

## ROSSEAU ON EDUCATION

**Mubasher Mehdi (M. Phil. English)**

Assistant Professor of English,  
Government Emerson College,  
Multan, Punjab, Pakistan

---

**ABSTRACT:** *There is a long tradition of delivering and getting the formal education, especially from Greek era. But, apart from it, around one million years ago when man raised himself from Homo-erectus to Homo-Sapien, Homo-Sapien Sapien, has been learning to know about Nature. He developed language, which also came to him from external atmosphere. Can we refuse that people made tools from stones, bronze and iron? This shows that, as many interacted with Nature. It also whispered in their mind its secrets. So, we can say that learning is not the phenomena of today. But, when eventually knowledge got its formal shape, it's considered, that man's heritage is stored in language, both written and oral. In many countries, still people orally recite legends. Written word was formed in Egypt in the shape hieroglyphics. Even, Herodotus admired Egyptian architecture. Eventually formal education started in Greece, and the first philosopher was Thales of Miletus who was a materialist. The ideas under discussion and in form of treatises were diverse. If we can sweepingly say, the source of human knowledge, in its earliest way, started from Greeks, and until now knowledge and education have their roots in Grecian thoughts. Greeks enriched every field of Knowledge. In historical context we still have to look back to Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, but this tradition didn't stop and has led to superior intelligence in the mind, which is making inventions and developing theories, day after day. In the history of philosophy, as its source is conjoined with Greeks, but in West, several philosophers have carried out this tradition, like Rosseau, Kant, Hegel, Marx, Sartre, Wittgenstein and Alfred North White Head. We don't indulge ourselves in the game of the greatest, or major or minor philosophers, but everyone has contributed according to his own capacity, to the collective body of human Knowledge. Knowledge can be easily equated with education. Knowledge and education go side by side. We seek knowledge and then after digesting it we become educated. But, it should be kept in mind, the body of knowledge is so large, that our mind is limited and can't attain everything and every type of education. This article is based specifically on the views of education by Rosseau, which are perpetually modern. Rosseau was the major figure, as an intellectual, behind French Revolution of 1789. Rosseau also was among the most persecuted philosophers due to his adventurous and rebellious, but diverse ideas. He wrote, 'Emile', which is known as the best book on education. It can also help the chaotic conditions of this post-modern world to exigize from it the true meanings of education, and resolve its problems. This book when reached to 'Kant' he was overjoyed. Moreover, 'Confessions' by Rosseau is a book which has no match, as a true autobiography. This article explores the modern creed of education and attempts to correlate it with high pitch ideas of Rosseau present in "Emile".*

**KEYWORDS:** education, knowledge, Rosseau, modern education.

---

## INTRODUCTION

World is a wretched place, Jesus Christ said: 'World is like a drunken prostitute'. In the recent world, Christ's quotation, may have a different interpretation. If it is definite, man has,

throughout the history, been in the need of morality. Morality is meant, the awareness of good and evil. This is the basic and clear purpose of education. We should induce such knowledge to seekers that their minds may distinguish between evil and good. However, even this is also relative. As if some seeker of knowledge may have awareness, to choose between good and evil, would this be enough? The greatest predecessor of Rosseau, Montaigne (1990) is of the view, like this,

Men, says an old Greek maxim, are tormented by the opinions they have of things, not by the things themselves. There would be a great point gained for the relief of our wretched human lot if someone could prove this statement true in every case, for if evils have no entry into us but by our judgment, it seems to be in our power to disdain them or to turn them down to good use. (p. 69)

Montaigne further says, “But let us see whether this can be maintained: that what we call evil is not evil in itself \_\_\_\_\_ or at least, whatever it is, that It depends on us to give it a different savor and a different complexion; for all this comes the same thing” (p. 69). This means that the imperative of good and evil is relative and we cannot independently judge but we have the choice as well. Education should develop the true morality in those who want to seek. But in depth as said by Montaigne, it is a matter and a different one because the nature of things depends on their quality or characteristics, and not by them. Moreover, ethics have been an arrogant question in every era of human history. As ethics is a wide range term and includes training of character, so, we can maintain that higher purpose of education must rely on training of character.

When man was pagan and living in primitive surroundings, even in that age, when there were swarms of people, they also followed the code. As man was free in nature, his learning came from external atmosphere, but it was a two way process. The learning since then is continuing. But the greatest question is that, whatever man has learnt or has he moved forward or is he still backward? This is a question, related to education of man, and raises a point on modern education as well.

Again Montaigne maintains that If the original essence of the things we ‘fear’ had power to lodge in us of its own authority, it would lodge alike in everyone; for men are all of a kind and are furnished, though some more and some less, with similar tools and instruments for thought and judgment. But the diversity of the opinions we have of these things shows clearly that they enter us only by mutual agreement; one man perchance lodges them in himself in their true essence, but in a thousand other men they are given a new and contrary essence (p.69).

This is very eloquent statement by Montaigne. The key term in this statement is ‘fear’, which implies that there is any internal system in human beings, which makes to filter in them, that certain things are not good. This is remarkable thing and it is the basis of sane society, which though still is impossible, but we can dream about it. Moreover, it also indicates that lodging of these things is not independent and their affects are also different on all types of people. This clearly shows that it lies in the paradigm of judgment and choice. It also extends the view that human beings have an authority to differentiate among certain things, and they are not thoroughly dependent on the course of Nature; which they have almost conquered, despite the fact that Nature, still is an independent variable, like Time, and has still its own course. The

biggest source of learning for men is still Nature. All inventions, accidental and incidental, and also the intricacy of matter seen by men like scientists and artists, depict that they are very tricky, i.e. matter and Nature.

Furthering his views Montaigne says,

But to return to my subject, we have as our share inconstancy, irresolution, uncertainty, grief, superstition, worry over things to come, even after our life, ambition, avarice, jealousy, envy, unruly, frantic, and untamable appetites, war, falsehood, disloyalty, detraction, and curiosity. Indeed we have strangely overpaid for this fine reason that we glory in, and this capacity to judge and know, if we have bought it at the price of this infinite number of passions to which we are incessantly a prey. Unless we like to make much, as indeed Socrates does, of this notable prerogative over the other animals, that whereas Nature has prescribed to them certain seasons and limits to the pleasures of Venus, she has given us free reins at all hours and occasions (p.273).

The essay from this extract has been taken by Montaigne is “Man’s knowledge cannot make him Happy”. He has demonstrated all the deadly sins in it and also differentiated between passions, physical and immaterial. He is of the view that we are victim of all these passions without any hurdle. He further points out that these are the matters of judgment and also of realization to know. He quotes Socrates in this regard as well, where Socrates, rank man above animals, especially due to the vital desire of sex.

According to Socrates, animals have been conditioned to love – making only in certain seasons, but man has this inbuilt desire which could be generated at any point. This is the point where, “ethics” intervene and which should be the aim of education. To harness this desire of sex, in other words is necessary to make the social bonds normal and because the desire of sex is directly related to violence, in a sense, if it is highly suppressed. This is also true that civic society has developed due to the harnessing of this desire. So, to develop sane society it is necessary that students in schools, colleges and universities should be educated about this wild passion.

Moreover, Montaigne maintains that knowledge cannot make man happy; it means until and unless he overcomes this desire he mentioned above, the true happiness cannot prevail in society and social relationships also cannot remain in balance. Further, this is also a subject and goal of education, where man has to judge among several passions and to control him, so that he knows the true knowledge, knowledge of virtue and vice.

Taking the issue further, Montaigne is of the view like this, “Yet must I see at last whether it is in the power of man to find what he seeks, and whether that quest that he has been making for so many centuries has enriched him with new power and solid truth”(p. 280). This is the biggest question of modern civilization and education. What we have learned throughout the ages is a development towards forwardness or is it backward?

The problem is this if we have truly found the knowledge or ignorance. It is true that so far what we have done collectively to push our civilization ahead is real development or we have been misled. In other words it is an inverted development. Why are we posing this question? We are posing this question because there is more suffering, more maladies, more

wretchedness, more agony, more pain and the worst war and violence. We have developed most lethal weapons than ever in human history. Why did Virginia Woolf, Hemingway, Sylvia Plath and the owner of Daewoo bus service suicide? This is not an age of loneliness or depression; this is an age of alienation. And also this poses another biggest question: have man been educated or not?

Taking this issue further, i.e. to seek and perceive knowledge, Montaigne gives the examples of Greek philosophers. According to Montaigne, philosophy is divided into three types. To seek knowledge, certain philosophers say they have found the truth, other say that their quest for knowledge is not complete, and yet other say they haven't found the truth or it could not be founded. (Ref)

He gives examples of Peripatetics, Epicureans, Stoics and others thought they have found it. Their views established sciences that we have, and treated them as certain knowledge. "While Clitomachus, Carneades, and the Academics despaired of their quest, and judged that truth could not be conceived by our powers. The conclusion of these men was man's weakness and ignorance. This school had the greatest following and the noblest adherents" (p. 281).

He further proclaims that, "Pyrrho and other Sceptics or Epechists – whose doctrines, many of the ancients maintained, were derived from Homer, the Seven Sages, Archilochus, and Euripides, and were held by Zeno, Democritus, Xenophanes – say that they are still in search of the truth." (p. 281).

Whether truth has been found and established or quest is not complete, or truth is being searched, we can say that hidden is more than known. Definitely it's a quest, a journey, a long journey, where nothing is certain and in this postmodern world, where center or axis is lost, because of the fissure of atom has posed several questions; yet alike for scientists and writers. We are scared from each other, at individual level as well as collectively.

Montaigne quotes Sallust in this regard, "That learning would please me little which brought its teachers no closer to virtue" (p. 284). This is a comprehensive quotation. As this is the prime issue about education and knowledge. Sir Richard Livingstone said in his remarkable essay, "Education and Training of character," that aim of the education must be to develop habitual vision of greatness in students." This should be the concern of our modern education which Montaigne clearly mentioned that we can judge as human being between virtue and vice.

If the thought of Montaigne is reviewed, it seems that it is founded at the platform of strict reason and logic. According to him knowledge, and, education, which is its essential part could be learned, and seeker of knowledge may be trained.

This education is like counting the beads of rosary. In the East it is totally different. One of the most renowned Sufis, Bulleh Shah, used to sit under the tree and counted the beads of rosary, which was very long, to attain the love of God. Once he was sitting under the tree and counting the beads, he heard the voice of two milk women talking. One said to other, "for how much price have you sold the milk?" She replied, "for one rupee". Then the other asked, she said, "I have also sold the milk for one rupee, but I made drink milk of twenty five paisa to my paramour". Then the other said, "O! innocent, where there is a friendship it is not counted". Bulleh Shah threw his long rosary and started a new life of Sufism.

Same is true for seeker of knowledge and education, that it is unending. The more we get that means; more we have eliminated our ignorance. The supreme knowledge is the knowledge of our Self or inside. The awareness of mind and reason, leave behind, and passion of love overcomes us and we start loving to each and everything in our surroundings, as we are gaining realization of our ecosystem today, and man as a microcosm; diminishing due to war – we also start loving him – and this is true meaning of life, knowledge, education and seeking our curiosities.

Isaac Newton is the most influential figure in Physics. The laws developed by him, were natural and observable. These laws led to naturalistic philosophy, and two profound Philosophers, Rosseau and Kant developed their ideas in this domain.

Rosseau (1889), moreover, is unlike his remarkable predecessor; Montaigne. Rosseau is more romantic than being less philosophical like Montaigne. We have seen various essays, of Montaigne which are very grave and diverse in the previous pages. Montaigne emphasized that knowledge should be based on ethics and true knowledge is the knowledge of Divine Reality.

Rosseau is also inspired by him on his notions of knowledge and education. Our focus in this article is on the book by Rosseau “*Emile*”, in which he has pursued the education of a child and education in general, in pedagogical perspective.

The translator opens its pages like this, “*Emile*” is like an antique mirror of brass; it reflects the features of educational humanity no less faithfully than one of more modern construction”. This is an important remark and place, “*Emile*”, on a lofty platform. As the translator puts that it is concerned with educational humanity. This means that it is classified and tagged with the humanity’s education. This is a very broad spectrum view and only and only could be done by a man who in all of the “*Emile*” suggests freedom and liberty to a child in learning process, from child-birth to his growth. He asserts that child may not be suppressed at any step in his/her learning period. This also refers to the creation of free society, where human instincts and perception are nurtured naturally.

Jules Steeg in the introduction of the translated version tracing the background of the book, maintains as, Jean Jacques Rosseau’s book on education has had a powerful influence throughout Europe, and even now in the New World. It was in its day a kind of gospel. It had its share in bringing about the Revolution which renovated the entire aspect of our country. Many of the reforms so lauded by it have since then been carried into effect, and at this day seen everyday affairs. In the eighteenth century they were unheard of daring; they were mere dreams (p.1).

He adds further, “Long before that time the immortal Satirist Rabelais and after him, Michael Montaigne, had already divined the truth, had pointed out serious defects in education, and the way to reform. No one followed out their suggestions, or even gave them a hearing” (p.1). As we have already discussed the views of Montaigne in which he maintains the dilemma of good and evil, and how can knowledge give true happiness. He discussed also the Greeks by commenting on them in a way: what are philosophy and its kinds, along with the seeking of true knowledge.

It is Montaigne who opened the gate of thinking for Rousseau, by giving profound views in his essays; and these became the basis of "*Emile*" in an inspired way. Montaigne was a moralist in every sense; and this is also true for Rousseau. It is unbelievable that the thoughts of Montaigne and Rousseau are still valid, as the icons of human civilization of today have been destroyed and the world is facing worst war and worst anarchy. This makes us think, whether we have really progressed or we are still lingering to know and explore the real meanings of civility. This is quite related to our education of today, pointed by Montaigne and Rousseau, long ago.

Steeg traces the background of 'Emile' in this way, Rousseau, who had educated himself, and very badly at that, was impressed with the damages of the education of his day. A mother having asked his advice, he took up the pen to write it, and little by little, his counsels grew into a book, a large work, a pedagogic romance (p.1).

Steeg further traces its impact, when it appeared in 1762, as such, "the archbishop declares that the plan of education proposed by the author, far from being in accordance with Christianity, is not fitted to form citizens, or even men." He accuses Rousseau of irreligion and bad faith; he denounces him to the temporal power as animated "by a spirit of insubordination and of revolt" (p.2).

This type of attitude has been shown by the Church and some of the institutions, from time to time. Galileo was accused of revolt by the Church for discarding Aristotelian physics. D.H. Lawrence was charged for blasphemy on writing "*Lady Chatterley's Lover*". Shelley and Philip Larkin were expelled from Oxford. This type of intolerance is still could be seen in our postmodern world as well. It brings us to the imperative of education, also in the past as well as today. If we educate our pupils in schools, colleges and universities to follow their own will and they should listen to their hearts, only then we can overcome these drastic elements of intolerance.

As book is a great cemetery and on its value history gives its verdict and in this context Steeg says;

The renown of the book, condemned by so high an authority, was immense. Scandal, by attracting public attention to it, did it good service. What was most serious and most suggestive in it was not perhaps, seized upon; but the "craze" of which it was the object had, not withstanding, good results. Mothers were won over, and resolved to nurse their own infants; great lords began to learn handicrafts, like Rousseau's imaginary pupil; physical exercises came into fashion, the spirit of innovation was forcing itself a way (p. 3).

Book First of "*Emile*" unfurls in a stunning romantic way. In "The Object of Education", the tapestry of words, so lure us as this,

Coming from the hand of the Author of all things, everything is good; in the hands of man, everything degenerates. "Man obliges one said to nourish the productions of another, one tree to bear the fruits of another; he mingles and confounds climates, elements, seasons, he mutilates his dog, his horse his slave. He overturns everything, disfigures everything; he loves deformity, monsters; he desires that nothing should be as nature made it, not even man himself. To

pleasure him, man must be broken in like a horse; man must be adapted to man's own fashion, like a tree in his garden (p.11).

This statement shows that there is an inbuilt destructive inclination in man. Since primitive times as he has to survive with barbarous Nature, where he was the most unarmed creature, he developed this tendency of destructiveness. But Rosseau implies from the above mentioned words or statement, that he could harness himself, i.e. man. Suggesting and referring to education, right from birth, Rosseau writes in this manner,

We are born weak, we need strength; we are both destitute of all things, we need assistance; we are born stupid, we need judgment. All that we have not at our birth, and that we need when grown up, is given us by education (p.12).

Elaborating further, this education comes to us from nature itself, or from other men, or from circumstances. The internal development of our faculties and our organs is the education which nature gives us; the use we are taught to make of this development is the education we get from other men; and what we learn, by our experience, about things that interest us, is the education of circumstances (p.12).

Rousseau wants to reiterate that child is weak and meek, and dependent. Moreover, according to him nature is his first guide; which makes him differentiate the kinds of education and maintains that, there are three kinds. First, we learn and get educated from nature. Second is that we get from other men. Third, from circumstances; all these kinds of education, which we seek, mainly come from external world. But the education which we take from nature may be internal or external. When we talk about the education, which we get from circumstances, it is that which comes from our surroundings; and this is the real education.

Rousseau assigns different teachers in this regard. He is of the view, "Each of us is therefore formed by three kinds of teachers". The pupil in whom their different lessons contradict one another is badly educated, and will never be in harmony with himself, the one in whom they all touch upon the same points and tend toward the same object advances toward that goal only, and lives accordingly. He alone is well educated (p.13).

Defining bad and good education, Rousseau wants to say that where a pupil is taught contradictory he can't get a balanced education. Where all three kinds of learning; learning from nature, learning from circumstances, learning from internal initiation, coincide, that develops harmony in the pupil.

Rousseau expounding further, about these kinds of educations relates in this manner, "Now of these three different educations, that nature does not depend upon us, that of circumstances depend upon us only in certain respects, that of men is the only one which we are really masters, and that solely because we think we are. For who can hope to direct entirely the speech and conduct of all who surround a child?" (p.13).

Though Rousseau has in the above mentioned quotation says "that we think, therefore we are", is a Cartesian frame and through this, Descartes proved God, by theorems of Cartesian plane. But apart from it, not only child but man is at every moment of life, dependent at the people who surround him, up till his death. Man is helpless due to his circumstances. Advancing further

---

to the pedagogical steps for the learning of child, Rousseau is apt in saying so, But seeing that human affairs are changeable, seeing the restless and disturbing spirit of this century, which overturns everything once in generation; can a more senseless method be imagined than to educate a child as if he were never to leave his room, as if he were obliged to be constantly surrounded by his servants? If the poor creature takes but one step on the earth if he comes down so much as one stair, he is ruined. This is not teaching him to endure pain; it is training him to feel it more keenly (p.14).

This depicts that child must be given liberty to act and so many people around him should not impose over him. Even now this concept is valid for the education of the child. Moreover, as Sartre said that absence of my father saved me from Super ego. In other words, let the child be exposed to external world. Rousseau, propounds his views on new born child, like this. The new-born child needs to stretch and to move his limbs so as to draw – them out of the torpor in which, rolled into a ball, they have so long remained. We do stretch his limbs, it is true, but we prevent him from moving them. We even constrain his head into a baby's cap. It seems as if we were afraid he might appear to be alive. The inaction, the constraint in which we keep his limbs, cannot fail to interfere with the circulation of the blood and of the secretions, to prevent the child from growing strong and sturdy, and to change his construction. In regions where these extravagant precautions are not taken the men are all large, strong, and well proportioned (p.15).

These are interesting remarks in the rearing of the child. It is also conjoined with the previous extracts as Rousseau wants to see rearing of the child in a natural way, whereas he is also concerned about the child's physical health. In underdeveloped countries, these things are still common as customs and rites in taking the care of a newly born child. The cotton pickers, and plucking the grains of wheat from stems, women who do these works but, small children are on their backs like bags.

Moving his ideas, concerning about the treatment of the child, when he is in infancy, Rousseau proposes as,

At birth a child cries, his earliest infancy is spent in crying. Sometimes he is tossed, he is petted, to appease him, sometimes he is threatened beaten, to make him quiet. We either do as he pleases, or else we expect from him what we please. We either submit to his whims, or make him submit to ours. There is no middle course; he must give or receive orders. Thus his first ideas are those of absolute rule and of slavery (p.21).

These ideas of Rousseau, let us ponder how to grow a child, and side by side they let us understand how ruler ship and how slavery is determined. Suggesting the concept of the earliest education, Rousseau comments so,

Since the only kinds of objects presented to him are likely to make him either timid or courageous. Why should not his education begin before he speaks or understands? I would habituate him to seeing new objects, though be ugly, repulsive, or singular; but let this be by degrees, and from a distance, until he has become accustomed to them, and from seeing them handled by others, shall at last handle them himself. If during his infancy he has seen without fear frogs, serpents, crawfishes, he will, when grown up, be without shrinking any animal that may be shown him. For one who daily sees frightful objects, there are none such (p.25).

This view is related also to the previous ones. In actuality, Rousseau, here is distinguishing between, apprehensive education or education that may make the child inapprehensive. We can also infer from it the virtue of valor, which makes one as to be demonstrative and bear the pains of life with patience. On the greatest phenomena and the greatest debate of today, the language, in “Emile” we find these remarks:

Children who are too much urged to speak have not time sufficient for carefully or to understand thoroughly what they are made to say. If, instead, they are left to themselves they at first practice using the syllables they can most readily utter; and gradually attaching to those some meaning that can be gathered from their own words before acquiring yours. Thus they receive you only after they understand them. Not being urged to use them, they notice carefully what meaning you give them; and, when they are sure of this, they adopt it as their own (p. 37).

These remarks may be in contrast with two greatest theories of language learning of today. One expounded by Chomsky, and the other by Skinner. Skinner says that surroundings inculcate the language in the mind and through the process of stimulus, response and reinforcement. Whereas on the other side Chomsky’s concept of language learning is that it is genetically preprogrammed and it is present in mind synchronically.

In book second, it seems that Rousseau is praying for the humanity for justice and liberty, for freedom and love, for being nonviolent and be humane. It seems that his rhetorical eloquence is at peak, when he cries for deplorable and wretched humanity, and himself also being inflicted by this pain, emanates,

Omen, be humane! It is your highest duty; be humane to all conditions of men, to every age, to everything not alien to mankind. What higher wisdom is there for you than humanity? Love childhood encourage its sports, its pleasures, its lovable instincts. Who among us has not at times looked back with regret to the age when a smile was continually on our lips, when the soul was always at peace? Why should we rob these little innocent creatures of the enjoyment of a time so brief, so transient, of a boon so precious, which they cannot misuse? Why will you fill with bitterness and sorrow these fleeting years which can no more return to them? Do you know, you fathers, the moment when death awaits your children? Do not store up for yourselves remorse, by taking from them the brief moments nature has given them. As soon as they can appreciate the delights of existence, let them enjoy it. At whatever hour God may call them, let them not die without having tasted life at all (p.43).

This seems the cry of Alpsian Prometheus who has taken the shape of Rousseau, not as a social scientist but as an idealist. A true naturalist, Rousseau, recurrently moves towards nature for his guidance, and it looks to be his mentor. But this is a prayer, a clarion call, but this can’t be achieved. History has its own momentum.

A philosopher, a poet a painter, a musician and a dancer, all of them could appease the man for a moment. But life is so as Shelley said, “I fall upon the thorns of life, I bleed.” Most of the paths of life are thorny, even Rousseau has suggested this as well.

Taking this notion further, the great sociologist and philosopher reiterates in this manner. “He alone has his own way who, to compass it, does not need the arm of another to lengthen his own. Consequently freedom, and not authority, is the greatest good” (p. 44).

This is also a voice of an idealist. Why? Because prevailing the goodness of freedom in society is possible only, if we revisit and renew our history which is replete with tyrants and tyranny, injustice and inequality, dissatisfaction and discontentment, pride and arrogance, war and bloodshed, slavery and poverty, oppression and humiliation, and with less true education than all-embracing ignorance. Rosseau in this matter is swept away from logic and behaves like a romantic.

Rousseau speaks about the duties and rights of the children, under the title “The idea of property”, and here again Rousseau becomes passionate and reflects, Our first duties are to ourselves; our first feelings are concentrated upon ourselves; our first natural movements have reference to our own preservation and wellbeing. Thus our first idea of justice is just not as due from us, but to us. One error in education of to – day is, that by speaking to children first of the duties and never of their rights, we commence at the wrong end, and tell them of what they cannot understand, and what cannot interest them (p. 63).

Rousseau after talking about the rights of children, says something about the possession of things to him. This is an ownership of a different kind, as marked by Rousseau. But the sense of this idea of possession leads to the idea of private property and is a bit confused perception.

This concept of possession has led humanity to the distortion of the world of today. These are the children, who have to become adults and youths, and if they start developing in their minds concept of ownership; this makes them at one side possessive, and on the other side, it gives them the notion of private property. In history various wars have been fought due to this very precept of private property, and very severe. This idea of private ownership stemming from childhood has given way to such notions, which now in this world of lethal weapons, have paved the way of such a war, which can not only destroy this globe, but it may wipe away human beings as well.

But as any man even philosopher is determined by his age and the stage of history, therefore he can't transcend from his age. This may not be true for Rousseau, who is modern as well, as we have claimed earlier. Every philosopher also has the right to justify his maxims, but again its history that decides, who has to live and who has to be wiped away. In case of Rousseau, like his predecessor, his commentary on education is now a historical document. Even then it is a book which will always attract the attention of the readers to follow and places Rousseau on a high stature.

Again emphasizing; the child passing the childhood, should be at liberty and enjoy freedom, Rousseau quotes

Plato, in that work of his considered so severe, the “Republic”, would have children accustomed to festivals, games, songs and pastimes; one would think he was satisfied with having carefully taught them how to enjoy themselves. And Seneca, speaking of the Roman youth, of old, says, “They were always standing; nothing was taught them that they had to learn when seated.” Were they of less account when they reached manhood? Have no fear, then, of this supposed idleness. What would you think of a man who, in order to use his whole life to the best advantage, would not sleep? You would Say, “The man has no sense; he does not enjoy

life, but robs himself of it. To avoid sleep, he rushes on his death.” The two cases are parallel, for childhood is the slumber of reason (p. 78).

The last line of these comments are unacceptable, because childhood is the period, when child is open to everything around him and this is the most important part of his life. He is fully alive to receive not only the impression of the external world but his senses are so sharp, that we can't say, he is deprived of reason, though learning and education of a child is slow.

Imploring faithfully, the rearing and concern about the education of the child, Rousseau extends himself to determine the features of “The Age of Study” in Book Third. After evaluating the subjects of youth, he turns his attention towards, how knowledge is sought. He maintains curiosity as a principle factor to seek knowledge. He starts this discussion, with the title “The Incentive of Curiosity”

He stirs this issue in this way,

There is a thirst for knowledge which is founded only upon a desire to be thought, learned, and another, springing from our natural curiosity concerning anything which nearly or remotely interests us. Our desire for happiness is inborn and as it can never be fully satisfied, we are always seeking ways to increase what we have. This first principle of curiosity is natural to the heart of man, but is developed only in proportion to our passions and to our advance in Knowledge. Call your pupil's attention to the phenomena of nature, and you will soon render him inquisitive. But if you would keep this curiosity alive do not be in haste to satisfy it. Ask him questions that he can comprehend, and let him solve them. Let him know a thing because he has found it for himself, and not because you have told him of it. Let him not learn science, but discover it for himself. If you substitute authority for reason, he will not reason anymore; he will only be the sport of other people's opinions (p. 124).

This extract from “*Emile*” shows that student's hidden abilities should be made alive as they are always in search of new ideas and new knowledge. They want to know. They want to learn, as it is shown by Rousseau, and that driven by the principle of happiness, which makes a pupil inquisitive, because he increasingly demands happiness, in order to satisfy him. The significant point by Rousseau is, let the student learn himself and in these terms he will reason about everything. Moreover, allowing him to know, and also discover anything, like science, is better. This shows that this is a way of education which we are now heading in this modern and qualitative sense and is known as sustainable concept of teaching. Taking the paradigm of superior education, our social scientist of “*Emile*” shows a mild displeasure by calling it so – called. He is of the view,

Suppose that while we are studying the course of the sun, and the manner of finding where the east is, “*Emile*” all at once interrupts me, to ask, “What is the use of all this? What an opportunity for a fine discourse! How many things I could tell him of in answering this question especially if anybody were by to listen! I could mention the advantages of travel and of commerce; the peculiar products of each climate; the manners of different nations; the use of each of the calendar; the calculation of seasons in agriculture; the art of navigation, and the manner of travelling by sea, following the true course without knowing where we are. I might take up politics, natural history, astronomy, even ethics and international law, by way of giving my pupil exalted ideas of all these sciences, and a strong desire to learn them. When I have done, the boy will not have done, the boy will not have understood a single idea out of all my

pedantic display. He would like to ask again, “What is the use of finding out where the east is?” but dares not, lest I might be angry. He finds it more to his interest to pretend to understand what he has been compelled to hear. This is not at all an uncommon case in superior education, so – called (p. 144).

The remarkable treatise of “*Emile*”, and Montaigne’s essays in background of Rosseau, depict a world which is of extreme reason and logic. Montaigne is more dejected at the case of seeking knowledge and education. His essays led Rosseau to review all the types and kinds of education.

Rousseau has faithfully constructed a book and a pedagogical one. He has dealt with the education of a child and then he ends at the age where child culminates in himself reason, most probably as defined by Rosseau as “The age of Study”. This age of study is essentially the age where child after passing through nursing of mother and other various stages, discussed in previous pages; finds himself as a youth, acquiring education and, here also he has painted him as such, that he should become a free thinker, and be induced with a knowledge and education in a natural way.

He himself is a free thinker and naturalist as suggested earlier, and believes that conventional and accustomed methods of rearing the child from birth up to the youth should be done by giving him extreme liberty, where he can judge, implore, explore and discover the boundaries of education himself, and this vast universe as well as society. He seems to object about the ideas of education which prevailed in eighteenth century, and the very “*Emile*” was considered as a threat, provoking a revolt.

Apart from its precious value, he, the Man, Rosseau, has in a very organized way touched every aspect of education, and the role of certain notions in education, as of senses, clothing, taste and other things like culture and in the end about the idea of superior education, which he calls, so – called in a romantic flair. His prose is sometimes analytical, and at another time very passionate. His faithful and diverse discourse, whereas is a gospel for developing humane humanity, but at large a peep in the human soul.

## References

- Montaigne, M. (1990). The Essays. The Great Books of the World (Vol. 23).  
Rousseau, J. J. (1889). *Emile or Concerning Education*, translated by Eleanor Worthing.