INVENTIO

INVENTIO
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA'S UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH JOURNAL

CONTENTS

EDITORS' LETTER

Studying at the Catholic University of America can be a contradictory experience. Students with diverse backgrounds, faiths, and interests populate this university whose Catholicism, born out of an apostolic letter from Rome, is pervasive and permanent. Herein lies the dualism inherent in the experience of learning at CUA: while not all students are Catholic, each must encounter the ancient faith and the challenges it presents.

It is with clear awareness of these challenges that we at *Inventio* have chosen a square as our visual theme for the undergraduate research journal. Similar to the complexity of the student body at CUA, the rhetoric in which squares are embroiled is heterogenous and challenging. The enclosed space of a square is particular, limiting, and definite. Simultaneously, a square in an ordained space has the potential to protect through implementing reasonable parameters within which there is freedom to explore, and outside of which we can think. Other understandings of "square" encourage creative thinking, problem solving, and personal growth. Both understandings require some sort of response; a square necessarily challenges us. This is what we strive to encourage through the publication of *Inventio.*

Striving to participate in this university's mission "to discover, perserve, and impart the truth in all its forms," *Inventio* stands as a venue through which the thoughtful and bold academic writing of students at CUA can express what has been learned through the limitations and challenges encountered in the pursuit of truth. A journal for undergraduate research allows students to move beyond the merely practical requirements of the classroom. *Inventio* entices students to take responsibility for their work, to acknowledge that their papers are more than a grade. In fostering a sense of pride in scholarship, we hope to enable a larger sharing of knowledge with a wide community of professors and peers.

Sincerely,

Mallory Nygard   Lucas Matheson
Editor-in-Chief   *Managing Editor*

LEX ORANDI EST LEX CREDENDI:
The Influence of the Laity and the Liturgy on the Doctrinal Debates of the Immaculate Conception

The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is still a widely misunderstood and controversial subject that sparked one of the largest theological debates of the Middle Ages. The Immaculate Conception, often confused with the doctrine of the Virginal Conception of Jesus, refers to the conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in her mother's womb and teaches that the Blessed Virgin was conceived without original sin. The teaching resonated well with the Marian devotions of the laity and even some of the clergy during the tenth and eleventh centuries, but generated backlash from many of the great Catholic intellectuals of the later Middle Ages. In this article, I shall begin by outlining the historical roots of the celebration of the feast of Mary's Conception to show that the celebration had an upward development from the liturgical life of the Church to doctrinal debates among the hierarchy of the Church. One might assume that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was imposed top-down on the laity, when in reality, the Immaculate Conception began as a liturgical celebration fueled by the devotion of the laity. After establishing the historical context and addressing some early responses to the doctrine, I shall examine the central theological battle, the great climax of this controversy which took place at the close of the thirteenth century within the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), who vehemently argued against the possibility of Mary's Immaculate Conception, and Bl. John Duns Scotus (d.1308), who wrote in defense of the liturgical celebration and the doctrine. Aquinas and Scotus are undoubtedly two of the greatest and most influential theologians in the Church's history and thus, their differing so extremely on the issue is an opportunity to see a theological issue expertly debated. Finally, I shall conclude by examining the question of what led the Church to side with Scotus on this matter rather than with Aquinas, whose works for quite some time had an authority second only to Scripture and

the magisterium, as well as what that decision says about the character of the Church, even through to the present day. In short, I have found that the Church, acting as Mother of the Faithful, operates on the principle of *"lex orandi est lex credendi,"* a phrase that means that the law of prayer is the law of faith. Because the faithful already celebrated the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, Scotus believed it was imprudent to tell them that they were praying incorrectly unless it were absolutely necessary to do so. This desire led him to become a kind of theological champion of the people, defending the devotion of the laity and their liturgical celebrations. Because of his parental care for his spiritual children, Scotus' approach to the doctrine was much closer to the spirit of Mother Church, whereas Aquinas' view was eventually judged as theologically incorrect and perhaps as a bit too dismissive of laical devotions. Thus, the Church's assent to Scotus' Mariological arguments reveals that *"lex orandi est lex credendi"* is a powerful guiding principle of the Church who acts as a mother to her children.

The earliest components, both theological and liturgical, of the feast of Mary's Conception existed well before the later Middle Ages and developed mainly through late antiquity and the early Middle Ages. The earliest celebrations of this feast arose in the Byzantine East and were observed with the purpose of honoring Mary's "prepurification," her cleansing from all stain of sin in the womb. The earliest major theological writer to bring attention to this notion is St. Gregory of Nazianzus.[1] Gregory lived in the fourth century and was a prominent Byzantine theologian and formulator of Christian doctrine.[2] His influence, the popular motifs of Mary as the new Eve, and the general fascination of theologians with the figure of the Blessed Mother, spurred the Eastern churches to incorporate into the liturgical calendar a number of new Marian feasts in succeeding centuries. Until the time of the Council of Ephesus in 431, at which Mary declared *Theotokos*, there had only been a single feast day honoring Mary, similar to most other saints in the liturgical calendar. However, during the early sixth century, the feasts of the Annunciation, the Nativity of Mary, and the Dormition were introduced into the liturgical calendars of the East. Finally, in the seventh century, there arose the first instance

of a liturgical celebration of the Conception of Mary in the womb of her mother, St. Anne.[3] Curiosity about the Blessed Virgin's life was present even in the early Church; the Protoevangelium of James, an apocryphal document dating from the middle of the second century. This narrative provides an account of the nativities of both Mary and Jesus, and demonstrates early Christian's interest in the details of the life of Mary and the other parts of the Gospels that provide very little information. However, by the seventh century, the focus on providing a narrative was eschewed in favor of theological work investigating how Mary relates to salvation history.[4] The fervent interest in the figure of the Blessed Virgin, seen in popular works such as the Protoevangelium, fueled the increase in doctrinal speculation about Mary over the following centuries and contributed to the development of diverse and new liturgical practices, most especially the Feast of Mary's Conception.

Initially, during the seventh and eighth centuries, the feast of the Conception appears to have been restricted to monasteries, as evidenced by the surviving liturgical documents such as the canon written for the celebration by St. Andrew of Crete (d. 712). St. Andrew's canon illustrates the Christological focus of this feast: "Today it is announced to us that the treasures of joy will be opened… in the holy Conception of the Mother of God… Her who will open the gate of grace of Paradise."[5] Another enlightening source for understanding the feast's position in the eighth century is the exhortation of the Syrian monk John of Euboea (c. 744) in which he urges that the feast be made a general one celebrated by all.[6] The celebration and the liturgical texts used in the East make clear the Christ-focused attitude behind their celebration with no hint of the theological problems that would eventually arise in the West four centuries later. The Feast of Mary's Conception, as well as those others that arose by the seventh century, indicate the immediacy with which Marian devotion directed believers to turn their thoughts to Christ. Rather than any prolonged focus on Mary's own virtues, the emphasis was on the role of Mary in the drama of salvation. These new feasts gave rise to a great deal of theological speculation through the eighth to eleventh centuries about Mary's role in salvation history and discussions of Mary's "prepurification," the acknowledgement that in some way, God cleansed her of sin in

the womb.

In the West, the first example of a celebration of Mary's Conception emerges in Anglo-Saxon England in 1060, prior to the Norman Conquest. This sudden appearance in the far West raises the question of how a Byzantine tradition reemerged in England. The feast came to be celebratedEurope through the travels of pilgrims who brought back the practices and devotions that they had observed in the Greek monasteries of Italy. These monasteries were filled with monks who brought with them the custom of a Feast honoring Mary's Conception; thus, "by way of southern Italy the Greek feast of the Conception and the idea it stood for came to the Latin West."[7] The Minaeon for December, an eleventh-century manuscript in use in the Greek monasteries of Italy, details the celebrations observed by the strongly orthodox monks, including the Feast of the Conception.[8] It is this document that shows the Feast to be "already received and established as traditional" among the Greek monks in Italy during the early eleventh century.[9] This feast was then disseminated by the ecclesiastical connections between Italy and England during the mid-eleventh century as well as by pilgrims from England who brought this new devotion back with them.[10] Shortly after the introduction of the Feast of Mary's Conception in 1060, St. Anselm of Canterbury (d. 1109), wrote in favor of the doctrine of Mary's purification in the womb in his position as the Archbishop of Canterbury, but did not necessarily assert the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception that would develop over the following century.[11] It was his close friend and biographer, Eadmer of Canterbury (d. 1128), who would first formulate the concept of the Immaculate Conception to clarify the devotions of the laity in celebrating the Feast of Mary's Conception; he understood that to celebrate Mary's Conception was to believe her to be holy, even though this is not explicitly stated in the liturgical texts.[12]

A distinction should be made between the English Feast of the Conception of the late eleventh century and the Norman Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the early twelfth century. While the English Feast acknowledges the immense graces and purification received by the Blessed Virgin, it does not necessarily teach this reception to have taken place at the moment of

conception as does the Norman Feast. It was the Feast of the Conception that was initially quite widespread in England, as evidenced by the liturgical documents in use during the final years before the Norman Conquest that detail various blessings for the celebration and the information recorded in English calendars of the mid-eleventh century.[13] Then, following the victory of William the Conqueror, this celebration fell largely out of use in England; nonetheless, by the beginning of the twelfth century, the Feast of Mary's Conception was being celebrated in certain regions of Normandy.[14] This appearance in Normandy followed the Council of London in 1129, at which the feast was reintroduced in England. Norman pilgrims were thus able to partake in its celebration and take the idea for a new liturgical feast back to Normandy when they returned.[15] Thus, the Feast of Mary's Conception spread from England into Normandy, and in turn dispersed throughout all of France due to the relatively close proximity of England to Normandy and the influence of the pilgrims who travelled to England. The stages of the feast's migration, namely, its appearance in Italian monasteries when Greek monks moved from their homes, its arrival in England due to the efforts of pilgrims and liturgists, and its eventual journey across the English Channel all demonstrate the major influence that the laity and the liturgy have on the life of the Church. Without the laity's interest and desire to participate in new customs, the Feast of Mary's Conception would have possibly been limited in the West to only a number of monasteries.

When the Feast of Mary's Conception became prevalent in Normandy and disseminated throughout all of France, those celebrating it began to clearly express a belief in the concept of the Immaculate Conception; the unstated belief began to become unofficial doctrine. The laity and their pastors developed a link between the moment of her conception and her sanctification, believing the two to have occurred simultaneously, meaning that Mary never suffered the stain of original sin.[16] The celebration of the feast and the idea of the Immaculate Conception provoked a harsh rebuke from St. Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153). Writing furiously to the Canons of Lyon for presuming to introduce a novel feast that in his mind detracted from Mary's honor, namely, the

honor of being the only woman to conceive a sinless person.[17] The doctrine was greeted with skepticism from St. Bonaventure (d. 1274), who recognized that it sprang from love for Jesus and Mary, but ultimately sided with Bernard, deciding that it was "more fitting, more reasonable, and safer" not to give assent to this doctrine.[18] These theologians, Sts. Bernard and Bonaventure, were unwilling even to consider the doctrine because it seemed to run contrary to Catholic teching and, due to their being largely unfamiliar with the theological developments in the East, it appeared to be utterly novel.

Though the theologians were opposed, a number of literary sources reveal how widespread devotion to the Blessed Virgin's Immaculate Conception had become by the thirteenth century. Jacobus de Voragine's *The Golden Legend* [compiled c. 1260] is an encyclopedic work, collecting all the pious traditions surrounding various saints. This work was an enormous influence on the artists of the Middle Ages and had an incalculable impact on iconography and how the laity learned about the Catholic faith visually.[19] The section on Mary's Nativity, like the speculations of the Greek Church Fathers, drew heavily from the Protoevangelium of James, filling in the gaps of the Gospel narrative. The laity felt a natural curiosity about these gaps; these apocryphal sources provided grounds on which to hypothesize and in which Voragine attempted to provide answers. In the sections relating to Mary, Voragine writes that Mary "had been made perfectly clean and holy in her mother's womb. Indeed, she was made so completely glorious and holy in the maternal womb… that no slightest inclination to sin remained in her."[20] Such a statement from a work that influenced so much of medieval devotion speaks volumes about the extent of the doctrine's appeal to and acceptance among the laity.

Likewise, another significant medieval text, the "Cantigas de Santa Maria" (completed c. 1270), testify to the spread of the Immaculate Conception. The "Cantigas," written by King Alfonso X of Castile, were heavily influenced by the Scholasticism of the thirteenth century.[21] His works were an immense visual, literary, and musical influence on the courtiers and artists who heard them.[22] Alfonso writes of Mary that "She was always sanctified from

the moment Her father made Her in the body of Her mother."[23] Alfonso's highly influential works inspired his court and many of his subjects because the "Cantigas" received much public attention and numerous dramatized readings; much of Alfonso's kingdom became familiar with his songs honoring the Blessed Virgin.[24] This widespread belief in the doctrine, of which The Golden Legend and the Cantigas are prime examples, and the consequent liturgical practices provoked the intense theological debate between two intellectual giants, namely, Aquinas and Scotus.

In the mid-thirteenth century, St. Thomas Aquinas, one of the most prominent thinkers of the medieval Church, commented on the Immaculate Conception in his *Summa Theologiæ*. Aquinas was born in southern Italy, near Naples, around 1225 and began his studies at the monastery of Monte Cassino, the community established by St. Benedict of Nursia in the sixth century.[25] After many years of struggle with his family due to their opposition to his pursuing a religious vocation, including a year of being captive up at his family's estate, Thomas was finally able to join the Dominican order and was eventually studied at the University of Paris.[26] Growing up in Italy, Thomas did not celebrate the Feast of the Immaculate Conception; in Italy, the feast was kept only in the Greek monasteries of the south.[27] The feast had spread from Normandy to the rest of France and was both celebrated in Paris by the laity in the parishes and, yet, hotly debated by the theologians at the University. Thus, when faced with this new liturgical celebration while in Paris and having no personal connection to it, Thomas strongly opposed the feast and the doctrine contained therein.

In the third part of his *Summa*, Aquinas posits a number of forceful objections, both theological and biological, to the doctrine. He argues from a biological perspective that purification from sin at the moment of conception would be utterly impossible. He also put forth the theological objection that, in his view, if Mary were free from all sin, it would detract from Christ's glory as universal savior. Working from an understanding of the soul that was heavily influenced by the corpus of Aristotle, he believed Aristotle's claim that the body was formed at the moment of conception, but that the soul did not exist until later. Thus, in his works, Aquinas

examines the possibility that sanctifying grace might be applied at conception; he observes that the rational soul must come from God.[28] Aquinas then aligns his ideas with the Aristotelian view that the rational, human soul develops out of a sensitive, animal soul, similar to the development of a seed into a flower.[29] Aquinas ultimately rejects this seed-like view of the soul, but nonetheless accepts the view of delayed hominization, the idea that the rational soul is infused only into a fully formed human sometime after conception.[30] This view plays an important role in his objections to the Immaculate Conception. In Aquinas' mind, the notion of Mary's purification from sin occurring at conception is an impossibility because sanctifying grace can only be applied to a rational soul. If Mary had no rational soul until sometime after her conception, it would be impossible for her soul to be purified at the moment of conception.[31]

Furthermore, Aquinas argues that the Immaculate Conception detracts from Christ's glory as the Redeemer; this objection is far more critical than the mere fact that it was impossible. In Aquinas' mind, while believing in something that could not have happened may be foolish, it is downright dangerous to believe something that seems to blaspheme against God. To teach that Mary was free of all sin was to say that Christ is not the universal Savior of all, thus threatening to lessen His dignity as such.[32] This implication is intolerable to Aquinas because it implies some imperfection in the universality of the salvation offered by Christ. Futhermore, to say that Mary was free from all sin is to imply that she was beyond the need for salvation. If Christ's Passion was unnecessary for any human being, it was potentially unnecessary for all. In this view, it is essential that Mary contracted original sin, even if only for a moment, so that Christ could be her savior, which she acknowledges in the Magnificat.[33] This assumption of her even momentary sinfulness satisfies the perceived demands of the theology of salvation. In short, Aquinas argues that Mary could not have been purified of sin prior to animation, or the infusing of her rational soul, because it is neither possible nor fitting. Thus, those who celebrated the feast were incorrect and were inadvertently damaging their understanding of Jesus and of salvation.

Shortly after the death of St. Thomas Aquinas, Blessed John Duns Scotus became the chief defender of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, developing into a theological champion of the people and their liturgical love for their Blessed Mother. Little is known of Scotus' early life beyond that he was born during the late 1260s in the Scottish village of Duns, joined the Franciscans, and was ordained into the priesthood in the early 1290s.[34] Growing up in the British Isles, Scotus would have been accustomed to observe the Feast of Mary's Conception as it was universally celebrated among those parishes following the Council of London in 1129. The effect of this celebration is clearly evident in the Mariological focus found in certain of his works. He was educated at Oxford and eventually became a teacher at the University of Paris, where Thomas Aquinas had also taught. Though the Feast of the Immaculate Conception was celebrated in Paris, the masters of theology and intellectuals at the University criticized it harshly.[35] The controversy and the theological debate reached a climax when Scotus and some of his colleagues began to question the common academic attitude of derision towards the Feast and the doctrine it celebrates. Scotus challenged the position put forth in the writings of Aquinas, and even some of his own Franciscan confreres, and ultimately defended the liturgical devotion to the Blessed Virgin of the celebration of her Conception. As Scotus, unlike Aquinas, had grown up with the feast he was therefore more likely to have a personal reason to protect its celebration. His attempts flew in the face of those who sought to suppress or downplay the feast even though the Church, as Aquinas notes, "tolerates the custom of certain churches that do keep that feast, wherefore this is not to be entirely reprobated."[36] Aquinas clearly held an opinion opposed to the celebration of the Immaculate Conception, but he did not take the extreme position that the feast must be entirely and forcefully suppressed; other theologians did take this stance and created an atmosphere in which Scotus found it necessary to state his case in defense of the Immaculate Conception. In taking on this defense, Scotus had two major obstacles to overcome before his opponents could ever give consideration to the doctrine. Namely, he had to contend with the views of Aquinas that sanctification prior to animation is impossible

and that no conception, as a result, can ever be truly immaculate. Likewise, he had to take on the even more daunting claim that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception detracts from Christ's dignity as universal savior.

In his reply to the first objection, Scotus argued that sanctifying grace can be applied to the soul prior to animation, the infusion of the rational soul into the body, and that likewise, God could purify the flesh before or during the moment of animation. The possibility of this method of sanctification derives directly out of Scotus' negative view of original sin, a view that sees original sin not as something acquired, but as a lack of something that should be present in the human person. Following St. Anselm, Scotus identifies original sin as the absence of original justice, writing that "every child of Adam begotten in a natural way is a debtor to original justice."[37] This way of seeing original sin clarifies that sin cannot exist in the same way as virtue, for sin is the absence of goodness just as darkness is only the absence of light. Thus, Scotus removes Thomas' first objection, showing that God may fill a deficiency and give a being what it should naturally possess. Scotus writes, quite movingly, that "in the instance of the conception [of Mary]… there was sanctification, not from guilt that was present there, but from guilt that would have been there if grace had not been infused into the soul at that moment."[38] God was capable of applying grace to the rational soul prior to uniting it to the body and likewise purifying the body. However, it was not a spiritual surgery excising an infection, but a nurturing act of love, supplying what should naturally be present. There was no necessary moment in which original sin must be present. Instead, the void of original sin was filled up with original justice by grace. Scotus saw that Mary was preserved from original sin rather than saved from it in the usual sense. She was saved in an extraordinary manner, being safeguarded from any stain of original sin.

Having countered the first argument, Scotus faced the second and far more intimidating issue, that of whether the notion of the Immaculate Conception diminished Christ's role as the "Savior of all."[39] The fear expressed by the opponents of the doctrine was that in some way, Mary did not require a savior. On

the contrary, Scotus argues, Mary needed a savior more than anyone else, for her salvation was achieved in an extraordinary manner. If someone is granted salvation by a singular grace, "this is not something the person has of [themselves], but only by the merit of another," for "it was because of another's merits that grace was conferred on this person."[40] Scotus argues that it was through no merit of Mary's that she received such an incredible privilege, but because of the merits of Christ and the saving power of His Passion. Furthermore, Scotus shows that rather than detracting from Christ, Mary's Immaculate Conception reveals even further His excellence as Savior of the world. Scotus shows Christ to be a most perfect mediator between God and man, reconciling mankind with the Father. Because Christ is a most perfect mediator, He performs a most perfect act of mediation while it is good to save someone who has fallen into a pit, it is better to prevent him from ever falling into the pit in the first place.[41] Scotus also illustrates this idea with the story of a king against whom someone commits a grave offense and, as a result of this offense, is continually offended by his children. A mediator does a good service to the king and, because of the mediator's good deed, reconciles the children to the king. Nonetheless, if this mediator is able to serve the king most perfectly and intercede for one of the children, he would most perfectly do so by assuring that the king never is offended by the child and thus does not need to be reconciled after an offense.[42] Through these examples Scotus shows the majesty of Christ's salvific power as a most perfect mediator capable of intervening even prior to the calamity of original sin. In showing that Mary still needed Christ as a Savior and that Mary's being preserved from all stain of sin actually glorifies Him, Scotus removes the final barrier, showing that the objections posited by Thomas Aquinas do not hold, leaving no obstacle to celebrating the Feast of the Immaculate Conception.

In the aftermath of this intense theological debate, the feast continued to grow in popularity, finally being introduced into most churches during the late fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries.[43] Many Franciscans, such as Raymund Lull, who was the first author to use the phrase "Immaculate Conception" to denote the doctrine, adamantly promoted Scotus' arguments and the celebration of the

Virgin's Immaculate Conception amongst the laity and engaged in vigorous debate with the Dominicans who promoted Aquinas' scholastic theology and who were opposed to the Immaculate Conception.[44] Finally, in the late fifteenth century, the papacy, having remained largely silent on the issue, responded to the laity's celebration of the feast. In 1476, Pope Sixtus IV issued the apostolic constitution, *Cum praeexcelsa,* giving full and official support to the celebration of the feast. Sixtus writes that after:

> thoroughly investigating the distinguished marks of merit, by which the Queen of Heaven, the glorious Virgin Mother of God, is preferred to all in the heavenly courts, just as among the stars the morning star foretells the dawn, we consider it just, even a duty, that all the faithful of Christ for the miraculous conception of this immaculate Virgin, give praise and thanks to Almighty God

and "that they say Masses and other divine offices" fitting to the feast.[45] This document is a bold statement on the part of the Pope because it pits the Church's official stance against that of St. Thomas Aquinas, a man whose works were incredibly authoritative in the centuries following his death.[46] The ultimate statement on the Immaculate Conception came about in 1854, after the doctrine had come to be widely accepted, when Bl. Pope Pius IX issued the apostolic constitution, *Ineffabilis Deus,* declared the Immaculate Conception a dogma of the Church. The Holy Father solemnly declared, invoking the power of papal infallibility, that:

> the doctrine which holds that the most Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instance of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege granted by Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Savior of the human race, was preserved free from all stain of original sin, is a doctrine revealed by God.[47]

Thus, the Church, after numerous centuries of reflection and liturgical celebration, developed a fully formed theology of the Immaculate Conception.

The primary question to consider about the Church's decision is what prompted her to side with Scotus and his defense of the Immaculate Conception. The Church, from the time of St.

Athanasius' defense of the Trinity at the First Council of Nicaea in 325, has approached such conflicts with the principle of *"lex orandi est lex credendi."* This principle demonstrates that the way in which the laity pray and worship is a guiding standard for theological investigation and reflection because the Church's first concern is for her children. The Catechism of the Catholic Church makes this abundantly clear, stating, "The law of prayer is the law of faith: the Church believes as she prays. Liturgy is a constitutive element of the holy and living Tradition."[48] In this statement, the Church acknowledges the essential role that her children play in her developing appreciation for the contents of the *depositum fidei,* the one deposit of faith given to her by Christ. The laity's embracing of the Immaculate Conception moved the Church to thoroughly examine this doctrine, new but not novel, and understand more fully the Blessed Virgin's significance in salvation history. The Church acts as a mother, similarly to the Blessed Virgin, guiding her children as they grow and not reprimanding them unnecessarily, lovingly listening to their devotions and not merely dismissing their practices. Scotus approached his theology with this principle in mind. This attitude of Scotus' placed him in accordance with the character of holy Mother Church, guiding his spiritual children. Thus the study of this theological controversy, its historical development, and the Church's response to it reveals the fundamental character of the medieval Church's motherhood of the faithful and her likeness to the Blessed Mother, Immaculate Mary.

NOTES

1. Christiaan W. Kappes, *The Immaculate Conception: Why Thomas Aquinas Denied, While John Duns Scotus, Gregory Palamas, & Mark Eugenicus Professed the Absolute Immaculate Existence of Mary* (New Bedford: Academy of the Immaculate, 2014) 30.

2. Brian E. Daley, *Gregory of Nazianzus* (Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2006), 1.

3. Francis Dvornik, "The Byzantine Church and the Immaculate Conception," in *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: History and Significance,* ed. Frank O'Connor (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958), 90.

4. Cornelius A. Bouman, "The Immaculate Conception in the Liturgy," in *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: History and Significance,* ed. Frank O'Connor (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958), 117.

5. St. Andrew of Crete, quoted in Bouman, "The Immaculate Conception in the Liturgy," in *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception,* 118.

6. Ibid.

7. Bouman, "The Immaculate Conception in the Liturgy," 123.

8. Ibid.

9. Edmund Bishop, "On the Origins of the Feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary," in *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918), 258.

10. Bouman, "The Immaculate Conception in the Liturgy," 130.

11. Ibid., 110-111.

12. Mary Clayton, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 86-87.

13. Ibid., 82.

14. Allan B. Wolter, introduction to *John Duns Scotus: Four Questions on Mary,* trans. Allan B. Wolter (Santa Barbara: Old Mission Santa Barbara, 1988), 2-3.

15. David Flory, *Marian Representations in the Miracle Tales of Thirteenth-Century Spain and France* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2000), 15.

16. Ibid., 133.

17. Wolter, introduction to *Four Questions on Mary,* 3

18. Carlo Balić, "The Medieval Controversy over the Immaculate Conception up to the Death of Scotus," in *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: History and Significance,* ed. Frank O'Connor (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958), 188-189.

19. Katherine L. Jansen, "The Apocryphal Gospels" (Lecture for Mary as Woman, Mother, Idea: An Interdisciplinary Seminar, February 13, 2015).

20. Jacobus de Voragine, "The Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary," in *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints,* trans. William Granger Ryan, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 1:148.

21. Richard P. Kinkade, "Scholastic Philosophy and the Art of the Cantigas de Santa Maria," in *Studies on the "Cantigas de Santa Maria": Art, Music, and Poetry: Proceedings of the International Symposium on the "Cantigas de Santa Maria" of Alfonso X, el Sabio (1221–1284)* in Commemoration of Its 700th Anniversary Year–1981. co-ed. by Israel J. Katz and John E. Keller; assoc. ed. Samuel G. Armistead and Joseph T. Snow (Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1987), 95-109.

22. John E. Keller, "The Threefold Impact of the Cantigas de Santa Maria: Visual, Verbal and Musical," in Studies on the "Cantigas de Santa Maria": *Art, Music, and Poetry: Proceedings of the International Symposium on the "Cantigas de Santa Maria" of Alfonso X, el Sabio (1221–1284) in Commemoration of Its 700th Anniversary Year–1981.* co-ed. by Israel J. Katz and John E. Keller; assoc. ed. Samuel G. Armistead and Joseph T. Snow (Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1987), 7-30.

23. *The Songs of Holy Mary by Alfonso X, the Wise: A Translation of the Cantigas de Santa Maria*, trans. Kathleen Kulp-Hill (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2000), 375.

24. Flory, *Marian Representations,* 112.

25. Robert Davies, *Aquinas* (London: Continuum, 2002), 1-2.

26. Ibid.

27. Bouman, "The Immaculate Conception in the Liturgy," 123.

28. St.Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiæ,* trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Cincinnati: Benzinger Brothers, 1947), I, q. 76, art. ii, co.

29. Aristotle, *The Basic Works of Aristotle,* ed. Richard McKeon (New York: Modern Library, 2001), *De generation animalium*. II, 3.

30. Aquinas, *ST*, I, q. 76, art. ii, ad. 2.

31. Ibid., III, art. 27, art. ii, co.

32. Ibid., III, q. 27, art. ii, ad. 2.

33. *The Holy Bible Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition.* (Charlotte: Saint Benedict Press, 2009), Luke 1:47.

34. Parthenius Minges, "Bl. John Duns Scotus" in *The Catholic*

Encyclopedia (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1909).

35. Donna Spivey Ellington, in *From Sacred Body to Angelic Soul: Understanding Mary in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2001) 53.

36. Aquinas, *ST.* I, 76, ii, ad. 3.

37. John Duns Scotus, *John Duns Scotus: Four Questions on Mary,* trans. Allan B. Wolter (Santa Barbara: Old Mission Santa Barbara, 1988) 47.

38. Ibid., 51.

39. 1 Timothy 4:10.

40. Wolter, *Four Questions on Mary,* 47.

41. Ibid., 39.

42. Ibid., 40.

43. Ellington, *From Sacred Body to Angelic Soul,* 53.

44. Luigi Gambero, *Mary in the Middle Ages: The Blessed Virgin Mary in the Thought of Medieval Latin Theologians* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005), 258.

45. *Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum,* ed. Heinrich Denzinger and Adolf Schönmetzer, 36th ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1976), no. 1400.

46. *Aquinas as Authority: A Collection of Studies Presented at the Second Conference of the Thomas Insituut Te Utrecht, December 14-16, 2000,* ed. Paul van Geest, Harm Goris, and Carlo Leget (Utrecht: Peeters Publishers, 2002), vii.

47. Bl. Pope Pius IX, *Ineffabilis Deus,* 1854.

48. *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1993), 1124.

"WHOEVER COMES AFTER US WILL FIND NOTHING":

Great Britain's Role in the Allied Fight against Nazi Art Theft and Acquisition

As Adolf Hitler swept across Europe in his military campaign to establish the Third Reich, he dreamed of creating his legacy in large part by amassing the greatest art collection in the history of mankind. Historian Charles de Jaeger relates that Hitler hoped to accomplish this goal through an operation known as Special Mission Linz, through which Hitler planned to refashion his hometown of Linz, Austria into the new art capital of the world with the furnishing of his Führermuseum.[1] The advance of the Allied Armed Forces toward Rome during the Italian Campaign in May 1944 brought to light the full extent of Hitler's and Nazi Germany's mindset regarding the acquisition of works of art. As author Robert Edsel describes in *Saving Italy*:

> In the ancient town of Terracina, [Monuments Man Deane] Keller discovered a message left by German troops on a blackboard in front of the Civic Museum. *"Chi entra dopo di noi non troverà nulla."* ("Whoever comes after us will find nothing"). The Roman sculptures, the pride of the museum, had been left in the unlocked building for anyone to steal. But something quite different had been left behind near the Temple of Jove Uxor: telephones, guns, beds, food, and two hundred dead bodies [of German soldiers] stretched out in rows.[2]

It is striking that the sculptures were the only cultural works left behind—due to transportation logistics involved in a hasty retreat—and that the Germans took with them the bulk of the museum's collections. The contrast of the items that the Germans *did* leave behind—military necessities, supplies, and even their deceased comrades—truly magnifies the plunder of the stolen art treasures.[3] Withdrawing northward in the face of the Allied military assault, the German Army saw a material need for the Allies to

receive and understand the deeper implications in the message left on the chalkboard: that Nazi art theft and acquisition had a two-fold purpose, transcending military operations. In one regard, the hoarded works of art fulfilled Adolf Hitler's desire to establish a legacy for himself and the Third Reich. At the same time, the Nazis considered art theft and acquisition as another manner in which to triumph over their enemies. Though retreating in Italy, the Nazis still managed to deal the Allies a severe blow, secure in the belief that the Allies would "find nothing" and, thus, never rectify the situation.

In the title of his book, *The Monuments Men: Allied Heroes, Nazi Thieves, and the Greatest Treasure Hunt in History,* author Robert M. Edsel claims to write about the Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives (MFAA) sub-commission of the Allied Armed Forces—the military group formed to combat Nazi art theft and acquisition—through the purview of the western Allies.[4] Though not the first major work on this subject, Edsel's book is certainly the most recent to date and arguably the most well-known, due in large part to its 2014 film adaptation, *The Monuments Men,* starring George Clooney and Matt Damon. Thrust into the spotlight of the general public's attention and scrutiny, a once obscure and esoteric dimension of the World War II narrative has suddenly been interpreted as fact through the lens of Edsel's book, no matter how loosely it served as the basis for the film. However, Edsel falls short of the claim he makes in his title; rather, he focuses exclusively on American efforts made to protect historic and cultural works and to counter Nazi art theft and acquisition during just the latter two years of the war, from 1943 to 1945. Further, he narrates only the frontline military efforts of the MFAA, scarcely mentioning either American or British home front efforts, which were vital to the operations of the MFAA. Edsel's limited chronology and emphasis on mainly American efforts provides readers with an incomplete picture of British contributions toward Allied efforts to counteract Nazi art theft and acquisition. More specifically, by making only brief mentions of British soldiers and officers and allotting only a sentence or two to their individual stories, Edsel's work creates a skewed perception of Allied efforts against Nazi art theft. Redressing this discrepancy within Edsel's book, this article intends to argue that Great Britain, motivated by the desire to

protect artistic and historical treasures as well as the reputation of its troops and government, played a role equal to that of the United States in the active defense of Europe's monuments and works of art before and during the Second World War, through front line and home front efforts.

The reach and magnitude of Nazi art theft and acquisition was extreme, with both its conception and execution deeply rooted in Hitler's personal beliefs. From an early age, Hitler rebelled against the professional ambitions his father held for him: "I wanted to become a painter and no power in the world could make me a civil servant."[5] Believing that he had held great promise as a painter or an architect, Hitler was devastated upon being rejected from the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna. This dismissal spurred Hitler to strive harder than ever to achieve his dream of becoming an architect. His studies placed him in Vienna and later Munich, for many years, where he nurtured his hatred for Marxism, the Jewish people, and even a zealous belief that the purification of the arts was a means by which Germany could become great once more.[6]

In his 1925 autobiographical manifesto, *Mein Kampf,* Adolf Hitler repeatedly discusses art as he ponders the past half-century of German history. In particular, Hitler makes a correlation between what he terms "Art Bolshevism" and the current circumstances of the German state. Hitler prized artwork that portrayed humanity along the same lines as his Aryan ideology—idealized and flawless.[7] Consequently, he bemoans the deterioration that certain abstract art forms of 'Bolshevism' have had on German culture:

> Once we pass the development of our cultural life in the last twenty-five years in review from this stand-point, we shall be horrified to see how far we are already engaged in this regression. Everywhere we encounter seeds which represent the beginnings of parasitic growths which must sooner or later be the ruin of our culture. In them, too, we recognize the symptoms of decay of a slowly rotting world. Woe to the peoples who can no longer master this disease![8]

He argues that Germany had become lax in its determination to achieve greatness not only in culture and the arts, but also in an overall sense of national identity. This Hitler blames on modern

and foreign art; Germany had stumbled, but he argues that it is largely due to degenerative influences. Further, Hitler implies that if Germany were to continue to allow or to even patronize modern and foreign art, it would succumb to what he describes as the disease of decay. Yet *Mein Kampf* suggests that there is still hope for Germany to once more achieve prominence—and this hope lay in Adolf Hitler and his cultural renaissance.

Among the more commonly used Nazi methods of acquiring works of art were confiscation, outright looting, legal negotiations, and legitimate purchase. Indeed, many art dealers, like Karl Haberstock and Maria Dietrich—prominent German art dealers prior to the Second World War—made a considerable amount of money from trading with and selling to Nazi officials.[9] Most significantly, Hitler created the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg, or the ERR, which acted as the primary agency to acquire art for Germany among its other functions. The ERR systematically combed through Europe, searching for works of art desired for the Führermuseum. Noted for their efficiency, the ERR troops consisted of specialized personnel that planned, executed, and recorded raids on designated targets.[10] The ERR maintained records of the art it acquired and subsequently hid them in repositories at Weesenstein and Neuschwanstein.[11] As the Nazis pressed on through Europe and invaded France, the ERR came under the influence of Reichsmarshall Hermann Göring, who, like Hitler, desired a superb art collection of his very own.[12] As a result, art theft and acquisition occurred at multiple levels of operations and on an even grander scale than perhaps originally anticipated by Hitler and the Nazi party. Such ravishment permeated the Nazi occupied countries of Europe, only passing over works of art created by populations the Third Reich labeled as 'sub-human.'

Hitler sharply divided his interests between the art of Eastern and Western Europe. According to historians David Roxan and Ken Wenstall, "Eastwards there was utter ruthlessness, brutal seizers, looting carried out nakedly without pretence….Westwards there was plundering, particularly of Jewish property, but Hitler and other top-ranking Nazis were also ready to purchase with money."[13] Poland, Belgium, Italy, and even Germany fell victim to the Nazi onslaught, but France, perhaps, suffered the worst. Indeed,

France succumbed to the avarice of Hitler and Göring alike, its museums, galleries, and private collections nearly stripped bare by the two men. Hitler held more of a long-term view for obtaining the nation's art, claiming "all France's most valuable treasures would form part of the compensation to be paid to Germany as one of the conditions to be laid down in any peace negotiations."[14] Göring, in contrast, quickly set about obtaining as many works of art as could fit in Karinhall, his residence just outside of Berlin, targeting, in particular, French-Jewish collections and properties, especially those belonging to the Rothschild family.[15] Göring "used the Einsatzstab Rosenberg [ERR] as his personal instrument, employed to outwit his Fuehrer," to ensure that his own art collection could rival even that of Hitler.[16] Competition between Hitler and Göring resulted in the loss of large numbers of works of art from France. Indeed, "the rich field tilled by the Einsatzstab in Paris was such that it [would] become the greatest source of works of art for Linz" as well as Karinhall.[17]

The extensive art acquisition resulting from Hitler's dream for Linz and the Führermuseum caused concern and anxiety throughout the art worlds of Western Europe and of the United States of America. In *The Monuments Men,* Robert Edsel posits that the first concerted effort to approach the topic of the danger that the Nazis posed to art occurred during a meeting at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, on December 22, 1941. Notably, no mention was made at this December, 1941 meeting of a military venture to protect and retrieve European art stolen by the Nazis. George Stout, a leading art conservator at Harvard's Fogg Art Museum and later an officer in the MFAA, made the first formalized suggestion to come from the United States for such a military venture in a pamphlet published in the summer of 1942—nearly three years after the war had begun.[18]

Edsel overlooks that Britain anticipated a German threat to art prior to the official commencement of hostilities in 1939, embracing an active approach with regard to the defense of its borders as well as its cultural heritage. To this end, historian N.J. McCamley relates that the Museums and Galleries Air Raid Precautions [ARP] Committee, established in 1934, was responsible for organizing and supervising the safe removal of

works of art from Britain's most preeminent establishments.[19] Though several country houses were originally chosen as repositories, logistical problems led to the termination of this strategy in early 1941.[20] The Committee then adopted the strategy proposed by Sir John Forsdyke, Director of the British Museum, who believed, "One really bomb-proof repository for perishable National Treasures of supreme importance ought to be provided somewhere."[21] The Westwood Quarry, located in the Avon valley, provided the ideal solution; it proved so successful that several other quarries were consequently developed. McCamley recounts that, after the war, some questioned the necessity of the immense work involved with safeguarding the nation's art: "The answer was unequivocally 'yes'….the Tate Gallery, the British Museum and the National Gallery all suffered considerable damage….Had the contents not been evacuated earlier the loss would have been incalculable."[22] Through these preparations, Britain successfully protected its works of art from the threat of devastation posed by Nazi theft and destruction that would later transpire throughout most of Europe.

The Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives (MFAA) sub-commission, officially established during the Italian Campaign in December 1943, was the primary means through which the Allied Armed Forces fought against Nazi art theft and acquisition. Sir Charles Leonard Woolley, a prominent figure in the creation of the MFAA, strongly emphasized the sub-commission "was a joint Anglo-American concern….the two [Great Britain and the United States] had to be in agreement before suggestions could be translated into action, and responsibility was therefore equally shared…let it be repeated once and for all that the United States and Great Britain share alike the credit."[23] On the front lines, the officers and soldiers of the MFAA performed three main duties: to preserve, to conserve, and to record.[24] Preservation required that precautions—primarily the distribution of pertinent information—were taken prior to a battle to ensure that unnecessary damage to monuments did not occur. After a battle, conservation comprised the bulk of the responsibilities held by the MFAA. During this stage, MFAA personnel assessed the damage to monuments and historical buildings and performed crucial, urgent repairs.

MFAA officers further emphasized the obligation of the Army to respect the buildings, regularly hanging signs that declared sites to be off-limits.[25] James Rorimer, the American Monuments Man in Normandy during August, 1944, recognized that "a monuments officer who objected to the use of a fine château as a military installation, or the use of rubble from a church as road fill, was anathema" to many soldiers and officers.[26] Woolley, however, observed that officers and soldiers came to hold more respect for monuments and historical buildings they encountered after the establishment of the MFAA as an official, authoritative sub-commission of the Allied Armed Forces.[27] Lastly the final duty of MFAA personnel was to record details of their fieldwork for published reports as well as evidence of Nazi art theft and looting for restitution processes, which were to take place after the war.[28] The MFAA performed these duties through the Civil Affairs Division of the Army, ultimately reporting to the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF).

In *The Monuments Men,* Edsel skims over the origin and early stages of the MFAA sub-commission in a brief five-page chapter. Even so, only two paragraphs relate to the circumstances in North Africa that made the MFAA a necessary military organization, and only one paragraph describes Sir Charles Leonard Woolley, the officer responsible for the conception, initial development, and work of the MFAA via his role at the British War Office.[29] Edsel specifically mentions that Woolley, "a world-famous archaeologist who…had been a close companion of…Lawrence of Arabia….was serving in the British War Office in a completely unrelated capacity," in 1943.[30] This directly contradicts the memoir Woolley wrote just two years after the close of the Second World War, entitled *The Protection of the Treasures of Art and History in War Areas: A Record of the Work Done by the Military Authorities,* which Edsel lists in his bibliography.[31] In the opening chapter, Woolley relates that he served, from 1941-42, "as the official adviser to the War Office on the subject [of archaeology] in addition to his other normal duties" and later, from 1943-46, as the Archaeological Adviser to the Director of Civil Affairs.[32] Contrary to Edsel's description, Woolley did indeed serve the British Army and later the Allied Armed Forces in a capacity related to the protection

of monuments.

Well before the entrance of the United States into the war, the British were already fighting the Italian Army in North Africa during the summer of 1941. Fighting primarily occurred throughout the northeastern coast of Africa, particularly around the cities of Cyrene and Leptis Magna in the administrative region of Cyrenaica in eastern Libya. These North African cities, founded in the time of the Roman Empire, held considerable importance to the agenda of Mussolini's Fascist regime. Woolley reports in his memoir,

> For the Fascist Government the Italian Colonies in North Africa were the symbol and the promise of the re-birth of the ancient Roman Empire. Everything that could link up Mussolini's Italy with the traditions of an imperial past had its propaganda value, and it was from this point of view that the [Italian] Government exploited to the full the classical remains of Cyreanaica and Tripolitana.[33]

Throughout the early months of 1943, both the British Army and the Italian Army each captured and re-captured the city of Cyrene several times over. During this time, the Italian government published a pamphlet, entitled "*Che cosa hanno fatto gli Inglesi in Cirenaica,*" translated to "The Thing the English Did in Cyrenaica," with accompanying photographs.[34] The pamphlet served as calculated propaganda, intended to discredit and damage the reputation of the British Army, by portraying the behavior of the soldiers and officers as that of "vandals….that…had in the most barbarous manner smashed and defaced the historic monuments which had been brought to light by the Italian excavation of the ancient city."[35] Though the British later determined these accusations to be completely false in 1942, the Italians had already dealt a serious blow to the reputation of the British Army. Officers on the frontlines and officials on the homefront shared equal concern over this poor reflection of British behavior; consequently, the troops "were instructed to take immediate steps for the preservation of any archaeological monuments which might come into our [British] possession during the course of the occupation."[36] To facilitate the identification of monuments to be protected, Woolley was chosen to advise the War Office, due to

his extensive archaeological experience in North Africa and the Middle East. As a result, "war damage to the Roman remains in Libya was so slight as to be almost negligible," despite continued conflict in the region for the remainder of the war.[37]

This controversial incident in North Africa in the summer of 1941 forced the British to face the reality of the unprecedented role that art—especially its propaganda value—played in military strategy. Through one falsified report and some false but still incriminating photographs, the Italian Fascist government portrayed the British Army as no better than a marauding mob intent on destroying the cultural heritage of other nations. More importantly, this single episode damaged the reputation of the British Army and plagued its officers and soldiers for the remainder of the war. Woolley relates in his memoir:

> It must be remembered that in creating a Monuments and Fine Arts Service the Army's first and most legitimate aim was the preservation of its own good name. As the champions of civilisation, the troops must be guarded against all charges of vandalism.[38]

A good reputation and the establishment of positive relations with those living under the Nazi and Fascist regimes, respectively, were essential to British strategy for victory in the war. As such, the primary objective of the MFAA and home front initiatives like, the Macmillan Committee (discussed in detail later), was the protection of the Army's reputation.

However, this is not to say that the British Army completely dismissed the protection of monuments and art for their own sake. Indeed, most of the officers—British and American—involved with the MFAA were well-known figures of the art world in their civilian lives. These officers, like Woolley, cared deeply about the fate of Europe's art treasures. More so, Britain had considerable experience with the destruction of its own art and monuments, especially during the bombing of the city of Coventry. During the night of November 14, 1940, several hundred German Luftwaffe bombers attacked the city of Coventry, located about one hundred miles northwest of London. The raid took the city by surprise, as most British intelligence reports claimed the Luftwaffe could not fly farther than London.[39] The raid left the unprepared city in

shambles, having both destroyed tens of thousands of buildings and claimed the lives of hundreds. A particularly poignant episode occurred at the end of the day on November, 14, illustrating the significance of monuments to the British people: the bells from the city's cathedral rang out, comforting the survivors "with the thought that the Cathedral must still be undamaged…that so long as it stood no real harm could befall the city."[40] Just a few hours later, only the shell of the Cathedral remained; the majority of the building had been destroyed by fire. The cathedral was more than a building for the people of Coventry: it symbolized their faith as well as their heritage and identity, which the Germans had very nearly eradicated. The bombing of Coventry became a powerful and evocative tragedy in the minds of all British people, impressing upon them a sense of urgency for the protection of historical monuments and works of art. This concern extended to monuments and art not only within Great Britain but throughout the entirety of Europe as well.

However, one must face the reality of the time and circumstances: by the time the MFAA had been created as an official sub-commission, in December,1943, Britain was only just turning the tide of the war with the help of the United States during the Italian Campaign. A victorious end to the war was the primary objective of all parties involved. General Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Commander of the Allied Armed Forces, delivered the following orders on May 26, 1944, just a few days prior to the Normandy Invasion on D-Day:

> Shortly we will be fighting our way across the Continent of Europe in battles designed to preserve our civilization. Inevitably, in the path of our advance will be found historical monuments and cultural centers which symbolize to the world all that we are fighting to preserve….In some circumstances the success of the military operation may be prejudiced in our reluctance to destroy these revered objects…. So, where military necessity dictates, commanders may order the required action even though it involves destruction of some honored site. But there are many circumstances in which damage and destruction are

not necessary and cannot be justified.[41]
Eisenhower clearly stressed that success in military objectives took precedence, even at the risk and potential destruction of monuments and works of art. However, commanders and soldiers were to use discretion in discerning the necessity of damage. To help in this discernment, Eisenhower emphasized, "Civil Affairs Staffs at higher echelons will advise commanders of the locations of historical monuments."[42] These "Civil Affairs Staffs" were more commonly known as the officers of the MFAA.

In *The Monuments Men*, Edsel devotes only two sections (1.6-1.7) to a description of the Italian Campaign, choosing instead to focus primarily on the work of the MFAA in France and Germany. More than likely, Edsel had already begun planning his next work while still writing The Monuments Men. In his next book, entitled *Saving Italy,* Edsel describes the work of the MFAA in Sicily and in the Italian mainland during the Second World War. As in his earlier work, in *Saving Italy* Edsel emphasizes the actions and achievements of the American officers of the MFAA, despite the Allied nature of the sub-commission. For example, of the eight Monuments Men listed in the Main Characters section, only two were British: Captain Edward "Teddy" Croft-Murray and Lieutenant Colonel John Bryan Ward-Perkins.[43] Croft-Murray served in Sicily and Bologna, later aiding in the recovery efforts at the Altaussee salt mine in Austria; Ward-Perkins served as the Deputy Director of the MFAA in Monte Cassino, Naples, Rome, Pisa, Florence, and Bolzano. Croft-Murray receives his most significant description, in regard to MFAA work in Italy, when Edsel mentions that he accompanied US Captain Deane Keller to Bologna.[44] Edsel does recognize, however, that Ward-Perkins was the first to conduct specific military efforts aimed at protecting monuments while stationed in North Africa, at Leptis Magna, in 1942. Ward-Perkins, during his service at Leptis Magna, implemented an educational program for soldiers stressing the importance of preserving the monuments. Edsel relates, "in time, Monuments Officers in Italy and Western Europe would repeat the strategies Ward-Perkins pioneered," acknowledging Ward-Perkins but ultimately understating the truly vital role that man played in furthering the mission of the MFAA.[45] Indeed, these actions, though

with far-reaching and long-lasting influence, provide Ward-Perkins with his most significant description in Edsel's work. More so, Ward-Perkins' efforts in North Africa occurred at least one year prior to the restricted chronology that Edsel uses in *Saving Italy.* Edsel purports that primarily American officers of the MFAA were involved with the protection and recovery of works of art in Italy.

As Woolley indicates in his memoir, this is not the entire truth. Woolley does recognize that the United States was more aggressive than Britain in filling officer positions within the MFAA: "by early November [1943] ten American officers had arrived as against two British—Captain [F.H.J.] Maxse and Major Baillie Reynolds, with a third, Captain Croft Murray of the British Museum, on the way."[46] Nevertheless, the British officers mentioned by Woolley contributed significantly to the work and development of the MFAA in Italy. Historian Ilaria Dagnini Brey illustrates the important work and achievements of the above-mentioned British officers. She explains that Maxse served as the Deputy Advisor for MFAA operations in Sicily, aiding in the establishment of positive relations between Sicilian authorities and the Allies.[47] When the Army moved from Sicily to the Italian mainland, "General Eisenhower…'appointed Baillie Reynolds as Acting Director of the Fine Arts, Monuments and Archives Subcommission of the Allied Control Commission in Italy'" until the arrival of Mason Hammond, the actual Director of the MFAA in Italy.[48] Croft-Murray also played an integral role in the MFAA while serving in Florence, arranging for the recovery and shelter of books and manuscripts from the demolished Colombaria, the Tuscan Academy of Science and Letters.[49] Ward-Perkins assumed control of the MFAA in Italy toward the end of the war, effectively closing operations in the region.[50] These are but a few of the significant contributions that the British officers of the MFAA made to the protection of monuments and works of art in Italy; their efforts reached farther than could be adequately described in this article. As indicated by the appointment of Ward-Perkins as Director of the MFAA in Italy toward the end of the Italian Campaign, other theaters of operations required the work of the MFAA.

The D-Day landings at Normandy on June 6, 1944, officially marked the opening of the French Campaign of the Allied Armed

Forces as well as the beginning of the work of the MFAA in France, although it took about two months for serious work to begin due to the slow expansion of Allied territory.[51] A MFAA personnel roster, dated May 23, 1944, listed one of the British officers serving in Normandy with the 21st Army Group as Major the Lord Paul Methuen, a painter and Trustee of the National Gallery.[52] Edsel describes Methuen briefly and derisively as "errantly wandering" throughout the French countryside, failing to properly follow orders.[53] Historian Lynn H. Nicholas, however, presents Methuen as a far more decisive figure. In her work, *The Rape of Europa,* Nicholas emphasizes that Methuen "took French officials around with him so that they too could evaluate damage" in an effort to establish relationships with the native caretakers of the hundreds of monuments within his territory.[54] Methuen was consequently responsible for the repair and maintenance of these damaged monuments and works of art.

The official establishment of the MFAA as a sub-commission of the Allied Armed Forces, in December, 1943, as well as the advancement of the Allies into France, necessitated military structure and directives, rather than the often-unpredictable arrangements implemented during the Italian Campaign and early French Campaign. Of the utmost importance was the appointment of the sub-commission's director, "it having already been agreed that the Director [Adviser] should be British owing to the closer connection which Great Britain enjoyed with the countries immediately concerned, i.e., France, Belgium."[55] Professor Geoffrey Webb, Slade Professor of Fine Arts at the University of Cambridge, assumed the position of Adviser at Woolley's insistence.[56] Edsel mentions Webb only twice after an initial two-sentence description: first as a hindrance to the work of James Rorimer, and later as one of many MFAA officers present during the discovery of the Merker mine in Germany, in April, 1945.[57] Webb, in his role as the commanding officer of the MFAA, deserves far more substantial credit than that which Edsel provides, due to his direct involvement with the organization of the MFAA branch at the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF).

Among his primary duties, Webb supervised and compiled reports on the work of the MFAA officers in the field and also

established relationships with art experts in recently liberated areas. One figure that Webb met with, during his September 1944 visit to Paris, was Jacques Jaujard, Director of the French National Museums and later a key player in locating works of art that the Nazis had stolen from France.[58] Webb, most importantly, understood that the MFAA was an *Allied* initiative and that the selection of personnel had to consider experts from both Britain and the United States, at the very least. In a report to SHAEF, dated June 27, 1944, Webb "decided at the outset that as the whole activity was a joint US/BR enterprise the principle should be established that US and BR Specialist Officers should be employed interchangeably irrespective of the nationality of the forces to which they were attached."[59] Later in the same report, Webb expressed concern that some of the American officers felt perturbed that their British counterparts held higher rank; Webb was adamant that the situation be addressed and resolved immediately.[60] Webb recognized the nature of the work of the MFAA had implications beyond the nationality of his officers.

Edsel neglects to acknowledge Webb's insight. In his discussion of the work of the MFAA in France, Edsel emphasizes the service of American Monuments Man Second Lieutenant James Rorimer exclusively. Rorimer, curator of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, arrived in France toward the end of the invasion of Normandy, in early August, 1944.[61] The most significant portion of Rorimer's work, however, occurred during and after the liberation of Paris thanks to the relationships he formed with Jacques Jaujard and Rose Valland, Temporary Custodian of the National Gallery of the Jeu de Paume. Here, it is understandable why Edsel deems it necessary to focus so extensively on Rorimer's work. Valland was privy to valuable information on the ERR as the Jeu de Paume served as the final checkpoint for French works of art awaiting shipment to Germany.[62] Rorimer certainly protected monuments throughout France, especially at Normandy and Paris, consistently posting "Off Limits" signs to warn the Allied troops against the possibility of damage.[63] Yet Rorimer's relationship with Valland proved to be more significant than any of his previous work, as she eventually provided him, in March, 1945, with "documents on the Nazi art repositories at Heilbronn, Buxheim, Hohenschwangau….

[and] Neuschwanstein."[64] This portion of Rorimer's work signaled a major turning point in the mission of the MFAA, as the primary focus now shifted to the search for and eventually the inventory of repositories, located in German and Austrian mines and castles, in which the Nazis had hidden works of art that they had acquired across the European continent.

The MFAA could only commence this search for repositories with the advance of the Allied Armed Forces into Germany at the start of 1945. Though Rorimer did transfer to the front lines after his time in France, Edsel more heavily emphasizes the respective service of Americans Lieutenant Commander George Stout, of the U.S. Twelfth Army Group, and Captain Robert Posey, of the U.S. Third Army, to the MFAA in Germany.[65] Stout had spent the majority of his service in Germany, protecting monuments from Allied vandalism. According to Edsel, however, Stout's most significant work was his discovery of the repository at Siegen, Germany, in early April, 1945, of which "every nook was filled with art….works by Rembrandt, Van Dyck, Van Gogh,…Renoir, and especially Peter Paul Reubens."[66] Edsel posits the discovery and inventory of the repositories at Merkers, Germany, in early April 1945, and at Altaussee, Austria, in early May, 1945, as Posey's most substantial contributions to the MFAA. The repository located in the salt mine of Altaussee proved to be the crown jewel of the work of the MFAA: located just a few hours from Linz, the Altaussee salt mine stored the premier works destined to fill Hitler's Führermuseum, including the Ghent Altarpiece painted by the Van Eyck brothers, Michelangelo's *Bruges Madonna*, and Vermeer's *The Astronomer.*[67] These discoveries defined the purpose and importance of the MFAA toward the end of the war, as they marked the beginning of the restoration of Europe's cultural heritage.

The discovery of these repositories would have been impossible if not for the work of British Squadron Leader Wing Commander Douglas Cooper, Royal Air Force, who later became the Assistant Director of the MFAA Branch at SHAEF under Webb.[68] Edsel makes no mention of Cooper in *The Monuments Men.* Though he had served in a variety of capacities since 1940, Cooper played his most significant role in founding and supervising the London-based German Country Unit of the

MFAA. The German Country Unit consolidated and transmuted intelligence on German art figures operating under the aegis of the Nazi regime, together with reports provided by MFAA officers in the field, especially the information gathered by Rorimer, via Valland, on the work of the ERR at the Jeu de Paume.[69] According to historians Harclerode and Pittaway, "Cooper's efforts resulted in the assembly of a formidable database comprising a number of card indices containing an extensive amount of information which would later play its part in the identification and tracing of the principals involved in the looting of Europe's treasures."[70] One element of Cooper's database was the Target List of German Personnel Implicated in Looting of European Art Treasures, submitted to the American Roberts Commission on May 15, 1945.[71] he list, also known as the "Black List," later served as a key factor in the restitution process that commenced following the close of the war.[72]

Cooper's report to the Roberts Commission demonstrates that the MFAA, though the most directly involved on the front lines, was not the sole organization through which the Allies fought against Nazi art acquisition. Indeed, the Allies relied heavily on organizations operating primarily on the home front to gather and process information on monuments and works of art in the path of the Army's advance. During his brief description of homefront organizations, Edsel solely focuses on the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, informally known as the Roberts Commission and established by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in August 1943.[73] The principal objective of the Roberts Commission was to advise the War Department in a three-fold manner: "recommending the proper personnel when requested….the consideration and the fulfillment of requests that may come from MFA&A officers for materials of use to them in the field….[and] the proper consideration and treatment of the field reports prepared by these officers."[74] There is no doubt that the Roberts Commission served an essential role in the Allied efforts to protect and save the treasures of Europe; however, it was not the only institution to do so.

Edsel makes just one reference to the Macmillan

Committee, the organization on the British home front formed to advise primarily on the process of restitution, describing it as the British counterpart to the American Roberts Commission.[75] This is true to a certain degree: the Macmillan Committee did function in much the same capacity as the Roberts Commission. However, the Macmillan Committee did assume additional tasks distinctly absent in the latter's operation: "Until the end of the war it nonetheless *de facto* acted as intermediary between Woolley's [Archaeology Adviser] bureau at the War Office, British and American MFA&A officers and other Allied bodies concerned with both the protection and the restitution of works of art."[76] The Macmillan Committee simultaneously corresponded with and made arrangements between Woolley, officers of the MFAA, members of Parliament, and, later, the Inter-Allied Commission for the Protection and Restitution of Cultural Material, informally known as the Vaucher Commission. Overall, Edsel's lack of any real detail on the Macmillan Committee fails to provide readers with the reality of the situation on the British home front, which engaged numerous individuals and groups in a contentious debate that began as early as 1941.

Sir James G. Mann, Director of The Wallace Collection, demonstrated the first significant concern over the fate of monuments and historic buildings within the city of London during the war.[77] Mann wrote to Edward Herbert "E.H." Keeling, of the House of Commons, on January 4, 1941, to express his growing alarm that "irreparable harm may be done within the next few days" to London monuments on account of vandalism, following a German raid during the Blitz.[78] Mann was one of very few articulating apprehension regarding the destruction of monuments during this early stage of the war. Early British strategy focused on fighting the Luftwaffe (the German Air Force) and preventing a potential German invasion; protection of monuments and works of art was not a top priority. Yet Mann grew ever more concerned as the war progressed, especially after the controversial events of the summer of 1941 at Cyrenaica. Mann, with these events in mind and the backing of the directors of the British National Museums, pushed for the establishment of a British organization analogous to the American Roberts Commission.[79] Similar to Woolley's

remarks on the foundation of the MFAA, Mann recognized "the serious consequences which may accrue to the reputation of this country in the future if we do not take every precaution to avoid unnecessary destruction of cultural monuments and works of art."[80] Mann valued the mission of the Roberts Commission, recognizing that immediate action for the protection of monuments and works of art was "really a matter of grand strategy," requiring the involvement and cooperation of organizations and agencies on both the front lines and the home front if Britain was to impart itself in good standing to posterity.[81]

  The British government remained indecisive in this regard, due to fears that endeavors to protect the cultural heritage of Europe would hinder the overarching war effort.[82] The British government made tentative steps toward this aim when it joined with several other nations in signing the Inter-Allied Declaration against Acts of Dispossession committed in Territories under Enemy Occupation and Control, on January 5, 1943. The Declaration addressed the reality of Nazi art theft and destruction and issued this resolution:

> The Governments….Hereby issue a formal warning to all concerned…that they intend to do their utmost to defeat the methods of dispossession practised by the Governments with which they are at war against the countries and peoples who have been so wantonly assaulted and despoiled. Accordingly, the Governments…reserve all their rights to declare invalid any transfers of, or dealings with, property, rights and interests of any description whatsoever which are, or have been, situated in the territories which have come under the occupation or control, direct or indirect of the Governments with which they are at war, or which belong, or have belonged to persons…resident in such territories.[83]

The nations involved consequently debated how to translate the aims of the Declaration into action; efforts made for the protection of monuments and works of art were still largely hypothetical at this stage of the war. The British government, though still not fully committed to safeguarding the fate of Europe's artistic

heritage, took further steps in this direction with the creation of the Register of War Damage and Loss of British Property outside the United Kingdom, in September, 1943. The Register recorded "debts or other monies due from enemies to any persons in the United Kingdom irrespective of nationality….[as well as] losses or damage arising from the war to property outside the United Kingdom to British persons."[84] The focus of the Register was provincial, choosing to protect the property of British subjects alone. Nevertheless, both the Inter-Allied Declaration and the Register ultimately contributed to the formation of the Macmillan Committee, though to a small degree.

The true catalyst resulting in the creation of the Macmillian Committee was a debate in the House of Lords on February 16, 1944, during which the question of British responsibility for the protection of monuments and works of art across the European continent became the topic of discussion. Lord Lang of Lambeth, the archbishop of Canterbury, argued against a singular concentration on military operations, insisting upon the formation of a British committee focused not only on the preservation of art, but also on "constant vigilance" over the behavior of British troops in this regard.[85] Viscount Herbert Samuel echoed Mann's earlier concerns in his support of Lambeth's position: "We want to take pride in the victory…without having to make any apology for disasters that may have fallen upon our human heritage through carelessness or neglect in the course of the campaign."[86] Though the debate continued for several hours, Lambeth eventually emerged victorious.

The months following the debate involved the assembly of personnel to serve on the British Committee on the Preservation and Restitution of Works of Art, Archives and Other Materials in Enemy Hands, better known as the Macmillan Committee, officially established in May, 1944.[87] Mann served as Honorary Secretary; other notable members included Lambeth as well as Sir John Forsdyke of the British Museum, the man responsible for the removal of British works of art to underground quarries, in early 1942.[88] Mann, in his role as Honorary Secretary, facilitated cooperation between the Macmillan Committee and other Allied institutions devoted to the protection of monuments

and works of art. For example, he instructed MFAA officers on preservation methods, at the request of Webb, and even secured the assistance of Woolley, despite his wariness over a British organization modeled after the Roberts Commission.[89] Woolley's assistance proved vital in November 1944 when he informed the Macmillan Committee on what later became part of Hitler's Nero Decree: "in the last resort, all historic buildings and works of art in Germany…should be destroyed rather than allowed to fall into the hands of Germany's enemies….Literal obedience to Hitler's order will result not only in the destruction of the artistic treasures of Germany itself, but of a great deal of the artistic heritage of many of our Allies."[90] The Macmillan Committee disseminated this communication to MFAA officers, both at SHAEF and in the field, thereby helping to prevent irreparable destruction. The Macmillan Committee turned its attention and efforts to the process of restitution upon the discovery and safe removal of works of art from repositories in Germany and Austria, assisting in this task until the Committee's dissolution in August, 1946.

      The Second World War in Europe came to an effective close on V-E Day, May 8, 1945. With this victory also came the Allied discovery of several Nazi art repositories in Austria and Germany, commencing the extensive and complex process of restitution, which officially ended, in 1951, with the consignment of the Central Collecting Point in Munich from American operations to German authorities.[91] Secondary literature on this topic parallels research on Nazi art theft and acquisition during the war years. Historian Michael J. Kurtz relates, "By March, 1946, the informal Anglo-American proposal had turned into an agreement. Religious, historical, and educational materials from museums, collections, archives, or libraries in one zone that belonged in the other zone were returned for comparable objects."[92] Here, Kurtz points to the fact that Britain and the United States shared the same view on the process of restitution, yet immediately launches into a discussion of American leadership in this regard, hardly mentioning Britain in favor of focusing on U.S.-Soviet relations. Despite the emphasis in historical accounts on American involvement, Britain was still very much involved with restitution during this time, indicated by the extensive correspondence between Geoffrey Webb and the

Macmillan Committee, providing one another with information and practical advice.[93] Nevertheless, the subject of British contributions to the process of restitution is still largely underdeveloped, echoing the lack of information on Britain's role in protecting works of art from the Nazis in the war years prior to restitution.

Nearly seven decades later, further research on this topic is as relevant today as it was in the immediate post-war years, and perhaps even more so. In early November, 2013, the BBC released a story on Nazi art dealings before and during the Second World War: "A collection of 1,500 artworks confiscated by the Nazis in the 1930s and 1940s has been found in the German city of Munich. The trove is believed to include works by Matisse, Picasso, and Chagall."[94] Cornelius Gurlit, the alleged owner of the trove, claims to have legally inherited the works from his father, Hildebrand, one of Hitler's primary art dealers; nevertheless, investigations are underway to process claims for restitution.[95]

The unfolding events and details of this Munich case, coupled with the 2014 film adaptation of Edsel's book, will undoubtedly spark interest in the subject of Nazi art theft and acquisition. In response, historians must provide the fullest and most accurate account possible of the Allied efforts made in this regard, rather than adopt a stance of Americanization on scholarship of this era. Victory in the Second World War and against Nazi art theft and acquisition was not achieved singlehandedly by the United States or even Great Britain, for that matter, but was the result of several nations and organizations— indeed, more than this article could effectively address—working together to perpetuate culture and civilization. Addressing British contributions, as Edsel fails to do in *The Monuments Men* in favor of portraying the American story, is a good starting point in rectifying a glaring historical inaccuracy. Britain protected works of art prior to and throughout the entirety of the war, both on the home front and the front lines, through mines and quarries, the conception and work of the MFAA, and the efforts of the Macmillan Committee. In the immediate circumstances of the war, these collective efforts aimed to protect Britain's reputation from potential and realized defamation. After several decades, however, it is clear that Britain also aimed to impart to posterity the artistic, the *human*

heritage of Europe. Ultimately, history has discredited the German soldiers retreating from Terracina, in 1943, who were so certain in their belief, '"whoever comes after us, will find nothing."'[96] As a main constituent of the Western Allies, Britain came after the Nazis and played a significant and successful role in protecting and finding what had been taken.

NOTES

1. Charles de Jaeger, *The Linz File: Hitler's Plunder of Europe's Art* (Toronto: John Wiley & Sons Canada Limited, 1981), 54.

2. Robert M. Edsel, *Saving Italy: The Race to Rescue a Nation's Treasures from the Nazis* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2013), 131.

3. Lynn H. Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1994), 250.

4. Robert M. Edsel with Bret Witter, *The Monuments Men: Allied Heroes, Nazi Thieves, and the Greatest Treasure Hunt in History* (New York: Center Street, 2009).

5. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf,* trans. Ralph Manheim (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1943), 17.

6. Hitler, *Mein Kampf,* 21.

7. de Jaeger, *The Linz File,* 75.

8. Hitler, *Mein Kampf,* 259.

9. David Roxan and Ken Wenstall, *The Rape of Art: The Story of Hitler's Plunder of the Great Masterpieces of Europe* (New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1964), 66.

10. Peter Harclerode and Brendan Pittaway, *The Lost Masters: World War II and the Looting of Europe's Treasurehouses* (New York: Welcome Rain Publishers, 2000), 24.

11. Harclerode and Pittaway, *The Lost Masters,* 97.

12. Ibid., 25.

13. Roxan and Wenstall, *The Rape of Art,* 48.

14. Harclerode and Pittaway, *The Lost Masters,* 17.

15. Kenneth D. Alford, *Herman Göring and the Nazi Art Collection: The Looting of Europe's Art Treasures and Their Dispersal After World War II* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc., 2012), 51.

16. Roxan and Wenstall, *The Rape of Art,* 54.

17. Ibid., 67.

18. Edsel, *The Monuments Men,* 23.

19. N.J. McCamley, *Saving Britain's Art Treasures* (South Yorkshire, UK: Leo Cooper, 2003), 5.

20. Ibid., 28, 33-34.

21. Ibid., 16.

22. Ibid., 142.

23. Lt. Col. Sir Charles Leonard Woolley, *The Protection of the Treasures of Art and History in War Areas: A Record of the Work Done by the Military Authorities* (London: H.M. Stationery Officer, 1947), 18.

24. Ibid., 20.

25. James J. Rorimer and Gilbert Rabin, *Survival: The Salvage and Protection of Art in War* (New York: Abelard Press Inc., 1950), 7.

26. Ibid., 5.

27. Woolley, *The Protection of the Treasures,* 22.

28. Ibid., 20

29. Edsel, *The Monuments Men,* 32-36.

30. Ibid., 35.

31. Ibid.*,* 450.

32. Ibid., 5.

33. Ibid., 10.

34. Ibid., 11.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid., 12.

38. Ibid., 7.

39. McCamley, *Saving Britain's Art Treasures,* 5.

40. Norman Longmate, *Air Raid: The Bombing of Coventry,* 1940 (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1976), 133.

41. General Dwight D. Eisenhower, 26 May 1944, "Orders Regarding Preservation of Historical Monuments," T209/24: 1, The UK National Archives, Kew.

42. Ibid., 1.

43. Edsel, *Saving Italy,* xxi-xxii.

44. Ibid., 266.

45. Ibid.,136.

46. Woolley, *The Protection of the Treasures,* 21.

47. Ilaria Dagnini Brey, *The Venus Fixers: The Remarkable Story of the Allied Soldiers Who Saved Italy's Art during World War II* (New

York: Picador, 2009), 67.

48. Dagnini Brey, *The Venus Fixers,* 82; John A. Gilmore to Dr. William Bell Dinsmoor, 18 November 1943, M1944/1518800, The US National Archives, http://www.fold3.com/image/270023072/, accessed 8 November 2013.

49. Dagnini Brey, *The Venus Fixers,* 184-185.

50. Lt. Col. Mason Hammond to Mr. John Walker, 17 October 1945, "An Informal Report on Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Activities in the European Theater," M1944/1518905: 2, The US National Archives, http://www.fold3.com/image/270257836/, accessed 8 November 2013.

51. Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa,* 283.

52. Col. Henry C. Newton to Major-General John H. Hilldring, 23 May 1944, M1944/1537270: 3, The US National Archives, http://www.fold3.com/image/270311947/, accessed 8 November 2013.

53. Edsel, *The Monuments Men,* 90.

54. Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa,* 300.

55. Woolley, *The Protection of the Treasures,* 41.

56. Ibid., 41

57. Edsel, *The Monuments Men,* 55; 75-76; 291.

58. Lt. Col. Geoffrey Webb, 5 September 1944, "Report on Visit of Adviser, MFA&A, SHAEF to France, 19 Aug to 29 Aug 1944," M1944/1537270: 3, The US National Archives, http://www.fold3.com/image/270327019/, accessed 9 November 2013.

59. Lt. Col. Geoffrey Webb to Chief of Staff (SHAEF), 27 June 1944, M1944/1537270: 3, The US National Archives, http://www.fold3.com/image/270312275/, accessed 9 November 2013.

60. Geoffrey Webb to Chief of Staff (SHAEF), 27 June 1944: 7.

61. Edsel, *The Monuments Men,* xviii; 73.

62. Ibid.*,* 177.

63. Ibid.*,* 78.

64. Ibid.*,* 248.

65. Ibid.*,* xviii.

66. Ibid.*,* 281.

67. Ibid.*,* 383.

68. Harclerode and Pittaway, *The Lost Masters,* 195.

69. Ibid., 87.

70. Ibid., 81.

71. Squadron Leader Douglas Cooper, 16 May 1945, "Target List of German Personnel," 11-004: 1-4, The US National Archives, http://www.fold3.com/image/270204243/, accessed 9 November 2013.

72. Major Mason Hammond, 2 October 1944, "Memorandum on Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives in relation to the G-2 Task Force Plan for Berlin, Hamburg, Kiel, and Munich," FO/1050/1390: 1, The UK National Archives, Kew.

73. Edsel, *The Monuments Men,* 41.

74. Sumner Mck. Crosby, 18 January 1945, "Report on Mission to England the Continent, September 15-December 10, 1944," M1944/1537258: 4, The US National Archives, http://www.fold3.com/image/270238617/, accessed 8 November 2013.

75. Edsel, *The Monuments Men,* 53.

76. Commission for Looted Art in Europe, "Introduction to The [UK] National Archives' Records on Nazi-Era Looted Cultural Property, 1939-1961" (Kew, UK: The National Archives, 2011): 5, http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/records/looted-art-in-depth-intro.pdf, accessed on 1 November 2013.

77. "Sir James Mann," Royal Armouries, http://www.royalarmouries.org/about-us/brief-museum-history/history-of-the-collection/early-scholars/sir-james-mann, accessed 5 November 2013.

78. James G. Mann to E.H. Keeling, 4 January 1941, T209/1, The UK National Archives, Kew.

79. Commission for Looted Art in Europe, "Introduction," 5.

80. James G. Mann to E.H. Keeling, 4 December 1943, T209/1: The UK National Archives, Kew.

81. James G. Mann to The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, 27 September 1943, T209/1: The UK National Archives, Kew.

82. Commission for Looted Art in Europe, "Introduction," 5.

83. "Inter-Allied Declaration against Acts of Dispossession committed in Territories under Enemy Occupation and Control," Commission for Looted Art in Europe, http://www.lootedartcommission.com/inter-allied-declaration, accessed 1 November 2013.

84. Commission for Looted Art in Europe, "Introduction," 4.

85. 130 Parliamentary Debate, House of Lords (16 February 1944): 818.

86. 130 Parl. Deb., H.L. (16 February 1944): 827.

87. Harclerode and Pittaway, *The Lost Masters,* 80.

88. Office of the Prime Minister to James G. Mann, 7 May 1944, T209/1: The UK National Archives, Kew.

89. Lt. Col. Geoffrey Webb to James G. Mann, 29 May 1944, T209/24: The UK National Archives, Kew; Lt. Col. Sir Charles Leonard Woolley to James G. Mann, July 1944, T209/10: The UK National Archives, Kew.

90. Lt. Col. Sir Charles Leonard Woolley to Lord Macmillan, 2 November 1944, T209/24: The UK National Archives, Kew.

91. Roxan and Wenstall, *The Rape of Art,* 174.

92. Michael J. Kurtz, *America and the Return of Nazi Contraband: The Recovery of Europe's Cultural Treasures* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 119.

93. Lt. Col. Geoffrey Webb, 4 April 1946, "Restitution Problems, Memorandum for the Macmillan Commission," T209/24: 1-2, The UK National Archives, Kew.

94. "Art Stolen by Nazis Found in Munich," BBC News Europe, 4 November 2013, accessed 25 November 2013, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-24799899.

95. "Nazi-looted art: German collector says he owns pictures," BBC News Europe, 17 November 2013, accessed 25 November 2013, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-24977814.

96. Edsel, *Saving Italy,* 131.

"THE STREIGHT COURSE OF HEAUENLY DESTINY":
The Tudor Genealogical Myth of *The Faerie Queene*

The problem of mutability is central to the books of the second half of *The Faerie Queene,* in which Edmund Spenser takes great pains to examine the consequences of mutability in the interpersonal and social virtues of friendship, justice, and courtesy. While the tension between the desire for constancy and the seemingly inescapable presence of mutability is one of the major underlying questions of the 1596 edition, what is less obvious is the way in which Spenser is already grappling with the problem of mutability in the books of the 1590 edition. At the center of Spenser's poetic myth, as it appears predominantly in Book III, is the development of the genealogical line of the British monarchy until the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. This genealogy, and subsequently the line of political rule, undergoes a substantial shift from the line of Arthur to the line of Britomart and Arthegall. While this shift appears to be an instance of mutability and rupture in the lines of authority, Spenser crafts the myth surrounding the shift to herald the constancy of providentially ordered political rule, even when that order is not readily apparent. At stake in such a myth is not only the inception of the royal lineage that leads to Queen Elizabeth I, but also the cultural identity that lineage creates for the Tudor line. Spenser's genealogical project seeks to present a justification for the transference of political and religious authority to the Tudor line in the wake of the English reformation, and to substantiate Elizabeth's claims to the headship of both the church and the state of England. In doing so, Spenser creates new national identity for the Tudor line that provides solutions to the problems ingrained in the Arthurian legends as an inheritance for Queen Elizabeth I. Ultimately, Spenser's vision of the transference of power as ordained by providence seems to call into question the role of the royal lineage, suggesting that there are additional qualifications for political and religious rule that are not the result of pedigree, but of predestination.

Andrew King has attempted to reconcile what he sees to be flaws in Spenser's portrayal of the royal genealogy with the idea of a myth that presents "a rhythmic continuity that opposes and defeats mutability."[1] King's stance is that "Spenser's intellectually honest work admits and explores the problematic nature of the genealogical narrative" by exposing the "difficulty inherent in all political and human institutions that seek to represent themselves as constant and grounded in objective authority."[2] He argues that Spenser intentionally ingrains mutability into the royal genealogy through a dramatic break in the established line of political authority from the line of Arthur to that of Britomart and Arthegall. King concludes that the "royal genealogy fails to provide [a cosmic] response to mutability" and that instead Spenser creates a myth that "[elevates] the ineluctable mutability of even the most resonant and enshrined of human constructs."[3] King fails, however, to see in Spenser's genealogical project the underlying force of providence as a weapon against mutability that substantiates Queen Elizabeth I's political and religious claims to authority.

Genealogy, Providence, and the Transference of Political Rule

The royal genealogy of Britain as a literary device is a common genre in English literature dating from before the eighth century works of the Venerable Bede. Genealogies typically trace the lineage of the ruling family through the great historical and mythological kings, and ultimately through the scriptural genealogies of Jesus to the patriarchs of the Old Testament. In the 16th century, such a composite understanding of the historical, mythological, and spiritual foundations of the royal line is key to understanding the British national identity. The burden of creating, manipulating, and promulgating these royal genealogies falls equally on historians, poets, and preachers.[4] The royal genealogy is often figured in sermons of the time as a tool for solidifying the spiritual authority of the Crown as inseparable from its political authority. Such a dual affirmation is necessary for the Tudor line, as both their political and religious authority is called into question at the time of Queen Elizabeth

I. By implementing the genre of genealogy, Spenser couches the Tudor line in the traditions of both the historical and the religious writers of the time. Ultimately, the particulars of the genealogy Spenser crafts, including both the characters and the circumstances of the transference of authority, create a narrative in which the apparently mutable shifting of political power is in reality governed by providence, which guides and directs all matters according to divine prescription.

      Although the narrative of the incident is relatively brief, the shifting of political power from the line of Arthur to the line of his half-brother Arthegall is vital to understanding Spenser's vision of a providentially ordered rule of authority. This transference is described in the prophecy given by Merlin to Britomart, in which Merlin foretells her marriage to Arthegall. Merlin tells Britomart that her son shall succeed his cousin Constantius, who had inherited the throne from their uncle Arthur. Spenser gives no specific context for Constantius' ascendance to rule in Merlin's prophecy, nor is it mentioned in the Briton Moniments episode in Book II which ceases just before the advent of Arthur, though the pseudo-historical character does appear as Arthur's heir and nephew in the genealogical accounts of Geoffrey of Monmouth, Spenser's main source for matters historical and genealogical. A. C. Hamilton identifies Arthegall's son as Aurelius Conanus, or Conan,who is described by Monmouth as unworthy of the crown as he delighted in civil war and usurping power unjustly.[5] However, because Spenser specifically does not name Arthegall's son, whereas all other characters in the lineage directly surrounding the shift in political power are named, the poet distances the royal heir from the inherited tradition, creating instead a clean transition from the Arthurian line to the lineage of Britomart and Arthegall. King, however, argues that the introduction of Arthegall in the place of Arthur in the line of succession jeopardizes the integrity of the new genealogical myth: "Despite his name, Arthegall is not 'equal to Arthur,' and … Arthegall merely covers another point at which the lines of authority break."[6] King's strictly linear approach to the succession of the line of political authority fails to recognize the intricacy of the mechanisms by which the transference of

authority is undertaken.

The transition itself, as described in Merlin's prophecy, is indicative of the providentially ordered line of authority that Spenser offers as an explanation for the apparent rule of mutability in temporal matters. Merlin foretells that Arthegall's son "shall take the crowne that was his fathers right."[7] The language of the crown, and therefore the supreme political authority, as belonging to a person by "right" is a strong indication of an underlying governance in political matters. This governing force implies that there exists a rightful monarch who takes authority in a rightly ordered manner. The subsequent line of Merlin's prophesy offers insight into the nature of the governing force: "and therewith crowne himselfe in the others stead."[8] The movements of the rulers are not dictated by the governing force to the exclusion of the will and action of the individual; rather it is by the son's own hand that he brings about the restoration of rule in accordance with right governance. Spenser, in presenting the transference of power under a shroud of ambiguity, presents a facade of mutability that when lifted reveals the intricacy of a providential ordering of temporal matters through the agency of human action. In doing so, the poet presents the constancy of providence as a force counter to the apparently mutable circumstances of temporal affairs, particularly in the shifting of political authority. Providence, therefore, does not guide only the mechanics of the transference of political power, it also ordains the origins of the very lines of authority which lie at the heart of Spenser's genealogical project of the marriage and subsequent lineage of Britomart and Arthegall.

Merlin's prophecy of Britomart's marriage to Arthegall is steeped in the language of divine planning and providence. Merlin declares that the very marital union between Britomart and Arthegall is a divine appointment: "The man whom heauens haue ordaynd to bee / The spouse of Britomart, is Arthegall."[9] Furthermore, Merlin explicitly refers to the providential ordering of the marriage in assuring Britomart of her affection for her intended: "...the streight course of heauenly destiny, / Led with eternal providence...has / Guyded thy glaunce."[10] Merlin articulates both the constancy of providence, as it is described

as a "steight course," and its guidance in the particulars of human action. Providence does not force Britomart to crave Arthegall against her will, but rather directs her gaze to the enchanted looking glass in which Arthegall's reflection is cast, stirring within her the desire to pursue her future husband. Britomart is free, therefore, to act according to this rightly ordered desire for Arthegall because the desire to do so is the result of providence. Merlin continues his prophecy by momentarily expanding the scope of his vision of providence to a more universal scale, in which all human action is directed by a heavenly order. The "fates" of men, Merlin says, "fare firme, / And may not shrinck, though all the world do shake: / Yet ought mens good endeuours them confirme, / And guide the heavenly causes to their constant terme."[11] Merlin offers this fuller understanding of the reciprocal relationship between the ordering power of providence and man's ability to bring divine plans to fruition, which is also present though less immediately evident in the passage describing the transference of the throne from Arthur to Arthegall's son. The complexity of this stance is striking, as it holds that the eternal plan remains constant in the midst of a changing world, and that the wills and actions of men enact and guide the providential plan into such constancy.

The relationship between the ordering power of providence and the tension between constancy and mutability that begins to develop in the first edition of *The Faerie Queene* is explored more thoroughly in the second edition and expressed most completely in the Mutability Cantos. Mutability proves to be a nearly insurmountable problem in Books V and VI, as the heroes of those books struggle to remain constant in the carrying out of their virtuous and practical quests. The Cantos of Mutability, however, expand the scope of the question of constancy to a cosmological context in which the personified character of Mutability is scrutinized. The solution to mutability that Spenser provides in the Mutability Cantos is placed in the allegorical context of the legal trial of the Titan Mutability in the court of Dame Nature. Mutability's claim to overtaking the authority of the Olympian gods rests on a dynastic claim and the evidence of changing earthly and celestial phenomena. Dame

Nature, however, rejects Mutability's plea with the following proclamation:

> I well consider all that ye haue sayd,
> And find that all things stedfastnes doe hate
> And changed be: yet being rightly wayd
> They are not changed from their first estate;
> But by their change their being doe dilate:
> And turning to themselues at length againe,
> Doe worke their owne perfection so by fate:
> Then ouer them Change doth not rule and raigne;
> But they raigne ouer change, and doe their states
> maintaine.[12]

The response to Mutability that Dame Nature provides is one that takes into account the eternal nature of the cosmos, not just the temporal changes that are manifest in everyday life. This view is similar to the solution offered by the generative power of the Garden of Adonis, in which the constant essence of nature prevails over the fading and changeable physical matter through cyclical generation.[13] Also present in Nature's solution is the interaction between action and fate, by which the constant and eternal order is made manifest in temporal reality. These similarities between the solution to mutability as offered in the earlier books and that offered by the Cantos of Mutability suggest consistency in Spenser's understanding of the dynamic relationship between constancy and mutability. Spenser sees that there is a natural order that prevails in the face of change, and that this order is governed by a force that is itself unchanging. This cosmological order is the same as is revealed in Spenser's providentially ordered genealogical line of Britomart and Arthegall.

The interaction between human will and action, and the governance of a higher order is in keeping with the doctrine of both free will and of predestination as set out in the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion of 1563. These articles, which were revised under the supervision of Queen Elizabeth I in an effort to create a sound foundation for the emerging English church in the wake of the bloody religious conflicts under Mary Tudor, are a manifestation of Elizabeth's religious authority as the head

of the English church. Man's free will, according to the Articles, is hampered such that he has "no power to do good workes pleasaunt and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preuentyng [him]," meaning that a man is capable of acting rightly only when directed by divine grace.[14] Similarly, predestination is articulated as the force by which God has, by his "euer lastyng purpose" and "before the foundations of the world were layed" decreed the salvation and damnation of all people. However, predestination is also considered to be the governing force of divine will in temporal matters, as Article XVII continues: "and in our doynges that wyl of God is to be folowed."[15] According to the theological teaching of the English church at Spenser's time, all human action is rightly ordered when it manifests the divine will. This providential understanding of the unfolding of temporal events is at the heart of both the lines describing the transference of political authority from the line of Arthur to that of Arthegall, and in Merlin's prophecy concerning the bringing together of Britomart and Arthegall and the inception of their royal lineage. By incorporating the theology prescribed in documents sanctioned directly by his monarch and patron, Spenser aligns his narrative on the justification of shifting political power with the spiritual authority of Queen Elizabeth I, confirming the origins of both her political and religious authority as divinely appointed.

As a whole, Spenser's genealogical project is a vehicle in which the poet seeks to justify the shifts in lines of political and religious authority surrounding the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, and expose the constancy of providence in the face of apparent temporal mutability. In crafting a narrative in which the transference of political power in a nonlinear fashion is governed by providential ordering, Spenser creates an allegory for his own Queen. Elizabeth I's authority, according to Spenser, is preserved by providence despite the complicated circumstances of its origin. The shift in political power from the House of York to the House of Lancaster and the Tudor line is reflected in the shift from the line of Arthur to that of Britomart and Arthegall. The justifying power of providence that is at work in the fictional line of succession, therefore, is at work

too in his own time in the Tudor line. The work of providence is not relegated to the political realm only, but also pervades the religious sphere. Following the English reformation, in equating the headship of the state of England with its religious headship, Queen Elizabeth I's legitimacy in both areas must be absolute. According to Spenser's narrative, however, there appears to be no contradiction in terms between the providential ordering of political power and of religious authority. Elizabeth's authority, therefore, in matters of both church and state, is derived not merely from the Tudor line of succession, but directly from the eternally ordained plan of providence. Furthermore, the divine guidance of temporal political and religious matters reveals the profound constancy that lies just below the seemingly unending mutability of human affairs. In coupling the origins of political and religious authority with constancy as the greatest weapon against mutability, Spenser creates a myth in which the very lines of authority that lead directly to his monarch and patron Queen Elizabeth I are not only divinely ordained, but are vital to the very execution of the divine will on Earth. Spenser's new myth, however, because it deviates from the inherited traditions of Arthurian legend and the accepted histories of Monmouth and others, generates an alternative history which has far reaching ramifications for the national identity of the Britons.

A New Tudor Identity

In crafting the new myth of the history of the Britons beginning with Britomart and Arthegall and continuing to the time of Queen Elizabeth I, Spenser addresses both the origins of the Tudor line and the traits that its original parents pass on as the royal inheritance. Roger Cotton, a contemporary of Spenser, argues, "The founder of a nation determines…the national destiny."[16] By placing Britomart and Arthegall in the role of the progenitors of the Tudor line, Spenser establishes the identity of the Britons as the inheritance they receive from the virtues and character of their parents. However, in creating this new national myth and alternative history, Spenser deviates from the myths long established and widely accepted as literary and historical cannon, primarily the legends of Arthur. This deviation is intentional on Spenser's part, as it allows him to overwrite the

issues of the Arthurian traditions and to create an inheritance for Queen Elizabeth I that is free from the taint of Arthur's failings. The three main issues in the legends of Arthur that find their remedies in Spenser's new national myth are the potential illegitimacy of his birth, his alleged unchastity, and his heirless state at the time of his death. Each of these issues, and the ramifications they bear on the collective identity of the Britons and specifically of the Tudor line, are resolved in Spenser's new myth by the individual persons of Britomart and Arthegall, and by their union and subsequent offspring.

The first Arthurian problem, that of illegitimacy, is a profound problem not only for the literary genre of genealogy, but also for the particular lineage that leads to Queen Elizabeth I. With the line of succession heavily contested in the years previous to her accession to the throne and the issue and repeal of the three Acts of Succession between 1533 and 1543, the legitimacy of Elizabeth's birth remains a topic of no small importance at the time of Spenser's writing. A child, particularly one who is the heir apparent to a great kingdom, who is born outside of the legal, natural, and spiritual confines of marriage, destabilizes the dynastic structure of royal succession. Arthur is one such child. He is the product of the extramarital affair between Uther Pendragon and the Lady Igraine, the wife of Gorlois, Duke of Cornwall. According to Monmouth, there is great ambiguity in whether Arthur's conception took place before or after the death of Gorlois, which had been orchestrated by Uther: "And upon that same night was the most renowned Arthur conceived…In the meantime…when [the army of Cornwall and that of Uther] met face to face in battle, Gorlois was amongst the first that were slain."[17] The ambiguity of legitimacy is undesirable for Spenser's project of establishing an authoritative genealogy for Queen Elizabeth I. If Spenser were to give Arthur a generative place in the royal genealogy, he would substantiate a precedent for illegitimacy in the royal line, and draw attention to the claims against Elizabeth rather than dispel them.

Spenser's solution is to have the line transfer from Arthur to the line of Arthegall for reasons that are not directly related to Arthur's potential illegitimacy. Rather than attempting to explain

away Arthur's illegitimacy or justify his right to the throne and thereby drawing a strong parallel between Arthur and Queen Elizabeth I, Spenser instead fashions a line of succession that is free from the taint of illegitimacy, which in turn removes the stain of a long line of bastard heirs from Queen Elizabeth I's heritage and personal past. Queen Elizabeth I, therefore, is placed at the pinnacle of a lineage that has its roots in a legitimate birthright to political rule. The origins of the legitimacy of the line of succession lie in the character and role of Arthegall as the rightful heir to the throne. Arthegall plays the key role in the genealogical project of *The Faerie Queene* of providing political and dynastic legitimacy to the royal line. According to Spenser's Merlin, Arthegall is "the sonne of Gorlois / And brother vnto Cador Cornish king," placing him directly in line to the Cornish throne and giving him legitimate claim to a royal heritage.[18] Arthegall's heirs, therefore, are doubly legitimized in their rule of the Britons: they are the rightful heirs of the throne of Cornwall by their father's birth, and the divinely appointed heirs of the kingdom of Britain at the end of the line of Uther Pendragon. Furthermore, the circumstances of Arthegall's birth do not allow for any ambiguity as to his own legitimacy. Despite his upbringing in Faerieland under the false pretense of being the son of an elf and a fairy, the deception surrounding Arthegall's childhood is dispelled by Merlin's vision and prophecy, in which the truth of his lineage is spoken plainly and directly: "But sooth he is the sonne of Goloris."[19] The lineage that stems from Arthegall, therefore, is unambiguously legitimate in both birth and right of rule. Consequently, Queen Elizabeth I inherits the purity of birth and of authority that is ingrained in Arthegall's lineage, rather than the dubious legitimacy inherent in the Arthurian traditions.

The second Arthurian problem Spenser addresses in the dynastic shift to the lineage of Britomart and Arthegall is the inherited tradition of Arthur's unchastity. Although this issue is not raised in Monmouth's account, other sources of Arthurian myth include an episode of incest between Arthur and his estranged half-sister Morgause, which produces the child Mordred. Not only does this tradition again raise the question of

the illegitimacy of heirs, it constitutes a major breach of chastity. Some traditions, such as the Vulgate Cycle *Mort Artu*, address this problem by developing Mordred as Arthur's archenemy whom he kills in battle but not before he himself suffers a fatal wound. This mutual expunging of the Arthurian line cuts off both the tainted progeny and the transgressor of chastity. Monmouth's Historia portrays Mordred as Arthur's final and greatest enemy, but maintains that he is the rightful son of Morgause and her husband the King of Orkney, and Arthur's nephew rather than the product of an incestuous relationship. Spenser follows Monmouth's tradition, giving no indication that Arthur sires a son with his half-sister. However, Spenser is not free from the tradition of an unchaste Arthur. Just as the problem for the potential of illegitimacy is solved by the intervention of the pure-blooded Arthegall, the problem for the potential of unchastity is solved by the intervention of the sexually pure Britomart.

As the knight of Chastity, Britomart's virtue is directed toward the specifically procreative sexuality of marriage. Her chastity is directly related to her marriage to Arthegall and the prophecy of their combined line. It is not Britomart's "wandring eye, Glauncing vnwares in charmed looking glas" that drew her to Arthegall, indicating that her desire for Arthegall and the children produced by that desire are not of a lascivious nature.[20] Rather, the quest upon which Britomart embarks as a result of hearing Merlin's prophecy is for the purpose of finding Arthegall, her future husband, and it is on and through this quest that she manifests her superior chastity. By transposing the genealogical line from the potentially unchaste Arthur to the champion of chastity Britomart, Spenser establishes a line that is not only legitimate but also virtuous. Recalling Cotton's claim that the virtue of a nation's founder is indicative of the character of the nation, it is evident that a foundation in chastity will produce a nation that is more virtuous than a nation rooted in a line of dubious virtue. Therefore, Britomart provides a virtuous foundation for the royal lineage, an inheritance that is highly relevant to the virtue of Queen Elizabeth I. Additionally, the virtue of chastity as exemplified by Britomart and inherited by Queen Elizabeth I bears a spiritual dimension in the light of

the Queen's role of the restorer of the pure faith in the English church. Unchaste Arthur, corrupted by lechery and sexual depravity, recalls the reformation figuring of the Roman Church as the "great whore" of Babylon from the book of Revelation.[21] Britomart, as the beacon of chastity, uproots the corruption of Arthur's line replacing it with a lineage that is pure. So, too, does Queen Elizabeth I's reformation efforts affect the restoration of an unblemished faith to the church in England. In this allegorical manner, Elizabeth inherits from Britomart the literal virtue of chastity and a spiritual purity, both of which restore the unchastity figured by Arthur.

The final Arthurian problem Spenser addresses is both the most monumental and the most easily overcome, and its solution is the natural result of the solutions to the first two problems. Arthegall solves the problem of Arthur's potential illegitimacy, Britomart solves the problem of his potential unchastity, and the marriage of Britomart and Arthegall solves the problem of his heirless death. Monmouth is not alone in his affirmation of Arthur's childless state at the time of his death; Layomon's early thirteenth century work *Brut* is emphatic on the subject: "he had none heire of his body bigeten: and grete harme was hit that soche a noble Kyng, and so doughty, had none childe of his body bigeten."[22] However, the desire to ground the royal line in the lineage of Arthur causes some other historians of Spenser's time, such as Arthur Kelton in his *A Chronycle with a Genealogie,* to systematically overlook the problem of an heirless king, choosing instead to portray Queen Elizabeth I as the direct descendent of Arthur. Spenser instead addresses Arthur's heirless death and presents an elegant yet simple solution to the problem of the apparent termination of the royal line through the introduction of a new and fruitful royal couple in the place of the heirless king. In the Briton Moniments episode of Book II, Spenser is clear that the direct genealogical line from which Arthur descends is interrupted by his heirless status. He addresses the cutting off of Arthur's line poetically: "Succeding There abruptly it did end, / Without full point, or other Cesure right…To finish it."[23] King points to the pun on the word "Cesure" as indicating that in Arthur's line there exists neither a proper

ceasing to end it, nor a proper Caesar to continue it. Rather, the ceasing comes abruptly, and the proper Caesar comes instead from the marriage of Britomart and Arthegall. The heirless king is replaced by a couple whose union produces a royal lineage.

The implications of this union when considered in light of Queen Elizabeth I's heirless state, however, raise more questions than appear to be resolved by drawing a parallel between the Queen and her fictional ancestors. Rather than creating an explanation for the Queen's childlessness or providing a way for her lineage to continue as it had from Britomart until Elizabeth I's birth, Spenser crafts the genealogical project of the new national myth to provide an open-ended line of succession after Elizabeth's reign. Because there is no universally acknowledged successor to the Tudor throne in 1590, Spenser is left in the position of needing to tread lightly so as to remain in the good graces of the next monarch, whoever he or she may be. Inherent in the myth he has crafted, however, is a reading that would allow Spenser to do just that. Spenser has presented political authority as granted by divine will and the transference of political power as ordered according to providence by virtue of the very nature of the position of monarch. Accordingly, any successor to Elizabeth's throne is the divinely appointed ruler, and whatever means are used to acquire the power of the monarchy are sanctioned by providence.

On the one hand, such a stance appears to place Spenser in the role of the reactionary Tudor apologist, justifying Queen Elizabeth I's reign and her Tudor successors, whomever they may be, for the sake of his own safety and reputation. In such a role, Spenser would appear to be creating a precedent for the justification of rule by virtue of providence, thereby presenting any ruler as ordained by the heavens, regardless of his or her dynastic claims. This stance is not only affirmative of the current monarch's legitimacy, but also creates the opportunity for Spenser to welcome an usurping monarch by affirming the inherent legitimacy of the transference of political power from Arthur to Britomart and Arthegall. Because Spenser crafts a myth in which such horizontal shifts of power are ordered by providence, he is free to support any deviation from

the current line of succession as equally divinely appointed. Thus, Spenser is in a position of supporting Elizabeth's successor, regardless of whether he or she is the next in line in the rightful Britomart-Arthegall lineage or the providentially appointed usurper of power.

When considered in the extreme, however, this stance of radical acceptance of political authority as providentially ordered regardless of dynastic lineage presents an unforeseen possibility for another level at which Spenser's myth changes the nature of the British monarchy. If the true justification of political power lies in divine appointment there may be no justifiable reason for succession according to dynastic lines and royal blood may cease to carry any inherent authority. Furthermore, if the justification for rule is derived from the virtue and the divine appointment of the monarch, traits which are entirely interior rather than ostensible in pedigree, it is possible that no political authority can be verifiable by human means. However, because Spenser couches the transference of power and the continuation of the royal lineage by means of familial procreation, it is evident that authority that is granted and preserved by providence is promulgated by the creative power of genealogy. Ultimately, the generative force of genealogy acts, as Nature in the Garden of Adonis, as the weapon of constancy against mutability.

Spenser, in crafting the genealogy of the Tudor line as stemming from Britomart and Arthegall rather than from Arthur, presents a providentially ordered line of succession that preserves the rule of constancy in the face of circumstances that appear thoroughly mutable. In doing so, he creates a new national identity for the British monarchy that instills in the royal lineage the very traits and virtues that justify Queen Elizabeth I's claim to political and religious authority. Elizabeth I bears Arthegall's unsullied royal heritage and Britomart's uncompromised virtue. Deriving her right to political rule from the providentially ordered line of succession, Elizabeth takes on also the divinely appointed role of head of the English church. In the uncertain political and religious climate at the close of the 16th century, Spenser's royal genealogy, and the myth that surrounds it, seeks to justify both the rule of Elizabeth, and of

her successor. Such an undertaking as the means of justification of rule echoes through the political writings of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as the re-emergent theory of the divine right of kings.

As it would happen, however, Spenser himself would not live to see Elizabeth's successor crowned. For him, the royal Tudor lineage that was prophesied ceases with the Virgin Queen, Elizabeth I. James VI of Scotland and I of England, himself a proponent of the divine right of kings, would ascend the throne, and the royal line would undergo a shift remarkably similar to the shift from the line of Arthur to that of Britomart and Arthegall. Such a transference of power, according to a Spenserian understanding, exemplifies the constancy of providence as the directing force behind apparently mutable human institutions and preserves the virtue and legitimacy of the evolving English monarchy.

NOTES

1. Andrew King, "Lines of Authority: The Genealogical Theme in *The Faerie Queene." Spenser Studies* XVIII (2003) 59.

2. King, "Lines of Authority," 61.

3. Ibid., 75.

4. Margaret Christian, "The Ground of Storie: Genealogy in *The Faerie Queene," Spenser Studies* IX (1991): 62.

5. Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene,* ed. A. C. Hamilton (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2007), footnote to III.iii.29; Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Histories of the Kings of Britain,* trans. Sebastian Evens (Boston: E. P. Dutton, 1958), XXI.V.

6. King, "Lines of Authority," 68.

7. Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, III.iii.29.6.

8. Ibid., III.iii.29.7.

9. Ibid., III.iii.26.1-2.

10. Ibid., III.iii.24.3-5.

11. Ibid., III.iii.25.6-9.

12. Ibid., VII.vii.58.1-59.7.

13. Ibid., III.vi.37.

14. John Cawood, trans., *The Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion of The Church of England* (London: 1571), Christian Classics Eternal Library, accessed May 1, 2015, http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/creeds3.iv.xi.html: Article X.

15. Ibid., Article XVII.

16. Christian, "The Ground of Storie," 63.

17. Monmouth, *History of the Kings of Britain,* VIII.IXX - XX.

18. Spenser, *The Faerie Queene,* III.iii.27.1-2.

19. Ibid., III.iii.27.1.

20. Ibid., III.iii.24.1-2.

21. *Geneva Bible.* (Peadbody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007), Revelation 17:1.

22. Quoted in King, "Lines of Authority," 64.

23. Spenser, *The Faerie Queene,* II.x.68.2-6.

DEEP ATTACKING THE ENEMY:

AirLand Battle, the 101ˢᵗ Airborne Division, and Operation Desert Storm

Introduction

In the First Gulf War, the United States and its coalition allies decisively defeated the Iraqi military. The First Gulf War began on August 2, 1990, when Iraqi President Saddam Hussein ordered his military to invade Kuwait. Iraqi forces quickly overwhelmed the much smaller Kuwaiti military and occupied the country. A U.S.-led coalition immediately deployed military units to Saudi Arabia as a part of Operation Desert Shield in order to prevent the Iraqis from launching an invasion of Saudi Arabia. As the U.S. forces in Saudi Arabia began training for the coming fight, General Norman Schwarzkopf, commander of U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), began planning the transition from Operation Desert Shield, the campaign to defend Saudi Arabia from an Iraqi invasion, to Operation Desert Storm, an offensive campaign aimed at driving the Iraqis out of Kuwait. The air campaign of Operation Desert Storm, which continued until the end of the war, began on January 17th, 1991. Then on February 24th, the ground campaign began as Coalition forces rolled into Iraq and Kuwait, engaging the Iraqi Army. By February 28th, hostilities had ceased. The result was a resounding victory for the Coalition; the United States and its allies had pushed the Iraqi military out of Kuwait and dealt it a severe blow.

Instrumental to the success of the U.S. Army in Operation Desert Storm was a new doctrine known as AirLand Battle. Army commanders developed AirLand Battle in the late 1970s and early 1980s, culminating with the publication of the Field Manual (FM) 100-5, *Operations,* in 1982. AirLand Battle had been developed at the end of the Cold War as the Army realized that it needed to be prepared to fight more than just the armies of the Soviet Union. Active Defense, the Army's previous doctrine, was designed specifically to fight Soviet mechanized divisions in Central Europe. For example, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the Iranian

hostage crisis showed U.S. military commanders that threats were emerging outside the U.S.S.R. and more specifically outside Central Europe. In response to this realization, the Army developed AirLand Battle. The decision to create a doctrine that was not designed exactly for Central Europe showed the foresight of Army commanders, because the next war the Army would fight was not against the Soviet Union and did not take place in Central Europe. In fact, AirLand Battle was not put to the test until the First Gulf War.

An integral part of actually implementing Airland Battle was the role of the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), which played different roles during the air campaign and the ground campaign of Operation Desert Storm. Apache attack helicopters from the 101st Division were at the vanguard of the air offensive, at one point launching an attack that destroyed a pair of Iraqi radar stations. The destruction of these stations opened a gap in the Iraqi radar defense network, and that gap enabled Coalition aircraft to systematically bomb Iraqi military units, command centers, and control capabilities. Later, once the ground offensive began, the 101st Division reverted to a supporting role. It prevented the Iraqis from deploying reinforcements into Kuwait, and it decimated retreating columns of Iraqi units. The initial raid against the Iraqi radar stations conducted by the 101st Airborne Division at the beginning of Operation Desert Storm demonstrates that the unit, with its fleet of well-protected, heavily-armed, and highly-mobile attack and transportation helicopters, was designed specifically to implement AirLand Battle.

This thesis will rely on two sets of primary sources, in order, to analyze the role of the 101st Division in AirLand Battle during Operation Desert Storm. The first is the 1982 edition of FM 100-5, Operations. This edition refers to FM 100-5 as "the Army's keystone How to Fight manual."[1] In other words, FM 100-5 is the primary field manual that explains how the Army should utilize its soldiers and weapon systems in order to defeat its enemies. The other type of primary source this thesis will use is a series of interviews conducted by the Aviation Branch History Office. Historians from this office interviewed soldiers from the 101st Airborne Division soon after those soldiers had returned from Iraq to the

United States. I obtained transcripts of these interviews from the archives of the U.S. Army Center of Military History at Fort McNair, Washington, D.C. Taken together, these primary sources will allow me to examine the transition from the theoretical idea of AirLand Battle to its actual implementation as seen in the 101st Division during Operation Desert Storm.

Regarding the development and publication of AirLand Battle, my thesis will rely primarily on a monograph written by John L. Romjue entitled, *From Active Defense to AirLand Battle: The Development of Army Doctrine 1973-1982.* In his work, Romjue explains the causes, both national and international, that led the U.S. Army to change its doctrine from Active Defense to AirLand Battle. He also examines the military commanders who were instrumental in bringing about this change in the mid-1970s and early-1980s.[2] Romjue's analysis forms a critical part of my argument; I will draw predominantly from him in my examination of why the Army moved away from Active Defense and towards AirLand Battle. However, my thesis will focus more on analyzing how military commanders took these theoretical ideas and implemented them in an actual campaign.

Historians have written extensively about how AirLand Battle shaped the Army before Operation Desert Storm. For example, John Sloan Brown traces the transformation of the Army from the end of the Cold War to the beginning of the War on Terror in *Kevlar Legions: The Transformation of the U.S. Army, 1989-2005.* Brown also examines how technological advances and new weapon systems shape and are shaped by doctrinal transformations. Regarding AirLand Battle, he explains that this doctrine shaped the development of the "Big Five," as they were called: the M1 Abrams main battle tank, the M2/M3 Bradley fighting vehicle, the AH-64 Apache attack helicopter, the UH-60 Black Hawk utility helicopter, and the Patriot air defense missile. According to Brown, the Army developed these new weapon systems, because after the development of AirLand Battle they recognized that the next U.S. military engagement would most likely be against a numerically-superior enemy. So, the Army would need to possess more modern, powerful weapon systems to overcome this disadvantage.[3] Thus, Brown's analysis of AirLand Battle and

Operation Desert Storm focuses on the changes this doctrine spurred in the Army.

Not all historians, however, view the application of AirLand Battle in Operation Desert Storm as a great success. Alberto Bin, Richard Hill, and Archer Jones provide a thorough account of the origins and military operations of the First Gulf War in *Desert Storm: A Forgotten War.* For example, in the final section of their book, these authors argue that the U.S. Army commanders did not actually put AirLand Battle to the test, because the U.S. military was superior to the Iraqi military in terms of technology, training, and morale. Therefore, the American victory had more to do with the inferiority of the Iraqi military than the superiority of the Coalition battleplan.[4] They also claim that the U.S. VII Corps was unable to synchronize its attack with other Coalition units during Operation Desert Storm, causing a "significant deviation" from the original plan.[5] AirLand Battle, as a method, emphasizes the need for synchronization. Based on that concept, the authors claim that given the difficulty commanders had in coordinating the advance of the VII Corps' armored divisions in "such favorable circumstances," the Army would have been unable to synchronize its forces in less favorable circumstances.[6] I am not arguing here that the Coalition flawlessly executed Operation Desert Storm; the critique these authors present is valid. Nevertheless, my thesis demonstrates that AirLand Battle, even when it is not perfectly synchronized, is an effective strategy, and in the case of Operation Desert Storm, the attacks conducted by the 101st Airborne Division played a crucial role in defeating the Iraqi military.

History and Organization of the 101st Airborne Division

The 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) is one of the most decorated units in the U.S. Army. Originally formed during World War II as an airborne unit, the 101st Division participated in the Allied invasion of Normandy, Operation Market Garden, and the Battle of the Bulge.[7] The 101st Division was later reorganized as an airmobile unit in August 1968 and deployed to Vietnam, where it participated in the Tet Offensive. Although it had become an airmobile unit, the 101st Division retained its "Airborne" designation to honor its heritage as a World War II parachute

unit, thus becoming the 101st Airborne Division (Airmobile). After the Vietnam War, the 101st Division was re-designated as an air assault unit, becoming the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault).[8]

The transformations from an airborne unit to an airmobile and then later to an air assault unit were fundamental changes for the 101st Division. For example, airborne units deploy primarily from transport airplanes, parachuting paratroopers and their weapons to the ground. In contrast, air assault and airmobile units rely primarily on helicopter aircraft to transport air assault troops and their weapons to the battlefield. Major General J.H. Binford Peay III, commander of the 101st Division during Operation Desert Storm, once described the unit as a "medium" division. Since the helicopters are organic to the unit—that is, a part of the division itself and not simply an independent unit temporarily attached to it—as Maj. Gen. Peay explained in an interview, the 101st Division is able to deploy rapidly like a light division, such as the 82nd Airborne Division, while still retaining the firepower of a heavy division due to the anti-tank capabilities of its attack helicopters.[9]

Helicopters are thus an integral part of the 101st Division, since it relies on them both to move the division and to provide anti-tank firepower. The 101st Division deployed six main types of helicopters to Saudi Arabia in support of Operation Desert Storm. The AH-64A Apache attack helicopter was the primary attack helicopter the 101st Division used in Operation Desert Storm. The Apache is armed with Hydra 70 rockets; deadly, laser-guided Hellfire missiles; and a 30mm chain gun. It is heavily armored and has night vision capability, enabling it to operate at nighttime or in reduced-visibility conditions.[10] It thus forms a crucial part of the 101st Division's offensive capability.

A New Strategic Situation and a New Doctrine, 1979-1982

Beginning in 1979-1980, the strategic situation that faced the United States changed dramatically. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the Iranian hostage crisis demonstrated that the U.S. Army could no longer prepare exclusively to fight a war in Central Europe, even as Europe remained the Army's main strategic concern. New types of enemies were emerging, enemies that differed from the mechanized divisions of the Soviet

Union. More fundamentally, leaders predicted that the battlefield of the future would be different from the battlefields of the past; battlefields would now be marked by fluidity, rapid movement, and intense fire.[11]

In August 1982, in response to all these strategic changes, the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) published a new edition of FM 100-5, *Operations*. This manual officially replaced the 1976 edition and its doctrine of Active Defense with the doctrine of AirLand Battle, and so the new FM 100-5 represented a significant shift in doctrinal thinking. It departed from Active Defense in important ways, including Active Defense's emphasis on lateral movement of forces to counter enemy attacks and its overall defensive nature. AirLand Battle returned to "a more traditional reliance on reserves" and was much more aggressive than Active Defense.[12] Simply put, AirLand Battle "referred to simultaneous battles on the forward line and deep in the enemy's rear echelons, in close concert with airpower and ground forces."[13] AirLand Battle thus called for a concerted and coordinated attack against the enemy in order to disrupt and destroy the opposing forces. A key part of AirLand Battle is the deep attack, confronting the enemy far behind the front lines, thereby using the full depth of the battlefield to disrupt the enemy's attempts to reinforce and resupply his frontline forces.

As I will prove, the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) was uniquely designed to implement AirLand Battle. The Army did not put this doctrine into practice in an actual conflict until Operation Desert Storm. The 101st Division, with its fleet of helicopters, was maneuverable, well-protected, well-armed, and well-led. The unit launched several deep attacks during Operation Desert Storm, decimating enemy rear areas and retreating columns. Consequently, the 101st Division played a crucial role in validating AirLand Battle and its emphasis on the deep attack.

101st Airborne Division and Operation Desert Storm, 1991

The 101st Airborne Division would play an important role in Gen. Schwarzkopf's overall battle plan for Operation Desert Storm from the very onset of the offensive campaign. Operation Desert Storm began on January 17,1991. When, the 101st Division

conducted the first attack of the air offensive by destroying two Iraqi radar stations. This attack opened the way for allied aircraft to bomb targets in Iraq. For the next five weeks, Coalition aircraft subjected the Iraqi military to daily airstrikes, averaging 1,000 airstrikes a day. The airstrikes targeted Iraqi infrastructure; command, control, and communication centers; and frontline units.[14] The Coalition air forces were thus preparing the way for ground units to launch a massive counterattack.

Then on January 17, 1991, a special task force, codenamed Task Force Normandy, fired the opening shots of Operation Desert Storm deep behind enemy lines. Task Force Normandy consisted of Apaches from the 1st Battalion, 101st Aviation Regiment, 101st Division, supported by Air Force MH-53J Enhanced Pave Low III helicopters, which provided navigational support.[15] This mission demonstrated the 101st Division's deep attack capability and therefore provides evidence of why the unit was so well-designed to implement AirLand Battle.

The objective of this mission, which was to destroy a pair of Early Warning/Ground Control Intercept (EWGCI) radar sites in Iraq, can also reveal some of the unit's other elements for success. By destroying these sites, Task Force Normandy would open a gap in the Iraqi radar defense network and enable U.S. and Coalition aircraft to bomb targets in Iraq without fear of being fired upon by surface-to-air missiles (SAMs).[16] This mission would ultimately have a domino effect because it enabled U.S. airplanes to hit other radar sites and even the Iraqi headquarters in Baghdad, greatly reducing the enemy's ability to fight effectively.[17] Furthermore, the Iraqi Air Force was only able to muster a few fighters to engage the Americans, thus giving the Coalition complete air superiority when the ground offensive of Operation Desert Storm began.[18]

After months of planning and rehearsing the mission, the day for the attack finally arrived. In the early morning hours of January 17th, the nine Apaches, one Black Hawk, and two Pave Lows of Task Force Normandy made their way into enemy-controlled territory. Operation Desert Storm had officially begun. The flight into Iraq was approximately 140 miles from the Apache's base, so the helicopters had to be specially modified to enable them to carry enough fuel for the mission.[19] The Pave Low

helicopters provided critical navigational support to the Apaches, helping them locate their targets in the darkness. Maintaining radio silence and flying low to the ground in order to avoid detection by enemy radar, the helicopters managed to arrive at the target sites unobserved.[20] The Iraqis were completely unprepared for the impending attack.

As they approached their objectives, the Apaches split into two teams to attack both of the Iraqi radar sites simultaneously. Once they were in position, the attack helicopters opened fire. Streaks of flame illuminated the night as salvos of deadly Hellfire missiles found their targets, followed by rocket and 30mm fire.[21] The radar sites were completely destroyed, raked by deadly missiles and bullets from the Apaches. Task Force Normandy encountered little resistance—most of the Iraqis were asleep in their barracks when the helicopters arrived—so the S-60 light anti-aircraft guns that defended the sites were unmanned. The Apaches had also quickly destroyed the guns before the Iraqis could man them, leaving the radar sites defenseless.[22] Lieutenant Timothy Devito, an officer from Task Force Normandy, summed up the whole mission concisely, "The only thing that would stop us would be, of course, if the enemy was aware that we were coming because if he wasn't, he was dead. As simple as that."[23]

Once they had destroyed the radar sites, the helicopters returned to friendly airspace in Saudi Arabia, having completed their mission and blown a hole in the Iraqi defense radar network. That same night, Coalition aircrafts began flying into enemy territory and bombing strategic targets in Iraq. The 101st Airborne Division had struck the opening blow in the Coalition's counteroffensive to liberate Kuwait. Their action was a validation of the crucial role that helicopters could play in AirLand Battle because the raid was an example of the type of mission emphasized by the doctrine: deep attacks aimed at controlling the full depth of the battlefield. The radar sites destroyed by Task Force Normandy were located 140 miles inside Iraqi territory, far behind the frontlines. Furthermore, the destruction of the radar sites allowed Coalition aircrafts to launch bombing runs against the Iraqi forces and their military headquarters in Baghdad. These bombing runs disrupted and destroyed enemy units, giving the

Coalition a significant advantage when the ground offensive began on February 24th.

Overall, the AH-64A Apache attack helicopter was critical to the 101st Division's success during Task Force Normandy's raid. A ground force would have taken too long to reach the radar sites without being spotted, and airplanes would have been detected by enemy radar before they could have launched their missiles and destroyed the sites. The Apache, on the other hand, with its sensor-jamming technology and ability to fly low to the ground, could reach the radar sites undetected. Once they arrived at their target, the heavy payload the Apaches could carry enabled them to destroy the radar sites before safely returning to friendly territory.

Although other American air units, such as the 229th Aviation Regiment, contain Apache helicopters, the 101st Division was unique in that it was, and remains, the only air assault division in the world. As an air assault unit, the 101st Division combines attack helicopters with cargo helicopters, utility helicopters, and air assault infantry.[24] This rare combination gives the 101st Division the ability not only to deep attack enemy forces, but also to transport infantry far behind the frontlines in support of such attacks. Infantry are critical to capturing and securing territory, a task which attack helicopters alone cannot achieve effectively. No other unit in the world possessed this unique capability.

Conclusion

On the evening of March 23rd, 2003, regiment of AH-64D Longbow Apache helicopters took off from its forward base and headed north towards Baghdad. The helicopters were conducting a deep attack as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom against an Iraqi Republican Guard division just south of Bagdad. The Americans' mission was to destroy the enemy division and clear the way for the U.S. 3rd Infantry Division's advance to the Iraqi capital. The Apaches were flying low to the ground, at between 100 and 120 miles per hour when, without warning, they began taking small-arms, antiaircraft, and rocket-propelled grenade (RPG) fire. Hiding in tree lines and buildings, Iraqi insurgents raked the Apaches from below. The attack helicopters took heavy fire, so the American pilots called off the attack. As the regiment limped back to base,

the pilots surveyed the scene: The Iraqis had damaged more than 90% of the helicopters, shot down one of the Apaches, and captured its crew.[25]

One of the reasons Americans found this raid so shocking was that the Iraqis had managed to defeat a regiment of Apaches, "the most advanced attack helicopter in the world," armed with only limited technology and small-arms weapons.[26] Using cell phones and comrades on the ground to coordinate their ambush along with their use of assault rifles, machine guns, cheap antiaircraft guns, and RPGs to attack the weak points of the Apaches, the insurgents never presented a concentration of enemies for the helicopters to attack. Instead, dispersed groups of fighters attacked the Apaches from multiple directions.[27]

Criticisms of the deep attack in general and of the Apache helicopter in particular began almost immediately after the raid. Air Force Secretary James Roche asserted that the U.S. Air Force would probably begin taking over deep attack missions after the poor showing by the Apache regiment.[28] Others claimed that the attack helicopter was designed for deep attacks against conventional forces and that this was an outdated idea in the modern age of asymmetric warfare.[29] Loren Thompson, director of the Lexington Institute, wondered if the Apache was no longer a viable weapon system, given that it had been so easily defeated in the operation on 23 March. Retired Air Force General Merrill McPeak was one of the staunchest critics of the Apache, saying that the helicopter had made no difference in Operation Iraqi Freedom.[30]

Another mission carried out several days later, however, showed that critics had been too quick to condemn the Apache as outdated. On March 28, 2003, the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) carried out a deep attack against the 14th Brigade of the Medina Republican Guard Division. Unlike the previous mission, A-10 Warthogs, the Air Force's primary ground attack airplane, provided support to the 101st Division's Apaches. When the helicopters began receiving organized, small-arms fire from enemy fighters, they called in the A-10s to attack the insurgents. The raid was successful, as the Americans destroyed 866 targets, including tanks, armored vehicles, artillery pieces, and antiaircraft guns.[31]

Nevertheless, as operations in both Iraq and Afghanistan have continued, it has become clear that the enemy the United States is facing has learned from the success of the U.S. military in Operation Desert Storm. Iraqi and Afghan insurgents no longer present a clear target for U.S. forces to engage. Due to the massive advantage that the U.S. military possesses in terms of technology, training, and weapon systems, enemy insurgents are forced to fight an asymmetric war. In both Iraq and Afghanistan, insurgents use ambushes, hit-and-run attacks, and improvised explosive devices (IEDs) to engage U.S. forces because they know that the U.S. military is too powerful to take on in a conventional fight.[32]

Apache pilots have thus been forced to adapt to fight in these new counterinsurgency operations. Deep attacks are effective against conventional, military formations, but they are ineffective against an enemy that refuses to present a clear target, preferring instead to launch hit-and-run attacks and to disperse before the helicopters can counterattack. This tendency has led to a fundamental shift in the way Apaches fight in Iraq and Afghanistan. Rather than deploying large formations of helicopters to engage enemy units, as it did in Operation Desert Storm, the 101st Division uses its helicopters to provide close air support for ground troops.[33] Working in teams of two, the Apaches support ground forces by launching airstrikes against insurgent positions.[34] The helicopters' 30mm cannon, Hydra rockets, and Hellfire missiles—which proved so effective against enemy armored units in Operation Desert Storm—have proven themselves again in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

The 101st Airborne Division has established itself as one of the most flexible units in the U.S. Army. Originally created as an airborne unit, the 101st Division fought valiantly across France, the Netherlands, and Germany. Reorganized as an airmobile and then as an air assault unit, the 101st Division excelled in its new role. Armed with attack, transport, and scout helicopters, the 101st Division played a crucial role in Operation Desert Storm, deep attacking enemy radar sites and Iraqi armored columns as they retreated. Even in the modern age of asymmetric warfare, in which enemy insurgents launch hit-and-run attacks against

U.S. forces, the 101st Division demonstrated that the critics of the attack helicopter were wrong. Deploying small teams of Apaches to support ground troops, the 101st Division has successfully adapted to this new style of warfare and ensured that their storied division will continue to play a critical role in future operations of the U.S. military.

NOTES

1. *Field Manual Number 100-5: Operations* (Headquarters, Department of the Army: Washington DC, 1982) Preface.

2. John L. Romjue, *From Active Defense to AirLand Battle: The Development of Army Doctrine 1973-1982* (Historical Office, United States Army Training and Doctrine Command: Fort Monroe, 1984) 1-2.

3. John Sloan Brown, *Kevlar Legions: The Transformation of the U.S. Army, 1989-2005* (Washington, DC: Center of Military History, 2011) 16.

4. Alberto Bin, Richard Hill, and Archer Jones, *Desert Storm: A Forgotten War* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1998) 250.

5. Bin, *Desert Storm: A Forgotten War,* 250.

6. Ibid.

7. 101st Airborne Division History," Fort Campbell Official Website, accessed 24 November 2014, http://www.campbell.army.mil/units/101st/Pages/History.aspx.

8. Ibid.

9. Major General J.H. Binford Peay III, "Air Assault in the Gulf: An Interview with MG J.H. Binford Peay, III Commanding General, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault)," interview by Major Robert K. Wright Jr., Mr. Rex Boggs, and 1st Lieutenant Cliff Lippard (Washington, DC: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 5 June 1991) 30.

10. Ibid., Appendix A.

11. Romjue, *From Active Defense to AirLand Battle,* 66-67.

12. Ibid., 71-72.

13. Ibid., 72.

14. Bin, *Desert Storm: A Forgotten War,* 95-115.

15. Captain Timothy Devito, interview by Dr. Burton Wright III, Aviation Branch History Office, 28 August 1991 (Washington, DC: U.S. Army Center of Military History) 10-12.

16. Ibid., 2.

17. Ibid., 15-17.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid., 22, 7-8.

20. Ibid., 12, 22.

21. Ibid., 22-23.

22. Ibid., 14.

23. Ibid., 10.

24. Stephen Everett, "Historical Essay," in "Air Assault in the Gulf," 3.

25. Robert M. Cassidy, "Renaissance of the Attack Helicopter in the Close Fight," *Military Review* July-August (2003): 38, 42; Eric Rosenberg, "Failed Raid Spurs Re-Evaluation of Gunship," Laredo Morning Times, 23 March 2004, http://airwolf.lmtonline.com/news/archive/032304/pagea1.pdf & http://airwolf.lmtonline.com/news/archive/032304/pagea7.pdf.

26. Rosenberg, "Failed Raid."

27. Cassidy, "Renaissance of the Attack Helicopter," 38, 42.

28. Rosenberg, "Failed Raid."

29. Cassidy, "Renaissance of the Attack Helicopter," 39.

30. Rosenberg, "Failed Raid."

31. Cassidy, "Renaissance of the Attack Helicopter," 42.

32. Ibid., 40.

33. Dave Majumdar, "The Apaches of the 1-101st Aviation Regiment: Expect No Mercy," *Examiner,* 25 June 2009, http://www.examiner.com/article/the-apaches-of-the-1-101st-aviation-regiment-expect-no-mercy.

34. Cassidy, "Renaissance of the Attack Helicopter," 43.

ANGER:
Aquinas in Dialogue with Modern Psychology

Be angry but do not sin; do not let the sun set on your anger, and do not leave room for the devil. (Eph. 4:26-27)

Every Wednesday night, priests, religious, and laypeople praying Compline come across this scripture passage in which St. Paul exhorts the people of Ephesus to live a truly Christian lifestyle. The verse summarizes the Christian perspective of anger and its role in the Christian life, a perspective that has developed over centuries of thought and dispute and continues to be debated today. Anger has been regarded with suspicion because of its potentially destructive consequences. Indeed, the emotions in general are often perceived as irrational and harmful to human flourishing.[1] In the thirteenth century, however, St. Thomas Aquinas proposed a different view, one that embraces the emotions as essential to the human person and as necessary for growing in virtue and union with God. After defining anger, he shows that it is a God-given faculty that is intrinsically tied to reason. Hundreds of years later, although the field of psychology has yet to reach a definitive consensus on the concept of anger, many psychological findings give credence to Aquinas' view. Looking to Jesus as a model of emotional integration and taking Aquinas' insights with the latest science, the Christian can gain a fuller understanding of anger, and most importantly, how to direct it toward its proper end.

Aquinas categorizes each emotion as either concupiscible, meaning it "is inclined to seek what is suitable, according to the senses, and to fly from what is hurtful"; or as irascible, meaning that it "resists these attacks that hinder what is suitable, and inflict harm."[2] The object of an irascible emotion "is something arduous, because its tendency is to overcome and rise above obstacles."[3] Aquinas defines anger, which belongs in the latter category, as "a desire for vengeance" after an injury is inflicted.[4] Anger involves sorrow from the grievance, hope of revenge (without which the injury leads only to sorrow), and pleasure from the anticipation of

revenge.[5] Unique because it has no contrary emotion, anger is directed toward two objects: "to vengeance itself, which it desires and hopes for as being a good, wherefore it takes pleasure in it; and to the person on whom it seeks vengeance, as to something contrary and hurtful, which bears the character of evil."[6] Aquinas borrows Nemesius' description of anger as "the sword-bearer of desire" that "assails whatever obstacle stands in the way of desire."[7] Thus, anger can be more simply understood as a response to a present, difficult evil that works to eliminate anything standing in the way of attaining happiness, which is the ultimate aim of every appetitive desire within the human person.[8] Aquinas argues that all of the emotions naturally obey reason.[9] Aware that anger often carries a reputation of irrationality, he takes special care to discuss whether reason has a role in anger, something he does not do for the other emotions.[10] He explains that the desire for vengeance necessitates the determination of the appropriate punishment for a perpetrated injury, which requires an act of reason.[11] Due to its reliance on reason, anger is less tainted by original sin than the concupiscible emotions are, a conclusion that may surprise many Christians.[12] That said, anger itself does not make a decision about the course of action to pursue; if one chooses to pursue vengeance, anger simply serves as a motivator.[13]

　　　Aquinas' description of anger presents some difficulties. First, one may object to his claim that when a difficult evil is judged to be impossible to overcome, sorrow results instead of anger.[14] It is plausible that a person judging a situation as hopeless may still fly into a rage. In *The Logic of Desire: Aquinas on Emotion,* Nicholas Lombardo responds that such a reaction is nonetheless the result of a belief, albeit an irrational one, that the fit of rage would achieve something.[15] Initially, this answer is somewhat unsatisfactory as it does not take into account the person who is furious precisely because his or her ability to take vengeance has been frustrated. For instance, consider a mother who flies into a frenzied rage because someone killed her child and she understands that nothing she can do, including killing the murderer, can bring her child back to life. One solution is that the mother is reacting to a separate pain inflicted—the grievance

of being rendered powerless over events in her life—that carries its own hope of revenge: the regaining of a sense of control. The morality and virtuousness of anger will be discussed later, but another possibility is that only an intemperate person who displays disordered anger would continue raging even after realizing that the situation is hopeless. Therefore, it does seem that hope is necessary to anger.

Another objection to Aquinas' account of anger is that in common experience, sadness is unnecessary to the experience of anger.[16] Lombardo suggests that to avoid this difficulty, anger can be thought of as a response to "a future good that is presently arduous, that is, a future good that is attained through the elimination of a present evil."[17] While hope is still necessary to the experience of anger, sadness is not, but neither is sadness precluded from co-occurring.[18] Although Aquinas' definition of anger raises some technical issues, on the whole his account is robust.

Because the emotions are now considered a topic properly studied in psychology, comparing Aquinas' ideas with modern psychological research is imperative. It is important to note that finding studies on anger as such is difficult, which psychologists themselves recognize; most research focuses on the relation between anger and aggression.[19] Consequently, although people generally understand what is meant by "anger," it is not a concept with an agreed upon definition. Some even argue that anger should remain undefined.[20] Thus, several definitions of anger will be presented. In his 1983 article "Studies on Anger and Aggression: Implications for Theories of Emotion," James Averill defines anger simply as "a response to some perceived misdeed."[21] Jan Smedslund, in "How Shall the Concept of Anger Be Defined?" (1993) offers the following definition: "a feeling involving a *belief* that a person one cares for has, intentionally or through neglect, been treated without respect, and a want to have that respect re-established."[22] In a 2010 psychological encyclopedia, researchers Raymond DiGiuseppe and Raymond Tafrate define anger as "a subjectively experienced emotion with high sympathetic autonomic arousal" that "is elicited by the perception of a threat to one's physical well being, property,

present or future resources, self-image, social status or image as projected to one's group, maintenance of social rules that regulate daily life, or comfort."[23]

Smedslund's definition is the closest to Aquinas' because it includes the components of injury, desire, vengeance, and reason. The other two definitions conspicuously leave out the desire for vengeance. Averill explains that his definition is purposely minimal because he wants to examine the subjective experience of anger without too many preconceived notions.[24] DiGiuseppe and Tafrate, on the other hand, emphasize the physical experience of anger, which conflicts with other researchers' claims that "mild or moderate anger need not be accompanied by high levels of arousal."[25] However, the encyclopedia authors note that "anger produces a strong tendency to approach rather than to avoid the eliciting stimuli," making it "the only negative emotion to motivate approach behaviors."[26] These latter points mesh quite well with Aquinas' account. The researchers also assert that "anger motivates a response of antagonism."[27] "Antagonism" carries a negative connotation, whereas revenge for Aquinas is a neutral term that can mean the rectification of injustice.[28] In fact, among the emotions, anger holds the distinction of triggering the greatest variety of responses, from silent fuming to violent outburst.[29] According to Averill, "contrary reactions" such as overt friendliness toward the offender are far more common than direct aggression,[30] and almost half of aggression that does occur as a result of anger is nonphysical.[31]

Two particular findings in psychological science support Aquinas' claim that reason is important in the experience of anger. First, as they describe in their article "Thinking Straight While Seeing Red: The Influence of Anger on Information Processing," Wesley Moons and Diane Mackie found in a series of three experiments that mild or moderate anger actually enhances analytic processing.[32] Second, Averill's research on the qualitative difference between anger and annoyance sheds light on how reason informs a person's response to a frustrating situation. He argues that because anger is more strongly tied to morality than annoyance is, an annoyed person will attempt to disguise the feeling and exit the situation, whereas an angry person may

purposely pursue a confrontation. In other words, anger impels one toward action in a way that annoyance does not.[33] Imagine, for instance, sitting in a movie theater while someone a few seats over munches loudly on popcorn. The "pain inflicted" is that it is harder to hear the dialogue on screen, and the "vengeance" desired is simply for the person to stop chewing so loudly. One may have the urge to ask the perpetrator to eat more quietly, but reason informs the beleaguered moviegoer that the popcorn will soon be finished, confronting the person may cause additional disturbance, and the person is likely unaware of his or her offense. In response, one chooses to suffer silently or perhaps move to another seat. On the other hand, if the instigator purposely shows disrespect by talking loudly, especially after polite requests to stop, then one would begin to feel anger at the willful offense and be motivated to rectify the situation, perhaps by calling the manager. Thus, the comparison of different levels of anger lends more credence to Aquinas' claim that anger responds to rational thought.

Understanding the structure of anger, the next step is to explore the morality of anger as understood by Christians. In the Christian tradition, much dispute surrounds Jesus' words in Matthew 5:22: "But I say to you, whoever is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment." Although the context of the passage is anger leading to murder, some have interpreted Jesus' words to be a categorical ban on anger.[34] St. Augustine, however, proposes an interpretation known as the "person/sin distinction": "[A]nger at persons is always sinful, while anger at sin is virtuous" because it is with cause.[35] Aquinas originally adopted the distinction, but then abandoned it for two reasons. First, the distinction does not encompass all the ways in which anger can be immoral, nor does it account for the fact that not all anger against sin is justified; it may be too excessive. Second, Aquinas argues that anger and hatred are different, and he distinguishes between them by contending that anger is directed toward a particular person, whereas the object of hatred can be something general, such as sin, an inanimate object, or a class of people.[36] If the object of anger is sin, as Augustine proposes, then there is no distinction between hatred and anger. Instead, Aquinas asserts that "the hater wishes evil to his enemy, as evil, whereas the angry man

wishes evil to him with whom he is angry, not as evil but in so far as it has an aspect of good."[37] The example of a parent and child shows that Aquinas' analysis is correct: Generally, a parent who is angry with a child for disobedience does not hate the child, but rather loves the child and wants what is best for him or her.

From a phenomenological perspective, the person/sin distinction is merely mental gymnastics. One becomes angry with the wrongdoer precisely because that person freely chose to perpetrate an evil.[38] In a situation in which one realizes that the perpetrator was not culpable for committing an offense—e.g. because of a mental illness, or the wrongdoing was accidental— one's anger usually subsides. The desire for vengeance inherent in anger is not for vengeance on the sin itself; although one desires that the injury be remedied, it is always in reference to the individual who sinned. For example, if a person's belongings are stolen and later found and returned by a third party, the victim will be happy to retrieve his or her possessions. Nonetheless, without a resolution with the thief, whether in the form of an arrest or an apology, in some sense the situation remains unresolved. Aquinas' rejection of the person/sin distinction therefore constitutes an important development in the understanding of anger.

Once it is established that being angry with someone is not inherently wrong, the Christian will want to understand what virtuous anger does and does not look like. To be righteous, anger must be properly ordered under both of its aspects: its object and its mode. In its object, anger is good, or "zealous," as Aquinas calls it, if vengeance is rationally applied. Conversely, anger is sinful if it leads one to desire punishment disproportionately, toward an innocent party, using illegal means, or for reasons other than the restoration of justice.[39] Christians must exercise the virtue of clemency, which "concerns the reasonable moderation of acts of punishment."[40] Meekness, or "the reasonable moderation of the passion of anger," must be cultivated to make sure that anger is rational in its mode, or intensity.[41] Otherwise, it may be too intense or last too long, as when someone chooses to ruminate over an offense, or it may not be intense enough.[42] Some may be surprised at the latter point, but Aquinas stresses that because people have bodies, "so also does it belong to the perfection of moral good,

that man should be moved unto good, not only in respect of his will, but also in respect of his sensitive appetite."[43] It would be unnatural for a father not to feel anger upon hearing that his child has been violently attacked and for him not to seek justice. Thus, against claims that anger is incompatible with a Christian lifestyle because it may show ingratitude to God and preclude forgiveness, Aquinas' account demonstrates that when anger is shaped by reason and does not disobey it, not only is it not sinful, but it is a necessity in a world marred by original sin.[44] After all, for God to give humans a capacity that cannot be virtuous would be illogical and contrary to his nature.[45]

More compelling, however, is that the Gospels provide accounts of Jesus, a sinless man, becoming angry.[46] Because Jesus was both fully human and fully divine, his experience of the emotions was unique. Jesus felt anger in a way that God, who is immaterial and does not feel sensible pain, does not.[47] Lombardo adds that Jesus' "affectivity is more human than ours, not less."[48] Jesus suffered on the cross more than anyone else could have precisely because his "humanity was more perfectly human, and therefore his body and soul were more sensitive."[49] In "Christian Anger? A Contemporary Account of Virtuous Anger in the Thomistic Tradition," William Mattison further points to three specific ways in which Jesus experienced anger differently. First, Jesus was never oriented toward disproportionate retribution. Second, Jesus' anger was always reasonable. And finally, whereas in an average person anger "disturbs" reason (despite relying on it), this was not the case for Jesus. [50] Christians thus naturally look to Jesus as the model of emotional integration in an imperfect world.[51] Because of the differences in Jesus' experience of the emotions, however, Stephen Voorwinde cautions in *Jesus' Emotions in the Gospels* against trying to replicate Christ's emotions too literally: "Christians are not designed to be emotional clones of Jesus."[52] Instead, they should be open to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who works with each person's unique temperament and situation. That said, Voorwinde argues that Christians should imitate Jesus' emotional responses when they "are enjoined in the more prescriptive passages of Scripture, such as in the Epistles and in the recorded teaching of Jesus."[53]

Expressing anger to a reasonable extent presents a challenge. St. John of the Cross reflects that even Christians who sincerely strive toward union with God are often prone to imperfections regarding anger.[54] In his discussion of the spiritual life, he contends that vicious anger "is an imperfection that must be purged through the dryness of the dark night."[55] The challenge of being temperate in anger might make some Christians more inclined to suppress angry feelings. Psychiatrist Conrad Baars warns, however, that suppression is unhealthy both psychologically and spiritually. Anger that goes unaddressed results in growing resentment. Even more importantly, stifling one's anger denies the perpetrator the opportunity to understand the effects of his or her actions as well as the chance to apologize, make restitution for the injury, and change his or her ways.[56] In other words, one should be honest about angry feelings.[57]

Mattison provides additional practical advice on how to guide one's anger to become virtuous. The first step is continence, in which one recognizes and controls unreasonable anger. Sources such as "divine law, conscience, upbringing, prayer, education, [and] advice from friends" can inform the intellect about whether anger is legitimate or vicious.[58] Next, in order to both prevent oneself from lashing out, and in order to subdue the anger itself, a person may employ a number of psychological methods, such as taking deep breaths, walking away from the situation, or counting to ten. Such restraint is vital, because psychological research indicates that "blowing off steam" (for instance, by punching something) when angry actually leads to increased anger.[59] Since the brain is "plastic," meaning that neural connections are malleable, every action reinforces a tendency toward a particular response. Therefore, every time a person chooses to practice mindfulness instead of lashing out in the midst of anger, an inclination toward reasonable assessment is reinforced so that eventually, a virtuous reaction to a provocation becomes automatic.[60] Grace, without which virtue is impossible, assists the person's growth throughout this process.[61]

In his paradigm of the emotions, Aquinas emphasizes that the purpose of the emotions is to guide the human person in the pursuit of goodness and happiness, which culminates

in God. Because of the corrupting effects of original sin, however, the emotions are prone to disorder and lead people to pursue lesser goods, making proper cultivation of the emotions essential. Disordered anger in particular can lead to grave harm. Nonetheless, in a fallen world, anger is vital because it impels people to fight for justice, which leads to peace. For this reason, Paul advises the Ephesians to take the balanced perspective that Aquinas would eventually espouse: While righteous anger should never be repressed, it must be carefully guided by reason, a task with which modern psychology can assist, but that ultimately requires God's grace. Even in righteous anger, however, Christians must follow Christ's example and forgive.

NOTES

1. For the purposes of this paper, 'emotions' will be used in place of Aquinas' terms 'passions' and 'affections' in order to avoid interdisciplinary terminological issues. 'Emotion' or 'emotions' refers to particular phenomena such as joy, sadness, anger, etc.

2. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* I, 81.2. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Online edition 2008. http://www.newadvent.org/summa/.

3. Ibid.

4. *ST* I-II, 46.4. According to Nicholas Lombardo, 'vengeance' is to be understood as a neutral term. See Nicholas Lombardo, *The Logic of Desire: Aquinas on Emotion* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2011), 66.

5. Lombardo, *The Logic of Desire,* 66.

6. I.e., joy and sadness are opposites, but anger has no corresponding opposite emotion in Thomistic categories; *ST* I-II, 46.2.

7. Ibid., obj 1.

8. Lombardo, *The Logic of Desire,* 33.

9. Ibid., 239.

10. Ibid., 67.

11. *ST* I-II, 46.4.

12. Ibid., 83.4.

13. Lombardo, *The Logic of Desire,* 239.

14. *ST* I-II, 46.1.

15. Lombardo, *The Logic of Desire,* 67, n83.

16. Ibid., 73.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid., 74.

19. James R. Averill, "Studies on Anger and Aggression: Implications for Theories of Emotion," *American Psychologist* 38, no. 11 (1983): 1153.

20. Jan Smedslund, "How Shall the Concept of Anger Be Defined?" *Theory and Psychology 3,* no. 1 (1993): 5-10.

21. Averill, "Studies on Anger and Aggression," 1150.

22. Smedslund, "How Shall the Concept of Anger Be Defined?" 30.

23. Raymond A. DiGiuseppe and Raymond Chip Tafrate, s.v. "Anger," in *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology* (4th ed.) eds. Irving B. Weinger and W. Edward Craighead (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2010), 100-101.

24. Smedslund, "How Shall the Concept of Anger Be Defined?" 1150.

25. Wesley G. Moons and Diane M. Mackie, "Thinking Straight While Seeing Red: The Influence of Anger on Information Processing." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 33, no. 5 (2007): 717.

26. DiGiuseppe and Tafrate, "Anger," 100.

27. Ibid.

28. Lombardo, *The Logic of Desire,* 66.

29. DiGiuseppe and Tafrate, "Anger," 100.

30. Averill, "Studies on Anger and Aggression," 1148. It should be noted that the research cited only examines anger in Western culture. As Mattison explains, since emotional experience is not merely biological but also social, one should be careful in making generalizations across cultures. See William C. Mattison III, "Virtuous Anger? From Questions of *Vindicatio* to the Habituation of Emotion," *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 24, no. 1 (2004): 173.

31. Ibid., 1147.

32. Moons and Mackie, "Thinking Straight While Seeing Red," 717.

33. Averill, "Studies on Anger and Aggression," 1152.

34. William C. Mattison, III, "Jesus' Prohibition of Anger (Mt 5:22): The Person/Sin Distinction from Augustine to Aquinas." *Theological Studies* 68 (2007): 861, 845.

35. Ibid., 840-843.

36. Ibid., 855.

37. *ST* I-II, 46.6.

38. Ibid., 46.7, ad 3.

39. *ST* II-II, 158.2.

40. William C. Mattison, III, "Christian Anger? A Contemporary Account of Virtuous Anger in the Thomistic Tradition." Ph.D. diss.,

University of Notre Dame, 2002. 279.

41. Ibid.

42. William C. Mattison, III. *Introducing Moral Theology: True Happiness and the Virtues.* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2008), 244; *ST* II-II, 158.8.

43. *ST* I-II, 24.3; Mattison,"Virtuous Anger?" 166-167.

44. Mattison, "Jesus' Prohibition of Anger," 857.

45. Ibid., 856.

46. Ibid.

47. Mattison, "Christian Anger?" 266.

48. Lombardo, *The Logic of Desire,* 206.

49. Ibid.; *ST* III, 46.3.

50. Mattison, "Christian Anger?" 267-268.

51. Ibid., 273-274.

52. Stephen Voorwinde, *Jesus' Emotions in the Gospels* (New York: T&T Clark International, 2011), 217.

53. Ibid.

54. John of the Cross, *The Collected Works of St. John of the Cross.* Translated by Kieran Kavanaugh and Otilio Rodriguez (Washington, D.C.: Institute of Carmelite Studies, 1991), 370.

55. Ibid.

56. Conrad W. Baars, *Feeling and Healing Your Emotions* (Plainsfield, N.J.: Logos International, 1979), 196.

57. Lombardo, *The Logic of Desire,* 106.

58. Mattison, "Virtuous Anger?" 172.

59. Brad J. Bushman, Roy F. Baumeister, and Angela D Stack, "Catharsis, Aggression, and Persuasive Influence: Self-Fulfilling or Self-Defeating Prophecies?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 76, no. 3 (1999): 375.

60. Ibid., 174.

61. Lombardo, *The Logic of Desire,* 137.

FYE
SERIES

DIRECTORS' LETTER

The First-Year Experience (FYE) is the foundational liberal educa-
tion core of the first-year curriculum at the Catholic University of
America, bringing first-year students together in small Learning
Communities for a shared, yearlong experience. Within Learning
Communities, students take a sequence of four core classes in
Philosophy, Theology, and English. The FYE also goes beyond the
classroom with service learning activities, class-based excursions
into Washington, D.C., an annual Speaker Series, and individual-
ized advising and mentoring.

The FYE is inspired by the Catholic intellectual tradition and guided
by the principles of liberal education. It prepares students not
only for the challenges of citizenship and morality, but also for
all of their subsequent academic work. In FYE classes, students
learn to think more rigorously, write more persuasively, and read
more perceptively, while confronting the great questions that have
shaped human history and that continue to challenge us today.
Tools and skills acquired in these classes become the foundation
for work in the major and beyond.

The select student papers below, drawn directly from the core
courses of the FYE, are prime examples of how our students are
developing as self-motivated, insightful, and ethical individuals in
the midst of their intellectual transition.

It is easy to see in these selections why the core of the First-Year
Experience consists of philosophy, theology, and writing courses.
The perspective developed by first-year students in these classes
prepares them to continue the rest of their studies at CUA. The
fundamental dialogue between faith and reason, as well as its
profound cognitive implications, informs both the professional and
the intellectual development of our students - regardless of their
major or specialization.

We are all inheritors of a rich intellectual tradition shaped by the
wisdom of the ancients and deepened by Catholicism. Since
it's founding, The Catholic University of America has played an
important role in cultivating this intellectual heritage. Our university

is rare in its commitment to elucidating the relationship between faith and reason, for it is only through their dialogue that true understanding becomes possible.

We hope you will join us in celebrating these talented students, and moreover, our entire first-year class as they continue to explore the tradition of liberal arts education and develop their skills, abilities, and experience.

Sincerely,

Dr. Herbert Hartmann   Mr. Colin David Pears
Director   *Associate Director*

THE THREE PARAGRAPH ESSAY EXPLAINED

In English 101 students write many assignments in a three paragraph essay form that is designed to meet the broad goal of improving student writing by creating an awareness of the thought processes that underlie writing. This awareness of thought is tied inherently to the topics for the assignments of the course – which are part of one of the five canons of rhetoric: Invention.

Invention encompasses techniques that help students generate ideas for any piece of writing, no matter the situation. The three paragraph essay is concerned with the common topics which are diverse ways of approaching an argument based on an analysis of patterns of human thinking that has evolved with rhetoric's fifteen hundred year history. In the first two paragraphs, students may use a given common topic in distinctly different ways. In the third, they generate and reflect upon original insights into the implications of the topic. These common topics – comparison, cause and effect, and definition, among others – are the foundations for every essay question a student is likely to face within their academic career and, perhaps more importantly, in a world that places an increasing demand on both clarity and originality.

The three paragraph essay encourages students to leave the standard five paragraph essay structure in order to practice the generation, arrangement, and stylistic considerations required to change the central focus of writing from one that is dependent on a pre-determined form to one that is geared to audience and purpose. Each essay produces an original inductive answer about the powers and limitations of one of the thinking patterns common to human reasoning. These, along with audience and purpose, are certainly what students will need to keep in mind to adapt to the diversity of subjects they will be required to write about inside and outside the university.

Dr. Pamela Ward   Mr. Benjamin Djain
Director, Writing & Rhetoric Program   *Graduate Teaching Fellow*

CAUSE AND EFFECT IN THE ART OF WRITING

This paper was written in response to the following prompt: In your opinion, what is the most important cause for the full stop that ends Levi's book? What are some of the most important effects the carbo atom has throughout its life? What is the relationship between the cause and the effect? What has writing the first two paragraphs shown you about using cause and effect logic in writing?

In Primo Levi's *The Periodic Table,* the sudden stop in Levi's chapter about carbon can be attributed to his choice to tell the story as a record of events, forcing the story to end in the present moment, which is sudden by nature. The story of the carbon atom is, according to Levi, a "micro-history," tracing the atom's path over the course of a few millennia.* The atom journeys all the way from a piece of limestone to its eventual form as part of a molecule in a glass of milk. After ingesting the milk, the carbon is transported to Levi's brain, which then stimulates his idea for the story he is telling, as well as his ability to write it down. Levi has essentially traced the history of this ancient atom of carbon all the way to the time at which this story was written. Therefore, the ending of this atom's journey takes the shape of the present moment, a sudden and instantaneous experience. It would thus make sense for the end of the atom's journey to be just as sudden as the moment it ends the text. The abrupt stop of Levi's chapter is simply a result of the nature of the "micro-history" he is telling, with its culmination in the present requiring the abrupt type of ending that Levi concludes with.

In Levi's narrative, an atom of carbon has numerous important effects during its life, and it is the results of these interactions that allow an atom of carbon to succeed in causing the end of the book. During the chapter, Levi only mentions a few of the atom's innumerable engagements during its centuries of travels. The most notable of these actions are the crucial moments that decide whether or not this atom of carbon's journey will continue. One of these instances would include the moment the carbon is separated from its limestone prison by man, starting the atom on its path across the world:

> But precisely for the good of the narrator, whose story could otherwise have come to an end, the

limestone… lies on the surface. It lies within reach of man and his pickaxe…a blow of the pickaxe detached it and sent it on its way to the lime kiln, plunging into the world of things that change.

Another would be its eventual consumption by man as fermented wine, ensuring it would not just sit in a cellar, forgotten. The moment the atom is eaten by the wood worm is also one of these important moments, freeing it from a cedar tree and the few centuries it might have been trapped there. All these instances are key points in the atom's story, allowing the book to finish how and when it did, due to how these situations are resolved. Had any of these turning points gone awry, the atom could have been lost, and the chapter would have been left without an ending due to the absence of the cause that results in the story's conclusion. Thus, the relationship between cause and effect is one of individual dependency. Causes have no need for an effect in order to happen; rather, they allow an effect to occur after they take place. Only after a cause transpires can the desired effect even have the possibility of resulting, for more than one effect can result from a single, original cause. The occurrences that transpire between cause and effect are key in determining which of these possible outcomes will ensue. In this case, the atom of carbon is the original cause that, after enduring an elaborate chain of events, eventually presents Levi with the final effect of the book's completion.

The logic of cause and effect can be utilized in writing in order to easily prove a point, thanks to its nature of supporting itself. By linking a possible occurrence to the desired final effect, writers may demonstrate their argument. After all, every effect requires some initial cause in order to occur, and all writers have to do is invent a believable circumstance that leads to the desired effect. Additionally, if the original cause cannot be directly linked to the final desired result, the original cause can be instead linked to "sub-causes" which allow the logic chain to eventually reach its required destination. This can be effectively utilized to prove almost any point for the writer, and it is even used in Levi's narrative of the carbon atom. In this instance, Levi desired to demonstrate the incredible value of carbon in the ecosystem and decided to achieve this through the story of the atom of carbon that gave him this idea. However, Levi had no idea where the atom that

had stimulated this idea had actually come from, nor how it had eventually reached his brain. But, through the use of cause and effect logic he was able to create a plausible scenario detailing this atom of carbon's journey. Levi decided on the original, fictitious cause of the atom being separated from limestone, from where it traveled through a chain of "sub-causes" listed in the chapter, and ending with the final effect of residing in his brain. Levi even acknowledges this use of cause and effect logic near the end of the chapter, discussing how he could have used hundreds of different scenarios to reach this final effect:

> I could tell innumerable other stories, and they would all be true: all literally true, in the nature of the transitions, and in their order and data. The number of atoms is so great that one could always be found whose story coincides with any capriciously invented story.

Levi's narrative clearly demonstrates how the utilization of cause and effect allows a writer to logically prove an argument without having to endure painstaking research, making it an invaluable tool in the art of writing.

*NOTE:

This and all subsequence references are to: Primo Levi, *The Periodic Table,* trans. R. Rosenthal (London: David Campbell Publishers Limited, 1995). The excerpt used is from pages 232-241.

ETHOS, LOGOS, AND PATHOS

This paper was written in response to the following prompt: Analyze King Richard's "Oration to His Army" for examples of logos, ethos, and pathos. Compare the first speech with the King Richard's "Oration to His Soldiers." Which of the two speeches is the most convincing?

In King Richard III's oration to his army, King Richard utilizes ethos, logos, and pathos, emphasizing pathos in particular, in order to inspire his soldiers before battle and to arouse a passion that would make the men fight harder. King Richard maintains an infuriated and enthusiastic tone throughout his speech which, serves to motivate and rile up his army. As he begins his speech, he refers to the enemy as, "A sort of vagabonds, rascals, and runaways, a scum of Bretons, and base lackey peasants."* This phrase elevates his own status and integrity by discrediting the opposition, through the use of harsh words such as "vagabonds" and "scum", while also serving to set the enraged tone of the speech, which ultimately appeals to the emotion of the soldiers by inflaming them. Through the next part of the speech, King Richard persistently bashes the enemy, calling them "famish'd beggars", "poor rats", "stragglers", and "bastard Bretons", each insult adding ethos and pathos in the same manner as before. Afterwards, King Richard further motivates his men by making an appeal to logic, stating that his men must fight to preserve their lands and wives or the enemy will "restrain the one, distain the other." This statement strongly implies that the soldiers have no choice but to fight, in order to protect what is theirs. King Richard then returned to his use of ethos and pathos. King Richard calls their leader "a paltry fellow" that "never in his life felt so much cold as over shoes in snow", revealing Richmond's cowardice. Insulting the enemy's leader not only makes King Richard's cause more credible, but it also encourages the troops who would have been eager to fight a group of feeble men. In the final lines of the speech, King Richard appealed to all three components of rhetoric, while also heightening his enraged tone. He first recites history, reminding his army how their ancestors "beaten, bobb'd, and thump'd and

in record, left [the enemy] the heirs of shame." He then concludes the speech by asking his men, "Shall these enjoy our lands? lie with our wives? Ravish our daughters?" These final words appeal to logic because if their ancestors beat the enemy in battle, so will they. In addition, King Richard appears even more credible because his ancestors fought for this same country in previous battles. Most importantly though, the final three rhetoric questions King Richard asks focus on ethos. The thought of the enemy taking their land and defiling their family paints a vivid and infuriating picture in his soldiers' minds. The word "Ravish" matches the tone of the speech perfectly and evokes anger towards the enemy. By the end of the speech, King Richard has appealed to logos, ethos, but most importantly, pathos. As a result, his army would be filled with fury and motivation, ready to fight with passion. This is the exact response any general would hope for right before battle.

In Richmond's oration to his soldiers, he is also faced with the task of preparing his army for battle. Richmond, unlike King Richard III, emphasizes logos and lacks a strong appeal to emotion. Consequently, Richmond's speech, while logically sound, was not as effective in inspiring the soldiers. To begin, Richmond says, "God and our good cause fight upon our side." He continues to talk about the support within them, claiming that "The prayers of holy saints and wronged souls, Like high-rear'd bulwarks, stand before our faces." While this may logically convince the men that they should fight this battle, Richmond's tone lacks the energy and the emotional appeal that King Richard achieved. Richmond then shifts to take an approach similar to King Richard's, Richard is attempting to discredit the enemy and appeal to ethos. Richmond calls the King, "A blood tyrant and a homicide; One raised in blood, and one in blood establish'd." Following these insults, Richmond makes the logical argument that King Richard is God's enemy thus, if you fight God's enemy, God will protect you. Once again, even though Richmond uses ethos and logos to convince his men that they have God's favor and will be protected, he fails to use a word choice that energizes and enrages his men. While King Richard referred to the enemy in harsh terms, including "scum", "vagabonds", and "bastards", Richmond merely labeled his opposition as "God's enemy." This same pattern continues

as Richmond's speech progresses. He makes another logical argument, "If you do fight in safeguard of your wives, Your wives shall welcome home the conquerors; If you do free your children from the sword, Your children's children quit it in your age," but fails to appeal to pathos in the way King Richard did. King Richard was able to inspire passion and rage by describing the awful things the enemy would do to the soldier's families, rather than simply describing the soldiers' families back home as supportive. Finally, to end the speech, Richmond cheered on his men as he urged them to march. While these final lines may have had some appeal to the emotions of the soldiers and even uplifted their spirits, these feelings still pale in comparison to the rage and infuriation King Richard created in his army. When men have feelings of rage, they tend to fight with more passion. King Richard's ability to appeal to pathos allowed him to give the better speech. Subsequently, King Richard's speech was more compelling and energizing, the exact outcome a general should hope to achieve from a pre-battle speech.

Although all three components of rhetoric: pathos, logos, and ethos are useful in creating a compelling and convincing argument, different appeals may be more effective depending on the setting and desired outcome. For example, in a presidential election, candidates are attempting to win votes of educated citizens by appearing to be the best leader with the best policies. The best way to convince people of this is through ethos and logos, the two most common aspects of rhetoric used by actual presidential candidates. In the instance of King Richard and Richmond's speeches, they are both preparing an army for war. The best way to do so, unlike in a presidential election, is by invigorating their soldiers to make them fight with passion. Pathos, appealing to emotion, is the best way to truly invigorate and inspire a soldier. While logos and ethos contributed to King Richard's cause, pathos is ultimately what made his speech more convincing than Richmond's speech. In order to make the most convincing speech or piece of writing, it is important to first identify the purpose of that writing. In this case, the speeches were intended to prepare soldiers for war. Afterwards, the best method of achieving this purpose must be identified. The best way to prepare soldiers

to fight a battle is by invigorating them and inspiring passion, each of which are done best through an appeal to emotion. Finally, this method should be the component of rhetoric emphasized in the writing. However just because one scenario may require more of a certain type of rhetorical appeal than another, does not mean a speech should appeal to only one type of rhetoric. A truly persuasive speech still appeals to all three aspects of rhetoric, while also emphasizing the rhetorical component needed most, just as King Richard's speech did.

*NOTE:

This and all subsequent reference are to: William Shakespeare, *The RSC Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works,* eds. Jonathan Bate, Eric Rasmussen, Heloise Senechal and Royal Shakespeare Company. (London: Macmillan, 2007).

THE GAP

This paper was written in response to the following prompt: What's the relationship between skepticism and jealousy in Othello?

　　In his poem "The Hollow Men," T. S. Eliot wrote, "Between the idea and the reality, between the motion and the act falls the shadow."[1] This poetic wisdom highlights the substantial gap between the abstract, internal, unperceivable reality and the tangible, external, perceivable reality. And within this gap falls not Eliot's "shadow," but also Iago. In *Othello*, the reoccurring statements that are perfectly false, and the few that are perfectly true, act as a reminder of reality and humanity's experience of it. Half-truths, half facts, and half the story are inherent to the human condition. Idealists, like Othello, choose to remain ignorant by denying this reality. Others, like Iago, use the half-truths of life to their advantage by achieving power.

　　Othello, by William Shakespeare, tells the story of a tragic downfall. Othello, the main character, is a decorated war hero of the Venetian army. Despite this status, he is an obvious foreigner in Venetian society for he is a Moor and has darker skin. Desdemona, a noble woman of Venice, falls in love with him after hearing his dazzling, heroic stories. She states, "I saw Othello's visage in his mind, and to his honors and his valiant part did my soul and fortunes consecrate," thus showing her love for Othello and his successes.[2] Desdemona and Othello elope secretly in part because of Desdemona's controlling father, Barbantio, and also because of societal expectations. The play opens on their wedding night with Iago, the deceptive villain who seeks to destroy Othello out of jealousy, and Roderigo, his ignorant sidekick, planning to expose the lovers' secret union.

　　People lie while telling the truth. Motives are exposed while being concealed. Actions are seen while not seen. This is the reality of human existence that few characters in *Othello,* and maybe many people in the world, fail to understand. "Half-truths," meaning not the complete truth, are inescapable facts of human existence. The issue is inherent to speech, actions,

and motives. Any sort of communication, verbal or nonverbal, is laced with problematic half-truths. For example, when asked by an acquaintance, "How are you?" I may respond, "I am well." This simple response is very problematic for I could be emotionally well but not well in other ways. Perhaps I got an A on a test, had a great date, and am eating chocolate ice cream resulting in feeling emotionally well. However, I may simultaneously also have chronic knee pain due to a couple knee surgeries, have gotten a restless four hours of sleep, and even have a stomach ache from the pint of Ben and Jerry's I consumed. I am definitely not physically well, and so my conventional response is partly a lie and partly a truth. We operate and exist with the tiniest fractions of truth and knowledge of others, and maybe even ourselves. "The problem of the other" is an interesting issue tackled by philosophical skeptics like Descartes. In psychology, Piaget categorized this issue as "theory of mind," or the realization that one's own mental states, such as beliefs, thoughts, and feelings, may differ from those around him. The issue of the half-truth is also a central theme in the play *Othello.*

Iago, the ultimate deceiver speaks the first perfectly false statement of the play. This speech foreshadows his central role as the chief manipulator of the play. He states, "I am not what I am," after having revealed part, and only part, of his evil plan to destroy Othello. This is an essential line that defines Iago as a character and foreshadows his extreme manipulation and deception. Iago, by being aware of and accepting about both the reality of the human experience and other's extreme epistemological limits, is able to manipulate those around him. He demonstrates this knowledge a few lines before his perfectly false statement when he says, "For when my outward action doth demonstrate the native act and figure of my heart in complement extern, 'tis not long after but I will wear my heart upon my sleeve for daws to peck at."[3] This statement may hint at a negative experience that Iago had with honesty and which has now resulted in his choice to conceal his internal world. Or perhaps he is just commenting on the ignorance of the total honesty of others. In the words of Eliot, Iago lurks in the "shadows;" he speaks deceptively in riddles and half-truths. His "shadowiness" is further emphasized in his stage movements

and physical portrayal; Iago is often seen crouched behind other characters, such as Roderigo, to diverge blame and conceal his plan. Iago is clearly knowledgeable and experienced in using uncertainty to his advantage, making him a vicious villain.

Now, what does "I am what I am not" mean? Here, Iago denies his nature as a human being by stating something and then immediately contradicting it. He means that his insides, which are motives, reason, emotions, beliefs, thoughts, and other unperceivable aspects, do not match his outsides, which are how he speaks, behaves, appears, and all other perceivable aspects. This denial of himself opens a gap between his being and his actions, which allows for deception and lies. This aspect of Iago epitomizes his character and is essential to his art of deception. This statement may also be interpreted as Iago representing the devil. As God said, "I am what I am" in the book of Exodus, Iago states the opposite. God's insides are his outsides and vice versa. There is no gap between his internal motives and outward appears. Therefore, ultimate evil is when one's external is in complete opposition with one's internal. However, I do realize the limitations of this argument due to the fact that attributing human characteristics, experiences, and ways of knowing to God is reductive and not exactly parallel.

Is complete truth and knowledge necessarily good? For example, in Plato's *Republic,* the perfect society participated in The Noble Lie; it consisted of the elders of the community telling the young people of false successes of their ancestors. By this deception, the community was made better because the young people strove for excellence because of the pride they felt for their people. Would the complete truth have been better in this situation? Is the deception of this society an evil? Or can it be seen as necessarily good for it made the society better? In regards of adapting this line of questioning to *Othello,* is Iago's lifestyle, one of falsehood and deception, truly the ultimate form of evil? Since deception is benefiting him, is it necessarily good?

Now, Iago's use of half-truths is compelling for it supports our daily experience and is often essential to success. For example, when I meet someone, they have no knowledge of me other than what I tell them, what others tell them, and what I appear

to be. These are all aspects that are only externally perceivable and can be easily manipulated. Human beings do not have a sort of X-ray vision into others minds and our pasts are not directly knowable to outsiders. Uncertainty and half-truths are inherent and arguably necessary to experience. For example, an experienced poker player works for years to master his poker face. This skill, after much practice, allows the player to control his facial and body language in order to puzzle or deceive his opponents. The use of half-truth is essential to the success of a poker player. As for Iago, his innovative mixtures of truths and lies are necessary to gain power and achieve his objectives.

Othello's view of human nature completely opposes Iago's, which allows Othello to easily fall victim to deception. It is clear from the first appearance of Othello that he has a very "all or nothing", black and white, view of nature. He is unaccepting of half-truths and contradictions; when these undesired realities do arise, he simply looks for empirical proof and definitive answers. For example, when Othello is accused by Barbantio of manipulating Desdemona into marriage, Othello simply tells the the others to look to his past merits and successes as a means of proving his character. Later on, when Iago calls into question Desdemona's loyalty, Othello states, "I think my wife be honest, and I think she is not. I think that thou are just, and I think thou are not; I'll have some proof."[4] When confronted with a contradiction or half-truth, Othello immediately runs in search of adequate evidence and understandable proof to stop the dissonance. Iago further encourages his polar views with comments like, "men should be what they seem."[4] These comments, along with his incessant echoing and falsified "empirical proof," eventually drive Othello to an ecstatic state of jealous rage, causing him to murder his loyal wife.

Desdemona, Othello's counterpart, also shares in Othello's drastically extreme views of human nature and truth, making her an easy target for someone like Iago too. Driven to madness by jealous suspicions, Othello strangles Desdemona in their bed. Just before she dies, her close companion, Emilia, asks her who has done this horrible deed. Desdemona responds with a perfectly false statement, "No one, I myself. Farewell.

Commend me to my kind lord."[5] This puzzling statement calls into question Desdemona's character and beliefs. Up until this point, Desdemona has seemed to be oblivious, ignorant, and painfully compliant. However, this statement redeems her because it reveals her depth of knowledge about the complexities and uncertainties of truth. Desdemona takes responsibility for her fate and at the same time completely denies it. However, her realization is tragic for she has achieved this knowledge but it is still unable to escape the consequences of her prior ignorance.

The most memorable of these tautologies occurs in the last few lines of the play. After Emilia desperately reveals the truth of Desdemona's loyalty and the evil of her husband, Iago, Othello demands from Iago, "why he hath thus ensnared my soul and body?" Iago replies with his final words of the play, "What you know, you know," a perfectly self-evident truth.

Truth, a necessary good, is both ironic and tragic in the case of Othello. Iago, the master of deception and catalyst of this tragedy, is the only one who speaks and knows truth. Perhaps this is because he knows that tragedy completes truths, not only half-truths. Unlike Othello, he is able to see through the absurdity in feebly attempting to draw sharp distinctions between a truth and a lie. Iago chooses the gaps, the shadows, and the half-truths for he sees the potential for power in the gray areas of life.

NOTES :

1. T. S. Eliot, "The Hollow Men." *T. S. Eliot: The Complete Poems and Plays 1909-1950* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1971), 58.

2. William Shakespeare, *Othello* (New York: Penguin Classics, 2001), I.iii.252.

3. Ibid., I.i.59.

4. Ibid., III.iii.389.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., V.ii.125.

ON VISITING THE HOLY LAND MONASTERY AND THE IMPORTANCE OF GEOGRAPHY

This paper was written in response to the following prompt: Discuss something that struck you about the trip to the Franciscan Monastery. Pick a passage from the Gospel of Matthew in which geographical context is relevant. Discuss how the geographical context is important to understanding what is described in the passage. Imagine setting the same passage in a different geographical context. What would change? Are the differences significant?

Man appears to place particular value in visiting places. Although one can hear various tales of or view pictures of a particular place, there is something special about visiting somewhere that makes the location become much more authentic. Having personally gone on a religious pilgrimage across the Italian peninsula, I can attest that actually having a chance to walk through St. Peter's Basilica or view the bodies of incorruptible saints allows one to more easily grasp the reality of the things that they signify. This odd power behind visiting places is what makes the Franciscan Monastery of the Holy Land in America such a blessing to visit; it provides the opportunity to experience, albeit replicas of, the Holy Land. By experiencing the Holy Land, the Gospels become more alive and help one to grasp the awe-inspiring reality that Jesus Christ truly is a person who, at one point, walked this earth.

One aspect of the Monastery that struck me was the artwork in the main church. The paintings around the main church were quite beautiful and provided detailed depictions of important scenes from the life of Christ. However, what is most striking about them is the style of having raised figures on the surface of the paintings. This creates a "popping-out" effect that I had never seen or experienced before. This effect caused me to view the paintings with a heightened sense of realism. Essentially, adding three-dimensional visual effect made the scenes depicted in the paintings much more alive to me. Similarly, the raised effect on the paintings helped to me better grasp the reality that Christ preached throughout Galilee, inspired the twelve Apostles to follow

him, and died on the Cross. The art gave me a sense that I was there when those events happened; this allowed to me to "visit" those places and better appreciate the realities.

This reflection upon the importance of physically visiting somewhere suggests the sheer importance of places themselves. Of course, from such a perspective, this is hardly a new idea. The Gospels themselves frequently communicate important truths about Jesus Christ, not only by the events they describe, but also by where the events take place. One example of this is the Transfiguration of Jesus, which is told in the Synoptic Gospels.[1] The event is significant in itself because at that time Jesus transforms before Peter, James, and John to appear in His full glory as the Son of God. The event itself confirms the divinity of Jesus, while the geography helps to reveal more truth about Jesus Christ. The beginning of the narrative notes that Jesus took the disciples and "led them up a high mountain by themselves."[2] With such a context, the fact that "his face shone like the sun" parallels the entire Transfiguration to the radiance of Moses' face in Exodus.[3] The geographical parallel of a secluded mountaintop serves to help signify a connection between the two events. Creating an explicit parallel between the two events serves to show the continuity between Moses and Jesus Christ. Specifically, by relating Moses and Jesus, it highlights that Jesus came both to fulfill the promise of Moses for another prophet and fulfill the role of Moses as mediator between God and man for the entire human race and for all time.[4] The ability to extract all of these connections is possible due in a large part to the geographic similarities.

If the Transfiguration was to occur in a different geographic context, the parallels between it and the radiance of Moses' face would be significantly reduced. However, even if the connection between the two events was more ambiguous, that would not change that fact that Christ is a fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy and that He completes several roles. Rather, these truths are made known more easily because the geography helps to illuminate the connection between the life of Jesus Christ and the life of Moses, and thus illustrate how Christ may be understood in relation to Moses. This way of knowing Christ is similar to the concept of visiting places explored earlier. Just as visiting places

helps to grasp the realities that they signify, relating Christ to other figures helps to better understand the multitude of roles that Christ fills.

The excursion to the Monastery and this examination of Sacred Scripture helped to highlight how important it is for man to receive assistance in trying to better understand and appreciate the answers to the higher questions of life. Although we are able to uncover the answers through the gift of faith, that is not enough. We must continue to pray for faith, not only to know the answers, but also for the ability to truly grasp the gravity of those answers and thus transform how we live our lives. Visiting holy places (or their replicas) and examining the interconnections of Scripture may assist in this endeavor, but ultimately only God is able to complete man and illuminate his mind to how much he needs Him.

NOTES

1. *The New American Bible Revised Edition* (Washington: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011), Matthew 17:1-8.

2. Matthew 17:1

3. Matthew 17:2; Exodus 34:27-35.

4. Deuteronomy 18:15; Exodus 32:11-14.

CONTRIBUTORS

NICOLAS NOVAK (Theology, Class of 2018) wrote a version of "*Lex Orandi est Lex Credendi*: The Influence of the Laity and the Liturgy on the Doctrinal Debates of the Immaculate Conception" under the supervision of Dr. Katherine L. Jansen for the course HSLS 202: Mary as Mother, Woman, Idea: An Interdisciplinary Seminar.

CAITLIN MONACO (History, Class of 2014) wrote a version of "'Whoever Comes After Us Will Find Nothing': Great Britain's Role in the Allied Fight against Nazi Art Theft and Acquisition" for Dr. Laura Mayhall's course HIST 496: Senior Thesis, "Britain and the Second World War."

LAURA ROTHGEB (English, Class of 2015) wrote a version of "'The Streight Course of Heauenly Destiny': The Tudor Genealogical Myth of *The Faerie Queene*" for Dr. Daniel Gibbons's course ENG 432: Senior Seminar, "Edmund Spenser."

MARK STRYCULA (History, Class of 2015) wrote a version of "Deep Attacking the Enemy: AirLand Battle, the 101st Airborne Division, and Operation Desert Storm" for Dr. Thomas Cohen's course HIST 496: Senior Thesis Seminar.

AUDRA NAKAS (Psychology and Politics, Class of 2015) wrote a version of "Anger: Aquinas in Dialogue with Modern Psychology" for Rev. Nicholas Lombardo, O.P., Ph.D.'s course TRS 460: Theology and the Emotions.

ANDREW CUNNINGHAM (Mechanical Engineering, Class of 2019) wrote "Cause and Effect in the Art of Writing" for Mr. Benjamin Djain's course Honors ENG 101, Writing: Logic and Rhetoric.

BRIAN GALFOND (Mechanical Engineering, Class of 2019) wrote "Ethos, Logos, and Pathos" for Mr. Benjamin Djain's course Honors ENG 101, Writing: Logic and Rhetoric.

CLARA BOSCO (Philosophy and Pre-Med, enrolled at CUA in Fall 2015) wrote "The Gap" for Dr. Antón Barba-Kay's PHIL 201: The Classical Mind.

RYAN BRAAM (Philosophy, Class of 2018) wrote "On Visiting the Holy Land Monastery and the Importance of Georgraphy" for Rev. Nicholas Lombardo, O.P., Ph.D.'s course TRS 201: Faith Seeking Understanding.