

1: Chris Clement (Author of Confessions of a Suburban Cowboy)

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

In 1791, Fox declared for a "radical reform" of the electoral system. This led to a general use of the term to identify all supporting the movement for parliamentary reform. Initially confined to the upper and middle classes,[citation needed] in the early 19th century "popular radicals" brought artisans and the "labouring classes" into widespread agitation[citation needed] in the face of harsh government repression. More respectable[citation needed] "philosophical radicals" followed the utilitarian philosophy of Jeremy Bentham and strongly supported parliamentary reform, but were generally hostile to the arguments and tactics of the "popular radicals". By the middle of the century, parliamentary Radicals joined with others in the Parliament of the United Kingdom to form the Liberal Party, eventually achieving reform of the electoral system. Origins[edit] The Radical movement had its beginnings at a time of tension between the American colonies and Great Britain, with the first Radicals, angry at the state of the House of Commons, drawing on the Leveller tradition and similarly demanding improved parliamentary representation. These earlier concepts of democratic and even egalitarian reform had emerged in the turmoil of the English Civil War and the brief establishment of the republican Commonwealth of England amongst the vague political grouping known as the Levellers, but with the English Restoration of the monarchy such ideas had been discredited. Although the Glorious Revolution of 1688 had increased parliamentary power with a constitutional monarchy and the union of the parliaments brought England and Scotland together, towards the end of the 18th century the monarch still had considerable influence over the Parliament of Great Britain which itself was dominated by the English aristocracy and by patronage. Candidates for the House of Commons stood as Whigs or Tories, but once elected formed shifting coalitions of interests rather than splitting along party lines. At general elections, the vote was restricted to property owners in constituencies which were out of date and did not reflect the growing importance of manufacturing towns or shifts of population, so that in many rotten borough seats could be bought or were controlled by rich landowners while major cities remained unrepresented. Discontent with these inequities inspired those individuals who later became known as the "Radical Whigs". William Beckford fostered early interest in reform in the London area. The "Middlesex radicals" were led by the politician John Wilkes, an opponent of war with the colonies who started his weekly publication *The North Briton* in and within two years had been charged with seditious libel and expelled from the House of Commons. The Society for the Defence of the Bill of Rights which he started in to support his re-election, developed the belief that every man had the right to vote and "natural reason" enabling him to properly judge political issues. Liberty consisted in frequent elections and for the first time middle-class radicals obtained the backing of the London "mob". Middlesex and Westminster were among the few parliamentary constituencies with a large and socially diverse electorate including many artisans as well as the middle class and aristocracy and along with the county association of Yorkshire led by the Reverend Christopher Wyvill were at the forefront of reform activity. The writings of what became known as the "Radical Whigs" had an influence on the American Revolution. Major John Cartwright also supported the colonists, even as the American Revolutionary War began and in earned the title of the "Father of Reform" when he published his pamphlet *Take Your Choice!* In 1790, a draft programme of reform was drawn up by Charles James Fox and Thomas Brand Hollis and put forward by a sub-committee of the electors of Westminster. The American Revolutionary War ended in humiliating defeat of a policy which King George III had fervently advocated and in March the King was forced to appoint an administration led by his opponents which sought to curb Royal patronage. Pitt had previously called for Parliament to begin to reform itself, but he did not press for long for reforms the King did not like. Proposals Pitt made in April to redistribute seats from the "rotten boroughs" to London and the counties were defeated in the House of Commons by votes to 175-170. They encouraged mass support for democratic reform along with rejection of the monarchy, aristocracy and all forms of privilege. Different strands of the

movement developed, with middle class "reformers" aiming to widen the franchise to represent commercial and industrial interests and towns without parliamentary representation, while "Popular radicals" drawn from the middle class and from artisans agitated to assert wider rights including relieving distress. The theoretical basis for electoral reform was provided by "Philosophical radicals" who followed the utilitarian philosophy of Jeremy Bentham and strongly supported parliamentary reform, but were generally hostile to the arguments and tactics of the "popular radicals". Radical organisations sprang up, such as the London Corresponding Society of artisans formed in January under the leadership of the shoemaker Thomas Hardy to call for the vote. One such was the Scottish Friends of the People society which in October held a British convention in Edinburgh with delegates from some of the English corresponding societies. They issued a manifesto demanding universal male suffrage with annual elections and expressing their support for the principles of the French Revolution. The numbers involved in these movements were small and most wanted reform rather than revolution, but for the first time working men were organising for political change. The government reacted harshly, imprisoning leading Scottish radicals, temporarily suspending habeas corpus in England and passing the Seditious Meetings Act which meant that a license was needed for any meeting in a public place consisting of fifty or more people. Throughout the Napoleonic Wars, the government took extensive stern measures against feared domestic unrest. The corresponding societies ended, but some radicals continued in secret, with Irish sympathisers in particular forming secret societies to overturn the government and encourage mutinies. In 1792, Major John Cartwright formed the first Hampden Club, named after the English Civil War Parliamentary leader John Hampden, aiming to bring together middle class moderates and lower class radicals. After the Napoleonic Wars, the Corn laws in force between 1793 and 1815 and bad harvests fostered discontent. The publications of William Cobbett were influential and at political meetings speakers like Henry Hunt complained that only three men in a hundred had the vote. Writers like the radicals William Hone and Thomas Jonathan Wooler spread dissent with publications such as *The Black Dwarf* in defiance of a series of government acts to curb circulation of political literature. Radical riots in 1817 and were followed by the Peterloo massacre of 1819 publicised by Richard Carlile, who then continued to fight for press freedom from prison. The Six Acts of 1819 limited the right to demonstrate or hold public meetings. Magistrates powers were increased to crush demonstrations by manufacturers and action by radical Luddites. To counter the established Church of England doctrine that the aristocratic social order was divinely ordained, radicals supported Lamarckian Evolutionism, a theme proclaimed by street corner agitators as well as some established scientists such as Robert Edmund Grant. Political reform[edit] Economic conditions improved after and the United Kingdom government made economic and criminal law improvements, abandoning policies of repression. In 1832, Jeremy Bentham co-founded the Westminster Review with James Mill as a journal for "philosophical radicals", setting out the utilitarian philosophy that right actions were to be measured in proportion to the greatest good they achieved for the greatest number. Westminster elected two radicals to Parliament during the 1830s. The Whigs gained power and despite defeats in the House of Commons and the House of Lords the Reform Act was put through with the support of public outcry, mass meetings of "political unions" and riots in some cities. This now enfranchised the middle classes, but failed to meet radical demands. The Whigs introduced reforming measures owing much to the ideas of the philosophic radicals, abolishing slavery and in introducing Malthusian Poor Law reforms which were bitterly opposed by "popular radicals" and writers like Thomas Carlyle. Following the Reform Act, the mainly aristocratic Whigs in the House of Commons were joined by a small number of parliamentary Radicals as well as an increased number of middle class Whigs. By 1839, they were informally being called "the Liberal party". Chartists also expressed economic grievances, but their mass demonstrations and petitions to parliament were unsuccessful. Despite initial disagreements, after their failure their cause was taken up by the middle class Anti-Corn Law League founded by Richard Cobden and John Bright in 1839 to oppose duties on imported grain which raised the price of food and so helped landowners at the expense of ordinary people. The parliamentary Radicals joined with the Whigs and anti-protectionist Tory Peelites to form the Liberal Party by 1841. Demand for parliamentary reform increased by with agitation from John Bright and the Reform League. When the Liberal government led by Lord Russell and William Ewart Gladstone introduced a modest bill for parliamentary reform, it was defeated by both Tories and reform

Liberals, forcing the government to resign. The Tories under Lord Derby and Benjamin Disraeli took office and the new government decided to "dish the Whigs" and "take a leap in the dark" to take the credit for the reform. The Radicals, having been strenuous in their efforts on behalf of the working classes, earned a deeply loyal following—British trade unionists from until , upon being elected to Parliament, never considered themselves to be anything other than Radicals and were labeled Lib-Lab candidates. Radical trade unionists formed the basis for what later became the Labour Party. Radical Party France and Radical Party of the Left Following the Napoleonic Wars and until , it was technically illegal to advocate republicanism openly. Republicans therefore tended to call themselves "radicals" and the term came to mean a republican who by definition supported universal manhood suffrage. At Montmartre in , they put forward a programme of broad social reforms. These radicals then formed the Radical-Socialist Party or Republican, Radical and Radical-Socialist Party, to give it its full name in , which was the first French left-wing modern political party. The Radical—Socialist Party continued to be the main party of the Third Republic —, but was discredited after the war due to the role of Radical members of the National Assembly in voting for the establishment of the Vichy regime. Continental Europe and Latin America[edit] This section does not cite any sources. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. September Learn how and when to remove this template message In continental Europe and Latin America , as for instance in Italy , Spain , Chile and Argentina Radical Civic Union , Radicalism developed as an ideology in the 19th century to indicate those who supported at least in theory a republican form of government, universal male suffrage and particularly, supported anti-clerical policies. In Denmark , the left-wing of the Liberal party Venstre was known as the radicals and founded their own party Radikale Venstre in However, by the twentieth century at the latest radicalism, which did not advocate particularly radical economic policies, had been overtaken as the principal ideology of the left by the growing popularity of socialism and had become an essentially centrist political movement as far as "radicalism" survived as a distinct political ideology at all. Serbia and Montenegro[edit] Main article: Liberalism and radicalism in Serbia Radicalism had played a pivotal role in the birth and development of parliamentarism and the construction of the modern Serbian state leading to the Yugoslavian unification. The Constitution of the Kingdom of Serbia that defined it as an independent nation and formalised parliamentary democracy was among the most advanced in the entire world due to Radical contribution and it is known as The Radical Constitution. In , a crack had occurred in which the Independent Radical Party left and "the Olde" remained in the party, leading it to its considerable downfall and veering into conservatism. In the Yugoslavian kingdom, the Independent Radicals united with the rest of the Serbian opposition and the liberal and civic groups in the rest of the new country and formed the Yugoslav Democratic Party as the central, while several Republican dissidents formed a Republican Party. Democrats and Radicals were the dominant political parties, especially since the exclusion of the Communists. Radicalism and liberalism[edit] See also: Liberalism In some countries, the radical tendency is a variant of liberalism. Sometimes it is less doctrinaire and more moderate while other times it is more extreme. In Victorian era Britain , the Radicals were part of the Liberal coalition, but often rebelled when the more traditional Whigs in that coalition resisted democratic reforms. In other countries, these left-wing liberals have formed their own radical parties with various names, e. In the French political literature, it is normal to make a clear separation between liberalism and radicalism in France. In Serbia, both radicalism and liberalism have had their distinctiveness during the 19th century, with the Radical Party being the dominant political party throughout the entire multi-parliamentary period before the unification of Yugoslavia. The Independents had created the Democratic Party , whereas the Radicals of today are a far-right political group.

Religious Radicalism in England, (Rutherford Studies, Series 1: Historical Theology) (Rutherford Studies Series One. Historical Theology) (Rutherford Studies in Historical Theology) Paperback - April 1,

University of Ulster at Coleraine Citation: The execution of Oliver Plunkett in was the last martyrdom of a Catholic on English soil. A Scottish student hanged for blasphemy in was the last person in the British Isles to be executed for his religious views. The careful noting of these milestones by John Coffey inevitably imparts a Whiggish tinge to his admirable and stimulating study of religious persecution and toleration in England from the accession of Elizabeth I to the passage of the Toleration Act of 1689. Indeed in terms of interest in the subject, if not necessarily in analysis and understanding, our debt to the Whig history of toleration has proved to be an enduring one. The weaknesses of the Whig analysis are well rehearsed and familiar: This is history enthused with national pride; the peculiar nature of its Protestant history was seen as enabling England not only to steal a lead over the rest of Europe, but also to export its liberal and tolerationist principles to the New World. The story is told by those historical giants, S. Gardiner, William Haller, A. Jordan, who have had a formative influence on a whole generation of historians. For much of the early modern period in England it was religious intolerance rather than tolerance that was most noticeable, as instanced by the political impact of anti-popery and the bitter divisions among Protestants. The case put for religious toleration during the Puritan Revolution should not be exaggerated. Cromwell and others traditionally portrayed as pro-tolerationist in the 1650s and 1660s had in fact much more modest aims; they were seeking to secure liberty for godly Protestants and toleration was to be withheld from the ungodly and followers of false religions. They were certainly not striving to create a liberal society in which divergent religious opinions were openly tolerated. After the Restoration, a reinvigorated intolerance was the order of the day as firstly Dissenters and later Catholics experienced severe persecution. Those still prepared to argue the case for toleration did so in qualified terms; John Locke, a much cited example, explicitly excluded Catholics and atheists from toleration. When legal toleration was finally achieved in the act of 1689 it was never the intention to establish religious equality even when restricted to Protestants. The great Whig milestone was in fact a fortuitous compromise and a fudge rather than the final triumph of a tolerationist ideal. England is also to be stripped of its title to European leadership; at the start of the seventeenth century, Protestant England, in common with most other Protestant countries, was still intent on enforcing religious uniformity, thus lagging behind the Catholic lands of Poland and France where a remarkable degree of toleration had been established. Furthermore, the generally accepted narrative of a chronological progression from a backward persecuting past to a modern tolerationist future has been shown to ignore earlier tolerationist efforts and other continuities, leaving those who seek to trace the rise of a tolerationist ideal with the problem of where to place the Taliban and other religious fundamentalists in our own world. Dr Coffey offers a persuasive post-revisionist approach to the central concerns of his book. Recognising in one important respect the strength of the revisionist argument, he places an emphasis on the power of intolerance in early modern England and devotes more space to discussing and explaining persecution than tolerance. At the very outset, he bravely nails his colours to the mast declaring that it is his intention to argue that there is considerable truth in the Whiggish claim that seventeenth century England witnessed a dramatic transformation from religious persecution and enforced uniformity to toleration and religious pluralism. He finds himself in broad agreement with Haller and Woodhouse in arguing that the 1640s were the key decade and that the initial impetus behind tolerationist ideas came from radical puritanism. Tolerationists emerged during those years to provide a principled opposition to religious persecution, even of heretics and schismatics, and to make the case for the peaceful co-existence within one society of a plurality of churches and religions. In the longer term, the stubborn survival of Dissenting churches and of Papists punctured the monopoly of the national church and an earlier consensus in favour of using coercion to support religious uniformity crumbled. The toleration act was indeed an important landmark in the struggle to achieve religious toleration. The book begins with a definition of the broad concept of toleration itself. When applying such a definition in the early modern period it soon becomes clear that toleration could take many different

forms and exist at different levels, as Bob Scribner has shown and as Coffey himself is only too aware. The two forms that lie at the heart of this study are civil and ecclesiastical toleration that are to be clearly distinguished. The policy of the state towards religious dissent, and especially the role of the civil magistrate, provides the focus for the debate about civil toleration and the preoccupation of pamphlets and other primary sources with this subject helps to ensure its heavy emphasis by Coffey. At one end of the scale, civil tolerance might grant Dissenters relief from persecution but deny them full equality as citizens as under the act while, at the other, it might bestow freedom of worship and full rights as citizens or even separate church and state entirely. The degree of diversity tolerated within a particular church whether a radical sect or the Anglican establishment is the focus of ecclesiastical toleration. Coffey correctly stresses this distinction and is critical of those historians who have blurred the two. Thus sectarian Protestants could make a heart-felt plea for civil tolerance while countenancing ecclesiastical intolerance within their own churches. A third form of toleration distinguished by Coffey, following Scribner and others, is toleration in its social context; the practical tolerance of religious dissidents by neighbours, relatives or friends. This could of course swiftly turn sour when there were anti-popish panics or upsurges of political protest against Dissent. Yet the chief interests of the book, largely due to the kinds of source materials Coffey restricts himself to, are decidedly more theological, philosophical and political than social. To fully understand the theory behind Protestant toleration we must first explain how its opposite, persecution, was justified. Toleration was to be condemned for encouraging erroneous, soul-destroying beliefs, leading to schism and inviting the wrath of an angry God. Even the persecuted believed in persecution as both Catholics and Dissenters demonstrated when they were in charge. Toleration was widely condemned as subversive of society and morality. These were powerful arguments in a patriarchal society. Coffey is right to insist on the importance of the debates of the 1640s in establishing a Protestant case for toleration. Prior to then, there was very little public debate in England about the subject, the General Baptist Leonard Busher being a notable exception. It was Baptists and other radical puritans who were to be at the forefront of the call for toleration in the 1640s when for the first time and this deserves emphasis it could be freely and openly debated. Roger Williams is traditionally seen as opening the debate in 1639 when his call for toleration went as far as embracing heretics, blasphemers, Catholics, Muslims and pagans. Coffey correctly reminds us of the importance of the theological arguments for toleration which some modern scholars, usually those from a history of ideas tradition, tend to bypass in favour of philosophical arguments. The New Testament teachings of Jesus, and especially the calls to love your neighbour and to do unto others as you would be done by, and the replacing of the old dispensation by the new with the coming of Messiah, provided the biblical and theological foundation for toleration. The parable of the wheat and the tares the believers and non-believers was a key text; both should be allowed to grow peacefully together until judgement day for any attempt to uproot the tares risk pulling up wheat as well. The need was to restore primitive Christianity and to experience the freedom that had been lost in the fourth century when worldly concerns came to preoccupy the church. Importance was also attached to drawing a clear distinction between the Old and the New Testaments; the duty incumbent on the magistrate under the old dispensation to punish idolatry and enforce the Ten Commandments and the First Table in particular was now gone with the coming of Jesus and Israel could no longer provide a model for justifying magisterial coercion in religious matters. Secular arguments supporting coercion were now turned on their head; rather than war, chaos and famine, toleration would bring political stability in place of the wars of religion caused by intolerance and tolerating societies were indeed viable and peaceful, and economically prosperous, as the often cited example of the Netherlands proved. For instance, the Independent divine Hugh Peter at the Whitehall debates quoted the example of the Netherlands as both a tolerant and a flourishing society. However, the goals envisaged by some of those endorsing toleration could be very restrictive and some beliefs were plainly intolerable. Support for toleration could be based on a negative position; freedom of conscience was necessary now in order that eventually truth might manifest itself. Toleration thus became an expedient rather than a positive statement of belief in the virtues of religious diversity. It suggests a history of ideas bias in which historical context is insufficiently appreciated. Atheism, blasphemy, idolatry and adultery were all to be condemned and excluded from toleration, even by most tolerationists, because they were regarded as contrary to natural reason and

public order. Catholics posed a particularly difficult problem because they could be excluded from toleration both as idolaters and as disloyal citizens owing allegiance to a hostile foreign prince. Cromwell, Milton and Locke were among those not prepared to grant Catholics toleration upon one or both of the grounds for exclusion. Apparently in the debate over whether to extend toleration to Catholics Vane was closer in opinion to his friend Milton than Coffey and other writers have suggested. Disappointingly, given the centrality of religious toleration to the movement, the Levellers and their distinctive contributions to the debate are given a relatively low profile in this book. It is to the Levellers that we are indebted for the notion of constructing a constitution that gave the state no religious role, even if circumstances and events later obliged them to accept modifications to that basic principle. They were also great popularisers of the idea of religious toleration and figures like William Walwyn and Richard Overton as Coffey acknowledges had radical and highly persuasive contributions to make. Coffey describes the ferocity of the persecution of Protestant by Protestant after the Restoration as unparalleled in seventeenth century Europe. Backed up by parliamentary legislation, there were clerical ejections on a large scale, prisons crammed full of religious dissidents, religious tests placed on the holding of public office and a theoretically restored Anglican monopoly of political and social life. On a pragmatic level, the tolerationist lessons of the s and s had sunk very shallow roots. Yet, as at other stages in the religious history of England, there was often a gap between the letter of the law and its implementation and there was an influential Anglican minority who sought to avoid schism and were prepared to concede a degree of ecclesiastical toleration. There was much later a championing of toleration from some unexpected quarters including James II whom Coffey is prepared to speculate may have been sincere. William III, the Protestant hero of Orange mythology, we are reminded tried to extend legal toleration of religious worship to Catholics. Although excluded from benefit of the toleration act, Catholics were able to benefit from the simple fact that, in practical terms, church attendance could no longer be made compulsory and they were able to establish discreet places of worship. In the early eighteenth century, practical toleration of most religious dissident was well advanced even if principled tolerationists were still a very small minority. To end on a justifiably positive note, this will prove to be a most useful text for undergraduate teaching with its admirable clarity, its extensive coverage of primary and secondary material and its construction of extremely useful tables. The placing of the debate in a wider European and New World perspective is also very valuable. Coffey is to be congratulated for re-igniting discussion of toleration at a time when examples of intolerance in our own world are only too self-evident. April John Coffey Posted: When surveying a broad theme like this across more than a century, one is acutely conscious of how difficult it is to capture the richness and complexity of the subject. The book is far from definitive, but I am delighted that Dr Lindley thinks it will provide a useful introduction and re-ignite discussion of the subject. Dr Lindley concurs with me on the importance of the s toleration debate, but he is disappointed that there is not more on the Levellers. Given their central role in the toleration controversy and their remarkable efforts to construct something like a non-confessional politics, I can only sympathise with his complaint. The Levellers were certainly not ignored in the book, but with only a single chapter devoted to tolerationists, it was difficult to discuss particular movements or individuals in any depth. No doubt other reviewers will lament similar omissions elsewhere. As for listing the Levellers and Diggers with Baptists and Independents, my intention was not to suggest that the Levellers and Diggers were religious sects, but to underline their origins in a radical Protestant milieu. As Dr Lindley himself has shown, the Levellers drew much of their early support from the sectarian congregations of London. At various points in the book, I do draw on the work of social historians like Christopher Marsh to explore the tolerance and intolerance of local communities, but I admit that this important theme needs to be treated in greater depth. Fortunately, Alexandra Walsham is preparing a book on persecution and toleration that should redress the balance here, and offer a fuller discussion of the lived experience of Catholic and Protestant dissenters in the English localities. Dr Lindley himself reminds us that contemporaries were fearful of the social consequences of toleration and religious pluralism. I was surprised to discover that I had not mentioned the significance of the Munster debacle of , since it did provide plentiful ammunition for the critics of radical Protestantism throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For Dissenters the journey to respectability was a very long haul, one that only reached its destination in the Victorian era. But during the early modern period there

was a gradual recognition that religiously pluralistic societies could work. If this owed much to the Dutch example, it was also the fruit of the resilience of Dissenters and their co-existence alongside Anglicans in local communities. Indeed, one of my key contentions is that the eventual demise of enforced uniformity owed more to the stubborn social reality of pluralism than to the intellectual ideal of toleration pp. The social dimension is a vital aspect of the story. Firstly, Dr Lindley reminds us of the early modern Christian belief in a God of judgement. Roger Williams was not a modern secular liberal but a firm believer in the reality of divine wrath. As I noted in the book, the grand theme of divine tolerance and intolerance lay behind much contemporary discourse about toleration pp. Tolerationists warned persecutors that God would judge them for oppression, that God himself was longsuffering and tolerant towards the ungodly, and that God alone could punish heresy and unbelief. Contemporaries were not struck by his conventional belief that God would judge the ungodly, but by his thoroughly unconventional belief that the magistrate should tolerate all peaceful religions.

3: Radical Religion in Cromwell's England | Socialist Review

Auto Suggestions are available once you type at least 3 letters. Use up arrow (for mozilla firefox browser alt+up arrow) and down arrow (for mozilla firefox browser alt+down arrow) to review and enter to select.

Stanford Reid, Richard L. Kyle, and others, have agreed that *On Predestination* 1 by John Knox " is characterized by a theology that tends to be more practical than speculative, and is far from systematic. Stevenson, , 5: Hereafter this edition will be cited as Works followed by the volume and page number. Original spelling, italics, and punctuation are retained in quoted passages. The Croall lectures for Richmond: John Knox Press, , 64; V. Drakensberg, , 42"47; W. Greaves, *Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation*: Christian University Press, , 29; Richard G. In fact, despite ubiquity of Knox as a Scottish historical icon, Knox has not generated much interest among academic theologians or ecclesiastical historians. The *Scottish Journal of Theology* has published only one article on Knox in its first fifty 66 *Puritan Reformed Journal* into the practical characteristic of *On Predestination*, it is necessary to examine who the main antagonists of *On Predestination* are in the historical context,4 what their theological positions are, and how certain years. Pastor, Preacher, and Prophet New York: In addition, the twentieth-century reception of Knox has been dominated by the literary circles and general Scottish Studies rather than by his theology. *Literature and Society in Scotland*, " Source Documents for the Scottish Glasgow: University of Glasgow, ; R. Aberdeen University Press, ; Kenneth D. With respect to the Roman Catholics, most scholars have reached an agreement as opponents, but some scholarly disagreements pertain to the Anabaptists. It has been questioned whether Cooche belongs to the English separatists, Free-willers, Lollards, Familists, or early Nonconformists. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*: Horst, *The Radical Brethren: Anabaptism and the English Reformation to Nieuwkoop*: De Graaf, , ; C. Clement, *Religious Radicalism in England*, " Carlisle: Paternoster Press, , , ; O. Robert Cooche variously Couche, Cooke, and Cowche , his authorship, and the contents of his treatise *The Confutation of the Errors of the Careless by Necessity* " With respect to the relationship between the secrecy of God and the church, M. Via the secrecy of the identity of the elect, the distinction between visible and invisible church was maintained. For an ecclesiological background of John Knox, see Ian B. Cowan, *The Scottish Reformation*: Mitchell, *The Scottish Reformation*: See Horst, *The Radical Brethren*, " As a result of this research, the differences in the theological stance between Knox and his adversary will be highlighted. The third step will be to examine such differences and their practical meaning in connection with the relationship between predestination and the ecclesiology of Knox. The last step of this research will be to examine the Scots Confession 7 as a point of practical application in conjunction with establishing pure doctrine and a holy society. Throughout these steps, as pointed out by Richard A. Nelson, , "72; George D. Henderson, *The Scots Confession*: Harper, , 3: For the contents of the Scots Confession and its historical background, see David B. Cochrane, *Reformed Confessions of the 16th Century Philadelphia*: Westminster Press, ; Edward A. Westminster Press, ; W. Stanford Reid *Grand Rapids*: Oxford University Press, , 47" Robert Cooche and *The Confutation* Since Knox focuses more on those opponents affiliated with the Anabaptists and other sectaries in *On Predestination* rather than on the Roman Catholics and various other heretics,11 the historical background of this article will be limited to the Anabaptists and associated sects, and in particular on Robert Cooche. Nevertheless, inasmuch as Laing believes that Robert Cooche is responsible for writing *The Confutation*, and most subsequent historians have followed him in this conviction, it seems likely that Cooche is the author. *The Religious Radicals of the 16th and 17th Centuries* Carlisle: In addition, in W. Whitley, *A Baptist Bibliography*, vol. Olms, , 2; G. Williams, *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers: Documents Illustrative of the Radical Reformation Philadelphia*: Westminster Press, , Knox also clarifies that a purpose for writing *On Predestination* was to reply on the book which 70 *Puritan Reformed Journal* Unfortunately, the original copy of *The Confutation* has not survived, but an edited version by W. Whitley in the *Baptist Historical Society* exists. First, as proposed by David Laing, historical circumstances support his authorship by chronological and circumstantial evidence. Clement, the contents of *The Confutation* reflect the theological tendency of Anabaptists and other English sects at that time. Portrait of a

Calvinist New York: Viking Press, . Actually, it does not possess any of the writings of Cooche other than the citations by John Knox and William Turner. I will use this edited version in the later discussion. Horst notes that although the exact date of *The Confutation* is not known [maybe around 1540], since it mentioned the burning of Cranmer, it must have appeared about 1540. See Horst, *The Radical Brethren*, Pearse states that since Knox left Geneva in January 1541, the manuscript of *On Predestination* was evidently completed during 1540 and was published by Jean Crespin at Geneva in 1541. Thus, perhaps, Knox had already encountered a copy of *The Confutation* around 1540 and responded to it with *On Predestination*. In 1542, Cooche took up a debate with William Turner concerning the doctrine of original sin and the practice of infant baptism. In 1543, Henry Hart, the most influential English sectary, was on the defensive against the attacks of the fervent predestinarian, John Careless. At this point, Robert Cooche also rose to defend his friend and mentor by composing *The Confutation* against the doctrine of predestination. See Clement, *Religious Radicalism in England*, 154. Thus, although there is no direct evidence that Cooche is the author, this body of evidence is not unreasonable. Cooche states the first error: God hath not created all men to be saved by any manner of means, but before the foundation of the world He hath chosen a certain number to salvation, which is but a small flock; and the rest, which be innumerable, He hath reprobated and ordained to condemnation: Because so it pleaseth Him. *The Confutation*, 93, Adam and David committing adultery and homicide, were favoured even then and beloved of God, and never out of election; the Reprobate, as Saul and Judas, were never in the favour and election of God. Covenantally, Cooche argues, if someone who is already elected refuses Christ, it is the same as if he or she breaks the covenant; as a result, he or she will fall out of election. God hath two manner of wills, one revealed will, and a secret will, which is only known to Himself. Meanwhile, Hargrave attempts to answer where the free-willers fit into the overall spectrum of Protestant evolution in England. Hargrave 41, they would be identified as radical sectarians within the broad spectrum of Anabaptists as designated by Knox. A Chapter in the History of Idealism Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963, 117. Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, 154. Knox regards Cooche as a sectarian and rails against him: Baker, 154, 3: Knox points out the mistake of calling free will the conscience; if human beings live according to the voice of conscience regardless of whether elect or reprobate, they would reach the condition which is most satisfactory in their own eyes. Knox asserts that conscience is not appropriate for self-assurance in well-doing, inasmuch as such conscience is alienated from the Scripture. Rather than overemphasizing human conscience and freedom, Knox indicates that human conscience and freedom are never grounds for the doctrine of predestination; the role of such human elements is not attested to by Scripture. Knox links his opponents with other advocates of free will, both past and present. Greaves, *Theology and Revolution*, 154. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation*: Fortress Press, 1966, 154. The Relationship between Predestination and the Ecclesiology of John Knox Although John Knox does not write a full treatise on ecclesiology, *On Predestination* manifests a strong concern for the church in connection with predestination: For the theological relationship between Calvin and Knox, see J. His Influence in the Western World, ed. Zondervan, 1964, 154; Charles D. First, during the extensive persecutions of the church, Knox accentuates the concept of an elected and afflicted flock, and he repeatedly gives consolation to the persecuted church. He [God] preserved and multiplied their number under the most extreme persecution:

4: The English Revolution,

Religious Radicalism In England In this valuable study Christopher Clement draws our attention to a varied assemblage of people who sought Christian faithfulness in the underworld of mid-Tudor England.

Scot, Mitch, and others. Where after examination had, for that he would not recant, he was first condemned, the sentence being read by D. When they had disgraced him, he sayd cherefully: In the meane time whilest it was doying, one standing by, asked Hullier what book he had in his hand. Wherat a Sergeant named Marginalia Brisley Sergeant, persecutor. Marginalia Hulliars stedfast trust in God. God hath layd the foundation, and I by his ayd will end it. This Boyes was one of the Proctors of the Vniuersity that yeare. Another circumstance points out as the true year, viz. To whome Mayster Graye spake, saying: Boyes spake with a loud voice: Maior, what meane ye? He is a pernicious person, and may do more harme then ye wote of. Wherat simple Hullier as meeke as a Lambe, taking the matter very patiently, made no answeare, but made him ready vttering his prayer. Neuertheles his frendes perceiuing the fire to be ill kindled, caused the Sergeantes to turne it and fire it in that place where the winde might blow it to his face. Marginalia The last wordes of Iohn Hullier at his death. Lord Iesu receaue my spirit, dying very meekely The place where he was burned is called Iesus grene, not farre from Iesus Colledge. He ministered to the wants of Thomas Mountain at Cambridge. All the people praied for him, and many a teare was shed for him. Which the Papistes seing, cried, Marginalia Papists of Cambridge forbid the people to pray for Hullier. Wher at the Papistes fell in such a rage that they manaced them with terrible threatninges to ward. Of the people some took as they could get of him, as pieces of bones. One had his hart, the which was distributed so farre as it would go: A Note of Thomas Rede. Commentary Close Thomas Read This anecdote first appeared in the edition. Marginalia Referre this to Thomas Rede, Martyr. Rede who was burned at Lewes, as it appeareth aboue pag. The night following, he sawe in a vision, a company of talle young men in white, very pleasant to behold:

5: The eschatology of Margaret Fell () and its place in her theology and ministry - CORE

Religious Radicalism in England, Paperback by C.J. Clement. In Stock - Usually dispatched within 24 hours. Free UK delivery when you spend £10 or more.

It implies a concentration of the focus of relevance on a particular principle, at the expense of the traditionally sanctioned regard for the complexities of context. The element thus abstracted becomes the salient core on which inference and action are based. Radicalism tends to be comprehensive; no matter where it starts, it tends to assimilate all aspects of life to the initial principle. In its positive sense this tendency implies a projection of a completely new version of human life and enterprise. In its negative sense it implies a threat to all aspects of ongoing life. Although many forms of radicalism eschew violence, there is little doubt that the overthrow of the existing order is part of the radical agenda. The radical reduction and its extension into a comprehensive doctrine need not have the character of logically derived conclusions. Quite often the assertions are the result of directly intuited truth, and the forms of expression range from scholastic demonstrations to rhapsodic prophecy. Whatever the form, the impulse behind it is to announce the sovereignty of a principle and to render a principled, unified, and internally consistent interpretation of the cosmos and the meaning of human life. There exists a close but somewhat misleading affinity between radicalism and zealotry, particularly in the areas of politics, morality, and religion. Zealotry, being a form of unquestioned and permanent obeisance, may, and often does, become the routinized pursuit of radical ideals. However, even when the attitude of the radical is wholly immersed in feeling, its expression is not compatible with emotional impulsiveness but is always pervaded by its own peculiar rational discipline. The rational structure of radical thought and action is the expressive mold that fits the unconscious-need dispositions of many persons; to others it is a matter of deliberate moral choice and closely reasoned inference; and to some it may be no more than a mask they can plausibly and deliberately display while being motivated by considerations of momentary expediency. The conception of radicalism as rational does not imply that it is ruled by logic, science, or economy but merely that the drive toward some sort of explicit intellectual generalization of the meaning of human action and experience is a constitutive property of radicalism. Radicalism usually attaches its single-minded emphasis to something that is already known and valued, albeit as one thing among many. What is new is not the tenet itself but the militant assertion of its sovereign and unqualified supremacy. However, while the banner of radicalism derives from the outlook of the society in which it occurs, its arguments turn against that society. Although radicalism is characteristically rational or at least rationalized, it is clearly and implacably inconsistent with reasonableness. In principle, pure radical thought and action is entirely devoid of practical wisdom, of sensitivity for the occasion, of opportunistic economizing, of the capacity to learn from experience, of flexibility and looseness of interest. It has been shown that radicalism has its origins and permanent focus of appeal in the socially displaced strata of society Lipset. Although this phenomenon is probably not present in every form or instance of radicalism, it is immensely important for the understanding of the social structure of radicalism. When men of radical persuasion look into the past, one of two alternative views is obtained. In one, the tendencies contained in mundane history are disregarded entirely in favor of tracing some doctrinal claim to a distant and mythical past. All that happened between some golden age and the radical discernment in its modern setting is defined as an ironic departure from the intended direction of the original state. In the second and more common view, mundane history is seen as a script of a determined sequence of events. In the huge historical panoramas of Hegel and Marx, all that is truly historical is defined as accidental and insignificant, and all that matters is the permanently lawful sequence of general tendencies. What Hegel called die Tücke des Geistes merely deludes man into thinking that what he does as a free agent matters historically. From either point of view, the polemic highlight of radical historiography is the announcement of an eternal truth. Knowledge of the past has as its principal function the exemplification and the aggrandizement of the timeless truth contained in the radical doctrine and the demonstration of its compelling necessity. The doctrine and the ethic of radicalism is inevitably invested with tensions. On the one hand, it is systematized by internal standards of warrant and sensibility; on the other hand, radical beliefs

remain responsive to tests of everyday life experiences. Even while the great goals and the order of the future are within the grasp of the imagination, there remain the petty vexations and distractions of everyday life. Even while he holds steadfast to the grand scheme, the believer must resist temptations to suspend the relevance of the doctrine for considerations of momentary interest. Worse yet, his resoluteness is threatened continuously by counterevidence that tends to discredit the doctrine. In the long run radicals succumb to these worldly pressures; they pay their price in sacrifice, settle for partial gains, and become assimilated. Often when they surrender their totalitarian claims, they become selectively dogmatized and develop the art of casuistry. This process is best exemplified in the transformation of sects into churches. The alternative to the corruption of rational purity and consistency, i. Several well-recognized features of extreme radical movements have precisely this effect. Most noteworthy are the following: Within this collectivity the tenets of the faith can be exercised freely and, thus, are validated, i. A common device to accomplish this is to associate it with the inspiration of a prophet. The particularistic access to truth discredits a variety of polemic opponents. The state of permanent purge functions at the level of self-critique, as well as that of collective and authoritative discipline. Not only does the movement usurp enormous powers of restraint over its members; it also annuls the significance of all external sources of sanction. Loyalty to the movement requires that no personal interest or obligation may be admitted as legitimately contesting a demand issuing from participation in the movement. This condition is substantially satisfied by dissolving all possible human ties and by deindividualizing members in the direction of some heroic ideal. While members are desensitized to pain, their conception of the relationship between the assailant and the victim becomes impersonal, and brutality becomes morally neutral. That is, members who are publicly compromised by participation in it are forced to burn their bridges behind them. The development of modern radicalism The original cause with which modern radicalism is associated is the attack on the traditionally inherited corporate structure of power, in the name of an equal and liberal distribution of political franchiseâ€”i. Although movements of democratic reform and rebellion appear sporadically throughout history, radicalism in this sense became endemic only to the Western world, and only since the late eighteenth century. During the Reformation, the main Protestant denominations, notably the Evangelical Lutheran church and the Church of England, never lost their footing in the established political hierarchy and have settled their quarrels with temporal authority under the doctrine, *Cuius regio eius religio*. Other sectarian movements, however, have been sporadically involved in partisan warfare against traditional secular privilege. In , at the time of the suspension of the Edict of Nantes, the fight for religious and political freedom was largely exhausted, muzzled, or confined to insignificant enclaves, from which irreconcilable partisans embarked on their voyages to the New World. Even in eighteenth-century England the dissenting bodies in the Bunyan tradition became reconciled to the status quo. Founded in part upon the largely academic discourses of Locke and Montesquieu, the doctrine of modern democratic radicalism was formulated, by Rousseau and a host of lesser writers, with full awareness of its seditious character. Their relentless argument urged that all existing conditions and customs are unnatural and must be destroyed and replaced by a new and rational order Talmon In contrast to the religiously inspired radicalism of the Reformation period, the new formulation was wholly secular. Foremost among the objects of attack was the belief, never seriously challenged in previous ages of Western civilization, that only a select few, an elite, had the wisdom and right and power to govern. In its place there was formulated a doctrine that proclaimed every man the patron of his own life and established the sovereign right of all the people to order their common affairs. The vision of individual liberty and popular sovereignty was made compelling by the endorsement of reason. Although it is now easily seen that this enlightenment of reason contained a strong admixture of romantic sentimentality, there is little doubt that the protagonists themselves perceived their arguments as appealing to discretion rather than feeling. Of course, the radicals did not invent or monopolize the use of reason as an instrument of politics. Other forms of governing and the opposition to radical innovation also had their rational apologists. None, however, depended to the extent the democratic radicals did on the persuasive power of reason and excluded so completely other considerations. Early radical movements The American and French revolutions in the closing decades of the eighteenth century were significant expressions of modern radicalism. They did not, however, express all existing radical tendencies, and they encompassed a great deal

more than merely radical idealism. More specifically, five movements, all derived from ideals of the enlightenment, show the directions and development of modern radicalism. The most direct translation of enlightenment ideals into political action was Jacobinism, which had been effectively practiced primarily in France—although Jacobin clubs existed in most European countries and in the United States—and for only a relatively short period of time. Yet it made a permanent contribution to the subsequent organization of all radical agitation. The small, locally based Jacobin clubs were focal points for revolutionary propaganda campaigns and were employed to mobilize mass support whenever the small core of activists needed such support. Jacobinism is an early model of a movement that requires for its perpetration a very high level of activist tension. Populism assumed a variety of forms, depending on the place of its occurrence. In the United States it traces back to the ideals of Jeffersonian democracy. The core of strength of American Populism was always agrarian, but Populism directed some of its appeals to, and derived some of its support from, the urban masses. In Russia a variety of influences, most notably Slavophile sentiments, led to the formation of the Narodnik movement around the time of the emancipation of the serfs. Here imported enlightenment ideals combined with romantic nationalism in the revival of the concept of the mir, an ancient Slavic form of agricultural polity. In Germany, starting with Herder, scholars and writers with a romantic medievalist bent cultivated an interest in folklore, ethnic history, and ultimately, national sovereignty. Although the German development concentrated on the intellectual glorification of the concept of Volk and did not lead to the formation of a populist movement in Germany, it furnished the ideological underpinning for a number of populist-peasant parties in eastern and central Europe. The common element of all these trends was a strong belief in the rights and creative powers of the common man, living close to nature, whose interests are naturally opposed to the oligarchic tendencies of large central governments and to professional political administration. The ideals of Jeffersonian democracy and those of the philosophical radicals of England are similar in that historically both are of Whig origin. The English reformers, however, were of distinctly bourgeois persuasion and appeal. Their idea of reconstructing government according to the principle of utility was an exercise in business rationality. Although the ideals of Bentham, the leading theoretician of this group, were close to the ideals of the Jacobins, and although he was in his own way as much a rationalistic simplifier as they were, the characteristic difference between them is that for the English reformer the fight for a rational social order did not admit the possibility of violence and chaos, even as a tactical instrument [See Bentham]. The strongest and most systematically radical version of radicalism is to be found in anarchism. William Godwin first formulated the complete version of anarchism, teaching that to compel men to act according to reason is superfluous and to compel them to act against reason is unjust. On this basis, he called for the abolishment of all institutions. With Proudhon, anarchism adopted a program of economic reform that far exceeded anything contained in other contemporary radical tendencies. Later the movement assumed the character of a quasi political party, always, however, refusing to participate in the affairs of government [see Anarchism]. Here the ideas of freedom and reason were wholly emancipated from man as a concrete being and were objectified in the modern state. Whereas for Godwin man in his natural state is the paradigm of reason and freedom, for Hegel reason and freedom are the attributes of a transcendental subjectivity whose only possible concrete manifestations are institutions. Even Fichte and the young Hegel stood on the left, in opposition to the conservative restoration forces of the post-Napoleonic era. From approximately the middle of the nineteenth century on, there appeared a split into what came to be known as right-wing radicalism and left-wing radicalism. The split was first manifest among the disciples of Hegel and ultimately led to the realignment of all radical forces. Right-wing radicalism By and large, right-wing radicalism is not readily discernible in nineteenth-century politics. The consolidation of the European states followed closely the Hegelian blueprint, and right-wing radicalism appeared mainly in the form of programs seeking to perfect an already existing state of affairs. Revisionist radical right-wing tendencies appear only at the close of the century, through the infusion of a new element. Statism achieved a new formulation, in a doctrine that based national sovereignty on historical missions of distinct races. Although this movement explicitly repudiated the influence of Hegel, it drew heavily on the translation of the idea of Weltbürgerthum into the idea of the Nationalstaat, and there is little doubt that it absorbed the bulk of the forces that were earlier affiliated with the

Hegelian right [See Gobineau].

6: C. J. Clement | LibraryThing

C. J. Clement, author of Religious Radicalism in England, , on LibraryThing LibraryThing is a cataloging and social networking site for booklovers Home Groups Talk Zeitgeist.

Suggested articles Citations [A book to] goe abroad onely amon all Friends in the Truth [in answer] to seuerall papers of Margaret Foxe. A Collection of Ranter Writings. Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to A History of the Jews in England. A Life of Menasseh Ben Israel: Rabbi, Printer, and Diplomat. A Sociological Analysis of the Theology of Quakers. Conscience and the Readmission of the Jews to England Antichrist in Seventeenth-Century England. Antichrists, Deceivers Which are in the World Apocalypse of the Word. Association of Friends for the Diffusion of Religion and Between God and History: George Allen and Unwin, Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace. Christian Judaizers in Early Stuart England. Conscience and its Critics: Quaker Women Preaching and Prophesying Daughters of the Church: Democracy in the English Commonwealth. George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism. George Fox and His Family. George Fox and the Origins of Quakerism. George Fox and the Valiant Sixty. Handmaid of the Holy Spirit: Hear the Word of the Lord: Quakers and the Second Coming. Woodbrooke College and Kelso: Jews of Medieval England. Jewish Historical Society of England, Judaism and the Gentile Faiths. Living at the End of the Ages: Apocalyptic Expectation in the Radical Reformation. Margaret Fell and the Rise of Quakerism. Margaret Fox of Swarthmoor Hall. A Study in the Background of the Idea of Progress. The Story of Quaker Women in America. Harper and Row, New Light on George Fox, On the Three Languages []. Proved, and Allowed by the Scriptures, Religion and the English People Religious Radicalism in England Research Note on Judge Thomas Fell Sabbatarianism in the Seventeenth Century. Sectarianism in Seventeenth-Century England. Studies in Mystical Religion. The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britian. The Assurance of Faith: Conscience in the Theology of Martin Luther and A Study in Quakerism. The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, vol 2: Apocalypticism in Western History and Culture. The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries. The Fells of Swarthmoor Hall and their Friends. The Fifth Monarchy Men. The Image of Bothe Churches. The Quest for Settlement The Jew in the Medieval Community: The Lancashire Gentry and the Great Rebellion, The Levellers and the English Revolution. The Light in their Consciences: The Early Quakers in Britain, The Making and Unmaking of a God: Puritan Eschatology to The Other Half s Story: Different But Equal In Importance. New England Eschatology in the Seventeenth Century. The Quakers and the English Revolution. The Quakers in English Society The Religion of Issac Newton. The Religious Foundations of Leveller Democracy. The Second Period of Quakerism. Sabbatarians and Sabbatarianism in England and Wales The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus: The Standard of the Lord Revealed. The Works of Francis Bacon. The Works of George Fox. The World of the Ranters: Religious Radicalism in the English Reformation. Lawrence and Wishart, The World Turned Upside Down. Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England. Walking in the Way of Peace: Quaker Women over Three Centuries. Women and Religion Women in European History.

7: Radicalism (historical) - Wikipedia

Religious Radicalism in England, (Rutherford Studies, Series 1: Historical Theology) (Rutherford Studies Series One. Historical Theology) (Rutherford Studies in Historical Theology).

This leads to a dilemma, because Bradstock adopts an undelineated definition of radical before arguing for a new way of understanding what motivated his subjects. His greatest debt, by his own admission, is to the influence of Christopher Hill. Yet Bradstock makes very few vital or critical references to the work of Hill. His attraction to Hill should not be surprising as the two have much in common, especially their well-espoused Socialist backgrounds. This provides them with similar underpinnings to their historical methodology. However, whereas Hill framed this in a Marxist historiographical tradition that identified the primary role of the socially and economically exploited in instituting hard-fought reform and the implementation of liberties based on the inherent principles that Marx and Hill would argue underpin socialism, Bradstock subtly but profoundly reorients the inspiration for change. Rather than a proto-Marxist revolution, Bradstock identifies Christianity as the radicalizing agent of change. In this interpretation, scriptural references in contemporary sources were not merely rhetorical tools or radical reinterpretations generated as a result of looking through a new ideological lens. This is an important distinction made by Bradstock. While he maintains much of the paradigm presented by Hill and other Marxist historians he profoundly repositions the source of change for the subjects addressed in the book. Structuring a study of this kind is no small challenge and Bradstock adopts a framework that begins with the development of Baptist principles. This approach is significant as the formulation and growth of what might be labelled radicalism "in the approach Bradstock takes" is inherently rooted in ecclesiastical constructions. While the Baptists did not espouse a unified political front, their awareness of being a gathered minority provided a seed bed for the development of a religiously motivated political and social dissent. After a useful chapter discussing the development of Baptist traditions, Bradstock develops the distinct ideological traditions that came to be identified as definable movements, while emphasizing throughout that these were often fluid and episodic in nature. Taking care not to overly normalize the likes of Robert Lilburne, Richard Overton, William Walwyn, John Wildman, the author manages to draw out the shared influence of biblical scripture in the formation of their ideas. Here Bradstock identifies the source of Leveller ideology to be theological. Lilburne, for instance, defined liberty in a rich linguistic tapestry woven from a combination of the Book of Genesis and the letters of St Paul. Yet despite similar ideas, Bradstock refrains from calling the Levellers a unified movement. Nor were they, in his estimation, akin to a political party. Instead, perhaps much more significantly, they were individuals motivated through distinct yet analogous theological perspectives. While Bradstock rightly raises the question proposed by Brian Manning as to whether the Levellers were driven by the pursuit of religious liberties for which political liberties were the means to that end or vice-a-versa, it is probably a question that cannot be uniformly answered for all that carried the Leveller banner. The crucial point is that for these individuals the two issues could not be neatly disentangled from one another. Even the most radical Levellers tended to couch their arguments in theological terms. From the Leveller pursuit of liberty, Bradstock turns to the Diggers to whom this review will return and the Ranters. Of all the movements studied in this book, the Ranters are to a certain extent the odd ones out. While Bradstock can identify that some individuals did advocate Ranter perspectives it remains unclear to what extent they existed as a networked movement. Much more likely, they represented the bogeymen of the mid 17th-century. Like witches, they were a constructed reality that represented the antithesis of what settled Christian society espoused. Thus disentangling myth from fact is difficult. Those that did espouse the personal moral libertarianism of the Ranters, such as Lawrence Clarkson and Abiezer Coppe, did so based on either a denial of the existence of sin or a claim to personal divinity. They represented an inversion of the ecclesiastical and political orders and for that reason they had little chance of any widespread success and at best prospered for two or three years beginning in They primarily represented a sacrilegious antithesis to orthodoxy and lacked a systematic ideology. Interestingly it is this group, with the least rooted religious identity, that had the smallest impact on the political and social life of England. In his balanced approach to the Ranters, Bradstock

provides very good guidance for discerning facts from fiction. Besides their phenomenal growth from a small handful of gatherings in to an estimated 60, spread across the Atlantic world by , the vibrancy of the Quaker movement wrought significant change and facilitated a strong social influence. Conviction of the presence of the Inner Light transformed the Quaker understanding of scripture. The belief that the Word spoken of in John 1, that created the world and inspired the biblical authors, was the same light the convinced Quaker recognized to be indwelling within themselves allowed for considerable reinterpretations of scripture and new authoritative revelations. Women and children were allowed to preach, the need for a paid clergy was rejected and so too the paying of tithes and many traditional social norms and hierarchies were rejected. However, the Friends were prepared for such tribulations, partly because the movement faced persecution almost from the outset and partly because their doctrine of the Inner Light provided an immediacy of spiritual support and sufficient flexibility to respond to changing circumstances. Such a great emphasis on the personal encounter with God could have become highly individualistic as it had with the Ranters and thus equally as short lived. For that reason, Bradstock follows H. Quaker unity was demonstrated in their ability to produce numerous petitions and supplications to the state, organized at local, regional and national levels. Bradstock is unequivocal that the Quakers are the greatest success story of the radical religious movements discussed in this study. To some degree this success must rest in their strong rooting not simply in historical texts, but in their belief that the spirit that inspired the Christian scriptures continued to inspire them directly and guide their actions in the world. The final two chapters address the Fifth Monarchists and Muggletonians. Their adherents spanned religious movements, although many came from Baptist or Independent communities. This expectation did much to encourage the course of events pursued by parliamentarians and the army, particularly up to the end of , but also proved to be one of the most divisive factors in the failure of the Interregnum experiment. Cromwell benefitted in his meteoric rise from obscurity to becoming the leading figure in England by being lauded as a second Moses. The question debated among many with Fifth Monarchist leanings was how much human agency was required for bringing about the reign of Christ. Some felt little action was necessary, others went as far as advocating that to kill Cromwell was not murder, while still others attempted full scale rebellions; the last of which occurred under the leadership of Thomas Venner in . As a product of an age of uncertainty and expectation, the Fifth Monarchists ultimately failed because they pursued a singular political aim although not all agreed upon how this should be fulfilled based on a narrow eschatological interpretation that left little room for redefining themselves once the Stuart political establishment had been restored. It is particularly good in its discussion of the relationship between Cromwell and the Barebones Parliament, as well as the changing perception of the Dutch among apocalyptically minded Englishmen. The two men also claimed the highest authority for interpreting the scriptures. The followers of Muggleton and Reeves were never numerous and they did not seek to win proselytes. They remained a largely informal movement that met on occasion in taverns and ale-houses rather than for formal programmed services. With the death of Muggleton, the last of the Two Witnesses, in the movement may have been expected to disintegrate, but remarkably it quietly persisted. By the 19th century the Muggletonians were believed to have become extinct. However, in an adherent was discovered as was the surviving Muggletonian library. The last known Muggletonian died in . This perseverance probably owed greatly to the limited nature of their political claims and expectations. Yet despite this, the influence of the movements discussed in this book persists in being deeply relevant to the story of England and the continuing development of the nation. He has been a highly productive author on the subjects of Liberation theology and social justice. Moreover, he is the former director of the Christian Socialist Movement. Bradstock reminds us of the danger of homogenizing the outworkings of religious belief or, perhaps even more importantly in an age of increasing Western secularization, marginalizing religion as something that is merely subject to external influences and lacking transformative power. He reminds us that to try to understand the history of 17th-century England without giving due credence to the arguments and sources used by the people themselves leaves us little room but to project our own methods and ideas into the past. Where Bradstock falls short in his study is in his presentation of source material. He states a key motivation for the work was to make difficult to find texts easily available to the reader. While the passages he provides are useful, his lack of referencing is deeply

problematic for the research student who would like to engage with the full texts. Often there is little indication of where Bradstock derives his material. When it is apparent for primary sources there is little indication of pagination. In this regard the book falls short and is found wanting. Yet despite this limitation, it is an important contribution to the historiography of the English Revolution. He also shows the middle-class nature of participation, a fact that undercuts some Marxist arguments. Moreover, Bradstock demonstrates the significance of kingdom thinking in prophetic calls for change. While the apocalypticism of Daniel and Revelation is prevalent, particularly among Fifth Monarchists, and certainly set the tone during an age of expectation, a wide range of other Old Testament and New Testament sources shaped the worldviews of English dissenters. More importantly, Bradstock clearly demonstrates that the Diggers, sometimes identified as the early modern exemplars of proto-Marxism, were inspired in their occupation of wasteland by the Genesis account of creation. Beyond this basic biblical claim for the common use of land, his perspective was also soteriological and Christological. He held that human sinfulness, epitomized in private land ownership, brought a curse upon the earth evidenced by crop failures and social ills. The end of land holding, he believed, would lift the curse and bring about the incarnation of Christ in the community of the faithful. Instead it was the bedrock of their worldview and the foundation of their expectations for a fundamental change in the social order and the restoration of the earth. Bradstock has without doubt offered an important survey. For example, why does he not offer brief chapters on Independents and Congregationalists? Yet in the paradigm offered by Bradstock Presbyterians, Independents and Congregationalists, who shared as strong an ecclesiological rooted identity as the Baptists and were equally radical in the aims they pursued, are overlooked. This is interesting, because the ambitions of these groups could be argued to have been the root causes of the English Revolution and the inspiration for a decade of governmental trial and error. England in the s London, , p. Back to 3 Hill, , pp. Back to 4 September Andrew Bradstock Posted: Scott has been kind enough to offer praise where he felt it due, and quite robust criticism where he felt that was due; and I take no issue with him where he engages in the latter. In any case, the purpose of this response is not to indulge in a self-justifying ordinance, but seek to build upon what has been offered in the hope of moving the debate even further on. I do, of course, make it clear p. I must admit I did entirely see their point “ and their concern that the book serve primarily to introduce new readers to the movements it discusses, not specific scholarly debates “ and so decided simply to flag up the debate and stick with the term though careful readers will notice that it actually appears very infrequently in the text, and then almost always in inverted commas. A second issue Scott raises is the extent to which I am influenced in my interpretation of this period by Christopher Hill. Never having been taught by Hill, and in fact only having met him once, his impact on me has been entirely through his writings, which I confess both to having enjoyed and allowed to shape my thinking. In fact, for the last 20 years I have gone into print arguing that Hill and other left-wing historians, particularly those with an interest in Winstanley have simply got it wrong regarding the significance of the biblical and theological terminology in the Digger, Leveller and other tracts, and I make the point again in this work. Perhaps what I would have liked Scott Spurlock to have considered a little more in his review is the connection I make in my final chapter between Christian belief and an active commitment to social, economic and political change: True, I was impressed by their rapid numerical gains in the early days, and by the fact that they alone of the groups formed in the period under discussion still survive today; but in terms of the impact of their ideas I would have said that the Levellers top the league, on the simple ground that virtually all of the profoundly far-sighted platforms they argued are accepted today without demur. Finally, Scott rightly takes me to task for not footnoting my sources: I claim to want to make the writings I am discussing available to the reader, he says, but then offer them no clue as to where they may find the actual texts from which I quote. That is indeed true.

english civil war radicalism Radicalism in the s and s was a fluid and dynamic phenomenon in which religious and secular ideas were often impossible to separate. Individuals frequently transferred their allegiance upon encountering a new and charismatic leader, while others broke away to forge their own individual paths.

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: A Sincere and Constant Love. Friends United Press, Some Ranter Principles Answered. Also reprinted in Wallace, 85â€” Popkin and Michael A. The Standard of the Lord Revealed. To the General Council and Officers of the Army. The Letters of Margaret Fell. Edited by Elsa F. Edited by David J. Unpublished Manuscripts Spence Manuscripts. Friends House Library, London. Jews of Medieval England. Jewish Historical Society of England, Conscience and Its Critics: University of Toronto Press, The Levellers in the English Revolution. Thames and Hudson, The Quest for Settlement, â€” The Works of Francis Bacon. The Story of Quaker Women in America. Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace. Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to Sabbatarians and Sabbatarianism in England and Wales â€” Oxford University Press, The Quakers in Puritan England. Yale University Press, Early Quaker Writings, â€” Conscience in Late Scholasticism and the Young Luther. Beck, William, and T. The Lancashire Gentry and the Great Rebellion, â€” Manchester University Press, Women in European History. The Levellers and the English Revolution. Stanford University Press, Bibliography Braithwaite, Alfred W. The Beginnings of Quakerism. Cambridge University Press, The Second Period of Quakerism. Vexed and Troubled Englishmen, â€” Quaker Women Over Three Centuries. Rutgers University Press, Religions Peace, or, a Plea for Liberty of Conscience. The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

9: The Acts and Monuments Online

**Kirk R. MacGregor is an assistant professor of philosophy and religion at McPherson Religious Radicalism in England Religious Radicalism,*

Europe, to Radicalism in the s and s was a fluid and dynamic phenomenon in which religious and secular ideas were often impossible to separate. Individuals frequently transferred their allegiance upon encountering a new and charismatic leader, while others broke away to forge their own individual paths. But from within this flux several more coherent movements emerged, and it is their stories we trace here. Returning to England in , they founded the first General Baptist church in London. Some of the other refugees, still Calvinist, returned later to establish a semi-separatist church in the capital, and by some of its members had broken away to form a Particular or Calvinist Baptist congregation. The Baptists were thus divided from the beginning into two distinct movements, the General and Particular Baptists, each deeply suspicious of the other. The religious freedom of the s allowed both movements to expand rapidly, and in the Particular Baptists issued a Confession of Faith signed by representatives of seven London churches. By there were about congregations, roughly 60 percent of them Particular Baptist, with perhaps 25, members in all. Particular and General Baptists agreed that baptism was only a valid sacrament for adult believers and should be administered by immersion in a river, following biblical precedent. They also agreed that each congregation should enjoy total independence. Both found recruits among artisans and small farmers, both attacked tithes and university learning, both found support in the New Model Army , and both nurtured millenarian dreams. But their fundamental division over the means of salvation outweighed these similarities. The Particular Baptists, closer in spirit to the Independents, or Congregationalists, were always anxious to stress their respectability. The General Baptists, by contrast, more distant from the Puritan mainstream, were more anticlerical and more evangelical. Leaders such as Thomas Lambe d. The Presbyterian polemicist Thomas Edwards â€” denounced Lambe and his kind as blasphemous anarchists. In reality, both Baptist movements were primarily concerned to secure religious toleration. While many individuals were drawn away by more radical groups, leaders such as William Kiffin â€” , a Particular Baptist merchant, persuaded the majority to cooperate with the parliamentary regimes of the period. LEVELLERS The Leveller movement, which emerged toward the end of the civil war, was primarily political in spirit, but most of its leaders had roots in radical Puritanism, and the gathered churches provided a key recruiting ground. This movement developed from fears that a postwar settlement would bring few rewards for the common people. In particular, Leveller leaders such as "Freeborn John" Lilburne c. Using pamphlets and mass petitions, the Levellers pressed for both religious freedom and a range of social and economic reforms, including sweeping changes to the law, economic freedom for small tradesmen, and the removal of tithes and taxes. Their central demand, however, was a radically new political order to make government accountable for its actions. The Levellers saw authority flowing upward from the people, not downward from a divinely appointed king. Monarchy and a House of Lords had no place in their vision, and they demanded reforms to make popular sovereignty meaningful in practice as well as theory: Parliament ignored their demands, and in the Levellers turned instead to the New Model Army , under Thomas Fairfax â€” and then Oliver Cromwell â€” The Levellers secured considerable influence among them and believed that a "citizen army" could act as agents of the sovereign people to overthrow Parliament and establish the new political order. But as the country slid back toward a second civil war, the officers regained control and the Levellers found themselves outmaneuvered. Moreover, in March the Commons guaranteed religious freedom to the Baptists and other separatists, which prompted them henceforth to distance themselves from the Levellers. Though the Levellers railed at the "tyranny" of the new republican regime, they had run out of options and their program provided far too narrow a base to stand any real chance of success. By contrast, the Diggers, or "True Levellers," fully accepted the principle of economic equality and placed it at the very heart of their ideology. The Diggers had little impact on political events, and most of our information about them comes from the prolific writings of their leading theorist, Gerrard Winstanley â€” Winstanley saw the overthrow of Charles I ruled â€” as proof that the new age was at hand, and on 1 April , inspired by a vision,

he persuaded a small band of disciples to establish a communist settlement at St. To the Diggers, all freedoms depended on economic freedom, by which they meant freedom from want. Winstanley dreamed of a society in which there was neither money nor private property, with everyone working to produce food and goods freely available to all, as needed, from communal stores. Moreover, human nature would be transformed as the inner spirit drove out sin in each individual. In such a perfect moral commonwealth there would be little need for laws or coercion. Winstanley repudiated the use of force, insisting that the communes were to be voluntary, and the Diggers planted only on common or "waste" land, leaving private landowners free to enjoy their own properties. Communist and propertied societies could thus coexist in peace, he explained, though he clearly hoped and expected that mass migration to the new communes would trigger the speedy collapse of private estates. At least nine other Digger communes sprang up across southern England and the midlands within the next few months, though little is known of their fate. The Diggers had expected hostility from local gentlemen and clergy, but they were also viewed with deep suspicion by many ordinary folk who regarded the commons as a valuable asset for rough grazing and firewood. The settlement also prompted fears that an army of squatters would bring crime and violence in their wake. Repeated attacks forced the Diggers to shift to Cobham, a few miles away, by August, and the settlement collapsed entirely in April. That spelled the end of the movement. But Winstanley later published a defiant manifesto, *The True Law of Freedom*, in which he revised and developed his utopian dream. Despite the recent disappointments, he stood by his faith in a classless, communist, agrarian society. He had lost his earlier millennial fervor, and he no longer looked for the sudden transformation of human nature. His text spelled out the laws and government that he now recognized as necessary bulwarks against tyranny and popular disorder alike. Winstanley dedicated the tract to Cromwell, with little expectation of any response, and the despairing verse that closes the work leaves little doubt that he was now writing for future generations rather than his own. The Ranters are the most difficult of all radicals to categorize; historian J. Davis has denied that any such "movement" ever existed. Contemporaries disagreed; radicals and conservatives alike described encountering Ranters over several years, and Parliament responded in with an act outlining and condemning their beliefs. Neither a sect nor a party, the Ranters are best described as a loose cluster of individual cells that held similar if not quite identical ideas and attitudes. Like many radicals, they anticipated an imminent millennial future. Abiezer Coppe, their most interesting pamphleteer, claimed that the overthrow of king and lords foreshadowed a far greater revolution that would sweep away all hierarchy, privilege, and property. Such a principle could easily open the way to immorality of every kind, and Ranters were repeatedly condemned as promiscuous and blasphemous atheists. Some individuals did pursue the libertine implications of their creed. The real sins, Coppe insisted, were the pride and greed that sustained a social order both oppressive and unjust. Most contemporaries reacted with horror to what they knew or heard of the Ranters. Their alleged "atheism," their rejection of heaven and hell, of all churches, and of traditional moral values, and their violent language and extreme behavior ensured that "Ranter" became a general term of opprobrium. With the Act of , Ranter pamphlets were banned, but it is clear from Quaker and other radical writings that their ideas lived on throughout the s. Taking their name from the vision of four beasts or world empires from the seventh chapter of the Book of Daniel, they looked for an imminent fifth: They also welcomed his decision to summon a nominated assembly of the godly " Barebones Parliament ", instead of calling fresh elections. The assembly, which contained a dozen Fifth Monarchists and many other religious radicals, pushed for sweeping reforms, whereupon Cromwell took fright and assumed power himself, as lord protector, in December. Viewing him no longer as a second Moses but as the agent of the Antichrist, the Fifth Monarchists became his implacable enemies. They continued to demand a range of social reforms, which in many respects resembled those of other radical groups, including law reform, the abolition of taxes and tithes, and the relief of the poor. But taking the Old Testament as their model for the government, law, and society of the coming kingdom, the Fifth Monarchists looked for rule by a godly elite, "the visible saints," and they rejected outright the democratic values of the Levellers and Diggers. At the same time they insisted that biblical Israel had been a just society, and they guaranteed a better life to everyone willing to live quietly under the new order. The Fifth Monarchists insisted on their right to take up arms against Cromwell, but in the event most proved reluctant to convert their violent rhetoric into open resistance.

They were too weak to challenge the regime alone, and their attempts to subvert the army and build alliances with radical Baptists and republicans proved abortive. A bid by Thomas Venner d. The collapse of the Protectorate in revived their hopes briefly, only to be dashed once more by the Stuart Restoration in Most Fifth Monarchists drifted back to the Independent or Baptist churches from which they had come. Spreading south in "they grew rapidly to number some 40, by Their leaders and evangelists, such as George Fox "and James Nayler ", were mainly small farmers and tradesmen. Women played a far more prominent role in the Quakers than in any other radical movement. Quaker belief centered on the inner light, which they insisted was capable of transforming each individual in this life and securing salvation in the next. Their religion stressed personal experience and repudiated outward forms; they insisted that the "church" was a gathering of believers, not a building or institution. Quaker worship was spontaneous and emotional hence their nickname , and they rejected all professional ministers and sacraments. They laid equal stress on the practical consequences of conversion; Quakers rejected all worldly vanities and pleasures and applied a strict ethical code to their daily lives. Their aggressive evangelism brought them enemies as well as converts; Quaker preachers, many women among them, often harangued crowds in the marketplace and interrupted church services. New laws on vagrancy and Sabbath observance in were aimed at the Quakers, and their outright refusal to pay tithes rather than simply attacking them led to numerous prosecutions. Roughly two thousand Quakers had been imprisoned by Of all these groups, only the Baptists and Quakers or Society of Friends have survived. Nevertheless they had a lasting significance, inspiring later generations and forming part of the Nonconformist bloc that successfully thwarted all attempts to reimpose a monolithic state church. The radicals thus helped to shape the pluralist values of individual freedom that define Western culture today. The Quakers in Puritan England. New Haven , Sensitive account from a Quaker perspective. Winstanley and the Diggers " London and Portland, Oreg. The Fifth Monarchy Men: Still the standard work. Fear, Myth and History: The Ranters and the Historians. A spirited but controversial argument that the "Ranters" were largely invented by conservatives to discredit their opponents. For a debate between Davis and his critics see Past and Present, Nov. The World Turned Upside Down:

Juliana Horatia Ewing And Her Books Our feathered friends Fumbling with a Flyrod Interdisciplinary instruction for all learners K-8 Samavaya Foundation of Nyava Valesika Philosophy Winstons First Day of School The railway cat and Digby Italy during the world war Philosophy after Hegel Wolves (Northern Trek) Easy-guide to camping comfort Mama knows her body Challenges and Solutions to Monitoring Indoor Pollution Curses, What They Are and How to Break Them The Rough Guide to Tito Puente CD Genius guide to talented bestiary Precious Rascal and Other Stories (Reunion Series, Book 2, book 2) A Discourse On The Authenticity And Divine Origin Of The Old Testament Nuclearisation of divided nations Anatomy and human movement structure and function African policy conflicts within the International Confederation of free trade unions General introduction to a pure phenomenology US Rifle M14 from John Garand to the M21 The Secret of Overcoming Verbal Abuse Connections world history volume 1 Appendix to the extracts from the minutes and advices of the yearly meeting, of Friends held in London FDI and the investment climate in the CIS countries Funerals as community practice Review of thickness swell in hardboard siding Collingwood on art as amusement 1. Scholarly publishing Advantages of cloning animals Trials of Oscar Wilde The New Rules of Retirement The Macmillan book of boating, Letter to Harrison G. Otis, esq. from John Q. Adams, senator of the United States, in reply to Timothy Pi Fact stranger than fiction The great gatsby teacher guide The Surrealist Angel Manifest Destinys legacy : race in America at the turn of the twentieth century.