



Email Communiqué
Society of King Charles the Martyr, American Region
May, 2010

EDITOR, MARK A. WUONOLA, PH.D. ☉ WUONOLA@EARTHLINK.NET ☉ ISSN 2153-6120

BACK ISSUES OF SKCM NEWS AND THE EMAIL COMMUNIQUÉ ARE POSTED AT THE AMERICAN REGION'S WEBSITE, WWW.SKCM-USA.ORG

Upcoming

SPECIAL PAN-REGIONAL GATHERING, AMERICAN REGION, S.K.C.M.

11 a.m. on Saturday 29 May 2010 at Saint Barnabas, Omaha

1660 **Solemn Mass in the Presence of a Greater Prelate** 2010
MDCLX **Commemorating the Semiseptcentenary of the Restoration** MMX

during this, the 362nd Year Following the Royal Martyrdom and
the 21st Year of the Society's Great Plains Chapter

The Rev'd Robert F. Scheibhofer, Rector

The Rt. Rev'd Daren K. Williams, Select Preacher

Nick F. Behrens, Chapter Secretary, Organist & Choirmaster
Basil Harwood, *The Office for the Holy Communion in the Key of A Flat, Op. 6*

✂ Of your charity, pray for the soul of the Rev'd Canon Marshall V. Minister, OL, *Obit.* 21 March 2010 ✂

Following, will be a Luncheon hosted by
The Great Plains Chapter of S.K.C.M. and The Central States Branch of The Monarchist League,
at the nearby Cultural Center at Saint Cecilia's.

Luncheon \$15 • Check payable to *S Barnabas Church* • Memo line, *SKCM* • Send by 21 May if possible.
Send to: Saint Barnabas Church, P. O. Box 31155, Omaha NE 68131.

The church is at 40th & Davenport Sts. Website: www.stbarnabas.net Phone 402 558 4633

A Greeting

Before discontinuation of the U.S. military draft, the dreaded notice from one's Draft Board (local branch of the vaguely and euphemistically named Selective Service Agency) began, prosaically, "Greetings". Bishop Ackerman's greeting (below) inspires the *heavenly* kind of awe and dread, while affording us a glimpse of the Throne of God, the ultimate destination of this earthly pilgrimage. These comforting words from Ascension liturgies explicitly state our heart's desire.

"So we may also thither ascend, and with Him continually dwell."

"That we may likewise thither ascend, and reign with Him in Glory."

"Exalt us unto the same place whither our Saviour Christ is gone before."

Only a fraction of our members and supporters is able to attend the Annual Mass. By tradition, greetings from our Patron and from the principal officers of S.K.C.M.-U.K. and the R.M.C.U. are read. These messages of good will and encouragement often remain unpublished, but are very much to the point and inspirational, like the following, penned in exemplary epistolary style for Jan. 2002:

"Beloved in Christ: How I thank God for your piety and devotion! I wish that I could be with you. I cannot even begin to tell you how important it is for us to keep fast to the Faith entrusted to us. Devotional Societies such as S.K.C.M. place us before the throne of Mercy and Grace where Saints and Martyrs worship. May Saint Charles intercede for us."

+Keith L. Ackerman, SSC, D.D., VIII Quincy (ret'd)
Episcopal Patron, American Region of S.K.C.M.

Volunteers are needed for several jobs: (1) Maintaining the email distribution list for this publication and handling its nine-times-a-year email distribution; (1a) transferring the existing distribution lists to a single utility (We've identified a utility that appears to be very suitable for our purposes and is free.) and if possible find a way to use it as a general email list for all Society officers to use; (2) searching the internet to find certain former and deceased members for the History and

Necrology; (3) searching for lost members' current addresses or dates of death using a commercial database to which the Editor has subscribed; and (4) searching the internet for information on certain important topics to provide background information and details for our publications and the History. There are three more jobs: (5) joining the editor in assembling our semiannual mailings;⁽¹⁾ (6) researching and writing occasional articles for *SKCM News* or this publication (A list of some desired topics is available.); and, as mentioned in previous issues, (7) working with Mr. Ruff (Proximity not required, although occasional sessions working together would be beneficial.) to learn all or some of the Secretary/Treasurer's duties; a desirable outcome would be mutual agreement that the job and the volunteer are a 'fit', followed by transition into the position.

Contact Doug or Mark to learn more about any of the above volunteer possibilities.

⁽¹⁾ These contain *SKCM News*, *Church & King*, dues and other notices, fund appeals, goods order forms, and so on. Preparing each mailing takes two people approximately two thirds of a working day. Meeting in the Boston area or at any convenient halfway point in Southern New England would be easy to arrange, as the required materials and supplies are all readily transportable. Not only is the work shared, but it goes faster when working with a commiserating member. (This is the only one of these proposed volunteer tasks requiring geographic proximity.)

For over a year, I expressed disappointment that no one had come forward to ask about any of the proposed volunteer tasks. It is very pleasing that **David D. Butler, Esq.**, of Des Moines responded to our need. He has begun to work as Assistant Secretary to the Board, helping Mr. Ruff and familiarizing himself with Doug's duties as Counsel and Secretary of the Board.

Deo gratias! As first mentioned in the March issue, two members have come forth; each is undertaking to write a chapter of the History. They are **Mrs. Nancy Ehlke** and **Bishop William C. Wantland**. Each will research the subject (starting with the meager information we have), seek out new sources of useful material, study it, and follow up with specific inquiries, to provide a draft chapter for the History. The subjects of these chapters, "Dedications and Depictions of the Royal Martyr" and "Efforts to 'Restore'⁽²⁾ 30 January to Anglican Calendars", are of paramount importance, addressing four of our Society's five Objects.

⁽²⁾ In the U.S. (but not Canada), Blessed Charles would actually be added, not restored, since he was never in the Episcopal Church's calendar. Before the American Revolution he was in the calendar used in the colonies that were to comprise the U. S. of A. The colonies, part of the C of E like all British colonies at that time, fell under the jurisdiction of and were administered by the Diocese of London. They thus used the 1662 BCP.

Samuel Seabury, born in Connecticut, the first U.S. bishop, had a diverse background: He studied theology (Yale) and medicine (Edinburgh), was ordained by Lincoln (1753), served parishes in Nova Scotia and New York, and was loyal during the Revolution. After the "Farmer's Letters" dispute with Hamilton he was imprisoned for a while, the elected bishop in 1783. "Unable" to take the Oath of Allegiance (to the King) he could not be consecrated by English bishops. He was consecrated by Scottish bishops (including Non-Jurors) in Aberdeen on 14 Nov. 1784.

From the Editor

Dear Fellow S.K.C.M. Members: In this issue of the ***EMAIL COMMUNIQUÉ*** we feature a sermon preached by an admirer of the Martyr King. His witness was surpassing bold, his strategy was simple, and his tactics were straightforward. His strategy was simply to tell the story. Nurse Brown, more low-key, encouraged people to read the story for themselves. When he had the opportunity, he took action. He was confident, and must have been convincing, too.

Before getting on to our main subject, we'll look at some background. The first bit will be about Father King, while the second will be about Cromwell. These are relevant as we commemorate the Restoration. You might well ask, what has the Restoration of the Monarchy have to do with us?

In the July, 2009, *Communiqué*, we reprinted (from the Dec. 1986 *SKCM News*) the story of how a New Jersey priest, the Rev'd David Rhineland King (of Saint John's, Elizabeth; mid-1950s) came to know and revere King Charles the Martyr. His background was typical, the 'Ivy-League version', from that 'sophisticated' learning environment. Fr. King's attitude about Charles I was superficial, too, and also typical. It is puzzling that many university scholars and teachers short-change their students by imparting a 'party line'; in charity, one supposes this is seldom deliberate, merely careless or unthinking acceptance of what they, themselves were taught, often in the interest of prioritizing other material.

Father King was in the office of a parishioner, Nurse Emily Brown, one day. Their conversation turned to King Charles I, a small picture of whom stood on Miss Brown's desk. When Nurse Brown suggested that Fr. King read about Charles *for himself*, he found that his image of Charles was not only superficial, it was far from correct and lacked balance. He saw the truth and became a vocal supporter of Charles and his cause. The 'fop' in cavalier garb, challenged by the severe, black-and-white military genius whose stated aim was to liberate the people from a monarch's tyranny . . . this picture was incomplete. . . deliberately so. "I'm all business." Black & white contrasts starkly with Cavalier color. "No frivolity here. . . no fun." (Reminiscent of a 50-year old Broadway play, *No Sex, Please, We're British*.)

That word-image of King Charles is rarely true to reality, although in its romanticism the image lingers, remaining part of the popular imagination to this day. King Charles wasn't a 'fop'. His attire may appear foppish to us with our modern fashion sense, which does not now admit of as great a variety of patterns or colors in juxtaposition. He is elegantly dressed, true, in clothing crafted of the finest fabrics, as befits one of the most powerful leaders of the day. The brilliance of and variations in color, pattern, weave, luster, texture, weight and translucency are best appreciated by studying one of the best van Dycks, face to face. Charles seemed shy, prim and proper, and prudish to many of his contemporaries.

On 28 April, Doug Ruff and I attended a lecture at the Smithsonian, 'It's All Oliver Cromwell's Fault'. The lecturer, Charles Cushman studied at West Point, pursued his doctorate while serving in the military, and then consulted for several 'inside the beltway' agencies. He is now Associate Dean of the Graduate School of Political Management at Georgetown University.

Dr. Cushman said that King Charles was "not too bright". King Charles's sense of proper, kingly dignity and reserve led many to think he was severe, glum, and humorless, and even stupid, none of which he was. As I've written before, that's how a modern opportunist might view a medieval king who didn't believe that the end justified the means. [The Editor is not speaking of Prof. Cushman himself as an opportunist. My comment is about the pervasiveness of some of the misconceptions and subtle slights concerning our Patron and the influence of our contemporary thinking on everything we see and read.. Dr. Cushman studies this period of history. He is a scholar, and specializes largely in the period's political and economic aspects, but not in a vacuum. He appears still to accept, or at least take for granted, some of the popular views of Charles. —Ed.] It is rare these days to hear that ethical and moral considerations have been taken into account in the course of important deliberations, and even rarer that the arguments *pro* and *con* are reported. Perhaps the most common contemporary example is the care taken to avoid offending a particular faction or constituency, *i.e.*, political correctness, which is more politics than ethics. Science, which is ideally committed to seeking Truth, is commonly subordinated to politics in the consideration of issues involving both. Even those trying to be honorable, practicing Christians in today's 'Post-Christian' age have 'dark nights of the soul' and episodes during which our consciousness of our conscience is inadequate.

We may become impatient with Charles when we read of yet another defeat, a botched attempt at diplomacy, or a decision that we see clearly in retrospect, to have been disadvantageous. In some of his toughest decisions he had the 'benefit' of deep analysis and consultation with advisers holding many points of view, including lords temporal and lords spiritual. The actions he most regretted in all his life were his eventual assent to the warrants concerning Laud and Strafford. He wrote of the latter in *Eikon Basilike*, saying that it was more than ample cause for his fate. In both of those cases, the position he eventually took was that advised by his senior bishops. In the case of Strafford, Juxon was among those who advised the King to sign the warrant. Charles never held that advice against Juxon, who remained a valued adviser to the end. Juxon *advised* but the King knew it was he himself who *acted on the advice*. One of the many misconceptions about Charles is that he was imperious, autocratic, and that he never changed his mind. Rather, and the matter of Strafford is a good example, he could be held up as an example of too much 'consensus management', popular in some executives today. The King complimented Juxon and other advisers who were moderate and able to articulate the reasoning behind various parties' points of view. (None of this is to say that Juxon was right on the Strafford matter.)

In the end, however, it is much harder to *do right* than to *look good*. We are warned not to be "pleasers of men". In our poll-driven politics, this risk is forgotten, and so it was in a royal court where personal preferment is the prime goal of most individuals, who pretend to be wise advisers while actually being self-serving sycophants. The possibility of preferment seduces even those egalitarians who have some vision; they are tempted to do whatever others are doing, whether right or wrong. The temptations presented to them at Court were extraordinary. Those without vision easily fall victim to any influence offering near-term advantage or pleasure. Selfishness and sybaritic enjoyment prevail over family ties, the loyalty that properly accompanies personal alliances and commitments (one's honor), one's oath to an unseen God, over solemn dynastic alliances, the vows and obligations of the bedchamber, and even over the eternal benefit of one's own soul. Look at the history of the Plantagenets, Medicis, Borgias, and countless others: son killed father, stepmother killed stepson, suitor *A* killed suitor *B*, and multitudinous other enormities. Consider the Biblical prototype of fratricide, Cain and Abel, or the abhorrent history of the House of Atreus. Ancient narratives of the oral tradition and archetypes like these set forth examples of treachery. Their directness prohibits denial and forces the hearer to confront the tendency to sin.

To allow immorality and degeneracy to prevail over nobility is not a matter of little consequence, as King Charles knew. Many monarchies and dynasties fell accordingly, the more simple-minded and weak-willed rulers thinking or rationalizing the Divine Right to be license to do anything they wished, after the wont of the Caesars, making themselves gods, then deifying a horse, and all the while going from excess to excess in a haze of enui. Perhaps in a self-parody, indulgence in greater and greater excesses attempts to prove that they can get by with even more outrageous misbehavior.

History and literature teach us that while power enables almost limitless excess that is not easily resisted by an ever-weakening conscience, tragedy often results when the limits of power are reached, a new situation presents itself (now called by some a 'paradigm shift' or more obscurely, a 'sea change'), or a worthy opponent is encountered, the Siegfried to pull Nothing out of the enormous tree into which it had been thrust by Wotan. Excess underlay this: Wotan violated dictates. It was proscribed behavior to have strayed from his wife, Fricka and, in one of several adulterous liaisons, to have fathered the Wälzung race, *viz.*, the siblings Siegmund and Sieglinde, whose unknowingly incestuous union produced the hero Siegfried. Pervasive in Wagner's operas is a redemptive theme, albeit pagan (from Germanic and Norse mythology), but ultimately in *Der Ring des Nibelungen* the gods' power is destroyed on account of Wotan's sin.

Dr. Cushman knew many of the complexities of the era, and brought several unfamiliar connections and relationships to the audience's attention. I found him particularly well-informed on trade, economics, international affairs, warfare, and of course, government. He was not as knowledgeable as one would desire in other areas—the ones that help us to

understand ‘Why?’—including the human side of the characters on the stage, their motivations, and interactions with others. Perhaps he was oversimplifying for the sake of time, or maybe, as an analytical historian, he found these aspects less interesting. They are certainly more subjective and hence more difficult for a scholar to consider; speculation is often required since direct evidence is not plentiful. Whatever the reason, Cushman did not seem as comfortable assessing this area as others, evincing more of a ‘knee jerk’ reaction or perhaps accepting the popular perception as a pragmatic expedient to avoid debate on a subject only incidental to his studies’ emphasis. This weakness warrants brief comment. These were complex people, who in addition to living their normal lives, were living during a period of history, the end of the medieval age—the end of all they knew and of the traditions with which they were imbued, where every custom was being questioned and where everything was in flux. Population was concentrating in cities, a new class, the bourgeoisie, was growing, and religion and government, previously in harmony, were increasingly at odds. In little more than a century, there had been three drastic, imposed changes of religion, each accompanied by mindless violence and bloodshed, while they were, as Cromwell seized power, in the midst of a fourth. That such atrocities were all justified on religious grounds may have done more to cause cynicism about religion than the Reformation itself, which was also justified (or rationalized) on apparently logical bases. Superimposed on all this, for some, was immersion in the very artificial milieu called ‘The Court,’ a situation not unlike an important dinner party anticipated by General Patton in a letter from North Africa to his wife, an event he characterized as of the sort that “is purely social, that is to say, purely political.” ‘The Court’ was not a new thing, but its dynamics were changed by social and economic change. Personal aggrandizement was harder to achieve because economic interactions were more complex and subject to more constraints.

Prof. Cushman seemed to be of a more conservative bent than many academics. His thesis was that checks, balances, and extra hurdles were incorporated into the U. S. Constitution because Cromwell, fresh in their minds over a century later, had been such a disappointment, having gone from an apparent idealist to a feckless dictator. (I use ‘conservative’ not in an overtly political sense, but to commend Cushman, acknowledging that he seems to be using his discipline, History, as a fine tool to get to the Truth, not as hammer and tongs, crudely beating and twisting the facts to conform to a preconceived agenda.) For me, Prof. Cushman was refreshing in his analysis and presentation of history. He is one of those whom I perceive to be among an increasing number of scholars who see XVII Century Britain with a matter-of-fact, impartial outlook. Granted, he does not regard Charles as favorably as we might, but neither does he accept the old mutation of Cromwell into the father of democracy. He sees him for what he was, a dictator who said the words but did not believe in the freedom of the people or did not know how to make progress toward that. The King was blamed, but he was not the problem. After the regicide removed the ‘problem,’ the people didn’t embrace Cromwell warmly. As time went on, his policies ensured that. The “*King’s Book*” (*Eikon Basilike*) was on the best-seller list: It went through scores of editions—several dozen the first year—while Milton’s hastily-written *Ikonoklastes* had to be remaindered in its second.

The regular reader of our S.K.C.M. publications might be surprised to find a positive overall assessment of Cushman the scholar. Yes, Dr. Cushman called King Charles stupid. (He would think otherwise if he read more about the King’s hobbies, his wit, and his non-governmental pursuits. He was not considered stupid by foreign ambassadors and diplomats who met with him and whose confidential dispatches are extant. His skill in reasoning is evident in the few statements he was allowed to make at his ‘trial’.) Regarding the ‘big picture,’ however, because of his impartial study of the period, especially of the political and economic forces at work, Dr. Cushman ‘gets it’. Unlike that macropodine travesty, the “High Court of Justice”, our lecturer left no doubt in his hearers’ minds of *who the tyrant was*. The people of the Realm, if not at once, surely after a decade of rule by the “Lord Protector” in what was dubbed a “Commonwealth” also *knew who the tyrant was*. And let’s not be too hard even on the members of that Court. Most of them probably knew in their hearts that the Charge of Treason, the Verdict of guilty, and the Sentence of “death by the severinge [*sic*] of his head from his body” against King Charles were factually baseless, without legal precedent, and at root, *wrong*, and all were *decided and ordered in advance*. One proof of this is Cromwell’s statement, “I will have his head, with the crown on it.” That was not an idle threat, it was a promise. A skill-set outside a headsman’s job description, the crown bit was an exaggeration for emphasis. The rebels had come to believe their rationalization for Regicide, renamed Tyrannicide. Most of the jury got out of town as quickly as possible, some before the trial had ended. Many of them had been coerced, some physically, for their signature on that death warrant. Yes, they too *knew who the tyrant was*.

Cromwell’s severe attire reflected less on his actual religious beliefs or practices than on the image he wished his constituency to perceive. To cite an example of this, the Lord Protector’s paranoia of assassination was so great that he wore an iron corset under his clothing, donning and removing it only behind locked doors. The point is not that he wore that day’s equivalent of a bullet-proof vest, but that he was ashamed that he did. No one expected Cromwell’s torso to be bullet-proof, but he wanted to be known as 100% macho—fearless, invincible, god-like—but he knew that he wasn’t. He knew that he was a fraud. His head was presumably impenetrable, but Bradshaw’s was not. The virtually unknown jurist John Bradshaw presided over King Charles’s trial. That judge’s hat, lined with crude iron plates, is exhibited at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford University. In a previous issue of this publication, we commented on the careful treatment of certain legal niceties, as if punctiliousness in a few matters compensate for the gross legal deficiencies of the entire proceeding.

Occasionally, Cromwell publicly thanked God for a military victory, using ostensibly extemporaneous prayers. To me, they seem self-congratulatory, arrogant, and studied, prepared in advance to elicit the desired effect. The prayers are like a play in which Cromwell plays both himself and God, himself declaiming God’s words of congratulation.

Cromwell was indeed a great military success; I will leave any judgment of “genius” to military strategists, but the style of his rule was like his style of military command, dictatorial, not democratic. In his decade of rule, Cromwell made no progress toward the peoples’ ‘liberation’, favoring oppression and subjugation, destruction and conformation. This fundamental failure, to realize his primary stated objective—to wipe out tyranny—was rationalized by John Cooke, counsel

to the “High Court of Justice”, who blamed the people, saying that they “more delighted in servitude than freedom.” In actuality, the people did not care for Cromwell’s brand of ‘freedom’.

Father King became a votary of King Charles the Martyr on his own. Miss Brown only encouraged him to read about King Charles I and the historical facts led him to understand, even though one finds many that are distorted. Father King was led to witness to his new understanding publicly. For example, he brought a proposal to his diocesan convention, to memorialize General Convention to make the commemoration of King Charles official. It passed in diocesan convention. I wish I could say, “The rest is history”, but can’t; all attempts in General Convention using whatever parliamentary means having failed. Our hope has failed to be realized, yet by having the courage to move the resolution and to speak in its favor, Father King caused many to become aware of Saint Charles and to understand him. Father King’s witness represented his discerning what he could do, and *doing it*. Before his encounter with Nurse Brown, who could have imagined him speaking for his resolution at the NJ Diocesan Convention? And it carried! Both Fr. King and Fr. Minister were direct, declaring their own views, avoiding complex arguments. We should take a lesson from them. When we bring the matter forward that way, we can follow in Fr. Minister’s and Fr. King’s footsteps with confidence. —MAW

The Rev’d Canon Marshall Vincent Minister, OL. *Requiescat in pace.*

The preacher of the sermon appearing below saw an opportunity and did what he could do. **The Rev’d Canon Marshall Vincent Minister, OL**, stands as one of the luminaries of the Society’s American Region. Nearly sixty years ago, he gave tangible expression to his commitment and devotion to the Royal Martyr. He once told me that he had resolved, before his ordination and before he had heard of our Society, to dedicate his first church to Saint Charles. As you read on in this account of the simple steps he took, it will become apparent to you that the vision he harbored and the resolve he possessed energized his work toward that goal.

As a young and freshly-ordained priest (26 Sept. 1950), Fr. Minister rapidly inculcated that same devotion and commitment in the members of his congregation at Saint Paul’s Mission in Fort Morgan, Colorado. In January 1951, the congregation voted unanimously to seek a change in dedication. They and their Vicar went to his Bishop, the Rt. Rev’d Harold L. Bowen, who supported the proposal. The parish’s elevation from mission status and its new Title, the **Parish Church of Saint Charles the Martyr**, were solemnized by Bp. Bowen on 24 April 1951. The new Vicar was already a Rector! Father Minister; in this success, achieved the first such dedication in the New World, or in the Americas.⁽³⁾ It may truly be said that Fr. Minister, energized by his vision, was pursuing as a first priority his vision to have a church dedicated to Saint Charles in the U.S. We will never know what sorts of practical or spiritual benefits he expected to result from his vision, only that there was to be a church with that dedication. He worked for it once he was in his first cure.

⁽³⁾ It may also correctly be stated, ‘in North America’, or ‘in the U.S.’ Occasionally one hears it said to have been ‘in the Western Hemisphere’. This is incorrect: No fewer than two of the English Restoration dedications are of churches located west of Greenwich, Falmouth in Cornwall, at about 5° W, in 1662, and Plymouth, Devon, c. 4° W, in 1665. It is interesting to note that many American settlers came from the traditionally royalist region of Cornwall and Devon.

The building—did I mention that Fr. Minister led fund-raising for a new building, too?—was formally consecrated when the debt on it had been nearly discharged, the cornerstone being laid at a Solemn Pontifical High Mass on the anniversary of the Canonization of Saint Charles the Martyr, 26 April 1957, by the Rt. Rev’d Joseph Summerville Minnis, Bp. of Colorado. The ceremonies included dedication of the Chapel of the Holy Ghost and the signing and witnessing of the Instrument of Dedication. [See note just below.⁽⁴⁾ There were a few interesting features, too. The service took place on Friday in Easter Week. The service was according to the American Missal, although the *Gloria* took the prayer book position near the end. In the programme, the *Gloria*’s setting is given as ‘Minister’, but nothing is said in the program, or in Father Minister’s correspondence with me on the consecration service, of his having written it. The mass was at 10 a.m., evening masses being discouraged in those days because of the impracticality of receiving communion fasting.

⁽⁴⁾ It is remarkable that, as recently as the 1950s, there appears to have been no difficulty in securing the support of two successive bishops of Colorado for the Fort Morgan church’s dedication. In Fr. Minister’s detailed account of the entire matter, there is no mention of objection or reluctance, even when the subject was first broached. In an incident contemporary with the Fort Morgan dedication, Archbishop Geoffrey Fisher (Abp. of Canterbury, 1945-61) upon arriving to consecrate a church under the title ‘Saint Charles, King and Martyr’, was first escorted into the Sacristy to complete the formalities. After inspecting the documents, Dr. Fisher ruled out the dedication, writing in its place, ‘King Charles Memorial’, before signing. . . . despite the use of the words ‘saint’ and ‘martyr’ in the State Service. That Service duly stands where it was properly placed, in the Sealed Book, and has never formally been removed.

Like many small churches, Fort Morgan’s Church of Saint Charles the Martyr has had its ups and downs, including reduction to mission status for a time. Under one of its incumbents, reversion to the church’s original name was seriously discussed on more than one occasion. Another vicar hardly knew who Saint Charles, the saint of his mission’s dedication and title, was, possibly a reflection not on that vicar but on his education. Saint Charles is central to Anglicanism: Would the Episcopal Church exist at all without bishops? Would its name be that because it *used to have bishops*? The church is now under the care of Father Bill Kindel, Priest-in-Charge, so for the present, the name of the Martyr King is still visible in Fort Morgan, almost sixty years after Father Minister did what he could do. *Laus Deo!*

A commemorative gift to Saint Charles the Martyr, Fort Morgan, is planned. It will elevate Saint Charles, the saint of their title, to higher prominence and emphasize what an historic dedication the church and its people are privileged to have. It is hoped that its presence will stimulate some interest, and even devotion. It will take the form of a reproduction of the famous 1636 van Dyck portrait in Garter Robes with a plaque on the frame. The plaque will state Fr. Minister’s historic rôle in the parish’s renaming, the name’s significance as a FIRST in all the Americas, and that S.K.C.M. presented the painting to recognize these achievements. It is hoped that the parishioners’ identification with Saint Charles will increase. It is unfortunate that the semicentennial anniversaries of 2001 and 2007 passed without recognition

After more than a decade as rector of Saint Charles in Fort Morgan (1951-62), Fr. Minister, a life member of the Society, went on to continue his ministry. It is not known to us why he chose to leave the church in Fort Morgan, the church that was the fulfillment of his vision, or to go to Nebraska. It is quite likely that he was the kind of priest who unquestioningly went where he perceived he was being called, or perhaps he actively pursued the opportunity in Omaha, the see city of the Diocese of Nebraska, because he felt that he could be of greater use there. He became rector of Saint Martin of Tours, Omaha, in 1962. After a few years he sat on the Standing Committee, chairing it for a year. From 1972-76 he served as dean of the Omaha Deanery. In 1977 he became a non-parochial priest, retiring in 1983. All in all, he served about one decade in Colorado and two in Nebraska. Fr. Minister served in the European Theater during World War II, in 1944-5, as a lead bombardier in the storied 93rd Bombardment Group of the Army Air Corps. This experience surely gave him more assertiveness, leadership ability, and confidence than a typical new curate or vicar. He died in Omaha recently, on 21 March 2010, at age 86. His obsequies, at Omaha's Trinity Cathedral on Saturday the 27th, were attended by at least one Society member, Fr. Robert Scheibhofer, rector of Saint Barnabas Parish.

In 1990, Saint Martin of Tours and its rector, Fr. Walinski, hosted a mass and meeting that established the Great Plains Chapter in Omaha. Nick Behrens, the Chapter's organizer for two decades, is also the Central States Representative of the Monarchist League; the League and our Society have persisted two decades in this very successful witness, which will be punctuated by the Restoration celebration 29 May 2010 at Saint Barnabas, Omaha. Nick, the churches that have hosted the Great Plains annual gatherings, their rectors, Fr. Walinski, Fr. Raybourn, and Fr. Scheibhofer, the other priests who have preached and assisted, and after-lunch speakers all deserve our sincere thanks for their witness and the chapter's success.

At that inaugural meeting in 1990, Father Minister, Canon of Omaha, gave a talk about the establishment of the Fort Morgan CO church dedicated to Saint Charles the Martyr. At the luncheon following the Restoration mass on 29 May 2010, Father John B. Pahls, Jr., sometime vicar of Saint Charles, Fort Morgan, will give a talk on the same subject. That action in 1951 established a witness that has persisted for nearly six decades. See how much one act can accomplish? In addition to Saint Charles, Fort Morgan, its dedication stimulated nearly ten further dedications within little more than a decade. Similarly, Nick Behrens and Father Stephen Walinski organized that mass to commemorate Saint Charles in January of 1990. Its witness continues now, twenty years later. Remember these actions' consequences when you are tempted to ask, "What can one person do?" One voice, the prophet Isaiah said, "Here am I; send me." (*Is. vi: 8*)

Fr. Minister's landmark achievement was recognized by the Board of Trustees at its 27 October 2009 meeting. He was unanimously elected an Inaugural Member of the Order of Blessed William Laud, Archbishop and Martyr. A few days later by post, he received the Board's Letter of Commendation which took note of his witness to Saint Charles and to the Cause, his contributions during six decades as a member, most notably his leadership in achieving that landmark Fort Morgan dedication, truly a **FIRST**, and the conferral of this honor. **May his soul rest in peace.**

What We Learn from King Charles the Martyr

Sermon Preached by the Rev'd Marshall V. Minister, 1984
(from *SKCM News*, December, 1984)

"Therefore take the whole armor of God, that you may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand." —Eph. vi: 13⁽⁵⁾

From time to time it is fitting for us to reflect on the life of one of the heroes of The Faith—one of the Saints—to examine his life and discover what he can teach us in our pilgrimages toward God. This morning we celebrate the anniversary of the martyrdom of King Charles the First, which makes this an appropriate time to ask what a murdered king of three centuries ago has to do with Americans today. Before that, however, we should—lest there be any confusion—clarify who he is, because, somehow, it often surprises people that King Charles the First should be included in our calendar of Saints and that anybody but the Pope ever canonized anyone, that is recognize officially that such and such a person is a saint.

Saint Charles was born in 1600, succeeded James the First as king of England in 1625, and in 1649, upon his refusal to abandon The Faith, was beheaded by Oliver Cromwell. The proper word is 'martyred'. In 1661, he was formally canonized as a saint of the Holy Catholic Church by joint action of Canterbury and York. There are many churches dedicated to him throughout the world with about a dozen in the United States.

Well, what does Charles Stuart have to teach us? Why is he important? He is important to us especially because of his witness before the world as an Anglican. The Reformation of the Church in England [had been] over for a hundred years when King Charles went to the scaffold, and it was in defense of the purified Church of England that he died. He went to the block praying for his murderers—as Saint Stephen had [done before he] died—and he surrendered the highest secular office on earth, along with his life, rather than betray the task with which God had entrusted him—that of being Defender of the Faith.

The first thing that Saint Charles teaches us is that high office is answerable first of all to God and the office is held in trust from God. This is the Christian concept of government. King Charles I firmly believed that on his Coronation he became Viceroy of Christ and Defender of the Faith. When it became finally a choice between loyalty to God and the welfare of his people on the one hand or denying the Church and delivering his kingdom to the tyranny of Oliver Cromwell on the other, he chose to obey God, and died doing so.

The second example Saint Charles provides for America, and England, is the unexcelled purity of his life. The sanctity of the family has in him one of the greatest champions it has ever known. Amid all the immorality with which high office is

tempted, he remained constant. He is one of the few chiefs-of-state known to Christian history whose conjugal fidelity was absolute.

The third and perhaps the most poignant lesson the life and death of Saint Charles has for us today is that he bore witness to his love for God as a layman. Admittedly, he was the most illustrious layman in the world, but still, a layman. There are always so many people around who regard the field of Christian sanctity as an area to be explored by clergymen only, but each and every Christian should witness to the power of Christ in his life right where he is, in whatever business or profession or station in life it has pleased God to call him. We are all the Church. The life and death of Saint Charles is testimony to what laymen can do to advance the Kingdom of God, and to show forth before the world how Christ can rule in the hearts of men, for as Tertullian (*c.* 160-*c.* 225) truly wrote, the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church.

When the headsman swung his axe on that dismal wintry afternoon of 30 January 1649, while the angels sang and a nation wept, a new saint was born into Heaven, the medieval concept of monarchy came to its final end. But in losing his life rather than losing his soul, Charles the First, King and Martyr, became numbered with that celestial band of saints who teach us that God is all that really counts, and that to die for Christ's sake is to gain everlasting beatitude. *Amen.*

(5) Fr Minister took his sermon text from the RSV. That version of the text has been retained here, although our usual editorial policy is to use the Authorized, or King James, Version of the Bible. Not only did it exist in King Charles's time, but he used it. Just as something of a commonality of spirit with our Lord in the experience of a pilgrim to the Holy Land walking in our Lord's Footsteps, so there is a oneness with Saint Charles in reading, speaking, and hearing the very words that Saint Charles did. Our sermon text hardly differs between the two versions; your editor finds it to be either simple-mindedly redundant or inscrutably arcane. In the Phillips translation it is rendered, "...even when you have fought to a standstill you may still stand your ground", and in the Jerusalem "or you will not be able to put up any resistance when the worst happens, or have enough resources to hold your ground." Perhaps a military specialist who understands hand-to-hand combat would be of help, since it strikes your editor as difficult to estimate how much energy one has left, or how soon one might get a 'second wind'.

Are the Authorized Version and the RSV most faithful to Saint Paul's original, replicating that scholarly apostle's inborn and schooled redundancy, typical, *e.g.*, of psalm verses' restatement of each point? The awkward, pedantic tedium of this verse in the Phillips and Jerusalem versions is good advertising for the Authorized Version.

Whatever Bible translation we favor, we should consider Fr. Minister's point in choosing the text. Saint Charles *stood*. He stood for his principles, for his responsibility to the Church he swore to uphold, as he was taught by his father and solemnized at his coronation. He died rather than compromise what he stood for. The Bible verse chosen as the sermon text is a message to us, as well. His oath *stood*.

Supporters of Saint Charles

More numerous than our members are our supporters. We give thanks for them, not that they are not members, but because they are supporters. We don't know why any particular individual declines to join. The reason may be one particular scruple, the concern that a formal affiliation may lay one open to some criticism, a desire to be non-partisan, *i.e.*, formally neutral on an issue that after three and a half centuries is still controversial, or a desire to present oneself as politically correct. Of course an agile flexibility is required to adopt new 'orthodoxies' with no evident effort.

A writer, columnist, and editor member referred to the Society some years ago in a humorous fantasy, wherein he speculated about some details, potentially ruinous to his likelihood of receiving Senate confirmation for an ambassadorial post. One was the presence of a monocle in his desk drawer. Would a *pince-nez* be considered less eccentric? A *lorgnette*? Inexplicably, the writer also felt that his membership in S.K.C.M. would likely be a bar to confirmation.

It is not a truism that "Everyone has his reasons." Some employment contracts allow termination "for any reason or for no reason", reminiscent of the childish "because". Some crimes are committed with no known motive, either confessed or discerned and confirmed. I never press people about their choice to enroll in the Society or not, but they sometimes feel a need to explain their reasons to me as if I were some kind of *arbiter* of reasons, rationales, and excuses. Frequently cited as a 'reason' and as lame as any, is, "I'm not a joiner." It's one of the things one hears said that really says nothing while purporting to be an explanation. Another often heard non-explanation (not for failing to enroll in the Society), favored by politicians, and generally uttered with a solemn expression, feigning lengthy ponderation, is, "Such-and-such may or may not be the case." It is always correct, but conveys no information, just like a stopped clock, is twice a day—one doesn't even have a way to know when the time on the stopped clock is correct, without another timepiece.

Suffice it to say that no explanation is required of your decision to become a member or not. We give thanks for our supporters.

Notices of Death

✠ **Clement Theodore Cooper, Esq.**, of the Ascension & Saint Agnes Chapter, *Obit.* 16 April 2007, *Aet.* 76

✠ **Capt. John S. Coussons**, of the Charles Towne, Carolanas Chapter, *Obit.* 31 Dec. 2009

✠ **The Rev'd Canon Marshall V. Minister, OL** of Omaha, *Obit.* 21 March 2010, *Aet.* 86 (*vide supra*)

We take notice also of two supporters who underwent their demise in recent months. I was very fond of both of them, and admired them as church leaders. As it happens, they were both active in Forward in Faith, in Britain and in North America. Both tirelessly applied their considerable talents to maintaining, defending, and proclaiming the Faith once delivered. We refer to:

✠ **The Rt. Rev'd Noël Jones, CB**, *Obit.* 28 Aug. 2009, *Aet.* 76; and

✠ **The Rev'd Canon Dr. John Heidt**, *Obit.* 23 Oct, 2009, *Aet.* 71.

Requiescant in pace.

Bishop Jones died of cancer in London, where he was serving at Saint Paul's Cathedral, on 28 Aug. 2009. Bishop Jones had preached at the R.M.C.U. mass in January of 2009. He was a powerful man, both physically and spiritually. Educated at Monmouth School, Saint David's College (Lampeter), and Wells Seminary, he had a notable career before the ecclesiastical one, in which he became Bishop of Sodor and Man, comprising the Western Isles, the Hebrides, and the Isle of Man and having only sixteen clergy. When at home in his diocese, he and his wife enjoyed showing hospitality in their home. Man is the origin of Manx cats, whose tails have only three vertebrae. But why was he known as the 'bishop in the pink dress'? A churchman in that diocese was quoted as saying with amusement that Bishop Jones administered the diocese as if it were an aircraft carrier. He traveled much for FiF, speaking with many concerned individuals having pastoral concerns, in parishes, dioceses, and at special gatherings of FiF, of which he was an articulate spokesman and zealous supporter. In his previous career, he rose from chaplain in the Royal Navy to Chaplain of the Fleet. Showing promise early in career, he received on his R.N. performance review the comment, "This man should be Chaplain of the Fleet." He and Father Peter Laister had been colleagues first at Lampeter and later, in the R.N. (with sometime Bishop of Gibraltar, Ambrose Weekes); thus he visited S. Clement's, where I was privileged to meet him. Bp. Weekes and Fr. Laister, the latter anonymously, were both contributors to *SKCM News*. When his obituary appears in *SKCM News*, read about his physical intervention to resolve a labor dispute in Hong Kong, where he singlehandedly disarmed an axe-wielding worker. Rather than suffer intolerable suspense, the reader should know that it was his habit of wearing his soutane when out and about that led to that nickname.

Our Patron was in his car when I telephoned him one evening. He told me he was on his way to visit **Canon Heidt**, who had suffered a stroke just a few hours earlier. That good priest and friend died soon afterwards. We got to know each other at Nashotah House, where Mrs. Heidt and I served together on the Board of Trustees for some years. At first, I found him very intimidating. Oxford educated, he was vicar of two parishes in the U.K., returning to the States as Canon Theologian in the Diocese of Fort Worth, a position for which he was admirably suited. He made his points in a discussion with remarkable clarity and force, and sometimes gestures. (I said *force* and was always careful to keep a safe distance.) In recent years he was helpful as its editor in placing our advertisements in FIF-NA's magazine.

Notice of the death of **the Rev'd Canon Dr. Dixon Barr** appeared previously. His obituary, with those of Fr. Heidt and Bp. Jones, will appear in the next issue of *SKCM News*. Dixon, as I knew him, remarkably exemplified the late vocation, unlike many, a calling for which he was most suitable. After his retirement from a distinguished career as a college dean, he became more active in a multitude of genealogical and philatelic organizations, many of which he served as an officer. I mention him here because he too, like Fr. Heidt, and I first became acquainted at Nashotah House, where his wife, Frances Keller Barr, L.H.D., long served with distinction as a Trustee.

Among other entities, **Nashotah House** seminary has played an important rôle in the American Region. In the course of research for the History I have been studying the membership. Fully ten percent of S.K.C.M. members over the years have had an association with Nashotah, most as seminarians and alumni. Associate alumni, trustees, faculty and staff, and honorary degree recipients also figure in our Society's 'Nashotah Connection'.

S.K.C.M. Publications

The **June, 2010, *SKCM News*** will be mailed in early June. For the December issue, members should submit content—articles, reviews, and news or miscellaneous items discovered in your reading—**by the first week of October**. Members are encouraged to submit articles for this publication. As editor, I'll be happy to chat with you about your ideas, questions, scheduling, or editorial policies.

The ***Email Communiqué*** appears nominally nine times a year; next will be the June issue. We expected the present issue to be published in April, not May, but conflicts with *SKCM News* combined with several computer problems made that impossible. I have tried to schedule the publications so the heaviest workloads don't coincide, but my attempts to harmonize the editorial work with the composition—text, layout, pagination, *etc.*)—are so far unsuccessful. Also requiring consideration is the job of preparing the actual mailing of the *SKCM News* (see above, pp. 1-2, "Volunteers. . .") The June issue will be accompanied by the latest ***Church & King*** (Christmas, 2009).

Problems with internet connectivity have affected my reading and response to email. Also, about 10% of the messages were arbitrarily deleted. If you have had no response to an email you sent me, first, please accept my apology; and second, feel free to contact me by phone at 781 308 0056 (cell) (If I am unable to pick up your call, please leave a voice mail stating when I may best return your call.) or write to me at P. O. Box 79212, Waverly MA 02479.

Consequently, *SKCM News* and the *Email Communiqué* have been delayed, as has completion of the *Devotional Manual*. Fortunately the files containing these documents remain intact.



SEND EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE & SUGGESTIONS BY EMAIL TO DR. WUONOLA.

EMAIL COMMUNIQUÉ EDITORIAL BOARD: LEE HOPKINS, J. DOUGLASS RUFF, ESQ., & MARK A. WUONOLA, PH.D.

**INQUIRIES & MEMBERSHIP [\$15 PER ANNUM, CURRENT AND FUTURE YEARS]: J. DOUGLASS RUFF, ESQ., SECRETARY & TREASURER
5500 FRIENDSHIP BLVD., STE. 2009 N • CHEVY CHASE MD 20815-7212**

MEMBERSHIP INCLUDES *SKCM News* AND *CHURCH & KING*, BOTH SEMI-ANNUAL. THE MONTHLY *EMAIL COMMUNIQUÉ* IS PROVIDED IN .PDF FORMAT, ATTACHED TO AN EMAIL, AND IS FREE TO MEMBERS AND NON-MEMBERS ALIKE. SIMPLY PROVIDE YOUR EMAIL ADDRESS AND IF QUERIED BY DR. WUONOLA'S RUDE FIREWALL, PLEASE ENTER, AS YOUR PURPOSE, '*COMMUNIQUÉ*'.

MDCLX • 350TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESTORATION • MMX