care for people struggling with addiction. Each of the interviewees above articulated a shared intuition – to care, to love – a sensibility that led actors to commit doing this sort of work. I want to suggest that the mutual recognition of the capacity of both religious and non-religious motivation helped co-generate hopeful sensibilities and ways of working that reflexively transformed religious and secular mentalities.

To illustrate this suggestion I draw on the example of the receptionist, Joy, who embodied intentional and routinised performances that helped to create representational and

emotional-affective landscapes conductive to rapprochement. Joy's daily routine involved operating the security door, dealing with all enquiries, collecting and giving residents keys, and organising appointments for residents and staff. Her jolly and calm demeanour was often commented on by residents and staff alike. She had a knack for 'picking people up', interspersing humour, small talk and remembering all the residents' names. Joy would dispel aggravated situations when residents were 'kicking off' by simply getting alongside people, and taking time to listen. The way she performed her job communicated certain affective and visceral messages to others. For instance, despite sitting behind a glass-fronted reception desk, when residents came with queries Joy would leave her seat to lean over the counter to offer a embodied gesture of hospitality and individual importance to clients. Sometimes she would leave the locked reception office to embrace residents in the lobby, or simply go and join one or two of the men having a cigarette outside the building, thereby revising some of the staff– resident hierarchies that can characterise professionalised welfare spaces.

Joy openly ascribed the manner in which she performed her job as 'part and parcel' of her evangelical Christian belief to 'show God's love in practical ways that are meaningful to the men' (Joy, receptionist 15/8/10). Equally, Joy articulated experiences of being 'empowered by God to love that one person' and feeling 'God was working through her' (Joy, receptionist 15/8/10). This theological belief was seen to attribute agency to the divine in ways that led the believer to enact particular embodiments of caritas and agape, suggesting the need to recognise the distinct psychogeographies at work for people of faith (Dewsbury and Cloke 2009, 696). The claim here is not that Christian motivation somehow produces a stronger display of caring and warmth, more than, say, secular humanist or humanitarian motivation. Rather it is to acknowledge different ethical precepts performatively elicit distinct affective registers, which, in this example of Christian belief in the immanent and not-yet-visible, means that 'certain things happen that would not otherwise – certain affects are produced that make people experience very real and specific feelings' (Dewsbury and Cloke 2009, 696). Here Joy's habitual performance driven in part by a theo-ethics of agape came to shape the emotional tonality of reception space, which evidently prompted similar performances of care from secular and other Christian staff. Certainly, when Joy was not on shift the atmosphere in reception was viscerally different in that it did not convey the same affective lines of hospitality. I would argue that it is this distinct constitution of an emotional-affective

landscape of care that allowed actors – religious or nonreligious – to recognise the salience of beliefs-in-action. In this example, the charismatic personality of one individual, combined with her generosity and hopefulness informed by Christian theo-ethics, helped shape a particular affective texture that spilled over into the sensibilities and practices of religious and non-religious actors.

Shared faith and hopeful sensibilities

Conceptualisations of faith have largely been framed as the reserve of the religious, to the neglect of recognising non-religious forms of faith. Faith can be taken to define an embodied sense of religious belief, but it can also suggest some form of secular belief or commitment, or a completely different form of fidelity to an idea (see Critchley 2012; Holloway 2013). From the example above we see religious and non-religious motivated practices of care coming together and in the process recognising shared ethical precepts of love, hope and compassion. According to Critchley (2012), faith is a commitment, a proclamation of fidelity to an ethical demand that enacts a new form of subjectivity – an emptying out of the self towards an 'other'. Faith is not necessarily related to transcendental belief but to an event that is shared by agnostics, atheists and theists alike. Here Caputo's (2001) reformulation of the distinction between religious and secular persons is useful to illuminate what he argues is the inherent religious characteristic of practices of going-beyond-the-self, or love-as-excess. In his treatise on 'religion without religion', Caputo indirectly draws on Kierkegaardian existentialism to open up a kind of endless substitutability and translatability between 'love' and 'God'. Rather than distinguishing between religious and non-religious people, he argues, it is better to speak of the religious in people – where a leap of love into the hyper-real leads to a transformative commitment.

In Hope House, religious, secular and humanist motivations take on a shared 'belief in the impossible' becoming possible – expressions of love steeped in a obstinate hope for transformation, an 'impossible' belief that someone or something can change when there is so little sign of it (see Caputo 2001). Caputo (2001, 13) marks out this distinction between the hope of the mediocre fellow – 'the sanguinity that comes when the odds are on our side' and

the more self-surpassing passion 'hope against hope', as St Paul says (Romans 4:18). He writes:

> [I]t is no great feat, after all, to love the loveable, to love our friends and those who tell us we are wonderful; but to love the unloveable, to love those who do not love us, to love our enemies – that is love. That is impossible, the impossible, which is why we love it all the more. (Caputo 2001, 13)

This faith-in-the-impossible, or venture into the hyper-real, is the crux of a shared faith that sustains religious and secular rapprochement. In Hope House, it was clearly seen in the offer of second, third and fourth chances to people who had violated the rules of the centre, or in the choice of staff to work with 'difficult' residents who had threatened other staff and residents. These hopeful sensibilities were seen in more ordinary practices of 'going-beyond-the-self', where religious and secular staff voluntarily stayed on 'after hours' with residents and befriended residents on the detoxification unit struggling with withdrawal and loneliness.

These gestures of care came from various and complex motivations and took place in the particular context of a TSA centre. It is important to note that emergent rapprochement between secular and religious belief emanated from, and was seen to negotiate, more longstanding discursive codes that maintained strict religious and secular identities. Some secular staff retained strong views on the legitimate role of Christianity in the centre, and criticised the few 'loose cannons' (Phil, resettlement team 12/8/10) who participated in proselytisation:

> [W]e haven't sold Christianity, the clients haven't signed up to that. Christian organisations can only claim Housing Benefit, they cannot be funded ... their actions are predatory – people are in a weak, suggestible state, any faith talk without mentioning all faiths is wrong. (Neil, outreach worker 20/8/10)

Equally, more conservative Christian staff identified faith-secular working as part of a 'secularising tide at work within The Salvation Army' that circumscribed opportunities to 'verbally share the Christian faith' (Emily, receptionist 12/8/10). For some the dilution of what they saw as the 'Christian' character of the project was too much, and left Hope House to work in more evangelical drug programmes (Molly, former doctor 3/ 9/10).

It is unsurprising that postsecular rapprochement comprised a series of contestations. Rapprochement emerges from the negotiation of existing secular and religious divisions – a process that by nature holds the possibility of entrenching existing religious and secular identity boundaries as much as fostering new relations of mutual translation across secular/religious boundaries.

Crossover narratives

Religious and secular collaboration in Hope House was sustained partly through ephemeral, visceral embodiments of shared faith, but also partly through the construction of crossover narratives and devices, capable of holding together the combined discourses and praxis of secular and religious workers.

Places and practices of addiction treatment present a distinct capacity for the crossover and co-production of religious, secular and scientific understandings of addiction and recovery. Indeed, the contemporary landscape of addiction treatment continues to be haunted by religio-spiritual discourses of deliverance and temperance, both through the sizeable presence of FBOs providing rehabilitation services, and by the historical constructions of religious, therapeutic and scientific discourses that shape professional and lay discourses of care in secular treatment programmes (see Berridge 2005; Mold and Berridge 2010; Valverde 1998).

More recently, landscapes of addiction treatment have witnessed the mainstreaming of spirituality in healthcare, as part of a wider shift in the sociology of medicine from a paternalistic benevolent ethos in the delivery of professional care to an increased autonomy for, and by, those using social services (Greenstreet 2006, 24). Person-centred care has been accompanied by a renewed openness to non-Western spiritual practices as part of secular treatment programmes, which could also be seen in the pragmatics of care in Hope House, with several staff specialising in aromatherapy, acupuncture, massage and Buddhist philosophy of mindfulness. These activities were made freely available and seemed popular among residents. The fact that these practices co-existed alongside optional Bible study classes and prayer groups, and fellowship meetings of Alcoholics Anonymous and other Higher Power groups, suggest an increasingly hybrid therapeutic space operates within Hope

House, where facilitators and service-users appropriate and experiment with blurring the boundaries of scientific, religious and therapeutic discourse and praxis (see Frisk 2011).

If the pragmatics of care in Hope House can be characterised by an overt metaphysical plurality, it is also important to note how staff and residents interacted with these often blurred encounters. What was most noticeable in therapy groups was an attempt by staff – religious and secular – to put aside their own secular or religious perspectives so as to respond in ways that enhance the resident's capacity to engage receptively and generously with the world. For instance, atheist staff sympathetically engaged with religious and alternative spiritualities – whatever the worldview of the client – in order to harness motivation for recovery in a way that respected alterity (Coles 1997). Equally, religious staff came to utilise 'secular' understandings of addiction and bracket out aspects of their own beliefs in order to work effectively with clients. These blurring encounters between religious and secular narratives of recovery came to be appropriated by the individual agency of residents.

Residents expressed a variety of different understandings and practices relating to their engagement in the treatment programme. Indeed, the individual agency of residents came to co-constitute, challenge or otherwise reshape the postsecular conditions. Take, as an example, participation with Buddhist practices of mindfulness and the Twelve Steps of Alcoholics Anonymous fellowships. Some residents openly accepted these practices and engaged to varying degrees with their philosophical and religious traditions and meanings. One of the detox residents noted the need 'find your own god … whatever you want to call it' and how 'you can develop that for yourself' (Colin, interview 20/ 8/10). Others saw the therapeutic value of these practices but detached them from their metaphysical signification, preferring instead to engage with a more individualised notion of Higher Powers and mediation – a move some have argued to reflect a 'post-modern negotiated spirituality' (Dossett 2012). In either case, the discourses and pragmatics of care were characterised by an 'overt metaphysical/religious pluralism' (Connolly 1999, 185) that residents experimented with and appropriated to create hybrid and increasingly complex interplays between religious, spiritual and therapeutic practices.

Crossover narratives and organisational power

Crossover narratives, then, need to be situated in relation to the social and organisational context in which they emerge. Furthermore, it would be wrong to attend to the 'crossing-over' and assimilation of religious and non-religious values, identities and beliefs without addressing the role organisational dynamics play in instituting particular social relationships. On an organisational level, rapprochement might be seen in the ethic of hospitality on the part of Christian staff shown to other monotheistic and Buddhist faiths, particularly with regard to efforts made to encourage residents to harness the emotional and spiritual support from their own faith community. Certainly any criticism of non-Christian faiths was seen immediately to be 'out of place' within Hope House. However, the Salvationist management of Hope House upheld a boundary of tolerance in terms of what lines were drawn between acceptable and inappropriate expressions of religious and spiritual belief. While the practices of 'mainstream' religions were tolerated, even encouraged, some New Age and Pagan members of staff at times were discouraged from sharing their own spirituality with clients. For example, Katie, one of the detox nurses was given 'a slap on the wrist' when she gave tarot card readings to several men on the Drug Programme (Katie, interview 12/8/10). Her request for senior management's permission to offer rock and crystal therapy to residents who had expressed an interest in New Age spirituality was declined, citing how this contravenes the ethos of the Salvation Army.

This raises the question of the power dynamics underpinning cases of postsecular partnership, the potential dangers of 'planned pluralism' or asymmetrical assimilation (Gressgard 2010), and how disagreement between disparate positionalities is managed. From this case study, at least two strategies can be seen at work. First, senior management used the central TSA image to jettison some proposals as 'out of place' in a Christian organisation, while circumscribing acceptable discursive practices through the rules, staff performance reviews and 'corridor talk' that regulate the space. In the interviews, several respondents recalled instances where senior staff dismissed the use of alternative spirituality in the treatment programme by parodying the need for 'auditable interventions', implying how that would look in the eyes of commissioners and funding bodies. Second, heated conversations between staff members of disparate beliefs were informally moderated by the presence of staff holding alternate viewpoints – coming from different denominations or intensities, or identifying as non-religious – as well as being curtailed if there was a sense the disagreement

was giving a 'bad impression to clients'. This highlights the ambiguous and contested nature of postsecular spaces, especially the asymmetrical power relations that structure the possibility for rapprochement.

Liminal spaces of rapprochement

Collaborative performativities of care, combined with accompanying crossover narratives, opened out spaces of rapprochement where actors came to reflexively transform and negotiate religious and secular mentalities. The concept of rapprochement may be highly significant in strengthening current literature on 'encounter spaces', which are seen to negotiate or reinforce religious and cultural difference (Amin 2002; Valentine and Sadgrove 2012; Wilson 2013). Rapprochement brings a slightly different focus by drawing attention to the assimilation of the religious and the secular through the construct of crossover narratives capable of translating the ethical sympathies of religious and secular actors (Cloke and Beaumont 2013). In the liminal space that emerges when religious and secular beliefs are negotiated, it has been argued 'new values may well be formed as part of a valuable poststructural reterritorializing of the faith-in-practice of postsecularism' (Cloke and Beaumont 2013, 47). To illustrate this, I present two broad reformulations of secular and religious identity and belief among staff and residents.

First, secularist staff who had fixed views on the privatisation of religion from public service delivery came to recognise shared intuitions and convergence points across religious, humanist and secular sensibilities. In some cases, there was a reluctant appreciation of the role religious theo-ethics of caritas played, when combined with the Salvation Army ethos, in fashioning a 'caring' centre that 'brings the best out of the men' (interview with Richard 3/8/10) by providing an 'atmosphere of understanding and acceptance' (interview with Tasha 11/8/10). The pluralistic therapeutic discourses accompanying person-centred care led atheist staff to cultivate a critical responsiveness (Connolly 1999) in relation to the positive role that religious and spiritual beliefs might play in the lives of residents. Equally for residents, there was an appreciation of the openness towards spirituality in treatment and the willingness to respect differences in worldview among staff and residents:

> They don't shove Christianity down your throat. And they allow you the space to develop whatever your belief system is, or wants to be, or needs to be or whatever. (Ali, rehab resident 20/7/10)

> Andrew's very good as well, he just says what he believes and allows you to say what you believe, and ... cause the answer is that none of us really know, it's a matter of faith isn't it? (Colin, detox resident 20/7/10)

These responses were combined with an acknowledgement that Hope House involved values of non-judgmentalism and tolerance of difference compared with other rehabilitation centres – faith-based and secular – they had visited. Religious monologues or preaching were deemed 'out-of-place' in the centre, which according to several residents permitted a more open dialogue between different standpoints, and in some cases led to new hybrid composites of different religious, scientific and spiritual resources in residents' narratives of recovery.

Second, in a similar manner, the entanglement of disparate metaphysical/religious identities and expressions fostered a critical responsiveness among Christian staff – prompting reflection on the limitations of Christian caritas and the practices of unwanted proselytisation (Coles 1997). Working across faith and secular boundaries led to a greater affirmation of the power 'other' religious, secular and humanist beliefs play in motivating a performative excess of care. In the interviews, staff described moments when the willingness of New Age staff 'to do stuff which isn't part of their job description' (Molly, former doctor 3/9/10), as part of their desire to show compassion to residents, led to a reconsideration among evangelicals of the legitimacy of New Age spirituality.

By the same token, the overt metaphysical/religious plurality meant religious and secular participants had to negotiate and translate their aspirations and deeply held convictions with each other. Sometimes people had to leave because they felt too compromised – others saw it as a form of liberation in which their own tradition becomes more alive and more credible. Resettlement worker Paul's experience working in the centre, for instance, gave him a heightened sensitivity to the erroneous identity-politics of conservative evangelicalism, which presented his role as 'saving souls' and 'bringing people to church' (interview 15/8/10). Working across faith-secular lines for him prompted a shift towards a theology of Missio Dei

– recognising 'Jesus is already at work in people's lives regardless, [and] my job is assist in that' (interview 15/8/10). Accordingly, Paul and others embraced theologies and practices that affirmed the revelation of God in expressions of love shown by religious and secular actors:

> Wherever there is truth there is Jesus ... wherever there is kindness, there is God. God doesn't just use Christians you know. (Joy, receptionist 15/8/10)

This example seems to resonate with Caputo's translatability between 'love' and 'God'. Yet for Joy, an evangelical Christian, this theology of immanence became a question about the inherited systematic theology in her church community. Accordingly, the deterritorialisation of theological belief can be seen as a fragmented and unfinished process, where rapprochement opens out the possibility of deconstructing the intuitive embodiments of religion and its reliance on particular institutional codes. Furthermore, the move towards faith-by-practice was seen by some to offer experimental space to 'reveal the true kernel of radical openness [of the church], but also transformative alterity that lies at its heart' (Baker 2013b, 10). This can be clearly seen in Paul's attempt to experiment with more dialogical expressions of faith-sharing and bottom-up, or rhizomatic, theologies that seek to rediscover 'how to be church in the community – with homeless people – outside the four walls of a [church] building' (Paul, resettlement officer 15/8/10).

These specific movements in the politics of becoming were accompanied by a revalorisation of Christian virtue ethics that prioritised a faith-through-praxis over propositional belief, which enabled a greater spirit of ecumenism across the religious–secular divide. Asked whether Hope House was a Christian programme, several evangelical Christian interviewees were able to downplay the place of mandatory, unwanted proselytisation, emphasising instead the importance of learning to respond consistently in line with the character of Christ (see Hauerwas et al. 2010):

> We can't save everybody, we can't convert everybody. We need to accept that ... But I think it's important here in this kind of situation because I believe the character that you put on of Christ is the character the people here that are resident need. (Esther, trainee manager 27/8/10)

It doesn't matter if I'm doing that [compassion] as an officer or if Joy is doing that as a Christian [then] that is a Christian programme to me ... there's people from the Salvation Army, there's people from other churches and then there's non-believers, there's a mixture and I think people aren't afraid to be themselves and I think that is quite an amazing thing to see ... (Esther, trainee manager 27/8/10)

From these short reflections, I want to suggest the possibility for postsecular rapprochement to generate thirdspaces where previously non-negotiable views are deterritorialised and new lines of flight and hybrid forms of belief across religious and non-religious identities emerge.

Postsecularity and subversive ethics

Theo-ethical notions of grace, understood as God's love for all people, opened up a discursive space within Hope House where non-religious staff and volunteers could share their own ethical commitment to universality and humanitarianism. This convergence of religious and secular ethical precepts came to open out political spaces that challenged the divisive politics of deservingness and individualisation of risk. Here postsecular rapprochement can be seen to deflect neoliberal subjectification in at least three ways.

First, the organisational identity of the TSA was used as a representational device that was deployed strategically in negotiations with commissioners and Drug Strategy Teams. Stephen, the centre manager explained that the 'Christian ethos of Hope House' gave him the flexibility and ethical rationale to openly challenge the government's referral-only homeless policy. When the referral-only policy first came in, Stephen and other TSA centre managers directly refused to adhere to the practice of turning people away without referrals, and continued to operate a direct access philosophy as an outworking of their organisational identity. The centre provided six beds to those ineligible under government criteria, using its own money from headquarters and private donations 'to meet any need as it presents itself' (Stephen, centre manager 12/1/10). The administration of Supporting People initially tried to mitigate Hope House's policy of direct access, which led to friction between TSA Hope House and the City council, but later welcomed a deal where Hope House would refer a new client to accommodation services the next day, conceding that hostel staff would simply continue to follow their ethical conscience to welcome those without referrals. By continuing to provide

direct access facilities over the weekends and in the evenings, when most mainstream services close their doors, Hope House has opened out an interstitial space where neoliberal calculations of need, and associated attempts to delegitimise the philosophy of direct access, are tempered by postsecular notions of caritas.

Second, organisationally Hope House introduced new regulatory technologies that supplanted the intended policies and processes of neoliberal contractualism. Theo-ethics of grace and mercy were regarded by many staff to positively inform organisational decisions concerning evictions and problematic behaviour. Rather than the 'one strike and you're out' penalty obliged in the licence agreement of emergency accommodation providers, the management of the centre sought to instil a 'culture of forgiveness' by showing leniency to clients and finding new ways of addressing problematic behaviour. At first, these technologies emanated from the ordinary ethics of staff – religious and secular – choosing to find ways around evictions; but these practices later came to be formalised into new technologies such as the Alcohol Assertiveness Scheme, providing intensive keyworker support for residents trapped in the revolving door of alcohol-related eviction. Frontline workers were aware the procedural ethical code preserved in tenancy contracts necessitates the eviction of those who break the rules, which can work only to exacerbate the exclusion of individuals with chronic alcohol-related problems who recurrently break licensing agreements in a number of accommodation providers. As Stephen explains:

> [Y]ou're freed to do that within the Salvation Army system, so I can show mercy and be flexible in a way that I wouldn't be in other places I've worked. And that has to be down to the faith element because that's what the governing instrument is at the start – the founding roots of the organisation, permeating things through. (Centre manager 12/1/10)

Third, the performances of staff and residents played a key role in generating more hopeful spaces of collaborative care and empowerment – creating social roles and relationships that unsettled in part the stigmatised identities of the drug user and neoliberal subjectivities of risk individualisation and self-responsibility. Residents often praised staff who went 'an extra mile' to properly get to know them, and the administration of Hope House centre who used its own money to provide trips out and recreational activities such as football and cinema trips. Communal spaces such as the canteen where staff and residents ate breakfast, lunch

and dinner together offered an event-space of conviviality rather than differentiated subject positions of 'chaotic drug user' and 'professional staff'. The argument here is not that TSA is somehow unique in its service provision, although other service providers might not enjoy the same level of financial resources. Care is also needed so as not to assume practices of sociality are characterised by symmetrical encounters devoid of rigid power relations. However, the argument here is that practices of care and sociality serve as liminal spaces where the stigma or moral distance that can accompany professionalised care regimes is challenged, and new relations to otherness can be fostered.

Researchers of governmentality have largely examined the role of keyworkers in relation to the politics of responsibilisation – teaching the skills of self-management and compliance through therapy groups and keeping appointments (McDonald and Marston 2005). However, ethnographies of the lived enactment of these programmes reveal that the empathy and emotional labour involved in keyworking should not be seen narrowly as a self-interested ruse to ensure the client's acceptance of the treatment methods and goals, given non-compliance with the programme would warrant an 'unplanned discharge'.

Equally, it might be easy to interpret the performance of staff as simply fulfilling contractual obligations enshrined in codes of best practice and following a pragmatics of care in keeping with notions of responsibilisation. However, it is clear in the way staff and residents 'people' these programmes that interstitial spaces are carved out within spaces of neoliberal subjectification and regulation. Moreover, each of these examples illustrates the possibility of locally situated negotiations that rework the intended values and practices of government policy (Barnes and Prior 2009). Subversion through the performativity of care does not usually fit conventional definitions of politics (see McGregor 2012), yet, if analyses of neoliberalism wish to conceive institutional environments not as immutable translation mechanisms but as assemblages of complex interplays between different discursive practices, materialities and performances (Conradson 2003; see also Darling 2010b), then we need to take seriously the potential of ethical agency in creating interstitial spaces of subversion as much as acquiescence. What is significant about these postsecular spaces, however, is the capacity for disparate religious and secular citizens to identify and sustain mutually acceptable narratives that energise ethical agency and counter-hegemonic narratives of welfare that cut against neoliberal formations. For that reason, spaces of care should also be understood as political

spaces – where conflicting ethical values and performances evident in individual, organisational and governmental codes are negotiated and contested. While it is unlikely for government-funded service providers such as TSA to enter into outright protest in the political sphere, the subversive ethics enacted in these spaces of care can offer important building blocks in broader urbanisms of hospitality and welfare (see Darling 2010a 2013, on the City of Sanctuary movement; but also Bagelman 2013 and Squire 2011 on the contested nature of this model of urban 'hospitality'). As third-sector welfare provision for drug users becomes increasingly grounded in evertightening systems of eligibility, responsibility and risk individualisation, I argue theo-ethical notions of agape and caritas might become acceptable registers in constructing crossover narratives that galvanise the ethical sensibilities of citizens – religious and secular – to challenge and disrupt the divisive politics of deservingness and dependency

Conclusion

Theoretical work on postsecularity has often exceeded actual empirical examination of the practical workings of rapprochement and its relation to neoliberal governance. This paper has shown how the space and agency of a certain FBO with a specifically Christian ethos provides a device for postsecular rapprochement, welcoming people who are not motivated by religious faith to join in with the practice of providing care and support to socially marginalised people. This is not simply a case of an organisation enforcing their ethical freight onto others, or pragmatically incorporating secular professionals in a religious charity in order to compete in the contractual environment of neoliberal drug governance. Rather, this paper has examined the particular discourses, practices and performances that have combined together to create an arena conducive for the translation and reflexive transformation of religious and secular belief. Professionalisation associated with neoliberal governance is but one factor among others that have brought these faith–secular partnerships about: others include the changing paradigms towards person-centred care and spirituality in professional social care (Furness and Gilligan 2010); the mainstreaming of holism and alternative spirituality in healthcare and addiction treatment (Frisk 2011; Greenstreet 2006); and significant shifts in the practical theology of TSA moving from a conversion-oriented ethos to a more 'without strings' postsecular caritas (Coles 1997). These movements have constructed an 'overt

metaphysical/religious pluralism' (Connolly 1999, 185) within the discourses and pragmatics of care, making possible the negotiation and 'crossing over' between religious and secular ethics, beliefs and practices.

This paper has offered an analytical framework that examines the practical dynamics of rapprochement, the entanglement of different discourses, practices and performativities that shape and sustain the propensity for religious, secular and humanist motivations to come together over shared ethical concerns. Evidence from this case study suggests postsecular rapprochement is performatively brought into being through the ethical frames, attitudes and performances of staff and residents – whose reflexive, routinised and improvised practices solicit affective encounters between religious and non-religious bodies, materials and relations. Hopeful sensibilities shared by religious and nonreligious actors were seen to construct a particular affective and psychosocial texture in Hope House, opening out liminal spaces whereby fixed religious and secular positionalities venture together into a thirdspace of negotiation and hybridity. Secularist actors, sometimes reluctantly, came to a new appreciation of the place theo-ethics of agape and caritas can play in articulating shared ethical impulses. Equally, rapprochement was seen to open out hybrid expressions of faith-through-praxis, centring on the practice of virtue ethics beyond the purview of institutional church.

These findings raise two further research questions for postsecular geographies. First the postsecular spaces illustrated in this paper highlight the contingent and fragile nature of rapprochement, constituted through a distinctive set of discourses and practices. This invites analysis of the different characteristics of discourse and practice that fashion other arenas of postsecular rapprochement in the public realm, for example: spaces of protest, tolerance and ethical agreement (Cloke et al. 2013a). However, the empirical work here highlights a need to tease out the variegated geographies of rapprochement in a range of 'secular' health and social institutions including, but not limited to, hospital spaces, palliative and hospice care, psychiatry and counselling, statutory social work, police and others. Each arena presents distinct capacities for the crossover and co-production of religious and secular ethics in secularised environments. Technologies such as the Twelve Steps of Alcoholics Anonymous or the growth of Buddhist mindfulness, each with their respective metaphysics, signal experimental spaces where facilitators and service-users appropriate and re-assemble

religious, spiritual and scientific understandings of addiction and recovery. Postsecularity provides the conceptual tools to understand the increasingly plural and performative geographies of religion and secularity in organisational spaces, breathing life into dry attempts to taxonomise the place of religion in faith-based organisations.

Second, this paper has illustrated how the translation of a theo-ethics of caritas can open up political and ethical spaces that cut against the 'ethics' of neoliberal governmentality. It has pointed to the possibility of locally situated and ethically flavoured actions of staff working the spaces of contractual service delivery to challenge neoliberal metrics of eligibility and introduce new technologies that ameliorate the more punitive elements of government policy considered to exacerbate the exclusion of service-users. Performative relations of care and sociality with service-users also brought new logics (compassion, hospitality, reciprocity) and experiences (friendship, hope) that run counter to, and even resist, the vicissitudes of neoliberal subjectification. As the limitations of neoliberal governance are increasingly felt by practitioners working in spaces of care, might postsecular notions of caritas engender important crossover narratives that accrete the shared intuitions and hopeful sensibilities of both religious and secular humanist actors? In this way, rapprochement presents an opportunity to articulate a counter-ethic that challenges the increasingly authoritarian-libertarian notions of 'just rewards' and the dehumanising model of 'fairness' that predicate care on behavioural deservedness.

References

Ager and Ager 2011 Faith and the Discourse of Secular Humanitarianism *Journal of Refugee Studies* 24:3 456-472

Amin A 2002 Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity *Environment and Planning A* 34 959–80

Asad T 2003 *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* Stanford University Press, Palo Alto CA

Atia M 2012 "A Way to Paradise": Pious Neoliberalism, Islam, and Faith-Based Development *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 102, 4, 808-827

Bagelman J 2013 Sanctuary: a politics of ease? *Alternatives* 38 49-62

Baker C 2013a The postsecular public square, spiritual capital and a progressive politics of hope. Paper given at the *Public Policy Exchange forum on Community Cohesion and Social Inclusion – Strengthening Partnership Working between Local Authorities and Voluntary and Faith Groups - 6th June 2013*

Baker C 2013b Current Themes and Challenges in Urban Theology *The Expository Times* 125 3-12

Baker C and Beaumont J 2011 Afterword: Postsecular Cities in **Beaumont J and Baker C** eds *Postsecular Cities* Continuum, London 254-266

Barbato M 2012 Postsecular revolution: religion after the end of history. *Review of International Studies* 38:5 1079-1097

Barnes M, Prior D eds 2009 *Subversive Citizens: Power, Agency and Resistance in Public Services* Policy Press, Bristol

Beaumont J and Baker C eds (2011) *Postsecular Cities: Space, Theory and Practice* Continuum, London

Beckford J 2012 SSSR Presidential Address Public Religions and the Postsecular: Critical Reflections *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 51:1 1-19

Bender C and Taves A eds 2012 *What Matters? Ethnographies of Value in a Not So Secular Age* Columbia University Press, New York

Berger P ed. 1999 *The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics* Washington Grand Rapids, Michigan

Berridge V 2005b *Temperance: Its History and Impact on Current and Future Alcohol Policy*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York

Bondi L 2013 Between Christianity and secularity: counselling and psychotherapy provision in Scotland *Social & Cultural Geography* 14:6 668-688

Bourgois P 2000 Disciplining addictions: the bio-politics of methadone and heroin in the United States *Culture Medicine and Psychiatry* 24 165–195

Caputo J 2001 *On Religion* Routledge, London

Cloke P 2010 Theo-ethics and radical faith-based praxis in the postsecular city, In **Molendijk A, Beaumont J and Jedan C** eds *Exploring the Postsecular: The Religious, the Political and the Urban* Brill, Leiden 223–241.

Cloke P 2011 Emerging geographies of evil? Theo-ethics and postsecular possibilities *Cultural Geographies* 18 475–493

Cloke P and Beaumont J 2013 Geographies of postsecular rapprochement in the city *Progress in Human Geography* 37:1 27-51

Cloke P, Johnsen S and May J 2005 Exploring ethos? Discourses of `charity' in the provision of emergency services for homeless people *Environment and Planning A* 37 385-402

Cloke P, May J and Johnsen S 2007 Ethical citizenship? Volunteers and the ethics of providing services for homeless people *Geoforum* 38 1089-1101

Cloke P, May J and Johnsen S 2010 *Swept-Up Lives? Re-envisioning the Homeless City* Wiley-Blackwell, London

Cloke P, Thomas S and Williams A 2012 Radical faith praxis in **Beaumont J and Cloke P** eds *Faith-based organisations and exclusion in European Cities* The Policy Press, Bristol 105-126

Cloke P, Thomas S and Williams A 2013a Introduction: Faith-based organisations in the city, In **Cloke P, Beaumont J and Williams A** eds *Working Faith: Faith-based Organisations and Urban Social Justice* Paternoster Press, Milton Keynes 1-24

Cloke P, Williams A and Thomas S 2013b Faith-based action against poverty: Christians Against Poverty and Church Action on Poverty, In **Cloke P, Beaumont J and Williams A** eds *Working Faith: Faith-based Organizations and Urban Social Justice* Paternoster Press, Milton Keynes 25-46

Coles R 1997 *Rethinking Generosity: Critical Theory and the Politics of Caritas* Cornell University Press, Ithaca NY

Connolly W 1999 *Why I Am Not A Secularist* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis MN

Connolly W 2008 *Capitalism and Christianity, American Style* Duke University Press, Durham NC

Conradson D 2003 Spaces of care in the city: the place of a community drop-in centre *Social and Cultural Geography* 4 507-525

Critchley S 2012 *Faith of the Faithless* Verso, London

Dabashi H 2012 *The Arab Spring* Zed, London

Darling J 2010a A city of sanctuary: the relational re-imagining of Sheffield's asylum politics *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35 125-140

Darling J 2010b Just Being there: Ethics, Experimentation and the Cultivation of Care, In **Anderson B and Harrison P** eds *Taking-Place: Non-Representational Theories and Geography* Ashgate, Aldershot 241- 260

Darling J 2013 Moral urbanism, asylum, and the politics of critique *Environment and Planning A* 45 1785-1801

Davelaar M, Williams A and Beaumont J 2013 Adventures at a border-crossing: the Society for Diaconal Social Work in Rotterdam, the Netherlands, In **Cloke P, Beaumont J and Williams A** eds *Working Faith: Faith-based Organisations and Urban Social Justice* Paternoster Press, Milton Keynes 165-184

De Vries H 2006, "Introduction: before, around, and beyond the theologico-political", in **De Vries H Sullivan L** eds *Political Theologies: Public Religions in a Post-secular World* Fordham University Press, New York 1–88

Deneulin S and Rakodi C 2011 Revisiting religion: development studies thirty years on. *World Development* 39:1 45-54

Derrida J 1998 Faith and Knowledge: The two sources of 'religion' at the limits of reason alone. **In Derrida J and Vattimo G** eds *Religion* Polity, Cambridge 1-78

Derrida J 2000 *Of hospitality* Stanford University Press, Stanford CA

Dewsbury JD and Cloke P 2009 Spiritual landscapes: existence, performance and immanence *Social & Cultural Geography* 10 695-711

Dossett W 2012 A consideration of the language of Higher Power as 'postmodern negotiated spirituality' Annual Symposium of the Society for the Study of Addiction, Park Inn, York, 8th & 9th November 2012

Dwyer C and Parutis V 2012 'Faith in the system?' State-funded faith schools in England and the contested parameters of community cohesion *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 38 267–284

Eagleton T 2009 Reason, Faith, and Revolution Yale University Press, London

Eder K 2006 Post-secularism: A return to the public sphere *Eurozine* 17 August

Ehrkamp P and Nagel C 2014 Under the radar: undocumented immigrants, Christian faith communities, and the precarious spaces of welcome in the US South *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* DOI: 10.1080/00045608.2013.858573

Fairbanks R 2009 *How it works: Recovering citizens in post-welfare Philadelphia* University of Chicago, Chicago

Featherstone D, Ince A, Mackinnon D, Strauss K, Cumbers A 2012 Progressive localism and the construction of political alternatives *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37 177–182

Fraser S and Valentine K 2008 *Substance and substitution: Methadone subjects in liberal societies* Palgrave Macmillan, New York

Frisk L 2011 The practice of Mindfulness: From Buddhist practice to Secular Mainstream in a Postsecular Society. Paper given in *Religion in Postsecular Society* Åbo, Finland, 15-17 June

Furness S and Gilligan P 2010 Religion, Belief and Social Work Policy Press, Bristol

Greenstreet W 2006 Past and present discourses in **Greenstreet W** ed *Integrating spirituality in health and social care* Radcliffe, Oxford 20-31

Gressgård R 2010 Multicultural dialogue: dilemmas, paradoxes, conflicts Berghahn Books, Oxford

Habermas J 2006 Religion in the public sphere *European Journal of Philosophy* 14:1 1–25

Habermas J 2010 An awareness of what is missing, In **Habermas J, Brieskorn N, Reder M, Ricken F and Schmidt J** *An Awareness of What Is Missing: Faith and Reason in a Postsecular Age* Polity Press, Cambridge 15–23

Hackworth J 2012 *Faith-Based: Religious Neoliberalism and the Politics of Welfare* University of Georgia Press, Athens GA

Hauerwas S, Wells S and friends 2010 *Living Out Loud: Conversations About Virtue, Ethics and Evangelicalism*, eds Bretherton L. and Rook R Paternoster, Milton Keyes

Heelas P Woodhead L with Seel B, Szerszynski B and Tusting K 2005 *The Spiritual Revolution: Why Religion is Giving Way to Spirituality* Blackwell, Oxford

Holgate J 2013 Faith in unions: From safe spaces to organised labour? *Capital & Class* 37 239-262

Holloway J 2013 The Space that Faith Makes: Towards a (hopeful) Ethos of Engagement, In **Hopkins P, Kong L and Olson E** eds *Religion and Place: Landscape, Politics and Piety* Springer Publishing, Dordrecht 203-218.

Jamoul L Wills J 2008 Faith in politics *Urban Studies* 45(10) 2035-2056

Kessler E and Arkush M 2008 *Keeping Faith in Development: The significance of interfaith relations in the work of humanitarian aid and international development organisations* Woolf Institute: Cambridge.

Khanum F 2012 A common agenda: Interfaith dialogue and faith secular partnership. Paper in *Africa-UK Annual Conference 2012: Faith and Development in Africa*. December 3rd 2012 Chelsea Old Town Hall, King's Road, London

Kong L 2010 Global shifts, theoretical shifts: Changing geographies of religion *Progress in Human Geography* 34 755–776.

Lancione M 2014 Entanglements of faith: Discourses, practices of care and homeless people in an Italian City of Saints *Urban Studies* doi:10.1177/0042098013514620

Ley D 2011 Preface, In **Beaumont J and Baker C** eds *Postsecular Cities: Religious Space, Theory and Practice* London, Continuum xii–xiv

Marsh C 2003 *The Beloved Community: How Faith Shapes Social Justice, from the Civil Rights Movement to Today* Basic Books, New York

Mavelli L 2012 Postsecular resistance, the body, and the 2011 Egyptian Revolution *Review of International Studies* 38 1057-1078

May J and Cloke P 2013 Modes of Attentiveness: Reading for Difference in Geographies of Homelessness *Antipode* DOI: 10.1111/anti.12043

May J, Cloke P and Johnsen S 2006 Shelter at the margins: New Labour and the changing state of emergency accommodation for single homeless people in Britain *Policy and Politics* 34 711-730

McDonald C and Marston G 2005 Workfare as welfare: governing unemployment in the advanced liberal state *Critical Social Policy* 25 374-400

McGregor J 2012 Rethinking detention and deportability: Removal centres as spaces of religious revival *Political Geography* 31 236–246.

McLennan G 2007 Towards a Postsecular Sociology *Sociology* 41 857-870.

Milbank J and Oliver S eds 2009 *The Radical Orthodoxy Reader* Routledge, London

Mold A and Berridge V 2010 *Voluntarism, health and society since the 1960s: Voluntary action and illegal drugs* Palgrave, Basingstoke

Molendijk A, Beaumont J and Jedan C eds 2010 *Exploring the Postsecular: the Religious, the Political and the Urban* Brill, Leiden

Monaghan M 2012 The recent evolution of UK drug strategies: from maintenance to behaviour change? *People, Place & Policy Online* 6 29-40

Olson E, Hopkins P, Pain R and Vincett G 2013 Retheorizing the Postsecular Present: Embodiment, Spatial Transcendence, and Challenges to Authenticity Among Young Christians in Glasgow, Scotland *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 103 1421-1436

Pattillo-McCoy M 1998 Church Culture as a Strategy of Action in the Black Community *American Sociological Review* 63 767-84

Pollard J and Samers M 2007 Islamic banking and finance: postcolonial political economy and the decentring of economic geography *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 32 313-330

Prochaska F 2006 *Christianity and Social Service in Modern Britain* Oxford University Press, Oxford

Seddon T 2010 *A History of drugs: Drugs and freedom in the liberal age* Taylor and Francis, Abingdon

Smith C 1996 *Disruptive Religion: The Force of Faith in Social Movement Activism* Routledge, London

Smith D 2000 *Moral Geographies: Ethics in a World of Difference* Edinburgh Univerity Press, Edinburgh

Snow D.A and Anderson L 1993 *Down on Their Luck: A Study of Homeless Street People* University of California Press, Berkeley CA

Springer S 2014 Postneoliberalism? *Review of Radical Political Economics* DOI: 10.1177/0486613413518724

Squire V 2011 From Community Cohesion to Mobile Solidarities: The City of Sanctuary network and the Strangers into Citizens campaign *Political Studies* 59 290-307

Sutherland C 2014 Political Discourse and Praxis in the Glasgow Church *Political Geography* 38 23–32

Taylor C 2007 *A Secular Age* Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.

Valentine G and Sadgrove J 2012 Lived difference: a narrative account of spatiotemporal processes of social differentiation *Environment and Planning A* 44 2049–63

Valverde M 1998 *Diseases of the will: alcohol and the dilemma of freedom* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Walker P 2001 *Pulling the Devil's Kingdom down: The Salvation Army in Victorian Britain* University of California Press, London

Wallace S 1965 *Skid Row as a Way of Life* Bedminster Press, Totawa NJ

Ward G 2009 *The Politics of Discipleship: Becoming Postmaterial Citizens* Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, MI

Watson J 2013 Post-secular schooling: freedom through faith or diversity in community, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 43 147-162

Wilford J 2010 Sacred archipelagos: Geographies of secularization *Progress in Human Geography* 34 328–348

Williams A 2012 Moralising the poor? Faith-based organisations, the big society and contemporary workfare policy, In **Beaumont J and Cloke P** eds *Faith-based Organisations and Exclusion in European Cities* Policy Press, Bristol 173–197

Williams A 2013 Practical Theology and Christian responses to drug use, In **Cloke P, Beaumont J and Williams A** eds *Working Faith: Faith-based Organisations and Urban Social Justice* Paternoster Press, Milton Keynes 47-65

Williams A, Cloke P and Thomas S 2012 Co-constituting neoliberalism: Faith-based organisations, co-option, and resistance in the UK *Environment and Planning A* 44 1479-1501

Wilson HF 2013 Multicultural learning: parent encounters with difference in a Birmingham primary school *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* doi: 10.1111/tran.12015

Wilton R and DeVerteuil G 2006 Spaces of sobriety/sites of power: Examining social model alcohol recovery programs as therapeutic landscapes *Social Science and Medicine* 63 649-661

Žižek S 2000 *The Fragile Absolute* Verso, London