Stephen A. Kent

Relative deprivation and resource mobilization: a study of early Quakerism*

ABSTRACT

Recent analyses of sectarian phenomena have utilized resource mobilization models at the expense of relative deprivation perspectives. Researchers justify their choice of resource mobilization perspectives by arguing that they not only direct their investigation to important elements of organizational development, but also avoid the unverified assumption of deprivation models that a link exists between pre-existing motivation and sectarian goals and activities.

Under certain circumstances, however, resource mobilization perspectives should be seen as complementing relative deprivation perspectives rather than contradicting them. If data allow researchers to determine a motivating deprivation or frustration among a sect's founding members, then resource mobilization perspectives can identify the extent to which the initial deprivation affects subsequent allocation decisions.

As a demonstration of the potential complementary functions of relative deprivation and resource mobilization theories, this article analyses the origins and development of early Quakerism with regard to the group's protest against the payment of tithes. It presents aspirational deprivation evidence regarding people's tithe-opposition prior to their conversion to Quakerism, and then illustrates how the group allocated resources in its efforts to secure the elimination of tithes in mid-seventeenth century England. Furthermore, the article argues that Quakerism's efforts to relieve its members' sense of aspirational deprivation both attracted constituents and created opponents to the group.

Recent trends in sectarian studies indicate that researchers are utilizing resource mobilization perspectives at the expense of once-popular relative deprivation theories. This development suggests a growing

529

interest in explaining the means by which groups survive and develop over a period of time, and indicates in part a diminished interest in questions about why sects first appear.[1] Certainly this shift also reflects the fact that some of the sects which arose in the 1960s and early 1970s have existed for a decade or more, and the limited motivational questions usually associated with relative deprivation theories have become outdated.[2]

In addition to the presumed limitations of their motivational questions, relative deprivation perspectives are falling into disfavour as a result of problems regarding their implementation and confirmation. Critics argue, for example, that relative deprivation cannot be determined unless evidence exists about pre-conversion attitudes of the members which reveal their sense of frustration, resentment, or 'unfair' denial. It is just as likely, critics assert, that groups socialize their members to feel relatively deprived than it is that people either form groups or join them as attempts to alleviate their deprivation.[3] Moreover, critics point out that relative deprivation theories virtually ignore the dynamics of group organization, and thereby fail to explain how feelings of relative deprivation are translated into collective action.[4] Finally, when researchers tested relative deprivation theories by investigating the reasons why people joined certain established sects, relative deprivation could not explain most of the conversions.[5]

These and other criticisms[6] are brought against relative deprivation theories as proof of their inadequacies, and are used to encourage the adoption of other perspectives. The most promising perspective to emerge as a replacement is concerned with groups' efforts to mobilize and utilize resources.[7] Briefly stated, this perspective emphasizes organizational analysis both as internal processes within the group and as external processes in relation to society. Special attention is paid to the methods by which a group procures and utilizes money and labour. Likewise, care is taken to identify both the assistance and the obstructions provided by non-members and their organizations. The level of discontent among members toward a given issue is no longer presumed to be the primary motivation for either the membership or sympathetic non-members.

The utility of the resource mobilization perspective in the analysis of sectarian movements is great, especially since it has heuristic value for as long as groups have resources at their disposal. Its frequent portrayal, however, as being incompatible with relative deprivation theories is often overstated. Although most relative deprivation theories do share certain basic assumptions, they are quite diverse in content,[8] and these differences must be distinguished before judgment is passed on their analytic compatibility. Certain resource mobilization advocates have, for instance, focused too narrowly on the psychopathological elements of relative deprivation perspectives,[9] and ignored other attempts to identify the structural forces in society

that generate widespread feelings of deprivation.

Moreover, resource mobilization advocates have frequently under-utilized Denton Morrison's relative deprivation theory[10] which discusses the non-deprivational recruitment incentives used by a group after it has a core membership of initial adherents whose sense of relative deprivation is high. Morrison's theory assumes, along with resource mobilization theories, that a sense of relative deprivation varies among members of 'power-oriented movements'[11] and that the analysis of 'the costs and rewards of participation'[12] must be under-taken in order to understand the conversion process. In addition, Morrison's discussion of the cost and benefits of movement member-ship not only invites the analysis of society's counterefforts against a group, but also calls attention to the process of social mobility and reward attainment within a group. Both of these perspectives also are crucial to resource mobilization theories.

This paper will demonstrate the complementarity of Morrison's relative deprivation theory with the resource mobilization perspective presented by McCarthy, Zald, and others by undertaking a sociological analysis of the emergence and development of early Quakerism from 1652 to 1660. It will analyse the appearance of Quakerism as a relative deprivation group or social movement organization which opposed the state-supported tithe system in Interregnum England. It will show that many prominent Quakers felt, prior to conversion, that the Puritans in power had denied them their 'legitimate' expectation regarding tithe-abolition. It also will reveal that this sense of depri-vation was not only a major issue around which the group converted members, but also served as the group's resocialization goal for people who converted in response to recruitment incentives. In addition, it will suggest that many constituents supported Quakerism because of the group's stand against both the state-supported tithing ministers and the tithe-receiving landed gentry. Finally, it will demonstrate that the way in which the group attempted to seek a structural solution to its relative deprivation largely determined the membership of its countermovement.

If we follow McCarthy and Zald's definition of a social movement as 'a set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represents preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or reward system of a society',[13] then we see that a social movement against tithe payments flourished in Interregnum England.[14] Indeed, this social movement had a long history,[15] and the victory of the parliamentary army in the Civil War set the stage for a fervent effort by several groups of political radicals and religious separatists[16] to have tithes abolished.[17] Early in the Interregnum, two Parliaments, the Rump and the Nominated, struggled over the question of tithe-support for the ministry, and while the former could not devise an acceptable financial alternative,[18] the latter (or at least its radical

members) worked so strenuously for its abolition that parliamentary moderates dissolved their own assembly in order to prevent such an extreme demand from becoming law.[19]

Much was at stake in these debates, since the issue was explosive. The abolition of the tithe-system not only would have undermined the state's control over religion and reduced the income of wealthy impropriators (i.e., laymen to whom tithes were owed), but it also would have eliminated the only means of support for many of the nation's ministers (unless of course some other means of support were to be found). To abolish tithes was to destroy a practice that was at the heart of England's religious, political and social values. Despite these consequences, if not because of them, many parliamentary soldiers during the Civil War believed that they were fighting to secure the right freedom of conscience in Christian religious worship, and further believed that this freedom could occur only when preachers were financially supported by the voluntary contributions of their approving parishes.[20] Before the crucial Battle of Dunbar in September 1650, Oliver Cromwell himself reportedly promised to abolish tithes 'if the Lord would but deliver him' from harm in the imminent battle.[21] He was delivered from harm that day; yet he seems to have reneged upon his promise.

Viewing this social movement in sociological terms, we can say that a large segment of the population[22] around the close of the Civil War, especially political and religious radicals, parliamentary soldiers, and farmers[23] experienced a rapid increase in their hopes for tithe-abolition, yet they were frustrated when, time and again, politicians did not fulfill their expectations on the issue. Using Morrison's terminology, these people felt aspirational deprivation, since 'the magnitude of aspiration [about tithe abolition] increase[d] to a much greater extent than opportunities for realizing the increased aspiration'.[24] Furthermore, this frustrated segment of the population felt that its expectations were 'legitimate' ones,[25] since tithe-abolition not only had been an important issue for the parliamentary army members during the Civil War, but also had been central to the sectarians' demands for the right to liberty of conscience in matters of religion.

A large number of Englishmen, therefore, felt the deprivation;[26] and this deprivation only intensified hostility between the predominantly rural tithe-payers and sympathetic sectarians on the one side and ecclesiastical and civil authorities, impropriators and other wealthy land-owners on the other.[27] Broadly speaking, a fairly 'high role and status commonality'[28] existed among tithe-payers who were 'from the middling and poorer sort, [since] the rich suffered comparatively little, and might even [have been] recipients of tithes'.[29] Consequently, tithe-payers tended to have far less political power and social prestige than did the wealthy;[30] and these disparities

heightened emotions in the tithe-controversy.

Quakerism first arose in the north of England among people who shared the aspirational deprivation over tithes and the state-supported church. Evidence for this claim need not be deduced from post-conversion statements by members, since abundant pre-conversion evidence exists in legal records about tithe resisters in the period immediately prior to Quakerism's emergence. This pre-conversion evidence has been summarized in two historical studies, one analysing pre-Quaker tithe resistance in Lancashire,[31] the other analysing similar evidence from Somerset, Kent, Essex, Suffolk, and Cumberland.[32] The author of the more extensive of the two studies concludes that, 'for many [people], Quakerism became not only (as Trevor-Roper has observed) "the ghost of decreased Independency" but also a possible haven for those involved in anti-tithe activity in pre-Quaker days ... Many Quakers had had a background of anti-tithe activity.'[33]

The frequent transition from tithe-resister to Quaker occurred for several reasons. For one thing, Quakerism originated as a spontaneous outburst among radical Independent or Seeker groups that met in religious worship outside the pale of established churches and tithed ministers. Many of their members 'had reached the Quaker experience [even] before [George] Fox came among them',[34] and the birth of Quakerism usually is dated from Fox's preaching successes in 1652 among the Seeker groups in Westmorland and western Yorkshire. In Westmorland's Preston Patrick district, for example, the Seeker group had rejected the tithe system and worshipped under the direction of two lay ministers who received only voluntary contributions. Not only did these two lay ministers, John Audland and Francis Howgill, become important Quaker evangelists, but also members of their group and other Seeker groups in Northern England 'formed the central nucleus of the new [Quaker] movement'.[35]

Applying Morrison's perspective, we can identify these groups as the 'voluntary association activity' which provided Quakerism with 'a residue of leadership and organizational skills that [were] crucial for getting [the social] movement off the ground'.[36] It is possible to sharpen Morrison's terminology, however, by viewing Quakerism as a 'social movement organization', a label that resource mobilization theorists have given to any 'complex, or formal organization which identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement or a countermovement and attempts to implement its goals'.[37] Quakerism was a social movement organization within the popular anti-tithe social movement; and it emerged from, and continued to recruit among, an existing but loosely formed social movement organization, the Seekers. Quakerism inherited the Seekers' style of worship, borrowed their pattern of monthly regional meetings, imitated their efforts at poor relief and gained some of its influential evangelists and organizers from among their ranks.[38]

In addition to the fact that Quakerism gained numerous tithe-resisters by recruiting among radical Independent and Seeker groups, Quakerism also attracted them because of its ideological assertions. Its religious ideology provided tithe resisters with a series of sanctified justifications for their refusal to contribute to the local ministers' (or local impropriators') upkeep. In general, Quakerism's ideological assertions support Morrison's theoretical claim which he intended primarily for norm-oriented movements in comparatively open and democratic societies.[39] He asserts that 'the beliefs in structural blockage and structural solution [constitute] the major features of the ideology of the movement'.[40] Since Quakerism was, however, part of a value-oriented movement in a relatively closed and aristocratic society,[41] its ideological assertions often were expressed in religious language, as is common when a society's institutions and norms are 'thoroughly integrated with a religious system'.[42]

Quakerism's central religious doctrine, for example, that there exists 'the good and just principle of God in everyone',[43] provided the theoretical basis for the Quakers' attack on the Calvinistic predestinarian teaching of many of the tithed ministers.[44] Likewise, Quakers' refusal to do either hat-honour or verbal honour to persons of high social status (and justifying this by claiming to give honour to God alone),[45] was often scornfully directed against the judges and justices of the peace who persecuted them for their tithe resistance and sermon disruptions.[46] Quakerism's claim of having reconstructed the Apostolic Church provided further support to tithe-resisters, since, according to the Quaker Anthony Pearson, the early Christians had rejected the Jewish tithe system. '[F]reely [the Apostles] preached the Gospel which they had received', Pearson asserted, 'and did not require any settled maintenance, but lived of[f] the free offerings and contributions of the Saints, who by their Ministry were turned to Christ Jesus.'[47] Likewise, Quakerism's personalistic eschatology and imminent millenarianism—its sense that Christ dwelt within the hearts of its members as a prelude to his physical return as worldly king—[48] initially provided Quakers with the spiritual strength to suffer the punishments that inevitably befell them for their tithe resistance and related activities.[49] Finally, Quakers' insistence on dressing plainly and simply, without lace or other frills, revealed their scorn for the 'pride' of the wealthy,[50] who as a group usually favoured the continuation of the tithe system and its ministers.[51] While it is true that each of the Quakers' religious tenets had long religious precedents within English society, each of them contributed to the Quakers' protest against tithe-payment and mandatory ministerial support in the 1650s.

Not all persons who converted to Quakerism did so because of its anti-tithe posture; yet all converts were expected to demonstrate their opposition against the tithe-supported ministry. Many people,

for example, converted to Quakerism because of its numerous healing miracles.[52] Others converted because Quakerism's doctrine of spiritual certainty offered a haven from long and anguished religious struggles against sin.[53] General Baptists, who were predisposed to Quakerism's anti-tithe position,[54] converted either as a reaction to a growing Baptist literalism, legalism, and ceremonialism or as a rejection of the salvific claims for the baptismal ritual itself.[55]

Healings, claims of spiritual certainty, anti-ceremonialism, and anti-sacramentalism were, therefore, important 'purposive' recruitment incentives[56] for joining the group, and these incentives had no direct connection to the group's stand against tithe-payment. As Morrison predicts,[57] these incentives helped to attract people to Quakerism by offsetting the high personal costs of joining (which included financial expenses, time commitments, persecution, alienation from family and friends, etc.). They also became part of Quakerism's compensations for worldly sufferings and present distress.

After they had converted, however, new members felt compelled to harass ministers of tithe-paying churches. Their verbal attacks on ministers, which often led to violent encounters with congregations, became 'an essential ritual that had to be performed to prove to themselves, their colleagues, and God the genuineness of their dedication and faith . . .'.[58] Even if members had not joined Quakerism because of its anti-tithe stand, they were rapidly socialized into placing both symbolic value and intra-group status on ministerial harangues and related activities. It is possible to view the Quakers' resocialization of members who had joined for reasons other than aspirational deprivation over tithe abolition as an attempt to instill in them feelings of deprivation over the issue. Members' public demonstrations against tithe-supported ministers became not only an important group ritual, but also a means by which individual members both 'proved' their faith to themselves and others, and gained status within the group.

It seems unlikely, however, that many people joined Quakerism without knowing that membership involved active opposition to tithes. Their tithe hostility and anti-ministerial attacks were too persistent and too notorious to be overlooked. Furthermore, they published a barrage of anti-tithe pamphlets that were directed to Interregnum parliaments and government figures which attracted considerable attention. These pamphlets reveal the expectations that many Quakers, especially former Parliamentary army members, had held in previous years regarding social and religious reforms, and the subsequent frustration that they now felt toward the Puritans who refused to implement them.[59]

James Nayler's proclamation from early January 1652-3 is typical of these pamphlets, especially since he was an eight-year Parliamentary army veteran. Like most seventeenth-century booklets, it carried a

long but descriptive title: *A Lamentacion [sic]. . . over the Ruines of this oppressed Nacion [sic], to be deeply layd to heart by Parliament and Army . . . .* His disgruntlement and frustration with the Puritans in power is clear from the very first line. 'Oh England', he exclaimed, 'how is thy expectation failed now after all thy travails? [T]he People to whom Oppression and Unrighteousness hath been a Burden, have long waited for Deliverance, from one year to another, but none comes, from one sort of men to another'.[60] One of the continued oppressions that 'Godly' people like the Quakers still suffered, Nayler charged, was tithe-payment, and their opposition to it was, they believed, a simple Christian act. 'Some of [the Quakers] are moved to go into the Idols Temples', Nayler argued in colourful Biblical language, 'to dispute and reason with them who upheld the Idol Worship, and to call the People out of it, unto the worship in Spirit; and though this seem[s] a heinous crime to you, yet it was the practice of the Apostles and Saints as is plain in Scripture.'[61]

A similar tone of disappointed hopes appears in an anonymous Quaker tract from 1658 entitled *To the Generals and Captains, Officers, and Souldiers [sic] of this present Army . . . .* The authors referred to themselves as 'the Faithful Friends of this Common-wealth, and well-wishers for the Peace and good Government thereof, who have undergone many great Battels [sic] (with you) for the purchasing [of] Peace and Freedom in the Temporal and Spiritual liberties in body and Spirit. . .'.[62] They went on to lament:

> what oppression by Tithes, and what oppression in the Laws doth abound, what oppressions are there abounding through the Law-yers, and through unjust Judges? Even the whole land mourns under it, and was it not in your hearts once to have Corrected and Regulated these things?[63]

As these two typical tracts demonstrate, Quakers continually de-manded that prominent political and military leaders abolish tithes in accordance with (the Quakers felt) promises that the leaders had made during the Civil War. During the politically unstable year of 1659, therefore, when it appeared to the Quakers that the Restored Rump of the Long Parliament might eliminate mandatory tithe payment, they acted with impunity. Making use of their group's extensive national network, two Quakers, Thomas Moore and Gerrard Roberts, organized and submitted to Parliament a list of justices of the peace who persecuted Friends (often of course over tithe resistance), plus lists of Quakers and non-Quaker moderates who were willing to replace them.[64] Moreover, by 27 June Quakers from at least six counties had collected an anti-tithe petition with 15,000 signatures and were presenting it to Parliament. Less than a month later, Quakers presented Parliament with a second anti-tithe petition, this one containing 7,000 signatures which had been collected by Quaker

women.[65] All of these efforts, however, came to naught, as the Rump chose to court the more numerous and more influential Presbyterians (which, by the way, it did unsuccessfully) rather than the Quakers and other radical sectarians.[66]

Quakerism's political activities demonstrate a clear connection between the aspirations concerning tithe abolition of its first members in the beginning of the 1650s and the group's ideological stand on the same issue at the end of the 1650s. Quaker ideology, therefore, in large part reflected its members' sense of deprivation over frustrated aspirations.[67] Moreover, many people converted to Quakerism because of its ideological stand against tithes. While aspirational deprivation of this kind is never sufficient by itself to explain the appearance of a sectarian group, it could easily be placed within a 'value-added scheme', as Smelser sketches, and thereby become the 'structural strain' component which not only contributes to a sect's emergence, but also, as Morrison and others suggest, provides the group with an ideology and recruitment incentive.[68] If a society is both 'conducive' to collective activity and unable or unwilling to suppress it, then aspirational deprivation can be the necessary condition of 'structural strain' around which people 'mobilize' in an effort to seek redress, compensation, or revenge.[69]

Having established the role of aspirational deprivation in the formation and ideological development of Quakerism, we also can see its effects in both attracting constituents and breeding opponents. Constituents 'are those [persons] providing resources for a [social movement organization]',[70] and at least some of Quakerism's constituents supported the social movement organization because they sympathized with its anti-tithe activities. Colonel William West, for example, had been one of the radicals in the Barebones Parliament who voted for the abolition of tithes,[71] and as a Lancashire justice of the peace during the Interregnum he intervened several times on George Fox's behalf to prevent his imprisonment.[72] He also entertained prominent Quakers in his home.[73] Captain John Herring, another former radical in the Barebones Parliament, allowed Quakers to hold meetings in his Hereford house.[74] Robert Minter, a former tithe resister in Kent, also held Quaker meetings in his home, and wrote an anti-tithe tract in 1657.[75] In the same vein, Henry Labor of Yeovil, Somersetshire, combined a scathing attack against tithes and the ministers that they supported with a defence of the Quakers and their anti-tithe activities, which he published in 1657.[76] Quakers were the most prominent anti-tithe opponents of the Interregnum, and their vocal and visible position won them sympathy and support from persons who shared their hopes.

In addition to the examples of tithe opponents who became constituents of the Quakers, numerous cases exist of community members who provided resources in the form of money, labour, or

community pressure against ministers for Quakers who suffered punishment as a result of tithe resistance. In 1657, for example, a Bedfordshire minister was forced by community pressure to return goods that he had seized from a Quaker for tithe payment refusal. Occasionally impropriators had trouble laying their tithe claims against Quakers because none of the Quakers' neighbours would testify about the amount of agricultural yield that Quaker farms produced. Wiltshire and Somerset records reveal that neighbours often warned tithe-resisting Quakers of approaching constables, and accounts from the Restoration period (post-1660) reveal that neighbours occasionally 'borrowed' particular items or animals in order to protect them from being confiscated.[77] Community and social bonds tied these neighbours together, and these bonds help to explain why some people assisted the persecuted Quakers. It none the less is true that quite a few of these supporting members were 'potential beneficiaries'[78] of Quakerism's desired goal accomplishment, and that support for persecuted Quakers indicated support of their goal.

Their desired goal was, as we have argued, the abolition of the state-supported tithe system. Around this issue they attracted a substantial number of constituents, but also a formidable number of opponents, even 'elite opponents', i.e., 'those who control[led] large resource pools'.[79] As a contribution to resource mobilization theory, the Quaker example shows that a social movement organization's identification of, and response to, its members' perceived source of structural blockage to an aspiration will suggest the persons or groups who are likely to become its 'opponents' in a 'countermovement'.[80] Not surprisingly, among the Quakers' bitterest opponents were those whose positions they wanted to abolish -- the state-supported ministers. Because the Quakers frequently harangued the state-supported ministers in the middle of their services, the ministers responded with vengeance. On several occasions, for example, they urged their congregations to take mob action against those 'vile fellows of ye rude multitude'.[81] At other times they appealed to local officials for the arrest of the vituperative or tithe-resisting Quakers.[82] Their charges in print were equally aggressive,[83] and of the approximately 150 authors who wrote against Quakerism during the Interregnum, a substantial portion of them were ministers.[84]

Not only did the Quakers' ideological stand on tithe abolition antagonize the nation's ministers, but it also aggravated governmental leaders' reactions to them. Although Oliver Cromwell occasionally intervened on the Quakers' behalf, he none the less came to feel that the group was a disruptive force in the nation. His Proclamation of 15 February 1654–5 made illegal the act of disrupting ministers, and specifically named the Quakers (along with the Ranters) as frequent 'disrupters of the civil peace'.[85] Even in 1659, the restored Rump

Parliament established 'a committee to tighten the laws on the disturbance of ministers', and this was an 'action clearly aimed against the Quakers'.[86] Throughout the era, therefore, the Quakers' hostility to ministers over the acceptance of tithes alienated important segments of the religious and political 'mass elite' who feared and resented the social disruption that the sect caused.

The history of Interregnum Quakerism is rich with implications for sociological theory that addresses itself to the origins and development of social movement organizations, particularly religious sectarian ones. Using Quakerism, we have demonstrated that relative deprivation theory can be compatible with resource mobilization theory. It can explain for resource mobilization theory not only the motive which, in combination with other factors, initiates the formation of a sect, but also the logic underlying a sect's ideological assertions and public activities. It has been shown that both a social movement organization's selection of a source of structural blockage to its 'legitimately' held aspirations and the way in which a social movement organization mobilizes to elicit a change in the source provide strong indications about who will comprise its opponents and counter-movement members. Finally, the paper has suggested that the espoused deprivationist goals of a social movement organization may significantly determine who its constituents or supporters will be.

It no longer seems wise, therefore, to insist, as some resource mobilizationists have, that resource mobilization theory is incompatible with relative deprivation theory. Despite their disclaimer that 'recent empirical work . . . has led us to doubt the assumption of a close link between pre-existing discontent and generalized beliefs in the rise of social movement phenomena',[87] McCarthy and Zald's formulation of resource mobilization assumptions allows for the possibility that relative deprivation can be the basis for social movements and social movement organizations. Their statement that 'social movements may or may not be based upon the grievances of the presumed beneficiaries'[88] is cautiously wise, since it entertains, even invites, the use of non-deprivationist approaches to explain the appearance of various movements and groups. This formulation also *should* suggest, however, that relative deprivation theory can be embraced by resource mobilization theory when it can be demonstrated that a social movement or a social movement organization *is* based upon the grievances of presumed beneficiaries.

All social movement organizations must attempt to mobilize their resources toward goals regardless of the reasons that cause the groups to form. Resource mobilization theory provides the most promising conceptual framework in which to analyse this mobilization process. It does not, however, provide an adequate discussion of the motives for the initial formation of particular groups, nor for their subsequent ideological positions. In some instances, a relative deprivation theory

such as Morrison's provides the necessary theoretical complement.

Stephen A. Kent
Department of Religious Studies
McMaster University

NOTES

*An abbreviated version of this article was presented on 31 October, 1981 at the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion in Baltimore, Maryland, USA. The author wishes to thank Robert Blumstock and Rachael L. E. Kohn for their thoughtful suggestions and careful editorial comments.

1. A. G. Neal, 'Conflict and the Functional Equivalence of Social Movements', *Sociological Focus*, vol. 3, Spring, p. 11; J. McCarthy and M. N. Zald, 'Resource Mobilization in Social Movements: A Partial Theory', *Amer. J. Sociol.*, vol 82, May, p. 1212.

2. T. Robbins, D. Anthony, and J. Richardson, 'Theory and Research on Today's "New Religions"', *Sociological Analysis*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 95-9.

3. Roy Wallis, 'Relative Deprivation and Social Movements: A Cautionary Note', *Brit. J. Sociol.*, vol. 26, no. 3, September 1975, pp. 360-1, 362.

4. McCarthy and Zald, op. cit., p. 1214; David Bromley and Anson D. Shupe, Jr., *'Moonies' in America: Cult, Church and Crusade*, Beverly Hills, California, Sage Publications, 1979, p. 19.

5. Bryan R. Wilson, 'Becoming a Sectarian: Motivation and Commitment', in Derek Baker (ed.), *Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian, Studies in Church History*, vol. 15, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1978, pp. 495-502; James A. Beckford, *The Triumph of Prophecy*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1975, pp. 152-3, 154-8; and Beckford, 'Sociological Stereotypes of the Religious Sect', *Sociol. Rev.*, New Series, vol. 26, 1978, pp. 110-13, 118. Note, however, that these studies examine conversion to established sects, not to newly forming ones.

6. McCarthy and Zald, op. cit., pp. 1214-16; Bromley and Shupe, op. cit., pp. 17-19; Virginia H. Hine, 'The Deprivation and Disorganization Theories of Social Movements' in I. I. Zaretsky and M. P. Leone, *Religious Movements in Contemporary America*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, pp. 651-6.

7. Published works that develop or utilize this perspective include, among others: McCarthy and Zald, op. cit.; Bromley and Shupe, op. cit.; Mayer N. Zald and Roberta Ash, 'Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decay and Change', *Social Forces*, vol. 44, March, pp. 327-40; and Mayer N. Zald and Michael A. Berger, 'Social Movements in Organizations: Coup d'Etat, Insurgency and Mass Movements', *Amer. J. Sociol.*, vol. 83, no. 4, pp. 823-61.

8. Joseph F. Zygmunt, 'Movements and Motives: Some Unresolved Issues in the Psychology of Social Movements', *Human Relations*, vol. 25, no. 5, November 1972, pp. 450-1.

9. For example, see Bromley and Shupe, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

10. Denton E. Morrison, 'Some Notes Toward Theory on Relative Deprivation, Social Movements, and Social Change', *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 14, no. 5, May-June 1971, pp. 675-90. McCarthy and Zald, op. cit., p. 1214, no. 4, refer to Morrison's article as 'an early attempt to move beyond a simple grievance model. [It] attempts to explain recruitment in social movement organizations rather than the attitudes of movement support of isolated individuals'. They do not, however, develop any of his ideas.

11. Morrison, op. cit., p. 676.

12. Bromley and Shupe, op. cit., p. 19.

13. McCarthy and Zald, op. cit., pp. 1217-18.

14. Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters*, vol. I, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1978, pp. 146-50.

15. Margaret James, 'The Political Importance of the Tithes Controversy in the English Revolution, 1640-60', *History*, vol. 26, June 1941, pp. 1-18; Christopher Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church*, 1956 (corrected), Oxford, Clarendon, 1968, ch. 5-6.

16. These various groups, including Quakerism, Fifth Monarchy Men, General Baptists, Seekers, Radical Independents, and remnants of the Levellers constituted what McCarthy and Zald, op. cit., p. 1219, would call the anti-tithe 'social movement industry', i.e., 'all social movement organizations that have as their goal the attainment of the broadest preferences of a social movement'.

17. Brian Manning, *The English People and the English Revolution 1640-1649*, London, Heinemann, 1976, pp. 291-2.

18. D. Underdown, *Pride's Purge. Politics in the English Revolution*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1971, pp. 271-2.

19. Antonia Fraser, *Cromwell: The Lord Protector*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1973, pp. 440-2, 446-7; Watts, op. cit., pp. 148-51.

20. Leo Solt, *Saints in Arms: Puritanism and Democracy in Cromwell's Army*, London, Oxford University Press, 1959, pp. 97-8.

21. Richard Hubberthorne, *A Word of Wisdom and Counsel to the Officers and Souldiers of the Army in England*, London, Thomas Simmons, 1659, n. pag., cited in Elizabeth Brockbank, *Richard Hubberthorne of Yealand*, London, Friends Book Store, 1929, p. 45. Hubberthorne fought under Cromwell's leadership at Dunbar, and he became a Quaker under George Fox's influence in 1652.

22. In relative deprivationist terms, the 'frequency', or 'the proportion of a group who feel' the deprivation was high. W. C. Runciman, *Relative Depriv-ation and Social Justice*, Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1966, p. 10; see Beckford, *The Triumph of Prophecy*, p. 155.

23. On the agrarian composition of the early Quakers, see Barry Reay, 'The Social Origins of Early Quakerism', *J. of Interdisciplinary History*, vol. 11, no. 1, Summer 1980, pp. 55-72.

24. Morrison, op. cit., p. 680. Runciman, op. cit., p. 10, defines 'magnitude' as 'the extent of difference between the desired situation and that of the person desiring it'. See also Beckford, *Triumph of Prophecy*, p. 153. Concerning aspirational deprivation, see also Ted Robert Gurr, *Why Men Rebel*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1970, pp. 50-6.

25. Morrison, op. cit., pp. 677-8, 682.

26. Ibid., p. 684.

27. James, op. cit., pp. 4-7.

28. Morrison, op. cit., p. 685.

29. Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*, 1962, rpt., New York, W. W. Norton, 1966, p. 164.

30. See Morrison, op. cit., p. 685.

31. Bruce Gordon Blackwood, 'Agrarian Unrest and the Early Lancashire Quakers', *Journal of the Friends Historical Society*, vol. 51, no. 1, 1965, pp. 72-6.

32. Barry Reay, 'Quaker Opposition to Tithes 1652-1660', *Past and Present*, no. 86, February 1980, pp. 98-120.

33. Ibid., p. 100. H. R. Trevor-Roper's quotation is from his *Religion, the Reformation and Social Change*, London, Macmillan, 1967, p. 443. Between Blackwood's and Reay's studies, sixty tithe resisters turned Quakers are mentioned, and many other tithe-resisters had surnames that appear in later Quaker records.

34. William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 2nd ed., 1919 repr., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1955, repr. 1961, pp. 60, 82. By 'the Quaker experience', I believe that Braithwaite means the belief in the immanent existence of God that was experienced through both silent worship and inspired preaching.

35. Rufus M. Jones, *Mysticism and Democracy in the English Commonwealth*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1932, p. 100.

36. Morrison, op. cit., p. 685.

37. McCarthy and Zald, op. cit., p. 1218.

38. Arnold Lloyd, *Quaker Social History*, Toronto, Longmans, Green & Co., 1950, pp. 1-2, 17-18, 24, 32; Rufus M. Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, London, Macmillan, 1909, pp. 462-7; Richard T. Vann, *The Social Development of English Quakerism 1655-1755*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1969, p. 24. The General Baptists also contributed to the membership, activities, and organizational structure of early Quakerism in much the same way as did the Seekers. See Vann, op. cit., pp. 25-7, 100; Robert Barclay of Reigate, *The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth*, 1876, 3rd ed., London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1879, ch. X; and William Tallack, *George Fox, the Friends, and the Early Baptists*, London, S. W. Partridge & Co., 1968, chs. III, IX. Later in this article, I discuss the conditions under which they converted to Quakerism.

39. Morrison, op. cit., p. 677.

40. Ibid., p. 684.

41. Lawrence Stone, 'Social Mobility in England, 1500-1700' in Paul S. Seaver, *Seventeenth Century England: Society in an Age of Revolution*, New York, New Viewpoints/Franklin Watts, 1976, pp. 26-70.

42. Robert Bellah, 'Religious Aspects of Modernization in Turkey and Japan', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 164, 1958, p. 1; quoted in Neil Smelser, *Theory of Collective Behavior*, 1962, rpt., New York, The Free Press, p. 320. Bellah's point, however, should not lead to the simplistic view that all of the Quakers' arguments against tithes were religiously motivated. Reay, 'Quaker Opposition . . .', p. 105, states that, 'As common as scriptural arguments was a wide range of economic and social objections to tithes and other exactions by ministers, grievances which reflected a deep hostility towards the social order and rabid anti-clericalism'.

43. George Fox, *The Line of Righteousness and Justice Stretched Forth Over All Merchants, etc.*, London, Robert Wilson, 1661, p. 8; abridged in Hugh Barbour and Arthur O. Roberts, *Early Quaker Writings 1650-1700*, Grand Rapids, Michigan, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1973, p. 43.

44. Hugh Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1964, pp. 133-5.

45. George Fox, *The Journal of George Fox*, John L. Nickalls (ed.), 1694, London, Religious Society of Friends, 1975, p. 36.

46. Barbour, op. cit., pp. 165-6.

47. A[nthony] P[earson], *The Great Case of Tythes Truly Stated, clearly opened, and fully resolved*, London, Giles Calvert, 1657, p. 3; see Anthony Pearson, *A Few Words to all Judges, Justices, and Ministers of the Law in England*, London, Giles Calvert, 1654, p. 7; George Fox, *A Message from the Lord, to the Parliament of England...*, London [n.p.], 1654, p. 6.

48. William Dewsbury, *A True Prophecy of the Mighty Day of the Lord...*, London, Giles Calvert, 1655, pp. 1, 5, abridged in Barbour and Roberts, op. cit., pp. 95, 97; Wyatt, op. cit., pp. 207-8; Bryan W. Ball, *A Great Expectation*, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1975, p. 209.

49. Owen C. Watkins, *The Puritan Experience*, New York, Schocken, pp. 169-70.

50. Amelia Mott Gummere, *The Quaker: A Study in Costume*, 1901 repr., New York, Benjamin Blom, Inc., 1968, p. 18.

51. Hill, *Century of Revolution*, p. 164.

52. Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971, p. 127. See Henry J. Cadbury, *George Fox's Book of Miracles*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1948.

53. Vann, op. cit., pp. 22-4; Watkins, op. cit., pp. 161-9.

54. *The Faith and Practise of Thirty Congregations...*, London, J. M., nos.

60 and 61; reprinted in William L. Lumpkin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, Philadelphia, Judson Press, 1959, p. 184; Watts, op. cit., pp. 146-9.

55. Watts, op. cit., pp. 205-7, 203.

56. Purposive incentives are ones that offer value fulfillment. See Zald and Ash, op. cit., p. 329. Membership in Quakerism also offered 'solidary incentives' of 'prestige, respect, [and] friendship', but, with the exceptions of poor relief to members and financial support to its evangelists, it did not offer 'material incentives (money and goods)'. To the contrary, membership in Quakerism usually brought on financial loss, both through contributions to the group and fines and confiscations over tithe payment refusal.

57. Morrison, op. cit., p. 686.

58. William Wayne Spurrier, *The Persecution of the Quakers in England: 1650-1714*, unpublished dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1976, p. 7.

59. '[W]hen the political structure of a society is smashed by war or other means, or fails to answer the needs of a people who wish to carry on the struggle, then a prophetic, often millenarian, leadership is likely to emerge.' Peter Worsley, *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of 'Cargo' Cults in Melanesia*, 2nd augmented ed., New York, Schocken, 1968, p. 230.

60. James Nayler, *A Lamentacion ... over the Ruines of this oppressed Nacion, to be deeply layd to heart by Parliament and Army...*, York, Tho[mas] Wayt, 1653, p. 3.

61. Ibid., p. 5.

62. Anonymous, *To the Generals, and Captains. Officers, and Souldiers of this present Army...*, London, [n.p.], 1658, p. 1.

63. Ibid., p. 5.

64. Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 400; Barry Reay, 'The Quakers, 1659, and the Restoration of the Monarchy', *History*, vol. 63, 1978, pp. 197-8.

65. Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 456-8.

66. Reay, 'The Quakers, 1659', pp. 197-8.

67. See David Aberle, 'A Note on Relative Deprivation Theory as Applied to Millenarian and Other Cult Movements', in Sylvia L. Thrupp, *Millennial Dreams in Action: Studies in Revolutionary Religious Movements*, New York, Schocken, 1970, p. 212.

68. Morrison, op. cit., p. 684; Aberle, op. cit., p. 213; Worsley, op. cit., pp. 225-6; Smelser, op. cit., pp. 23-46, 313-87.

69. See Smelser, op. cit., pp. 12-22.

70. McCarthy and Zald, op. cit., p. 1221.

71. Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 119 and nn.

72. Fox, *Journal*, pp. 136, 139-40.

73. Ibid., pp. 141-8.

74. Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 168.

75. Reay, 'Quaker Opposition', pp. 102-3.

76. Henry Lavor, *Replies made to the Antiqueries of Thomas Lye, who writes himself Minister of the Gospel at Chard ...*, London, Dan[iel] White, 1657.

77. Reay, 'Quaker Opposition', p. 113; Alan B. Anderson, 'A Study in the Sociology of Religious Persecution: The First Quakers', *J. of Religious History*, vol. 9, no. 3, June 1977, pp. 247-62.

78. McCarthy and Zald, op. cit., p. 1221.

79. Ibid.

80. Ibid., pp. 1221, 1218.

81. Quoted in Barry Reay, 'Popular Hostility Towards Quakers in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England', *Social History*, vol. 5, no. 3, October 1980, p. 401.

82. Reay, 'The Quakers, 1659', pp. 206-7; Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 171-2; D. Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649-1660*, 1960, rpt., Hamden, Conn., Archon Books, 1971, pp. 256-7.

83. Stephen A. Kent, 'The Papist Charges Against the Interregnum Quakers', *J. of Religious History*, Fall 1982.

84. See Barbour, op. cit., p. 53; Barbour and Roberts, op. cit., pp. 568-9; Joseph Smith, *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana; or A Catalogue of Books Adverse to the Society of Friends*, London, Joseph Smith, 1873.

85. Quoted in Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 181; Fraser, op. cit., pp. 572-3.

86. Reay, 'The Quakers, 1659...', op. cit., p. 198.

87. McCarthy and Zald, op. cit., p. 1214; Bromley and Shupe, op. cit., pp. 17-19.

88. McCarthy and Zald, op. cit., p. 1216.