

Emile  
Jean Jacques Rousseau

It is surprising how blind we can be to the things we read until somebody points them out. I read Rousseau's Emile rather naïvely the first time. I should have paid attention to the introduction of book 1. His first sentence. "God makes all things good; man metals with them and they become evil."

From this it doesn't take much of extrapolation to infer that man is everybody Jean-Jacques Rousseau, messing things up. And another easy extrapolation is that Jean-Jacques Rousseau knows how to put things right, and he is instructing his TT, the epiphenomenon is a meal, and how to be a proper man.

In reading this book the first time I noticed that the children are always stood a level above the charity. The tsetse, the student, was never expected to achieve equality with the teacher, to argue with him as an equal, or to be free to go out on his own. I think this is probably a pretty good analogy of Locke's view object Back of Rousseau's view of the role of the state. The citizen is never mature enough to act on his own. He always needs adult supervision in the form of the Gulf government.

Locke starts with a fundamental misunderstanding of human nature. He starts out by saying that man must learn his places like a saddle horse, and be shaped to his master's taste like the Chinese in his garden. Yet things would be worse without this education, and man cannot be made by halves.

What Locke absolutely does not understand is that man is a social animal, a primate, one red one conditioned by evolution to live in society with fellow man and to learn how to behave in that society. Education in that sense is a natural part of our upbringing. The socialization process takes place among all primates and all peoples. The only thing that is unique to French people of Rousseau's day is the education in the in academic subjects, reading writing and mathematics, and the peculiar cultural manifestations of his day, such as dancing prancing music and so on.

But let us get this straight. Results starts off on a false premise, that of the state of nature, the idea that man is a noble Savage and we would be perhaps better off without existing in society. No. Mankind evolved within society and has always lived with him sign in the noble Savage, as we find him today, is very much a social creature. All the social creatures have their mechanisms for socializing the young.

Therefore there is nothing unusual, perverse, unnatural about in education. It is one young primates are subject to any tribe.

More politics. "The laws, always more concerned about property than people, since the object is not virtue but peace, the laws give to little authority to the mother." Rousseau repeats blocks notion of a blank slate at 1% we are born sensitive and from our birth onwards we are affected in various ways by our environment. He seems to be talking about the MMMS model, and leaving child's natural temperament and intellect out of the equation. Locke talks a great deal about natural temperament and intellect. Let us see what Rousseau does with that.

Here's a note that belongs at the beginning. Rousseau wrote a meal in 1762. This is 70 years after Locke wrote some thoughts on education. It is at the eve of the French Revolution, the time of the great philosophers in France, and a time of social form for social ferment. Correct that. It

is not on the eve of the French Revolution. It is 27 years before. Nonetheless, the great philosophers were active, and there was quite a bit of discussion about liberty and natural law, considering how they applied among other things to the American colonies.

Locke says that every child is educated by his three masters. The first is nature, his own physiological development over the years. The other two sources, the other two masters, are formal education first, and life's experience. Locke says that when these three work in harmony the product is a good education. When they are at cross purposes, there is confusion. Locke once again shows that he does not understand that man is a social animal. He says "the natural man lives for himself; he is the unit, the whole, dependent only on himself and on his like." Russo demonstrates his classical education, citing incidents from the Greeks and the Romans.

Speaking of the Spartans, he wants their self-sacrifice. Involves their dedication to the government, even their willingness to die for it. He wants the ancients for their patriotism, saying that the men of his age do not measure up to their standards.

Rousseau says that the objective of education is to create a man. Does not matter whether that man is a priest soldier Prof. worm what profession you for hours. The objective is to create a whole man. He says that this was the objective of education back in Grecian times. Walking herself says all his life long man is imprisoned by our institutions.

Results starts talking about education by talking about the confinement of infants by swaddling clothes. He says that this is for the convenience of the adults. Their mothers want to ignore them and get back to society, the nurses want to ignore them and simply be lazy. The children are all tied up in swaddling clothes and they can even be hung one things.

Rousseau speaks of women giving up their children, the foundlings, Birth were refusing to nurse them. He speaks of the widespread practice of using wet nurses. It was not at all fashionable for a woman to nurse her own baby. Rousseau talks about the upcoming depopulation of Europe. It is interesting that he was talking about this 2 ½ centuries ago. It has become a reality. Abortion and refusal to raise in France have in the read one reached widespread proportions. It is worth noting that 50 years after Rousseau, Napoleon lamented that there were that there were not enough soldiers, and encourage motherhood by all sorts of checks so they would be more young men from the Army.

Rousseau watches into polemic against wet nursing. He says the family in which the mother nurses the children is closer, there is no question of divided affections for either the child or the wetnurse. He goes on to say that the other children in the house will feel more affinity for one another. He describes a situation rather similar to Washington society today, in which there is a lot of outside activity, business and social, but not much common family life. Russo warns against coddling a child. He notes, correctly, that mothers have a tendency to be overprotective, and fathers to have excessive expectations for a child. He thinks that the child stands a better chance of surviving an overly protective mother, but that nonetheless this is a fault that must be addressed. Rousseau makes the correct observation that a child's worth increases through the years. The added value is socialization and education.

A child spends his first six or seven years in the company of women, Kabul and spoil him. After this, he is given to a charger. And I think I should pitch black background ((I have friends with

Jimmy back and couldn't find any pictures that I think I found the facts can't forget the MySpace page is at hand for just Is still Talks about anything... Anything from horizontal

3% of men who begets children scratch that

3% of the father has done but a third of his task when he begets children and provides a living for them. He owes man's inhumanity, citizens to the state. A man who can pay this threefold that and neglects to do so is guilty, more guilty, perhaps, if he pays it in part when he neglects it entirely.

Locke is ranting against parents giving up their duties as a mother to suckle their children and to be tendered to them, to minister to the needs, and the father to educate his children. He talks about the noble Romans, who taught at the most important thing in their life, despite their responsibilities as heads of state, to educate their children and grandchildren properly.

Some thoughts on reading Jean Jacques Rousseau's book a meal. Emile is the story of tutoring a boy into manhood, teaching him all the things that he needs to know. I first read it naïvely, assessing all of the things which Rousseau felt to be important for a boy's formation. I accepted Russo's catalog of all the things that were wrong with a traditional education. These include the stern discipline, the road exercises, and the subjects which are really of no real world use. Rousseau seduced me into believing that these evil old practices were something that indeed be avoided. He then goes into his description of what he will be doing for his ideal idealized to T., a meal. I have to say that my own intellect was not perceptive enough to see what was wrong with it, so I will say that I know a great deal to John Taylor got so for explaining what's wrong with it.

First of all, Rousseau's presence around this supposed child seems to be smothering. He is with child day and night. Moreover, each reach the child has the subject, never an equal. The presumption throughout is the Rousseau knows best how to raise the child, and recognizes the limits of what the child should be allowed to do. He recognizes the limits to which the child should be pampered, the limits to which the child should be allowed to experience pain, the limits to which the child should be allowed to argue with his tutor. Therefore, in every particular, Rousseau winds up reading the stronger party, the one with a mission appreciation of what it in education should consist out.

Of course no individual could be on missions, could know exactly what the child needs in the form of education. It is not a far leap to imagine that Russo speaks for the state and not for himself. We see that his ideas were incorporated by the leaders of the French Revolution and by other idealists who sought government taking over the role of this ideal educator. This is dangerous because no government anywhere has ever had perfect knowledge of what it subjects need. This was Plato was the first to examine this, in saying that the ideal form of government was by a philosopher king, but he did not hold out much hope that there should ever be such a philosopher king. Even if there ever were a philosopher king, one can be quite certain that said philosopher king would never be able to find perfect minions to the delegate the lesser functions such as educating children.

If we follow a meal to its logical end then, but we have this a supposedly benefits and state, all powerful, assuming the education of children ostensibly for their own improvement. But this ignores the nature of government. Governments do things for their own purposes, and civil servants do things for their own purposes as well, which do not necessarily coincide with the

interests of government. And therefore we have the model of compulsory schooling which refined throughout the West. We give the task of educating our children over to other people who are serving their own interests in serving the interests of government.

If we examine it, we find that the parents input is not solicited and not wanted. I countered this myself when I was a member of the school board for the school for twice children attended. They really did not want my opinion, they wanted the education of Mike Child left in the hands of professionals. Unfortunately Iraq we asked, and my children got the standard education. It served one of them poorly, the others had a quickly. For Edward I. want something else.

---

### Notes on rereading Emile

It is surprising how blind we can be to the things we read until somebody points them out. I read Rousseau's Emile rather naïvely the first time. I should have paid attention to the introduction of book 1. His first sentence. "God makes all things good; man metals with them and they become evil."

From this it doesn't take much of extrapolation to infer that man is everybody Jean-Jacques Rousseau, messing things up. And another easy extrapolation is that Jean-Jacques Rousseau knows how to put things right, and he is instructing his TT, the epiphenomenon is a meal, and how to be a proper man.

In reading this book the first time I noticed that the children are always stood a level above the charity. The tsetse, the student, was never expected to achieve equality with the teacher, to argue with him as an equal, or to be free to go out on his own. I think this is probably a pretty good analogy of Locke's view object Back of Rousseau's view of the role of the state. The citizen is never mature enough to act on his own. He always needs adult supervision in the form of the Gulf government.

Locke starts with a fundamental misunderstanding of human nature. He starts out by saying that man must learn his places like a saddle horse, and be shaped to his master's taste like the Chinese in his garden. Yet things would be worse without this education, and man cannot be made by halves.

What Locke absolutely does not understand is that man is a social animal, a primate, one red one conditioned by evolution to live in society with fellow man and to learn how to behave in that society. Education in that sense is a natural part of our upbringing. The socialization process takes place among all primates and all peoples. The only thing that is unique to French people of Rousseau's day is the education in the in academic subjects, reading writing and mathematics, and the peculiar cultural manifestations of his day, such as dancing prancing music and so on.

But let us get this straight. Results starts off on a false premise, that of the state of nature, the idea that man is a noble Savage and we would be perhaps better off without existing in society. No. Mankind evolved within society and has always lived with him sign in the noble Savage, as we find him today, is very much a social creature. All the social creatures have their mechanisms for socializing the young.

Therefore there is nothing unusual, perverse, unnatural about in education. It is one young primates are subject to any tribe.

More politics. "The laws, always more concerned about property than people, since the object is not virtue but peace, the laws give to little authority to the mother." Rousseau repeats blocks notion of a blank slate at 1% we are born sensitive and from our birth onwards we are affected in various ways by our environment. He seems to be talking about the MMMS model, and leaving child's natural temperament and intellect out of the equation. Locke talks a great deal about natural temperament and intellect. Let us see what Rousseau does with that. Here's a note that belongs at the beginning. Rousseau wrote a meal in 1762. This is 70 years after Locke wrote some thoughts on education. It is at the eve of the French Revolution, the time of the great philosophers in France, and a time of social form for social ferment. Correct that. It is not on the eve of the French Revolution. It is 27 years before. Nonetheless, the great philosophers were active, and there was quite a bit of discussion about liberty and natural law, considering how they applied among other things to the American colonies.

Locke says that every child is educated by his three masters. The first is nature, his own physiological development over the years. The other two sources, the other two masters, are formal education first, and life's experience. Locke says that when these three work in harmony the product is a good education. When they are at cross purposes, there is confusion. Locke once again shows that he does not understand that man is a social animal. He says "the natural man lives for himself; he is the unit, the whole, dependent only on himself and on his like." Russo demonstrates his classical education, citing incidents from the Greeks and the Romans.

Speaking of the Spartans, he wants there self-sacrifice. Involves their dedication to the government, even their willingness to die for it. He wants the ancients for their patriotism, saying that the men of his age do not measure up to their standards.

Rousseau says that the objective of education is to create a man. Does not matter whether that man is a priest soldier Prof. worm what profession you for hours. The objective is to create a whole man. He says that this was the objective of education back in Grecian times. Walking herself says all his life long man is imprisoned by our institutions.

Results starts talking about education by talking about the confinement of infants by swaddling clothes. He says that this is for the convenience of the adults. Their mothers want to ignore them and get back to society, the nurses want to ignore them and simply be lazy. The children are all tied up in swaddling clothes and they can even be hung one things.

Rousseau speaks of women giving up their children, the foundlings, Birth were refusing to nurse them. He speaks of the widespread practice of using wet nurses. It was not at all fashionable for a woman to nurse her own baby. Rousseau talks about the upcoming depopulation of Europe. It is interesting that he was talking about this 2 ½ centuries ago. It has become a reality. Abortion and refusal to raise in France have in the read one reached widespread proportions. It is worth noting that 50 years after Rousseau, Napoleon lamented that there were that there were not enough soldiers, and encourage motherhood by all sorts of checks so they would be more young men from the Army.

Rousseau watches into polemic against wet nursing. He says the family in which the mother nurses the children is closer, there is no question of divided affections for either the child or the wetnurse. He goes on to say that the other children in the house will feel more affinity for one

another. He describes a situation rather similar to Washington society today, in which there is a lot of outside activity, business and social, but not much common family life. Russo warns against cobbling a child. He notes, correctly, that mothers have a tendency to be overprotective, and fathers to have excessive expectations for a child. He thinks that the child stands a better chance of surviving an overly protective mother, but that nonetheless this is a fault that must be addressed. Rousseau makes the correct observation that a child's worth increases through the years. The added value is socialization and education.

A child spends his first six or seven years in the company of women, Kabul and spoil him. After this, he is given to a charger. And I think I should pitch black background ((I have friends with Jimmy back and couldn't find any pictures that I think I found the facts can't forget the MySpace page is at hand for just Is still Talks about anything... Anything from horizontal

3% of men who begets children scratch that

3% of the father has done but a third of his task when he begets children and provides a living for them. He owes man's inhumanity, citizens to the state. A man who can pay this threefold that and neglects to do so is guilty, more guilty, perhaps, if he pays it in part when he neglects it entirely.

Locke is ranting against parents giving up their duties as a mother to suckle their children and to be tendered to them, to minister to the needs, and the father to educate his children. He talks about the noble Romans, who taught at the most important thing in their life, despite their responsibilities as heads of state, to educate their children and grandchildren properly.

---

Russo talks about the difficulty of finding a tutor. He says, rather quixotic Lee, that the children should not work for money. This begs the question, who is it that works but not for money? He says it should not be a hireling. This would mean they could be only the child's father, who would do it out of love and devotion, or perhaps a very special encore cousin. In any case, the qualifications for extruder rather like Plato's qualifications for a philosopher king. They will not be easily found. This begs the question of why you would bother. Reserve use the resource they said he is talking about setting up an ideal tutor for a child. The tutor should be a young man. In fact he believes that the tutor can probably handle only one child in a lifetime. It should be a chore of 25 years, starting before the child is born. Tutor should ideally be the child's father. In fact, who else would stay with the child for 25 years? Especially without compensation? The relationship which Russo describes between the tutor and the seats he is quarrying. They must remain together until the end. There is no provision made for different people having different geniuses. There is no provision made for the extravagance of having a tutor who has no other job than teaching the one child. And there is no provision made for the child learning on his own, without the tutor. The tutor has nothing else to do, he will be far too present in the child's life. It is fairly clear that Russo did not have experience as a tutor. This is an intellectual exercise. It is far too expensive ever to be undertaken in real life, and like most utopian notions, would not succeed if it were attempted. Imagine finding a person rich enough to engage such a tutor. Would he give up his parental rights, as Rousseau would have them do? One doubts that, if he is paying the tab. Russo is quite open with his prejudices in favor of Frenchmen who were someway adds and Africans, even in the matter of intellect. He is also refreshingly honest about caring for an invalid, saying that it is awful loss – the invalid will never contribute anything and the tutor's time is wasted. Locke rails against the medical profession. He says that it keeps people alive in the sense that they are only breathing, but they are of no use themselves or anybody else. Moreover, for every person cured there are 100 dying, and the doctors take

successfully take credit for the cures. What displays a similar prejudice against the rich. They are cheated on all sides by the people who serve them, and everything is-year-old done for them except what they do themselves, and they do next to nothing.

Russo gives advice on choosing a wet nurse. He would assume that they not be done at all, but if you use one, the one whose baby was born at the same time as the foster child, she is a healthy woman, and the countrywoman who doesn't need too much meat. Russo speaks about the beauties of country living for raising children. He says that people are watching the crowded cities. He advises the country way of raising children. Don't swallow, don't confine them, that use training wrote teach them how to walk, and don't force them to walk or to speak to really. He observes that all adults are able to walk and talk. When it come naturally. He contends that the practice of swallowing children tightly exists to help lazy nurses, you don't have to chase them around and not have to change them often.

5%, Russo advances the theory of knowledge, a kind of an empty sleep theory. He says that people have to learn how their bodies are connected and so on. He does not give credit for the innate knowledge, and the wiring that takes place in utero. In the womb. Russo advises that the child be exposed to natural things such as thunder, crayfish, whatever they come across without absorbing the prejudices of their elders, either by filtering what they are exposed to, or by giving them a precondition reaction.

Rousseau advocates satisfy a child's real needs, but denying his fancied needs. He expresses the thought that a child can easily be a tyrant is his every need is satisfied. A parent has to say no to him.

Russo has a quaint theory that there is a common knowledge for all mankind, that of children. He neglects to note that children cannot use it to communicate with one another. It is not a language whatsoever, merely passes.

He correctly observes that they communicate via the expression and gesture, and that their faces are very expressive. This they have in common with their primate ancestors.

Prolonged crying was neither small nor out of health, by a child who lacks nothing, is merely the result of habit or obstinacy. These tears are no longer the work of nature but the work of the child's nurse could not resist its importunity and so has increased at without considering that while she requires the child today she is teaching him to cry louder tomorrow.

Russo has a theory of language acquisition. He makes some good observations about the way children learn, but he has no idea of an innate need natural language such as has been hypothesized by Noam Chomsky.

Always praising nature, he praises the presence for not having speech impediments and knowing how to speak loudly or softly when the occasion warrants. For being sure of themselves. I think that this is idealization.

At 8% "him, the child is out of infancy.

When the child hurts himself a little bit, falls down, bumps his head, don't make any special fuss over him. The child has to learn that he is just one among many, and that his role is to grow up and be a man, that he will not be passed over all of his life.

He notes that fewer than half of all children born attain adulthood, and very few attain old age. He asks the question, why shouldn't children simply be happy, source of life is so short? Why should they be eternally in preparation for an adults with them may never happen? He says that it is a cruel education which stems the man, forces them to spend all diet presented tasks. This goes back to Rousseau's notion that the child's education should be natural. He says it someplace that he would never teach the child verbally, but let him learn by words.

This is a forerunner of the lab school approach. Which is nice in theory, but doesn't work.

Doesn't work because the teachers always thought the children whatever the setting. It is a natural thing to do. It is unnatural also because not all children's curiosity drives them to learn the things that one would expect them to learn in an established course of education.

Unfortunately, or rather, the way the world is, there's certain specified topics that it showed child needs to follow and learn.

As an aside, Rousseau discourses on the nature of happiness. He says that he who suffers least is the most happy. The most miserable as he enjoys least. Happiness is a negative state, it is the situation when the fewest things are wrong.

He says that happiness is the situation when one's wants and ones abilities are matched. Person is unhappy, whatever his state in life, with his wants greatly exceed his ability to satisfy them.

In here on the subject of wants, there is a reference virtue to the noble Savage, whose wants are few but who is happy. And Rousseau says that the French had extensive contact with Indians in North America. I do not see how he could have made these observations, or borrow them secondhand, from travelers in the Americas. The American Indians are not a picture of a happy bunch of people. They are a stolid bunch, constantly at war with one another. Rousseau goes into another rant against doctors, saying that although they save a few, this is more than offset by the millions whom they kill. You are better off living without them, accepting what may. Rousseau goes on the ballot social organization, saying that the happiest man is the man who is self-sufficient. He does not depend on others. This would be absolutely the opposite of what Adam Smith would say. We are wealthy because we do depend on one another, we support one another. Rousseau is thinking of her articles social organizations, Adam Smith was thinking about the organization of society in which each of us does something of use to the others.

Rousseau says "society has enfeebled man, not merely by robbing further increase get this right "society has enfeebled man not merely by robbing him of the right to his own strength, but still more by making his strength insufficient for his needs. That is why his desires increase in proportion to his weakness; this is why the child is stronger than the man." Rousseau advises to keep the child dependent on things only. We are unreasonable wishes be met with physical obstacles only, or the punishment which results from his own actions.

Rousseau speaks against the empty courtesies of the court, in which I beg really means I command.

12%

Rousseau is enamored of the country life. He wants to have a meal brought up in the country, using country ways. There are number of reasons for this. Emile will sleep on a hard bed. He will eat simple food. He will get up early in the morning. The devices he is exposed to will be country vices, so crude that they are not at all attractive.

Russo sees the child as a savage. In fact, he glorifies savages. He compares the Savage to the peasant. The savages cunning, wise to the ways of the world, able to get along in the forest. He sees the present as being trapped by society, the ways of his father's.

It is interesting the period in which Russo lived. The French had considerable contact with Native Americans in Québec. Russo was romanticizing the Indians. The French at this time probably also had some contact with Islanders in Tahiti, and may have already been in Indochina. But the savages of whom he speaks are most likely North American Indians. Perhaps also Africans, although France had little to do with colonization in sub-Saharan Africa.

Russo goes into a few more rants against doctors. Even when it comes to smallpox, he would not have a meal vaccinated, even though he is aware that smallpox is quite certainly fatal when one is not vaccinated. Russo himself admits to presenting a number of paradoxes. He is being rather cute with some of them.

He tells an anecdote about a child who plants a garden, only to have it torn up by a peasant who it turns out own the land where he planted it. He makes an important point that the child will value something he has contributed to himself. That would be the garden. The child is not value things that are given to him.

Russo contends that children lie in order to escape the burdens that are laid upon them by adults. Their low lying as a means of escape. If we do not lay burdens on them, they will have no need. This I doubt.

It takes lot to task for attempting to teach a child generosity by example. He says the children are not naturally generous, and that teaching them to put your money into the collection box is teaching them nothing.

Russo does not understand the nature of man as a social animal. He does not understand that we should are socialized by contact with our fellow beings, and that we are born predisposed to become social animals. We are born predisposed to seek court recognition, to deceive one another, and so on. Russo falsely attributes these characteristics to our socialization. No, they are in innate.

Russo speculates on observing signs of genius in a child. He says that those signs are often misread. He goes on to say that unpromising children sometimes grow up to be quite accomplished adults, and vice versa.

Russo contends that children give the appearance of having learned things when they do not deeply understand them. A child may understand and be able to repeat the words, but does not have enough life's experience to understand the meaning. His advice is not to teach the children such material in the first place. I think that is misguided. I think the children will grow into the material, and I do not believe that not understanding something fully means that they do not get something out of it.

Russo takes the position, rather assumes the posture, that a child should not learn languages until the age of 12 or 15. He contends that no one truly commands a second language, always thinking in his first however he may speak in other languages. Russo was Swiss; he should have been in a good position to observe. However, this does not seem consistent with my own experience.

From what we know of learning language, it generally works better in earlier years. Children who grow up learning two languages early in life speak them both quite well. This would be the Swiss, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Danes for example. I disagree with Russo's position, and I think it is hyperbole.

This is at 15 percent.

He makes the same argument about geography. He contends that it is useless to study maps, because a child does not understand the relationship between a map in the real world. Here I strongly disagree. The child needs to learn to work with symbolic representations of reality. Words, numbers, and maps are all symbolic representations of some physical reality. The whole left side of our brain is involved with symbolic manipulation.

Russo gives an anecdote about Alexander the great, and how a 12-year-old kid expected praise for reciting an account of Alexander's bravery, when Russo's more mature take on the matter is that it was a demonstration of other of Alexander's qualities. Again, I think Russo is wrong. The child will learn, and will refine his judgment as he gets older. Better to build the judgment bit by bit.

Russo says that a meal will not learn anything by heart. He will not learn by rote. Again, he says the children are unable to understand the full meaning of something like the tales of La Fontaine., I say, so what.

Russo likewise rejects teaching aids such as the dice that John Locke recommended. He says that education should come only from natural sources, such as daily experience.

Locke says that the child should not necessarily learn how to read until he feels a need for it, which may come at the age of 12 or so. Once again, he did not have an intuitive knowledge of how the brain develops. The child needs to develop abstract manipulation skills, language and arithmetic, at an earlier age. Moreover, children have an interest in reading at an earlier age. This is at 17 percent.

Here is the quote I mentioned earlier "speaking generally, there is nothing dollar than a peasant or sharper than a savage."

Russo advocates the use of the body. On this I agree. He quotes a number of classic authors to say the same thing. A sound mind in a sound body.

Here at 18 percent, he gives an anecdote about his own encounter with a willful child whose mother let him get away with anything.

Russo advises simple clothes, with bright colors. Along with John Locke, he advises not over addressing the child. Let him be called at times. He advises a hard bed.

The section on smallpox is here at 20 percent. He advises against inoculation.

Russo advises teaching a child how to swim. It is free and useful. This is in contrast to horsemanship, which is not essential and is expensive.

He has a long passage on the dark. Teaching a child not to be afraid of the dark, and sharpening his senses so he can move around at night without a light. He speaks of overcoming fear.

22 percent. This is a stop.

Rousseau speaks of the value of running, not as cardiovascular exercise, but simply in the general sense of movement. He talks about the trick he employed to get a lazy boy to run, staging false competitions.

He advises the virtues of letting a kid run around barefoot. It is part of toughening him up, and it is also building his sense of touch.

Russo goes again into the teaching of geometry, asking a child to estimate distances. This is a big and recurring theme. The child should learn how to reason about the world about him. He connects this with the theme of drawing, which is another of his hobbyhorses. The child should learn how to draw in some perspective.

24 percent

Russo starts on music by advising that a child learn how to sing simple tunes. He should learn them by heart. There is no problem with this. He then goes on a riff about how the French handle music, the difference between the solfage and the scale, majors and minors, sharps and flats. This is quite a ways from quite a child is going to be interested in learning at first.

Next topic is food. Once again, Russo believes that the simplest is best. Fruits, bread, milk. Russo believes that the taste for meat is unnatural.