

— Anton Jansson, »Religion as ideology and critique: Per Götrek's Christian communism«

— A B S T R A C T —

Since Karl Marx, studies of ideology have tended to treat religion as negatively ideological, as social cement hiding real conflicts. But throughout history religion has also been used as a resource for criticizing ideology. This paper investigates the latter function, combining a historical study of one religiously framed critique with a discussion of religion as ideology and critique. The focus is on the work of early Swedish communist Per Götrek, who was active during the mid-nineteenth century. I analyze four of his texts and summarize his Christian critique of society, going on to suggest that in a sociological definition of ideology, religion can function both critically as well as ideologically.

— Anton Jansson is a PhD student in History of Ideas and Science at the Department of Literature, History of Ideas, and Religion, and the Centre for European Research at the University of Gothenburg. He is writing his dissertation on religion in the early formulations of political ideologies in Vormärz Germany.

— Keywords: Götrek, ideology, religion and politics, history of communism, Marxism

— <http://lir.gu.se/LIRJ>



■ INTRODUCTION ■

The first ever translation of the *Communist Manifesto* by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels was done into Swedish as early as 1848. The translation bore the Swedish title of *Kommunismens röst* (The voice of communism) and included some minor adjustments to the original text. The most apparent change was to the famous slogan of the title page: »Proletarians of all countries, unite!« was omitted and replaced with, »The voice of the people is the voice of God«. ¹ This slogan of course seems out of place, considering Marx's stance towards religion, but in view of the historical context and the Swedish situation, it is less odd. At the time when the Communist Manifesto arrived, religiously framed critique was relatively common in Europe. In Sweden it was primarily represented by a person who has also been credited for the translation: the bookseller and author Per Götrek. ²

In what follows, I begin by focusing on how the concept of ideology and the critique of ideology related to religion during its establishment as a modern political concept, and on religion as ideology in general. Here, Marx is a central figure. Second, I consider how religion, and more specifically Christianity, was put in use as a critical resource by one of the first introducers of Marx and Engels in Sweden, Per Götrek. I then sum up Götrek's thoughts together with a short concluding discussion on religion as ideology and critique. ³

■ RELIGION AS IDEOLOGY ■

When searching for the most blatant examples of ideology, religion is often the first thing to come to hand. In the introduction to his 1991 work on ideology, Terry Eagleton offers as one of the reasons for writing the book the rise of Islamic fundamentalism in the Middle East and growth of Christian evangelicalism in the United States. ⁴ Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that the concept of ideology evolved from the critique of religion. ⁵ The well-known Marxian statement that »the critique of religion is the prerequisite of all critique« ⁶ is therefore a suitable departure point for understanding Karl Marx's critical project, as well as for exploring the rise of the concept of ideology in general.

Of course, critique of religion pre-dates the term ideology and its use in the subject matter. Within some traditions of early modern materialist and empiricist philosophy, this

critique culminated in a dismissal of traditional religion, as formulated by some of the *philosophes* of the French Enlightenment.⁷ Religion had begun to »be seen as the legitimation of political domination«⁸ and as propagated from above by power-holders and priests in order to keep the masses under control. According to this view, control was exercised through preaching a certain kind of morality and world view, as well as through the promise of eternal life. This critique of »priestly deceit« was brought forward by Enlightenment philosophers such as Holbach and Helvetius, who also thought that reason and education were able to overcome religious deceptions.

Another critique of religion more closely connected to Marx's was that of Ludwig Feuerbach, in his project of »dissolution of theology in anthropology«.⁹ The point for Feuerbach was that the essence of religion was the essence of man himself, and that man had objectivized this into the idea of God. This may have been necessary historically, but was nevertheless something that man had to overcome in order to fulfill his existence as human being. For Feuerbach, religion was not merely something invented by power-holders and deceitfully forced upon the masses, nor was it irrational and false in a simple sense. Rather, it was an incomplete self-understanding of man as a human being.

Though sharing much with Feuerbach, Marx's concept of ideology is also based on a criticism of him. For Marx, religion was famously an »opium of the people«, something coming from the people themselves as a way of handling the vale of tears in which they live, or »the heart of a heartless world«.¹⁰ This was an analysis close to Feuerbach's, but from Marx's viewpoint, what Feuerbach did not realize was that religion, as well as man, was a social product, and that what was needed in order to succeed with a real critique of religion was an understanding of man's material conditions in specific societies.¹¹ For Marx, the critique of religion was not an end in itself, but the point of departure for a more thorough critique and analysis of material conditions. Religion was for Marx the first ideology or, as Slavoj Žižek has put it, »ideology *par excellence*«,¹² because the focus on the eternal and ideal shuns the reality of material organization and class interests underlying the idea system.¹³

In the Marxist and socialist political traditions, religion has more often than not been dismissed as ideological and therefore something to fight or ignore. This also goes for the Marxist tradition of ideological analysis and critique, where religion, when it has appeared, has done so as ideology in a negative sense.¹⁴ In other words, as deception or false consciousness, something obscuring conflicts and contradictions and integral for the way society works, despite these inherent contradictions.¹⁵ There is, however, an alternative way in which religion

may work, and that is as a point of departure for a critique of ideology and power constellations in society.¹⁶

Religious opposition movements and critique of course have a deep historical tradition, and though they may mostly be found in medieval and early modern history, religion also played a part in early communist critique.¹⁷ In Europe during the first half of the nineteenth century, communist writers such as Wilhelm Weitling and Etienne Cabet used a predominantly, if not exclusively, Christian argumentation.¹⁸ This is the period in which the concept of ideology appears, and in which Marx formulates his analysis of it. I will consider religion as critique through a reading of a few texts of early Swedish communism in the first half of the nineteenth century. They all originate from Per Götrek, a pioneer in Swedish socialism, »one of the first to plant the red flag on Swedish soil«.¹⁹

— PER GÖTREK'S CHRISTIAN COMMUNISM —

Per Götrek was a bookseller, publisher and writer who lived most of his adult life in Stockholm and Karlskrona.²⁰ It was during his years in Stockholm that he was politically active; these activities were centered on a few organizations, namely *Bildningscirkeln* (The circle of education), *Skandinaviska sällskapet* (The Scandinavian society), and later *Arbetareföreningen* (The workers' association). These groups were not the broad popular movements of the kind that the labor movement of Sweden would later become, but they organized meetings, lectures and discussions, kept contact with socialists and communists in the larger European countries, and spread the doctrines of these groups in Sweden.²¹

Götrek's publication of books with political content centers on the revolutionary years of 1830 and 1848, the latter the year that the Communist Manifesto was published. The Swedish translation of the manifesto, which may have been translated by Per Götrek, was not the only work for which he was responsible. In 1831 and 1833 he published two different books about the teachings of the French utopian socialist Saint-Simon.²² These were interpretations and presentations of Saint-Simonianism, which after the death of its founder in 1825 evolved into something between a political movement and a religious cult. For a short period, Saint-Simon and his followers had a great influence on European radical movements, but declined over the years; in the 1840s, the Stockholm communists were mainly influenced by the Frenchman Etienne Cabet and his »Icarian« communists, but were also in contact with the London Communist League. These contacts show in a publication from 1847 with the title *Om proletariatet och dess befrielse genom den sanna kommunismen* (On the proletariat and its emancipation through true communism), for which Götrek has been credited. This tract is closely based on an

unpublished »creed« of the London Communist League, possibly written by Friedrich Engels, but it also contains formulations close to Cabet's and a description of the Icarians' planned emigration to a utopian society in North America.²³ The last publication with an explicit political message from Götrek was a speech held by him in 1850 at the newly founded »workers' association«, in which he presented and defended his interpretation of communism.²⁴ What is striking about Götrek's communism is the omnipresent explicit references to religion, and specifically Christianity.

A common topic in Götrek's writing is that of the misuse of Christianity. Götrek lamented the role of priests throughout history but especially in his own time. Religion has

— been a zealous servant of the reigning political opinion. Thus, we find in the time of flourishing individualism how the servants of religion regarded it as their first duty to ceaselessly teach the oppressed masses to be submissive and patient.²⁵

Priests are seen more or less systematically as hiding the content of Christianity. In the introduction to one of his books on Saint-Simon's teachings, Götrek compares the latter's ideas about nepotism and inheritance with the New Testament and what is preached in churches. Saint-Simon wanted to abolish inheritance; Götrek relates this to Matthew 12, where Jesus speaks about his family as being not only his biological mother and brothers, but all his followers. Götrek then turns to the existing church: »Let us focus on the priests of Jesus in this respect. [...] never have I heard anyone making this important issue the subject of any sermon.«²⁶

Connected to this was a critique of double standards, of talking about values without practicing them: »In all other systems, one speaks, as in communism, about *brotherly love*, but almost always without putting it to use.«²⁷ The »systems« referred to here probably refers to systems of political ideas, but the abuse of religion is also attacked: the »young citizen of the world is admitted into the Christian congregation through baptism, and is immediately cast out«.²⁸ According to Götrek, it was unreasonable to consider a person who was denied education or sustenance through decent work, and instead left to beggary, as really having been admitted into a Christian society.²⁹

As with many contemporaries and predecessors, Götrek's critique of ideology was thus very much a critique of religion. This critique of Christianity as it was practiced in churches may be seen as a dismissal of »priestly deceit«: priests were seen as distorting reality or at least hiding truth in order to secure the submission of the masses to existing power. But Götrek did not consider religion *as such* to be the problem, and

did not envision a society without religion as an alternative. The thought that religion *as such* was a means to keep the masses compliant was widespread, according to Götrek, but this was not necessarily what religion was about.³⁰

That Christianity as it exists is not really Christianity was one of the most frequently recurring themes of Götrek's writing.³¹ Instead, he identifies true Christianity with communism. At the beginning of his speech of 1850, he declares:

— I am a communist. [---] I am also baptized. – Yes, this is indeed true; for communism is a new name for an old thing: Christianity. I am further confirmed in communism through the Gospel, to whose confession I have been baptized. For the true doctrine of communism really exists in the gospel of Christ.³²

This is not the only instance in which Götrek supports his argumentation using the New Testament. That the gospels of the New Testament include a true communist teaching is important in understanding Götrek's argument. For example, elsewhere he cites Matthew 19, where Jesus tells a man to sell everything he owns, and states that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich person to enter the kingdom of God.³³ Götrek underlines that this is not about mere philanthropy or charity, but should be considered as a radical renunciation of private property.

Apart from the gospels, Götrek based his argumentation on the Christians of the apostolic age as told in the Acts. He pointed out that the Acts, »the oldest history of religion that we own«,³⁴ recount how the apostles sold their private property and instead owned everything collectively. The »rigorous and clear description of the social life of the first Christians«³⁵ was to be taken as a model for how to live as Christians, including Christians in the modern world.

This »restorationist« self-perception of Götrek is confirmed by Stockholm author Claës Lundin in his account of Stockholm in the nineteenth century; in the gatherings at Götrek's home, Götrek allegedly used to compare the group with the first Christian congregations.³⁶

One of the main problems of society, Götrek thought, was the power of individualism. In individualism, which he connected to egoism, everything primarily takes the particular or individual into account, at the expense of the common or societal. This leads to enmity or hate, and to bad social conditions.³⁷ The opposite of individualism can be conceptualized as communism, but it can also be conceptualized as brotherhood. In his speech from 1850, Götrek envisaged the history of humanity as a »battle between individualism, whose highest principle is *everything for oneself*, and brotherhood, whose chief principle

is *everything for the brothers*«. ³⁸ True *Christianity*, which for Götrek was more or less synonymous with communism, was not an enemy to individualism, since Christianity for Götrek preaches brotherhood.

The view of history as a battlefield between two »principles« is idealistic; that individualism may have its roots in the material organization of society was not something that Götrek discussed. But he did point out how the organization of society is what creates the possibilities for a person's morality and integration into social life. For example, he stated that the »current social organization is so corrupted through individualism that morality has been almost impossible«. ³⁹

For Götrek, the goal of communism was often conceived as the kingdom of God in its immanent, worldly form – the »realization of the Christian idea, the kingdom of God on earth«. ⁴⁰ Götrek stated his belief in the kingdom of God filled by righteousness, peace and happiness, writing that the Christians had prayed for it in eighteen centuries in the phrase »Thy kingdom come« and that they should not be opposed to it when it arrived in the form of communism. ⁴¹ The kingdom of God is a central part of the teachings of Jesus, but the true meaning of the concept has been hotly debated in the history of religion and theology. The dominant view during the twentieth century was that the kingdom of God is transcendent and equals heaven, but a worldly interpretation is also possible and was common during the nineteenth century and used in radical political projects throughout history. ⁴² Götrek adheres to this view that the kingdom of God should be seen as worldly.

Communism, according to Götrek, is the *realization* of the original and true Christianity as told by the gospels and practiced by the first congregations. ⁴³ If genuine Christianity were to be introduced there would be no more proletarians. ⁴⁴ This idea is founded on the understanding of the rise of a proletarian class as a result of a social organization based on anti-Christian and egoistic principles.

For Götrek, religion in general and Christianity in particular was very much about the organization of society. Starting out from the observation that faith without deeds is dead (James 2:26), Götrek explained in his foreword to his first tract on Saint-Simon the connection between politics and the state, on the one hand, and religion on the other:

— It is probably the case that many will find it peculiar that, under the term religion, a system is presented that specifically concerns the organization and government of the state. However, the person who studies Christian doctrines will easily realize that the worship of God is not solely about sensual movements, but also about activities. ⁴⁵

How human activities should be organized in order to best promote human happiness is thus the »highest doctrine of religion«. ⁴⁶ The text from 1847, departing from the text upon which it was based, expands on religion and its relation to communism. Götrek states in it that communism is the era and organization in which society finally acquires »a wholly religious character«. ⁴⁷

— CONCLUDING DISCUSSION —

Götrek may not be interesting primarily because of his theoretical contributions to the field of ideology; his critique and his political ideas are rudimentary compared to his contemporaries and writers coming after him. But reading his texts is rewarding because they show how a radical political group in a specific historical situation was able to conceptualize a critique of existing society and its ideologies in religious and specifically Christian terms. Just as it is not his theoretical depth, so it is not Götrek's originality in a historical sense that is the focus. He is, however, a telling example of early socialism before the dominance of Marxist thinking. Below, I sum up his critique before briefly returning to a discussion of religion as ideology and critique.

It should be pointed out that the overarching ideology of society during Götrek's time is religious and that Christianity, as it was integrated in the individualistically organized society, was that which was to be overcome. Important, however, is that Götrek made this critique from a point not outside religion but rather from his interpretation of Christianity and his exegesis of biblical texts. Thus, his critique of priestly deceit was not one of Christianity *as such*, but of the way Christianity had been conquered by the principle of individualism, which had led to priests being at the service of worldly power interests. ⁴⁸

His critique can thus be conceptualized as a kind of immanent critique, or critique of ideological inconsistencies. This may entail, for example, calling attention to the fact that the ideals and values supposedly inherent in Christianity, and partly still preached, are not attained or practiced by those that preach them.

One part of the critique which Götrek performs, again using a Christian argumentation, is to point out possible alternatives for social organization, which according to him will lead to a better society in which ideals and values such as freedom, equality and brotherhood may be realized. This alternative is a realization of true Christianity, and can be conceived of as being the kingdom of God in its worldly form.

How should a religiously framed critique such as Götrek's be understood and interpreted in connection to the study of ideology? It depends on what view of ideology is taken. If ideology is mainly a question of truth and error in a positivist sense,

which is one of the traditional ways in which it has been conceptualized,⁴⁹ religion may be seen as problematic, since much of it deals with questions of a metaphysical and/or other-worldly character, in other words principles beyond cognitive verification.

However, it is possible to emphasize not the epistemological aspect of ideology but the sociological: the aspect of class interest and material organization of society.⁵⁰ This means focusing on whether a certain idea system obscures material and sociological conditions, or whether it tries to expose them and aims at practical rather than theoretical solutions, that is, at the transformation of material conditions. Here, the investigation would not stop at asking whether a specific way of thinking were religious and, if it was, dismissing it as ideological. Rather, the question would be whether religion aims at the establishment of a radically different social order, conceptualized, for instance, as a Kingdom of God on earth – in other words it is aimed to break the relations of domination, rather than sustain them.

I began by citing Terry Eagleton's reference to the resurgence of religion as the reason for him to write his book on ideology; but it should be emphasized that Eagleton himself is a proponent of the possibility of viewing religion as a critical resource. For him, ideology is not solely about correct cognition, but about whether it helps people »invest in their own unhappiness.«⁵¹ Eagleton has also pointed out how religion, as well as having a history of oppression, also has an emancipative tradition.⁵² In other words, what for Marx is ideology *par excellence* may also work as a critique of ideology.

It is easy to place a figure such as Per Götrek in an emancipatory Christian tradition, since his appeal is to end people's investment in their own unhappiness through a different organization of society. Even if he is to be criticized from a Marxist perspective, it need not be because he used a Christian argumentation; more problematic would then be his failure to concentrate his analysis sufficiently on empirical material conditions and instead discussing »principles« in an idealistic fashion. ————— ■

■ — ENDNOTES — ■

1 Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels: *Kommunismens röst: förklaring af det kommunistiska partiet, offentliggjord i februari 1848* (Stockholm, 1848). This slogan, in Swedish »Folkets röst är Guds röst«, is a translation of the Latin expression *vox populi, vox dei*, which is first attested in the ninth century, and often has been used to legitimate calls for democratization.

2 Per Götrek, whom I will introduce below, has traditionally been considered the translator, but his most recent biographer Erik Gamby argues convincingly for why this may not have

been the case. Erik Gamby: *Per Götrek och 1800-talets svenska arbetarrörelse* (Stockholm, 1978), 200ff. Whether or not Götrek was the translator of the *Communist Manifesto* is of minor importance here; clear however is that Götrek was involved in the process, and that it spread mainly through his book shop.

3 Religion in this paper is generally positive or historical religion, mostly in the form of Christianity. That I talk about religion both generally and Christianity specifically reflects most literature on the concept of ideology, as well as my historical sources.

4 Terry Eagleton: *Ideology: An Introduction* (London, 2007), xx. The 1991 introduction I am referring to is also included in the 2007 edition.

5 Apart from Eagleton's introduction to ideology, two such historical introductions following this path are Jorge Larrain: *The Concept of Ideology* (London, 1979), and Kurt Lenk (ed.) *Ideologie: Ideologiekritik und Wissenssoziologie*, (Frankfurt am Main, 1984).

6 Karl Marx, »Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie. Einleitung« in Marx & Engels: *Werke. Bd 1*, (Berlin, 1970 [1844]), 378. »die Kritik der Religion ist die Voraussetzung aller Kritik«.

7 Larrain: *The Concept of Ideology*, 24–26.

8 Larrain: *The Concept of Ideology*, 25.

9 Ludwig Feuerbach: »Grundsätze der Philosophie der Zukunft«, in Feuerbach & Jodl (eds.): *Sämtliche Werke. 2, Philosophische Kritiken und Grundsätze*, (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1959 [1843]), 245, 315. »Auflösung der Theologie in der Anthropologie«.

10 Marx: »Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie. Einleitung«, 378. »Opium des Volkes«; »das Gemüt einer herzlosen Welt«.

11 Karl Marx: »Thesen über Feuerbach« in Marx & Engels: *Werke. Bd 3* (Berlin, 1958 [1888]), and Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels: »Die deutsche Ideologie« in Marx & Engels: *Werke. Bd 3* (Berlin, 1958 [1932]), 17ff.

12 Slavoj Žižek: »The spectre of ideology« in Žižek (ed.): *Mapping ideology* (London, 1994), 9.

13 Ulrich Dierse: »Ideologie« in Brunner, Conze & Koselleck (eds.): *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland. Bd 3, H-Me* (Stuttgart, 1982), 153.

14 Larrain sees the difference of conceiving ideology in a positive and in a negative sense as one of the foundational aspects surrounding the concept. A negative definition has to do with false consciousness and deception, and is how Marx conceived of it. A positive one would be about the world views of a class, and here it is possible to talk about »ideologies« in plural. Larrain: *The Concept of Ideology*, 13–14.

15 See for example Robert Boccock & Kenneth Thompson (eds.): *Religion and Ideology: A Reader* (Manchester, 1985).

16 This should of course also be connected to the now very rarely supported secularization thesis, which has posited the disappearance of religion from modern society and governed much of the view of history, not least for the Marxist socialist tradition, where historical progressiveness has been central. A more thorough discussion of this is however outside of the scope of this article.

17 For a historically deeper perspective on the history of socialism, with much focus on the religious traditions, see Ronny Ambjörnsson: *Socialismens idéhistoria: en inledning* (Stockholm, 1984).

18 Examples of works where these authors argue that Christianity and communism are more or less the same, is Weitling's *Das Evangelium des armen Sünders* and Cabet's *Le Vrai Christianisme suivant Jésus-Christ*, both from 1846. The two of them were indebted to the priest and theorist Félicité de Lammenais, who may not have been a socialist himself, but whose *Paroles d'un croyant* of 1834 was very influential among socialists, communists and other radicals. See for example G.D.H. Cole: *A History of Socialist Thought. Vol. 1, Socialist Thought: The Forerunners* (London, 1953), 1789–1850, 78–79, 189ff.

19 Gamby: *Per Götrek*, 243.

20 Two biographical works putting Götrek in his mid-nineteenth century context were published in the 1970s: Apart from the above-mentioned book by Erik Gamby, Knut Bäckström: *Götrek och Manifestet* (Stockholm, 1972).

21 For more about the organizations mentioned see Gamby: *Per Götrek*, 121ff. The historian Yvonne Hirdman uses Götrek as a starting point in her history of the Swedish labor movement, but rather as a prologue, before the broader movement as such. Yvonne Hirdman: *Vi bygger landet: den svenska arbetarrörelsens historia från Per Götrek till Olof Palme* (Stockholm, 1990), 22–25.

22 Per Götrek: *Framtidens religion, uppenbarad af Saint-Simon: En kort framställning af den nya religionsläran, enligt Saint-Simonisternes skrifter* (Stockholm, 1831). Per Götrek: *Saint-Simons religions-lära i kort sammandrag* (Stockholm, 1833).

23 Per Götrek: *Om proletariatet och dess befrielse genom den sanna kommunismen. Jämte Bihang: Om kommunisternas beslutade stora emigration till Icarien* (Stockholm, 1944 [1847]). The original publication contains no author name, in the reprint from 1944 however, Götrek is specified as the author. Götrek's biographers choose to see this differently: Bäckström cites Götrek as author, Gamby chooses not to do so, and instead lists it as a work without author, but still includes it in his analysis of Götrek's work. Gamby: *Per Götrek*, 186ff.

24 Per Götrek: *Tal, hållet vid Arbetare-föreningens allmänna sammankomst i Stockholm den 12 Maj 1850* (Stockholm, 1850).

25 Götrek: *Tal, 7*. »varit en nitisk tjenarinna åt den herrskande politiska meningen. Således finne vi under individualismens florerande tid, huru religionens tjenare ansågo sin första pligt vara att oafåligt förmana de förtryckta klasserna till undergifvenhet och tålmod«.

26 Götrek: *Saint-Simons religions-lära, 4*. »Fästom våra ögon på Jesu Prester i detta afseende. [...] aldrig än har jag hört någon göra detta viktiga ämne till föremål för någon predikan«.

27 Götrek: *Om proletariatet, 18*. »Uti alla andra systemer talar man, ävenså väl inom kommunismen, om *Broderskärlek*, men nästan alltid utan att sätta den i verket«

28 Götrek: *Framtidens religion, 29*. »man intager den unge verldsmedborgaren genom dopet i de Christnas samfund, och man förskjuter honom genast«

29 Götrek: *Framtidens religion, 29*, and Götrek: *Saint-Simons religions-lära, 7*.

30 Götrek: *Framtidens religion, 27–28*.

31 Götrek: *Saint-Simons religions-lära, 6*.

32 Götrek: *Tal, 2*. »Jag är communist. [---] Jag är dertill döpt. – Ja, så är det i sanning; ty kommunismen är ett nytt namn på en gammal sak: Christendomen. Jag är ytterligare bekräftad uti kommunismen genom det Evangelium, till hvars bekännelse jag blifvit döpt. Ty kommunismens lära finnes verkligen i Christi Evangelium«

33 Götrek: *Tal, 2–3*. See also Götrek: *Saint-Simons religions-lära, 5*.

34 Götrek: *Tal, 3*. He here refers to Acts 4:32–35, Acts 2:44–45.

35 Götrek: *Om proletariatet, 28*.

36 Claës Lundin: *En gammal stockholmares minnen. 1*, (Stockholm, 1904), 298–309, especially 306.

37 Götrek: *Om proletariatet, 4*.

38 Götrek: *Tal, 6*. »strid emellan individualismen, hvars högsta grundsats är *allt för sig sjelf*, och broderligheten, hvars öfversta grundsats är: *allt för bröderna*«. See also Götrek: *Om proletariatet, 12*.

39 Götrek: *Om proletariatet, 25*. »vår nuvarande sociala organisation är så fördärvad genom individualismen, att sedligheten blivit nästan omöjlig«.

40 Götrek: *Tal, 6*. »realiserandet av den kristna idéen, Guds rike på jorden«. See also Götrek: *Saint-Simons religions-lära, 7*.

41 Götrek: *Framtidens religion, 4–5*. Götrek: *Saint-Simons religions-lära, 7*.

42 Peter Steinacker: »Kingdom of God«, in Fahlbusch & Bromley (eds.): *The Encyclopedia of Christianity. Vol. 3, J-O*, (Grand Rapids & Leiden, 2003), 128–29.

43 Götrek: *Om proletariatet, 15*.

44 Götrek: *Om proletariatet*, 29.

45 Götrek: *Framtidens religion*, 3. »Det torde förefalla mången besynnerligt, att man under benämningen af Religion framställer ett system, som i synnerhet rörer Statens organisation och styrelse. Den som studerar Christendomens läror skall dock lätt inse, att Guds dyrkan icke allenast består i sinnets rörelser utan äfven uti verksamheten«

46 Götrek: *Framtidens religion*, 4.

47 Götrek: *Om proletariatet*, 14.

48 Götrek: *Tal*, 7.

49 Larrain: *The Concept of Ideology*, 173.

50 That »facts« may very well suit ideological purposes, and that ideology therefore cannot simply be about truth and falsity epistemologically speaking is something which is repeatedly pointed out by theoreticians today. See Eagleton: *Ideology*, 26, or Žižek: »The spectre of ideology«, 10.

51 Eagleton: *Ideology*, xxii.

52 Terry Eagleton: *Reason, Faith, and Revolution: Reflections On the God Debate* (New Haven, 2009), xi–xii. For a more thorough investigation of Eagleton's thinking with a focus on ideology and theology, see Ola Sigurdson: *Theology and Marxism in Eagleton and Žižek: A Conspiracy of Hope* (New York, 2012), especially the first two chapters.