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Spotlight on a Historian:
Interview with Dr. Edith Sheffer, Stanford University
Conducted by Edward Litwin

Litwin: What drew you to German History?

Professor Sheffer: I took German at Lab School and got to college and wanted to study History and an advisor of mine suggested I spend the summer in Berlin, and it was soon after the Wall came down in 1993 and Germany had just reunified and you could still see the effects of Communism everywhere and I could really see history happening before my eyes and that got me really excited about studying German history to try to understand what was behind these events and talking with those who experienced them.

Litwin: Now that you are a professor, why do you think it is important to study history?

Professor Sheffer: The Humanities is important to study so you can learn empathy and human behavior of past worlds. Trying to put yourself in other people’s lives and in other people’s shoes is fascinating and helps to put together a society that functions. History also offers a great way to travel. There are a lot of things you can do today to expose yourself to history.

Litwin: You were talking about empathy. How do you think that the study of history can be applied to the present in other ways?

Professor Sheffer: You mean through empathy? Here is a concrete example. When I teach my European history class, I ask students to develop a historical character that they keep throughout the quarter. The first day, they are born, which is in 1800, and they all age together and have an opportunity in their 20s and 30s to see fascism and communism and throughout the process of developing these characters and hearing the lectures they begin to understand how someone at the time might have been attracted to something like Nazism or make the choices that they did, and the world is full of grey areas rather than black and white. Then when I see students go off into the workforce, how does that apply, and again it’s about being able to look at different perspectives, so if you are working with someone, no matter what you’re doing; if it is a business, or if you are teaching, charitable work, etc., the skill of perspective sharing is so important.

Litwin: That is really an interesting way of thinking about it.

Professor Sheffer: To me, it’s really about the excitement of learning, but my philosophy is to give students as much independence as possible, and to really become self-motivated to have a personal stake in what they are learning, which is also an important part of becoming an adult. Internally motivated, rather than driven by grades, so I try to have deep projects in my class.

Litwin: When you are teaching undergraduate students, how well-prepared do you feel they are, or how much knowledge do you feel they come to college with?

Professor Sheffer: I am not necessarily looking for conventional preparedness, because I can teach them anything they want to know, or they can go online and learn anything, but the skill to me that is important that doesn’t necessarily require school knowledge is the curiosity component. Desire to learn, critical thinking and forcefulness to give voice to your opinions is what I look for in a student. A lot of people don’t have conviction. Writing is also so important. I can’t tell you how many kids can’t write. It is shocking. I have been so surprised at times when a student is so articulate in class and has done all the
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reading, and has interesting thoughts, but just can’t convey his or her thoughts. I think writing is the key to success in college...The bulk of your grade is your written work. Writing is a critical skill but a lot of people just aren’t developing this skill.

Litwin: How do you think that high schools could teach students to be better writers?

Professor Sheffer: The best assignment I ever got was doing some odd 3-way debates in high school with Mr. Bell. That was the best writing assignment of my life because I learned critical thinking and ways to look at multiple sides to every issue through research and writing assignments. Many kids just write superficial essays, and you can’t do that.

Litwin: Did Mr. Bell teach you how to be a better writer through this exercise, or was there more to it?

Professor Sheffer: No, he didn’t work on linguistic style or anything. It was really just learning clarity and thought rather than the actual mechanics of writing.

Litwin: Thank you so much for taking the time to talk.

Professor Sheffer: Sure. There is something else I would like to add about writing, which is to never be complacent. You can always write.
The French Politique
Jacob Mazzarella

Introduction

Sixteenth century France was fragmented by feudal divisions, religious strife, and a weak central government. Beginning with the rule of Henry IV, and during the subsequent regime of Cardinal Richelieu, France’s rulers attempted to centralize power. Eventually, this form of more centralized control blossomed into absolutist rule, exemplified by the reign of Louis XIV. Contemporary scholarship frequently posits that the foundation for French absolutism was the divine right of kings, and that as a consequence absolutism died with Louis XVI, even though there was an absolutist ruler after the French revolution – Napoleon Bonaparte. Napoleon was an absolutist – regardless of his Republican guise as Consul, Consul for Life, and Emperor – because he was a politique as defined by sixteenth century philosopher Jean Bodin. Jean Bodin lived during the sixteenth century – a time when the kings of France remained embroiled in religious strife between the Huguenots and the Catholics. In the previous century, the cause of political discord had been religion, and accordingly Bodin’s philosophy specified that rulers should act as “politiques,” whom he defined as leaders that prioritize political and stately interests over those of faith. Thus all of these rulers, with the exception of Louis XVI, who recognized the Estates General, implemented Bodin’s philosophies regarding matters of religious uniformity, political centralization, and military endeavors because they acted as politiques to accomplish an absolutist end.

The philosophical basis for French Absolutism

Ideally, Bodin believed that politiques should be able to act unequivocally to establish a centralized state based on the authority of individual sovereigns, as opposed to constitutional bodies. This set the expectation that leaders should rule with the aim of eliminating any opposition, which Bodin called “legitimate resistance.” In France this typically found its expression in the historic rights of the nobility and Estates General. Consequently, Bodin set the precedents for French absolutist rule: a centralized state based on individual authority and the right to act with impunity against dissidents. In order to ensure that nothing undermined this absolute authority, Bodin believed leaders had no obligation to uphold previously enacted law. In addition, Bodin supported religious universality. His philosophy explicitly stated that there should be one religion of state, so as to avoid partisanship within the government. While Henry IV directly applied Bodin’s politique theory during his rise to the throne, subsequent French rulers applied it in differing contexts. The underlying importance of emphasizing politics over faith was that it prioritized attaining personal power as opposed to principled rule. As a result, duplicitous and disingenuous leadership became fundamental to consolidating Bodin’s breed of absolutist control; over time it became the second layer to Bodin’s definition of politique.

Henry IV: a pioneer of Bodin’s theory

Henry IV, a Huguenot, created the foundations for absolute monarchy in France when he abandoned his faith for Catholicism. Henry then proceeded to marginalize the Huguenots by upholding
the dominance of Catholicism in government affairs by moving to gain the support of Paris, as is the famous statement: “Paris is worth a mass.”7 Paris was the capital and center of French power, and in order to consolidate his rule, Henry needed its support. Henry further proved himself to be a *politique* by granting the Huguenots the right to practice Protestantism privately through the Edict of Nantes in 1598.8 While this may seem to contradict Bodin’s call for religious universality, it actually underscored Henry’s *politique* nature. By creating a Catholic government, he had already attained the religious universality he needed. However, he went further by feigning religious tolerance in order to diffuse a possible source of resistance by Huguenot nobles. Although he did not completely realize absolutist rule, Henry laid its foundations. He set an example by prioritizing political relationships over religious affiliations, exercising royal authority over provincial legislatures, decreasing feudal powers, and establishing a dominant religion of state. Indeed, the degree to which he expanded the scope of French royal authority at the expense of legislative power was evident in that the Estates General that convened four years after Henry’s death in 1610 would be the last to assemble until 1789.9

**Richelieu: An Absolutist without a throne**

Cardinal Richelieu was an ecclesiastic, but spent all his life consolidating an absolutist monarchy, centralizing power, and pursuing an aggressive foreign policy agenda. While Richelieu was an advisor to King Louis XIII in title, for more than 20 years he was the central shaper of French policy.10 He epitomized Bodin’s *politique* philosophy: his rule was characterized by tireless activity, knowledgeable foreign policy with aims towards expansion, and savvy political negotiation to counter spiritually driven Huguenots.11 Although he was a Catholic, he promulgated France’s interests from a pragmatic, not religious, perspective, fighting Catholic Spain and aiding Protestants in Switzerland.12 In 1626, Richelieu rapidly responded with unequivocal military force to a Huguenot rebellion at La Rochelle. He proceeded pragmatically, ordering the demolition of the feudal castles that were the focal point of Huguenot rebellion.13 He exercised his power as an absolutist by excluding Protestants in government. In addition, Richelieu operated throughout his tenure as advisor to the king with the highest confidence in his own judgment, never calling upon a legislative body to aid him.14 After solving internal disturbances related to the Huguenots, Richelieu became involved in the Thirty Years War (1618-1648). French participation in the conflict paved the way for greater influence across the European continent due to the break-up of the Holy Roman Empire into hundreds of German principalities. These comparably weak states were then at the mercy of both French foreign policy and influence.15 Unlike future absolutist rulers of France, Richelieu expanded France’s borders with caution. Perhaps Richelieu proved such an effective absolutist because he could never be king. Although he exercised total authority, he was just an advisor to the king in title, and as a consequence visions of personal grandeur and glory did not cloud his judgment as they later would with Louis XIV and Napoleon.
**Louis XIV: Unabashed Absolutism**

Louis XIV not only implemented Bodin’s *politique* theories, he created an undisputedly absolutist state. Raised under the tutelage of Richelieu’s successor, Cardinal Mazarin, Louis was instilled with a hatred for the nobility and legislative bodies of France at a young age because of the Fronde (1649-1653). The Fronde was a series of civil wars fought against the French king due to the exorbitant taxes levied to fund France’s involvement in the Thirty Years War. The Parlement of Paris responded unequivocally by voicing their support for the rebels in their demand for the cessation of taxes unless verified by law courts or validated by edicts. Eventually Mazarin coordinated a victory over the rebels, but the conflict left a deep impression upon the young Louis XIV. The war instilled within Louis a deep fear of Paris and a fundamental distrust of the nobles, subsequently motivating him to build his palace at Versailles. Upon his rise to the French throne, Louis took action to disempower the nobles who had troubled France for so long. He required the highest nobility to attend to him at Versailles, where he made an ornamental parade of them — a parade he strictly enforced. In fact, the constant expenses of lavish court life impoverished the nobles of his court, to the extent that they were financially ruined if they did not marry well. Louis thus acted as a true absolutist, following a political agenda that ensured he did not have to answer to any other authority.

At Versailles, Louis XIV further guaranteed absolute power by centralizing the bureaucracy. Louis concentrated authority with a handful of ministers, all of whom were upwardly mobile commoners, without independent power bases and thus subject to his supreme authority. These ministers corresponded with 3 secretaries — war, finance, and foreign affairs, — who supervised intendants located in each province. Through this centralized method of governance, Louis guaranteed total control over each sector of his government. Louis skillfully acted as an absolutist by focusing on personal political gain through depriving both the aristocrats and the ecclesiastics of influence. Jean-Baptiste Primi Visconti, who spent time in Louis’ court, marveled at the king’s supremacy, writing that there were no intermediaries in the court; if one wanted something he went directly to the king and nobody else. Even Louis’ trusted ministers of state were not granted the authority to represent the king. Furthermore, Louis dominated France’s blossoming cultural life. Louis lived during the so-called century of genius and used patronage of innovators such as Pascal, Poussin, Descartes, and Corneille to increase his own personal luster and prestige. France was seen as the apex of culture and magnificence, and the nation’s goods became sought after luxuries on the international market. Paradoxically, the people he oppressed supported his absolutism through their ingenuity.

Louis’ vanity compelled him to rule as an expansionist who acted with militarist aggression. As king he waged devastating wars and constantly pursued growth – all with the ultimate goal of asserting the authority and glory of his kingship. The war of Spanish Succession, for example, was fought solely to place a Bourbon ruler on the Spanish throne. When Louis waged war, a cry of vengeance rang against him from Prussia, England, and Holland. They branded the king a barbarian and a blasphemer. In turn,
the French press responded with nationalist defenses of their king. Consequently, Louis succeeded in projecting both absolutist authority and a powerful image to the extent that his actions appeared to represent those of the country as a whole. In fact, Louis’ policies of centralization, self-promotion, and destruction of any feudal power neutralized the threat of legitimate resistance. In 1678, Bishop of Meaux Jacques Benigne Bossuet published a treatise declaring God’s ordination of Bourbon authority. The subsequent revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 further increased the effectiveness of Bossuet’s treatise by officially creating the religious universality that Bodin had held in high esteem. Annulling the Edict of Nantes, which permitted the private practice of Protestantism, and replacing it with a treatise proclaiming the divine right of kings ensured that Louis’ authority was felt far beyond the walls of Versailles. Through his use of religious faith as a platform for legitimizing his authority, Louis displayed the politique method of manipulating religion as a tool for personal political advancement. Additionally, Louis’ revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 conforms to Bodin’s approval of the unilateral annulment of existing laws. By the end of his reign, Louis made Bodin’s vision a reality: through politique methods he created a state with little regard for constitutionalism in which he exercised absolute authority through the neutralization of legitimate resistance, religious universality, and a centralized government apparatus.

The Rise of Bodin’s Absolutism in a Republic

Napoleon Bonaparte stands out among the aforementioned absolutists because he not only rose to prominence after the demise of the Bourbon dynasty, but also began and ended his career as a supposed champion of burgeoning French Republicanism. Prior to this, the potency of the Bourbon dynasty had begun to wane because of the unassertive reign of Louis XVI. In fact, according to scholars such as Max Bellof, Louis XVI cannot be considered a true absolutist, as defined by Bodin. Louis invalidated the actions of his Bourbon predecessors through decisions such as the one to reestablish the regional parliaments that had been set aside or dissolved during the reign of Louis XV. Concurrently, Louis granted nobility influential positions within the regional parliaments. Previous absolutist leaders had worked tirelessly to ensure that centralized authority was vested in themselves to deter legitimate resistance. However, through the aforementioned actions Louis failed to do either. Had Louis not restored aspects of the feudal authority perhaps he would not have felt obligated to retain the structure of the Estates General — an action that directly led to creation of the National Assembly — when it convened in May of 1789. In contrast to Louis XVI, Napoleon was a modernist who regarded absolutism as obsolete. Napoleon himself believed his greatest accomplishment was the Napoleonic Code of 1804. In addition, Napoleon realized the significance of the Revolution and as a result his code instituted a wide variety of ideals of the Revolution — from the abolition of privilege by birth to the establishment of government selected on the foundations of meritocracy. While one could postulate that the code was the work of a liberal and revolutionary, it was in fact the product of an enlightened politique navigating the social circumstances of post-revolutionary France. Napoleon’s actions echoed those of Henry IV and his declaration of the Edict of Nantes two centuries previously. Unlike Louis XVI, both
Henry and Napoleon appeared to limit their authority by granting the people unprecedented civil rights. In turn, however, both men won the support of the governing classes, facilitating the centralization of bureaucracy and the expansion of borders. Consequently, it is evident that absolutism evolved to fit the post-revolutionary political climate of France, and thus cannot be called an anachronism of the Ancien Régime.

Although Napoleon began his military career fighting for The Directory, a Republican government, it is imperative to remember that he was of noble birth and believed in the power of bloodlines. Napoleon entered the French military during a time when there were a plethora of opportunities for competent young soldiers to rise up the ranks because of an exodus of senior officers after the Revolution. Napoleon did not fail to impress; in 1793, at the age of 25, he overpowered a royalist rebellion in Toulon and was promoted to Brigadier General. Within a few years, Napoleon rose to command the French armies in Italy. Displaying his military genius in the Italian campaigns, Napoleon established himself as a shining light in the psyche of the French people who were unhappy with their weak Republican government. By the late 1790s the increasingly popular Napoleon, who had become renowned for his campaigns in Italy and Egypt, began to distance himself from the Directory. The Directory, a moderate government established in the aftermath of Robespierre and the Terror, was failing due to a massive inflation rate, constant military defeats, and loss of credibility because of a blatant disregard for its own Constitution. In addition, the young Republic had no form of stable executive authority. Instead, the executive branch of the government consisted of five legislators chosen each year by random drawing. This turmoil set the stage for Napoleon’s coup; an act proclaimed in the name of revolution.

In the coup of 18 Brumaire Napoleon, alongside Emmanuel Sieyès, a famed author and politician, and Roger-Ducos, a legislator, seized power from the Directory. Napoleon’s armies and the bourgeoisie — who wanted a stronger government to protect the gains they made during the Revolution — supported the takeover. In 1799 the French public was so accustomed to government overhaul that there was little violent reaction to the coup. The three men declared themselves consuls, and immediately took action to consolidate power into what was supposed to be a Republican oligarchy. Contemporary observers of the coup certainly would not have associated either Sieyès or Napoleon with the previous Bourbon rulers. In fact, only a few years beforehand, Napoleon — an ascendant artillery officer — defeated royalists. Likewise, Sieyès was closely associated with the revolution against royal absolutism, having written what is commonly considered its manifesto — “What is the Third Estate?” Within his pamphlet Sieyès emphatically stated that any form of governance outside the commoners’ Third Estate was not of the nation, and that as a consequence the Third Estate was the only incarnation of French popular sovereignty. However, by the time of the coup these men, who had previously been ideological revolutionaries, were wary of centralized government based in representative bodies. Sieyès, a supposed champion of the
people, neutralized popular democratic power by creating an electoral pyramid, ensuring that power ultimately remained in the hands of the few.41

A legislative chamber, a tribunal, and a Senate constituted Napoleon’s government. The powers of these bodies were rigidly defined so as to limit the action one body could take in tandem with another.42 In addition, only the Consulate and the Conseil d’Etat, whose members were chosen by the Consuls, could propose legislation.43 Napoleon’s creation of the Conseil d’Etat allowed him to consolidate power in the hands of a few men. As a result, Napoleon’s form of government crushed the constitutionalism fervently supported during the French revolution, and instead reverted back to Bodin’s philosophy of maintaining ultimate power in one man. The group of learned men that constituted the Conseil d’Etat epitomized both the rise of a middle class elite and the centralization of Napoleon’s power.44 The consuls also reserved the right to override legislation proposed by their handpicked Senate.45 Napoleon quickly worked towards consolidating absolutist rule once he was consul, assuming the position by arguing he should be first consul because his name came first in the alphabet.46 As Napoleon rapidly stripped them of their powers, Sièyes and Roger-Ducos resigned in disgust.47 In addition, Napoleon destroyed the potential for legitimate resistance within government by ratifying the end of seigneurism and feudal privilege in conquered states.48 The end of feudal privilege meant that Napoleon’s bloodline was the only recognized bloodline in the Empire. In short, Napoleon’s Republic allowed him to act as a politique and an absolutist because it provided the appropriate structure for him to centralize power by monopolizing authority. All the while Napoleon maintained that his government upheld the values of representative institutions, and that the revolution was finished because he had supposedly fulfilled its ideals of liberty and equality.49 Given his previously mentioned actions to consolidate power, this duplicitous proclamation exhibited Napoleon’s politique nature. Similarly to Henry IV, Napoleon feigned a conviction, this time a revolutionary one, to facilitate absolute authority.

Napoleon believed he could use faith as a tool to consolidate his power and endear his regime to the people, stating, “[p]eople need a religion. This religion must be in the hands of the state.”50 Believing in the truth of Bodin’s philosophy that an effective government had religious control, Napoleon clearly sought the subservience of the Pope. Much like Henry IV and Richelieu, Napoleon viewed religion as a means to a political end. In 1804, upon his coronation as Emperor, Napoleon took the crown from the Pope’s hands, and placed it on his own head.51 Acting as a militarist, Napoleon invaded the Papal States with impunity, and even arrested the Pope in 1809.52 Perhaps Napoleon’s most audacious usurpation of Papal power was his Imperial Catechism in 1806, in which he claimed to be the Supreme Representation of God on earth.53 Furthermore, this decision mirrored Louis XIV and the establishment of the Divine Right of Bourbon Kings in 1678. Like the Sun King and Henry IV before him, Napoleon associated himself with the Church to affirm his authority. However, Napoleon went one step further than other French politiques by asserting his supremacy over the entirety of the Catholic Church – and consequently the European Continent - as opposed to the Gallican Church of Bourbon rulers.
Once he declared himself and his descendant’s emperors of France, Napoleon sought to expand his control over Europe. However, the success of his absolutist rule seems to have been his ultimate downfall. Napoleon believed that he himself was the incarnation of popular will. As a result, he also believed that France’s fortunes were his own. His own mythic status, along with the Bonaparte dynasty he established, made the focus of his leadership the fate of his legacy. Similar to Louis XIV, Napoleon sought continental preeminence through his practice of placing family members on foreign thrones. Napoleon expressed this outlook with regards to rising tensions with Russia in 1812, saying that his costly invasion of Russia was inevitable because “what has been begun must be carried through.” By saying this, Napoleon exhibited a hallmark trait of absolutists. Like Richelieu and Louis XIV, he believed in implementing brute military force towards expansionism if diplomatic demands were resisted. In fact, Napoleon’s use of “must” emphasizes his assertion of a personal right to reprimand Tsar Alexander. Because he believed that his power was absolute, Napoleon entirely disregarded Alexander’s right to act as an autonomous monarch. Even Napoleon – one of the most renowned strategists in modern history – proved susceptible to a lapse in judgment where his legacy was concerned, failing to realize the importance of diplomacy. The subsequent failure of the Russian campaign sparked doubt in Napoleon’s capabilities and overextended his economic resources. By 1814 Napoleon was forced to abdicate as the Sixth Coalition seized the capital. Shortly afterwards, Paris declared a constitutional monarchy under the leadership of the Bourbons, and Napoleon was exiled to Elba. Apart from a brief return to Paris during his reign of 100 days, Napoleon spent the rest of his life in exile.

Conclusion

Absolutism survived as the default form of government in France through the 19th century despite recurrent conflicts between the executive leadership, the church, and legislative bodies. Both Henry IV and Napoleon Bonaparte elevated themselves to positions of supreme control through acting as politiques juggling discordant parties. To strengthen their power, French absolutists were not afraid to rely on symbolic figureheads as means to deter legitimate resistance. Napoleon manipulated the once omnipotent Pope with the aim of using Catholicism as means to sanctify his position in the eyes of the people. Like Henry IV, Napoleon – who believed in religious universality - acted as a politique by feigning religious conviction to allow for the consolidation of his authority. Consequently, besides Louis XIV, all of the hitherto mentioned absolutist leaders gave the appearance of conceding certain principles when they saw a long-term benefit for themselves. The differing historical contexts that faced absolutists over time resulted in contrasting action — with Henry IV enacting the Edict of Nantes, Louis XIV revoking it, and Napoleon reestablishing religious tolerance through the Napoleonic Code. However, while implementing different policies, each man maintained the outward religious universality within government that Bodin advised. In addition, all of these leaders displayed the absolutist tendency of ignoring previously enacted laws. Cardinal Richelieu, perhaps because he knew he would not produce an heir to the throne, was the only absolutist ruler of France both to realize his despotic vision and to restrain
himself from overstepping the bounds of reasonable expansion. The shortcoming of both Napoleon and Louis XIV was that both men ultimately lost the power of pragmatism with the coming of their dynasticism. By doing so, these men revealed the limitation of Bodin’s absolutism as a system; that the politique rationale was ultimately undermined by the irresistible desire to abrogate the past for each ruler’s idyllic future.
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Harmony and Stability through the Primary Colors
Leah Umanskiy

Isaac Newton first observed that the human eye receives color through variations of light wavelengths. Though the reception of light can be studied through a scientific point of view, painters explored the different properties of colors earlier than scientists provided evidence of their understanding of light. Dating to prehistoric times, humans created their own form of paint to depict images, feelings or occurrences they experienced in their lives. As civilizations progressed, so did their methods of paintings and the overall technical sophistication of their artwork. Rapid development and advancements in painting and use of color began as early as the Renaissance, nearly one-thousand years after the climax of Classical Greece and Rome, and reached its pinnacle during Modernism, a philosophical and artistic movement that predominated the twentieth century by including a wide range of ideas that challenged previous classical thoughts. Impressionists, one sub-movement of Modernism, projected their response to light and color instead of form, later followed by varying movements such as post-impressionism, cubism, fauvism, and finally abstractionism. Each of these styles focused on color, form, composition, or a mixture of the three to distinguish them from the previous style. These styles also reflected artists’ feelings towards the political or social changes. After modernist artists explored and deviated from the classic Renaissance, Baroque, or Romantic styles, artists abandoned subjective material, as was the focus of these previous artistic movements, to produce abstract art. This movement experienced its most successful and mature period between World War One and World War Two, allowing artists to express feelings about the current political situations. Two abstract artists, Wassily Kandinsky and Piet Mondrian, each focused on the three primary colors - red, yellow, and blue - in their abstract works during this time, though their purpose and use of these colors differed greatly with Kandinsky’s abstract expressionism and the search for harmony contrasting with Mondrian’s geometric abstraction and the struggle for stability.

The primary colors, in reference to art and painting, are generally assumed to be red, yellow, and blue. A combination of two primary colors produces secondary colors - orange, green, or purple - to complete the color wheel every student learns about in elementary education. One may think that, given the nature of light, these colors had always been “primary colors;” in fact, the said primary colors were only popularized by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832). He was a Romantic German poet and philosopher who first presented his idea in *Theory of Colours* (1810).[^1] Goethe studied and wrote in response to Isaac Newton’s study on light in *Opticks* (1704), which declared that white light is split into its component colors, red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo, and violet, when directed through a prism. Goethe, outraged by Newton’s ideas, believed color exclusively originated in the human soul. Colors did not occur because of a physical phenomenon, but rather were the experience of sensations based on the patterns of light and dark.

Though it is important to recognize Newton studied the nature of light and Goethe studied the nature of color, the style of their work overlapped so much that Goethe felt the need to publish a more
romantic theory on color. He wanted to counter Newton’s more scientific and universally accepted theory. Goethe based his theories on the human soul in addition to Aristotle’s ideas of the humours in the body: blood, phlegm, black bile and yellow bile. Harmonious proportions of the humours cause harmonious sensations in the body, therefore affecting the mood and sensation of color. The idea that the way an individual receives color affects their mood differs dramatically from Newton’s theory. It appealed more to artists, especially later Impressionists and Abstractionists who used color as their main source of subject matter. Goethe collaborated with a young Romantic painter named Philipp Otto Runge to create his final theory with of three primary colors. In a letter from July 3, 1806, Runge wrote to Goethe, “as is known, there are only three colors, yellow, red and blue.” This was attempt by Runge to establish the world of colors as a mixture of only three. In a final endeavor to relate the Aristotelian humours and Runge’s suggestion of the three primary colors, Goethe stated that each color relates to a specific feeling: yellow to rational or lucid thought, red to vitality and aggression, and blue to melancholy, sadness and sentiment. David Burton, the author of Red, Yellow and Blue: The Historical Origin of Color Systems, concluded that: “colors should harmonize the soul (not the artistic composition) is all but forgotten today when we teach children that red, yellow, and blue are the primary colors.”

Indeed, many people like Newton diluted color to a scientific theory instead of the beauty and feeling it stimulates; still, many artists chose color as their vehicle to relate their feelings towards an audience about a work that lacked objectivity. Wassily Kandinsky (1866-1944), a Russian painter famous for abstract expressionist work, used color to bring about the formless style of his art. Kandinsky used a combination of the three primary colors to portray his feelings and ideas. He used the primary colors as a foundation for his painting Yellow, Red, Blue (1925) The main components include a yellow rectangle, a slightly inclined red cross, and a large blue circle to the right of the painting. This signature work of Kandinsky’s combines Goethe’s fundamental color theory, his view of politics and social values of the time, and Kandinsky’s relationship to music and feeling.

Although Yellow, Red, Blue (1925) offers insight into one case of Kandinsky’s color choice and technique, his motives and style can be studied through all of his abstract works. According to Donald Kuspit, Kandinsky’s motive to produce abstract art stemmed from an, “objection to the general existence and the values which sustain them,” and a protest, “against all social forms which hold man back from his abstract relation with his fundamental nature and from his fundamental relationship with abstract nature.” Kandinsky dominated his work with with primary colors because, citing Goethe, the combination creates harmony in contrast to the chaos he experienced in society. Prior to his most successful work as a painter,
Kandinsky witnessed traumatizing student protests in Russian and Western universities, in addition to World War One and its painful aftermath. Kandinsky added, in addition to the central primary colored shapes, spontaneous lines, curves, and other geometric objects to satisfy his needs for individual spontaneity. He believed his individuality was being destroyed by totalitarian society. Furthermore, absolute order in society seemed nearly impossible in the 1920s as scientists split an atom for the first time and the world as a whole recuperated from the devastating losses of the War. Kandinsky’s reaction to this may be analyzed from this work, *Yellow, Red, Blue*, although he painted many more in an attempt to free himself from social order and connect more deeply with abstract nature. Kandinsky, through his excellent education, became familiar with Goethe’s writings and used his theories and the feelings caused by each color to reflect his sadness, aggression, rationality, or other feelings in his works. Kandinsky focused on expressionism, with color as a main vehicle, in his painting *Yellow, Red, Blue* among his many other abstract works.

One of Wassily Kandinsky’s contemporaries in abstract painting focused on geometric abstraction with a grid-like structure in his unique style. This artist, Piet Mondrian (1872-1944), painted in the impressionist, post-impressionist, fauvist and cubist styles before reaching his mature abstract geometric style. Like Kandinsky, Mondrian painted his most famous works between the first and second World Wars, though Mondrian searched for stability and structure in his abstract style instead of the lack of it - contrasting Kandinsky’s style. At the climax of World War One, Mondrian began to paint in his mature style, using only variations of red, yellow, and blue on various grids. He also founded his journal *De Stijl*, a neoplasticism-based journal, with friend Theo van Doesburg. The debut of the journal correlates with need for social and political stability at the time, as neoplasticism does not have any representational objects - the style only uses red, yellow, and blue colors; black, white, and grey values; and balances the work with the use of opposition instead of symmetry. Mondrian, a Dutch-born man, used the three primary colors, in accordance with Goethe’s theory, to obtain the most stability through his art. Following the traumatizing War, Mondrian’s father passed away in 1921, which motivated Piet Mondrian to perfect the stability in his art since he could not control the stability in his surroundings. In Mondrian’s 1922
work *Composition with Red, Blue, Yellow, Black, and Gray*, one can discern his characteristic style: the lack of recognizable objects, vertical and horizontal lines, and the three primary colors and three primary values. The dramatic red square located in the top left corner is strategically balanced by less dramatic, but more plentiful yellow, black and blue rectangles in the opposite corner. Though the viewer only sees useless squares of various colors painted on a canvas, Mondrian hoped people would only interpret the painting in relation to the artist’s life: “a life dedicated to pure form.” Mondrian believed the use of the fundamental colors would allow him to reach his personal nirvana, the pure form that life lacked. In contrast to Kandinsky’s style, which used color, lines, and curves to express and evoke emotions, Mondrian sought to find the fundamental structure of society and ultimately, of life, through the most basic colors and geometric objects.

In the early nineteenth century, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe introduced the idea that color originates in the human soul, and individuals experience sensations from the painted colors. Just as every individual has a different response to color, famous painters interpreted the use of fundamental primary colors - red, yellow, and blue - to signify stability and return to foundation or to guide the viewer to understand the unstructured relationship with abstract nature. Wassily Kandinsky used the sensations introduced by Goethe to stimulate his abstract expressionist art. He protested the idea of universal order sustained by eternal principles popularized by scientists of the time with this medium. Kandinsky’s beautiful colors stimulated emotion and a connection with nature and abstraction that, he believed, society lost with the increasingly popular universal scientific theories, such as Einstein’s, who reached his most famous discoveries at the same time of Kandinsky and Mondrian. Alternatively, Piet Mondrian returned to stability through the basic primary colors, basic values, and his use of vertical and horizontal black lines. Mondrian believed society needed a social framework and stable structure, and his mature style reflects these ideas. Art and color, as seen by the works of these two artists, are means of expressing one’s emotions visually. As Kandinsky and Mondrian had hoped, the interpretation remains unclear, which allows the viewer to search for the connection with abstract thinking aside from objective and material
ideas society values so dearly. The work of these two great artists remains well-studied and well-recognized for its creative style, theories, and individual interpretations of society and its cure for stability and harmony through abstract art.

4 Burton, “Red, Yellow, Blue,” 43.
11 Deicher, “Mondrian,” 70.
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Christianity and Its Effect on Japanese Development

Eriko Koide

Japan’s unique structural and cultural development can be credited to a number of things: climate, location, or even language. However, the greatest factor in its unique culture was the fact that it had no influence at all from the West until the middle of the 16th century. Until that time Japan was a relatively unknown island in the ocean near China and India, which were both countries that had unique cultures but adopted some European cultural features as well. Due to exposure from trade and colonization, China and India both have certain western elements in their cultures despite having the same percentage of Christian citizens as Japan. However, Japan lacks such cultural elements because of Japan’s unwillingness to assimilate Christianity, separating Japanese culture from European culture.

Portuguese traders first reached the Japanese archipelago in 1543 when they were blown off course and shipwrecked onto the island of Tanegashima, which lies on the southern coast of Japan. The local warlord, or Daimyo, was fascinated by the Portuguese firearms and he ordered his swordsmith to make copies.1 Japan had already been introduced to gunpowder weapons from China and had been using Teppo, which were guns and cannon tubes which originated in China over three centuries before the Portuguese arrival. However, the Portuguese arquebus rifle had some obvious improvements; it was much lighter and easier to transport, it had improved accuracy, and it was faster because the matchlock firing system eliminated the need to use a match to set off the weapon. The arquebus spread quickly through Japan, known as the “Tanegashima” due to its origin of introduction within Japan, and within 10 years a reported three hundred thousand Tanegashimas had been manufactured.2 After the arrival of this far superior weaponry, Japan quickly welcomed trade with the West.

This period of trade with the West was called the Nanban trade period. Nanban, literally meaning “southern barbarian,” became the title for any foreigners who went to Japan due to their alien appearance and unsophisticated manners by Japanese societal standards.3 Japan had already initiated trade with Vietnam and the Philippines before the 17th century, but those Asian cultures were more similar to the Japanese than the Portuguese were. Since then, Nagasaki, already a major international trade port, expanded to accommodate for the arrival of the European traders. Nagasaki itself also had a unique culture that was different from the rest of Japan’s as a result of the busy trade. However, only after the Portuguese arrived did it become significant for cultural development.

In their trade, the Portuguese not only traded their own items but also acted as an intermediate for other countries as well. At the time Portugal had already established trade with India and China, who were willing to trade for Portuguese silver. The first Portuguese ships to Japan carried products almost entirely from China, such as silk or porcelain.4 The products were quite popular, because despite Japan’s proximity to the Middle Kingdom, it had been banned from trading with it as retribution for the Wako pirates. These were pirates mainly from Kyushu, the southernmost island of Japan, who raided the coasts of China and Korea along the South China Sea starting in the 13th century.5 From Japan, the Portuguese
primarily brought exports of silver and precious coins, art and crafts, which they then sold to various
countries back in Europe, as well as in Asia. In the race for domination of the seas in Europe, the ability to
moderate trade in Asia was a major advantage for Portugal. In addition, being the only European country
with the ability to trade with Japan built on this strategic advantage and increased the country’s overall
edge in the race for the seas.6

After trade was successfully begun and trading ports had been set up, the Portuguese began
expanding their culture into Japan. Francis Xavier, a Roman Catholic Missionary and the cofounder of the
Society of Jesus from the Kingdom of Navarre (now part of Spain) who led an extensive mission in the
Portuguese empire during the 16th century, chose to go to Japan as part of the first Christian mission to
ever visit Japan. He was assisted by a Japanese man named Yajiro, who had fled from Japan after
committing a murder. He changed his name to Anjiro (the Japanese pronunciation for Angelo) and
returned to Japan acting as Xavier’s translator.7 He arrived on the coast of Japan on July 27th, 1549, but
was not permitted to enter any ports until August 15th, when he entered Kagoshima as a representative of
the Portuguese king. He initially faced disinterest and scorn due to the difference of religion. Therefore,
he used a different approach, altering some details of Christianity to make it more applicable to Japanese
tradition. One of the changes that he observed to be effective from his missions in Portugal was to change
the name of the Christian god. He therefore changed the god’s name to “Dainichi” and the term “Deus” to
“Deusu” to make the names pronounced more easily and to relate to Japanese traditions of worshipping
the sun, which can be called “niche.”8 Xavier established the first mission at Kagoshima, where other
missionaries would later arrive, such as Luis Frois.

Luis Frois was born in Lisbon, Portugal around 1532, and joined the Society of Jesus when he
was sixteen years old. He immediately began missionary work, going to Goa, India where St. Paul’s
College, established by Xavier was already training recruits for further missionary work. In 1562, Luis
Frois first went to Japan to continue further missionary work, landing in Yokoseura, where there was a
Christian mission established in around 1552.9 Not only a missionary but also a writer, Frois was most
famous for his work, Historia de Japon, which shed light on Japan during the latter half of the 16th
century. He described details such as the civil wars and conspiracies that rocked Japan during his stay, and
followed the course of his travels throughout Japan. He gave an especially detailed account of his travels
to Osaka for his mission, where a fire broke out, damaging much of the city and the officials’ grounds.
The city was barred as officials searched for suspicious individuals. Because he was not Japanese, in all
likelihood he would have died if it had not been for a Buddhist priest who helped him escape the city in
disguise. Frois observed that Japan was able to maintain peace with religious diversity.10 The fact that
different religions could coexist was especially surprising to him because of Europe’s history of religious
wars. As a missionary he was influential and saw both everyday life in Japan and the lives of the nobility
and the daimyō of prefectures, which allowed him to portray Japanese life in his books, which he sent
back to Portugal. As one of the few people actually able to observe life within Japan, his books and
dictionaries are some of the only accounts in existence of Japanese society and religious practices during the 16th century from a non-Japanese perspective.

Christianity had settled in Japan, concentrated mainly in Kyushu under Oda Nobunaga’s rule. Oda saw no threat from Christianity and no reason to limit or monitor missionaries, and the missions were able to peacefully navigate around Japan. However, in 1582 Oda was supposedly assassinated by a close general (there is some uncertainty around his death) and after that his successor, Toyotomi Hideyoshi, stepped into control. Toyotomi was less appreciative of the Christian missionaries than Oda had been, but he valued them because of the trade and communication the Portuguese provided between Japan and the west. However, he began to see Christianity as a threat to his control, and in 1587 he issued an edict that forbade missionaries from entering the country and prohibited the practice of Christianity.

Even with the edict issued by Toyotomi, missionaries continued to enter the country and Christianity continued to be exercised because there was no means to enforce the law. Therefore, in response to the open defiance of his power, in 1597 Toyotomi increased persecution of Christianity and worked to turn civilians against Christianity through encouraging defense of national culture. As a warning to those who wished to continue to defy his power, he arrested 26 Christians and had them all crucified in public. Two years later when Pope Pius IX heard of the executions, he proclaimed them martyrs. By executing the 26 Christians, Toyotomi caused a wave of inspiration for Christianity around the world, and Nagasaki became the epicenter of secret Christian activity until trade with all countries except the Netherlands was banned in 1638 for fear of smuggling priests into the country.

Despite the banning of the Portuguese from 1638, there was clear Portuguese influence absorbed into Japanese society. The biggest and most prominent influence Portugal had on Japan was through food. Some famous Japanese dishes, such as tempura, originate from Portuguese cooking. In addition, foods like kompeito (clumps of sugar dyed different colors) whose names originated from Portuguese “confeito” have become staples of Japanese confectionary. The Japanese also got vocabulary from the Portuguese for items that had been introduced to them through Portuguese trade, such as “pan” from “pao,” meaning bread. Even though the expulsion of Christianity was Japan’s main priority, it also wished to continue trade with Europe without being forced to assimilate. For that reason, it decided to continue trade with the Dutch in 1641.

The Dutch were the only successful people to reopen trading with Japan. They faced tough competition against Spain and Portugal at the time, and wanted to expand their foreign trading grounds even if it meant allowing the Japanese to set the standards for trade. Japan accepted them, but only under the conditions that the Dutch would not bring Christian missionaries into Japan to try to continue the Christian mission that the Portuguese had started, and if a mission was caught, trade would immediately be cut off. The Japanese also wished to continue the trade that had been cut off for the previous three years in order to trade products, but more importantly to monitor foreign events and affairs that were
going on. However, despite the numerous conditions they set for the Dutch in order to continue trade, the Japanese continued to be weary of any potential religious efforts.

The shogunate chose to continue to use Nagasaki’s trading port, but only that port, for two reasons: first, it had been the main trade port for Portugal and other European countries and was easy for traders to reach, but more importantly it was on the “edge” of Japan and was far from Kyoto and Edo. Edo, which would later become Tokyo, was the center of Japanese society and tradition, and the Japanese felt that if foreign contact was too close to Edo, the national culture would be at risk. Following this decision, the government closed other ports to international activity. Northern ports were close to Russia, a chronic threat to Japan, but they were also affected by the winter weather every year, and so trade persisted only in the southernmost region. However, due to increased civilian and government concerns about the threat the West posed to Japan, trade was banned on the mainland in Nagasaki and was instead moved to Dejima.

Dejima was an artificial island built in 1634 by merchants of the local area. The Tokugawa Shogunate, under Tokugawa Iemitsu, created a foreign policy during the Edo period called “Sakoku.” This Sakoku was an isolationist policy that prevented any foreign peoples from entering the country, and prevented any native Japanese from leaving. To abide by this policy, Dejima was used for trading to accommodate for the trading needs of Japan while preventing the presence of any foreign people on its shores. Trade with Asia also began to be handled exclusively from Dejima, including some of the trade with countries like Vietnam that had been going on for centuries.

Unlike the Portuguese, who were called “Nanban” for “southern barbarian,” the Dutch traders were called “Komo,” literally “red hair” because of the unique feature of their red hair, which was obviously unlike the black color of Japanese hair but also very different from the hair of the Portuguese. Japan succeeded in shutting out Christianity by exclusively trading with Dutch traders from Dejima. However, there were some setbacks because of the lack of diverse international trade opportunities. Being the only western traders in Japan, the Dutch were able to charge higher prices for goods than in areas where multiple trading partners were established. Until 1853, when Commodore Matthew Perry forcibly opened Japan to international trade, Japan lacked the diversity of materials other countries acquired from their major trade routes and thus developed in a way unique from the rest of the world.

While Japan’s Nationalist population and government firmly supported the decision to keep its culture isolated from other nations, the severity of the isolation caused a rift between Europe and Japan to develop. Japan was not able to receive materials developed in other nations and could not be competitive with those nations. The policies also forbade anyone in Japan from leaving the country, and while that was fine on a domestic level it prevented Japan from learning techniques other nations exercised to fuel their economies. Though most of Japan’s foreign policies were created to prevent a cultural invasion, the caution with which Japan regarded Christianity was a major contributor in its inability to keep up with European development.
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“Dejima, the Island that served as Japan’s window to the world during Japan’s period of Isolation.”
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