

A Dissenter's view of Anglicanism and Establishment

Revd Dr Janet Wootton, Director of Studies for the Congregational Federation

One of my great heroes, Anna Laetitia Barbauld, wrote a number of satirical articles under the pseudonym 'A Dissenter', a title I am proud to adopt. Let me tell you some of the things she wrote about the Church of England.

She deplored its attempt to mix reformed and catholic theology and ecclesiology, and, above all, its establishment in law: 'let her keep her golden prebends, her scarfs, her lawn, her mitres. Let her dignitaries be still associated to the honours of legislation; and in our courts of executive justice, let her inquisitorial tribunals continue to thwart the spirit of a free constitution by a heterogeneous mixture of priestly jurisdiction. . . .'¹

She abhorred Britain's war with France, as unjust and unjustifiable. But she found the part played by national religion to be utterly unacceptable: 'an unjust war is in itself so bad a thing, that there is only one way of making it worse, and that is, by mixing religion with it.'² In a brilliant piece of satire, she provides the words for an honest prayer before war: 'God of love, father of all the families of the earth, we are going to tear in pieces our brethren of mankind, but our strength is not equal to our fury, we beseech thee to assist us in the work of slaughter Whatever mischief we do, we shall do it in thy name; we hope, therefore, thou wilt protect us in it. Thou, who hast made of one blood all the dwellers upon the earth, we trust thou wilt view us alone with partial favour, and enable us to bring misery upon every other quarter of the globe.'³

She describes the Church of England as a petulant mother-in-law, trying to prevent



the children, who are not her own, from enjoying their rights of natural inheritance from their father, the state. The word, 'Toleration' (as in religious toleration of non-conformists) incenses her: 'What you call toleration, we call the exercise of a natural and inalienable right.'⁴

Barbauld was a Unitarian, wife of a Huguenot refugee, who established schools for the poor in Suffolk and North London. She was among those who viewed the French Revolution and then the American Revolution as hopeful signs of the future. Both nations had successfully thrown off the shackles of monarchy and state religion and found freedom.

She highlights two major elements in the dissenting critique of the Church of England in particular and Anglicanism in general: its attempt to hold together Catholic and Reformed doctrine and ecclesiology, and its pretensions to the title of 'national Church' (which include establishment).

I want to look at both of these, and suggest that neither can be properly upheld. I am speaking as an English dissenter,

from the heritage of dissent in this country, to the Church of England specifically – not the Anglican Communion generally.

Establishment

Let's deal with Establishment first. This is the element of the Church of England that most rankles with nonconformist and non-religious people alike.

What is breathtaking is the assumption that most people in England really want an established Church. I was the representative of the Congregational Federation on Churches Together in Britain and Ireland (CTBI, formerly the Council of Churches for Britain and Ireland, CCBI) from its inception in 1990 for about a decade. And I can remember having a discussion about disestablishment with Archbishop Habgood during a tea break at one of the gatherings. I was staggered by his seemingly casual assumption that I was speaking for a small and culturally ignorant minority.

Habgood states something of this in his much-quoted letter to the *Times* on 30th January 1993, where he makes the two points that: 'beyond the ranks of the regular week-by-week Anglican churchgoers, there are millions who instinctively regard the Church of England as "our Church" and who seek its ministry'; and 'for the most part members of other Christian Churches, and indeed of other faiths now present in this country, are not in favour of disestablishment', going on to say that, 'their leaders often see the fact of establishment as enabling the Church of England to be in the vanguard of action with them or on their behalf on matters of common concern.'⁵

Quite apart from the evidence, which stacks up against these statements, their cultural imperialism is amazing. For four hundred years, the Church of England has presented itself as the Christian version of the State. For many of those years, non-Anglicans were excluded from the universities and from holding civic

office. What is surprising is not that generations grew up thinking that to be English was to be vaguely Christian, which meant Church of England, but that such a strong nonconformist voice was maintained despite this. This has not been the case in many other countries with national or established churches.

Hobson chronicles the current decline even in that folk-Anglicanism on the basis of church weddings and baptisms. He estimates that it has now fallen below 25% and asks at what point this loss of national consciousness should be admitted.⁶

But the colonisation of other English denominations and other faiths is utterly staggering! I have had one conversation with a member of another denomination, in which my interlocutor applauded the establishment of the Church of England on the basis that Habgood suggests. But the general attitude is a kind of hopeless shrug of the shoulders – much like the attitude of a family to Barbauld's overbearing mother-in-law.

Colin Buchanan's version of the simile, in *Cut the Connection*, is people embarrassed by a batty relative. Barbauld's analogy is a bit more angry than his. However, Buchanan also challenges the Archbishop's claim to a general consensus on establishment.

He refers to the Partners in Mission Consultation in 1981, in which the procedure was that 'external' partners made an initial response, which was then combined into a general report by consultation between external and internal partners. The sections of the report of the external partners quoted by Buchanan are highly critical of establishment, as 'a hindrance to the mission of the Church', which renders the Church 'unable to perform its prophetic ministry freely', and call for a break from the historic past of the Church of England.⁷

He goes on to comment: 'people from other denominations in England, and

The Modern Churchpeople's Union

General Secretary, Rev. Jonathan Clatworthy, MCU Office, 9, Westward View, Liverpool L17 7EE

☎ 0845 345 1909 ☎ +44 (0)151 726 9730 ✉ office@modchurchunion.org 🌐 www.modchurchunion.org

Registered charity no. 281573

from Anglican Provinces and other parts of the world simply cannot see how the present Church and State relationship can be defended. It is obvious, almost at sight, that it is an anachronistic and indefensible run-on from the past.⁸

Later, in the 1990s, I was part of the ecumenical group that gave evidence to the Royal Commission on the House of Lords chaired by Lord Wakeham. This was the result of some very interesting discussions within Churches Together in England. At first, and publicly, the Church of England claimed twenty five million members – about half the population of the British Isles! This was on the basis of recorded baptisms, and caused an outcry among Habgood's two 'supportive' constituencies.

Many faithful, almost life-long, members of non-Anglican churches had been baptised in their local Church of England as infants. And, of course, a huge number of the baptised now had nothing to do with Church or were inimical to it. Eventually, the figure was revised to include the number of 'members', though this is very hard to define in comparison with different ecclesiologies which count membership in different ways.

In any case, it came down to a rough statistical equality between Anglicans, Catholics and Free Churches (taken as a group), and a rising number of members of other faiths. So we made representation to the Commission that religious representation in the House of Lords, if, indeed, maintained, should be calculated according to a formula that took account of these figures.

Incidentally, what I think none of us foresaw at that time, though perhaps we should have, was the way the pattern would go in the then future. In the year 2000, Church of England attendance dropped below one million, while both the Catholic Church and Islam have increased in numbers. If we had gone along that path, would we now be revis-

ing the constitution of the House of Lords again?

Most denominations also made written representation to the Commission and, with the sole exception of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, came out *against* the status quo. The evidence is emphatically not that we are all tremendously grateful to the Church of England for taking the vanguard with us, *or on our behalf* in matters of common concern.

That is the point. This is not an argument about the House of Lords, but a refutation of the Anglican assumption that no-one really wants to see disestablishment. Of course we do! We agree with Hobson's view that, 'The Church of England, by its very nature, associates the Gospel of Jesus Christ with a sixteenth century ideal of national unity.'⁹ That is what Barbauld was satirising in the eighteenth century, and what the regicides rebelled against a century before.

Englishness

Just for a moment, look at our 'heritage' from a dissenter's point of view. The continental Reformation was greeted with enormous enthusiasm by many people in England, who saw it as the opportunity for a social and religious revolution. Unlike the later revolutions in France and America, this was neither secular nor deistic, but godly.

I was taught my basic history in a series of primary schools, including at least one Church school in the 1950s and 1960s. We learned about the course of the Reformation in England. We were told about a crazy period when some religious nutters murdered the King, and did away with Christmas. Their ring-leader was a monster called Oliver Cromwell, with his bully boy Roundheads. But cheer up children! Good old English moderation brought everyone to their senses again, the King was restored, and the Church of England has been our religion ever since.

I was beaten up in the playground for being a Congregationalist!

There is a kind of fury mixed with desperate longing in the writings of dissenters, as they were executed, imprisoned and excluded from church and state. In 1993, we commemorated the martyrdom of dissenters, Henry Barrow, John Penry and John Greenwood four hundred years earlier. For the commemoration, I wrote a song drawn pretty well word for word from the transcript of trial.¹⁰

Robert Browne's 1582 treatise, *Reformation without tarying foranie* lambastes the notion of a State Church. He calls for ecclesiastical reformation 'without tarying', in which the Church rules 'by a liuelie lawe preached and not by a ciuill lawe written', and complains that 'The Lordes kingdome must waite on your policie forsooth, and his Church muste be framed to your ciuill state.'¹¹

More than four hundred years later, we are still tarrying!

And there is a bitter sadness in the hymn of Richard Baxter written following the ejection of 2000 ministers from the Church of England in 1662 – a date fixed in our minds for that reason.¹²

Despite all this, tremendous religious advances were being made. It is astonishing that this side of English religious history is so overlooked. Far from Anglicanism representing Englishness, it could be argued that the burgeoning Free Churches of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries expressed the national spirit far more effectively, and have deeply influenced our national character and institutions.

The sixteenth to eighteenth centuries were full of innovation and experimentation. There was a plethora of dissenting movements, which developed different models of worship, authority, priesthood, mission and discipleship.

During the long years of exclusion from the two universities, Oxford and Cambridge, the dissenters set up Dissenting

Academies, which were of very high standard, and established educational criteria which had an influence on the development of learning in our own time. J. W. Ashley Smith debates the suggestion that, 'On the basis of the actual record of the academies it is possible . . . to point to the number of directions in which they anticipated modern university and sixth form practice, and to claim for them *the principle rôle* in creating modern English higher education.'¹³ This influence includes the study of English language and literature, the study of science based on experiment, and interactive teaching methods.

I benefited from these influences, not least as I did my theology degree at Mansfield College, Oxford, one of the nonconformist private halls (at that time), which stood ready to set up in the ancient universities once the restrictions were lifted. Incidentally, I took my first degree at St Hilda's College, and so became aware that women had been admitted to Oxford before nonconformists!

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, urbanisation and industrial revolution produced enormous populations of poverty-stricken and new middle class citizens who were unserved, at least initially, by traditional Anglican parishes. The nonconformist churches rushed into these communities, with evangelising zeal and social concern. My own former church, Union Chapel in Islington, mirrored these developments in its own story, having started as a house-church run by evangelical non-conformists and Anglicans in that fast-growing London suburb.¹⁴

The nonconformist conscience, sharpened by contact with poverty and wealth-generation (as opposed to paternalistic land-ownership) led major political reforms. We have just commemorated the bi-centenary of the abolition of the Atlantic slave trade – you know, Wilberforce and Newton! The Anglican establishment challenging the State to end an injustice.

The Modern Churchpeople's Union

General Secretary, Rev. Jonathan Clatworthy, MCU Office, 9, Westward View, Liverpool L17 7EE

☎ 0845 345 1909 ☎ +44 (0)151 726 9730 ✉ office@modchurchunion.org 🌐 www.modchurchunion.org

Registered charity no. 281573

Why have the countless others, whose methods pretty well invented modern campaigning, forgotten? The dissenters who opposed the slave trade did so from a position that was fundamentally different from that of the evangelical establishment. Helena Maria Williams, for example, held abolition among a range of social and political concerns, arising from her dissenting background. Moira Ferguson comments that, 'As a foremost spokeswoman for non-conformist ideas, Williams mounts a sophisticated, even politically perilous argument, keenly aware that evangelical politicians like Wilberforce who were spearheading the abolitionist fight also spearheaded the suppression of Dissenters' rights.'¹⁵ She comments wryly that Horace Walpole told More that he regarded Williams and Barbauld as Deborah and Jael from Scripture!¹⁶

The triumph of the establishment narrative was tragic. Adam Hochschild comments: 'For many Britons, the idea that emancipation had sprung from the benevolence of a wise elite was deeply comforting. Such confidence in British good intentions was gradually transformed into justification for more than a century of conquests and colonialism in Africa and a dramatic and often bloody expansion of British imperial holdings in India and the Far East.'¹⁷

The suppression of the radical or dissenting contribution to the debate was instrumental in defining the character of nation and empire, with global consequences that have lasted to the present day.

At the same time, mission followed colonialism in taking the gospel to the nations. My point here is not to glorify the mission movement, nor to vilify it, but to recognise that for many people, their experience of English mission and religion is not Anglican, but Congregational, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist and so on.

I have recently visited Mizoram, in the hill country of North East India on the border with Burma, where tribal and religious lines coincide, according to their evangelists in the early 20th century. We travelled through rough terrain in our 4x4 vehicles from the capital, Aizawl, which is in Presbyterian territory. On the way, we had a flat tyre. We had broken down in Baptist territory, and were hosted by the Baptist minister while our tyre was changed.

We were on our way to the Mara people, the last of the groups to be evangelised. Their missionary was not sent by any of the missionary societies, but had travelled independently – so they were Congregationalists! I tell the story not to satirise the Mara people, with whom I made a close connection, nor even to satirise exported denominations, but to illustrate the diversity of perception of English 'national' religion.

Catholic and Reformed

And yet in this country, the perception of Christianity is still that the Church of England holds a kind of representative function, holding together all that any decent person requires of Catholicism and Protestantism (and nowadays Evangelicalism and Liberalism). I believe that this has a crippling effect certainly on genuine liberal Protestantism and maybe on the other traditions to which the Church of England lays claim.

Hobson, among others, argues that this depends on the overarching political ideal of establishment, of national religious unity under the crown, which he describes as 'an ideal from the sixteenth century which died during the nineteenth century and stank during the twentieth'.¹⁸ The overriding purpose of unity having disappeared, he argues, 'We have the worst of both worlds: open schism with an unpopular established Church.'¹⁹

The claim to be Catholic and Reformed may have been rooted in a true desire to draw the best from both traditions, and

both traditions within the Church of England have had sincere and spiritual proponents. But seen from outside, it tends towards arrogance and falls into complacency.

Indeed, recently, this consensus has descended into bitter division and farce. You don't need a Congregationalist to rehearse the recent battles over women priests (and now bishops), homosexuality, and human fertility issues, which have dominated the Church's agenda (to the exclusion of the grand prophetic issues of injustice, poverty, political corruption and hypocrisy). But let me tell you how it feels to other people who are trying to live out their Christian faith in this country.

We don't care! We wish you would go away and sort out your differences, or split into two (or several) different Churches and just shut up for a bit. That may be a little harsh. Of course, we do care. Divisions in the Church of England cause me anguish just as those of my congregational brothers and sisters in Nauru, or Maraland do. And of course we care for our Anglican friends who are caught up in these battles. I watch in horror as my women friends who were priested in the 1990s have to go through more petty legislation before they are eligible to be bishops – but then, I can't see why you want bishops in the first place.

But the damage you are doing by destroying yourselves so publicly spreads far beyond your own boundaries, because you still hold onto the claim to be the national Church. Because your legislation is tied up with state legislation and because the press still see you in a representative function, your mess becomes our mess.

During the 1990s, I was involved in a number of Christian social action projects. I was for a while chair of UNLEASH (now Housing Justice), which did a great deal of work supporting and informing homelessness projects in London, and

working, for example with the London Assembly, to combat homelessness. In my own borough of Islington, that meant co-ordinating day centres and winter night shelters.

But Islington has some extremely prestigious Anglican Churches, generally at the evangelical end of Anglicanism, and it was pretty well impossible to engage in co-operative work, or – and this is more subtle – to engage in theological thinking about homelessness as a social or human rights issue. There was a wall of evangelical Anglican do-gooding that was impossible to penetrate.

Nationally, I was variously secretary or chair of two organisations supporting women's ministry. They were exciting times. We were inspired by the acceptance of women ministers by the Methodist Church, and put our efforts into the ordination of women in the Church of England.

The Society for the Ministry of Women in the Church had been formed in 1929, following the achievement of women's suffrage and the ordination of women in three free church denominations. There was the lively expectation that the other denominations, including the Church of England, would soon follow suit. *Women in Theology* was a newer organisation, with a broader brief, including the development of feminist theology and inclusive liturgies.

After the vote to ordain women in 1992, these excellent ecumenical organisations declined, and closed. The Anglican women were no longer interested. Women such as Jean Mayland and Peggy Jackson continued to support the wider organisations, but could not lift the sights of their colleagues beyond the in-fights of the Church of England.

I sound as though I am whinging that the rest of us can't manage on our own – I wish it were not the case, and sometimes it is not. But the immense disempowering

The Modern Churchpeople's Union

General Secretary, Rev. Jonathan Clatworthy, MCU Office, 9, Westward View, Liverpool L17 7EE

☎ 0845 345 1909 ☎ +44 (0)151 726 9730 ✉ office@modchurchunion.org 🌐 www.modchurchunion.org

Registered charity no. 281573

presence (or absence) of the Church of England is a reality.

This was clearest in the ecumenical movement of the 1990s. The decade started with great hope, and new ecumenical instruments. The language of organic unity began to take a back seat to ideals of pilgrimage together, working together. For the first time, the Roman Catholic Church came into full membership of an ecumenical organisation of this kind. And the non-conformist and free churches were also recognised in all their variety, or 'legitimate diversity' as the documentation called it.

In the same decade, the Church of England ran into severe financial difficulties and took its ball home. I have watched the ecumenical instruments, particularly CTBI, atrophy.

I wonder why we other churches are so disempowered. Perhaps it is because we have become accustomed to being co-opted by the Church establishment in the way that women who take on 'male' jobs are co-opted into the male establishment. This happens when people gain status in joining a more powerful group, often at great cost to themselves, and therefore find themselves aping the powerful group instead of bringing their own diversity to it. This does not change anything, and, in fact, may make it more difficult for others to make more far reaching changes.

Silenced voices

Let me give you an example from the debate in which I have been most closely involved.

In my book, *This is Our Story*, I express some of the frustration of Free Church women ministers, who were effectively silenced during the debate on Anglican women priests, despite a long history of women's ministry and ordination. The first women were ordained in congregationally ordered churches in the United States at the end of the nineteenth cen-

tury, and in England in 1916 to 1918. At the time, the campaign was linked to women's suffrage, and, when this was achieved, it was widely anticipated (or feared) that the Church of England would soon follow suit.

It took an incredible seventy further years. Generations of women saw that hope disappointed. And the fact that it was the established Church, the self-described national Church, that was dragging its feet, had enormous consequences. It meant that second wave feminism, and, in particular, Christian feminism, which made such strides in other areas, was disconnected from the reality of female church leadership. Scholarship and debate forged ahead in other parts of the world, most powerfully in the United States, but was stifled in England by the overpowering presence of the Church of England.

I write: 'My own experience during those years, as an ordained minister, was that I was often regarded as a peculiarity - 'Oh, I didn't know you were allowed to do that . . .' Post 1992, people said, 'Oh you're one of these new women priests, are you?' After more than a decade of ministry, I think I found that more enraging than the former attitude, because it meant that women, whom I had supported and campaigned for, were complicit in the same silencing and denial of my ministry as had been experienced by women through time.'²⁰ I was not alone in experiencing this double silencing as frustrating and disempowering.'²¹

I have heard the same frustration from Evangelicals and, to a lesser extent, Catholics: that the Church of England makes it impossible to be heard unless *they* say it (rather like the *Punch* cartoon depicting a boardroom in which a man says to the one woman present: 'That is a good idea; let's get one of the men to suggest it').

Like Barbauld, I deeply resent the Church of England's claim to openness and toleration. At its most irritating, it is pre-

The Modern Churchpeople's Union

General Secretary, Rev. Jonathan Clatworthy, MCU Office, 9, Westward View, Liverpool L17 7EE

☎ 0845 345 1909 ☎ +44 (0)151 726 9730 ✉ office@modchurchunion.org 🌐 www.modchurchunion.org

Registered charity no. 281573

sented as a claim to be just like us. The Church of England is as diverse as all the other churches put together, the argument goes. In other words, we don't need any other diversity – we are broad enough to encompass all. And we do it while maintaining unity – the altar on which all other ideals are to be sacrificed.

I recall another debate with an Archbishop at a CTBI meeting: with Rowan Williams when he was Archbishop of Wales. The subject was the then proposal for an ecumenical bishop, a post which was being advertised for male applicants only. After all, it was important to maintain unity while not all denominations (particularly the Catholic Church) could not accept a woman bishop. Quite apart from the proper outrage of denominations that held women's leadership as a matter of conscience, the nature of the argument astonished me.

Williams argued that this was a matter of witness. A divided Church would lose its credibility with the ordinary people of Wales and this would stand in the way of the gospel. My response in the debate was that the ordinary people of Wales probably didn't think much about church unity. But they were (at least the Welsh people I knew were) laughing – or weeping – at a Church so embroiled in internal politics and out of touch with the real world as to advertise a major post for men only.

If you are diverse enough to encompass us all, accept women in national and regional leadership as pretty well all the Free Churches do! Let's see lay leadership at communion; recognition of ministers ordained by local churches. How dare you, from your rigid, shattered, legalistic embattlements, smile down patronisingly on the free?

Russell McCutcheon puts his finger on this when he speaks of the ways in which dissenters are either dismissed or controlled: 'dissenters who are dismissed in this manner apparently do not share the dominant group's luxurious sense of

irony' (irony of which I have frequently been on the receiving end); and 'dissenters, when they dissent *properly*, help to ensure that members of the dominant group understand themselves as generous, well-intentioned, accepting, pluralistic, and thus tolerant.'²²

A Hermeneutic of Suspicion

I would like to puncture the big shiny balloon of easy generosity and well intentioned tolerance. And I would like to do it by inviting you to look at all these claims with a hermeneutic of suspicion.

Look again at the history and heritage of England. To be English *is* to be Methodist or Congregational or Pentecostal, just as much as Anglican. These traditions have their roots and origin in our national history, roots that are just as long and integral as those of the Church of England. The educational traditions worked out in the Dissenting Academies are those of our education system today. The nonconformist conscience shaped the democratic conventions of our time.

Look again at the notion of benevolent establishment, the Oh so onerous responsibility of representing those lesser denominations in legislation and bearing the burden on their behalf, and recognise the cultural imperialism of the Church of England, which looks so shabby now that so few people in this country adhere to it – but which was always indefensible.

Underlying all of this is a hermeneutic of suspicion in reading the Bible. The whole notion of a national Church comes from an extremely one-sided view of Scripture. The Hebrew Scriptures are deeply suspicious of religion at the service of the State. Every institutionalising movement is resisted by prophetic dissent, from Samuel's dark warnings about monarchy to Isaiah's vision of a completely open temple, or even no temple at all.²³ Any ecclesiology that seeks to mirror monarchy and national government must answer to those voices.

The Modern Churchpeople's Union

General Secretary, Rev. Jonathan Clatworthy, MCU Office, 9, Westward View, Liverpool L17 7EE

☎ 0845 345 1909 ☎ +44 (0)151 726 9730 ✉ office@modchurchunion.org 🌐 www.modchurchunion.org

Registered charity no. 281573

There is nothing in the New Testament to support the idea of a national Church, geographically based, on the assumption that it has a claim on, or even a duty towards, every person who lives within its bounds – like a taxation system, or a police force.

Just as liberation theologies have learned to read the Bible by listening out for hidden voices and hearing resounding calls to justice, so nonconformists and dissenters can call attention to the clamour of the prophets against institutional and national religion, and the dissenting voice of Jesus in his own time.

Maybe we could achieve the same thing in England. I suppose we saw a glimpse of the way things could be, in the early years of the ecumenical instruments. A less arrogant, repentant and above all disestablished Church of England might, in a few generations, be able to work alongside other churches and expressions of faith in England. But it would take a fantastic amount of theological

and practical work. It is not just a matter of who owns the cathedrals, or who sits in the House of Lords, but of unpicking generations of cultural oppression.

I have some experience of involvement in this kind of work through the feminist movement, and in post-colonial international relations. But that just teaches me how hard it is to *recognise* the problem (on both sides), let alone set it right.

The status quo will not do. Almost every voice in debates on mission or prophetic engagement in our country says this. I don't know if it is possible to change. We have lived with this situation for the entire modern era in this country, and well into post-modernity. We can't undo those centuries of wrong. But maybe we can forge a new model for the future, and one which will allow the gloriously diverse, lively and creative Christian heritage of this country to bear fruit in witness to the liberating gospel of Jesus Christ.

Notes

- ¹ *Address to the Opposers of the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts*, (London: March 3rd 1790), by A Dissenter, p. 8-9.
- ² *Sins of Government, Sins of the Nation Etc., A Discourse for the Fast Appointed on April 19th 1793*: by A Volunteer, p. 33.
- ³ *Sins of Government, Sins of the Nation*, p. 31
- ⁴ *Address to the Opposers of the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts*, (London: March 3rd 1790), by A Dissenter p. 11
- ⁵ Quoted in Theo Hobson *Against the Establishment*, (London: DLT, 2003), p. 40 and Colin Buchanan, *Cut the Connection: Disestablishment and the Church of England*, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1994), p. 72.
- ⁶ Hobson *Against the Establishment* p. 43, 51.
- ⁷ *To a Rebellious House? Report of the Church of England's Partners in Mission Consultation 1981* (CIO 1981), pp. 27-8, cited in Buchanan, *Cut the Connection*, p. 191.
- ⁸ Buchanan, *Cut the Connection*, p. 191.
- ⁹ Hobson *Against the Establishment* p. ix
- ¹⁰ 'For Freedom in Worship recall Henry Barrow', *Eagles' Wings and Lesser Things* (London: Stainer & Bell, Ltd., 2006), p. 74.
- ¹¹ T. G. Crippen (ed.) Robert Browne, *A Treatise of Reformation without Tarying for Anie* (London: Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1903), pp. 28-9
- ¹² Richard Baxter (1615-1691), 'He wants not friends that hath thy love'.
- ¹³ JW Ashley Smith, *The Birth of Modern Education, The Contribution of the Dissenting Academies, 1660-1800*, (London: Independent Press, 1954), p. 265, my emphasis.
- ¹⁴ See Janet Wootton, 'English Congregationalism and its relation to ownership of land and property' in *International Congregational Journal*, 2.2, August 2002, pp. 179-200.
- ¹⁵ Moira Ferguson, *Subject to Others: British Women Writers and Colonial Slavery, 1670-1834*, (London, Routledge, 1992), p. 159. See also Janet Wootton, 'Redemption Song: Hymns and their relation to Social Change from Slavery to the Sex Trade' Hymns and Slavery' in *International Congregational Journal* 7.1, Winter 2007, pp. 73-92.
- ¹⁶ Ferguson, *Subject to Others*, p. 164.
- ¹⁷ Adam Hochschild, *Bury the Chains: The British Struggle to Abolish Slavery*, (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005), p. 351.
- ¹⁸ Hobson, p. 130.
- ¹⁹ Hobson, p. xi.
- ²⁰ Janet Wootton, 'Women's Leadership in the Church and Feminist Theology' in Janet Wootton (ed.) *This is our Story: ????* (Peterborough: Epworth Press, 2007), p. 90.
- ²¹ See Carol McCarthy, 'Ordained and Female' in *The Baptist Quarterly*, 31, no 7, July 1986, 334-335, p. 336, cited in Wootton, *This is our Story*, p. 3.
- ²² Russell T. McCutcheon, *Religion and the Domestication of Dissent, or How to Live in a Less than Perfect Nation*, (London: Equinox, 2005), pp. 65, 79, emphasis his.
- ²³ *1 Sam 8:1-18, Is 56:1-7, 66:1-2.*