

Letter to the Clergy of the G-3 Anglican Churches

The Anglican Catholic Church (ACC), The Anglican Church in America (ACA), Anglican Province of America (APA)

In light of the recent controversy surrounding the revocation of Calvin Robinson's license to serve as a priest in the ACC, and in response to allegations he has made against the ACC and its Archbishop of failure to communicate, acting hastily and without due process, and being "on the side of cancel culture" (Robinson's own words), Archbishop Mark Haverland and Bishop Patrick Fodor have authorized the following statement to be communicated to the clergy of the G-3.

In August of 2023 the See of the ACC's Diocese of the Midwest (DMW) fell vacant upon the death of its bishop, the Right Reverend Rommie Starks. In accordance with Section 4.1 of the [ACC Canons](#), which charges the Metropolitan with "the pastoral care of vacant Sees within his Province," and Section 5.05 of the [DMW Canons](#), which authorizes the Metropolitan to exercise the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese, Archbishop Haverland assumed the duties of Bishop Ordinary until the vacancy could be filled. As part of an effort to advance G-3 unity, the Archbishop appointed Bishop Patrick Fodor of the ACA's Diocese of the Missouri River Valley as Episcopal Visitor.

In October of 2023, Calvin Robinson was invited to the Anglican Joint Synods in Orlando by members of the ACA. Either before or at that Synod, people from the ACC parish of Saint Paul's, Grand Rapids, which was without a resident priest, engaged with Father Robinson. Earlier in 2023, Archbishop Haverland had recommended a different priest for that vacancy, but following a request from St. Paul's to consider calling Robinson, the Archbishop arranged for a video call with him. During that call (March 13th, 2024), Archbishop Haverland made two main points:

Robinson had in the previous two years been in three Churches. He had been denied a place in the ordination process by the Church of England; he had been ordained as a deacon by the Free Church of England; and, he had been ordained a priest by the Nordic Catholic Church. Now he was interested in a parish in the ACC. That is four Churches, none of which was in communion with each other. He needed to decide which Church he should belong to;

and

Robinson's desire to be a parish priest was in tension with his high profile as a politician (e.g., spokesman for the United Kingdom Independence Party and as a former candidate for Parliament), culture warrior, and social media personality. While a spectrum of political engagement exists, and while the Church's moral teaching has political implications, the distinction of offices needs to be maintained.

Archbishop Haverland then told Robinson that if these two problems could be resolved, he would not stand in the way of his service in an ACC parish.

Following this discussion, St. Paul's continued its conversations with Robinson. In the course of his interviews with the parish, Robinson answered a questionnaire from the Vestry about his plans and hopes for parish ministry. That [document](#) clearly states his intention of being a full-

time parish priest. In response to the question, “as spiritual leader, can you promise to prioritize St. Paul’s needs and interests first,” Robinson replied:

One of the reasons I am looking for a full-time parish is so that I can invest more fully in a parochial context. At present, I am a self-supporting minister, so I have to split my time between the parish and my other work. I feel called to readdress that balance and put the majority of my time into Sacramental ministry.

And in response to a question about how he would raise the profile of St. Paul’s in the community, Robinson wrote:

I also discussed the idea of building a media platform. I would step back from my media work and form a new public ministry as part of the parish. Bishop Robert Barren [*sic*] does a good job of this with his Word on Fire ministry. A lot of churches host online streams of their services now, but we could do something more interesting. Think along the lines of professional podcasts with exegesis and apologetics.

The only mention of things relating to Robinson’s previous political and social media agitation was a plan to use his skills for catechetical purposes. In the entire document, there is no hint that he planned to engage in constant travel away from Michigan or to continue with the same level and same kind of on-line activity as in previous years.

In April of 2024 Archbishop Haverland received communications indicating that the Vestry of St. Paul’s were moving forward in their desire to bring Robinson to the parish, and that they were working with the Episcopal Visitor to the Diocese of the Midwest to arrange for an R-1 visa. After Robinson himself inquired about that matter, the Archbishop [wrote back](#) to share his own experience with clergy seeking R-1 visas, and told Robinson to contact him if he could be of assistance. Subsequently Robinson came to Grand Rapids, took the canonical oaths, and was licensed as priest-in-charge at St. Paul’s. In an effort to support Robinson in his ministry, Bishop Fodor assigned him two mentors (one of whom was actually with him when his license was revoked) who were to help him with pastoral matters and other issues. Robinson also had easy access to his Episcopal Visitor and, as both the email about the R-1 visa and the excerpts below indicate, the ability to communicate directly with the Archbishop.

During this time, several DMW clergy expressed severe reservations to the Archbishop about Robinson’s presence and ministry in the diocese. In fact, this disquiet among the DMW clergy related in part to the issues that were raised in the video call of March 13th. Concerns were also raised about other issues, such as Robinson’s lack of a theological degree (he did study for two years at Saint Stephen’s House, Oxford, but appears to have been dismissed without a degree or postulancy), and his exit from the Nordic Catholic Church (NCC), for which he received an [official letter of reprimand](#). In that letter, Bishop Nikolai Flemestad noted that Robinson had “not adequately consulted with [his] superiors” about his move to the ACC and that the plans that they had for his ministry in London were now “falling apart.” Bishop Flemestad went on to write:

Consequently, in the light of your failure to understand or to pay due regard to your promises of obedience to those in authority over you which results in a serious threat to good order in the church, as well as failing to seek letters of endorsement that would be required to accomplish a transfer to another jurisdiction, I must sadly now issue this Reprimand to you electronically. This will be followed by a signed document called Admonition which will be activated when you take up your duties within the Anglican Catholic Church. This will mean: You are no longer to be considered a priest in good standing, your licence is withdrawn and your priestly ministry with the NCC is prohibited.

Bishop Flemestad's assertion that Robinson failed to regard his "promises of obedience to those in authority" in the NCC would be borne out in the ACC in the months ahead.

After taking up residence in Grand Rapids, Robinson wrote Archbishop Haverland to complain about attacks by Father Robert Hart, which involved personal abuse. Robinson's complaint was lodged on September 24th, and he received a response the very same day. The Archbishop noted that he was sympathetic to Robinson's complaint, but at the same time warned him against straying "into excessively political realms":

I have two diocesan priests who are, in my opinion, much too political. One is on the right. Father Robert Hart is my lefty priest. I have myself removed him from my 'friends' list on Facebook, not because he is not a friend, but because I deplore (and often disagree) with his postings on secondary and tertiary matters for which his priesthood gives him no particular insight or competence. Clergy who opine widely on matters outside their specific duties as teachers of the faith and morals are leaving the higher for the lower office. I consistently oppose such, as - being consistent - I will also in your case if you stray into excessively political realms. Father Hart knows my position. In your own case, now that you are a parish priest, you need to become circumspect in your public pronouncements outside matters theological and moral.

On September 25th [Robinson responded](#) that he "accept[ed] that criticism" and believed that it was best for "priests to focus on faith and morals," rather than "the personality-driven mudslinging of partisan politics." This reply belies Robinson's assertion that he had no warning that he was to refrain from overtly political activity.

It is also worth noting that, while Father Robert Hart has been very political, the cases are different in several ways. First, Father Hart was a rector (he is now retired). Rectors enjoy tenure in office, unlike a Priest-in-Charge, who serves at the pleasure of his bishop. Given assertions of lack of due process, it should be pointed out that the [ACC Canons](#) make it quite clear that the Bishop Ordinary may lift a priest's license, when the priest is not an instituted Rector, for almost any reason. And while the Archbishop has received many complaints about Father Hart, his Vestry has never asked to sever the pastoral relationship, and no one has ever filed an accusatory *libellus* against him. While the Archbishop was not free simply to fire Hart, he was free to rebuke him, as he often has done. Finally, it should be noted that Father Hart has always been strongly and consistently pro-life and supported the Church's teaching concerning sexual morality. His "leftism" concerns matters relating to economic and social welfare policy, not Church moral teaching.

Two months after this exchange, the Archbishop received [another complaint](#) from Robinson about Father Hart. Robinson's email was sent on Friday, November 1st, and it too received a response the same day. In it Archbishop Haverland wrote:

Father Hart's behavior is very wrong....

[Father Hart] wrote me today (at 1:50 a.m.) to complain about you. He included a copy of the Facebook picture of you with what looks to me to be a cardboard Donald Trump. It is very inappropriate, in my view, for clergymen to post such a picture in the midst of an election campaign. I am not happy to be receiving a stream of e-mails complaining about your ongoing political activity. These e-mails have come from two ACC bishops, some clergy within DMW, and clergy in non-ACC, G-3 Churches. What I am being told is that my expressions of concern have had no discernible effect on your activity.

At this point my life would be simpler, to be frank, if you and Father Hart both got off-line and off other media outlets entirely and worked your parishes. While I accept that the simplification of my life is not necessarily a great concern to others, in this case the simplification would come from clergymen observing the traditional distinction of offices. Father Hart is without self-knowledge, is close to retirement, which I am likely to hasten, and simply isn't going to change. You are young and can change, and I expect that you will.

Once again, Archbishop Haverland expressed clear, and indeed growing, displeasure that his admonitions from September – and indeed from March – were being ignored by a newly licensed and recently ordained priest. During this period, the Archbishop also had periodic communication with Bishop Fodor about Robinson. Bishop Fodor asserts that he was trying, in a pastoral fashion, to steer Robinson away from the shoals onto which he has since foundered. Despite the Archbishop's repeated warnings and Bishop Fodor's pastoral advice, a month later the situation took a significant turn for the worse.

In December of 2024, Robinson began posting about Judaism, starting with a post on X (formerly Twitter) about the Talmud. Although it was framed as "just asking questions" and "being anti-Zionist, not anti-Semitic," it was based on contested scholarship and succeeded in stirring up controversy. Robinson then began to use certain rhetoric that was clearly and intentionally anti-Semitic, i.e., "noticing". While the term itself may seem innocuous, it is used within [certain online](#) circles [as a code-word](#) for "becoming aware of the extent to which Jews control government, culture, the media, finance, etc." Posts, such as this [one](#), featuring a Jewish politician from the Netherlands named Job Cohen, illustrate Robinson's familiarity with the term and its implications. One of Robinson's more prominent posts about "noticing" drew favorable attention from people with extreme anti-Semitic views, eliciting responses featuring memes of [Hitler](#) and [Holocaust denial](#). As of February 10th, 2025, Robinson has not removed or condemned any of these responses.

The principal "noticing" post was made on December 4th. On December 9th Robinson invited Joel Webbon onto his YouTube show, "Bros with Fros." Webbon is a pastor at the Covenant Bible Church in Austin, Texas, and a public figure whose antisemitic [priors](#) are [well established](#). During

the course of the interview, Robinson sat nodding while Webbon stated, "[religiously, spiritually, Judaism, I believe, is a pernicious evil](#)," and while he eventually replied that he wanted to "push back" on that statement, he never did. Instead, Robinson said, "I think Islam is perniciously evil, but I haven't heard it argued that Judaism is, so I'd love to hear your argument for that." He then gave Webbon the floor.

After the Webbon interview, the Archbishop received expressions of concern, both from G-3 clergy and others, that Robinson was courting anti-Semites online. He responded by communicating his displeasure with Robinson's behavior to Bishop Fodor and telling him very clearly that such incendiary activity had to stop. Bishop Fodor, in a telephone call on December 11th, warned Robinson that he was in trouble with his Ordinary. This warning produced [an email from Robinson](#) (dated Friday, December 13th) in which he declared that he is not an anti-Semite. While this statement may lend credence to Robinson's assertion that the salute given in Washington was merely a joke, it further contradicts his claim that his suspension came out of the blue. To quote Archbishop Haverland in a recent letter to the American members of the College of Bishops:

If this had been the first such 'crass' (Robinson's word) act, it *might* have been overlooked..., but after accusations of anti-Semitism from a month earlier, the salute was an utterly foolish and intemperate act by a priest. Calvin Robinson is not a cheeky Oxford undergraduate. He is not a 25-year-old making his first mistakes as a parish priest. He is almost 40, he has been unstable in his employment and Church history, and he had been warned about his inappropriate activity. At best he is gravely intemperate and has poor judgement. At worst he is toying with anti-Semitism and engages in the deeply uncharitable activity of trolling and political provocation. He is free to behave in such ways, but not using the ACC as his platform.

The revocation of Robinson's license was based on the history outlined above, which, contrary to claims that the ACC acted hastily and without good cause, shows that the Archbishop's actions should not have been unexpected. First, Robinson ignored an initial, very polite statement of expectations from March 2024; he ignored a clear warning in September 2024; he ignored a clearer warning in November; he ignored a warning so clear as to necessitate a written response in December of 2024; and then, in January of 2025, he made his controversial, very public, and incendiary salute. His action at the National Right to Life conference was simply the end of a string of inappropriate acts and statements, yet Robinson continues to characterize himself as a party who has been wronged, who never received any warning that he needed to amend his actions, and who "was never given an opportunity to explain" himself. This final statement is also untrue.

At 9:02 the morning after receiving [notification](#) of the revocation of his license (which occurred by email, not social media, at 4:45 PM EST on January 29th), Robinson [wrote the Archbishop](#), asking for a telephone or Zoom call. At 10:39 that day, the Archbishop responded that he would "read anything that Robinson might care to write [him]." Rather than sending an email response to the Archbishop, Robinson took to social media and initiated a proxy campaign to discredit the

ACC and pressure the bishops into reversing their decision. The bishops have not bowed to this pressure, and Robinson has since [asked](#) (February 7th) to make a canonical appeal. He has been given information and instructions on how to do this. Given that an appeal may be initiated, no further comment will be made here other than to point to the [ACC's Canons](#) and the fact that the statement on the [Revocation of Fr. Calvin Robinson's License](#) gives a detailed explanation of the process by which Robinson was suspended from ministry in this Church.

It is unfortunate that this situation has been the cause for contention and unrest. The information above is presented to assuage concerns that have been voiced and to offer transparency as to the ACC's actions in dealing with Robinson. In making this background clear, it is hoped that the G-3 can continue moving forward together in charity and grace.