USE OF THESES

TRUE RELIGION:

CHRISTIANITY AND THE MAKING OF RADICAL IDEOLOGY IN ENGLAND,
1816-1834

Mark Clement

This volume is a thesis submitted for the degree of
Master of Arts
at the Australian National University

November 1990

This thesis is my own work. All sources have been acknowledged.

OWClement

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

BD	Black Dwarf
BDMBR	Biographical Dictionary of Modern British Radicals
BPU	Birmingham Political Union
CO	Christian Observer
DM	Deists' Magazine
DNB	Dictionary of National Biography
MO	Manchester Observer
NT	New Times
NUWC	National Union of the Working Classes
PM	The Political Magazine
PMG	Poor Man's Guardian
PP	Penny Papers
PR	(Cobbett's) Annual Political and Weekly Register
PT	Political Tracts
RR	Hone's Reformists' Register and Weekly Commentary
Sherwin's PR	Sherwin's Weekly Political Register
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
SWR	Shadgett's Weekly Review of Cobbett, Wooler Sherwin and Other Democratical and Infidel Writers

Introduction

INTRODUCTION

Noting the importance of religion to the lives of many leading radicals of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Edward Royle and James Walvin remarked: "The religious dimension to secular affairs is probably one of the most unfamiliar aspects of the period under consideration".[1] The early nineteeenth century saw the enormous growth of evangelical non-conformist denominations and sects. A debate has raged for many years over the nature of the impact upon the common people of this religious revival, and over the social and political effects of Methodism in particular. While Elie Halevy's famous thesis that it was Methodism which prevented the outbreak of a French-style revolution in Britain has usually been regarded as at best an overstatement, it has become an axiom of modern historiography that Methodism was a stabilising influence in early-industrial England.[2] On the one hand there is E.P. Thompson's caustic characterisation of the attraction of Methodism to working-class people as the "chiliasm of despair".[3] On the other, Alan Gilbert argues that the inherent social deviance of Methodism and Dissent produced a moderate radicalism which acted as "the political equivalent of the safety valve".[4]

In the longer term working-class people were probably

---

1. Edward Royle and James Walvin, English Radicals and Reformers 1760-1848 (Brighton, 1982), p.185.
2. For a useful summary of the debate up to 1974 see Malcolm I. Thomis, The Town Labourer and the Industrial Revolution (London and Sydney, 1974), chapter 9.
3. See E.P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class (Harmondsworth, 1968), pp.411-40.
4. Alan D. Gilbert, "Methodism, Dissent and Political Stability in Early Industrial England", The Journal of Religious History, Vol.10, No.4 (Dec. 1979), pp.381-99.

becoming indifferent, if not hostile, to organised religion. This was the impression of many observers around mid-century, and seemed to be confirmed by the census of 1851.[5] But hostility to the Church did not generally produce atheism; a multitude of popular Christian sects sought to rediscover "true" Christianity.[6] An emphasis of labour historiography, nevertheless, has been the essentially secular inspiration and character of modern working-class movements - of Jacobins, Owenites, socialists and Marxists. Even the "labour sects", such as the Primitive Methodists and the Labour Church, have been seen as anomalous: "the achievement or penalty of the social pioneer" (one suspects Hobsbawm thinks the latter), a product of England's early bourgeois and industrial revolutions. Thus:

> The declaration of the Rights of Man established itself among the British people, not in the Roman toga and the illuminist prose of the late 18th century, but in the mantle of the Old Testament prophets and in the biblical language of Bunyan: the Bible, the Pilgrim's Progress and Foxe's Book of Martyrs were the texts from which English labouring men learned the A.B.C. of politics, if not the A.B.C. of reading.[7]

While acknowledging the magnetic power of Biblical language, Hobsbawm discounts Christian theology as inherently unsuited to "the construction of a consistently social-revolutionary

---

5. Thomis, The Town Labourer, pp.181-2. For a discussion of the religious census and the conclusions drawn by its architect, Thomas Mann, see Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church, Part 1 (London, 1966), pp.363-9.
6. Edward Royle, Radical Politics 1790-1900: Religion and Unbelief (London, 1971), pp.9-11.
7. E.J. Hobsbawm, Primitive Rebels: Studies in the Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries (Manchester, 1959), p.145. See the whole of chapter 8.

doctrine".[8]

E.P. Thompson similarly points to the ambivalence of the Puritan legacy, epitomised by Bunyan's _Pilgrim's Progress,_ which, along with Paine's _Rights of Man,_ he considered "one of the two foundation texts of the English working-class movement".[9]   While it undoubtedly contributed to the pabulum of anti-aristocratic and libertarian ideas which nourished nineteenth-century radicalism, its concern with personal salvation and the after-life militated against collective social and political activism.[10] Yet Thompson allows for a much wider and more significant legacy than does Hobsbawm.   Their discussions of the use of Biblical language/imagery illustrate the difference.   Hobsbawm refers to the labour sectarians' "clothing the social protest of the workers in the familiar and powerful language of the Bible".[11]   Thompson, discussing the millenarian dimension of Dissent, perceives the inadequacy of the clothing metaphor:

> ...when we speak of "imagery" we mean much more than figures of speech in which ulterior motives were "clothed". The imagery is itself evidence of powerful subjective motivations, fully as "real" as the objective, fully as effective...in their historical agency. It is the sign of how men felt and hoped, loved and hated, and of how they preserved certain values in the very texture of their language.[12]

Thompson's observations have not been the subject of detailed investigation.   They deserve closer scrutiny. Hobsbawm's discussion of the labour sects in the context of

---

8. _Ibid.,_ pp.148-9. Hobsbawn seems to believe that this was the "preordained" end towards which nineteenth-century working-class movements were evolving.
9. Thompson, _The Making,_ p.34.
10. _Ibid.,_ pp.34-8.
11. Hobsbawm, _Primitive Rebels,_ p.148.
12. Thompson, _The Making,_ p.54.

the ultimate secular character of the modern labour movement (and of politics generally) is flawed by its teleological perspective. It is a Marxist equivalent of the Whig view of history.[13] This thesis aims to scrutinize the language used by radicals, in an attempt to render the religious strand of their ideology in its contemporary proportions.

By the early nineteenth century Christianity was being seriously challenged by the critical resources of freethought. Any analysis of the connections between religion and radicalism must take account of the profound impact of the Enlightenment upon European societies. Thomas Paine ignited the torch of anti-Christianity among English plebeian radicals in the 1790s, and handed it on to Richard Carlile, the pre-eminent infidel-radical publisher of the post-war years and luminary of the Zetetic societies of the 1820s.[14] Militant freethought initially failed, however, to attract a majority following among working-class radicals. Carlile's preoccupation with ideological purity was, numerically, the loser in the split among radicals which followed in the wake of the collapse of the mass

---

13. This remark was inspired by the introduction to J.C.D. Clark's English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime (Cambridge, 1985), a trenchant revisionist account of the long eighteenth century, which places religion and politics at the forefront of the main conflicts and developments of the period. See p.1 especially.
14. See I.D. McCalman, "Popular Radicalism and Freethought in Early Nineteeth-Century England: A Study of Richard Carlile and his Followers, 1815-32" (Australian National University MA thesis, 1975), and Joel H. Wiener, Radicalism and Freethought in Nineteenth-Century Britain: The Life of Richard Carlile (Westport, Connecticut, 1983). Edward Royle gives Carlile a distinctive place in the history of the British secularist movement; see Victorian Infidels: The Origins of the British Secularist Movement 1791-1866 (Manchester, 1974), pp.31-43.

agitation of 1819.[15]   The struggle between Carlile and Henry Hunt in the early 1820s has been described as "a major controversy over religion".[16]   Carlile was indisputably a vigorous and uncompromising opponent of Christianity, while the Huntite leadership has been denominated "openly Christian".[17]   At the same time it has been said that religion played "only a minor role in Huntite agitations for reform".[18]   It would seem that, rather than signifying an ideological espousal of Christianity, Hunt's attack upon Carlile's avowed determination to destroy the Christian religion was directed towards unifying radicals on the basis of toleration of all religious beliefs.   He was aware that infidelity was "an outrage upon popular opinions", and in response "articulated a popular, unsophisticated religious libertarianism".[19]

A possible implication is that Christianity, although privately valued by many working-class people, was prevented from making a constructive contribution to popular radicalism because of religious differences among the rank-and-file of the reform movement. Lacking effective organisation, ideology was the central uniting element of early nineteenth-century popular radicalism: "Remembered and republicized ideas were all that maintained the concentration of collective attention from peak to peak of

15. See John Belchem, "Orator" Hunt: Henry Hunt and English Working-Class Radicalism (Oxford, 1985), pp.151-7.
16. J.R. Dinwiddy, From Luddism to the First Reform Bill: Reform in England 1810-1832 (Oxford, 1986), pp.39-40. This is not to discount the central importance of differences over political goals and methods.
17. Robert Glen, Urban Workers in the Early Industrial Revolution (London, 1984), p.268.
18. Ibid.
19. Belchem, "Orator" Hunt, pp.154-5.

activity".[20]   If popular radicalism were to achieve its

aims, the building of mass support was essential.   As one

historian has written:

> Effective social movements are constructed as alliances
> - a problem within the working class, given its
> fragmentations of skill, gender, occupation, region,
> etc., as much as in its relations to other groups - in
> which different languages of mobilization have to be
> articulated together, very often around some kind of
> language of popular democracy and radical humanism.[21]

The   fragmentation   of   religion   might also have been

mentioned.   It should be noted too, that popular radicalism

was   not   an   exclusively   working-class phenomenon.   It was

conceived as a struggle for political representation by the

unrepresented,   and   alliances   between middle-class and

working-class reformers were forged at times, particularly

during   the   reform   crisis   of   1830-2.   The   language of

radicalism was essentially one of political exclusion.[22]

Ideology thus   served   an   inter-class,   as   well   as   an

intra-class, mobilisational purpose.

The   potential   to   create   strife   among   reformers   must

somehow   have   been   obviated   (or   was   disregarded by some

propagandists),   for   several   studies   of   the   last decade

indicate   that   Christianity   probably   did   inform   radical

ideology.   It has   been demonstrated   that radical Christian

beliefs   were   an   important   element   of Chartist ideology,

---

20. Craig Calhoun, <u>The Question of Class Struggle: Social
Foundations of Popular Radicalism during the Industrial
Revolution</u> (Oxford, 1982), p.79.
21. Robert Gray, "The Deconstructing of the English Working
Class", <u>Social   History</u>, Vol.11,   No.3 (October 1986),
p.373.   Gray argues that Chartism was such a movement.
22. On the language of radicalism as "a vocabulary of
political exclusion" see Gareth Stedman Jones, "Rethinking
Chartism", in his <u>Languages of Class: Studies in English
Working Class History 1832-1982</u> (Cambridge, 1983), chapter
3, esp. pp.102-7.

acting in concert with its dominant constitutionalist rhetoric.[23] Given that Chartism was arguably the apogee of the political radicalism which originated in the 1760s and 1770s, and deployed the language of that radicalism, might not Christianity have similarly informed the popular struggles of the post-war years and the early 1830s? A strong Scriptural component is certainly evident in the ideas of the Spenceans, reflecting both genuine religious faith and "a desire to buttress opinion by recourse to widely recognized authority".[24] Rationalist ideas undoubtedly permeated the thought of Spence and his followers and successors, but far from displacing the Biblical elements, they were fused with them.[25] Biblicism was successfully used to influence the courts in 1819 by the ultra-radicals Waddington and Wedderburn, prompting Iain McCalman to remark:

> Much has been written about constitutionalist rhetoric as part of the tactical and ideological armoury of popular radicalism, but historians have been less disposed to acknowledge the similar function of scriptural symbols.[26]

This thesis aims to explore this neglected area of research as a contribution towards enlarging our understanding of the religious dimension of popular radicalism between the end of the wars with France and the beginning of Chartism.

A vital consideration in undertaking this task is that radical ideas were articulated in the context of discursive

---

23. Eileen Yeo, "Christianity in Chartist Struggle 1838-1842", Past and Present, 91 (1981), pp.109-39.
24. Malcolm Chase, "The People's Farm": English Radical Agrarianism 1795-1840 (Oxford, 1988), p.81.
25. See Iain McCalman, Radical Underworld: Prophets, Revolutionaries and Pornographers in London, 1795-1840 (Cambridge, 1988), pp.63-72.
26. Ibid., p.143.

struggles with conservatives. John Belchem, writing of the challenge of the mass platform in early nineteenth-century England, considered the populist political rhetoric of radicalism appropriate because it contested the language used by the ruling class:

> ...hegemonic values were still phrased in terms of history, law, and the constitution, territory which the radicals sought to appropriate as their own. On the constitutional mass platform the radicals did not articulate some counter-hegemonic ideological alternative, Paineite, Spencean, Owenite, or otherwise: instead, they contested the very language of the ruling class, confronting the establishment with the popular interpretation of the dominant value system. By summoning up the myth and folklore of "people's history," the radicals appeared in heroic guise as the true loyalists and patriots, upholding the constitution which had been "won by the valour and cemented with the blood of our ancestors." Through the emotive language of popular constitutionalism the radicals hoped to outmaneuvre and coerce the government, "peaceably if we may, forcibly if we must."[27]

Ideology thus served a tactical as well as a mobilisational purpose. Other historians have demonstrated how radicals attempted to appropriate the languages of patriotism and constitutionalism.[28] In her article on Christianity and Chartism, Eileen Yeo remarked that both religious and labour historians "have taken too little account of Christianity, not as the possession of any one social group, but as contested territory".[29] Did radicals attempt to

---

27. John C. Belchem, "Radical Language and Ideology in Early Nineteenth-Century England: The Challenge of the Platform", <u>Albion</u>, Vol.20, No.2 (Summer 1988), pp.255-6.
28. See, for examples, Hugh Cunningham, "The Language of Patriotism, 1750-1914", <u>History Workshop</u>, 12 (Autumn 1981), pp.8-33; James Epstein, "Understanding the Cap of Liberty: Symbolic Practice and Social Conflict in Early Nineteenth-Century England", <u>Past and Present</u>, 122 (Feb. 1989), pp.75-118; James Epstein, "The Constitutional Idiom: Radical Reasoning, Rhetoric and Action in Early Nineteenth Century England", <u>Journal of Social History</u>, Vol.23, No.3 (Spring 1990), pp.553-74.
29. Yeo, "Christianity", p.109.

appropriate the language of Christianity in their struggles with governments? Did they assume the guise of the true Christians as well as the true loyalists and the true patriots? One might expect so, given that Christianity was an integral component of the dominant value system, arguably even its final authority.[30] Or did differences among radicals over religion dilute such an overt championing of Christianity?

To answer these questions it is necessary to understand the ways in which conservatives cast hegemonic values in religious terms. In arguing the importance of analysing the discursive structure of political languages, Gareth Stedman Jones suggested that these languages need to be mapped out "laterally in relation to the rival political languages with which they are in conflict".[31] An attempt to do this - with respect to the religious component of radicalism - is made in this thesis. The rival language may in part be gleaned from radical sources (especially where they give some account of the ideas they are contesting), but in order to render a more complete and coherent account, a discrete study of anti-radical discourse is also undertaken. The thesis examines selected radical and anti-radical discourse published during the two main peaks of activity in our period: the agitations of the immediate post-war years (1816-20) and the reform crisis and its aftermath (1830-4).

---

30. Epstein argues that to abandon constitutionalist rhetoric and fully embrace Paineite republicanism would have meant "vacating important cultural and political terrain", and he suggests that the same argument could be advanced to explain the greater relative importance to radical rhetoric of popular Christianity over freethought, "The Constitutional Idiom", p.567.
31. Stedman Jones, Languages of Class, pp.21-2.

A comparison and contrast of the two affords an assessment of the development of radical ideology over the time.

In what ways did the religious dimension of radical ideology change in relation to the events of the 1820s and early 1830s? Did freethought, promoted among the Zetetic societies of the 1820s, have a greater discernible impact upon radical ideology in the 1830s than it did in the post-war years? The growing popularity of Owenism among the working classes may also have contributed to a decline in the influence of Christianity among radicals. Does radical discourse of the thirties suggest that this was so? Did the uneasy and partial alliance between working-class and middle-class reformers during the reform crisis affect the use of religious language in the radical press? What about the new economic analysis which, it has been argued, signified a revision of, even if it failed to supersede, the post-war attribution of distress to Old Corruption?[32] Was religious language used to sanction the new analysis, or was religion left behind with the attacks on priests, who had featured in the old demonology? Finally, how are we to understand Richard Carlile's new allegorical interpretation of the Bible, which he announced to the world in 1832 in terms of a personal conversion to Christianity?

One of the most important developments after the war was the emergence of a virile working-class press which survived the government's imposition in 1819 of a crippling four-pence stamp duty on periodicals. It was of course

---

32. This is the argument of Patricia Hollis, _The Pauper Press: A Study in the Working-Class Radicalism of the 1830s_ (London, 1970), ch.VII. Hollis's thesis is outlined and discussed in ch.2 and 4 below.

William Cobbett's celebrated publication of a two-penny weekly radical paper in 1816 which paved the way for this development. By means of such papers radical ideology was disseminated around the country, each copy being read (or heard read aloud) by a number of people. Many anti-radical papers were also published, often with government financial assistance. These papers, along with the pamphlet literature of the time, comprise the main sources of this study. In addition to containing journalists' comments on current events, radical periodicals published accounts of reform meetings (and meetings of working-class organisations), readers' letters, poems, and extracts from (or complete reprints of) various kinds of works such as sermons and tracts. All of these constitute what is here called "discourse", and are used to reconstruct radical and anti-radical "ideology".

It must be conceded that these ideologies are the constructs of the historian. The mass of speeches and writings examined are not equivalent to a definitive work by a single political philosopher. They do not express identical ideas, nor are they unyielding to further amendment. They are ideologies in the making, characterised by internal diversity and flexibility. Thus these constructs are not offered as monoliths. Furthermore, an attempt shall be made to render apparent to the reader much of that diversity and flexibility, by identifying the purpose(s) of the various authors and speakers in relation to the occasions and audiences of their "works", and

considering their rhetorical strategies.[33] To structure
this potentially very unwieldy task, the two primary
purposes of radical ideology identified above - the
mobilisational and the tactical - shall be invoked as
analytical tools: that is, the religious elements of radical
and anti-radical discourse shall be considered principally
in relation to these (overlapping) purposes.

It is hoped that by doing these things it will be possible
to avoid the idealist-reductionism for which the work of
Stedman Jones has been criticised. John Foster believes
this to be implicit in Jones's non-referential conception of
language, which, he alleges, results in the problem of the
meaning of words being solved "quite arbitrarily, by linking
specific words into a wider, subjectively constructed
language system".[34] This is not, however, a defect of the
non-referential theory of meaning per se, but a failure to
pay sufficient attention to the contextual factors mentioned
above. A non-referential theory of language use is one of
the assumptions upon which this thesis, too, is based. No
attempt is made here, however, to draw conclusions about the
chronology of radicalism's peaks and troughs in the period
under discussion, something which Stedman Jones's less

33. "Discourse analysis" - in the strict materialist sense
initiated by the work of Michel Foucault - is not undertaken
here, although this study does generate conclusions about
popular radicalism which transcend the intentions of
individual "authors" and may therefore suggest something
about the "mentality" of the time. For a discussion of
Foucault, in the context of an account of historians'
analyses of language and discourse, see Peter Schöttler,
"Historians and Discourse Analysis", History Workshop, 27
(Spring 1989), pp.37-65. For the sake of theoretical
clarity, the assumptions about language which inform this
thesis are outlined below.
34. John Foster, "The Declassing of Language", New Left
Review, 150 (1985), p.40.

specialised analysis of Chartist language claimed to have achieved.[35]

The particular formulation of non-referential linguistic theory which underpins the present analysis is the "reality construction" view of language as expounded by George W. Grace. Grace's book The Linguistic Construction of Reality complements the thesis of the well-known work by Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality. Both are founded on the premise that the "reality" which shapes our everyday lives is, effectively, a model of reality which is culturally formulated, rather than "actual" reality. Since this model is constructed by means of language, and is transmitted from person to person and generation to generation in its linguistically encoded form (and in fact does not exist apart from its encoding in language), Grace believes it is appropriate to refer to the linguistic construction of reality.[36] This view of language is distinguished from an alternative model, the mapping view, which sees the relationship between language and actual reality as much more direct, analogous to the relationship between a map and the territory it represents.[37] Because of this very close correspondence between language and reality, the mapping view assumes linguistic expressions to be like "autonomous text": that is, they may be understood entirely without reference to contextual information. As a proponent of the reality

---

35. See Stedman Jones, "Rethinking Chartism", in Languages of Class, pp.168-78.
36. George W. Grace, The Linguistic Construction of Reality (London, 1987), p.3.
37. Ibid., p.6.

construction view, Grace believes, by contrast, that "we cannot understand the relation between a linguistic expression and a real-world situation to which it refers unless we recognize the mediating roles played by the speaker and the context of the speech event".[38]

Each speech act, as well as each entire language (such as English or Japanese), reflects a constructed reality. In fact, as one speaks one constructs reality. To say something, one begins with purposes. Satisfying these purposes entails (among other things) the incorporation of an expository strategy: "a deliberate strategy which is designed to influence the process of understanding by the hearer".[39] So, far from excluding sociolinguistic factors from consideration, an analysis of discourse based on a non-referential theory of meaning confers upon them great significance. The term "non-referential" alludes to the belief that human perceptions of the real world (which vary among different cultures) mediate between actual reality and language. Language does not refer directly to reality, but to cultural (embodied in linguistic) constructions of reality. In this sense it may be said that language refers to itself (or that linguistic expressions are meaningful only in relation to each other) and not to an external

---

38. Ibid., pp.26-7.
39. Ibid., pp.64-5.

reality.   Hence   it   is   non-referential.[40]
Contextualisation is   fundamental   to   language   use -
contextual clues are even built into single sentences.
These clues place each conceptual event (a linguistically
structured unit of reality, as the speaker - constrained by
his/her linguistic repertoire - conceives of it) within an
ongoing discourse.[41]   Context   resides within discourse
rather than within the real world.

The notion of context residing within <u>ongoing</u> discourse is
crucial to this thesis.   What an individual speaker says,
can be understood only by placing it within the context of
what other speakers (radical and conservative) have been
saying.   This can be done by interpreting the contextual
clues within each discourse.   As a result, the attempts of
people to find ways of talking about the problems which
confront them can be apprehended.[42] The ways in which
they talk about them are highly significant, reflecting

40. This is what Stedman Jones refers to as the "broader
significance of Saussure's work": that is, the belief in
"the   materiality   of language itself, the impossibility of
simply referring it back to some primal anterior reality,
"social being", the impossibility of abstracting experience
from the language which structures its articulation". It
was this conception of language which informed his work on
Chartism.   Stedman Jones, <u>Languages of Class,</u> pp.20-1.
Early this century Ferdinand de Saussure, by observing that
the relationship between a sign and what it signifies is an
arbitrary one, showed that in a system of signification
(such as a language) the elements are invested with meaning
only in relation to the other elements of the system. See
Rosalind Coward and John Ellis, <u>Language and Materialism:
Developments in Semiology and the Theory of the Subject</u>
(London, Henley and Boston, 1977), pp.12-15.
41. Grace, <u>The Linguistic Construction of Reality,</u> pp.35-7.
42. Grace sees the whole of language as composed of ways of
talking about things.   New subjects require that speakers
find new ways of talking about them.   This is achieved by
extending the use of existing linguistic expressions to
those new things, on the basis of perceived analogical
relations. <u>Ibid</u>., ch.7.

self-constructed models of reality. In the discursive struggles between radicals and conservatives (and indeed among radicals, and among conservatives) different models come into conflict and vie for recognition as "the truth". Radical discourse is "a field of debate, marked by shifts in register, elements of parody and the ironic quoting in of phrases which are then turned against their originators".[43] By listening to the ongoing discourse we can hear (in Thompsonian terms) the working class taking part in its own making. The language people use is indicative of their assumptions about the world, their feelings and their aspirations. The religious elements of that language are integral to those assumptions, feelings and aspirations, and therefore demand the serious attention of the historian.

So it is proposed to identify religious language in radical discourse and, as far as possible, to contextualise its deployment, thereby elucidating (to recall the phrase of Royle and Walvin quoted above) the "religious dimension to secular affairs". At the outset it should be suggested that the categories of "religious" and "secular" are fluid, referring more to people's attitudes than actions. This may be briefly illustrated by the campaign to abolish slavery. To the evangelical this was a sacred task, and so no less religious than attending church or praying, acts which are conventionally thought to be religious. To the utilitarian, equally dedicated to the same cause, anti-slavery had no

---

43. Gray argues that radical discourse ought to be seen in this way. He considered that Stedman Jones's account of Chartism communicated little sense of such debate. See Gray, "Deconstructing the Working Class", p.370.

religious implications. It has been cogently argued that it is wrong to view abolitionism as part of a process of "secularization" - "as a bridge between purely spiritual reform and later secular struggles for social justice" - for to do so "obscures the complex and dialectical relation between Christianity and the Enlightenment".[44] Davis's argument has obvious resonances for this thesis, raising the possibility of popular radicalism, for some of its personnel at least, being a religious cause. It also points to the co-existence, and moreover, the mutually enriching and reinforcing blend of Christian and secular ideas, which informed the social and political struggles of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

---

44. David Brion Davis, <u>Slavery and Human Progress</u> (New York, 1984), p.143.