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INTRODUCTION

The seventeenth century period of the English Revolution was a period of a plethora of religious and political ideas of all types. Royalist and Parliamentary, Roundhead and Cavalier, Leveller and Monarchist vied with each other. Calvinists, Baptists, Independents, Seekers, Ranters, Behemists, Familists, and Millenarians were among the religious groups in existence. The abolition of the Long parliament of the censorship authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the consequent disuse of the monopoly of the Stationers Company made possible the collapse of the censorship of printed matter. Polemical pamphlets were published on unlicensed printing presses primarily in London. Tracts were written and promptly answered. Individuals moved freely from one sect to another writing of the religious errors, recanting their heresies and offering testimonials proclaiming their religious truth. Political institutions, such as the law and clergy, were criticized and land rents condemned.

Gerrard Winstanley, the leader and principal pamphleteer of the Digger movement, formulated his ideas amidst this backdrop. Unlike the twentieth century, seventeenth century actors combined their religious and political ideas. Religious and politics ideas were propounded so rapidly that it is only in retrospect that we can date the founding of religious sects such as the Baptists,
Quakers, or the long forgotten Ranters, or recall other political theorists besides Hobbes and the Levellers. In this context Winstanley formulated a religious and political theory. No other seventeenth century English theorist delivered such a thorough-going critique of property, church, and state. He sought to abolish landed property, the clergy, and "kingly government." In their places he proposed common landed property, a system of common distribution of economic goods, and the "restoration of true monarchy."

The chief aim of this dissertation is to analyze the political theory of Gerrard Winstanley. In order to do this, the evolution of his ideas will be traced in the order he presented them. In this way the paramount features of his political theory will be obvious by comparing those ideas which remained constant with the ideas which changed quickly and easily. Three major periods of the life and writings of Winstanley are crucial in understanding the three stages of his political theory. He wrote his first five pamphlets before he formed the digging community at a time in which he may have been an itinerant preacher. In the second period he wrote his next fifteen pamphlets while leader of the Digger community. The third period corresponds to the demise of the Digger movement after which he wrote his last work, The Law of Freedom in a Platform. In all three periods, the major effort of this dissertation is to recover what Winstanley intended to say. Only in this way can one understand the meaning which he sought to convey to his seventeenth century audience.

The recovery of the historical intention of Winstanley or any political thinker requires both content and context be analyzed.
The paradox is that doing one requires the other be dealt with also. When an interpreter of a political theorist is trying to determine how the thinker's ideas developed out of immediate circumstances, he must understand both the content and context of the ideas analyzed. Otherwise how would an interpreter know what circumstances or context of the thinker were important unless the thinker has made written references which single out an aspect of his context rather than another. The content of the writings of Winstanley and the context in which he wrote his pamphlets exemplify this relationship. Winstanley made many references to the common people having the common land. Unless the interpreter understands the manorial system of landholding and how the status of different social groups related to landholding among Winstanley's contemporaries, the significance of how substantial was the change of giving the common people the common land which Winstanley advocated would not be understood. Thus, content cannot be understood without an understanding of the context nor can the context be understood without an understanding of content. The act of digging or cultivating some barren common land on St. George's Hill by Winstanley and a group of followers cannot be understood unless his belief in the imminent millenarianism found in his pamphlets is understood as a source of motivation.

The chief technique in relating the context and content is to use the content as the arbiter of what is important in the context. An exhaustive description of seventeenth century England is not necessary. What aspects of the context of Winstanley was he aware of? How does this awareness relate to what Winstanley intended to say? For example,
Winstanley was leader of the Digging community consisting of people cultivating the land and denying landed property. The local populace used the local clergy, economic boycotts, a court suit, and physical attacks against the Diggers on their settlement. All of these activities were part of the context of Winstanley. This awareness became part of his critique of society. Winstanley widened his criticisms of the clergy, the Lords of Manor, and the court system and reached the conclusion that these institutions were based on preserving landed property. Only by examining the content of Winstanley's writings can the importance of his context be evaluated.

His context also has some special problems. Little is known about the life of Winstanley. Even less is known about the Digger community. Religious ideas are very difficult to differentiate from each other in mid-seventeenth century England. Consequently, one most frequently rely more on the pamphlets of Winstanley than if more complete information were available. This is the task of the first chapter.

This dissertation is based on the theme that the political theory of Winstanley is based on the concepts of equality and morality. Equality and morality was the unifying theme of his political theory. The first pre-digging period was characterized by his application of the standard of inequitable social conduct to the church and its ally the government. In the second period of his digging pamphlets, he applied this same standard to landed property. In the process of applying this standard, he developed the view that the court system, the clergy, and the Lords of Manor were all institutions based on
preservation of landed property. In his last period during which he wrote, *The Law of Freedom*, he proposed a restructured society based on common landed property and a common system of distribution of economic goods. Winstanley shares with the socialists the belief that property is the basis of social oppression. However, millenarianism remained important as defining his goal of restoring men to their condition before the Fall of man. The last three chapters will deal with the content of political theory of Winstanley.

The first chapter will analyze the secondary literature so that the interpretations of others may be used as a guideline in developing one's own interpretation of Winstanley. This guideline should provide some comparison of how different interpreters have approached Winstanley.
CHAPTER I

WINSTANLEY: THE SECONDARY LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the interpretations of the political theory of Winstanley available in the secondary literature. The secondary sources were largely histories of seventeenth century England or frequently histories of socialism. Thus, Winstanley was frequently analyzed in terms of a theme of a book in which, at best, he played only a contributing part.

Despite the fact that Winstanley wrote his pamphlets in the mid-seventeenth century, the secondary literature did not start in that century or the successive eighteenth or nineteenth centuries. Only cursory references to Winstanley appeared in the nineteenth century. The first reference to Winstanley was that of the anarchist William Godwin in his work, The History of the Commonwealth of English, written in 1827. He considered the Diggers scarcely worth recording except that they exemplified the unstable temper of the age. In 1894 the English historian Samuel Gardiner in his book, History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, Vol. 1, wrote that the failure of the Diggers to have much appeal to their contemporaries could best be explained by the fact “communism had no root in the England of the seventeenth century.” Gardiner suggested that Englishmen were too interested in supporting their social institutions to allow realization of the Diggers' aim of eliminating private property and buying and selling. David Hume, in his work, The History of England, written in 1778, also
dismissed the Diggers as a "disorder that broke out among the people." In 1845 Thomas Carlyle described them as "bean dribblers" in his work, *Oliver Cromwell\'s Letters and Speeches*.

Winstanlean literature did not really begin in earnest until publication of Eduard Bernstein\'s book, *Cromwell and Communism* in 1895. This work was the first not to relegate Winstanley to passing references. Bernstein devoted two chapters of his book to an analysis of the political theory of Winstanley. This author was the German Marxist revisionist Eduard Bernstein. In his later career he was to challenge the basic tenets of Marxism by proposing Marxism be purged of its utopian elements by rapid democratization of the movement. However, Bernstein\'s approach to Winstanley was that of a classical Marxist. First, Bernstein assumed that Winstanley\'s ideas reflected the material relationship to production of the class to which he belonged. Secondly, Bernstein emphasized the revolutionary intention of Winstanley was evident by the fact that the Digger sought to overthrow existing property relations by putting his ideas into practice.

Bernstein proposed no evolution in the development of the ideas of Winstanley. He discounted any religious phraseology in Winstanley\'s writings. He regarded Winstanley as using religion as a means of communication with fellow members of the working class to put into practice his revolutionary intent of abolishing property relations. For example, Bernstein noted Winstanley\'s description of a vision in which he warned his readers that workers who continued to work for the wealthy would be punished by God. Bernstein thought Winstanley
had used religious terms to serve as "a cloak to conceal the revolutionary design of the author." 7 The digging which began on St. George's Hill was done by Winstanley to propagandize the view that the earth was a common treasury. The Diggers were representing the interest of their class by suggesting agricultural laborers had a right of equal access to the land. The Diggers were quite unlike the Levellers who represented the artisan class. Despite many attacks against their settlement, the Diggers attempted to practice their ideas. Winstanley regarded such an assault on the Diggers as an example of the result of the Civil War. The Civil War had heightened exploitation by more firmly establishing property. 8 Winstanley's writing in which digging was justified was a "good criticism of the English Revolution from the proletarian of the period." 9

Bernstein regarded The Law of Freedom, Winstanley's last work, as different because he no longer had to cloak his revolutionary intentions. The digging was disbanded because economic conditions had not been bad enough to enlist enough working class support for success. The revolutionary practice of Winstanley no longer had to be masked. Winstanley believed all social oppression had an economic foundation. He compared Winstanley's suggestion that in his future society all buying and selling should be abolished with a similar statement made in The Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx. Bernstein noted that Winstanley regarded fines, rents, and feudal dues as merely perpetuating the inequalities of use of the land. 10 The selling of Crown and Church lands seized in the war to army officers
and speculators had the same effect. When Winstanley criticized scholarly knowledge, Bernstein proposed that the basis of such criticism was the Digger's belief that such knowledge was used to justify the oppression of the working class. Winstanley noted the clergy's justification that the inequality of goods as the intention of the Creator was part of the oppression of the working class.11

Bernstein considered Winstanley's new society to be a communist utopia. By providing for equality in the land and in goods, he had eliminated exploitation. The amount of goods a citizen could take from the common storehouses to which everyone donated was not dependent on the amount of one's contribution. Need, rather than the ability to produce, determined a person's consumption. Bernstein regarded Winstanley's preference for a utopia based on small household production as an indication of the lack of industrial conditions present in the period in which the Digger lived.12

The appearance of these two chapters enabled Bernstein to found the "Marxist socialist school" of interpretation of Winstanley. The contributors to this school have several characteristics in common. First, they13 all characterized Winstanley as a socialist and most frequently cited his proposal to abolish landed property as proof of their contention. Secondly, they all either discounted his religious pronouncements or they ignored them altogether. Winstanley was regarded as a secular thinker with religion having nominal or no importance in his political theory. They interpreted any religious reference of Winstanley to have twentieth century or modern meaning. Thirdly,
they interpreted Winstanley's chief concerns were to describe the economic oppression of the seventeenth century working class and to change this condition by his writing and his digging. Despite these common characteristics, these interpreters do not borrow from each other's interpretations. If another socialist exponent is cited, it is to expose the weaknesses in interpretation and compare them with the author's superior judgments.

Louis H. Berens in his book, The Digger Movement in the Days of the Commonwealth (1906), claimed there were really two Winstanleys. The first Winstanley was represented by his early writings in which he appealed for men to put into social practice their religious beliefs. In proposing social conduct as the standard of religiosity, Berens proposed Winstanley founded the Quaker tradition. Social practice required men to become aware of their own inward divinity and overcome their bondage to selfishness of the flesh. Such realization was a requirement for men to conduct themselves righteously. Ethical conduct was exemplified by men abolishing buying and selling of the land, landed property, enclosing the earth, killing, imprisonment, and whipping. Berens regarded Winstanley as undergoing a shift in which opposition to landed property became a "keynote" of his thought. Berens regarded Winstanley as having used religion as kind of a springboard to ethical insights which now became socialist.

He regarded the second Winstanley's ideas as most closely resembling those of Henry George, the nineteenth century single tax advocate and socialist. George advocated a single tax on land to prevent the
exclusion of anyone from use of the land. Winstanley had also emphasized equal access of all to the land. His advocacy of the poor's access to the common land was an attempt to change unjust economic conditions. Winstanley regarded social inequality of the poverty of man and wealth of few were rooted in land ownership. Cultivation of the common land was a means of the poor reclaiming their rightful claim to the earth. Berens considered the Digger manifestoes which were addressed to parliament, the army, and the city of London to be aimed at establishing such an equitable state of society. The Diggers were the first in history to proclaim the rights of men against the rights of property.

The utopia Winstanley described in The Law of Freedom was to be a society in which each person received according to his needs and gave based on his ability. This could only be realized if all persons respected the equal rights of all to the earth. His Free Common-wealth was to legalize this right. Berens regarded the laws Winstanley suggested for planting and harvesting the earth, handicraft, trade, commerce, and industries as suggestive. Berens thought these suggestions would result in the fruits of the united labor of all being shared based on needs. No buying or selling would be necessary in his Free Common-wealth. Winstanley compared his utopia and the Laws of Monarchy; the former was based on legal sanctions for inequality. Berens regarded Winstanley's last work as the fruition of the evolutions of his thought to socialist conclusions. For Berens, Winstanley's religious ideas became part of the evolution of his socialism. These religious ideas were a catalyst in the development of his ethical insights which led him to socialist conclusions.
G.P. Gooch in his book, *The History of English Democratic Ideas* (1898) depicted Winstanley as a communist. He proposed no evolution of his ideas from a religious origin. Gooch characterized the thought of Winstanley as distinctive because it was based on seeking the welfare of the working class. Gooch noted Winstanley was not part of the English tradition of political ideas advocating reform. Winstanley's primary concern was the economic exploitation of the working class. His standard of judgment of political and social condition was the "well being of the proletariat." Since this standard of well-being was not secured in society, Winstanley proposed a "scheme of socialism." Winstanley regarded human nature as no barrier of his scheme because human nature could be altered by social conditions. In his society no inequality of riches was allowed because wealth was a social product. All would share in this product. This sharing would eliminate the social oppression resulting from the inequality of English society. All must have property. Winstanley desired for production and distribution to be as cooperatively shared as wealth. Gooch suggested that Winstanley's exchange system was "purely communistic" because each person produced for a common storehouse and took from the storehouse based on his need.

John Strachey regarded Winstanley as a socialist in his book, *The Theory and Practice of Socialism* (1936), but from different premises than Gooch. His interpretation was much closer to Bernstein's in his emphasis on unity and practice of Winstanley's working class ideas. However, he had no conception of Winstanley's using religious
phraseology as a cloak to conceal his revolutionary intentions. Rather
Winstanley's religious phrasing exemplified the fact economic questions
were discussed in this seventeenth century idiom. Moreover, Winstanley
used religion to express the materialism characteristic of his working
class status. Strachey proposed that Winstanley's belief, that men
cannot know anything about what happens after death, but men could
know the secrets of nature, was an example of his materialism. In
the society proposed in his last work, The Law of Freedom, Winstanley
described the chief function of the "ministers" or Commonwealth
officers to be imparting knowledge to people of politics, economics,
and natural science. When Winstanley wrote that God manifested himself
in actual knowledge, Strachey interpreted this as Winstanley's commit­
ment to applying knowledge to material economic problems.25

Strachey proposed Winstanley had advanced the evolution of social­
ism by unifying theory and practice. Winstanley's thought had working
class character because the working class in their daily existence used
their labor to manipulate the material reality of nature. Winstanley
advanced socialism by practicing materialism and formulating materialism
in theory. Sir Thomas More, his predecessor, had presented socialist
ideas but never expected their realization by practice. Winstanley
more closely approximated working class thought in attempting to put
his ideas into practice. The digging on St. George's Hill was an
attempt to realize his ideas which were undertaken before he began
writing. More specifically, the digging venture was an attempt to
put into practice the worker's conception of freedom. Freedom to
them meant the right to cultivate the soil. Moreover, the changes
Winstanley suggested in *The Law of Freedom* were designed for practice. He expected these changes to be implemented in seventeenth century English society.²⁶

David Petegorsky was one of the few interpreters to write a book devoted to Winstanley and the Diggers. In the book, *Left-wing Democracy in the English Civil War* (1940), he depicted Winstanley as a Marxian socialist. Petegorsky thought Winstanley exemplified all aspects of Marxian socialism in that respect he differed from others of the socialist school. Winstanley was the only person in the seventeenth century to articulate "a wholly proletarian ideology."²⁷ Winstanley's ideas were based on the belief that economics was the basis of all social change. Winstanley grasped this economic basis of historical materialism. For Petegorsky, Winstanley's opposition to private landownership and his preference for common landownership exemplified his historical materialism. The appeal for developing the wastelands for use by the poor rested on Winstanley's economic interpretation.²⁸ Petegorsky described the Digger's views as follows:

> It [the private ownership of the means of subsistence] is the only key to the understanding of history; and on the foundation of the social relationships that the system of private ownership creates is reared the superstructure of government and law, of religion and education.²⁹

Petegorsky presented Winstanley's view of natural law as requiring an end to the private ownership of subsistence. Natural law was interpreted by Winstanley as involving the interdependence of liberty and equality. The end of natural law was to equally
provide to all men a material basis on which they could live. The
existing English society was based on maintaining inequality by denying
some men equal access of the law. The natural, original state of society
was common ownership of everything and the self-sufficiency of all by
their labor on the soil. Winstanley believed that history demonstrated
this state of society historically existed and was ended by William the
conqueror's introduction of private property.30

Winstanley regarded private property as the foundation of seventeen
century English society. Enclosures separated the poor from the
land; the workers became landless wage laborers. This allowed the land-
lords to live on the labor power of others. The lawyers had an interest
in improving their property by preserving complicated laws written in a
foreign language. The clergy taught the people to accept their lot by
giving the system a spiritual sanctity. The Civil War had been a strug-
gle for supremacy of the monarchy and gentry in which the common people
had been promised freedom from oppression. This freedom was illusory
because the original state of society remained unrestored. Freedom
required the destruction of private property and replacing it with common
ownership. With the elimination of their propertied basis of power, the
clergy and lawyers would have no reason to exist.31

Although Winstanley spoke of restoring a prior state of society,
Petegorsky did not conclude that Winstanley accepted a medieval
communism. Winstanley's analysis was founded on an analysis of
social and historical forces, whereas medieval communism was an
expression of the spontaneous discontent of the peasants. Moreover,
medieval communists had believed the Fall had made impossible any
form of social organization other than private property because of the depraved condition of human nature. Winstanley thought abolishing property would transform human nature. Medieval communism insisted on an equal division of the fruits of production. Winstanley wanted common ownership of both distribution and production. Thus Winstanley provided a theoretical framework lacking in medieval communism.32

Petegorsky dealt with the meaning of Winstanley's use of religious terminology in a distinctive way in comparison with his colleagues of the socialist school. He did not view Winstanley as using religion as a vehicle to disguise revolutionary intentions or a means of discussing economic problems. Winstanley's use of religious terminology evidenced the class consciousness of the Digger in contradistinction to his working class associates. Winstanley's fellow workers used religious terms to lessen the power and wealth of the propertied classes by embracing religious mysticism as an escape from the unpleasant material conditions of their lives.33 Since Winstanley possessed superior class consciousness, his religious conceptions were based on an understanding of how the historical process worked which produced such deplorable conditions for the working class. Petegorsky represented Winstanley's concept of God to be a conception of laws operating in the natural order and society. Winstanley presented history as a struggle between the opposing forces of God and the Serpent. God selected the poor to be his Saints, while the Serpent was represented by existing social institutions. These institutions, such as the clergy by their
tithes and prosecution of heresy, persecuted the Saints. The end result of the struggle between these two social forces was the inevitable victory of the Spirit of Christ.34

Thus Petegorsky portrayed Winstanley as a Marxist socialist. His characterization would appear stronger than his statement that Winstanley was on the threshold of modern socialism. "Babeuf is Winstanley plus a century of historical development."35

A less complex exegesis was delivered by H.N. Brailsford in his book, The Levellers and the English Revolution (1961). He classified Winstanley as presenting "a simple but clear cut communist theory."36 Brailsford gave no credence to religion as having any importance in Winstanley's thought. He insisted the religious phraseology of Winstanley was best understood as Winstanley's anticipations of the ideas of Karl Marx.

Like Marx, Winstanley viewed phenomena from a class perspective. Brailsford insisted that Winstanley's class perspective could only be adequately understood if his Biblical idiom were translated into socialist phraseology. He thereby negated any lasting importance of religion in Winstanley's thought. When Winstanley viewed the Second Coming of Christ as the penetration of men's mind thereby ending oppression, covetousness, and government, Brailsford compared this to Marx's withering away of the state.37 When Winstanley used the phrase, "Voice of the Spirit," Brailsford translated this to mean "sub-conscious self."38 When Winstanley cited Biblical prophecies assuring triumph of the despised over the earth, the author concluded
that Winstanley had a “sharp consciousness of class.” Brailsford proposed that Winstanley’s criticism of the clergy for selling words and universities for pretending to have the only valid interpretation of scripture were examples of how “strong class consciousness” colored things he wrote. When Winstanley said in The Law of Freedom that religion was being used as a cloak for social purposes, Brailsford equated this with Marx’s view that religion was the opium of the people. Moreover, Brailsford suggested the communist international outlook was an adequate explanation of why Winstanley in his utopia suggested that ministers were to give lectures in foreign languages. Brailsford considered Winstanley’s pamphlet, The New Law of Righteousness, as “a Communist Manifesto written in the dialect of its day.”

Moreover, Brailsford interpreted Winstanley’s The Law of Freedom as a sort of sketch of a classless society. Winstanley’s advocacy of common land ownership in that work reflected the proletarian character of the Digger movement. The Diggers had attempted to establish a classless society and end all oppression. The form of this classless society was to be satisfaction of men’s needs from storehouses. By eliminating private property and basing society on need, Brailsford thought Winstanley sought the same goal which was to be later articulated by Karl Marx.

Unlike the continuity Brailsford described in the thought of Winstanley, Margaret James concluded Winstanley’s ideas had evolved. In her book, Social Problems and Policy During the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660, she pictured two Wistanleys. The first Winstanley was a religious radical who based his ideas on mysticism. The Digger thought
all men had an immanent morality or "inner light." James noted that Winstanley conceived of the idea of digging as a result of a series of trances. Winstanley thought the standard of living of the poor would be improved by divine intervention. The Biblical prophecy, the poor shall inherit the earth, would be materially fulfilled. The spirit of Christ would transform men. The poor would have to accept the plea of the priests that they should achieve satisfaction of mind while the rich monopolized control of the earth. 

James regarded a conversion of Winstanley to communism as occurring in his fifth pamphlet, The New Law of Righteousness. Winstanley's "fairly complete theory of communism" was evident in his belief that landed property would be abolished as a result of the digging on St. George's Hill. Winstanley regarded the political democracy after the Civil War as inadequate without the poor cultivating the common land. The landless poor were worse off economically than before the war. When the poor would have land, then England could become the Commonwealth the government had proclaimed. Winstanley's description of kingly power as having three bases: the power of the Lords of Manor, bad laws, and tithing priests, suggested his communism. In The New Law of Righteousness, Winstanley proposed private property was the cause of all wars, bloodshed, and misery of mankind. The only solution was for men to adopt common property.

James thought Winstanley's communism placed him outside the English political tradition of "practical activity" or striving to get reforms adopted. Winstanley's communism was based on a
revolutionary theory based on "first principles." James proposed that the Diggers were "the economic offspring of the Levellers." James concluded that the advanced political democracy the Levellers proposed had allowed the Diggers to take such a proposal to its logical conclusion of social revolution as advocated by the Diggers.

Like James, George Juretic pictured a two stage development in the thought of Winstanley. In his article, "Digger, no Millenarian: The Revolutionizing of Gerrard Winstanley," in The Journal of History of Ideas (1975), he suggested before digging Winstanley was a millenarian; after digging he became progressively secular and socialist.

The mysticism of the earlier Winstanley was irrelevant in understanding the later socialist Winstanley. Juretic's interpretation was similar to Bernstein's in concluding revolutionary practice was the basis of what Winstanley meant. Unlike Bernstein, Juretic thought Winstanley's experience of the digging enterprise enabled him to cast off his mysticism and embrace socialism. Bernstein had not described any interplay between practice and theory to have existed in the thought of Winstanley. Juretic characterized The True Leveller Standard Advanced as the point of conversion. In that pamphlet Winstanley abandoned millenarianism and realized England had to abolish property to complete the revolution. The Diggers would bring about socialism in action. From this secular critique of his England, Winstanley's views became more socialist as he expanded his explanation for property as the basis of oppression in England. In The Law of Freedom, Winstanley advocated a communist society. Juretic thought Winstanley's insight into actual social problems led him into a socialist path.
Barrington Moore gave an even more distinctive interpretation of Winstanley than had Juretic. He regarded the ideas of Winstanley as reflecting the economic conditions of seventeenth century England. This assumption was part of Moore's approach in his book, The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy (1966). He examined the French Revolution, the American Civil War, twentieth century Asia, and the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries of England to understand the role of the landed aristocracy and peasants in leading to bourgeois revolutions, fascism, and communism. In his description of the peasant radicalism of seventeenth century England, Moore described Winstanley's ideas as typical of the peasant radicalism which accompanied the development of capitalism. Winstanley's ideas represented peasant radicalism in that he protested the effects of the growth of capitalism which destroyed traditional English peasant life.  

Throughout his book, Moore regarded all political ideas as determined by the economic conditions he described. The ideas of Winstanley and the Diggers reflected the discontent of peasants with the effects of economic modernization. In seventeenth century England, industry and commerce were undermining the peasant agrarian economy. The enclosure movement was destroying the agriculture of villages which had been based on juxtaposed strips of lands individually owned and cooperatively harvested and planted. As a spokesman for the peasantry, Winstanley did not view liberty, equality, and fraternity as the townspeople did. He thought democracy was incomplete without social equality. He emphasized equality rather than liberty or
fraternity. He defined liberty in equalitarian terms. Liberty meant getting rid of the landlord who exploited them by taking away their land and making them work for nothing. By fraternity the peasants meant the preservation of the village as a self-contained cooperative, economic, and territorial unit. Winstanley sought to abolish landed property by the digging example of common cultivation, to bring about "a program of agrarian communism." Winstanley's ideas represented those of the peasants who favored a radical change and the establishment of agrarian communism. Moore regarded the causes of the Puritan Revolution as solely economic. Nowhere does he discuss religion even as a consequence of economic changes. Thus, Moore regarded Winstanley's religion as not very important.

Perhaps Sanford Lakoff's interpretation of Winstanley can only be categorized as part of the socialist school by default. In his book, *Equality in Political Philosophy* (1964), he only described Winstanley as representing the socialist idea of equality. His book was based on the topic of the evolution of the concept of equality in the history of political philosophy. Lakoff's concern was much more with how the socialist concept of equality was expressed by Winstanley than how Winstanley's concept of equality might have been distinctive. Lakoff based his approach on Arthur Lovejoy's concept of tracing a doctrine throughout a history of its evolution. Lakoff proposed there were three concepts of equality present from early history. These concepts had become more clearly articulated by the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The three concepts of equality could be classified as
liberal, conservative, and socialist. The socialist concept originated with Plato in "early vision of a Golden age."\textsuperscript{57} The Diggers had a socialist concept of equality; the Levellers had a liberal concept of equality. Both groups exemplified the evolution of the concept of equality from theology to politics. Both desired a social equality based on the analogy from their religious ideas of an equality of believers.\textsuperscript{58}

Lakoff argued that Winstanley's concept of equality was a surrogate for the concept of socialist equality developed by nineteenth century socialists. Winstanley combined a belief in the millennium with a belief in mysticism by which God as spirit would restore men to their original condition of communist equality.\textsuperscript{59} Winstanley was distinctive in proposing that men carry out mystical relation with God by activity. Lakoff regarded Winstanley's replacement of action for spiritual contemplation, frequently associated with mysticism, to be exemplified by the digging on St. George's Hill. The digging was a "Socialist form of labor."\textsuperscript{60} Winstanley conceived of the restoration of men to a condition of equality was only possible by the spreading of the divine spirit equally to all men. Winstanley was convinced such a spiritual restoration could not occur by violence but only by each man being converted by the spirit.

Lakoff characterized Winstanley as shifting to a voluntarist view of restoration in his last pamphlet, The Law of Freedom. In that pamphlet he appealed to established authority in the form of Cromwell for assistance, not just patience and faith as in his earlier writings.
Moreover, he provided for coercion in the new society he outlined. The establishment of communism in production and distribution in his new society would not eliminate the need for compulsion. Lakoff regarded Winstanley's new society as advocating revolution from above as a means of attaining the millennium. Coercion replaced the inner conversion of men to the spirit he had described earlier. Lakoff regarded Winstanley as a religious socialist. He completed "the spectrum of egalitarian expression in the seventeenth century." Although Lakoff analyzed the ideas of Winstanley, his primary concern was that Winstanley represented a phase in the development of the concept of socialist equality. Marx combined Winstanley's belief in the attainment of spiritual consciousness by labor and the concept of a vanguard to legitimize coercion in a period of transition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. 61

Perhaps even more distinctive than either Lakoff or Moore was the literary interpretation of Winstanley by T. Wilson Hayes. Unfortunately, his book about Winstanley, as the title suggests, *Winstanley, the Digger; A Literary Analysis of Radical Ideas in the English Revolution* (1979), was largely concerned with Winstanley's literary images and comparing him with the poet William Blake. Therefore, his characterization of Winstanley's political ideas are scattered throughout the book and he gives no clear interpretation. His examples were based on a characterization of Winstanley as a Marxist. He wrote:

> Viewing his works in a literary perspective minimizes the sterile debate about whether he is a political materialist or a religious mystic and clarifies his position in the history of revolutionary utopianism. 62
Unfortunately, Hayes never defines "revolutionary utopianism," but he does equate Winstanley's seventeenth century idiom as having a Marxist meaning. He thought that Winstanley's dramatization of the Fall in his early pamphlets exhibited his awareness of "class conflict." When Winstanley cited Genesis and the mankind bruising the serpent's head to represent private property as a curse, Hayes writes:

Winstanley's language and imagery flow
directly from his discovery of what is
called the Labor theory of value.  

This is Hayes' explanation for why Winstanley emphasized the poor as being so oppressed. Hayes contended Winstanley was representative of the seventeenth century trend toward secularism. He characterized Winstanley's initial description of the Fall in his first pamphlet, The Mysterie of God, as based on a belief in the importance of universal salvation and social cooperation among all men. Hayes regarded such a belief in social cooperation to reflect Winstanley's awareness of "class conflict." Unfortunately, Hayes was more interested in the images in Winstanley's writings than in providing a sustained description of his political theory. Therefore, characterizations of the Digger's political ideas are scattered throughout the book.

Of all the adherents of the socialist school, the English historian Christopher Hill has written the most extensively on both Winstanley and seventeenth century England. Hill has written six books in which parts are devoted to Winstanley. These books include the following: the introduction to Winstanley, The Law of Freedom and Other Writings (1973); The World Turned Upside Down (1972); Puritanism

In all of these four books, Hill characterized Winstanley as a communist. Hill throughout emphasized three aspects of Winstanley's political theory. First, he pictured Winstanley as a sort of unsung hero who advocated a radical revolution which was never implemented. The successful Puritan Revolution in England gave power to the men of property and established the Protestant ethic emphasizing regularity of work habits and personal restraint in one's conduct. Winstanley advocated a revolution by replacing cooperation to replace the Puritan ethic and common property to replace private property. Hill wrote:

... The economically significant consequence of Puritan emphasis on sin was the compulsion to labour, to save, to accumulate, which contributed so much to making possible the Industrial Revolution in England. Ranters simply rejected this: Quakers ultimately came to accept it. Only Winstanley put forward an alternative. Exploitation, not labour, was the curse of fallen (i.e. covetous) man. Abolish exploitation with the wage relationship, and labour in itself, to contribute to the beauty of the commonwealth, would become a pleasure.67

Secondly, Hill regarded Winstanley's use of religious terminology as having an underlying secular meaning. Hill cited Winstanley's characterization of the Fall as corrupting nature itself as an example of his insight that the covetousness of man can destroy nature. Hill wrote:
Winstanley, however, as so often, is putting startlingly new content into traditional forms of language. If we bear in mind that for him the Fall was caused by covetousness and set up kingly power, we may rather think to-day that this is one of the profoundest of Winstanley's insights. As we contemplate our landscape made hideous by neon signs, advertisements, pylons, wreckage of automobiles; our seas poisoned by atomic waste, their shores littered with plastic and oil; our atmosphere polluted with carbon dioxide and nuclear fall-out, our peace shattered by supersonic planes; as we think of nuclear bombs which can 'waste and destroy' to an extent that Winstanley never dreamed of--we can recognize that man's greed, competition between men and between states, are really in danger of upsetting the balance of nature, of poisoning and destroying the fabric of the globe. We are better placed to appreciate Winstanley's insight that in a competitive society the state is just a part of the competitive system.

This example was typical of Hill's approach to Winstanley's religious terms as readily translatable into a more modern socially revolutionary idiom. Thirdly, Hill regarded Winstanley as viewing the English Revolution from a class perspective. Each of Hill's four works exemplified these characteristics.

In the introduction to his book, Winstanley, The Law of Freedom and Other Writings, Christopher Hill described Winstanley as exemplifying a transition between backward looking agrarian communism of the middle ages to modern socialism. Yet, all of Hill's evidence supported Winstanley's ideas as being identical with modern socialism.
Hill proposed that Winstanley saw the English Revolution and Civil War in class terms. The gentry and merchants with the support of the common people defeated the king and church hierarchy. Winstanley wanted the English Revolution to go further by altering the property relations. He intended his digging venture to inspire others to follow his communal example. Hill believed that Winstanley advocated Digger nonviolence because he realized that the propertied class felt threatened and was aware of the power of the army. Hill regarded Winstanley's appeals to workers to refuse to work for landlords as both advocating something like a General Strike and attacking wage labor. 69

Hill believed Winstanley wanted a society based on providing freedom by economic equality of property. The Diggers' society was to replace private property, competition, the Protestant ethic, and the desire to establish world empire with a communist society based on cooperation and a secular humanist ethic with no desire to dominate other people. By the communal organization of society, Winstanley established economic equality and thereby freedom in the community. Winstanley grasped that justice and equality were more important than wealth, and distribution was more important than production. 70 Hill thought Winstanley had added coercion in The Law of Freedom because of his bitter experience of St. George's Hill. Hill regarded Winstanley's society in The Law of Freedom to be the first English communist political program. 71

As consistent with his communist outlook, Hill did not believe that Winstanley took religion very seriously. His argument was
similar to Bernstein's in that Hill discounted possible religious meanings and emphasized social interpretation. Unlike Bernstein, who had thought the revolutionary practice of Winstanley was the most important, Hill concluded that Winstanley used a religious idiom in order to be readily understood. Hill characterized Winstanley's relation to traditional theology as like Marx's relation to Hegelianism. Winstanley stood theology on its head by using its forms but supplying social meanings. Winstanley interpreted the Garden of Eden as representing a state of social equality which had existed in the past and was only a memory retained in a society containing unequal class divisions. Hill compared Winstanley's interpretation to that of a modern anthropologist who described a myth and extracted the profound social truth it contained. Winstanley was able to combine the Norman Yoke with the Fall because he believed both were allegorical and not actual descriptions of history. Winstanley rejected the religious basis of sabbatarianism and retained in The Law of Freedom the practice of a seventh day of rest in which the annually elected minister acted as educator rather than cleric. Winstanley presented prophecies of earthy arrival of Christ to establish a Kingdom as symbolizing the struggle within men to overcome their own covetousness. Hill concluded that Winstanley's use of the idea of a Kingdom of God meant the struggle for a true community in which private property and covetousness were banished.

Hill elaborated these same three aspects of Winstanley as proof of his socialism in his book, The World Turned Upside Down. He
devoted this book to a description of English radicals who questioned the institutions and ideology of seventeenth century society. He believed Winstanley was the most radical of these radicals. The Digger rejected capitalism more completely in not yearning for the restoration of a backward looking unrealistic capitalism which existed in the past. Winstanley went beyond negative criticisms in suggesting positive alternations of society. He wanted a cooperative society free from property.24

Hill believed that Winstanley transcended religion in formulating his ideas. Winstanley's anticlericalism was more drastic and systematic than any other writer during the revolution. Although he began his foray into religious formulations with recounting of a vision, Winstanley in The Law of Freedom formulated a materialistic pantheism. He presented a psychological explanation of belief in a personal God, angels, and hell. This was founded on Winstanley equating God and abstract reason and suggesting both could only be known in man or nature, not in supernatural phenomena. Hill described this formulation as materialistic pantheism. The doctrine of rationalism was added to this by Winstanley's belief that every man is subject to Reason or God's Law. Men regarded Reason to be their inner sovereign not governed by some distant deity. Hill thought this rationalism had within it a belief in democracy. Moreover, Hill stressed that since Winstanley believed God existed everywhere, the distinction between the secular and sacred was eliminated. Winstanley's pantheism leads to secularism. Hill did not believe that Winstanley accepted the Bible. He thought
that Winstanley used the Bible to justify the beliefs he already had. He used Act 4: 32 to justify community of property.  

Hill emphasized that Winstanley's class perspective was evident in his belief that property was the major source of social corruption. The Digger interpreted the Fall to be reenacted in men as they grow up. Rather than accept the view property was the consequence of the Fall, Winstanley believed when men began to covet objects they began the Fall. Moreover he regarded the parceling up of the earth and the founding of a society based on competition as a major means whereby this covetousness was institutionalized. Winstanley proposed society be founded on cooperation and the abolition of property.

Hill devoted an appendix of his book to the contention that Winstanley was the only seventeenth century radical who understood Hobbes' problem and offered an alternative solution. The solution of Winstanley described by Hill was the replacement of a competitive propertyd society with a cooperative communist one. Since Hobbes conceived of society as consisting of equal, competing persons, the Hobbist solution was a sovereign with absolute authority to prevent anarchy and maintain order. Winstanley did not accept the Hobbist premise, that all men are naturally competitive and asocial, on which seventeenth century society was based. Instead, he proposed that men are social and cooperative and the natural state was one of men involved in mutual help and cooperation. Hill believed that Winstanley's view that Reason would dictate identical conclusions was the basis of the expectation that men would reject the covetousness underlying private property. Since cooperation and self-help were the natural state of
men, Winstanley thought even the rich would realize they would gain by communism. Every man has his day of judgment in which he must decide to act on the basis of covetousness or Reason. Winstanley believed the result of that choice (Reason) would make Hobbes' solution superfluous. Winstanley thought only the abolition of property would eliminate preachers of sin and a coercive state. If competitive individualist property relations were abolished, the problem of sovereignty would no longer exist.\textsuperscript{77}

Hill's concern in the book, \textit{Puritanism and Revolution}, was to describe only Winstanley's formulation of the theory of the Norman Yoke. Hill contended Winstanley's explanation of economic oppression as originating with William the Conqueror exemplified the Digger's communism. This interpretation was consistent with his earlier observations; Winstanley used the Norman Yoke theory to attack the whole structure of society and the state.\textsuperscript{78} Winstanley used the Norman Yoke to explain English society just as the socialist had the labor theory of value.\textsuperscript{79} The Norman Yoke was a sort of surrogate of the Marxist view that oppression is caused by economic conditions. Hill regarded Winstanley's use of the theory as an appeal for a more radical revolution in agrarian relations. By such an economic interpretation, Winstanley's communism was obvious. Hill emphasized the Digger's tracing of the establishment of oppressive practices to the Norman Conquest. Winstanley asserted that these practices ought to be abolished. The abolition of the copyhold would free peasant land from feudal services. The common people would be given the wastelands and the confiscated royal and church estates. After
abolishing landed private property, communal cultivation could be established by voluntary association from below. The Diggers thought the democratic rural community was still strong enough to flourish if the supremacy of the landlords were destroyed. Hill emphasized Winstanley's distrust of political means because the laws retained their kingly principles. Such laws could only lose their oppressive character by changes in property.80

In his book, Antichrist in the Seventeenth Century England, Hill described Winstanley's use of the myth of antichrist as socialistic. Seventeenth century sectaries used antichrist as polemic for criticizing the Pope and all clerical authority. Winstanley considered most of the existing social order to be antichrist. He argued that anyone attempting to set up the worship of God by human law speaks like the Beast. The Civil War had not ended the Reign of the Beast. The power and government of the Beast were the monarchy. Such a government kept the poor out of the commons. Winstanley accused the clergy of aiding the government and gentry in repressing the common people. The doctrine of a heaven after death was articulated by the clergy. Winstanley described this doctrine as the language of antichrist. Winstanley gave the most "democratic" interpretation of the myth by suggesting that a poor man had an equally just title to land as does the rich man. He predicted the destruction of the antichrist by a communist future in which enmity over the land and seeking dominion over men would end.81

What common assumption did all these exponents make in their socialist interpretation of Winstanley? They presented Winstanley as
either the first Marxian socialist or as an early version of a socialist who anticipated characteristics of nineteenth century socialism. For example, Bernstein and Brailsford judged Winstanley as a Marxist; Berens and Lakoff judged him as a nineteenth century socialist. Moreover, only three of the twelve interpreters regarded Winstanley as beginning as a religious thinker and culminating as a socialist thinker. Berens pictured Winstanley as beginning as a mystic who in his last writings anticipated the socialist Henry George. James characterized Winstanley as first a mystic then later a communist. Lakoff regarded Winstanley as first a mystic and then a socialist egalitarian. The remaining nine pictured Winstanley's ideas as relatively consistent throughout his career. For example, Bernstein regarded Winstanley as only changing tactics when in *The Law of Freedom* he advocated the revolutionary socialism which had been the basis of his earlier digging activity. Hill pictured Winstanley as only using religion as a vehicle for making comments to his contemporaries about the importance of property and property relationships. Juretic concluded that the mysticism of the early pamphlets of Winstanley was totally cast aside by the Digger when he achieved insight into the importance of private property in his contemporary England. Both Petegorsky and Strachey pictured Winstanley as representative of the development of socialism in its infancy. Both writers were more concerned with tracing the evolution of socialism than the evolution of the thought of Winstanley. Moreover, most of the members of the school regarded the ideas of Winstanley as reflections of the material reality of the
seventeenth century England in which he lived. They regarded class conflict as the basis of his appeal to abolish landed property. They had no belief in ideas having any independence from the economic realities they described. They described seventeenth century England as largely the consequence of economic forces. Their economic determinism was the foundation of their unwillingness to grant any but transitory importance to religious ideas. The economic status of Winstanley determined the content of his ideas. Bernstein regarded Winstanley's ideas as only representative of the socialist belief that theory should reflect the revolutionary practice. The proof of Winstanley's revolutionary intent was in the revolutionary practice he attempted by his digging. This conception of Winstanley, as a revolutionary socialist, was the foundation of the assumption of the socialist school that he had clear cut concepts of political and economic institutions as separate from religion. When each exponent discussed Winstanley's plea for abolition of landed property, each assumed Winstanley conceived of property to be an economic institution. Petegorsky, Bernstein, Brailsford, and Juretic characterized the common property of Winstanley in The Law of Freedom as an economic institution involving proper production and distribution techniques. The socialist school by these assumptions never entertained any possibility that Winstanley was a religious thinker.

This was not true of another school of interpretation of the ideas of Winstanley. They regarded him as a religious thinker. The religious school of Winstanlean interpretation had three common characteristics. First these exponents regarded Winstanley as never becoming a secular
or nonreligious thinker. Unlike the socialist school, the religious school regarded Winstanley’s religious and political ideas as either so intertwined as to be inseparable, or for his political ideas to have originated in his religious outlook. Secondly, each exponent selected an aspect of his religious ideas as more important than Winstanley’s opposition to property in understanding Winstanley. Thirdly, all were in agreement that the religious aspect they selected was the underpinning of his belief that landed property ought to be abolished. Though they shared with the socialist school the acknowledgment of the importance of Winstanley’s desire to abolish landed property, they regarded the intention of Winstanley as religious, not secular.

Rufus Jones in his book, *Studies in Mystical Religion* (1909), presented the first religious interpretation of Winstanley. Jones concluded that the mysticism of Winstanley was the most important of his religious ideas. He defined mysticism as a “type of religion which puts emphasis on the immediate awareness of relation with God on direct and intimate consciousness of the Divine Presence.” He proposed Winstanley’s adherence to the common ownership and use of the land was linked directly to his mysticism. His belief in common land ownership would not have been possible without his mysticism. The central basis of his mysticism was the belief in an inner awareness of God. Man was the epitome of creation; Divine Reason was revealed both in men and the world. Winstanley thought university knowledge was not necessary for guidance to or achievement of salvation; men had only to become aware of their inward divinity. **83 These mystical beliefs did not lead Winstanley to a withdrawal from involvement in political life.**
Winstanley's mysticism led him to a kind of social activism. Jones thought Winstanley was determined "to turn his vision into deeds."\textsuperscript{84} This mysticism was the basis of Winstanley's chief concern, to alter conditions so all men could obtain a subsistence in the earth. Mysticism was thus the foundation of his digging venture; his mysticism required him to try to change social conditions.\textsuperscript{85}

Walter Murphy concurred with Jones in his emphasis on mysticism. In his article, "The Political Philosophy of Gerrard Winstanley," in The Review of Politics (1957), he emphasized mysticism as important in explaining Winstanley's social ideas. However, Murphy did not cite Jones despite their agreement. Moreover, there were major differences between the two in interpretation. First, Murphy contended that Winstanley was a communist because of his "mystical tendencies."\textsuperscript{86} Jones focused on Winstanley's mysticism; his political ideas were only mentioned briefly. Secondly, Murphy pictured the mystical and communist aspects of Winstanley's thought as equal in importance, but he portrayed Winstanley as never a completely secular thinker. He described Winstanley's mysticism as important because "... overtones of mysticism were never shaken off in any of Winstanley's other works."\textsuperscript{87} Alone of the seventeenth century English sectaries, Winstanley made "religion the vehicle which transported a communist theory of society into existence."\textsuperscript{88}

Murphy defined the mysticism of Winstanley as the belief that only the "Spirit of God working in man could bring about redemption."\textsuperscript{89} His mysticism involved men actively trying to improve their conditions. The digging was an attempt for man to bring about his own redemption.
by presenting an example of how landed property ought to be abolished in England. Winstanley thought that original sin did not exist; man could redeem himself and return to the common property condition he once enjoyed before the Fall. The struggle between the spirit and the flesh within men had been won by the latter. The victory had taken the form of the condition of common property and had ended by a series of sinful seizures of property. Winstanley believed that if men did not work to bring about divine redemption, God would punish the poor for not forsaking landed property by joining the Diggers. God would punish the rich for resisting the "divine command" of common property. 90

Murphy characterized Winstanley's last pamphlet as advocating communist utopia. He outlined a millennium, but unlike his earlier writings, he no longer believed the spirit of God and the action of the poor were enough to bring about the social changes he desired. In this work he thought a rational appeal for assistance from government was necessary. However, Murphy regarded Winstanley as not abandoning his religious mysticism. His communism was of a religious origin, not one based on the secular view of Karl Marx. Murphy regarded the society Winstanley presented in his The Law of Freedom as based on giving to every person access to the earth. The author labeled the society communist because Winstanley wanted productive property in land to be owned in common. Legal provisions were to insure this goal. Buying and selling and claims of landownership were to be treated as crimes. Murphy did not believe Winstanley had rejected religion by providing for this society. No institutional
supports of established religion were provided, but an individual religion of the spirit based on inward illumination was considered preeminent. Winstanley thought true religion was not providing some future paradise but assisting in making restitution of the earth. He thought men were not justified in using force to secure common land ownership. Only the inner working of Christ's spirit in men could have lasting value. Such a religious outlook of Winstanley was absent in Y x. Moreover, unlike Marx, Winstanley believed that a coercive state would be necessary in his society. 91

Three exponents of the religious school of Winstanlean thought selected millenarianism as the crucial aspect of his thought. Robert Kenny in the introduction to his edition of The Law of Freedom emphasized the advocacy of Winstanley of common property and his millenarianism. He noted that Winstanley's millenarianism was the same as his fellow sectarians in his early pre-digging pamphlets. Winstanley thought the Coming of Christ's Kingdom of Earth was imminent. The millenarianism of Winstanley's first four pamphlets was passive; he thought men could play no active role in helping to bring it about. Kenny observed that Winstanley's concept of the millennium changed from passive to activist sometime between the writing of his pamphlet, The New Law of Righteousness, and beginning of the digging. He appealed for men to assist in bringing about the millennium by joining the Diggers. Moreover, his concept of the millennium became economic; its achievement required the establishment of common landed property. 92
Kenny thought the last pamphlet of Winstanley represented another shift in the ideas of Winstanley. His ideas remained religious, not secular. His millenarianism based on God performing his will without any action of mankind was not present. Instead, he appealed to government in the form of Cromwell to bring about God's will. Winstanley proposed "a detailed plan for a communist state." The foundation of his society was common landed property. His society was not an ideal possibility but an actual society in which men organized themselves to work cooperatively for the common good. Winstanley thought nationalized land could become a reality because men were not naturally aggressive. If the few men having dominion over others were denied the property on which dominion were based, harmony and love would flourish. The government was designed to maintain common preservation by guaranteeing protection of the weak. Lawyers were banished from his Commonwealth and replaced by easily understood, simplified laws. Winstanley believed that the labor of each man should be valued equally. Buying and selling should be abolished because economic transactions would be exchanging whatever one made for whatever one needed. Economic activity was to be based on the parish and its agricultural pattern of planting, harvesting, and plowing. The major function of parliament was to serve as a grievance court for ordinary citizens and safeguard common land ownership, thereby preventing any return to private property.

Winthrop Hudson in his article, "Economic and Social Thought of Gerrard Winstanley. Was he a Seventeenth Century Marxist?" in the
Journal of Modern History (1946), also stressed the millenarianism of Winstanley. Unlike Kenny, Hudson did not think any evolution of Winstanley's ideas occurred. Hudson's interpretation lacked the emphasis of Kenny on millenarianism. Hudson characterized Winstanley as a religious thinker with no political ideas. Hudson criticized what he termed the Marxist school of Winstanlean interpretation—Bernstein, Berens, Petegorsky, and Hill. Hudson characterized all four exponents as completely ignoring the religious framework on which Winstanley formulated his ideas.

He proposed that Winstanley was not different from other seventeenth century religious radicals, except for his digging activity. The digging was part of the millenarianism of Winstanley. He initiated his digging merely to serve not to initiate these changes, but to symbolize England as the first nation to fall off from the Beast and establish righteousness. The digging was to bear witness to what life would be like in the world to come. The Diggers did not regard their venture as a means of effecting social changes. The Diggers were seeking to serve God by assuring the righteous of the coming millennium and warning the wicked. The digging and the opposition it encountered, Hudson characterized as instances of Winstanley's belief in the cosmic struggle of good and evil. Those righteous who joined in the tilling of the soil and quit working for landlords, such as the Diggers, were merely affirming their faith in the millennium. Opponents of the Diggers would be dealt with by the wrath of God for opposing his will and would be punished on the Day of Judgment. The millennium was not to be
brought about by men's actions; men could only wait until God directly intervened by his Coming. Winstanley expected the earthly reign of Christ to be established momentarily. He presented a great deal of Biblical exegesis to support the widespread changes in men's lives. Citing particularly the fourth chapter of Acts which promises equality for the poor and the rich surrendering their possessions, Winstanley expected the abolition of buying and selling, lawyers, and government. Nature was to be purified by God's Coming; the bareness of land would be replaced by fertility; storms would be calmed; and natural disasters would be ended. All the ills of man's existence would cease, such as war, misery, poverty, crime, fear and sorrow, because the power of Satan in men's hearts would be eradicated. Property would be unnecessary and be replaced by a community of the earth.97

Though Hudson did not think Winstanley's society in The Law of Freedom was not the millennium, his thought remained millenarian. As a result of the opposition to cultivating the commons, Winstanley appealed directly to Cromwell not to bring about the millennium but to establish an interim Holy Commonwealth. The Digger concluded a transition was necessary before millenarianism could arrive. This transition would make the nation prepared for God's final restoration. Earlier Winstanley had thought that the millennium would be introduced by the conversion of people. In The Law of Freedom, he believed the outward institutions of the magistracy of this Holy Commonwealth would be an interim period prior to the Coming of Christ. Kingly government would be abolished. Common storehouses, annually elected ministers,
and allowing members of the congregation to speak when the Spirit moved
them, would all pave the way for the millennium. Hudson did not emphasize
Winstanley's interim Commonwealth nor particularly his economic ideas.98

Unlike Hudson, A. S. P. Woodhouse singled out a characteristic of
millenarianism as crucial in understanding the thought of Winstanley.
In the introduction of his edition of seventeenth century pamphlets enti-
titled, Puritanism and Liberty (1951), he argued that puritanism was a major
source of the development of democratic ideas. Woodhouse regarded the
crucial belief which resulted in the formation of democratic ideas as
the belief of the Puritans in the division of existence into earthly
and heavenly realms. The democratic thought of the Levellers and the
communism of the Diggers were rooted in the presence or absence of this
belief in a split between the earthly and heavenly spheres of existence.

The Levellers believed no perfection of mankind was possible until
men entered the realm of grace. Men were too steeped in sin from the
Fall to be capable of any acts except restraints of their sinful natures.
They made the law of nature known to men by means of their reason;
reason survived the Fall. It became an absolute standard within the
natural order.99 Consequently, their prime concern was the presentation
of liberty in the political or natural sphere. By analogy the Levellers
as Puritans had applied their ideas of the realm of grace to the condition
of nature in which earthly men had occupied. Puritanism was the source of
the conception of liberty. For example, the Levellers did not think
the liberty of the regenerate could be guaranteed without guaranteeing
the liberty of all. The Levellers by analogy applied the idea of
Christian liberty to the realm of nature. Their conception of equality originated with the belief in a spiritual equality arising from the equality and priesthood of all believers. By analogy, all men were equal in the realm of grace as they were in the realm of nature. Just as all church members had equal privileges, all members of the state should be equally privileged. For example, the Levellers made the liberty of conscience not the birthright of the Christian but one of the natural rights of man. Woodhouse believed the division into realms of nature and grace prevented the Levellers from accepting political ideas involving radical change to democracy. The Levellers desired only limited government. The principle of segregation exalted the law of nature into an absolute standard within the realm of nature and scripture as the standard for the realm of grace.

Woodhouse proposed that the Diggers were distinct from the Levellers because they believed the realms of grace and nature were the same. He thought this disbelief originated from millenarianism which proposed changes in man's life. As a millenarian Winstanley believed that men did not have to postpone attainment of a perfect millennium until men had gone to heaven; men could attain it now. The Diggers desired an "economic millennium." Winstanley proposed the Fall introduced covetousness and private property. Winstanley's radical ideas were the consequence of his disbelief in a division between the two realms of nature and grace.

Unlike Kenny, Woodhouse, and Hudson, Paul Elmen's interpretation was founded on the concept of Winstanley's prelapsarianism or concept of the condition of men before the Fall. In his article, "The Theological Basis of Digger Communism," in Church History, which was written in
1954. Elmen characterized Winstanley's concept of the Fall as crucial to understanding his thought because it was the origin of all his political ideas. He proposed that Bernstein, Petegorsky, and Strachey had one fatal flaw of analyzing Winstanley's religious language from a vantage point of twentieth century skepticism. He argued that Winstanley's thought could best be analyzed at three levels. These levels, anthropological, psychological, and political, indicated the importance of Winstanley's allegorical view of the Fall. The anthropological was construed by Elmen as founded on Winstanley's view of man's origin of state as idyllic and prelapsarian. It was not a state of innocence like the Garden of Eden. Men lived in an equalitarian condition and they were hostile to social hierarchy. Winstanley reinterpreted the Fall to be, not the consequence of the sin of Adam and Eve, but to have originated when men took pleasure in the objects of creation. The introduction of private property was the basis of sin, and property was perpetuated by the subjection of the poor by the landowners. Winstanley termed these property lovers and their descendants as Cain. Those retaining the memory of the idyllic state were termed Abel. 104

To Elmen the psychological level of argument was founded on the operation of the Fall. Winstanley believed that the result of the Fall was a weakening of reason and will. Only the strength of imagination continued. The functioning of reason and will was so weakened that imagination was supreme, allowing authority to be used by one group against another. Within man's nature the struggle between the two
Adams continually occurred: one based on imagination, the other on reason and will. By reason Winstanley did not mean what in the eighteenth century was meant by reason, but the indwelling Christ.

The political level of argument was the Fall expressed in political terms. Giving an English history version of the Fall, Winstanley argued that William the Conqueror made his officers, and thus their descendants, the present landlords. Winstanley gave a literal interpretation of the Fall of Babylon from the Beast; England was the tenth part of the city that would fall from the Beast.

Elmen did not think that Winstanley's ideas ever could become secularized even when he presented political ideas. Winstanley based his basic economic principle of making the earth a common treasury solely on scripture. His digging symbolized a new age in which men would once again live in Adam's idyllic state or the English would restore the state before the Norman Conquest. Winstanley thought that in such an age the primitive state of the Jerusalem community would be restored in which selflessness required abolition of private property. Elmen believed that only Winstanley's belief in such a prelapsarian state could explain why Winstanley believed the infertile commons could profitably be cultivated and communism established. Elmen viewed Winstanley as shifting from believing men that they should passively await Christ to emphasizing restoring the condition before the Fall by institutional means. He still stressed such a change was based on prelapsarianism.
Thus Elmen concluded that Winstanley's concept of the Fall was sufficient to explain his communism. Like all seventeenth century sectaries, Winstanley united economics, politics, and religion; he made no distinction among the three.

Compared to all the foregoing exponents, George Sabine's interpretation of Winstanley was much more complex. In the introduction of his book, *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley* (1965), and in his text, *A History of Political Theory* (1950), he characterized Winstanley as a religious communist. Sabine was unwilling to accept either Bernstein's opinion that religion was a camouflage to Winstanley's revolutionary intentions or Strachey's view that religion was a way Winstanley could discuss the material application of knowledge characteristic of the working class. Sabine's conception was much closer to Berens' view that Winstanley's religious ideas justified his social ideas. Sabine thought that Winstanley advocated a communist society, not the establishment of equality of land use characteristic of Henry George's ideas. Rather than emphasize Divine Reason as an important link in Winstanley's social ideas as Jones had, Sabine thought that Winstanley's religion was founded on the belief that ethical ideas should be put into practice.

Unlike any of his contemporaries, Winstanley made his religion the basis of his communist theory. Sabine proposed that communism was a sort of "social corollary" to Winstanley's religion. He characterized Winstanley's ideas as popular political thought without the logical coherence of such theorists as Hobbes and Harrington.
Winstanley did not delineate his premises in any logical order because his ideas were being continually formulated and his writing composed as situations demanded. Nonetheless, Sabine proposed that his thought could best be analyzed by arranging it in a logical series of premises.109

His initial premise was his belief in the importance of millenarianism in his Puritan England. Winstanley believed this transformation would occur by the earthly establishment of the Kingdom of God. Realization of this Kingdom entailed Winstanley's second premise. Men could establish this Kingdom only by becoming aware of their inward divinity. An awareness of divinity within all men would necessitate their reliance on forces much greater than they. Mankind would be bound together by the universal love of common divinity. The result of not seeking oneself in inward divinity was to allow covetousness in one's actions. Moreover, such failure would encourage individuals to adopt a selfish morality because they failed to understand why men are universal brothers. The product of such self-seeking actions of the unaware was political oppression and poverty.110

Sabine proposed that the results of consciousness of inward divinity was Winstanley's third premise. Consciousness of this divinity would change individuals, nature, and society. Society would no longer be a collection of individuals fulfilling selfish motives but a community based on universal brotherhood. Winstanley assumed that the old society would be transformed by this universal brotherhood becoming the basis of religion and church institutions.
Political and economic institutions would therefore no longer be guided by covetousness and would thereby be changed. The underlying dependency of political and economic institutions on the clerical would necessitate this result. Moreover, the end of corruption of the flesh would also allow nature to be altered. Barren land would become fertile; people could be fed from land which had been sterile. Men had previously been so evil that their evil had infected plants and livestock reducing their productivity.

Sabine thought that the communism of Winstanley was an outgrowth of his religious mysticism. This mysticism was his belief that men could know God by a divine inner light. Moreover, he suggested that Winstanley's belief, that true religion had to be practiced as a way of life and had resulted in his belief that men could establish true righteousness as a social condition. Thus, Winstanley's communism originated not only from his religious mysticism but also in social activism. Sabine thought that Winstanley in his *Law of Freedom* had made a slight shift in depending more on altering social organization than in men establishing a Common-wealth from their awareness of inward divinity. He concluded that this shift was probably only prompted by the failure of the digging venture.

Moreover, Sabine emphasized that the major argument of *The Law of Freedom* proved that the link between religion and communism in Winstanley's thought was still intact. For example, Winstanley interpreted the 1643 Solemn League and Covenant of Parliament to require people to establish a real reformation in England. Establishing this reformation meant destroying all covetousness which could only be done by restoring the land to a common treasury for all men. All war,
misery, and bad government would vanish when their root in private property was ended. Sabine also proposed that Winstanley's comparison of the Commonwealth and monarchy as based on different aspects of human nature was further proof of the continued importance of religion. The Commonwealth was the society men could have by heeding their inward divinity and practicing social righteousness. Monarchy was the consequence of men being guided by covetousness and thus the desire for outward things as reflected in property.113

Though equally complex in his characterization of the stages of the evolution of Winstanley's thought, Perez Zagorin formulated an interpretation which emphasized rationalist communism. He put more emphasis on secular elements than did Sabine. In his book, A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution (1966), he warned that Winstanley's ideas were not the secularized product of the Marxist interpreters.114 Unlike the "Marxian socialist school, Zagorin concluded Winstanley was consistently religious.

He depicted the evolution of Winstanley's thought as a series of complex stages. Initially, Winstanley was a mystic. He believed that God existed only as a spirit within men and denied the efficacy of external methods of knowing God. He condemned the compulsion of established religious practices and emphasized knowing God by personal experience. Knowing God required man's understanding that men's unrighteousness in their relations with their fellows was the essence of evil. Religion was overcoming this evil by righteous conduct.115

Zagorin termed the next phase of Winstanley's thought as pantheism. Winstanley equated God with reason and considered it as an immanent
principle within the creation. God was the spirit within all creatures. He was not far away but was in the total creation.

Zagorin thought Winstanley's third or rationalist phase was an important link to his political radicalism. He stressed Winstanley's belief that reason was the law of righteousness which was to triumph on earth. Knowing God and knowing the world were synonymous. Man's redemption was not to take place only in heaven. Winstanley believed that restoration of the law of reason could be accomplished by men living cooperatively and peacefully in society. Refusing to admit that the world could not recover from the Fall, Winstanley believed the establishment of absolute justice was a real possibility. 116

Zagorin believed that the culmination of the evolution of Winstanley's thought was his communism. However, the author did not mean that Winstanley's thought became completely secular and his religious ideas were discarded. His communism was an attempt to show what conditions would have to change to allow for man's complete redemption. Winstanley believed the origin of evil and covetousness was in private property. Righteousness and reason would ensue by making the earth a common treasury. Zagorin also underlined the fact that the Digger movement was neither a political tactic nor program. Rather Winstanley believed the digging was to claim the commons as a sign of the imminent redemption. 117

Zagorin disagreed with Sabine's view that Winstanley's communism developed out of his religious ethics and his mysticism. He emphasized instead that Winstanley's rationalism was a more important source of Winstanley's communism. Winstanley concluded that covetousness took the form of private property in Adam's time.
He thought it was a breach of reason's law for some men to be denied abundance of the earth. Christ judged such a practice wrong according to the light of reason. When the Spirit of Christ would have spread in all men, they would have consented to the law of reason. If a man failed to act against property then he was an enemy to reason. Zagorin argued that Winstanley's argument for communism in his *The Law of Freedom* was also based on his rationalism. The only difference was that in *The Law of Freedom* Winstanley described property as the underlying basis of the whole social order. Before *The Law of Freedom*, Zagorin noted that Winstanley had only emphasized the importance of property in scattered passages. Moreover, in *The Law of Freedom*, Winstanley proposed reordering society because only by this means could reason be the basis of all social institutions. By establishing reason in this fashion, men could realize true righteousness. Before *The Law of Freedom*, Winstanley had thought righteousness was sufficient. In his last work he regarded reason as a necessary support.

Moreover, Zagorin believed that Winstanley's thought had greater coherence than Sabine had believed. Sabine thought that Winstanley's thought did not have the coherence of a Hobbes or Harrington. Unlike any of his fellow interpreters, Zagorin presented Winstanley as a preeminent theorist. He emphasized how Winstanley systematized his thought on the basis of the unifying principle of ownership of the earth. Winstanley was one of the few seventeenth century theorists to thus explain the social order at such a high level of generality.
More importantly, Winstanley exemplified utopianism in his political thought. Zagorin defined utopianism as a viewpoint which transcended the existing order by proposing alternatives to it. Zagorin noted that Winstanley was the first person to suggest that freedom needed more than political equality to be realized. To Winstanley, political liberty and economic equality were inseparable. Zagorin suggested that the thought of no other religious radicals evolved over such a wide gap. Winstanley consummated the

transition between two classic types of utopian outlook: from the blazing chiliasm of the religious radical who daily looks for Jesus' Second Coming to inaugurate a reign of righteousness, to the rationalist communism; abounding in plans and projects, which appears as an aspect of the enlightenment.

Instead of the rationalistic communism of Zagorin, three commentators of Winstanley regarded him as an anarchist. The chief of these was George Woodcock in his book, *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements* (1962). Woodcock characterized the Digger as a pioneer of anarchism. In his writings, "Anarchism first appeared as a recognizable doctrine." Woodcock thought Winstanley an anarchist because of his desire to abolish all political authority. He proposed Winstanley's opposition to property was founded on his rationalism. By means of his rationalism, Winstanley criticized existing society. The Digger believed that God dwelled in every creature. He combined this pantheistic conception with the belief that God was the incomprehensible spirit, Reason. He thought Reason was
supremely present in men. Winstanley believed man's reason required
him to act in a responsible fashion to fulfill his duty as a social
being. Woodcock thought Winstanley's belief in social cooperation was
similar to Kropotkin's plea for mutual aid. The Digger criticized
political power, economic power of master and servants, and the
familial power of husband over wife. Winstanley desired to rid society
completely of the corrupting nature of authority.123

In The New Law of Righteousness, Winstanley presented the follow-
propositions: (1) the corrupting nature of power whether economic
or political; (2) rejection of property and authority; and (3) a
suggestion on the nature of egalitarian society. Woodcock regarded
these beliefs of Winstanley as later tenets of anarchism. The digging
represented Winstanley as an anarchist activist. Woodcock concluded
that Winstanley sought to bring about agrarian communism and a state-
less society by the example of the Diggers.124

Woodcock emphasized that the ideal society Winstanley sought by
his digging was best represented in The New Law of Righteousness and
his other digging pamphlets. In The Law of Freedom Winstanley intro-
duced compulsion in his society because of the frustration of the
opposition he encountered by his digging activity. This was unchar-
acteristic of the anarchical society for which he consistently appealed.
Woodcock thought the society that Winstanley desired was to be
"a primitive sketch for Kropotkin's anarchist communist society."125
Winstanley's Commonwealth would be egalitarian in which property and
authority would vanish. Men would live peacefully basing their conduct
on conscience. Work was to be done in common and the products shared
equally by means of storehouses. No rulers would be necessary. Since crime arises from economic inequality, Winstanley condemned punishment and thought it was not needed. Woodcock also stressed that by their digging activities the Diggers represented the anarchist tradition of direct action. Winstanley hoped that people would realize the virtues of a society without inequalities and authority by the example of the Digger community. By this means Winstanley hoped to transform his society into an anarchist-communist one. 126

Unlike Woodcock and Harrison, W. Schenk regard Winstanley's millenarianism as the basis of his anarchism. In the book, The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution (1948), he emphasized the importance of religion to Winstanley. He accused Hill, Berens, and Petegorsky of judging Winstanley from a modern secular perspective. 127

Schenk selected the concept of the Fall of Winstanley as the groundwork for his anarchist millennium. The Digger pictured men before the Fall as not needing government, laws, or property. Before the Fall, men lived in a virgin state of innocence. Universal love prevailed and no selfishness or covetousness existed. Since authority and universal love were incompatible, no government was necessary. The earth was common to all. Schenk emphasized that the virgin state only ended when covetousness persuaded men to introduce property. Then government and laws to punish stealing were introduced. Winstanley believed that by casting out such covetousness and by God replacing it with the law of righteousness the millennium would become a reality. The form the millennium would take was restoration of the state
existing before the Fall. Winstanley anticipated its establishment momentarily. Each man struggles against the covetousness and attempts to assert his inward righteousness in all men which totally transformed social institutions and relationships. Man's righteousness would make property and government unnecessary and communism and anarchism would be the consequence.¹²⁸

Like his colleagues, Woodcock and Harrison, Schenk interpreted Winstanley's digging to be an attempt to realize an anarchist society. Schenk was alone in his belief that millenarianism provided Winstanley with a guideline on the nature of anarchist society. Winstanley asserted that the Diggers had no need of laws, prisons, and punishments. They had no need of government. Winstanley thought government supported property by coercion. Property inequality led to unequal stealing and the government hanging them for their theft.¹²⁹

Three characteristics of Winstanley were common to the secondary literature. Almost all exponents of the socialist, anarchist, and religious schools selected Winstanley's proposal to abolish property as the foundation of his thought. In their characterization of Winstanley as socialist, all the socialist school regarded his belief that landed property should be abolished as proof of his socialism. The anarchist school regarded Winstanley's commitment against landed property as part of his distrust of government using property to equal its power and preserve itself. All the religious interpreters, except Hudson, thought Winstanley was some kind of religious communist. For Jones and Murphy, he described a mystical communism; Kenny and Woodhouse saw a millenarian communist. James and Sabine
regarded Winstanley as religious communist. Elmen typed Winstanley a prelapsarian communist; Zagorin classified him a rationalist communist. Virtual unanimity existed that Winstanley was a radical political thinker. The disagreement of the socialist and anarchists was over the form his radicalism had taken. Except for Hudson, the religious exponents thought Winstanley was a religious communist. The religious school differed from the other two schools in the nature of that communism. The religious school agreed Winstanley never became secular or non-religious.

A second characteristic common to all schools of interpretation of Winstanley was disagreement on the means as to how Winstanley became a socialist or religious communist. No member of the Marxist school described Winstanley's thought as evolving; it was static. According to their reckoning, Winstanley remained consistently a socialist with no significant changes in his thought. The anarchist school was of the same view. Most religious interpreters of Winstanley regarded his ideas as undergoing significant changes in the course of his writing. Woodhouse, Hudson, and Jones were exceptions in viewing no evolution to have taken place. Jones thought Winstanley remained a mystical communist; Hudson relegated Winstanley to only one of the many seventeenth century sectaries. Woodhouse emphasized the unitary conception of grace and nature of Winstanley was the element which enabled the Digger to propose an abolition of property.

This difference was rooted in the characterization by the religious school of Winstanley as a religious communist; the religious and political
were not usually regarded as complimentary. Most students of political theory would regard communism as a secular or nonreligious concept. The religious interpreters thus had to combine what is regarded as diametric opposites. The socialist purged Winstanley's ideas of a religious dimension. The religious interpreters proposed religion was like a "ladder" by which Winstanley attained his communism, but his religious ladder was never discarded or abandoned. The socialist regarded Winstanley's socialism as a consequence of the economic factors which impinged on him and caused him to articulate a version of the doctrine. On the other hand, the religious interpreters ignored economics and singled out different aspects of the myriad of religious ideas which proliferated in seventeenth century England. Both schools disagreed about the nature of the context of Winstanley. The next chapter will present my interpretation of this context.
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CHAPTER II

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF WINSTANLEY

The purpose of this chapter is to determine what circumstances of the life of Gerrard Winstanley were important in understanding his political theory. By relating the specific ideas and events in his pamphlets to the history of seventeenth century England, a better understanding of how his political theory developed will result.

Problems exist in dealing with this period of English history and Winstanley. Many of the religious groups which existed during this time were in the process of formation; some, such as the Quakers, survived the restoration to become sects; others, such as the Ranters and Seekers, did not. Consequently, the distinguishing of one religious group from another is difficult. The ideas of one religious group blends into another. Some of their ideas are so similar to each other that the source from which Winstanley might have derived a specific idea is debatable. Moreover, Winstanley makes very few references to outside sources. The result is only the similarities of specific ideas and those of the religious groups can be described. Another problem is very little is known
about the details of the life of Winstanley or the digging community he led. No history of the digging community exists nor no comprehensive economic history of the English Civil War period and Interregnum.

Gerrard Winstanley was born sometime during 1609 in the county of Lancashire. He was baptized in the parish church at Wigan on July 10, 1609. Winstanley's father may have had local standing since he was listed as Mr. in the parish records. Moreover, the earliest surviving list of Wigan notables listed his father as a burgess.¹ Winstanley's father was by occupation a mercer. Mercers were not just small cloth tradesmen but persons who dealt with varied goods, such as "linen cloths, buckrams, fustians, satins, jewels, fine woolen and other English clothes, drugs, cotton, thread and wool, silk, wood, oil, cooper, wine, lead, and salt."²

Although Winstanley probably had a grammar school education, particularly in view of his father's social standing, the name and nature of any school attendance is unknown. He probably did not have a university education. His pamphlets lack the replete Latin quotations characteristic of the seventeenth century university educated. His sentences do not reflect grammatical practices, such as punctuation and subject-verb agreement.³

Exactly when Winstanley left Wigan and became a London resident is unrecorded, but at the age of twenty-one he was already
a London resident. On April 10, 1630, he was apprenticed to Sarah Gater of Cornhill, the widow of William Gater of the Merchant Taylors Company. There were three ways a person could become a member of the Merchant Taylors Company: by patrimony, payment of a fee, or by apprenticeship. Since his father had not been a merchant, Winstanley could not become a member by patrimony. He chose not to pay a redemption fee. Therefore, he chose to serve an apprenticeship.

The exact conditions of Winstanley's apprenticeship are unknown, but the prevailing circumstances of seventeenth century apprentices were regulated. The Statue of Apprenticeship of 1559 still governed the relationship of master and apprentice. The latter was to be at least twenty-one years old which meant Winstanley qualified after 1630. Moreover, the parents had to pay a fee in money or labor or both to the master when the indenture or contract was signed between master and apprentice. The apprentices had to serve under the master's tutelage for seven years. There were very few legal restrictions placed on the master's treatment of his apprentice. The treatment depended almost solely on the master. The law required that the apprentice work in the summer from 5 a.m. to 6 or 8 p.m. and the remainder of the year from daylight to dusk. The apprentice received no pay, but he did receive free instruction and maintenance. The master was to provide the apprentice with the necessities of life, such as linen, hose, shoes, food, and shelter. Apprentices would not be allowed to become freeman or become a recognized member of their trade. Apprentices could not marry until twenty-four years old.
Having reached the required age, Winstanley became a freeman on February 21, 1637. Becoming a freeman meant that he could legally practice the tailoring trade, thereby becoming a full fledged member of the company. As a member of the company, Winstanley was supposed to keep the mysteries of his trade, regulate apprentices, and aid in preventing unauthorized persons from practicing the trade. The relations of a member with his company went beyond the occupational. Winstanley could participate in the annual election of the masters and wardens, who were the administrative heads of the corporation. Despite the fact that by the seventeenth century religious observances were less important than they had been in earlier times, the companies still expected attendance of members at the funerals and accompanying feasts held for company members. The companies also maintained obits and chantries for their dead. The companies frequently were patrons of the bequests to churches of their dead members. For example, Merchant Taylors were possessed of the living of St. Martin Outwich.

Having qualified for a trade may explain why on September 28, 1640, Winstanley applied to marry Susan King at St. Martin Outwich. The entry described him as a Merchant Taylor in the Parish of St. Claves in Old Jewry and a bachelor about thirty years old. This would suggest Winstanley was practicing his trade in that parish. Of his wife and any subsequent offspring nothing is known. The records of the marriage were destroyed in the Great Fire of 1666. Winstanley's writings contain no descriptions of, or remarks about, his family.
A year after the beginning of the Civil War, Winstanley was, as he phrased it, "beaten out both of estate and trade." Winstanley stopped operating his tailoring business. One would expect small tailoring operations like his, in which the merchant kept his own accounts, to be affected more severely by the bad economic conditions in London. The cloth industry in London had been depressed for the three decades before the war. Small producers were either brought under the control of merchants who had large resources of money to buy raw materials and hire looms or were ruined. Competition from cheaper cloths made and imported from the Netherlands further depressed the market. Charles I's successive grants of monopolies for necessities, such as salt, iron, feathers, and soap, increased their prices. By the late 1630s the clothing industry was severely affected by the increased cost of soap and alum and the scarcity of potash. Wars with Spain and France and cloth disputes with the Dutch added to the economic distress. Charles I extracted 5,000 pounds from the Merchant Taylors Company for his northern army in 1640. Parliament borrowed 26,000 pounds from the Merchant Taylors Company for the prosecution of the Civil War in 1642.

After giving up his business, he described himself as accepting "the good will of friends crediting of me, to live a Country life." He resided in the area around Cobham in the county of Surrey. His living conditions were not favorable. Apparently he tended other people's cattle to support himself. Yet, he must not have been completely destitute because he complained of the "burthen of Taxes and much Free-Quarter," the boarding of troops in homes, and
finding the burden "heavier than I could bear."  

The populace of Surrey felt similarly about free-quarter. On December 17, 1647, Surrey farmers presented a petition to parliament complaining that for six years they had endured soldiers being lodged in the county. Though they were impoverished by free-quarter, their landlords nevertheless demanded the payments of rents. Not receiving a reply, thousands of Surrey residents presented another petition to parliament in May, 1648. They marched through the streets of London afterwards in order to demonstrate their opposition. Scuffles occurred and troops had to be used to subdue them. Not only was their grievance not redressed, but in 1649 more soldiers were quartered in the county following a Royalist uprising. 

In the midst of these conditions, Winstanley launched the Digger movement. Before the digging began, he wrote four pamphlets. The first was published on May 20, 1648, entitled, The Mysterie of God; the fourth was published on January 1, 1649, entitled, The New Law of Righteousness. In the January pamphlet, he announced his digging enterprise. He wrote that the "Lord doth show me the place and manner, how he will have us that are common people, to manure and work the common lands." On April 1, 1649, Winstanley and approximately five unidentified men began planting and sowing parsnips, carrots, and beans on the common land at St. George's Hill in the county of Surrey. No definite information exists as to why they chose this site, perhaps the infertility and lack of occupancy may have been factors. William Blith in his book, The English Improver Improved, 1652, said there were "thousands of places more capable of improvements." The men who
initiated the digging were residents of Walton-upon-the Thames or Cobham. The Diggers invited others to join them in cultivating the common land for the support of the needy. Henry Sanders, a local resident of Walton-upon-the-Thames, wrote a letter to Thomas Fairfax describing the digging activity as threatening all park pales and threatening to force the local population to dig. Sanders feared they have "some designe in hand."  

A state inquiry followed. On the recommendation of John Bradshaw, President of the Council of State, Fairfax dispatched troops to St. George's Hill to investigate. Captain John Gladman reported back to Fairfax that four of his men talked to Winstanley and William Everard, who shared the early leadership of the Diggers. He concluded that their venture was "not worth the writing not yet taking nottis of..."  

Four days after Gladman's inquiry, Winstanley and Everard appeared in London before Fairfax to explain their actions. At this time Everard appeared to be the leader and made a brief speech. He described the aim of the Diggers, "to restore the creation to its former conditions" by tilling only the common land, not other men's property. Moreover, he disavowed any use of arms to defend themselves. Neither Fairfax nor others present reacted with particular alarm to the Diggers. Fairfax also visited the Digger settlement the following month on his way to London and found twenty persons at work on the commons. He chastised the Diggers for their activities and received assurance by Winstanley of the opposition of the Diggers to the use of force. The government took no action against them apart from these admonitions.
The local population opposed the Diggers because they were using common land to which some of them had tenant rights. A few days after their interview with Fairfax in London, the Diggers were forcibly driven off St. George's Hill by the local inhabitants. A few days later they returned to the Hill and resumed their activities. As Winstanley remarked in his May, 1649, pamphlet, *A Declaration from the Poor Oppressed People of England*, the Diggers had planted their crops and were awaiting the arrival of their first crop. Moreover, Winstanley noted that the Diggers were cutting and selling trees on the commons to support themselves until harvest time. This activity may have provoked the next attack. On about June 1, 1649, several infantrymen under Captain Stravie attacked the Digger settlement, seriously wounding a boy and burning a house. Winstanley protested the attack in a June 9 letter addressed and hand delivered to Lord Fairfax. Two days later another attack was made on the settlement. Winstanley described the attackers as consisting of horsemen and men on foot dressed as women. The Diggers did not resist; one man was beaten severely and the cart in which wood for rebuilding their house was transported was smashed.

Having received no direct orders from the Council of State, the participation of the soldiers in these attacks may have been induced by pleas from local residents. It is difficult to determine the extent to which these attacks were abetted and paid for by the Lord of the Manor, Francis Drake, or the extent to which the attackers were unpaid local inhabitants who were indignant about the use of the commons by the Diggers. The law and prevailing social practice required that the
Lord of the Manor had to give permission for erection of buildings on the commons. The Diggers had not obtained this permission. Consequently, in June of 1649, Winstanley and fourteen of his fellow Diggers were arrested on a charge of trespassing on St. George's Hill and were brought to Kingston Court. The Diggers refused to hire a lawyer and the court would not allow them to plead their own case. A declaration submitted by Winstanley to the court was not recognized. The jury found for the plaintiff imposing ten pounds per person for trespassing and twenty nine shillings and a penny for court costs. When the bailiffs came to execute the sentence of the court, there were no assets except four cows in Winstanley's possession. Since the cows were owned by a neighbor and were only being tended by Winstanley, they could not be used for the court fine. Winstanley avoided paying any of the costs levied by the court.

Driven from St. George's Hill, the Diggers moved to the Cobham Manor Commons. The Diggers built four houses and planted a crop of winter grain. The heath on which they settled belonged to John Platt, who was rector of West Horsley.

The reaction of Platt and some of his neighbors was also hostile. Winstanley claimed that Parson John Platt spent a fortnight persuading Fairfax to send soldiers to suppress the Diggers. Fairfax ordered them to support the sheriff. The decision was apparently stimulated in part by a tumultuous meeting in the city of Cobham, a meeting which conveyed to the Council of State the concern of the local citizenry. The following month the troops supported the local inhabitants in destroying two houses, trampling corn, and
beating Diggers. The landlords gave the soldiers ten shillings to
buy drinks. 41 In December, Winstanley had gone to Whitehall to see
Fairfax. In January he defended the Diggers in his pamphlet, A New
Year's Gift for the Parliament and Armie. 42

The local populace probably with the backing of Platt also
organized a boycott of the Diggers. Winstanley claimed that Surrey
ministers had established a lecturer at Cobham "to preach down the
Diggers" 43 and advise people neither to buy nor to sell to them.
Winstanley recounted how he bought three acres of grass for making
hay but his money was refused by the Manor Lord when he came to
mow it and the grass was sold to another. 44 Parson John Platt and
Francis Drake filed suit and Winstanley was arrested and fined four
pounds for trespass. 45

By the spring of 1650, the Digger community appeared to be in
dire financial straits. A delegation of Diggers visited communities
in Buckinghamshire, Surrey, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, Berkshire,
Huntingdonshire, and Northamptonshire urging these communities to
set up digging ventures of their own and to send assistance. Two of
the original Diggers, Thomas Heaydon and Adam Knight, carried a letter
from Winstanley signed by twenty-five Diggers making these appeals and
noting the summer crop was destroyed. 46 The extent to which such
evangelizing was initiated by Winstanley is uncertain. In March of
1650 in an addendum to his pamphlet, A Vindication of Those Whose
Endeavors is only to Make the Earth a Common Treasury, called
Diggers . . ., Winstanley claimed that the letter was a forgery and
anyone wanting to contribute to their cause should send gifts directly
to the Diggers or by some trusted emissary. The letter may have been the result of the independent action of Thomas Heaydon and Adam Knight, members of the digging community at Cobham. The emissaries were arrested in Wellingborough in the county of Northamptonshire.

Their efforts met with limited success. The poor at Wellingborough established a short-lived digging venture in the commons called Bareshank. Nevertheless in the pamphlet, *An Appeal to All Englishmen*, in March of 1650, Winstanley congratulated and encouraged the digging ventures in Wellingborough. However, no indication of the Wellingborough Diggers sending aid to the Cobham Diggers exists.

Shortly afterwards the Cobham digging venture ended, but not chiefly because of finances. A week before Easter in 1650, Parson John Platt and Thomas Sutton pulled down a house and attacked the Diggers. Despite Platt's promise that if no wood were taken from the heath, he would leave them alone, he and several men returned a week later setting fire to their houses and scattering belongings. He hired several men to keep a twenty-four hour vigil on the heath to prevent the return of the Diggers. Winstanley claimed that the Diggers were threatened with murder if they returned. Moreover, sometime during the spring an indictment was returned in Surrey Assize Court against Winstanley and fourteen Diggers for disorderly and unlawful assembly at Cobham. Records do not indicate if further action were taken. No further attempts by the Surrey Diggers to resettle on Cobham heath or anywhere else are recorded.
The results of the digging were unspectacular. The venture lasted only a year. Winstanley claimed that the largest extent of Digger property was eleven acres of corn and six or seven houses. The ground at St. George's Hill and Cobham heath was not regarded as fertile. Winstanley and the members of the digging community numbered seventy-three at maximum, the number varying with arrests and disaffections. The digging activity was halted by local authorities, not the Council of State or army, probably because state authorities regarded the activity as insignificant.

Winstanley's view of June 1649 that the digging was "the talk of the whole land" was clearly an overstatement. Some English newssheets did in fact describe the digging activity, but most of these accounts were restricted to the spring of 1649. Moreover, almost without exception they were critical of the venture. The April 16-23 newssheet, Perfect Summary of an Exact Diary of Some Passages of Parliament, characterized the digging as the work of madmen. The Kingdom's Faithful and Impartiall Scout for April believed the Diggers had "dreamed dreams." The Mercurius Pragmaticus for April concluded that the digging was lunacy and a "fanatical insurrection." The April issue of The Moderate Intelligencer called the digging as based on an hallucination. The mid-July 1659 issue of The Weekly Account condemned the Diggers on theological grounds suggesting that eliminating private property would not work among the sinful men because of the Fall. Most of these newssheet accounts confused the Levellers and Diggers. A few newssheets, such as the April issue of
The Perfect Diurnall merely gave factual accounts of the Digger interview with Fairfax and other activities. Rarer still was the April, 1649, issue of The Moderate which published a "Declaration" from the Diggers in support of their effort.

Details of the life of Gerrard Winstanley after the collapse of the Digging Community are meager. In the summer or fall of 1650, he went, accompanied by some of his fellow Diggers, to Pitron, Hertfordshire, to become an estate steward to Lady Douglas. She was widely regarded as a prophetess and had foretold the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham and the execution of Charles I. She wrote at least thirty-seven known tracts, in which astrology, numerology, and religion were intermixed. The only known facts about any relationship between Winstanley and Lady Douglas were those of employee to employer. In a letter to Lady Douglas dated December, 1650, Winstanley complained of her failure to pay him for threshing tithe wheat and defended himself from charges of mismanagement. It may have been during his stint as estate steward that Winstanley wrote his major work, The Law of Freedom, which was published early in 1652. In The Law of Freedom, he gave some glimpse of what his living conditions were during this time. He said:

... my health and estate is decayed, and I grow in age, I must either beg or work for day wages, which I was never brought up to, for another ...

Exactly when he left her employ is unknown.

After working for Lady Douglas, the record of his life is almost nonexistent. In 1660 a suit was filed by the executors of
Richard Aldsworth, a London citizen, for a debt of 114 pounds. The suit described Winstanley as incurring the debt for cloth commodities during 1641-1643. In 1666 a Gerrard Winstanley claimed that Ferdinando Gorges owed him 1,850 pounds and promised an annuity of 200 pounds to his wife and two sisters. This Winstanley was a cornchandler living in Bloomsbury who died a Quaker in 1676 leaving a widow, Elizabeth Stanley. Yet, if the parish register is correct about his birth, the Digger Winstanley would have been 67, not 62. Moreover, the Digger Winstanley's wife was Susan King, not Elizabeth Stanley. Thus some question exists whether the Digger Winstanley and the Quaker Winstanley are the same man.

Though whether he later became Quaker cannot be authoritatively determined, Winstanley had undergone a process of conversion. In The New Law of Righteousness (1649) he described his former views as follows:

blind Professour and a strict goer to Church . . . and a bearer of Sermons, and never questioned what they spake, but believed as the learned Clergy (the Church) believed; and still forgot what I heard . . . .

Winstanley then suggested that his current beliefs were regarded by the same Priests, and the Professours [and] . . . my former acquaintance now begin to be afraid of me, and call me a blasphemer, and a man of errors. . . .

Besides the experience of conversion, Winstanley recounted that the eating and working together which became the basis of the digging venture was imparted to him in a trance. Moreover, he claimed that
his ideas had not been read in the works of, or heard from, other people, but were divine communications. 68

Such accounts of spiritual experience were common place during Winstanley's lifetime. Many people including Protestant sectaries, Presbyterians, and Anglicans vied with each other in describing their inward struggles to know God directly. Such descriptions ranged from learned treatised and sermons to anecdotes and legends, some of which were solely by word of mouth. Seeing visions was not unknown in the description of one's inner travail. 69

Winstanley was probably much more in sympathy with a smaller group of Protestant sectaries who opposed the churches and creeds of Anglicanism and Presbyterianism. In The Law of Freedom, Winstanley criticized the Presbyterian doctrine of predestination as enslaving people as Lords and Servants "while they are in the Mothers womb." 70

The underlying basis of such criticism was a belief that the individual was responsible for his own salvation, without recourse to intermediaries. The widely circulating King James version of the Bible allowed each person to be his own clergyman, interpreting the scripture for himself. The belief in liberty of conscience may explain why sectarian ideas, such as the Seekers, Familists, Ranters, Baptists, and Behmenists, developed with little or no accompanying organization. These sects regarded clerical institutions as barriers to their direct relationships with God. Therefore these sects all formulated their ideas in opposition to existing clerical arrangements.
They shared this anticlericalism with many of their contemporaries who were not sectarian. The chief target of opposition was the sole right of ordained ministers to act as unwanted middlemen between God and the faithful. So many pamphlets appeared endorsing lay preaching that parliament unexceptionally attempted to prohibit them in 1644, 1645, and 1646. Even the least gifted man only needed faith and reading knowledge of scripture to preach. Samuel How in *Sufficencie of the Spirits Teaching*, 1639, claimed that a man be he peddler, tinker, chimney sweeper, or cobbler needed only the Spirit of God.

Not being allowed to select ministers of the established church, the sectaries also opposed tithes. Tithes were forced payment of ten percent of income to maintain the clergy. G.K. Fortescue's *Catalogue of the Pamphlets...* collected by George Thomason gives voluminous lists of pamphlets opposing tithes. The number of such publications as *An Indictment of Tithes...* by Divers Citizens of London Before the Lord Mayor, 1645, substantially increased after the beginning of the Civil War.

Sometimes criticisms of the clergy were even more severe. For example in a 1644 sermon, Edmund Calamy declared that in the minds of the people the clergy were "dumb dogs, greedy dogs which have... more pomp than circumstance." In 1641 there were 900 parliamentary petitions, representing one from every ten parishes in the land, complaining of the clergy's immorality.

Though they had in common anticlericalism and a belief in liberty of conscience, each sect had its own unique belief in the means to realize individual salvation. Of all these religious groups, the
Seekers were perhaps the most elusive. They represented a trend of thought rather than constituting a distinct sect. Even their origins are obscure. They may have developed out of early seventeenth century English views or out of continental Anabaptism. Bartholomew Legate probably was the founder of the English Seekers. He was burned at the stake in 1612. He believed that no true church can exist until men can be stirred of God, as the disciplines were. Christ was not divine but a man in whom the Spirit of God existed beyond measure. The learning of the university was not important in having a valid ministry. A Christianity based on actual revelations and sincere convictions would have to wait on later revelation.

This belief in waiting became part of the Seeker creed. The Seeker believed that no true church, no true sacraments, and no person having apostolic sanctity existed. Without this spiritual experience the preaching of the Word and the adherence to the letter of the scripture are carnal and worthless. The administration of ordinances, such as the Lord's Supper and Baptism, was opposed because no properly authorized agency for their performance existed. The Seekers could find no satisfaction in the doctrines and liturgy of existing churches. Because antichrist ruled the church for so long, neither a true church nor true church officers survived.

The Seekers disagreed over the necessity of establishing a new church. Some expected God to send new apostles or prophets to establish new churches. These people would establish a true ministry by the performance of miracles. In this church people could seek real salvation. Other Seekers believed that the
visible church was totally unnecessary, because religion should be founded only on inward experience. They awaited the demonstration of spirit within the soul and regarded organization as an indication of weakness.81

Both groups of Seekers, however, shared a sufficiently strong belief in divine revelation as manifested in individual experience to avoid the established churches and form groups of their own. The distinctive attitude of the Seekers was the belief that men should not seek to hasten God's business by outward rituals. Men should wait for divine grace.82

Aside from this agreement, the views of the Seekers embraced many seventeenth century heresies. The trial of Edmund Wrightman for his Seeker ideas presented a sample of these heresies. He did not believe in the Trinity. To him, Christ was only a man; he was not a combination of humanity and divinity in one person. He opposed baptism of infants and believed both the body and soul are mortal. Wrightman thought that the promise "that the seede of the Woman shall break the serpents head was not fulfilled in Christe."83 The Holy Ghost was not coequal nor coexternal with the Father and Son. He thought that Christ's crucifixion involved the end of both his body and soul.84

Seeker ideas were very pervasive and became incorporated by the sects. The tendency of their thought toward inward salvation was perhaps the most influential. John Saltmarsh who wrote and preached widely in the 1640s was an example. In all his books, such as The Sparkles of Glory, Grooves for Livity, Smook in the Temple, and the Beam of Light, he sympathized with the Seekers.
Although it is not known that he was a member of a Seeker congregation, he shared many of their ideas. Religion was best practiced in the invisible church of men's hearts, where the Spirit of God was located. He believed that all church practices were unnecessary, for the real reformation will result from Jesus Christ as the Eternal Seed formed in us. Other persons active in the 1640's were John Webster and Robert Brierly. Both men shared Saltmarsh's views of Christianity as a religion of the heart. Like Saltmarsh, they were not members of a Seeker congregation.

Though their ideas spread farther than the Seeker congregations themselves, the Seekers did exist as an independent movement. There were large congregations of them in many parts of England by the beginning of the Civil War. A number of pamphlets endorsing and condemning them in the 1640's reflected their influence. The Seekers had their own "regular assemblies" based on their distinct views. They were particularly widespread in Yorkshire, Lancashire, Westmorland, Bristol, and London.

A more distinct religious group than the Seekers was the Familists or the Family of Love. The sect was founded in the 1530's by David George and was spread throughout England in the 1560's by Christopher Vittel. They were the most numerous during the Commonwealth. They preached in the open air in 1645. In his pamphlet, *Survey of Spiritual Antichrist*, 1648, Samuel Rutherford claimed that the Familists had spread through twelve counties in England.

Like the Seekers, the Familists repeatedly emphasized the irrelevance of outward forms and ordinances when compared to the
inward experience of God's presence. They endorsed the idea of a Divine Light in the soul of everyone. They could become as embodied with illumination as any of the prophets were.

Rather than waiting for the leadership of apostles who had divine grace, as the Seekers urged, the Familists believed these revelations were occurring. They believed that Henry Nicholas, one of their sixteenth century leaders, had produced miracles. They thought that the law of God could be attained on earth. The same perfection which existed in Adam before the Fall could be attained now in this life.

Yet, scripture was regarded as allegorical. The Familists believed Adam, the first man, was but a symbol of earthly man. Allegorical Biblical interpretation became the basis of unusual social and political beliefs as well. For example, a requirement for membership in a Familist congregation was that each person's goods were to be held in common. Participation in war and service as a magistrate was considered incompatible with Christianity. Heaven and Hell had only an earthly existence; both were believed to exist in the present world. Since the Familists believed that nature ruled all things, references to God were not necessary.

Like both the Seekers and the Familists, the Ranters were another sectarian group, whose doctrines Winstanley could have known. They appeared in England about 1640 or 1641. They were in London, Lancashire, Yorkshire, Warwickshire, Leicestershire, and the communities in East Anglia, Norfolk, Suffolk, Hampshire, and Wiltshire. They were very active from 1645 onwards, but disappeared from
public view in the mid-1650s perhaps being incorporated into the Quakers. 96

The Ranters were numerous in areas where Anabaptism was practiced. Perhaps one reason for this was that part of the ideas of the Ranters came from a sect of Adamities who were of Anabaptist origin and who first appeared in England in the early 1640s. Like the Ranters, the Adamities abhorred marriage and practiced group nakedness. Promiscuity was widely practiced with the justification that Adam did not know his own wife until he had eaten the forbidden fruit. The Adamities appear to have merged with the Ranters. 97

The Ranters believed that God existed in every creature, in a leaf as well as an angel. God was the one Spirit in the world. The division of Spirits into Good or Bad merely frightens men. 98 The Ranters would not accept a dualism of God in the sky and sinful man on earth. Since God was within each man, the notion of sin was absurd. All man had to do was to heed the divinity within his heart. Since the divinity within was the reality, the body (the world of flesh) had an existence somewhat like that of a reflection in a cup of water. 99 Men have no freedom of will to do evil or good. God does not exercise moral judgments. God was not personal. No fixed authority existed except the divinity within each man. Since nothing existed after death, the rituals of the seventeenth century were considered unnecessary. The Ranters thought they had no need of "outward administration" or "carnal ordinances" such as baptism and fellowship together in the breaking of bread. 100

Scripture was interpreted allegorically. Believing themselves instructed by the Word of God within themselves, they minimized the
importance of any literal scriptural interpretation. Christ was only a fleshy apparition of God. What Christ did and suffered in his own person was only a figure or type of what should be done and acted in every man. Christ within ourselves should be the focus of concern instead of the scriptural fact that Christ died at Jerusalem. The world existed long before the scriptural Cain or Adam.  

The Ranters' lack of any recognized theoretician may be explained by their belief that the indwelling divinity was so potent that they could write scripture as binding and infallible as Paul. Each of their leaders, such as Jacob Bauthmeley and Abiezer Coppe, had his own following and his own variation of the creed. For example, the Ranter Coppe condemned the institution of private property. The basis of his condemnation was that all things belong or ought to belong to God alone. Ranterism, however, did not usually focus on a critique of private property.

Though he may not have been aware of Coppe's ideas in particular, Winstanley was generally aware of Ranter ideas. In a February, 1649, pamphlet entitled, A Vindication of Those, Whose Endeavors is Only to Make the Earth a Common Treasury, Called Diggers, or Some Reason Given by them Against the Immoderate Use of Creatures, or the Excessive Community of Women, Called Ranting or Rather Renting, Winstanley criticized Ranter ideas and attempted to dissociate the Diggers from the Ranters. He says that the pamphlet was motivated by a desire "to write as a Vindication of the Diggers, who are slandered with the Ranting action." In his pamphlet, A New Years Gift for the Parliament and
and Armie, Winstanley noted that some Ranters have "come among the
Diggers that have caused scandal, but we dis-own their ways." 105
The major criticism Winstanley makes of ranting in his Vindication of
Those . . . Called Diggers was its immoral practices such as its
"excessive community of women." 106 In his pamphlet, England Spirit
Unfouled, Winstanley made similar criticisms of the Ranters. He
characterized Ranterism as filling "the body with diseases, rottenesse,
sickness and poor . . the mind with anger, distempers, and vex-
ation." 107 His comments were based on attempts to disprove reports
that "digging practices, leads to Ranting principles." 108

Some other evidence however suggested Gerrard Winstanley's
connection with the Baptists. In his pamphlet, Truth Lifting up Its
Head (October 1648), he said that he had undergone the ordinance of
"dipping." 109 In The New Law of Righteousness, he characterized
those who practice dipping in water as "still under the min-
istrations of Jesus Christ after the flesh." 110 Such references
suggest that Winstanley had been a Baptist sometime before he began
writing pamphlets in 1648.

Despite the fact that his father Edward Winstanley and his wife
were presented to the church courts in 1605 for holding conventicles or
voluntary religious gatherings, 111 it seems unlikely that Winstanley was
reared a Baptist. The first Baptist church was not established in London
until 1612. The sect did not establish any following in the county of his
birth, Lancashire. Almost no references to Anabaptists in Lancashire
exist prior to the 1672 Indulgence. 112 The largest number of Baptists
were concentrated in the midlands and southern counties: Coventry, Salisbury, Lincoln, and Tiverton and in Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, and Warwickshire. Moreover, the origin of "dipping" is later than the founding of the Baptists. "Dipping" was the practice of immersion of adults and was introduced into England not earlier than 1633 nor later than 1641.

Winstanley spent the years 1630-1643 in London. He may have been exposed to Baptist ideas during those years. London was a major focus of Baptist activity. By 1644 seven congregations of Baptists had been established in London. On May 8, 1642, a sermon, which was subsequently reprinted as a pamphlet, entitled "The Anatomy of Separatists, alias Brownists" was given by an Anglican bishop in St. Olaves, a church in the Old Jewry section of London. In the sermon the bishop complained that "many places in England and London are too much Amsterdammified." Several outstanding London merchants were Baptists. Edwin Barber founded in 1639 the Bell Alley Church and was a merchant tailor by trade. Samuel Richardson and William Kiffin were wealthy Baptist merchants and influential in London public affairs. The latter preached throughout the city during the 1640's.

The Baptists had distinct religious views. They endorsed religious toleration. Of all the religious sects only the Baptists were willing to allow toleration to those with whom they had religious disagreements. Even the independents with similar ideas were unwilling to extend toleration to opponents. John Robinson, one
of the Independent leaders, believed the magistrates could legitimately further Christ's kingdom by rooting out heresy. However, the two early founders of the Baptists, Thomas Helwys and John Smythe, believed all prosecution was wrong. The latter suggested men should not be punished for blasphemy. Later leaders of the 1640-1660 period, such as Blackwood, Barber, Dell, and Richardson, endorsed religious toleration. The pamphlet literature reflected this Baptist commitment to toleration. During the 1640-1649 period, there were twenty-nine pamphlets published which supported toleration.

The Baptists also believed in the universal salvation of all mankind. The founders of the sect, Helwys and Smyth, advocated ideas of universal salvation. Henry Denne, a Baptist preacher, in his 1646 pamphlet, *The Drag Net of the Kingdom of Heaven or Christ Drawing All Men*, advocated that Christ died for all men. The Baptist Thomas Lamb preached universal salvation at Grace Church in London, November 5, 1644.

It also seems likely that Winstanley was opposed to Behmenist ideas. Although Jacob Boehme was a sixteenth century German mystic, his ideas were popularized in seventeenth century England. Many of his works were translated into English by the Englishmen John Sparrow and John Ellistone. The first of Boehme's works to be translated was, *Two Theological Epistles*, which appeared in 1645. The appearance of a translated version of the work, *Antichrist*, marked the tenth work of Boehme to be translated and published in England. Many of Boehme's works had been translated and commented on before Winstanley began writing pamphlets in 1648.
The Behmenist God was not a supernatural being, regulating the universe from heaven. The Eternity, or God, consists of both internal and external worlds. The external world was a manifestation of divinity. God was the unity which contained the universe. The inward world of man's mind was a manifestation of divinity. Men had but to become aware of the unity of himself in God to become part of the divinity. By such awareness, men can speak the Word of God as flawlessly as the prophets. Salvation will occur when men become aware of this unity. Men will know they are saved when their hearts are inflamed with divine love. When this happens, divine love will be reflected in speech and practice. 124

The Behmenists throughout stressed that this inward divinity was symbolized by light. Self-realization of divinity was equated with an awareness of a ray of light. Ellistone states that Boehme personally underwent an experience which taught him that the visible world was but an aspect of the spiritual world within. By means of divine light, metals, minerals, plants, and herbs may be applied to "their right natural use for the curing and healing of corrupt and decayed nature." 125 Because of the oneness of God, understanding inward divinity expands the faithful's knowledge of the use of nature. 126

Another major aspect of Behmenist teaching was that man must return to the condition of the unfallen Adam. Adam was a sort of prototype of all future men in that both retained free will and a dual nature. Two kingdoms of nature struggle within men for mastery. God planted within man the seed of redemption, the
divine light. Man can either become aware of this light or choose self-seeking. God will not dictate the outcome of the struggle. Man acting by his free will develops a Heaven or a Hell out of his innermost being. Heaven and Hell are created by men and therefore neither has an independent existence. 127

The ideas of the English Behmenists are similar to those of the Seekers in their shared opinion that religion is a spiritual, inward experience. The works of Boehme were read by serious Seekers during the Commonwealth. The extent to which the Behmenists formed coherent groups before 1648 is unknown. Boehme's ideas seem to have been spread throughout England primarily by interpreters, such as Sparrow, Ellistone, and others.

A connection can be made between the Diggers and the Behmenists through the teachings of John Pordage. He was a follower of Jacob Boehme. He emphasized the doctrine of the divine light, the symbol of the Virgin Sophia, and the belief in Adam's original androgyny. He became the focus around which the Philadelphian Society was later formed. 128 In 1644 John Pordage became curate-in-charge of the Church of St. Lawrence at Reading. By 1647 he was established as rector of the Parish at Bradfield. 129

William Everard might have been connected to John Pordage either at Reading or at Bradfield. Everard, rather than Winstanley, was described as the Digger leader from the outset of the digging venture in April, 1649. When Winstanley and Everard appeared before Fairfax and the Council of State, Everard acted as spokesman. 130 Everard's affiliation with the Diggers did not continue;
The True Leveller Standard Advanced of April, 1649, was the last pamphlet signed by Everard.

The early life of William Everard is obscure. Winstanley devoted his pamphlet, Truth Lifting Up Its Head, to a defense of the charge that he held blasphemous opinions. For these opinions he had been imprisoned by the bailiffs of Kingston. Winstanley refers to Everard as Chamberlain, the Reading man, called after the flesh, William Everard. A William Everard from Reading had been a spy for Sir Samuel Luke, Scoutmaster General to the army of the Earl of Essex early in 1643. In 1647 a William Everard was a supporter of the Levellers and supported the Agreement of the People in the New Model Army. The same year he was charged with being involved in a plot to assassinate the King and was arrested for participating in the mutiny at Ware in November, 1647. The following month he was dismissed from the army and was released from prison. After leaving St. George's Hill, newsheets of that period suggest that Everard joined the mutiny of the army which was suppressed at Burford.

The only clue to Everard's views was the possibility that after the Burford mutiny he stayed with John Pordage at Bradfield at harvest time in 1649. If this was the same William Everard, Pordage described him as "a separatist, then a scoffer at ordinances, . . . then a blasphemer." During his three to four weeks with Pordage, Everard suggested a variety of apparitions, including a giant and a great dragon. The extent to which Everard had been influenced by Behmenist ideas earlier is unknown.
Unlike the Behemists, the Quaker ideas were unlikely to have influenced Winstanley. Some authors have suggested a direct connection between Winstanley and the Quakers. The earliest reference to the two was the suggestion by Thomas Comber in his work, *Christianity, No Enthusiasm*, that Winstanley was the spiritual founder of Quakerism. More recent commentators, such as Winthrop Hudson and R.T. Vann, have proposed that the similarities between the ideas of Quakers and Winstanley would indicate Winstanley influenced the Quakers. Hudson presented the most extensive argument. Hudson claimed that every idea Fox had was duplicated in Winstanley. Hudson gave no proof of the direct influence of Winstanley on the Quakers. Hudson noted the idea of an "inner light" in man and the imminent reformation of mankind were ideas of Fox identical in Winstanley. However, the concept of a coming millennium was widespread in seventeenth century England and the idea of God being an inner light in men were both commonplace in the seventeenth century. Hudson gave no evidence of Fox citing Winstanley; only tenuous connections, such as Giles Calvert was the printer of both of their pamphlets and the area of England from which the Diggers originated, particularly Surrey and Buckinghamshire, were the same as the Quakers, were presented. Without either direct contact of Winstanley and the early Quakers or the Quakers citing passages or ideas distinctively from Winstanley, it is difficult to agree with Hudson.

Winstanley and George Fox were contemporaries. George Fox did not begin proselytizing until 1647 when he began preaching at Dukinfield and Manchester. Winstanley began writing his pamphlets in 1648.
No evidence exists of direct contact between the two. R.T. Vann has proposed that Winstanley became a Quaker in his later life after the collapse of the digging venture. His death in 1660 was registered with the Westminster Society of Friends. Not enough is known about the later life of Winstanley to know if this indicates Winstanley became a Quaker in his later life. Moreover, the religious groups of the period were unstable, one splitting off and combining with others. For example, the Westmoreland Seekers became part of the Quakers. Winstanley, the Seekers, and the early Quakers were all contemporaries; they all shared the idea of man as a spiritual microcosm of the universe. This idea they shared with Jacob Boehme. It is difficult to know the origin of this idea. Without any direct evidence, the strongest statement that can be made is that Winstanley and the Quakers may have been drawing their ideas from a common source.
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CHAPTER III

RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL UNORTHODOXY;
THE PRE-DIGGING PAMPHLETS OF WINSTANLEY

The basis of the entire political theory of Gerrard Winstanley can be reduced to the following: he thought men could restore the pristine innocence they fell from by changing their social conduct and abolishing some institutions.

This chapter focuses on the first part of the political theory of Winstanley found in his first five pamphlets. This chapter analyzes how conceptions of political theory in these first five pamphlets were based on the formulation above. First, he believed the nature of morality of men was so paramount and fundamental that the Fall did not diminish it. Secondly, the Fall marked the origin of immorality in men as evidenced by their social conduct; the chief criterion of morality and immorality was the social conduct and institutions of men. Thirdly, the millenarianism of Winstanley was the basis of his conviction that men could restore themselves to the social conditions before the Fall. Fourthly, Winstanley advocated abolition of the church and landed property based on his conception of equality and morality. Thus, the political theory of Winstanley constituted one unity. His proposed abolition of landed property was based on a conception of equality and morality which he consistently adhered to in these five pamphlets.

103
In his first pamphlet, *The Mysterie of God*, Winstanley depicted an allegorical Fall. The Fall established not just the first nature of man or Adam but all mankind. Winstanley’s conception of the Fall revealed the paramount importance he attached to the nature of morality of both God and mankind. God had given to all men morally perfect natures devoid of any immorality. Before the Fall, God dwelled in each man just as God had been bodily present in Jesus Christ.¹ Men had no knowledge of evil. Mankind had a direct relationship with God by means of their divine nature. The moral nature of man was evident in his divine qualities of joy, love, peace, humility, obedience, delight and knowledge.² Man lived an idyllic existence without conflict. Men were "pure and spotless."³ God established a Law or Covenant by which men acknowledged God to be their maker and themselves to be creatures of God.⁴

Winstanley linked this morality before the Fall to a conception of equality. All men were equal before God. No one man was given any special treatment by God. God regarded each man as part of his handiwork.⁵ The Fall occurred because men sought to improve their moral condition and their equal status. Men strived to establish inequality in their relationship with God. Thus in striving for inequality men committed an immoral act. Inequality and immorality developed at the same time. Men exercised the independence God gave them to end their idyllic existence. The Fall represented the foundation of all immoral conduct by mankind. Immorality occurred when men exercised their individual will and severed their direct relationship with God. Adam or mankind fell whenever they acted selfishly by aspiring to be as a God knowing good and evil. By seeking to be more knowing beings than God intended, men violated the Law
or Covenant of God.\textsuperscript{6} The underlying desire and conduct of men was "to become a Being above, equall to, or distinct from God."\textsuperscript{7} The "inward disposition to promote themselves"\textsuperscript{8} men displayed by their act of inequality was the origin of sin. God was dishonored when men sought to change their relationship with God into an equal one. Men should have contented themselves with the unequal one in which God had determined the means by which men and God communicated. Winstanley regarded God as dishonored by the actions of men by which they declared themselves beings separate from God. Men tried to be more knowing beings than God had intended. Thereby men violated the will of God.\textsuperscript{9}

The conception of human nature of Winstanley was unique in regarding the Fall as merely adding an immoral dimension to their natures while retaining their original innocence. He did not think for the Fall that God had condemned man to a perpetual nature of wickedness in which only weakened moral aspects remained. God condemned mankind only for his actions. Winstanley wrote:

\begin{quote}
When Adam had broke the Covenant, and died by the Law, God did not denounce an utter destruction, without recovery to . . . mankinde. But he pronces the finall curse against the Serpent or mans work.\textsuperscript{10}
\end{quote}

Men could by their conduct restore themselves to their lost innocence. God condemned man for actions which man retained the moral capacity to cease. Each man had within him a moral capacity or conscience which condemned him for violation of the Law or Covenant they had disobeyed. This moral capacity was the indwelling divinity which God had originally instilled in each man.\textsuperscript{11}

This conception of the Fall of Winstanley was unorthodox in comparison to the view of most of his contemporaries. They subscribed to the conception of the Fall described by John Calvin. Calvin thought that the Fall
had caused a permanent change in human nature, not the impediment Winstanley insisted on. Calvin believed that before the Fall, the first man Adam had possessed soundness of mind and unrighteousness of heart. Adam had the free will to choose between eternal life and the course of unfaithfulness he selected. \(^{12}\) Ambition, pride and ungratefulness rose in Adam, and he sought more than God had granted him. The result of this act was the origin of original sin and the consequent change in the nature of man.

God punished Adam and his descendants for their sin by depriving them of their divine nature "good and pure." \(^{13}\) The result of original sin was that the nature of man became one of "hereditary depravity." \(^{14}\) His nature became not only destitute of good by "so fertile of every evil it cannot be idle." \(^{15}\) The reason he had possessed before the Fall which had distinguished clearly between good and evil was weakened and corrupted. Enough reason survived so man could be distinguished from the brute beasts. \(^{16}\) Man no longer had the power of reasonable deliberation to determine what was good for himself. Like animals, men were inclined to follow their own nature without reason. \(^{17}\) Men became so universally depraved that they could be "impelled only to evil." \(^{18}\)

Therefore, Calvin believed that this depraved nature of man prevented him from the attainment of his former perfection in earthly life. The life of man could be divided into the spheres of grace and nature. Nature or the earthly life was merely an ephemeral state before the blessedness of a spiritual afterlife in which men could be restored to the grace of God. \(^{19}\) In the realm of nature or early existence, the lessened capacity of men made them capable only of wickedness. Calvin stressed that perfection "can never be found in a community of men." \(^{20}\)

God created Government
to restrain the wickedness of fallen men. He believed that government was as necessary as bread, sun, or air.\textsuperscript{21} Government was to keep public peace among men. It was to provide the means for each man to keep "his property safe and sound."\textsuperscript{22} Men have to "obey and suffer even a despotic government because it was a judgement of God."\textsuperscript{23} As long as the government did not interfere in religious activity of the godly church, men should obey government. He recognized a sphere of autonomy in which government could operate as long as it did not directly conflict with religious concepts. As long as obedience to government did not result in disobedience to God, it might function independently.\textsuperscript{24}

A corollary of this depraved nature of mankind was Calvin's belief that men could not rely on their own actions for salvation. He did not accept the doctrine men could achieve salvation by their good works. "Man can contribute nothing to his own righteousness."\textsuperscript{25} No matter how good their works are they cannot advance a man's chance for salvation. Calvin declared men as unworthy of salvation because of their corrupted natures which gave them no means to produce actions worthy of God.

\begin{quote}
if we are judged by our own worth . . \textsuperscript{26}
we still deserve death and destruction.
\end{quote}

Only "faith alone could save men."\textsuperscript{27} Men are saved by the mercy of God who grants them righteousness.\textsuperscript{28}

On the other hand, Winstanley believed that the overwhelming number of his contemporaries were in bondage to their selfishness.
However, unlike Calvin, he thought each man had only to overcome his self-inflicted immorality and ignorance in order to achieve salvation. Fallen men who exercised their individual wills were in bondage.

Ever since the fall; the same selfish spirit, leads every man and woman captive at his will, and enslaves them in that prison, and bondage. . . .29

Men were in bondage to their immorality which made them ignorant. Their selfishness prevented them from an awareness of their divine moral capacity. The "light of the Son or Righteousness Jesus Christ is hid from the generality of men. . . ."30 Men obey only their individual selfish will and seek to satisfy solely their personal desires. Selfish people do not know that sin was the result of actions of men and was not dictated by God. They did not realize that the "Serpent" or selfishness was their invention.31 A selfish person based his life on "riches, in friends, in self-satisfaction, in my pride, covetousness, and contents of the flesh."32 Such a person was in a condition like the bondage of a prisoner. His inward selfishness dominated him as "an overpowering wave of wickedness."33 Moreover, such conduct was accompanied by ignorance of God. His selfishness prevented him from realizing God existed within him as an indwelling divinity.34 Instead, he believed God existed outside himself in a spiritual realm. He regarded the best means of worshiping God was by observing the ordinance of the church.35 Selfishness was a "power of darkness" which deceived men into thinking their actions were moral.36
The importance of Winstanley's conception of equality and morality was obvious in his evaluation of his contemporaries. He thought some of his contemporaries had been able to partially subdue their selfishness. These Saints had fulfilled the potential all men had for morality or equitable social conduct. All men were potentially Saints. Winstanley had emphasized in the Fall that immorality was a product of the voluntary action of men. Winstanley described the Saints as experiencing an inner revelation or awareness of their indwelling divinity or moral nature. This experience was an anointing of the spirit of Christ in them. They had acknowledged God by placing their faith in him and accepting their responsibility for their selfish actions. Winstanley described each Saint as tempted by the same "Serpent of selfishness" which tempted Adam. Each had been tempted to be unjust, seek revenge, and be adulterous. The power of God had assisted each of them in resisting such wicked conduct. The Saints were witnesses for Christ by their own conduct. Therefore, the Saints declared to the other men their inward testimony. Christ had sent them "to speak of what they had heard and seen of the indwelling and inworking of God in themselves." The Saints were thus like the Apostle Paul who after the Serpent's head was bruised in him had preached and practiced the faith of God.

Winstanley did not think superior reason was the basis of how the Saints overcome immorality. Their saintly accomplishment was not by the operation of their natural reason. Moreover, in his characterization of the Fall, Winstanley regarded morality or immorality as determining the actions of men in this instance, not reason. The selfishness of men of the Fall acted not only
as a source of immoral conduct, but also caused ignorance. Selfishness was like a "Serpent" which winded its way into every "created faculty of man." Thus, the whole basis of the Fall was that men by means of their immoral act were ignorant that salvation could be accomplished by becoming aware of their indwelling divinity and changing their attendant conduct. Only when men became Saints did their immorality lessen enough to allow their reason to discover the true origin of sin in the conduct of men.

Winstanley did suggest a sort of determinism by which one could account for the existence of the Saints. God would dispel the "mystery" of the origin of immorality in a manner predetermined by him. God would do this by a series of dispensations in which the clarity of men in this regard would steadily increase. These dispensations were the means by which God subdivided the history of mankind. Six dispensations were foretold in the Bible. The first had been the Fall, the second had been the scriptural promise of Genesis that selfishness or the Serpent's head would be broken by the seed of woman. This promise lasted from Adam to Abraham. By the third dispensation, God made clearer how salvation would occur by the divine prophecy: that by the seed of Abraham all nations would be blessed. Thus men knew in what generation God would cast selfishness out of mankind. The fourth dispensation was the appearance of Christ on earth by which men had a model of how selfish temptation could be resisted and men achieve earthly salvation. The fifth dispensation was the spreading of the
spirit of Christ by means of the Apostles of Christ. Winstanley regarded his contemporary England as in the midst of a sixth dispensation. Men were striving to overcome their immorality and were hindered by the existence of a state church. To Winstanley, God was using the Saints, the men he selected to overcome morality, as an instrument of his will. This was what he meant when he refers to the Saints as "witnesses." ⁴⁵

Winstanley’s depiction of the seventh dispensation day which followed the sixth dispensation was important because it showed God used works as a criterion of salvation. Moreover, he had no conception of salvation as occurring in a spiritual afterlife but in an earthly context. Though all men would thereby be saved, God would punish men for immoral conduct. ⁴⁶ "God brings every man to judgement and rewards everyman according to his work...." ⁴⁷ God would pass judgment on all men, but not assign their disembodied souls to a place of Heaven or Hell. He thought Judgment Day would begin by God raising all the bodies of men from their graves. ⁴⁸ The Saints would be rewarded for their moral conduct. They would be saved first as a reward for subduing their selfishness. Winstanley again gives no criteria which justified such preferential treatment particularly in view of his description of God as intervening by assisting each Saint in overcoming his selfishness. Those who have been under the Serpent or selfishness will be cast into "everlasting fire." The "everlasting fire" meant that these unbelievers would suffer a second death. Since they had not been delivered from the Serpent by the first ressurrection, they would suffer a second death
or the anguish of God's wrath. Although they would not literally die, the wrath would give them pain more intolerable than the plucking out of their right eye or cutting off their right hand. Such men were in Hell because they were below the comfort and joys of God. Moreover, the wrath of God inflicted on them would last only for the duration of the seventh dispensation. These people were only punished, not eternally damned. By means of this punishment God would treat men unequally, but this would be followed by God treating all men equally by saving them all.

Winstanley believed in the universal salvation of all men. The basis of this belief was the equality of all men before God. God would "deliver the whole creation from bondage."

God will not lose any part of his Creation, Mankind . . . and will destroy nothing but the Serpent . . . that would be a being equall to or above God. . . .

Winstanley in several instances in this pamphlet presented the same ideas: that God valued the moral worth of each person and would save all men. Men would be restored to the equality all had enjoyed before God.

There was an inconsistency in his concept of equality and morality with regard to punishment. His insistence that all men would be treated in such a way that no one would receive special consideration was a maxim that could be applied in a variety of ways. His acknowledgment that God would punish men unequally indicated that equality for him did not mean men should be treated alike in all respects. God saved
the Saints first and the sinners last because the conduct of the former deserved it. Winstanley was arguing for distribution of punishment based on merit. However, in his description of the Fall he declared all men were of equal moral worth. His description contained no qualifications based on social ranks; all men were equally meritorious. Clearly their conduct was not equally meritorious but he gave no criteria for determining how to judge the moral, social conduct he sought men to adopt. Rather this criteria was a divinely instilled part of the nature of each man; each man knew what these standards of conduct were.

Winstanley was also inconsistent in his conception of the relationship of reason and morality. Sometimes he wrote that reason was dependent on morality. His first pamphlet showed this. He believed he was presenting religious truths his readers ought to acknowledge and adopt. Since he thought of himself as a Saint, his moral capacity had subdued his selfishness, leaving his reason more unclouded than that of his contemporaries. He wrote:

God . . . makes me to see and possess freedom, in my own experience from him, every day more and more; I am not still a captive, in a being of darkness distinct from God.56

Winstanley's sainthood had given him a sense of freedom because he had obeyed the will of God in subduing selfishness. His contemporaries were too immoral for their reason to be capable of understanding religious truths. For example, at the outset of his first pamphlet,
The Mysterie of God, Winstanley had told his readers that if they regarded his views as errors they were showing how selfish they were. Men in such a state "cannot apprehend a truth of God." He was inconsistent in saying he was writing religious truths and then characterizing his readers as lacking the means of understanding. His actions in advocating these ideas for adoption by his readers suggested he actually believed reason to be capable of functioning independently of morality. Otherwise, his readers could not understand what they were not morally equipped to understand. The emphasis of Winstanley on morality probably resulted in his unawareness of any conflict in his statements about the relationship of morality and reason.

In his second pamphlet, Breaking of the Day of God, Winstanley focused on the church as a source of immoral conduct. He criticized the church as contrary to his concepts of equality and morality. The church represented the inequitable treatment by men of their fellows in their social conduct.

Winstanley endorsed an anticlericalism based on his conception of equality and morality. In his first pamphlet, anticlericalism was an important part of his political theory. He believed that each believer could know God by his direct relationship with him. No man needed any intermediaries. Such intermediaries as learned ministers and translated scripture were barriers to the direct revelation that each man had an indwelling divinity within him. In his second pamphlet, the church became the embodiment of the inequality and
immorality which originated with the Fall which he depicted in the first pamphlet. The church was a sort of replay of the immoral relationship men founded when they fell from grace. Winstanley wrote:

the Posts of the Beasts house
set equal with the Posts of
Gods House . . .59

The "Posts of the Beasts" referred to those ordinances and rituals by which the church prescribed the means by which men should worship God.60 It was a Beast because it fostered inequality among men because the clerics dared to regard themselves as capable of prescribing the means of worship for others. This prescription was based on their assumption that they were entitled to preferential treatment from God, not the equality of all believers before God. The clergy regarded themselves as the most knowledgeable about and enjoying the best link with God. Thus, the church violated the twin canons of Winstanley's equality and morality. This was why he regarded the church as having its "seat in every son and daughter of Adam."61

Winstanley described the church as an invention of mankind, but he made no provision in his conception of men as of equal worth to explain why the clerics were more immoral than the rest of mankind. Winstanley said:

this ecclesiastical power is no power
which God did ordain or make. . . .62

He thought the clergy had demonstrated greater immorality in their conduct. He condemned the church for using force to get immoral compliance from the population. He compared the church rituals with
the real meaning of the scriptures. The church made its ignorant interpretations binding by the legal sanctions of imprisonments, whipping, and death. The church used the scripture of Christ to justify its clerical rituals. The true meaning of the scripture was turned "upside down." The church set aside the Sabbath for weekly worship. This was contrary to scripture because the relationship with God could be perpetual, not one day a week. The church allowed only ordained ministers to preach. The prerequisite for preaching was learning. The church violated the scriptural practice of lay preaching, such as fishermen and tradesmen preaching from their baptism and communion should be experienced inwardly by striving against selfishness; they did not need to be formalized in a church.

The absence of any description of the origin of the church in the political theory of Winstanley reflected his assumption that the church was inherently immoral. By means of the Fall, all men began from an equal footing with regards to their immorality. How could he have explained how such fallen men had established an institution which was more immoral than the rest of the population. Otherwise, Winstanley could merely have asserted that the church was immoral and would disappear after the immorality in all men disappeared. Instead, he asserted that the church had to be abolished as part of the overcoming of morality by mankind.

The inherent immorality of the church was evident by its ability to increase the immorality of its clerics. Winstanley used the
term "Beast" to describe the church because in the Biblical Book of
Revelations the Beast was described as coming out of a bottomless pit.
Winstanley interpreted the bottomless pit to be the insatiable selfish-
ness of men. However, Winstanley then gave an example which shows he
regarded the institution as insatiable, not necessarily the men who
occupied it. When a Bishop first took office he might be tender-
hearted; his duties as Bishop soon altered him and made him hard-
hearted and a great oppressor of peaceful men. Thus, the beginner
became a more immoral man than he was capable of as a single indi-
vidual because he assumed office.

He also asserted that the inherent immorality of the church was
evident in their compelling believers to act immorally. He proposed
that when men were forced to accept these rituals they knew they were
acting immorally. Men were forced to act contrary to their inner moral
knowledge because of their fear. The church by use of legal force
had compelled men to pretend a fear of God. Men are made to fear
men more than God. By use of force men are made "hypocrites to
act contrary to their knowledge for fear of punishment." Many
men practiced a false worship out of this "slavish fear of men"
and were ashamed to acknowledge God as an indwelling divinity within
them. Winstanley estimated that in every parish in England were many
of these people who had thus killed their consciences. The rituals
of the church fostered in some men ignorance about the nature and
worship of God. Other men became imbued with the "vain confidence"
that clerical worship was warranted by scripture. Winstanley thus
depicted the church as a source of immorality:
Every man were or could be forced to maintain and practice one outward lazie, formall, customary, and tyth-oppressing way of pretended Divine worship, which please the flesh; for it nurses up pride, covetousness, ignorance, oppression ... 68

What does Winstanley’s description of the church reveal about his concept of morality? Morality was the equitable relationship of men in their social conduct. He opposed the church so vehemently because it could never be equitable because it was based on the clergy assuming the inequality of acting as intermediaries with God. Morality and equality were for Winstanley two aspects of the same relationship. This was why Winstanley thought the church had to be eradicated.

Winstanley also argued that the church was based on a delusion. Its delusion was the belief that its practices were based on the word of God in scripture. 69 The church regarded its persecution of the Saints as doing “God a good service.” 70 The church was deluded into the belief that men could know God by clerical means. The church regarded the Saints as deluded by their belief that learning about God required no guidance from an intermediary. Actually, Winstanley viewed these delusions as making it possible for the church to carry out its real motivation—earning a temporal living by means of tithe collecting. 71

Not only the church but also the conception of government of Winstanley were based on equality and morality. He criticized seventeenth century English government for supporting inequitable social conduct of the church. God commanded men to be obedient to government. 72 The government had been used by the clergy to compel the believers to
assert immoral beliefs. The clergy had used this loyalty to government to propagate its doctrines.\footnote{73} The clergy had deceived the people into believing that any proper government required a state church.\footnote{74} Winstanley's criticism of this relationship of the church and state was not based on a belief in the division of church and state. He favored using government's power against those who act immorally. Presently, the government was persecuting the Saints. If the government would cease persecuting them and act against the wicked, those who sought to conduct themselves on immoral selfishness, then the government could exercise "a tender love and delight" for the safety of the commonwealth.\footnote{75} The English government had acted in a "backwards" fashion by punishing Saints and protecting hypocrites.\footnote{76} The conception of Winstanley of a self-evident morality was complimentary to his belief that government could legitimately regulate social conduct. His conception of morality was much more important to Winstanley than a possible aversion to the state using its power to support the clergy. Winstanley opposed government only when the state and clergy were persecuting social conduct he favored.

The millenarianism of Winstanley was important in his political theory because it gave him the certainty that men could be restored to the condition before the Fall by restoring moral social conduct and abolishing property. It was a prophecy indicating the order of a series of events would take place which would precede it. Millenarianism did not originate with Winstanley. Many of his contemporaries believed that Christ would return to reign for a thousand years or some indefinite period. The doctrine was embraced by people of all political persuasions. The
Royalists expected a Second Coming in the 1650s. Both Cromwell and Sir Henry Vane spoke and wrote of a coming millennium. Many Presbyterian ministers wrote pamphlets describing the imminent arrival of the millennium. The majority of formal sermons delivered before the Long parliament espoused a belief in the millennium. The Civil War was widely depicted as a struggle between Christ and antichrist which was the event ushering in the millennium.

Moreover, it was very fashionable not only to believe in the millennium but to formulate elaborate eschatologies in which the sequence of events leading up to the millennium were depicted based on Biblical passages. Many of the most influential appeared after the beginning of the English Civil War. Translations were published in 1643 and 1644 of Brigman's *The Revelation of St. John*; John Alsted's *Diatrise and Beloved City*; and Joseph Mede's *Clavis Apocalyptica.* Another important commentator was John Foxe who wrote *Acts and Monuments.* All of these works were based on interpretations of the Book of Revelation because it was widely believed that the millennium was imminent and Revelations would soon become part of England's contemporary history. All these works interpreted antichrist or the Beast in Revelations as the established church which had to be destroyed because of its irreligious nature. They all made heroes of the Protestant beliefs and villains of Catholicism. They differed, however, in their assessment of the role that the government had played and would soon play in ushering in the millennium. Foxe in his work contended that the monarchs of England had been duped by the church. It was this idea which Winstanley singled out when he cited Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* in his second pamphlet.
He noted that Queen Mary had banished, killed, and fined the Saints. Queen Mary was typical of how "tender hearted magistrates" had been given immoral advice by the church.  

Unlike Foxe, Winstanley made this odd relationship of uncorrupted government and a corrupt church the basis of his history and eschatology. This gave his millenarianism a uniquely Winstanlean quality. He believed the millennium was imminent but it would be a return of men to the earthly innocence from which they had fallen. Moreover, his uniqueness was represented in his belief that as the church gradually withered away as morality became stronger, the reestablishment of innocence would again become a reality. His view of past history had only one major dimension: the relationship of church and state made possible the persecution of moral conduct of Saints and their ideas. The period from Christ to the present he subdivided into three days or ages and one half. The three days he adopted from the Book of Revelations as did many of his fellow millenarians. His view of the predominant immoral power of the church was the basis of his use of the Beast to represent again the church. The church, like the Beast of Revelations, existed for three ages and a half before being destroyed and replaced by the millennium. Throughout all three and a half ages, the government was deceived by the clergy into using coercion to support immorality. Winstanley asserted the three ages could be called the Dragon, the Leopard, and the Beast mentioned in Revelations. All three creatures were different expressions of immorality. In the Age of the Dragon, the Roman Empire established a state church. Christ and his followers were persecuted by open violence. The Second Age of the Leopard represented the period of the supremacy of
the papacy. The Catholic church punished people for religious errors. The third age of the Beast represented the period of Protestantism or in England "reformed episcopacy." Despite its reformed nature, the church wielded the same power against the Saints.

Winstanley was clearly far more interested in millenarianism as he applied it to the present and the future. He spent a great deal more space in discussing both present and future. More importantly, he adopted a version of millenarianism in which England was regarded as the country which acted as a leader in bringing in the millennium. Many of his contemporaries had written and spoken of England as the elect nation. The common version of the elect nation was the belief that England was the locale of the true religion and was a kind of Israel. Only by returning to the covenant with God could England regain the blessings God had bestowed on the chosen people. Puritans widely believed God had given England godly ministers to lead them to salvation to either destroy the church or purify it depending on the religious preference of the writer or speaker. England would assume its elect function by an apocalyptic struggle with the antichrist. The triumph over antichrist would result in the millennium. Writers and speakers believed antichrist was for Presbyterians the Anglican church, for the sectarians the Presbyterian church.

For Winstanley the elect nation did not assume solely a function of importance as part of the rallying cry of the believers who struggle against immorality and the church. Rather for Winstanley the elect nation was important because he used the elect nation to emphasize that he thought the church was not "worthy of the work to which his
nation is elect."\textsuperscript{88} The sole basis of their election for Winstanley was the abolition of the church occurring first in England, Scotland, and Ireland. He regarded England as in the half day. The half day was different from the third day in the fact the Saints were not persecuted as vigorously as they had been. This was a way of saying since the Anglican church had been abolished, the Presbyterian church had not persecuted the Saints as vigorously. As Winstanley phrased it, the Saints were no longer in "absolute bondage by Ecclesiastical Laws, as formerly neither in absolute freedom. . . ."\textsuperscript{89} Winstanley thought that the appearance of the Saints in England was an indication that England, Scotland, and Ireland would cast off the Beast first. This meant that these three kingdoms would abolish their state churches. He believed this event was imminent. He cited Revelations 19:13 as the "tenth part of the city Babylon fall off first from the Beast."\textsuperscript{90} By casting off their churches, these kingdoms would lead the way for a restoration of mankind to their condition before the Fall.\textsuperscript{91}

As part of this elect function, the English clergy would be "destroyed." As one of the last indications of divinity, Christ would become the only head of the church. He cited Revelations 11:13 in which the seven thousand were slain immediately before the millennium. These seven thousand Winstanley regarded as the English clergy who would be slain by the wrath of God. Since they would be relieved by their selfishness, the clergy would become aware of their ignorance by seeing the "inferior and unlearned poor" preach of their understanding of God. The clergy would become vexed at such knowledge and many would deny their trade of the ministry. The clergy would
realize, as one of their fellow men already had, that the church was a superfluous institution. 92

Winstanley did not conceive of the millennium as an ethereal condition. His millennium was earthly. The Fall of man would be reversed. Christ would make a return to earth, not literally, but his spirit would become universal. He wrote:

Christ . . . shall reign in the Kingdoms and Magistracy of the world for a certain space, or a thousand years. . . . 93

Thus, Winstanley adopted a premillennialist view in which the transformation of things was imminent. 94 All men's institutions would be transformed by the resurgence of his divinely instilled morality. He described the change like the earthquake foretold in Revelation 11:13. He wrote:

when God . . . shakes down and cast out the Beast out of mens hearts, the outward abominations and unjust practices in church and State, shake together and fall presently. 95

In contradistinction to many of his contemporaries who regarded the millennium to be primarily one of spiritual cleansing, Winstanley presented the millennium as far reaching because God would transform or abolish any practices which preserved selfishness. God would "shake" or transform parliaments, kings, armies, counties, kingdoms, universities, human learning, rich and poor men. 96

Moreover, Winstanley's description of the retention of government in the millennium was contrary to his earlier view that pure innocence would be completely restored. If the government were to be retained,
what was its function if all immorality or inequitable social conduct
had ceased to exist? Would not the government have withered with the
end of the immorality of the Fall? Winstanley never tells us what
government will do in the millennium. Rather he offers vague character-
izations with few if any specifics. When the millennium comes, the
ordinance of government would be restored to its "purity and justice."97
He stressed that no person should believe that there will be no laws or
government in the millennium. He wrote of government as a duty:

The reformation and preservation of
magistracy ... is that which every man
is to mind with tender care; it being Gods
ordinance.98

Perhaps Winstanley meant that as an institution God had a function for it
for which men had no understanding. Yet, this idea is probably not true
in view of Winstanley's view that the government would become "a terror
to the wicked, and to protect them that doe well."99 What persons would
be left to terrorize when all men will be equally moral cannot be deter-
mined from Winstanley's comments.

In his third pamphlet, Saints Paradice, Winstanley argued that
moral and immoral conduct had attendant moral and immoral states within
each man. In the earlier two pamphlets, Winstanley had believed that the
moral part of man's nature was stronger than the immoral part of his
nature. Men would restore themselves by reassertion of their morality.
His eschatology assumed morality as the more potent would prevail in
the end of history in a millennium. Morality was God created; immorality
man instituted. In part of his third pamphlet, Winstanley argued that
men had inward conflict between their consciences and their selfish
desires. A conflict continued which originated in the Fall. Ever since that time, the conscience of man had sought to moderate or act as an inward check on his selfishness. On the one hand, man sought to advance himself above God or "at least to be equal with him." Man did this when his conduct was based on satisfying his own desires. On the other hand, his divine moral nature motivated him to place God above himself. This moral nature in the form of the "Law of Righteousness" condemned men for their disobedience in seeking selfishness. This condemnation was expressed by the torment which each man's conscience inflicted on him. Each man was divided and inwardly at war:

Since unrighteousnesse was acted in humane flesh against his maker, every son and daughter of that disobedient flesh is like a man whom two fierce . . . dogs both laid hold, tearing, and pulling to pieces.

This conflict between each man caused within him an enmity. This enmity was:

set in our hearts since the fall, being a mixture of opposite natures.

Winstanley suggested inward torment of all men's experience was the result of the potency of divinely instilled conscience when battling internal selfishness. All men in a selfish state were plagued by tormented thoughts. This torment reflected the potency of the inward morality God had bestowed on man. In this condition of selfishness every thought a man has resulted in "some freeing or trouble tied to it . . . ." a person under the bondage of selfishness may have inward states of
peace, but these are ephemeral and will be followed by further torment. Winstanley noted that economic activity of men would be accompanied by the torment of all his other activities. He wrote:

in his course of trading in the world, if he ask sometimes too little, or sometimes too much for his wares, then he is troubled, and do what he can, his heart is troubled, because he thinks he might have done better; when business goes cross to his mind, he is troubled.

This trouble was caused by the conflict between his conscience which caused him to be tormented for selfishly desiring to better himself by trading.

Earlier Winstanley had contended that reason was subordinate to morality, but had not shown what he meant by applying this idea to specific circumstances. He believed that morality was evident in the equitable social conduct of men. Now he suggested that when men engaged in inequitable social conduct or immorality, their reason was based on abstractions, not experience. When men demonstrated morality by their equitable social conduct and thereby subdued their internal selfishness their reason was based on knowledge gained by experience, not by abstract formulations. He called abstract formulations delusions from his status as a Saint. For example, one of the greatest delusions was their conception of the nature of God. Winstanley termed this:

a great delusion within mankind; you call the Father your God, and the word God is much in your mouths; but here you deceive your selves; for you know not . . . God until you call him your God, till you see and feel by experience that he rules and governs in you . . . .
Men without this experience sought God outside themselves and worshipped him by rituals. Such men are like swine in delighting in nothing but flesh. Winstanley regarded men dominated by inward selfishness as like the swine depicted in Matthew 8:28. In this verse, Christ cast mad demons out of two men into swine which then ran into the sea. Winstanley represented his interpretation of this passage as based on having experienced God inwardly. He regarded the swine as symbolic of those men who remained bound to selfishness. The swine perished in the sea just as men do who selfishly separate themselves from God. They were deceived by the church and their selfish condition. The sea into which the swine plunged was symbolic of how men draw themselves in by their own inventions and imaginations. Men invented the idea that God was incomprehensible; he is pure spirit. God lives far above the heavens. Earthly men cannot understand God. The selfishness of men caused them to believe or "fancie" that God dwelled in some local places above the skies. These inventions were developed into established religious doctrines. Men accepted them by their observance of rituals. Each man was thus deceived by the "imaginations of his own heart."

The idea of the devil shared by Winstanley's contemporaries represented for him an example of the functioning of abstract reason. This delusion allowed men to continue to believe that the Fall had not been a voluntary act of men. His contemporaries believed the devil was "a third power between God and man. . . ." Winstanley argued that such a devil did not exist. When men were tormented by the clash between selfishness and their consciences, they thought that the devil had implanted in them selfish thoughts and caused them "to forsake God and
goodness." The course of their torment was the Law of Righteousness which by their consciences tormented them for their selfishness. What his contemporaries called a devil was the human invention of selfishness. God had allowed the existence of human evil in the form of selfishness to dominate the bulk of mankind for three and a half days. The devil was the proud flesh of each man in conflict with the manifestations of "the appearance of God in the heart of man . . . ." Winstanley compared the limited power of the devil as similar to a jailer who carried out a sentence of a judge on a prisoner or sinner.

The conception of Winstanley of Heaven, Hell, and angels was based on his reason rooted in experience, not abstractions. Most of his fellow religious enthusiasts believed that Heaven and Hell existed in some afterlife by which men would be rewarded for their earthly endeavors. For Winstanley this was a delusion because the direct relationship between God was an earthly one in which the afterlife had no status. It explains why for Winstanley the idea of religion as primarily an inward coming to grips with divine grace had no attraction. Winstanley thought the belief that Hell and Heaven existed in a particular place apart from the earth was imaginary. He depicted Heaven as the condition a person experienced when selfishness was subdued by God within him. Every Saint was in a "true heaven" because God dwelled in him. Moreover, when God restored men to their condition before the Fall and united men into a oneness of love with God, this was Heaven. Hell was the condition of any person in bondage to selfishness. This was Hell because it was "a condition of darkness, below the life, comfort, and peace of God. . . ." A man was tormented by the Law of Righteousness for his selfishness.
For Winstanley, angels were moral or immoral agents God used. Angels were those "sparks of glory" which God had given to Adam before the Fall. These sparks were the qualities of man, such as love, delight, peace, humility, and obedience to God.\footnote{121} After the Fall, these sparks became part of the flesh of men and were transformed into the evil of enmity against God. Thus, they became evil qualities of pride, covetousness, love of self, and imagination. These were "angels of darkness."\footnote{122} Such men as Moses or Christ were selected by God to be his moral agents. Such men were angels or instruments of God's will.\footnote{123} An angel may take the form of a voice, vision, or a revelation, such as the angel which appeared to Elijah (Kings 19:5). An angel may have a divine mission to destroy a rebellious people or to awaken people as in Chronicles 21:12-13. This warning or destruction may be pestilence, sword, or famine.\footnote{124}

Winstanley believed that evil or immorality originated with men in the Fall, but he also thought God could impose evil as part of the test of the morality of men. God may allow evil to exist as external changes in a man's well being. A godly person or Saint may suffer because others conduct themselves based on envy, hypocrisy, and cruelty. The persecution of the Saints was an example of this. God may allow disasters to befall even those who were Saints. For example, the sufferings of the Biblical Job were tests by which God determined whether Job had really conquered his selfishness. The burning of Job's house, his children killed, his body diseased, and his friends forsaking him did not establish a breach between himself and God. Job accepted the will of God. He became more faithful to God. Having experienced these
disasters, Job worshipped God by his conduct.\textsuperscript{125} These disasters were the same temptations which the Saints had to withstand. The Saints were persecuted, reproached, and reviled by many of his contemporaries. The Saints would resist the temptation to blame these afflictions on the Devil, but those people who were dominated by the flesh would blame the "Devil."\textsuperscript{126}

It is important to note that the examples Winstanley used of abstracted reason based on immoral conduct were all parts of the religious dogma of the contemporary church. Did Winstanley think the clergy adopted these because of their common, abstracted reason and inequitable social conduct they shared with all men? Or did the clergy use these doctrines because they knew they were false and therefore more likely to prevent any lessening of the immorality of men? Earlier Winstanley had proposed the church was inherently immoral. Consistency requires that he would expect the reason of the clergy and the church to be inherently abstract. The clergy could not know their doctrines were false if their reason were determined by their inequitable social conduct or immorality. Winstanley never explained why or how the reason of the clergy could be independent of their immorality.

\textit{Truth Lifting Up Its Head} was a major turning point in the political theory of Winstanley. In all three prior pamphlets, he had been preoccupied with identifying what immorality was and how it was to be overcome. Also, little is known about his circumstances during the time he wrote these three pamphlets. He may have been an itinerant preacher. In this pamphlet though his focus changed and he presented a view of how believers should conduct themselves in order to behave morally.
This change may have the consequence of the pamphlet being written as a defense against the accusation of blasphemy by the local ministers. Both Winstanley and a friend, William Everard, were accused of denying God, Christ, and scripture by the parish ministers. Winstanley was not arrested, but Everard was arrested and imprisoned by the bailiffs of Kingston for his views. Winstanley regarded this pamphlet as an exposition of his views and addressed it to all the Oxford and Cambridge scholars and city and country ministers.  

Another important development in this pamphlet was Winstanley's adoption of terms of the natural rights theorists. He changed the name of God to Reason, but his substitution rejected reason as the natural rights theorists described it. For them reason was a sufficient guide for man's social conduct; abstract reason was just another form of reason. He retained his fundamental conception of equality and morality. He wrote:

\[
\text{I am made to change the name from God to Reason; because I have been held under darkness by that word, as I see many people are. . . .}^{128}
\]

He emphasized his "Reason" did not mean the natural reason by which men calculated their individual advantage in specific daily circumstances. This was the natural, abstracted reason of men still controlled by their inequitable social conduct or immorality. Reason was for him the equitable social conduct which all men had as divinely installed potential. Reason sought to preserve all men equally since all men were equal before God. To Winstanley, men based themselves on Reason when they acted as follows:

\[
\text{First, When a man lives in all acts of love to his fellow creatures; feeding the hungry; cloathing the naked; relieving the oppressed; seeking the preservation of others as well as himself; looking upon himself as a fellow creature . . . to all other creatures of all kinds; and so doing to them, as he would have them doe to him . . . .}^{129}
\]
Winstanley described the Golden Rule as containing a guideline of the equitable way men ought to conduct themselves. He equated reason, morality, and the Golden Rule. The Golden Rule was based on treating all men as of equal moral worth. He wrote:

\[
\text{act righteousness to all fellow creatures . . . as Reason requires doe to men and women, as you you have them doe to you . . . }^{130}
\]

Thus Winstanley assumed the Golden Rule was a self-evident guideline.

Despite his belief in its self-evident character, the concept of the Golden Rule of Winstanley did not provide a clear means for telling men what is moral or immoral conduct. The Golden Rule provided men should be treated impartially; no man should be given preference over another.\(^{131}\) Yet, the only specific examples Winstanley gave of the application of the Golden Rule, such as feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and relieving the oppressed are not necessarily valid examples. For example, a cannibal could apply the Golden Rule to mean he would treat others as himself. He would strive to kill and eat them just as he would expect them to do so to him. It is doubtful Winstanley could have accepted the cannibal's version of feeding the hungry. When a person of limited resources must choose between clothing the naked and feeding the hungry, what does the Golden Rule tell him to do?

Despite the fact Locke wrote later than Winstanley, a comparison of the two clarified that Winstanley had no individualist emphasis in his political theory. Locke began his analysis with the state of nature and the creation of civil society. Locke believed individuals created society and the state; the individual judged when the state had violated his natural rights. He regarded society as little more than a collection
of the individual atoms which make it up; the individual was the unit of analysis. For Winstanley, rather than the individual, the unit of analysis was men in a social context. The Fall occurred because of a change by men in their conduct, not because of the action of each individual. Winstanley regarded God as making men social beings, not the individuals Locke postulated.

Rather Winstanley critiqued individual exercise of reason. He regarded it as based on inequitable social conduct. He compared the actions of immoral or selfish men to their horses. Reason existed within these men but they did not understand its existence.

Their actings are like their horses . . .
they know the spirit that rules them,
no more than their horses. 132

Men by their mutual consent in the Fall had created natural reason. Despite the fact Reason impelled men to uphold their fellow men, the inequitable social conduct of immorality of men preserved their natural reason. Without the change from immoral to moral conduct men could only strive to preserve their own individual interests. Without Reason men would have no "moderator and Ruler" and only the "selfwilledness of the flesh" would exist. 133 The awareness of God or Reason within men occurs when they conduct themselves righteously or with a standard of impartiality toward their fellow men, not favoring one over another. 134 The closer the natural reason could approximate this standard in men's conduct the more spiritual they became. 135 When Winstanley used the term "Law of Reason," he meant the law or covenant before the Fall in which men had enjoyed an equitable relationship with God. 136
Locke in his description of the origin of the legislature characterized the natural law. This description revealed how distinctive is Winstanley's conception of the "Law of Reason." Locke described men in a state of nature surrender arbitrary power to the legislature. The basis of legislature in natural law was described as follows:

Law of Nature gave him for the preservation of himself, and the rest of Mankind; this is all he doth, or can give up to the Common-wealth, and by it to the Legislative Power, so that the Legislative can have no more than this. Their Power in the utmost Bounds of it, is limited to the publick good of the Society. It is a Power, that hath no other end but preservation, and therefore can never have a right to destroy, enslave, or designedly to impoverish the Subjects. The Obligations of the Law of Nature, cease not in Society but only in many Cases are drawn closer, and have by Humane Laws Known Penalties annexed to them, to inforce their observation. Thus the Law of Nature stands as an Eternal Rule to all Men, Legislators as well as others. The Rules that they make for other Mens Actions, must, as well as their own and other Mens Actions, be conformable to the Law of Nature, i.e. to the Will of God, of which that is a Declaration, and the fundamental Law of Nature being the preservation of Mankind, no Humane Sanction can be good, or valid against it.\(^37\)

Thus Locke contended that the law of nature provided men with a duty for men to regulate their conduct based on the will of God. Locke also emphasized that natural law was to provide for both the preservation of individuals and common preservation of mankind. This was why men leave the state of nature. Winstanley could agree with all these characterizations. However Locke thought that the means by which men know the natural law was by means of their natural reason. He wrote:

the Law of Nature being unwritten, and so no where to be found but in the minds of Men, they who through Passion or Interest shall mis-cite, or misapply it, cannot so easily be convinced of their mistake where there is no establish'd Judge.\(^38\)
Locke argued here that the crucial step in men accepting the legislature was what their reason told them was right. On the other hand, for Winstanley men have an immanent sense of what is moral. What is crucial for Winstanley was the natural reason of men was determined by their immorality or inequitable social conduct. A change in conduct was required before the reason of men would be based on experience. For Winstanley, God was an activist because divinity was within every man in the sense all men are capable of equitable social conduct. For Locke, God was the source of natural law, but his role was that of a passive onlooker, not a participant.

The intention of the political theory of Winstanley was also more distinctive when compared to the intention of the political theory of Locke. Locke wrote the Second Treatise as a means of refuting Filmer's Patriarcho. In the process of refuting it, he described his own formulation of how government originated. He described government as originating in the consent of individuals and in the preservation of property. He wrote: "the beginning of Politick Society depends upon the consent of individuals to joyn into and make one society." Men had not only a right to determine government and the nature of its legitimate functions, but men had the right to resist tyranny. Forty year later Locke wrote that if men became convinced

\begin{verbatim}
 in such cases, as the Precedent, and
 Consequences seem to threaten all and
 they are persuaded in their Consciences,
 that their Laws, and with them their
 Estates, Liberties and Lives are in
 danger . . . .140
\end{verbatim}

Thus Locke argued that men may withdraw consent and power was dissolved back to the society. Locke exemplified the whole thrust of the
natural rights theorists' argument that men formed a government safeguarded by the rights of individuals. A right could be withdrawn from government. These rights ceased to be obligations when the government violated natural law.

In contrast Winstanley thought freedom was only realized when men obeyed the will of God by adopting inequitable social conduct. His intention was to describe the source of immorality in the social conduct of men and their institutions. His problem was the nature of transformation necessary for men to secure freedom. In such a task, the idea of a limited government had no place. Men may choose to behave immorally but they cannot secure freedom in this way. Winstanley thought men could assist themselves into restoring their pure innocence.

This intention of Winstanley to describe the origin of immorality in conduct and institutions was hampered by ambiguity when his concept of equality or morality was applied to daily examples. He failed to provide for two contingencies: self-preservation and conflicting choices in everyday decisions of men. The ambiguity and impracticality of his formulation may best be demonstrated by the following examples. The only place in all four pamphlets Winstanley ever mentioned self-preservation was in response to a rhetorical question: what does righteous conduct mean? Winstanley wrote that it meant the Golden Rule and "seeking the preservation of others as well as himself." He gave no indication that the seeking of the two might ever be in conflict. If my neighbor is starving, I ought to feed him because it would be the moral thing to do. But if the food I give my neighbor
results in my own children starving, then am I not confronted with a situation in which I violate morality no matter what choice is made? Secondly, what about a man who acts immorally for the purpose of self-preservation? What if my choice is between my neighbor staring or me starving? Now what route did Winstanley's formulation provide me to take? Nowhere in any of his four pamphlets does Winstanley discuss how self-preservation would fit into his moral scheme. Or what about the circumstances in which I allow my neighbor to starve but not to feed myself or my family but to let the vegetable matter be recycled next year so that I may feed many starving neighbors during the next year. In other words, Winstanley has not provided any means of judging and choosing preservation in an immediate sense and in a deferred or future sense. Failure to provide for such specific cases is a fatal flaw in Winstanley's idea of social conduct. Two people could take contrary actions in the same situations and still claim that they were being true to their mentor.

Despite such shortcomings, Winstanley made no major changes in his conception of the church. In his previous pamphlets, particularly Saints Paradice, he depicted the church as having delusions. He had previously suggested that immorality had hampered the reason of the clergy from producing false religious doctrine. Now he proposed that the clergy was using religious doctrines for self-preservation. The clergy knew their religious dogmas were false but propagated them anyway because thereby they preserved their jobs. The church developed these rituals in order to preserve their livelihood. They were motivated by covetousness to get a living. Religion was a trade men
practiced. He described the clergy as motivated by "covetousness . . . to get a temporal living that stirs you up to use this trade."\textsuperscript{142} Winstanley described the church as not really Christian:

\begin{quote}
\ldots the Clergie and professors of England, in their pub-like worships doe practise their own inventions, which neither Reason nor Scripture, doth warrant; and yet they call them Bods Ordinances; by which practise they are the men that deny God and Christ, and turne the Scriptures into a lie.\textsuperscript{143}
\end{quote}

The church by its practices were "enemies to Jesus Christ."\textsuperscript{144} The church compelled parishioners to hear their preaching on the Sabbath. Required observance of the Sabbath preserved the trade of clergymen. Only clergymen approved by the state were allowed to preach. Clergymen were usually selected by the size of their purse instead of their religious commitment. The practice of sprinkling or baptizing children was not warranted by scripture nor was the taking of communion by the parishioners of a church. The practice of tithing was another unwarranted practice. All parishioners were compelled to donate one tenth of their income as payment to the clergy. All of these were inventions.\textsuperscript{145} They were inventions in the sense the clergy used them to preserve their institution and their tithes.

Winstanley also emphasized that the poor or common people would be the first to adopt equitable social conduct. The poor would be first because in the past the Saints had come from the common people. He still wrote that all men were of equal moral worth; therefore, all men were potentially preachers. However, he emphasized a person did not have to be educated to know how to preach. The scripture revealed many poor people had been Saints. For example, Moses was a shepherd, Amos
was a fruit gatherer, and Christ was a carpenter. The poor or common
people would become baptized first in the sense of overcoming morality. The common people would be more likely to experience it first.

Winstanley characterized government as being broad in its power
as he had in his last pamphlet. He applied the standard of morality
expected of all men to government. He had no conception that the power
of government should be limited. He wrote "The Lord will condemn . . .
unrighteous, cruel self-seeking and oppressive government. . . ."

Moreover, the government had a responsibility to protect people who
worshipped God by their inner testimony or by conducting themselves as
if men were of equal moral worth. God had obligated government to
protect such believers from "oppression of unreasonable men."

This conception conflicted directly with his description of govern-
ment as limited in its power with regard to religious worship. Winstanley
responded to the rhetorical question of what the relationship between
government and religion ought to be. He proposed that an agent of the
government could read scripture to a voluntary gathering. However,
the agent should not interpret the scripture nor compel anyone to
listen. This example suggested Winstanley was applying a standard
of restraint on the government. If the government were expected to
uphold the equality of moral worth of all men, they why should not the
government interpret scripture? Winstanley's example suggested that
he might be wary of state power which he used to establish a new
orthodoxy. Winstanley wrote that the government should not punish
people whom the clergy "brand heretics." How could the government
Winstanley described as based on morality become arbitrary or oppressive?
Winstanley gave no answer to this inconsistency because he probably did not recognize it. He wrote the pamphlet out of the immediate circumstance to defend himself and Everard from blasphemy charges by parish ministers. In his contemporary England parish ministers were supported by the government. This fact might have induced Winstanley's concern about government becoming oppressive in enforcing religious orthodoxy.152

The fifth pamphlet of Winstanley, The New Law of Righteousness, contained his most radical departure. In the four prior pamphlets, he had concentrated his condemnation on the church as the institution which hampered the restoration of men to their pre-Fall innocence. In this pamphlet, he turned his attention to landed property and insisted it had to be abolished before innocence could be restored.

Why did Winstanley decide to add landed property to the church as an institution which hampered men in overcoming immorality? The only known aspect of his life which might have a bearing on his choice of landed property was that after his bankruptcy he moved into a rural part of the county of Surrey and tended peoples' cattle for a living. However, Winstanley never mentioned his living condition in this regard even once in this pamphlet. The only clue was his insistence that the poverty of the common people represented an unequal burden on them. Clearly he had the condition of the poor in mind. His emphasis on equality was essentially negative; he argued that landed property was the basis of the inequality of the poor in comparison to the landowners. The inequality between poor and the landowner was itself contrary to the equality of moral worth of all men before God.
He made the same argument as the one employed against the church. The church had sought to be equal or above God by presuming to prescribe the means by which their fellow men should worship God. Landownership was based on striving to be equal or above God. Property originated from the selfish, corrupted nature of man. Landowners sought to make themselves more than equal to their fellow men. God created all men equal as moral beings. Landownership was thus immoral because landowners became more than equal to their fellow men. He believed that when God created mankind he gave each man a moral nature. By means of this moral nature each man could know that he was equal to his fellow men. Landowners were prevented from becoming aware of this by their immoral conduct. They were engaged in an irreligious act; they denied the morality of God and their fellow men. They were loyal to: "covetousness . . . the God, or ruling power, which all men that claim a particular interest in the earth, do worship."\textsuperscript{153} By this covetousness these landowners had made the earth their "particular Treasury."\textsuperscript{154} The earth should not be confined to a "particular interest."\textsuperscript{155}

Winstanley opposed landed property because it violated the equitable social conduct of men. Landed property could never be moral because God did not establish it. Such property did not exist before the Fall. God or Reason had intended for all men to share the earth as a "common treasury for all."\textsuperscript{156} God had created all creatures to preserve each other.\textsuperscript{157} Winstanley wrote:

\begin{quote}
In the first entrance into the Creation, every man had an equal freedom given him of his Maker to till the earth . . . This freedom is broke to pieces by the power of covetousnesse, and pride, and self-love, not by the Law of Righteousnesse . . . . \textsuperscript{158}
\end{quote}
Winstanley termed this "equal freedom" because all men would equally share the earth. Men were free because common landed property was an expression of their common moral capacities. The sharing of the earth was thus an expression of the will of God. The moral nature of men was the basis of this sharing. He wrote:

\[ \text{as one spirit of righteousness is common to all, so the earth and the blessings of the earth shall be common to all...} \] 159

Winstanley's conception of landed property embodied the immoral conduct he abhorred. Obviously for him, the landowner could never be moral; his unequal status required him to be immoral. Landed property was repugnant to the moral nature of God. The landowner sought to serve his self-interest rather than to serve God. A landowner could not legitimately claim that he created cattle and corn. Only God created these and only he owned the earth. 160 As an invention of men without any divine sanction, property could never be moral. This was why Winstanley repeatedly regarded God as "continually provoked" or dishonored by the existence of property. 161 Selfishness in each landowner prevented him from "freedome of the spirit within and without." 162 His landownership denied any possibility that he could ever overcome his immoral conduct. Men had to get rid of their landownership because it represented their immoral conduct. This was why Winstanley thought the enclosing of the earth by any man was "rebellion and high treason" against God. 163

Winstanley also argued that landowners were increasing inequality and immorality by their practices. Landownership had become a source of both throughout English society. The government was used by the
the rich landowners to preserve their property. The rich did not do this because there was a scarcity of land. There was enough land in England that no poverty should have existed. The rich represented the selfishness or immorality as typified in the first Adam. He wrote:

The first Adam is the wisdome and power of flesh broke out and sate down in the chair of rule and dominion, in one part of man-kind over another. And this is the beginner of particular interest, buying and selling the earth from one particular hand to another, saying, This is mine, upholding this particular propriety by a law of government of his own making, and thereby restraining other fellow creatures from seeking nourishment from their mother earth. So that though a man was bred up in a Land, yet he must not worke for himself where he would sit down. But from Adam; that is, for such a lone that had bought part of the Land, or came to it by inheritance... So that he that had no Land, was to work for those for small wages, that called the Land theirs; and thereby some are lifted up into the chair of tyranny, and others trod under the foot-stool of misery, as if the earth were made for a few, not for all men.

The rich by buying and selling the earth and its fruits had preserved property in the hands of a few. The only purpose of buying and selling or trading was for some men to oppress others. The poor had created the means to make the rich unequal. The poor had to work for the landowners because they were landless. The poor by their labor worked for the buyers and sellers of the land. The labor of the poor had made these landowners rich.

Winstanley regarded seventeenth century England as based on the inequitable social conduct the rich inflicted on the poor. He did not propose the poor employ violence against the rich. In this pamphlet he only condemned the rich. The rich lived from the labor of the poor. The poor worked to maintain "particular interest" so the rich could live
in ease. The rich believed that it was righteous that the poor should be their slaves. The rich told the poor that by taking from the rich they offended Reason's Law. The rich were offenders by their landownership.\textsuperscript{167}

The most puzzling aspect of this pamphlet was why Winstanley did not advocate abolition of government as well as property. Immorality and inequality were inequitable social conduct. He regarded government as being used by the rich to preserve their property. Government was never regarded as preserving or expanding its own power. He described all men who have authority in their hands as acting immorally. He wrote:

So that this Adam appears first in every man and woman; but he sits down in the chair of Magistracy, in some above others; for though his climbing power of self-love be in all, yet it rises not to its height in all; but every one that gets an authority into his hands, tyrannizes over others; as may husbands, parents, masters, magistrates, that lives after the flesh, doe carry themselves like oppressing Lords over such as are under them; not knowing that their wives, children, servants, subjects are their fellow creatures, and hath an equal priviledge to share with them in the blessing of liberty.\textsuperscript{168}

Winstanley gave numerous examples of how government had fostered inequitable social conduct. The rich had selfishly used government to covet the earth. They ruled as tyrants over the poor forcing them to work for hire. These laws were immoral because they were based on the will of the rich, not the will of God. These laws were contrary to the divine grant of equality as moral beings. The poor were subject to laws they did not make. The rich had established a government of the first Adam which murdered the poor but regarded it as “justice.”\textsuperscript{169}

The rich made laws to hang the poor who steal. The poor steal because
of their landless condition. The rich had made the poor landless, but by law prevented the poor from stealing enough to subsist. God or Reason did not make a law that some men should kill or hang other men. Reason did not create a law that a landless debtor could be imprisoned by his rich creditor. By law, landlords were authorized to engage in inequitable conduct to rule in tyranny over the poor. By this practice of government support of property, people were denied their "liberty." The poor were imprisoned over long periods, sometimes for six months without a trial. The justices, state officers, and bailiffs imprisoned the poor to satisfy the will of the rich, not for "the breach of any known law." The poor did not violate the moral nature on which laws were based. Thus, the governors multiplied wrongs and oppressed people instead of delivering them from oppression. The governors acted as if the people had made them their "Egyptian taskmasters." 170

Winstanley's view of the government's conduct was immoral and the institutions of government were moral in intention and the origin was contradictory. Though he emphasized misuse in support of the inequality of land, he did not regard government as the source of immorality. He still insisted that government had been created by God; it could be corrupted but not become so totally immoral it ought to be abolished. Despite its corruption the government had some moral aspects. For example, he believed the government had set aside the letter of the law just as priests do with scripture. They ruled by their wills, not by the morality and equality present in all men. In setting aside the letter of the law, the government was acknowledging the presence of the "Law of Righteousness" or the universal moral equality of men. 171 This was why
Winstanley continued to appeal to government "to relieve people in their wrongs and preserve peace." He assumed the government was based on some immanent sense of morality.

Winstanley again makes a "natural rights" argument against property. He used some of the terms of natural rights, but he repeated his arguments for equality and morality. Why then did he make this argument? The only plausible answer was his adoption of the language reflected his contact with a widespread term the "law of equity and reason." He thought that he would explain to his readers what this phrase really meant. He equated the Law of Righteousness with the law of equity and reason. He reaffirmed its paramount importance as the foundation of all society. God had originally created men in that condition. God did not make some men tyrants and others slaves, but all were to enjoy "equity and reason." The idea of a community based on common landownership would be a fulfillment of this reason and equity. God did not make the earth for a few men. Christ had desired that all men ought to have "a quiet substance and freedom, to live upon the earth." He treated the casting off of the "bondage of selfishness" as synonymous with the abolition of property. Without landownership, men will conduct themselves based on equality and morality or the "pure law of equity and reason."

An examination of the conception of Locke of property will enable one to see how radically different Winstanley's conception of property was.

Winstanley's concept of property demonstrated he had little in common with the natural right tradition. The conception of Locke
represented the natural rights tradition. Locke had suggested that in a state of nature, God had made the earth common to all men. Individuals must be able to appropriate the fruits of the earth for private use. Each man had a right to property in his own person. Therefore, when an individual mixed his labor with an object, he thereby had acquired property. Locke argued that the first man to mix his labor with an object became the owner. Thus, the property owner by being first had established an exclusive right of objects. Men had a right to property because God had granted his species rationality. All men were given "reason which was the Voice of God in him" by which men could seek the means for their preservation. The law of nature limits individual appropriation to only what the individual can use. Nothing should spoil or go to waste according to natural law. Thus Locke proposed that in a state of nature men had no motivation to seek to gain more property because property is perishable and cannot be accumulated.

Locke proposed that the invention of money changed this relationship of men and their property. Men tacitly consented to creation of a monetary system. Money does not spoil or waste and can be hoarded. Money can be exchanged for other items. The consequence of money was individuals can desire more and more and seek to expand their property. Thus did Locke think property existed before the creation of government. Therefore, Locke said that "Government has no other end by the preservation of property." Locke suggested that when an individual accepted property this signified a "voluntary submission" to political society. In order for people to enjoy property, they had to accept the protection of the law. Locke suggested that the transfer of property by inheritance
was consent to the political society. No new generation could reformulate the contract. The rights of individuals to property were protected by a government limited in function by natural law based on contract. The government was excluded from intrusion with individual rights.

For Winstanley, property was the consequence of the inequitable social conduct in institutional form. He stood Locke on his head by insisting that the act of acquisition by which men acquired landed property, was the very embodiment of the immorality he sought to completely eliminate. He emphasized acquisition was exactly the deed which ended in the Fall. Only removal of the church and landed property could allow men the equality and morality of their natures. For Locke this acquisitiveness was a given condition of men in civil society; for Winstanley, it was to be annihilated at the earliest opportunity.

Evidence of the importance of both millenarianism and his desire to abolish landed property in the political theory of Winstanley was in creating the idea of the Diggers. They were a small group of people who were to form a society in which the earth would be shared in common. As an agent of God, Winstanley believed God wanted him to advocate such a community in word and writing. When God had indicated the time and place, Winstanley was to form such a community. In a trance, God had revealed to him:

... together. Eat bread together; ... Whosoever it is that labours in the earth, for any person or persons, that lifts up themselves as Lords and Rulers over others, and that doth not look upon themselves equal to others in the Creation, The hand of the Lord shall be upon that labourer: I the Lord have spoke it and I will do it. ...
Winstanley thus believed this community would only be temporary but an important step in restoration of men to their original innocence. This community was not to be formed by the poor seizing the land of the rich. Rather the common land of England would be shared by all. The landowners would no longer depend on the hired poor and would have to labor the earth without assistance. God would bless the community of the earth by making their labor reap good agricultural yields. The poor would share the land and all that was grown on it so that private property in land and produce did not exist. The community would be formed by voluntary action of each person who joined; no one would be forced to join against his will. Thus, he regarded the community as putting into practice the common ownership of land that God had intended. Ultimately all the land would be shared in common. 186

Winstanley also regarded his digging community as the proof that England was the elect or chosen nation which would usher in the millen­niunm or restoration of mankind’s innocence. He depicted the Diggers and the rest of England as having an analogous situation to that of the Israelites and the Egyptian Pharaoh in the Old Testmanet. Using the millenarian scheme he adopted in an earlier pamphlet, Winstanley argued that such a community represented the “half day” or eve of restoration. 187 The Diggers or members of this community would become, like Israel, a moral forerunner of the coming transformation. Winstanley thought the Biblical description of the Israelites’ deliverance from Pharaoh was applicable to his Diggers. The contemporary poor would gather together and form a righteous community free of the practice of
property, just as Israel had when delivered from the bondage of Pharaoh. The poor in forming such a community would become a spiritual Israel. The poor no longer practiced the established rituals of religions because of their awareness of their moral nature. The poor were oppressed by the government and denied nourishment from the earth. In all these respects, the poor or common people were like the Biblical Jacob. Jacob had been persecuted for not accepting established religion; his fellow men tried to "hinder him of his temporal lively-hood." Jacob represented the spirit of Christ which preserved all. The poor were imbued with this spirit. Winstanley suggested that the contemporary poor in this respect had the same difficulties; thus, they have "Jacob's spirit" in them. God had chosen "the lowest and despised" to manifest the Law of Righteousness as in Christ and his apostles. It was manifest in them first just as it was to be first evident in the Diggers.

Winstanley's actual description of the characteristics of the digging community contained some basic conflicts. He argued that the abolition of landed property would eliminate the need for buying and selling. There would be no poverty. Everyone will have meat, drink, and clothes. No man will be idle because the earth will be cultivated by all. Because of this absence of property, there would be no need for punishment as the rest of society employed.

He made the same argument against punishment as he had against property. Since all men had a true moral nature God gave to all men, any law providing for punishment would not be required. The immoral outsiders had used "death and smaller punishment" to protect their self-interest. In his community, self-interest no longer existed.
God or Reason did not make a law that some men should hang or kill other men. Like property, such laws reflected the immorality or corrupted nature of men. The inequality of some men punishing others was a consequence of this immorality. If any man can show that he can create life, he has a right to take away life. God was the sole, legitimate source of life and death. Any person who takes the life of another by any law was "a murderer of the Creation." God was dishonored by some men destroying others. Men should honor God by all lending "a mutual help of love in action to preserve the whole."

However, Winstanley provided for a means of punishment in the digging community. It would be unlike the punishment of the immoral outside world. There would be no death or imprisonment. The likely offenses would be stealing or idleness. The most serious offense would be trying to reintroduce particular interest by buying and selling the land. All offenses would be punished by a kind of ostracism of the individual within the community. All members of the community would be subject to Reason's Law and would thus enjoy "the benefit of sonship." This sonship was the common sharing of the earth. Winstanley believed an offender should be punished by no longer enjoying the community of the earth with his fellow men. The offender would have land assigned to him to cultivate alone without others helping him. No other person would have communion with him. A mark would be placed on him and he would become a servant to others as a "fool in Israel." The offender would become like the slaves of the Biblical Israel, a "Gibeonite to work in the earth." The purpose of this punishment was for the offender to know his Maker. The offender
would labor in solitude until the "spirit in him, make him know himself to be equal to others in the Creation." The offender must realize that he was equal to all men, but not Lord over any other men. The governor in this community would be the Righteous Law by which men live together in love.

Winstanley did not implement his digging community until four months after he had written this pamphlet. The clear conception he had of how the Diggers would organize their community was based on millenarianism. He contended that the digging community would consist of a selfless group of people seemed to have been based on what their goal or the millennium would realize. Men would experience earthly salvation or the Second Coming of Christ. All men would conduct themselves according to the Law of Righteousness or Reason. All men would act selflessly because this was the basis of their innocence or moral purity which God had created in them. Winstanley described this condition as one of "universal liberty" because all men would enact their "real moral self" into their conduct. Men will have no desire to be immoral or evil. Winstanley depicted the condition as:

... the earth becomes a common treasury as it was in the beginning, and the King of Righteousnesse comes to rule in every ones heart, then he kills the first Adam; for covetousness thereby is killed. A man shall have meat, and drinke and clothes by his labour in freedome, and what can be desired more in earth. Pride and envy likewise is killed thereby, for every one shall look upon each other as equall in the Creation; every man indeed being a perfect Creation of himself. And so this second Adam Christ, the restorer, stops or damnes up the runnings of those stinking waters of self-interest, and causes the waters of life and liberty to run plentifully in and through the Creation, making the earth one storehouse, and every man and woman to live in the Law of Righteousnesse and peace as members of one household.
III
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CHAPTER IV
THE POLITICAL RADICALISM OF WINSTANLEY: HIS DIGGING PAMPHLETS

This chapter analyzes the division of political theory of Winstanley into two parts. The parts existed partially because during the fifteen pamphlets he wrote during this period, he was leader and pamphleteer of the digging community. He and five other men began cultivating St. George's Hill which was part of the common land of the manor of Cobham. An analysis of the fifteen pamphlets in the order in which he wrote them reveals the presence of arguments based on immediate appeals to those in authority to the common land for the common people. He regarded securing the common land by both his appeals and the example of digging as only an intermediary goal to eliminating landed property completely. The second part of his political theory was based on his belief that landed property could be abolished completely if men would restore equality and morality to their social conduct. Both parts of his political theory were based on these concepts of equality and morality.

Winstanley made such a division of his political theory possible when he appealed for both the common land and the abolition of all landed property. This division cannot be adequately understood unless the landholding practices of seventeenth century England are described. In making his appeal, Winstanley was acting contrary to both law and the custom of the manor.

163
The common and wasteland was part of the land known as the manor. The rights of landholders and rankings on the manor were determined by custom. The Lords of Manor owned the manor by feudal right from the monarchy. The Lords could occupy their holdings, or as occurred more often, could hire an assistant or bailiff to supervise their holdings during their absence. Below the Lords were the freeholders. They were minor landlords who had custody of their land by feudal right of loyalty to the Lords. The freeholders in the seventeenth century had only to make a token annual payment to the Lords. Below the freeholders were the copyholders whose ownership depended on possession of a copy of the entry from the manor roll. The Lord of Manor could remove him if he had no copy as evidence of ownership. If the copyhold had a valid copy, the Lord of Manor could raise the rent by whatever amount he decided when the copyholder died and his heirs inherited it. By doubling the rent or refusing to renew the copyhold, the Lord of Manor could increase the size of his land holdings and the copyholder would become landless.

The land held by the copyholder was related directly to the common and wasteland. The distinction between the copyholder's land and the common and wasteland was determined by the varying customs of the manor. The land of the copyholder was part of the common field and consisted of the open field of the manor. Each copyholder had the right to cultivate designated strips of land and use the produce grown on these strips. Moreover, the copyholder had the right of common which allowed him to pasture his livestock between harvesting and sowing time on all the strips of the common field.
Sometimes the right of common included the common and wasteland. Both these lands were owned by the Lord of the Manor. The common and wasteland was frequently combined with the common field in order to pasture the animals of the tenants and the Lord of the Manor. In some manors the rights of common pasturage were restricted so that each tenant was allowed only a certain number of beasts on other manors and the right of common was limited by dividing up the acreage each tenant could use. The importance of the common land and wasteland to the commoners was that by feeding his cattle on pasture he could sell the corn grown in the common field at market. If the right of grazing on the common land were restricted, the commoners had to feed his cattle with his produce. The custom of the manor required that only tenants of the Lord of the Manor could use the common land.

Winstanley did not advocate taking land which was enclosed. The enclosure to which Winstanley frequently referred was a major change in the English system of land management which had begun in the thirteenth century and was continuing in the seventeenth. Enclosure was the enclosing, usually by hedges and fences, of estates composed of separate strips of the common arable field system and of the common and wasteland into compact properties. Enclosure made possible the consolidation of land strips which were scattered and which were communally grazed into areas of land which were contiguous and individually managed. By the seventeenth century, many of the manorial requirements of the tenant no longer existed and
had been converted into monetary payments. The landlord was interested in enclosing land in order to make a larger profit from his land by cattle or sheep farming. The Statute of Merton of 1236 still applied in the seventeenth century and gave Lords of Manors the right to enclose a common or wasteland if a sufficiency still remained for the tenants. The enclosure movement was not exclusively the Lords of Manors enclosing the copyhold land of their tenants or the common and wasteland to which the tenants had common rights. In some instances the Lord of Manor did enclose land so that he could make exclusive use of the land for his expanding sheep and cattle herds. The Lord of Manor could refuse to renew leases or tenancies on land belonging to the common field thereby consolidating his holdings in one contiguous area which he could enclose. The common and wasteland was an easy victim for enclosure by the Lord of Manor. Generally, the Lord of the Manor began by overstocking the common pasturage. This was the overstocking criticized by Winstanley. He said:

... you, [Lords of Manors], and the rich Freeholders, make the most profit of the Commons, by your overstocking of them with Sheep and Cattle; and the poor that have the name to own the Commons have the least share therein; nay, they are checked by you, if they cut Wood, Heath, Turf, or Furseys, in places about the Common, where you disallow.13

Winstanley's ideas differed from the landed discontent of seventeenth century England. The enclosing of lands which was steadily expanding during the seventeenth century resulted in discontent as tenants tried to retain their traditional common land. Their attempts were by court suits and by mob violence against the enclosers. Winstanley and the Diggers
made no arguments for the rights to the common land as tenants of the Cobham Manor but as commoners as such. Thus, Winstanley appealed for the common people to be given the common land as part of the end of landed property. He did not, nor did any of the Diggers, claim any rights as tenants of any manor. They were legally trespassers who paid no rent to any Lord of the Manor. Winstanley never identified the Diggers as tenants because he opposed the system of landholding of his England.

An example of this was the policy of deforestation of Charles I by which selected forests were exempted from the Forest Law and the forests were divided up among Lords of Manors, Crown, and commoners. The crown and the landlords enclosed their sections and rented them out as agricultural enterprises for the highest rents possible. The commoners were given small tracts and had longer rights of common to pasture their animals through the whole forest. In the Forest of Dean, there were 13,611 people with rights in common; a major part of the livelihood of many of them. In 1628 there began a peasant uprising largely unplanned and unled against the enclosing of three royal forest of Gillingham in Dorset, Brodon in Wiltshire, Dean in Gloucestershire, and Frampton and Selbridge. The peasants between 1628 and 1631 remained in a constant state of opposition pulling down the enclosures which had been recently erected in these areas. The riots were entirely the result of the loss of the common land to the peasants by enclosures.

Another royal policy was draining the fenlands so that these marshy, previously uncultivated areas, could be enclosed. The result was the loss of common rights and the shrinkage in the size of common land holdings. The biggest drainage of the fenland occurred in Lincolnshire
beginning in 1626 and continuing until 1640. The commoners lost
two thirds of their pasture by the project. The small peasants
became destitute and the landless peasants became paupers. Although
in some cases each landlord lost some common rights and opposed the fen
drainage, most of the opposition came from the peasants. They took
legal action in the courts which was fruitless just as in most cases
of forest enclosure. Then, they tore down enclosures. The end result
was many peasants lost respect for their landlords, the courts, and the
monarchy. By the civil war the whole fenlands was in a condition of
open rebellion against the government. The peasants no longer
regarded the monarch as a protector but now they regarded Charles I
as just another greedy landlord. Nor did the peasant rebellions
end with the arrival of the civil war. The peasant rebellion which
began in the fens of Lincolnshire, Cambridgeshire, and Huntingdonshire
in 1641-1642 spread to the commoners of Hotfield Chase who were deprived
of two thirds of their commons by the draining and enclosing of the land.
In February of 1643 they flooded and ruined the private farms which had
been established on the former common land. Moreover, during the war
in 1642 there was a great deal of opposition to the royal deer parks.
For example, the Long parliament had established a commission to
restore the boundaries of the deer park at Windsor to its original
boundaries under James I. The people of Surrey who lived nearby
were frequently poaching the deer for their food supply. The people
of Egham had lost their right to pasture cattle in the Great Park of
Windsor. The poaching was pervasive despite attempted protection
of the deer by local justices of the peace, and this practice spread to
other royal forests. In Surrey on several occasions in 1642, the
commoners killed many deer. This was probably a reflection of their loss of the ancient right to the common land by the deer parks. 19

The creating of so many landless common people provided a target population for the digging venture of Gerrard Winstanley. Winstanley's targets of the Lords of Manor, freeholders, and the monarchy had their origin in the agrarian discontent of seventeenth century. His arguments against landed property relied on the inequity or unfairness of landed property for some and landlessness for another.

The political theory of Gerrard Winstanley was consistent in these fifteen pamphlets with regard to equality and morality as it had been in the previous five pamphlets. He thought that God had determined that each man was to be treated equitably. God recognized the moral worth of each person on an equal basis and did not respect one man above another. He depicted property as both inequitable and immoral. God never intended one man to be valued above another by possessing landed property alongside his landless fellow. He wrote:

. . . That we may work in righteousness, and lay the Foundation of making the Earth a Common Treasury for All, both Rich and Poor, That every one that is born in the Land, may be fed by the Earth his Mother that brought him forth, according to the Reason that rules in the Creation. Not Inclosing any part into any particular hand, but all as one man, working together, and feeding together as Sons of one Father, members of one Family; not one Lording over another, but all looking upon each other, as equals in the Creation; so that our Maker may be glorified in the work of his own hands, and that every one may see, he is no respecter of Persons, but equally loves his whole Creation, and hates nothing but the Serpent, which is Covetousness, branching forth into selfish Imagination, Pride, Envy, Hypocrisie, Vncleanness, all seeking the ease and honor of flesh, and fighting against the Spirit Reason that made the Creation; for that is the Corruption, the Curse, the Devil, the Father of Lies; Death and Bondage that Serpent and Dragon that the Creation is to be delivered from. 20
Landed property can never be anything but immoral because it represented the "peculiar interest of lords and landlords" and shuts other people out instead of emphasizing the common morality of men. Men "dishonor the work of the Creation" because landed property was based on the assumption God valued some men more than others.\(^{21}\) Winstanley repeatedly described the earth as being a common treasury by which he meant landed property should be common for all men. Common landed property was described as granted by the "Law of Reason and Creation."\(^{22}\) He depicted the landlords as guilty of violating the eighth commandment against theft because they have no right to landed property.\(^{23}\) The common people have "an equal right to land by the righteous Law of Creation."\(^{24}\) The purpose of the digging was to restore the "earth to the common treasury without respect to persons."\(^{25}\) He repeated this phrase in The Letter to Lord Fairfax, in An Appeal to the House of Commons, in Watchword to City of London and the Army, in Two Letters to Lord Fairfax, and in The New Year's Gift to Parliament and Army.\(^{26}\) In all these repetitions of the phrase, Winstanley interpreted the phrase to mean that divine grant established common landed property because it was based on equal respect for persons. As he wrote in An Appeal to All Englishmen:

> the earth was not made for a few, but for whole mankind, for God is no respector of persons.\(^{27}\)

In his litany of equality and morality as justification for opposition to landed property, Winstanley regarded both concepts as having an equal footing in his argument for common landed property. Both concepts were so interrelated; one was an aspect of the other. This explained why he never expanded his opposition to
include inequitable arrangements by the government. Landed property was immoral because God never ordained and established it. Equality cannot be more fundamental or Winstanley could have applied his same argument of inequity to government. When the courts give one offender a light sentence and another a harsh sentence for the same offense, this is inequitable. Why then should not the government or at least the courts be abolished? Surely God did not intend that some men be respected above others by allowing such inequalities in judicial penalties. By what right can government be allowed to execute a man. Is this not a violation of equity? God never intended for some men to treat others in such an unfair fashion. Such a practice denies the equality of all men as moral beings before God. Why did Winstanley not use any of these arguments to oppose government practices? These arguments were used only to oppose practices of "kingly government" but not government in general. He observed that the crucial aspect of immorality was absent. Unlike landed property, God did not make any of these acts immoral. If inequity were sufficient, then Winstanley could have advocated abolition of the social rank of the Lords of Manors. Certainly for some men to be called Lord and be treated with deference was a violation of their moral worth as equal beings before God.

Another way of demonstrating the interrelatedness of equality and morality is his argument on landed property. Winstanley could have provided equality by advocating equal land shares for all. But he opposed property because people had unequal shares when property existed. Moreover, he thought it was an immoral condition. For Winstanley inequality was immoral; morality was based on equality
or equitable treatment of each man to his fellow men in their daily social conduct.

Winstanley's focus was on the necessity for men to fulfill their duty to God by opposing landed property. He emphasized the immediate goal of getting the government to allow the common people to cultivate the common land. Alongside this aim he also emphasized the abolition of all landed property. These two goals were not contradictory because he continued to adhere to his pre-digging millenarianism. The digging venture was a kind of moral vanguard to lead the people of England to a condition of common property. The cultivation of the common land by the Diggers and as they advocated the digging of the common land by the common people were intermediary steps in an imminent propertyless millennium. This was why Winstanley depicted the Diggers as like Biblical Israel because they were a self-righteous community that would lead the way to the promised land. The idea of the Diggers originated in a divine trance in which he equated the Diggers with Biblical Israel. The Israelites were bound together in a common undertaking. The Diggers were bound together by their involvement in laying the foundation for the earth becoming a common treasury. The earth as a common treasury was like the promised land of Israel in which the "Land of Canaan was the Common livelihood of such and such a Tribe, and of every member in that tribe, without exception, neither hedging in any, nor hedging out." The land of England was to be shared as the Land of Canaan was the common livelihood without respect to persons. All the prophecies, visions, revelations of scriptures of the calling of the Jews, the Biblical Restoration of
Israel, and making the Israelites the inheritors of the earth were justification of the Diggers seeking to make the earth a common treasury. Israel disowned buying and selling, paying of rents, and taking hire just as the Diggers had. The Diggers would eat together as one man restored from the bondage of property, just as Israel had when restored from Egyptian bondage. Winstanley thought the Diggers would make England like a righteous land of Israel restored from bondage when everyone agreed to make the earth a common treasury. He compared the poor or common people of England who worked as virtual servants for the clergy and gentry to the Israelities under their Egyptian task-masters. The Lords of Manors, clergy, and the governors who refused to let the poor have the common land and held the earth in bondage acted like the Egyptian pharaohs.

The dominant image on which the political theory of Gerrard Winstanley was founded was the obedience of each man to the will of God. This obedience was represented by the maintenance of a moral and equitable relationship among men. His theory can be divided by his focus on the immediate desire for the common land and the imminent restoration of men to their propertyless condition before the Fall. One segment of his theory has already been described: his justification of the earth as a common treasury by a moral law established by God. This segment was the same as his pre-digging pamphlets. He repeated the argument in all of his fifteen pamphlets with no change. He did not alter or reword the arguments to appeal to any of the seventeenth century audiences to whom they were addressed. He regarded the equality
and morality concepts on which this segment was based as the truth which he had portrayed them to be in his earlier five pamphlets. This argument was not related to the successes or failures of the digging venture. This first segment remained the foundation of his entire political theory.

Winstanley presented a series of arguments in nine of these fifteen pamphlets which can be described as the second segment of his political theory. The second segment was distinct in three major ways. First, the ideas changed with the underlying circumstances including the immediate successes or failures of the digging venture and the assessment by Winstanley of what group to address in his pamphlet appeal. Secondly, the second segment of his theory was founded on the concepts of equality and morality, despite the presence of natural rights elements. The obvious question was: why did Winstanley write ideas which can be characterized as the first and second segments if the foundation of his political theory were the same for both. Winstanley was a propagandist in his ability to vary his appeal to the pamphlet reader. He sought to further the digging venture by this ability.

The second segment of his theory consisted of three major arguments: The Norman Yoke, the National Covenant, and the contract-conquest. The first argument, "The Norman Yoke," was based on a widespread historical myth shared by many of his fellow seventeen century Englishmen, particularly the Levellers. Initially, Winstanley used the Norman Yoke as explaining a specific circumstance
of current events. The Civil War between the King and Parliament had just ended. The King has lost the war and his head in January 1649. Winstanley regarded the continuance of the landed property and the practice of the common people not having the common land as a practice that should have ended with the King's beheading. "Kingly Government" continued even without a king. In his first pamphlet written after he launched the digging venture, he described the practice of landed property as originating from Norman times. He wrote:

If you cast your eye a little backward, you shall see, That this outward Teaching and Ruling power, is the Babylonish yoke laid upon Israel of old, under Nebuchadnezzar; and so Successively from that time, the Conquering Enemy, have still laid these yokes upon Israel to keep Jacob down: And the last enslaving Conquest which the Enemy got over Israel, was the Norman over England; and from that time, Kings, Lords, Judges, Justices, Bayliffs, and the violent bitter people that are Free-holders, are and have been Successively: The Norman Bastard William himself, his Colonels, Captains, inferior Officers, and Common Souldiers, who still are from that time to this day in pursuite of that victory, Imprisoning, Robbing, and killing the poor enslaved English Israelites.32

Thus, Winstanley used the Norman Yoke as a means of tracing the origin of landed property. He portrayed the Norman Yoke as a condition to be eliminated as soon as possible.

The idea of Norman legal oppression originating in the conquest was widespread. For example, in a petition to parliament (1643) signed by thousands, it was urged that copyhold tenure, the chief remaining badge
of Norman tyranny, should be removed. In late September, 1647, Thomas Collier gave a sermon at army headquarters in Putney in which he urged that the oppression of writing English laws in Norman French be ended. The Norman Conquest was so widely accepted in both parliament and the army that one of the first reforms of the Commonwealth government was to abolish Norman French and require all laws be written in English. In 1650 during the debate on this legislation, those favoring the reform in the House of Commons presented as an argument that William the Conqueror had created all the existing laws after the conquest.

Winstanley probably learned about the Norman Yoke from primarily legalistic sources. At least he cited two legal sources which discussed the Norman Yoke in a later pamphlet. Both works, Part II of The Institutes, by Sir Edward Coke and The Mirror of Justice, by Andrew Horn, dealt with the Norman Conquest. Horn in The Mirror of Justice presented the idea of the noble Saxon who was conquered and oppressed by the Norman usurper. The Saxons chose a man from among their number to serve as king. They required him to be a Christian and "to guide his people by right with all his power, without respect to persons." Coke cited Horn as proof of the oppressive nature of the Norman Conquest. He believed the Saxon institutions and laws represented the perfection of reason existent in the common law tradition. The Norman Conquest was a violent infringement on the primitive rights of Englishmen.

The second argument in this segment of the thought of Winstanley was the "National Covenant." He based this on the Solemn League and Covenant agreed to by England and Scotland. In this treaty parliament agreed to establish a Presbyterian church in exchange for military
assistance of Scotland against King Charles. Winstanley did not address the military aspect of the treaty. He was much more concerned with its religious meaning.

When the treaty appeared in 1643, England was in the midst of a controversy about what kind of church government, if any, should replace the discredited Anglican one. The National Covenant became part of this controversy. In order to safeguard their consciences and protest the establishment of a Presbyterian church in England, the sectarians in parliament had added a reservation to the treaty that each man would maintain a church "according to the word of God." This phrase became the basis of widespread opposition to an established Presbyterian church. Many pamphlets appeared interpreting the "word of God" to mean a church with little state control or a state controlled Presbyterian church. Many of the contemporary millenarians singled out Article 6 in which the covenant was obligated as striving for a "real reformation according to the word of God." Winstanley also singled out Article 6 and interpreted the Covenant to be a reaffirmation by the government that it would strive to reestablish man's loss of innocence.

Winstanley used the actual phrase of the Solemn League and Covenant "to endeavor a real reformation" to mean the abolition of landed property. His initial use of the National Covenant argument reflected this. He wrote that parliament had

made the people to take a Covenant and Oaths
to endeavour a Reformation. . . to lift up
the Creation from that bondage of Civil
Propriety. . . .

His second use of the National Covenant was the same as the first.
In the *Poor Oppressed People*, he wrote:

... the National Covenant bind[s]... Parliament and people to be faithful and sincere, before the Lord God Almighty, wherein every one... hath covenanted to preserve and seek the liberty each of others, without respect of persons.  

This respect he again equated with the abolition of landed property.

The third argument comprising the second segment of the political theory of Gerrard Winstanley was based on "conquest-contract." He argued that a contract had been agreed to by parliament and the people to fight the war to end tyranny. The people had performed their part of the contract by their donations of blood, taxes, free-quarter, and money. However, parliament had not performed their part of the contract by eliminating oppression particularly by elimination of landed property. In *The True Leveller Standard Advanced*, he wrote parliament had failed to restore "universal liberty" (or common property) even though:

we [the common people] have bought with our Money, in Taxes, Free-Quarter and Blood-shed; all which Sums thou hast received at our hands, and yet thou hast not given us our bargain.

The most important question was if these three arguments of the second segment of Winstanley were based on the same conceptions of equality and morality, why did Winstanley use them? On at least one occasion he had termed two of the three arguments as "our weakest proofs" in trying to justify the necessity for returning the earth again to a common treasury. He emphasized that the soundest argument was based on equality and morality as described previously in the first segment.
The three arguments which constitute the second segment were geared to the immediate goal of the common people cultivating the common land. He was trying to persuade parliament, the Lords of Manors, the army, and the freeholders who would not necessarily accept his argument based on equality and morality. The nine pamphlets contain appeals to the authorities whether government, army, or Lords of Manors. The True Leveller Standard Advanced was a manifesto of why the digging was carried out addressed as the subtitle revealed to "the Power of England and All the Powers of the World." The Poor Oppressed People was addressed to the Lords of Manors asking them not to cut the wood on the common land because the Diggers needed it as part of their common stock. The third pamphlet was addressed to Lord Fairfax and his Council of War complaining of the attack on the Diggers by quartered soldiers from a nearby town. A Declaration of the Bloudie and Unchristian was written as a moral condemnation of another attack on the Diggers and not addressed to any special institution. Winstanley made no use of the three arguments in this pamphlet. In An Appeal to the House of Commons, he appealed to the House of Commons as the court of appeal to determine the justness of the Digger cause and either deliver them into or out of the hands of the Lords of the Manors. In the pamphlet, A Watchword to the City of London and Armie, Winstanley was trying to get their understanding and support of what "true freedom" is. In the next two pamphlets, Winstanley wrote again to Lord Fairfax and the Council of War to complain of another Digger attack and defend themselves from allegations
by Lords of Manors that they were storing guns and were cavaliers. In the pamphlet, New Year's Gift for Parliament and the Armie, Winstanley appealed for support from both to root out landed property and related institutions of clergy and laws supporting it.

His argument of the Norman Yoke was also an appeal for the government to allow the common people to cultivate the common land. This was consistent throughout nine of the fifteen pamphlets written after he began digging. In The True Leveller Standard Advanced, he described the Norman power as landlords' power so that the poor are acknowledged to have a right to the common land. In The Poor Oppressed People, he castigated the freeholders who wanted the common land so "Norman tyranny" would be upheld over the common people. In his Letter to Lord Fairfax, he argued that William the Conqueror had divided the land into enclosures and commons. Vassals were successors to William's officers and Charles, the defeated King, was a successor to William. The right to the land, including the commons, originated from the King. His recent defeat should restore the common land to the common people. In his Appeal to the House of Commons, he accused the Lords of Manors as owners of the commons and wasteland as maintaining the Norman murder and theft by which ownership was procured. Winstanley traced the origin of the Lords of Manors controlling the commons as originating with William. In Watchword to the City of London and Armie, he used the Norman Yoke as a polemical device to explain the motivations of his opponents during his trial for trespassing on manor land. The bailiffs who arrested him were "upolders of Norman power." The jury who sentenced him also represented Norman power. His use of
Norman Yoke extended to their motivations. He wrote:

Norman officers of Knights, Gentlemen, and rich Freeholders did spend at the White Lion at Cobham, when they met the 24. of August, 1649, to advise together what course they should take to subdue the diggers; for say they, if the cause of the diggers stand, we shall lose all our honour and titles, and we that have had the glory of the earth shall be of no more account then those slaves our servants and younger brothers that have been footstools to us and our Fathers ever since the Norman William our beloved Generall took this land (not by love) but by a sharp sword, the power by which we stand: and though we own Christ by name, yet we will not do as he did to save enemies, but by our sword we will destroy our enemies, and we not deserve the price of some of the diggers Cows to pay us for this our good service? And doe not our reverend Ministers tell us that William the Conquerour and the succeeding Kings were Gods anointed? And do not they say that our inclosures which were got by that murdering sword, and given by William the Conquerour to our Fathers, and so successivly from them, the land is our inheritance, and that God gave it us, and shall these broken fellows, and beggarly rogues take our rights from us... .57

In The New Year's Gift to Parliament and Armie, Winstanley described William's seizure of landed property as the basis of "kingly power." He defined "kingly power" as the support of laws and the clergy for landed property in his contemporary England. Kingly power had survived despite the fact the King no longer existed.58

In the instance of the Norman Yoke, Winstanley varied his argument as circumstances surrounding the Diggers changed. In his first use of the Norman Yoke in True Leveller Standard Advanced, he described the establishment of landed property by William and his colonels, captains, common soldiers, kings, lords, judges, justices, bailiffs, and freeholders. His sole focus was on their assistance in establishing and preserving
landed property. This was the pattern of the argument despite several attacks on the Diggers and their settlement sponsored by the Lords of Manors and freeholders. In June of 1649, a lawsuit was instituted in Kingston court against the Diggers for trespass on the manor of Lord of Manor Drake. The pattern of the argument changed in both content and tone. He accused the men who arrested him, Wenman, Verny, and Winwood, as representing the three ranks of Norman nobility: gentleman, knight, and esquire respectively. Moreover, he expanded on his previous description of corrupt Norman laws by suggesting lawyers were a profession created by William. He also introduced the suggestion that William had invented the practice of tithes in order to reward the clergy for preaching to the people for obedience to the monarchy. The addition of the lawyers was a reaction to his recent court experience, but the addition of the clergy was a reaction to a clerical campaign against the Diggers. He described both Lord of the Manor Drake and the Surrey ministers as setting a lecturer to preach against the Diggers. The lecturer was a clergyman hired for an express purpose. Winstanley described his function as "to drive off the Diggers." He also described the local church rector Parson Platt as telling Lord Fairfax that the Diggers were drunkards, were cavaliers, and were likely to start a revolt and have four guns in their houses where their settlement was located.

The three arguments revolved on natural rights assumptions. What criteria should be used in identifying natural rights characteristics? Several criteria were readily available in seventeenth century political
theory. In the seventeenth century, the natural rights theorists were becoming predominant over the Christian natural law theorists. The latter in seventeenth century England were based on Calvin. The whole emphasis was on man obeying a universal law laid down by God. The reason of men will allow them to discover their duties to God and man by discovery of right reason. The focus was not so much on the responsibility of an individual for himself but the responsibility of an individual for upholding the values of the community such as was inherent in established institutions. Calvin exemplified a Christian view of the natural law when he wrote the following:

... that inward law ... even engraved upon the hearts of all, in a sense asserts the very same things that are to be learned from the ... /Ten Commandments/. ... For our conscience does not allow us to sleep a perpetual insensible sleep without being an inner witness and monitor of what we owe God, without holding before use the difference between good and evil and thus accusing us when we fail in our duty. But man is so shrouded in the darkness of errors that he hardly beings to grasp through this natural law what worship is acceptable to God. Surely he is very far removed from a true estimate of it. Besides this, he is so puffed up with haughtiness and ambition, and so blinded by self-love, that he is as yet unable to look upon himself and, as it were, to descend within himself, that he may humble and abase himself and confess his own miserable condition. ... the Lord has provided us with a written law to give us a clearer witness of what was too obscure in the natural law, shake off our listlessness, and strike more vigorously our mind and memory.62

The natural law was of divine origin and established an eternal framework for the ordering and development of all things. The foundation of the doctrine was based on a conception of human nature. Man had an immanent sense of what was right or wrong; he did not know it. The assumption was man was primarily evil as a consequence of the Fall. The best that could be expected of him was pious conduct until the afterlife, the worst selfish conduct and wanton destruction.63
The natural rights theorists considerably changed the emphasis of the natural law theorists. They emphasized the rights of the individual, not his duties to God. His relationship with government was of greater concern than his purely religious relationship to God. They wanted to insure each individual used his natural reason to determine his conduct based on his understanding of natural rights, not the government's interpretations of what they should be. Such natural rights theorists assumed men had no need to continue to determine God's will, but to accept God as a kind of backdrop and concentrate on secular matters. The natural rights theorists conceived of man as creating the political order; man was not, as the classical natural law theorists imagined, determined by the political order. Each man was to depend on the operation of his reason to guide him in understanding his natural rights, not the values of the community as based in selected institutions, such as the state and the church. The human nature of man was viewed optimistically and capable of high moral principle and conduct. It was not viewed as by the natural law theorists as fundamentally depraved. Thus the natural rights' approach was to liberate men's rights from the clutches of grasping government. The approach of the natural laws theorist was to get men and institutions to right reason by fulfilling the common duties expected of all mankind.

These natural rights concepts of limited government, individual rights, and contract were present in Winstanley's view of the Norman Yoke. Perhaps the best means of clearly demonstrating this would be by comparing his view of the Norman Yoke with that of the Levellers. The Levellers were contemporaries of Winstanley. Winstanley may have
read their pamphlets; many were written at the same time as the Digger ones. He entitled his first pamphlet after the digging began as The True Leveller Standard Advanced. He may have been trying to distinguish the Diggers from the Levellers.

The ideas of the Levellers were based on an emphasis on the protection of individual rights against the authority of government. They stressed each person had natural rights which government should recognize and safeguard. The Levellers proposed all just government had to be based on consent of individuals. In The Case of the Armie Truly Stated, the Levellers wrote:

... free choice of consent is the originall or foundation of all just government. 65

In The Third Agreement of the People (1647), the three Leveller leaders presented the concept of a constitution providing permanent protection to unalterable personal rights. The parliament should have no right to infringe on ... "Rules of equall Government, under which a Nation may enjoy all its Rights ... securely." 66 The natural rights basis of laws was right reason. Richard Overton in Appeal to the People wrote:

if right reason be not the only being and bounder of the law over the corrupt nature of man, that what is rationall (the which injustice and tyranny cannot be. ... 67

Reason was not only the basis of it; it was also:

a firm law and radical principle in nature, engraven in the tables of the heart by the finger of God in creation ... 68

This belief in limited government was evidenced by successive Leveller proposals for written constitutions or as they call them
agreements of the people to protect individual rights. These constitutions were to ensure that government enroachment was unlikely. For example, in their third agreement of the people, the Leveller leaders demanded that members of parliament be barred from seeking successive terms, annual parliament, and no member of parliament allowed to practice law and continue as member of the House of Commons. Moreover, the rank and file members of the army should be paid by local, county, cities, or towns, not parliament. All of these were examples of the general concern of the Levellers with protecting the individuals from arbitrary power of government. Also in their third Agreement of the People, they proposed replacement of all law courts in London by locally administered courts administered by locally elected sheriffs and justices of the peace. They desired annual parliament, no practicing attorneys could be members of parliament, and rank and file members of the army were to be paid by local, county, cities, or towns, not parliament. 69

The importance of limited government based on natural rights for the Levellers was present in their conception of the Norman Yoke as legal oppression. They regarded natural rights as a kind of fault line between what government should and should not do. They wanted a government which acted as an important administrator of rules consented to by each individual. 70 The Levellers regarded seventeenth century England as lacking it but capable of restoring this condition existing in the Saxon past. John Lilburne wrote in A Remonstrance of Many Thousand Citizens (1646):

The conquerour. . . . introduced the Norman Laws . . . .
He erected a trade of Judges and Lawyers, to sell Justice and injustice at his owne unconscionable rate . . . . 71
All three of the Leveller leaders complained of the legal oppressions created by the Normans. Imprisonment for debt, trials in London courts, and the trade of justices and lawyers were creations of William the Conqueror. The Levellers favored having all laws translated and written only in English, not in Norman French or in Latin. Accused persons should be tried by jury only; the legal profession would be unnecessary. Parliament should have no right to cause an accused to testify against himself, thereby resulting in possible self-incrimination. Moreover, the government should allow each man the right to use witnesses for defense during a trial.

The Levellers believed that Saxon laws had some of these oppressions. For example, John Lilburne depicted the Magna Charta as a "beggerly thing..." containing "markes of intollerable bondage." The practices of trial by jury, bail, or self-incrimination of court witnesses and debt imprisonment had been replaced by legal oppressions by William. The Levellers demanded these legal rights of the Saxon past be restored.

The view of Winstanley of the Norman Yoke as already indicated was based on the paramount concepts of equality and morality. His refrain that the poor get the common land and landed property be abolished were only possible by abolition of the Norman Yoke. He had no view of government as limited. The only way the Norman Yoke could be abolished was for each man to treat his fellow men in the equitable and moral manner God had instilled in his nature. Though he used the term right he only regarded rights as secured by performing the duty owed to God. He characterized the common people as having equality of rights with their fellow men. He wrote:
have an equal right to it \(\text{the land}\) with your selves, by the Law of Creation . . . ."?

He stressed what gave men this right was not natural law but performance of their duties by each man. The abolition of the Norman Yoke was only part of his overriding goal of man's return to the condition before the Fall. He wrote:

The Reformation that England now is to endeavour, is not to remove the Norman Yoke only, and to bring us back to be governed by those laws that were before William the Conqueror came in, as if that were the rule or mark we aime at: No, that is not it; but the Reformation is according to the Word of God, and that is the pure Law of righteousness before the fall. . . .

Perhaps the most important way Winstanley and the Levellers were distinct resulting in their Norman Yoke differences was in their estimations of human nature. The Diggers' assessment of human nature remained the same as in Winstanley's previous five pamphlets. He regarded immorality as an aberration correctable by alteration in human conduct and social institutions. Morality was a more fundamental part of man's nature. Though in his fifteen digging pamphlets he did not emphasize the nature of man and his Fall, he still regarded mankind as destined to restore themselves to their innocence as it existed before the Fall. Moreover, men were moral enough to abolish the church and landed property and allow the equality and morality to be reestablished. He thought the conflict in the relationship between men and government was capable of a permanent solution. If man's intrinsic morality and equality came to the forefront and the church and landed property were abolished, the millennium would ensue and no conflict would exist or ever would
exist. He wrote:

this Enmity in all Lands will cease, for
none shall dare to seek a Dominion over
others, neither shall any dare to kill
another, nor desire more of the Earth than
another. . . .79

Winstanley thought the future was a replay of the past. Men would
restore themselves to their condition before the Fall. He was so
optimistic about the morality of human nature that he regarded
human development as essentially circular. He wrote:

once the Earth become a Common Treasury
again . . . for all the Prophesies of
Scriptures and Reason are Circled here
in this Community. . . .80

For Winstanley history was not a Saxon straight line, but a moral
circle.

Winstanley's view of morality left no role for self-interest
in his political theory. He appealed in his three arguments for
government to allow the common people the common land because of man-
kind's divine duty. He suggested that the tovernm ent as assisting in
the perpetuation of landed property was upholding selfishness or self-
interest, but this condition was immoral. He never conceived of the
plausibility or even possibility that the government was not likely to
grant the common land to the common people because its self-interest with
the landowners was frequently identical. Self-interest had no legitimacy
as a continuing condition, only as a condition to be eradicated at
the earliest opportunity. For example, his depiction of the Diggers
in the pamphlet, *The Poor Oppressed People*, as cutting wood from
upon the common for their interest was based on divine duty. He wrote:

to take those Common Woods to sell them,
now at first to be a stock for our selves,
and our children after us, . . . for we
shall endeavour by our righteous acting
not to leave the earth any longer
intangled unto our children, by self-
seeking proprietors. . . .

The Diggers were to be the epitome of morality devoid of any self-
interest. He wrote:

What need have we of any outward selfish
confused Laws made, to uphold the power
of Covetousness, when as we have the
righteous Law written in our hearts. . . .

This lack of legitimacy to the role of self-interest was the
basis of his expectation of how the Diggers should conduct their
lives. He emphasized that because the Diggers lived their lives
based on the law of righteousness they had no need of arresting,
imprisoning, whipping, or hanging fellow men because of ownership
of the "objects of the earth." Unlike their contemporaries, the
Diggers did not lock up their corn and cattle for their exclusive
use; they wanted to share it with the rest of the nation. They
did not seek to be "proprietors in the middle of the Nation. . . ."

They practiced the intention of God that the earth was a "common
treasury of livelihood to one equall with another, without respect
of persons." The Diggers were ruled by the spirit of righteousness,
not the power of covetousness. The Diggers had no need of any
"selfish, confused Laws" for protection since the Diggers had
adopted God as their protector. Winstanley portrayed selfishness
as the direct opposite of the righteousness which the Diggers symbolized.
He described the attack by the local citizenry who represented the "Laws of Propriety" on the Diggers as an example of covetousness. The attackers were "ignorant, covetous, free-holders." Such people were completely devoid of the meaning of "freedom: or performing their duty to God."36

On the other hand, the Leveller had a much harsher view of human nature. They remained Calvinist with regard to man's Fall from Grace. Man was consequently permanently ensnared in depravity and ignorance.

In a pamphlet written by the three Leveller leaders: Robert Overton, John Lilburne, and William Walwyn, they said they mistrusted government because of man's nature. They wrote:

We know very well the pravity and corruption of man's heart is such that there can be no living without government.37

The corrupted will of fallen men determined the necessity for a government of limited powers because the depravity of men would result in their grasping for unlimited power over their fellow men. Self-interest of man was for them a natural condition not capable of being permanently banished. There could be no permanent solution as Winstanley had envisaged. A perpetual conflict between government and the individual would always exist. Natural rights furnished a boundary by which this conflict was kept in bounds. The best future of mankind was reforms which would safeguard individual rights and protect them from government interference.

Winstanley characterized his conquest-contract argument as having natural rights characteristics. He assumed the government he was appealing to was a limited government because the contract had to be complied with before the government had any authorization to act.

Much of the formulation of the argument was for government to comply
with an agreement only the common people had complied with. He assumed a trust between governors and people that the former might honor their agreements. Yet, he simultaneously insisted that the contract involved the duty of all men to comply with equality and morality. He presented government and the people as entering into a contract to secure the freedom of the latter. In his True Leveller Standard Advanced, he argued that the people had complied with their part of the contract: taxes, freequarter, and blood, but had not gotten their return of freedom of the common land. In his Poor Oppressed People, he acknowledged that the "powers of England" had not delivered freedom of the land. The common people were only claiming by the law of contract what they had earned on equal privilege of livelihood. In The Letter to Lord Fairfax, he described those who had paid taxes, given freequarter and shed their blood as entitled to recover England from bondage by securing cultivation of the common land. In his Appeal to the House of Commons, he described the common people as entitled to recovery from the Norman Yoke. He defined the yoke as the freedom of the common land for the common people. He observed that the common people by fulfilling their part of the contract had a truer title by conquest than did the Lords of Manors. In his Watchword to the City of London and Armie, he noted that all sorts of people (poor and rich, landlord and tenants) had destroyed the kingly office; therefore, all sorts should have freedom of land, such as the poor the common land. In his Two Letters to Lord Fairfax, he wrote that the law of contract was made and confirmed by the performance of the common people. Their claim waited for performance by the government
allowing the common people the common land.\textsuperscript{93} In his New Year's Gift to Parliament and Armie, he noted the common people by complying with the contract were entitled to their part of the spoils of war—the common land. He argued that by the law of bargain and sale the common people should be granted the common land. Winstanley claimed the common people ought to have an "equal freedom" by their cultivation of the common land since they were equally involved in conquering the King. The parliament and the army were guilty of theft by the common people not being granted the common land which was their just reward for their contribution to the contract.\textsuperscript{94}

Winstanley also used the term "equity and reason", but he did not interpret the phrase as did the natural rights theorists. They defined "equity and reason" as what the individual reason told him was the correct meaning of his natural rights as provided by natural law. Winstanley defined equity and reason as allowing the common people to have the common land. He based equity and reason on the government performing its part of the contract but not a voluntary act such as a person choosing to act or not act. The whole basis of his appeal to the government was for it to grant the common people the common land and thereby fulfill its moral duty, not comply with a right of the common people. In his Appeal to the House of Commons, he appealed to parliament to "settle this matter in the Equity and Reason of it . . ." by proclaiming the common land as the common peoples.\textsuperscript{95} He described making "all laws in the light of equity and reason as respecting the freedom of all sorts of people.

In the Watchword to the City of London and Armie, he described
equity and reason as possible only by abolishing the Norman laws denying the common people the common land. He depicted England as based on the light of reason and equity when the earth becomes "a common Treasury to all her children. . . ." In trying to explain why the Kingston court would not recognize him to speak without a lawyer he suggested that the court must have been unsure its laws were based on "reason and equity, the foundation of all righteous Lawes. . . ." Winstanley concluded that the Diggers never violated any law based on equity and reason.

An examination of Winstanley's formulation of the National Covenant argument demonstrated the same presence of the forms of natural rights terms, but the substance was based on his concepts of morality and equality. The concepts of limited government, trust between government and people, and individual rights were obvious. Winstanley described the National Covenant as agreed to by

... the powers of England . . . by promises and Covenants. . . to make England a free people, upon condition they would pay moneys, and adventure their lives against the successor of the Norman Conqueror. . . . And we [the poor oppressed people/ look upon that freedom promised to be the inheritance of all, without respect of persons; And this cannot be, unless the Land of England be freely set at liberty from proprietors, and become a common Treasury to all her children. . . .

Winstanley intertwined his National Covenant and contract as based on morality and equality. The purpose of the National Covenant was defined by him as seeking to fulfill the duty of each man to bring about the earth as a common treasury. In A Letter to Lord Fairfax, he termed the National Covenant as breached by the gentry forcing the common people to live by renting the earth and working for hire.
By the poor having the common land, the National Covenant could be fulfilled. In his *An Appeal to the House of Commons*, he noted that the reformation to which men swore in the National Covenant was "a Reformation . . . to restore . . . freedom in the earth . . . in which the earth was to be a common treasury of livelihood to all . . . ." He repeated his belief that the National Covenant was to make England a common treasury in his next pamphlet, *A Watchword to the City of London and Armie*.

Winstanley discontinued use of two of the three arguments of the second segment of his political theory. His conception of duty was so pervasive that his two new arguments, based on laws establishing the commonwealth and abolishing the monarchy, were also founded on morality and equality. This was significant since the tenth pamphlet, *An Appeal to all Englishmen*, signaled a decisive change in tactics of Winstanley's writing. In his previous nine pamphlets he had used the conquest-contract, National Covenant, and Norman Yoke arguments to try to get government to allow the common people the common land. His approach had been to appeal to those in authority to change their policy and he used these three arguments to get this change. In November of 1649, his settlement had suffered an attack. This was not unusual; there had been two earlier attacks on the Diggers and their settlement. This attack was different because the Council of State had authorized use of troops in the attack whereas the earlier attacks had not been supported by troops, only local freeholders and Lords of Manors. The physical damage was not as important as the loss of the army's support as symbolized in Lord Fairfax. As Winstanley described it: "the soldiers presence was a great crush to our business. . . ." Therefore, Winstanley shifted
his approach instead of addressing those in authority, such as government and the army; he appealed for grass roots support from all Englishmen. The pamphlet, An Appeal to All Englishmen, was a manifesto for support for the digging venture.

Simultaneously, as an addendum to the pamphlet, Winstanley wrote a letter of appeal for funds. A Digger delegation visited several counties urging the poor to emulate the example of St. George's Hill and asking for financial assistance. Two of the Diggers carried a letter from Winstanley and twenty-five of his fellow Diggers in which they said with the destruction of the summer crop having been destroyed without assistance they might have to stop digging. This delegation visited Buckinghamshire, Surrey, Herefordshire, Middlesex, Berkshire, Huntingdonshire, and Northamptonshire. The Digger delegation was arrested in Wellingborough in Northamptonshire. In this community another digging venture was launched briefly by trying to cultivate common land called Bareshank. This venture was quickly suppressed.

His change in approach was not matched by a change in content. Morality and equality remained paramount. He stopped using the National Covenant and conquest-contract arguments and did not use these again until his final pamphlet, The Law of Freedom in a Platform. He substituted a newly formulated argument based on two recent laws. He singled out the laws abolishing the monarchy, the House of Lords, and establishing the commonwealth. His substitution was distinctive because, unlike the National Covenant and contract arguments, these laws had already been implemented. Winstanley had appealed to the authorities to fulfill the National Covenant and contract by allowing the common people the common land. In his interpretation of these laws, he regarded the
law as already allowing the common people the common land and the 
abolition of the Norman Yoke. These two laws upheld the power of the 
Lords of the Manors over the common land. He equated these laws with 
the abolition of landed property and the imminent establishment of 
common sharing of the land. He wrote:

behold all Englishmen, that by vertue of 
these 2. Lawes, and the Engagement, the 
Tenants of Copyholds, are freed from 
obedience to their Lords of Mannors, 
and all poor People may build upon, 
and plant the Commons. . . . 

The Lords of Manors cannot compel their tenants of copyholds to come 
to their court, Barons, nor be of their Juries, nor take a loyalty 
oath because the Commonwealth and Engagement have ended these practices. 
The Lords of Manors cannot compel their tenants to beat the common people 
for using the common land. To do so would break the Engagement. 
Winstanley believed that the law abolishing monarchy and making 
England a Commonwealth had destroyed "Norman power." The old laws 
are no longer in force; the land of England is and "ought to be a 
common treasury to all Englishmen." 

The Engagement was an oath of loyalty to the new commonwealth 
and support of abolition of the monarchy. He equated the Engagement 
with the treatment—equality and morality—God expected of all men. 
The Engagement confirmed the Commonwealth and law abolishing the 
monarchy. If the Lords and tenants try to assert right to the 
common land, then they have broken the Engagement. Winstanley 
thought the common lands' improvement by the common people would be 
proof that England would be the elect, the country to lead the way to the
millennium. He wrote:

England to be the first of Nations, or the
tenth part of the City of Babylon, which
falls off from the covetous beastly
Government first . . . .

Those who imprison or put to death their fellow Englishmen is not
warranted by the Engagement nor provided by the freedom of the Common-
wealth. The English ought to have

equal freedom by the Law of Righteousness.

This freedom in the common earth, is the poorer's
right by the Law of Creation and equity by the
Scriptures, for the earth was not made for a
few, but for whole Mankind, for God is no
respector of Persons.

Perhaps Winstanley gave his strongest support for the Common-
wealth in his pamphlet, England's Spirit Unfoulded or An Incouragement
to Take the Engagement. The entire pamphlet was written to urge
people to take the Engagement oath to the Commonwealth. The Engagement
was instituted to legitimatize the Commonwealth government since
the King had been executed and the monarchy and the House of Lords
abolished. In 1649 after the execution of Charles, the republican
regime had introduced an oath or "Engagement" of allegiance to the
government be taken. In 1649 the oath was restricted to members of
parliament and office holders. In 1650 the Engagement was extended to
the entire male population.

Winstanley was aware of the pamphlet controversy about the proper
grounds for taking the Engagement. He described "the great dispute
is about the Engagement." He does not cite any of the pamphleteers
in his justification of the Engagement. Some writers, such as Rous
and many others, justified the Engagement on the grounds of providence. They cited the Biblical doctrine of St. Paul that required men to accept an established government as ordained by God. Therefore, the Commonwealth should be accepted because its de facto nature reflected its divine status. Another major defense of the Engagement was based on the writings of Anthony Ascham, particularly of the *Confusions and Revolutions of Governments*. Ascham suggested that an essential duty of any government is the preservation and protection of our society. If a government had a capacity to offer protection to its citizens, it was entitled to obedience. There was a necessity of government to avoid confusion and preserve order.

Winstanley did not refer to either of these arguments in his justification of the Engagement. His argument was based on the belief that the Engagement promised to abolish the condition of land inequality. By the Engagement all Englishmen were to be restored to their creation right, thereby making England a common treasury to all without respect to persons. He cited the abolition of the monarchy and the establishment of the Commonwealth as promising that all Englishmen would be freed from the Norman Conquest and kingly power abolished. Moreover, he suggested that people took the Engagement for another reason. By eliminating the King and the House of Lords, the Commonwealth government gave full liberty to all sorts of people to choose their representatives. Unlike the King and House of Lords, the House of Commons would not become tyrannical because its representatives would be permitted to sit only successively being elected. Persons would not be allowed to occupy parliamentary seats indefinitely. If they were not reelected, the representatives in
the House of Commons should willingly vacate their seats. If representatives try to perpetuate their seats, they would corrupt Commonwealth government and violate the Engagement. Winstanley suggested that the corruption of a particular man who was perpetually occupying governing positions was a general condition to be guarded against. The Commonwealth government represented a government by our equals chosen by the people for a specified time.

Winstanley explained the consequences of taking the Engagement by making a distinction between the Norman Yoke and the restoration of men to before the Fall. He criticized tithing priests, Lords of Manors, lawyers, Impropriators, and usurers for refusing to take the Engagement. They sought by their refusal to preserve the kingly power of the Norman Yoke. The taking of the Engagement would only strip these people of the power they secured from the Norman Yoke. If this power were ended, these people would become "equall to other Englishmen their bretheren . . . ." The Engagement would abolish the Norman Yoke and the powers originating from the conquest; it would not restore men to their divine innocency before the Fall. Those who refused to take the Engagement would not lose any of their "creation rights." Winstanley defined "creation right" as the land of England shall become a common treasury without respect to persons. Winstanley noted that even Cavaliers could have "equal freedom with others" because they are Englishmen. Those who refused to take the Engagement do because they are subject to the kingly covetous power within.

The foregoing description of twelve of Winstanley's pamphlets indicated his political theory had strong continuity based on equality,
and morality of the first segment. The concern of his political theory was not with political obligation to government. He never conceived of any such problem because to him the dimensions of the problem were part of the cosmic conflict between good and evil. Instead of political obligation, Winstanley was interested in immoral obligation and how it could be completely abolished. His conception of government was authoritarian; he appealed for government and the army—anyone in authority—to assist the Diggers by granting the common land to the poor. In these twelve pamphlets he did change his view of government from that of the previous five. Government was ordained by God; it can and would carry out his divine purpose for mankind. He had no conception of any mechanism to restrain the power of government as did the Levellers.

His ambivalence toward government in his pamphlets was his belief that government instituted by men was a mixture of selfish desires and moral drives. The selfish desires were present in his description of the legal system as the means of preservation of property. Most laws were a means “to enslave the poor to the rich.” English law had promised justice, but men used it to control the earth. He described such law as the Law of Covetousness which frightens people into obeying it by prisons, whip, and gallows; such law was of the “kingdom of the Devil.” The law was based on such covetousness that the client who seeks righteousness from the law gets only “a hardnesse of heart and cruelty against our fellow creature.” The law was not based on God's commandment to love and preserve one's fellow creatures. The law was based on every man saving himself without
regard to his fellow creatures. The lawyer bought and sold justice to
the highest bidder. The lawyer would promise his client he could get
justice by spending money to present his case in court. Such clients
would be abandoned when they became beggars as a result of their ap-
peals.  He pictured England legally as follows:

England is a Prison; the variety of
subtleties in the Laws preserved by the
Sword, are bolts, bars, and doors of the
prison; the Lawyers are the Jaylors, and
poor men are the prisoners; for let a man
fall into the hands of any from the Bailiffe
to the Judge, and he is either undone, or
wearie of his life.  

He advocated transformation of the law by basing it on the moral
nature of men. This was the basis of his appeal to parliament to cast
out law which pretends love to all but is faithfull to none. Unless
equality of the earth was established, law would only be "Club-Law." This equality was the basis of the new government he advocated. This is
what he means when he says:

Old Whores, and Old Laws, picks men pockets
and undoes them: If the fault lie in the
Laws, and much does, burn all your old Law-
Books in Cheapside, & set up a new Wine into
old Bottles; but as your Government must be
new, so let your Laws be new.  

If the people would cast out the kingly power of the Lords of Manors
over the common land, covetousness would be ended and the people would
live in love towards each other.  

Winstanley thought that the moral nature of man and the abolition
of property could be the new basis of government. The allegation that the
Diggers opposed all government was untrue. He wanted to make government
more righteous. The parliament and army seemed to believe that the
common people

would have no government; truly Gentlemen,
We desire a righteous government with all
our hearts, but the government we have gives
freedom and livelihood to the Gentrie, to have
abundance, and to lock up the Treasures of the
Earth from the poor, so that rich men may have
chests full of Gold and Silver, and houses full
of Corn and Goods to look upon; and the poor
that works to get it, can hardly live, and they
cannot work like Slaves, then they must starve.
And thus the Law gives all the Land to some part
of mankind whose Predecessors got it by conquest,
and denies it to others, who by the righteous
Law of Creation may claim an equal portion; and
yet you say this is a righteous government, but
surely it is no other but selfishness, which is
the great Red Dragon, the Murtherer.\(^\text{137}\)

A fundamental difficulty plagued the political theory of Winstanley
of which his view of the government was only a reflection. He thought
that morality and immorality existed in both men and institutions.
There were never any guidelines on how to distinguish what specific
effects of immorality were the result of institutions and what aspects
of immorality were the consequence of the nature of individual men and
not assisted by institutions. His emphasis on the importance of landed
property and how it had to be abolished before men could restore them-
selves to their condition before the Fall suggested that immorality was
rooted only there. He wrote:

\textit{Particular Propriety, which is the cause of
all wars, bloodshed, theft, and enslaving
Laws, that hold the people under miserie.}\(^\text{138}\)

Yet, he also described the cosmic struggle between good and evil
and suggested the following:

\textit{this coming in of Bondage . . . First within
the beast, by filling it with the slavish
fear of others. . . .}\(^\text{139}\)
Immorality occurred first in men so that immoral institutions were only a consequence. He described the beginning of inward selfishness as arising in the same manner as he had earlier in his five pre-digging pamphlets. He wrote:

Before the Fall . . . Man's... covetousness began to rise up in him, to kill the power of love and freedom in him . . . .

Winstanley never seemed to realize any ambiguity in this matter. His belief that morality and immorality could be realized by men in a self-evident or intuitive fashion was probably a hinderance. His problem was very similar to the chicken and egg controversy of which came first. If he thought immorality derived from institutions, then how could bad institutions get created by such moral men. If he thought immorality derived from individuals, then he could not explain how he could designate government as fundamentally moral. Without any criteria to distinguish individual and institutional immorality, Winstanley remained in difficulty. His increased emphasis on the immorality of the institution of landed property in his digging pamphlets left no means of explaining how landed property ever originated except by inordinately immoral persons. If such inordinately immoral persons existed, then the origin of immorality was in individuals, not in institutions.

His problem was relatively unchanged from his first five pamphlets. In his earlier pamphlets, he had failed to clarify while declaring immorality in both the individual and the church. His problem in the fifteen pamphlets was in some ways made worse by the emphasis on landed property and government support. There was no way his earlier view of
humans as basically moral with immoral aberrations could possibly explain landed property. Landed property had existed as long as man has been civilized. How could basically moral men create an institution with no moral aspects, an institution inherently immoral?
IV
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CHAPTER V

THE UTOPIA OF WINSTANLEY: THE LAW OF FREEDOM IN A PLATFORM

In 1651 Gerrard Winstanley's last pamphlet, The Law of Freedom in a Platform or, True Magistracy Restored, was published. The pamphlet was distinct from all his previous pamphlets in several ways. First, it was the only book length pamphlet written after the collapse of the digging venture in April of 1650. Secondly, the pamphlet was not written as an appeal for his readers to adopt common property and give the common people the common land. The pamphlet was written as a detailed platform addressed to Oliver Cromwell to establish England with the type of society Winstanley thought necessary to embody divine righteousness. Thirdly, the society he described was restructured so that institutional changes would eliminate the immoral conduct which had so consistently plagued mankind.

In his past pamphlets Winstanley had focused on exposing immoral conduct and trying to persuade others to abolish immoral practices. In The Law of Freedom, he designed a society based on equality and morality. He had greater space to delineate what constituted the nature of equality and morality he placed as a conceptual centerpiece of his political theory. The concept of morality remained as important as it had in his past pamphlets. Though Winstanley did not use the term equality, he presented equality and morality as linked. As in his past
pamphlets, he made no positive plea for equality but proposed men were equal in moral potentiality because of their divine origin. Men should treat each other based on merit; irrelevant criteria such as social status would be irrelevant. "The righteous Power in the creation is the same still."¹ He based his Commonwealth on the "Laws of Common Freedom." He described the great "Lawgiver of the Commonwealth" to be morality. He wrote:

The great Lawgiver in Commonwealth Government

Is the spirit of universal Righteousness dwelling in Mankinde, now rising up to teach every one to do to another as he would have another do to him, and is no respecter of persons. . . .²

His negative plea for treatment based on merit was also characteristic of all landed property being shared. This morality justified the common property characteristic of his new Commonwealth. He wrote:

. . . The Earth is my Birth-Right, as well as yours, and God who made us both, is no Respec ter of persons. . . .³

He described freedom to have the earth in common was part of his "Creation right."⁴ By such institutional changes, Winstanley thought men would fulfill "the righteous law of Christ." He wrote:

. . . can you be as ready to obey the law of liberty which is the command of Christ . . . in this common freedome, here will be food and rayment . . . for you and your brethren; so that none shall beg or starve, or live in the straits of poverty; this fulfils that righteous law of Christ, Do as you would be done by . . . .⁵
Winstanley again equated equitable moral conduct or morality and the law of reason. He described this law of righteousness as a "law of nature" which had either an "irrational" or "rational" character. He described the conduct of men as irrational or exhibiting inequitable social conduct.

... rashly, through a greedy self-love, without any consideration, like foolish children, or like the brutish beasts...

The laws of the Commonwealth were to restrain such irrationality.

When the law of nature was based on reason, Winstanley did not refer to the natural reason of men in which his dispassionate amoral intellect sought conclusions based on factual evidence. He wrote:

... this rises up in the heart... called the record on high; for it is a record in a mans heart above the former unreasonable power. And it is called the witness or testimony of a mans own conscience.

Winstanley offered the same criticism as in earlier pamphlets of landownership and buying and selling. He outlawed both in his society. He argued:

the righteous Spirit of the whole Creation did never enact such a law. That unless his weak and simple men did go ... and fetch Silver and Gold ... in their hands to their Brethren, and give it them for their good-will to let them plant the Earth and live and enjoy their livelyhood therein,... they should not have the use of the land.

To sanction such practices would have been inequitable social conduct and contrary to God. Instead, the Commonwealth should be based on the "principle of common Preservation." The principle of common preservation was to seek in "every one... the good of others, as himself, without
respecting persons.\textsuperscript{10} He defined Commonwealth government as "the
government of Righteousness and Peace, who is no Respec ter of persons.\textsuperscript{11} Winstanley noted that God was not partial but fair to all men.\textsuperscript{12} He thought men had morality by which they need to conduct themselves.

Alongside his conception of equality and morality, Winstanley presented the view that determinate needs were the foundation of the Commonwealth. In his digging pamphlets, his emphasis had been on securing the basic needs of the Diggers and the common people for food by cultivation of the earth. In this last work, he made only provisions in his Commonwealth for fulfilling basic needs which were readily known and finite. For example, he asked the question: "having food and raiment, lodging, and the comfortable societies of his own kinde; what can a man desire more . . . ?\textsuperscript{13} Such finite needs had a religious sanction:

\begin{quote}
\textit{does not Christ tell you, that if you have food and rayment you should therewith be content?}\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

Buying and selling was replaced by every person getting what he needed from the storehouses. The storehouses were to be common depositories of goods such as cloth, leather, and wool.\textsuperscript{15} The needs of all men would thereby be met; no man would be treated in a partial way by being denied goods because he could not pay for them. No man would own land; thereby, no man works for another. All contribute to the storehouses; all men would work at some trade or in agriculture. The employment of all in some useful activity insured all assisted in securing their basic needs. He provided employment for all as long
as they employed their "Talent in some bodily action, for the increase of fruitfulness, freedom, and peace in the Earth..." Teaching and law encouraged abstract impractical knowledge and encouraged people to be idle. Employment involving bodily activity was the basis of the range of options of work of people. For example, carpenters and musical instrument makers involved bodily activity and were approved. Professional musicians, however, were never mentioned because such activity involved no basic needs.

Winstanley thought these convictions of determinate needs were to be realized by equality and morality as the guideline. For example, his preference for employment in which people engage in bodily activity and provide some practical service applicable to everyday life meant no person could engage in scholarly work. He thought lawyers and teachers lived by making abstractions and depended on the labor of other men. Each man was to participate bodily in work so no man would have an inequitable advantage of an occupation like law. People were to be given titles of honor for inventions, industry, or election to offices, but not idle occupations. Idleness would lead some men to oppress others and seek to establish themselves in inequitable advantages. Winstanley provided only monogamous marriage as the sole means to satisfy sex. He provided each family would be separate; sex outside marriage would not be available. Sex with a variety of women would be prohibited. If a man should impregnate an unmarried woman, he would marry her by law. Moreover, Winstanley saw no conflict between the needs of the individual and the needs of society because the conduct of both was to be based on his concept of morality. Sex
for the confirmed bachelor was not foreseen.

Perhaps Winstanley was the most consistent in retaining the problem of whether immorality or inequitable social conduct was a consequence of institutions or institutions a consequence of immorality in his political theory. In his pre-digging pamphlets he had castigated the clergy as fostering immorality among the people by its teachings. The immorality fostered by the clerical institutions was so prevalent to require the abolition of churches before men could be restored to their pre-Fall innocence. In his digging pamphlets, he emphasized landed property prevented the restoration of men to their prelapsarian innocence. At the same time, Winstanley depicted immoral conduct as attended by an immoral internal state rooted in the heart of every man. Indeed he described both as enabling men to Fall from the moral practices mankind had so universally practiced. Man's heart was like the bottomless pit from which the Biblical Beast of Revelations came. Like man's heart, the pit was bottomlessness, there being no end to man's taste and practice for immoral mischief.

They that live upon the outward objects are filled with inward trouble.23

He wrote:

... out of Mankinde arises all that darknesse and Tyranny that oppressest it selfe ... 24

Winstanley described the Fall of man as reenacted in each man during the process of growing up. Childhood was a period of original innocence without covetousness. He wrote:
Looke upon a childe that is new borne, or till he growes up to some few years, he is innocent, harmelesse, humble, patient, gentle, easie to be entreated, not envious; And this is Adam, or mankinde in his Innocency; and this continues till outward objects intice him to pleasure, or seeke content without him; And when he consents, or suffers the imaginary Covetousnesse within to close with the objects, Then he falls, and is taken captive, and falls lower and lower.25

Thus, Winstanley argued that immoral conduct determined internal covetousness.

In The Law of Freedom, Winstanley appeared to have resolved his confusion by his statement that both kinds of immorality were the result of institutions. He wrote:

I am assured that if be rightly searched into, the inward bondages of the minde, as covetousnesse, pride, hypocrisie, envy, sorrow, fears, des­peration, and madness, are all occa­sioned by the outward bondage, that one sort of people lay upon another.26

On the basis of the premise that specific institutions cause immorality, he eliminated the following: the abolition of landed property and its replacement by common property and the elimination of the clergy, tithes, the church, and lawyers. He provided for legal safeguards by requiring for state compulsion against covetous practices. For example, he provided for common property, but no person would be allowed to be idle or beg for a living. No person would be allowed to have indiscriminate copulation with women; every man's family would be
private and each man's wife. The first offense of idleness was to be admonition from a Commonwealth officer or overseer, the second offense the idler was to be whipped, and the third offense the idler was to be placed under forced labor for one year. The crime of rape was punished by state execution of the rapist. If any person should attempt to reinstitute landed property or buying and selling, he would be executed for his first offense. Persons who made their living as clergymen would be executed. By outlawing these practices Winstanley was avoiding the immorality which attended these practices. He provided for Commonwealth officers to be "fit officers" by which he meant they would be "free from covetousness." These officers by freedom for covetousness were unlikely to interfere with the established laws of the Commonwealth; they were unlikely to make their laws the usurped law of the land. Parliament was not allowed to make legal interpretation because the law was to be so simply written as to be self-evident. Passage of laws was to occur after a one month referendum during which citizens could comment; it no objections to the law were received the laws were to be passed by parliament. By this means, the presence of covetousness in the law could be detected and the law changed. The citizens were less likely to be covetous than the members of parliament. He proposed that members of parliament who try to advance self-interest into a free Commonwealth will be discovered and expelled from office.

Winstanley provided for restraints in his officeholding arrangements. For him immorality was inequitable social conduct. Why did he these restraints were necessary unless immorality survived in the
nature of men? A person free from covetousness could acquire it as a consequence of officeholding. Although men may seek the freedom of others as their own, when they first take office the honors and greatness of the position soon resulted in them becoming selfish and no longer seeking common freedom. He thought this tendency for the office to corrupt fit men could be corrected by requiring that all Commonwealth officers be elected to annual terms. He thought officers serving annual terms would be less likely to attempt an oppression because this would be apparent to their successors. Moreover, when one official of the Commonwealth no longer is guided by moral equality because he is blinded by his covetousness, an unblinded subordinate may tell him where he has "gone astray." Why do you need restraints, such as a subordinate spotting your immorality or annual terms, unless some aspect of immorality survived in the heart of men?

Winstanley provided for a whole series of moral institutional arrangements: common property, storehouses instead of buying and selling, a simple court system, and a parliament. Despite his design, he provided for punishment for stealing, idleness, attempted landownership, practicing clergy, and rape. Why would punishments be necessary if all the institutions were moral based on Winstanley's design? The only explanation which makes sense was that he believed men even in a moral institutional setting still have the capacity in their nature to commit immoral acts. Otherwise why would he even suspect that a man might try to establish landed property. He described the harshness of the Commonwealth laws as necessary because of the fact all men are not
moral. He wrote:

the spirit in Mankind is various within it self; for some are wise, some are foolish, some idle, some laborious, some rash, some milde, some loving and free to others, some envious and covetous, some of an inclination to do as they would have others do to them; but others seek to save themselves, and to live in fulness, though others perish for want . . . . 36

The law was added to restrain immoral persons.

Winstanley's provisions for limitations on the power of his Commonwealth government also suggested he feared the development of immorality from the nature of men. He proposed that if men held office for a long period of time they might become covetous. Therefore all members of parliament were limited to annual terms. 37 His belief that law in his Commonwealth should not be interpreted by anybody was rooted in his conviction that the Commonwealth laws were rooted in a morality of a self-evident character. He required that only the "bare letter of the law" be enforced and judges not be allowed to interpret the law. Interpretation allowed them to substitute their own will for moral equality. 38 Any official of his Commonwealth, except parliament, who interpreted the law would be permanently banned from officeholding. 39 The laws of his Commonwealth would be short and simple. They would be in English, not in the Latin and French which had preserved ignorance of the law among his contemporaries. 40 Moreover, the legal profession was to become illegal; lawyers would be executed as traitors to the Commonwealth. 41 He thought the absence of lawyers would lessen litigation because he thought much of the contention among
men was encouraged by lawyers so they could earn a great deal of money by buying and selling justice. If the laws were simply stated, the contention among persons about law would decrease because each man would know the law. In order to correct ignorance of the law, Winstanley created a Commonwealth official or minister in each parish. This official was to read the Commonwealth laws to the parish congregation at least four times a year. Thus, despite Winstanley's conviction, the law of his Commonwealth as based on morality would have a self-evident character; he provided for the means to increase knowledge of law and limit the power of the lawmaker. His caution was based on the conception men would act selfishly. Could it be Winstanley retained a lingering belief in original sin?

Winstanley's conception of the origin of government underlies this basic confusion. His description gives no hint as to why restraints on government were necessary. In his earlier writings he did say that government or magistracy was ordained by God and was to fulfill all men in a moral fashion. He wrote:

True Government . . . that I long for is the power, Authority, and government of the King of righteousnesse rule over all . . . .

In The Law of Freedom he depicted the origin of government as based solely on morality. Government originated in the family with the relationship of father and his children. But Winstanley's view was not a patriarchal view but was based on paternal morality. Adam held the joint position of governor and father because he embodied "common preservation." Adam was the strongest for labor and the most qualified
to fulfill the "law of necessity" of planting the earth for the common preservation of his household. Adam sought the common preservation of his children and taught them to plant the earth. His children lacked any experience; they were weak and simple. Winstanley depicted the children as consenting to their father acting as their governor. The children of Adam "might not speak, yet their weakness and simplicity did speak." Adam was chosen in that fashion. Consequently, Winstanley argued the father of each family in his proposed Commonwealth should become an officer of the Commonwealth because of policy of force. Like Adam, the father of each family would be chosen because "the Necessity of the young children choose him by a joynt consent . . . ." Winstanley described the operation of government as primarily moral. He depicted his Commonwealth as having a paternal government which would seek to "help the weak and foolish." Just as Adam had been, each subsequent governor was bound to implement the Golden Rule. His Law of Common Preservation on which the Commonwealth was based was the Golden Rule. The Law of Common Preservation should be the basis of all particular laws. This Law of Common Preservation was written into the heart of every man by God to be a guide to his conduct. Each man could fulfill the law by "seeking the good of others as himself without respecting persons." The work of all governors was to uphold this law which would preserve the peace of all and to cast out all self-ended principles and interest which represented tyranny and oppression. The Commonwealth government should make provision for the oppressed, weak, and simple by allowing freedom of the earth for all. This
government will not depend on the will of any single man but the spirit of mankind or son of righteousness. The great lawgiver of Commonwealth government was the spirit of universal righteousness dwelling in mankind which was rising up to teach everyone the Golden Rule without respect to persons. The Commonwealth would abolish all laws or customs which deny brethren freedom of the earth. This government restored lost freedom by casting out oppressions brought on mankind by kings, Lords of Manors, lawyers, landlords, and the clergy.51

The assumption underlying Winstanley's description of the restraints on government was that consent was an important consideration. However, his portrayal of the origin and operation of government suggested that government originated in the family. How can children in any family consent to the father as governor? What is the alternative? He described it as follows:

... this Law was so clearly written in the hearts of his people, that they all consented quietly to any counsel he gave them for that end.52

The problem exemplified in this quote was Winstanley used the word consent as if men were choosing alternatives. Does Winstanley mean by consent the people have some restraint on government? Can they withhold their consent? His description of the origin of government denied any. He never described the children in a family as consenting to the father's rule but rather "the necessity of the young children" was the basis of the father becoming the basis of the state. This necessity arose because the father was the only person equipped to exercise the moral guidance and take care of the children. This was not consent but
another way of saying government arose out of the necessity for moral
guidance of the father.

In constructing his Commonwealth, Winstanley violated his own
conception of morality in the case of the lowest office of Commonwealth.
His view of morality required men to conduct themselves in an impartial
fashion. Each person should be treated according to his merit. For
example, all men should share the earth in common; all men were of
some moral worth in sight of God. For example, Winstanley provided
that men would be awarded "titles of honor" not based on parentage but
on performance. A man could get a title by officeholding, industry,
or discovery of a secret of nature. Winstanley outlawed unearned
social status by this provision, but he provided for fathers of the
family to be the lowest officers of the Commonwealth. In order for each
person to become a father who served a master teaching his trade to his
children, each person or child had to serve a seven-year apprenticeship.
After this the man would become a freeman and master of his own household.
Then he would be entitled to have servants assigned to his family.
Thus, Winstanley kept the same social status of freeman and servant
which characterized his seventeenth century England. He never explained
why the practice was not immoral. Why is it not unfair for the servant
to work for the master? While the servant child was serving his appren-
ticeship, his life was controlled by the master. He was not allowed to
marry or to fornicate with women. He was not even allowed to leave his
master's premises without his permission. Thus by means of this appren-
tice system Winstanley provided the means for the father to engage in
inequitable social conduct.
A similar contradiction existed in his preferences for older men to hold Commonwealth offices. This violated his belief that all men had potentiality for equitable social conduct. Only men over forty years of age were to be eligible to be chosen Commonwealth officers. All men over sixty years of age were to be elders. These elders were to act as troubleshooters if they saw any neglect of duty in the Commonwealth. They were to see the "Laws carefully executed." All Commonwealth officers were to assist and protect them. Winstanley said such men were older and more experienced. His preference for older men was based on the assumption of their greater resistance to immorality.

One possible explanation for Winstanley's conviction that his Commonwealth had immoral potentialities was his continued millenarianism. His Commonwealth was an interim measure until the restoration of men to their pure innocence before the Fall. The same millenarianism as in his Digger writing is in The Law of Freedom. In The True Leveller Standard Advanced, the first pamphlet written after he began his digging venture, he wrote:

... now the time of Deliverance is come
... stout-hearted Covetousness ...
must come down, and be lord of the
Creation no longer; For now the King
of Righteousness is rising to Rule In,
and Over the Earth.59

He appealed to his readers to let the common people use the common land and thereby God would be merciful to them. Winstanley thought the Commonwealth signified coming perfection of men. He regarded Cromwell
as acting as God's instrument to bring about the Second Coming. He warned Cromwell that if he should not fulfill his role as God's instrument and the Commonwealth would not be established, then the immoral society of seventeenth century England would be destroyed by God. This immoral society would represent the half day of the Beast as foretold in Revelations. The millennium could not be reached unless his Commonwealth was established first. The choice was between destruction and being part of "the coming Reformation of the world." Winstanley described his Commonwealth for his readers as follows:

This Platform of Government . . . is the Original Righteousness and Peace in the Earth . . . it begins to have his Resurrection, despise it not while it is small.

In the first thirteen pages addressed to Cromwell, Winstanley described him as like the Biblical Moses leading the Israelites. His contemporary England was the Egyptian Pharaoh and Cromwell, like Moses, would free the English by implementing his Commonwealth. Cromwell could free the English from buying and selling, tithes, clergy, lawyers, and landed property. Moreover, Winstanley suggested that Cromwell not force anyone to accept his Commonwealth. The commons, waste, parks, forests, and chase land of all willing to try a new society would be used in common in the new society. Those who did not want to try the new society "let them stay in the way of buying and selling . . . till they be willing. . . ." Winstanley proposed that if the Commonwealth be implemented into law by Cromwell "then we or our posterity shall see the comfortable effects."
England would act as a kind of moral vanguard. If England adopted his proposed Commonwealth, then it would be the leader of nations and other nations would seek to learn how it had achieved "peace and plenty." He suggested that England would be like the Biblical David who desired rather to be a doorkeeper in righteousness than continue to live in the tents of wickedness. Like Israel, England would become a "Gospel-commonwealth" which represented "perfect freedom." England would simply adopt the mode of living of Biblical Israel. After the tribes of Israel had conquered the Canaanites, they made the land a common treasury of livelihood to all the tribes so that no begging or want existed. They did not divide the land so that some were Lords of Manors and others poor. The land became common stock so that all tribes and families had freedom in the Commonwealth. He compared his Commonwealth to Moses and Joseph in Pharaoh's Court because it was the "moderator of oppression." His proposed Commonwealth government would unite all people into one heart and mind, just as Moses described the many tribes and families of Abraham as one house of Israel.

Such a description by Winstanley of his Commonwealth as an interim stage before the millennium leads to the question: If the Commonwealth is not the millennium, what is it? His Commonwealth can best be described as a utopia. A utopia has three major characteristics. First, it is a proposal for an ideal society by transformation of the structure of society. Secondly, utopia was to be implemented by men, not God. Thirdly, utopia was based on the assumption that men are imperfectible and capable of immoral actions. Utopias are founded on the realization of "deficiencies in the nature of man" and provided the means "to contain
and condition them through organizational sanctions." Institutional restraints were the method of restraining imperfectibility. Thus can utopia be distinguished from millenarianism. Millenarianism was based on the beliefs in the perfectibility of man and the conviction God had predetermined events to bring about a millennium.77

The earlier pamphlets of Winstanley have both millenarian characteristics. In his first pamphlet, he believed that in being a pamphlet writer he was an emissary carrying out the will of God. He emphasized men had to wait for the coming millennium. Unlike many of his contemporaries, he had no conception of an ethereal or heavenly place of abode. For example, in The Breaking of the Day of God, he described the millennium as earthly. Moreover, he depicted the millennium as being brought about solely by the action of God. He compared its coming to the earthquake foretold in the Book of Revelations 11:13.78 In his digging pamphlets, he emphasized the role of the Diggers as serving as witnesses in the imminent millennium. The idea of digging was the result of a series of visions by Winstanley. In The New Law of Righteousness, Winstanley described the type of society which God would establish in the millennium. He recounted mankind would become like one family without any conflict. There would be no oppression, no complaining, or even unhappiness. No conflict or wars of any kind would exist and material abundance would be available to all.79

But in his description of the Commonwealth, all three characteristics of utopia are present. Previously his belief that Cromwell could implement his Commonwealth has been described. Winstanley addressed Cromwell in his introduction to The Law of Freedom; he characterized his
society as a platform from which Cromwell should discern what was worth implementing. As he addressed Cromwell, "... be as industrious Bee, suck out the honey and cast away the weeds." His attitude was that here was the blueprint that Cromwell should implement. He wrote:

... the candle at your door, for you have power in your hand ... to Act for Common Freedome ... I have no power.81

Despite his statement, Winstanley had acted by writing *The Law of Freedom* which was based on the assumption men could change their social environments.

Such activism was related to another characteristic of the Commonwealth as a utopia; its complete transformation of society. The abolition of landed property and the common sharing were examples of these changes. The Commonwealth would be based on making the earth and its fruits a common treasury.82 England would become a cooperative society in which the cultivation of the earth would be undertaken by the labor of all and both agricultural and artisan products would be shared. By law, all land would be common including crown land, abbey land, bishop land, parks, forests, chases, common and waste land.83 The use of money, renting land, hiring others, or riches would be banned. Money encouraged men to have no regard for the Golden Rule. Since all own the earth, no man should rent land or work for another.84 Men earned their riches by the work of all; therefore, their riches were shared by all. Moreover, riches made men "vain-glorious, proud and to oppress their Brethren ... ."85 All of these practices would be replaced by public storehouses which would supply the agricultural and artisan goods of everyone in
exchange for their labor. He thought these storehouses would prevent the starvation of any person. Only covetous, proud, or beastly minded men would desire more than they needed from the storehouses. He expected the storehouses to "kill covetousness and oppression." By providing for the needs of everyone, the storehouses fulfilled the righteousness law of Christ of doing unto others as you would be done by. Each family would be part of a common effort in sowing, tending, and harvesting the earth. The pay of each person would be access to the common stock in the storehouses in exchange for his labor. When the effort of everyone was not necessary in agriculture, people would return to their other trades of making hats, woolen cloth, or iron. All of these manufactured goods and food would be deposited by their producers in storehouses located in their places of residence. If any person wanted any of these commodities, he would come to the storehouse and take whatever he wanted to his family. For example, if a person needed a horse for travel, he could take one from the common stables. Butter and cheese could be procured from public dairies. Meat could be procured from common herds of livestock.

Such restructuring was accompanied by indications of Winstanley's belief in the imperfectibility of man. His provision for institutional restraints was based on his recognition that the perfection of the millennium was not possible. He said that Commonwealth law was necessary because men vary in their motivations and some pursue only their selfish interests. His requirement that men who practice landholding, the trade of clergyman or lawyer, and buying and selling be executed exemplified this. He thought institutions cause immorality. Why then would
people try to practice any of these? Why have gradations in punishments, such as reproach, whipping, and forced labor for offenses such as stealing and idleness unless you think the offenses will be frequent and prevalent? Winstanley even provided punishments for gossiping with neighbors, striking a Commonwealth officer, or striking one's neighbor.\textsuperscript{91}

Thereby Winstanley gave his Commonwealth a vigilant character because human conduct can be substantially less than the moral conduct he desired. This is what made Winstanley's Commonwealth a utopia—he provided for an ideal institution to become part of society. These institutions were based on the goal of the coming millennium for mankind. But Winstanley viewed the institutional restraints as necessary because of the current imperfectibility of men.

The frequent characterization of utopia as unreal and unrelated to space and time is in the case of Winstanley's Commonwealth unfounded. Like all utopians, he sought to combine his concern to visualize a society which has not been realized and his selection of how aspects of society were to be reorganized.\textsuperscript{92} Winstanley patterned some of the ideal institutions and their functions from those of his seventeenth century England.

One example was the provision for the father as political officer in his Commonwealth. The chief basis of his Commonwealth was the family. Since he had regarded government as originating with Adam as father, he made the father an official of the Commonwealth. The father was to function as the master of each family and his children were to be his apprentices. Every family was to share land communally with the other ones but their house and the goods they had selected from the common stock
were their possessions. Those who tried to make the wife and children or his home common property violated the laws of the Commonwealth.\textsuperscript{93} Marriage would be based on mutual consent of man and woman.\textsuperscript{94} He wanted the children of each family "trained up in subjection to parents and elder people more than now they are . . . ."\textsuperscript{95} The major aspect of this subjection was that the father in each family was to educate his children in the trade of which he was master. If the children should desire to learn a trade different from the father, they would be assigned to another family. Moreover, the father was to instill in each child the importance of work. If the children were idle, he was to whip them. Each father was to raise his children so they would be obedient to the Commonwealth by complying with the Golden Rule.\textsuperscript{96} Winstanley required that each child would become a father and master of his own family by serving a seven year apprenticeship. Then, he would become a freeman and master of his household. Thus, he would be entitled to have servants assigned to his family.\textsuperscript{97}

Winstanley thus preserved features of the seventeenth century English family in which education and economics had been combined by the apprentice system. The English family included more than just husband, wife, and their children. The family included children and adolescents who were not blood relatives but part of the family because they were apprentices to the father or master of the family in order to learn a trade. These apprentices were under the same supervision of the master of the family as his own children. Until they completed their apprenticeship, they were not allowed to marry. Moreover, in the households of Lords of Manors and yeomen, the children
of the husbandmen, cottager, laborer, or craftsman might serve as servants. The father or master of the family agreed to supply his apprentices with instruction in his trade and lodging and clothing. The apprentices in exchange were obliged to obey the master and be his unpaid workers. The apprentice agreed in his seven year agreement with the master not to patronize ale houses and taverns nor play cards or dice. He must not commit fornication with any woman. The apprentice was not allowed to be absent from the household during the day or night except with the permission of the master.

Winstanley also preserved this apprentice system by his creation of overseers for trades. In each town, city, or parish, these Commonwealth officials would function as a supervisor of education in each family and occupation. Winstanley provided for an overseer of trades to perform the same educational function of the seventeenth century English overseer. Every overseer was to see that each master of each family taught a trade and the secrets of nature to his young people. One overseer would check every house to see that no youth was idle. He would also transfer youth from one trade to another trade he preferred with the consent of the father to the household of another master. The overseer would also see that if the father or master were dead, weak, sick, or "naturally foolish," the children would be transferred to other families where they would be educated. The overseers would require every man to serve his seven year apprenticeship and learn his trade before he was eligible to become master of a family. When a man qualified to become a freeman, the overseers would determine what servants and young people would become part of
his household. He would see that each family was furnished with sufficient working tools for common use, such as carts and plows. He would also ensure that barns privately owned and public storehouses owned by the parish were repaired. Overseers would supervise all aspects of the economy, both trades and agriculture. These agrarian overseers would see that each family contributed their labor for production to stock the storehouses. Each overseer was to be elected annually by the trade he supervised, but only freemen who had served their apprenticeship were eligible to vote.

Winstanley acknowledged that his Commonwealth overseers were based on the master or wardens of the London apprentice system. He described such London Companies as “very rational and well ordered government.” In developing the duties of the Commonwealth overseers, he had combined the London apprenticeship companies with the functions of the seventeenth century civil officials. According to the Great Poor Law of 1598, one of their primary duties was to supervise the children of the poor and see that they became apprentices. The overseers in each parish could require the children of all parish paupers to be apprenticed into domestic service and the crafts. The overseers could require any householder to take a pauper child as an apprentice by securing an order of the justice of the peace or the Court of Quarter Sessions. This apprenticing of orphans and paupers was to prevent these people from becoming beggars or vagabonds and being supported by the parish. Only children born in the parish or adult paupers were entitled to be either apprenticed or supported by that parish. Otherwise the overseer assisted by the constable was to whip any beggar or vagabond in the
public square and see that they left the parish in the direction of the parish of their birth. Winstanley required the entire population to serve apprenticeships. He had adopted the practice of the London Companies of restricting election of masters or wardens to the freeman of that company.

Winstanley also based another type of Commonwealth overseer on the seventeenth century parish overseer. He provided for the Commonwealth overseer to perform one of the functions of the English overseer as provided in the Great Poor Law of 1598. The English overseer was to provide a stock of raw material so that the unemployed poor would not become beggars but be usefully employed by using this raw material. The English overseers were to supervise the work of the poor on the raw materials he allotted them. The purpose of having this parish stock was not only to prevent begging but to reinstate some persons to employment. Industrious men who had been reduced to pauperism by misfortunes, such as fire or bad harvests, might be given money to buy their own raw material. The Commonwealth overseer of Winstanley was to supervise the common storehouses for the entire population. His overseers were to see that the storehouses were replenished. They were to supervise the clerks or keepers of the storehouses. They were to see that raw materials were available to everyone. These should have received commodities from those who make them and allow anyone who comes for items to have them. For example, tanned leather would be available to all without buying and selling. The overseer would admonish any employed in the storehouses or shops if they neglected their duties. The overseers would see that the keepers of the shops
and storehouses kept them in repair. If keepers did not perform their duties and refused to change after admonishment by the overseers and peacemakers, they would be legally punished by the judges.

The focus of Winstanley in creating the overseers, peacemakers, and fathers as Commonwealth officials was the small scale of seventeenth century parish and family life. Each Englishman was likely to conduct most of his activities within the family and the parish church. The master or father of the family was regarded as the focus of obedience. Most people rarely left the households of their master or father for any period of time unless they attended religious services conducted by the parish priest. Each parish priest taught every member of his congregation the catechism of the church. The catechism taught submission to authority as part of the Fifth Commandment honoring parents. The Puritan Catechism of 1644 also emphasized the importance of the Fifth Commandment as the basis of Christian obedience to authority. This Fifth Commandment was sometimes used by seventeenth century Englishmen to justify the obedience of the tenant for the Lord of the Manor. The parish church was the focus of information. Most families engaged in social intercourse by weekly church attendance. In a society in which social communication was largely oral, except for a small minority of educated, the parish priest was a major connection between the illiterate mass and the literate minority. The parish church also had the only library consisting of a Bible and devotional books for the use of parishioners.

Winstanley acknowledged this small scale and the importance of information the parish priests provided in his provision for the
postmaster and minister. They would replace the communication function of the parish minister. The Commonwealth minister would conduct parish meetings in which speeches would be made by parishioners. These speeches could describe the past oppression and well ordered government, nature of the arts and sciences, such as husbandry and astronomy, and the nature of mankind, such as his inward and outward bondages. Like the English parish church meetings, he thought the Commonwealth parish meeting would "preserve fellowship" among parishioners. The postmasters were officials in each parish whose function was to prepare a monthly account of the occurrences in the parish. All of these parish accounts were to be combined into a national account. The purpose of the circulation of news among parishes was to enlist aid in cases of natural disasters or insurrection and to share knowledge of any new inventions.

Why did Winstanley write his utopia? Why did he think men could realize such a millennium? They could realize the millennium because the major source of the inequitable social conduct Winstanley had consistently opposed was in landed property. Landed property had been eliminated in his Commonwealth. The provision for storehouses was to prevent the rise of future inequities among men; "the Storehouses shall be every mans substance and not any ones." All persons will be involved in cultivating the ground either as supervising as Commonwealth officers or as laborers. Thereby all contribute and use the storehouses. Laws against idleness are enforced because such a person engaged in conduct which placed him in an inequitable relationship with his fellow. The prohibition against buying and selling
was designed to prevent the rise of landed property and its attendant inequity. Both his preference for education using talent in some bodily action for the increase of the earth and his opposition to knowledge based on contemplation was based on a belief that thereby the Commonwealth would prevent idleness. Only by these means did Winstanley think "kingly government" could be prevented.

The conviction that property was the source of social oppression had been present in his pamphlets beginning with his digging pamphlets. He viewed the other institutions of society, such as the clergy and government, as based on preserving property. The pamphlet, The New Years Gift Sent to Parliament and Armie, had described kingly power as like a tree with the control which King Charles had over landed property being the root of the tree. The branches of the tree of the clergy had judges or bad laws and the power of the Lords of Manors were preserved by William the Conqueror's control of property.

Winstanley's political theory was based on this fundamental insight of socialism that the basic cause of social oppression is property. How else can Winstanley's critique against the clergy in his The Law of Freedom be understood. He characterized the clergy as using religious doctrine as a means of denying the claim of all men to landed property. The clergy was the chief means of deception in a society based on land inequality. The people were told by their ministers that they should not trust their own understanding of God and should accept the understanding of the ministers. The ministers promised the people they would be rewarded for belief in these doctrines by heaven and disbelief by hell. He pictured his contemporaries as follows:
Well, the younger brother being weak in spirit, and having not a grounded knowledge of the Creation, nor of himself, is terrified, and lets go his hold in the Earth, and submits himself to be a slave to his brother, for fear of damnation in Hell after death, and in hopes to get Heaven thereby after he is dead; and so his eyes are put out, and his Reason is blinded.

So that this divining spiritual Doctrine is a cheat; for while men are gazing up to Heaven, imagining after a happiness, or fearing a Hell after they are dead, their eyes are put out, that they see what is their birthrights, and what is to be done by them here on Earth while they are living. . . .

Religion was thereby a means of the clergy deceiving the people into becoming exclusively concerned about their fate after death and ignoring earthly oppression.

The clergy was an ally of the government in preserving property. They preached their doctrines in exchange for their tithes. Winstanley thought this joint cooperation had originated with William the Conqueror. William had granted tithes in exchange for the clergy preaching that he should be obeyed as lord of the earth. Winstanley believed that the English clergy had continued such cooperation. The clergy had deceived the people into believing that "true freedom" consisted of every man enjoying heaven after death instead of freedom of the earth. He also compared the English government's land inequality to the doctrine of predestination. The government had stolen the creation rights of the earth of some people of landed property. The government had acted as a God of the earth when it made some men pay rent for use of the earth, water, and air and allowed others to live at ease. The government thereby destined some men to be lords
of the earth and others their servants before either had committed
good or evil and were still in the womb. William had granted
tithes in exchange for the clergy preaching that William should be
obeyed and lord of the earth.

The concept of equality and morality was a much more fundamental
characteristic of his political theory. In his pre-digging pamphlets,
he had criticized the church for being based on an inequitable relationship in that the clergy was a necessary intermediary to God. Winstanley applied this conception to property in his pamphlet, *The Law of Righteousness*. Without his initial critique of the church and its alliance with the state based on equality and morality, Winstanley might never have arrived at his understanding of the role of property as the basis of all inequitable social relationships. Equality and morality represent the only unifying theme in all periods of his political theory—before the digging, during the digging, and the Commonwealth. Only after his digging community began did Winstanley's insight become progressively keener in viewing property as a means of preserving a social system. Both socialist and religious interpretations of Winstanley fail to regard his religious and political ideas as part of a theme. His political idea did not emerge out of his religious ideas. His political theory was present in his first and second pamphlets when he combined a conception of equality and morality and an anti-clericalism, both of which were focused on the social conduct of men.

Despite the contradictions and impractical suggestions in his political theory, there are important reasons for reading Winstanley.
First, the political theory of Winstanley reminded students of political theory that radical political ideas may originate in religious unorthodoxy not just in twentieth century ideologies. Of the political theorists of the seventeenth century, he gave the most thorough critique of property and organized religion as mutually supporting. He emphasized the relationship between equality and liberty. Secondly, he reminded us that men in their everyday life operate on a practical ethics much like his concepts of equality and morality. He regarded each man as wanting to be treated by his fellow men by an unvarying standard in which social status had no place. He never gave a clear presentation of the nature of this equitable treatment, but this attitude was and still is the basis of everyday ethics. Winstanley exemplified that religious zealotry if combined with a questioning of religious doctrines can become a routinized pursuit of radical ideas.
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APPENDIX I

CHRONOLOGY OF THE LIFE AND TIMES OF GERRARD WINSTANLEY

July 10, 1609 - Baptized at Wigan

April 10, 1630 - Apprenticed to Sarah Gater of Cornhill, widow of Samuel Gater of the Merchant Taylor's Company

Feb. 21, 1637 - Became a freeman

Sept. 28, 1640 - Married Susan King

Aug. 22, 1642 - Civil War began

1643 - Victim of economic depression

July 1646 - Civil War ended

Early 1648 - Mysterie of God published

May 20, 1648 - The Breaking of the Day of God published

Summer/Early Fall 1648 - Saints Paradise published

Oct. 16, 1648 - Truth Lifting Up Its Head published

Jan. 26, 1649 - The New Law of Righteousness published

Jan. 30, 1649 - King executed

March 17, 1649 - Monarchy abolished

March 19, 1649 - House of Lords abolished

April 1649 - Six residents of Cobham or Walton upon Thames appeared on St. George's Hill, Surrey

April 16, 1649 - H. Sanders sent information to Council of State about Diggers' intentions

April 26, 1649 - True Levellers Standard published

June 1, 1649 - Second manifesto, A Declaration from Poor Oppressed of England, issued

June 1, 1649 - Soldiers and locals raided Digger settlement
June 9, 1649 - A Letter to Lord Fairfax written complaining about raid

June 11, 1649 - A Declaration of the Bloudie and Unchristian Acting of William Star and John Taylor of Walton was published.

June 23, 1649 - Four suits against Diggers for trespass damages

July 11, 1649 - An Appeal to the House of Commons published

August 26, 1649 - A Watchword to the City of London and Armie published

Fall 1649 - Diggers left Drake's land and moved into Cobham Manor (Property of John Platt)

Oct. 10, 1649 - Council of State directed Lord Fairfax to send troops to support Justices of Peace

Nov. 28, 1649 - Attack on Diggers occurred; house and goods destroyed

Dec. 1649 - To his Excellency Lord Fairfax and Counsell of Warre published

Dec. 1649 - To my Lord Generall and his Counsell of War published

Jan. 1, 1650 - A New Year's Gift for Parliament and Armie published

Feb. 20, 1650 - A Vindication of those Whose... Diggers issued

March 19, 1650 - Fire in Bush published

Jan.-March 1650 - England's Spirit Unfolded issued

April 1650 - Week before Easter the digging venture ended

April 4, 1650 - A Letter to All That Are Friend to Universall Freedome and That Looke Upon the Digging issued

April 9, 1650 - A Humble Request issued

Early 1650 - A collected edition of theological works published; preface was written in Dec. 1649

1650 - Became a steward to prophetess Lady Elenor Douglas

Feb. 1651-2 - Law of Freedom in a Platform published

1660 - Ranter Laurence Claxton attacked Winstanley for taking tithes in Lost Sheep Found

Oct. 1660 - Alsworth sued Winstanley for 115 pounds promissory note which had been made when Winstanley was a merchant

Sept. 10, 1676 - Winstanley died; occupation listed as corn chandler; record is in burial register of Westminster Friends
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