

THE FUNCTION OF EDUCATION IN ROUSSEAU'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Thesis submitted to the

Institute of Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Philosophy

by

Ismahan ÖZDEMİR

Fatih University

June 2011

© Ismahan ÖZDEMİR

All Rights Reserved, 2011

APPROVAL PAGE

Student : Ismahan ÖZDEMİR
Institute : Institute of Social Sciences
Department : Philosophy
Thesis Subject : The Function of Education in Rousseau's Political
Philosophy
Thesis Date : June 2011

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Şengül ÇELİK
Head of Department

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Şengül ÇELİK
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Yusuf ÇETİNDAG̃

Assist. Prof. Dr. Şengül ÇELİK

Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet GÜNENÇ

It is approved that this thesis has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences.

Assoc. Prof. Mehmet KARAKUYU
Director

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

1. The material included in this thesis has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.

2. The advanced study in the philosophy graduate program of which this thesis is part has consisted of:

i) Philosophy requires regarding the phenomenon and facts with a certain goal and method. In this kind of research, even if philosophy's being abstract, the relation between concepts, and conceptual analysis sometimes raise difficulties, they gets man exited most of the time. Also, the relation of philosophy with different disciplines will extend its topic and content. In this thesis statement, certain method and concept analysis are regarded.

ii) Thesis statement mainly consists of philosophy of education and politics. Besides, moral philosophy is included in some topics. The main sources of the thesis statement are primary books, in other words philosopher's own books. Also, secondary sources are used.

Ismahan ÖZDEMİR

June, 2011

ABSTRACT

Ismahan ÖZDEMİR

June 2011

The Function of Education in Rousseau's Political Philosophy

Education subject is among the researches towards human and things what is good for human. Since Ancient Greek philosophers, education is given specific functions to create an ideal society. While Plato wants to train a good administrator and guardian, Aristotle grounded on the relation between education and good life. When we look at Rousseau, we see that he mainly moves from human's nature idea, and creates education model with notions of education-society-nature. First most remarkable side of Rousseauian education is grounding education on nature, and with the education which is made in accordance with nature, a good person and citizen can be raised. Meaning of education which is suitable for nature is, not damaging the properties nature gave to human and taking them into consideration. In this scope, Rousseau sees it as a gift of nature when first teeth give pain to child, because child will learn to endure pain since that little age. Therefore, some problems of human which are given by nature shall be seen as bad, and education's foundation shall be shaped by considering them. Secondly, sentiments are given place in education of ethics. When Rousseau takes this matter into consideration, he especially draws attention to sentiments of "*amour de soi*" (self-love) and "*amour propre*". When you teach some subjects to child and when you assign some duties, one must be careful so that bad sentiments are not created. Thirdly, Rousseau wants the child to be raised a social being, instead of a individual being. Therefore he teaches the child the subjects such as social values, state and government. In this study, my purpose is determining Rousseau's "human" understanding and examining educational model stages which he based on this understanding. In this scope Rousseau's ideas about society, contract, "will" and state will provide depth for thesis because his understanding of politics includes the efforts to teach citizenship conscious to person. He especially keeps patriotism in the foreground.

This study will analyze the method for raising a person who is compatible with social order. But in order to prevent corruption of person especially by social rules and institutions in this life, contents and methods of the education given since young ages will be taken as basis. Therefore this subject impels us to think about the method and contents of education. The purpose which will be considered is determining the position of sentiments and reason in education. According to my arguments, education shall be based on sentiments and experience because cooperation and communication between people are carried out by sentiments; not reason. This study will present a detailed examination about how and when sentiments, reason and senses shall be activated during education. The result which is aimed to be reached is the possibility of raising good individuals for society with an education based on sentiments.

Key words: nature- education relation, sentiments, moral education, citizenship education.

KISA ÖZET

Ismahan ÖZDEMİR

Haziran 2011

Rousseau'nun Siyaset Felsefesi'nde Eğitimin Rolü

Eğitim konusu insana ve insan için iyi olana yönelik araştırmaların arasında yer almaktadır. İlk çağ Yunan filozoflarından itibaren ideal bir toplum oluşturmak için eğitime belirli işlevler yüklenmiştir. Platon eğitim ile iyi bir yönetici ve bekçi yetiştirmek isterken Aristoteles eğitimle iyi yaşam arasındaki ilişkiyi esas almıştır. Rousseau'ya baktığımız zaman ise temel olarak insan doğası fikrinden hareket ettiğini, eğitim-toplum-doğa kavramları ile eğitim modelini oluşturduğunu görürüz. Rousseaucu eğitimin en dikkat çekici birinci yanı eğitimin doğaya dayanmasıdır, doğaya uygun olarak yapılan eğitim ile iyi bir birey ve yurttaş yetiştirilebilecektir. Doğaya uygun eğitimin anlamı ise doğanın insana verdiği bazı özellikleri bozmamak, onları dikkate almaktır. Bu bağlamda Rousseau çocuğun ilk dişleri çıkarken ona acı vermesini doğanın bir lütfu olarak görür çünkü çocuk küçük yaştan itibaren acıya karşı dayanmayı öğrenebilecektir. Bu nedenle doğanın insanlara verdiği kimi sıkıntıları kötü olarak görmeyip eğitimi onları dikkate alarak temellendirmek gerekir. İkinci yan ise ahlak eğitiminde duygulara (*sentiment*) yer verilmesidir. Rousseau bu konuyu ele alırken özellikle *amour de soi* ve *amour propre* duygularına dikkat çeker. Çocuğa bazı konular öğretilirken ve ona yerine getirmesi için bazı görevler verilirken onda kötü duyguların oluşmamasına dikkat edilmelidir. Üçüncü yan, Rousseau çocuğun sadece bireysel bir varlık (being) değil toplumsal bir varlık olarak da yetişmesini ister. Bu nedenle ona toplumsal değerleri, devlet, yönetim gibi konuları anlatır. Bu çalışmada benim amacım Rousseau'nun “insan” anlayışını belirleyip bu anlayış üzerine temellendirdiği eğitim modelinin aşamalarını incelemektir. Bunun için Rousseau'nun topluma, sözleşmeye, iradeye, devlete dair düşünceleri teze derinlik katacaktır çünkü onun siyaset anlayışında yurttaşlık bilincinin bireye öğretilme çabası vardır. Özellikle yurt sevgisi ön planda tutulur.

Bu çalışma toplumsal düzene uyumlu bir birey yetiştirmenin yöntemini analiz edecektir. Fakat bu yaşamda özellikle bireyin toplumsal kurallar ve kurumlar

tarafından bozulmaması için küçük yaştan itibaren verilen eğitimin içeriği ve yöntemi konusu esas alınacaktır. Dolayısıyla bu konu bizi eğitimin içeriğinin ve yönteminin nasıl olması gerektiği konusu üzerinde düşünmeye sevk eder. Göz önünde bulundurulan amaç eğitimde duyguların ve aklın yerini belirlemektir. Benim argümanım eğitimin duygulara ve deneyime dayanması gerektiğidir çünkü insanlar arasındaki iletişim ve iş birliği akılla değil duygular aracılığıyla olur. Bu çalışma eğitimde duyguların, aklın ve duyguların nasıl ve ne zaman etkin hale getirilmesi gerektiği konusunda ayrıntılı bir incelemeyi sunacaktır. Ulaşılmak istenen sonuç duygulara dayalı eğitimle toplum için iyi birey yetiştirilebileceğidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: doğa-eğitim ilişkisi, duygular, erdem, ahlak eğitimi, yurttaşlık eğitimi.

LIST OF CONTENTS

Approval Page	iii
Author Declarations	iv
Abstract	v
Kısa Özet	vii
List of Contents	ix
Acknowledgements	xi
Introduction: The Relationship between Education and Society	1
Chapter 1: Education System in Utopias	10
1.1. Plato and <i>the Republic</i>	11
1.2. Thomas More and <i>Utopia</i>	15
1.3. Tommaso Campanella and <i>the City of the Sun</i>	19
1.4. Francis Bacon and <i>The New Atlantis</i>	22
Chapter 2: Rousseau's Educational Model	26
2.1. Social Order and Citizenship Education	26
2.2. Education's Purpose and Function in Rousseau	39
2.3. Basic Concepts in Rousseaunian Education Idea	50
2.3.1. Human Nature and Natural Man	51
2.3.2. Society	56
2.3.3. Self- Love and <i>Amour propre</i>	61
Chapter 3: The Stages of Rousseau's Educational Theory: <i>Emile</i>	65
3.1. Book I: Infancy and Physical Education	71
3.2. Book II: Childhood and Education of Senses	77

3.3. Book III: Adulthood and Intellectual Education	92
3.4. Book IV: Adolescent: Moral Education and Sentiments	100
3.5. Book V: Sophie, Marriage and Citizenship	109
Conclusion and Evaluation	121
Bibliography	126

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It was like an adventure to start philosophy education. Hopes became bigger with given advices and confidence feeling. At each confusion someone illuminated my way; the people, whose sacrifices can never be paid in full, became my lighthouse. This study became the most beautiful resting place of this adventure, for taking some breath to begin a new journey. I want to say thanks to my family, who always trusted me, believed me and whose presence I always felt near me, and to whom I will be in debt forever. I present my endless thanks to my dear sister who is my only confidant in my life.

I want to say thanks to my teachers in Mugla University, philosophy department who have great efforts on my philosophy undergraduate education. I present my thanks to my valuable teacher Prof. Alparslan AÇIKGENÇ, whose philosophy love I admire. I want to thank Dr. Betül AÇIKGÖZ, whose book suggestions I listened to gladly.

I thank Fatma GÖRAL, Tuğba SAĞIR and Nurdane ŞİMŞEK, who never withhold their help, advices and encouragements during my study. I want to thank Fatma ELLİKÇİ and Hayriye SAKLAYICI, together with whom I spent my years, with all my sincerity. If it was not for their support and advices, I could never finish this study. Also I present my thanks to my valuable teachers; Assist. Prof. Dr. Bülent SÖNMEZ and Assist. Prof. Dr. Kenan YAKUBOĞLU, whose support and help in Diyarbakır, where I began a new life, can never be forgotten. Many thanks to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Sengül ÇELİK, who showed patience to my all mistakes during every stage of my study. Lastly, I want to thank beforehand to little existence Ayse Yüstra (daughter of my sister) who is my source of hope, who will join the family in June and who is the smallest producer of this study.

To my family and my dear lecturer Prof. Hatice Nur ERKIZAN, who influenced me with her education idea.

INTRODUCTION

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND SOCIETY

The education idea has been an important part of man's social life and sometimes has been a main problem in almost all eras. At first glance, the most obvious aspect of education is that it arises from a social need. The changing social order and many innovations have led to the questioning of these improvements and this ensured many ideas to be put forward about state structure. According to John Dewey (1997:6), a need for a new social order triggers a new educational movement. Therefore; the educational models stated in the books about political formation which have been written in different periods are all different from each other. Many philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, Thomas More and Francis Bacon highlighted an idea about ideal state and social structure considering the contemporary needs. While Plato wants to determine a good master with education, Aristotle wants to determine good life for man isolating education from its political identity and the effect of education on virtues. With the humanism concept born out of Renaissance, figures such as Comenius acknowledged that education should be for everybody. With the enlightenment movement, the figures such as Locke, Rousseau, Herbart put forward new ideas about the idea of education. In the following periods, Paulo Freire and Joel Spring assessed education from a different point of view and criticized the oppressive attitude in education.

The present study mainly focuses on the educational model of Rousseau; however, before explaining his ideas about education, it would be more appropriate to give some knowledge about the content of "education" concept in this part. In particular, brief knowledge is given about the elements of education, how education should be and educational concepts and a short assessment is made in this regard. Based on this, first of all, educational concept and then commonly mentioned pedagogy concept and the meaning and methods of both are discussed. Then, discipline concept which has a wide and controversial place in education is explained.

The first pages of *Moral Education*, Emile Durkheim, a work bringing forward an important study on education, discusses about pedagogy. Durkheim who suggests that moral education should be based on a rational basis wants to analyze this education as an educator. However, what he wants to do primarily is to identify what pedagogy is. He endeavours to clarify whether pedagogy is a science or an art for this identification.

Durkheim believes that pedagogy is not a science and thinks that if it was an educational science; it would not be called pedagogy. In case pedagogy was accepted as a science, its theories should be analyzed using scientific research rules; however, Durkheim finds this method wrong. In trying to prove that pedagogy cannot be a science, he draws attention to deadline, which is binding for science and art. According to him, while science is doing research deliberately and there is no time limit in it, pedagogy has some problems and issues it needs to solve immediately. In this regard, pedagogy cannot expect anything in time. (Durkheim, 1961: 1). Durkheim states that in any social change, society expects people to act in compliance with this change. What educators should do is to give shape to the action combining the knowledge science gives.

Durkheim acknowledges that pedagogy is not an art as well as it is not a science. (1961: 2). Since “Art, indeed, is made up of habit practice, and organized skills.” Emphasizing that the art of teaching does not have the same meaning as pedagogy, Durkheim remarks that the art of teaching is the background of an educator and the practical experience of a teacher. (Durkheim, 1961: 2)

Consequently, Durkheim accepts that pedagogy is a concept between science and art and expresses the distinction between pedagogy and both fields as follows:

It is not art, for it is not a system of organized practices but of ideas bearing on these practices. It is a body of theories. By that token it is close to science. However, scientific theory has only one goal- the expression of reality; whereas educational theories have the immediate aim of guiding conduct. While these theories do not constitute action in themselves, they are a preparation for it, and they are very close to it.” (Durkheim, 1961: 2)

In brief, while Durkheim acknowledges pedagogy as a practical theory, he thinks that it is not a practice. Pedagogy should not present man what he should do or his

practices already available. Durkheim defines pedagogy as “Educational theory essentially is the most methodical and best-documented thinking available, put at the service of teaching”. (1961: 2)

Education and pedagogy have almost the same meaning today. However, Bedi Ziya Egemen makes a careful distinction between these two. Egemen points out to the distinction between pedagogy and discipline, and while regarding discipline as a science, he assesses pedagogy from a different point of view. Those who would like to develop pedagogy as a science base on “individual” and choose the subject of mental and ideal manifestations or the development of body functions of children. They use the method of experience. Main questions of science of discipline are “What is the common meaning and value in all kinds of disciplines?” and “Whatever the way it is, where does discipline’s original meaning come from?” (Egemen, 1965: 33-34). In this regard, Egemen thinks that science of discipline should have a new method. What should be done is to access scientific knowledge about the nature, the stages, the ways and the laws of discipline. (Egemen, 1965: 41). For these purposes, Ziya Egemen does not pay attention to the practical function of science of discipline but wants to reach a pure science of discipline. According to him (1965: 41), the objective of science of discipline is to have the most accurate knowledge on truth and on its laws as in all other sciences. Therefore, it is essential to determine the nature of discipline and to find its laws which are valid anytime and anywhere. He suggests that the differences between societies and nations should be ignored in this regard. According to him, the difference between pedagogy and science of discipline is the questions that they are based on. In this context, the question “What should I do?” constitutes the basis of the research of pedagogy. What science of discipline wants to know and find out at first is what discipline is. Main questions of discipline are “What is discipline? How and where does it come from? What are the ways, the stages and the laws? (Egemen, 1965: 42)

Egemen finds the method that classic pedagogy uses dogmatic. He assesses the method of science of discipline as critical. Thinking that science of discipline deals with all mankind, Egemen thinks about the possibility of a science of discipline which would function according to the same laws in all societies regardless of race, geographical location, historical and cultural differences. Even though the norms

about language, economy, religion, art, political order, morality and legal system have formed in all societies in all periods as a result of living together and they have different contents, he says that they have the same humanity function. (Egemen, 1965: 42). On the other hand, pedagogy establishes its system on educator-child, student. While the science of discipline is based on the concept of humanity, he emphasizes that it does not bear resemblance to the idea of humanity. According to him, the concept of humanity is the one which has been able to exist in nations and cultures. Therefore, it is based on the idea and the reality of the society it exists. In this context, individuals are an element of the nations and the society they live in. (Egemen, 1965: 43).

While there is a close relation between science of discipline and society, pedagogy is interested in individual. According to Egemen, individuals are developed within the framework of the society as they come from it and they determine the meaning and direction of their lives through the society again. Hence, he names society as a spiritual organism as the order and unity of it is determined by spiritual ties. (1965: 44). As people live in a society such as a family, neighborhood, culture or state, they cannot lose touch with it. These communities establish superior life unities with moral norms and spiritual values.

According to Egemen who acknowledges the basis of societies as the basis of all kinds of disciplines, discipline is a necessary imaginary manifestation and a function of a society. (1965: 44). If the fundamental rule is that people in the community resemble each other and participate in the objective norms and ways of the community, this is also the rule which constitutes the nature of the science of discipline. It aims to enable people to comply with the rules and the order of the society and to follow its values. For the maintenance of a society, young people should resemble adults; otherwise, society disappears. In this regard, discipline is of great importance for inoculating the common values of society to individuals.

Subjects and fields such as language, religion, ethics and economy are significant functions for social life. Similarly, discipline is a necessary function of a society. These fields also enabled the sciences bearing the same names to be established. For Bedi Ziya Egemen, what should be done next is to help disciplinary function to establish science of discipline. After this point, what should science of

discipline do is to discuss and research subjects as facts. Science of discipline does not have the purposes “to preach ideals” or “to improve mankind”. Instead, stating that researching and perceiving the fact of discipline in terms of its phases, types, ways and laws, Egemen thinks that its borders cannot be exactly drawn. What can be definitely said about science of discipline is to understand and examine communal and social life based on its idea of discipline. Similar to the analysis of sciences such as language, law, etc. regarding life in their own perspectives, science of discipline also should try to understand life with the idea of discipline. Pedagogy, on the other hand, evaluates this situation from a different point of view. The main question of its research is “What should I do as an educator and as a teacher?”, while the science of discipline discusses the questions “What is discipline?”, “How does it really occur anytime anywhere?” (Cited from Ernst Kriccek by Bedi Ziya Egemen, 1965, 64).

Science of discipline uses phenomenological analysis and description method. Besides, it benefits from sciences such as history, sociology, etc. The studies on psychology, biology and ethics are the sources which can support science of discipline. Emphasizing that the purpose of the science of discipline is to reach the knowledge which would be valid for all times and nations and the results and laws which would be valid for everybody, Egemen suggests that history would be helpful in this regard. He says that the science of discipline aims to find out natural and meaning laws which have been remained unchanged since the establishment of mankind by being fed by historical events. (Egemen, 1965: 67).

Since Egemen mainly points out the concepts of individual and society, he also gives form to education and science of discipline in line with these two concepts. His main idea is that science of discipline is necessary for society and individuals can develop in society. In brief, he acknowledges that society should exist for the development of an individual. He asserts that individuals and society develop and complete each other having continuous and mutual relationships. Thinking that society should exist for the existence of discipline, Egemen thinks that individuals do not make any sense without a society. For the maintenance of the society, values should be transferred to young generations.

Due to his thoughts, Egemen assesses the education understanding of Rousseau as individualist pedagogy. He points out to the fact that Rousseau is the

author of both *Emile* and *Social Contract*. According to him, Rousseau's pedagogic thoughts are the practices of his ideas about society, state and culture in the field of discipline. (1965:76)

There is a contradiction between the ideas of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the fact that Bedi Ziya Egemen gives importance to society and evaluates individuals in their relationships between them and the society. In fact, the main reason why Rousseau's education understanding is directed to individual is his thoughts about society. Since Rousseau thinks that human is good but spoiled by society and institutes; he wants to educate Emile keeping away from the society. Rousseau considers that there was no reason for fights or wars during the period when people used to live as individuals; however, with the transition to social life, fights appeared. When people started to live in society, their relationships with each other increased and man tried to do what he cannot do by himself with other people and therefore had some free time. During these free times, people started to gather and spend some time together. In these activities, individuals began to determine the best, the most powerful, skillful, intelligent one and therefore everybody wanted to gain prestige. This inequality brought about evil as well since pride, disdain and jealousy started to arise among people. These emotions led conflicts among them. Hence, Rousseau adopts a personal educational method so that the child does not learn the emotions and conditions such as jealousy being involved in the social life at an early age.

Rousseau undoubtedly draws reaction at the most for his thoughts about society, which means with his idea that an individual who is good by nature is corrupted by society. However, Beauvalon points out a different aspect of Rousseau and finds unfair to call a person who writes a work called "*Social Contract*" an enemy of society; because the subjects included in the *Social Contract* such as the beauty of politics and value of law are all social values. (Cited from Beauvalon by İsmail Hakkı: p: 11).

Rousseau is criticized not only due to his thoughts about society but also about education. In particular, the educational portrait he draws is asserted to be inapplicable and isolated. However, the main aim of Rousseau is to determine an education system which is completely far away from the society. Moreover, instead of creating a system that could be implemented in a certain group of a society,

Rousseau wants to determine the rules of discipline which do not change depending on time and place. Therefore, his education understanding is the education of not a certain nation or time but that of the whole mankind. For this reason, Rousseau does not tell from which country Emile, who he wants to raise. (Hakkı, 1925: 13).

What is expected from an ideal education understanding is the moral development stage and method of a child. For this reason, it would be appropriate to determine the outline of the discipline understanding of Rousseau. Ismail Hakkı explains Rousseau's understanding of discipline by resembling it as an artwork. Acknowledging philosophical system as a composition and creation like an artwork, Hakkı explains the difference between a philosophical work and an artwork based on the idea that philosophy starts off from ideas, questions and dreams while arts starts off from colours, lines and sounds. Another difference between art and philosophy is the meaning of art is an aesthetical element and goes up to a dream, while a philosophical artwork has an ideal value and is based on concepts. According to Ismail Hakkı, Rousseau's idea of discipline is related to the metaphysics of discipline. (1925: 29).

Briefly, according to Egemen, main differences between pedagogy and discipline are as follows. Pedagogy has a practical aim and is a technology as it has the requirements and instructions necessary for the implementation of discipline and education. It is a theory of education and discipline. (Egemen, 1965: 26). The main question of pedagogy is based on "What should I do?" asked by an educator or a teacher. Therefore, pedagogy regards discipline as a free voluntary job. Discipline is based on laws and it is a pre-determined fact as it pays attention to personal development and inherent skills of a child. Discipline has a conscious and planned influence and power determined by a teacher. Pedagogy, on the other hand, bases all of its skills on arbitrary and coincidental grounds rather than scientific ones. (Egemen, 1965: 27). The system and aim of pedagogy has no relations with historical events and cases and even with society. Although pedagogy uses philosophical or empirical methods, it has not explained the relationships between them.

The main subject of this thesis statement is to analyze the thoughts of Rousseau on education in detail. Considering the pros and cons provided by education model of Rousseau, his education model is discussed. Assuming that there

is a significant connection between society and education, these two concepts are emphasized. The best method to understand education's role in society in a newly established state is to know its purpose and function. Therefore, the first chapter of the thesis discusses the philosophers who design a perfect state model and their books on it. The philosophers whose state theories explained under this section are Plato, Thomas More, Thoma Campanella and Francis Bacon. These names are gathered under the same because their thoughts are called utopia. In other words, whether an ideal education idea is a utopia or not is discussed in line with the doctrines of these four philosophers. In fact, these figures explain the requirement of education for the stability of a state and for social wealth, even though their state theories are utopias. In the second chapter, education idea of Rousseau is discussed. First of all, the reason why a society comes together and the factors which drive people to live together to have a common life for Rousseau are explained. Such an introduction is of great importance to see the place of education in Rousseau's society idea. Briefly, the reason of the transition from an individualist life to a social life and the rules of maintaining the social wealth are discussed. In addition, the content of the education which Rousseau determines in order to raise a good citizen is also explained. Secondly, an explanation is presented about the purpose that Rousseau attributes to education and its function. In this section, knowledge is given on the Rousseau's classification of education and the ideal education method. Thirdly, basic concept of Rousseauian education is discussed. The reason why this subject is being explained is that some concepts in education are not clear and they lead to controversies. Therefore, basic concepts and thoughts in Rousseauian education system are analyzed. The most distinguished concepts are nature and society. Thus, general knowledge is given on these two concepts and emotions.

In the third chapter, the phases and the characteristics of these phases that Rousseau determined for the development of a child are explained. In particular, the subjects such as moral development of a child especially after his physical development, the function of his emotions and transition to social life are emphasized. In the last part, a short summary and evaluation is made. Finally, considering the Rousseauian idea of education, we see he takes the freedom problem of mankind to the field of education. One of the most common thoughts of Rousseau

is the idea that man is good by nature; however he is corrupted by environment and society. One of the philosophers who fight against traditions and society is Friedrich Nietzsche. He talks about the conventionality of people as follows:

When a traveler who had seen many lands and notions and several continents was asked what characteristic he discovered to be common to all of humanity, he replied: "They have a tendency toward laziness." To many it will seem that his reply would have been more accurate and valid if he had said: "They are all fearful. They hide behind customs and opinions." (Nietzsche, 1995:171)

Like Nietzsche, Rousseau also thinks that traditions shape human thoughts; therefore he dreams about an education system far away from society.

CHAPTER 1

EDUCATION SYSTEM IN UTOPIAS

The main characteristic of utopia works is that they are imaginary products; however, utopia is not completely isolated from facts. A utopia author creates an imaginary artwork after analyzing and understanding the real world very well. Considering the criticism of experiences, he asks the question how the things should be. In utopia works, after social reality is subjected to criticism, unfair and unequal practices, oppression and drawbacks of the system in that period are highlighted and the best order is desired to be reached. (Cevizci, 2005: 1682-1683)

Another characteristic of utopia is that it fictionalizes a reasonable society besides creating an imaginary and ideal social order. People are required to attain to a form of rationalism which rejects all kinds of determinism so that such a society could be realized. Man has to remain within the limits of mind but, at the same time, has to surpass the existing institutes in order to find society. (Cevizci, 2005:1683)

In utopia works, there is an impression of a socialist approach rather than an individualist approach. Therefore, personal happiness depends on social happiness. In utopia, rather than eliminating the contradiction between society and individual, there are efforts to build society with competent structures and institutes. In this respect, in products called utopia, the underlying wish is to make individuals happy in the society cutting loose them from different addictions, tyrannies and oppressions. Hence, utopias can be said to have a liberating aspect. Besides, since utopias aim to have happiness, they may bring people into an instrument position in order to take this happiness out. (Cevizci, 2005:1683)

In line with this characteristics of utopia works, in this chapter, thoughts about society and education included in the works known as utopias are explained.

1.1. Plato and *the Republic*

Plato generally talks about how a good state can be established and how an ideal social structure can be created in his book, the *Republic*. Thus, he presents a state model elaborating several subjects. The role and the content of education in the state and social structure he designs are important for us in this book. Therefore, the subjects such as a social order and the regime of a state included in *Republic* are briefly explained and the basically education idea is analyzed.

Plato starts the first parts of his books with a study on what justice is. He seeks for justice in society first and then he argues about what a fair person is by going towards individual. Therefore, what he wants to do at first is to question how justice and injustice arise in the rising of a systematic society. According to Plato (2003:51), the reason why people come together and create a society is that they cannot meet their requirements by themselves. Since people have to ask help from different people for their different needs, it is passed to a common life and therefore a social order is established. Listing the fundamental needs of man as food, housing and clothing, according to Plato, there should be different people to meet these needs in society. Since people are not equal by nature, their tendencies and skills for a task are different as well. Hence, in Plato's social order, a person should be engaged in only one job. As it is not possible to create an introverted society, help may be asked from other states, when necessary, and other states may be provided help as well. The product a society raises should be abundant. Since the abundancy of products lead to an increase in works, society would need more people. After a certain order is established considering the needs of the society and people, it is possible to pass a common life. What Plato points out here indeed is how injustice arises in a systematic society and what the source of war is. After Plato questions what justice is primarily in state structure, he heads towards to look for it in man. Hence, he thinks how a state should be at first and then he explains the necessary virtues for the state. Plato suggests there should be four basic virtues should be in a perfect state such as: temperance, courage, wisdom and justice. Justice is the source of the other three virtues. In Plato's social structure, everybody should do a job suitable for their nature and should not be engaged in another job. Plato divides the state into three categories such as traders, auxiliaries and counselors. Moreover, he thinks that man has

similarly three aspects such as rationale, concupiscent and passion. As long as each class only deals with their own tasks in a state, justice and wealth can be sustained in society. Therefore, these three principles such as rationale, concupiscent and passion should perform only their tasks so that a person can be fair.

According to Plato, the reason of a war and a chaos is property. In other words, hunger for having more properties than other people leads to a war among people. Hence, in state, there is a need for guardians who ensure the wealth of the society. The main characteristic of these guardians is that they know the martial arts very well, they are quick and strong and they are philosophers. The reason why Plato seeks for the qualification of being a philosopher in people who protect the country is that he is keen on the passion for knowing and learning. Hence, they would not have any difficulty in distinguishing who is an enemy, who is a friend. At this point what should be requested for Plato is how these guardians should be educated. This research also explains how justice and injustice arises in a society.

Plato thinks that education should begin with music at first. While music is necessary for the education of soul, gymnastics is necessary for body and it comes second in education. Literature is also included in musical education. Literature is divided into two groups as real and fictional. Since children are told tales before learning gymnastics, the content of these tales are of great importance. If those tales are good, children should be told and if they have a bad side, they should not be told as their soul should be kept away from bad thoughts because they tend to have all kinds of characteristics at an early age. The tales which Plato criticizes are the ones by Homer and Hesiod. As Hesiod tells in his books that Gods fight against each other, a God takes revenge from his father and, tricks and cheats between Gods, children learn bad behaviours from these tales at an early age. Children to be raised as guardians should know that there is no grudge and hate between citizens. Therefore, they should be told tales which teach goodness to them. Since the souls of children are strengthened by music in musical education, when they encounter a bad case or behavior, they would not be affected immediately. Music should be in harmony with lyrics and sounds. There should not be any defects that would ruin the human nature in its lyrics. Briefly, Plato thinks that in the primary education of a child, he should be protected from mistakes of a society. In Plato's state system,

since guardians cannot be property owners, everything including women and children are in common among them. One of the different ideas of Plato is that women can work as guardians. Therefore, people who are responsible for protecting the state have to get married among each other. The education given to women should be equal to that of given to men. First of all, women prone to this position by nature are selected. Then, they are taught lessons including music and gymnastics. Finally, the education required by the job is provided. So that guardians protect the laws and the institutes of the society.

Plato points out a distinction by God between people who are governing the state and the guardians of the state. Although both of them are a part of the society, he says God creates those people as golden in order to determine the main ruler. Those who help the ruler are created as silver, while farmers and other workers are made from iron and bronze. Hence, Plato accepts that there are some differences among people by nature. Moreover, the guardians of the state should not be property owners as they should not make efforts to enlarge their lands and to increase their wealth, they should only think about how the state could be protected well.

The guardians of the state should enable the education to continue without being corrupted. As can be remembered, the basis of the education system of Plato is on music and gymnastics. The content of these courses should be determined in a way to teach benevolence to children. Therefore, the tales told to children are as important as their games. Children's games should not have any elements that would lead them to cheat and to disobey the rules. In addition, they should be taught some moral rules such as being respectful to elderly and being conventional about clothes.

Guardians are in charge of protecting laws and social order. However, main problems are the questions "who is going to govern the state?" and "who is going to make laws?" Plato solves this problem by making the philosopher a king at the same time. The person who is to be a philosopher is the one who can patiently go after knowledge. However, anybody cannot be a philosopher. Therefore, those who receive a certain education can be interested in philosophy. Hence, Plato thinks that guardians can be philosophers the best. Guardians are directed to science studies after a hard physical education. Those who sustain these studies patiently and with a

passion to learn become philosophers. Those who are to be philosophers are raised by going through a mentally and physically hard education.

Plato thinks that guardians should be both aggressive and mild-mannered. Their aggressive nature would help them fight fearlessly in case of an attack or any disorder in the society. However, those people should have a mild character at the same time so that they could help people and they are not merciless against citizens. Plato resembles this situation to the behaviours of a well trained dog: “Well, you can find them in a number of animals, but especially in the one we compared with our guardian. You are aware, presumably, that it is the natural disposition of pure-bred dogs to be as gentle as possible to those they know and recognize, and the exact opposite to those they don't know” (2003: 59). According to Karl Popper, the basis of this approach of Plato is the desire to determine the necessary conditions for maintaining the state consistently. In addition, Popper bases Plato’s idea of education on this thought. (Popper, 2008, 53). According to him, the aim of Plato’s education is to protect the stability of the state ensuring these two characteristics to be balanced in rulers. In brief, education for Plato has a political purpose. (Popper, 2008:53)

Plato thinks that education should begin with music and gymnastics so that guardians can be both aggressive and mild-mannered. While soul is educated by music, body is educated by gymnastics. According to him, philosophers have the nature to protect these characteristics in harmony. Undoubtedly, one of the most criticized ideas of Plato is that the person to govern the state should be a philosopher. Popper states that his idea can be assessed from two different activity perspectives: education and eugenic production. According to him, the reason why Plato gives importance to philosophical education has political basis. In short, Plato wants rulers to be philosophers as he wants to increase their authority. However, not everybody is inclined to being a philosopher. This is because those who are to be philosophers are different from regular people as they take a share from holy things. (Popper, 2008: 156). Popper explains the political duty of philosophical education saying that Platonic wisdom is necessary to establish a permanent political class. “It puts a mark on the rulers, and it establishes a barrier between the rulers and the ruled.” (Popper, 2008:157)

1.2. Thomas More and *Utopia*

Thomas More talks about the structure of a perfect state system considering the political and social problems of the time in his work, *Utopia*. The book includes the dialogues between Giles, Raphael and More and Raphael tells the social, political and physical of the Utopia Island he visited. Therefore, More bases the fiction of an ideal state system on the narration of Raphael. The key feature of a state system and social structure More designs is to ensure the happiness of citizens. More explains this feature and the purpose as follows:

In the institution of that commonwealth, this end only is aimed at and minded, that whatever time may possibly be spared from the necessary occupations and affairs of the commonwealth, all that, the citizens should withdraw from manual labor and apply to the free liberty of the mind, and to cultivating the same. For herein they suppose the felicity of this life to consist. (More, 1947: 90)

First of all, the geographical location and the shape of the island are described and then knowledge about daily life and social relations is given. The key feature of the island is that it is in the shape of a new moon and it has a gulf. Since the gulf looks like a large lake, the water is calm and therefore, there are many ports in the island and the people can easily carry out their tasks thanks to these ports.

In Utopia Island, there are fifty four towns which have the same language, traditions, institutes and laws. Since each town is built the same, they all look like each other. As the capital of the island is Amourot, all the issues are discussed here. The common problems of the island are discussed in a meeting in Amourot where three citizens, who are the eldest and the most experienced in public works come to each year. While More is introducing the towns in the island, he selects Amourot. However, since all the towns look like each other, the identification of one town gives us knowledge about the other towns, too. What is distinguished in this town is that it is the capital of the island and therefore the representatives coming from the other towns gather here. More defines how all the other towns in the island are by identifying Amourot town. The most distinguished feature of towns is that they do not have any personal ownership, which is firstly proven by the fact that they change their houses by lot every ten years. Another feature is that everybody knows

agriculture as a trade. Agriculture is taught by the education given in lands in both schools and in cities since childhood. Everybody should be taught a second trade which would fit into themselves besides agriculture and this second craft field should be determined according to the skills and personality of people. While women can select easy jobs due to their delicate structures, men deal with heavier jobs. In Utopia Island, days consist of twenty four hours and only six hours of this time are allocated for working. People in Utopia spend their days working three hours in the morning, having lunch, having rest three hours after the lunch and working again three hours. Moreover, anybody can be busy with a task they want to do during the time remaining from eight-hour sleeping; however, this task should be based on a mental activity, which means free time cannot be spent being lazy and without doing anything. More tells that people are engaged in free arts in their free times and they are given lectures everyday in the Utopia Island. While those who want to receive education about free arts can attend those classes, those who want to deal with their own tasks can be engaged with their own tasks. According to Thomas More, since the minds of those people are not suitable for thinking over any sciences, they are engaged in public works.

More tells that an hour after the dinner is allocated for diversion in the Utopia Island. Since they do not know about the games such as dice rolling, they spend this one hour with music or discourse. Moreover, they know two kinds of games which are based on numbers and which discuss evil and virtue in a war front. More explains that this game is the one regarding how wickedness which has a contradiction in itself comes together against virtue. This game, on the other hand, explains which wickedness is against which virtue, how virtues should defend themselves in order to defeat wickedness, the methods applied by virtues to keep away from wickedness and the paths used for victories by both of them.

As the basic trade is agriculture in Utopia Island, agriculture is the first task that should be primarily taught. However, More enables those who would like to be engaged in science to be engaged only in science being exempt them from such kind of works. If those people fail in science-based education, then they have to go back to working life.

Since More contemplates that each town is comprised of a family, in the town model he designs, there are many families which have blood-relations with each other. According to him, since all kinds of products are abundantly produced in the Island, everybody can easily buy whatever they want. The eldest of the family buys what he/she needs without paying any money and without bartering. Therefore, pointing out the abundancy of production, More eliminates two problems that could be encountered in daily life. Firstly, it is prevented to buy more than you need and therefore there is no competition in order to meet their needs among people. Secondly, nobody wants to have anything they do not need as there will not be any period of famine since they always produce. In short, More keeps the sense of competition and lack away from the society. Besides, he contemplates that the Utopian people are not arrogant, though they have everything.

Another aspect which takes attention in this social life designed by More is that slaughtering animals is carried out by slaves. Citizens never slaughter animals and take them to bazaars since this habit harms the sense of pity in human nature, as thought by More.

In towns, all dinners and lunches are had in the dining halls in neighborhoods and both meals start with reading a moral text. The elderly people who have a prestigious place in society make long and non-boring explanations about this text to those they have dinner with. In villages, everybody has dinner at home and what they eat does not differ from what people in cities eat.

Thomas More establishes social order on an ideal system that everything is equal. However, what basically interests us is the place of education in the society. As briefly explained before, More assumes that people are engaged with a mental task or they attend the courses given depending on their inclinations during the time remaining from the activities such as working, eating and sleeping in Utopia Island. Although all children receive a good education, those who are gifted, intelligent and prone to science do not work in cities and they continue their education. Since mother tongue is rich in vocabulary, it is nice to pronounce and it provides convenience in expressing ideas, learning is provided in mother tongue. According to More, although Utopians do not know the names of famous philosophers and doctrines, they have knowledge about music, logic, arithmetic and geometry.

Another field in which people have knowledge is the movements of stars and celestial bodies. Thanks to the devices they invent, they could calculate the movements of the sun and other stars. Based on their knowledge on stars, they are not engaged in unnecessary works such as prophecy. Moreover, they can foresee the nature making observations, which means they can predict rain, wind and other changes.

To sum up, since More who is looking for a perfect state structure cannot base their ideas on a real and definite ground, his doctrine has been accepted as a utopia. Although Plato's work titled *Republic* is accepted as a utopia, it has some common and contrary ideas with More. Their primary common point is that both of them desire for an ideal state and social structure and they give place to education in social life. The content of education is definitely clear in Plato. Since his education is comprised of the education of soul and body, music education and gymnastics come to the forefront. For More, education should be given equally to all children and those who are intelligent should continue their education if they desire. While Plato forbids private property for only rulers, More completely eliminates it, which means nobody would have private property. More sees private education and determining the value of everything by money and dealing as an obstacle before good administration. For social wealth, property should be equally distributed. Thinking that everybody should have a job in society, More acknowledges that the best craft everybody knows is agriculture. Another distinctive point is directed to the concept of family. While Plato ignores family, More emphasizes it and makes the eldest member of the family gain a prestigious place in family assuming that each town is comprised of a family.

1.3. Tommaso Campanella and *the City of the Sun*

One of the philosophers whose social structure is accepted as utopia is Campanella. He expresses his ideas upon the perfect structure of the state and society with the dialogues of Grandmaster of the Knights Hospitalarius and Genoese Sea-Captain in his work entitled "*The City of the Sun*". The main difference of social structure idea designed by Campanella from the idea of More is that education is attached more importance and the state and social life are shaped on the basis of astronomy. In this chapter, merely the role of education in the state system designed by Campanella will be analyzed.

The prime ruler in *the City of the Sun* is the priest who is called as Hoh. Campanella call this person as Metaphysic. The main authority of this ruler is to get the last word in the social issues and juridical cases. Besides, he controls the secular and spiritual works. There are three assistants who have the same authority with the priest. Their names are Pon, Sin and Mor which mean Power, Wisdom and Love respectively. Each assistant is responsible for a different area. Power is responsible for war and peace and he has a say in soldiery and war. Wisdom is in charge of free and mechanical arts and all the sciences, the trainers of these disciplines, scholars and students.

There are officials in *the City of the Sun* who are called as Astrologus, Cosmologist Cosmographus, Geometra, Historiographus, Poeta, Logicus, Rhetor, Grammaticus, Medicus, Physiologus, Politucus and Moralis, and all the officials have a single book Wisdom, which encapsulates all the sciences. Another task of the Wisdom is to ensure that all the walls of the city are decorated with pictures and to make pictures of all the sciences drawn. A teacher explains these pictures to children and makes them informed about this science. In this way, children learn only history of these sciences until they are ten years old. The third executive, Love, is responsible for controlling propagation so that a flawless generation goes on. Love is also in charge of some fields such as education of these children, medical science, feeding and propagation and men and women trainers in these fields. Although Metaphysic, Power, Wisdom and Love are responsible for regulating the social

structure of the country, Metaphysic has more responsibilities, and the others have to behave according to his decisions.

There is no private ownership in Tommaso Campanella's state; because private ownership causes a selfish love in his opinion. The love which needs to exist is the love of society indeed. Moreover, everything, even the women are shared in the society. There will be no rivalry among people to get something, for everything is shared. As people love their homeland everybody does their part in the best way.

When the administrators are elected, their life styles play an important role. Men and women wear clothes proper to war and their clothes are nearly identical. The clothes of women are under their knee and clothes of men are upon their knee. Both the man and woman begin to undergo training in art disciplines as from they are one year old and learn their language when they are nearly three. Then these children are grouped into four, and there is an old person in each group. The old people are trainers and leaders of the children.

Upon children are trained in sports such as gymnasium and running which empower their muscles until they are seven, they are directed to the art discipline in which they have ability. The children's ability are measured in ateliers like cookery, forging and picture drawing in order to determine which discipline they are prone to. Lessons last for four hours, and each group takes different lessons. While a group takes physical education lesson another one takes lessons on public affairs and the other group studies reading. Therefore, four groups will have taken all the lessons at the end of four hours. Then, education of harder lessons such as math and medical sciences begins. Logical assumption and word play methods are used during their education. When the individuals specialize in a science field or mechanical art, they are accepted as a trainer in that field.

Metaphysic is the hardest in terms of administration among Metaphysic, Power, Wisdom and Love. The person who wants to have authority in this field has to know histories of nations, laws, conventions and regimes of them. He also must be informed about mechanical arts, natural sciences, astrology and math. The essential subject which he has to know is the knowledge in the fields of metaphysic and theology. Campanella explains why a metaphysician must be like this in this way:

For that one cannot know so many arts and sciences thoroughly, who is not esteemed for skilled ingenuity, very apt at all things, and therefore at ruling especially. This also is plain to us that he who knows only one science, does not really know either that or the others, and he who is suited for only one science and has gathered his knowledge from books, is unlearned and unskilled. But this is not the case with intellects prompt and expert in every branch of knowledge and suitable for the consideration of natural objects, as it is necessary that our Hoh should be. (Campanella, 2009: 23)

Although training a metaphysician is hard, the general education given to children is easier. The trainers are chosen according to the sex of the child. If the child is a girl she is given to a mistress, and if the child is a boy he is given to a master. The education of children comprises of learning the alphabet, drawing pictures, sports like running and walking, and getting knowledge about historical persons and events in the pictures drawn on the walls. After they are six, the education of mechanical sciences starts after they are educated on natural sciences. If the child is not skilful or intelligent he/she is sent to the farm. After he/she succeed in any art discipline the child is taken to the city again.

Everybody has a different task in *the City of the Sun*, professions and works are shared among the people. Everybody works for four hours, and most of the remaining time is spared for learning. People read, discuss, tell to each other, write and make intellectual exercises among themselves. Apart from this, activities like jogging and physical education are also significant for them.

1.4. Francis Bacon and *the New Atlantis*

New Atlantis is Bacon's book, in which he expresses his ideas on the foundations of a perfect society, and it is also the book which he has not completed. In fact, the main characteristic of the book is its featuring the nature and technique. The State is founded in an island called Bensalem, and the most precious institute is the place called Salomon's House. Every kind of scientific activity is executed here. Bacon emphasizes family in the social life. He doesn't exclude the family as an institute like Plato or Campanella. An important characteristic of the island people is that they know most of the languages spoken in the Europe. Also, they travel once in twelve years so as to learn about developments, inventions, geographical and historical characteristics of the other countries. They use the knowledge they get from these travels to develop it and produce new things and make new inventions. In the state model designed by Bacon, the human being must have control over the nature, and can use it as he wishes to satisfy his needs. Salomon's House has been constructed with this aim. Its each chamber is separated for different scientific works.¹ Bacon explains the aim of founding this house in this way: "The end of our foundation is the knowledge of causes, and secret motions of things; and the enlarging of the bounds of human empire, to the effecting of all things possible." (Bacon, 2009: 51).

One of the constructions used for scientific aim is the high towers. These towers are used for sunning, cooling and saving purposes. They are also used to observe different weather conditions and estimate the nature events such as wind, snow and sleet. Spacey homes are constructed in order to perform events similar to nature events, and artificial rain fall, thunder, lightning and flash are generated in these houses. Moreover, some animals like frogs and flies are propagated in these places. Air is used in different ways for the therapy of different patients in the chambers called as health chambers. There are different types of broad gardens in the island, and some fruits are produced artificially before or after their natural times on the trees in these gardens. At the same time, procedures such as growing, shrinking

¹ For a confirmation of this idea, see pp. 51-63.

and producing buds and fruits of the trees are conducted in the desired way and the different way from the natural one. There are different lights in the perspective houses, and different colors are produced here. There are materials regarded to geometry and astronomy in the mathematical house. Cheating, forgery and deceptiveness are detected in the houses of deceits of the senses.

The people who are responsible for going to other countries by ships, following all the developments there and buying books and materials for their country are given the name Merchants of Light by Bacon. These people are called Depredators, Mystery-men, Pioneers or Miners, Compilers, Dowry-men or Benefactors, Lamps, Inoculators and Interpreters of Nature among themselves. Depredators are in charge of compiling the experiments in the books. Mystery-men are both responsible for collecting the experiments conducted in the fields mechanical arts and liberal sciences and they compile the knowledge of the things other than the art. Pioneers make studies on the experiments which they believe that will be useful for them. Compilers categorize the experiments done by pioneers into titles, and make them comprehended better. Dowry-men control the experiments and determine their benefits for human life and daily life. The duty of the group which is called Lamps is to control the experiments done after the meeting into which every group has participated and after the discussions of ideas, and decide for the new experiments. Inoculators are responsible for applying and executing the experiments which are decided to be done, and informing the authoritarians about the results. Interpreters of Nature make explanation by degrading the experiments which are first discovered in the nature to experiences and proposals again with bigger observations.

To sum up, To sum up, four utopia creations are given place in this study because of the educational ideas they contain. In a way, the question of “is perfect education an utopia?” was tried to be explained. These four books have common features with Rousseau’s ideas about society, education and ethics. Plato explains the method to train a good administrator and person with education. Private property is alienated in utopias. Rousseau, too, does not give value to private property and does not want Emile to have too much private property. Bacon allocated a wide space for science in ideal society. He expresses the benefits of science for society and dreams of having command of science and nature. For Rousseau, the biggest mistake of

human is hidden in this idea. Although nature gave humans everything they need, humans damaged the nature. This damage is given with the advancement of sciences. Bacon expresses the benefits of sciences for society but Rousseau analyses the results obtained from the development of sciences and arts. According to him, nature wants to protect humans from science. Each knowledge which is not given by nature to human is to protect him from evil. As the scientific knowledge is harmful, obtaining it is a demanding work. (Rousseau, 1964: 47). These are all gifts of nature to humanity. But human needs science because of the badness he made to himself.

In Rousseau's mind, science is a product of genius and reason. (Rousseau, 1997:63). In arts such as literature, artist wants to be admired. If a person wants to be admired, he will become someone who only thinks of himself. Therefore Rousseau thinks this question deserves to be explored.

The question of whether it would be advantageous for men to have science bears examination, even assuming that what they call by that name does indeed deserve it: but it is folly to pretend that the chimeras of Philosophy, the errors and the lies of the philosophers can be good for anything. Shall we forever be deceived by words? And shall we never understand that studies knowledge, learning and philosophy are but empty shams conjured up by men's pride and altogether unworthy of the pompous names which it gives them? (Rousseau, 1997: 64-65)

Rousseau's idea which says science and arts make human bad opens the door of two problems. Firstly, if people are naturally bad, do benefits and harms of sciences increase or decrease? A human who is bad because of his nature may use sciences for evil purposes. Secondly, if human is naturally good, can't he use science and arts for good things? Rousseau is pessimistic about this subject. Firstly, let us accept human as naturally bad. In this situation, although sciences provide benefits for science and humanity, it is clear that they will give harm after a while. In Rousseau's opinion, a bad human uses the things he has, to do evil things. This is like giving a weapon to a madman. (Rousseau, 1997: 69). If human is naturally bad, he will develop sciences for doing evil things. Secondly, if man is naturally good, this does not include the proof to show that sciences are beneficial. Rousseau believes that each situation which impels human to work with science also starts corruption. Besides, sciences

accelerate this process.² (Rousseau,1997: 70-71). Therefore the only thing Rousseau shall do to make this subject understandable is finding the source of sciences. According to him, “Hence the sciences do not arise from our vices. Hence the sciences arise from our vices. They are therefore not all born of human pride.” (Rousseau, 1997: 84). Rousseau’s these ideas reflect to his education understanding. Rousseau does not teach much scientific knowledge to child. Instead of this, he wants to teach being true first, then being temperate, and then being courageous. As the result, child will learn to become virtuous. (Rousseau, 1997: 83). Also Rousseau thinks that people’s need shall not be increased. Increase of needs causes competition. This damages social prosperity. Rousseau’s this idea shows similarities with the ideas of Plato, More and Campanella. They put forward the idea that every kind of need shall be met easily in the society. Shortly, society must not have deprivation and a related competition.

In utopia creations, subjects of the government, the society and politics are given place. These subjects can also be found in political philosophy of Rousseau. But Rousseau’s ideas cannot be regarded as an utopia. But why? Its reason is the consistency of theory and practice in ideas which are put forward. Some of Rousseau’s ideas show similarities with the ideas of utopia writers. For instance, “Like Plato, Rousseau always believed that a just society was one in which everyone was in his right place.” (Duignan, 2010: 188). But generally, the applicability of the ideas in utopia creations have low possibility. But although it is for an utopia, education is found necessary for society, which is remarkable. Therefore study includes four main creations. In the next part Rousseau’s ideas about society and education will be examined.

² See footnotes of page 70-71 for detailed knowledge.

CHAPTER 2

ROUSSEAU'S EDUCATIONAL MODEL

2.1. Social Order and Citizenship Education

Rousseau's ideas on social and political structure are fundamentally found in his works titled *Social Contract*, and *The Government of Poland* in which he finds solutions to the problems of Polish government. Although the issues such as the social compact, government, law and the people are dwelled on for the most part in his work titled *Social Contract*; the issues of law, government, economy, citizenship education come to the forefront in his work titled *The Government of Poland*. In this part, after explaining Rousseau's ideas on social structure and political formation; his ideas on citizenship education determined by laws are mentioned. In fact, the main book in which Rousseau's ideas on education are presented is *Emile*, in which an individual education is explained. Nevertheless, Rousseau suggests ideas regarding how a child should be raised for the state in the last chapters of the book. For this reason, it is necessary to resort to *Emile* when assessing Rousseau's ideas on citizenship. In this part, Rousseau's thoughts suggesting how social structure is formed is explained at first; then his idea of education is discussed.

The reason behind Rousseau's writing the book titled *Social Contract* is to research whether there are legitimate and reliable governance rules in the social order or not. (Rousseau, 1978a: 46). Although man lives alone in primitive state, he starts to establish social structures as his needs increase. Rousseau expresses in his work titled *On the Origin and Foundations of Inequality among Men* that men learned to build houses as their mental skills increased, and thus the foundations of both family and personal property were laid. In *Social Contract*, he defines family as the oldest and only natural society. (1978a:47). Children depend on father until they can meet the needs of being looked after and being protected on their own. If the needs of children are removed, the natural bond will also be removed. As a result, while children become free of the responsibility of not acting against the advices of father, father also become free of his duty of taking care of children. If they continue to stay together, a contract will be formed between them for the continuation of the family.

As for Rousseau, this common freedom is based on human nature, because the first law of man is self preservation. (Rousseau, 1978: 47)

Rousseau accepts family as the first example of political society and assumes father as the administrator and children as the people. Since everyone is born as free men, freedom can only be abandoned for the sake of interests. Comparing the way of constituting the state with the way of constituting family, Rousseau explains the difference between family and state as follows: “The entire difference is that in the family, the father’s love for his children rewards him for the care he provides; whereas in the State, the pleasure of commanding substitutes for this love, which the leader does not have for his people.” (1978:47).

In social order, someone who will provide the maintenance of this order is needed. The most powerful man in the society can maintain this order; however, Rousseau thinks that in order for the most powerful man to continue being the master he should turn power into right and turn obedience into duty. The point that should be taken into consideration here is that the most powerful is not always deemed as right. If the most powerful is always accepted as right, everyone will strive for being the most powerful. Rousseau is of the opinion that the word “right” should not add anything to the word “power”. According to Rousseau, if the expression of “obey those in power” means that people should obey the power, this expression is null and void. (1978:52). He explains the reason behind this with two examples. First, although all power comes from the God, diseases also come from him. In this case, it would be forbidden for a person with a disease to call a doctor, because he would oppose power and this is a ridiculous condition. In the second example, Rousseau asks whether we give our purse to the robber we come across while walking in the jungle just because we have to, or there is a meaning in giving our purse to the robber anyway even if we have the chance to save our purse or not. The underlying reason in Rousseau’s thinking is that he sees the gun in the hand of the robber as power and wants to draw the lines of submission to power. As a result, force does not form right and for this reason, man should only submit to the legitimate authority and the basis of this legitimate authority is only contracts. (Rousseau, 1978: 49)

In social contract, each individual should dedicate all of his rights and himself to community. In this condition, everyone is equal and the conditions are the same

for everyone. For this reason, turning the tables on somebody else about any right or condition does not provide any benefit. Rousseau summarizes the social compact as follows: “Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will; and in a body we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole.” (1978:53). Rousseau who finds an individual’s giving himself for free nonsense accepts that even if everyone assigns their own rights to someone else, the rights of children cannot be assigned. According to him, since children are born free and human, their freedom belongs to themselves and no one else has the right to use their freedom. Father should protect his children and present them a good life until they reach a certain age in which they can act reasonably. However, he cannot assign them to someone else. Likewise, Rousseau lays down a condition suggesting that all the people should have the competence of accepting or not accepting a form of government in question in order for an arbitrary regime to become the legitimate regime. This is the condition which prevents government from being arbitrary.

In social contract, nothing should lose its freedom, and also everything should be in safe. Rousseau reduces the conditions of the contract to one item:

Properly understood, all of these clauses come down to a single one, namely the total alienation of each associate, with all his rights, to the whole community. For first of all, since each one gives his entire self, the condition is equal for everyone, and since the condition is equal for everyone, no one has an interest in making it burdensome for the others. (1978: 53)

Since all individuals come together and choose a sovereign power, it comprises of the individuals forming it; and for this reason, it does not include any interest which is against their interests. This is because sovereign power does not necessarily assure its nationals. (Rousseau, 1978: 55). If sovereign power cannot provide welfare of its nationals, the individuals forming it have the right to not to keep their words. According to Rousseau, “Indeed, each individual can, as a man, have a private will contrary to or differing from the general will he has as a citizen.” (1978: 55). If there is someone opposing general will, the whole society will pressure him to fulfill his duty; however, Rousseau interprets this pressure as “he will be forced to be free.”

(1978: 55). For, this order is an application that attaches each citizen to his country and saves him from any kinds of personal dependency.

Society puts pressure on a person who has no respect for general will. Shortly this means “he will be forced to be free”. (Rousseau, 1978a:55). But in this situation, these questions must be asked to Rousseau, about the general will: “Is one free insofar as one depends on the general will? Is one free if one must be forced to recognize and adhere to the general will? (Gauthier, 2006: 57).

Although general will is indispensable for Rousseau, we cannot talk about the freedom of a person who is forced to follow it. Rousseau believes that freedom is born with general will. But being “forced to be free” turns into a kind of slavery. (Gauthier, 2006: 57). Power of society is dominant over general will. Power of society protects people and ensures their survival. But a person, who objects to general will, evaluates this as alien power. In this situation what Rousseau shall do is, explaining the difference between the state of nature and the civil state. In that way, he points to idea that people gain some values with transition to civil state:

This passage from the state of nature to the civil state produces a remarkable change in man, by substituting justice for instinct in his behaviour and giving his actions the morality they previously lacked. Only then, when the voice of duty replaces physical impulse and right replaces appetite, does man, who until that time only considered himself, find himself forced to act upon other principles and to consult his reason before heeding his inclinations. (Rousseau, 1978a: 55-56)

Rousseau points out that although man acquires some kinds of values by means of social contract, there are some kinds of values they lose. Firstly, man has lost their natural freedom and unlimited rights on the things they can have as a result of social contract. In addition, they have acquired civil freedom and the right to really possess what they have. Rousseau suggests that the basic contract does not eliminate natural equality, but just introduces ethical and legitimate equality. Whereas, nature creates physical inequality between people and they differentiate in terms of power and intelligence. Nevertheless, Rousseau believes that people have become equal by means of the contract. We can define the human between nature state and civil state like this:

In the state of nature each individual has only his own desires as a basis for action. Without a standard for judging these desires, he is their slave rather than their master. He has no real will of his own. But in the civil state, an individual has at least the opportunity to identify with a will that rests on interest that he shares with his fellows, thereby providing him with a standard for judging his own desires. (Gauthier, 2006: 57-58)

According to Rousseau, only general will can make the powers of the state appropriate for common interest; because, the conflict between special interests provides a basis for the constitution of societies and coming together in a common ground in relation to the interests makes it possible. The reason behind the formation of social bonds is different interests' which come together. If there had not been a common value on which all interests agree, the formation of societies would not have been expected. For this reason, Rousseau is of the opinion that society should be governed by taking the common interest into account. (1978: 59). For Rousseau "... sovereignty, being only the exercise of the general will, can never be alienated, and that the sovereign, which is only a collective being, can only be represented by itself." (1978: 59). In order for general will to function in a perfect way, there should be different alliances within the scope of state and each citizen can express his own ideas. The sovereign power is a collective circumstance. Each citizen has to fulfill his duty and meet the demands of the sovereign power. However, the sovereign power cannot pressure them to carry out anything which is not for the benefit of them. In social contract, it is expected that general will should be correct and everyone should want happiness for others. Since all individuals include themselves in the concept of everyone and think about themselves while voting for everyone, the concept of justice depends on man's seeing himself superior. Rousseau regards man's seeing himself superior as a part of his nature. In order for general will to be applied to everyone equally, it should not be considered as "individually"; that is to say, it should not have an individual aspect and a certain objective.

Rousseau seeks the condition of will's being general in the relationship based on interest that forms votes. While constituting general will, everyone has to obey the rules or the conditions which they want another person to obey. Since social contract provides a perfect equality among citizens, everyone has to keep their words and everyone should benefit from the same rights. Rousseau thinks that the general will

express by him as the activity of sovereignty brings an equal obligation among citizens. This act of sovereignty; “It is not a convention between a superior and an inferior, but a convention between the body and each of its members. A convention that is legitimate because it has the social as a basis; equitable, because it is common to all; useful, because it can have no other object than the general good; and solid, because it has the public force and the supreme power as guarantee.” (Rousseau, 1978: 63). Individuals cannot be put under the command of anyone until they abide by this kind of contracts. Thus, Rousseau draws the limits of the sovereign power; because, the sovereign power cannot go beyond the limits of the general contracts even if sacred or untouchable. In addition, the sovereign power cannot discriminate among nationals, and cannot give more rights to someone. The occurrence of such a situation would damage its’ reliability and power.

Rousseau explains that political society gains existence and life by means of social contract. He claims that legislation should exist in order to give momentum and objectives to political society. According to Rousseau, the objective of laws is general and it means that laws take citizens as a whole and their actions concretely into consideration. (1978: 66). Rousseau determines that a man cannot be evaluated as an individual and an action cannot be evaluated as special in law. In law, no privilege can be given under the name of anyone, yet it can be accepted that the privilege may exist. Although law allows the existence of class discrimination in society, it cannot express an opinion about who is to be included in which class. Succession system or kingdom can be founded by means of law, yet laws do not allow choosing a king or royal family. Rousseau explains the content of law as “In short, any function that relates to an individual object does not belong to the legislative power.” (1978: 66). Since Rousseau accepts that laws depend on general will, the ruler cannot be superior to the laws. This is because the ruler is also one of the people of the state. Since laws are determined with the common will of everyone, they are fair. For this reason, no one wants to be the first one being treated unfairly.

The interest of all society should be taken into consideration in legislation and this interest has two fundamental objectives: one of them is freedom and the other one is equality. “Freedom because all private dependence is that much force

subtracted from the body of the State; equality because freedom cannot last without it.” (Rousseau, 1978: 75).

Rousseau determines the content of laws in this way; however, the main problem is who will apply the laws and who will be the executer of the laws. After this point, Rousseau researches government.

There are two reasons behind each free action, one of them being moral and the other one being physical. While the moral side of an action is the will that determines the action, physical side of an action is the power that executes the action. Rousseau explains the relationship between these two reasons as follows: “When I walk toward an object, I must first want to go there, and in the second place my feet must take me there.” (1978: 78). On the condition that a paralyzed man wants to run and a not paralyzed man does not want to run, they both cannot move and they stay where they are. Applying this situation for political society, Rousseau determines the power valid in this area as legislative power and the power as executive power.

Legislative power is under the control of the people; however, what is important is who has the executive power. Rousseau vests this power to government and defines government as follows: “An intermediate body established between the subjects and the sovereign for their mutual communication, and charged with the execution of the laws and the maintenance of civil as well as political freedom.” (1978: 78). Government is, in short, the application of the power of execution in a legitimate way. The ruler or the official is the person or the society who is / are responsible for the power of execution.

The distinction which is distinguished among the ones made by Rousseau is the one between state and government. According to this distinction, while state exists by itself, government comes into being with sovereign power. This explains the fact that the sovereign power of a ruler is not / cannot be anything else from general will; that is to say, the law. The power of the ruler is public power and if he carries out any application by himself, the relationships among the integrity will be vanished. The ruler should not have a more effective will other than that of sovereign power in order for social integrity and political society not to be separated.

Expressing that political society dies as soon as it is born like human body, Rousseau seeks the underlying reason in society again. Stating that “The constitution

of man is the work of nature; that of the State is a work of art.” Rousseau is of the opinion that prolonging a man’s life is not in the hands of himself; however, state’s having a long life depends on man. (1978: 99). According to Rousseau, the best state will be destroyed; however what is important is to prevent a timeless destruction as a result of an unexpected event. (1978: 99).

Rousseau who thinks that “The principle of political life lies in the sovereign authority” describes legislative power as the heart of a state while describing the power of execution as the brain of the state. (1978: 99). People can survive even if the brain does not function; that is to say, a man can live even if he is an idiot. However, when the heart of a man stops, the life is over. For this reason, when legislative power cannot function, the state will collapse. Laws do not bring the state into existence; however, it is the legislative power that keeps the state alive. Regarding all of these, Rousseau is of the opinion that laws should have a place in the hearts of citizens, and country and laws should be endeared to the citizens. In this respect, considering Rousseau’s book titled *The Government of Poland* in which he expressed his opinions about Polish Government, we can understand why a country can split and what can be done in order to protect it. Rousseau gives prominence to laws and legislative power about this issue; however, he does not ignore the function of education and suggests that the feeling of patriotism can be acquired by means of education.

According to Rousseau, regarding law above man is the problem of politics. (1985: 3). In an ideal administration system, laws should have a place in the hearts of citizens. Thinking that as long as there is no place for legislative power in the hearts of citizens, it would be ineffective; Rousseau researches how laws can occupy a place in hearts. The main thing carried out by law-makers when the laws are in question is power and punishment. However, what should be done is to endear country and laws to citizens.

As mentioned before, Rousseau distinguishes between natural human and human in civil state. Therefore Rousseau wants to educate a child in a corrupted society or a in civil state. But this child needs to be trained with an education in compliance with nature. Nevertheless Rousseau mentions about a person with influential power in society: The Legislator. In this situation child meets with the

rules of two people: The Legislator and the Tutor. The legislator is needed in society because of this:

The general will always right, but the judgment that guides it is not always enlightened. It must be made to see objects as they are, or sometimes as they should appear to be; shown the good path it seeks; safe guarded against the seduction of private wills; shown how to assimilate considerations of time and place; taught to weigh the danger of remote, hidden ills. (Rousseau, 1978a: 67)

According to Rousseau, private individuals can refuse a good thing although they see it. Public wants the good thing but cannot see it. Therefore, individuals and people need guides. (Rousseau, 1978a: 67). Individual and people shall have compromise between each other. What is required to achieve this: “The former must be obligated to make their wills conform to their reason. The latter must be taught to know what it wants.” (Rousseau, 1978a: 67). Rousseau searches for the foundation of public enlightenment here. The things anticipated for both sides, the understanding and the wills, are united. In that way everyone supports each other. Therefore legislator is needed. (Rousseau, 1978a: 67). Society needs the legislator and educator at the same time. But each of them has different functions.

Just as the tutor must understand what is to be a natural man in a world in which men have lost their original nature, so the legislator must understand what it is to be a citizen in a world in which there are only masters and slaves. Rousseau never explains how either can exist. (Gauthier, 2006: 60)

Gauthier thinks this situation can be solved by determining the task of Legislator. (Gauthier, 2006: 60). Therefore he points to Rousseau’s this idea.

One who dares to undertake the founding of a people should feel that he is capable of changing human nature, so to speak; of transforming each individual, who by himself is a perfect and solitary whole, into a part of a larger whole from which this individual receives, in a sense, his life and his being; of altering man’s constitution in order to strengthen it; of substituting a partial and moral existence for the physical and independent existence we have all received from nature. He must, in short, take away man’s own forces in order to give him forces that are foreign to him and that he cannot make use of without the help of others. The more these natural forces are dead and destroyed, and the acquired ones great and lasting, the more the institution as well is solid and perfect. So that if each citizen is nothing, and can do nothing, except with all the others, and if the force acquired by the whole is equal or superior to the sum of the natural forces of all the

individuals, it may be said that legislation has reached its highest possible point of perfection. (Rousseau, 1978a:68)

Therefore, what legislator does is depriving absolute and independent existence of each individual. In return, he gives relative, partial and dependant existence. (Gauthier, 2006: 60). Therefore Rousseau's effort for raising the natural man is contradictory. Because, in *Social Contract*, legislator is given the right to change human nature. It is hard to raise a person in compliance with nature, in such a society where legislator changes human nature. Nevertheless, Rousseau gives place to citizenship education in *The Government of Poland* and *Discourse on Political Economy*. One of the most important paragraphs of *Discourse on Political Economy* is below:

If it is good to know how to use men as they are, it is better still to make them what one needs them to be. The most absolute authority is that which penetrates to the inner man and is exerted no less on his will than on his actions. It is certain that people are in the long run what the government makes them." (Rousseau, 1978b: 216)

In this situation what Rousseau shall do is, finding an answer for the question of "How is this achieved; how does one make citizens as society needs them?" (Gauthier, 2006:62). Good educated citizens are necessary for a good state. "The homeland cannot subsist without freedom, nor freedom without virtue, nor virtue without citizens. You will have all these if you train citizens; without doing so, you will have only wicked slaves, beginning with the leaders of the State." (Rousseau, 1978b: 222). Nevertheless, Rousseau is aware that training citizens is not a work lasting only one day. Children need to be trained, to achieve this. (Rousseau, 1978b: 222)

Someone may tell me that anyone who has men to govern should not seek, outside of their nature, a perfection of which they are not capable; that he should not want to destroy their passions, and that the execution of such a project would not be any more desirable than it is possible. I will agree the more strongly with all this because a man who had no passions would certainly be a very bad citizen. (Rousseau, 1978b: 222)

For instance, people shall find themselves in relation with state, since young ages. People shall accept themselves as individuals of motherland. Each individual shall love his motherland. (Rousseau, 1978b: 222). The result expected by Rousseau as the result of such an application is this: “ thereby to transform into a sublime virtue this dangerous disposition from which all our vices arise.” (1978b: 222). Also, there is one more principle people shall learn after their births: “It is from the first moment of life that one must learn to deserve to live; and since one shares the rights of citizens at birth, the instant of our birth should be the beginning of the performance of our duties.” (Rousseau, 1978b: 223).

According to Rousseau, national pattern education can be given to people. Also, education shall canalize people’s opinions, the things they like and they do not like. Therefore the person becomes patriotic, with each inclination, passionate and necessity. (Rousseau, 1985: 19). These emotions of children shall be awakened:

The newly- born infant, upon first opening his eyes, must gaze upon the fatherland, and until his dying day should behold nothing else. Your true republican is a man who imbibed love of the fatherland, which is to say love of the laws and liberty, with mother’s milk. That love makes up his entire existence: he has eyes only for the fatherland, lives only for his fatherland; the moment he is alone, he is a mere cipher; the moment he has no fatherland, he is no more; if not dead, he is worse-off than if were dead. (Rousseau, 1985: 19)

Four important results can be obtained considering Rousseau’s this idea:

First is the idea of a national education, an education for a particular political community with its unique mores. Second is the idea of a free man, who is the product of a national education. Freedom, Rousseau insists, requires participation in a particular community, rather than existence in an amorphous society. Third is the idea of a common existence, and Rousseau’s insistence that free persons and only free persons enjoy such an existence. The fourth idea makes clear, that the members of the community are bound by law, the expression of the general will that they share. (Gauthier, 2006: 64)

Therefore, national education, freedom, common existence and law become important notions in Rousseau’s idea of citizenship. (Gauthier, 2006: 64). Then, what was Rousseau’s mistake? As mentioned before, Rousseau finds two separate people necessary for social order: The tutor and the legislator.

The education of the citizen is as much an exercise in control as the education of Emile. The aim is of course very different – to create total dependence rather than to prevent it, to bring about identification with society rather than separation from it. Although both Legislator and Tutor exercise control, their roles are in fact opposed. The Tutor must prevent the denaturing of the individual; the Legislator, rather, must complete that denaturing, obliterating the fallen individual in order to create the redeemed citizen. (Gauthier, 2006: 67)

But duties and purposes of the tutor and the legislator, are different. Therefore child will be trained with two people's control, rules and thoughts. This is a dilemma for individual's education.

Rousseau thinks that French, English, Romans and Greek are powerful societies and he ranges the features that separate them from the people of the time as prejudice, limited philosophy which are found in the people of the time and interest addition which is created via non-compatible institutes. In modern nations, only the law-makers have power; there is no legislator.

Since the power and welfare of the state is constituted by good citizens, the feeling of patriotism should be given to the people and they should be ensured to become good citizens. Rousseau handles a form of administration which mostly bears patriotism and virtue accepted as an integral part of laws by him.

Rousseau sees the inequality of wealth difference between seigneurs and small noble classes as a great hinder for patriotism. That luxury among powers comes into prominence causes gluttony to have a place in all hearts. Since the individuals of this class want to have the admiration of the people, the passion for becoming rich will be the most important passion. According to Rousseau, this passion is an effective means of corruption. In his opinion, it is difficult to eradicate a luxury in which inequality prevails; however, whether there is a way for changing the contents of this luxury and making it less harmful or not can be questioned. (Rousseau, 1985: 18). For example, he states that in the previous periods of Poland, poor noble classes depended on the great noble class that educated and sustained them. The way for driving luxury away from society is not to make laws, but to drive the passion of luxury away from the heart of man and give him more noble feelings. Rousseau who thinks that forbidding the things which should not be made is not a

valid solution explains the effective solution as to teach hating and humiliating them. Thus, laws can be valid. The feature that people should have to deal with education is that “He who would try his hand at founding a nation must learn to dominate men’s opinions, and through them to govern their passions.” (Rousseau, 1985: 18). A simple life style instead of a luxurious life style can only be obtained as a result of not laws but education.

“It is education that you must count on to shape the souls of the citizens in a national pattern and so to direct their opinions, their likes, and dislikes that they shall be patriotic by inclination, passionately, of necessity.” (Rousseau, 1985: 19). Rousseau thinks that a new born child should be interested in his country from his birth to his death. Praising Republic as the best form of administration, Rousseau believes that real republicans find patriotism -law and freedom- in the milk of their mothers. Such a person only thinks about his country; lives for his country and dies when his country no longer exists.

In the system of education determined by Rousseau for Polish Government, he wants a Polish citizen at the age of twenty not to be someone else but an absolute Polish citizen. Again, such a person or such people should read the books related with his country when learning how to read and know the products produced in his country when he is ten years old. He should know all regions, cities of his country at the age of twelve and have knowledge about the history of his country at the age of fifteen. At the age of sixteen, he should know the laws of his country very well. Rousseau thinks that the subject, the order and the shape of such an education that should be given to children should be determined by laws. Married, ethical, honest, honorable, prudent, intellectual Polish citizens should undertake this education.

In the system of education, Rousseau opposes college and academy education which separates rich and poor nobles. Thinking that any kind of education should be equal in the scope of the state, Rousseau suggests that everyone should be educated together and in the same way, and state should arrange fees of education in a way by which the poor can pay on the condition that the state cannot provide free education.

Rousseau considers a place where physical exercises can be carried out in each college where children are educated necessary. This is because, this is necessary both for children’s being strong and healthy, and for their ethical development. One

of the basic principles that should be taken into consideration in education is to prevent bad actions. Thus, virtue can be taught. Another principle in the education of children is not to make them immobile. They should be ensured to move while they are given an education which they like. Games of children should not be separated, children should be ensured to spend time together, and thus help should be provided for competition and competence among them. Rousseau advises this also to the parents who want to educate their children in the family. Children receiving a special education in the family should spend time playing games. Rousseau is of the opinion that such games are beneficial for children in two ways. Firstly, children can have a tough body, move fast and be comfortable playing games. Secondly, children get used to order, equality, fraternity and competence, to living in front of the eyes of all citizens and getting a general approval at an early age.

Rousseau deems founding the principals and heads of the schools suitable for state education. The people who are members of this institute would appoint the managers of the college as they wish. Rousseau defines the fundamental principles of education in this way and thinks if the Polish shape education, ethics, customs and traditions in this line, corrupted principles and worn-out institutes cannot damage them. If these applications were ignored, then laws would not have any effect and these laws would fail in practice.

2.2. Education's Purpose and Function in Rousseau

“What, according to Rousseau, is the aim of education? Who should be its ultimate beneficiary? How should it be designed?” and such questions are important, when Rousseau's education idea is examined. (Rorty, 1998:237). Rousseau wants to make human free and active, with education. Society and civil institutions shall never corrupt him. According to Rousseau, human's needs shall be reduced to lowest level. People's needs in nature are low, while in society, these needs increased. Therefore, foundation of education shall be based on nature. Also Rousseau thinks that human shall not only be trained for himself, but also for the state, because, he cannot be himself unless he is a good citizen. (Rorty, 1998: 242). Therefore Rousseau gave importance to both human sentiments and citizenship sentiments.

The aim is set by our natures: we are active, independent beings who are transformed (and readily malformed) by culture and social hierarchies; but we are also capable of autonomous critical rationality in the service of civic harmony. Education should be designed to preserve that activity, to bypass a natural tendency to dependency and the ills it produces. It should enable us to be freely and rationally self-legislating, actively participating in the construction of the political arrangements that form our character, our sentiments and motives. Education is in the first instance moral education: that is, education of a person's active psychology: his fundamental needs, the habitual direction of his imagination and sentiments, his ability to reason and to act from reason. (Rorty, 1998: 237)

Rousseau's ideas about education can be found neatly in his work of art *Emile*. In this work, Rousseau undertakes the education of a boy from his birth to his youth even up to his marriage age. The subject that is discussed in this part is the meaning of education attributed by Rousseau and on what purpose education should be. But before that, "society" and "nature" concepts which are fundamental in Rousseauian education are emphasized.

Ismail Hakkı, who points out that to be able to understand Rousseau's society perception better, the characteristics of the society and age in which Rousseau lived must be understood, propounds that society concept is not the incidents happening in it. Society is the sum of religion, morality and some good thoughts. To understand Jean Jacques Rousseau's works, French society's thoughts about religion, morality and laws in the 18th century should be studied. Since the concepts of religion, morality, laws and the merits they embody do not exist on their own, 18th century's perception of family, school, profession and politics should be considered. Through these concepts and merits, it is appropriate to review the 18th century in which Rousseau lived.

Ismail Hakkı generally starts off these thoughts in order to review Rousseau and the era he lived in: (1) Rousseau's life. (2) The significant characteristics and merits of the time and society that Rousseau lived in. (3) The philosophy tradition that Rousseau had. (4) In this philosophy tradition, Rousseau's place against his contemporaries and their thoughts he agrees or disagrees. However in this study, the era Rousseau lived in is explained comprehensively.

The main difference that separates the 17th century from the 18th century is rationalism's being more dominant in the 18th century. The main characteristic of

this philosophical tradition, especially starting with Descartes, is to bring the activities of mind to the forefront in scholarship, morality and philosophy. (Hakkı, 1925: 46). The 18th century philosophy is based on mind too, yet it has a different aim. In 17th century, besides having a universal nature, mind has a voice in every field of philosophy. Although the 18th century is rationalist and universalist, it is rooted from life and society. In this century, there is a struggle of criticising the existing and replacing it with the better. Contrary to the effort of the 17th century for knowing everything thanks to mind, the 18th century draws a border to mind and puts experience, empiricism and sensualism instead. (Hakkı, 1925: 50)

Considering the philosophy tradition Rousseau has, we see Encyclopedia of Philosophy which is based on intelligence. This philosophy tradition, influenced by Newton, bases its doctrines on physics. Encyclopaedists, who do not value the past, regard morality as physics and interpret it from an individualistic approach. What is lack in philosophy of Encyclopedia is that it does not have religious sensitivity, destiny idea, mystic and lyric characteristics. (Hakkı, 1925: 50)

Although Rousseau takes part in Encyclopedia thought as well, he values individual, individual's needs and feelings and he stands against tradition like them; he separates from them at some points. Primarily, while Encyclopedists base the prosperity and the happiness of the society on science and mind, Rousseau heads for "nature". He thinks that state of nature must be recognized in order to develop a natural morality, a natural law and a natural discipline. (Hakkı, 1925: 62-63). It is possible to say that Rousseau's idea of nature, especially the idea of natural man, does not have an existing basis. In short, Rousseau does not deal with the personality of the natural man but with his thoughts. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to put aside the idea of natural man and to search for the nature of man according to Rousseau's the way of thinking. (Cited from Trancisque Viale İsmail Hakkı, 1925: 65).

Rousseau creates the nature concept firstly from animals, secondly from barbarians and thirdly from the use of an intellectual history. Animals do not live in a certain society yet show an example of an intellectual life, they live in a natural environment and they live on their own. Second one is the lives of barbarians despite very little modern heritage they left. The third one is to imprison intellectual

elements into social roots. Rousseau solves this by ancient men, by knowing the history, modernity and by himself. During his questionings towards himself and during the time he walked around in forests, Rousseau finds natural man as he lives as a natural man by doing so. In short, Rousseau becomes the natural man himself. (Hakkı, 1925: 65-66).

The most important aspect of natural man is that he is free and he can do whatever he wants but he wants what he can do. He is not going after an arbitrary interest. The source of this freedom of natural man is "*Amour de soi*" (love of self). For this reason, man wants to live in full. Since *Amour de soi* is a natural sentiment it even exists in animals. Also this sentiment is the source of all other sentiments. Loving yourself -love of self- is a good sentiment and as a result, man wants to protect himself. However man loves not only himself but also the people that protect him via this sentiment. (Hakkı, 1925: 69). Since *Amour de soi* sentiment, which has an important part in Rousseau's education perception, and other sentiments are explained on the next chapters in a more detailed way, we are moving on to Rousseau's thoughts on society and education.

The natural state of man and all the good features that man has in its natural state such as freedom, innocence, happiness have degenerated with the transition to social life. (Hakkı, 1925: 73). The reason why man has passed to social life is their increasing needs and lacking of the ability to fulfill these needs on their own. The participation of man in social life has also been realized by intelligence because man accomplished to do difficult tasks and to invent more advanced tools using his brain. However these developments and innovations also have bad results in social life. Consequently, Rousseau wants to change and to improve the moral conditions in society. (Hakkı, 1925: 76).

Rousseau's main thought is based on the idea that man is good by nature but corrupted by society and social institutes. For this reason, what is essentially done is to be able to present new things about education, the art of forming man. According to Rousseau, even though the most sophisticated people emphasize what people should learn, they do not have the knowledge on what children should learn. (1979: 33-34). For Rousseau, the main mistake that these wise people make is that they recognize children as adults and forget what the child is before he becomes an adult.

Because of the fact that Rousseau accepts this situation as a main problem, he claims that students should be well examined and well known in order to eliminate this mistake. This is why he starts education from infancy and discusses the development and education of an individual up to his adulthood.

Rousseau, actually, looks for the roots of education in three articles.

1. the political solution
2. the psycholical and educative solution
3. the domestic / affectional solution (Rorty, 1998: 242)

These three roots of education has the same purpose.

To bring men to the fulfillment of their real natures by assuring their independence and blocking the formation of the structures of dependency; to reunite the subject and object in autonomous activity; to promote equality; to strengthen true universalizing rationality over the calculations of personal prudence; to replace the tumultuous and fortuitous passions with stable, generalized benevolent sentiments. And all three educational strategies have the same problems: they presuppose the conditions they are meant to achieve; they depend on the intervention of a benign, paternalistic, unflawed Legislator- Tutor; and they introduce elements and structures that undermine the primary aims and directions of education. (Rorty, 1998: 242-243)

Concerning education, Rousseau asserts that he has found the subject that should be worked on however his solution to this problem might be wrong. (1979: 34). Yet, he proposes a project about education and says that every project should include two things. The first thing is that the absolute goodness of the Project. The second thing is the facility of execution. The main condition for the acceptability and applicability of the project is that what it has as good should also exist in commodity as well. In this aspect, Rousseau wants education to be suitable for man and to be adaptable to man's heart. The second condition of the project is it is dependent on certain relationships and it has a changeable characteristic. Hence, education applied in one country might not be suitable for another country. (Rousseau, 1979: 35). Briefly Rousseau builds up his own education thought based on these two conditions.

According to Rousseau, who thinks that the creator creates everything good but man corrupts it, man has shaped the nature. As a result of mankind's desire to establish superiority over nature, a tree can yield another tree's fruit and climates and

seasons resemble each other. Mankind is differentiating not only the nature but also the man. The education that should exist in this environment must be in the nature again, just to spite mankind's domination over nature. (Rousseau, 1979: 37). Another point that Rousseau remarks is society's effect on individual. Rousseau, who thinks that a man left alone among other people just after he is born will be the most improper of mankind, explains the reason of it as follows:

Prejudices, authority, necessity, example, all the social institutions in which we find ourselves submerged would stifle nature in him and put nothing in its place. Nature there would be like a shrub that chance had caused to be born in the middle of a path and that the passers-by soon cause to perish by bumping into it from all sides and bending it in every direction. (1979: 37)

Therefore, the first feature of his education Project is that it is suitable for nature. At this point what needs to be explained is what "nature" means for Rousseau. According to Rousseau, man is born sensitive and beginning from his birth he is affected from the objects around. Man who comprehends the sensations wants to know objects or to search or to get away from these objects. (Rousseau, 1979: 39). Man realizes this in three ways. Firstly, whether he likes the sensations or not; secondly, depending on the properness or improperness between man and these objects; and thirdly, depending on his judgment about happiness and competency idea provided by mind. (Rousseau, 1979: 39). Rousseau is of the opinion that these thoughts get stronger as man starts to be more sophisticated and sensitive. However, they are corrupted because of habits' pressure and judgments. Rousseau calls the situation where this corruption does not take place nature.

On the other hand, Rousseau thinks that nature helps man's development and therefore the rules given to man by nature should not be broken. Rousseau assumes that nature is always making children practice against difficult conditions; therefore he reacts positively to the change in the temper of nature. A child's learning pain and sadness at an early age, the discomfort of a new teeth, a stomachache and such situations can be useful in a his upcoming life. This is because child gains strength thanks to the discomforts like them and would not be shattered with the least danger. In such cases, people who undertake the nursing and the education of a child should avoid malpractices. For this reason, he thinks that child cannot be educated by everyone. Rousseau lists the main elements taught to man by education as follows:

We are born weak, we need strength; we are born totally unprovided, we need aid; we are born stupid, we need judgment. Everything we do not have at our birth and which we need when we are grown is given us by education. (1979: 38)

Rousseau does not consider basically raising the child suitable for a situation or a profession in children's education. His main purpose is to ensure that child becomes a human and the only profession he wants to teach is life. When the child learns how to be human and to live and then when he runs into a difficulty he would not be afraid of it and would know how to endure it. Hence, Rousseau thinks that education should be directed to practice not to rules. In the education of Emile, this can easily be observed as Emile learns everything not by reading them but by watching and thinking about them in a natural environment.

Rousseau, who acknowledges that what we do not know inherently should be taught by education later, assumes such education comes from the nature, the men or the things and divides education into three groups. Education of nature is the internal development of man's organs and faculties. The use of this development taught to men is the education of men. The education which is gained by men's own experiences about the objects that affect themselves is the education of things. There are three different teachers corresponding to three education types. Teacher should ensure that these three types of education should be in harmony in student. The education of nature does not depend on men, while the education of things depends on men only partially. Education of men is the education that we have the most knowledge about.

Rousseau accepts education in two forms as raising citizen and raising human. As raising an individual for another individual is called being raised as a citizen, if the individual wants to be raised for himself then it is called being raised as human. The main problem in this case is what man who is raised and educated for himself can do for somebody else, how he would be beneficial to society. In order to avoid being drawn into the vortex of this problem, Rousseau asks from Emile to do something for the state. Although the work titled *Emile* consists of education of nature, in other words, education of family, Rousseau gives importance to the social development of a child. Therefore, emotions are important especially for the

connections of a child with society. Since the child is in need of people around him since the day he is born, he first communicates with them via tears. At first, the child explains what he wants or what he need with tears. Therefore, Rousseau thinks that children's education starts as soon as he is born and he can learn from the people around him. He claims that the biggest harm given to the child during this period is swaddling him tightly. He indicates this application would leave a bad impression on the child's character as he feels as he was shackled since the first day he is born. With this behaviour, family or nanny teaches him his first pain and sadness sentiment. This is why Rousseau gives importance to children's sentimental and moral development since the first day. A well trained mother or nanny may be careful about in order for him not to experience this situation. Therefore, as education teaches what to do since the birth of a child, it is required to be in social life.

Another figure that makes a statement about the purpose of education is Bertrand Russell. According to him, before researching how the best education should be, what kind of a man is desired to be raised. (2009: 391). Russell thinks that there are four main characteristics in all men and they underlie an ideal personality. These four characteristics are as follows: vitality, courage, sensitiveness and intelligence. For him, with physical, emotional and intellectual education, these four main characteristics can be popularized.

Vitality is a physical attribute. Despite the fact this attribute is at its highest level before going to school, Russell claims that it increases with education. Since vitality increases pleasures and alleviates pain, it keeps man's interest for his environment alive. Russell thinks that the tendency of men to turn in on themselves and to be isolated from their environments prevents them from doing useful activities. On the other hand, vitality increases man's interest to the outside world and prevents jealousy. Therefore in social life, man would share what he has.

The second attribute is courage. Whereas some of the things men are afraid of have a reasonable basis, some of them are irrational. According to Russell, some fears are instinctive but most of them are based on either experience or suggestion. Fear of loud noises is instinctive, though fear of dark is caused by suggestion. For Russell, children learn fear from adults because they can imitate nanny's or parents'

fears. However, adults may not be aware that they are infusing fear to children. (2009: 398). At this point, the subject that Russell wants to explain is that fear is coped with suppression. The society assigns men the duties such as not running away from wars; not losing self-command during accidents such as fire, earthquake and showing no sign of fear in these situations. Russell criticizes this social pressure and says that courage would not be developed using an oppressive method. Russell also states that shame and disgrace emotions are accepted by society as two emotions that makes a man courageous. However, these emotions cause fear conflict in men and lead to the anxiety of being condemned by the society. According to Russell, the only way to teach men courage is to make fear be defeated both in behaviour and in subconscious. Another method is that man values other people and does not regard himself superior. Therefore, we can say that there is a similarity between the ideas of Russell that society shapes men and the idea of Rousseau. Rousseau considers that men learn new emotions such as hate, competition, jealousy with the beginning of the social life.

The third attribute appointed for Russell's ideal man is sensitivity and it is related with emotions. He describes sensitivity as: "A purely theoretical definition would be that a person is emotionally sensitive when many stimuli produce emotions in him; but taken thus broadly the quality is not necessarily a good one." (2009: 401). In order for sensitivity to be a good attribute, the emotional reaction arising should be appropriate in a certain sense. Interpreting it in more differently, Russell envisages to be able to be positively influenced by many things and the right things so that sensitivity can be in good nature. What Russell wants to explain next is what the right thing is. According to Russell, the main phase necessary for sensitivity to be able to develop as desired is sympathy. That a little girl is crying because her brother is crying is a physical sympathy but this is not the sympathy that Russell mainly attaches importance to. The feeling we have when we see a person we don't recognize or love suffering is Russell's primary sympathy. The second one is that we feel the sympathy even if we are not with the person suffering just because we know his existence. The second type of sympathy depends on intelligence, it is not only an abstract but also a rare sympathy. Someone's being affected and suffering because of a bad incident in a novel he reads is an example for the second type of sympathy.

People might feel sorry when they see a man suffering in the hospital, whereas they might not get sad due to the death ratios caused by cancer they see on a newspaper. The reason why those people are not emotionally affected is they are not stimulated by abstract stimulus. The developments in science are the cause of several destructions and now people do not share the pain of the ones got hurt by those destructions, because abstract stimulus do not boost the sympathy emotion. Therefore science has damaged the personality of people. Rousseau claims that science and art corrupt men's morality and as a result of corrupted morality, pleasures get corrupted, too. According to him, the reason why science and arts emerged is vices in men. Astronomy arouses out of superstitions, physics out of vain curiosity and morality is born out of arrogance. (Rousseau, 1964a: 48). Although the developments in science and arts provide a comfortable life in society, it causes courage and soldiership merits disappear. Since these sciences increase the prosperity level in society, not fulfilling even a small need in time has caused problems in the society. Rousseau believes that the people, who cannot stand when even a small need has not been not fulfilled, cannot bear hunger, thirst, danger and fatigue. (Rousseau, 1964a: 48).

Russell's solution for increasing people's sensitivity against each other and for arising a reaction to abstract stimulus is education. By education, men would be able to feel sympathy with abstract stimulus too.

The last attribute is intelligence. Russell claims that traditional morality underestimates intelligence. For example church claims that merits can be gained by avoiding doing what is considered as a sin. According to Russell, intelligence consists of knowledge and the ability to have knowledge. For the education of intelligence knowledge is required. According to Russell, the most important purpose of education is to ensure the development of intelligence. For Russell, who accepts that there is a tight connection between intelligence and curiosity, the source of real curiosity is the love of knowledge. Russell says that in order for the sense of curiosity to be useful, knowledge acquisition methods such as the habit of observation, faith in the existence of knowledge, patience and effort should be present. He believes they will develop with curiosity and intellectual education.

Russell continues his study on the purpose of education with a question: “This brings us to a somewhat difficult question: to what extent should the good life be emancipated from the herd?” (2009: 404). Russell accepts people’s desires to be in a relationship with their family, neighbors, colleagues natural as the pleasures of life cannot be perceived without co-operation. If more than one person feels an emotion at the same time, this affects others easily. In this regard, Russell gives the example of almost everyone’s feeling the same emotion in an exciting meeting. Even though Russell approves the idea of co-operation with others in some situations, he thinks that this should be suppressed. The desire to have the ear of other people prevents people from being rude and also helps social groups develop. For example if children didn’t want to gain appreciation of their parents, they would not want to go to school. Russell thinks that while doing daily tasks, co-operations with other people can be established and this should have an instinctive basis. For Russell, a person should make decisions on his own about a special situation only he knows and should be able to oppose stereotyped thoughts in society, when necessary. Russell says free decision making and opposing can exist in case all the men have the attributes of vitality, courage, sensitiveness and intelligence.

As a result, according to Russell, a society established by the people with these four types of attributes thanks to education would be a happy society. This is because people would have the desire to overcome poverty and intelligence with the help of sensitiveness and intelligence would give the method of it to them. People would adopt that method with courage. Therefore, Russell describes the ideal man’s characteristics based on virtues and claims that these characteristics can be taught to individuals by education. Moreover, these virtues have an important role in social relationships. Rousseau finds that after a completely individual education, his student should establish a connection with social life. During his infancy, man establishes connection with the people around him by his tears. Hence, for Rousseau, the situation that makes man communicate with others is he cannot fulfill his needs on his own. Therefore, child loves people who help him. During infancy, this can be seen as being affiliated with nanny or mother. In his adulthood, not being able to fulfill his increasing needs makes him dependant on others. Besides, this man’s sentiments are also important for social connection. Especially the sentiment of pity

is important for maintaining the order and helping each other. According to Rousseau, the source of all the passions of a man is self-love. (Rousseau, 1979: 212-213). This passion is primitive and inborn. Rousseau acknowledges that all other passions are modified versions of self-love. While educating Emile, Rousseau first teaches him how to use his body and senses. Secondly, after he teaches him to use his mind and the ability to think, he teaches him to use his organs and abilities. Thirdly he focuses on using his wisdom via his emotions. Hence, at first glance we can say that the education model of Rousseau is based on the development of body, senses and sentiments. The other concepts that become prominent in his education system are discussed in the next chapter.

Rousseau's educational understanding includes a dilemma. Autonomous citizen idea is the base of this contradiction. Although Rousseau moves from the idea of natural creature, he wants to train this natural existence from social and political angle. Also, "There is the private, familial man, and there is man as rational citizen. It would be a piece of false consciousness to deny any of these aspects; none can be transcended." (Rorty, 1998: 251) .

2.3. Basic Concepts in Rousseauian Education Idea

Some of the philosophers who want to establish an ideal education model examining educational problems have started from their own concepts. For instance, Paulo Freire identifies the education system of his time as "*banking education*" and criticizes this education. He asserts problem-posing education instead of this model of education. John Dewey calls his education understanding as "*progressivism*" (Dewey, 1997: 6). The basis of Dewey's education idea depends on the concept of "*experience*". He criticizes the strict attitude of traditional education idea and gives individual's experience prominence. Dewey thinks that Education Philosophy should be expressed with words and symbols. Furthermore, education philosophy should make plans for implementing education in the best way. While forming this plan, the questions of what to do for an excellent education and how to achieve it should be considered. (Dewey, 1997: 28). What is important here is to find the tracks of Dewey's idea on Rousseauian education model.

2.3.1. Human Nature and Natural Man

Considering Rousseau's book titled *Emile* in which he represents the education of a child, it may be asserted that his education is also based on experience. Rousseau attaches importance to the assertion that children should do everything by themselves during the education. Therefore, the concept of experience is also a basic concept in his idea. Besides, he also attaches importance sensitive and mental development as well as paying attention to moral and social development of children. Considering that science and arts undermine ethics and society teaches what is bad to man who is good in nature, Rousseau claims that education should be provided in compliance with the nature and natural conditions. Thus, child should be raised since his birth by a person who has sufficient knowledge on education.

Rousseau assumes that some sentiments are important in child's passing to social life, communicating with others and learning what is good and bad. These basic sentiments are passion, self-love, pity and vanity. It would be useful to explain thoughts of Rousseau on human nature before explaining importance of such sentiments on his education system. Considering his thoughts and comments on human nature and morality, basis of Rousseauian education system can be easily understood. In order to explain Rousseau's ideas on human nature, certain arguments of him should be considered. Primarily, his ideas about man's life while living in the state of nature alone are explained. Secondly, his views on the reasons leading people to live together are emphasized. Finally, which values man has lost after passing to social life and the effect of society on individual are analyzed. As well known, Rousseau thinks that human is good by nature and has learned the bad from the society. If the society and social institutes did not help human develop morally, education would undertake this task. Therefore, how the education should be is required to be planned in order to raise a good individual. Thus, Rousseau's solution to this problem is researched. While specifying prominent concepts in Rousseauian education model and the reasons for passing to social life, his books *Emile* and *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality* are referred.

Rousseau participates in the competition held by the Academy of Dijon starting with the question "What is the origin of inequality among men; and is it authorized

by natural law?" and claims that the human should be known at first in order to find the origin of this inequality. He emphasizes that the natural man should be known at first in order to describe the relationship between inequality and natural law. According to him, as long as the natural man is unknown, the rule suitable for his structure cannot be determined. (Rousseau, 1964b: 95).

Rousseau attempts to know man in order to determine the principles of the natural law and describes man physically, metaphysically and morally. At first, he determines the physical side of man. In order to achieve this, he ignores the scientific books accepting man as he is and draws attention to the first and simple operations of human soul. The first principle of natural law is the principle which is related to well-being and self-preservation of human. The second one is the repugnance sentiment man experiences naturally when he sees a person who is in pain or extinction of his kind. Rousseau explains the reason why man harms others with the inner impulse of commiseration. He does not base the reason why a person does not harm others on the fact that other people are also rational beings, on the contrary, he attributes this reason to their sensitive being. Rousseau even considers sensitivity as a common characteristic for men and animals and thus men do not harm animals. (Rousseau, 1964b: 96). Like Rousseau, Russell also is based on this emotion. This emotion called by Russell sensitiveness allows a person to have pity for another. Undoubtedly, Russell evaluates this concept in a wider sense and also describes sympathy under this concept, as explained in more detail in previous section.

Rousseau assumes that there are two inequalities among people as natural or physical inequality and moral or political inequality. Natural inequality consists of the differences created by nature such as age, health, intelligence, etc. Political inequality depends on convention and is accepted by the consent of people. In this inequality, some people become richer and more important, while others become obliged to give way to them. Hobbes, whose ideas on human nature are far more different than Rousseau's ideas, also separates from Rousseau in inequality. While Hobbes describes man as bad, selfish and hypocrite by nature, he assumes that nature creates people equal in terms of their faculties of body and faculties of the mind. According to Hobbes, when a person who is physically weaker is in danger, he comes together with other people who are in danger like him and becomes stronger

enough to eliminate the most powerful. In equality in terms of the faculties of the mind, he excludes some cases; in other words, people are equal except for the art of words and science. (Hobbes, 1996: 87). In fact, Hobbes bases equality of faculties of mind on prudence. Hobbes describes the prudence as “For Prudence, is but Experience; which equal time, equally bestows on all men, in those things they equally apply themselves unto” (1996: 87). For Hobbes, the reason why people do not believe mental equality arises from conceit. Although the person, by his nature, accepts that there are others smarter and more informed than him, he does not accept that person or people are smarter or more informed than him. According to Hobbes, the reason for this situation is the fact that man knows his wit closely but knows other’s with from a distance. In fact, for Hobbes, this situation indicates that there is equality among people because if everyone is satisfied with their own shares in this environment, this means that these people are equal.

Rousseau thinks that the source of natural inequality cannot be examined because its source covers the whole of the natural inequality. The problem of whether there is a connection between the two types of inequality may be discussed by slaves but the rational and free man does not strive for this. This is because this is about examination of the issue of whether the command is more valuable than the submissive ones or whether the same people have physical and mental capacity. Rousseau thinks that this study is useless and changes the subject of discourse in order to answer the question of Academy of Dijon’s competition. He lists the subjects which should be examined as follows:

To indicate in the progress of things the moment when, right taking the place of violence, nature was subjected to law; to explain by what sequence of marvels the strong could resolve to serve the weak, and the people to buy imaginary repose at the price of real felicity. (Rousseau, 1964b: 102)

However, what is important for us is, beginning from this subject, Rousseau’s thoughts on the state of nature and the human in the state of nature.

Rousseau asserts that the philosophers who want to analyze the fundamentals of society explain the state of nature at first but none of them make sufficient explanation. The philosophers who claim that the human at the state of nature knows the concepts of just and unjust considers the will of everyone for protecting

everything they possess as a natural right. Establishment of government is found necessary in order to legitimize the authority of powerful on the weaker. For such philosophers who accept presence of the state of nature, the human is bad, importunate and selfish at that state.

Rousseau does not start from man's embryo state in order to explain man's natural state; he starts from man's adulthood instead. In this period, the man observes animals and eats what they eat. Their bodies are strong for protection from weather conditions, tiredness and wild animals. Since the man living at the state of nature lives in the way the nature created it, he is happy and healthy. However, the man becomes weaker and fearsome along with start of social life.

Rousseau, who wants to describe the metaphysical aspect of human, starts with handling the differences between man and animal. The main difference between man and animal is that the animal directs its options or rejects them with its instincts but the man act with act of freedom. Rousseau believes that all animals have ideas as they have senses. He does not think that the difference between man and animal arises from understanding. The main superiority of man is the act of freedom. When the nature commands to human and animal, the animal immediately does it but the human is free to object or resist to nature. Man's power of the willing and selecting exists only in his spiritual acts. Furthermore, Rousseau recognizes that the main difference between the man and animal is the faculty of self-perfection. The faculty of self-perfection develops other abilities of man and exists as species and individual in the man. On the contrary, the animal reaches the form that it will have during its entire life in a few months. Aging is also a characteristic of human only. The animal does not experience significant losses since it does not gain anything during its entire life. However, the man loses those, which he owned by means of his faculty of self-perfection during his entire life, in old age. Rousseau recognizes that the human at this state is at a lower level compared to animal. In fact, man's faculty of self-perfection is the source of all of his fatalities.

For Rousseau, who thinks that the man's understanding depends on passions, the mind becomes perfect by means of operation of passions. The man tries to know for his own benefit, therefore anyone who has no desire and fear does not think. The source of passions is requirements; and their progress depends on our knowledge.

The reason why we desire for objects or fear of them is the idea or the motivation of nature aroused in man by passions.

Man can develop his potential faculties by using them. For Rousseau, “He (man) had, in instinct alone, everything necessary for him to live in the state of nature: he has cultivated reason, only what is necessary for him to live in society” (Rousseau, 1964b: 127-128). Since there is no moral relationship or task among people in such a life, they may not be called good or bad; they may not be evaluated with the words “fault and morality”. Rousseau recognizes the most important morality of man, in other words the natural morality of man, as pity. Social moralities such as generosity, clemency, humanity, benevolence, friendship are derived from pity. We put ourselves in the shoes of people who are suffering and try to understand them due to our sentiment of pity. According to Rousseau, this sentiment is dark but strong in savage man and developed but weak in civilized man. Rousseau considers pity as a natural sentiment and man cares about not only himself but also the entire species due to this sentiment. When we see a man suffering, our pity leads us to help him. Although there are no laws or morals in the state of nature, there have been no conflicts because people do not harm others due to this sentiment. Rousseau puts the saying “Do what is good for you with the least possible harm to other” instead of the saying “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you” which is the starting point of Hobbes’ thought. The basis of Rousseau’s saying is based on pity and lead people to hate the bad.

The sentiment of love is the most enthusiastic sentiment of man and makes him dependent on the opposite sex. As the impetuosity of passions increases, the laws protecting people from fighting and malignity become essential. However, Rousseau makes a distinction in the sentiment of love as physical and moral. The physical aspect is about the emotions experienced between two genders. The moral side is the element which makes this desire prominent and realizes this on a single subject. (Rousseau, 1964b: 134). Rousseau thinks that the moral side of love is established from habits of society and especially by women. Therefore, this sentiment is obtained within the society and sometimes become the subject of fight.

2.3.2. Society

Since Rousseau asserts that there is no inequality in the state of nature, he seeks for his origin in the development of human mind. Perfectibility, social morality and potential faculties of man do not develop automatically; there is a need for external reasons. Man has learned the bad when passing to social life. Therefore, Rousseau wants to examine the reason of such cases. According to Rousseau "Man's first sentiment was that of his first care that of his preservation". (1964b: 142). Man has learned how to use and how to be fed with these products of land thanks to his instincts. Man, who feels his existence with the desires such as appetites, has ensured the sustainability of his existence with the sentiment of love. Mankind had only sensations at first. He tried to find various solutions for overcoming the difficulties he encountered. New difficulties have arisen as mankind reproduced and man learned how to survive in different climates and in different places. They became warriors for protecting themselves against animals and found the fire. Such changes occurring in the human's social life have led to the rise of the concepts such as big, small, strong, weak, fast, slow, brave, coward. As the man gained victory against animals, he also ensured superiority on them.

Through observation, man has found out that his love of well-being is about the motivation of acts. He made a distinction between the case in which he asks others for help and the case in which he should suspect from others due to competition. In the first case, the man lives together with others until he satisfies his needs. In the second case, everyone tries to protect their own benefits. These cases cause people to assert ideas for compromising in mutual agreements. But this idea did not become a certain plan.

As man began to use his mind, what he produced and invented also increased. When people began to build houses and establish families, the idea of possession came to occurrence. Rousseau assumes that the possibility that the people who first built houses were strong people is high. The weaker ones made huts because they could not build houses as strong people did. The habit of living together with the family brought the love of partners and parents. Occurrence of natural disasters led people to gather and raised the idea of living a common life. As the connections and relationships got stronger in social life, comparisons among people started as well.

The most beautiful, the strongest and the most capable people had reputable positions. This inequality also paved the way for the bad. States such as pride, contempt, shame, envy have emerged. Those who want to be appreciated responded to humiliating attitudes against them and fights have started. As the fights and wars increased, the need for security institutes arose. The fights experienced in the social life and the idea of seeking for the moral one in the social acts created the laws. Such implementations and changes gradually decreased the sentiment of commiseration in man.

When the people, who started to cultivate, wanted to share the land, the foundation of law rules were laid. Everyone would take what belonged to them. Since the people were not equal in terms of abilities, the social balance was also deteriorated. The strongest one worked more, the most capable one obtained more yields and the smartest one invented new tools. In this way, inequality has occurred.

When the rich began to seize and the poor began banditry, an entire chaos environment arose and after the natural pity and justice got weakened, the people became mean and bad. Laws were designed for terminating the chaos environment in the society, and thus, a political life was begun. Therefore, contracts were made between the people and the ruler and the society gathered all of its wills under one single will. According to Rousseau, the basis of the inequality which does not exist in the state of nature occurs as a result of the abilities of man, development of human mind and the rise of possession and laws. (Rousseau, 1964b: 180)

Christopher Bertram describes Rousseau's process for transition from individual life to social life in four stages. The first stage is the period in which man lived alone. The second stage is the period in which the population and thus the needs of people increased. In this period, technical abilities of man developed and man established cooperation with others. The third stage is the period in which the sentiment of *amour proper* arose. The fourth stage is the period in which technical developments were experienced and the concept of private possession rose. It is the period in which the comparisons among people such as the rich and the poor, the strong and the weak started. (Bertram, 2004: 36-37).

Freedom is an important notion in Rousseau's political thought. Rousseau categorizes freedom in 3 titles: natural freedom, civil freedom and moral freedom.

The contradiction mainly exists between civil freedom and moral freedom. Civil freedom is limited with general will, while moral freedom is the only thing which makes the human his own master. (Rousseau, 1978a: 56). Another difference between civil freedom and moral freedom depends on external and internal impediments: “The difference is that civil freedom refers to the absence of external impediments to alternative actions whereas moral freedom concerns, at least in part, internal impediments.” (Simpson, 2006: 92).

For example, an alcoholic person is aware that his life will become better when he quits drinking. But he cannot quit. Let us assume that this person lives in a country where drinking is not forbidden and where he is not forced to drink alcohol. In this situation this person has civil freedom because there is no provision in law about this subject and he can do the things he wants without other people's interference. Therefore he has civil freedom, but not moral freedom. “ Because he is unable to live according to his own judgment about what is good.” (Simpson, 2006: 92). Even if we say he is free in civil sense, we cannot say he is free in moral sense. Because, according to Rousseau “ the impulse of appetite alone is slavery.” (1978a: 56). Therefore an alcoholic person is the slave of his passions.

Rousseau believes that a person can only achieve moral freedom in a political society. Human becomes a being with moral freedom, especially with social compact. Why moral freedom is possible in a political society? (Simpson, 2006: 94). Answer of this question is related with social compact. Rousseau claims that social compact is made with reason of self-preservation of people. At this point, this question attracts the attention of Rousseau: “But since each man's force and freedom are the primary instruments of his self-preservation, how is he to engage them without harming himself and without neglecting the cares he owes to himself?” (Rousseau, 1978a: 53).

An individual does not think of himself; he thinks of the benefit of society, he abandons self-interest and passions. Rousseau thinks human has different qualities in state of nature and civil state. For example, in state of nature human acts with instincts while he takes justice into consideration in civil state. In state of nature, human has physical impulses while reason is dominant at civil state. Human freedom

is in the foreground at civil state. According to this, Rousseau makes a distinction between humans and animals based on behaviors.

In every animal I see only an ingenious machine to which nature has given senses in order to revitalize itself and guarantee itself, to a certain point, from all that tends to destroy or upset it. I perceive precisely the same things in the human machine, with the difference that nature alone does everything in the operations of a beast, whereas man contributes to his operations by being a free agent. (Rousseau, 1964b: 113)

In short, “he assumed, further, that actions that happen according to mere natural necessity have no moral significance.” (Simpson, 1996: 96)

Actually freedom notion of Rousseau has complexity. Rousseau claims that human is free in state of nature. And at the same time, human behaves according to passions and needs, in state of nature. Therefore we cannot talk about a human’s freedom in state of nature, because all people are the slaves of their own passions. To summarize, everyone is like a slave. (Simpson, 1996: 98). At least he can't be said to have moral freedom. Rousseau’s thought of freedom is contradictory from this angle. These thoughts of Rousseau bring his thoughts about freewill in mind. The relation between freewill shall be reconsidered. According to Rousseau, “Nature commands every animal, and the beast obeys. Man feels the same imputes, but he realizes that he is free to acquiesce or resist; and it is above all in the consciousness of this freedom that the spirituality of his soul is shown.” (1964b: 114).

Rousseau's this definition for freewill has ambiguity. “At times he seemed to say that freewill consists in the power of deciding which of one's inclinations to follow, while other times he seemed to say that it is the power of ignoring one's inclinations altogether and of acting on purely rational principles.” (Simpson, 2006: 99). For example a pigeon near a meat basin and a cat near fruit or grain basin die of starvation. But if they had tried to eat them, they would be well fed. (Rousseau, 1964b: 113-114). Human has the right to obey or resist when he is under pressure of nature in such situations. There is such a difference between human and animal, from the angle of will: “A person has a desire to eat just as does a pigeon or a cat; the difference is that a person can reason about what to eat and then choose something other than that to which he is initially drawn. But the ground of the choice is still

some passion or inclination. Freewill in this sense refers to the capacity to use and act upon prudential reason.” (Simpson, 1996: 99).

Rousseau’s thought of freewill requires re-interpretation of his “be forced to be free” expression. Rousseau thinks a society has the right to pressurize a person who objects to general will. This pressure is forcing that person to be free. Being forced to be free is for his own good; it gives freedom to him. But, “the expression ‘force to be free’ refers only to moral freedom, not to civil freedom or to democracy.” (Simpson, 1996: 103)

At this point, we must explain another question. Is it possible to force people to be free? Therefore the relationship between general will and freedom needs to be examined again.

Rousseau’s political thought, then, contains two distinct accounts of how individuals realize their freedom through the general will, accounts that differ with respect to both (i) the nature of the relation claimed to hold between freedom and the general will and (ii) the type of freedom said to be realized: According to the first, membership in the state is (i) a *precondition* of (ii) a negatively defined *civil freedom*, insofar as the rule of law effectively mitigates the freedom-endangering consequences of dependences; according to the second, membership in the state is (i) an embodiment of (ii) moral freedom (or social autonomy), insofar as citizens are ruled by laws they construct for themselves in accord with a shared conception of the common good.” (Neuhouser, 1993: 392).

Every individual represents individual freedom in Rousseau’s political thought. An individual has a limited or partial freedom in the absence of other individuals. (Neuhouser, 1993: 394). Briefly, “This is obvious enough in the case of being forced to be free: to fail to affirm the principles which in fact constrain one’s actions is to fall short, in an important way, of the ideal of being subject only to one’s own will.” (Neuhouser, 1993: 394). Individuals can be forced to be free for an exact freedom by obeying laws.

2.3.3. Self- Love and *Amour propre*

Rousseau bases his education system on the sentiments existing in man's nature, the change of these sentiments and their influence of society on this change. What should be considered in the education of a child is not allowing the society to deteriorate his sentiments. In particular, the sentiment of self-love man inherently has and other sentiments arising from this sentiment should not be harmed. Self-love and vanity are two separate sentiments. Rousseau describes this separation as follows in one of the notes he added to his book *On the Origin and Foundations of Inequality among Men*:

Vanity and love of oneself, two passions very different in their nature and their effects, must not be confused. Love of oneself is a natural sentiment which inclines every animal to watch over its own preservation, and which, directed in man by reason and modified by pity, produces humanity and virtue. Vanity is only a relative sentiment, artificial and born in society, which inclines each individual to have a greater esteem for himself than for anyone else, inspires in men all the harm they do to one another, and is the true source of honor. (221-222)

Considering this paragraph, Bertram points out the distinction made by Rousseau between self-love and vanity. Bertram asserts that interpretation of *amour-propre* as vanity or pride gives a wrong meaning. In general, *amour de soi* is a mild passion which enables man to want physical well-being. He describes *amour-propre* as the mass of toxic reactive passions and asserts that it causes conflict among people due to the feelings such as arrogance, pride, vanity and resentment. (Bertram, 2004:22).

“Natural sentiment, reason, relative sentiment, society, humanity and evils” are the notions which express the difference between self-love and *amour-propre*.

‘Relative’ here means relative to *other subjects*, and Rousseau’s point is that the good sought by *amour-propre* is defined by, even partially constituted by, certain relations one has to subjects other than oneself. In fact, *amour-propre* is relative in two respects, each of which distinguishes it from *amour de soi* and helps to explain the difficulties *amour-propre* poses for beings who possess it. First, the good that *amour-propre* seeks is relative, or comparative; to desire recognition is to desire to have a certain standing in relation to the standing of some group of relevant others. Secondly, *amour-propre* is relative to other subjects in the further sense that, since the good it seeks is recognition *from others*, its satisfaction requires—indeed, consists in—the opinions of one’s fellow beings. (Neuhouser, 2008: 32-33)

This difference between *amour de soi* (self-love) and *amour-propre*, points to another difference of them: Natural and artificial. While self-love is a natural sentiment, *amour-propre* is an artificial sentiment. The word “natural” points out three important features of *amour de soi*: “it is a sentiment we share with the animals (and so is part of our biological nature); 2. it is a benign sentiment, essential to virtue and humanity and not itself a source of human evils; 3. it is not ‘born in society’ but is (or would be) operative even in the absence of all social relations.” (Neuhouser, 2008: 37)

At this point, social passion property of *amour-propre* sentiment is important for us. *Amour-propre* sentiment has the feature of being social passion because it is formed as the result of relation between human and other individuals. Self-love is the natural sentiment of human. Therefore it will be suitable to ask this question to Rousseau: “Granted that *human* beings never exist without it, why call *amour-propre* artificial rather than simply social?” (Neuhouser, 2008: 38). Here the important point is; how the relation between people is realized. According to Rousseau, the reason of establishing social relations is that, people need each other’s help. As the result of increased needs of people, the idea of living together is given birth. Therefore, social world is artificial. (Neuhouser, 2008: 39). Also, Rousseau’s inequality separation is important. Rousseau discriminates between two types of inequality: Natural or physical inequality; moral or political inequality. Natural inequality is based on nature. Moral inequality is based on convention. Rousseau thinks the second type of inequality has one more feature: “The latter consists in the different privileges that some men enjoy to the prejudice of others, such as to be richer, more honored, more powerful than they, or even to make themselves obeyed by them.” (Rousseau, 1964b:101). Therefore, people created the moral or political inequality. As it is based on convention, it is subject to consent of individuals. (Neuhouser, 2008: 39). Therefore, *amour-propre* sentiment is given birth in the inequality environment formed by people. Consequently, “Rousseau does think that *amour-propre* is the principal source of the evils that beset human beings, but he does not believe that it leads to evils necessarily, in all its possible forms.” (Neuhouser, 2008: 40).

Rousseau expresses the sentiment of *amour de soi* (self-love), while searching for the source of human passions.

The source of our passions, the origin and the principle of all the others, the only one born with man and which never leaves him so long as he lives is self-love—a primitive, innate passion, which is anterior to every other, and of which all others are in a sense only modifications. (Rousseau, 1979: 212-213)

Two different situations shall be considered here, in order to solve the uncertainty. “whether the two passions are distinct with respect to their *nature* (because they have, say, different structures or effects or aims); and whether they are *genetically* distinct (because both are equally primordial and neither develops out of the other).” (Neuhouser, 2008: 43)

Rousseau claims that self-love (*amour de soi*) sentiment is the source or origin of *amour-propre*. But separates their natures. (Neuhouser, 2008: 43). Therefore, origin of both sentiments need to be determined. Rousseau explains the difference between self-love and *amour-propre* in *Emile*, in this way:

Self-love which regards only ourselves is contented when our true needs are satisfied. But *Amour-propre* which makes comparisons, is never content and never could be, because this sentiment, preferring ourselves to others, also demands others to prefer us to themselves, which is impossible. (Rousseau, 1979: 213-214)

In brief, “the two passions are fundamentally distinct: they represent independent sources of value for human beings; the ends of *amour-propre* are sought for their own sake, not merely because they are a means to achieving *amour de soi*’s ends, and vice versa.” (Neuhouser, 2008: 44)

In summary: Self-love exists both in animals and in men and it is a necessary passion for animals for enabling them to protect themselves. It is managed by mind in men and related with the sentiment of commiseration. For Rousseau, self-love is a natural sentiment and has an importance position in formation of humanity and morality. Vanity is shaped within the society. As it can be remembered, Rousseau claims that comparisons such as strong, weak, rich, poor are made among people when they began to live in a society. Therefore, man wants to think himself superior. Contrary to man’s state of civilization, there exists no vanity in the primitive state or in the state of nature. As man lives alone in this state, he only observes himself. As a

result, Rousseau determines the results arising from the passing to social life, development of science and the relationships established among people. For keeping the child out of the effects of negative results, he should be raised far from the society.

CHAPTER 3

THE STAGES OF ROUSSEAU'S EDUCATIONAL THEORY: EMILE

We can summarize the aforementioned statements of Rousseau with this quotation from Nietzsche: "Nature is good, for a wise and good God is its cause. Who, then, is responsible for the "corruption of mankind"? Its tyrants and seducers, the ruling orders-they must be destroyed"-: *Rousseau's* logic. (Nietzsche, 1968: 190). After grounding his opinions on this basis, Rousseau leans to education opinion and aims to raise a good individual with education.

Rousseau's book of *Emile* is known to be the one best dealing with individualized education. In this study, the topic to be studied mainly is to explain the methods of raising a good individual and citizen in Rousseau's education idea. But the main problem here is that how a person will be both a good citizen and a good individual. In other words, "in short, how can the individual be set in place within the counterpoint of private and public culture, how can he play the main theme and at the same time the subordinate theme as well?" (Nietzsche, 1996: 116). Therefore, in the first chapters of the study, there were the opinions of Rousseau about society and politics. Also, the relation between society and education was tried to be explained. The reason why this thesis statement is canalized in this direction is that the education is present as an important factor in search for an ideal society during historical process. This situation is maybe best explained by Locke's these statements:

The well Educating of their Children is so much the Duty and Concern of Parents, and the Welfare and Prosperity of the Nation so much depends on it, that I would have every one lay it seriously to Heart; and after having well examin'd and distinguish'd what Fancy, Custom, or Reason advises in the Case, set his helping Hand to promote every where that Way of training up Youth, with Regard to their several conditions, which is the easiest, shortest, and likeliest to produce virtuous, useful, and able Men in their distinct Callings; tho' that most to be taken Care of is the Gentleman's Calling. (Locke, 1892: Ixiii)

While stressing the necessity of education for the welfare of society, Locke believes that the education is required to be based on habit. When we look at the opinions of Locke about education, there is the idea that the discipline given to the child or the general orders in raising must be gained by habits. But Rousseau is not in the opinion of children's gaining behaviour through habits. Children should not be get accustomed to eat or sleep in the same hour or always behave in the same manner, instead they should be taught to use their freedom by realizing their demands in a self-dominant way. Apart from the idea of habit, the most different opinion between these two men is the issue whether the children should be taught too much rules. Rousseau is in the opinion that education should be based on practice not rules. Locke, too, objects to imposing rules to child, which is impossible for him to learn them all. Locke assumes that the child should repeat the good characteristics until he does the best of them and gains them. In this way, the child will learn the good one.

When we make the evaluation from the habit perspective, we can say that Rousseau's opinion is more effective in education. Because, Rousseau keeps the child's awareness alive while teaching him the good one and behaving well. Therefore, while acting, the child will know the reason and aim of this action. But Locke does not give the child the opportunity to explain or examine his behaviour. The child will act by habits.

One of the main problems of education is the difficulty of moral education. The issue of when and how moral should be taught to children necessitates a careful study. When we look at Rousseau's idea, we can see that his moral education is based on sentiments. Rousseau, who thought science and art corrupted human moral, did not teach Emile difficult science topics in her education. Instead, he taught the arts of agriculture or forging. According to Rousseau, before art shaped human manners and made human sentiments artifact, human customs were natural even if they were rustic. The manners of human behaviours would give knowledge about their characteristics. Even if the human nature were not better before, people knew each other better. Therefore, there was security between individuals in the society. (Rousseau, 1964a: 37). Science and arts corrupted human soul in time. Rousseau claims that bad results were not only in his age, but they

which rose from humans' useless curiosity were as ancient as the earth. With these words of Rousseau, we can tell about this idea that:

The daily ebb and flow of the ocean's waters have not been more steadily subject to the course of the star which gives us light during the night than has the fate of morals and integrity been subject to the advancement of the sciences and arts. Virtue has fled as their light dawned on our horizon, and the same phenomenon has been observed in all times and in all places. (Rousseau, 1964a: 39-40)

Therefore, in this section the virtue doctrine of Rousseau will be stressed because Rousseau believes that science and art both corrupt individual moral and kill values like patriotism and courage. Before mentioning about this topic, we will discuss; infancy period where Rousseauian education begins will be examined and virtue issue during the moral education period of children will be emphasized. While researching how malignancy occurred in society, Rousseau comes to the conclusion that the human's adventure of commencing social life should be examined and before examining society, he chooses to examine human nature. But he does not commence his inquisition about humans in infancy period in his book titled *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality*. Instead, he chooses to examine human physically, metaphysically and morally. When we look at his book, *Emile*, we can say that the education of the child is mainly based on these three stages. The child firstly is educated physically, indeed, his nutrition and bodily health is taken care. Then, the well use of his senses is regarded. And in the last stage, it is endeavoured for his moral development and for him to be virtuous in social life.

The reason why Rousseau's perception of education proceeds in these stages is that its educational base is nature. Dewey assesses Rousseau's idea of education in compliance with nature in four aspects: the first is regarding natural development, bodily organs, bodily strength and health. Therefore, health is among the aims of education. The second is that natural development regards physical mobility. Therefore, Rousseau primarily provides physical development of the child and then focused on mental development. The aim of following nature is to examine the benefits of environment, objects, plays and sports to body for physical development. When we look at the content of the Rousseau's education, we can see that Emile learnt moral rules through various plays and stressed the importance of

relations with the surrounding objects. Thirdly, Rousseau does not neglect the individual differences between children. The innate characteristics and strength of human should be noticed early and they should be differently educated according to their specialties. Fourthly, education oriented to nature provides importance to human skills. As the skills of individuals form in different periods, the skills of children should be observed properly. (Dewey, 1921, 134-135-136). Rousseau advises to observe the skills of the children in natural environment like during plays not in society. Individual does not behave pursuant to his actual characteristics but behaves as himself in natural environment. To gain actual knowledge about individual, he should be examined in environment and time under none of these pressures.

The virtue issue is a topic Rousseau gives importance in education. According to Rousseau, the source of moral corruption in individuals is the conflict between nature and social order. (Dewey, 1921: 134). Therefore, Rousseau commences the relation of children with society in later ages. But he does not ignore to teach him social virtues besides individual virtues.

James Delaney assesses Rousseau's notions of virtue in three aspects: (a) virtue as impossible and the goodness of the state of nature as the only possibility for human goodness; (b) virtue as the proper disposition of an individual within any given society, however corrupt; and (c) virtue as the accord of a person's will with the general will of a good society. (Delaney, 2006: 135-136).

In the state of nature, the good man is corrupted by the institution of society. According to Delaney, to avoid from this corruption state, individuals need education to virtuous. (2006:136). This situation is a necessary step towards founding the ideal state. Virtuous individuals should be virtuous citizens, at the same time. Therefore, there will be no tension between the individual and society. Delaney thinks that there is a difference between nascent men and civilized men and sorts the characteristics of the nascent men as follows: (1) they are dispersed; (2) they are amoral; (3) they identify with their species through compassion and reason; reflection and *amour-propre* are untriggered; (4) they are ignorant or indifferent to the opinions of others; (5) they are timid, but without anxiety; (6) they are indolent; (7) there is little communication beyond cries of warning; (8) sexuality consists of

haphazard couplings; and (9) inequalities are unimportant. (2006:56). Then, there remains to state the characteristics of virtuous human beings. Naturally, Delaney determines the characteristics of virtuous men considering the ones of nascent men. Some of these characteristics are as follows: civilized man is not dispersed, has moral. In natural environment, man is indolent but in civil society man is industrious. In civil society, with the foundation of state based on general will, certain tasks are assigned to individuals. Maybe the biggest difference between these two types of men is that in the state of nature the difference between men is not important while in civil society this difference becomes important. (Delaney, 2006:138-139). Within this regard, Delaney claims that Rousseau's political philosophy aims to explain the inequality between citizens. When human being realizes the inequalities between themselves and others, competition and *amour-propre* emerges. Human beings will not be indifferent to inequalities thanks to virtue. (Delaney,2006:139).

It would be wrong to say that there is no virtue in natural state. Delaney's statement is the best words making this detection. "Virtue in the state of nature exists in the form of a kind of amoral goodness; it is good in the sense that is not bad, and vices come from the institution of society." (Delaney, 2006: 139). Individual should not be raised by neglecting people's opinion and inequalities. The individual's abilities should be improved pursuant to the nature but the individual should be educated considering social connections. Therefore, an individual will not be raised distant from society.

One of the philosophers considering education and virtue together is Aristotle. Aristotle divides virtues into two sections as intellectual virtue and moral virtue. Intellectual virtues are philosophic wisdom, accurate understanding and practical wisdom. Moral virtues are liberty and temperance. The difference between these two kinds of virtue is that intellectual virtues come into existence by education and therefore based on experience and time. But moral virtues come into existence as a result of habits. In fact, this attractive idea of Aristotle regards his examination regarding the function of man. Human's only occupation should not only be "life" because "life" is the common trait of humans and plants. This kind of life related to nutrition and growth can not be the function of man. Life of perception is a life form special to both humans and animals and the function of man cannot be this. And

there remains active life and the function of man is related to this kind of life. Active life is a life form being in activity. “The function of man is an activity of soul which follows or implies a rational principle.” (Aristotle, 2009:11). This drives us to think about which life is the best for man. Aristotle accepts the existence of three types of life: life of enjoyment, the political life and the contemplative life. The contemplative life is the life type Aristotle determined as the best life and is based on reason and virtue.

Rousseau, also minds the development of reason and sentiments of a child for him to have the best life. Therefore, he wants to raise a virtuous individual through education considering his developmental stages and characteristics. We can divide the child’s developmental stages Rousseau determined into four sections considering the division Nicholas Dent made: 1. the age of nature: it is the period till the age of twelve and is the topic of the first and second books of *Emile*. 2. The age of reason: It covers the period between the ages twelve and fifteen and is the content of third book. It is the age when the practical and applied intelligence of the child is wanted to be improved. 3. The age of force, energy, vitality of life: It is the period between the ages of fifteen and twenty and it is the period when the sexual interest of the child arouses and it is the topic of the fourth book. 4. The age of wisdom: It is the period between the ages of twenty and twenty five and is the topic of fifth book. (Dent, 2005:83).

In the following sections of the thesis statement, the developmental stages of Rousseau’s education will be grouped and the content of the education will be discussed.

3.1. Book I: Infancy and Physical Development

Rousseau wants to raise the individual as citizen or human or both by education. He mentions about this idea as follows:

He who in the civil order wants to preserve the primacy of the sentiments of nature does not know what he wants. Always in contradiction with himself, always floating between his inclinations and his duties, he will never be either man or citizen. He will be good neither for himself nor for others. (Rousseau, 1979: 40)

Therefore, the individual should be educated in the manner that he becomes human or citizen or both. So, Rousseau thinks that two contrary institutions emerge related to this issue. One of these instructions is public and common; the other is individual and domestic instruction. According to Rousseau, the best book giving knowledge about public education is Plato's work, *Republic*. (1979: 40). Rousseau finds the educational systems and instructions in his and previous times useless. Individual is shaped towards opposite directions by nature and humans. If the human is not raised by education, individuals who are not beneficial for themselves or others appear in society. As public and common education is not beneficial, there remains domestic education or the education of nature but with this education, an individual who is beneficial only for himself can be raised. Therefore, the basic question is what an individual can do for others. Rousseau is in the opinion that natural man and his inclinations should be known well to raise beneficial individual in all two aspects. In short, as Rousseau accepts the goodness of natural man, he raises him away from social pressure and impression.

Rousseau examines how a newborn baby should be raised in the first book of his work, *Emile*. In fact, Rousseau mainly wants to teach his apprentice how to live. Human life begins with birth. Rousseau describes life as follows:

To live is not to breathe; it is to act; it is to make use of our organs, our senses, our faculties, of all the parts of ourselves which give us the sentiment of our existence. The man who has lived the most is not he who has counted the most years but he who has most felt life. (Rousseau, 1979: 42)

When we look at the stages of education of Rousseau, we can see that the child is not raised actively rather than passively in an educational manner based on application. Rousseau gives knowledge about the mistakes in child raising before he mentions about the education of Emile. One of these mistakes is the roughly rubbing of infant's head by midwives. In this way, it is thought that infant's head takes a proper shape. According to Rousseau, even if the head of the infant is shaped by the midwife from outside, it is shaped by the philosopher inside. (1979: 43)

Rousseau opposes to the tightly swaddling of infants the moment they are born. Immobilizing the infant's body harms him rather than providing benefits because as the child cannot move at his own will, he suffers and cries. This immobilization of chills and the pain from this affect his disposition and constitution. Rousseau comes to the conclusion that as a result of this situation the first sentiments of the infant become the sentiments of pain and suffering. Rousseau thinks that by immobilizing the child, the first gift to him becomes chain and the first behavior he learns from an individual becomes torment.

Locke and Kant, too, oppose to tight cloths and some implementations on child after birth. Locke thinks that a growing child's clothes should never be tight because nature shapes the body form ideally. But this requires the body to have a development space and freedom of movement. Tight clothes hinder this requirement. Kant thinks that tight clothes can be beneficial for protecting organs and a solution for bone fracturing. But this situation gives disappointment to the child and claims that if a mature individual is restricted from moving, he would be disappointed too. Therefore, Kant is in the opinion that the orders of nature should be taken into consideration in the first education of the child. According to Kant, the following should be done: "In general we must bear in mind that early education is only negative-that is, we have not to add anything to the provision of Nature, but merely to see that such provision is duly carried out." (Kant, 1900: 39)

However Rousseau thinks that nature teaches the pain to the child. This, in fact, is not against the nature of the child; it is a good growing method. Nature teaches the child pain and suffering, stiffens his temperament. For instance, even if the first growing teeth, stomachaches of the children give them pain; they learn how to tolerate them in early ages. Considering the mistakes in child rearing and

education, Rousseau determines a new beginning in his own education theory. For this, he designed an imaginary pupil and educates him from birth until the age when he does not need a guide other than himself. (Rousseau,1979:50). In this kind of education, Rousseau wants the pupil to discover precepts rather than learning them.

Rousseau wants the pupil he will educate to have some certain characteristics. For example, he must have been born in a country having moderate climate like France. The people in northern region consume much even if the land is arid and the people in southern region consumes too little even if the land is fertile. Rousseau assumes that this division results in another division. Third difference draws some people to be industrious, and some of them to dream. The division of rich and poor in the society is based on this. While the poor lives in arid lands, the rich lives the fertile land. According to Rousseau, the poor person does not need education because his situation provides him a compulsion education. (1979: 52). Also the poor person can become an individual by himself but the same situation is not available for the rich one. Rousseau chooses his pupil from the rich families to gain one more individual to society. Another feature of Emile is his being orphan.

Rousseau believes that man's education begins with birth. As the first sensations of child are affective, he can realize only the pain and the pleasure. The child begins to see and recognize the surrounding objects in time. And as he begins to recognize, he begins to make choices. He becomes interested in the ones he cannot recognize and wants to know them. As some new objects frighten the child, while teaching them, it is important to pay attention for not leaving a detrimental effect. Therefore, Rousseau commences the education of the child before he begins to speak. He should get accustomed to see the different objects and animals no matter whether they are ugly or not. The reason why Rousseau pays attention to this issue is that the child is interested in everything he recognizes with his senses in the first years of his life. The child uses his sensations as a means of gaining knowledge. Therefore, child should be given everything in order. Rousseau is in the opinion of the necessity that the child should touch or handle the object he is interested if he wants. The child should feel the size, warmth or weight of the objects. In this way, he learns new things by using his both sense of touch and sight. As he cannot distinguish the distance between objects in the first years of his life, he reaches out to

touch the near of far object. In fact, with this behavior, he wants to handle the object he saw first in his brain then with his eyes. Rousseau finds taking out child beneficial to generate the distance concept in child.

In the first development of child, sensations and sentiments are effective; while sensations can be realized by the grimaces of the child, sentiments can be realized by sighs. Actually, this first behavior of child is his deficiency and weakness. He tries to tell all of his annoyances and demands by crying. He gives voice to his eating, drinking or moving demands by tears. Rousseau thinks that the child contacts with the persons around with his tears and by this way he proceeds to social order. The point to be paid attention in the relation of the child with his environment is that the tears should not become a command. Also, in the subject of handling the objects, the demands of children should not become a command, too. Rousseau accepts that the child is dependent on someone else with tears and he cannot meet his own requirements but if all of the demands of the child are fulfilled, the child begins to be served. For this reason, the dependence sense of the child gives place to the thoughts of influencing and prevalence. Rousseau sees the requirement of not fulfilling every demand of the child to avoid this situation. While meeting the needs of the child, it is important to be careful. For example, when the child wants the distant objects, he wants whether to be taken to there or the object to be taken to him. Rousseau advises but hearing the crying of the child in the second situation because the child learns to command in this way. Thus, Rousseau stresses the demands of the children and meeting them in the first education. The first knowledge about the objects is gained by our senses and sensations but it is the reason that discriminates between the good and the bad.

Reason alone teaches us to know good and bad. Conscience, which makes us love the former and hate the latter, although independent of reason, cannot therefore be developed without it. Before the age of reason we do good and bad without knowing it, and there is no morality in our actions, although there sometimes is in the sentiment of others actions which have a relation to us. A child wants to upset everything he sees; he smashes, breaks everything he can reach. He grabs a bird as he would grab a stone, and he strangles it without knowing what he does. (Rousseau, 1979: 67.)

Rousseau thinks that there is an answer for these behaviors of the child. Philosophy explains this with natural vices like pride, the spirit of domination, *amour-propre*, the wickedness of man; and the feeling of his weakness but Rousseau does not accept these explanations. According to him, forming something is a slower action but destructing it is faster and is more appropriate for liveliness. The child has this liveliness and efficiency; therefore he wants to bring everything around liveliness, the child's destructing something does not show that he is a bad person because the nature gives him the power to do so. But, if the child commands the ones around to get what he wants and makes them do so, he learns to be destructive. To avoid this, the characteristics nature gave to the child should not be corrupted. Rousseau explains the ways of this protection with four maxims. These maxims are as follows: First maxim: "Far from having superfluous strength, children do not even have enough for everything nature asks of them. One must, therefore, let them have the use of all the strength nature gives them—a strength they could not know how to abuse." (Rousseau: 1979:68)

Second maxim: "One must aid them and supplement what is lacking to them, whether in intelligence or strength, in all that is connected with physical need" (Rousseau: 1979:68)

Third maxim: "One must, in the help one gives them, limit oneself solely to the really useful, without granting anything to whim or to desire without reason; for whim, inasmuch as it does not come from nature, will not torment them if it has not been induced in them." (Rousseau: 1979:68)

Fourth maxim: "One must study their language and their signs with care in order that, at an age at which they do not know how to dissimulate, one can distinguish in their desires what comes immediately from nature and what comes from opinion." (Rousseau: 1979:68)

According to Rousseau, the aims of these rules are to avail the children with more true freedom and less dominion and the opportunity to do more things on their own. Rousseau thinks that as a result of this kind of implementation, desires and strengths will be limited. Therefore, when the child could not get the thing he is not strong enough, he will feel its deficiency less. (Rousseau,1979:68).

The duty of adults in response to children demands is not condoning the commands of the child and not giving the opportunity to children striving against them at their own will. If the crying of the child is ignored sometimes, he would stop crying in time.

Another philosopher giving importance to the unnecessary crying of children is Thomas Hobbes. Hobbes thinks that the reason of crying, yelling, tempering of children when they cannot get what they wanted is in the nature. The nature pushes the children to behave like that. Hobbes thinks that the child should not be accused for that because they are not evil and in their infancy period they cannot harm anyone. As they cannot use their reason, they don't have any duty. When they grow up, and reach to certain strength that they can harm someone, if they behave in the same way, then they are called evil. Consequently, Hobbes describes evil man and evil as follows:

Thus an evil man is rather like a sturdy boy, or a man of childish mind, and evil is simply want of reason at an age when it normally accrues to men by nature governed by discipline and experience of harm. Unless then we say that men were made evil by nature simply because they do not have discipline and the use of reason from nature, it must be admitted that they can have greed, fear, anger and all the other animal passions from nature, but still not be made evil by nature. (Hobbes, 2003:11)

During this period, the language education of the child is important. The child should be taught every word and urged to speak. Even if the child is taught many words, he does not hurry to use them; he tries to understand their meanings before. Therefore, in the first period, the child should be taught few words that he certainly understands.

3.2. Book II: Childhood and the Education of Senses

Rousseau, who assumes that the second period of life begins, at the same time imagines that the child learns to speak at the same time. The child can express his requirements and pains with words not by crying. If the child unnecessarily cries, he should not be responded. The child will stop doing so when he realizes that. Rousseau gives importance to how child responds to his pains in this stage of education because the child will assess his pain according to the responses of others. If the adult stays even tempered, the child will act that way, too. If an adult helps the child apprehensively, the child would exaggerate his pain.

Rousseau does not evaluate Emile's falling or wounding as a bad incident. In this way, he will learn pain sentiments. In this situation the child will learn how to get up and the tranquility of freedom earlier.

The difference of this period from the others is the development of sentiment of identity. As the child strengthens and realizes to do something freely with this strength, he will need other's help less. The child slowly gains his identity and is accepted as a moral being. Therefore, Rousseau thinks that a child should be raised as a child not as an adult.

In order not to pursue chimeras let us not forget what is appropriate to our situation. Humanity has its place in the order of things; childhood has its in the order of human life. The man must be considered in the man, and the child in the child. To assign each his place and settle him in it, to order the human passions according to man's constitution is all that we can do for his well-being. The rest depends on alien causes which are in no way in our power. (Rousseau, 1979: 80)

Rousseau thinks that the reason of unhappiness depends on the state of desires and faculties of humans. He assumes that a person whose desires and faculties are equal is will be happy. A person should decrease his desires to be happy and ensure that his desires and faculties are equal. If the desires are under the strength of a human, the faculties would become ineffective. Accordingly, happiness comes from the limiting of desires and faculties and stabilizing strong will. And the nature gave human desires and faculties to live on. Human's first and most competent faculty is imagination. Imagination awakens desires and feeds them. As long as the human

stays in his natural state, the difference between his desires and faculties stays decreased and he becomes happy.

The only one who does his own will is he who, in order to do it, has no need to put another's arms at the end of his own; from which it follows that the first of all goods is not authority but freedom. The truly free man wants only what he can do and does what he pleases. That is my fundamental maxim. It need only be applied to childhood for all the rules of education to flow from it. (Rousseau, 1979: 84)

Every person should know his place in society and stay there. The child should know this, too, but as he is not aware of this, adults should teach him that. The child should know that he is weak but this state should not harm him. He should know that he is dependent on someone else to meet his needs and completely succumb. He should want, not command. (Rousseau, 1979:85). The child wants what is beneficial for himself. A father does not have the right to give the child the things that is not beneficial for him.

Rousseau accepts two kinds of dependence in *Emile*; the dependence on things and the dependence on men. The dependence on things is natural but the dependence on men is societal. The dependence on things has no moral aspects, as it does not damage freedom, it does not bring evil with itself. The dependence on men is without order and generates evil. In this kind of dependency, master and slave corrupts morals of each other. Laws are constituted to avoid this evil resulting from this dependence in society and general will is preferred rather than private will. In this way, laws are constituted in society. Therefore, Rousseau gives importance to the dependence on things in child's education, thus wants to follow nature's order.

Accordingly, the child's doing evil should not be forbidden, but prevented. Rousseau gives importance to freedom in his education idea and wants the child to be free. Therefore it is important to explain Rousseau's thoughts about dependence in details. Generally Rousseau system includes three types of dependence: on things, on desires, on person. (Gauthier, 2006:28). Rousseau explains the difference between the dependence on things and dependence on men in this way:

Dependence on things, which is from nature; dependence on men, which is from society. Dependence on things, since it has no morality, is in no way detrimental to freedom and engenders no vices. Dependence on men, since it is without order, engenders all the vices, and by it, master and slave are mutually corrupted. (Rousseau, 1979: 85)

According to Rousseau dependence on things, “For the impulse of appetite alone is slavery, and abedience to the law one has prescribed for oneself is freedom. (1978a: 56). Rousseau thinks the dependence on things among the three dependence types is useful for education. Nature’s order in education is preserved by child’s being dependent on things. Punishment or physical obstacles shall be applied for child’s indiscriminating will. It must not be forbidden for children to do evil. Instead, it would be suitable to prevent him from doing evil. Child’s desires must be fulfilled because they are his needs, and child must understand this. Rousseau objects to desires and dependence on people. As people’s needs increase, their dependence to other people increases too. Therefore child must not be left in a situation with lots of needs. In that way Rousseau protects child from the dependence on desires. These ideas of Rousseau about freedom and will are eye catching:

The only one who does his own will is he who, in order to do it, has no need to put another’s arms at the end of his own; from which it follows that the first of all goods is not authority but freedom. The truly free man wants only what he can do and does what he pleases. That is my fundamental maxim. It need only be applied to childhood for all the rules of education to flow from it. (Rousseau, 1979: 84)

Although Rousseau gives importance to freedom of child, some situations in *Emile* are contradictory to this idea. For example, Rousseau accepted a capricious child’s education for a few weeks. One day child gets bored and wants to go out. Rousseau seems to be busy and says he could not come with him. In this situation the child says he would go out alone and Rousseau gives permission for this. Child tells what he would do when he goes out. His purpose is making Rousseau feel worried so that he comes with him together to outside. But Rousseau does not care about child’s words. When the child understands this, he wants help from the servant to follow him when he goes out. Servant says that she had lots of things to do and could not

come. Child becomes obliged to go out alone. When he goes out, people around him begin to tell something about him.

“Neighbor, look at the pretty monsieur! Where is he going all alone? He is going to get lost. I want to ask him to come in our house.” “Don’t you dare, neighbor. Don’t you see that this is a little libertine who has been driven out of his father’s house because he did not want to be good for anything? Sanctuary must not be given libertines. Let him go where he will.” “Too bad. Let God guide him. I would be sorry if misfortune were to come to him.” (Rousseau, 1979: 123)

When child walks further, he meets other children of his age. Children tease with him and make him angry. Child understands that his epaulettes and gold trim can not protect him from dangers. Rousseau had wanted a friend to follow the child. His friend comes near the child and tells him that walking alone was a reckless, mad action. Child returns home, ashamed. On the other day, Rousseau goes for a trip with the child. Child passes near those children who had teased with him the previous day with a big pride this time. Because this time Rousseau is near him and he knows no one can do harm to him. Rousseau tells these words at the end of story:

It is by these means and others like them that during the short time I was with the child I got to the point of being able to make him do everything I wanted without prescribing anything to him, without forbidding him anything, without sermons, without exhortations, without boring him with useless lessons. Thus, so long as I spoke, he was satisfied; but he was afraid of my silence. He understood that something was not going well, and the lesson always came to him from the thing itself. But let us return. (Rousseau: 1979: 124)

We can tell that freedom is kept in background in these thoughts of Rousseau. Child is dependent to other people here to walk outside. But Rousseau thinks people’s dependence on men shall not have a place in education. A better example which explains child’s dependence on men can be seen during education of Emile. Emile marries with a woman whose name is Sophie. A few months later Emile comes near Rousseau and talks about Sophie’s being pregnant. Emile has some requests from Rousseau: “Advise us and govern us. We shall be docile. As long as I live, I shall need you. I need you more than ever now that my functions as a man begin. You have fulfilled yours. Guide me so that I can imitate you.” (Rousseau, 1979: 480)

Rousseau gives importance to dependence on things in child's education. But this is the result at the end of Emile's education: "Emile acknowledges that he is not the true natural man, raised to a condition of self-sufficiency, but the permanent dependent of the Tutor." (Gauthier, 2006: 44). This situation is the paradox in Rousseau's education system. When we look generally, dependence on men plays an important role in losing freedom. (Gauthier, 2006: 29). While Emile is educated as a natural man, these properties must be considered: "Emile must be protected from the unrestrained explosion of desire. His powers must be developed so that he can meet his real needs. But above all, he must be kept in dependence only on things." (Gauthier, 2006: 32)

While fulfilling the child's demands, it should be made him feel that it is his requirement, not his wish. In this situation, the child would not think he made that person succumb. Rousseau finds the teaching of some words to children to use when they demand something hazardous. Indeed, with this polite words, the child commands to the person. The important thing is the meaning of the word the child attributed to even if they are rude while telling his demands. Thus, Rousseau teaches Emile decent demand sentences apart from polite sentences. Rousseau believes that fulfilling every demand of the child will make him unhappy because he will begin to make impossible demands in time. As his demands are fulfilled, he becomes ill-tempered. A child whose almost every demand is fulfilled will have difficulties in society, too, because he made the persons around succumbed. When he entered social life, as he will have to succumb to society, he will have difficulties and be unhappy. Accordingly, Rousseau thinks that meeting the needs of the children is important in this aspect. The strength division between child and adult should remain and the child should know that the reason of his inability to meeting his own needs is not a result of authority but the insufficiency of his strength. When some of his wishes are rejected the child becomes patient, stable and accepts his own fate.

Kant, too, approves not fulfilling every wish of the children but rejecting every wish is a wrong type of raising. The state of fulfilling every wish is common in the period when they begin to speak. And rejecting their every wish affects their temper. Therefore, Kant recommends not corrupting the children's nature. To do so, it is important of take into account the reason of their crying and whether their needs

are really important. According to Kant, when they are crying for an important reason, children should be helped. And when they are crying for no reason, it is beneficial to leave them alone. (Kant, 1900, 56). Kant thinks that getting every wish of children by crying will make them ill-tempered, and getting every wish by continually demanding will weaken their character. Thus, what should be done is considering the real needs of children.

As Rousseau does not believe the innate corrupted moral in humans, he searches its reasons in society. The natural passion of human is his self-love or *amour-propre*. *Amour-propre* can be beneficial or harmful itself or depending on individuals. It is determined by its implementation. When considered from this point of view, Rousseau accepts that human is good from birth but alters according to the use of his features. Therefore, the following rule should be taken into consideration in children education: “Therefore, up to the time when the guide of *amour-propre*, which is reason, can be born, it is important for a child to do nothing because he is seen or heard—nothing, in a word, in relation to others; he must respond only to what nature asks of him, and then he will do nothing but good.” (Rousseau,1979:92-93)

The evil action of the child is not the products of an endamaging thoughts, the child does not have bad intentions. Rousseau finds placing too much furniture in child’s room unnecessary because he has to have comfortable space. As he grows up, he furnishes it at his own will. Rousseau, who accepts the period between birth and the age of ten as the most dangerous one, believes that mistakes and evil arises in these ages. In this period, if the child learns evil, it would be hard for him to get rid of. Thus, the child should not use it until the faculties of his soul become effective. Rousseau names this first education of child negative because virtue and reality cannot be taught to him; only the child’s heart protects him from evil, and mind from mistakes. (Rousseau,1979:93). The child should be protected from prejudices and habits. In the first education of the child, he should be provided to use his body, organs and strength, but the efficiency of the soul should remain in back. Rousseau thinks that to implement this, the child and his temperaments should be known well. To know the child, he should be observed and his behaviors in his natural environment should be examined thoroughly. After comprehending the manner of

the child, how to behave him should be decided. In this stage, the question Rousseau wants to answer is where the child will be raised:

But where will we put this child to raise him like a being without sensation, like an automaton? Will we keep him in the moon's orb or on a desert island? Will we keep him away from all human beings? Will he not constantly have in the world the spectacle and the example of others' passions? Will he never see other children of his age? Will he not see his parents, his neighbors, his nurse, his governess, his lackey, even his governor who, after all, will not be an angel? (Rousseau, 1979:94)

Rousseau targets natural education and prefers carrying out this education in a village. Its reason is that the objects the teacher will teach to the child are more dominant in village. The teacher can have the reputation in village, which he cannot reach in city because as he tries to be beneficial for everyone, he is admired and appreciated by others.

Rousseau considers necessary to teach primarily the notion of property, and then the notion of freedom to the child in this period of life. The reason of giving knowledge about the notion of property to the child is to prevent him from destructing the objects around. The child should know the clothes, toys and stuff he owns and protect them. Rousseau wants to deal with the beginning of property and as he raised Emile in village, he imagines him as having a garden and cultivating bean. Thanks to this activity, Emile will learn the actions of strength, imitation and production. As the broad beans grow, Emile will feel that they belong to him and be happy. In this situation, by telling "This belongs to you", Rousseau tries to explain the word "belong" to him. However, some day the child sees that the beans in the garden are plucked and the land is corrupted and becomes unhappy by the thought of injustice. The case is searched and found out that the gardener is behind this. Actually the gardener cultivated melon to the places of broad beans but as Emile gave damage to them, gardener plucks the beans. The gardener gets angry by the action of intervention to the garden he owns and says him not to give damage to something he owns. After, they ask him to give some part of his garden to them and he accepts. Rousseau wants to tell Emile what property is and how first property comes into existence.³ Emile also learns the notion of exchange with this incident.

³ For a detailed version of this story, see Rousseau's book "*Emile*" (Book II, pp.98-99).

(Rousseau, 1979: 99). In another words, Rousseau tells the first commencement of property in the same way: “The first person who, having fenced off a plot of ground, took it into his head to say *this is mine* and found people simple enough to believe him, was the true founder of civil society.” (Rousseau, 1964b: 141)

In the situations which children always harms the objects, instead of buying new objects, Rousseau advises to make the children feel the deficiency of that stuff. For example, if the child continually shatters the glasses of his room, instead of renewing them, the child should be slept in that room and even taken ill. If he keeps doing that, he advises to keep him in dark room for a few days. When nobody speaks with him there, he will get bored and understand his mistake. In this situation, an agreement will be made with the children and he will be taken out of the dark room as long as he promises not to do so. In case that he lies, he will think that nobody would believe in him after that and explain the other bad results of that lie.

Rousseau, who gives importance to the child’s language improvement, opposes to his learning a foreign language in early ages. The words should be clearly taught to children and too many words should not be loaded to them. According to Rousseau, minds form according to language and thoughts are painted in the color of idioms but reason is always common (1979: 109). Therefore, before the child learns to compare the thoughts, he should not learn another language besides his mother tongue. Rousseau does not want Emile to learn new things by memorizing while teaching him. He also keeps him away from tales, especially from the ones of La Fontaine because the words in this tales are not beneficial for the child. Again this tales affects the moral development of the child negatively. Tales include morals for adults but everything should directly be explained to children. Rousseau explains the harmful content of the tales of La Fontaine by examining the tale, *The Crow and the Fox*.

The Crow and the Fox
F A B L E

Master Crow, on a tree perched,
Master! What does this word signify in itself? What does it signify in front of a proper name? What meaning has it on this occasion?
What is a crow?

What is *a tree perched*? One does not say: “on a tree perched”; one says: “perched on a tree.” Consequently one has to talk about poetic inversions; one has to tell what prose and verse are.

Held in his beak a cheese.

What cheese? Was it a Swiss cheese, a Brie, or a Dutch? If the child has not seen crows, what do you gain by speaking to him about them? If he has seen them, how will he conceive of their holding a cheese in their beak? Let us always make images according to nature.

Master Fox by the odor atticed

Another master! But to this one the title really belongs: he is a pastmaster in the tricks of his trade. One has to say what a fox is and distinguish its true nature from the conventional character it has in fables.

Atticed. This word is not current. One has to explain it; one has to say that it is not used anymore except in verse. The child will ask why one speaks differently in verse than in prose. What will you respond to him?

“Atticed by the odor of a cheese!” This cheese held by a crow perched on a tree must have quite an odor to be smelled by the fox in a copse or in his hole! Is this the way you give your pupil practice in that spirit of judicious criticism which does not allow itself to be impressed except by real likelihoods and knows how to discern truth from lie in others narrations?

Made to him a speech of this kind.

A speech! Foxes speak, then? They speak, then, the same language as crows? Wise preceptor, be careful. Weigh your response well before making it. It is more important than you think.

Well, good day, Monsieur Crow!

Monsieur! A title that the child sees used derisively even before he knows that it is a title of honor. Those who say “Monsieur du Crow” will have a lot of explaining to do before they explain that *du*.

How charming you are! How handsome you seem to me!

Padding, useless redundancy. The child, seeing the same things repeated in other terms, learns slovenly speech. If you say that the redundancy is part of the author’s art and belongs to the plan of the fox who wants to appear to multiply the praises with the words, this excuse will be good for me but not for my pupil.

Without lying, if your song

Without lying! One lies sometimes, then? Where will the child be if you teach him that the fox says “without lying” only because he is lying?

Corresponds to your plumage,

Corresponds! What does this word signify? Teach the child to compare qualities so different as voice and plumage. You will see how he will understand you!

You would be the Phoenix of the landlords of these woods.

The Phoenix! What is a phoenix? Here we are cast suddenly into antiquity’s lies, almost into mythology.

The landlords of these woods! What figurative speech! The flatterer ennobles his language and gives it more dignity to make it more seductive. Will a child understand this finesse? Does he so much as know, can he know, what is a noble style and a low style?

At these words the Crow cannot contain his joy.

One must have already experienced very lively passions to have a feeling for this proverbial expression.

And to show his fine voice

Do not forget that to understand this verse and the whole fable, the child ought to know what the crow's fine voice is.

He opens his big beak, lets fall his prey.

This verse is admirable. The harmony alone produces an image. I see a big ugly beak opened; I hear the cheese falling through the branches. But this sort of beauty is lost on children.

The Fox grabs it and says: My good monsieur,

Here, then, goodness is already transformed into stupidity. Assuredly, no time is lost in instructing children.

Learn that every flatterer

General maxim. We can no longer follow.

Lives at the expense of the one who listens to him.

Never did a ten-year-old child understand that verse.

This lesson is doubtless worth a cheese.

This is understandable, and the thought is very good. However, there will still be very few children who know how to compare a lesson with a cheese and who would not prefer the cheese to the lesson. One must, therefore, make them understand that this remark is only mockery. What finesse for children!

The Crow, ashamed and embarrassed,

Another pleonasm; but this one is inexcusable.

Swore, but a little late, that he would not be caught that way again.

Swore! Who is the fool of a master who dares to explain to the child what an oath is? (Rousseau, 1979: 113-115)

Rousseau thinks that this kind of tales affects the moral development of the children negatively. As we can remember, Plato also chooses not to tell any kind of tale to children. Therefore, he forbade telling the tales of Homer and Hesiod. Aristotle stresses the importance of the tales in the child's development. But firstly he advises to pay attention to his nourishment in the period between the infant's birth and the age of five and make them do some body movements to him. The infant should be raised in way that he can accommodate with cold climate and with play; his bodily movements should be increased. These plays should both include orders and not be tiring. The tales and stories that will be read to children in this period should be chosen carefully and the tales that may have a bad influencing content to their later school life should not be read. The law maker should take these into account in child's education and determine the laws on this basis.

Rousseau forbids the child's reading book as a result of the words in the books and their content. Emile could read books when he becomes twelve. When reading becomes beneficial for him, he will learn how to read. The child avails himself from reading until he knows the benefits of it for himself.

Rousseau wants the child to be active during education. The first natural activity of human is to detect the features of objects around. As the knowledge is gained in the faculty of human understanding through senses, human first gains a sensual reason faculty. Through this faculty, he has intellectual reason faculty. As Rousseau accepts the arms, legs, senses and organs as the means of intelligence, he believes that intellectual skill can improve by using them. If the individual wants to use his organs very well, he should be healthy and strong. The intellectual faculty of human certainly can not develop apart from body and the healthier the body is, the easier the mind activities function. As the senses are the first faculty to develop, they have to be developed. To develop senses, we not only use them but also learn reasoning and feeling through them because Rousseau believes that human learns what he touches, what he sees and what he hears. The body can be improved by the exercises like swimming or running but while these activities as the organs like eyes or ears are used, five sense organs are developed at the same time. Rousseau wants to organize a foot race to commence these implementations in Emile and teach him the importance of senses. Rousseau takes two cakes for them in their tour with Emile afternoon. But one day Emile sees that he took three cakes and wants to finish his and eat the third one. But Rousseau objects and tells him that he can eat or share that piece with him. Instead Rousseau offers to make a race between the two kids there and give the cake to the winner. Emile accepts this offer and is told the rules of the race. Accordingly, the cake will be put on a stone in a certain distance and after the race begins, the first one to reach it will have the right to eat it. Both children accept the rules and Rousseau starts the race and with Emile he watches the race. One of the kids runs faster and eats the cake without sharing with the other one. In their subsequent tours, Rousseau increases the number of racing children by taking more cakes with him and also increases the distance. The rules are same and the winner eats cake. Also, some children play tricks like holding the other one or throwing stone to their path. Rousseau made these cheating children start the race in different

paths. Emile becomes unhappy as he sees that the cakes he loves much are eaten by others. Therefore, he gradually realizes that he can also take place in the race and he is strong enough for that. One day, he wants the last cake from Rousseau, but he does not give it. Then, Emile demands the reorganization of the race and he wants to participate. As Rousseau expects this demand, he starts the race by calling other children. In the first days when Emile won the race, he eats the cake alone like other children. As he gets used to winning, he begins to share the cake with the others. In this ways, Rousseau provides Emile to have this kind of generosity. Rousseau thinks that he finds the true principle of generosity in only this way. (1979: 142)

As Rousseau wants to teach Emile some other knowledge, too, he disarranges the equality of the distance without noticing Emile. In this situation, as some of the children are further from the stone, they would have to run more distance. When Rousseau wants Emile to choose the running path, he chooses the finest path instead of the shortest one. In time when Rousseau tells him his cheat, expostulates on him. But Rousseau tells him that he did not promised to keep the distance equal, he was free to choose his own path and it was senseless of him to choose the finest path without regarding its distance. Emile wants to pace out the shortest path but it is a long haul. Instead, he tries to determine the distance of the paths by eye. Through these trials, Emile becomes skilled in determining the distances by eye. Consequently, Rousseau reaches his aim in Emile's comprehending the importance of his senses. The second aim of Rousseau is to gain Emile to use movement and judgment together. With the help of this race Emile has this ability, too. Thirdly, Emile has virtue by learning generosity. After these, the aim of Rousseau is to develop the senses of Emile. In general, the lesson of this story to the children is:

This story conveys many lessons. As a story about moral training, it tells us to apply the correct techniques to the different stages of children's development: elementary stimulus-response, an appeal to greed and self-interest. But at the same time children learn lessons not of simple egotism, since they come to appreciate the pleasures of elementary generosity, as they learn to share the cakes. (O'Hagan, 1999:50)

According to Rousseau, the sense of touch is the sense that is most used. Even if the judges got by the touch sense are defective and rustic, they are the most trustable ones. The touch sense is accompanied by the sense of sight. The object is first seen

and then touched. As the eye recognizes the object first, the mind produces thoughts before the sense of touch. Therefore sense of touch may sometimes be faulty. While there are exercises blinding touch sense, there are the ones sharpening it, too. In the first situation, the exercises make the skin stiff and calloused and corrupt its nature. In the second situation, the natural sensibility of the skin is developed by light and frequent touches. This situation exists especially when playing musical instruments.

Even if the sense of sight is used as frequently as the sense of touch, it has faulty features because human can see the half of his horizon. With the sense of sight, we can see the size and the distance of the objects. Rousseau suggests subjecting the sight organ to touching organs because while seeing is faster, touching is slower and regular. Therefore these two senses should work together. The people best doing these are engineers, architectures and painters. Besides using sense organs together Rousseau, at the same time, wants moving and thinking faculties to function together. The child should have an interest in measuring the distances and weighing. The child should guess about the situations like whether the ladder's height is adequate for picking cherries, how long the rope should be for making swing between two trees, whether the fishing line is adequate for fishing from the castle. Rousseau accepts painting as the art sufficient for developing the sense of sight of the child. The child should draw a house by looking at house, human by looking at human and tree by looking at tree and by this way should learn to observe their appearances very well. Rousseau decorates the room of the child (Emile) with the paintings of his; the room which is empty in the first stage is now decorated with paintings.

In this stage of teaching the sense of sight, Rousseau includes an interesting geometry.

I have said that geometry is not within the reach of children. But it is our fault. We are not aware that their method is not ours, and that what becomes for us the art of reasoning, for them ought to be only the art of seeing. Instead of giving them our method, we would do better to take theirs. For our way of learning geometry is an affair just as much of imagination as of reasoning. When the proposition is stated, it is necessary to imagine its demonstration—that is to say, to find of which proposition already known this one must be a consequence and, out of all the consequences that can be drawn from that same proposition, to choose precisely the one required. (Rousseau, 1979: 145)

Rousseau does not include only rules and the demonstrations in geometry education. Instead he wants the child to reason.

Make exact figures, combine them, place them on one another, examine their relations. You will find the whole of elementary geometry in moving from observation to observation, without there being any question of definitions or problems or any form of demonstration other than simple superimposition. As for me, I do not intend to teach geometry to Emile; it is he who will teach it to me; I will seek the relations, and he will find them, for I will seek them in such a way as to make him find them. For example, instead of using a compass to draw a circle, I shall draw it with a point at the end of a string turning on a pivot. After that, when I want to compare the radii among themselves, Emile will ridicule me and make me understand that the same string, always taut, cannot have drawn unequal distances. (Rousseau, 1979: 145)

In the classical geometry education, the studies are carried out over demonstrations by ignoring the accuracy of the shapes. But Rousseau ignores the demonstrations; according to him, drawing a perfect square is drawing a perfect line and a full round ring. The accuracy of the shapes drawn will be known by examining the visible features. Thus, Rousseau aims to teach better the different features of different shapes to Emile. Emile will not know geometry as a science consisting of ruler rule or compass. Emile, who learns the difference between paint and geometry won't use these tools in painting. Timothy O'Hagan draws attention to the similarity between Rousseau's including geometry in education and Socrates' teaching geometry to the slave in the dialogue in *Meno* of Plato. As we can remember, in the dialogue of *Meno*, by calling him, Socrates does not teach geometry to the slave. He only enables him to remember the knowledge he already has because for Socrates, knowledge is gained through only remembering. The common feature of the pupils of both philosophers is: "Both Rousseau's Emile and Plato's slave boy in the *Meno* learn geometry *for themselves*, through skilful orchestration by the instructor. The latter discovers geometrical proofs by recollecting ideas already present innately in him. Through trained practice, Emile discovers proofs by relating himself to the world. He thereby discovers truths about himself, as a learning, practising subject, and at the same time he learns truths about the law-governed world." (O'Hagan, 1999: 52). Emile will gain knowledge about axioms, definitions and proofs at the end of his

geometry education. But he could not arrange this knowledge in an order. At the end of this lecture, Emile will know the abstract concept and necessary relations. Rousseau's main aim, of course, gives more importance to the moral development of his pupil. (O'Hagan, 1999: 52).

Rousseau, who advises listening music to improve the sense of hearing, is in the opinion of child's knowing simple lyrics. As the child does not know how to read, he will listen to notes. And while listening, he will learn to use his voice accurately, balancedly and flexibly. The activity of the sense of taste does not affect imagination as it is physical and material. Rousseau is in the opinion that there exist a relation between the sense of sight and the sense of touch. This relation results from seeing a thing before touching it. Just like this, there exist a relation between the sense of taste and the sense of smell. The sense of smell gives knowledge about the object to the sense of taste, in other words we have preliminary knowledge about something we will taste from the smell of it. According to Rousseau, as the smells are weak sensations, the stimulative effects of them are extensive but they stimulate senses lightly. (Rousseau, 1979: 156). Therefore, Rousseau accepts the sense of smell as the sense of imagination.

In education system, another person who gives importance to senses is Comenius. Comenius uses senses while he teaches words and the functions of the objects to the child. The reason why he lays importance to the senses is:

We can neither act nor speak wisely, unless we first rightly understand all the things which are to be done, and whereof we are to speak. Now there is nothing in the understanding which was not before in the sense. And therefore to exercise the senses well about the right perceiving the differences of things, will be to lay the grounds for all wisdom, and all wise discourse, and all discreet actions in one's course of life. (Comenius, 1810:7)

Comenius teaches new knowledge and concepts to the child through paintings. For example, the child will learn the concept of "tree" from the painting including a tree and other objects. Each drawing on the painting has a number and in numerical order the child will be told about object or event. So, the child will learn to be the wise person. And to learn to be wise is "to understand rightly, to do rightly, and to speak out rightly all that are necessary." (Comenius, 1810:17-18).

The attractive thought of Rousseau is acceptance of sixth sense and naming this sense as cultivation. Rousseau accepts cultivation as common sense but the reason why it is called common is not its being found in everyone. As the sense of cultivation comes into existence as a result of regular use of other senses, Rousseau calls it common. Also, this sense gives knowledge about the nature of the things. The place of the sense of cultivation is brain and internal sensations are called perceptions or ideas. The number of these ideas shows the level of knowledge a person has. Rousseau claims that the evidence of the accuracy of the mind is based on its distinctness and clarity. Human reason is the one making comparisons. Rousseau divides reason into intellectual or human reason and sensual or childish reason. The faculty of generating simple ideas or complex ideas is human reason. Sensual reason is the faculty of generating simple ideas from various sensations. In Emile's education, Rousseau firstly gives importance to his sensation and then wants to develop childish reason. Then, we want to accept the child as adult and continue his education. At the end of this period, Emile will learn everything with experiences, not memorizing. His ideas are clear and he does not trifle and he uses his reason. Emile is a child who does not know the customs in the society and does not have ant habits. He talks and does appropriately. Therefore, Emile behaves at his own will under no authority. Emile has little moral notions but his moral notions do not include men's relative condition. As Rousseau taught property to Emile, the child knows the reasons of the things he does or does not own. Emile thinks that all men are equal and want help from everyone and talks with everyone in the same manner. As the child's imagination is not used, this issue is emphasized in the subsequent lessons.

3.3. Book III: Adulthood and Intellectual Education

Rousseau analyses the development of Emile in the age of twelve or thirteen and the education of him in these ages. The utmost characteristics of the child in this age are the rapid development of his imagination but Rousseau talks about the development of intellectual power and skills rather than physical strength. The knowledge that will be taught to the child will not be theoretical but will be based on

experience. As Emile is in the age that he can discriminate between the beneficial and useless, moral knowledge to do this will be taught to him. And in the subsequent period, he will learn the good one and to discriminate it. The reason of all this changes is the intellectual activities awakening in the child's mind. While the child is very lively in the first periods of the child's life, in this period his sense of wonder and learning effort is in the foreground. In the previous periods, the senses of the child were developed and the sensations were given emphasis. After this, the sensation should gradually turn into ideas. The senses should be a guide to his ideas for the child. Therefore, Rousseau tells that the best book a child can read is world, and the best education is the education dependent on facts. According to him, a child who can read only reads, not thinks and learns only words. (Rousseau, 1979: 168)

Rousseau wants the child to be active in education. Instead of learning science, he wants him to find something and to know the real reason of the phenomenon. For example, if the child is wanted to be taught geography, he should not be demonstrated map or globe. Instead, he should be raised in natural environment. To tell the direction of the sunrise or sunset, the child should be taken to tour to make observations. Rousseau, also, finds asking short questions to the child beneficial to make him think about the issue. By making observations in different times, the child is told that sun has summer east wind and winter east wind.

While teaching geography to the child, Rousseau firstly begins with the knowledge about the city he lives and the house of his father. Secondly, he introduces the places and the rivers around. Thirdly, he tells the shape and the movement of the sun. The child will learn this knowledge from his observations not from a map and will produce his own map by drawing what he sees. Knowing the ways of gaining knowledge is the most important thing for the child. He will know the means of the shapes in the map very well. He can decorate his room with his own maps. The reason why Rousseau plans education in a simple way is hidden in the aim of his education: "Remember always that the spirit of my education consists not in teaching the child many things, but in never letting anything but accurate and clear ideas enter his brain." (1979: 171). The important thing for Rousseau is to prevent the child from being wrong and protect him from mistakes. The questions rising from the learning eagerness of the child should be answered properly, according to

Rousseau and he is also in the opinion of being attentive for the ridiculous questions of him. The inconsistent questions of the child are for captivating. Therefore the reasons of these questions should be understood well.

The most important feature of the education of Rousseau is while it teaches science to the child, at the same time it teaches moral values. He wants the child to enjoy from the science instead of learning while explaining sciences. As the child enjoys from the sciences, he should be explained about them by developing new methods. Rousseau accepts this rule as the main principle of the sciences. While explaining sciences to the child, Rousseau, he teaches him not to focus on something for so long. The child should learn the important things without getting bored. After the education of geography, Rousseau commences the education of physics.

Emile and Rousseau observe that the objects like glass or candle pull halm by rubbing. They also realize that other objects do not do the same thing. After that, Rousseau and Emile realize that magnet pulls the objects like iron without rubbing. One day, Rousseau and Emile go to street fair and watch the show of a magician. The magician moves a duck made of candle in a small ship with a piece of bread in his hand. Rousseau and Emile, who are surprised at the first sight, are sure that this nothing to do with magic, and try to do the same thing when they return to home. To do this, at first they cover a needle with candle by magnetizing and pretend this to be a duck. They complete the candle duck by putting the needle as the nose of the duck. They put the duck on the water and approach a key to the duck to make it move.

After solving the mystery of the duck following the piece of bread, Rousseau and Emile go the place where the show takes place by preparing the pieces of breads at night. When the magician completes his show with the ducks, Emile immediately tells that it is simple and he can do the same thing. The magician lets the child to make his show. The child takes the bread which has a piece of iron in it out of his pocket and makes the duck follow it. When he sees his success, he gets excited. The people watching him congratulate him. And the magician, too, congratulates him in a big surprise and tells him to come tomorrow again and also tells him that much more people will watch him tomorrow. Even in Emile wants to tell something more by getting proud of it, Rousseau prevents him and they leave. Emile waits the following day in a big excitement and invites everyone to see this show. They go to the big

showroom in the street fair and realize that it is very crowded. The magician firstly demonstrates his other shows but while waiting his turn, Emile loses his patient, sweats and gets angry. Then the time for the duck show comes and the magician calls him for the show. Emile, a little bit embarrassedly, approaches his bread to the duck but sees the duck's not following, instead going in the opposite direction. Emile tries again but the result is always the same. The audience is laughing at him, and also jeering at him. Emile claims that the first and the second duck is not the same and the magician is cheating him. He wants the magician to do the same. The magician first moves the duck with his own piece of bread and then takes Emile's and moves it to the direction he wants. Then he removes the piece of iron in the bread of Emile. This situation causes the audience to tease with Emile. The magician makes his show with other pieces of bread and succeeds in each time. The duck moves as he wants. Then the magician claims that he can move the duck with his voice and so actually the duck goes wherever he says. Rousseau and Emile immediately leave the place not to be teased and insulted any more.

The following day the magician comes to their house and asks why they intervened in his show in the first day. He tells that he affords his life by making shows and he does not have an ability to do another thing and their attitude can put an end to his job. Solving the mystery of swimming duck has resulted in bad for Rousseau and Emile. The magician tells the misery of his new show and asks them not to do anything like that again. He gets angry to Rousseau for letting him to do something like that. The man departs by leaving them ashamed and not accepting the gift they want to give to him.⁴ Rousseau comes to this conclusion after this incident:

Each detail of this example is more important than it seems. How many lessons in one! How many mortifying consequences are attracted by the first movement of vanity! Young master, spy out this first movement with care. If you know thus how to make humiliation and disgrace arise from it, be sure that a second movement will not come for a long time. "So much preparation!" you will say. I agree—and all for the sake of making ourselves a compass to take the place of a meridian. (Rousseau, 1979: 175)

⁴ See *Emile*, Book III, pp. 172-175.

This story of Rousseau is the best example of reunion of science and moral. It is also an evident that the environment and the educator are important for the child. With a little mistake, Rousseau causes the child to be insulted and be ashamed. As we will see in detailed later on, necessity, utility and morality have central place in Rousseau's education. (O'Hagan, 1999:46)

While educating the child, Rousseau enables him to learn on his own for not making him dependent on someone else's reason. He chooses the most general and notable nature laws and teaches them to Emile. For example, Rousseau handles a stone and drops it and asks the child the reason of its dropping. Emile thinks that it results from its weight. Thus, the child learns a topic about physics. In fact, the education of the child does not consist of only these lessons. In this third stage of childhood, as the intelligence of the child is developing, he can think about different topics. For example, he may want to learn what happiness is or how people become happy. Rousseau tells the details that should be paid attention as following:

Every man wants to be happy; but to succeed in being so, one would have to begin by knowing what happiness is. The happiness of the natural man is as simple as his life. It consists in not suffering; health, freedom, and the necessities of life constitute it. The happiness of the moral man is something else. But that kind of happiness is not the question here. I cannot repeat too often that only physical objects can interest children, especially those whose vanity has not been awakened, and who have not been corrupted ahead of time by the poison of opinion. (1979: 177- 178)

The child in this age should be taught useful things for him instead of society's habit regarding moral. The child should learn the useful things according to his age. What should be remembered is what experience and sentiment provide us. Human finds what is best and useful for him according to the conditions. Thus, the child will determine the useful thing for him by himself, there is no need for anyone else to undertake this. Rousseau includes the question "What is that good for?" to this stage of education. The child asks what he wants to learn but the important thing is to make him think about this question "In what way is what you ask me useful to know?"

Rousseau gives this example about this topic. One day he and one of his pupils try to determine the movement and the direction of the sun. The pupil asks in

what way it is useful to know. Rousseau tells about the benefits of the travels, the advantages of trade, climates, calendars, the importance seasons for agriculture, navigation, and the necessity of this to find direction. Also he gives knowledge about the politics, natural sciences and astronomy. The child could not understand all of this knowledge but one day when Emile and Rousseau were touring in the jungle, they realize that they are lost and confirm their direction by determining the south and north direction from the shadows of the trees. At the end of this adventure, the child becomes happy by telling that astronomy is useful. For Rousseau, the important thing in this lesson is the child's realization of the astronomy as a useful science. The most important factor that makes Emile realize it that Rousseau's education method depends on action not words. Rousseau believes that the source of any evil in the child results from his presuming to understand knowledge rather than not understanding them.

Chemistry is among the lessons Rousseau teaches to the child. He tells the child about the mines and how the ink is made. While teaching, Rousseau does not compare the child with the other because he does not want to create the jealousy and pride sentiments in the child. He compares Emile again with himself. He compares what Emile does in this year and what he did in the previous year. By this way, Emile does not get jealous of someone else and becomes the rival of himself. Emile gains the knowledge by actions and observing not from books. The only book he will read is *Robinson Crusoe*. The reason of Rousseau's choosing it is Robinson's being alone in the island and his not having any instruments of all arts. But in spite of everything, he can survive and provides his food and clothes. Robinson lives only considering his own benefits. Rousseau explains the other reason why he chooses this book as: "The surest means of raising oneself above prejudices and ordering one's judgments about the true relations of things is to put oneself in the place of an isolated man and to judge everything as this man himself ought to judge of it with respect to his own utility."(Rousseau, 1979: 185). But Rousseau wants Emile to put himself in Robinson's shoes. Thus, Emile could imagine himself in leather clothes with a sword in his hand and a hat in his head. He will learn what to do when something is deficit, analyze the attitudes of Robinson and examine the things he

forgot and whether there are better things to do. Emile will note the mistakes of the protagonist of this book and learn not to do them.

To this respect, Rousseau discriminates between natural arts and the arts of industry. Natural art is performed by the ones living alone or the savage ones. The art of industry is the kind of art emerging among society. Thus, the arts of industry require social life. Redundant products bring communion and division of work together. One person provides only his own food and clothes but people living together have to provide other people's needs, too. The child should not be gained knowledge about the social relations until he reaches a certain intellectual maturity. If the realization of people is to be told, this explanation should be made through industrial and mechanical arts. According to Rousseau, the arrangement between arts should be done from the most independent one to the one which is more dependent to one another. (1979: 188). To this respect, agriculture is the art in the first rank the second is forging and the third is joinery. The main aim of Rousseau is to make the child learn an art by using his arms and legs. The other arts are dependent arts.

Rousseau believes that in the base of society of art is the exchange of skills, in the base of the society of trade is the exchange of things and in the base of the society of banks is the exchange of currency and symbol. His aim is to introduce the child with the social life and give knowledge about man. Rousseau claims the first constitution of every society is conventional equality. Societies came into existence through exchange, exchange through common measure, and common measure through equality. Conventional equality requires government and laws. The knowledge of politics the child should know should be about only property.

Conventional equality resulted in the invention of money; with money, the value of things is determined and at the same time money became the bond of society. Rousseau wants to tell Emile how people passed to social association. The most proper time for this is when they go to the dinner in a rich house where there is a qualified dining table and a lot of guests. Rousseau asks the child that how many people have endeavored to prepare this meal. Emile thinks this question throughout the dinner. Rousseau explains him that many people, maybe twenty thousand people have endeavored and wants the child to understand that people works together to produce things. Briefly, people as a result of their need, in other words as they cannot

meet their needs on their own, they began to live together. Rousseau wants Emile to understand this because according to him a person cannot fulfill everything on his own and cannot live alone. As he is the owner of everything in the world, he cannot meet the basic needs necessary for him to survive. However, the first law of the nature envisages the care of preserving oneself. (Rousseau, 1979: 193)

Rousseau gives knowledge about the emerging of the social relations before the pupil becomes an active individual in social life. Emile realizes that he needs other people's tools for his works. He makes exchanges to have them. The works people do by hand resemble his natural state. Artisan is not dependent on fate or humans, he is dependent only his work. Therefore, while the artisan is free, the farmer lives a dependent life. The production of farmer is dependent on his land and other conditions. An enemy, the king or the neighbor of the farmer may harm his land but an artisan may immediately leave as soon as he realizes something evil for him. But the farmer cannot leave his land. However Rousseau prefers Emile to choose carpentry as profession because besides its being a respectable profession, it is beneficial and makes the body exercise. As Emile is experiencing the agriculture from early ages, Rousseau wants him to learn new things. In line with the saying he is taught, Emile will not make mistakes as he will consider what is beneficial for him. To learn carpentry, Emile has to work with a master carpenter.

Rousseau accepts that Emile have had a personality at the end of the education in this period. Now, he is about to pass the childhood period. In the first education of Emile, his body and senses are given importance to be developed. Then, he was taught to use his mind and the faculty of thinking very well. By providing him to use his faculties with his organs, he was raised as an effective and thinking person. Rousseau's aim after this stage is to develop his reason through his sentiments. Rousseau explains the results of the education he gives until this period as following: "At first our pupil had only sensations. Now he has ideas. He only felt; now he judges; for from the comparison of several successive or simultaneous sensations and the judgment made of them is born a sort of mixed or complex sensation which I call an idea."(Rousseau, 1979: 203)

Emile has the knowledge of virtues he is taught and shown but he has to know the relation between the virtues to have social virtues. Therefore, Rousseau will give importance to this issue in his education in following periods.

3.4. Book IV: Adolescent: Moral Education and Sentiments

This is the adolescence period of Emile and it is the period which explains the changes occurring in the child. Considering the changes and the needs of the child, his education reshapes him. Therefore, Rousseau wants to explain the factors effective in his new education. Firstly he discusses passion and believes that it is given by god. As passions are given by god, it would be meaningless effort to remove it from the nature. Through passions, man protects himself but it could be wrong to say that all passions are natural. Even if the sources of the passions are natural, they are corrupted by a lot of exogenous factors. According to Rousseau, natural passions are few and they are the instruments of freedom. The aims of the natural passions are to protect our lives. The passions harming us are not natural but we adopt them. (Rousseau, 1979: 212)

Rousseau thinks that the source of all passion is self-love. The self-love is born with human and never leaves him. Self-love is primitive, innate and primary passion. Other passions are the altered kind of self-love. To this respect, Rousseau thinks that the source of all passions is not natural because there are alien causes of passions' altering. This alteration gives harm to human rather than benefits. Self-love is a passion proper to order. Each person wants to preserve his own presence. To preserve it, human has to love. Self-love provide human to love both himself and the surrounding things. Since his birth, human's protectors have been nurses and his mother. Even if they are dependent on nurse, this dependence is absolutely mechanic. Human owes the one doing favor to him. Rousseau accepts a blind instinct as a source of it. However the first sentiment of the child is self-love. His second sentiment is to love approaching him. The second sentiment emerges from self-love.

The child is weak and requires care when he is born. In this period, he knows the caring and helping him because he knows that these persons are beneficial for him. Basing on this, Rousseau claims that the child naturally has benevolence. On observing the one helping him, the child gains a sentiment over his own kind. As the

interests and the needs of the child increase, he has the sentiment of his connection with other. From this sentiment, the sentiment of duties and preferences emerge. In this situation, Rousseau thinks that the child will become peremptory, jealous, deceitful and revengeful. If he is forced to do something, he protests against it because he does not see any benefits of it. If there is anyone argues against him in a place where everyone is succumbing him, the child takes this as a protest and harms the things and the ones around. Self-love becomes pleasant when the needs of the human are met. But *amour-propre* never becomes pleasant. Rousseau explains the reason of it as following: “This sentiment, preferring ourselves to others, also demands others to prefer us to themselves, which is impossible.” (1979: 214). Rousseau comes to this conclusion after assessing the sentiments like this: “This is how the gentle and affectionate passions are born of self-love, and how the hateful and irascible passions are born of *amour-propre*.” (1979: 214). Having few needs and his rare comparison himself with others makes him good essentially; many needs and giving importance to other’s thought make him evil. This explains how goodness and evil emerges from the passions of adults and children. Human needs to live with other people to meet his requirements. Therefore, Rousseau accepts the examination of human relations as a proper inquisition. Human is in connection with things as a physical being. This situation can be seen in childhood period. Man is in connection with other people as a moral being. And this begins in adolescence period and continues throughout life.

Rousseau wants to settle the dispute among humans by examining the connections between humans. Hobbes, who is in a different direction from Rousseau, searches the reason of disputes among humans. O’Hagan draws the attention to the three principle of quarrel argument in nature of human of Hobbes. According to Hobbes, there are three principals of quarrel as competition, diffidence and glory. While competition drags people to quarrel for acquisition, diffidence drags for safety. And glory causes quarrel for reputation. When competition causes chaos, humans use violence to have control over their personality, wife, children and animals. In case of diffidence, humans use violence to protect themselves. And glory causes individual to use violence when his personality, profession or friends are attached or insulted. (Hobbes, 1996:88). Timothy O’Hagan draws attention to the similarity between the

cause of violence by reputation and the sentiment of *amour-propre* of Rousseau but even so, he accepts that there is a difference between Rousseau and Hobbes in two aspects:

First he rejects the Hobbesian premiss that the three ‘causes of quarrell’ derive from ‘the nature of man’. For Rousseau all three are in different ways the result of disordered social conditions. The *Second Discourse* provides the causal story of their genesis. Second, he assigns to *amour-propre* a pivotal role in the formation of humanity, of the individual and of the citizen. The outcome of that formation, whether for good or for evil, depends on the correct channelling of *amour-propre*. (O’Hagan, 1999: 112).

While examining the reason of competition between humans, Rousseau examines the sentiment of love. Then, by examining the social life of humans, he assesses *amour-propre*.

Rousseau begins with sentiment of love firstly when he is examining the relation of humans with others. If a man needs a wife, he is not alone any more. The need of both sexes to each other is a natural inclination. Time and knowledge are the two required factors for love. According to Rousseau “One loves only after having judged; one prefers only after having compared.” (1979: 214). The preference in love is made by reason. Rousseau is in the opinion that love does not come from nature but it makes the two sexes approach together. Otherwise, one sex would not mean anything for the other.

Rousseau, who is in the opinion of existing preference in love, defines that this causes jealousy among humans. Person has to make himself valuable and feature himself to gain the preference of someone else. To provide this, the person examines the ones of the same sex and makes comparisons. This causes the rise of emulation, rivalries and jealousy among humans. A man gaining the love of a woman wants to have the love of friendship at the same time. A man understanding that the sentiment of being loved is beautiful wants to be loved by so many people but cannot earn everyone’s preference. By this way, love and friendship cause hate and opposition. Briefly, *amour-propre* is not a natural sentiment and self love causes pride and arrogance in some people. Its reason is the planting of these sentiments to the child by humans, however child does not have this evil features. In adolescents, these

sentiments are formed by themselves. Therefore, Rousseau changes his method in this stage of education. He gives knowledge about the factors of passing to adolescence from childhood before he explains the new methods of education. The alterations in humans in adolescence period are not determined by the nature. The temperament and climates affect the individuals. Rousseau thinks that humans can be mistaken about the reasons of this. While some reasons are related with the moral sides of humans, they may be regarded as the physical side of them. Rousseau discriminates between the education of nature and the instruction of humans.

Nature's instruction is late and slow; men's is almost always premature. In the former case the senses wake the imagination; in the latter the imagination wakes the senses; it gives them a precocious activity which cannot fail to enervate and weaken individuals first and in the long run the species itself. (Rousseau, 1979: 215)

The aim of Rousseau after this is to examine whether the curiosities of the children should be explained to them or not. Rousseau draws attention to three important points about this issue: 1) the reason of existing of curiosity in children is their having this opportunity in this issue. 2) If the child asks question about something he is curious about, he should not be lied. Instead of lying, it better to provide his silence. 3) If the question of the child will be answered, it should be done simply, readily and without laughing.

Rousseau thinks that to preserve the innocence of children, this innocence should be respected. While talking with them, proper expressions and comprehensible sentences should be chosen. This solution also protects them from a dangerous curiosity. Rousseau gives the question of children "Where do children come from?" as an example. The answer of this question will affect the afterlife of the child in terms of moral health. The best response of the mother to this question may be silencing the child. According to Rousseau the answer should be like "That's the secret of married people. Little boys shouldn't be so curious." (1979: 218).

Rousseau gives importance to the moral development of Emile in this period of childhood. Therefore, it is important to give a direction to the passions of the child. According to Rousseau, the source of all passions is sensibility and imagination is not bent in passions. Rousseau accepts the importance of sensibility in

respect to moral development but he thinks that there is more important rule to be considered:

So long as his sensibility remains limited to his own individuality, there is nothing moral in his actions. It is only when it begins to extend outside of himself that it takes on, first, the sentiments and, then, the notions of good and evil which truly constitute him as a man and an integral part of his species. It is on this first point, then, that we must initially fix our observations. (1979: 219-220)

Rousseau believes that the first sentiment of an adolescent raised well will be friendship. The sentiment of love will rise in his heart afterwards. Imagination shows the child that there are his congeners. Rousseau believes that species affects the child before sexes. He thinks that young person should benefit from sensibility to teach human love.

As man is a weak being, he must be in social life. As man feels his inadequacy, he understands that he is dependent on someone else. Rousseau claims that man becomes jealous about the happiness of others but shares the pain of them. Man can put himself in other's place and suffer for his pains. And also he becomes happy for not having that pain. Others' happiness rises the sense of envy in man. To raise the sensibility in the heart of adolescent, to teach him beneficence and goodness, he should be shown the deceptive image of the happiness of the men. The deceptive happiness of man causes others to have pride, vanity and envy. The child should be taken away from the glorious places from early ages. The child should be aware of not only the bad incidents of himself, but also he should know that other people expose to different evilness. In the first periods of the child, he only knows what he lives. As the development of senses triggers imagination, the child begins to feel the pains of his congeners and accepts their pain as his own. But in the education of the child, if he is taught to show the sensations he does not feel as if his own; the child will not understand other's pains. Therefore, the child should not be seemed unhappy if he is not, and if he does not love someone, he should not say otherwise. Briefly, the child should reflect the senses he feels.

Emile is a child knowing to reflect the senses he feels because he has the clean sense even before he knows the sources of these senses. Therefore, a suffering animal upsets Emile, another person's pains saddens him. The child's knowing that

there are other beings suffering and being in pain just like himself makes him sensitive and pity. Even if the pity of human is the first relative sentiment, it is required to understand the condition a person is in. Imagination has an impact on the creating of the sentiment of commiseration. Imagination makes humans to put themselves on the suffering person's shoes. Person feels the pain as if it is his own. To preserve this sensibility in child, the passions of goodness, humanity, commiseration and beneficence should be raised in his heart. On the other hand, the rise of the passions like envy, covetousness and hate should be prevented. Rousseau summarizes this condition of the child with three maxims:

First Maxim: It is not in the human heart to put ourselves in the place of people who are happier than we, but only in that of those who are more pitiable.

Second Maxim: One pities in others only those ills from which one does not feel oneself exempt.

Third Maxim: The pity one has for another's misfortune is measured not by the quantity of that misfortune but by the sentiment which one attributes to those who suffer it. (1979: 223-225)

Rousseau wants Emile to know that his fate can alter in any moment and he can find himself in a bad position. Emile should not belong to any social class and know to love every person from every class. He does not despise people and every person is valuable for him. In the first periods of his life, the child does not love any one. In this period, he only thinks himself and his needs. As he begins to love, his commitment to the ones he loves increases and the first connection with his congeners is established. As the child begins to recognize his own sentiments and other's sentiments, he learns the abstract idea of humanity. Therefore, the child learns to include others' personal affections to his own affections.

After this stage, Rousseau gives plenty of time to the moral development of the child. But, he wants to show the child that sentiments and knowledge alters according to constitution in moral development. Thus, he does not give emphasis on the creation of the sentiments of love and hate or the good and the bad. He does tell the child that the source of the concepts of the justice and goodness is the true affections of the soul rather than understanding. The child will not know that law of

nature cannot be generated only by reason, conscience is also necessary for law of nature.

Instead of all these knowledge, Emile will try to know his congeners. As he keeps doing that, he compares himself with them. As a result of this comparison, the desire to be in the first position among humans rises in Emile. This is the situation when self-love converted to *amour-propre* in humans. Rousseau believes that all passions based on comparison are occurred in this way. The important thing here is to make Emile know that his personality will be formed according to his passions. In other words, Emile knows that he will be human and gentle or beneficence and commiserate in the state of being in the possession of his own. On contrary, he knows that a person will become cruel and malignant or envious and covetous. Emile's duty here is to know his place among humans and what he will do to come to the position he wants. To help him in this issue, Rousseau tells Emile the different characteristics of humans. With this help, Emile can understand the inequality in nature and civilization and social order.

While giving knowledge about this issue to Emile, Rousseau comes back to the decision that humans passed to social life as a result of their requirements. As a result of their relation, they had some passions. And as a result of their development of their passion and the increase in their requirements, their relation became frequent. Therefore, Rousseau thinks that the society should be examined through humans, and the humans through society. So, politics and morals cannot be separated. Rousseau wants to tell Emile about humans by describing. Also while Emile was using his own experiences in his first education and in this stage he will use others'. Rousseau arranges the things to be taught in this stage of Emile's education as follows:

Let him know that man is naturally good; let him feel it; let him judge his neighbor by himself. But let him see that society depraves and perverts men; let him find in their prejudices the source of all their vices; let him be inclined to esteem each individual but despise the multitude; let him see that all men wear pretty much the same mask, but let him also know that there are faces more beautiful than the mask covering them. (1979: 237).

Rousseau accepts that this method has some deficit parts in itself. If the child is accustomed to this carefully, he gains the habit of examining other's actions. This child will become gossiper, argumentative, and precipitant in his judges. To protect

the child from this state, Rousseau finds it beneficial to tell him about man before directing him to social relations. He will give him history lessons for this. Rousseau accepts that to know human, his behaviours should be observed but humans hide their real behaviors in the society. In this state, we can only hear their statements; we cannot see the reality of their action. But throughout history, we realize the actions of humans and examine the consistency of their statements. But Rousseau accepts that history has some deficiencies. The first of them is telling the bad incidents and stating humans' evil actions. The second of them is that history takes its shape according to the one telling it. Accordingly, the one writing the history is adding his own comments, too. This situation does not give accurate knowledge. In this point, Rousseau asks this question:

What would be required, then, in order to observe men well? A great interest in knowing them and a great impartiality in judging them. A heart sensitive enough to conceive all the human passions and calm enough not to experience them. (1979: 244).

Emile is the appropriate age to observe humans and he is gained the ability to determine what is beneficial for him with a good education. Emile has never encountered with prejudices. As he did not spend time in social life, he does not have prejudices against humans.

Rousseau is not in the opinion of teaching only speculative studies to young people. They must have experiences. After gaining experiences, they should get into touch with society. They cannot comply with the social life by staying in their room or talking with disinterested men. Rousseau taught Emile how to live on his own and how to afford his own life. But there are other things to be learned for him to live in world. He has to learn how to talk and discuss with people, considering particular interest in civil society, and the conditions that require him to presuppose things. These implementations are necessary for the social life of the child. The social virtues should be implemented to enable the child to gain the love of humanity. These are the virtues like helping poor people, reconciling with the quarreled ones, listening to the worries of the unhappy man.

While accustoming the child to social life, it should be paid attention for the sentiment of pity not to alter to weakness. To do so, it would be beneficial to use the

sentiment of pity for all humanity. In this state, the sentiment of commiseration and pity exists together. Rousseau accepts that justice is a virtue serving for the common benefits of society.

Other topics Rousseau includes in moral education are the religion choice of the child and the issue of marriage. Rousseau does not urge the child in the choice of religion. He will be permitted to choose the best sect by using his reason. Rousseau lets the child free in this issue. The human authority and the country's prejudices will not be permitted to influence the child's choices. According to Rousseau, nature generates the physical man. Therefore, he wants to generate the moral man by education. The moral man is the person who is educated from birth by considering his needs, senses and sentiments.

Plato states the followings about the issue of virtue and the characteristics virtue gains to men:

In brief, this was the substance of the agreement: in whatever way a member of the community, whether his nature be male or female, young or old, might ever become a good man, possessing the virtue of soul that befits a human being –whether this be as a result of some practise, or some habituation, or some possession, or desire, or opinion, or certain things learned at some time-toward this, which we are describing, every serious effort will be made throughout the whole of life; no one of any sort is to be seen giving precedence in honour to any of the other things that are impediments, not even, finally, to the city, if it appears necessary that the alternative to its destruction is either willingly tolerating the slavish yoke of being ruled by worse men or departing from the city in exile. (Plato, 1980: 158)

Like Plato, Rousseau wants the child to be virtuous throughout his life after gaining him virtue. Therefore, he gives importance to moral education and continues this education in adolescence period. Rousseau gives importance to sexual education of Emile in adolescence period. Rousseau believes that nascent desires arise from imagination. If the imagination of the child is not exposed to ridiculous ideas' impact, the sexual and moral development of the child completes each other. Rousseau thinks that Emile cannot live alone forever because he has duties among society. Men should live together to know each other. Rousseau told Emile about men but Emile should know individuals. Emile who knows what duties are performed in society does not know the ways of living. Therefore, he should also

know social life. (Rousseau, 1979: 327). Rousseau accepts that he can teach Emile maybe everything by keeping him away from society. But the main problem is teaching the art of living together with his congeners necessary for living as a human and citizen. He solves this by introducing Emile with a girl named Sophie and making him pass to social life. Rousseau ascribes the fifth part of the book to the marriage life of Sophie and Emile.

3.5. Book V: Sophie, Marriage and Citizenship

As Rousseau is in the opinion that Emile cannot live alone throughout his life, he wants him to get married. But the girl he will marry is not any girl. She is good educated just like Emile. Rousseau accepts that the only difference between them is their sexes and their common features are about species.

The only thing we know with certainty is that everything man and woman have in common belongs to the species, and that everything which distinguishes them belongs to the sex. From this double perspective, we find them related in so many ways and opposed in so many other ways that it is perhaps one of the marvels of nature to have been able to construct two such similar beings who are constituted so differently.
(Rousseau, 1979: 358)

In the relation between man and woman, woman should bring herself to the state that man appeals. Rousseau, who thinks that the power of women is based on their beauty, encourages women to use their power to men owing to their beauty. Rousseau accepts that two sentiments arise from the relation between man and woman.

The surest art for animating that strength is to make it necessary by resistance. Then *amour-propre* unites with desire, and the one triumphs in the victory that the other has made him win. From this there arises attack and defense, the audacity of one sex and the timidity of the other, and finally the modesty and the shame with which nature armed the weak in order to enslave the strong. (Rousseau, 1979: 358)

The main aim of Rousseau is to find the proper wife to the man after he generated the natural man. Rousseau, who does not regard a certain relation between man and woman, accepts that nature created them elaborately. Nature gave equal right to men and women to think, love and gain knowledge. But according to Rousseau, women

should know only what they have to instead of learning everything and he accepts that two species have some divisions. For example, men do not behave according to others' thoughts, in other words they do not care what others think about themselves. But women regard the thoughts about themselves. As a result of this division, Rousseau thinks that the education given to men and woman should be distinguished. If we state with the statement of Rousseau, this differences is based on this thought: "Opinion is the grave of virtue among men and its throne among women."(Rousseau, 1979:365). According to Rousseau, the duties of women and the things that should be taught to them from early ages should be appealing men, being useful for them, endearing themselves, gaining the respects of men and raising them from childhood. (1979: 365). Rousseau thinks that if these principles are adhered, the aim will not be alienated.

Rousseau accepts that the body is born before soul and therefore he assumes that the education of the body should be initial. For both sexes, firstly the body should be cultivated. But in this cultivation, there are different aims for each sex. For men, the development of the body should be for the development of strength while for women, the development of it should be for the development of attractiveness. While woman should function in grace, men should function in facility.

Rousseau claims that the taste develops through means of industriousness and talents. Mind has an impact on learning the ideas of the beautiful and the moral notions emerging in relation with these ideas. Rousseau claims that the sentiments of seemliness and decency develop in girls earlier. The reason of it is the mind's earlier reach to the moral notions through tastes. Rousseau, who states attracting men in the duties of women, assumes that talent at speaking has an important place in the art of pleasing. As the sentiments and ideas develop, the expression of face changes. Speaking gives a different spirit to the face of humans. Rousseau believes that girls begin talking before boys do. He also assesses the thought that girls talk much more from a different aspect. According o him, men need knowledge to talk, but women need taste. While men talk about beneficial things, women talk about pleasing things. The common feature of the discourse of both sexes is their reflecting the truth.

Rousseau adopts the importance of the question "What is it good for?" in the education of Emile while he gives importance to the question "What effect will it

have?” in the education of girls. In the first ages, the girls should be provided to be polite to the ones they are talking. Rousseau, who believes that a woman in an early age cannot be the judge of someone other, expects them to tell only the truth. As women don't like rusticity, they will learn to stay away from it with the help of education. Rousseau is in the opinion of not giving the chance to the boys to ask inappropriate questions. Similarly, the questions of the girls should be answered carefully. He advises to ask them different questions during talking and develop their skills in talking. About religion, Rousseau approves girls' adoption of their mother's religion and women's adoption of their husbands' religion.

Rousseau thinks that the love of good morals can be taught to young girls without continually repeating “be pure”. What should be done is to make the child realize that being pure is beneficial for her. The child realizing the value of purity will love this. This benefit should be demonstrated to the child in the relations she established suitable for her age and in the character of their lovers. Rousseau claims that the girls should be told about the good man and the man of merit. The girls should know that this kind of men will make them happy as friend, husband and lovers. He thinks that the virtue should be taught through reason. The thing that should not be told is the understanding of moral of their age. Women should know that men will serve them to the extent that they serve to virtue. Telling them about fashionable people will cause them to look down on people. The girl Rousseau chooses for Emile should be raised in line with these maxims and the name of this girl is Sophie.

Sophie is a well raised, decent and intelligent girl who knows how to be pretty. But the clearest feature of her is her love of virtue and her making it her dominant passion. She knows that the virtuous woman is like an angel and virtue gives happiness. As a woman without virtue has a miserable and unhappy life, Sophie knows the value of the virtue.

Rousseau takes the appropriate features as the basis when he was determining the relation between Emile and Sophie. Rousseau says that the natural thing should not be confused with the savage state and the natural thing should not be confused with the civil state. (Rousseau, 1979: 406). He explains the difference between both conditions with these words:

In the former state all women are suitable for all men because both still have only the primitive and common form. In the latter, since each character is developed by social institutions and each mind has received its peculiar and determinate form not from education alone but from the well ordered or ill-ordered conjunction of nature and education, men and women can no longer be matched except by presenting them to one another in order to see whether they suit one another in all respects— or at least in order to determine the choice resulting in the greatest degree of suitability.
(Rousseau, 1979: 406)

He requires the ignoring of prejudices and not consulting to human institutions for happy marriages in the society. Instead, he finds the consulting to nature sufficient. While two people are getting married, their suitability for each other is determined by their suitability in every condition not just in one condition. He believes that as the conditions change, if the suitability of the persons alters, there will be no happy marriages in the society. The other condition for the order of society is to enable man to marry with an alliance person. Man should never get married with a person beyond his level. With this marriage, man will lower both himself and woman. The marriage of man with a person under his level is found appropriate because in this state, man will elevate his wife but his level will never decline.

There is appropriateness between Emile and Sophie in this respect. Emile is eager to tell Sophie what he does not know and Sophie is curious to learn from him. Emile gives her lessons about geography and geometry. Even if Sophie does not have the adequate knowledge in this respect, Emile loves her moral side and appreciates her being virtuous. The deficient part of Emile's education is his not having enough knowledge about virtue. Rousseau summarizes the education he gives to Emile as following: "When you entered the age of reason, I protected you from men's opinions. When your heart became sensitive, I preserved you from the empire of the passions." (Rousseau, 1979: 443). The next aim of Rousseau is to tell Emile the virtue. Rousseau believes that without courage happiness will not occur and without struggle, virtue will not occur. And he explains the base of virtue as following: "Strength is the foundation of all virtue. Virtue belongs only to a being that is weak by nature and strong by will. It is in this that the merit of the just man consists; and although we call God good, we do not call Him virtuous, because it requires no effort for Him to do good." (Rousseau, 1979: 444). Rousseau thinks that

virtue gains value through implementation. Therefore, a need for knowing virtue emerges. Passions reveal this need in humans. Until now, Rousseau tries to make Emile a good person, not a virtuous one. Even if a good person is not evil, this state of him continues as long as he likes this. Passions vanish by colliding with each other. Rousseau defines the virtuous person as: “Who, then, is the virtuous man? It is he who knows how to conquer his affections; for then he follows his reason and his conscience; he does his duty; he keeps himself in order, and nothing can make him deviate from it.” (1979: 444-445). For Rousseau, until now Emile was only apparently free. The thing Rousseau wants from him to make him really free and be the master of himself.

The reason why Rousseau gives a new dimension to Emile’s education is that he will begin to a new life and he prepares for social life. Rousseau also wants Emile to think about freedom as a result of his commitment to Sophie and his passion towards her. According to Rousseau, this passion of Emile oppressed him. Rousseau realizes that Emile could not be able to get over this in case of losing Sophie. Therefore, Emile should not submit to his passions, he should dominate his passions. Rousseau takes nature, reason and conscience as a core from the beginning. He accepts that there are things these three factors forbid: “What is forbidden to us by nature is to extend our attachments further than our strength; what is forbidden to us by reason is to want what we cannot obtain; what is forbidden to us by conscience is not temptations but rather letting ourselves be conquered by temptations.” (Rousseau, 1979: 445). People do not choose to have passions but controlling them is in the power of humans. All sentiments humans dominate are legal but the sentiments dominating humans have the characteristics of felony. Rousseau wants to teach Emile only one precept of morality: “Be a man. Restrain your heart within the limits of your condition.” (Rousseau, 1979: 445). Rousseau gives some advises to Emile to live happily and wisely. Emile should know that some day he will lose the thing he owns and he should learn to give up everything in case that virtue requires. He should learn that he will not be accused as long as he fulfils his duties and protects from being miserable by being courageous. So Emile will learn to be sensible against his passions. Rousseau thinks that Emile should leave Sophie to learn these. The other reason of Emile’s leaving Sophie is that it is the time for him

to learn to be a member of state. Besides, the child has to learn the concepts like administration, law and country. Before being a member of social order, he has to recognize the society and find the proper place for himself. After this stage, the question that will determine the education of Emile is: “does it suffice for a well-educated man to know only his compatriots, or is it important for him to know men in general?” (Rousseau, 1979: 451). Emile learned to make connection of other things with physical relations and other men with moral relations. The learning of making civil connection with citizens remains. Rousseau thinks that this comes true only by learning governing structure, different governments and whether the life where he lives is suitable for him. The best way of this is to examine whether the government of his state is the best. Administration, public morality and the principle of state are the main issues of Emile’s education. Rousseau thinks that a good knowledge will come into existence by uniting the principles of political right and the positive right. Rousseau grounds the reason of this onto this basis: “It is necessary to know what ought to be in order to judge soundly about what is.” (Rousseau, 1979: 458). He accepts that this state has some difficult situation. The first difficulty is the ability of person’s discussing and his paying attention to these questions: “What importance does it have for me?” and “What can I do about it?” (1979: 458). The second difficulty is keeping the prejudices and rules in foreground while giving knowledge about administration and state to the child. Therefore, the child should be kept away from prejudices and pressures.

After Emile leaves Sophie, he begins his new education. Rousseau commences his education about these issues with the natural state of nature of man. The first and main questions of his are how men come into the world, in other words it came whether free, dependent or as slave; whether he passed to social life at their own will, what the bond or power that connects them is.

Secondly, Rousseau wants to examine whether all sources of every illness is God. If so, he wants to examine whether it is fault to consult to doctor.

Thirdly, he examines whether it is an obligation of us to give all of our money to an armed robber demanding our money. The arm in man’s hand is an element of power and he wants to question whether to obey him or not.

Fourthly, he wants to define which power is legitimate and the base of laws.

Fifthly, he explains the authority of father over his children and in which state this authority will disappear before accepting a legitimate power. He examines whether there is a necessity for accepting the authority of the father when the child's weakness disappears and the reason of the child matures.

When we look at the books of Rousseau titled as *Social Contract* and *Discourse on Political Economy*, we can see that he assesses state and family, and leader and father together. This state is the same for his work, *Emile*. The domestic government of father and civil government of leader are different from each other. Father limits everything as he sees in his domestic government. Leader should regard everything as others. However, Rousseau accepts that there is a similarity between the government of state and family. The foundation of the family government is based on being physically stronger. As father has superiority and the children are in need of help, there is the dominion of father in the family. But in state, as all individuals are equal, order is provided by convention. The magistrate may have a supreme voice through laws. While the base of father's duty is natural feelings, the responsibilities of the leaders are limited with their words they give to society. The other difference between the family and the state is property. In family, the children do not own anything except their demands from their father, thus all property rights of the family belongs to father. While all family members do domestic works, they know that one day the property of the father will inherit to them. And the wealth of the public treasury aims the welfare and the peace of people. In this case, the family members are aware that one day the family will disperse but the state aims to be present forever. (Rousseau: 1978: 209-210)

Rousseau claims that father's leadership in the family bases on natural sources. According to this source, father and mother does not have equal rights over authority. A consensus should be present in the family but the power of decision should be in father. As Rousseau is in the opinion of the existence of incoherency in women, he accepts their inactive condition. For this, the authority of father becomes legitimate again. Also, husband should conduct his wife's life and should provide the safety of his children. The obedience of children to their father should base on necessity and gratitude. According to Rousseau, fathers meet the needs of their children till the half of their lives. (Rousseau, 1978:210). Therefore, children should

help their father in the second half of their lives. As father undertakes keeping domestic servants, servants should serve him, too.

In political society, the leader cannot provide the happiness of the individuals all the time. Rousseau draws the attention to the different functions of the father and the prince. Father should listen to the nature's voice when he needs an advice and should keep them. But for the magistrate, nature's voice has deceitful features and divides him from his people. The magistrate must have the most sublime virtue. Otherwise, he causes himself and the state to be destroyed. The father of family should keep away from depravity and keep his natural inclinations. But natural inclinations are the source of depravity for the magistrate. The father of family may behave coherently by listening to his heart but this is not valid for the magistrate. The magistrate may be mistaken on listening to his heart; his guide is the laws consisting of the voice of people.

Sixthly, in case of the death of the father, he examines another power for the children to obey. In other words, will the child obey the elder one or will another leader be chosen in the family? From this point of view, Rousseau wants to tell Emile how an authority should be chosen, how it is shared and whether more than one person can administer people.

Seventhly, he examines whether the individuals who are bound to their brothers, uncles or relatives at their own will are free and volunteer community or not.

Eighthly, he deals with the right of slavery. The main question of Rousseau in this examination is whether a person can delegate himself to another one unconditionally. He will examine whether the individual can give up his own personality, life, his I, and the moral base of his actions. Briefly, he will tell whether it is possible for an individual to die at his own will.

Ninthly, he will examine whether there is a condition that individuals can make contracts with each other.

Tenthly, Rousseau wants to examine how people can be bound to a master unconditionally. According to Rousseau, even a slave cannot be bound to his master completely so the guaranty of the society's bound to authority should be determined.

If the slave wants his master to adhere to the contract, the same wish may rise between the society and the administration.

Basing on the tenth examination, in the eleventh examination, the meaning of the word of society is tried to be cleared. "Since the people is a people before electing a king, what made it such if not the social contract? Therefore the social contract is the basis of every civil society, and the nature of the society it forms must be sought in the nature of this transaction." (Rousseau, 1979: 460)

Twelfth, the tenor of this contract will be examined. He searches the base of the contract in this sentence: "*Each of us puts his goods, his person, his life, and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will, and we as a body accept each member as a part indivisible from the whole.*" (Rousseau, 1979:460).

Rousseau searches not the particular person but a moral and collective person in the contract. He calls this public person formed as body politic. The members of the society are called state if they are passive and sovereign or power if they are active. The members of the society are called people. And when they obey the sovereign one, they are called citizen. The individuals obeying the same sovereign are called subjects. With contract, the public and the individuals enter into two obligations. The first of them is the obligations of a member of the sovereign to the individuals. The second of them is the obligations of the member of the state to the sovereign.

Thirteenth, he examines the possibility of rescission of the contract. How will be the solution if a dispute between the public and the individual of the contract? If there is no power to solve the problem, is the individual free enough to nullify the contract?

Rousseau stresses that sovereign cannot behave arbitrarily, he should consider common and general wills. According to Rousseau, sovereign can never be put into a difficult situation. The social contract bases on the power of the public. The individual not meeting his own liabilities is punished.

Rousseau is in the opinion of division of natural liberty and the civil liberty. And in case of possession, he makes comparisons between the right of sovereignty and the right and the individual domain- eminent domain. The sovereign authority

becomes respected right by the individuals when it grants the right of property. The sovereign authority becomes divine and incorruptible when it becomes particular and individual right. If it becomes the right of all citizens, he will be dependent on general will. And general will can end this authority.

Rousseau attributes to his books “*Social Contract* and *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality* within this regard. For subjects, general will is valid. Therefore, he gives importance to how general will is created. He explains the meaning and the features of the law in line with general will.

The sovereign takes its power from law; it takes decisions and implements by abiding this law. Law is general and valid for all members of the state. Therefore, the sovereign cannot take decision for particular reason or individual. With this point of view, the issue Rousseau wants to examine is the mainstay of the sovereign when it takes decisions about the particular issues of the state.

The core of sovereign consists of general will. The particular will shall comply with general will. But the ways of this are not clear. The inconsistency between these wills results from the difference expectations of benefits of this two wills. While private interest is connected with preferences, the public interest is connected with equality.

Rousseau accepts that in the structure of the state, there is a body between the subjects and the sovereign. The duty of this organ is the charge of public administration, the execution of the laws, and the maintenance of civil and political liberty. The members of this organ are called *the magistrate* or the king. When it is assessed regarding the individuals generating this organ, it is called *the prince*. Again with regarded within this respect, the administration is called *government*. He examines whether there is a relation between government and the magistrate. Namely, he tells that the magistrates in big number cause the government to weaken. Rousseau deals with this explanation with the claim of three wills in the personality of each magistrate. The first will is the personal will of the individual. Individual considers only his own interests. The second is the common will of the magistrates, in other words, will *de corps*. Common will is general according to government and particular according to the state. The third will is the will of the people or the sovereign will. Will of the people also has general characteristics. While general will

is the weakest one, will *de corps* is stronger than it. Particular will is beyond these two wills.

To make particular will and will *de corps* compatible, he thinks that the government should be undertaken by one person. Keeping particular will and will *de corps* together makes a stronger will to come into existence. Otherwise, when sovereign is prince and magistrate is citizens, particular will become stronger. The reason of this is the compatibility of the particular will and will *de corps*. The increase in the number of magistrates weakens the government. As the population of the public increases, the oppressive power of the government increases. In case of state's growth, he finds the narrowing of the state appropriate. Hereupon, Rousseau explains the kinds of government. Basically, he explains democracy, aristocracy and monarchy. Democracy is a type of government covering all people or half of the people. Aristocracy is a matter of half of the people and may be narrowed to smaller numbers. Monarchy is a product of sharing between father and son or between two sons. But the best government is: "But if the number of magistrates in the different states ought to be inversed to the number of citizens, we shall conclude that generally democratic government is suitable for small states, aristocratic government for medium-sized states, and monarchic government for large states." (Rousseau,1979:466).

The education of Emile lasts for two years and in these two years, he has the chance to travel to various countries in Europe. So, he learns two or three different languages, and gains knowledge about natural history, government, art and men. At the end of his education Rousseau asks Emile what he learned and what his observations are. The most important thing Emile learns from his travels is about freedom. According to him, a man can not free himself, but if he wants to give up freedom, this becomes his freedom. Rousseau has taught Emile obligations to make. (Rousseau,1979:472). For two years, Emile searches for a piece of land to possess, but then he gives up. Because if Emile hds this, he would be bound to it. However, as Emile wants to be free throughout his life, he does not want to be bound to a piece of land. The thing that will set him free is his becoming dependent on nature not to people. Rousseau teaches Emile the following about freedom: "Freedom is found in no form of government; it is in the heart of the free men. He takes it with him

everywhere. The vile man takes his servitude everywhere.” (Rousseau,1979:473). Emile learnt to be virtuous by resisting to his passions. He realizes that laws free him. Even evil people will have the courage to be just through laws. Emile, also, learns to perform his citizenship service in case government or state calls him. At the end of this education, Emile learns that a person should not be fully bound to something because it can be lost any moment. Therefore, the time for Emile to marry Sophie comes. Then, Rousseau permits them to marry and Emile’s education ends in this stage.

CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION

Rousseau's philosophy includes a historic examination. Rousseau analyses how societies are destroyed during historical process and how the humanity learned evil. Rousseau wants to examine human passions in history, and ethics in society. His questions made it necessary to make an examination about human nature and foundation of societies. During this process, he looks for one of the solutions of problems which arise, in education. With education, a good individual and citizen can be raised. In short, Rousseau's education idea is based on "good education against bad history." (Kelly, 2001:123). "How can one be good in an evil world?" (Delaney, 2009: 67) starting from this question, Rousseau determined the method for education. . In this study, I focused relationship between individual and citizen in Rousseau's educational system. In my analysis, I tried to explain that society had very important role for education; because, education is not possible a without well-ordered society. Against existentialist philosopher Nietzsche's "A man as he ought to be: that sounds to us as insipid as "a tree as it ought to be." (Nietzsche, 1968:181) idea, Rousseau desires to raise a good human.

Liberty and discipline are two notions in the center of Rousseau's educational idea. At the same time, these two notions are notions which are effective on his moral and political thinking. (Porry, 2001:247). This is Rousseau's educational purpose or his purpose in Emile: "to show how a child can be turned into a man in civil society or, more accurately, despite civil society. The boy Emile stands for all children born within existing society. Although the striking feature of his upbringing appears to be that he is isolated from society, in fact society looms as the ever – present threat to his development as a human being." (Porry, 2001:250)

Joel Spring says "a new society cannot be born unless a new person is born that can function within it." in *A Primer of Libertarian Education* (1977:9). This idea of him is a good expression which summarizes the relation between society and education. Spring evaluates Rousseau's educational theory, as saving the individual from the domination of a system of internalized prescribed beliefs (1977:35). According to Spring, Rousseau's educational plan is based on the argument that a person cannot do reasoning about moral and social problems until the age of adolescence. His argument's most important characteristic is being psychological.

Every idea about moral and society which will be thought to child before the age of adolescence contains acceptance based on authority. Child does not accept any event before the age of adolescence, by reasoning and taking the reason as basis. Therefore Rousseau gives importance to using one's own mind correctly for child's education. To realize this thought Rousseau suggests that child shall be educated by being away from moral and social problems. (Spring,1977:35). Under this condition, Spring asks two questions: "What is it really feasible to isolate the child from any dogmatic teaching? And what do you teach if you are isolating the child from all dogma?" (1977:35).

Rousseau objects to give moral instruction at an early age. At this age, individual cannot use moral rules, on the contrary they begin to become the ruler of individual's actions. Another feature of Rousseau's education is being based on experience. Rousseau intentionally kept children away from books. Emile shall realize education, via abiding by experience and necessity. For example, as Emile cannot read the invitations coming to house, Emile will learn reading because of self-interest and necessities. (Spring,1977:36).

Spring draws attention to Rousseau's principle of utility, which comes after the law of necessity. Emile is learning the benefits of social relations with the question of "What is the good of that?". Of course, during this stage the moral education is not given. Learning manual arts and occupations, taught Emile the dependence among people and the usefulness of social organization. When Emile reaches the age of reason, choices will be made by considering necessities and usefulness.

Rousseau thinks the individual is given birth one more in adolescence period. With the development of sexual drives, individual tries to know social world. (Spring,1977:37). The development of moral and social reasoning is related with self-love. For an individual to be able to understand other people's feelings, identity must be build between that person's feelings. Good and bad concerns of individual for other people are the results of established identity. Emile is given social and religious education to learn this. An education without the authority of individuals and the prejudices of society is taken as basis, in accordance with nature. In that way,

reason will guide the individual. According to Spring, Emile can give such a reply to the question of “what did you learn” at the end of education:

He replied that he had been taught to be free by learning to yield to necessity, the ultimate necessity of life being death. Rather than struggle with destiny, freedom requires its acceptance. He also argued that people cannot obtain freedom under the safeguard of laws. Liberty, he claimed, was not to be found in government but in the heart of the free person. (Spring, 1977:37)

Spring thinks the biggest mistake in Rousseau’s education model is the importance given to necessity and usefulness. Rousseau based social and moral beliefs on these two foundations and turned them into the product of reasoning.

Rousseau wants to awaken awareness of child with useful notion. In other words, child understands the reason of the thing which is thought or which the child wants to learn. There is an important point here. When child learns the useful thing, he does not learn what is necessary for his self-interest. He just understands that he is learning an unnecessary knowledge. Necessity exists in the first stages of Rousseau’s educational system. He must know that child’s needs are met in this period because of necessities. Child must know that his requirements are met not because he wants, but because he really needs it. Rousseau keeps an eye open so that no submission idea is adopted by child in this stage. Not everything child demands shall be done. But, from this point, child shall not think that he is submitting to opposite side. Rousseau accepts necessity to prevent this thought’s occurrence in child.

Although Nietzsche objects to a specific human figure or model, it is hard for people who did not obtain a specific value with education, to adapt to social life. Hobbes, whose thoughts about human nature are opposite to Rousseau’s ideas, shares the same thought with Rousseau about the benefits of education for society. Hobbes accepts that living alone since the birth is hard for people. Children need the help of others to live, while adults need other people to live good. Therefore Hobbes accepts that nature compels people to live together. But according to him, civil societies are not formed by people’s gathering together. A good faith and agreement is necessary for the foundation of civil societies. For Hobbes, infants and uninstructed people are not aware of their force and the people who does not know what will be lost when

there is no society are also those who does not know the benefits of society. People in the first group can not join society, as they do not know what it is. The people in second group, does not know the good of society. Therefore Hobbes, in scope of these ideas, thinks that not all men are suitable for society. Also, because of mental illness or lack of training, many people are in the class of people who are not suitable for society. Hobbes thinks these people have a human nature as child or adult. Hobbes thinks that people become suitable to society by training; not by nature. Even if people are given birth as beings which desire social life, this is not a proof of having suitable tools for social life. (Hobbes, 1998:25). For a systematic society, common values and virtues shall be taught to individuals. Otherwise, it would be hard for individuals to find a common characteristic in social life. Although Rousseau and Hobbes have different ideas about human nature, they have a common aspect with their ideas about the adaptation of man into social life with education. Man becomes a good individual and citizen with education.

The striking characteristic of Rousseau's educational idea is giving a wide place for sentiments. As mentioned in the thesis, Russell too, claims that people can understand each other with sentiments. Rousseau expresses self-love, which is a good sentiment and which is owned by humans since their birth. But *Amour-propre* causes bad sentiments to occur inside human. Rousseau begins child's moral education with sentiments firstly. Then, he develops child's faculties and reason. Child's loving others, helping them and pitying are realized on ground of sentiments. On the other hand, sentiments are also included in the foundations of jealousy and competition conditions, but social life comes later. Competition, jealousy, contempt and such sentiments are created as the result of people's living together. Therefore Rousseau, that is to say, designed an educational model which takes the education of sentiments as the basis. Situations such as a person's pitying on others, becoming emotional by feeling their problems like they were his own, take shape via sentiments Humans found innovations by reasoning. Most of them resulted with destruction or corruption. Therefore, protection of child from mistakes, authority and prejudices of society via emotions must be achieved. Rousseau reinterprets human nature by objecting the pressure of the church and the meaning it gives to humans in his period. Rousseau wants to raise a new and useful individual for his society by

thinking that sciences and arts corrupts human morals and virtues because he has concerns about future and wants to find solutions. As Paulo Freire stated, “Without a vision for tomorrow, hope is impossible.” (2000: 45)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aristotle (1998), *Politics*, translated by C. D. C. Reeve, Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.

_____ (2009), *The Nicomachean Ethics*, translated by David Ross, New York: Oxford University Press.

Bertram, Christopher (2004), *Rousseau and the Social Contract*, London: Routledge.

Comenius, John Amos (1810), *Visible World*, translated by Charles Hoole, New York: T. & J. Swords.

Delaney, James (2006), *Rousseau and the Ethics of Virtue*, New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

_____, (2009), *Starting with Rousseau*, New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Dent, Nicholas (2005), *Rousseau*, London: Routledge.

Dewey, John (1921), *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*, New York: The Macmillan Company.

_____ (1997), *Experience and Education*, New York: A Touchstone Book Published Simon & Schuster.

Duignan, Brian (eds.) (2010), "Jean- Jacques Rousseau", *The 100 most Influential Philosophers of All Time*, New York: Britannica Educational Publishing, pp. 182-188.

Egemen, Bedi Ziya (1965), *Terbiye İlminin Problemleri ve Terbiye Felsefesi*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.

Freire, Paulo (2000), *Pedagogy of the Heart*, translated by Donaldo Macedo and Alexandre Oliveira, New York, The Continuum Publishing Company.

_____ (2005), *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, translated by Myra Bergman Ramos, London: Continuum Publishing Company.

Gauthier, David (2006), *Rousseau: Sentiment of Existence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hakkı, İsmail (1925), *Jean- Jacques Rousseau: Terbiye Felsefesi*, İstanbul: Kanaat Kütüphanesi.

Hobbes, Thomas (1996), *Leviathan*, Richard Tuck (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (2003), *On the Citizen*, Richard Tuck and Michael Silverthorne (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, Immanuel (1900), *On Education*, translated by Annette Churton, Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. Publishers.

Kelly, George Armstrong (2001), “A general Overview”, *The Cambridge Companion to Rousseau*, Patrick Riley (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Locke, John (1892), *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

More, Thomas (1947), *Utopia*, W. J. Black (eds.), New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.

Nietzsche, Friedrich (1968), *The Will to Power*, translated by Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale, New York: Vintage Books.

Neuhouser, Frederick (1993), “Freedom, Dependence, and the General Will”, *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 102, No. 3, (Jul., 1993), Cornell University.

_____ (2008), *Rousseau’s Theodicy of Self-Love: Evil, Rationality, and the Drive for Recognition*, UK: Oxford University Press.

_____ (1995), “Unfashionable Observations”, *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche*, volume: 2, translated by Richard T. Gray, California: Stanford University Press, pp. 169-255.

_____ (1996), *Human, All Too Human*, translated by R. J. Hollingdale, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O’Hagan, Timothy (1999), *Rousseau*, Ted Honderich (eds.), New York: Routledge.

Parry, Geraint (2001), “Emile: Learning to Be Men, Women, and Citizens”, *The Cambridge Companion to Rousseau*, Patrick Riley (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Plato (1988), *The Laws of Plato*, translated by Thomas L. Pangle, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

_____ (1997), “Meno”, translated by G.M.A. Grube, *Complete Works*, John M. Cooper (eds.), Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 870-897.

_____ (2003), *The Republic*, translated by Tom Griffith, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Popper, Karl (2008), *The Open Society and Its Enemies, Volume One: The Spell of Plato*, New York: Routledge Classics.

Rorty, Amelie O., (1998), “Rousseau’s Educational Experiments”, *Philosophers on Education: New Historical Perspectives*, New York: Routledge.

Rousseau, Jean- Jacques (1964a), “Discourse on the Sciences and Arts” (First Discourse), *The First and Second Discourses*, translated by Roger D. and Judith R. Masters, New York: St Martin’s Press, pp: 31-74.

_____ (1964b), “On the Origin and Foundations of Inequality among Men” (Second Discourse), *The First and Second Discourses*, translated by Roger D. and Judith R. Masters, New York: St Martin’s Press, pp. 77-181.

_____ (1978a), “On the Social Contract or Principles of Political Right”, *On the Social Contract with Geneva Manuscript and Political Economy*, translated by Judith R. Masters, New York: St. Martins’s Press, Inc., pp. 46-133.

_____ (1978b), “Discourse on Political Economy”, *On the Social Contract with Geneva Manuscript and Political Economy*, translated by Judith R. Masters, New York: St. Martins’s Press, Inc., pp. 46-133.

_____ (1979), *Emile or On Education*, translated by Allan Bloom, USA: Basic Books.

_____ (1985), *The Government of Poland*, translated by Willmoore Kendall, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

_____ (1997), “Last Reply by J.J. Rousseau of Geneva”, *The Discourses and other Early Political Writings*, Victor Gourevitch (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 63-85.

Russell, Bertrand (2009), "The Philosopher of Education", *The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russell*, Robert E. Egner and Lester E. Denon (eds.), New York: Routledge Classics.

Salkever, Stephen G., "Interpreting Rousseau's Paradoxes", *Eighteenth – Century Studies*, Vol: 11, No. 2 (Winter, 1977-1978). The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 204-226.

Simpson, Matthew (2006), *Rousseau's Theory of Freedom*, New York: Continuum Studies in Philosophy.

Spring, Joel (1977), *A Primer of Libertarian Education*, New York: Free Life Editions.

Encyclopedic Resources

Cevizci, Ahmet, "Utopya", *Felsefe Sözlüğü*, İstanbul: Paradigma, 2005.

Online Resources

Bacon, Francis (2009). *The New Atlantis*, library.nu online: <http://www.library.nu/docs/Y3HJR5EC9Z>, (9 May 2011).

Campanella, Tommaso (2009). *The City of the Sun*, library.nu online: <http://www.library.nu/docs/C0N28YBD1Z>, (9 May 2011).

Durkheim, Emile (2002). *Moral Education*, translated by Everett K. Wilson and Herman Schnurer, books.google.com online: <http://www.books.google.com/books/hx16ULMGqbYC>, (9 May 2011).