

COMPARATIVE
SOCIAL RESEARCH

An Annual Publication

RELIGION AND BELIEF SYSTEMS

Editor: RICHARD F. TOMASSON
*Department of Sociology
The University of New Mexico*

VOLUME 10 • 1987



JAI PRESS INC.

Greenwich, Connecticut

London, England

PURITAN RADICALISM AND THE NEW RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS: SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND AND CONTEMPORARY AMERICA

Stephen A. Kent

INTRODUCTION

During the mid to late 1970s, the study of religious sectarianism expanded dramatically within the sociology of religion. No doubt this was true because the proliferation of sects, cults, and 'new' religions in Europe and North America provided sociologists of religion with an abundance of data with which to develop and refine theory. The value of theory, however, and indeed its true test, lies in its applicability to situations and groups beyond those which provided the data for its original constructions.

One era that is reminiscent of the contemporary period during and after the Vietnam war, and, therefore, one to which sectarian theories should apply, is the English civil war and Interregnum period of the 1640s and 1650s. These two decades, over three hundred years ago, were characterized by an explosion of religious sectarianism that is well documented in both primary and secondary sources. Many students of Puritanism¹ have recognized similarities between the two eras and occasionally have considered the ways in which their understanding of the past might be increased from sociological analyses of the present. An historian known for his studies

Comparative Social Research, Volume 10, pages 3-46.

Copyright © 1987 by JAI Press Inc.

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.

ISBN: 0-89232-737-5

of the Muggletonians and the Quakers, Barry Reay (1985, 1976; C. Hill, Reay, and Lamont, 1984), affirmed this new awareness by stating that "[s]ociological concern with sectarian activity provides the historian of seventeenth-century English Nonconformity with a potentially fresh awareness denied to most nineteenth-century historians and, unfortunately, still not utilized by many" (1976, p. 32). Likewise, a student of 'new' religious organizations in contemporary Western society could suggest that historians' concern with Interregnum sectarian activity provides sociologists of religion with an unusual opportunity to develop and apply theory to a carefully documented period of history. In this article, therefore, I shall identify the numerous comparisons that scholars and religious apologists have made between Interregnum sectarianism and the sectarian outbreak during and around the 1970s, and then provide a conceptual base for these and other comparisons by interpreting the proliferation of the religious groups and their opponents in both periods through an expanded version of relative deprivation theory.

While many of Reay's colleagues have yet to apply sociological theories and concepts from modern sectarian studies to further their own work, some at least are suggesting parallels between groups in the two periods. Others are being stimulated to study problems in seventeenth-century religious history as the result of witnessing contemporary events. Perhaps the most frequently compared groups are the Ranters of the 1650s (Morton, 1970; N. Smith, 1983) and the hippies of the modern period. Christopher Hill, for example, in his monumental study of John Milton, drew a comparison between them regarding drug use. He pointed out that "[i]n the [English] revolutionary decades [of the 1640s and 1650s] smoking was still rather a naughty habit: for Ranters and others it was a means of heightening consciousness akin to drug-taking in our own society" (1977, p. 98; see also C. Hill, 1972b, p. 160; Yinger, 1982, p. 116). Similarly, Norman Cohn discusses the ecstasy and the terror that Ranters experienced in their mystical visions, and then suggested that "[i]n our own time similar experiences have been induced in some subjects by psychedelic drugs" (Cohn, 1970b, p. 21; see also Cohn, 1970a, p. 286). Cohn and others also have compared the Ranters with various modern examples of deviance or criminality, including Charles Manson's 'Family' (Cohn, 1970b, p. 25; Nielson, 1984, pp. 331-334), free love (Cohn, 1970a, p. 151), Abbie Hoffman's advocacy of 'ripping off [i.e., stealing from] the system' (Yinger, 1982, p. 116; see Cohn, 1970a, p. 301), hippie-like lifestyle (Ellens, 1971, pp. 106-107), and vulgarity among the Yippies (Ellens, 1971, p. 97). One author goes so far as to say, with good reason, that "Escapism, subjectivism, introversion—these are the marks of the Hippies as of the Ranters. Both groups seek an escape from harsher concepts of reality" (Ellens, 1971, p. 107).

Equally thought-provoking are the presumed similarities between social dissenters in the mid-seventeenth century and those in contemporary times. Given Christopher Hill's Marxist orientation (Hobsbawm, 1978, pp. 21, 28, 34, 36), it is not surprising that he has spoken about them. After suggesting that the 1650s radicals may have helped "to bridge that gap between the waning of magical beliefs and the rise of modern technology" through their attempts to offer economic solutions to society's problems, Hill further asserts that, "[e]ven more important, perhaps, for our generation, were the glimpses of a possible society which would transcend the property system, of a counter-culture which would reject the protestant ethic altogether" (C. Hill, 1972b, pp. 309-310). His statements about "transcending the property system" and rejecting the protestant ethic allude to the Diggers, although the latter comment might better be applied to the Ranters (J. C. Davis, 1980, pp. 76-93).² Hill continues in the same vein, apparently with the Diggers still in mind:

The technological possibilities may now exist even for a community in which the creation of unemployment need not be regarded as a principal task of government, and in which 'the beauty of the commonwealth' could take precedence over private profit, national power or even the G.N.P. My object is not to patronize the radicals by putting them on the head as 'in advance of their time'—that tired cliché of the lazy historian. In some ways they are in advance of ours. But their insights, their poetic insights, are what seem to me to make them worth studying to-day (C. Hill, 1972b, pp. 309-310).

Likewise, another historian of the mid-seventeenth century equates the Diggers' seizure of commons land in 1649 with "sit-ins and People's Parks" (Kim, 1974, p. 460), as does the respected American sociologist and social historian, E. Digby Baltzell (1979, p. 83, see pp. 79-83). In a similar vein, a commentator on Bob Dylan located the bard's "pastoral vision" within a tradition that included the Diggers and Levellers (Campbell, 1975, p. 698). Not surprisingly, a San Francisco commune in the 1960s that dedicated itself to providing food and shelter for other hippies adopted the name, "Diggers" (Perry, 1984, p. 82), as did its Toronto offshoot (Westhues, 1975, p. 397).

The social unrest of the past two decades serves as a basis for identifying similar reactions between seventeenth century and contemporary radicals. The best known example of this comparative identification appears in Baltzell's attempt to equate the decline of the American New Left with the demise of mid-seventeenth-century Puritanism (Baltzell, 1972). Less well known, but equally intriguing, is Hugh Trevor-Roper's (1973) comparison between Parliament's struggles with Charles I and the constitutional crisis over Richard Nixon's involvement in the Watergate affair. From a different angle, the Levellers, who were politically active in the late 1640s and early 1650s, served as the inspiration for the title of a London socialist magazine

that was published intermittently during the late 1970s and early 1980s (*Leveller Collective*, 1978–1980).³ Likewise, the popular British historical author, Antonia Fraser, sees parallels between the reactions of contemporary MPs to the Greenham Common women and the reactions of mid-seventeenth-century MPs to Leveller and Digger women.⁴ So too did the anonymous author of a front page article in the 17 February 1985 issue of the *Manchester Guardian Weekly* (1985).⁵

Another researcher, who characterized the early 1970s as an “‘age of anxiety,’ . . . of political crisis and radical restructuring of social values,” mentioned an early Quaker form of prophecy, which involved either walking or running naked through the streets. He claimed that this behavior was indicative of “the antinomian personality” which appears in “recurrent times of crisis and change” such as his own era (Adler, 1974, p. 283). The Quakers’ behavior, along with their prophesying in sackcloth and ashes in the spirit of the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible prophets, has received extensive analysis by the Quaker historian, Kenneth L. Carroll, whose interest in the phenomenon was spurred by protests about which he read in 1970. One of these protests was by a Christian commune, probably the Children of God, whose sackcloth-garbed members picketed a political appearance by Richard Nixon, who, ironically, is a ‘birthright’ Quaker (Carroll, 1977, p. 84, n. 65).⁶ The respected scholar on sects, Bryan Wilson, also drew similarities between the early Quakers and the Children of God regarding their millennialist beliefs (Wilson, 1981, p. 222, see p. 221).⁷

Just as the social tumult of the early 1970s brought to mind the millennialist and politically uncertain climate in which the early Quakers first appeared, so too has the religious tumult of the later 1970s (and even the early 1980s) brought to mind the persecution that the early Quakers suffered at the hands of their opponents. In both periods, new religions and their opposition groups engaged in acrimonious and occasionally violent struggles, and in the process produced an enormous number of books, tracts, and other polemical literature. When contemporary scholars and polemicists wish to place the recent “climate of fear” about the new religious groups in a historical perspective, they use mid-seventeenth-century Quakerism as a comparative reference. Examples of persecution against early Quakerism for its reputed “subversion,” antinomianism, and social disruption contrast dramatically with modern Quakerism’s social respectability, and the new religions attempt to acquire legitimacy themselves by drawing analogies between current “anti-cult” campaigns and the mid-seventeenth-century anti-Quaker attacks. For example, in an article distributed to the public by the Unification Church (i.e., the Moonies) in Toronto, Frank K. Flinn summarizes the talks that were presented about deprogramming at a 4 February 1977 meeting held in New York City under the auspices of the

American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). The article says that the chairperson of the ACLU, Aryeh Neier, told the assembly that “‘This is not the first time that different religions have competed for the loyalty of the young.’ Mr. Neier went on to note that Quakers, Levellers, and Puritans were considered ‘insane’ in their own time” (Flinn, n.d., p. 1).⁸ Similarly, a Unification Church spokesperson, Joy Garratt, dismisses charges that former ‘cult’ members often require counseling for psychological problems by scoffing, “‘This is part of the antireligious movement. This is the same stuff they uttered against Catholics, Jews, and Quakers” (quoted in Kelly, 1985, p. 7).⁹

Harvey Cox, in his introduction to the book *Strange Gods* uses Quaker examples to further his argument about the injustice of the current “persecution” of the new religions, sects, and cults. He asserts that “America has not set an exemplary record in the area of religious freedom,” and as an early example of intolerance he cites the hangings of four Quakers on Boston Common between 1659 and 1661 (Cox, 1981, pp. xi, xii, xiii). He even refers to the early Quaker martyr, Mary Dyer, as being “among our first ‘cultists’” (1981, p. xiii). David Bromley and Anson Shupe, in the text of the book in which Cox’s introduction appears, expand Cox’s apology by insisting that various persecuted religious groups, including the Quakers, suffered only because of “other’s fears that they would have some detrimental effect on American society” (1981, p. 7). An article on the new religions in the Toronto-based *Globe and Mail* mentions another Boston Quaker, Edward Wharton, whom a Puritan magistrate sent off to jail in March, 1661 because:

his hair [was] too long and he act[ed] strangely. Mr. Wharton [was] one of the lucky ones to reach the safety of a prison cell. His crime [was] that he [was] a member of the upstart Quaker church at a time when Quakers [were] being hanged, flogged, sold into bondage, [and] having holes burned through their tongues with hot irons (Lancashire, 1978, p. 10).¹⁰

Following this story is an account of a young man who was “snatched” from of a New York street by “right-thinking Christians” who abducted him to Kentville, Nova Scotia and spent twenty-eight days trying to forcibly “rehabilitate” him (Lancashire, 1978, p. 10). The *Globe and Mail* article even has a four column illustration of two Quaker men who are tied to a horse-cart and being led through the streets as Puritans whip them.

Similar examples of early Quaker persecution are again mentioned in the 1980 report that was commissioned by the Ontario government on sects, cults, and mind development groups. “In 17th-century New England,” the report states, “Quakers were hanged, flogged, deported, maimed, and sold into bondage by Puritans” (D. Hill, 1980, p. 50, see p. 529).¹¹ A recent

study of collective behavior and persecutions mentions that "[s]eveneenth-century England produced such religious groups as the Quakers, the Diggers, and the Ranters, and each of these was subjected to savage repression at the hands of outraged mobs" (Rose, 1982, p. 141). Along the same lines, Barry Reay points out that "Friends [Quakers] could be extremely disruptive, splitting families (modern sects are hated for similar reasons) and upsetting the local community. Indeed, sectarian loyalties superseded familial ties" (1980a, p. 396, n. 50).¹² Finally, a recent article on new religions in Britain insists that Quakers (along with several other religious groups) "are now regarded as proper, respectable and respected religious bodies, but in their early history they were greeted with a horror and widespread opposition similar to that which greets the present wave of new religious movements" (Barker, 1983, p. 34).

Disparate as these quotations are, they nonetheless give substance to Christopher Hill's insight that "[h]istory has to be rewritten in every generation, because . . . each generation asks new questions of the past, and finds new areas of sympathy as it re-lives different aspects of the experiences of its predecessors" (1972b, p. 13). Indeed, the apologetical use of particular Civil War and Interregnum sects to bolster the position of the new religions, sects, and cults frequently mention issues involving "religious persecution,"¹³ and the scholarly interpretations that were made in the early 1970s stressed both periods' antinomian elements.

None of the writers, however, who have made comparisons between contemporary religious events and mid-seventeenth-century English history have offered analyses of *why* the comparisons ring true. A major claim of this article is that religious sects flourished in both periods because of the profound political frustration and resentment that people felt toward political leaders whom they believed had betrayed them. Individuals and groups in both periods had political expectations that they felt were legitimate and realistic but which were not being implemented by their political leaders whom they had trusted to do so. In sociological terms, persons and groups in both periods felt "deprived" relative to their political and social aspirations, and they suffered 'crises of feasibility' regarding the failure of their political leaders to implement the desired changes.

Certainly the *causes* of resentment and felt deprivation were substantially different in the two periods, with, for example, the hippies wanting to see a war concluded and the Interregnum radicals wanting to see the social and political fruits of a war extended. Nevertheless, the crises of feasibility caused by the felt deprivation and resentment in both eras took religiously millenarian forms, so that the religious ideologies of both periods contained poignant social and political criticism. This criticism, in turn, elicited harsh reactions from persons and groups in both eras who either feared for their

own well-being if the sects were to achieve their demands, or experienced actual loss of some kind that they blamed on the sects themselves. I propose, therefore, that not only can contemporary theories on sects, cults, and new religions help us conceptualize the movements of the 1650s, but also analyses of the Interregnum sects and their opponents can help refine sociological theories that have broad applicability for the study of contemporary religious movements.

By utilizing the concept of relative deprivation in the interpretation of sectarianism in both the Interregnum and the early to mid-1970s, social scientists and historians can draw upon a large and established body of research in the areas of sociology, social psychology, and social movement theory (J. A. Davis, 1959; Smelser, 1962, pp. 13, 15ff., 54-59, ch. 3; Runciman, 1966; Merton, 1968; Merton and Rossi, 1968; Aberle, 1970; Gurr, 1970, pp. 22-122, 319-327, etc.; Morrison, 1971; Crosby, 1976; Kent, 1982b). Twenty years ago the social historian and demographer, Peter Laslett, realized this, but his suggestions for comparative research never have been pursued. Based upon his appreciation of W. G. Runciman's book, *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice*, Laslett wondered:

about those occasions on which change of reference group did come about in seventeenth century English society. It could be argued, for example, that the disturbances caused by the English Civil War and especially those connected with the recruitment and activities of the parliamentary army, did bring humble people into contact for the first time with those who were better off and had a more aspiring outlook . . . [T]he very fact of bringing them together might be expected to have some crystallizing effect on the attitudes to their social position and political rights.

If for example the literature of the Levellers of Cromwell's army and of the city of London could be shown to have arisen to any extent from such circumstances as these, [then] it would provide a fascinating parallel with events in our own country (1971, p. 184).

When Laslett made these comments about the two periods, he probably had in mind parallels between perceptions of social inequality rather than of new religious appearances. Nevertheless, the parallels hold true for a comparative study of sectarian outbursts especially *because* of the political and social frustrations that people felt in both periods toward persons in power.

PARLIAMENTARY VICTORY AND RADICAL EXPECTATIONS IN THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR

As Laslett suggested, many of the 'common people' who swelled the ranks of the parliamentary army or supported it with contributions of money and supplies felt deprived of their desired political and religious reforms during and immediately after the civil war. To the extent that these people believed

the civil war to have been a struggle against monarchical political oppression and 'popish' religious influence, they expected that the defeat of the King naturally would lead to an alleviation of various social and economic conditions which they considered to be oppressive (see Woodhouse, 1938, pp. 74, 349-350, 365, 438; Haller and Davies, 1944, pp. 137, 138, 157, 423). Particularly odious to many persons was the politically sanctioned tithe system, whereby persons had to pay roughly a tenth of their earnings, farm production, tillage, or (as in London) rent-charge to either the local minister or the lay proprietor who owned land that formerly had been part of the tithe system of the Catholic Church. Tithes accentuated the social and class differences between those who paid them and those who received them, at the same time that it preserved a religious system whose ministers' teachings often differed from the beliefs of the local parishoners. In short, the debate over tithe-abolition was inextricably bound to political, class, and religious issues that were fundamental to mid-seventeenth-century English society (James, 1941; C. Hill, 1956, pp. 77-167).

Related to the issue of tithe-abolition was the question of political participation, since tithes were maintained by a parliamentary system in which the right to vote for representatives was tied to the ownership of land or wealth. The franchise was restricted to men (women were excluded) twenty-one years-old and above who either owned freehold land valued at forty shillings a year or were freemen of trading corporations. Of course, participation in the parliamentary army was not restricted by property or wealth requirements, so many poorer men found themselves risking their lives to defend a political system into which only their wealthier commanders had direct say (Woodhouse, 1938, pp. 1-124; Macpherson, 1962, pp. 107-159; Thomas, 1972).

The protest group that became the voice of the common soldiers' political and religious aspirations was the Leveller party (Aylmer, 1975; Gardiner, 1903a, pp. 29-54; Watts, 1978, pp. 117-129; Gimelfarb-Brack, 1979; Seaberg, 1981; Mulligan, 1982; Manning, 1984). Throughout the mid to late 1640s, the Levellers produced a stream of pamphlets and books that put forward radical demands for political, social, economic, and religious reform. They called for the elimination of mandatory tithe payments and an extension of religious toleration to all Protestants, abolition of government sponsored monopolies, extension of the franchise, election of annual parliamentarians, and indemnity for parliamentary soldiers. Many of these issues affected men and women alike, and women frequently lent their active support to Leveller or other radical causes.

Concomitant with the growing likelihood of a parliamentary victory was an increase in the radicals' expectations that their demands would be translated into public policy by the victors. Indeed, as the country's most

powerful political figures debated the reformulation of English government in the aftermath of their civil war victory, the Levellers' demands appeared close to becoming adopted as the structural basis for new governmental reorganization. More conservative political forces, however, prevailed, and in bitter frustration over the Levellers' declining fortunes some fourteen hundred soldiers unsuccessfully mutinied in April 1649. Their crushing defeat at the hands of Thomas Fairfax's and Oliver Cromwell's forces marked the irreparable demise of the Leveller party, although many of their ideas resurfaced in the religious ideologies of the sects that appeared around that same period.

The suppression of the mutiny smothered hopes that either the country's victorious political figures would implement the radicals' social, political, and religious changes, or that the Levellers could intimidate the government into doing so through a show of force. Radicals, therefore, found themselves holding expectations for changes that no longer had feasible means, through either political channels or mutinous rebellion, of being realized. The resultant feeling of profound frustration among the radicals was aptly captured in a pamphlet that was penned by six Burford mutineers, who themselves had been appointed to write for the soldiers of three regiments:

[T]he whole fabric of the Commonwealth has fallen into the grossest and vilest tyranny that ever Englishmen groaned under; all their laws, rights, lives, liberties and properties wholly subdued . . . to the boundless wills of some deceitful persons, having devolved the whole magistracy of England into their martial domination, ruling the people with a rod of iron, as most men's woeful experience can clearly witness (Wood and others, 1649, rpt. in Morton, 1975, p. 298).¹⁴

In sociological language, they experienced a classic imbalance between the aspirations to which they felt entitled and the reality of achieving them—their expectations dramatically exceeded their opportunities (Morrison, 1971, p. 680; Gurr, 1970, pp. 50-52; Runciman, 1966, pp. 25-26).

Diggers, Ranters, and Quakers

The Diggers, Ranters, and Quakers emerged at the very time that the Levellers were declining, and the appearance of these groups should be interpreted in light of the Levellers' failure to achieve their radical goals. They attracted adherents from the same social ranks as did the Levellers, and in some cases received former Leveller supporters into their fold.¹⁵ While differing amongst themselves in their emphases on particular radical programs, all three groups shared basic reformist hopes about tithe aboli-

tion and bitter opposition to the ministers who received them. Moreover, they called for greater poor relief, extension of religious toleration, and significant governmental reforms (C. Hill, 1972b). In an early Digger tract, for example, its author, Gerrard Winstanley, blasted parliament for not having fulfilled its promises and obligations to free the land from oppression, which for him meant especially the alleviation of poverty among the landless of the countryside. Winstanley charged that Parliament had said, "Give us your taxes, free quarter [of soldiers], excise [tax], and adventure your lives with us to cast out the oppressor Charles [I] and we will make you a free people" (Winstanley, 1649, rpt. in Sabine, 1941, p. 347). In the minds of the landless poor, this promise meant that they were to have tillage access to the commons and waste ground, but now, after the parliamentary victory, such access had not come to pass. Parliament, in short, had reneged upon its promise to the poor, or so Winstanley claimed.

The Ranters were even more hostile toward parliament than were the Diggers, even though their political attitudes were less firmly shaped than those developed by Winstanley. Primarily known for their antinomian religious stands, they nonetheless bitterly denounced tithing, tithed ministers, and the wealthy whom they felt controlled the government. For example, on the various financial burdens that Parliament had not lifted from the people after the conclusion of the civil war, the Ranter, Abiezer Coppe, wailed: "Oh, my back, my shoulders. Oh tithes, excise, taxes, pollings, etc. Oh Lord! Oh Lord God Almighty! . . . [Why] have I engaged my goods, my life, etc., and forsook my dearest relations, and all for liberty and true freedom—for freedom from oppression—and [then had] more laid on my back . . ." (Coppe, 1649, rpt. in N. Smith, 1983, p. 93).¹⁶ Furthermore, Coppe decried the loss of several soldiers' lives as the result of the 1649 Leveller mutinies. He insisted that these soldiers were "most barbarously, unnaturally, hellishly murdered [by the parliamentary army commanders]; and they died Martyrs for God and their country." Coppe further charged the country's leaders with having deceived the nation, since radicals now were able to see that "these Levellers (so-called) you mostly hated, though in outward declarations you owned their Tenants as your own principle" (Coppe, 1649, rpt. in N. Smith, 1983, pp. 93–94). As these passages suggest, frustration and resentment over the leaders' failure to institute the Levellers' reforms infused segments of Ranter writings with a contemptuousness that is unrivaled in the protest literature of the early Interregnum.

Like Diggers and Ranters, the Quakers also held governmental officials accountable for not having met the promises for reforms that they had made during the civil war. They felt that politicians and military leaders in the 1650s had betrayed the principles for which common soldiers had fought, and particularly odious for them was parliament's refusal to abolish tithes.

Tithe-opposition became, therefore, the central political cause in which the group engaged throughout the 1650s (Reay, 1980b; Blackwood, 1965; Kent, 1982b), and one of the group's prominent members, Anthony Pearson, published the most comprehensive and critical attack on tithes that had appeared for decades (Pearson, 1657). In 1659, therefore, when it appeared that a new government was giving serious considerations to tithe abolition, the Quakers organized and presented to Parliament the names of approximately 15,000 men and 7,000 women who called for the cessation of their payment, and many of the signatories were not Quakers themselves (Braithwaite, 1955, p. 458).¹⁷

Radical Millenarianism

In sum, the radical religious sects of the 1650s felt politically and socially deprived of fundamental reforms that they believed parliamentary leaders had promised the nation during appeals for support amidst the English Civil War. After petitions and pamphleteering failed to secure the reforms, suppression of the Leveller mutinies made it clear that Parliament could not even be forced to implement its presumed promises. In reaction to this crisis of feasibility, many frustrated and despairing radicals developed millenarian expectations that posited their reforms as part of a new divine order. Thus, all of the new religious groups of the 1650s expected to see the radical policies realized in the very near future, not through men's and women's efforts but instead through Christ's second coming. Even if the political figures could not be convinced (or forced) to fulfill their promises for significant social, political, and religious reform, Christ himself, they believed, would institute these godly policies during his imminent reign on earth. More than this, however, Christ also would punish the ungodly for their denial of justice to the oppressed, or so the sectarians believed. All one need do was purify oneself in order to ensure a place among those whom Christ would save (Kent, 1983a, pp. 20–27; 1983b, pp. 314–316).

Certainly, general millenarian expectations had strong currents in English religious and political thinking prior to the Interregnum, and the Puritan ascendance to power, along with the beheading of a 'popish' English king, gave salience to the notion that the then-living generation was witnessing the last days as described in the Book of Revelations (Christianson, 1978; Firth, 1979; C. Hill, 1971; Lamont, 1969, 1979). The frustrated radicals, however, infused this tradition with millennialist prophecies whose content predicted the success of their political and social dreams through the apocalyptic workings of God's hand. So certain were they in the righteousness of their cause, and so deeply committed and invested were they in seeing the achievement of their goals, that many radicals were

ence to attack and impede the sectarians through every available avenue of social control. In dynamic interaction, therefore, with radical members of society who felt frustration and anger over blocked aspirations, conservative religious and political figures felt decremental deprivation over changes that they feared would befall them in the future if the radicals were to gain power.¹⁸

"Reader, I do verily believe that if these wicked men [i.e., Quakers] had power in their hands, there would be no toleration of any true minister of Jesus Christ in England, and one of the first things they would endeavor would be, if not to raise a tempest of persecution by raining blood, yet at least to raise and extirpate the sacred callings . . . of the ministry." So warned the tithed Puritan minister, Francis Higginson, in 1653, in what was the first major anti-Quaker book to be published (Higginson, 1653, rpt. in Barbour and Roberts, 1973, p. 76, see p. 64). Quickly the number grew, however, and by 1660 one hundred and fifty authors had denounced Quakerism in print. As the Quakers themselves were aware, a substantial number of these denunciations were penned by the clergy, and ministers remained consistent opponents of Quakerism and other radical sectarian movements throughout the Interregnum period (Barbour, 1964, p. 77; Kent, 1982a, p. 188; Nuttall, 1983). The Diggers, too, suffered the wrath of the ministers, and eventually the main colony was destroyed by the persistent legal harassments, physical brutalities, and destruction of crops and property perpetrated under the direction of a local rector and lord of the manor at Cobham, John Platt (see C. Hill, 1972b, p. 91; Winstanley, 1649, in Sabine, 1941, p. 346). As one might expect, ministers also led the printed attacks against the Ranters, with at least four clergymen publishing prominent accounts and denunciations of either Ranterism or similar antinomian ideas.¹⁹

Additional opposition to the sects came from the gentry, some of whom also were prominent political or parliamentary personalities. For example, fifteen Digger men, including Winstanley, were arrested for trespassing in 1649, the charges having been laid by a lord of the manor and Member of Parliament, Francis Drake (Petegorsky, 1940, p. 171; Sabine, 1941, pp. 316, 319, n. 5). On 9 August 1650, parliament passed an act for the "Punishment of Atheistical, Blasphemous and Execrable Opinions" specifically against the Ranters. Wording in the act reveals the parliamentarians' fear of social upheaval in addition to their abhorrence of the Ranters' theological ideas. Ranterism, they shuddered, fostered not only "the notorious corruption and disordering" among its followers, but also "the dissolution of all human society, [because Ranters] deny the necessity of civil and moral righteousness among men" (excerpted in Cohn, 1970a, p.

unable to accept defeat at the hands of rulers whom at one time had been their sources of hope. Put succinctly, radicals were driven into millennialist longings by political failure and collective despair. The effect, in turn, that this uniquely colored millenarianism had on the stalled radical movement was profound. By sanctifying their aspirations through millenarian doctrines which held that God would initiate whatever just reforms the rulers, in their folly, prohibited, the radicals invigorated their movement and gave their convictions an air of certain success.

Despite, for example, acrid language against political and military leaders that occasionally verged on the incendiary, Digger, Quaker, and Ranter tracts ultimately conveyed a message of apocalyptic passivity to their more careful readers. Conjointly, this passivity was flavored with the insistence that the respective groups' adherents were God's chosen saints who already were experiencing an inward purification and salvation that prefigured the worldwide transformation that was about to occur. Thus, Winstanley admonished his followers, "whatsoever your condition is, murmur not at it, but wait, [because] he that is come to others will come to you . . . His power and name is love, and he will conquer all by love and patience . . ." (Winstanley, 1650, rpt. in Sabine, 1941, p. 448). The Quaker leader, George Fox, advised his followers in 1652 to "wait upon God in that which is pure . . . and stand still in it every one, to see your saviour, and to make you free from that which the light [of God] doth discover to you to be evil. For the voice of the bridegroom [i.e., Christ] is heard in our land . . ." (rpt. in Fox vol. 7, 1831a, p. 24). And Joseph Salmon, a former parliamentary soldier who was drifting into Ranterism in 1649, combined both political condemnation with millenarian expectations when he wrote, first, "that the Lord is in you and amongst you," then concluded by pronouncing that, "The Lord was, when you were lowest; he is, now that you are highest, and he is to come, when you shall be nothing. *Even so, Come Lord Jesus, Come Quickly*" (Salmon, 1649, rpt. in N. Smith, 1983, pp. 199, 200).

The Anti-Radical Movement: Social Privilege and Fear of Loss

Sectarian ideology in the 1650s challenged the religious order, the class structure based upon land ownership and wealth, and the political structure through which both the established social privilege was protected and the contentious tithe system was maintained. Not surprisingly, therefore, opponents of the sects usually were those persons who would have lost the most had the sectarians been successful in achieving their reforms. Ministers, politicians, and upper-class gentry mobilized their considerable social influ-

295; see also Levy, 1981, p. 231). The 15 February 1655 proclamation on religious liberty, which S. R. Gardiner called "the charter of religious freedom under the Protectorate," specifically identified "Quakers, Ranters, and others" as "disturbers of the civil peace," especially regarding their hostility towards ministers and judges, and added that the government "shall expect and do require all officers and ministers of justice to proceed against them accordingly" (Gardiner, 1903b, pp. 260–261; Braithwaite, 1955, pp. 180–181). Many local officials and clergy were only too happy to comply, hauling off to court as many disruptive Quakers as they could.

Finding themselves before magistrates, however, the Quakers stubbornly disregarded both accepted social decorum and presumed legal authority. Among the most infuriating customs they maintained was their habit of deliberately keeping their hats on while appearing before judges and justices of the peace. A modern historian of early Quakerism explains this behavior as an attack against "lordship and social inequality but, above all, pride" (Barbour, 1964, p. 165), yet it was the first two of these three reasons that indignant magistrates perceived.²⁰

Parliament itself took dramatic political action against the Quaker, James Nayler, for his imitation of Jesus's triumphant ride into Jerusalem. After Nayler modeled his entry into Bristol on this biblical tale (riding a donkey and proceeded by adulating admirers), he was arrested and eventually brought before the MPs. Outraged at his reputed blasphemy while availing themselves of the opportunity to show their scorn for a generous policy on religious toleration, conservative parliamentary members kept the debate going about his punishment for over ten days. After defeating a motion to punish him with death, they voted to combine his imprisonment with two public whippings and the infliction of a hole to be burned through his tongue. The sentence was carried out, and somehow Nayler survived it (Braithwaite, 1955, pp. 241–278; Bittle, 1984; Levy, 1981, pp. 258–296).

As these examples suggest, opponents of the sects had different motives for attacking them. On the one hand, traditional Christians abhorred the sectarians' reputed religious heresy, and ministers feared the probable loss of their occupations if the sectarian platform of tithe abolition were to have been adopted. On the other hand, politicians and the upper gentry particularly dreaded the social upheaval, if not revolution, that they felt would result from the sectarians' religious and social programs, and their anxiety was shared by many of 'the common people.'

Even when these two orientations appeared in the same antisectionarian tracts, the authors themselves frequently put forward different interpretations as to why the sectarian members acted in the manner that they did. A few authors intuited that the rise of the sects somehow was related to the

social and political disruption of the times, but none of them developed their intuition into a systematic explanation. For example, the famous Puritan, Richard Baxter, admitted to the Separatists and Anabaptists that "I am not of their mind who make light of the strange providences in our military affairs and changes of state, though I think every carnal admirer of them does not understand them. . . ." The word of God, however, was clear, so it was lamentable "that many of those same men who seem so much to magnify these [military and political affairs] do no more observe, understand, and lay to heart the more remarkable providence of our spiritual judgements. . . ." as revealed in scripture. Apparently he had in mind with his lament such groups as the Seekers, Ranters, Familists, and Quakers, since he followed this section with an attack on these "professed infidels" (Baxter, 1655, rpt. in Barbour and Roberts, 1973, pp. 265–266). Another anti-Quaker writer, Francis Higginson, bemoaned the existence of "many evil men and blasphemous heretical seducers through the nation, [who make] many honest Christians now look upon the present times as ill-boding times. . . ." "[A] few years ago," however, these same persons "were raised in their expectations to see better days than any ever produced since the time that our Savior Christ and his apostles were living on the earth" (Higginson, 1653, rpt. in Barbour and Roberts, 1973, p. 65). Unfortunately, neither these nor other authors clarified the connection between social and political expectations and the rise of the sects, as all of them quickly launched into specific attacks and defenses.

A more developed interpretation put forward to explain the appearance of the sects was that their members were the agents of antichrist who were doing the work of Satan. For example, the Puritan lawyer and pamphleteer, William Prynne, attributed the Quakers' enthusiastic spasms and fits to demonic possession, and Baxter warned that ". . . the Quakers' faith is hatched by the Prince of Darkness" (Prynne, 1655, p. 11; see Baxter, 1656, p. C.3; Reay, 1980a, pp. 396–400; Gummere, 1908). Antagonists who saw social upheaval lurking within sectarian ideology claimed that the sects were agents of an insidious foreign power that many English believed was bent on destroying the English state—the Roman Catholic Church under the Pope's direct command. As the Puritan minister, Joshua Miller, alleged, "Seeing [that the Quakers] are against all ministers as antichristian, the Pope laughs in his sleeve. . . , for he hath told them so. . ." (1655, p. 30; see Kent, 1982a, p. 185; Bitterman, 1973, pp. 207–209).²¹ Interpretations varied as to whether all sectarians were disguised Catholics (usually thought to be Jesuits) or only their leaders were (see Kent, 1982a), but in either case various sectarian movements were seen to be subverting the very foundations of English society. "Given the Catholic fear and paranoia of the time, many

Puritans were unable to view the bitter attacks by their [sectarian] adversaries as part of a struggle within the Protestant faith" (Kent, 1982a, p. 189).

Conclusion: Puritan Radicalism and Its Opponents

In sum, the appearance of sectarian religions during the Interregnum period illustrates how a collectively held sense of frustration in relation to unfulfilled societal reforms can generate millenarian religious movements. Radicals developed millennialist hopes of a returning Jesus who would initiate a social revolution from which they would emerge as the beneficiaries at the expense of their current opponents. These hopes were coupled with claims of personal inner purity that sectarians believed were the accompaniments if not the heralds of the dawning of Christ's kingly reign. Likewise, the appearance of oppositional groups to the sects illustrates the manner in which a collectively held sense of possible diminishment in social, political, or material conditions stimulates attempts among threatened parties to maintain their dominance in a particular social realm. Because the sectarians' proposed reforms only could have been achieved at the expense of persons benefiting from entrenched social privileges, groups that felt themselves threatened by the possibility of sectarian success strove to ensure that the sects' reformist demands would fail. Therefore, just as the sectarians felt deprived regarding their aspirations for reform, so too did their opponents feel detrimentally deprived regarding their social positions and livelihoods when they imagined the sectarians gaining power.

An analogous set of social dynamics occurred during the 1970s, during which time politically frustrated North American youth flocked to millennialist sectarian groups—groups that in turn generated oppositional movements soon after their inception. Similar to their seventeenth-century counterparts, contemporary sects fostered millennialist ideologies that portended not only massive social and political transformation on a macrocosmic, societal level, but also important 'consciousness alterations' on a microcosmic level. Broadly speaking, therefore, the sect/antisectional/cult/anticultural movements of the 1650s and the 1970s paralleled one another, and it is to an analysis of the recent era that we now turn.

RELIGIOUS SECTARIANISM IN THE AMERICAN 1970s

Just as the Interregnum sects must be located within a radical ideological climate of frustrated hopes that had been raised by the parliamentary victory in the English Civil War, so too must the recent sects of the 1970s be situated in the radical climate of frustrating political efforts to end the

Vietnam War. Admittedly the 1960s were rocked with protests over a wide range of issues, many of which were not directly related to America's involvement in Indochina. But by the close of the 1960s, two of the most dramatic protest movements—civil rights and campus reform—found themselves immersed in issues involving the controversial war. As an angry Students for Democratic Society (SDS) pamphlet alleged in 1969:

The war goes on, despite the jive double-talk about troop withdrawals and peace talks. Black people continue to be murdered by agents of fat cats who run this country . . . by the pigs or the courts, by the boss or the welfare department. Working people face higher taxes, inflation, speed-ups, and the sure knowledge—if it hasn't happened already—that their sons may be shipped off to Vietnam and shipped home in a box. And young people all over the country go to prisons that are called schools, are trained for jobs that don't exist or serve no one's real interest but the boss's, and, to top it all off, get told that Vietnam is the place to defend their "freedom" (SDS, 1969, rpt. in Albert and Albert, 1984, pp. 247–248).

As this passage indicates, radicals in the late 1960s saw a host of issues—the Vietnam War, racism, welfare, taxes, and education—as being intimately connected, even if the exact nature of the connection remained within elusive conspiracy and control theories about 'the bosses' and 'fat cats.' Given, however, the extensiveness of the perceived problems of American society, nothing short of a massive restructuring of society and a complete reordering of national values—a revolution—would correct the nation's ills. As the Columbia [University] Strike Coordinating Committee insisted, "Our attack upon the university is really an attack upon this society and its effects upon us . . . [O]nly through struggle can we create a free, human society, since the present one is dominated by a small ruling class which exploits, manipulates, and distorts for its own ends . . ." (Columbia Strike Coordinating Committee, n.d. [1968?], rpt. in Albert and Albert, 1984, p. 234).²²

Also clear from the SDS passage is the growing sense of frustration among the war's opponents concerning America's continued involvement in Indochina. Opponents tried numerous legal and illegal activities in attempts either to convince or force the American government to cease its entanglement in the Vietnam War, and with hindsight it seems that the growing unpopularity of the war did in fact keep pressure on Nixon's administration to disentangle itself from the fighting (Zaroulis and Sullivan, 1984, p. 296). At the time of the protest activities themselves, however, Nixon's authorization of heavy bombing raids on North Vietnam and Cambodia (Karnow, 1983, p. 582), plus factional disputes with the antiwar movement itself (Lerner, 1971, pp. 20ff.), masked the impact that the protests actually were having. Moreover, the antiwar movement suffered a

number of demoralizing defeats to its cause, several of which proved costly to both finances and general morale. One such defeat occurred to the movement in 1968, the same year in which the civil rights leader and Vietnam War critic, Martin Luther King, Jr., was murdered. Antiwar youth campaigned for Eugene McCarthy and Bobby Kennedy for the Democratic nomination only to suffer the anguish of Kennedy's assassination and McCarthy's rejection by the Democratic delegates (Schlesinger, 1978, pp. 956-959, 965, 971; see Viorst, 1979, pp. 439-443, 447, 460). More devastating were the political consequences of the 1972 presidential election—an election in which Richard Nixon, an indefatigable opponent of the youthful antiwar demonstrators, won a landslide reelection victory over the peace candidate, George McGovern, despite the fact that 18-year-olds were enfranchised for the first time (L. Jones, 1980, pp. 285-286).²³

During this same period, the nation was rocked by numerous illegal protests and riots against the war, among the most violent taking place outside of the Chicago Democratic Convention in 1968. As television cameras rolled, demonstrators and police locked themselves in pitched and bloody battles, and eventually President Johnson called out the National Guard, which in turn used tanks, fixed bayonets, and highly visible machine guns in its attempt to contain the demonstrators. A subsequent study of the affair charged that "a police riot" had occurred in Chicago (Walker, 1968, p. 5), and commentators on the period have suggested that "the war in Southeast Asia . . . was causing a kind of civil war in the United States" (Zaroulis and Sullivan, 1984, p. 200). Less than two years later, when President Nixon announced that the United States had attacked Communist troops in Cambodia, over 50 percent of the nation's college and university campuses experienced protests, and fifty-one of the institutions were forced by the disruptions to cancel classes for the rest of the term (Zaroulis and Sullivan, 1984, pp. 318-321). Meanwhile, Nixon had initiated a policy of governmental surveillance, prosecution, and harassment of antiwar activists, while he and Vice-President Spiro Agnew agitated sentiment against the young activists by their belligerent public statements against them (Albert and Albert, 1984, pp. 36-37; Oberschall, 1978, pp. 275-280). Despite massive marches in cities throughout the United States against the war, and increasing acts of sabotage against draft boards and property thought to symbolize political and economic exploitation, the government continued a policy of gradual rather than immediate troop withdrawals. As the Vietnam War ground on, the radicals' heralded social revolution was nowhere in sight.

By the early 1970s, several cultural commentators were remarking about the numbers of former New Left activists who were becoming involved with meditation and related religious practices. In 1971, for example, *Harper's*

ran an article entitled, "The Rush for Instant Salvation," in which a 21-year-old California yoga practitioner defended his religious activity by insisting that, "[Yoga's] not a cop-out. I don't want to withdraw from the world, I want to change it. But how can we have a peaceful society if there's no peace within us?" (quoted in Davidson, 1971, p. 40). In 1973, a contributor to the leftist magazine, *Ramparts*, observed that "the phenomenon of politics-into-mysticism . . . this spring seems to have exploded into some new level of social importance," and mused that "in some ways, in certain areas, . . . [mysticism] supersedes the politics of the '60s" (Kopkind, 1973, p. 26). In the same year, Harvey Cox cautioned that "people could rush pell-mell to a religious metaphor that has no place for politics at all" (Cox, 1973, p. 18 [original emphasis]), and two sociological theorists, John McCarthy and Mayer Zald, projected that "[i]ntrospection does appear to be a serious competitor to action. Indeed, a clear result of the triumph of Charles Reich's 'Consciousness III' would be a withdrawal from [leftist] movement activity" (McCarthy and Zald, 1973, p. 27).²⁴

Many prominent activists, however, were withdrawing from movement activity as they swelled the ranks of the new religious seekers. As Robert Bellah observed after co-directing a study of San Francisco Bay area new religions during the early 1970s:

Far more of those involved in the cataclysmic events of 1968 to 1970 have turned to quiet politics or withdrawn from politics altogether than have become hypermilitant. Indeed, the burned-out activist was almost as common in the early 1970s as the burned-out drug user. For many of them 'getting my head together' became the first priority. Every one of the new religious groups, from the Zen Center to the Christian World Liberation Front, has had its share of former activists for whom the group has helped to provide a new and more coherent personal identity (Bellah, 1976a, p. 87).

Undoubtedly the most dramatic conversion to a new religious group involved the 33-year-old Rennie Davis, who had been director of the May Day Collective and a Chicago 7 defendant. In January 1973, he became a devotee of Guru Maharaj Ji (Kopkind, 1973, pp. 28ff.; Morgan, 1973, p. 92). By 1976, another Chicago 7 defendant, Jerry Rubin, had been involved in Tantric yoga, psychic therapy, Arica, and est (Rubin, 1976, pp. 157, 161, 164, 182-189; 165-181).²⁵ The writer and feminist organizer, Sally Kempton, joined Arica in 1972, and by 1976 had devoted herself to the guru, Swami Muktananda (Kempton, 1976). Even the former Black Panther Party leader, Eldridge Cleaver, was a born-again Christian by 1977 (*New York Times*, 1977, p. III.2). Countless others repeated these patterns, as a review of journalistic and scholarly articles on the early 1970s clearly indicates (Kelly, 1973, p. 35; Richardson, 1973, p. 463; Needleman, 1970, pp. 95-96; Wolfe, 1976, p. 34).

The explanation for this transformation, I offer, is analogous to the reason that radicals and radical sympathizers of the late 1640s involved themselves in millenarian groups during the 1650s. Activists in the 1970s held values regarding fundamental social and political changes that they felt were legitimate, but they had no means to implement them. Both political efforts involving lobbying, peaceful protest, court action, and illegal riots, demonstrations, and bombings failed to bring about the 'revolution' to American society that the activists desperately wanted. Like the English radicals of the late 1640s, the activists of the early 1970s were unable to see any feasible political means of translating their aspirations into social policy. Religious millenarianism and introversionist introspection, however, compensated for the 'crises of means' by providing activists with cognitive and emotional frameworks for believing that they still would accomplish, now through self-purification and the dawning of 'the new age,' that which they could not achieve through their own political efforts. In sum, former activists compensated for the perceived failure of their attempts to transform American society by believing either that a divine force or figure was about to initiate the desired changes, or that the changes would unfold as the social environment came to reflect the qualities of individuals' purified consciousness. Their attraction to the new religious groups bespoke their 'crises of feasibility' regarding the means to reach their desired political and social ends.²⁶

Divine Light Mission, Hare Krishna, and Transcendental Meditation

The ideological appeal that various groups held for disheartened activists is best illustrated by the Divine Light Mission of Guru Maharaj Ji, which grew from a mere six American members in 1971 to a phenomenal 40,000 American adherents by late 1973 (Morgan, 1973, p. 84; Gray, 1973, p. 38). At Maharaj Ji's much-publicized "dawn of a New Age" celebration in the Houston Astrodome, "Millennium, '73," giant video pictures of the tumultuous 1960s and early 1970s flashed behind a huge stage. Events that had moved and torn apart a nation appeared there—John Kennedy's and Martin Luther King's assassinations, Vietnam War scenes, shots from the May Day protests, and ghetto riots. Their location behind the platform on which Maharaj Ji ascended conveyed to the audience that their guru was the fulfillment of a generation's hopes (Levine, 1974, p. 48; Gray, 1973, p. 39). Indeed he was for the former activist-turned-Divine Light *premie*, Rennie Davis, who admitted, "As for myself, I'm blown out. Here's the lord of the universe speaking from the stage of the Houston Astrodome saying, 'Here is peace'" (quoted in Blau, 1973, p. 38). When Davis himself spoke to the

smaller-than-expected audience (around 10,000 persons), his comments epitomized the compensatory function that religion served for his politically frustrated generation. He sermonized to the audience that "Jesus said we must create the kingdom of God on earth by realizing it within us first . . ." (quoted in Gray, 1973, p. 38). By combining millenarianism with meditation, therefore, the Divine Light Mission provided an ideology that attracted many activists who had grown weary with trying to alter American society through direct political action.

Unlike the Divine Light Mission, which did not enter the United States until the early 1970s, Transcendental Meditation first arrived on the North American continent in 1959, then got itself established in 1965 (Bainbridge and Jackson, 1981, p. 138). Its religiously millenarian ideology also addressed the frustrations that people felt toward the perceived political failures of the 1960s, but did so in a less direct way than did the Divine Light Mission. In 1975, TM's guru, Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, announced, "A beautiful time is coming to the world. The Age of Enlightenment will be a time when there will be less sickness, less crime, when problems will be fewer. It will be a time when life will be happier, more harmonious. Progress will be more, success will be more, life will not be a struggle" (quoted in Oates, 1976, pp. 19–20). The key to progress, so TMers believed, was the widespread dissemination of their meditational technique to both government employees and the nations' citizens. Toward this end, the Maharishi insisted that after "members of a government" had begun the TM meditational program but still found "that their decisions are not bringing completely good results, [then] they must run back to their people and get them to meditate" (quoted in Oates, 1976, p. 97). Social change, therefore, would inevitably result from the collective effect of individuals meditating, and between 1970 and 1975, 704,539 people received TM initiations in the United States (Bainbridge and Jackson, 1981, p. 144).

Even the Hare Krishnas' religious ideology contained an implicit solution to the failure of activists to achieve their vision of a reformed American society. In the early 1970s, J. Stillsen Judah administered questionnaires to sixty-three devotees in Berkeley and Los Angeles. Ninety-seven percent of the devotees responded to a question about their attitude toward the Vietnam War, and of those respondents, eighty-nine percent registered either strong opposition (68 percent) or moderate opposition (21 percent) to the conflict. So striking was this finding that Judah concluded that "[t]he Vietnam war was probably the most significant factor in driving devotees from the society of the establishment to the counterculture. Of all the protests they have made, none has registered as strong as this" (Judah, 1974, p. 115). Their proposed solution to the nation's Vietnam involve-

ment, however, was not direct political action but instead was devotion to the Lord Krishna. When one devotee was asked about whether he was concerned about Richard Nixon and the war, he answered:

A little bit, but not with much feeling. We understand the underlying reason for it [e.g., the war] and that is godlessness, forgetfulness that everything belongs to Krishna. We understand that there is a root cause of all distress, and so we're going to the root cause of all problems: pollution, overpopulation, starvation, and wars . . . [W]e are going to that root by reviving everyone's God Consciousness so that they benefit from this society (quoted in Judah, 1974, pp. 115–116).

The Hare Krishnas, therefore, resembled other new religious groups of the early 1970s by believing that a new age (in their case, a new age of Krishna Consciousness) was dawning, and in this age the world would see itself freed from many of the terrible problems that beset it. It would be “an epoch of peace and happiness,” fulfilling if not exceeding the failed dreams of the previous decade (Judah, 1974, p. 192).²⁷

The Anticult Movement

As happened to the sectarian groups of the 1650s, a vigorous opposition movement sprang up against the new religious groups of the 1970s (Shupe and Bromley, 1980). Although far better organized and more complex than its earlier counterpart, the contemporary ‘anticult movement’ (as it was called) shared basic similarities with the Interregnum sectarian opponents. These similarities stemmed from the fact that both Puritan England and post-Vietnam America experienced critical challenges to the legally sanctioned relationships between religion and politics in their respective societies. Put simply, Puritan England’s political system prescribed and proscribed the religious practices of its population, while the American political system was constitutionally required to maintain (as Jefferson phrased it) “a wall of separation between church and State.”²⁸

Part of the ‘cult/anticult’ debates in both periods raged over the extent to which the sectarian groups were attempting to alter their societies’ church/state relationship. Had the sects in Interregnum England been successful at destroying the tithe system, then ministers, parliamentarians, and gentry feared that the entire edifice of a politically maintained church system would have come crashing down. Had the contemporary sects been successful at (to coin a word) ‘theocratizing’ the American governmental system, then a foundation of the American constitutional system would have been destroyed, or so various government officials and concerned citizens believed.

The contemporary group most feared for its theocratic political aims was the Unification Church (the Moonies), and various governmental studies of the group examined its intended political program by documenting the intimate links between the Unification Church and both the South Korean government and the Korean CIA in the 1970s (Boettcher, 1980; Committee on Standards, 1978, p. 107; Select Committee on Ethics, 1978, p. 21; House of Representatives, Subcommittee on International Organizations, 1978 Part 4, pp. 152–237, 250–495). Related to these connections but analytically separate from them were Moon’s aspirations to gain influence, power, and control in governmental and educational institutions throughout the United States (see Horowitz, 1981), and these efforts, along with the reaction to them, attracted the scrutinizing attention of various governmental investigators.

One thorough examination of the Unification Church was the 31 October, 1978 *Investigation of Korean-American Relations: Report of the [House of Representatives] Subcommittee on International Organizations*, Donald M. Fraser, Chairman (Fraser, 1978). In a documented and scathing indictment of the Moon organization, the report charged that Moon’s insistence on the churchly status of his group was merely “because it provides the greatest opportunity for reaching his goals” (Fraser, 1978, p. 316). His goals, so an ex-Moonie claimed in the report, were ones designed to “change the political systems of the world” (quoted in Fraser, 1978, p. 316). “Moon’s overriding religious goal,” the report stated bluntly, was “to establish a worldwide ‘theocracy,’ that is, a world order which would abolish separation of church and state and be governed by the immediate direction of God” (Fraser, 1978, p. 314). Moon himself was then quoted as proclaiming, “‘we cannot separate the political from the religious’” (quoted in Fraser, 1978, p. 314 [original emphasis]), and the report deduced that his anticommunism was “one key reason” for his “rejection of some of the most fundamental tenets of American democracy” (1978, p. 314).²⁹ The investigation concluded that “the Moon Organization has attempted, with varying degrees of success, to gain control over or establish business and other secular institutions in the United States and elsewhere, and has engaged in political activities in the United States” (1978, p. 387). While the Moonies experienced the most dramatic charges concerning theocratic or ideological aspirations of all the groups in the 1970s, others, including Transcendental Meditation, and est, received similar charges by either social control agents or the press.³⁰ Although the particular content of the charges in the 1970s reflected the culturally and historically specific circumstances of modern American society, analogous debates over the issues of church/state relations were instigated by sectarian fear during the Interregnum.

Charges of Social Subversion

A second set of charges that were brought against some of the groups in the 1970s were closely related to the theocratic ones. Journalists as well as several governmental agencies accused groups of showing complete disrespect for judicial and administrative procedures. Because they put their groups' goals above those of all other societal institutions, these groups were charged with being subversive to the social order—a charge that had been levelled against the enthusiastic sects of the Cromwellian era. In both periods, judges and other law enforcement personnel experienced firsthand the blatant disregard that some religious sects showed for their countries' laws and legal systems, and these personnel deduced that the sects held contempt for the most basic tenets of civil order and justice.

Once again, the Moonies received harsh criticism on these grounds. For example, a zoning board of appeals committee in New Castle, New York, denied the Moonies the right to receive a 'special use permit' needed to transform their large house into "a religious retreat center" (or as their critics said, "an indoctrination center"). In defending the constitutionality of the decision, the New York Supreme Court pointed out that the Moon organization:

often exhibits contempt for local zoning laws and regulations. Where local law has been incompatible with its objectives or restrictive of its practices, [the Moon organization] has disregarded legal strictures, ignored legal representatives, been untruthful respecting its activities, sought to intimidate local officials and unfriendly neighbors and generally demonstrated an antagonism destructive of the orderly and harmonious development of residential and rural communities in which it has settled (Zoning Board of Appeals, 1980, p. 14).

The decision went on to charge that the Moonies had exhibited many of these behaviors during its rezoning application procedures with the New Castle board (1980, pp. 14–16).

The Children of God [COG] also received criticism for their reputedly wanton disregard for government and the judicial process. The 30 September 1974 report to the Attorney General of New York by the Charity Frauds Bureau accused COG of harboring hatred toward all of society's fundamental institutions. "Although COG claims to 'rehabilitate' young people," the report stated, "it actually alienates them from society, family, government and education" (Charity Frauds Bureau, 1974, p. 56). Earlier, in a section entitled, "Obstruction of Justice," the report warned that "[o]ne of the most serious charges that can be leveled against COG is its attitude and teachings relative to disrespect for court process, orders and decrees. From the beginning, members are taught to subvert these pro-

cesses through lies, chicanery and to [sic] circumvent legal process . . ." (1974, p. 16).³¹ Indeed, the report added, "Testimony and exhibits overwhelmingly established that COG members are taught that *all* government is evil" (1974, p. 25). Interestingly, one of COG's antigovernment activities during the Vietnam War period involved efforts to get exemptions from the draft for its male members (1974, pp. 4, 18–19).

Along with various local, state, and federal governmental agencies that attempted to curb the activities of several new religious groups, ministers from both fundamentalist and mainline Christian denominations were active in the contemporary anticult movement. Fundamentalists were these groups' most vocal Christian opponents, attacking them for their deviations from an orthodoxy that they considered to be immutably true. "Jesus Christ is unmatched in all history," one fundamentalist publication pronounced. "While men like Sun Myung Moon and Maharaj Ji get rich quick off their people, Jesus Christ died for his" (quoted in Shupe and Bromley, 1980, pp. 52, 48ff., 238). Mainline denominations, in contrast, were less threatened by the doctrinal innovations than they were "by the reformulation of institutional boundaries envisioned by the new religions" (Shupe and Bromley, 1980, p. 239). Denominations feared harsh governmental reaction against all religions if the Moonies pressed too far with their erosion of the traditional church/state boundary, and this anxiety on their part contributed to their exclusion of the Unification Church from both the National Council of Churches and the New York Council of Churches (Shupe and Bromley, 1980, pp. 239, 57; see *Time*, 1978, p. 52; Montgomery, 1982, pp. 1, 33; Plowman, 1973, pp. 40–41; Frame, 1983, p. 31).³²

'Cult' Involvement and the Loss of Mental Faculties

Unparalleled in the seventeenth century was the parent movement against new religious movements in the 1970s. Occasional mention appears in the records from the 1650s of tension and strife between Quaker youths and their parents,³³ but no national organization appeared of parents whose children were involved in various religious sects. Given the state of communications and travel within England at the time, this is not surprising. The anticult movement in the 1970s, however, was spearheaded by parents who, along with the deprogrammer, Ted Patrick, formed the 'Free Our Sons and Daughters From the Children of God Organization' (FREECOG) in 1972. This organization, in term, spawned several other parent groups, some of which have survived into the mid-1980s (Shupe and Bromley, 1980, pp. 89–94).

For comparative sociohistorical purposes, the most interesting feature of these groups is the content of the arguments that they developed to explain

why children had gotten involved with 'cults' and remained in them for extended periods. Common to all of the arguments was the claim that young members had not been in control of their mental faculties at the time of their conversion—a claim that is reminiscent of English anti-sectarian attacks over three centuries earlier. One form of this allegation appeared in literature and statements made by fundamentalist Christian parents and their supporters who asserted that children had fallen under the influence of Satan. Summarizing their position, two sociologists stated that "[t]he influence of Satan might be explicit or implicit, but it was further assumed that this influence was expressed through 'cult' leaders and members who were themselves regarded as having been duped by virtue of their human weaknesses" (Shupe and Bromley, 1980, p. 65). As a Presbyterian Church publication put it, "Anyone who leaves the way of life in Jesus Christ is open to influence and control by the powers of evil. At the very minimum we are accurate in saying that this is true of Sun Myung Moon and the Unification Church" (quoted in Shupe and Bromley, 1980, p. 65).³⁴ In a form and style of argumentation also heard during the 1650s, the converts were thought to be under the control of Satan.

'Cults,' Foreign Political Powers, and Social Decay

Even the secular interpretations that parent groups and their supporters used to explain their children's conversions parallel interpretations that had appeared in the 1650s. Many opponents to the Interregnum sectarian groups accused Quakers and others with serving as handmaidens to foreign powers (usually Catholic Rome) that supposedly were committed to England's destruction, and also charged that, for the most part, sect members were beguiled by their leaders down seditious paths. Many opponents of the sectarian groups in the 1970s accused sectarians of serving as handmaidens to various forms of totalitarianism, and also charged that, for the most part, sect members were brainwashed by their leaders who led them into seditious activities that violated basic premises of American democracy.

Thus, in both periods the sects and their opponents engaged in "a struggle for the construction of social reality," the consequence of which would be the assignment of labels that would mobilize and legitimize sentiment and action either in favor of or against the groups themselves (Bromley, Shupe, and Ventimiglia, 1979, pp. 43, 52). Ted Patrick warned, for example, that "[w]hat most of the cults are out to do is to destroy this country and turn this country into a totalitarian nation" (statement before Dole, 1979, p. 63). When testifying before an anticult hearing in 1976, Rabbi Maurice Davis related that "[f]or the last time I ever witnessed a movement that was totally monolithic, that was replete with fanatical followers prepared to do any-

thing, that hated everyone outside and fostered suspicions of parents—the last time I saw this was the Nazi youth movement, and I tell you, I'm scared" (quoted in Shupe and Bromley, 1981, p. 249; see Dole, 1979, pp. 77, 78). ACLU's Privacy Committee circulated a report in 1976 which indicated that many deprogrammers believed 'cults' to be part of "an international Communist conspiracy" "because members rejected the material values of their parents (rpt. in Alliance for the Preservation of Religious Liberty, n.d., n.p. [appendix]),³⁵ and the anticult psychiatrist, John Clark, charged that the cults' conversion techniques were actually forms of brainwashing similar to what the world witnessed both during the Korean War and in the German terrorist organization, the Baader Meinhof gang (testimony before Dole, 1979, p. 154).³⁶ In this same vein, the former Staff Director of the Fraser Subcommittee on Korean-American Relations indicated the "Fraser Subcommittee claimed that Reverend Moon is working to create a sectarian unified civilization centered in Korea, corresponding to the Roman Empire" (Robert Boettcher's testimony before Dole, 1979, p. 14). Anti-American ideologies, if not foreign powers themselves, fed the cult organizations, or so claimed many of their critics in the 1970s.

Finally, various parents and their supporters shifted blame onto society itself for fostering culturally 'pathological' conditions that inhibited the normal moral development of their children, and this interpretation allowed them to view converts merely as "victims of their own misdirected idealism and personal inadequacies . . ." (Shupe and Bromley, 1980, p. 80, see 78–85). Unlike the 1650s, in which only a few authors sensed a connection between cultural upheaval and the rise and appeal of new sects, the 1970s saw this perspective become well developed. It is aptly represented by the interpretation that two modern anticult writers gave for the conversion of so many young people. "Hope springs eternal," Carroll Stoner and Jo Anne Parke claimed, "especially in the hearts of the disillusioned and disoriented young. It is by building on the natural hopes of the young—for a better world, for a better life sometime in the future—that the disciples of contemporary gurus and messiahs hope to recruit others to their way of life" (1977, p. 26).

Anticultism in the 1970s: A Summation

In sum, various governmental agencies feared that the disregard shown for the judicial system by several new religious groups in the 1970s revealed their intention to subvert the hallowed American principle of separation of church and state. This fear of subversion against an established and legally sanctioned church/state relationship paralleled fears that were held by seventeenth-century government officials and ministers, who also were

convinced that the sects in their period wished to destroy the state's control over the content and practice of religious worship. Thus, antagonists in these debates from both periods attempted to denigrate their opponents in the public's eye by associating them with generally recognized seditious threats. Charges of religious heresy against new groups also brought support from some ministers in both eras, while parents of converts, along with anticult supporters, pronounced that members were not in control of their rational faculties. Just as occurred in the 1650s, some accusers claimed that the converts were possessed by Satan; others levelled the more modern accusation that they had fallen prey to unscrupulous cult recruiters who manipulated the youths' immaturity and idealism during a period of general sociocultural pathology.

Thus, in both periods a sizable and active portion of the opposition movement to the new sects came from persons (ministers, government officials, and parents of youthful members) who felt deprived in some essential way by the possible achievement by the sects of various social, political, and religious goals. Their attacks against the groups, their explanations offered for the groups' apparent appeal to the young, and the interpretation of the groups' goals, reflected the vantage points of persons who felt themselves disadvantaged if the sects were to attain power.

CONCLUSION

With the blossoming of sectarian religions during the early 1970s, the sociology of religion achieved new prominence in the wider sociological discipline. As youth replaced their political slogans and drugs with prayers and meditational mantras, sociologists were forced to explain the upsurge of interest in forms of association that seemingly flew in the face of generally accepted sociological assumptions about growing secularization. With the eyes of the academic discipline upon them, religion specialists were asked by their colleagues to interpret a phenomenon that was more than a little perplexing. Religious sectarianism, in short, gave new meaning to the sociology of religion and raised the status of the subdiscipline with the field of sociology itself.

Among the most favored interpretations to emerge about the exotic religious forms in North America was one that emphasized the manner in which these groups satisfied people's needs for meaning during a cultural period of uncertainty if not crisis (see Robbins and others, 1978, pp. 96-99). In the shadows of Durkheim and Parsons, sociologists of religion asserted and occasionally documented how religious ideology and communal practice provided meaning and order to individuals who otherwise were unable to find them in an increasingly atomistic social world. Just as sectarianism

had invigorated the sociology of religion within the wider field of sociology, so too did sociologists of religion believe that sectarianism invigorated the lives of people who were feeling the burden of modern living in an increasingly secularized world.

These intellectual assumptions colored much of the research done on religious sectarianism (Bellah, 1976b; Tipton, 1982), and they coincided with the development of a theoretical perspective that allowed sociologists to study the operations of religious organizations without having to question their own cherished assumptions about why so many persons found the groups' ideologies attractive in the first place. This new perspective, known as resource mobilization theory, specifically deemphasizes the role that relative deprivation plays in either social movement formation or functioning (McCarthy and Zald, 1973, pp. 17; 1977, pp. 1214-1216). Although its major proponents, John D. McCarthy and Mayer Zald, acknowledged that at least two forms of relative deprivation theory were not as unsophisticated as they portrayed it (McCarthy and Zald, 1977, p. 1214, n.4), influential sociologists of religion who subsequently adopted the resource mobilization perspective went so far as to reject relative deprivation as a valuable explanatory concept (Bromley and Shupe, 1979, pp. 17-19).

Just as relative deprivation theory received scant attention from sociologists of religion who were influenced by resource mobilization theory, so too is it apparently receiving sparse attention from two prominent sociologists of religion who are developing an important theoretical statement on the origins of religion and religious commitment. When William Sims Bainbridge and Rodney Stark mentioned relative deprivation in their theoretical construction on cult formation, they unfortunately portrayed it as a theory closely aligned with a psychopathology perspective on religious origins, and thereby disassociated it from its primary sociological grounding, two studies of which they themselves mentioned but did not explore (Bainbridge and Stark, 1979, p. 284). Subsequently, in a related theoretical piece on religious commitment, they insisted that "the long tradition of deprivational theories of religious commitment was very incomplete" (Stark and Bainbridge, 1980, p. 127) without either outlining their understanding of relative deprivation or citing a single source on it in their bibliography.

Even by itself, relative deprivation theory had problems in its formulation, the most serious of which involved the need for researchers to establish *pre-existing* felt deprivation among subsequent religious participants or group founders (Wallis, 1975, p. 362). Recent research, however, has located pre-existing deprivational material on subsequent members of one of the religious groups discussed in this study, the Quakers, and in doing that study also so was able to combine relative deprivation theory with current

resource mobilization research (Kent, 1982a; see Sayles, 1984, p. 461; Klandermans, 1984). Likewise, a recent paper begins to suggest one of several ways in which Bainbridge and Stark's theoretical formulations might relate to a broad relative deprivation perspective (see Kent, 1986).

While the comparative material presented in this study did not intend to systematically explore the intricacies of relative deprivation theory, it did intend to both rekindle interest among sociologists of religion in a once-popular interpretive concept, and perhaps introduce that concept to religious historians. By using it to examine questions involving the relationship between political frustration and religious ideology, both sets of scholars would likely gain insights into questions of sectarian origins (as with radical Puritan sects) and sectarian growth (as with both the Puritan sects and the 1970s religious groups). Furthermore, these same researchers also may find relative deprivation theory useful in explaining motivational factors behind the countermovements that invariably appear in opposition to new religious messages. Relative deprivation theory demands attention once again, even if its ultimate fate is for it to become fully incorporated into a larger, more comprehensive framework. This, I suspect, will happen, and when it does then we will witness a small but important step in the development of sociological theory.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, whose generous grant made possible parts of this research.

NOTES

1. Numerous authors have attempted to define 'Puritanism,' and among the most successful is Greaves (1977). I follow the very general notion of Puritanism defined by Max Weber (1920, p. 217, n. 2) as "the ascetically inclined religious movements in Holland and England without distinction of Church organization or dogma, thus including Independents, Congregationalists, Baptists, Mennonites, and Quakers."
2. What appears to be a definitive refutation of Hill's belief that the Diggers rejected both the property system and the Protestant work ethic is Davis (1980). While it remains true that, as Levitt (1984, pp. 189-190) claims, activists in the 1960s "seriously eroded the Protestant ethic (especially among those under forty-five)," several of the new religious movements of the 1970s seemed to have rediscovered it. See Robbins and others (1975, p. 50); Tobey, (1976, p. 28 n. 150); Khalsa (1986).
3. When I was in London during the late spring and early summer of 1984, the magazine had ceased publication, although I heard talk that it might be appearing again.
4. Fraser made comments to this effect on the BBC 4 television show, *Book Four*, 6 May, 1984.
5. The article mentions, by the way, that most of the Greenham Common protestors were pacifist Quakers.

6. I wrote to Kenneth Carroll, who is a religious studies professor at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, Texas, with the hope that he might have recorded the name of the protesting group, but unfortunately he had not done so (personal communication, 16 February 1985). The Children of God, however, are known for their apocalyptic proclamations while wearing sackcloth and ashes, and in 1970 the group spent time at the Thurber, Texas farm of a radio and television evangelist named Fred Jordon. For mention of their habit of demonstrating in sackcloth and ashes, see Wallis (1981, p. 101, see pp. 100-102); Wallis (1976, p. 812), and for a picture see *U.S. News* (1972, p. 33). On the Children of God's aversion to Richard Nixon, see Wallis (1981, p. 102); David (1976, pp. 52, 53, 105, 825, 930, 931, 947, 955-56, etc.). David mentions the Quaker, William Penn, as an example of one of many "God-fearing, courageous reformers" (David, 1970, rpt. in David, 1976, p. 457). In *Christianity Today* (1977, p. 20 [560]), a former Children of God member claims that David believed Oliver Cromwell to be one of his many spiritual counselors, but I am unable to verify this.

7. For what the fact is worth, the company that published the book in which Wilson's essay appeared, Rose of Sharon Press, was owned by the Unification Church. Worth mentioning, too, is the strained comparison made between the experience of "light" in seventeenth century Quakerism and the Divine Light Mission in Buckley and Galanter (1979, p. 288).

8. For a general discussion of insanity charges against Fifth Monarchists, Quakers, "zealous Puritans, Anabaptists, millenarians, prophets, and other radical sects and individuals who opposed existing Church order," see Heyd (1981, pp. 276-280); Thomas (1971, p. 145); Cherry (1984). While I am not aware of any instances of the Levellers being considered insane, I know of at least two incidents in which John Lilburne was considered to be mad during incidents that occurred before his Leveller days (Shaw, 1968, pp. 27, 29). For a mid-seventeenth century example of a father (who also was a minister) who thought his son was mad and therefore tried to "deprogram" him from Quakerism, see Cadbury (1948, pp. 15-16).

9. Interestingly, when Reverend Moon's special assistant, Pak Bo Hi, was testifying before "The House of Representatives Subcommittee on International Organizations" (22, March 1978), he alluded to the Quakers' political activities during the Vietnam War while defending the activities in which the Moonies reputedly engaged. "If we really look at the record," Pak asserted, "we'll see that the Unification Church has been far less political than other American religious organizations. Then, to be fair, one would have to investigate many other religious organizations as well. Perhaps he [sic] should start with the United Church of Christ and all the religious groups who [sic] demonstrated against the Vietnam War, or those groups who [sic] actually sent aid to North Vietnam" (House of Representatives, 1978, p. 161). On the Quakers giving aid to North Vietnam during the Vietnam War, as well as engaging in on-going lobbying efforts in the US Congress, see Teltch (1981, p. E18).

10. This particular court appearance by Edward Wharton (there were others) is described in Bishop (1661, pp. 198-199). When Wharton enquired of the magistrates why he had been called in front of them, they replied, "'Your hair is too long and you are disobedient to that commandment which saith 'Honour thy father and mother.' To which Edward said, 'Wherein?' 'In that you will not put off your hat before the magistrates,'" they answered. He was not, however, imprisoned for this, as Lancashire claims, but rather he was banished from the colony (an order that he disobeyed). He was hardly lucky, either, since he already had been whipped for his Quaker beliefs, and he was to be whipped several times more. For some of his whippings he was tied to the back of a horse-cart in the manner that is depicted in the newspaper illustration (Bishop, 1661, pp. 112, 276, 280, 285, 288, 304). Because the predominant political ideology of the mid-seventeenth century equated the state with the household (hence magistrates with the father or parents), Wharton and others were charged with violating the Fifth Commandment regarding parent-honour when they refused to give that honor to judges (Schochet, 1969, 1975). Although a law was passed that required a Quaker man to have his tongue bored with a hot iron if he were to return to the Massachusetts colony a third

time after having been banished, that part of the sentence seems not to have been carried out on anyone. An English Quaker, James Nayler, did have his tongue bored in 1656 (Braithwaite, 1955, p. 262), as did the Ranter, Jacob Bauthumley (or Bottomley) in the early 1650s (Morton, 1970, p. 96). For examples of seventeenth-century youth (in this case, apprentices) who rebelled through violating dress and hair-length restrictions, see Smith. (1973, pp. 220–221, 229–230). Smith points out that the London apprentices “displayed many of the characteristics which have been ascribed to twentieth-century youth” (1973, p. 219). He borrows his conception of adolescence (as “a way of life between childhood and adulthood”) from the psychoanalyst, Erik Erikson (see Smith, 1973, p. 227, quoting Erikson, 1968 p. 128).

11. For documentation of the brutal and sadistic whippings that both Quaker men and women suffered, along with the deportations and maimings that were inflicted upon them, see Bishop (1661); Jones. (1923). (Regarding maimings, for example, three Quakers, Christopher Holder, John Copeland, and John Rous, had their ears cropped.) The children of Quakers Lawrence and Cassandra Southwick, who were named Daniel and Provided, were ordered sold into slavery because they had no money or estate with which to pay a fine for not attending a church service. The family had been ruined by fines that had been inflicted on the parents. The slavery order, however, was never carried out because the ship-captain whom an official approached about taking the children to Barbados refused to do so, calling the sentence “A thing so horrible” (Bishop, 1661, pp. 88–92; Jones, 1923, p. 69).

12. For example, in 1654 George Fox reprinted an anti-Quaker tract in order to refute it, and in the piece “several gentlemen, justices of the peace, ministers of the gospel, and people, within the county of Lancashire” had charged that Quakers “have broached opinions tending to the destruction of the relation of subjects to their magistrates, wives to their husbands, children to their parents, servants to their masters, congregations to their ministers, and of a people to their God” (Fox, 1654, pp. 587, 588). Worth keeping in mind, however, is that often parents rejected or abused their children because of their conversions. See, for example, Thomas Ellwood’s (1714) accounts of the beatings that his father inflicted upon him for his refusal to give him hat honor, as well as the story summarized at the end of note 8 (above). The Quaker historian, Joseph Besse (1733, pp. 40–41), relates a story from Austell, Cornwall in October 1658, about the way in which a family persecuted a Quaker named Anne Upcott. Anne’s father, who was a minister, and his three sons were angered at her conversion to Quakerism. One of the sons, who was a constable, got a local justice of the peace to charge Anne with the offence of working on the Sabbath because she had sown a tear in her waistcoat on Sunday morning. The justice let the brother choose between fining her or putting her in the stocks, and he chose the latter. For five rainy hours she remained in the stocks as her father and brothers stood inside their house shouting and jeering at her, and even encouraging the town’s boys and other “rabble” to harass her.

13. An intriguing exception to this statement occurred in the Moonie publication, *The Unified Family Monthly*, apparently in 1971. Mark Cozin indicates that the Moonies, in this publication, linked Moon with prominent figures in English religious history, including William Tyndale, John Knox, John Wesley, and George Fox. “By allying Moon with the sacred figures and values of Britain, the Unified Family [i.e., the Unification Church] is able not only to create a charismatic aura about Moon but also to generate a model to emulate and with which to compare their [sic] sufferings.” Earlier Cozin pointed out that “In one instance, quoted in a Unified Family missionary pamphlet, George Fox himself reputedly appeared in a vision to a member of the audience listening to one of Moon’s lectures. ‘She saw George Fox and the other Quaker elders kneeling with their faces to the ground. On being asked, “Why don’t you look at Mr. Moon?”’ George Fox replied, “I was so sinful in my life that I can not look directly at him so bright is his light. I envy you and all the others who can” . . .’ (Cozin,

1973, pp. 118, 117). I wrote to the Unification Theological Seminary in an attempt to locate a copy of the original article in which Fox was mentioned, but its Library Director, Walter Ruf, was unable to locate one (personal communication, 23, April 1985). The Unification Church’s scripture, *Divine Principle*, contains a brief discussion of the Quakers and George Fox (HSA-UWC, 1977, p. 463).

14. In this and other seventeenth century quotes, I have modernized spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.

15. The early Digger leader, William Everard, may have participated in both the Leveller-influenced army mutinies at Ware in November 1647 and Burford in late April and early May, 1649 (Sabine, 1941, pp. 103–104, n.1). In any case, the ideological connection between Diggers and Levellers seems clear (see Sabine, 1941, pp. 12–13, 62–3, 606, 641–47; Thomas, 1969, pp. 60–68). The Ranter, Lawrence Clarkson, received £ 12 for writing a Leveller piece in 1647 entitled, *A General Charge or Impeachment of High Treason, in the Name of Justice Equity, against the Community of England* (Claxton, 1660, p. 24). The famous Leveller, John Lilburne, converted to Quakerism in 1655, and his conversion, along with Quaker/Leveller similarities, is ably discussed in Nuttall (1973, pp. 154–160; see Reay, 1984, p. 144). In 1650, the Ranter, Jacob Bauthumley, got a book published by William Learner [Larner], who was well known as the publisher of Leveller material. Winstanley also published at least one tract through him (Bauthumley, 1650, rpt. in N. Smith, 1983, p. 227; Aylmer, 1968, p. 8). Levellers, Diggers, Ranters, and Quakers all published material through Giles Calvert (Terry, 1937). Winstanley converted to Quakerism by the early 1660s (Alsop, 1979), and he was supportive of, and in communication with, the Quakers in London during 1654 (Reay, 1984, p. 149).

16. The poll tax was a “tax on individuals; that of 1641 fixed contributions according to rank, occupation or income from £ 100 for a Duke to 6d. per head for poorer people.” In July, 1643, “[t]he Excise Ordinance . . . authorized a ‘New Impost’ on home-produced ale, beer, cider, sherry, and on imported tobacco, figs, raisins, wine, currants, sugar, pepper, silks, leather, lace and furs. . . . The introduction of excise was without precedent in England. Although the tax was justified as being easy to collect, productive in time of need and equitable in distribution, it was bitterly attacked for its threat to the cost of basic necessities and to personal liberty [since excise commissioners could search and examine suspects]” (Cook and Wroughton, 1980, pp. 28, 31).

17. Having researched hundreds of names on the women’s petition, I know that many of the signatories were not Quakers. Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine with any precision what proportion of them were members of other religious groups, since only Quakers kept somewhat accurate records from that period. The fact, however, that thousands of the tithe-opposers were not Quakers suggests how widespread hostility to tithes was. I hope to have my research findings on this petition ready for publication soon.

18. Morrison (1971, p. 680) defines decremental deprivation as the feeling that results when opportunities suddenly decline faster than do aspirations regarding a particular goal. He also indicates that this feeling is likely to result when, for example, “social, institutional, or legal changes take opportunities away” (see also Gurr, 1970, pp. 46–50). On feelings of deprivation over anticipated future circumstances, see Aberle (1970, p. 209).

19. Cohn (1970a, pp. 298–301) summarizes Humphrey Ellis, *Pseudochristus: A true and faithful Relation of the Grand Impostures, Horrid Blasphemies . . . in the County of Southampton* (1650). Ellis was a minister of the Cathedral Church of Winchester, according to W. Shaw (1900, p. 543). Morton (1970, p. 108) mentions an attack on Abiezer Coppe in an appendix to John Tickell, *The Bottomles Pit Smoking in Familisme*. Tickell was a Devonshire minister (W. Shaw, 1900, p. 448). Cohn (1970a, pp. 291–292) quotes anti-Ranter material from a Doctor of Divinity, Edward Hyde, *A Wonder and yet no Wonder: a great Red Dragon*

in *Heaven* (1651). Finally, Cohn (1970a, pp. 290–291) quotes Thomas Edwards, *Gangraena, or a Catalogue . . . of Many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time . . .* (1646). Watts (1978, p. 87) identifies him as a Puritan minister. Although Edwards's study was published before the Ranters appeared, he attacked ideas that were to become prominent among them a few years later. Articles on Hyde and Edwards appear in Stephen and Lee (1885–1900).

20. In a court hearing in 1656, for example, a judge commanded George Fox three times to remove his hat when standing before him, after which Fox infuriated the magistrate by demanding to see the law that required him to do so. "And then the judge grew very angry," Fox reported later, and he exclaimed amidst his fury, "I'll firk [i.e., beat or trounce] him" (Fox, 1694, p. 243). With slight variations, this same scene was repeated countless times throughout the Interregnum, as Quakers consistently refused to show respect for the judges and justices who sat in judgement of them.

21. Levellers also had been accused of being Jesuits—see Lilburn and others (1649, in Morton, 1975, p. 251).

22. Worth noting here is that the historian, Christopher Hill (1972a, p. 114; 1974, p. 133) refuted an argument about seventeenth century radicals wishing to destroy learning by saying about the charge that "it is no more true than that most student revolutionaries today want to destroy the universities."

23. Disillusionment continued to grow with the Nixon Administration into 1973, despite the fact that the United States and North Vietnamese governments signed "The Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring the Peace in Vietnam" on 27 January. In May 1973, for example, an article appeared in *Harpers* which insisted that, despite the treaty if not because of it, "we are 'progressing back' to the kind of covert warfare practiced in Vietnam during the late Fifties and early Sixties, and in Laos almost continuously since 1962" (Brannman, 1973, p. 65, see 65–76).

24. In 1970, Charles Reich put forward a three-stage process of individual and cultural growth, in which the most evolved stage, Consciousness III, combined communitarian social structures with the individualistic qualities of self-exploration, self-expression, and wholeness (Reich, 1970).

25. Arica (or the Arica Institute in America, Inc.) was a self-realization system that involved complicated and repetitious combinations of meditation, physical exercise, chantings, and sensitivity to color. Its ideology and practices seemingly borrowed from a variety of other psychological and religious systems, including Hinduism, Sufism, Zen, Rolfing, Gurdjieff, and yoga. It first appeared in the United States in 1971, and by 1981 had given courses to approximately 25,000 people. Although I do not know of any scholarly studies of the group, journalistic or impressionistic accounts appeared in Hiss (1973); Rosen (1973); *Time* (1972); *Newsweek* (1981); and Lilly (1972, pp. 139–155). Est is a psychotherapeutic group that borrows techniques from the human potential/therapy group movement. Scientology, Mind Dynamics, Zen, and psychological motivation theories. In the 1970s, its sessions involved an instructional presentation of est's ideas, self-disclosures in front of the entire group, and large group "processes" involving relaxation, psychodrama, and guided visualizations. A few of the many studies that have been published on the still-active movement include, Bartley (1978); Tipton (1982); Abraham (1983); Glass and others (1977a, 1977b).

26. Credit for first developing this interpretation for the 1970s religious phenomenon must go to the journalist and former SDSer, Andrew Kopkind. When pondering the causes of the defections from politics to religion, Kopkind utilized 'cognitive dissonance' theory to help provide and explanation. "The 'failure' of revolution, according to the hyperboles employed by the political movements of the late '60s, freaked out the people who had set their life-clocks according to the apocalyptic timetable. What happens 'when prophecy fails'? . . . [T]he

moment of disconfirmation—the day the world does *not* end—creates extreme dissonance in the minds of those whose belief systems are based on the fulfillment of the prophecy. . . . The un-success [sic] of rapid, radical political change in America; the reelection of Nixon; the 'winding down' of the war in Indochina without the unconditional surrender of the Pentagon—all that created an amount of dissonance (not to mention despair) among those who had invested the most in the expectation of a quick victory. Everyone has a way of blunting that dissonance; and one of them is the acceptance of a new belief system that either *confirms* the success of the left in new terms, or *invents* drastically new terms" (Kopkind, 1973, p. 49 [original emphasis]).

27. Several accounts by persons who left the Unification Church (which, of course, must be used cautiously) indicate that it, too, attracted persons who either had been politically involved (Underwood and Underwood, 1979, pp. 29–35) or were interested in political and social change (Kemperman, 1981, pp. 32–33; Durham, 1981, pp. 16–17). It attracted them through at least three channels: its utopian efforts to build "the 'International Ideal City'" (late 1960s and early '70s); the International Re-Education Foundation (early 1970s), and the Collegiate Association for the Research of Principles (after 1973). In 1971, the International Re-Education Foundation received approval from the American Alternative Service Program to function as an option to military service for conscientious objectors (Barker, 1984, pp. 48–54). In this vein, Eileen Barker (1984, p. 245) indicates that "during the late 1970s, those who joined [the Moonies] in California were likely to have been more worried about the social mess the world was in than about its secularism." Ironically, Unificationist ideology is strongly anti-communistic, and Moon's organization was a major supporter of President Nixon (see Barker, 1984, p. 54), and, therefore, one might imagine that the group would have had little attraction for counterculture youth. The explanation for this apparent incongruity lies, I suspect, in Moonie recruitment and socialization tactics, which sheltered potential and new inductees from more specific points of theology and doctrine until they were well connected with more committed members (see Bromley and Shupe, 1979, pp. 70–71, 80). The pattern of groups withholding complex or potentially alienating ideology from new converts until they are socially integrated into the group is well established in sectarian literature, and appears to be quite an old and widespread practice (see Kent, 1982c, pp. 317–318).

28. The first amendment to the United States Constitution (ratified 25 September 1789) states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . ." Jefferson used the "wall of separation" phrase in a letter "To Messrs. Nehemiah Dodge and Others, a Committee of the Danbury Baptist Association, in the State of Connecticut" (rpt. in Jefferson, 1984, p. 510).

29. The report then quoted Moon as believing that "American-style democracy" was "a good nursery for the growth of Communism" (Fraser, 1978, p. 314).

30. A journalistic piece accused est of trying to gain political inroads into the Carter administration through the movement's Hunger Project (Gordon, 1978). Transcendental Meditation got embroiled in (ultimately unsuccessful) court cases involving their attempts to get TM taught in schools (Kleiman, 1977; Baird, 1982).

31. According to Stewart (1980), the Washington, DC branch of Scientology demonstrated disregard for a proper sense of legal justice through its policy of "attack" litigation during a major court case in 1979–1980. On attacks against troublesome public officials and news reporters by the Clearwater, Florida branch of Scientology, see Orsini and Stafford (1980, pp. 6–13). A Canadian incident in which members of a local Church of Scientology were accused of disrespecting the legal process occurred in 1983. In a decision rendered against the Church of Scientology of British Columbia over a dispute between it and a landlord, BC Supreme Court Justice J. Murray wrote a stinging criticism of several BC Scientology's witnesses. "As to the witnesses for the tenant, with two exceptions I have seldom encountered

a more unreliable collection of witnesses. In particular the Reverend Harvey Schmiedeknecht and time again came very close to committing perjury. On numerous occasions he was evasive and on other occasions independent documentary evidence completely contradicted him. . . . The kindest thing I can say about Reverend Schmiedeknecht is that all his testimony consisted of a 'airy trifling with the truth'. . . . I find the evidence of [three other BC Scientology] witnesses to be part of a crude arrangement made by them with Reverend Harvey Schmiedeknecht to distort the true facts" (*Law Reports*, 1983, p. 299).

32. Several of these articles document the involvement of various Jewish groups in the anticult movement, but space prohibits me from exploring this aspect of the movement in depth.

33. In addition to Cadbury (1948, pp. 15–16), see the detailed story that the famous Quaker minister, James Nayler, related to the prominent Quaker correspondent, Margaret Fell, in a letter from around 25 April 1654. The protracted incident began with Nayler's conversion of the son and two daughters of a minister. The father, along with twelve of his colleagues, attempted to change the converts' minds through reasoned argument, and when that failed, the ministers became enraged—particularly, it seems, at the son. "One priest [the-receiving minister] stroked off his hat, another bade send him to [the] house of correction, another bade [that they] slit his skin from his back to his feet, others bade [that they] bind him and whip him, and all went away in a great rage." This incident is recorded in Swarthmore Mss. 3:192, tr. 2.869 (Nuttall 51), in Friends' House Library, London. In the manuscript itself this story is crossed out, but on the basis of a marginal comment that was written in Nayler's hand I concluded, in consultation with the Librarian at that time, Edward Milligan, that the expurgement had not been done by Nayler as part of the original letter. The story related, after all, the kind of incident that Quakers might have wished never happened, and which, for purposes of public image at the time or later, they might have wished would be forgotten.

34. For balanced perspective, however, one must realize that the Moonies themselves divided the world into a spiritual struggle between Godliness and Satanism (HSA-UWC, 1973, pp. 50–51ff.).

35. On p. 5 of this memorandum, LeMoult labelled Ted Patrick's practice of lumping together quite diverse groups as "a sort of McCarthyism."

36. Worth mentioning, too, are the pro-cult attacks by the sectarians and their supporters, in which they refer to their opponents in the same seditious terms—Nazis, enemies to democracy, Soviet-like repressors of dissent, etc. (Dole, 1979 pp. 73, 101–102, 120; APRL, n.d., [opening quote]).

REFERENCES

- Aberle, David (1970) "A Note on Relative Deprivation Theory as Applied to Millenarian and Other Cult Movements." Pages 209–214 in Sylvia L. Thrupp (ed.), *Millennial Dreams in Action: Studies in Revolutionary Religious Movements*. New York: Schocken.
- Abraham, Gary (1983) "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Utilitarianism: The Case of EST." *Theory and Society* 12:739–773.
- Adler, Nathan (1974) "Ritual, Release, and Orientation: Maintenance of the Self in the Antinomian Personality." Pages 283–297 in Irving I. Zaretsky and Mark P. Leone (eds.), *Religious Movements in Contemporary America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Albert, Judith Clavir and Stewart Edward Albert (eds.) (1984) *The Sixties Papers: Documents of a Rebellious Decade*. Toronto: Praeger.
- Alsop, James (1979) "Gerrard Winstanley's Later Life." *Past and Present* 82:73–81.

- APRL [Alliance for the Preservation of Religious Liberty] (no date) *The Anti-Religion Movement*. Los Angeles: no pub.
- Aylmer, G. E. (ed.) (1975) *The Levellers in the English Revolution*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- (1968) "England's Spirit Unfolded, or an Incouragement to take the 'Engagement.'" *Past and Present* 40:3–15.
- Bainbridge, William Sims and Daniel H. Jackson (1981) "The Rise and Decline of Transcendental Meditation." Pages 135–158 in Bryan Wilson (ed.), *The Social Impact of New Religious Movements*. New York: Rose of Sharon Press.
- Bainbridge, William Sims and Rodney Stark (1979) "Cult Formation: Three Compatible Models." *Sociological Analysis* 40:283–295.
- Baird, Robert D. (1982) "Religious or Non-Religious: TM in American Courts." *Journal of Dharma* 7:391–407.
- Baltzell, E. Digby (1979) *Puritan Boston and Quaker Philadelphia*. New York: The Free Press.
- (1972) "Epilogue: To Be a Phoenix—Reflections on Two Noisy Ages of Prose." *American Journal of Sociology* 78:202–220.
- Barbour, Hugh (1964) *The Quakers in Puritan England*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Barbour, Hugh and Arthur O. Robert (eds.) (1973) *Early Quaker Writings 1650–1700*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Barker, Eileen (1984) *The Making of a Moonie: Brainwashing or Choice?* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- (1983) "New Religious Movements in Britain: The Context and the Membership." *Social Compass* 30:33–48.
- Bartley, William Warren III (1978) *Werner Erhard, The Transformation of a Man: The Founding of est*. New York: Clarkson N. Potter.
- Baithumley, Jacob (1650) *The Light and Dark Sides of God*. . . . London: William Learner; pages 227–264 in N. Smith (1983).
- Baxter, William (1656) *The Quakers Catechism*. London: A.M.
- (1655) *The Quakers Catechism*. London: A.M.; pages 262–276 in Barbour and Roberts (1973).
- Bellah, Robert (1976a) "The New Consciousness and the Berkeley New Left." Pages 77–92 in Glock and Bellah (1976).
- (1976b) "The New Consciousness and the Crisis in Modernity." Pages 333–352 in Glock and Bellah (1976).
- Besse, Joseph, (1733) An Abstract of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers . . . , Volume 1 (From the Year 1650 to the Year 1660). London: J. Sowle.
- Bishop, George (1661) *New England Judged by the Spirit of the Lord* (abbreviated rpt. 1703, rpt. 1885). Philadelphia: Thomas Stuckey.
- Bitterman, M. G. F. (1973) "The Early Quaker Literature of Defense." *Church History* 42:207–209.
- Bittle, G. (1984) "Religious Toleration and the Trial of James Nayler." *Quaker History* 73:29–33.
- Blackwood, Bruce Gordon (1965) "Agrarian Unrest and the Early Lancashire Quakers." *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* 51:72–76.
- Blau, Eleanor (1973) "Guru's Followers Cheer 'Millennium' in Festivities at Astrodomo." *New York Times* 12 November, p. 38.
- Boettcher, Robert (1980) *Gifts of Deceit: Sun Myung Moon, Tongsun Park and the Korean Scandal*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Braithwaite, William Charles (1955) *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (1912, 2nd ed., Henry J. Cadbury, ed. and rev). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Branfman, Fred (1973) "Indochina: The Illusion of Withdraw." *Harper's* (May):65ff.
- Bromley, David and Anson D. Shupe (1981) *Strange Gods*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- (1979) "Moonies" in *America: Cult, Church, and Crusade*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bromley, David G., Anson D. Shupe, Jr., and J. C. Ventimiglia (1979) "Atrocity Tales, the Unification Church, and the Social Construction of Evil." *Journal of Communication* 29:42-53.
- Buckley, Peter and Marc Galanter (1979) "Mystical Experience, Spiritual Knowledge, and a Contemporary Ecstatic Religion." *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 52:281-289.
- Cadbury, Henry (ed.) (1948) *George Fox's 'Book of Miracles'*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, Gregg M. (1975) "Bob Dylan and the Pastoral Apocalypse." *Journal of Popular Culture* 8:694-707.
- Carroll, Kenneth L. (1977) "Quaker Attitudes Towards Signs and Wonders." *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* 54:70-84.
- Charity Frauds Bureau (1974) "Final Report on the Activities of the Children of God, to Hon. Louis J. Lefkowitz, Attorney General of the State of New York." Rochester, NY: Office of the Attorney General, 30 September.
- Cherry, Charles L. (1984) "Enthusiasm and Madness: Anti-Quakerism in the Seventeenth Century." *Quaker History* 74:1-24.
- Christianity Today* (1977) "The Children of God: Disciples of Deception" 18 February:18-23 [558-563].
- Christianson, Paul (1978) *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Claxton, Laur. [Lawrence Clarkson] (1660) *The Lost Sheep Found*. . . . (London, rpt. 1974 by *The Rota*). Exeter: University of Exeter.
- Cohn, Norman (1970a) *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (1957, rev. and enlarged). New York: Oxford University Press.
- (1970b) "The Ranters." *Encounter* (April):15-25.
- Columbia Strike Coordinating Committee (n.d. 1968?) "Columbia Liberated." No pub. or date [Fall?]; pages 233-237 in Albert and Albert (1984).
- Committee on Standards (1978) *Korean Influence Investigation: Report by the [U.S. House of Representatives] Committee on Standards of Official Conduct*. . . . (December 22). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cook, Chris and John Wroughton (eds.) (1980) *English Historical Facts*. London: Macmillan.
- Coppe, Abiezer (1649) *A Fiery Flying Roll*. . . . London: no pub.; pages 80-97 in N. Smith (1983).
- Cox, Harvey (1981) "Introduction." Pages xi-xv in David Bromley and Anson D. Shupe, *Strange Gods*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- (1973) "Why Do Americans Want a Child God." *Intellectual Digest* 4 December:17-19.
- Cozin, Mark (1973) "A Millerian Movement in Korea and Great Britain." Pages 100-121 in Michael Hill (ed.), *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, volume 6. London: SCM Press, Ltd.
- Crosby, Faye (1976) "A Model of Egoistical Relative Deprivation." *Psychological Review* 83:85-113.
- David, Moses (1976) *The Basic Mo Letters*. Geneva: Children of God.
- (1970) "Who Are the Rebels?" (March 8). Pages 455-458 in David (1976).
- Davidson, Sara (1971) "The Rush for Instant Salvation." *Harper's* (July):40ff.
- Davis, James A. (1959) "A Formal Interpretation of the Theory of Relative Deprivation." *Sociometry* 22:280-296.
- Davis, J. C. (1980) "Gerrard Winstanley and the Restoration of True Magistracy." *Past and Present* 70:76-93.
- Dole, Robert (1979) "Information Meeting on the Cult Phenomenon in the United States." Lexington, MA: American Family Foundation.
- Durham, Deanna (1981) *Life Among the Moonies: Three Years in the Unification Church*. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International.
- Ellens, F. S. (1971) "The Ranters Ranting: Reflections on a Ranting Counter Culture." *Church History* 40:106-07.
- Ellwood, Thomas (1714) *The History of Thomas Ellwood* (rpt. 1885). London: Routledge and Sons.
- Erikson, Erik (1968) *Identity, Youth and Crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Firth, Katharine R. (1979) *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flinn, Frank K. (no date) "Deprogramming: The Legal, Religious, and Psychiatric Issues." *Supplement to New Religious Newsletter* 1, no. 1:1.
- Fox, George (1831a) *A Collection of Epistles*. . . . , volume 7 in *The Works of George Fox*. 8 vols. Philadelphia: Marcus T. C. Gould.
- (1831b) *The Works of George Fox*, volume 3. Philadelphia: Marcus T. C. Gould.
- (1694) *The Journal of George Fox* (1975, ed. John L. Nickalls, epilogue Henry J. Cadbury and intro. Geoffrey F. Nuttall). London: Religious Society of Friends.
- (1654) *Saul's Errand to Damascus*. London, rpt. in Fox 3. (1831, pp. 584-614).
- Frame, Randy (1983) "And Now—Deprogramming of Christians Is Taking Place." *Christianity Today* 22 April:31.
- Fraser, Antonia (1984) Interview on *Book Four*. BBC Television, Channel 4 (6 May).
- Fraser, Donald M. [chairman] (1978) *Investigations of the Korean-American Relations. Report of the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the Committee on International Relations, U.S. House of Representatives*. (31 October). Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Gardiner, Samuel Rawson (1903a) *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*, volume 1, 1649-1650. London: Longman's Green and Co.
- (1903b) *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*, volume 3, 1653-1655. London: Longman's Green and Co.
- Gimelfarb-Brack, Marie (1979) *Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité, Justice! La Vie et l'oeuvre de Richard Overton, Nivéleur*. Las Vegas: Lang.
- Glass, Leonard L., Michael A. Kirsch, and Frederick N. Parris (1977a) "Psychiatric Disturbances Associated with Erhard Seminars Training: I. A Report of Cases." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 134:245-247.
- (1977b) "Psychiatric Disturbances Associated with Erhard Seminars Training: II. Additional Cases and Theoretical Considerations." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 134:1254-58.
- Glock, Charles Y. and Robert N. Bellah (eds.) (1976) *The New Religious Consciousness*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gordon, Suzanne (1978) "Let Them Eat eat." *Mother Jones* December:41ff.
- Gray, Francine du Plessix (1973) "Blissing Out in Houston." *The New York Review of Books*. 13 December: 36-43.
- Greaves, Richard (1977) "The Nature of the Puritan Tradition." Pages 255-275 in R. Buick Knox (ed.), *Reformation, Conformity, and Dissent: Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Nuttall*. London: Epworth Press.
- Gummere, Amelia Mott (1908) *Witchcraft and Quakerism*. London: Headley Brothers.
- Gurr, Ted Robert (1970) *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Haller, William and Godfrey Davies (eds.) (1944) *The Leveller Tracts*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Heyd, Michael (1981) "The Reaction to Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth Century: Towards an Integrative Approach." *Journal of Modern History* 53:258-280.

- Higginson, Francis (1653) *The Irrigation of the Northern Quakers*. London: H. R.; pages 63–78 Barbour and Roberts (eds.), 1973.
- Hill, Christopher (1977) *Milton and the English Revolution* Markham, Ontario: Penguin Books.
- (1974) *Change and Continuity in Seventeenth Century England*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- (1972a) "The Radical Critics of Oxford and Cambridge in the 1650s." Pages 107–132 in J. W. Baldwin and R. Goldthwaite. (eds.) *Universities in Politics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press (also rpt. in Hill [1974], p. 127–148).
- (1972b) *The World Turned Upside Down*. London: Temple Smith.
- (1971) *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1956) *Economic Problems of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hill, Christopher, Barry Reay, and William Lamont (1984) *The World of the Muggletonians*. London: Temple Smith.
- Hill, Daniel [Special Advisor] (1980) *Study of Mind Development Groups, Sects and Cults in Ontario*. Toronto: Government of Ontario Publication Department.
- Hiss, Tony (1973) "The Chic of Araby." *Saturday Review of the Society* May:53ff.
- Hobsbawn, Eric (1978) "The Historians' Group of the Communist Party." Pages 21–47 of Maurice Cornforth (ed.), *Rebels and Their Causes, Essays in Honour of A. L. Morton*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis (1981) "The Politics of New Cults: Non-Prophetic Observations on Science, Sin and Scholarship." Pages 161–179 in Thomas Robbins and Dick Anthony, *In Gods We Trust*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- House of Representatives (1978) *Hearings Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the Committee on International Relations*, House of Representatives. Part 4. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- HSA-UWA [Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity] (1977) *The Divine Principle* (1973, 5th ed.). New York: The Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity.
- James, Margaret (1941) "The Political Importance of the Tithes Controversy in the English Revolution, 1640–1660." *History* 26:1–18.
- Jefferson, Thomas (1984) *Writings*. Merrill D. Peterson (ed.). New York: Literary Classics of the United States.
- Jones, Landon Y. (1980) *Great Expectations: America and the Baby Boom Generation*. New York: Coward, McCann, & Geoghegan.
- Jones, Rufus (1923) *The Quakers in the American Colonies*. London: Macmillan and Company.
- Judah, J. Stillson (1974) *Hare Krishna and the Counterculture*. New York: John Wiley.
- Karnow, Stanley (1983) *Vietnam: A History*. New York: The Viking Press.
- Kelly, Ken (1973) "Blissed Out with the Perfect Master." *Ramparts* July:32ff.
- Kelly, Michael (1985) "Picking Up the Pieces After Life in a Cult." *Cult Awareness Network News* 10 (1):3–7.
- Kempman, Steve (1981) *Lord of the Second Advent*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books.
- Kempton, Sally (1976) "Hanging Out With the Guru." *New York Magazine* 12 April: 36–46.
- Kent, Stephen A. (1986) "Slogan Chanters to Mantra Chanters: A Mertonian Deviance Analysis of Conversion to the 'New Religious Movements' in the Early 1970s." Presented at the Association for the Sociology of Religion, New York; forthcoming in *Sociological Analysis* (1988).
- (1983a) "The Quaker Ethic and the Fixed Price Policy: Max Weber and Beyond." *Sociological Inquiry* 53:16–31.
- (1983b) "Weber, Goethe, and the Nietzschean Allusion: Capturing the Source of the 'Iron Cage' Metaphor." *Sociological Analysis* 44:297–320.
- (1982a) "The 'Papist' Charges Against the Interregnum Quakers." *Journal of Religious History* 12:180–190.
- (1982b) "Relative Deprivation and Resource Mobilization: A Study of Early Quakerism." *British Journal of Sociology* 33:529–544.
- (1982c) "A Sectarian Interpretation of the Rise of Mahayana." *Religion* 12:311–332.
- Khalsa, Kirpal Singh (1986) "New Religious Movements Turn to Worldly Success." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 25:233–247.
- Kim, Chrysostom, O. S. B. (1974) "The Diggers, The Ranters, and the Early Quakers." *The American Benedictine Review* 25:460–475.
- Klandermans, Bert (1984) "Mobilization and Participation: Social-Psychological Expansions of Resource Mobilization Theory." *American Sociological Review* 49:583–600.
- Kleiman, Dena (1977) "T. M. Study Barred in Jersey's Schools." *New York Times* 21 October:D13.
- Kopkind, Andrew (1973) "Mystic Politics: Refugees from the New Left." *Ramparts* July:26ff.
- Lamont, William (1979) *Richard Baxter and the Millennium*. London: Croom Helm.
- (1969) *Godly Rule*. London: Macmillan.
- Lancashire, David (1978) "The New Religions: Mind-Benders or True Redeemers?" *Globe and Mail* 21 January:10.
- Laslett, Peter (1971) *The World We Have Lost* (1965, 2nd ed.). London: Methuen and Company.
- Law Reports* (1983) *British Columbia Law Reports* April:297–321.
- LeMout, John E. (1976) "'Memorandum' to the Privacy Committee, American Civil Liberties Union." 22 October:18–19, Appendix to APRL, [no date].
- Lerner, Michael P. (1971) "May Day: Anatomy of the Movement." *Ramparts* July:20ff.
- Leveller Collective (1978–1980) *The Leveller* London: no pub.
- Levine, Richard (1974) "When the Lord of All the Universe Played Houston: Many are Called But Few Showed Up." *Rolling Stone* 14 March:36ff.
- Levitt, Cyril (1984) *Children of Privilege: Student Revolt in the Sixties*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Levy, Leonard W. (1981) *Treason Against God. A History of the Offense of Blasphemy*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Lilburn, John, William Walwyn, Thomas Prince, and Richard Overton (1649) *A Manifestation*. Pages 247–259 in Morton (1975).
- Lilly, John C. (1972) *The Center of the Cyclone*. New York: Julian Press.
- Macpherson, C. B. (1962) *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Manchester Guardian Weekly* (1985) "The Jackboot Way with Protesters" 17 February:1.
- Manning, Brian (1984) "The Levellers and Religion." Pages 65–90 in J. F. McGregor and Barry Reay (eds.), *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCarthy, John D. and Mayer Zald (1977) "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82:1212–1241.
- (1973) *The Trend of Social Movements in America: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Merton, Robert K. (1968) "Continuities in the Theory of Reference Groups and Social Structure." Pages 335–440 in Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press.
- Merton, Robert K. and Alice S. Rossi (1968) "Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior." Pages 279–334 in Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press.
- Miller, Joshua (1655) *Antichrist in Man The Quakers Idol*. London: J. Macock.
- Montgomery, Paul (1982) "Major Faiths in City Undertaking First Unified Effort Against Cults." *New York Times* 1 August:1, 33.

- Morgan, Ted (1973) "Oz in the Astrodome." *New York Times Magazine*. 9 December:38ff.
- Morrison, Denton E. (1971) "Some Notes Toward Theory on Relative Deprivation, Social Movements, and Social Change." *American Behavioral Scientist* 14:675-690.
- Morton, A. L. (ed.) (1975) *Freedom in Arms: A Selection of Leveller Writings*. New York: International Publishers.
- (1970) *The World of the Ranters*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Mulligan, Lotte (1982) "The Religious Roots of William Walwyn's Radicalism." *Journal of Religious History* 12:162-179.
- Needleman, Jacob (1970) *The New Religions*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Newsweek* (1981) "Arica: The Same Old Yen for Zen" 9 November:20.
- New York Times* (1977) "Notes on People [i.e., Eldredge Cleaver]." *New York Times*, 15 December, sec. III:2.
- Nielson, Donald A. (1984) "Charles Manson's Family of Love." *Sociological Analysis* 45:331-334.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey (1983) "Record and Testimony: Quaker Persecution Literature 1650-1700." Manuscript, London: Friends House Library.
- (1973) "Overcoming the World: The Early Quaker Programme." Pages 145-164 in *Studies in Church History*, volume 10, *Sanctity and Secularity: The Church and the World*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Oates, Robert M. (1976) *Celebrating the Dawn*. New York: G. P. Putnam's.
- Oberschall, Anthony (1978) "The Decline of the 1960s Social Movements." Pages 257-289 in Louis Kriesberg (ed.), *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change*, volume 1. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Orsini, Bette, and Charles Stafford (1980) "Scientology: An In-Depth Profile of a New Force in Clearwater." *The St. Petersburg Times* [Florida].
- Pearson, Anthony (1657) *The Great Case of Tithes Truly Stated*. . . . (Rpt. 1730). London: J. Sowle.
- Perry, Charles (1984) *The Haight-Ashbury: A History*. New York: Random House/Rolling Stone.
- Petegorsky, David W. (1940) *Left Wing Democracy in the English Civil War*. London: Victor Gollancz.
- Plowman, Edward E. (1973) "Open Season for Deprogrammers." *Christianity Today* 31 August:40-41.
- Prynne, William (1655) *Quakers Unmasked, and Clearly detected to be but the Spawn of Romish Frogs, Jesuites, and Franciscan Fryers* (2nd ed., enlarged). London: Edward Thomas.
- Reay, Barry (1985) *The Quakers and the English Revolution*. London: Temple Smith.
- (1984) "Quakerism and Society." Pages 141-164 in J. F. McGregor and B. Reay (eds.), *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1980a) "Popular Hostility towards Quakers in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England." *Social History* 5:387-407.
- (1980b) "Quaker Opposition to Tithes 1652-1660." *Past and Present* 86:98-120.
- (1976) "The Muggletonians: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Sectarianism." *The Journal of Religious History* 9:32-49.
- Reich, Charles A. (1970) *The Greening of America*. New York: Bantam.
- Richardson, James T. (1973) "Causes and Consequences of the Jesus Movement in America." *Social Studies* 2:457-473.
- Robbins, Thomas, Dick Anthony, and Thomas E. Curits (1975) "Youth Culture Religious Movements: Evaluating the Integrative Hypothesis." *Sociological Quarterly* 16:48-64.
- Robbins, Thomas, Dick Anthony, and James Richardson (1978) "Theory and Research on Today's 'New Religions.'" *Sociological Analysis* 39:95-122.
- Rose, Jerry D., (1982) *Outbreaks: The Sociology of Collective Behavior*. New York: The Free Press.
- Rosen, Winifred (1973) "Down the Up Staircase: Upside Down at the Arica Institute." *Harper's June*:28ff.
- Rubin, Jerry (1976) *Growing (Up) at Thirty-Seven*. New York: M. Evans and Company.
- Runciman, W. C. (1966) *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Sabine, George (ed.) (1941) *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley*. New York: Russell & Russell.
- Salmon, Joseph (1649) *A Rout, A Rout*. Pages 189-200 in N. Smith (1983).
- Sayles, Marnie L. (1984) "Relative Deprivation and Collective Protest: An Impoverished Theory?" *Sociological Inquiry* 54:449-465.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M. (1978) *Robert Kennedy and His Times*. New York: Ballantine.
- Schochet, Gordon J. (1975) *Patriarchalism in Political Thought*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- (1969) "Patriarchalism, Politics, and Mass Attitudes in Stuart England." *The Historical Journal* 12:41-441.
- SDS [Students for a Democratic Society] (1969) "Bringing the War Home." *New Left Notes*. Pages 247-249 in Albert and Albert (1984).
- Seaberg, R. B. (1981) "The Norman Conquest and the Common Law: The Levellers and the Argument from Continuity." *The Historical Journal* 24:791-806.
- Select Committee on Ethics (1978) *Korean Influence Inquiry: Report of the Select Committee on Ethics, United States Senate* (October 10 [legislative day, September 28], Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office).
- Shaw, Howard (1968) *The Levellers*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Shaw, William A. (1900) *A History of the English Church During the Civil Wars and Under the Commonwealth 1640-1660*. 2 volumes. New York: Longmans, Green.
- Shupe, Anson D. Jr. and David G. Bromley (1980) *The New Vigilantes: Deprogrammers, Anti-Cultists, and the New Religions*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- (1981) "Witches, Moonies and the Accusations of Evil." Pages 247-261 in Thomas Robbins and Dick Anthony (ed.), *In Gods We Trust: New Patterns of Religious Pluralism in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.
- Smelser, Neil (1962) *Theory of Collective Behavior*. New York: Free Press.
- Smith, Nigel (ed.) (1983) *A Collection of Ranter Writings*. London: Junction Books.
- Smith, Steven R. (1973) "The London Apprentices as Seventeenth Century Adolescents." *Past and Present* 61:576-582.
- Stark, Rodney and William Sims Bainbridge (1980) "Towards a Theory of Religion: Religious Commitment." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 19:114-128.
- Stephen, L. and S. Lee (eds.) (1885-1900) *The Dictionary of National Biography*. London: Oxford, University Press.
- Stewart, James B. Jr. (1980) "Scientology's War Against Judges." *The American Lawyer* December:30-32.
- Stoner, Carroll and JoAnne Park (1977) *All Gods Children: The Cult Experience—Salvation or Slavery?* Radnor, PA: Chilton.
- Teltsch, Kathleen (1981) "Philanthropy From Friendly Persuaders." *New York Times* 6 September:18E.
- Terry, Altha E. (1937) *Giles Calvert, Mid-Seventeenth Century English Bookseller and Publisher, An Account of his Career, With a Checklist of his Imprints*. New York: Columbia University, School of Library Service.
- Thomas, Keith (1972) "The Levellers and the Franchise." Pages 57-78, 219-222 in G. E. Aylmer (ed.), *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement 1646-1660*. London: Macmillan Press.
- (1971) *Religion and the Decline of Magic*. New York: Charles Scribner's.

- (1969) "Another Digger Broadside." *Past and Present* 42:60–68.
- Time* (1978) "The Quandry of the Cults: Main-Line U.S. Churches Are Unsure How To Confront Them" 18 December:52.
- (1972) "Toward Level 24" 29 May:68.
- Tipton, Steven M. (1982) *Getting Saved From the Sixties: Moral Meaning In Conversion and Cultural Change*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tobey, Alan (1976) "The Summer Solstice of the Healthy-Happy-Holy Organization." Pages 5–30 in Glock and Bellah (1976).
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh (1973) "America's Charles I: Invitation to a Beheading." *New York Magazine* 5 November:48.
- Underwood, Barbara and Betty Underwood (1979) *Hostage to Heaven*. New York: Clarkson N. Potter.
- U.S. News* (1972) *The Religious Reawakening in America*. Washington, DC: U.S. News And World Report.
- Vann, Richard T. (1969) *The Social Development of English Quakerism 1655–1755*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Viorst, Milton (1979) *Fire in the Streets: America in the 1960s*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Walker, Daniel (1968) *Rights in Conflict: The Violent Confrontation of Demonstrators and Police in the Parks and Streets of Chicago During the Week of the Democratic National Convention of 1968*. New York/Toronto/London: Bantam Books.
- Wallis, Roy (1981) "Yesterday's Children: Cultural and Structural Change in a New Religious Movement." Pages 97–133 in Bryan Wilson (ed.), *The Social Impact of the New Religious Movements*. New York: Rose of Sharon Press.
- (1976) "Observations on the Children of God." *Sociological Review* 24:807–829.
- (1975) "Relative Deprivation and Social Movements: A Cautionary Note." *British Journal of Sociology* 26:360–363.
- Watts, Michael R. (1978) *The Dissenters*, volume 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, Max (1920) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1905, rev.; trans. Talcott Parsons, 1930). New York: Charles Scribner's.
- Westhues, Kenneth (1975) "Inter-Generational Conflict in the Sixties." Pages 387–408 in Samuel D. Clark, J. Paul Grayson, and Linda M. Grayson (eds.), *Prophecy and Protest: Social Movements in Twentieth Century Canada*. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing.
- Wilson, Bryan (1981) "Time, Generations, and Sectarianism." Pages 217–234 in Bryan Wilson (ed.), *The Social Impact of the New Religious Movements*. New York: Rose of Sharon Press.
- Winstanley, Gerrard (1650) *Fire in the Bush*. Pages 443–497 in Sabine (1941).
- (1649) "To My Lord Generall and His Councell of War." Pages 346–349 in Sabine (1941).
- Wolfe, Tom (1976) "The 'Me' Decade and the Third Great Awakening." *New York Magazine* 23 August:26ff.
- Wood, John, Robert Everard, Hugh Hurst, Humphrey Marston, William Hutchinson, and James Carpen (1649) *The Levellers (Falsely so-called) Vindicated*. . . . London: [no publisher]; pages 295–318 in A. L. Morton (ed.), (1975) *Freedom in Arms, A Selection of Leveller Writings*. New York: International Publishers.
- Woodhouse, A. S. P. (ed.) (1938) *Puritanism and Liberty*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons.
- Yinger, J. Milton (1982) *Countercultures: The Promise and the Peril of a World Turned Upside Down*. New York: The Free Press.
- Zaroulis, Nancy and Gerald Sullivan (1984) *Who Spoke Up? American Protest Against the War in Vietnam, 1963–1975*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Zoning Board of Appeals* (1980) "Application of the Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity," Town of New Castle [New York], Decision and Report, 26 14 May.