

Irina Manokha

Jean-Jacques Rousseau and his ideas in the spectrum of the pressing challenges of our time: to the postulates of modern psychological and pedagogical interaction

Problemy Wczesnej Edukacji/Issues in Early Education 11/2(29), 44-52

2015

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Irina Manokha

East European Institute of Psychology, Kiev, Ukraine
manokha@ukr.net

Jean-Jacques Rousseau and his ideas in the spectrum of the pressing challenges of our time: to the postulates of modern psychological and pedagogical interaction

Summary

The personality and creativity of Jean-Jacques Rousseau are multifaceted, sometimes difficult to structure and observe in modern humanistic theorizations, although the *idea of a special social function of personal sovereignty* and the *idea of history as a meaningful synthesis of historical facts* have not lost their relevance today, if we find the necessary range of review and ways of implementation. Another example – the *idea of education as a system, which should be the very nature* – the nature of the pupil, the “nature-loving” educator, and the natural educational process itself. If we consider the idea of following the natural pupil so as to create conditions for detection, disclosure, and facilitating the full deployment of the individual capacities of the pupil, this idea is at least highly relevant. This is an aspect of the modern psychological, pedagogical, and even – political – mainstream, the focus of what is most concerned about contemporary human society and its various institutions. If we consider that the idea of naturalness facilitates the educational process as a way of bringing it closer to some “maieutic” ideal – it is also one of the centrifugal issues of modern pedagogy and educational affairs in general, the question – how to make the process – non-violent, opening prospects, and not prevent them from forming the ability to independently explore the world and find ways of acting effectively in it. If we treat the idea of the “nature-loving” educator as subtly and carefully acting in relation to any of the manifestations of the pupil, thereby unleashing the potential of the tutor, is not this the way to pre-empt all types of “burn up” (both professional, and emotional) for the modern educator in the broad sense of the word – “sculptor of human souls”? In this article with the elements of an essay – the proposal is to make a fascinating excursion, full of unexpected discoveries into the world of Rousseau.

Keywords: philosophizing, theorizing, explanatory model of social world, social function, personal sovereignty, a meaningful synthesis of the historical facts, “natural” nature of education, the freedom of choice – as elements of the philosophy of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, postulates of modern psychological and educational interaction.

Introduction

The system of philosophical views of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, as well as its historical identity in general retain the attention of philosophers, sociologists, psychologists, and educators. The historical experience of the era of Rousseau – again relevant and in demand,

as the socio-historical situation of his time actually resonates with today. The issue of the role of “personal experience” in the system of social transformations and the history of the whole, question of the superiority of “the progress of ideas” on the historical relevance of the “historical, past experience”, the problems of modern education in the context of the urgent requests of the day – all of these issues and problems are without a doubt relevant today. Some of them are even acutely relevant.

On the other hand, the personality of Rousseau – a man and a philosopher, who lived a philistine life, has created an unusual system of philosophical views, “tried and tested”, difficult, and full of a variety of conflicts of individual experience of the philosopher himself, is also of great historical-psychological and historical-critical interest.

Following the philosophy of Rousseau we are aware that we surrender involuntarily to the logic of his questions and perspective, as if “picking up”, and continuing his reasoning. Either as the author, or instead of the author... What was first? Or who was the primary? Man or society? Personal ability to understand, or socially imposed limitations?

Depart from society or remain in it, but certainly in an activity rather than in passivity as a single entity – this is the issue that is being solved all the time, but it cannot be solved fully. But most importantly – man should try to understand and feel the World – open to be revealed, loved, warmed, enriched with self, and then – one can start looking for “oneself”.

It seems that Rousseau acted in different periods of his life as a waiter, home tutor, domestic secretary, “secular savage”, “trendy man”, lexicographer, philosopher. In “Discovering Life” the human “I” ought to make an effort to focus on issues that are not marked with words. As ordinarily suitable for poetry and how it distorts its essence to the detriment of the actual substance, society in its universality can dissolve and absorb the individual – its individuality, personality, and unique world.

Let us take one of the attempts to synthesize individual views in a series of Rousseau postulates for modern psychological and pedagogical interaction.

Postulate 1. Man – there is a possibility of Progress, without which there is no History; The life (Personal History) of Man – there is improvement (Progress)

The philosophizing realm, defined as a realm of the aggregate social intelligence suggests one of its functions, the content of the ideal reflection (expected, intended, desired) on life and, on the other hand – the real (existing, really unfolding directly, continuous) existence. The realm of history (in general) and policies (in particular) in the system of its components (ideological, cultural and historical, real and practical, and others.) minimized the present continuum of the basic principles and conceptual ideas of Rousseau’s time, because philosophizing about the cultural and historical realm of policy (for example – in its expression in the phenomenon of “political culture”) is always a philosophizing about time, about the history of the person in two dimensions and layers: ideal (sometimes – irrational, potentially possible) and real (real, actual).

Understanding history, following Rousseau, as a meaningful synthesis of historical facts – causes several issues and research questions to be updated: who is doing the most “historical synthesis”, and also – who (or what) makes the event (or – its possibility) a historical fact? And again, in front of us – the problem of “Man and Society”, transformed into “Man and History.” On the other hand – the problem of “actual and potential”, “actual and potential”, “given freely and unfolding.”

According to Rousseau, the philosophy of history “is only possible with the help of human progress and progressive development.” The cause of the progress lies in the innate human capacity for improvement (fr. – *perfectibilité*), the pursuit of excellence and perfection. Thus, the person is not less than history. It is not easy. History arises and exists thanks to him – Man. Although, as the author, along with a truly perfect facts “improvement” can be seen through his “negative quantities.”

Perfection – none other than the progressive actualization of potential traits and characteristics, converting potential into actual – possible into reality. “Improve” only that which in fact already exists. A currant cannot be improved into a blueberry “or “a crocus into a narcissus”, namely: “existing” one to the “non-existent”. Consequently, the progress – towards the “currently, the potential” turns into “reality.”

Progress, given continuing Rousseau search “engine of history”, subservient only man, therefore, without it – history is not realized in fact, neither the mechanism of updating and deployment. Why is man, in spite of its “historical objectivity greatness”, so “suffering” and “dependent”? The answer of Rousseau, whose life was the most philosophizing (as thinking and reasoning about life in an effort to “define it”) is not less paradoxical: the problem of man is in his ability to think – “thinking is an unnatural state, reflecting the fact that man is a depraved animal» (fr. – *animal dépravé*).

However, man creates the possibility of progress, without which there is no history.

Postulate 2. The social function of Personal Sovereignty is the capacity for Free Choice

Ruggedness easily satisfies the modern era – whenever the “essence of the matter is at stake.” P-aradoxically, our era shows more accuracy and more superficiality than any other. It pampered people – people a burden to it. This is – the words and the result is the idea of another famous Frenchman – *Paul Valery. Be afraid of the ordinary, try to avoid it, because you can lose the ability to choose to be “I”.*

The real life of an individual is a continuum of certain feelings and emotions, which in their purpose and social status do not determine the designations, or finally set the direction of emotional and sensuous “coloration”, but stipulate it, nonetheless. Alienation Concerns Need to be careful, to the avoidance of Intention – signs of human social life, seeking inwardly to “enjoy the freedom.” Is it possible to choose between these two poles of the harmonious and inharmonious, the calcitonin and non-calcitonin essences of human existence?

There is a choice: reality or a myth – the question of the eternal and imperishable high status both in relation to social problems of free will, and in relation to the individual, the person acquires and directly implements the ability “to be or not to be free,” “do or not to do the will.

Discover the essence of the phenomena of “freedom” and “free choice”, in relation to what the present day person is told about in the first place: the freedom of action. The question is about the boundaries of the feasibility of the manifestations of freedom – physical, physiological, mental, spiritual, and others. So Benedict Spinoza mentioned the parable “about falling rocks”: if a falling stone were conscious, it might think that it falls freely – on its own. An even greater illusion of free will would strongly throw up a stone – it would seem that it overcomes the laws of nature. Freedom of action is a practical, “technical” problem. With respect to the human being it (the external and not all-encompassing expression of the problem of free will as a spiritual problem) is deeply psychological.

In the psychological content of the problem, we often talk about freedom of choice, recognizing that the issue of freedom of choice is the much more complicated issue of freedom of action. In it the question is not about bringing faith into action, but on the internal borders of the will. Can the human will choose between motives, or is she (will) only the registrar, driving the strongest motive? Direct experience shows that a person is able to choose between motives only if they are of approximately equal strength (because in the case of apparently disparate forces, choice is made automatically – in fact, even if there is no choice but to follow a direct motive). But if victory is achieved through the addition of a new, third, motive, our “I” cannot remain a passive spectator of the struggle of motives or abandon temporarily the solution.

Is it psychologically true that selection is accompanied by a sense of freedom? Quite the contrary: the most painful thing is having to choose, and the greater the choice of items, the more intense is the psychological feeling of freedom. Often, a person chooses what is not the best, just to put an end, finally, to the need to choose, and be freed from the “freedom of choice”.

Much easier to transfer the making of the right choice to society, someone else (a stranger), traditions, conventions, or habits. It is much easier to take something known, well-established, already-existing, rather than worry about suffering the sense of insecurity and uncertainty (emptiness, “suspense” non-rooted) brought on by searching. If we are talking about situations, not just the evaluation, recognition or non-recognition of something, consent or non-consent to something or someone, and situations of self-design and the creation of values (their lives), style (one’s own behaviour and acting), image or personification being (their own, individual, unique individual), one’s reason often agrees with the stereotype, a cliché, “tracing paper being” rather than solved by an independent search. Is it easier to delegate its functions self-defining and self-determining actor to someone (or something) – a social institution to popular belief, social “background”?

Here it is important to consider another form of identification of the phenomenon of free will – freedom of intent (the will – according to S.A. Levitsky). Choice is essentially

free, because non-freedom of choice destroys the notion of choice. So, the problem is not whether there is freedom of choice, and whether there is freedom of intent, the will, which determines the choice. The problem is not the issue of freedom of choice of the actual moral and ethical issue – namely, having the context of socio-priced (accepted or rejected by) the fact manifestations of life or status of the person (citizen, artist, certain social functions, etc.). For ontologism the problem is, how a person is able and willing to carry out, implement, implement its essential ability – the ability to be free and to choose.

For a man, “who goes back to being” the essence of his own being, naturally has to be in society, and to be out of it, because it is impossible to ignore the objective reality of society and its environment, and on the other hand – as it is impossible to realize his full humanity, while not understanding and overcoming all the “limits” of its essence-free deployment.

Is there in Rousseau’s thinking any thoughts about the idea of freedom of choice of a particular social function of personal sovereignty and if so, where is its place? ”The answer, in fact, is simple: only one who has the sovereignty of the “other” in relation to “other” makes the choice, and only if he finds the social system of coordinates in which the “choice is possible”...

Postulate 3. “Natural” education is a way to the “potential “Self” of the Person”

Human nature determines personality only in the dimension of the potential of its formation: that is individualized developmental tendencies. But the question of which of these tendencies will be brought to fruition will be decided upon depending on the further development of the personality, the nature of the “material” in which the character of an individual is manifested and sculpted, and on the presence of a conscious force that influences the manifestation of nature in a certain direction of development. One can speak of the specific nature of philosophical foundations of personality which are the focal point of an informed process of constructing the personality, focused on the goal, through experiencing one’s life.

On the question of the nature of education, we are talking not only about the possibility of education in general, but also about whether a man can be free while he is in the process of deploying the essence of his being. One view denies the possibility of character education, pointing to his natural conditioning and tasks on which “split” all “ideological” effects – proper upbringing – the part of the individual. Thus it becomes inevitable to deny individual freedom “I”: the individual in his bid to complete certain objectives powerless in the natural manifestations of his psycho-physical nature, is fully committed to the independent power of his forces, and everything in his life is determined not by the rules, not the future goals, and previous sequence of causes and effects. According to this position, the individual personality, as such, becomes impossible, is not responsible for the logic of life and the essence of the human mode of existence itself, the leading feature of which is the ability to self-improvement.

The strength of character of a person is manifested primarily in that the individual must have the ability to confront situations in combat: contradictions should have the spirit of initiative, prevention, resilience, courage, etc. For the direction of this ability, common sense is needed together with reason, and persistent moral principles. Actions that an individual performs, are the result of manifestations of his character and, at the same time, the character is formed and developed in the moral, purposeful action with respect to the phenomena of the world and his own "I". It is also important to remember that the nature of the individual is not the sum of individual inclinations, abilities, and other elements – it is alive, connected inseparable unity and common internal principle – a one spirit personality.

The true meaning of the personal "I" appears in the unique, individual implementation of its own existence, the deployment of the essential relationship with the world, the development of the value of the property deeds in the world. The personal manifestation of the individual is the cultural and historical content as playing a certain spiritual and effective stage in the history of human existence. Identity and culture are inextricably linked, but the culture in its quintessence cannot be reconciled with the production of hopeless, false experiences of knowledge and action. Man, is a person and a subject capable of meaningful and significant transformations of the phenomena of the world; he appears as an absolute value that has individualized and specific historical, cultural, and historical significance. Just as a person, a person discovers his dignity to be the bearer of the human mode of existence itself, to face the world actively, able to change and influence the subject, to be a self-contained unit, an end in itself, "immediate self-existence" (SL Frank). In person, regardless of the scale of its self-manifestation and self-activity always lies the inexhaustible possibility of generating a new force for creating a culture, and hence – New Stories and New Progress.

Genius and the "mere mortals" are both values, and though no matter how great the distance between them, the first will never replace the second, and the existence of the first will never deny the relevance of the existence of the other. Culture needs both creative personalities and also those who can see and appreciate creative individuals and their creations. Regardless of the dimension of their individual influence, each of these groups is a unique cultural and historical value.

And again: culture provides only a certain inherent road which is implemented in a personalized way. And Rousseau travelled along one of these roads, and lived through it in his own way – Life as Philosophizing: creative, personalizing, and over the elapsing centuries, still constantly finding a certain "I" – among others by the multiple reconstruction, and even negation of the author by reflective readers of his works and achievements.

Conclusions

Summing up this short reflection on the relevance of the views and ideas of Jean-Jacques Rousseau to modern humanistic knowledge in general, and in psychology and pedagogy in particular, it is important to summarize the following postulates:

1 – Postulate “Man – is the possibility of Progress, without which there is no History; The Life (Personal History) of Man – there is improvement (Progress)” may be considered in the context of understanding the individual person’s life as his “personal history”, the “principle of progress” becomes the main explanatory principle for understanding the logic of individual development. Each stage of ontogenesis, or sociogenesis, or culturogenesis should be viewed as “progress” – the addition of an increment, multiplication (from the previous step). In modern psychology, we can find a similar parallel postulate (“zone of proximal development”, theory of mental structures, etc.), but the main essence of this postulate – in the “progressivity” of each subsequent stage of human development, is the one of man’s ability to function.

In pedagogy and education this postulate could be the basis for the “progressive-oriented” technology pedagogical influence, when the whole process of education or training is built as a series of stages of the purchase of new, “progressive” qualities, knowledge, skills, and capabilities.

2 – Postulate “The social function of Personal Sovereignty is the ability to Free Choice” can be reconstructed into a principle that explains how to form “individual sovereignty” and anticipate the divine man in a state of “subjective anonymity” when a person loses the ability to interact subjectively with the world, behaviour and acting. A key mechanism here (as, in fact, one of the results) – is the ability to implement “free choice” in social interaction, as well as in the context of intrapersonal conditioning and his or her behaviour.

This point refers to the prospect of possible promises being more effective as a psychological and pedagogical influence on the process of forming personality, and in situations of interaction with a mature personality.

3 – Postulate “Natural” education is a way to “the potential “Self” of the Person” allows us to update the idea of Rousseau’s “natural education”, and on the other hand – makes it possible to point out the “naturalness” of the deployment of the personality in the process of developing its own capacity, updating its “Self”.

This postulate fundamentally changes the psychological principles of personality research in the development process, as well as the understanding of how to implement a formative influence in this process.

For pedagogy – it can be a radical change of approaches to “how to educate and train”: 1 – to create conditions and help the actualization of the identity of individual capacities, or 2 – to invest and build on something of their own, but alien to the nature of still a young personality and individuality.

Trying to use these postulates in modern psychological and pedagogical interaction will be an updating of the historical experience of Rousseau and – modernization of the modern experience too.

References

1. Adolphe A. (1884), *Souvenirs d'un musicien – Calmann Lévy*.

2. Cassirer E. (1945), *Rousseau, Kant, Goethe*. Princeton University Press.
3. Kitsikis D. (2006), *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et les origines françaises du fascisme*. Nantes, Ars Magna Editions.
4. Асмус В.Ф. (1962), *Жан Жак Руссо*. М., Знание.
5. Букер И. *Свобода и фантазии Жан-Жака Руссо*. // "Правда". ru, 28.06.2012.
6. Валери Поль. *Избранные произведения*. – М., 1996.
7. Верцман И.Е. (1958), *Жан-Жак Руссо*. М.
8. Дворцов А.Т. (1980), *Жан Жак Руссо*. М., Наука.
9. Длугач Т.Б. (2006), *Три портрета эпохи Просвещения. Монтескье. Волтер. Руссо (от концепции просвещенного абсолютизма к теориям гражданского общества)*. М.
10. Занадворова Т.Л. (1983), *Сентиментализм Ж.-Ж. Руссо*. Челябинск.
11. Занин С.В. (2007), *Общественный идеал Жан-Жака Руссо и французское Просвещение XVIII века*. СПб., Мирь.
12. Златопольская А.А. (2005), *Ж.-Ж. Руссо: Pro et Contra*. М.
13. Лотман Ю.М. (1967), *Руссо и русская литература XVIII в., в кн.: Эпоха Просвещения*. Л.
14. Манфред А. З. (1974), *Молодой Руссо*. "Новая и новейшая история", № 4–5.
15. Маноха И.П. (1995), *Человек и потенциал его бытия*. К.
16. Маноха И.П. (2001), *Психология потаённого «Я»*. К.
17. Морлей Д. (2012), *Руссо. Пер. с англ.* 2-е изд. М.
18. Рассел Б. (2004), *История западной философии*. М.
19. Роланд-Гольст Г. (1923), *Жан Жак Руссо: его жизнь и сочинения*. М.
20. Роменець В.А. (1998, 2001), *Маноха И.П. История психологии XX столетия*. К.
21. Руссо Жан-Жак (1988), *Диалоги: Руссо судит Жан Жака*. – *Избранные произведения*. М.
22. Руссо Жан-Жак (1988), *Исповедь*. – *Избранные произведения*. М.
23. Руссо Жан-Жак (1988), *Нарцисс*. – *Избранные произведения*. М.
24. Руссо Жан-Жак (1988), *Об общественном договоре*. – *Избранные произведения*. М.
25. Руссо Жан-Жак (1988), *Прогулки одинокого мечтателя*. – *Избранные произведения*. М.
26. Руссо Жан-Жак (1988), *Рассуждение о науках и искусствах*. – *Избранные произведения*. М.
27. Руссо Жан-Жак (1988), *Рассуждение о начале и основании неравенства между людьми*. – *Избранные произведения*. М.
28. Руссо Жан-Жак (1976), *Эмиль, или о воспитании*. К.
29. Руссо Жан-Жак (1988), *Юлия, или Новая Элоиза*. – *Избранные произведения*. М.
30. Сиволап И.И. *Ж.-Ж. Руссо в советской литературе. 1917–1976 гг. (к 200-летию со дня смерти)*. "Французский ежегодник" 1976. – М., 1978. – С. 247—257.
31. Фейхтвангер Лион (1988), *Мудрость чудака, или Смерть и преображение Жан-Жака Руссо*. М.
32. Франк С. (1989), *Непостижимое*. М.

Transliteration

4. Asmus V.F. (1962), *Zhan Zhak Russo*. М., Znanie.
5. Buker I. (2012), *Svoboda i fantazii Zhan-Zhaka Russo*. "Pravda". ru, 28.06.2012.
6. Valeri Pol' (1996), *Izbrannye proizvedenija*. М.
7. Verzman I.E. (1958), *Zhan-Zhak Russo*. М.

8. Dvorcov A.T. (1980), *Zhan Zhak Russo*. M., Nauka.
9. Dlugach T.B. (2006), *Tri portreta jepohi Prosveshhenija. Montesk'e. Volter. Russo (ot koncepcii prosveshhennogo absoljutzizma k teorijam grazhdanskogo obshhestva)*. M.
10. Znadvorova T.L. (1983). *Sentimentalizm Zh.-Zh. Russo*. Cheljabinsk.
11. Zanin S.V. (2007), *Obshhestvennyj ideal Zhan-Zhaka Russo i francuzskoe Prosveshhenie XVIII veka*. SPb., Mir#.
12. Zlatopol'skaja A.A. (2005), *Zh.-Zh. Russo: Pro et Contra*. M.
13. Lotman Ju. (1967), *M. Russo i russkaja literatura XVIII v., v kn.: Jepoha Prosveshhenija*. L.
14. Manfred A. 3. (1974), *Molodoj Russo*. „Novaja i novejšhaja istorija”, № 4–5.
15. Manoha I.P. (1995), *Chelovek i potencial ego bytija*. K.
16. Manoha I.P. (2001), *Psihologija potaemnogo «Ja»*. K.
17. Morlej D. (2012), *Russo. Per. s angl.* 2-e izd. M.
18. Rassel B. (2004), *Istorija zapadnoj filosofii*. M.
19. Roland-Gol'st G. (1923), *Zhan Zhak Russo: ego zhizn' i sochinenija*. M.
20. Romeneč V.A., Manoha I.P. (1998, 2001), *Istorija psihologii XXI stolittja*. K.
21. Russo Zhan-Zhak. (1988), *Dialogi: Russo sudit Zhan Zhaka*. – *Izbrannye proizvedenija*. M.
22. Russo Zhan-Zhak (1988), *Ispoved'*. – *Izbrannye proizvedenija*. M.
23. Russo Zhan-Zhak (1988), *Narciss*. – *Izbrannye proizvedenija*. M.
24. Russo Zhan-Zhak (1988), *Ob obshhestvennom dogovore*. – *Izbrannye proizvedenija*. M.
25. Russo Zhan-Zhak (1988), *Progulki odinokogo mechtatelja*. – *Izbrannye proizvedenija*. M.
26. Russo Zhan-Zhak (1988), *Rassuzhdenie o naukah i iskusstvah*. – *Izbrannye proizvedenija*. M.
27. Russo Zhan-Zhak (1988), *Rassuzhdenie o nachale i osnovanii neravenstva mezhdju ljud'mi*. – *Izbrannye proizvedenija*. M.
28. Russo Zhan-Zhak (1976), *Jemil', ili o vospitanii*. K.
29. Russo Zhan-Zhak (1988), *Julija, ili Novaja Jeloiza*. – *Izbrannye proizvedenija*. M.
30. Sivolap I.I. *Zh.-Zh. Russo v sovetskoj literature. 1917–1976 gg. (k 200-letiju so dnja smerti)*. “Francuzskij ezhegodnik” 1976. – M., 1978. – S. 247–257.
31. Fejhtvanger Lion (1988), *Mudrost' chudaka, ili Smert' i preobrazhenie Zhan-Zhaka Russo*. M.
32. Frank S. (1989), *Nepostizhimoe*. M.