

TO: The Primates and bishops of the Anglican Communion

“AN UNSAFE PLACE”: HOW THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY ROWAN WILLIAMS HAS MADE THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION UNSAFE FOR THE ANGLICAN FAITH

On March 28, 2007, the Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams issued a public statement which the Anglican Communion News Service made available to the world via the Internet under the headline “Archbishop of Canterbury – Church must be ‘safe place’ for gay and lesbian people.” By what he teaches in the statement, and by issuing it as the spiritual leader of the Anglican Communion, Williams makes it impossible to effectively propound the Anglican Faith in the Communion. Anyone who attempts to do so will be susceptible to having Williams’s teachings used to accuse him or her of making “hate” speech against persons who wish to engage in same gender sexual relations, which violates their “liberties” and causes them to experience suffering, pain, and death. This becomes evident when what Williams teaches in the statement is considered after briefly describing the Anglican Faith and what its followers are required to obey and teach.

The Anglican Faith

The Anglican Faith was formed in the Church of England during the Protestant Reformation. The Anglican Faith is defined by the Church of England’s Articles of Religion and 1662 Book of Common Prayer and Ordinal.

The Anglican Faith holds that the Church is under the sovereign authority of Scripture and may not ordain anything contrary thereto. Article XX of the Articles of Religion provides that “it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s Word written” and the Church “ought not to decree anything against the same.” The principal author of the Articles of Religion and the Ordinal, the then Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Cranmer, explained why Scripture must be sovereign over the Church, as follows:

If there were any word of God beside the Scripture, we could never be certain of God's Word; and if we be uncertain of God's Word, the devil might bring in among us a new word, a new doctrine, a new faith, a new Church, a new god, yea himself to be a god. If the Church and the Christian faith did not stay itself upon the Word of God certain, as upon a sure and strong foundation, no man could know whether he had a right faith, and whether he were in the true Church of Christ, or in the synagogue of Satan.

(Works of Archbishop Cranmer, Parker Society I, p 53 – Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556. Ed. John Edmund Cox, Parker Society, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846).

The Anglican Faith also holds that all members of the Church must obey the “moral commandments of the law given from God by Moses” contained in Scripture.

Article VII of the Articles of Religion provides:

Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral. (Emphasis added).

The moral commandments concerning sexual relations given from God by Moses are set forth in Chapter 18 of the Book of Leviticus in Scripture, as follows:

1 The LORD said to Moses, 2 "Speak to the Israelites and say to them: 'I am the LORD your God. 3 You must not do as they do in Egypt, where you used to live, and you must not do as they do in the land of Canaan, where I am bringing you. Do not follow their practices. 4 You must obey my laws and be careful to follow my decrees. I am the LORD your God. 5 Keep my decrees and laws, for the man who obeys them will live by them. I am the LORD.

6 " 'No one is to approach any close relative to have sexual relations. I am the LORD.

7 " 'Do not dishonor your father by having sexual relations with your mother. She is your mother; do not have relations with her.

8 " 'Do not have sexual relations with your father's wife; that would dishonor your father.

9 " 'Do not have sexual relations with your sister, either your father's daughter or your mother's daughter, whether she was born in the same home or elsewhere.

10 " 'Do not have sexual relations with your son's daughter or your daughter's daughter; that would dishonor you.

11 " 'Do not have sexual relations with the daughter of your father's wife, born to your father; she is your sister.

12 " 'Do not have sexual relations with your father's sister; she is your father's close relative.

13 " 'Do not have sexual relations with your mother's sister, because she is your mother's close relative.

14 " 'Do not dishonor your father's brother by approaching his wife to have sexual relations; she is your aunt.

15 " 'Do not have sexual relations with your daughter-in-law. She is your son's wife; do not have relations with her.

16 " 'Do not have sexual relations with your brother's wife; that would dishonor your brother.

17 " 'Do not have sexual relations with both a woman and her daughter. Do not have sexual relations with either her son's daughter or her daughter's daughter; they are her close relatives. That is wickedness.

18 " 'Do not take your wife's sister as a rival wife and have sexual relations with her while your wife is living.

19 " 'Do not approach a woman to have sexual relations during the uncleanness of her monthly period.

20 " 'Do not have sexual relations with your neighbor's wife and defile yourself with her.

21 " 'Do not give any of your children to be sacrificed to Molech, for you must not profane the name of your God. I am the LORD.

22 " 'Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; that is detestable.

23 " 'Do not have sexual relations with an animal and defile yourself with it. A woman must not present herself to an animal to have sexual relations with it; that is a perversion.

24 " 'Do not defile yourselves in any of these ways, because this is how the nations that I am going to drive out before you became defiled. 25 Even the land was defiled; so I punished it for its sin, and the land vomited out its inhabitants. 26 But you must keep my decrees and my laws. The native-born and the aliens living among you must not do any of these detestable things, 27 for all these things were done by the people who lived in the land before you, and the land became defiled. 28 And if you defile the land, it will vomit you out as it vomited out the nations that were before you.

29 " 'Everyone who does any of these detestable things—such persons must be cut off from their people. 30 Keep my requirements and do not follow any of the detestable customs that were practiced before you came and do not defile yourselves with them. I am the LORD your God.'" (NIV Bible, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI 1984, <http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Leviticus%2018&version=31>). (Boldface added).

The Anglican Faith further requires the Church's bishops and priests to defend the Church from anti-Scriptural teaching. All bishops must make the following 1662 ordination vow: "with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word; and both privately and openly to call upon others to do the same." All the Church's priests are required to make a similar vow.

The Anglican Faith, with its adherence to Scripture's sovereign authority and moral code, was the faith of the Church of England for over 450 years. The Anglican Faith spread to and was embraced by people in every continent. The Anglican Faith was purchased with the life of Thomas Cranmer who was burned at the stake, and the lives of at least 300 other English martyrs. The Anglican Faith was defended by the lives of converts in other lands such as the martyrs of Uganda who were killed for refusing to engage in same gender sexual relations with the king of that country. The Anglican

Faith was at least ostensibly the common faith of the Church of England and the 38 other churches which form the Anglican Communion. Thirty-five years ago a person could enter an Anglican church anywhere in the Communion with a reasonable expectation that Scripture and the moral commandments given from God by Moses would be upheld.

All of that began to change when clergymen in Anglican Communion churches, such as Rowan Williams, Jeffrey John, John Spong, William Countryman, and Frank Griswold, decided to do away with the Anglican Faith and its adherence to Scripture's authority and moral code, and to replace it with different kinds of faith and moral codes according to their likings. Their efforts have been enormously successful. The Anglican Faith is under attack in every church in the Anglican Communion, and one of the leaders of the attack, Rowan Williams, is now the spiritual and institutional head of the Communion.

Rowan Williams's March 28, 2007 Statement

Rowan Williams issued his March 28, 2007 statement for the ostensible purpose of lauding the efforts of the Anglican Consultative Council's staff in gathering materials from the dialogue program based on the "listen to the experience of homosexual persons" provision of the 1998 Lambeth Resolution I.10. This program was instituted by the former Archbishop of Canterbury George Carey, in consultation with the former Primate of the Episcopal Church of the United States of America ("ECUSA") Frank Griswold. Carey and Griswold based the program on the incorrect premise that the purpose of the bishops' commitment in Resolution I.10 to "listen to the experience of homosexual persons" was to permit persons engaged in same gender sexual relations to persuade bishops to favor the Church's approval thereof. In fact, the purpose of the commitment was just the opposite. The commitment's true purpose was to guide bishops in their efforts, in Christian love, to persuade persons to refrain from such

conduct, which the resolution declared to be “incompatible with Scripture.” Notwithstanding the incorrect premise of the dialogue program, Williams pushed the program after he became the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the 2005 and 2007 Primates’ Meetings were led to endorsing it. As a consequence, the program has been implemented throughout the Communion and will take a center stage at the 2008 Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops.

While lauding the efforts of the ACC’s staff, Williams’s main focus is arguing the alleged necessity of providing a “safe place for gay and lesbian people.” Williams asserts they have the “liberty” to engage in same gender sexual relations. Williams emphasizes the “hate” crimes committed against them.

Rowan Williams’s statement says in full:

“I am profoundly grateful to Canon Phil Groves and all at the Anglican Communion Office who have worked so hard to produce this preliminary account of what the Communion has done to honour its commitment at Lambeth 1998 to listen to the experience of gay and lesbian people. It is a commitment that has been repeated many times but it has not proved easy to set up an appropriate process that will involve the whole Anglican family.

“The sensitivities of this exercise are obvious. Social, cultural and legal contexts are very varied indeed. And in the present climate of the Anglican Communion, there is inevitably a suspicion either that this is just window-dressing, or that it is a covert programme for changing doctrine and discipline. Real – and mutual – listening is hard to achieve. There are contexts where it is difficult to find a safe place for gay and lesbian people to speak about their lives openly. There are contexts where people assume the debate is over. The report shows that listening is possible, but also that there is a great deal still to be done. The work continues, but we have a solid start here.

“The commitments of the Communion are not only to certain theological positions on the question of sexual ethics but also to a manifest and credible respect for the proper liberties of homosexual people, a commitment again set out in successive Lambeth Conference Resolutions over many decades. I share the concerns

expressed about situations where the Church is seen to be underwriting social or legal attitudes which threaten these proper liberties. It is impossible to read this report without being aware that in many places – including Western countries with supposedly ‘liberal’ attitudes – hate crimes against homosexual people have increased in recent years and have taken horrifying and disturbing forms.

“No-one reading this report can be complacent about such a situation, and the Church is challenged to show that it is truly a safe place for people to be honest and where they may be confident that they will have their human dignity respected, whatever serious disagreements about ethics may remain. It is good to know that the pastoral care of homosexual people is affirmed clearly by so many provinces.

“I welcome this document as a valuable first stage in our collective response to the challenge that the last Lambeth Conference put before us, and I hope that it will be part of the ‘deep and dispassionate’ study of issues in sexual ethics for which an earlier Lambeth Conference called.”

The premise implicit in Williams’s statement that “homosexual persons” have the “liberty” in the Church to engage in same gender sexual relations is directly contrary to the Anglican Faith

It is certainly true that people have the liberty to engage in same gender sexual relations under the secular laws of such nations as England, Canada, and the USA. It is also true that they may have this liberty in churches which do not adhere to the Anglican Faith, such as ECUSA.

It is not true, however, for members of churches which follow the Anglican Faith. They do not have the liberty to deliberately and unrepentantly act contrary to Scripture and the moral commandments given from God by Moses set forth therein. While they are free from the ceremonial laws of the Old Testament, they are bound to obey the moral commandments of the law given from God by Moses. This was made clear by the edict of the Council of Jerusalem which is described in the Book of Acts and is embodied in Article VII of the Articles of Religion. Consequently, persons who join Anglican Faith churches must conform their sexual behavior to the moral commandments given from

God by Moses set forth in Chapter 18 of Leviticus. Being human, they might violate the commandments, but if they do, they must repent thereof and seek by God's grace not to do so again.

As can be seen from Chapter 18 of Leviticus, same gender sexual relations are not the only form of sexual conduct prohibited by the moral commandments given from God by Moses. The commandments provide a comprehensive scheme regarding with whom men and women may have sexual relations. While the commandments prohibit a man from having sexual relations with another man, they also prohibit him from having sexual relations with his mother and sister and various other relatives, as well as animals.

Consequently, there are clear and strict limitations on with whom members of Anglican Faith churches may have sexual relations. While some civil societies may permit the liberty of sexual relations prohibited by the moral commandments given from God by Moses, people who follow Christ by entering Anglican Faith churches must give up those liberties. They have no liberty to have sexual relations prohibited by the moral commandments given from God by Moses, regardless of what their civil liberties may be. They are to give up the things of this world and conform their lives to the Word of God.

Bishops and priests of Anglican Faith churches are obligated to teach their flocks the moral commandments given from God by Moses. They are also obligated to oppose contrary teaching and drive it from their churches. They must teach their flocks to refrain from any desire they may have to have sexual relations with their parents, siblings, and children, as well as with persons of the same sex. They must also oppose and drive away teaching in favor of such practices from the churches. If they do anything less, they violate their solemn vows.

Williams's implicit charge that the Anglican Faith teaches hate

Also implicit in Williams's statement is that the Anglican Faith's teaching that members of the Church should obey the moral commandments given from God by Moses is a contributing cause of "hate crimes against homosexual people" and persons who so teach bear responsibility for such crimes. In short, Williams implies that bishops and priests who carry out their 1662 ordination vow are complicit in criminal violence against persons who wish to engage in same gender sexual relations.

In so implying, Williams is voicing an attitude which he has held and expressed for many years. In 1989, when Williams founded the Institute for the Study of Christianity and Sexuality to be the "intellectually respectable arm" of the gay rights organization, The Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement, he stated: "The pressure that some church figures put upon people of differing sexual identities is a greater disgrace than anything else seen in the church." ([Telegraph](#), Jonathan Wynne-Jones, "Gays must change, says archbishop," August 27, 2006).

This idea was given full expression by Williams's long-time colleague in the movement to win the Church's approval of same gender sexual relations, Canon Jeffrey John, with whom Williams and others founded the Affirming Catholicism movement, and whom Williams appointed to be the Dean of St. Alban's Cathedral. John does so in his book, "Permanent, Faithful, Stable": Christian Same-Sex Partnerships (London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd. in assoc. with Affirming Catholicism, 1993, 2nd ed. 2000). The book was first published in 1993 in association with Williams's and John's Affirming Catholicism movement. A second edition of the book, which John revised to attack the 1998 Lambeth Resolution I.10's prohibition of same gender sexual relations, was published in 2000, and reprinted in 2003 and 2004, all in association with the Affirming Catholicism movement.

In "Permanent, Faithful, Stable," John tells a story of his experience with a "gay evangelical" college student who committed suicide because he desired to engage in same gender sexual relations, but felt condemned by the teachings in Chapter 1 of Scripture's Book of Romans if he acted in furtherance of his desire:

I have a vivid memory of spending an unhappy afternoon some years ago over a Bible trying to talk Simon out of attempting suicide again. Simon was a gay Evangelical student, totally convinced on the basis of Romans 1 that if he ever succumbed to his feelings he would be damned. He had consulted with the vicar of his own church, who had promptly prayed for 'healing,' and simultaneously ordered him to give up helping in the Sunday School, 'to protect the little boys.' Not surprisingly, Simon had come back to college and swallowed half a bottle of pills. (p. 7).

John then places the blame for such tragedies on "would-be 'Bible Christians'":

It was particularly tragic for him, and still is for many gay Evangelicals, that so many would-be 'Bible Christians' seem to have made a hard line on this issue practically a test of faith. Fortunately, some Evangelicals are now protesting against this line, but a great deal of damage is still being done. (Id.).

John embellishes in his book on Williams's assertion that "the pressure some church figures put on people of differing sexual identities is a greater disgrace than anything else in the church." John asserts that the bishops who voted for Lambeth Resolution I.10's prohibition of same gender sexual relations are responsible for "deeds of 'homophobia'." John states:

Almost as long as it has existed, the Church has been directly responsible for evils and injustices committed against homosexuals. Appalling atrocities have been perpetrated on homosexuals by the Church, or in the name of the Church, or as in Nazi Germany, with the tacit connivance of the Church. Yet there is not a glimmer of repentance; rather the opposite – an arrogant and unintelligent reaffirmation of bigotry. The much televised attempt of one bishop at the Lambeth Conference forcibly to exorcise a gay Christian leader was an iconic moment which has imprinted itself deeply in the gay psyche. It will not be quickly forgotten. Nor should the bishops imagine that the deeds of 'homophobia' can somehow be isolated

from their own words and votes. They continue to supply the ideology which undergirds prejudice, and continue to bear the heaviest responsibility for it. (p. 55).

John's and Williams's assertions are not isolated bursts of rhetoric, but a standard refrain of the movement to obtain the Church's approval of same gender sexual relations. The claim that young persons are driven to suicide by the teaching that members of the Anglican Faith should obey the moral commandments given from God by Moses was invoked by Bishop Michael Doe in his book, Seeking the Truth in Love, the Church and Homosexuality (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, Ltd. 2000). Doe dedicated his book, for which Williams wrote a laudatory forward, to a young female priest who Doe implies committed suicide because of the teaching (p. 116-117).

The "evil" of the 1998 Lambeth Conference in following Scripture by adopting Resolution I.10 alleged by John was expressed less than three weeks after the conference by the Chaplain of ECUSA's House of Bishops and a regular columnist for the church's national newspaper, Episcopal Life, the Rev. Martin L. Smith, SSJE. In a sermon on August 25, 1998, Smith included the following assertions in his description of the events of the conference:

Thus the debate on sexuality itself was memorable not so much for the result -- a typically unrealistic blanket ecclesiastical statement restricting all sex to the legal confines of the marriage bed -- as for the volcanic eruption of homophobic spleen. Only those who were actually present can describe the uncanny presence of evil. A deeply spiritual and learned bishop afterwards told the Archbishop that he knew what it was like now to be present at one of Hitler's Nuremberg rallies.

Literally hundreds of bishops in the newly expanded churches have had no more theological education than a few months of bible school, and the only form of discourse they know is a very simple form of biblical literalism. (<http://newark.rutgers.edu/~Lcrew/lambeth73.html>). (Emphasis added).

Williams's and John's accusations were given vociferous expression by ECUSA clergy against the bishops who voted for the 1998 Lambeth Resolution I.10, when, in October 1998, a young, gay Episcopalian was robbed and brutally murdered by two men he met in a bar. In decrying this terrible crime, some proponents of the Church's approval of same gender sexual relations expressly or implicitly placed blame for it upon Bible-believing Christians, including the bishops who voted for Resolution I.10. In a special memorial service for the young man at St. Philips Cathedral in Newark, New Jersey, Bishop John S. Spong gave a sermon that included the following assertions:

When we proposed to conduct this memorial service for Matthew Shepard, we asked a statewide gay and lesbian organization to assist us in planning and promoting this event. To our surprise they declined stating that Christianity had killed Matthew Shepard. When we protested this charge and said that this was only the religious right, they responded by quoting the resolution passed by the Anglican/Episcopal bishops of the world at last summer's Lambeth Conference which proclaimed by a large majority that homosexual persons are sinful, and voted to continue to exclude them from full membership in the life of the Church.

* * *

All Christians must live with the judgment of the homosexual community on the Church because, as painful as it is to realize, their charges are accurate.

Words shape consciousness and therefore words have consequences. When religious voices claim [sic] to speak for Christ suggest in their prejudiced ignorance that homosexual people are sinful, abnormal, unclean or subhuman, we do nothing less than to sow the seeds that are used to justify hate and even murder. These words embolden those religious voices who believe that they speak for God when they oppose extending hate crime laws to include gay and lesbian people. Christianity does have bloody hands. We did contribute to the murder of Matthew Shepard.
(<http://www.intac.com/~rollins/jsspong/shepard.html>).

The Rev. Dr. Bonnie Ring stated in a sermon delivered on October 25, 1998, at Trinity Church in San Francisco:

The Pharisee immediately reminds us of the righteousness of the Religious Right in our day: Senator Lott, members of the Christian Coalition, spokespersons for EXODUS, the organization that presumes to change homosexuals, and the majority of Bishops at Lambeth. Their dedication to Scripture makes them unaware of the depth of their own loathing. They do not notice the seeds of hatred and violence which their words incite. They cannot see their complicity in the murder of Matthew Shepherd or the growing number of hate crimes suffered by homosexual and transgendered people. They wash their hands, like Pilate did, hoping to remove the blood of responsibility.

The stains of their self-justifying hatred will not wash away!

* * *

Many of us have noted with horror the recent pronouncements by main line churches, including our own, that homosexuality is incompatible with Scripture. Matthew's murder coincided with a new barrage of TV ads promising to change homosexuals and make them acceptable to God. To all of this we must say NO! (<http://newark.rutgers.edu/~Lcrew/joy03.html>).

On March 1, 2007, Bishop Spong prefaced Rowan Williams's March 28 statement with the following statement:

The attempt in the name of religion to impose ancient and dying prejudice on any segment of the population is a sinful act. Many in the Christian Church at the highest levels of ecclesiastical leadership are today guilty of that sin. The repentance needed is not the repentance of homosexual people who are increasingly self-accepting people; the repentance that is needed must come from religious leaders and religious people whose ignorance on this subject has led the Christian Church to act toward gay and lesbian people in a way that violates everything that Christianity has ever taught.

Williams's implication that the moral commandments given from God by Moses are "hate speech"

Williams's statement also implies that the moral commandments of the law given from God by Moses are themselves "hate" speech and a contributing cause of "hate crimes against homosexual people." If to teach that the moral commandment "Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman" should be obeyed is a cause of hate crimes, then

the commandment itself is a cause of such crimes. Consequently, Williams's statement not only inhibits teaching the moral commandments given from God by Moses, but nullifies the commandments as well.

This nullification of at least the moral commandment given from God by Moses against same gender sexual relations is exactly what Williams has devoted much of his clerical career to achieve. Some twenty-five years ago, he set about to do so when, during the course of his experience of "being the spiritual director to people of the homosexual orientation," he "did come to a point where" he "could no longer say that the Biblical account answers all of the questions we have or want to ask." ([A Line in the Sand, Reform and Rowan Williams](#), David Holloway, October 2002, citing interview, [Anglican Media](#), Melbourne).

Prompted by this experience, Williams provided in his writings a theological justification for the Church's approval of same gender sexual relations, despite Scripture's prohibition of such conduct. Williams began doing so in 1989 when he published [The Body's Grace](#). In [The Body's Grace](#), Williams: (a) propounded the thesis that committed and loyal same-sex unions are compatible with the Christian faith; (b) dismissed reliance on Scripture's prohibition thereof as "an abstract fundamentalist deployment of a number of very ambiguous biblical texts;" and (c) called for "a fuller exploration of the sexual metaphors of the Bible...to teach us about a theology and ethics of sexual desire than will the flat citation of isolated texts."

Williams went further in 1994 with the publication of a collection of his sermons and essays in the book, [Open to Judgement](#). In [Open to Judgement](#), Williams dismisses Scripture as a reliable source for discerning "the mind of God." Williams contends therein that we should not read Scripture with "a kind of blind and thoughtless obedience to every word of scripture as if it simply represented the mind of God." Williams then asserts that the reason we should not do so is that the "writers of scripture" were "caught

up in the blazing fire of God's gift yet struggled with it, misapprehend[ed] it, and misread it." In short, Williams says we cannot rely on Scripture because the writers thereof did not correctly discern "the mind of God."

Williams thus says we cannot rely on the moral commandment given from God by Moses prohibiting same gender sexual relations, because in setting forth the commandment Moses did not correctly discern "the mind of God." In other words, Williams says that the opening verse of Chapter 18 of Leviticus "The Lord said to Moses" is false.

The Anglican Communion is no longer safe for the Anglican Faith

The members of the Anglican Communion who attempt to practice the Anglican Faith thus find themselves in an untenable position. The Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams and his fellow proponents of the Church's approval of same gender sexual relations have turned everything around. Conduct which Scripture teaches is sinful and destructive is deemed to be good and life-enhancing, and the Scriptural teaching is deemed to be sinful and destructive. The moral commandment "Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman" was not given from God, but is "hate" speech and anyone who teaches the commandment is guilty along with Moses of hate speech and complicit in "hate crimes against homosexual people."

The Anglican Communion is thus no longer a safe place for the Anglican Faith. In light of the teaching of the spiritual leader of the Anglican Communion the Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams and his allies, it is impossible for any Scripture-believing member of the Communion to effectively teach Scriptural morality. No Anglican Faith bishop or priest can effectively carry out the 1662 ordination vow. No bishop or priest or parent or grandparent in the Communion can teach children (or adults) to conduct their sexual lives in accordance with the moral commandments given from God by Moses without such teaching being rejected as "hate" speech that harms people, based on the

overriding teachings of the Communion's leader, the Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams.

While Christians are to love their neighbors and cannot condone or encourage hate crimes of any sort, they cannot deny what God has spoken clearly and often. Nor would such denial be loving to their neighbors.

The Society for the Propagation of Reformed Evangelical Anglican Doctrine

April 2007

The Society is dedicated to the preservation and propagation of the Anglican Faith, as defined by "the Anglican Formularies" comprised of the Church of England's Articles of Religion, 1662 Book of Common Prayer and Ordinal.

The Society may be reached at: <http://www.anglicanspread.org/>