

The Role of Education:
Plato's *Republic* and Rousseau's *Emile*

Anna Maria Melachrinou
April 10, 2012
Tufts University

Introduction

The subject of Education is integral in Plato's *Republic*, which rests heavily on an analysis of the proper education of its guardians. As Rousseau wrote in *Emile, or on Education*: the *Republic* "is not at all a political work, as think those who judge books only by their titles. It is the most beautiful educational treatise ever written."¹ Rousseau is one of the most important Enlightenment thinkers, with a profound influence on political theory and educational thought. *Emile*, Rousseau's own treatise on education is the only other book of Rousseau's works that includes a detailed analysis of the *Social Contract* in Book V, when he teaches Emile what is the social contract and why he should commit to it. Both Rousseau and Plato believe that men live in chains and education is the means of dealing with the bonds that restrict them. For Rousseau, man's chains are social bonds, in the form of the prejudices and the human attachments that exist in society (E, 85). For Plato education may be the means to liberate man from his chains as illustrated in the allegory of the cave, which is the "image of our nature in its education"². Despite this strong similarity and despite the fact that both the *Republic* and *Emile* have been substantially cited and commented on, there is very little written on the comparison of the role of education in Plato and Rousseau's philosophies, and scarcely anything comparing the role of education specifically in these two books. Allan Bloom, who translated both,

¹ Jean Jacques Rousseau, *Emile, or on Education*, (Basic Books, 1979. Translated by Allan Bloom) p.40, hereafter cited as "E," followed by page numbers from this edition.

² Plato, *Republic*, (Basic Books, 1968. Translated by Allan Bloom) paragraph 514e, hereafter cited as "R," followed by paragraph section from this edition.

noticed this important connection, and claimed that *Emile* is “the greatest modern book on education,” and the “natural companion” to Plato’s *Republic*³.

As Bloom notes these two great books deserve an in depth examination as independent writings, but also as companions to one another. There are important principles and methods of education in *Emile* that are similar to those of the *Republic*, and it is of great interest to study why, and how Rousseau follows, or differentiates himself from Plato. I believe that in his search for the best education, Rousseau is heavily influenced by Plato’s ideas, while developing a theory of his own. By closely studying the *Republic* and *Emile*, and their relationship with each other, we gain invaluable insight into the role education in the state and its effect on the individual.

The central question in both books is what is the purpose of education, which is directly connected to the issue of the chains. Rousseau is caught between raising an ideal citizen who follows the social contract, and a man who lives in accordance with nature. His educational treatise is an attempt to reconcile the two, and show how the bonds of society can be legitimized. Based on the city-soul analogy in the *Republic*, Plato explains the proper ordering of the soul through the foundation of the ideal city. Socrates and the interlocutors search for justice in the ideal city in order to create a blueprint for the soul, and find the meaning of justice. According to Socrates the happy man is the just man with a well-ordered soul, and according to Rousseau happiness comes with freedom, and with “diminishing the excess of the desires over the faculties” (E, 80).

Freedom can be achieved when a man learns from a young age to keep his desires in harmony with his strength and thus, not depend on others to fulfill his needs: “The truly free man wants only what he can do and does what he pleases. That is my

³ Plato, *Republic*, (Basic Books, 1968. Translated by Allan Bloom) Introduction, p.x

fundamental maxim. It need only be applied to childhood for all the rules of education to flow from it” (E, 84). However, the bonds that constrain men the most are the attachments they inevitably develop in society by living with other people. Their first attachments come from their family and their loved ones; Rousseau eventually anticipates an attachment to their country and a dedication to the social contract. These bonds cannot be broken, but they can be legitimized. Through his education Rousseau aims to make Emile accept his social attachments and thus, combine his natural and social side.

According to the allegory of the cave, men are inside a cave with their legs and necks chained, facing a wall, and unable to move. There is a fire burning behind them and they can only see the shadows of puppets, which they believe is the truth. They have to be released from the bonds and turned to the right direction to see the light that will lead them to true knowledge. The chains are the limitations of our bodies that constrain us from seeing the truth because, men believe only in the visible based on their senses. But according to Plato there is more to the world than what we can see, and through education he attempts to teach men to think comparatively and search for the general forms rather than the visible images.

In order to achieve their aims, Plato and Rousseau have identified two main phases in their proposed education. The first part lasts from birth until puberty where they set the foundation for the conversion that will take place in the second phase. Rousseau describes the first stages of his education as a “negative education” because it is based on preventing his student from learning harmful things that will corrupt his original natural state. The beginning of education is of critical importance because the first lessons once imprinted in a child’s mind are very hard to change (E, 89). Especially for the first years

of a child's life the most important task is to prevent him from being exposed to false opinions, prejudices, and the corruption of society that will draw him further from his purer state (E, 93). Thus, Rousseau tries to keep Emile as close as possible to the natural man who is self-sufficient and with limited desires.

Plato also emphasizes the importance of beginnings, and claims that education is important because it can make things right from the start, and then they are easier to be maintained. Plato aims to build a strong and balanced character that will be able to follow and enforce the right opinion of the intellect. He trains the spirited part of the soul to cultivate the necessary courage that will follow reason in the second phase. In Books II and III, men are educated in music and gymnastics to cultivate the spirited part of the soul and achieve a harmonic combination of moderation and courage (R, 412). Similarly, according to Rousseau there is a direct connection between strength of mind and body (E, 125). He believes that his pupil must "work like a peasant and think like a philosopher," (E, 202) and with the habit of exercising his body he will get a taste for reflection and meditation.

In the second phase, Rousseau and Plato present the teachings that will make the biggest changes. Plato attempts to cultivate reason, teach men to search for the forms, and learn the art of dialectic in order for the guardians to become capable of ruling the city. Rousseau begins to shape the citizen who will dedicate himself to the *Social Contract*. In the *Republic*, the guardians will study geometry, calculation, astronomy, and finally dialectic. Rousseau also proposes a similar curriculum that includes language, geometry, music, physics, comparing, and the study of man. In discussing the basic curriculum, both Rousseau and Plato support a more theoretical, rather than practical application of the

subjects. Rousseau believes that it is more important for his pupil to learn the means of learning, rather than memorize the content of the lesson. He claims that “a fundamental principle of every good education,” is “not to teach him the sciences but to give him the taste for loving them and methods for learning them...” (E, 172). Plato straightforwardly claims that men should study for the sake of learning, and not just for practical reasons. For example, he says they should study calculation to “come to the contemplation of the nature of numbers with intellection itself, not practicing it for the sake of buying and selling ...” (R, 525). Socrates describes the journey of dialectic when a man tries through discussion and argumentation to understand what each thing itself *is*, and perseveres until he grasps by intellection what is good. Only then can he be released from the limitations of his senses, such as sight that leads to misleading beliefs, and turn to the study of the intelligible.

Emile faced his greatest challenge when Rousseau asked him to leave the girl he fell in love with in order to become master of his own heart. Rousseau wants Emile to limit his desires and detach his heart in order to become capable of putting his duties above his inclinations, losing whatever can be taken from him. Only then will Emile be happy regardless of what fortune puts on his way. Thus, Rousseau and Emile left for two years of travel, during which Emile learned the science of politics. In the end, Emile recognizes the chains of necessity and accepts Rousseau’s explanation of the importance of dedicating himself to the homeland and to fulfilling his duties as a citizen.

Both books include a harsh critique on education, since Rousseau and Plato disagree with the existing methods of education, and they express the need for change. Rousseau straightforwardly says: “I do not envisage as a public education those laughable

establishments called *colleges*,” (E, 41) and criticizes them for their wrong tactics such as “persuasion, force, and threats or, what is worse, flattery and promises” (E, 90). Rousseau believes that experience is the most effective way to learn, and he criticizes the use of long uninterrupted speeches (E, 169, 180). He claims that lessons ought to be made in actions rather than in speeches and thus, uses artifice to demonstrate the lesson to his pupil. Like Socrates, Rousseau believes that deeds speak louder than words, and it is through experience that one learns best.

Socrates makes an effort to show that he differs from the infamous sophists who claimed to be wise men that give knowledge to their students. Instead, Socrates declared ignorance about things and presented his role as simply to guide, and help bring out the knowledge that already exists within his students⁴. Thus, Socrates adopts a more guiding role that will help men bring out the knowledge that exists within, and turn their soul to the right direction. He avoids giving long speeches, and engages in a dialogue that will make the other person an active participant in learning.

Plato’s education is a type of conversion; through the proper guidance men use their natural inclinations in a positive way and turn towards the right direction, where they will be able to see things in a different light. It is about learning to think comparatively and developing a sense of perspective, so they can see true knowledge and not be fooled by prejudices and opinions. For Plato, man first has to turn towards the right direction, (R, 518) and then education is re-enforced through habituation. For Rousseau, man is born in the ideal state, which is the natural state and through prevention

⁴ As he says: “Education is not what the profession of certain men assert it to be. They presumably assert that they put into the soul knowledge that isn’t in it, as though they were putting sight into blind eyes.” (R, 518)

and habitation he can remain as close as possible to nature while being part of civil society.

In chapter one, I will introduce the *Republic* by explaining how the discussion about justice begins, what is the city-soul analogy, and how education enters the discussion. Then I will examine the role of education in both sides of the analogy, the two phases of Socrates' education, and finally how it explains the allegory of the cave. In chapter two, I will discuss Rousseau's views on nature and society, the development of *amour-propre* and the two phases of his education. For the first phase I will study the concept of "negative education," how it delays *amour-proper*, the method of "well-regulated freedom," and the relationship of the body to the mind. For the second phase, I will study the development of the passions, the role of religion, the study of history and politics and finally, Emile's introduction into the *Social Contract*.

My third chapter will be a comparative analysis based on the two previous chapters. I will first discuss their critique on the existing education, the importance of gymnastics, the relation of freedom and censorship and the role of religion. I will then look into their views on nature vs. nurture, their distinct purposes, and finally, how it all connects to the chains. Rousseau's civic education trains the citizen of the *Social Contract* and Plato's civic education prepares citizens to order their soul properly and act in accordance with justice. Plato and Rousseau attempt to build strong characters and cultivate the intellect so students learn how to think critically.

Chapter One

REPUBLIC

“Next, then,” I said, “make an image of our nature in its education and want of education, likening it to a condition of the following kind. See human beings as though they were in an underground cave-like dwelling with its entrance, a long one, open to the light across the whole width of the cave. They are in it from childhood with their legs and necks in bonds so that they are fixed, seeing only in front of them, unable because of the bond(s) to turn their heads all the way around. Their light is from a fire burning far above and behind them. Between the fire and the prisoners there is a road above, along which see a wall, build like the partitions puppet-handlers set in front of the human beings and over which they show the puppets. (R, 514a)

“They’re like us,” (R, 515a) Socrates says after he describes Plato’s famous allegory of the cave. According to the allegory, men are chained inside a cave from childhood, facing a wall and seeing only the shadows of puppets that are illuminated by a fire. Since all they have ever known are these shadows, they believe that what they see is the only truth⁵. Socrates explains the unique case of a man that is somehow released from the chains, and manages to turn his neck around and look towards the light⁶. Socrates then asks: “What do you suppose he’d say if someone were to tell him that before he saw silly nothings, while now, because he is somewhat nearer to what *is* and more turned toward beings, he sees more correctly...” (R, 515d). At first he is at a loss, but if someone dragged him to the light, even though at first his eyes would not be able to see, they

⁵ As Socrates says, they believe that “the truth is nothing other than the shadows of artificial things.” (R, 515b)

⁶ Plato does not clearly explain how and why the man is released from the chains, and it appears to be a sort of accident, or miracle due to an unknown force that compels him to act the way he does. Plato’s description is the following: “Take a man who is released and suddenly compelled to stand up, to turn his neck around, to walk and look up towards the light...” (R, 515d) The unknown force is referred to as ‘someone’ who talks to the man and drags him: “What do you suppose he’d say if someone were to tell him that before he saw silly nothings...?” or “And if someone dragged him away from there by force along the rough steep, upward way and dint let me go before he had dragged him out into the light of the sun, wouldn’t he be distressed annoyed at being so dragged?” (R, 515 d, e) This unknown force is reminiscent of the daemon Socrates often refers to that compels him to act in certain ways.

would slowly adjust and eventually be able to make out the things themselves and finally face the sun (R, 516a).

Deciphering the meanings behind the allegory of the cave is imperative in understanding the *Republic* as a whole and the central role that education has in it. What is the world of the cave? What do the chains represent? How is someone liberated from them, and what happens when one exits the cave? Answering these questions requires an in depth understanding of Plato's view of human nature, its capacity to change, and how that change can happen. The question of "how" is connected to the role of education, as the means to possibly liberate men and turn them towards the right direction. As Socrates claims, he will make "an image of our nature in its education and want of education." The allegory of the cave represents the life of the uneducated man and how it can change through education.

Even though the title of the book suggests it is a political work, the *Republic* at its core is about the human soul and its education. The original title «Πολιτεία» has a common root with the words "polis" and "politics," which encompasses the meaning of city, constitution, and state. However, the main theme of the book is expressed in its subtitle «Δικαίον» which means "On Justice." It depicts the discussion of Socrates and the interlocutors who attempt to discover what is justice in the individual, in other words, what is the just soul. Like most of Plato's works, the *Republic* is written in the form of a dialogue and is presented from the point of view of Socrates. A discussion begins when a group of interlocutors order Socrates to join them at their house. The question of justice is raised at the beginning of Book I after Socrates asks Cephalus, an elderly man to account for his view of old age. Cephalus' first response is that some men complain about the

evils of old age and long for the pleasures of youth, while others find peace and freedom within themselves and are satisfied. Thus, Cephalus explains it is the character of the individual that determines who he is, and how he perceives the important questions in life.

But of these things and those that concern relatives, there is one just cause: not old age, Socrates, but the character of human beings. If they are orderly and content with themselves, even old age is only moderately troublesome; if they are not, then both age, Socrates, and youth alike turn out to be hard for that sort. (R, 329e)

In response, Socrates argues that most people will not accept this view and believe that old age is made easier through the possession of wealth. Cephalus admits that money is helpful but only in order to pay back what one owes before their death because, as the tales about Hades say, “the one who has done unjust deeds here must pay the penalty there” (R, 330d). Fearing that this might be true, he tries to pay back for the unjust deeds he committed to avoid punishment in the afterlife, and make sure he does not owe anything to another man. At this point, Socrates inquires for an explanation of what Cephalus means by justice because if justice is “giving back what a man has taken from another,” (R, 331c) if a man borrows a weapon from a friend who later becomes insane, and the sane man has to return the weapon to the mad man, that would be an injustice. Cephalus admits he did not describe justice correctly and exits the room to attend to his own sacrifices leaving the argument about the meaning of justice to continue between Socrates and the interlocutors. The discussion about justice was not accidental but was initiated by Socrates and becomes the principal theme of the *Republic*. The quest for justice, leads to the study of the just city, the just soul, how to avoid injustice and how to become just. The process of learning how to become just under the guidance of Socrates is tied to the next most important issue in the *Republic*: education.

Finding justice in the individual is inherently connected with how one should live his life, and to a larger extent, defining what a happy life is. Socrates explains that the “just man is happy,” and “will have a good life” (R, 353e). At first glance, the reason seems to be that as the just man approaches death he will have peace of mind and not worry over the punishments that lie ahead for any unjust deeds. But another important reason for not fearing death lies in Cephalus’ claim that what really matters is the character of men. As Socrates says, “justice is virtue of soul,” (R, 353e) and because living is the work of the soul, he explains in the first Book that the real question of the *Republic* is about the way we should live:

But whether the just also live better than the unjust and are happier, which is what we afterwards proposed for consideration, must be considered. And now, in my opinion, they do also look as though they are, on the basis of what we have said. Nevertheless, this must still be considered better: for the argument is not about just any question, but about the way one should live. (R, 352d)

A just soul will be orderly and content, and so in youth and old age it will have the right attitude towards life. A question that can be raised in response to this claim is what are the factors that will determine the character of men? Is it determined from birth by nature, or does it change throughout life? This is a very important issue because it is connected with the capacity of education to mold and change men’s character, towards what Plato believes will be a more just and happy soul.

Out of the effort to discover justice in one’s soul, a political discussion develops around the city. After Book I ends with an apparent failed attempt to find justice in the individual, Socrates proposes to search for justice in the city, claiming it will be easier to find justice by looking at something bigger. A city is made out of many individuals, so

“there would be more justice in the bigger and it would be easier to observe closely⁷” (368e). Thus, Socrates and the interlocutors are faced with the task of constructing a city in speech to see how justice will come into being in the ideal city (R, 369a). Even though the interlocutors repeatedly criticize Socrates that the city is not feasible in practice, he has to constantly remind them that it was created to act as an analogy for the soul⁸. Thus, the reader must keep in mind that Socrates through the city-soul analogy, guides the interlocutors to discover what is the just life and how it can be achieved.

The method of creating the city-soul analogy to find justice is rooted in Plato’s theory of the forms and manifestations. He believes that there is one true form for everything that includes all the different manifestations that could exist and is too large for the human mind to comprehend in its totality. For example, there is the form of justice, and there are different manifestations of justice, such as justice in a good city, in a bad city, justice in different men etc. Another, more simple example is a chair; the form of the chair includes everything that has to do with chair, it includes all of its manifestations, such as the different types of chairs, pictures of chairs, shadows of chairs etc. Like the perfect justice, the perfect chair is unattainable, but the true philosopher is in constant quest for them. Through examining the different manifestations and comparing them to each other, one comes to a closer understanding of the form.

⁷ As Nettleship claims in his book, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*: “Instead of meeting the new requirement by analyzing the human soul, Plato proceeds to analyze human society. The reason for this is to be found in his conviction that in society (to interpret his own familiar simile) we see man ‘writ large’; in other words, that in the broad outlines of the state, with its classes, its trade and industry, its military and political institutions, the secret and subtle elements of human nature come to the surface, take visible shape, and are unmistakably legible to the observer.” Nettleship Richard Lewis, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*, (Oxford University Press 1951), p.3

⁸ For example, In the end of Book IX, Socrates explains: “perhaps, a pattern is laid up for the man who wants to see and found a city within himself on the basis of what he sees. It doesn’t make any difference whether it is or will be somewhere. For he would mend the things of this city alone, and of no other.” (R, 592b)

According to the founders of the city in speech—Socrates and the interlocutors—the city comes into being out of people’s necessity to fulfill their needs, assuming that they are not self-sufficient. With the division of labor, the members of the city work together to provide for food, housing, and clothing. From the beginning, Socrates clarifies that a prerequisite for the city in speech to be successful is that every man specializes in what he is naturally most fit to do. He claims it is best to have “one man, one art,” (R, 470b) where each man will apply his skills to the art that suits him the best. The city slowly grows in population and it requires doctors, craftsmen, farmers, house builders, shoemakers, and tradesmen, who make up the moneymaking class of the city.

The second class of the city is the guardians, who will make up the army and protect the city. The founders must choose the men who by nature are most fit for guarding the city. They must be “philosophic, spirited, swift, and strong,” (R, 376c) and resemble noble dogs, which are known to be the philosophic animals. Noble dogs are courageous because they have an “irresistible and unbeatable spirit,” (R, 375b) and philosophic because they have knowledge of what is familiar. Thus, they can be gentle to what is familiar and aggressive to what is foreign and protect the city. However, picking the guardians with the best nature for this position is not enough, they must also be educated to develop their natural elements.

Throughout their education, the founders closely observe the guardians and will select the best of them to become the rulers of the city. The rulers are called the perfect guardians, and will make up the third class of the city, while the rest of them are now called the auxiliaries. In order to become a guardian one must not only be naturally fit for

the job but also have proved his skill during the first part of his education⁹. Once chosen, the guardians will have to continue their education at a higher level of sophistication that will train them to become successful rulers of the whole city. Thus, their natural elements are not sufficient; they must nurture those elements and be trained properly to become truly successful guardians.

In order to find justice in the city, Socrates proposes a method; he explains that the perfectly good city is made out of four essential elements: wisdom, courage, moderation, and justice. By identifying what the first three elements are, they will be able to identify justice by looking at what is left over. Because they have assumed that the city in speech is completely good, it must include these four elements. By identifying the first three elements and then subtracting them from the good, the remainder will be justice. The interlocutors agree that this is the method to be adopted and proceed to define the three elements. Wisdom is “a kind of knowledge” (R, 428b) that the perfect guardians possess in order to supervise and rule the city. Courage is “a certain kind of preserving,” (R, 429c) which Socrates explains is a preserving of “the opinion produced by law through education” (R, 429c). It is the ability to stick to the right opinion brought by the proper education and not disregard it during pleasures, desires, fears, and pains. Courage is represented by the auxiliaries who must preserve the directions of the rulers. Moderation exists when there is an agreement on what the task of each class is, so that

⁹ It is important to note here that Socrates clearly states that in order to be chosen as a guardian of the city one had to have the appropriate nature for the position: “Now then, as I said a while ago, we must look for some men who are the best guardians of their conviction that they must do what on each occasion seems best for the city. So we must watch them straight from childhood by setting them at tasks in which a man would most likely forget and be deceived out of such conviction. And the man who has a memory and is hard to deceive must be chosen, and the one who’s not must be rejected, mustn’t he?” (R, 413d) As Nettleship also explains: “He is never tired of insisting upon the importance of choosing the right natures for the study of the sciences, and still more for that of ‘dialectic’. Nettleship, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*, p.136

each part that follows its task and minds its own business. Moderation leads to “a kind of harmony,” (R, 431e) when the better parts of the city rule over the weaker, so there is order and a harmonious co-existence of its parts under the rule of wisdom.

After Socrates and the interlocutors agreed on the three definitions, Socrates appears to have a moment of revelation. He realizes that justice has been in front of them all along they had just been unable to *see* it:

It appears, you blessed man that it’s been rolling round at our feet from the very beginning and we couldn’t *see* it after all, but were quite ridiculous. As men holding something in their hand sometimes seek what they’re holding, we too didn’t look at it *but turned our gaze somewhere far off*, which is also perhaps just the reason it escaped our notice (R, 432e).

Justice turns out to be what they had stated from the beginning of the city’s founding, namely, “justice is the minding of one’s own business and not being a busybody” (R, 433b). Socrates explained from the start that each man must focus on what he does best and specialize in his own art. If men followed this principle they would not interfere with other people’s business and thus, have justice in the city. Justice however, cannot come about on its own; it requires the existence of courage wisdom and moderation. Justice is the result of moderation in the city when each part executes its role and does not get involved in the affairs of other parts. The moneymaking class produces the arts, the auxiliary courageously follow the directions of the guardians, who rule wisely. Thus, “each of them minding its own business in a city—would be justice and would make the city just” (R, 434d). When the better part of the city rules over the weaker, there will be order and harmony, thus moderation will be achieved, and in effect each part of the city minding its own business will bring justice. Thus, the four elements of the city connect to each other and depend on the three classes executing their position effectively.

Socrates believes it is essential that the city be founded properly from the beginning, so that it rolls on “like a circle in its growth” (R, 424a). The good founding depends on educating the rulers and protectors so they execute their roles properly from the start:

And hence ... the regime, once well started, will roll on like a circle in its growth. For sound rearing and education, when they are preserved, produce good natures; and sound natures, in their turn receiving such an education, grow up still better than those before then, for procreation as well as for the other things, as is also the case with the other animals (R, 424a).

This leads the interlocutors and Socrates to the very important discussion of what is the best education for the auxiliaries and the guardians of the city (R, 376). It is made evident from the discussion of the city that Socrates believes there are different natures among men, meaning they should adopt different roles in the city. The first class composed of the craftsmen will produce money in the city, the second class, the auxiliary will protect the city, and the third class, the guardians will rule the city. There is a hierarchy in the different natures that leads to higher responsibilities and a different level of education to improve each nature. Thus, Socrates does not limit himself to one form of education that is applicable to everyone, but suggests that there should be different levels of education addressed to different types of people in the city.

Before moving on to an examination of the best education for the classes of the city, we must return to the city-soul analogy. Even though the city and the soul are not directly equivalent, there is a strong correlation between the composition of the city and the soul. The four main elements of the city, wisdom, courage, moderation, and justice exists in the soul as well, and the division of the city into three classes, the moneymaking

the auxiliaries and the guardians correspond to three respective parts of the soul: the desiring, the spirited, and the calculating part.

Socrates proves there is more than one part in the soul, because one can have two opposite feelings at the same time. For example, a man can desire to drink water because he is thirsty, but if the water is dirty he also does not want to drink it. Thus, there is “something in their soul binding them to drink and something forbidding them to do so, something different that masters that which bids?” (R, 439c). Socrates explains: “they are two and different from each other, naming the part of the soul with which it calculates, the calculating, and the part with which it loves, hungers, thirsts and it agitated by the other desires, the irrational and desiring, companion of certain replenishments and pleasures” (R, 439d). Thus, there is the calculating part, which is wise and rational, the spirited part, which “sets its arms on the side of the calculating part,” (R, 440e) and the desiring part that loves, hungers, thirsts, and in general desires and is irrational (439d). Socrates believes that the calculating part is better and must rule over the weaker, desiring part of the soul. The desiring is the part that is mostly connected to the body and is made weaker by the irrational bodily needs and desires that the soul must take care of¹⁰. The spirited part must preserve the decisions of the better over the weaker just like in the city “we put the auxiliaries in our city like dogs obedient to the rulers, who are like shepherds of a city” (R, 440d).

¹⁰ According to Nettleship when Socrates “speaks of the ‘appetitive’ as a specific part of the soul, he intends primarily those desires of which bodily satisfaction and wealth are the typical objects. Of such appetites he distinguishes in a later book two kinds, ‘necessary’ and ‘unnecessary’. Necessary appetites are those which we cannot get rid of, or those of which he satisfaction does us good; unnecessary are those which are superfluous and harmful.” Nettleship, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*, p.10

Similarly to the city, there are four elements in the soul; there is wisdom in the calculating part, and courage in the spirited part that must be obedient to reason and preserve its decisions. Moderation is achieved when that which is “better by nature is master over that which is worse” (R, 431a). A balanced soul exists when each part performs its proper task, and moderation is the harmonious co-existence under the voice of reason. Thus, as the city was just because each of its parts minded its own business the soul similarly requires that each part mind its own business.

The city develops from having two classes to three classes when the perfect guardians are chosen from the auxiliaries. Likewise the soul goes through a transitional phase; a child at an early age does not have the capacity to reason and follows only his desires, but as he grows, he develops the calculating part. Just as the auxiliary and guardian classes of the city must be trained specifically for their role in the city, the spirited and calculating part of the soul also needs to be trained for their respective role in the soul. Socrates proposes two main types of education; the first one is outlined in Books II and III, and is addressed to the auxiliary for the training of the spirited part, and the second one is outlined in Book VII and is addressed specifically to the guardians and the training of the calculating part. Thus, the different levels of education that Socrates initially addressed to different types of people in the city can be applied to each individual for the different parts of his soul.

It is impossible to interpret the *Republic* without keeping in mind the city-soul analogy. The city and the individual are inherently connected and one cannot exist without the other. There is no city without men and men cannot develop without a city to support them. The main characteristics that exists in one, exists in the other as well, since

a city is made out of a group of men, and as Plato has set up the analogy in the *Republic*, each man seems to have an internal city of his own. The three different classes that make up the city exist in ones soul as well; even though all souls are composed of these three elements, each soul is different in the composition of its parts. For example, the auxiliary men have the desiring and calculating part, but the spirited part is stronger and more dominant in their souls. Thus, they are naturally more suited to become auxiliaries and should train themselves for that job. Similarly, the guardians have a stronger calculating part and must train their reason to become good rulers. As a result, even though men have the same elements, the composition of those elements differs, leading to different types of men, in other words, different natures. Similarly, Socrates explains there are different types of cities, such as the timocratic and the democratic city, which I will discuss further in my paper.

The purpose of the first education is to prepare the character and the will of the soul, as the foundation for the second education that focuses on the intellect¹¹. The first stage of Plato's education aims to train the spirited part of the soul in order to cultivate courage that will preserve the decisions of the calculating part. The purpose is to build a strong and balanced character that will be able to follow and enforce the right opinion of the intellect over the desiring part¹². This education is important because, the spirited part may be corrupted and support the weaker part of the soul instead of the stronger¹³. Also,

¹¹ See James Adam, *The Republic of Plato Vol 1*, (Cambridge University Press, 1975), p.110 ft.376e

¹² Nettleship correctly claims that the appetites have to be regulated: "The degree of education of which the appetites are capable is expressed by his own word 'taming', and by this he seems to mean such a regulation of them shall prevent them from interfering with the higher physical activities, and train them to contribute to the good of the whole soul that basis of healthy physical life which is the necessary groundwork of those activities." Nettleship, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*, p.11

¹³ Socrates says, "just as there were three classes in the city that held together, money-making, auxiliary, and deliberative, is there in the soul too this third, the spirited, by nature an auxiliary to the calculating part, *if its not corrupted by bad rearing.*" (R, 441a) As Nettleship explains, the spirited part of the soul "is the

if it is wrongly trained it may become too cruel or too harsh; “if rightly trained, [it] would be courageous; but if raised to a higher pitch than it ought to have, would be likely to become cruel and harsh” (R, 410e). The spirited part of the soul must be trained to the proper degree so as not to become too harsh or too soft, but achieve a harmonic balance that will make it courageous in preserving the demands of reason.

Just like the foundation of the city is critical for its future growth, the beginning of a person’s education is very important because it is best to set things straight from the start, and also at a young age children are more susceptible to absorb what they learn: “...the beginning is the most important part of every work and that this is especially so with anything young and tender? For at that stage it’s most plastic, and each thing assimilates itself to the model whose stamp anyone wishes to give to it” (R, 377b). Socrates’ first statement on the education of the guardians is that it should be “of course, gymnastic for bodies and music for the soul” (R, 376e). Their education begins at a very young age, when they are told stories from their nurses and mothers. Even before they are capable of learning gymnastics, their education starts with music. However, Plato’s view of music in the *Republic* is different from the contemporary understanding of music¹⁴. By music he means speeches that can either be said or sung, and are either true or false. In other words, it is poetry that includes true and mythical elements and was mostly sung in

‘hard’ element in human nature, which, if rightly nurtured, becomes true bravery, but if exclusively encouraged degenerates into blind brutality, surliness, quarrelsomeness, or self-will.” Nettleship, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*, p.12

¹⁴ By music and harmony, Socrates does not mean learning an instrument or understanding musical theory such as scales, intervals and chords. As Barrow explains “Harmony is not to be confused with ‘music appreciation’, ‘musical composition’, ‘band’, ‘piano lessons’, or anything of the sort that we tend to associate with music education; ‘harmony’ is not a cultural or aesthetic matter, so much as a cousin of mathematics and astrology.” Barrow Robin, *Plato*, Continuum Library of Educational Thought Vol. 9, (Continuum International Publishing Group, 2007), p.86 Music in ancient Greece was inherently tied with poetry. According to Adams: “In the Best period of Greek music, lyric poetry was written only for music, and music only for poetry, the separation of the two being condemned as illegitimate.” James Adam, *The Republic of Plato*, p.156 ft.398d

ancient Greece. Socrates first explains what must be said in the speeches, then he will explain how it must be said, and finally he will talk about the manner of a song and melody.

The content of music in Socrates' education are false speeches in the form of tales told to children. They may contain truth in them but to a large extent they are crafted, and include lies. For example, the lies are myths about daemons, heroes, gods that have died, and the facts about their lives can be changed. There are also true speeches concerning the conduct of human beings, but Socrates claims he cannot give detailed guidelines for them yet, until they have determined what justice is¹⁵. Socrates pays particular attention to the tales that children are exposed to since at this young age they are most vulnerable to affecting their souls:

A young thing can't judge what is hidden sense and what is not; but what he takes into his opinions at that age has a tendency to become hard to eradicate and unchangeable. Perhaps it's for this reason that we must do everything to insure that what they hear first, with respect to virtue, be the finest told tales for them to hear (R, 378e).

Nurses and mothers should only tell approved tales that will affect positively the soul of their children. Hence, tales from Hesiod and Homer that include harmful lies for the children's souls should be censored (R, 377e). For example, tales about Hades such as the following will create a fear of death that will make the fighters afraid in battle:

¹⁵ According to Socrates: "Won't we come to an agreement that such speeches must be made about human beings when we find out what sort of a thing justice is and how it by nature profits the man who possesses it, whether he seems to be just or not?" (R, 392c)

“The soul flew from his limbs and went to
Hades,
Wailing his fate, leaving manliness and the bloom
of youth” (R, 386c)

and,

“Under the earth, like smoke,
Went the gibbering soul” (R, 387a)

Socrates claims that boys, who must be “free and accustomed to fearing slavery more than death,” (R, 387b) should not be exposed to these types of stories that cultivate the exact opposite effect. They must be free from opinions that will create limitations such as the fear of death. According to Socrates, a decent man will not consider death a terrible thing and as a result he will lament the least and bear hardships better than others. The issue of one’s attitude towards death is very important in all of Plato’s works. Death is something that all men share, since the common ending of death is unavoidable. The manner in which, one perceives the end of their life affects how he deals with life itself. For example, if most people fear death their attitude towards life will be very different from a man like Socrates who claims that death is not something to worry about. Socrates believes that when they are not overwhelmed by fear of dying they become more courageous and have a stronger character. In order to develop such a disposition in life, children must become accustomed from a young age to believe stories that will make them courageous.

As a result, Socrates differentiates between the lies that are not fine and can harm children, and the ones that can benefit them. Stories that include harmful lies should be censored, whereas stories with helpful lies should be used for the good of the city. They are useful because they are preventive, like a drug that keeps people from doing foolish things. Thus, false speeches that contain a combination of factual lies and some truth can

be used positively “likening the lie to the truth as best as we can, don’t we also make it useful?” (382d). For example, the youth need to cultivate moderation in their soul; the most important elements of moderation are “being obedient to the rulers, and being themselves rulers of the pleasures of drink, sex, and eating” (389d). To achieve this kind of teaching Socrates claims they must be exposed to poetry such as the following:

“Smiting his breast, he reproached his heart with word.
Endure, heart; you have endured worst before”

These types of verses promote from an early age a kind of thinking geared towards self-mastery of the soul and moderation.

Socrates proposes that the founders use a noble lie that will be told as a tale when they are children for their own benefit, in order to persuade the different classes to accept their role and also be united under the rule of the guardians¹⁶. According to the noble lie, the earth is men’s mother, and so all men in the city are brothers. However, the gods have mixed different metals in their souls from birth; there is bronze for the farmers and craftsmen, silver for the auxiliaries, and gold for the guardians. In the cases that a child is born with a different metal from its parents, they must “assign the proper value to its nature” (425b) and place it at its proper class. Through this story, Socrates will persuade men that there are different natures in the city, and the composition of the souls of the people will determine their position in the city. As previously said, a noble lie contains elements of truth in it, combined with factual lies, and if people believe this story, the city as a whole will benefit from it. Each person will accept his place in the city and fulfill his analogous responsibilities, while still seeing each other as brothers. To successfully

¹⁶ Socrates says: “Could we somehow contrive one of those lies that come into being in case of need, of which we were just now speaking, some one noble lie to persuade, in the best case, even the rulers, but if no them the rest of the city?” (R, 414c)

persuade the city, the noble lie will be told to children from a young age, and it will be repeated, so they always remember it.

After Socrates discusses what must be said in the tales, he proceeds to explain how it must be said, claiming that the style of the speeches is as important as the content (R, 392c). This is an interesting discussion where Socrates explains the proper method of narrating speeches which echoes in many ways what Plato himself is doing in the *Republic*. Socrates explains that imitation should be used in the narration of a story, just like a poet who “likens his own style as much as possible to that of the man he has announced as the speaker” (R, 393c). There should only be small changes in the account of the story, and the storyteller will use the appropriate harmonic mode and rhythm to the style of the story. Through the use of dialogue, Plato separates his personal style as much as possible and directly imitates the style of Socrates and the interlocutors through a dramatic kind of imitation,¹⁷ and the reader feels he gets a first hand account of the dialogue from Socrates himself.

This leads to the third element in learning music, which is the manner of a song and melody. Melody is composed of speech, harmonic mode, and rhythm. Speech can be sung or not sung, as long as it follows the content and method previously described and result in harmonic mode and rhythm. Rhythm is achieved by “arranging a proper sequence of short and long notes and syllables,” to achieve fast and slow rhythms.¹⁸ Harmony refers to musical modes, and each mode has a different effect on the character

¹⁷ For example, in Book I when Thrasymachus attacks Socrates and shouts at him for not giving direct answers to their questions, Plato gives dramatic details on Socrates reactions such as: “Then both Polemarchus and I got all in a flutter from fright,” (R, 336c) or “I had looked at him first, so that I was able to answer him; and with just a trace of tremor, I said...” (R, 336d)

¹⁸ See James Adam, *The Republic of Plato Vol. 1*, p.156 ft.398e

and emotions¹⁹. Socrates says that there should be two main harmonic modes: a violent one and a voluntary one. The first will “imitate the sounds and accents of a man who is courageous in warlike deeds,” and will stand up against chance (R, 399a). The second mode is for peaceful deeds such as, persuading, making a request or being able to hold oneself in check when someone else tries to persuade then. This will lead men to “act intelligently, not behaving arrogantly, but in all these things acting moderately and in measure and being content with the consequences” (R, 399c).

There is a direct connection of the harmonic mode of music and the actions of a man, as it can cultivate self-control to act courageously in war, and intelligently in peace. Rhythm and harmony connect with the deepest parts of the soul, because as music can make a man graceful, as well as develop sharp senses and taste in nature. He would thus learn to praise the fine things and eventually bring them in his soul, cultivating the gentleman within (R, 401d). As Socrates explains, the style of the speech follows the disposition of the soul; “good speech, good harmony, good grace, and good rhythm accompany good disposition” (R, 400d). Music leads to moderation in the soul when there is harmony between words and deeds, and the spirited part enforces the decisions of the calculating part. A man can thus hold himself in check, whether that is to persuade in rhetoric, or to act in war.

After Socrates has concluded with the discussion of music he turns to gymnastics, but this time changes the stated purpose of education in gymnastics. At the beginning he had claimed that the youth must be educated in music for the soul and gymnastics for the

¹⁹ The effect is similar to the difference between music written in minor and major keys. See James Adam, *The Republic of Plato Vol. I*, p. 157 ft. 198e

body. He now reveals that the main purpose of gymnastics is also to improve the soul by acting as a counterbalance to music:

Now I, for one, would assert that some god gave two arts to human beings for these two things, as it seems—music and gymnastics for the spirited and the philosophic—not for soul and body, except incidentally, but rather for these two. He did so in order that they might be harmonized with one another by being tuned to the proper degree of tension and relaxation (R, 412a).

Thus, the primary purpose of gymnastics is to strengthen the soul and as a practical consequence, the body benefits as well. According to Socrates' view of education, the effect of gymnastics on the body is incidental and a practical reason to train. The real purpose is to strengthen the soul, and in return, having a strong soul will also lead to having an even stronger body: "It doesn't look to me as though it's a sound body that by its virtue makes the soul good, but the opposite: a good soul by its own virtue makes the body as good as it can be" (R, 403d). According to Socrates, the auxiliaries must eat like athletes, stay away from drunkenness and sweets, and avoid sleeping too much. When the body goes through these types of labors, the spirited part of the soul is strengthened. If emphasis is placed on gymnastics the soul will become harsh and cruel, whereas, if emphasis is placed in music it will become too soft and tame²⁰. Music and gymnastics will work together to achieve a harmony in the soul between speeches and deeds, so that the spirit is strong enough to secure the rule of reason over desires.

²⁰ As Nettleship says: "To satisfy its craving with the right food, to offer true nobility to its admiration and true beauty to its love, to keep its perceptions wakeful and clear, to refine and balance its emotions, these are, in Plato's opinion, the functions of 'musical' education. But it will not be truly 'musical', truly 'harmonious', unless it be counterbalanced by something different.... This is the office of 'gymnastic', which. By bodily exercises, develops and educates the element of 'spirit'. Nettleship, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*, p.30-31

Socrates discusses in more detail the effects of an imbalance in Book VIII, where he describes the five different types of men that can emerge due to an imbalanced education. The timocratic man that has placed more emphasis on gymnastics will become warlike, harsh, and value money a lot. An excessive care for money makes the timocratic man oligarchic, who is focused on the acquisition of wealth, and suppresses his desires to get more money. When the oligarchic man succumbs to greed, he becomes democratic, where too much freedom in the soul leads to lack of order and discipline over his desires. Finally, the tyrannical man will develop when the worst parts of the soul become the leader and the man has become “drunken, erotic, and melancholic” (R, 573c). Since the city takes its character from its men, the city will in turn become a timocracy, an oligarchy, a democracy, or a tyranny. Socrates explains these different types to show that an imbalance in the first stages of one’s education leads to the development of different types of men, with different characteristics.

The fifth type of man Socrates describes is the kingly man who, is the best, most just, and happiest man. He is “king of himself,” (R, 580c) because he is in control of his faculties, with the better parts ruling over the worst²¹. If rightly trained, a balance between music and gymnastics will make the spirited part of the soul courageous, and at the same time tame and orderly, leading to a kind of harmony²². The spirited part will obey the calculating part, and he will be in control of harmful desires. Thus, the best

²¹ “But in truth injustice was, as it seems, something of this sort: however, not with respect to man’s minding his external business, but with respect to what is within, with respect to what truly concerns him and his own. He doesn’t let each part in him mind other people’s business or the three classes in the soul meddle with each other, but really sets his own house in good order and rules himself; he arranges himself, becomes his own friend, and harmonizes the three parts, exactly like three notes in a harmonic scale, lowest, highest, and middle. And if there are some other parts in between, he binds them together and becomes entirely one from many, moderate and harmonized.” (R, 443d)

²² As James Adams explains: “The soul has, so to speak, two strings, the φιλόσοφον and the θυμοειδές, which make a kind of ἁρμονία when they are turned to the proper pitch by Music and Gymnastic...” *The Republic of Plato Vol. 1*, p.187 ft.33

guardians who have achieved a perfectly balanced combination of music and gymnastics will have a well-harmonized soul: “Then the man who makes the finest mixture of gymnastics with music and brings them to his soul in the most proper measure is the one whom we would most correctly say that he is the most perfectly musical and well harmonized....” (R, 412a) As Nettleship describes in his book:

“The soul is like a stringed instrument, and education has to tune it, tightening here and slackening there, that it may become one instead of many, and its life a harmony instead of a discord. The man who can thus educate himself or others, who can ‘combine music and gymnastic, and apply them in due proportion to the soul’, deserves, far more than any musician, to be called a ‘musical’ man.²³

Each part will follow its task and the soul will be moderate and well ordered. By taking good care of their bodies when they are young, the guardians secure a helper for philosophy in the future (R, 498b). The strength, perseverance and courage they have developed through gymnastics will be applied in their future studies, so they labor in study as much as they labored in gymnastics (R, 504d).

The founders will watch the auxiliaries during this phase of their training and select the ones that have been most successful in achieving a harmonious balance of aggressiveness from gymnastics and melody and rhythm from music. There are only a few who will have the best nature, coupled with the best education, and are capable of being good guardians of themselves, and the city.

But the simple and moderate desires, pleasures, and pains, those led by calculation accompanied by intelligence and right opinion, you will come upon in few, and those the ones born with the best natures and best education” (R, 431c).

The guardians must have by nature, a good memory, be good learners, be lovers of learning, and through education their natures will be perfected. Those with the best nature

²³ Nettleship, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*, p.31-32

have the capacity of perfecting themselves under a good education, but they can also turn exceptionally bad under a bad education. They can be corrupted by the praise and blame of the multitude and become sophists who follow the popular convictions. Thus, it is important to keep the good natures from being corrupted and “and be turned and drawn toward philosophy (R, 494e). Once chosen, their education continues to a different level of sophistication, training them to become rulers of the other two parts of the city.

Similarly, in the soul of people, those who have completed the first phase of education and cultivated the best character will continue to the second phase, which is concerned with cultivating the intellect. Socrates claims that philosophy is the ascent to what *is*, which occurs by turning the soul around²⁴ “from a day that is like night to the true day” (R, 521c). Glaucon asks Socrates to explain what studies have such power, and Socrates begins to explain the second and most important part of the guardian’s education. Music and gymnastics have educated their character and cultivated courage, harmony and rhythm, so they have a well-ordered and tame soul. Now they are seeking a study that will train their reason, and lead to intellection.

According to Socrates the greatest study of all is the study of what *is* the *idea* of the good. Even though some claim it is pleasure, others claim it is prudence, but Socrates believes that people don’t have sufficient knowledge of the idea of the good. Socrates

²⁴ In Plato’s dialogues, Socrates demonstrates his most important principle on education through his “mid-wife” method of questioning others to bring out the knowledge they have within. Socrates demonstrated in Meno that a slave boy who did not know mathematics could solve the problem Socrates presented him with. According to Socrates, knowledge is not something that is put inside the mind of a student, but it already exists and must be brought out, by a way of turning the student to the right direction. Socrates outlines this principle in the *Republic* in the following passage: “...education is not what the profession of certain men assert it to be. They presumably assert that they put into the soul knowledge that isn’t in it, as though they were putting sight into blind eyes. ...But the present argument, on the other hand,” I said, “indicates that this power is in the soul of each, and that the instrument with which each learns—just as they eye is not able to turn towards the light from the dark without the whole body—must be turned from around from that which *is coming into being* together with the whole soul...” (R, 518c) I will explain this in more detail further in my thesis.

claims, “the soul divines that it is something, but it is at a loss about it and unable to get a sufficient grasp of just what it is...” (R, 505e). The *idea* of the good is the cause of knowledge and truth; it “provides the truth to the things known and gives the power to the one who knows” (R, 508e). Socrates claims the sun is the offspring of the good, and its light enables men to see in the finest way. As he says: “the good is the intelligible region with respect to intelligence and what is intellected, so the sun is in the visible region with respect to sight and what is seen” (R, 508c). The search for what *is* the *idea* of the good is the greatest study because it leads towards true knowledge and cultivates man’s greatest faculty: reason. As James Adam explains, Plato’s supreme duty of education is to develop the faculty of reason and “to keep alive humanity’s most precious heritage, the love of truth and knowledge²⁵.” Through this cultivation, Adams explains, Plato’s education turns men from darkness to light.

According to Socrates learning through things that are sensible does not lead to knowledge, and he finds himself unable “to hold that any study makes a soul look upward other than the one that concerns what *is* and is invisible” (R, 529b). Socrates explains that there is an instrument in everyone’s soul that may be blinded by the wrong practices but it can also be purified in order to see the truth (R, 527e). He refers to man’s capacity to reason, the human «νοῦς». Socrates purpose is to set in motion the intelligence within the calculating part of the soul so the guardian learns to search for what *is* the thing he is studying, and allows the soul to “turn around toward the contemplation of what *is*²⁶” (R,

²⁵James Adam, *The Republic of Plato Vol. 2*, p.168

²⁶ According to Adam, Plato’s most valuable theory of education is summarized in the following translation of the text: “It follows that Education is not a way of putting knowledge into empty souls, but a revolution of the Reason or organ of Knowledge, whose gaze must be directed upon Being and the brightest part thereof, which is the Good. The entire soul turns round along with Reason in the revolution. Other virtues are secondary and adventitious, but Reason never loses its power, and works weal or woe according as it is or not converted by means of Education...” James Adam, *The Republic of Plato Vol. 2*, p.97 ft 518b-521b

525a). Thus, every part of the guardian's education is geared towards developing the intellectual skills that will allow them to eventually study the *idea* of the good. Their education is composed of five parts: calculation, geometry, stereometry, astronomy and dialectics. The first four parts lay the groundwork for the fifth and most important. The common element in the study of calculation, geometry, and astronomy is that the emphasis is placed on the intellectual growth of the guardians rather than the practical applicability of the studies. In fact, very little information is given on the substance of each study, and Socrates repeatedly says that the purpose is to gradually learn how to think comparatively and in general terms.

The first study is the art of calculation and number. The aim of this study is not to develop the capacity to count and calculate numbers, in order to practice it in buying and selling, or for trading. Socrates emphasizes the importance of learning for the sake of knowledge itself. One will study calculation to contemplate on the nature of numbers, and exercise his intellection. The study must not only base its judgment on sensation, such as sight that can be misleading, but use the intellect for the contemplation of invisible things. In order to summon thought, the student must be exposed to opposite sensations that will trigger intelligence to compare and ask what the thing he is studying is. In this way, he will learn to think comparatively and develop a sense of perception. By discussing the nature of numbers, the soul is detached from the limitations of discussing visible and tangible things. Socrates believes this is a very important study because it “compels the soul to use the intellect on the truth itself²⁷” (526b).

²⁷ Mathematics is Plato's *προπαιδεία*, because it enables the student to make the transition from contemplating the particulars to the Ideas. See James Adam, *The Republic of Plato Vol. 2*, 1975, p.162

Following and connected to calculation, is the study of geometry. Similar to calculation, a very small part of this study is for the practical benefits, such as how to set up camp during war and draw up lines in the army. But at the heart of studying geometry is the ascending of the soul in trying to make out the *idea* of the good:

It must be considered whether its greater and more advanced part tends to make it easier to make out the *idea* of the good. And we say that this tendency is possessed by everything that compels the soul to turn around to the region inhabited by the happiest part of what is, which is what the soul must by all means see (R, 526d).

Again Socrates explains, “the whole study is surely pursued for the sake of knowing” (R, 527b) and not for the direct practical implications. The knowing of what *is*, is not temporary that comes into being and passes away, but it is the knowing of what *is* always. Thus, it will lead the soul towards truth and ‘be productive in philosophic understanding in directing upward what we now improperly direct downward” (R, 527b).

Socrates initially claimed the third study was astronomy, but he quickly retreated and says that “wasn’t right,” (R, 527a) and they first need to consider the solid itself before they set it in motion. Socrates’ mistake to rush into astronomy before considering geometry in three dimensions was not accidental. He uses it as an example to demonstrate that rushing into learning can cause mistakes and eventually being slowed down even more in the process of learning: “My haste to go through it quickly is the cause of my being slowed down” (R, 528d). Geometry in three dimensions (Stereometry), such as the dimension of cubes, will investigate “the dimension with depth” (R, 528c). Even though it has not yet been discovered in the city, Socrates claims that it has not been sought after because of its difficulty, but if the whole city supervises the effort to continuously seeks to understand geometry in three dimensions, “its

character would come to light” (R, 527c). Plato assigns the order of studies in such a way that will add an element of difficulty to the preceding one. Thus, the student will gradually progress from the less to the more complex.²⁸

Following geometry, the fourth study of astronomy will examine “the motion of what has depth” (R, 528e). Similarly, the benefit of this study is not to assist in navigation and knowing the months and years. The movement of the stars is visible and connected with bodies, and it would be wrong to infer truth from visible objects. It must “be grasped by argument and thought, not sight” (R, 529d). Thus, Socrates suggests that astronomy should be pursued by the use of problems to engage the intellect and not be limited by sight. Plato is distrustful of the senses, such as sight that lead to misleading beliefs, and urges the student to investigate the intelligible world rather than sensible phenomena. The goal of Plato’s *προπαιδεία* is to “discipline the intellectual powers and prepare the student to enter on the higher dialectic” where he will contemplate on the Ideas.²⁹ According to James Adam “the *Republic* aims at combining different Ideas under yet higher and higher Ideas, and all of them finally under the Idea of the Good³⁰.”

Calculation, geometry, stereometry and astronomy are studied as a means to turn the mind towards a way of thinking that will eventually lead to the highest study of all: dialectics; “all this activity of the arts, which we went through, has the power to release and leads to what is best in the soul up to the contemplation of what is best in the things that are” (R, 532c). Dialectics allows you to start from a hypothesis as a steppingstone in order to reach a point in the argument that is free from the hypothesis, and contemplate the intelligible. Then you can go back to the hypothesis and see it in a different light.

²⁸ James Adam, *The Republic of Plato Vol. 2*, p.165

²⁹ *ibid* p.167

³⁰ *ibid* p.173

Socrates describes the journey of dialectics when a man tries through discussion and argumentation to understand what each thing itself *is*, and perseveres until he grasps by intellection what is good. Only then is he released from the limitations of his senses and turns to the learning of the intelligible. According to Socrates:

...only the dialectical way of inquiry proceeds in this direction, destroying the hypotheses, to the beginning itself in order to make it secure; and when the eye of the soul is really buried in a barbaric bog, dialectic gently draws it forth and leads it up above, using the arts we described as assistants and helpers in the turning around (R, 533d).

Socrates illustrates the progress of learning in the Image of the Line. According to the Image of the Line, there are two forms, the intelligible and the visible. A line is drawn and cuts two segments, one for the class that is seen and one for the class that is intellected. In the visible part, there are images (shadows, appearances), things (animals, artifacts), which in turn depend on imagination and trust. According to Plato, the visible part is described both as *ορατόν* and *δοξαστόν*. It is important to note that *δοξαστόν* includes not only objects that can be seen, but also opinions and common beliefs.³¹ In the intelligible part there are mathematical objects and the forms, which in turn depend on thought and knowledge.

³¹ As Adam explains, *δοξαστόν* refers to «τα των πολλών πολλά νόμιμα καλου τε πέρι και των αλλων» which contains the “popular canons or opinions on the subject of what is beautiful, ugly, right wrong etc.” James Adam, *The Republic of Plato Vol. 2*, p.157
According to Nettleship: “The ‘shadows and echoes’ amongst which Plato’s prisoners live, are not, however, only the illusions, intentional or unintentional, produced by art and literature; they are also the illusions of our own passions.” Nettleship, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*, p.120

Intelligible	Forms Mathematics	Intellection Thought
	Things	Trust
Visible	Images	Imagination

The attitude of the uneducated man is reflected on the lower part of the line which is further from the truth and he is bound to the senses, believing only in the visible images and things he sees. As one climbs up the line he is liberated from dependence on the visible, and develops his intellection through turning his soul to the study of what *is*. What is the *Idea* of a thing, in other words its Form encompasses all types of images and things and different expressions of the thing itself. The visible section of the line is limited only to images of the real thing and one will never reach true knowledge unless he turns from studying the visible towards searching the general form of the thing, which can only be intellected.

...in the knowable the last thing to be seen, and that with considerable effort, is the idea of the good; but once seen, it must be concluded that this is in fact the cause of all that is right and fair in everything—in the visible it gave birth to light and its sovereign; in the intelligible, itself sovereign, it provided truth and intelligence—and that the man who is going to act prudently in private or in public must see it (R, 517b).

At the top of the line is the intellection of forms, where true knowledge exists, and one can only reach that point through the practice of dialectics. Socrates explains that they should not rush student into dialectics before they are ready for it, because they may misuse the power of argumentation (R, 539b). Socrates also clarifies that “the instruction

must not be given the aspect of compulsion in learning” (R, 535c). The soul does not learn through force, rather than using force in training they should use play.

This process of learning through the five studies and the progress of the image of the line are all incorporated in the allegory of the cave. At the lowest part in the image of the line, one is chained inside the cave. The proper nature coupled with the right education may lead the guardian to be freed from the chains, turn his soul around until he sees that there is more to the world than he had realized, “he is somewhat nearer to what is and more turned towards beings, he sees more correctly” (R, 515c). Through this education Plato tries to make people realize that life is not only what they can see. Once people grasp that there is more to the world than what is visible, their priorities and their attitude towards life will change³². The biggest example is what is one’s attitude towards death. Socrates believes that people should not be afraid of death. If men turn their soul to a different perspective towards death, their life will become very different as well. The turning of one’s soul leads to seeing a different view of the world. It is a change of perspective that will lead to another view of life.

The chains that keep them from this realization are the restrictions of the human body coupled with popular canons and opinions people believe in. A man that judges the world based on his senses will never reach true knowledge, because he will always be trapped in the visible part of the line, unable to ascend beyond what he sees, and there are limitations to the human senses, which lead to erroneous conclusions. In addition, when a man has to attend to the multiple needs and desires of the body, he is distracted from

³² “If the scale of knowledge and truth is what it has been represented to be, education must be a method for leading the soul from the lowest stage, where it apprehends nothing but ‘images’, through that of direct sensible experience, to the region of essential ‘forms’ of existence, and so finally to that perception of the systematic unity of truth which is the ideal of science.” Nettleship, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*, p.124-125

philosophy and the contemplation of what *is*. Our passions and desires are driven by the body and they keep the spirit and reason from focusing on the higher task of contemplation. The body is the prison of the soul, and a true philosopher must try to overcome the limitations of the body and have control over the physical desires³³.

The breaking of the bonds can happen when the guardian ascends the line from learning based on what is visible to learning based on intellection. It is a difficult and painful process that requires time and effort. Socrates describes the case of a man who is released by the bonds. He turns his head and sees the artifacts that caused the shadows that he had always believed were the true things, and is confused as to what is really true. When he looks at the light from above his eyes hurt and he tries to flee, but someone drags him by force upward to the light of the sun. He is distressed and annoyed at being dragged, and he is unable to see clearly because his eyes are blinded by light. Slowly he gets accustomed to it, and starts to make out the shape and later the things themselves. “And from there he could turn to beholding the things in heaven and heaven itself” (R,

³³ “The lovers of learning know that when philosophy gets hold of their soul, it is imprisoned in and clinging to the body, and that it is forced to examine other things through it as through a cage and not by itself, and that it wallows in every kind of ignorance. Philosophy sees that the worst feature of this imprisonment is that it is due to desires, so that the prisoner himself is contributing to his own incarceration most of all. As I say, the lovers of learning know that philosophy gets hold of their soul when it is in that state, then gently encourages it and tries to free it by showing them that investigation through the eyes is full of deceit, as is that through the ears and the other senses.” (R, 83e)

In *Phaedo* Plato explains that the body belongs to the visible and mortal part of man and falls apart when one dies. The soul is the invisible and immortal part, and leaves the body once it dies. However, the soul that has been too much associated with the bodily desires and pleasures it becomes imprisoned in the physical part of man. Thus, he explains “those how practice philosophy in the right way keep away from all bodily passions, master them and do not surrender themselves to them.” (82c) In this way, man will not fear losing his visible body and his soul will travel to a region that is “noble, and pure, and invisible, to Hades in fact.” (80d) As a result, Socrates concludes: “It is pure when it leaves the body and drags nothing bodily with it, as it had no willing association with the body in life, but avoided it and gathered itself together by itself and always practiced this, which is not other than practicing philosophy in the right way, in fact, training to die easily. Or is this not training for death?” (80e) Plato, *Five Dialogues: Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Meno, Phaedo*, (Hackett Publishing Company, Inc. 2002), Translated by G.M.A. Grube, Second Edition

516c). Finally, he makes out the sun itself. Going up and seeing what is above the cave is the soul's journey through dialectic upwards to the intelligible.

Dialectic can lead to “the release from the bonds and the turning around from the shadows to the phantoms and the light, the way up from the cave to the sun...³⁴” The purpose is to convert man's soul, by turning his gaze to the right directions. For Socrates, knowledge is not put inside the head of a person, the knowledge is within and it is brought out from the student. Socrates criticizes the education of his time, claiming “education is not what the professions of certain men assert it to be. They presumably assert that they put into the soul knowledge that isn't in it, as though they were putting sight into blind eyes” (R, 518c). On the other hand, Socrates explains that knowledge exists in the souls of men, and the instruments of learning must be turned towards the right direction through education:

...this power is in the soul of each, and that the instruments with which each learns—just as an eye is not able to turn toward the light from the dark without the whole body—must be turned around from that which *is coming into being* together with the whole soul until it is able to endure looking at that which *is* and the brightest part of that which *is*. And we affirm that this is the good, don't we?

“Yes.”

There would therefore,” I said, “be an art of this turning around, concerned with the way in which this power can most easily and efficiently be turned around, not an art of producing sight in it. Rather, this art takes as given that sight is there. But not rightly turned nor looking at what it ought to look at, and accomplishes this object (R, 518d).

³⁴ “...the release from the bonds and the turning around from the shadows to the phantoms and the light, the way up from the cave to the sun; and once there the persisting inability to look at the animals and the plants and the sun's light, and looking instead at the divine appearances in water and at shadows of the things that *are*, rather than as before at shadows of phantoms cast by a light that, when judged in comparison with the sun, also has the quality of a shadow of a phantom—all this activity of the arts, which we went through, has the power to release and leads what is best in the soul up to the contemplation of what is best in the things that *are*, just as previously what is clearest in the body was led to the contemplation of what is brightest in the region of the bodily and the visible” (R, 532e).

The soul as a whole must take part in this process. Just like in the city, Socrates talked about the unison of its parts in order for the city to function properly; all of its parts must cooperate. Socrates explained that the purpose is not to have one part happy, but the city as a whole³⁵.

After the guardian has left the cave, he remembers how it was inside the cave, and sees everyone in there as prisoners, and feels pity for them. Going back down in the cave again, “his eyes get infected with darkness” (R, 516e) and he becomes the source of laughter as he is unable to make judgments of the shadows like the others. Socrates explains that there are two kinds of disturbances for the eyes: when he is transferred from darkness to light, and when he has been transferred from light to darkness. Thus, there are times that the soul is dazzled, either from going from lack of learning to greater brightness, or even from coming from a brighter life to the darkness (R, 518a). The man that has left the cave is now able to evaluate where he was before and where he is. He can see the visible, which was also the cause of the shadows in the cave. There is a constant tension in the philosopher, since he is drawn to the city, but also pushed away from it. He constantly turns around to see where he was and where he has gone. Using his comparative skills he evaluates the world around him, and sees things in a new light.

The second part of Socrates’ education applies to the men with the best natures. Education can turn them towards the right direction, but for it to be successful it must be reinforced by habituation, or else there is the possibility of turning back to where they were before: “one must always habituate the soul to turn as quickly as possible to curing and setting aright what has fallen and is sick...” (R, 604c). There is the possibility of

³⁵ “However, in founding the city we are not looking to the exceptional happiness of any one group among us but, as far as possible, that of the city as a whole” (R, 420b).

even the best nature being corrupted, and may go to the wrong direction. Thus, Socrates needs to put institutions in place that will develop the right habituation. To achieve the continuation of developing habits, Socrates uses once again the method of a tale that will keep men in practicing what is good for them. He creates the myth of Err, which is a story about the immortality of the soul; when each man dies his soul journeys to a demonic place, where judges await to decide which souls were just and will go upwards towards heaven, and which souls were unjust and will go downwards. Each soul became different according to the life it had chosen. Socrates claims that the just man who philosophizes in a healthy way will lead a happy life in earth and in heaven. Thus, Plato closes the *Republic* with the following paragraph:

And thus, Glaucon, a tale was saved and not lost; and it could save us, if we were persuaded by it, and we shall make a good crossing of the river of Lethe and not defile our soul. But if we are persuaded by me, holding that soul is immortal and capable of bearing all evils and all goods, we shall always keep to the upper road and practice justice and prudence in every way so that we shall be friends to ourselves and the gods, both while we remain here and when we reap the rewards for it like the victors who go about gathering in the prizes. And so here and in the thousand year journey that we have described we shall fare well (R, 621d).

If men keep this story and repeat it to themselves as an incarnation or a prayer, they will be constantly reminded of it. Even if it is not completely true, by persuading men to believe it, they will benefit from believing in it, because it will lead to a better purpose and attitude towards life. The myth of Er is like the noble lie, which will benefit people if they accept it and believe in it. As Barrow claims: “But we should see this not as akin to telling children fairy stories so much as to instilling commitments to a religion, the American way of life, or an ideology³⁶.” Similar to children’s tales, but more like

³⁶ Barrow, *Plato*, p.42

religious prayers these myths are created to instill ideas in the minds of the people for the benefit of the city as a whole. This shows that Socrates uses persuasion coupled with habituation to re-enforce education.

In conclusion, education plays a very important role in the *Republic*. Socrates' education prepares each class of the city to take up on its proper task, and it is a preparation for the right ordering of the soul. Plato supports the view that different natures exist, and not all of them are capable of breaking the chains of their cave. For some men, Socrates' education is the means to order their soul based on their natural elements. Through music and gymnastics, the spirited part of the soul is strengthened and developed into courage so that it enforces the right opinion of reason. A strong character is formed, with order, moderation, and justice in its soul. For the guardians, education can possibly lead to the liberation from the restrictions of one's body and popular beliefs that keep them chained from seeing true knowledge. By going through the four studies with the right purpose in mind—to learn to think comparatively and critically—they can reach the study of dialectics that will enable them to ascend from the visible to the intellected part, and attain true knowledge of the forms. In order for Socrates' education to succeed it must be reinforced by habituation to keep men in the right direction. The use of tales play an important role in Socrates' education, as it enables him to persuade men who cannot understand what Socrates says.

Chapter Two

EMILE

In Plato's *Republic*, Socrates describes the condition of men living inside a cave, chained to a wall, seeing nothing but shadows in front of them. Breaking the bonds and leaving the cave is a rare occasion, that according to the book happened to one man due to an accident or a miracle. In the previous chapter, I introduced the *Republic* and studied the role of education in relation to the allegory of the cave. I will now look into the role of education in Rousseau's *Emile* and examine what is his solution to the bonds that he also claims enchain men:

Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains. He who believes himself the master of others does not escape being more of a slave than they. How did this change take place? I do not know. What can render it legitimate? I believe I can answer this question (*Social Contract Book I, Chapter I*).

The famous passage from the *Social Contract* demonstrates the issue Rousseau attempts to answer in *Emile, or on Education*. Rousseau believes that in civil society, men live in chains, and he can explain how to render them legitimate. As he also claims in *Emile*:

Civil man is born, lives and dies in slavery. At his birth he is sewed in swaddling clothes; at his death he is nailed in a coffin. So long as he keeps his human shape, he is enchained by our institutions (E, 43).

What these chains represent and how they can be dealt with is discussed in Rousseau's work, *Emile*. Rousseau does not aim to break those chains as it would entail exiting the social order, but he seeks to legitimize them, so man will learn to live by them. Through the right education that Rousseau proposes in *Emile, or on Education*, he attempts to render legitimate the chains and bring freedom within civil society. What are the chains,

what kind of freedom is Rousseau referring to, and what is the role of education in achieving this are the questions I am going to examine.

As the title of the book suggests, *Emile, or on Education*, is about Rousseau's philosophy of education where he presents his reflections and observations on the most useful thing for the public: "the art of forming men" (E, 33). Rousseau describes the ideal education he would give as a tutor to his imaginary student Emile. Rousseau assumes he has all the resources to work on Emile's education from his birth until he has become a self-sufficient man. He describes in detail what and how he wants Emile to learn, and traces his development from the day he is born until he turns twenty-five. Emile is a child with a healthy body and an average mind and social background that can act as an example for the average man³⁷.

In his book, Rousseau explains the ideal education and applies it on Emile not through actions, but through writings. As he says, "following the example of so many others, I shall put my hand not to the work but to the pen; and instead of doing what is necessary, I shall endeavor to say it" (E, 50). The English translator of the book Allan Bloom explains that *Emile* is not a manual on education to be directly put into practice.³⁸ Rousseau cannot literally enact the ideas he puts forth through writings, because it is virtually impossible to have all the resources and opportunities he assumes in the book.

³⁷ "I would take only a common mind, such as I assume my pupil to be. Only ordinary men need to be raised; their education ought to serve as an example only for that of their kind. The others raise themselves in spite of what one does" (E, 52).

³⁸ "*Emile* might seem to some ridiculous because it proposes a system of education which is manifestly impossible for most men and virtually impossible for any man. But this is to misunderstand the book. It is not an educational manual, any more that Plato's *Republic* is advice to rulers. Each adopts a convention—the founding of a city or the rearing of a body—in order to survey the entire human condition. They are books for philosophers and are meant to influence practice only in the sense that those who read them well cannot help but change their general perspectives." Allan Bloom, *Emile, or on Education, Introduction* (Basic Books, 1979) p.28

Emile, like the *Republic*, is intended as a book for philosophers where Rousseau describes human nature and the best way to nurture it for men to live better in society.

According to Rousseau, “Education is certainly only habit;” (E, 39) the habits that one adopts from a young age slowly shape the character of a man’s soul: “Plants are shaped by cultivation, and men by education” (E, 38). Rousseau differentiates between three types of education: education that comes from nature, from men, and from things. The education of nature leads to the internal development of organs and faculties. The education of men is teaching to make use of our organs and our faculties. The education of things is what we learn from our experiences with our surroundings. Rousseau concludes that the well-raised individual is the one that has three types of education that are in harmony with each other and aim to reach the same ends. A student who is pulled in different directions from these three types of education will never be “in agreement with himself” (E, 38). The only education we have some control over is the education of men, and thus, Rousseau claims it is our responsibility to ensure that men are taught to use their faculties in accordance with nature and their surroundings. However, Rousseau admits that it is impossible to control everything in the child’s surroundings, but his task is to come as close to the goal of following nature as possible.

Emile, is not just a book about educating a young boy, it extends farther than that into an examination of our human nature.

Our true study is that of the human condition, He among us who best knows how to bear the goods and ills of this life is to my taste the best raised: from which it follows that the true education consists less in precept than in practice. We begin to instruct ourselves when we begin to live. Our education begins with us (E, 42).

Rousseau explains that most of the errors of the previous educational systems stem from a lack of understanding of the nature of children, in that they are treated like little men: “They are always seeking the man in the child without thinking of what he is before being a man” (E, 34). Thus, the first step before determining the right education is to know who your pupil is. One must first study children in order to educate them, and one must know the nature of men in order to form them.³⁹ Hence, Rousseau explains: “Begin, then by studying your pupils better. For most assuredly you do not know them at all. Now if you read this book with this in view, I believe it will not be without utility for you” (E, 34). The purpose of his work is to describe an education that is in harmony with the nature of men, so “that the proposed education be suitable for man and well adapted to the human heart” (E, 34).

The first Book in *Emile*, begins with Rousseau’s view on man in his natural state, and compares him to man in civil society. Rousseau claims that man distorts all natural things and degenerates from his original natural condition: “Everything is good as it leaves the hands of the Author of things; everything degenerates in the hands of man” (E, 37). He blames man for mixing, confusing, and disfiguring everything around him, including himself, and especially his education. He claims that in the present state man is trained like a school horse and if he is “abandoned to himself in the midst of other men from birth would be the most disfigured of all” (E, 37).

According to Rousseau, men are born with the capacity to learn, but as newborns enchained in a body that has not yet fully formed, we cannot do anything.⁴⁰ Assuming a

³⁹ As Rousseau explains, “humanity has its place in the order of things; childhood has its in the order of human life. Te man must be considered in the man, and the child in the child” (E, 80).

⁴⁰ “We are born capable of learning but able to do nothing, knowing nothing. The soul, enchained in imperfect and half-formed organs, does not even have the sentiment of its own existence” (E, 61).

child was born with the strength and stature of a grown man, he would be “a perfect imbecile, an automaton, an immobile and almost insensible statue” (E, 61). This, Rousseau claims was “pretty nearly the primitive state of ignorance and stupidity natural to man before he learned anything from experience or his fellows” (E, 62). Thus, Rousseau claims, we know the first point from which we started, but the other end of the limit is unknown. Each person has a different limit to what he can learn, and develops differently based on his personal talents and capabilities: “Each advances more or less according to his genius, his taste, his needs, his talents, his zeal, and the occasions he has to devote himself to them” (E, 62). Thus, Rousseau admits that there are different levels of genius and not all people are the same. Based on each person’s genius, talents, and how much he devotes himself, he will advance more or less than others.

In *Emile*, Rousseau defines nature as man’s state prior to the corruption of opinions. It is the state where man discovers his surroundings and reaches conclusions about objects based on what is pleasant or unpleasant, and makes judgments based on his ideas of happiness as dictated by reason. These were the original dispositions of man that were eventually corrupted by opinion (E, 39). In our natural state, man’s strength is in balance with his desires and thus he is self-sufficient and happy. When imagination was awakened, man’s desires were excited and became too many to fulfill on his own; “...the closer to his natural condition man has stayed, the smaller is the difference between his faculties and his desires, and consequently the less removed he is from being happy” (E, 81). Accordingly, man is truly free when he is self-sufficient and does what he pleases; this is the fundamental maxim that Rousseau’s rules of education come from⁴¹. When

⁴¹ “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” (E, 84).

men formed societies and created the division of labor, they became dependent on one another. Man's freedom that was based on his self-sufficiency was replaced by a reliance on the social body. Thus, Rousseau differentiates between two types of men: natural man and civil man. Natural man is a "numerical unity" dependent only on himself, whereas civil man is a "fractional unity" dependent on his denominator, which is the social body (E, 39).

In addition, when man comes into contact with other people his passions change, which leads to the development of *amour-propre*. According to Rousseau "our passions are the principal instruments of our preservation" (E, 212). Any effort to destroy our passions or prevent their birth is equally impossible as trying to control nature itself. Our passions have a natural source but they are eventually transformed, and become very different from their original state. The natural passions are limited and have the aim of preservation. Their source is *amour de soi-meme*, the most innate and primitive passions of all, which is always good and in conformity with order (E, 213). As Rousseau claims "we have to love ourselves to preserve ourselves" (E, 213) and thus man takes care of his own needs for his preservation.

The rest of the passions are modifications of the original one and lead to distancing oneself from nature: "They alter the primary goal and are at odds with their own principle. It is then that man finds himself outside of nature and sets himself in contradiction with himself" (E, 213). Once we enter society and begin making comparisons with others around us a harmful passion is born out of self-love called *amour-propre*. *Amour-propre* begins once man starts to have a sense of his moral being, and soon he feels the need to have a companion. In effect "he is no longer an isolated

being. His heart is no longer alone” (E, 214). *Amour-propre* goes beyond the concern of loving ourselves and what is good for us, to wanting everyone around us to love us too, and thus, man becomes dependent on the opinions of others.

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. 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*. Thus what makes man essentially good is to have few needs and to compare himself little to others; what makes him essentially wicked is to have many needs and to depend very much on opinion (E, 214)⁴².

It is a harmful passion, because in order to be preferred the most of all others and loved, we have to make ourselves better, “at least in the eyes of the beloved” (E, 214). Thus, we begin to look at the people around us and make comparisons with them, and as *amour-propre* develops, jealousy, competition, and emulation develop too.

According to Rousseau, living in society leads to the creation of social bonds. When man develops *amour-propre* and builds relations with the people around him, chains are formed around his heart due to his human attachments:

His first affections are the reins with which you direct all his movements. He was free, and now I see him enslaved. So long as he loved nothing, he dependent only on himself and his needs. As soon as he loves, he depends on his attachments. Thus are formed the first bonds linking him to his species (E, 233).

Society weakens man by making him attached to others, and making his strength insufficient for him to fulfill his desires. According to Rousseau, man’s unhappiness is a

⁴² See for more detail in Rousseau, *The Second Discourses and other early political writings*, (Cambridge University Press, 2008), Edited and Translated by Victor Gourevitch, Part I, p.152
“*Amour-propre* [vanity] and *Amour de soi-meme* [self-love], two very different passions in their nature and their effects, should not be confused. Self-love is a natural sentiment which inclines every animal to attend to its self-preservation and which, guided in man by reason and modified by pity, produces humanity and virtue. *Amour propre* is only a relative sentiment, factitious and born in society, which inclines every individual to set greater store by himself than by anyone else, inspires men with all the evils they do one another, and is the genuine source of honor.” *Second Discourse*, Note XV [1]

result of his weakness in society, due to the disproportion between his desires and faculties, and thus his dependence on other men⁴³.

From where does man's weakness come? From the inequality between his strengths and his desires. It is our passions that make us weak, because to satisfy them we would need more strength than nature gives us. Therefore, diminish desires, and you will increase strength (E, 165).

Thus, according to Rousseau, human wisdom and true happiness consists in diminishing the excess of our desires and bringing them in equilibrium with our faculties. Because our nature is corrupted by social institutions such as: "Prejudices, authority, necessity, example, all the social institution in which we find ourselves submerged would stifle nature in him and put nothing in place" (E, 37). As a result, Rousseau is caught between raising the man who is free and the civil man who is in chains.

Initially, Rousseau claims it is impossible to have natural man and citizen at the same time, (E, 39) since the former lives only for himself and the later lives for others. These are two contrasting impulses that if one tries to reconcile will achieve nothing, and man will be hanging between his natural inclination and his duties, never really knowing who he is. As Rousseau says we will live "in conflict and floating during the whole course of our lives, we end it without having been able to put ourselves in harmony with ourselves and without having been good either for ourselves or for others" (E, 41). This will lead to a divided individual that is neither natural man nor citizen, but is turned into what others want him to be.

⁴³ According to Rousseau, "Our unhappiness consists, therefore in the disproportion between our desires and our faculties" (E, 80). Becoming dependent on other men, "engenders all the vices, and by it, master and slave are mutually corrupted" (E, 85).

Rousseau discounts the education of society as failing in its attempt to attain two contrary ends, and criticizes the colleges for being “laudable establishments” (E, 41) that center on the needs of the individuals as produced by the bourgeois way of life. Their education focuses on learning how to use the public to advance in society and thus, develop false ideas about things. Rousseau disagrees with the current educational system and criticizes it heavily: “What, then must be thought of that barbarous education which sacrifices the present to an uncertain future, which burdens a child with chains of every sort” (E, 79). Because they have failed to understand children, they have failed to educate them properly. They rush to teach the student too many things before he is ready to absorb them, and ends up learning nothing that is useful. He may appear smart because he can memorize well and repeat the ideas of others, but he has not learned how to think on his own and judge constructively.

Rousseau believes these two contrary ends require a different instruction. The perfect citizen must give himself completely to the whole and believe “himself no longer one but a part of the unity” (E, 40). The ideal citizen is shown in the example of the Spartan woman, who is informed about the loss of her five sons in battle, but disregards this information in the face of victory and runs to the temple to thank the gods. She is a citizen more dedicated to the welfare of the city rather than her personal happiness. For these types of citizens, Rousseau explains a public and common instruction is needed, and refers to Plato’s *Republic*: “Do you want to get an idea of public education? Read Plato’s *Republic*. It is not at all a political work, as think those who judge books only by their titles. It is the most beautiful education treatise every written” (E, 40). However, Rousseau claims that public instruction no longer exists since the true notion of

fatherland and citizen does not exist. This claim is intended to express his disagreement with the cosmopolitans of the 18th century who have diminished the importance of dedicating oneself to his own country and are more concerned with the international community⁴⁴.

The second intention is to raise the natural man that depends only on himself: “To be something, to be oneself and always one, a man must act as he speaks” (E, 40). He has to be a man that sticks to his decisions and acts in accordance with his words. This type of man needs an individual and domestic education, which Rousseau also calls “the education of nature” (E, 41). He should strive to become a man like Robinson Crusoe who is a natural individual that knows himself and depends on himself alone. Interestingly, the description of the second type of man that “must act as he speaks,” is very similar to Plato’s Socrates who teaches that men must keep in harmony their words with their deeds. It appears that Plato’s *Republic* is not just a work on public education, as Rousseau classifies it, but also contains elements of what he claims to be the natural or domestic education. In fact, according to Rousseau’s definition of domestic and public education, we may say that Plato’s *Republic* attempts to achieve both.

This interpretation is reinforced when Rousseau makes a shift from his initial claim that achieving these opposite ends is impossible and blurs the lines between private and public education; “the double object we set for ourselves could be joined in a single one by removing the contradictions of man” (E, 41). First, “the natural man would have to be known,” who is one by himself and acts as he speaks (E, 41) and then he would be

⁴⁴ In the first book of *Emile*, Rousseau explains: “The essential thing is to be good to the people with whom one lives. Abroad, the Spartans was ambitious, avaricious, iniquitous. But disinterestedness, equity, and concord reigned within his walls. Distrust those cosmopolitans who go to great length in their books to discover duties they do not deign to fulfill around them. A philosopher loves the Tartars so as to be spared having to love his neighbors” (E, 39).

joined to the civil man. That is what Rousseau attempts to achieve, and thus, Emile's education will have two important phases: during the first part he will be raised as close to nature as possible, which will then be the foundation for transforming him into the civil man he ought to be.

During the first phase of Emile's education, Rousseau's purpose is to make a man that is self-sufficient, and by relying only on himself, will be stronger and free. Through this method he wants to form men "who are judicious, robust, healthy of body and understanding. Men who, without having made themselves admired when young will make themselves honored when grown" (E, 112). Rousseau aims to create an individual that is holistic and complete, a man that first and foremost knows how to live.⁴⁵ Man's primary calling is "nature's call to human life" (E, 41) that supersedes the parents' call for his occupation. Rousseau's purpose is that Emile becomes not a priest, or a soldier, but a man. By being "all that a man should be" (E, 42) he will be able to survive in any place he finds himself.

The first phase of Rousseau's education is based on the following claim: "What must be done is to prevent anything from being done" (E, 41). If Rousseau's definition of education is the development of habits, he claims that at this stage: "The only habit that a child should be allowed to contract is none" (E, 63). For the largest part of childhood, the purpose of Rousseau's education is not to teach Emile things, but to prevent his soul from learning the wrong things. It is a "negative education" because the spirit of this education "consists not in teaching the child many things, but in never letting anything but accurate and clear ideas enter his brain" (E, 171). Rousseau believes that the most critical time of a person's education is from his birth to the age of twelve, because at this time errors with a

⁴⁵ As Rousseau claims, "Living is the job I want to teach him" (E, 41).

lasting effect can easily be made. Ignorance never hurt anyone, but it is the erroneous ideas that are fatal because they mislead people into believing they know things when they do not know. Rousseau concludes “they ought to do nothing with their soul until all of its faculties have developed, because while the souls is yet blind, it cannot perceive the torch you are presenting to it or follow the path reason maps out across the vast plain of ideas...” (E, 93). Mothers must secure their young children “from the impact of human opinions!” (E, 38) and he advises them to: “Form an enclosure around your child’s soul at an early date. Someone else can draw its circumference, but you alone must build the fence” (E, 38). The opinions that Rousseau wants to protect them from are the opinions of the cosmopolitan thinkers of his time that prevent people from being committed to their country. As Allan Bloom explains in his introduction, Rousseau tries to defend men from the *bourgeois* who lead to the debasement of our species by disregarding the common good and exploiting others for their own self-interest⁴⁶.

Through building a protective fence around Emile’s heart, he will be free from prejudices and harmful habits that can hinder his future education. Rousseau explains that he should exercise his body, his organs, his senses, his strength but his soul must be kept idle for the longest possible time, and his mind must be kept clean from the public opinion. To achieve isolation from vices, Emile will be kept from the opinion of society by being exposed only to the opinion of his tutor. Rousseau has complete control of his

⁴⁶ “Emile is written to defend man against a great threat which bids fair to cause a permanent debasement of the species, namely, the almost inevitable universal dominance of a certain low human type which Rousseau was the first to isolate and name: the bourgeois.” In describing the *bourgeois* Bloom says “The *bourgeois* comes into being when men no longer believe that there is a common good, when the notion of the fatherland decays.” He is the man who “when dealing with others, thinks only of himself” and “distinguishes his own good from the common good.” Bloom’s claim is in accordance with Rousseau’s criticism of the cosmopolitans who diminish the importance of being dedicated to your country. Allan Bloom, *Emile, or on Education, Introduction*, p.4-5

surroundings and orchestrates different situations to teach Emile lessons, as I will describe further in this chapter.

Rousseau tries to stifle the development of *amour-propre* for as long as possible. It is important to remain free from false opinions, and prejudices that once ingrained in the mind of a child are hard to overcome.⁴⁷ As Rousseau says, happiness comes with freedom, and children must remain as natural and free as possible. “Before prejudices and human institutions have corrupted our natural inclinations, the happiness of children, like that of men, consists in the use of their freedom” (E, 85). Thus, they must learn from an early age to depend on their own strengths⁴⁸. To achieve this, children must be kept from developing too many desires that will be impossible for them to fulfill on their own, and thus weaken them by constantly depending on others. Rousseau advises: “Keep the child in dependence only on things. You will have followed the order of nature in the progress of his education” (E, 85). By fulfilling only his necessary desires, the child learns to have limited desires that will not exceed his strengths. Rousseau believes it is crucial to observe nature and follow its example. He calls for mothers as the first teachers of a child to study and follow nature: “Observe nature and follow the path it maps out for you. It exercises children constantly; it hardens their temperament by tests of all sorts; it teaches them early what effort and pain are” (E, 47). For example, from a young age children suffer from teething, colic, coughs, and other sicknesses. Once the child passes the tests

⁴⁷ As Bloom explains: “The primary intention of the negative education is to prevent amour de soi from turning into amour-propre, for this is the true source of man’s dividedness.” Allan Bloom, *Emile, or on Education, Introduction*, p.10

⁴⁸ “Prepare from afar the reign of his freedom and he use of his forces by leaving natural habit to his body, by putting him in the condition always to be master of himself and in all things to do his will, as soon as he has one” (E, 63).

of nature, he comes out stronger and abler to face the difficulties of life⁴⁹. Rousseau emphasizes that children begin to learn from the day they are born from their experiences: “I repeat: the education of man begins at his birth: before speaking, before understanding, he is already learning. Experience anticipates lessons⁵⁰” (E, 62).

Another important way to keep *amour-propre* under control is to keep the child from giving orders and feeling it can command others: “It is important to accustom him early not to give orders either to men, for he is not their master, or to things, for they do not hear him. When a child cries he needs help to satisfy his needs, whether he needs to be fed, comforted, dressed more warmly, or given something he can’t reach by himself. Once a child becomes aware of the power he has over his caretaker he takes advantage of it and soon he may scream and cry not because he needs help but because he wants to be served, and his tears of helplessness become tears of command: “The first tears of children are prayers. If one is not careful, they soon become orders. Children begin by getting themselves assisted; they end by getting themselves served” (E, 66). From this young age, the caretaker must be aware of the child’s education, and show him that he is not the master of things. Thus, when a child desires something he sees it is better to carry

⁴⁹ Rousseau explains that even before the child speaks and understands he is still affected by the objects he sees, which can make him either timid or courageous. For example, Rousseau wants Emile to be accustomed to seeing ugly, disgusting, and peculiar objects without being afraid (E, 63). Through movement and the sense of touch he learns that there are things around him, and feels when something is hot, cold, hard, soft etc. Thus, Rousseau advises, he should take walks often in order to “make him feel change of place, in order to teach him to judge distances” (E, 64).

⁵⁰ A child’s first teacher is his mother, and Rousseau stresses the important role that mothers play in a child’s education. “The first education is the most important, and this first education belongs incontestably to mothers... Always speak, then, preferably to women in your treatise on education.” (E, 37 ft) Thus, Rousseau calls for women to adopt their valuable role as mothers and re-establish the family values. He claims that without mothers there are no children, and they ought to fulfill their role as mothers in order to raise healthy children. They should not be excessive in neither neglecting their child nor take care of them too much and increase his weaknesses (E, 47). A child must be taken care of, because he is weak and needs assistance. A mother must protect her child and fulfill its basic needs. She must always love her child and thus, be loved in return. However, Rousseau points out that they must not be too excessive in their care because then the child becomes spoiled and weak.

the child to the object than to bring the object to the child. The false presumption of dominion leads to the first prejudices taking place in the human heart: “Dominion awakens and flatters *amour-propre*, and habit strengthens it. Thus, whim succeeds need; thus, prejudice and opinion take their first roots” (E, 68).

Rousseau’s establishes four basic Maxims for the first education of children at their earlier stages in life, which will act as guidelines for whoever who take care of them:

First Maxim: They must learn to use the strength they have been given by nature.

Second Maxim: In things connected to physical needs, one must supplement what is lacking in them in terms of intelligence and strength.

Third Maxim: When giving help, one must be limited only to what is useful and not give in to whims and desires without reason.

Fourth Maxim: Study their language and signs in order to distinguish between desires that come from nature and from opinion.

These four maxims have a general form and are not specific in content. But they all adhere to the same purpose, which is the following: “The spirit of these rules is to accord children more true freedom and less dominion, to let them do more by themselves and to exact less from others. Thus, accustomed early to limiting their desires to their strength, they will feel little the privation of what is not going to be in their power.” (E, 68) Thus, we can see that the first part of Emile’s education focuses on keeping the development of *amour-propre* under control, and keeping his desires in harmony with his strength in order to give him some degree of independence.

To a great extent Rousseau attempts to give more freedom to Emile by keeping his desires in check and being self-sufficient. At the same time, during the first phase of Emile's education Rousseau is in strict control of Emile's surroundings in order to censor anything harmful he could be exposed to. However, because children seek freedom, his governor must control him in such a way that he remains undetected to Emile. Having observed his pupil since birth, he knows him so well that he can predict his every move and word⁵¹. Rousseau describes this method as "well-regulated freedom," (E, 92) whereby controlling his surroundings Emile learns from experiences while believing he his master of himself, when in fact it is his tutor that is the true master. Every lesson he gives Emile is a well-staged scene calculated to every detail.

For example, one time during Emile's and his tutor's daily walk where they usually each have a cupcake, Rousseau decides to bring a third cupcake. He places the cupcake on a rock and finds local boys to race for it. Emile is intrigued and eventually decides he wants to race for the cupcake as well. Rousseau knew which route Emile was going to choose to reach the cupcake, and he manipulated the set up of the routes and cupcake and to control whether Emile would win or not. As Diana Brown says: "In the race for the cakes, the imperative of independence is achieved through a theatrical stage direction... The *idea* of independence is reinforced through rhetoric which repeatedly tells Emile that he is free, and carefully camouflages any trace of limitation."⁵² By trying to

⁵¹ "Doubtless he ought to do only what he wants; but he ought to want only what you want him to do. He ought not to make a step without you having foreseen it; he ought not to open his mouth without you knowing what he is going to say" (E, 120).

⁵²Diane Berrett Brown, *Rousseau and Freedom*, (Cambridge University Press, 2011) Edited by Christie McDonald and Stanley Hoffmann, p.163

As McEwan explains, Rousseau hides his instruction by teaching Emile through example and experience. However, to achieve that he must manipulate his environment and set up the right context: "This is a matter of carefully setting up the appropriate social context and encouraging the appropriate forms of attachment so that the pupil is put in the right frame of mind to learn from the teacher's example. Rousseau observes

keep Emile closer to nature, he is still free from the chains of society, but his freedom is always limited, even if Emile is not aware of it. By controlling his student's surroundings, Emile believes he acts in accordance with the necessity of his environment rather than the choices of his tutor. As Rousseau admits: "One enchains, pushes, and restrains him with the bond of necessity alone without his letting out a peep" (E, 92). The bonds of society are replaced with the bonds of necessity and Rousseau is in control of the forces around Emile.

The next three most important principles of Rousseau's education are to do everything at its proper time, train the body, and to first learn things that are useful.⁵³ Rousseau emphasizes the need to treat the students according to their age: "With each depth of their hearts" (E, 92). Children should be children and make the most of their years of innocence and games. "Dare I expose the greatest, the most important, the most useful rule of all education? It is not to gain time but to lose it" (E, 93). Before becoming men, they must enjoy and exhaust all the benefits of childhood. "Leave nature to act for a long time before you get involved with acting in its place, lest you impede its operations" (E, 107). Using time badly and educating falsely is more wasteful than giving no instruction. The most complex of all man's faculties, reason, should be the latest to develop, and children should gradually and at the right time be introduced to the cultivation of their reason. There is a progression in the human development, and everything must be learned at its proper time.

that there is considerable art in lifting his 'young disciple's heart above baseness without appearing to think of instruction' (E, 264)." Hunter McEwan, *A Portrait of the Teacher as Friend and Artist: The example of Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, Educational Philosophy and Theory, 2011, Vol 43, Issue 5, p 516

⁵³ Because human intelligence has its limitations, "a choice must therefore, be made of the things that ought to be taught as well as the proper time for learning them" (E, 166).

According to Rousseau a prerequisite to cultivating a student's intelligence is to firstly cultivate his strengths and learn to be in control of them. He must train and develop his body in order to succeed in training his mind: "To the activity of the body which seeks development succeeds the activity of the mind which seeks instruction" (E, 167). Thus, his body must be exercised continuously to make him strong: "make him robust and healthy in order to make him wise and reasonable" (E, 118). Children should run, yell, be active, and always be in motion. However, Rousseau makes the important point that he must not constantly be given directions about what to do. His arms must be controlled by his own head and not somebody else's, in order to learn to think for himself, and depend on his own skills. Rousseau believes that men who have lived the most are those who have exercised their body the most and endured fatigue and work (E, 56). Thus, he insists that manual labor and exercises of the body are necessary to make Emile stronger and healthier. Rousseau describes two examples of men who exercise their bodies but with different results. The servant and the savage man are in constant activity and physical exercise. However, the servant always follows directions and works based on a routine given to him and thus, his reason is replaced by habit and obedience. On the other hand, the savage man roams by himself, and obeying no one he is forced to use reason in his actions (E, 118). As a result, when Emile exercises his body, he feels he must think about his actions to cultivate his reason.

Rousseau believes in the connection of the body and mind: "It is a most pitiable error to imagine that the exercise of the body is harmful to the operations of the mind, as if these two activities ought not to move together in harmony and that the one ought not always to direct the other!" (E, 118) As the body is more exercised, the mind is also more

enlightened, “his strength and his reason grow together, and one is extended by the other” (E, 118). A fragile body makes the soul weaker, to the demands of the passions, whereas a strong body is able to obey the soul and make it stronger: “The weaker the body the more it commands; the stronger it is, the more it obeys” (E, 54). Rousseau summarizes the importance of training Emile’s body as a supplement to the rest of his education in the following passage:

“As for my pupil, or rather nature’s, trained early to be as self-sufficient as possible, he is not accustomed to turning constantly to others; still less is he accustomed to displaying his great learning for them. On the other hand, he judges, he foresees, he reasons in everything immediately related to him. He does not chatter; he acts. He does not know a word of what is going on in society, but he knows very well how to do what suits him. Since he is constantly in motion, he is forced to observe many things, to know many effects. He acquires a large experience early. He gets his lessons from nature and not from men. He instructs himself so much the better because he sees nowhere the intention to instruct him. Thus his body and his mind are exercised together. Acting always according to his own thought and not someone else’s, he continually unites the two operations: the more he makes himself strong and robust, the more he becomes sensible and judicious. This is the way one day to have what are believed incompatible and what are united in almost all great men: strength of body and strength of soul; a wise man’s reason and an athlete’s vigor” (E, 119).

Rousseau describes an Emile that is independent, learns from experience, and is active while he learns. The body and the mind are two operations that are united, and as one is strengthened the other becomes stronger as well. The fact that Emile is completely unaware of what is going on in society shows that he is not involved in the affairs of others and is purely concerned with his own development and progress. In other words, Emile is a person that minds his own business. At the same time his ignorance makes him a blank slate on which Rousseau can implant his own ideas about the meaning of society and citizenship.

Before the age of reason a child does not receive ideas that are determined by the relations of objects, but only images, which are depictions of objects. “When one imagines, one does nothing but see; when one conceives, one is comparing” (E, 107). Rousseau claims that our sensations are passive, whereas ideas are “born out of an active principle that judges” (E, 107). He believes it is easy to put words in the mouths of children, who can memorize them and recite well. However, whether distinct ideas are attached to those words is questionable. Ideas are formed through the comparison of the relations between objects, and it requires the ability to make judgments. Once a child repeats another person’s words without thinking about the utility behind them, he loses the capacity to judge. Emile has to begin by learning what is necessary, then what is useful, and finally study what is good. According to Rousseau, there are many fields of learning, some are false, some are useless, and some feed the pride of men. The ones that truly contribute to the prosperity of a man are knowing things that are useful to him: “It is a question not of knowing what is, but of knowing what is useful” (E, 166). He believes it is important to conceive ideas that relate to his happiness and are useful, and will make an impression on his brain so that one day he will be enlightened about his duties. To conceive and form ideas one must make comparisons, which requires making a judgment about the relations of the objects. The ideas that he will form will be based on his own utility and happiness.

Rousseau claims that intelligence is determined by the aptitude of comparing ideas and finding relations between things. A solid mind is one that forms ideas on the basis of real relations rather than apparent and superficial relations. The purpose is to teach Emile to judge well. He should not rush to draw conclusions, and always examine

carefully the evidence before he responds to a question. “Forced to learn by himself, he uses his reason and not another’s” (E, 207). When he makes a mistake, the tutor should not rush to correct him, but wait in silence “until he is ready to see and correct them himself,” or gradually make him aware of them (E, 171). Rousseau believes mistakes have a role, when the student identifies his mistakes and learns from them. Mistakes are acceptable because, “the goal is not that he know exactly the topography of the region, but that he know the means of learning about it” (E, 171). In addition: “The issue is not to teach him the sciences but to give him the taste for loving them and methods for learning them when this taste is better developed. This is very certainly a fundamental principle of every good education” (E, 172). Rousseau explains that the task of the governor is not to instruct and give the child all the precepts he must learn but to lead him to discover them himself (E, 52). As the student observes the phenomena of nature he becomes curious. To maintain his curiosity, he should not be given answers to his questions right away.

Put the questions within his reach and leave them to him to resolve. Let him know something not because you told it to him but because he has understood it himself. Let him not learn science but discover it. If ever you substitute in his mind authority for reason, he will no longer reason. He will be nothing more than the plaything of others’ opinions (E, 168).

Emile has little knowledge, but what he knows, he knows well. Thus, “Emile has a mind that is universal not by its learning but by its faculty to acquire learning; a mind that is open, intelligent, ready for everything...” (E, 207). According to Rousseau, Emile has learned how to think, and judge for himself rather than base himself on the opinion of others, because he makes judgments based on the true utility of the objects.⁵⁴ It should be noted that while Rousseau is training Emile to make his own judgments and think

⁵⁴ “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” (E, 185).

independently, he is under the control and judgment of his tutor. Rousseau wants Emile to be an independent thinker in order to avoid the harmful opinions of the *bourgeois*, which at the time were becoming the popular view. However, as a mind that is “open, intelligent, and ready for everything,” Rousseau will be able to instigate in Emile ideas that will benefit him and society, according to Rousseau’s political philosophy.

At this point Rousseau describes Emile as a “savage made to inhabit cities” (E, 205). At fifteen years old, he counts on himself alone, does not compare himself to others, and does not care about their opinions. *Amour-propre* has not yet been aroused in him, and he lives with a healthy body, an unprejudiced mind, and a heart free of passions. Emile goes through different stages of learning that contribute to his gradual growth. He first exercised his body then his mind, which have resulted into a thinking being:

After having begun by exercising his body and his senses, we have exercised his mind and his judgment. Finally, we have joined the use of his limbs to that of his faculties. We have made an active and thinking being. It remains for us, in order to complete the man, only to make a loving and feeling being—that is to say, to perfect reason by sentiment (E, 203).

In the first phase of a child’s education, Rousseau attempts to delay the development of *amour-propre* and keep Emile from developing new needs that will chain his heart. As Emile enters into puberty and *amour-propre* will slowly develop Rousseau moves on to a different phase of his education. According to Rousseau this is the time when “man is truly born to life” (E, 212) and *amour-propre* develops as nature leads each sex to be attracted to each other. As Emile becomes attached to others, he compares himself to them and eventually, “chains grow around his heart.”

Since my Emile has until now looked only at himself, the first glance he casts on his fellows leads him to compare himself with them. And the first sentiment aroused in him by this comparison is the desire to be in the first position. This is

the point where love of self turns into amour-propre and where begin to arise all the passions which depend on this one (E, 235).

These passions will inevitably develop and the second and truest phase of his education begins where Rousseau will attempt to direct those passions in the right directions. As he says: “Whatever we may do, these passions will be born in spite of us. It is therefore time to change method” (E, 215).

Rousseau establishes three fundamental maxims on how to face the development of *amour-propre*:

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” (E, 223). If Emile is exposed to a deceptive image of happiness based on riches, the seeds of pride, vanity, and envy will be placed in him. On the other hand, if he is exposed to the unhappy side of this life, he learns to be more moderate. In addition, by seeing the life of humble and pastoral people, he will be touched by their happiness while at the same time, feel pleasure in seeing his own resources (E, 223).

Second Maxim: “One pities in others only those ills from which one does not feel exempt” (E, 224). Rousseau explains that we feel pity for people whose condition we believe we will never be in. For example, the rich pity the poor, believing they will never become poor themselves. Thus, Rousseau claims that Emile should understand that the fate of men they feel pity for, could very well one day become his own, because there are numerous unforeseen and inevitable events that can change his life at any moment. Thus, it is important to “teach how to count on neither birth nor health nor riches” (E, 224). To achieve this, Emile must be shown examples of men who fell from higher to lower positions in order to unsettle him with dangers that are constantly around him.

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” (E, 225). In other words, based on the importance one gives to someone, his happiness is considered more or less valuable. For example, a carthorse that is whipped is not as pitied, because one does not give much value to a carthorse. Rousseau wants to teach Emile to respect his species and to love all men in order to “puts himself in no class but finds his bearings in all” (E, 226).

Through these maxims Rousseau aims to affect Emile’s heart “in order to arouse the first emotions of nature and to develop his heart and extend it to his fellows” (E, 226). In doing so, he must take out his personal interest in order to avoid comparisons that will lead to harmful sentiments such as vanity, emulation, or glory. We can see that Rousseau is trying to form a man who feels connected to all his fellows and is part of a whole. He tries to expand Emile’s mind so that he is not limited to care only about what is good for him, but think about what is good for everyone, and generalize his will⁵⁵. He begins to form the civil man that will interact with other people and will be part of the social body⁵⁶. Rousseau takes advantage of the rise of Emile’s passions and points them towards a direction that will benefit him, and in a way uses the passions themselves to combat harmful passion⁵⁷.

⁵⁵ According to the *Social Contract*, every citizen must generalize his interest and give in to the general will: “Each of us places his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will...” Jean-Jacque Rousseau, *The Basic Political Writings*, (Hackett Publishing Company Inc, 1987), Translated by Donald A. Cress, p.148

⁵⁶ According to Thomas Davidson’s interpretation, through the three maxims, Emile will compare the world of wealth to the world of poverty, and feel sympathy to the sufferings, and eventually distinguish between the true equality due to nature, and the vain equality of society. Davidson Thomas, *Rousseau and Education According to Nature*, (AMS Press Inc. New York 1989), p.160-161

⁵⁷ As he claims in *Emile*: “One has a hold on the passions only be means of the passions. It is by their empire that their tyranny must be combated; and it is always from nature itself that the proper instruments to regulate nature must be drawn.” (E, 327) Moreover, according to Thomas Davidson: “Rousseau sums up

The key point during the rise of these passions is whether the dominant ones to develop will be gentle and humane, or cruel and spiteful. Rousseau claims that it is the moderation of hearts, which makes men independent and free. For this reason, he tries to direct Emile's passions, to feel compassion for his fellows, but also teach him to limit his desires so that he achieves moderation. Whoever controls his desires depends on fewer people, but the more things we desire, the more we need others to fulfill them. Due to the existing dependence between people, Rousseau claims it is important to learn to judge people and see men for what they really are behind their appearances.

In the effort to know the human heart, one has to begin by studying man: "But it is no less true that one must begin by studying man in order to judge men, and that he who knew each individual inclinations perfectly could foresee all their effects when combined in the body of the people" (E, 240). However, observing men well requires "a great interest in knowing them and a great impartiality in judging them" (E, 244). Through the study of history Emile will see men from afar, and judge them without his interests affecting him. History allows you to see men's actions while comparing them to what they say:

To know men, one must see them act. In society one hears them speak. They show their speeches and hide their actions. But in history their actions are unveiled, and one judges them on the basis of the facts. Even their talk helps in evaluating them; for in comparing what they do with what they say, one sees both what they are and what they want to appear to be (E, 237).

"the whole of human wisdom in the use of the passions" in two rules: (1) to feel the true relations of man, both in the species and in the individual; (2) to order all the affections of the soul in accordance with these relations. Only by following these does man become moral." And to achieve these two rules, Rousseau lays down the three maxims. Davidson, *Rousseau and Education According to Nature*, p.159

Rousseau claims Thucydides is “the true model of historians” (E, 239) because he presents facts without passing judgments and lets the reader make his own conclusion. He manages to hide himself and make the reader feel he sees the events unfold before him.

Due to the fact that Emile is not a solitary man, but a member of society with duties that must be fulfilled, in order to live with men he has to know them. Thus, Emile has to learn the social practices. It is time for Rousseau to show the difference between men and study the whole social order: “Society must be studied by means of men, and men by means of society” (E, 235). Just as he studied men’s passions in history, he now has to study men’s morals in society: “While studying men’s morals in society, as he previously studies their passions in history, he will often have occasion to reflect on what delights or offends the human heart. Now he is philosophizing about the principles of taste, and this is the study which suits him during this period” (E, 340). Politics and morals are interconnected and one can only understand them if they take the two together. At first, Emile feels the connection with the people he has close relations with, but as he reflects on his sentiments and observes others around him, “he will be able to get to the point of generalizing his individual notions under the abstract idea of humanity and to join to his particular affections those which can make him identify with his species” (E, 233). Rousseau starts to generalize Emile’s interest and make him feel connected to his fellow humans.

Emile has to learn to calculate the action and reaction of an interest in society and foresee events successfully in order to choose the best method to succeed. Men who are deceived by their passions may harm themselves. According to Rousseau: “To live in the world, one must know how to deal with men, one must know the instruments which give

one hold over them” (E, 249). Moral knowledge is acquired by one’s own experiences, and in certain cases he can draw the lesson from a story. Once again, Rousseau sees mistakes as experiences that can be valuable if the tutor draws lessons from them in the right way. Rousseau claims that the tutor must warn his pupil about his mistakes, but once he makes them he should not reproach him for them. Instead, through the use of fables, he can instruct without offending him: “from a fact he draws a maxim; and by means of the fable the experience he would soon have forgotten is imprinted on his judgment” (E, 248).

During the first phase of Emile’s education, religion does not play a role, because he was not ready to comprehend religious notions, (E, 257-260) but in the second phase, when the passions develop, Rousseau needs faith to complement his education. He introduces the Savoyard Vicar, as a “man more worthy than I thought,” (E, 260) to present his reflections on faith, and begin Emile’s moral education.⁵⁸ Rousseau expresses his disagreement with the practices of the Church, and discusses his views of a natural religion.

According to Rousseau, Emile must not be “carried away by either the passions or the opinions of men, that he see with his eyes, that he feel with his heart, that no authority govern him beyond that of his own reason” (E, 255). However, because men are limited by their senses, it is made harder for them to raise themselves to more abstract notions: “Consider also that since we are limited by our faculties to thing which can be sensed, we provide almost no hold for abstract notions of philosophy and purely intellectual ideas”

⁵⁸ According to Davidson, religion contributes to the control of Emile’s passions “There is still one more influence which may now be brought to bear, to calm the passions and give them beneficent direction, and that is Religion.” Davidson, *Rousseau and Education According to Nature*, p163, 169

(E, 255). Thus, Rousseau claims that to arrive at them we must either separate ourselves from our body or “make a gradual and slow climb from object to object, and finally, clear the gap rapidly and almost at a leap, by a giant step upwards of which childhood is not capable and for which even men need many rungs especially made for them” (E, 255). Following this paragraph Rousseau begins his discussion of religion and specifically the role of God who he describes as “the incomprehensible Being who embraces everything, who gives motion to the world and forms the whole system of being...” (E, 25). Thus, Rousseau believes that religion is important in Emile’s education and through his belief in God he will learn to think in abstract terms and thus overcome the limitations of our faculties.

Rousseau explains that the world, as a whole, is impossible to be conceived in its entirety, but it is governed by a “powerful and wise will,” which he calls God (E, 276-7). He claims that “the passions are the voice of the body” (E, 286) and the passions distract man and carry him away from contemplation (E, 279). He speaks strongly against materialism, claiming that the soul “is immaterial, it can survive the body; and if it survives the body, providence is justified” (E, 283). In this way he urges Emile to overcome the illusions of the body and his senses in order to contemplate on the Supreme Being, “and the eternal truths of which He is the source” (E, 283). Rousseau expresses his disagreement with the practices of the church: “the true duties of religion are independent of the institution of men; that a just heart is the true temple of divinity...” (E, 311). Thus, he calls for a universal, natural religion that includes the elements of every religion (E, 296) and is based on a faith in God that comes from the heart.

Emile's faith will urge him to be good, and fulfill his duties not only for the sake of order in society, but also due to his belief in God. As Rousseau claims: "He does this not only for the love of order, to which each of us always prefers love of self, but for the love of the Author of his being—a love which is confounded with that same love of self..." (E, 314). In this way, Rousseau unites Emile's self-love with his love of God and directs his interest towards a higher good and a virtuous conduct that will enable him to put the general interest above his particular interest in society. Rousseau uses religion to enhance his education and benefit society.

Rousseau claims that in order to transform *amour-propre* into a virtue one must generalize one's interest as much as possible. According to Rousseau, the more directly involved we are with our object of care, the more affected we are by the illusion of the particular interest. By keeping Emile at a distance from himself, he cares more for the happiness of others and thus he becomes enlightened and wise (E, 252). He does not care "who gets a greater share of happiness provided that it contributes to the greatest happiness of all" (E, 253). When he feels pity, he must generalize it and extend it to the whole of mankind and not just to particular groups: "For the sake of reason, for the sake of love of ourselves, we must have pity for our species still more than for our neighbor..." (E, 253). Rousseau attempts to take Emile out of himself and in order to profit the whole social body.

Moreover, it must be remembered that all these means by which I take my pupil out of himself, always have, nevertheless, a direct relation to him; for not only does he get an inner enjoyment from them, but also, in making him beneficent for the profit of others, I work for his own instruction (E, 253).

Rousseau is gradually teaching Emile to identify with a general good instead of focusing on his own private interest. Through pity, Emile learns to have a sense of his species, Rousseau is setting the groundwork for teaching him the ideas of the *Social Contract*.

Already Emile is chained by the attachments he has made through friendship, gratitude, and other affections: “But see how many new chains you have put around his heart. Reason, friendship, gratitude, countless affections speak to him in a tone he cannot fail to recognize” (E, 316). According to Rousseau the true moment of nature comes when Emile at twenty-two years of age, falls in love with Sophie. The day they meet and Rousseau observes the effect she has had on him, he claims: “He no longer speaks, he no longer responds; he sees only Sophie, he hears only Sophie... Farewell freedom, naiveté, frankness!” (E, 415) As Sophie and Emile spend more time together they develop a friendship and the bond between them is strengthened. “Now he is intoxicated by a nascent passion” (E, 419). At this moment, Rousseau decides to teach Emile one of his greatest lessons by leaving Sophie. Rousseau explains to Emile that throughout his life he protected his reason from men’s opinions, and protected his heart from harmful passions. Now he must protect him from himself, as he is about to make a big mistake due to a strong new passion he does not know how to control. Emile’s lesson is to become his own master by commanding his heart (E, 445) Rousseau wants Emile to limit his desires and detach his heart in order to become capable of putting his duties above his inclinations, and losing whatever can be taken from him. Only through this way will Emile be strong regardless of what fortune brings his way.

Let your condition limit your desires; let your duties come before your inclinations; extend the law of necessity to moral things. Learn to lose what can be taken from you; learn to abandon everything when virtue decrees it, to put yourself above events and to detach your heart lest it be lacerated by them; to be

courageous in adversity, so as never to be miserable; to be firm in your duty, so as never to be criminal. Then you will be happy in spite of fortune and wise in spite of passions (E, 446).

Through this method Rousseau wants to subject him to the hard exercise of strengthening his soul. He will be untouched by deceptive opinions and especially the opinions that place a great value on life. His ultimate goal is for Emile to become detached from all things, and not fear disturbances or threats to his life. The biggest challenge to overcome is the fear of death:

As the conqueror of so many deceptive opinions, you will also be the conqueror of the opinions that places so great a value on life. You will pass your life without disturbance and terminate it without fright. You will detach yourself from it as from all things.... Death is the end of the wicked man's life and the beginning of the just man's (E, 447).

If that is achieved, Emile will be capable of the ultimate sacrifice for his country, the sacrifice of his own life if duty calls.

Rousseau eventually persuades Emile that he must leave Sophie and travel in different states of Europe to learn the principal languages and see whatever is worthy of curiosity, "whether in natural history, or in governments, or in arts, or in men..." (E, 471).

Rousseau's purpose is to teach him the "science of political right", in other words, "all matter of government, in public morals, and in maxims of state of every kind..." (E, 458). He asks him questions on what the collective word "people" means, what the difference between power and legitimate power is, or whether a person can "legitimately alienate himself to another without restriction" (E, 460). During the two-year journey Rousseau discusses the social contract as the "basis of every civil society," (E, 460) where each man puts his life and all his power under the supreme direction of the general

will. They discuss the different forms of government, democracy, aristocracy, monarchy and their different characteristics⁵⁹. It is important to note, that Emile is urged by Rousseau to think and make comparisons. For example, they discuss and compare the different social institutions, the role of the government and the sovereign, and the difference of natural liberty to civil liberty⁶⁰. This method of learning is in accordance with Rousseau's earlier claim that intelligence is connected with one's capacity to make judgments and form ideas.

As the travelling comes to an end, Rousseau asks Emile what he concludes from his observations. Emile sees how men get involved with numerous attachments that make them slaves and appreciates Rousseau's efforts in teaching him to yield to necessity. "To remain what you have made me and voluntarily to add no other chain to the one with which nature and the law burden me.... All the chains of opinion are broken for me; I know only those of necessity" (E, 471- 472). Rousseau has successfully implemented in Emile his beliefs and views on how he should live his life. The only mistake Emile makes is to claim: "Freedom is found in no form of government; it is in the heart of the free man" (E, 473). Rousseau corrects him at the end, and explains: "you would be mistaken Emile, for he who does not have a fatherland at least has a country. In any event, he has lived tranquilly under a government and the simulacra of laws" (E, 473). Thus, he tells Emile that even if the notions of a fatherland are not what they used to be, he still has a country to remain faithful to, to which he owes "what is most precious to man—the

⁵⁹ As Jurgen also explains: "The governor, in other words, uses the tour through a few of the great and many of the smaller countries of Europe, no just for learning languages (Rousseau 193, p.522) but for teaching the social contract." Oelkers Jurgen, *Jean-Jacque Rousseau, Continuum Library of Educational Thought Vol 13*, (Continuum International Publishing Group. 2008) Edited by Richard Bailey p.127

⁶⁰ "After having compared natural liberty to civil liberty with respect to persons, we shall, with respect to possessions, compare the right of property with the right of sovereignty, individual domain with evident domain" (E, 461).

morality of his actions and the love of virtue” (E, 473). Thus, if the state calls him to serve the fatherland, he must leave everything to fulfill his duty as a citizen and remain at the post he has been assigned to⁶¹.

Ultimately, Rousseau’s education is very similar to the public education he claims Plato’s *Republic* is concerned with. His ultimate goal that is revealed in the fifth chapter of *Emile*, is to make Emile loyal to his country and capable of leaving everything to fulfill his duties as a citizen. By closely supervising every aspect of Emile’s life, Rousseau has managed to mold the Emile he had envisioned. Beginning with his “negative education,” Rousseau kept Emile unaffected by the opinions of others, and delayed the development of *amour-propre*. Emile’s freedom was always regulated by his tutor who sought to keep his desires limited, and his judgment active in order to keep him as independent from others as possible. With this foundation, Rousseau later implemented in Emile his own ideas about the Social Contract that would keep him attached to his country. Through cultivating the natural man in Emile, Rousseau managed to determine the civil man. Emile’s chains are legitimized once he willingly accepts the civil contract and embraces his duties as a member of society.

⁶¹ In Rousseau’s writings on the government of Poland he directly explains the important role of education in shaping the dedication of the citizens to their country: “It is education that must give the national form to souls, and direct their opinions and their tastes so that they will be patriots by inclination, by passion, by necessity. Upon opening his eyes a child ought to see the fatherland and until death ought to see nothing but it” (Poland, 179) He also insists that children should only play games in public with other children in order to “accustom them early to regulation, to equality, to fraternity, to competition, to living under the eyes of their fellow citizens and to desiring public approval.” Jean-Jacque Rousseau, *The Plan for Perpetual Peace, on the Government of Poland, and Other Writings on History and Politics*, (Dartmouth College Press, 2005), Translated by Kelly Christopher and Judith Bush, Edited by Kelly Christopher, p.181 As Patricia Lines claims: “Rousseau presents ideas on the state’s role in education in two short works. In *Considerations on the Government of Poland*, he indicates a preference for universal, free public schools. While recognizing that some parents prefer to educate their children at home, he recommends that the state nonetheless require them to send their children to public school for physical exercise.” Patricia Lines, *Shackling the Imagination: Education for Virtue in Plato and Rousseau*, (National Humanities Institute XXII, 2009), p.49

Chapter Three COMPARISON

The most important connection concerning education is that both Rousseau and Plato claim that men are in chains, and their solution is offered through education. Rousseau takes us through the life of one boy, and Plato takes us through the city-soul analogy to examine the human condition and its nurturing. Rousseau raises Emile protected from public opinion to keep his mind open, only to implement his own ideas when the right time comes. He seeks to legitimize the bonds by teaching Emile the *Social Contract* and cultivating sentiments that will lead him to accept his duties as a citizen. Through the right education Plato seeks to order the soul properly in order to achieve moderation and justice. The development of a strong character coupled with the exercise of reason through dialectic may lead few men to break free from the limitations of the body that kept them enchained.

Both Rousseau and Plato expressed disagreement with the existing methods of education and proposed an alternative approach. Even though the issues Rousseau and Plato are addressing are different, they are both trying to protect readers from the mistakes of other philosophers or educators. Thus, it appears that an important part of education is avoiding harmful ideas and methods that may be popularly accepted but hinder the effectiveness of better teachings.

Socrates is against the sophists who present themselves as teaching experts and charge high fees to give people 'true knowledge.' In all of Plato's dialogues Socrates tries to set himself apart from sophists, by pointing out that he never asks for money, and does

not present himself as an expert⁶². Unlike the sophists he does not believe that knowledge is placed into a person's mind as if it were an empty vessel: "education is not what the professions of certain men assert it to be"⁶³. Even though Socrates criticizes the sophists' teachings there is some common ground between their educations. For example, like them, Socrates uses speech and discussion, and values the same subjects such as calculation and geometry. The difference is that they teach with a different understanding of education and a different purpose in mind; the sophists believe that knowledge comes from the outside, and develop an instrumental use of our qualities aimed at satisfying the appetites, while Socrates' education takes a different direction and claims that knowledge already exists within, and that our studies should not be focused on practical application but on cultivating reason for the sake of knowledge. Thus, Socrates' critique is not a total dismissal but a rethinking of another educational system.

Rousseau is against the *bourgeois* and explicitly tells his readers to "distrust those cosmopolitans who go to great length in their books to discover duties they do not deign to fulfill around them" (E, 39) and lead men to lose their ties to the social contract. Allan Bloom explains in his Introduction to *Emile* that it was written to protect man against the evils of the *bourgeois*⁶⁴. This is one of the reasons that Rousseau's "negative education" plays a dominant role in Emile's early years who was kept as far as possible from public opinion, in other words, from the influence of the *bourgeois*.

⁶² Apology 21b

⁶³ As explained in Chapter One, the sophists assert that they put into the soul knowledge that isn't in it, as though they are putting sight into blind eyes." (R, 518c) According to Socrates, knowledge already exists within the soul of each, and his role is to guide them in order to bring it out, through the practice of dialectics.

⁶⁴ "Emile is written to defend man against a great threat which bids fair to cause a permanent debasement of the species, namely, the almost inevitable universal dominance of a certain low human type which Rousseau was the first to isolate and name: the bourgeois" (E, 4).

Rousseau also criticizes the type of education that makes men weak babblers and with no strength of body and soul to act courageously, with a juxtaposition of the education of the Athenians and the Spartans:

You will never get to the point of producing wise men if you do not in the first place produce rascals. This was the education of the Spartans: instead of being glued to books, they began by being taught how to steal their dinner. Were the Spartans as a result crude when grown? Who does not know the force and saltiness of their rejoinders? Always made to conquer, they crushed their enemies in every kind of war; and the Athenian babblers feared their words as much as their blows (E, 119).

According to Rousseau, the Spartans' education began with physical activities to strengthen the body, which then led to the strengthening of the mind. They were active and learned from experiences rather than useless words. Rousseau's description of the Spartans as "rascals" is reminiscent of Emile's description of a "savage made to inhabit cities" (E, 205). Similar to the Spartans, Emile was not buried in books but was raised to be active and roam around without being restricted to the regulations of politeness. His criticism of Athens echoes Plato's views as well, which emphasize the importance of training in gymnastics to cultivate the strength that will enable men to be courageous and thus, prove their words through their actions. This connection shows Plato's influence on Rousseau's views and the existence of continuity at their critique of education.

Rousseau and especially Plato discuss education in general terms and try to give more general guidelines rather than precise advice that will be limited to a specific time and place. For example, Plato does not give exact details of what the curriculum should be. Instead he emphasizes that in each subject the purpose should be to exercise the student's ability to reason about abstract notions, and gradually lead him towards dialectic. Similarly, Rousseau will give general guidelines to his readers, such as the

importance of teaching students the means to acquire learning themselves, rather than only learning the content of a subject. He lays down his main principles that his philosophy of education is based on such as: following nature, not rushing into learning, delaying the development of *amour-propre*, and exercising the body.

As Allan Bloom notes, *Emile* should not be taken as a manual of education to be put into practice⁶⁵. The main prerequisite the book is based on is the impossibility of finding a tutor that would dedicate 25 years of his life exclusively to the training of a child from the day he is born, to achieve complete control over his surroundings. Rousseau himself admits to this problem: “For who can hope entirely to direct the speeches and the deeds of all those surrounding a child” (E, 38) and claims that one should try to “come more or less close to the goal...” (E, 38). Neither is the *Republic* a book about the founding of the city and the nurturing of the soul to be directly implemented. A recurring theme in the *Republic* is the interlocutors’ distress over the feasibility of the city in speech. Socrates has to lead them away from this way of thinking that focuses on practicalities, in order to discuss the city in speech in a more abstract way and uphold the analogy with the soul. Only then will they be able to use their reason and by means of argument search for justice. The *Republic* as a whole represents Socrates’ use of dialectic and his effort to guide the interlocutors towards the direction of dialectic in order to contemplate about the meaning of the most important ideas: what *is* justice and what *is* good. According to Bloom, Plato’s dialogues:

are intended to perform the function of a living teacher who makes his students think, who knows which one should be led further and which ones should be kept away from mysteries, and who makes them exercise the same faculties and virtues

⁶⁵ See above, Chapter 2 p.2 ft

in studying his words as they would have to use in studying nature independently⁶⁶.

The dramatic style of the book makes the reader feel as if he is discussing with Socrates and the interlocutors, which in effect participates in the learning experience. A careful study of the *Republic* leads the reader to philosophize and think about the issues discussed in the book, such as the meaning of justice, the composition of the soul, the idea of the good and the role of education⁶⁷.

Both the *Republic* and *Emile* are philosophic writings that aim to make their readers think about the issues discussed and possibly change the way they see things, especially how they see education. They differ from the common understandings of education and propose a challenging alternative that will urge their readers to make comparisons and think about the meaning of education and its role in society. Socrates challenged the sophists who believed that knowledge is something to be *put into* their students' minds, and Rousseau went against the cosmopolitans who weakened men's dedication to their country, and against the teachers' who rushed students into memorizing without truly learning.

Rousseau and Plato's writings are not limited to their time, but their different views also pose a challenge to other understandings of education. For example, while

⁶⁶ Allan Bloom, *The Republic of Plato, Preface*, p. xxi

⁶⁷ I agree with McEwan who claims that both Plato and Rousseau use the examples of Socrates and Jacques (both fictional characters based on real people) to demonstrate their teachings: "Like Plato's Socrates, Rousseau's Jean-Jacques can also be viewed as a 'poetic-philosophic construct'—a figure designed to teach us how to lead our lives with reference to one representative and heroic example. They are 'practitioners of the art of living', to use Alexander Nehamas' (1998) apt phrase. And though their philosophies present quite different, almost opposing conceptions of the relationship of human beings to the world, Plato and Rousseau are kindred spirits in seeking to teach us through the forceful example of one, exemplary, life. But, as I hope to show, these portraits offer more than mere examples of how to live; they also teach us something about how to teach. Thus, to adapt Nehamas' phrase, Socrates and Jean-Jacques can also be understood as 'practitioners of the art of teaching.'" McEwan, *A Portrait of the Teacher as Friend and Artist: The Example of Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, p.509

today most people find that a child's education officially begins at school and ends at graduation in their twenties, Rousseau and Plato believe that education officially starts from birth, and lasts for the rest of one's life. They show that any experience Emile, or the youth in the *Republic* affects their education; the poetry they are exposed to as children, the exercise of their body when they play, and the discussions they have with their tutors can all be useful experiences⁶⁸. There is no graduation date in Rousseau or Plato's education, and their school is life itself⁶⁹.

Socrates and Rousseau prefer that their students learn by experience, and are against teaching with long-uninterrupted speeches, while the student passively listens. Socrates' teaching method is dialectic, where he uses a structure of questions and answers that leads the student to discover knowledge himself even though Socrates is always guiding him. Similarly, Rousseau uses artifice to let Emile learn from his own mistakes and experiences⁷⁰. He carefully orchestrates events, such as the race for the cupcakes,

⁶⁸ They both agree that the first education of a child is crucial, because the first experiences are engraved in one's mind. Rousseau continuously claims in *Emile*: "I repeat: the education of man begins at his birth..." (E, 62) and insists that mothers follow the fundamental maxims he lays out. Socrates claims that children begin their education as babies from the stories they are told, and he is very cautious of the poetry they are exposed to.

⁶⁹ The guardians' education continues until they are older in age and ready to study dialectics, which does not have an ending point. In fact, according to Socrates' statement in *Phaedo* that "philosophy is learning how to die" one learns from philosophy for as long as he is alive (*Phaedo*, 80e).

⁷⁰ According to McEwan both Socrates and Rousseau teach by example. Because one learns from everything around him, Rousseau seeks to manipulate that environment for the sake of teaching Emile the right thing. He claims that "Rousseau created a literary version of himself in his writings as an embodiment of his philosophy, rather in the same way and with the same purpose that Plato created a version of Socrates," and thus "Plato and Rousseau are kindred spirits in seeking to teach us through the forceful example of one, exemplary, life." (p.1) In his analysis of what teaching by example means, he claims: "Teaching by example and learning from example occur within the context of specific communities—as Aristotle discusses in the *Ethics*, we learn to be virtuous by growing up in a virtuous community (1953, p. 56) ... How one learns one's moral lessons and what one learns may depend largely on the nature of the particular community in which one grows to maturity. In some traditional communities, the kinds of examples that one can set may be strictly limited, and powerful social forces will come into play that make it difficult to rebel and encourage conformity to norms of conduct. But whatever the community the idea of teaching by example acts as a powerful tool of socialization." McEwan, *A Portrait of the Teacher as Friend and Artist: The Example of Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, p.512

Emile's encounter with the Gardener, or the Magician for Emile to experience different lessons.

There is a similar pattern in the education of Rousseau and Plato. In both cases there are two principal phases; during the first phase the purpose is to cultivate a strong character, which will be the foundation for the second phase. In the *Republic*, the guardians are trained in music and gymnastic to achieve a harmonious balance of gentleness and spiritedness in order to form characters that are courageous. In *Emile*, Rousseau shapes his student into a healthy, physically strong boy, with a mind that is free of prejudice and open to learning. Even though the purpose of their second phases are quite different, both Socrates and Rousseau begin by molding their students into appropriate ground for their future teachings. This shows that part of a successful education is preparing the right foundation in order to learn more effectively in the future: Socrates will cultivate their reason through the art of dialectic, while Rousseau will teach Emile in his twenties his duties as a citizen.

Rousseau emphasizes that everything has its proper time and students should not be rushed to study too much too soon. This view is similar to Socrates' who waits until a certain age to begin the curriculum that will lead to the study of philosophy, because if they are exposed to it too soon they might misuse it⁷¹. Rousseau repeatedly claims that children should not be rushed into learning, because mistakes will be made that are impossible to erase⁷². In fact, for Rousseau, one of the crucial principles of education is to

⁷¹ "Isn't it one great precaution not to let them taste of arguments while they are young? I suppose you aren't unaware that when lads get their first taste of them, they misuse them..." (R, 539a).

⁷² "The most dangerous period of the human life is that from birth to the age of twelve. This is the time when errors and vices germinate without one's yet having the instrument for destroying them, and by the time the instrument comes, the roots are so deep that it is too late to rip them out" (E, 93).

lose time⁷³. Unlike the popular view of teaching a child to think and reason as early as possible, Rousseau goes the opposite direction and makes his main rule not only to stop rushing children into learning but to delay time as much as possible.

Rousseau insists that children must live their childhood to the fullest and keep their soul idle:

They ought to do nothing with their soul until all of its faculties have developed, because while the soul is yet blind, it cannot perceive the torch you are presenting to it or follow the path reason maps out across the vast plain of ideas a path which is so faint even to the best of eyes (E, 93).

Rousseau's language in this passage echoes Plato's *Republic*; he speaks of the soul that is blind and thus cannot *see*, and the *light* of a torch will guide them to reason and find the "vast plain of *ideas*" (E, 93). One cannot doubt the influence of Plato on Rousseau who also claims that the eyes of the soul cannot see well and will reach an understanding of ideas through reasoning.

In fact, when Rousseau explains that tutors should not rush into instructing children who should naturally enjoy their childhood by spending time playing and running, he directly uses Plato as an example: "Plato in his republic, believed to be so austere, raises the children only by festivals, games, songs, and pastimes; one should say he has done everything when he has taught them well how to enjoy themselves" (E, 107). It is true that Plato conceals his teaching in the stories children are told when they are young and in the exercise of their bodies. In the second phase of their education Plato explains that the guardians should not study calculation and geometry as if it were compulsory, but as if it were a game for children: "the study of calculation and geometry and all the preparatory education required for dialectic must be put before them as

⁷³ "Dare I expose the greatest, the most important, the most useful rule of all education? It is not to gain time but to lose it" (E, 93).

children, and the instruction must not be given the aspect of a compulsion to learn” (R, 215). The reason for this is that forced studies will not teach anything to the soul⁷⁴. Both Plato and Rousseau believe learning should not be compulsory but as enjoyable as playing in order to be effective and children should not be rushed into training their reason too soon.

During Emile’s early years, when his faculties have not fully developed Rousseau explains that Emile should keep his body in constant activity and become strong and healthy. Rousseau explains that the body should be trained hard, because it will contribute to the cultivation of the mind as well, claiming that Emile’s body should be exercised “in order to make him wise and reasonable” (E, 118). Like Socrates, he explains that the mind and the body should move together in harmony: “Thus, the more his body is exercised, the more his mind is enlightened; his strength and his reason grow together, and the one is extended by the other” (E, 118).

Gymnastics is one of the main elements of Socrates’ first education; the guardians should live like athletes regarding their diet, and habits in drinking and exercising. Even though Socrates at first claims that the purpose of gymnastics is the conventional understanding of training the body to be strong and healthy, he later admits that the real purpose of gymnastics is to train the soul. Through gymnastics, the spirited part of the soul is strengthened and becomes courageous. As Socrates explains in Book VI, when children are young and blooming into manhood they should take “good care of their bodies,” so in the future when the guardians have been chosen and the second phase of

⁷⁴ Thus, Socrates concludes: “don’t use force in training the children in the studies, but rather play. In that way you can also better discern what each is naturally directed toward” (R, 216).

their education begins, they will have secured a “helper for philosophy” (489b). Thus, a well-balanced soul will be able to practice philosophy in the best possible way.

Thus, we see the connection between Rousseau and Socrates regarding the role of gymnastics in education. It is important to train the body hard not only for reasons of physical health and strength, but also for intellectual reasons. Rousseau claims that gymnastics help cultivate the mind, and Socrates believes that it contributes to the development of the soul.

The second element of Socrates’ first education is music, which as previously explained, means the education of speech or poetry. The poetry the guardians are exposed to cultivates sentiments that affect the development of their soul and could make them courageous, gentle, or fearful. Plato censors the poetry that children are exposed to in order to control what stories they are told. Anything that could lead to fear of death or show the weaknesses of the gods is not allowed. Only poetry that cultivates courage and respect for the gods can be accepted. Both philosophers understand the effect literature can have, and they attempt to control it, Plato filters poetry, while Rousseau apart from one book, bans literature completely⁷⁵.

Rousseau, in a more extreme approach bans all books from Emile’s reach, except one: Robinson Crusoe. While today education is focused on literature and reading to enrich students’ imagination and expose them to different ideas, Rousseau allows only one book to be part of Emile’s childhood. Like Socrates, he understands the effect that literature has on a child’s education and bans literature that could expose him to ideas other than the ones Rousseau intends to instill in him. Robinson Crusoe is the only book

⁷⁵ As Bloom claims: “Plato purified poetry so to make its view of the world less hostile to reason, and he replaced ordinary lies by a noble lie. Rousseau banishes poetry altogether and suppresses all lies.” Allan Bloom, *Emile, or on Education, Introduction*, p.9

that is in accordance with Rousseau's views, because it will make Emile identify with an isolated man who depends on himself to survive and judges everything based on their utility. In this way, Emile will raise himself above the prejudices of society and make his decisions based on what is useful⁷⁶. By banning any other book and exposing Emile to one specific story, he forces on him a certain teaching. It could be said that Rousseau is using literature to "brainwash" Emile into a specific way of thinking. This extreme censorship in Emile's education is proof of the lack of freedom in Rousseau's education, and that from a young age he is turning his student into what he wants him to be.

Rousseau recognizes man's desire to be free, but also believes that strict control is necessary for Emile's successful education, he uses the tactic of what he calls "well-regulated freedom." The tutor crafts his pupil's environment so well so that it goes undetected by Emile who feels free, even though he is constantly supervised. Rousseau's influence over Emile is so strong that eventually his pupil wants only what Rousseau wants him to want and can foresee his every reaction⁷⁷ (E, 120). Diane Brown likens Emile's early childhood to a state of sleep, where he lives in ignorance of his tutor's invisible hand that guides his every move. Emile lives in an artificial world, designed by Rousseau who tries to keep him protected from the harmful influences of society, but

⁷⁶ As Rousseau explains: "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" (E, 185).

⁷⁷ It must be noted that Plato also has a large degree of control of the guardians that are educated: they are taken from the age of six from their families and are raised together as brothers and sisters. They are always watched by the founders, who observe the best natures in order to select the future rulers. The children are isolated by their actual families and placed in an environment that is structured to provide them with the best education in music, gymnastics and eventually a curriculum that will lead to philosophy. Patricia Lines compares Plato and Rousseau's use of control in education to isolate the students from their families and limit their exposure to poetry and books. "Both would isolate the child from parents, family and neighbors. Second, both wish to curtail the imagination of the pupil and to ban rival imaginative presentations. Rousseau's ban on books echoes Plato's ban on poets." Patricia Lines, *Shackling the Imagination: Education for Virtue in Plato and Rousseau*, p.61

eventually will have to let him enter it⁷⁸. According to Rousseau, Emile has to be kept in isolation from society in order to be raised as close to nature as possible, and when the right time comes Rousseau will teach Emile his citizenship duties as part of his civic education. But this is not a true isolation, because even though Emile is not exposed to the opinion of society, he is constantly exposed to and immersed in the opinion of one man, his tutor. Emile's freedom is not true freedom, but a "well-regulated freedom" under the control of his tutor. Everything he learns and is exposed to is determined by Rousseau. In the end, Emile becomes a product of Rousseau's philosophy; his education is based on Rousseau's view of human nature and his purpose to form the citizen of the *Social Contract*.

In the *Social Contract*, he does not seek to break the chains in an attempt to reach true freedom; he aims to legitimize them through men's acceptance of the bonds. It is a certain kind of freedom that comes within the existing constraints of one's environment. Even though Emile is not directly aware of Rousseau's constraints on him, he accepts his environment as it is and lives with a freedom that to him is sufficient. Thus, Rousseau sets the groundwork for Emile to feel free while living in a condition of restraint⁷⁹. Some

⁷⁸ "Rousseau embarks on a singular educational project set outside of the strictures of society yet intended to allow its subject eventually to participate in the public sphere." Diane Brown, *Rousseau and Freedom*, p.160

⁷⁹As Brown claims: "In many ways, then, *Emile* creates conditions of instruction that center on the notion of the child experiencing a feeling of freedom. He will be told he is free, without being shown the ties that bind him; he will be monitored, but will be unaware of much of the surveillance (Brown, p.159-160) "In devising an individual education that avoids the corrupting influence of institutions, Rousseau nonetheless deploys a rhetoric of liberty; his fictional tutor presides over a sphere where the child will experience submission to authority, but always in the guise of liberty." Diane Brown, *Rousseau and Freedom*, p. 161
Josue Harari also agrees with this interpretation claiming that, the dilemma in Rousseau's pedagogy is how to make the tutor's authority a natural necessity; instead of using force, Rousseau chooses to use deception: "As a result, Rousseau's psychological strategy involves trapping the child in a system where his freedom of choice is only an illusion; to this effect the pedagogue produces a series of situations which the child perceives not only as a necessary state of affairs but also as one in which he has the initiative." Josue Harari, *Therapeutic Pedagogy: Rousseau's Emile*, (*The Johns Hopkins University Press* 97 No. 4) p. 497, 797

people who equate democracy with unconditional freedom may react to this view, but if there were no control in democracy there would be total chaos.⁸⁰ In order to achieve social order, there must be some control, and Rousseau's education prepares Emile to feel free within the necessary constraints of society.

An important element in Plato and Rousseau's education that contributes to the effectiveness of their teaching is the use of religion. The only part in *Emile* that is not narrated by Rousseau is the section on religion called *The Professions of the Savoyard Vicar*. Rousseau uses this section to first express his disagreement with materialism, and secondly his disagreement with the practices of the clergy⁸¹. He talks about a natural religion that is universal and includes all elements of other religions and thus, will keep men unified under one natural God (E, 295-6). The starting point of Emile's negative education is Rousseau's belief that man is by nature good, and that man's sins come from *amour-propre* and pride that develop in society. Even though Rousseau denies the

⁸⁰ According to Patricia Lines, "...only a few familiar with Jean Jacques Rousseau recognize that this seemingly liberal writer would require similar control. Rousseau, after all, calls for a democratic state and an organic education steeped in nature. He claims to outline an education that would throw of all restraints. As will be seen, however, Rousseau also seeks total control over the child's education. All learning comes through experience, but Rousseau's tutor manipulates that experience, through control of the child's environment." Lines, *Shackling the Imagination: Education for Virtue in Plato and Rousseau*, p.48

⁸¹ Some still argue that Rousseau is an atheist, and the ideas expressed in this section are not really his, hence they come through the Vicar. However, I agree with Williams who argues against the view that the Vicar's views are not Rousseau's. David Lay Williams, *Rousseau's Platonic Enlightenment*, (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007) p.63

Rousseau has expressed his faith in God, not only in the Vicar's profession of Faith, but also in his *Letter to Voltaire*, (Williams, p.66) and the *Letter to Beaumont*. Jean-Jacque Rousseau, *Letter to Beaumont, Letters Written from the Mountain, and Related Writings*, The Collected Writings of Rousseau; Vol. 9, (University Press of New England 1990) Edited by Kelly Christopher and Bush Judith, p.29, 49, 50

According to one of his statements in the *Letter to Beaumont* (p.49): "Let those who accuse me of being without Religion, because they cannot conceive of having one, at least agree among themselves if they can. Some of them find only a System of atheism in Books, others say I pay homage to God in my Books without believing deep in my heart But if I preach atheism in public, then I am not a hypocrite, and If I affect a faith I do not have, then I do not teach impiety. By heaping up contradictory imputations, the calumny reveals itself. But malice and blind passion does not reason." According to Davidson: "Rousseau now undertakes to give an account of the religion of Nature or Reason; but, instead of this, he really gives us his own beliefs which sprang, not from Reason, but from tradition, sentiment, and desire. Moreover, instead of setting these forth in his own name, he puts them into the mouth of a humble and unfortunate Vicar, whose traits are drawn from two men who he had actually known." Davidson, *Rousseau and Education According to Nature*, p.165, (Also, see p. 38,40)

Original Sin and disagrees with certain aspects of the church's doctrine, he still calls himself a Christian of the Gospel⁸².

Rousseau tells Emile that the soul is not material but it is eternal and survives after the death of the body. His language strongly echoes the *Republic*: "Why is my soul subjected to my senses and chained to this body which enslaves it and interferes with it?"⁸³ (E, 292) The similarity with the *Republic* is striking in this section as he urges his audience to be just and practice contemplations in order to come closer to the truth: "after being delivered from the illusions given us by the body and the senses, we will enjoy the contemplation of the Supreme Being and the eternal truths of which He is the source" (E, 283). In this section, Rousseau tries to achieve two goals, firstly, to make Emile think in more abstract notions and act more virtuously. By believing that his soul is immortal and by having faith in God, Emile is more likely to be good and fulfill his duties and thus, be a better citizen. Secondly, Emile's contemplation of the existence of the Supreme Being will make him think in more general and abstract ways, which is important in teaching Emile to generalize his will and detach himself from his self-interest. Thus, according to Rousseau's view, civic religion does contribute in his civic education and has a role in politics.

Similarly, in the *Republic*, Socrates uses religion for the proper founding of the city. According to Socrates, they must tell stories to children when they are young, and these stories must be repeated throughout their lives so that they are reminded of them.

⁸²Ioannis Evrigenis, *Rousseau and Freedom*, (Cambridge University Press 2010), Edited by Christie McDonald and Stanley Hoffmann, p.15-16

⁸³ This phrase is practically the same with Socrates' views in *Phaedo*: "The lovers of learning know that when philosophy gets hold of the soul, it is imprisoned in and clinging to the body, and that is forced to examine things through it as though a cage and not by itself, and that it wallows in every kind of ignorance. Philosophy sees that the worst feature of this imprisonment is that it is due to desires, so that the prisoner himself is contributing to his own incarceration most of all." (*Phaedo*, 82e)

Two of the most important stories are the noble lie, and the myth of Er and they refer to important matters such as the gods, the soul, and human nature. According to the myth of Er that Socrates narrates in Book X, the gods are watching everyone and the men who are just will be rewarded, while the unjust will be punished. By taking the higher road of justice, which is reflected in the city in speech, people will be saved by being good and minding their own business.

Socrates' purpose is to present his ideas in a specific way in order to persuade the members of the city⁸⁴. Even though the noble lie is called a lie its purpose is to benefit the people, and for this reason it is noble. The religious elements are the content of these stories, but also the fact that they have to be repeated over and over like a prayer. Plato uses a combination of education and habituation to instill ideas in people's minds and sets up a mechanism to keep those ideas alive. He needs to put institutions and mechanisms in place to develop the right habituation that will reinforce his education.

Rousseau and Socrates are similar in terms of using religion to persuade men that the soul is immaterial and they have to act virtuously in life because the soul survives the body after death. Faith is the "giant step" (E, 255) of Rousseau that will raise men to higher and abstract notions. Religion plays a role in politics by urging citizens to be more loyal and virtuous. Thus, Plato and Rousseau use a civic religion that is in accordance with their political goals in the city and thus, contributes to their civic education.

⁸⁴ As Bloom also notes in his Interpretive Essay to the *Republic*: "The noble lie is precisely an attempt to rationalize the justice of civil society; it is an essential part of an attempt to elaborate a regime which most embodies the principles of natural justice and hence transcends the false justice of other regimes. The thoughtful observation will find that the noble lie is a political expression of truths which itself leads him to consider. In other words, there are good reasons for every part of this lie, and that is why rational man would be willing to tell it." (Bloom, *Emile, or on Education, Introduction*, p.367) I agree with Bloom there are good reasons for the lie, in other words, it is used for the benefit of the people, and for this reason it is a noble lie.

Plato and Rousseau's views on education are based on their distinct understandings of what human nature is and how it should be nurtured. In his analysis of Plato's education, Nettleship starts with an examination of Plato's view of the soul, how it "has to be fed, and the needs to which its circumstances have to be adjusted"⁸⁵. The first part of Socrates' education is geared towards cultivating the spirited part in order to be strong and disciplined in controlling the appetites. The guardians are trained in gymnastics and in music to become courageous in executing the commands of the intellect. Rousseau's first reaction to *amour-propre* is to delay it for as long as possible during the "negative education" phase. The moment the passion develop when Emile has grown older, Rousseau claims that one must try and point them in the right direction. In both cases, building a strong character is an important foundation for the next phase of their education. Socrates will try to raise the guardians higher in the Image of the Line, and Rousseau tries to cultivate in Emile sentiments that will connect him with his fellows and make him feel part of the social body⁸⁶. Rousseau also tries to teach Emile how to become a master of his own heart by leaving Sophie and thus, learn to control himself. This is very similar to Socrates' education that focuses on training the spirited part in order for reason to control the desiring part.

⁸⁵ Nettleship, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*, p.9

⁸⁶In fact, he says that it is impossible to destroy our passions since they are part of our nature and thus, a work of God, which cannot be changed by us humans "Our passions are the principal instruments of our preservation, It is therefore, an enterprise as vain as it is ridiculous to want to destroy them—it is to control nature, it is to reform the work of God." (E, 212) Thus, it appears that Rousseau accepts the passions as part of the soul and not something external that is derived in society.

According to Bloom: "Rousseau's teaching about *amour-propre* goes to the heart of his disagreement with Plato." (E, 12) Bloom claims that the spiritedness in Plato's analysis of the soul is akin to Rousseau's *amour-propre*, with the difference that according to Rousseau it is not natural but derived in society, whereas to Plato it is part of the soul's composition. I disagree with Bloom's view that *amour-propre* is derived in society. Rousseau clearly states that *amour-propre* will inevitably develop in society and it depends on each person and the different conditions he is in. Claiming that something is natural implies that man is in isolation, away from civil society.

Both philosophers believe in the power of nurture since education plays a critical role both in the *Republic* and *Emile*. The question that remains is to what extent they believe that education can alter the nature of men. In the *Republic*, there is a strong interaction between nature and nurture. A division of labor exists in the city in speech based on the skills of each person, leading to the class that includes shoe makers, carpenters, artists, doctors etc. and the guardian class who will later be divided into the rulers and the auxiliaries based on their natures and their performance during the first stage of their education. Socrates creates the myth of the bronze, silver, and golden souls to persuade the members of the city that by nature they must follow their role in the class they have been assigned to. These two elements coupled with Socrates' insistence that only the best natures can become guardians, is based on the assumption that there are different natures that compose the different classes in society.

On the other hand, according to the city-soul analogy, the three classes of the city correspond to three parts in the soul of each individual, thus one might claim that there may be differences between each class in the city, but every man has all three classes within, so in the end, all men are the same. However, even though everyone has the same three elements in the soul, each soul has a different balance of its parts, leading to different types of men. In other words, the way the three parts of the soul are ordered is different. For example, some may have a stronger calculating part, while others may have a more dominating desiring part; in some men the spirited part may have been trained too much and become harsh and cruel, while others may be too weak and gentle. According

to Bloom, “The different men see very different things in the world and, although they may partake of a common nature, they develop very different aspects of that nature...⁸⁷”

In Nettleship’s view, the purpose of education is to give the appropriate nurture to the soul.⁸⁸ The education that will be given and whether it will be successful depends on man’s inherent qualities. Even though a child can be placed in a better environment, he cannot be forced to learn; his learning depends on his natural talents—what sort of metal was he born with—and how will he make use of the education he is provided with. Socrates can only guide his student to turn in the right direction where he will then discover true knowledge. The turning is based on his intrinsic capacity coupled with the proper guidance and his own effort. As Nettleship explains:

On the other hand, while the inherent vitality of the soul makes the question of its nourishment all-important, it also precludes a merely mechanical treatment of it. We can place it in a healthy atmosphere, but we cannot compel it to assimilate only the healthy elements. The ‘eye of the soul’ is not, as some ‘professors of education’ seem to think, a blind eye into which knowledge can be put; its power of vision can neither be originally produced by education, nor entirely destroyed by the want of it; it can only be ‘turned to the light’, for which it has an intrinsic capacity. “Plato’s idea of the essence of education is most simply and comprehensively expressed in the word ‘nurture’. To him the human soul is emphatically and before all else something living, something which in the strict sense we neither create nor destroy, but which we can feed or starve, nourish or poison. As in the case of other living things, of plants and animals, the stronger and better the nature of the soul, the more important it is what nourishment it gets...It is this feeling of the assimilative power of the soul which leads Plato to attach such immense importance to the circumstances and environment of life, and makes him on the whole more disposed to attribute moral evil to bad nurture than to inherent vice⁸⁹.”

Plato accepts the existence of different natures, and sees them as is the foundation on which education may then play its part, and either improve or worsen them.

⁸⁷ James Adam, *The Republic of Plato Vol I*, p.351

⁸⁸ Nettleship, *The Theory of Education in Plato’s Republic*, p.5-6:

⁸⁹ *ibid* p.7

It must be noted that even the best natures in Plato's *Republic* can be corrupted in the wrong environment. In Book VI, Socrates explains that the multitude can affect the guardians, because their praise and blame can reduce them to the public opinion⁹⁰. Thus, the guardians are always at risk of being turned to the wrong direction and becoming sophists rather than true guardians. In addition, the guardians can be badly affected by their own education if there is no moderation in music and gymnastics, since an imbalance can make them either very cruel, or very soft. Thus, they need to keep their natures from being corrupted, as well as the proper education to balance their soul properly. But for Socrates that is not enough, he also uses habituation to reinforce his education and make it last. As previously discussed, he puts mechanisms in place through stories like the myth of Er that men memorize and repeat to themselves in order to always be reminded of them. As a result, even though the nature of the guardians is important, it is not sufficient by itself. It requires the right kind of education coupled with habituation to keep them in the right direction.

In *Emile*, Rousseau applies his education to a common boy, without claiming that only the best natures are suited for it as Plato claims about the guardians⁹¹. Thus, his education appears more universal and applicable. He also mentions a few times in *Emile* that men are equal: "In the natural order, since all men are equal, their common calling is man's estate and whoever is well raised for that cannot fail to fulfill those callings related to it" (E, 41). Rousseau's claim that men are by nature equal refers to our natural

⁹⁰ "Then when they themselves refuted many men and are refuted by many, they fall quickly into profound disbelief of what they formerly believed. And as a result of this, you see, they themselves and the whole activity of philosophy become the objects of slander among the rest of men" (R, 539c).

⁹¹ On the other hand Bloom believes that Rousseau's education in *Emile* resembles the selectivity of Plato's guardians: "In imagination he takes an ordinary boy and experiments with the possibility of making him into an autonomous man—morally and intellectually independent, as was Plato's philosopher-king, an admittedly rare and hence aristocratic human type" (E, p.6).

capacities that are on average equal since no man is exceedingly different from another. But in society, the natural equilibrium is broken, and there is ‘de jure equality’ with the stronger oppressing the weaker. Rousseau admits that there are different levels of genius and different types of talents: “Each advances more or less according to his genius, taste, his needs, his zeal, and the occasions he has to devote to them” (E, 62). According to Rousseau’s statement it is the combination of different factors, including zeal, and hard work that lead to one’s advancement. His claim that there are different levels of genius, which means that not all men are the same but there are inherent qualities that differentiate between them. Thus, both Socrates and Rousseau acknowledge that there are differences among men, and the effect of education depends on other factors as well.

Based on their understanding of human nature coupled with their political philosophy, Rousseau and Plato develop distinct purposes for their civic education. Rousseau’s education has two principal purposes: the development of Emile as an individual, and training him for his civic responsibilities.⁹² As previously described, the first part of Emile’s education is focused on developing a strong and independent individual.⁹³ But Rousseau’s true intentions are shown in Book V when he travels with Emile and teaches him all the ideas in his *Social Contract*. Through discussions during their two years of travelling, Rousseau talks to Emile about the meaning of power, slavery, and people, and eventually teaches him the *Social Contract*. Thus, Rousseau

⁹² As Gross claims: “Rousseau’s educational program thus included both extremes of a “progressive” concern with the full development of individual powers, and a classical regimen of training for civic responsibility.” Ronald Gross, *The Teacher and the Taught; Education in Theory and Practice from Plato to James B. Conant*, (Delta Book, 1963) p.41

⁹³ “The wholeness, unity, or singleness of man—a project ironically outlined in the Republic—is the serious intention of Emile and almost all that came afterward.” Allan Bloom, *Emile, or on Education*, Introduction, p.4

prepares him for a life of civic duties, dedicated to his country. By the end of their journey Emile is persuaded that men are his brothers and his duty is to his country.

When interpreting the purpose of education in the *Republic* it is important to keep in mind the city-soul analogy. By looking at the education of the city, its purpose is naturally directly related to the political life of the city and its classes. It places people into the class they belong to and teaches them to accept their position and mind their own business. It trains the auxiliaries who will protect the city and prepares the guardians to become successful rulers. Moreover, in the *Republic*, Socrates expands the notion of education by expanding the notion of the students' class. The classes of the city are the basis for how the classes of education are separated in the auxiliary and guardian classes, demonstrating once again the importance of education in political life. From this point of view, the education in the *Republic* is similar to *Emile* as it prepares the members of society for their civic responsibilities for the benefit of the social whole.

According to the analogy to the soul, the purpose of Plato's education is to achieve a balanced composition of the soul, where as in the city each part will play its role and the best part will rule over the worst. As the city requires that guardians become rulers with the help of the auxiliaries, the soul must have the calculating part rule over the desiring part, with the support of the spirit⁹⁴. The parts must work together for the proper ordering of the whole soul to achieve happiness; just like in the city the purpose is for the

⁹⁴ As Nettleship explains, "... each social element should do that which it is most fitted to do, thus contributing to the common stock the best that it has to give, and receiving from each other element that of which it is itself most in need." According to this "principle of harmonious cooperation," Plato's system of education is developed in the first three books. Nettleship, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*, p.5

entire city to be happy, and not just its parts. Thus, by doing what each part is most suited to do and minding its own business, they will contribute best to the whole⁹⁵.

Since it is the people who make up the city, if each individual achieved a balanced composition of the soul, developed a strong character, cultivated reason, and thus, minded his own business, would form a strong citizen body that would in effect benefit the city. Plato's city-soul analogy reflects an important truth about human society: that one cannot exist without the other. Plato's education for the individual soul will trickle down and benefit the city, and Plato's education for the city as a whole will also trickle down and benefit the individual who will live in a better society. It is important to separate the two, and thus, Plato's analogy in the *Republic* is fundamental in order to search for justice.

Apart from the political purposes that exist in both of Rousseau and Plato's education, there is also a common individual purpose. In both the *Republic* and *Emile*, the ability to make comparisons between opposites is emphasized in their writings. Rousseau's "negative education" is based on being virtuous by avoiding vice rather than pursuing virtue itself⁹⁶. In the *Republic*, justice is discussed in comparison to its opposite, injustice, and the unjust man is found first in order to define the just man. Both Rousseau and Socrates adopt a method of defining something based on its opposite, demonstrating

⁹⁵ In the same way, the guardians will have to make sacrifices and dedicate themselves to the ruling of the city, and live without luxuries and riches, so that in the end, the city as a whole benefits.

⁹⁶ In his Introduction to *Emile*, Bloom points to the existence of oppositions in Rousseau: "By this I mean that Rousseau is at the source of the tradition which replaces virtue and vice as the causes of a man's being good or bad, happy or miserable, with such pairs of opposites as sincere/insincere, authentic/inauthentic, inner-directed/other-directed, real self/alienated self. All these have their source in Rousseau's analysis of *amour de soi* and *amour-propre*, a division within man's soul resulting from man's bodily and spiritual dependence on other men which ruptures his original unity or wholeness. The distinction between *amour de soi* and *amour-propre* is meant to provide the true explanation for that tension within man which had in the past been understood to be a result of the opposed and irreconcilable demands of the body and the soul." Allan Bloom, *Emile, or on Education, Introduction*, p.4

the importance of making comparisons, which is also a central part of their teachings.

Developing a sense of perspective and learning to think comparatively is the first step to finding the forms. Most people are trapped into a kind of thinking that is based on images, but the more focused people are on the manifestations, the more they will lose sight of the forms. Every step of Socrates' curriculum, starting from mathematics and gradually increasing in complexity to geometry, stereometry, and astronomy, is meant to train the guardians to think more and more in general ideas and raise people's eyes from looking at practical and visible things to contemplating the ideas that cannot be seen. It is by making comparisons between the different manifestations of a thing that one comes closer to understanding the forms. As one goes higher in the Image of the Line, one is able to look back at where he started and compare it to how he changed and the different perspective he has developed. His soul is slowly turned around and he sees things in a different light in comparison to where he was before.

According to Rousseau, as Emile grows older, his intelligence is determined by his capacity to make judgments by comparing and thus, forming ideas. At the end of his education, when he travels with his tutor to learn about the science of politics, and specifically the social contract, Rousseau urges Emile to think by comparing concepts, such as natural liberty to civil liberty (E, 461). Thus, the true learning of Rousseau and Plato's education lies in the exercise of making judgments through constructively comparing things and thus, developing critical thinking.

The chains that keep them from seeing the truth represent two main things: the limitations of the body and popular opinions and canons. In the Image of the Line the lowest part of the line—the visible part—is the condition in which man is chained and

sees only the shadows. The visible part includes two elements, as James Adam explains: the *ορατόν* and the *δοξαστόν*. The former means anything that is visible but in a physical manner, thus it represents the limitations of our senses that falsely judge based on what we see and also the physical needs and desires that affect our soul. The latter refers to public opinion about the things around us that people habitually accept regardless of whether they are not true.

According to Rousseau, men are not naturally chained inside a cave, but he is in bonds the moment he enters civil society and establishes relations with other people. Once *amour-propre* develops and we become attached to the people around us, our heart is chained to the bonds of relationships. For example, when Emile met Sophie and developed feelings for her, Rousseau declared: “Farewell freedom, naïveté, frankness!” (E, 415) Chains are starting to form around his heart, among others “reason, friendship, gratitude, countless affections...” (E, 316). Rousseau also speaks about chains similar to Plato’s, such as public opinion and prejudices that corrupt people’s views about life: “Prejudice, authority necessity, example, all the social institutions in which we find ourselves submerged would stifle nature in him and put nothing in its place” (E, 37).

For Plato the chains represent our physical limitations and prejudices, and for Rousseau they represent human attachments and prejudices. The main difference between the two philosophers is that one seeks to legitimize the chains, while the other shows how a few rare men can break free from them. According to Rousseau, the chains of society can become legitimate if a citizen willingly accepts and embraces them. He has to acknowledge the benefits of living in a unified, secure society and thus, willingly accept the restrictions to his freedom. As Isaiah Berlin claims: “...chains cease to be unnatural

restrains when they signal the collective rules one has agreed to abide by. If the chains are freely chosen, they are marks not of enslavement but of free will⁹⁷.” Thus, by voluntarily agreeing to be part of the social contract and what that entails, namely giving up his will to the general will, Emile may legitimize the chains that restrict his freedom. The legalization is also made possible through distinguishing between the sovereign and the government, allowing each member of the social contract to participate in the formation of the general will through the sovereign⁹⁸.

Allan Bloom explains that at age fifteen, Emile “sees that his fellow men are prisoners in a cave and by which he is freed from any temptation to fear the punishments or seek the honors which are part of it⁹⁹.” I disagree with this interpretation because, Rousseau does not seek to take Emile out of the cave, but to transform it into a place that Emile will be able to live happier by accepting the limitations to his freedom and living in accordance with the social laws. However, if we do accept Bloom’s claim that Emile sees his fellow men in a cave that he is freed from, I would have to add that Emile has simply moved from one cave to another. He is now in what we may call, “Rousseau’s cave” made from Rousseau’s opinions and ideas that have been ingrained in Emile all his life through the education provided to him.

Plato on the other hand, does not seek to legitimize the chains, but takes a greater step in trying to break them. However, breaking the chains is only the first step; one also has to try and exit the cave by going towards the light, which is a painful and difficult

⁹⁷ Diane Brown, *Rousseau and Freedom* p.162

⁹⁸ “By insisting that, although he is everywhere in chains, man is born free from domination and sin, Rousseau was able to part ways with Hobbes, and make the notions of individual agency and responsibility not only plausible, but perhaps also appealing. This almost imperceptible difference allowed him, in turn, to distinguish between sovereign and the government, and to pronounce every individual participant in the social contract a member of the sovereign. Thus, he was able to keep his promise, at the start of the *Social Contract*, to render man’s enslavement legitimate.” Evrigenis, *Rousseau and Freedom*, p.18

⁹⁹ Allan Bloom, *Emile, or on Education, Introduction*, p. 9

process. But this is the only way to discover true knowledge and come close to seeing the idea of the good, which is the ultimate task of the philosopher. As a result, Rousseau attempts to legitimize the chains by providing an education to Emile that will protect him for the first years of his life from the opinions of society, and based on a mind free of prejudice he is able to engrave his own opinions as a philosopher and educator that in the end will lead Emile to embrace the social contract and thus legitimize the chains. Plato on the other hand, talks about breaking the chains and guiding men to true knowledge. This can be achieved with the help of the education he proposes, which during the first phase aims to harmonize the soul and create a strong character, which will gradually be imitated in the art of dialectic that will enable him to turn his eyes in the right direction and contemplate on the Idea of the good.

The great caveat in Plato's education is that the breaking of the chains and exiting the cave, can only be achieved by a few philosophers and not by everyone. Achieving this is rare and depends on numerous factors. First and foremost, as Plato repeatedly claims in the *Republic*, only the right natures can become guardians, only those with gold in their soul have the potential to achieve this breakthrough. But this by itself is not sufficient; the soul also requires the proper nurturing that is given to us by Plato's analysis of education and the contribution of habituation. Only the right education, with the right purposes in mind can potentially lead someone with the right nature to break the chains¹⁰⁰.

¹⁰⁰ According to Gross: "This unforgettable and endlessly suggestive parable is a basic source of the classical philosophy of education. Plato portrays the process of learning as an individual's radical encounter with a truth that exists independently of himself... It is a lonely, harrowing experience through which each man frees his mind from the prejudices of those around him and accepts his responsibility for helping others achieve the same goal." Gross, *The Teacher and the Taught*, p.2
I disagree with Gross' view that each man frees his mind from the prejudices around him. In fact, very few men will eventually be capable of achieving the breaking of the bonds.

Interestingly, in the *Republic*, there is only one example of a man leaving the cave and it happened because of some unknown force that dragged him outside. According to Allan Bloom: “In the account of the cave given here, a man is liberated from his bonds not by his own efforts but by a teacher who compels him to turn to the light¹⁰¹.” Plato does not specify that it is the effort of a teacher that compels the man towards the light, but it is a possibility. There is also the important question of how the man comes across the teacher. Nevertheless, whether it is a teacher or some other unknown force that guides him, the fact is that it is a very rare occasion.

This brings us back to the main difference between Rousseau and Plato’s treatment of the chains. Rousseau seeks to transform the cave and legitimize the chains, whereas Plato discusses a higher goal of breaking the chains and coming out of the cave altogether. In the words of Allan Bloom: “The Enlightenment teaches that the cave can be transformed; Socrates teaches that it must be transcended and that this transcendence can be accomplished only by a few¹⁰².” Rousseau has modest goals but addresses the average man, whereas Plato has very high goals that can only be achieved by few men, since it requires a genius to discover true nature. Rousseau does not seek to break the bonds of the cave and guide Emile to exit and discover true knowledge, at best he moves him to a better cave. In this way Bloom claims: “Rousseau, the genius, has made it possible for ordinary men to be free...¹⁰³.” Thus, since not everyone could leave the cave,

¹⁰¹ Allan Bloom, *The Republic of Plato, Notes*, p.406

¹⁰² *ibid* p. 403

¹⁰³ Allan Bloom, *Emile, or on Education, Introduction*, p.9

Rousseau—who sees himself as one of the few geniuses who achieved it—gives a solution that will allow the average man to feel free¹⁰⁴.

Plato bears a strong influence on Rousseau's philosophy of education. The domestic and the public education, which Rousseau described as “two contrary forms of instruction” (E, 40) are brought together in his *Emile*, just like Plato brought them together in the *Republic*. They both develop a civic education that seeks to prepare future citizens and unify them within the social body; Rousseau trained the citizen of the *Social Contract*, and Plato prepares the citizens that will make up the city. They also develop a domestic education; Plato focuses on ordering the soul properly and training the character and intellect of the guardians, while Rousseau trains Emile's body and mind to become master of himself and limit his desires.

¹⁰⁴ According to Allan Bloom: “Here then we have Rousseau's response to Plato. Plato said that all men always begin by being prisoners in the cave. The cave is civil society considered in its effect on the mind of those who belong to it. Their needs, fears, hopes, and indignations produce a network of opinions and myths, which make communal life possible and give it meaning. Men never experience nature directly but always mix their beliefs into what they see. Liberation from the cave requires the discovery of nature under the many layers of convention, the separating out of what is natural from what is man-made. Only a genius is capable of attaining a standpoint from which he can see the cave as a cave. That is why the philosopher, the rarest human type, can alone be autonomous and free of prejudice. Now, Rousseau agrees that once in the cave, genius is required to emerge from it. He also agrees that enlightenment is spurious and merely the substitution of one prejudice to another. He himself was born in a cave and had to be a genius to attain his insight into the human condition... But he denies that the cave is natural. The right kind of education, one independent of society, can put a child into direct contact with nature without the intermixture of opinions.” Bloom, *Emile, or on Education, Introduction*, p.8-9

Conclusion

Out of the examination of the role of education in the *Republic* and *Emile*, and a close comparison of the two works, striking similarities surface between Plato and Rousseau's views, demonstrating that *Emile* is more Platonic than initially anticipated. Following Plato, Rousseau attempts to reconcile the domestic and public education he initially claimed had contrary ends. Plato combines a civic education that prepares citizens for their duties in the city, with a private education that cultivates the soul of each individual. Similarly, Rousseau educates Emile to become the citizen of the *Social Contract*, while cultivating Emile's physical and intellectual skills. The influence of Plato centuries later in Rousseau's work is proof of the lasting importance of Plato's philosophy of education. Through studying the *Republic* and *Emile* important questions are raised about the role of education in any society.

Comparative Thinking:

One of the most important common elements between Rousseau and Plato's systems of education is their emphasis on man's capacity to compare between opposite objects and draw conclusions based on those comparisons. For Rousseau, intelligence is determined by comparing and thus, making judgments. That is how ideas about things are formed, and that is how people learn to think about things. Plato's second phase of the intellectual part of education is based on raising man's reason to think about general forms. This is achieved by slowly comparing the specifics and drawing a conclusion that will take them a step further into the contemplation of what *is*. Once he has made a step

forward he turns around, and seeing where he has come from he understands what he has learned. Plato's education is about turning; turning and comparing; and thus judging and learning. In other words, learning how to think, and more specifically, how to think with critical skills. According to Socrates the main element in education is thinking comparatively, and anything can be turned into an educational experience as long as one does it critically.

Censorship and Control:

Rousseau and Plato agree that there should be a certain amount of control over what the students are exposed to in order to effectively direct them towards the right direction. They ban literature, they constantly supervise their students' activities and they control everything in their environment. Even though Rousseau and Plato may be criticized for this element of control and censorship in their respective education, both Rousseau and Plato act for the best interest of their students. Rousseau helps Emile legitimize the chains and prevents the development of harmful passions. Socrates tries to keep reason in control over desires and helps the guardians overcome the limitations of the body.

The important role of control in education coupled with the existence of the chains raise the question of how much freedom is there in education. Would Emile, or the guardians benefit if they could do anything they wanted, or is there a good reason for the existence of strict control and censorship? There are constraints in every system of education, since every curriculum sets prerequisites about what must be studied and eliminates areas that are not to be studied. Also, specific books are chosen, while others

are disregarded, and the content of each subject is restricted to a specific syllabus. Every educator has a conception of what is permissible or not and what should be taught.

Rousseau developed the concept of “well-regulated freedom,” where Emile is tricked into not feeling the constraints that exist around him. Teachers also develop a certain amount of authority over their students in order to keep the class in order and teach effectively. Just like in democracy, citizens are not allowed to act freely and do anything they want, but they have to abide by certain laws and regulations for the safety of society. Likewise in Rousseau and Plato’s education there has to be some control for their education to be made possible. It is the existence of constraints that gives each citizen the opportunity to be free within those boundaries. However, the presupposition is that the person setting the constraints knows what is right and wrong, and that requires deep knowledge of the meaning and purpose of education, and the nature of the students.

Nature vs. Nurture

The importance of education is inherently tied with the question of whether we are predetermined by our natures, or whether we have flexible natures that can be changed through the proper nurturing. Neither Plato, nor Rousseau believes that men are solely formed by nurture, but there are factors that differentiate men between them. In Plato’s *Republic*, only few men have gold in their soul according to their nature and can become guardians. He specifically claims that the guardians must by nature have certain qualities that will be the foundation for the proper education to nurture them appropriately and raise the guardians to their proper task. Even though Socrates believes that knowledge can come out of everyone, he does not believe everyone can grasp the

forms. Thus, expectations are adjusted according to each individual's nature. Rousseau as well, believes that *amour de soi meme* is part of our nature and in society *amour-propre* will inevitably develop. He also admits that different levels of genius exist, and each will advance according to his genius, but also his drive and proper education. Thus, the effectiveness of education to mold people depends on what they are made of.

People are most likely to object to this view, since the idea of being predetermined by our nature, or in more modern terms, by our genetics is repugnant. The notion that there is some sort of destiny, takes away the illusion of control over the course of one's life. The modern liberal individual is accustomed to seeing himself as equally capable of achieving anything as anyone else. Accepting this would mean that teachers and parents can classify their students and children and differentiate between them. Interestingly, people already do this kind of differentiation even though they will not admit to it. The claim that one's son is very talented in a musical instrument, or is a genius in mathematics is admission that he is better in something and has a natural aptitude for that something. The variety in talents and achievements between young people is proof of the different natures that exist. Not everyone can be President of a country, and not everyone can win an Olympic metal. There are different capabilities that receive different nurturing, and only those who receive the best of both will go the furthest.

Education and Politics

In both books, education is proven to be to a large extent connected to the political intentions of each philosopher. Rousseau attempts to mold Emile into a citizen

capable of embracing the social contract and accepting its laws. He is preparing him for a civil life, where he will give up all his rights to the whole and live as part of society. Plato trains the auxiliaries in order to protect the city, and the guardians in order to rule the city. Each class must be taught to mind its own business and follow its duties. They should not be concerned with their individual happiness, but care about the happiness of the city as a whole. Thus, the guardians especially must make sacrifices in order to rule the city properly.

The *Republic* is also about the soul of every individual, and Socrates draws an analogy between the composition of the soul and the composition of the city. Thus, the *Republic* is also about the internal polis of each person, where he has to train the spirit to protect the soul by following the commands of reason that must rule over the desires. Each part of the soul must mind its own business and fulfill its duties in order to achieve moderation and justice and thus, the soul as a whole to be happy. Since the city is made out of many individuals, if each person developed a well-ordered soul, they would mind their own business and thus, benefit the city as well. Plato demonstrates the strong connection between the city and the individual and by improving either, the benefits will trickle down to the other. Thus, Plato and Rousseau show the role of education in making men part of their society.

Rousseau's purpose of legitimizing the chains by training Emile to eventually accept the social bonds and live in accordance with his duties as a citizen seems more plausible than Socrates' discussion of using the proper education as a possible means to break the chains and discover true knowledge, which is close to impossible. Yet, in both cases achieving the legitimization or liberation from the chains, and directly

implementing their ideas on education are not very feasible goals. There is some practical significance in the fact that they are trying to turn their readers into something by affecting their way of thinking and their beliefs. By taming our natures, Rousseau and Plato want to turn us into better citizens; Rousseau wants to show the importance of obeying one's duties in society and caring more about the general will than the particular interest, and Plato wants to show that each citizen must mind his own business and act in accordance with justice. Isn't the purpose of today's education also to prepare future citizens and form good citizens that have a social consciousness?

However, the direct practical application of their writings is impossible. They might be seen as a higher goal to strive towards in an effort to improve our systems of education, but they are not manuals of education. Their purpose is to make their readers think about the meaning of education, challenge their ideas and turn them toward the direction each philosopher thinks is best. Rousseau turns us towards an education that is in accordance with nature and keeps our desires limited, but also prepares future citizens to fulfill their duties in the social contract. Plato turns us towards the direction of cultivating reason and spirit to control the passions, and gradually dispatching us from the limitations of the body in order to use our reason and contemplate the general meaning of ideas. Both philosophers value the importance of building a strong character and the capacity to make comparisons between things. By contemplating the meaning of their ideas and comparing their writings with each other, or comparing them to the present views on education, we develop a deeper understanding of the meaning of education by embracing or rejecting some of their arguments and creating ideas of our own.

Education today:

Plato's curriculum appears not that different from today's curriculum in theory; there is art in music, gymnastics, mathematics, and the science of astronomy that many schools include as well. But there is a difference in the purpose of each subject that makes the way of studying it distinctive. As with Socrates' critique with the sophists, even though there is common ground on their education, there is a small twist that makes a big difference. Socrates believes the true benefits of education are not visible, and each study should be geared towards the proper ordering of the soul. For example, gymnastics should train the intellect, while today people work out to be healthy and have a fitter body. Mathematics should be studied to begin thinking more abstractly by contemplating the nature of numbers, rather than solving practical problems to become good accountants, bankers etc. Socrates emphasizes the importance of having the right purpose in mind, even if it is not visible, and then practical benefits will come as a consequence.

Similarly, Rousseau claims that Emile should study physics, history, and the science of politics, but each study is geared towards learning the methods of learning rather than focusing on the content. Moreover, by studying man in history and the social sciences, Rousseau tries to cultivate sentiments that will make Emile a better citizen. Rousseau also brings out the importance of guiding students to learn from their mistakes, which is also a very modern belief.

Interestingly, Socrates' use of the noble lie and the myth of Er in his education lead men to learn these stories by heart in order to remember them. Thus, Socrates uses memorization in his education, a technique that is criticized by numerous educators today

as a wrong teaching method that encourages passive remembering rather than thinking. Socrates uses of it in the *Republic*, raises the question of whether memorization should keep a role in learning, as long as it is done with the right purpose in mind.

The *Republic* was relevant to Rousseau in the 18th century and remains relevant today, along with its companion, *Emile*. Rousseau and Plato raise important issues, such as how civic education can contribute to the state, how much freedom does the student actually have, what type of thinking is cultivated, and to what extent religion can also contribute in education and politics. It is clear that civic education is very important, and both Rousseau and Plato believe their students should be dedicated to the state. In fact, Rousseau trains Emile to become master of his heart, so if the time ever comes where he will have to give up everything to fulfill his duties as a citizen he will be ready. Socrates as well, claims that the guardians should not be concerned about their own happiness, but about the city's happiness as a whole and learn to act courageously in war. The question that remains is what is Emile, or Socrates' guardian trained to do if they are ever asked to sacrifice their life for the state? In both cases, Plato and Rousseau's philosophy trains them to overcome their fear of death and sacrifice themselves for benefit of the whole society. Can we claim that education today fosters the same dedication to one's country, or is Rousseau's initial claim that public education no longer exists true?

Bibliography

Robin Barrow. *Plato*. Continuum Library of Educational Thought; Continuum Library of Educational Thought. Vol. 9. London ; New York: Continuum, 2007.

Thomas Davidson. *Rousseau and Education According to Nature*. New York: AMS Press Inc., 1971.

Rousseau Emile and Cooper Laurence. *Human Nature and the Love of Wisdom: Rousseau's Hidden (and Modified) Platonism*. *The Journal of Politics* 64, no. 1 (2002): 108-125.

Ronald Gross. *The Teacher and the Taught; Education in Theory and Practice from Plato to James B. Conant*. New York: Dell Pub. Co., 1963.

Josué V. Harari. *Therapeutic Pedagogy: Rousseau's Emile*. *The Johns Hopkins University Press* 97, No. 4, (03/09/12)

McEwan Hunter. *A Portrait of the Teacher as Friend and Artist: The Example of Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 43, no. 5 (2011).

Adam James, *The Republic of Plato, Volume I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Adam James, *The Republic of Plato Volume II*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Rousseau Jean-Jacques. *The Basic Political Writings*. Translated by Cress Donald Hackett Publishing Company Inc., 1987.

Rousseau Jean-Jacques. *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings*, edited by Gourevitch Victor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Rousseau Jean-Jacques. *Emile, Or on Education*. Translated by Bloom Allan. New York: Basic Books, 1979.

Rousseau Jean-Jacques. *Letter to Beaumont, Letters Written from the Mountain, and Related Writings*. *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*; Vol. 9. Edited by Kelly Christopher, Bush Judith. University Press of New England, 1990.

Patricia M. Lines. "Shackling the Imagination: Education for Virtue in Plato and Rousseau " *National Humanities Institute* XXII, no. 1, 2 (2009): 40-68.

Christie McDonald and Stanley Hoffmann, *Rousseau and Freedom*. Cambridge, UK, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Richard Lewis Nettleship. *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic*. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

Oelkers Jurgen. *Jean-Jacque Rousseau, Continuum Library of Educational Thought Vol 13*, edited by Richard Bailey Continuum International Publishing Group, 2008.

Plato. *Five Dialogues*. Translated by Grube G.M.A. Second ed. Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc, 2002.

Plato. *The Republic*. Translated by Bloom Allan. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Jean-Jaques Rousseau. *The Plan for Perpetual Peace, on the Government of Poland, and Other Writings on History and Politics*. Translated by Kelly Christopher and Judith Bush, edited by Kelly Christopher. Dartmouth College Press, 2005.

David Lay Williams. *Rousseau's Platonic Enlightenment*. University Park, Pa: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007.