

**Chapter 1 : Classical Carousel: Tears, Idle Tears by Alfred Lord Tennyson**

*The Pursuit of Laziness: An Idle Interpretation of the Enlightenment Chapter 3 The Great Project of an Idle Life: Rousseau Pierre Saint-Amand, Jennifer Curtiss Gage.*

Biography Youth Rousseau was born in Geneva , which was at the time a city-state and a Protestant associate of the Swiss Confederacy. Since , Geneva had been a Huguenot republic and the seat of Calvinism. Five generations before Rousseau, his ancestor Didier, a bookseller who may have published Protestant tracts, had escaped persecution from French Catholics by fleeing to Geneva in where he became a wine merchant. The citizens were a minority of the population when compared to the immigrants referred to as "inhabitants" whose descendants were called "natives" and continued to lack suffrage. In fact, rather than be run by vote of the "citizens" the city was ruled by a small number of wealthy families that made up the "Council of Two Hundred", these delegated their power to a twenty-five member executive group from among them called the "Little Council". There was much political debate within Geneva, extending down to the tradespeople. Much discussion was over the idea of the sovereignty of the people, which the ruling class oligarchy was making a mockery of. In , a democratic reformer named Pierre Fatio protested at this situation, saying "A sovereign that never performs an act of sovereignty is an imaginary being. Isaac followed his grandfather, father and brothers into the business, except for a short stint teaching dance as a dance master. After local officials stepped in it was Isaac who was punished, as Geneva was concerned with maintaining its ties to foreign powers. Vincent Sarrasin whom she fancied despite his continuing marriage. After a hearing she was ordered by the Consistory to never interact with him again. Later the young Rousseau was told a romantic fairy-tale about the situation by the adults in his family a tale where young love was denied by a disapproving patriarch but that prevailed by sibling loyalty that, in the story, resulted in love conquering all and two marriages uniting the families on the same day. Rousseau never learnt the truth. Sometimes, in the morning, on hearing the swallows at our window, my father, quite ashamed of this weakness, would cry, "Come, come, let us go to bed; I am more a child than thou art. Throughout his life he would recall one scene where after the volunteer militia had finished its maneuvers they began to dance around a fountain and most of the people from neighboring buildings came out to join them, including him and his father. Rousseau would always see militias as the embodiment of popular spirit in opposition to the armies of the rulers whom he saw as disgraceful mercenaries. He remarried, and from that point Jean-Jacques saw little of him. Here the boys picked up the elements of mathematics and drawing. Rousseau, who was always deeply moved by religious services, for a time even dreamed of becoming a Protestant minister. At age 13, Rousseau was apprenticed first to a notary and then to an engraver who beat him. At 15, he ran away from Geneva on 14 March after returning to the city and finding the city gates locked due to the curfew. She was a noblewoman of Protestant background who was separated from her husband. As professional lay proselytizer, she was paid by the King of Piedmont to help bring Protestants to Catholicism. They sent the boy to Turin , the capital of Savoy which included Piedmont, in what is now Italy , to complete his conversion. This resulted in his having to give up his Genevan citizenship, although he would later revert to Calvinism in order to regain it. Adulthood Finding himself on his own, since his father and uncle had more or less disowned him, the teenage Rousseau supported himself for a time as a servant, secretary, and tutor, wandering in Italy Piedmont and Savoy and France. During this time, he lived on and off with De Warens, whom he idolized and called his "maman". Flattered by his devotion, De Warens tried to get him started in a profession, and arranged formal music lessons for him. At one point, he briefly attended a seminary with the idea of becoming a priest. When Rousseau reached 20, De Warens took him as her lover, while intimate also with the steward of her house. A rather profligate spender, she had a large library and loved to entertain and listen to music. She and her circle, comprising educated members of the Catholic clergy, introduced Rousseau to the world of letters and ideas. Rousseau had been an indifferent student, but during his 20s, which were marked by long bouts of hypochondria , he applied himself in earnest to the study of philosophy, mathematics, and music. At 25, he came into a small inheritance from his mother and used a portion of it to repay De Warens for her financial support of him. At 27, he took a

job as a tutor in Lyon. His system, intended to be compatible with typography, is based on a single line, displaying numbers representing intervals between notes and dots and commas indicating rhythmic values. Believing the system was impractical, the Academy rejected it, though they praised his mastery of the subject, and urged him to try again. From 1749 to 1754, Rousseau had an honorable but ill-paying post as a secretary to the Comte de Montaigu, the French ambassador to Venice. This awoke in him a lifelong love for Italian music, particularly opera: I had brought with me from Paris the prejudice of that city against Italian music; but I had also received from nature a sensibility and niceness of distinction which prejudice cannot withstand. I soon contracted that passion for Italian music with which it inspires all those who are capable of feeling its excellence. In listening to barcaroles, I found I had not yet known what singing was. The risk of the education of the foundling hospital was much less. When Rousseau subsequently became celebrated as a theorist of education and child-rearing, his abandonment of his children was used by his critics, including Voltaire and Edmund Burke, as the basis for ad hominem attacks. In 1755, Rousseau was paying daily visits to Diderot, who had been thrown into the fortress of Vincennes under a lettre de cachet for opinions in his "Lettre sur les aveugles", that hinted at materialism, a belief in atoms, and natural selection. He wrote that while walking to Vincennes about three miles from Paris, he had a revelation that the arts and sciences were responsible for the moral degeneration of mankind, who were basically good by nature. According to Diderot, writing much later, Rousseau had originally intended to answer this in the conventional way, but his discussions with Diderot convinced him to propose the paradoxical negative answer that catapulted him into the public eye. Rousseau continued his interest in music. The king was so pleased by the work that he offered Rousseau a lifelong pension. Rousseau as noted above, was an enthusiastic supporter of the Italians against Jean-Philippe Rameau and others, making an important contribution with his Letter on French Music. Return to Geneva On returning to Geneva in 1755, Rousseau reconverted to Calvinism and regained his official Genevan citizenship. In 1756, Rousseau completed his second major work, the Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality Among Men the Discourse on Inequality, which elaborated on the arguments of the Discourse on the Arts and Sciences. Diderot later described Rousseau as being, "false, vain as Satan, ungrateful, cruel, hypocritical, and wicked He sucked ideas from me, used them himself, and then affected to despise me". During this period Rousseau enjoyed the support and patronage of the Duc de Luxembourg, and the Prince de Conti, two of the richest and most powerful nobles in France. These men truly liked Rousseau and enjoyed his ability to converse on any subject, but they also used him as a way of getting back at Louis XV and the political faction surrounding his mistress, Mme de Pompadour. Even with them, however, Rousseau went too far, courting rejection when he criticized the practice of tax farming, in which some of them engaged. Even his friend Antoine-Jacques Roustan felt impelled to write a polite rebuttal of the chapter on Civil Religion in the Social Contract, which implied that the concept of a Christian Republic was paradoxical since Christianity taught submission rather than participation in public affairs. Rousseau even helped Roustan find a publisher for the rebuttal. Because it rejected original sin and divine Revelation, both Protestant and Catholic authorities took offense. This religious indifferentism caused Rousseau and his books to be banned from France and Geneva. He was condemned from the pulpit by the Archbishop of Paris, his books were burned, and warrants were issued for his arrest. The liberty of the press is not so secured in any country His powerful protectors discreetly assisted him in his flight, and they helped to get his banned books published in Holland by Marc-Michel Rey distributed in France disguised as other works, using false covers and title pages. Isolated, Rousseau, never very emotionally stable, suffered a serious decline in his mental health and began to experience paranoid fantasies about plots against him involving Hume and others. France Although officially barred from entering France before 1764, Rousseau returned in 1765 under a false name. Though she was illiterate, she had become a remarkably good cook, a hobby her husband shared. In 1766 they were allowed to return to Paris. As a condition of his return he was not allowed to publish any books, but after completing his Confessions, Rousseau began private readings in 1769. All his subsequent works were to appear posthumously. In 1771, Rousseau was invited to present recommendations for a new constitution for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, resulting in the Considerations on the Government of Poland, which was to be his last major political work. In 1772, he completed Dialogues: In order to support himself, he returned to copying music, spending his leisure time in the study of

botany. Final years Although Rousseau was a celebrity, his mental health did not permit him to enjoy his fame. His final years were largely spent in deliberate withdrawal. However, he did respond favorably to an approach from the composer Gluck, whom he met in 1771. Gluck admired Rousseau as "a pioneer of the expressive natural style" in music. Rousseau was initially buried at Ermenonville on the Ile des Peupliers, which became a place of pilgrimage for his many admirers. From how many crimes, wars, and murders, from how many horrors and misfortunes might not any one have saved mankind, by pulling up the stakes, or filling up the ditch, and crying to his fellows: Beware of listening to this impostor; you are undone if you once forget that the fruits of the earth belong to us all, and the earth itself to nobody. Rousseau criticized Hobbes for asserting that since man in the "state of nature. On the contrary, Rousseau holds that "uncorrupted morals" prevail in the "state of nature" and he especially praised the admirable moderation of the Caribbeans in expressing the sexual urge [19] despite the fact that they live in a hot climate, which "always seems to inflame the passions". The more one reflects on it, the more one finds that this state was the least subject to upheavals and the best for man, and that he must have left it only by virtue of some fatal chance happening that, for the common good, ought never to have happened. The example of savages, almost all of whom have been found in this state, seems to confirm that the human race had been made to remain in it always; that this state is the veritable youth of the world; and that all the subsequent progress has been in appearance so many steps toward the perfection of the individual, and in fact toward the decay of the species. Rousseau held that this third savage stage of human societal development was an optimum, between the extreme of the state of brute animals and animal-like "ape-men" on the one hand, and the extreme of decadent civilized life on the other. These were sentiments shared with animals, and whose existence even Hobbes acknowledged. Humans "in a state of Nature" may act with all of the ferocity of an animal. They are good only in a negative sense, insofar as they are self-sufficient and thus not subject to the vices of political society. Rousseau, a deteriorationist, proposed that, except perhaps for brief moments of balance, at or near its inception, when a relative equality among men prevailed, human civilization has always been artificial, creating inequality, envy, and unnatural desires. Amour de soi represents the instinctive human desire for self-preservation, combined with the human power of reason. In contrast, amour-propre is artificial and encourages man to compare himself to others, thus creating unwarranted fear and allowing men to take pleasure in the pain or weakness of others. Rousseau was not the first to make this distinction. It had been invoked by Vauvenargues, among others. In Discourse on the Arts and Sciences Rousseau argues that the arts and sciences have not been beneficial to humankind, because they arose not from authentic human needs but rather as a result of pride and vanity. Moreover, the opportunities they create for idleness and luxury have contributed to the corruption of man. He proposed that the progress of knowledge had made governments more powerful and had crushed individual liberty; and he concluded that material progress had actually undermined the possibility of true friendship by replacing it with jealousy, fear, and suspicion. In contrast to the optimistic view of other Enlightenment figures, for Rousseau, progress has been inimical to the well-being of humanity, that is, unless it can be counteracted by the cultivation of civic morality and duty. Only in civil society, can man be ennobled through the use of reason:

Chapter 2 : Jean Jacques Rousseau (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

*Project MUSE promotes the creation and dissemination of essential humanities and social science resources through collaboration with libraries, publishers, and scholars worldwide. Forged from a partnership between a university press and a library, Project MUSE is a trusted part of the academic and scholarly community it serves.*

Rousseau left the city at the age of sixteen and came under the influence of a Roman Catholic convert noblewoman, Francoise-Louise de la Tour, Baronne de Warens. Rousseau spent some time working as a domestic servant in a noble household in Turin, and during this time a shameful episode occurred in which he falsely accused a fellow servant of the theft of a ribbon. This act marked him deeply and he returns to it in his autobiographical works. Rousseau then spent a brief period training to become a Catholic priest before embarking on another brief career as an itinerant musician, music copyist and teacher. Rousseau remained with Mme de Warens through the rest of the 1720s, moving to Lyon in 1729 to take up a position as a tutor. In 1733 he travelled to Paris, having devised a plan for a new numerically-based system of musical notation which he presented to the Academy of Sciences. The system was rejected by the Academy, but in this period Rousseau met Denis Diderot. In 1734, while walking to Vincennes to visit the briefly-imprisoned Diderot, Rousseau came across a newspaper announcement of an essay competition organized by the Academy of Dijon. The Academy sought submissions on the theme of whether the development of the arts and sciences had improved or corrupted public morals. Rousseau later claimed that he then and there experienced an epiphany which included the thought, central to his world view, that humankind is good by nature but is corrupted by society. Rousseau entered his Discourse on the Sciences and Arts conventionally known as the First Discourse for the competition and won first prize with his contrarian thesis that social development, including of the arts and sciences, is corrosive of both civic virtue and individual moral character. The Discourse was published in 1750 and is mainly important because Rousseau used it to introduce themes that he then developed further in his later work, especially the natural virtue of the ordinary person and the moral corruption fostered by the urge to distinction and excellence. The First Discourse made Rousseau famous and provoked a series of responses to which he in turn replied. The first of these was his opera *Le Devin du Village* *The Village Soothsayer*, which was an immediate success and stayed in the repertoire for a century. Rousseau, who had already developed a taste for Italian music during his stay in Venice, joined the dispute through his *Letter on French Music* and the controversy also informed his unpublished *Essay on the Origin of Languages*. Rousseau went so far as to declare the French language inherently unmusical, a view apparently contradicted by his own practice in *Le Devin*. In 1755 he regained this citizenship by reconverting to Calvinism. In the following year he published his *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*, again in response to an essay competition from the Academy of Dijon. *Julie* appeared in 1759 and was an immediate success. The novel is centred on a love triangle between Julie, her tutor Saint Preux and her husband Wolmar. Unfortunately for Rousseau, the publication of these works led to personal catastrophe. *Emile* was condemned in Paris and both *Emile* and *The Social Contract* were condemned in Geneva on grounds of religious heterodoxy. Partly in response to this, Rousseau finally renounced his Genevan citizenship in May 1762. Rousseau was forced to flee to escape arrest, seeking refuge first in Switzerland and later, in January 1766, at the invitation of David Hume, travelling to England. He spent fourteen months in Staffordshire where he worked on his autobiographical work, the *Confessions*, which also contains evidence of his paranoia in its treatment of figures like Diderot and the German author Friedrich Melchior, Baron von Grimm. He returned to France in 1767 and then spent much of the rest of his life working on autobiographical texts, completing the *Confessions* but also composing the *Dialogues*: He also completed his *Considerations on the Government of Poland* in this period. In later life he further developed his interest in botany where his work proved influential in England via his letters on the subject to the Duchess of Portland and in music, as he met and corresponded with the operatic composer Christoph Gluck. Rousseau died in 1778. Conjectural history and moral psychology Rousseau repeatedly claims that a single idea is at the centre of his world view, namely, that human beings are good by nature but are rendered corrupt by society. Unfortunately, despite the alleged centrality of this claim, it is difficult to give it a clear and plausible interpretation. One obvious problem is

present from the start: In various places Rousseau clearly states that morality is not a natural feature of human life, so in whatever sense it is that human beings are good by nature, it is not the moral sense that the casual reader would ordinarily assume. Rousseau attributes to all creatures an instinctual drive towards self-preservation. Human beings therefore have such a drive, which he terms *amour de soi* self love. *Amour de soi* directs us first to attend to our most basic biological needs for things like food, shelter and warmth. Since, for Rousseau, humans, like other creatures, are part of the design of a benevolent creator, they are individually well-equipped with the means to satisfy their natural needs. In the *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality* Rousseau imagines a multi-stage evolution of humanity from the most primitive condition to something like a modern complex society. Rousseau denies that this is a reconstruction of history as it actually was, and Frederick Neuhouser has argued that the evolutionary story is merely a philosophical device designed to separate the natural and the artificial elements of our psychology. The human race barely subsists in this condition, chance meetings between proto-humans are the occasions for copulation and reproduction, child-care is minimal and brief in duration. If humans are naturally good at this stage of human evolution, their goodness is merely a negative and amounts to the absence of evil. In this story, human beings are distinguished from the other creatures with which they share the primeval world only by two characteristics: Freedom, in this context, is simply the ability not to be governed solely by appetite; perfectibility is the capacity to learn and thereby to find new and better means to satisfy needs. Together, these characteristics give humans the potential to achieve self-consciousness, rationality, and morality. Nevertheless, it will turn out that such characteristics are more likely to condemn them to a social world of deception, dissimulation, dependence, oppression, and domination. As human populations grow, simple but unstable forms of co-operation evolve around activities like hunting. According to Rousseau, the central transitional moment in human history occurs at a stage of society marked by small settled communities. At this point a change, or rather a split, takes place in the natural drive humans have to care for themselves: In *Emile*, where Rousseau is concerned with the psychological development of an individual in a modern society, he also associates the genesis of *amour propre* with sexual competition and the moment, puberty, when the male adolescent starts to think of himself as a sexual being with rivals for the favours of girls and women. *Amour propre* makes a central interest of each human being the need to be recognized by others as having value and to be treated with respect. The presentation of *amour propre* in the *Second Discourse* and especially in his note XV to that work often suggests that Rousseau sees it as a wholly negative passion and the source of all evil. Interpretations of *amour propre* centered on the *Second Discourse* which, historically, are the most common ones for example Charvet, often focus on the fact that the need for recognition always has a comparative aspect, so that individuals are not content merely that others acknowledge their value, but also seek to be esteemed as superior to them. This aspect of our nature then creates conflict as people try to exact this recognition from others or react with anger and resentment when it is denied to them. More recent readings of both the *Second Discourse*, and especially of *Emile*, have indicated that a more nuanced view is possible Den, Neuhouser This project of containing and harnessing *amour propre* finds expression in both *The Social Contract* and *Emile*. In some works, such as the *Second Discourse*, Rousseau presents *amour propre* as a passion that is quite distinct from *amour de soi*. In others, including *Emile*, he presents it as a form that *amour de soi* takes in a social environment. The latter is consistent with his view in *Emile* that all the passions are outgrowths or developments of *amour de soi*. Although *amour propre* has its origins in sexual competition and comparison within small societies, it does not achieve its full toxicity until it is combined with a growth in material interdependence among human beings. In the *Discourse on Inequality*, Rousseau traces the growth of agriculture and metallurgy and the first establishment of private property, together with the emergence of inequality between those who own land and those who do not. In an unequal society, human beings who need both the social good of recognition and such material goods as food, warmth, etc. Subordinates need superiors in order to have access to the means of life; superiors need subordinates to work for them and also to give them the recognition they crave. In such a structure there is a clear incentive for people to misrepresent their true beliefs and desires in order to attain their ends. Thus, even those who receive the apparent love and adulation of their inferiors cannot thereby find satisfaction for their *amour propre*. Once people have achieved

consciousness of themselves as social beings, morality also becomes possible and this relies on the further faculty of conscience. It is, to that extent, akin to a moral sentiment such as Humean sympathy. But as something that is merely instinctual it lacks, for Rousseau, a genuinely moral quality. Genuine morality, on the other hand, consists in the application of reason to human affairs and conduct. This requires the mental faculty that is the source of genuinely moral motivation, namely conscience. Conscience impels us to the love of justice and morality in a quasi-aesthetic manner. However, in a world dominated by inflamed amour propre, the normal pattern is not for a morality of reason to supplement or supplant our natural proto-moral sympathies. For recent discussion of Rousseau on conscience and reason, see Neidleman, , ch. So, for example, theatre audiences derive enjoyment from the eliciting of their natural compassion by a tragic scene on the stage; then, convinced of their natural goodness, they are freed to act viciously outside the theater. Philosophy, too, can serve as a resource for self-deception. However, many of his other works, both major and minor, contain passages that amplify or illuminate the political ideas in those works. This idea finds its most detailed treatment in *The Social Contract*. In *The Social Contract*, Rousseau sets out to answer what he takes to be the fundamental question of politics, the reconciliation of the freedom of the individual with the authority of the state. This reconciliation is necessary because human society has evolved to a point where individuals can no longer supply their needs through their own unaided efforts, but rather must depend on the co-operation of others. The process whereby human needs expand and interdependence deepens is set out in the *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*. In the *Second Discourse*, this establishment amounts to the reinforcement of unequal and exploitative social relations that are now backed by law and state power. In an echo of Locke and an anticipation of Marx, Rousseau argues that this state would, in effect, be a class state, guided by the common interest of the rich and propertied and imposing unfreedom and subordination on the poor and weak. The propertiless consent to such an establishment because their immediate fear of a Hobbesian state of war leads them to fail to attend to the ways in which the new state will systematically disadvantage them. *The Social Contract* aims to set out an alternative to this dystopia, an alternative in which, Rousseau claims, each person will enjoy the protection of the common force whilst remaining as free as they were in the state of nature. The key to this reconciliation is the idea of the general will: The general will is the source of law and is willed by each and every citizen. In obeying the law each citizen is thus subject to his or her own will, and consequently, according to Rousseau, remains free. On such a reading, Rousseau may be committed to something like an a posteriori philosophical anarchism. Such a view holds that it is possible, in principle, for a state to exercise legitimate authority over its citizens, but all actual states—and indeed all states that we are likely to see in the modern era—will fail to meet the conditions for legitimacy. Rousseau argues that in order for the general will to be truly general it must come from all and apply to all. This thought has both substantive and formal aspects. Formally, Rousseau argues that the law must be general in application and universal in scope. The law cannot name particular individuals and it must apply to everyone within the state. Rousseau believes that this condition will lead citizens, though guided by a consideration of what is in their own private interest, to favor laws that both secure the common interest impartially and that are not burdensome and intrusive. For this to be true, however, it has to be the case that the situation of citizens is substantially similar to one another. In a state where citizens enjoy a wide diversity of lifestyles and occupations, or where there is a great deal of cultural diversity, or where there is a high degree of economic inequality, it will not generally be the case that the impact of the laws will be the same for everyone. In such cases it will often not be true that a citizen can occupy the standpoint of the general will merely by imagining the impact of general and universal laws on his or her own case. First, individuals all have private wills corresponding to their own selfish interests as natural individuals; second, each individual, insofar as he or she identifies with the collective as a whole and assumes the identity of citizen, wills the general will of that collective as his or her own, setting aside selfish interest in favor of a set of laws that allow all to coexist under conditions of equal freedom; third, and very problematically, a person can identify with the corporate will of a subset of the populace as a whole. The general will is therefore both a property of the collective and a result of its deliberations, and a property of the individual insofar as the individual identifies as a member of the collective. In a well-ordered society, there is no tension between private and general will, as individuals accept

that both justice and their individual self-interest require their submission to a law which safeguards their freedom by protecting them from the private violence and personal domination that would otherwise hold sway.

**Chapter 3 : Rousseau, Jean-Jacques | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy**

*\*Prices in US\$ apply to orders placed in the Americas only. Prices in GBP apply to orders placed in Great Britain only. Prices in €, represent the retail prices valid in Germany (unless otherwise indicated).*

In this case, all the springs of the State are vigorous and simple and its rules clear and luminous; there are no embroilments or conflicts of interests; the common good is everywhere clearly apparent, and only good sense is needed to perceive it. Peace, unity and equality are the enemies of political subtleties. Men who are upright and simple are difficult to deceive because of their simplicity; lures and ingenious pretexts fail to impose upon them, and they are not even subtle enough to be dupes. When, among the happiest people in the world, bands of peasants are seen regulating affairs of State under an oak, and always acting wisely, can we help scorning the ingenious methods of other nations, which make themselves illustrious and wretched with so much art and mystery? A State so governed needs very few laws; and, as it becomes necessary to issue new ones, the necessity is universally seen. The first man to propose them merely says what all have already felt, and there is no question of factions or intrigues or eloquence in order to secure the passage into law of what every one has already decided to do, as soon as he is sure that the rest will act with him. Theorists are led into error because, seeing only States that have been from the beginning wrongly constituted, they are struck by the impossibility of applying such a policy to them. They make great game of all the absurdities a clever rascal or an insinuating speaker might get the people of Paris or London to believe. They do not know that Cromwell would have been put to "the bells" by the people of Berne, and the Duc de Beaufort on the treadmill by the Genevese. But when the social bond begins to be relaxed and the State to grow weak, when particular interests begin to make themselves felt and the smaller societies to exercise an influence over the larger, the common interest changes and finds opponents: Finally, when the State, on the eve of ruin, maintains only a vain, illusory and formal existence, when in every heart the social bond is broken, and the meanest interest brazenly lays hold of the sacred name of "public good," the general will becomes mute: Does it follow from this that the general will is exterminated or corrupted? Each man, in detaching his interest from the common interest, sees clearly that he cannot entirely separate them; but his share in the public mishaps seems to him negligible beside the exclusive good he aims at making his own. Apart from this particular good, he wills the general good in his own interest, as strongly as any one else. Even in selling his vote for money, he does not extinguish in himself the general will, but only eludes it. The fault he commits is that of changing the state of the question, and answering something different from what he is asked. Instead of saying, by his vote, "It is to the advantage of the State," he says, "It is of advantage to this or that man or party that this or that view should prevail. I could here set down many reflections on the simple right of voting in every act of Sovereignty" a right which no one can take from the citizens" and also on the right of stating views, making proposals, dividing and discussing, which the government is always most careful to leave solely to its members, but this important subject would need a treatise to itself, and it is impossible to say everything in a single work. VOTING IT may be seen, from the last chapter, that the way in which general business is managed may give a clear enough indication of the actual state of morals and the health of the body politic. The more concert reigns in the assemblies, that is, the nearer opinion approaches unanimity, the greater is the dominance of the general will. On the other hand, long debates, dissensions and tumult proclaim the ascendancy of particular interests and the decline of the State. This seems less clear when two or more orders enter into the constitution, as patricians and plebeians did at Rome; for quarrels between these two orders often disturbed the comitia, even in the best days of the Republic. But the exception is rather apparent than real; for then, through the defect that is inherent in the body politic, there were, so to speak, two States in one, and what is not true of the two together is true of either separately. Indeed, even in the most stormy times, the plebiscita of the people, when the Senate did not interfere with them, always went through quietly and by large majorities. The citizens having but one interest, the people had but a single will. At the other extremity of the circle, unanimity recurs; this is the case when the citizens, having fallen into servitude, have lost both liberty and will. Fear and flattery then change votes into acclamation; deliberation ceases, and only worship or malediction is left. Such was the vile manner in which

the senate expressed its views under the Emperors. It did so sometimes with absurd precautions. Tacitus observes that, under Otho, the senators, while they heaped curses on Vitellius, contrived at the same time to make a deafening noise, in order that, should he ever become their master, he might not know what each of them had said. On these various considerations depend the rules by which the methods of counting votes and comparing opinions should be regulated, according as the general will is more or less easy to discover, and the State more or less in its decline. There is but one law which, from its nature, needs unanimous consent. This is the social compact; for civil association is the most voluntary of all acts. Every man being born free and his own master, no one, under any pretext whatsoever, can make any man subject without his consent. To decide that the son of a slave is born a slave is to decide that he is not born a man. If then there are opponents when the social compact is made, their opposition does not invalidate the contract, but merely prevents them from being included in it. They are foreigners among citizens. When the State is instituted, residence constitutes consent; to dwell within its territory is to submit to the Sovereign. This follows from the contract itself. But it is asked how a man can be both free and forced to conform to wills that are not his own. How are the opponents at once free and subject to laws they have not agreed to? I retort that the question is wrongly put. The citizen gives his consent to all the laws, including those which are passed in spite of his opposition, and even those which punish him when he dares to break any of them. The constant will of all the members of the State is the general will; by virtue of it they are citizens and free. Each man, in giving his vote, states his opinion on that point; and the general will is found by counting votes. When therefore the opinion that is contrary to my own prevails, this proves neither more nor less than that I was mistaken, and that what I thought to be the general will was not so. If my particular opinion had carried the day I should have achieved the opposite of what was my will; and it is in that case that I should not have been free. This presupposes, indeed, that all the qualities of the general will still reside in the majority: In my earlier demonstration of how particular wills are substituted for the general will in public deliberation, I have adequately pointed out the practicable methods of avoiding this abuse; and I shall have more to say of them later on. I have also given the principles for determining the proportional number of votes for declaring that will. A difference of one vote destroys equality; a single opponent destroys unanimity; but between equality and unanimity, there are several grades of unequal division, at each of which this proportion may be fixed in accordance with the condition and the needs of the body politic. There are two general rules that may serve to regulate this relation. First, the more grave and important the questions discussed, the nearer should the opinion that is to prevail approach unanimity. Secondly, the more the matter in hand calls for speed, the smaller the prescribed difference in the numbers of votes may be allowed to become: The first of these two rules seems more in harmony with the laws, and the second with practical affairs. In any case, it is the combination of them that gives the best proportions for determining the majority necessary. Both have been employed in various republics, and a highly complicated mixture of the two still survives in the election of the Doge at Venice. If we bear in mind that the election of rulers is a function of government, and not of Sovereignty, we shall see why the lot is the method more natural to democracy, in which the administration is better in proportion as the number of its acts is small. In every real democracy, magistracy is not an advantage, but a burdensome charge which cannot justly be imposed on one individual rather than another. The law alone can lay the charge on him on whom the lot falls. For, the conditions being then the same for all, and the choice not depending on any human will, there is no particular application to alter the universality of the law. In an aristocracy, the prince chooses the prince, the government is preserved by itself, and voting is rightly ordered. The instance of the election of the Doge of Venice confirms, instead of destroying, this distinction; the mixed form suits a mixed government. For it is an error to take the government of Venice for a real aristocracy. If the people has no share in the government, the nobility is itself the people. A host of poor Barnabotes never gets near any magistracy, and its nobility consists merely in the empty title of Excellency, and in the right to sit in the Great Council. As this Great Council is as numerous as our General Council at Geneva, its illustrious members have no more privileges than our plain citizens. It is indisputable that, apart from the extreme disparity between the two republics, the bourgeoisie of Geneva is exactly equivalent to the patriciate of Venice; our natives and inhabitants correspond to the townsmen and the people of Venice; our peasants correspond to the subjects on the mainland; and, however

that republic be regarded, if its size be left out of account, its government is no more aristocratic than our own. The whole difference is that, having no life-ruler, we do not, like Venice, need to use the lot. Election by lot would have few disadvantages in a real democracy, in which, as equality would everywhere exist in morals and talents as well as in principles and fortunes, it would become almost a matter of indifference who was chosen. But I have already said that a real democracy is only an ideal. When choice and lot are combined, positions that require special talents, such as military posts, should be filled by the former; the latter does for cases, such as judicial offices, in which good sense, justice, and integrity are enough, because in a State that is well constituted, these qualities are common to all the citizens. Neither lot nor vote has any place in monarchical government. The monarch being by right sole prince and only magistrate, the choice of his lieutenants belongs to none but him. I should now speak of the methods of giving and counting opinions in the assembly of the people; but perhaps an account of this aspect of the Roman constitution will more forcibly illustrate all the rules I could lay down. It is worth the while of a judicious reader to follow in some detail the working of public and private affairs in a Council consisting of two hundred thousand men. Experience teaches us every day what causes lead to the revolutions of empires; but, as no new peoples are now formed, we have almost nothing beyond conjecture to go upon in explaining how they were created. The customs we find established show at least that these customs had an origin. The traditions that go back to those origins, that have the greatest authorities behind them, and that are confirmed by the strongest proofs, should pass for the most certain. These are the rules I have tried to follow in inquiring how the freest and most powerful people on earth exercised its supreme power. After the foundation of Rome, the new-born republic, that is, the army of its founder, composed of Albans, Sabines and foreigners, was divided into three classes, which, from this division, took the name of tribes.

**Chapter 4 : Great European of the Week: Jean-Jacques Rousseau - Project for Democratic Union (PDU)**

[3] *The Great Project of an Idle Life Rousseau (pp. [51]-[75]) Idleness is one of the contradictory figures that weave through Rousseau's works.*

His mother died only a few days later on July 7, and his only sibling, an older brother, ran away from home when Rousseau was still a child. Rousseau was therefore brought up mainly by his father, a clockmaker, with whom at an early age he read ancient Greek and Roman literature such as the Lives of Plutarch. His father got into a quarrel with a French captain, and at the risk of imprisonment, left Geneva for the rest of his life. Rousseau stayed behind and was cared for by an uncle who sent him along with his cousin to study in the village of Bovey. In 1722, Rousseau was apprenticed to an engraver and began to learn the trade. Although he did not detest the work, he thought his master to be violent and tyrannical. He therefore left Geneva in 1728, and fled to Annecy. Here he met Louise de Warens, who was instrumental in his conversion to Catholicism, which forced him to forfeit his Genevan citizenship in he would make a return to Geneva and publicly convert back to Calvinism. During this time he earned money through secretarial, teaching, and musical jobs. In 1733, Rousseau went to Paris to become a musician and composer. After two years spent serving a post at the French Embassy in Venice, he returned in 1735 and met a linen-maid named Therese Levasseur, who would become his lifelong companion they eventually married in 1735. They had five children together, all of whom were left at the Paris orphanage. It was also during this time that Rousseau became friendly with the philosophers Condillac and Diderot. The work was widely read and was controversial. But Rousseau attempted to live a modest life despite his fame, and after the success of his opera, he promptly gave up composing music. In the autumn of 1750, Rousseau submitted an entry to another essay contest announced by the Academy of Dijon. Rousseau himself thought this work to be superior to the First Discourse because the Second Discourse was significantly longer and more philosophically daring. The judges were irritated by its length as well its bold and unorthodox philosophical claims; they never finished reading it. However, Rousseau had already arranged to have it published elsewhere and like the First Discourse, it also was also widely read and discussed. In 1755, a year after the publication of the Second Discourse, Rousseau and Therese Levasseur left Paris after being invited to a house in the country by Mme. In 1756, after repeated quarrels with Mme. It was during this time that Rousseau wrote some of his most important works. In 1759 he published a novel, *Julie or the New Heloise*, which was one of the best selling of the century. Then, just a year later in 1762, he published two major philosophical treatises: *Paris* authorities condemned both of these books, primarily for claims Rousseau made in them about religion, which forced him to flee France. He settled in Switzerland and in 1765 he began writing his autobiography, his *Confessions*. A year later, after encountering difficulties with Swiss authorities, he spent time in Berlin and Paris, and eventually moved to England at the invitation of David Hume. However, due to quarrels with Hume, his stay in England lasted only a year, and in 1769 he returned to the southeast of France incognito. After spending three years in the southeast, Rousseau returned to Paris in 1770 and copied music for a living. It was during this time that he wrote *Rousseau: Judge of Jean-Jacques* and the *Reveries of the Solitary Walker*, which would turn out to be his final works. He died on July 3, 1778. His *Confessions* were published several years after his death; and his later political writings, in the nineteenth century. Rousseau wrote the *Confessions* late in his career, and it was not published until after his death. What is particularly striking about the *Confessions* is the almost apologetic tone that Rousseau takes at certain points to explain the various public as well as private events in his life, many of which caused great controversy. It is clear from this book that Rousseau saw the *Confessions* as an opportunity to justify himself against what he perceived as unfair attacks on his character and misunderstandings of his philosophical thought. His life was filled with conflict, first when he was apprenticed, later in academic circles with other Enlightenment thinkers like Diderot and Voltaire, with Parisian and Swiss authorities and even with David Hume. Although Rousseau discusses these conflicts, and tries to explain his perspective on them, it is not his exclusive goal to justify all of his actions. He chastises himself and takes responsibility for many of these events, such as his extra-marital affairs. At other times, however, his paranoia is clearly evident as he discusses his intense feuds with friends and contemporaries.

And herein lays the fundamental tension in the Confessions. Rousseau is at the same time trying both to justify his actions to the public so that he might gain its approval, but also to affirm his own uniqueness as a critic of that same public. As such, it is appropriate to consider Rousseau, at least chronologically, as an Enlightenment thinker. Descartes was very skeptical about the possibility of discovering final causes, or purposes, in nature. Yet this teleological understanding of the world was the very cornerstone of Aristotelian metaphysics, which was the established philosophy of the time. In the Meditations, Descartes claims that the material world is made up of extension in space, and this extension is governed by mechanical laws that can be understood in terms of pure mathematics. The State of Nature as a Foundation for Ethics and Political Philosophy The scope of modern philosophy was not limited only to issues concerning science and metaphysics. Philosophers of this period also attempted to apply the same type of reasoning to ethics and politics. In doing so, they hoped to uncover certain characteristics of human nature that were universal and unchanging. If this could be done, one could then determine the most effective and legitimate forms of government. Hobbes contends that human beings are motivated purely by self-interest, and that the state of nature, which is the state of human beings without civil society, is the war of every person against every other. Hobbes does say that while the state of nature may not have existed all over the world at one particular time, it is the condition in which humans would be if there were no sovereign. These obligations are articulated in terms of natural rights, including rights to life, liberty and property. Rousseau was also influenced by the modern natural law tradition, which attempted to answer the challenge of skepticism through a systematic approach to human nature that, like Hobbes, emphasized self-interest. Rousseau would give his own account of the state of nature in the Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality Among Men, which will be examined below. Also influential were the ideals of classical republicanism, which Rousseau took to be illustrative of virtues. These virtues allow people to escape vanity and an emphasis on superficial values that he thought to be so prevalent in modern society. This is a major theme of the Discourse on the Sciences and Arts. Discourse on the Sciences and Arts This is the work that originally won Rousseau fame and recognition. For the Enlightenment project was based on the idea that progress in fields like the arts and sciences do indeed contribute to the purification of morals on individual, social, and political levels. The First Discourse begins with a brief introduction addressing the academy to which the work was submitted. In addition to this introduction, the First Discourse is comprised of two main parts. The first part is largely an historical survey. Using specific examples, Rousseau shows how societies in which the arts and sciences flourished more often than not saw the decline of morality and virtue. He notes that it was after philosophy and the arts flourished that ancient Egypt fell. Similarly, ancient Greece was once founded on notions of heroic virtue, but after the arts and sciences progressed, it became a society based on luxury and leisure. The one exception to this, according to Rousseau, was Sparta, which he praises for pushing the artists and scientists from its walls. Sparta is in stark contrast to Athens, which was the heart of good taste, elegance, and philosophy. Interestingly, Rousseau here discusses Socrates, as one of the few wise Athenians who recognized the corruption that the arts and sciences were bringing about. In his address to the court, Socrates says that the artists and philosophers of his day claim to have knowledge of piety, goodness, and virtue, yet they do not really understand anything. The second part of the First Discourse is an examination of the arts and sciences themselves, and the dangers they bring. First, Rousseau claims that the arts and sciences are born from our vices: The attack on sciences continues as Rousseau articulates how they fail to contribute anything positive to morality. They take time from the activities that are truly important, such as love of country, friends, and the unfortunate. Philosophical and scientific knowledge of subjects such as the relationship of the mind to the body, the orbit of the planets, and physical laws that govern particles fail to genuinely provide any guidance for making people more virtuous citizens. Rather, Rousseau argues that they create a false sense of need for luxury, so that science becomes simply a means for making our lives easier and more pleasurable, but not morally better. The arts are the subject of similar attacks in the second part of the First Discourse. Artists, Rousseau says, wish first and foremost to be applauded. Their work comes from a sense of wanting to be praised as superior to others. Society begins to emphasize specialized talents rather than virtues such as courage, generosity, and temperance. This leads to yet another danger: And yet, after all of these attacks, the First Discourse ends with

the praise of some very wise thinkers, among them, Bacon, Descartes, and Newton. These men were carried by their vast genius and were able to avoid corruption. However, Rousseau says, they are exceptions; and the great majority of people ought to focus their energies on improving their characters, rather than advancing the ideals of the Enlightenment in the arts and sciences. *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* The Second Discourse, like the first, was a response to a question put forth by the academy of Dijon: It exceeded the desired length, it was four times the length of the first, and made very bold philosophical claims; unlike the First Discourse, it did not win the prize. However, as Rousseau was now a well-known and respected author, he was able to have it published independently. This is primarily because Rousseau, like Hobbes, attacks the classical notion of human beings as naturally social. In the *Confessions*, Rousseau writes that he himself sees the Second Discourse as far superior to the first. The *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* is divided into four main parts: Like them, Rousseau understands society to be an invention, and he attempts to explain the nature of human beings by stripping them of all of the accidental qualities brought about by socialization. Thus, understanding human nature amounts to understanding what humans are like in a pure state of nature. This is in stark contrast to the classical view, most notably that of Aristotle, which claims that the state of civil society is the natural human state. Like Hobbes and Locke, however, it is doubtful that Rousseau meant his readers to understand the pure state of nature that he describes in the Second Discourse as a literal historical account. In its opening, he says that it must be denied that men were ever in the pure state of nature, citing revelation as a source which tells us that God directly endowed the first man with understanding a capacity that he will later say is completely undeveloped in natural man. However, it seems in other parts of the Second Discourse that Rousseau is positing an actual historical account. Some of the stages in the progression from nature to civil society, Rousseau will argue, are empirically observable in so-called primitive tribes. Hobbes describes each human in the state of nature as being in a constant state of war against all others; hence life in the state of nature is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short. Instead, they have taken civilized human beings and simply removed laws, government, and technology.

**Chapter 5 : Jean-Jacques Rousseau - Wikipedia***3 - The Great Project of An Idle Life Rousseau 51 4 - Paradox of the Idler Diderot*

Youth[ edit ] Rousseau was born in Geneva , which was at the time a city-state and a Protestant associate of the Swiss Confederacy. Since , Geneva had been a Huguenot republic and the seat of Calvinism. Five generations before Rousseau, his ancestor Didier, a bookseller who may have published Protestant tracts, had escaped persecution from French Catholics by fleeing to Geneva in , where he became a wine merchant. Rousseau was proud that his family, of the moyen order or middle-class , had voting rights in the city. The citizens were a minority of the population when compared to the immigrants, referred to as "inhabitants", whose descendants were called "natives" and continued to lack suffrage. In fact, rather than being run by vote of the "citizens", the city was ruled by a small number of wealthy families that made up the "Council of Two Hundred"; these delegated their power to a twenty-five member executive group from among them called the "Little Council". There was much political debate within Geneva, extending down to the tradespeople. Much discussion was over the idea of the sovereignty of the people, of which the ruling class oligarchy was making a mockery. In , a democratic reformer named Pierre Fatio protested this situation, saying "a sovereign that never performs an act of sovereignty is an imaginary being". Isaac followed his grandfather, father and brothers into the business, except for a short stint teaching dance as a dance master. After local officials stepped in, it was Isaac who was punished, as Geneva was concerned with maintaining its ties to foreign powers. She was raised by her uncle Samuel Bernard, a Calvinist preacher. He cared for Suzanne after her father Jacques who had run into trouble with the legal and religious authorities for fornication and having a mistress died in his early thirties. Vincent Sarrasin, whom she fancied despite his continuing marriage. After a hearing, she was ordered by the Genevan Consistory to never interact with him again. The child died at birth. Later, the young Rousseau was told a romantic fairy-tale about the situation by the adults in his familyâ€”a tale where young love was denied by a disapproving patriarch but that prevailed by sibling loyalty that, in the story, resulted in love conquering all and two marriages uniting the families on the same day. Rousseau never learnt the truth. While the idea was that his sons would inherit the principal when grown up and he would live off the interest in the meantime, in the end the father took most of the substantial proceeds. Sometimes, in the morning, on hearing the swallows at our window, my father, quite ashamed of this weakness, would cry, "Come, come, let us go to bed; I am more a child than thou art. Throughout his life, he would recall one scene where, after the volunteer militia had finished its manoeuvres, they began to dance around a fountain and most of the people from neighboring buildings came out to join them, including him and his father. Rousseau would always see militias as the embodiment of popular spirit in opposition to the armies of the rulers, whom he saw as disgraceful mercenaries. He remarried, and from that point Jean-Jacques saw little of him. Here, the boys picked up the elements of mathematics and drawing. Rousseau, who was always deeply moved by religious services, for a time even dreamed of becoming a Protestant minister. At age 13, Rousseau was apprenticed first to a notary and then to an engraver who beat him. At 15, he ran away from Geneva on 14 March after returning to the city and finding the city gates locked due to the curfew. She was a noblewoman of Protestant background who was separated from her husband. As professional lay proselytizer, she was paid by the King of Piedmont to help bring Protestants to Catholicism. They sent the boy to Turin , the capital of Savoy which included Piedmont, in what is now Italy , to complete his conversion. This resulted in his having to give up his Genevan citizenship, although he would later revert to Calvinism in order to regain it. Finding himself on his own, since his father and uncle had more or less disowned him, the teenage Rousseau supported himself for a time as a servant, secretary, and tutor, wandering in Italy Piedmont and Savoy and France. During this time, he lived on and off with De Warens, whom he idolized and called his "maman". Flattered by his devotion, De Warens tried to get him started in a profession, and arranged formal music lessons for him. At one point, he briefly attended a seminary with the idea of becoming a priest. Early adulthood[ edit ] When Rousseau reached 20, De Warens took him as her lover, while intimate also with the steward of her house. A rather profligate spender, she had a large library and loved to entertain and listen to music. She and her circle,

comprising educated members of the Catholic clergy, introduced Rousseau to the world of letters and ideas. Rousseau had been an indifferent student, but during his 20s, which were marked by long bouts of hypochondria, he applied himself in earnest to the study of philosophy, mathematics, and music. At 25, he came into a small inheritance from his mother and used a portion of it to repay De Warens for her financial support of him. At 27, he took a job as a tutor in Lyon. His system, intended to be compatible with typography, is based on a single line, displaying numbers representing intervals between notes and dots and commas indicating rhythmic values. Believing the system was impractical, the Academy rejected it, though they praised his mastery of the subject, and urged him to try again. He befriended Denis Diderot that year, connecting over the discussion of literary endeavors. This awoke in him a lifelong love for Italian music, particularly opera: I had brought with me from Paris the prejudice of that city against Italian music; but I had also received from nature a sensibility and niceness of distinction which prejudice cannot withstand. I soon contracted that passion for Italian music with which it inspires all those who are capable of feeling its excellence. In listening to barcaroles, I found I had not yet known what singing was. The risk of the education of the foundling hospital was much less". Ten years later, Rousseau made inquiries about the fate of his son, but no record could be found. When Rousseau subsequently became celebrated as a theorist of education and child-rearing, his abandonment of his children was used by his critics, including Voltaire and Edmund Burke, as the basis for ad hominem attacks. In 1769, Rousseau was paying daily visits to Diderot, who had been thrown into the fortress of Vincennes under a lettre de cachet for opinions in his "Lettre sur les aveugles", that hinted at materialism, a belief in atoms, and natural selection. According to science historian Conway Zirkle, Rousseau saw the concept of natural selection "as an agent for improving the human species. He wrote that while walking to Vincennes about three miles from Paris, he had a revelation that the arts and sciences were responsible for the moral degeneration of mankind, who were basically good by nature. Rousseau continued his interest in music. The king was so pleased by the work that he offered Rousseau a lifelong pension. He also turned down several other advantageous offers, sometimes with a brusqueness bordering on truculence that gave offense and caused him problems. Rousseau as noted above, was an enthusiastic supporter of the Italians against Jean-Philippe Rameau and others, making an important contribution with his Letter on French Music. Return to Geneva[ edit ] On returning to Geneva in 1764, Rousseau reconverted to Calvinism and regained his official Genevan citizenship. In 1762, Rousseau completed his second major work, the Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality Among Men the Discourse on Inequality, which elaborated on the arguments of the Discourse on the Arts and Sciences. He resented being at Mme. Diderot later described Rousseau as being "false, vain as Satan, ungrateful, cruel, hypocritical, and wicked He sucked ideas from me, used them himself, and then affected to despise me". His mansion was Le Palais du Peyrou. These men truly liked Rousseau and enjoyed his ability to converse on any subject, but they also used him as a way of getting back at Louis XV and the political faction surrounding his mistress, Madame de Pompadour. Even with them, however, Rousseau went too far, courting rejection when he criticized the practice of tax farming, in which some of them engaged. Even his friend Antoine-Jacques Roustan felt impelled to write a polite rebuttal of the chapter on Civil Religion in the Social Contract, which implied that the concept of a Christian republic was paradoxical since Christianity taught submission rather than participation in public affairs. Rousseau helped Roustan find a publisher for the rebuttal. A famous section of Emile, "The Profession of Faith of a Savoyard Vicar", was intended to be a defense of religious belief. Because it rejected original sin and divine revelation, both Protestant and Catholic authorities took offense. This religious indifferentism caused Rousseau and his books to be banned from France and Geneva. He was condemned from the pulpit by the Archbishop of Paris, his books were burned and warrants were issued for his arrest. Rousseau, he wrote, "has not had the precaution to throw any veil over his sentiments; and, as he scorns to dissemble his contempt for established opinions, he could not wonder that all the zealots were in arms against him. The liberty of the press is not so secured in any country. Subsequently, when the Swiss authorities also proved unsympathetic to him"condemning both Emile, and also The Social Contract "Voltaire issued an invitation to Rousseau to come and reside with him, commenting that: Let him come here [to Ferney]! I shall receive him with open arms. He shall be master here more than I. I shall treat him like my own son. He also mentioned that he had criticized Frederick in the past

and would continue to be critical of Frederick in the future, stating however: We must succor this poor unfortunate. His only offense is to have strange opinions which he thinks are good ones. I will send a hundred crowns, from which you will be kind enough to give him as much as he needs. I think he will accept them in kind more readily than in cash. If we were not at war, if we were not ruined, I would build him a hermitage with a garden, where he could live as I believe our first fathers did I think poor Rousseau has missed his vocation; he was obviously born to be a famous anchorite, a desert father, celebrated for his austerities and flagellations I conclude that the morals of your savage are as pure as his mind is illogical. Frederick made no known reply, but commented to Keith that Rousseau had given him a "scolding". In the meantime, the local ministers had become aware of the apostasies in some of his writings, and resolved not to let him stay in the vicinity. He wrote back asking to be excused due to his inability to sit for a long time due to his ailment. Around midnight of 6<sup>th</sup> September, stones were thrown at the house Rousseau was staying in, and some glass windows were shattered. Although it was within the Canton of Bern, from where he had been expelled two years previously, he was informally assured that he could move into this island house without fear of arrest, and he did so 10 September. However, on 17 October, the Senate of Bern ordered Rousseau to leave the island and all Bernese territory within fifteen days. He replied, requesting permission to extend his stay, and offered to be incarcerated in any place within their jurisdiction with only a few books in his possession and permission to walk occasionally in a garden while living at his own expense. On 29 October he left the Ile de St. Here he met Hume, and also numerous friends, and well wishers, and became a very conspicuous figure in the city. No person ever so much enjoyed their attention Voltaire and everybody else are quite eclipsed. Diderot wanted to reconcile and make amends with Rousseau.

**Chapter 6 : Rousseau: Social Contract: Book IV**

*Saint-Amand focuses primarily on Diderot's and Rousseau's defense of the idle life as a kind of secular bliss. The author makes a strong case for distinguishing the utilitarian program of calculation and task efficiency from aesthetic reveries and world-open stance of philosophers.*

In a teleological line of reasoning, it would seem as though things like artistic and scientific developments, that enrich and prolong life, would be justified if not necessitated by society, and unsurprisingly, J. Mill was optimistic about the ability of human progress in the arts and sciences to eventually get rid of human ills altogether. Even the most intractable of enemies, disease, may be indefinitely reduced in dimensions by good physical and moral education, and proper control of noxious influences; while the progress of science holds out a promise for the future of still more direct consequences over this detestable foe Utilitarianism 7. He believed, that in a free marketplace of ideas, the best ideas sponsored by those with a natural propensity towards them, would rise to the top and push the arts and sciences forward. He warned, however, that society did often times fail to recognize the ideas that would benefit society, and that ensuring individual liberties was the only safeguard against societal suppression of these ideas against its better judgment. In the third chapter of *On Liberty*, Mill argues: If it were felt that the free development of individuality is one of the leading essentials of well-being; that it is not only a co-ordinate element with all that is designated by the terms civilization, instruction, education, and culture but itself is a necessary part and condition of those things, there would be no danger that liberty would be undervalued, and the adjustment of the boundaries between it and social control would present no extraordinary difficulty. But the evil is that individual spontaneity is hardly recognized by the common modes of thinking, having any intrinsic worth, or deserving any regard on its own account *On Liberty* 1. They are happier, wiser, and nobler than they would be otherwise. The second type of civilization that Mill describes is civilization as a distinguishing factor from savagery, or that which differentiates Europeans and ancient barbarians. Jean-Jacques Rousseau would be less generous towards the uncontested benefits of the civilizing forces in both definitions. With regard to the first definition, the logical strain that: Rousseau, however, would have retorted that Mill was overlooking a step: He anticipates those who defend the false associations of progress, when they discover the failure of their logic, to fall back on arguments like: What would history become if there were no tyrants, no wars, no conspirators? What would we do with the arts without the luxury that feeds them? It is reasonable to believe that Rousseau does not wish or expect a drastic abandonment of artistic and scientific development in fact he argues that in some capacity they may be necessary for society, but he does advocate a scaling back of abundance and luxury as they exert a corruptive influence on the arts and sciences. In a natural state, Rousseau believes that individuals enjoy a healthy self regard and sympathy for other individuals. Is an Inspector Calls an example of a well-made play? Essay At some point, though, this self-regard turns unhealthy, as a person in the state of nature lusts after acceptance and distinction and begins to act according to how he wants to be seen in the eyes of others. The way he argues to achieve this is through a general will, where individuals in society are educated to have similar interests, and a compassion towards the competing ideas of each other. Mill admits to two pernicious effects the arts and sciences can have on the moral development of civilized society: Mill describes exactly how this happens in *Civilization*: He argues first that indulgences in the arts like theatre, which is born from the vices of laziness and luxury, manifest those vices in society, and on that level, they cause more people to be lazy, luxurious, and waste time in their indulgences. In addition to being born out of and spawning idleness, Rousseau attributes the arts and sciences to the deterioration of other important societal values. Rousseau, in this argument, seems to be elucidating a downside to what Mill describes as a benefit to civilization in his essay on the subject. Mill argues that the minimization of pain for individuals in a society caused by technological and artistic advancements is undeniably a good thing for society. Rousseau, in his discourse, argues that on face, this is not the case. Rousseau would have looked at modern man, and the state of modern warfare, and admitted that if modern man were to gather all of his tools around him and face a savage opponent, he would win easily. But, Rousseau would add, that stripped of the instruments of modern warfare,

he is no match for the heroic individual who has developed by embracing physical pain, and can use his body to the fullest. Mill believes that civilization has crafted individuals in such a way that: The second moral dilemma presented by the arts and sciences that J. Mill confesses to in *Civilization* is the moral effects produced by the insignificance into which the individual falls in comparison with the masses. *Madame Bovary vs The Awakening Essay* Using the example of a tradesman in a large and small town, he illustrates the idea that in a highly civilized, highly developed society, people tend to be more reliant on public opinion, and less reliant on themselves. In the example of a tradesman in a small society, where for the most part everyone knows everyone else, an opinion of this particular tradesman has been formed by his customers after repeated trials. Individuals in this society judge for themselves whether his products are worth buying, and the tradesman will acquire the character, individually and professionally, which his conduct entitles him to. *Civilization* The case is far different than that of an individual seeking goods in a large city, who must rely almost exclusively on public opinion when deciding which patrons he will patronize. Mill also expresses concern for literature in a society with many books. But, he goes on to say: How does Mill ultimately propose to solve these problems in conjunction with the continued human progress in the arts and sciences? In terms of a spirit of cooperation, Mill points to the growing trend in Europe towards the dissolution of competitive businesses due to the fall of profits and consequent increases in population and capital. He argues that this trend will lead not to the complete extinction of competition, but to business administered by, and for the benefit of, a general association of the whole community. The third argument that Rousseau puts forward is an argument from decrease in trade, because less is produced and prices are higher. Such displays will reify class distinction and destroy the healthy sense of community that government and society should seek to create between the individuals within it. Most importantly, Rousseau goes on to say, the geometers, chemists, astronomers, poets, musicians, and painters of society are simply unnecessary. In Part One of his *Discourse*, Rousseau elaborates on the foundations of society, and claims that: The mind has its needs, as does the body. The needs of the latter are the foundations of society; the needs of the former make it pleasant. The civilized values impressed upon us by the arts and sciences misrepresent what are our real ethical mores. The overarching effect of the arts and sciences on society is not, like Mill argues, to promote the accomplishments of the individual, but to push those accomplishments in a particular direction in line with the refined tastes of civility, but not with the will of the individual. Choose Type of service.

Chapter 7 : Rousseau And Mill On The Arts And Sciences Essay Example For Students | Artsolumbia

*The great project of an idle life (Rousseau). Paradox of the idler (Diderot). Philosophy on the pillow (Joubert). Epilogue (Towards moderation) Awards.*

Themes, Arguments, and Ideas  
The Necessity of Freedom  
In his work, Rousseau addresses freedom more than any other problem of political philosophy and aims to explain how man in the state of nature is blessed with an enviable total freedom. This freedom is total for two reasons. First, natural man is physically free because he is not constrained by a repressive state apparatus or dominated by his fellow men. Second, he is psychologically and spiritually free because he is not enslaved to any of the artificial needs that characterize modern society. Rousseau believed that good government must have the freedom of all its citizens as its most fundamental objective. Rousseau acknowledged that as long as property and laws exist, people can never be as entirely free in modern society as they are in the state of nature, a point later echoed by Marx and many other Communist and anarchist social philosophers. Nonetheless, Rousseau strongly believed in the existence of certain principles of government that, if enacted, can afford the members of society a level of freedom that at least approximates the freedom enjoyed in the state of nature. In *The Social Contract* and his other works of political philosophy, Rousseau is devoted to outlining these principles and how they may be given expression in a functional modern state. Rousseau strips away all the ideas that centuries of development have imposed on the true nature of man and concludes that many of the ideas we take for granted, such as property, law, and moral inequality, actually have no basis in nature. The most important characteristic of the state of nature is that people have complete physical freedom and are at liberty to do essentially as they wish. That said, the state of nature also carries the drawback that human beings have not yet discovered rationality or morality. In different works, Rousseau alternately emphasizes the benefits and shortfalls of the state of nature, but by and large he reveres it for the physical freedom it grants people, allowing them to be unencumbered by the coercive influence of the state and society. The Danger of Need  
Rousseau includes an analysis of human need as one element in his comparison of modern society and the state of nature. In the state of nature, human needs are strictly limited to those things that ensure survival and reproduction, including food, sleep, and sex. By contrast, as cooperation and division of labor develop in modern society, the needs of men multiply to include many nonessential things, such as friends, entertainment, and luxury goods. As time goes by and these sorts of needs increasingly become a part of everyday life, they become necessities. Although many of these needs are initially pleasurable and even good for human beings, men in modern society eventually become slaves to these superfluous needs, and the whole of society is bound together and shaped by their pursuit. By authentic, Rousseau essentially means how closely the life of modern man reflects the positive attributes of his natural self. Not surprisingly, Rousseau feels that people in modern society generally live quite inauthentic lives. In the state of nature, man is free to simply attend to his own natural needs and has few occasions to interact with other people. The entire system of artificial needs that governs the life of civil society makes authenticity or truth in the dealings of people with one another almost impossible. Even more damningly, the fact that modern people organize their lives around artificial needs means that they are inauthentic and untrue to themselves as well. Given this fact, the modern society that has sprung forth from this act can be nothing but inauthentic to the core. The Unnaturalness of Inequality  
For Rousseau, the questions of why and how human beings are naturally equal and unequal, if they are unequal at all, are fundamental to his larger philosophical enquiry. His conclusions and larger line of reasoning in this argument are laid out in the *Discourse on Inequality*, but the basic thrust of his argument is that human inequality as we know it does not exist in the state of nature. In fact, the only kind of natural inequality, according to Rousseau, is the physical inequality that exists among men in the state of nature who may be more or less able to provide for themselves according to their physical attributes. Accordingly, all the inequalities we recognize in modern society are characterized by the existence of different classes or the domination and exploitation of some people by others. Rousseau terms these kinds of inequalities moral inequalities, and he devotes much of his political philosophy to identifying the ways in which a just government can seek to overturn them. As Rousseau explains, the general will is the will of the

sovereign, or all the people together, that aims at the common good – what is best for the state as a whole. In a state where the vulgarities of private interest prevail over the common interests of the collective, the will of all can be something quite different from the general will. The most concrete manifestation of the general will in a healthy state comes in the form of law. To Rousseau, laws should always record what the people collectively desire the general will and should always be universally applicable to all members of the state. The first is, how can we know that the will of all is really equivalent with the common good? The second is, assuming that the general will is existent and can be expressed in laws, what are the institutions that can accurately gauge and codify the general will at any given time? Most often, the sovereign took the form of an authoritative monarch who possessed absolute dominion over his or her subjects. The people, as a sovereign entity, express their sovereignty through their general will and must never have their sovereignty abrogated by anyone or anything outside their collective self. In this regard, sovereignty is not identified with the government but is instead opposed against it.

Chapter 8 : results in SearchWorks catalog

*No other philosopher's biography is perhaps so well-known as that of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who made his own life the subject of a number of his writings, including his great autobiographical work, the Confessions.*

Bio, Life and Influence Article shared by: After reading this article you will learn about Jean Jacques Rousseau: Life and Time of Jean Jacques Rousseau 2. Political Ideas of Jean Jacques Rousseau 3. Influence on Political Thought. Life and Time of Jean Jacques Rousseau: Attended a seminary at Turin and obtained favour with Madame de Warens, who supported him for ten years. David Hume invited him to England in , and he returned to France in His birth place was Geneva which was Calvinist, that is, it was under the tremendous influence of Calvin. Rousseau was a bohemian. He did not settle anywhere, rather roamed from one place to another. He spent a larger part of his life in Paris. He went to Paris in and by he came in contact with Diderot. There was an exchange of academic matters between the two. He was adjudged for the first prize and got francs and a gold medal. He wrote another essay but it failed to bring a prize for him. Rousseau, however, was able to establish himself as an author or writer at the age of thirty eight. The winning of prize lifted him from obscurity and placed him at the centre-stage of the academic circles of Geneva. Cale, there is no hyphen between Jean and Jacques. But majority writers use hyphen. A Discourse on the Origin of Inequality. These two books were published, respectively, in and His next work Political Economy was published in The most important work The Social Contract in He also authored few other books such as Emile and The Letters from the Mount. Rousseau is read and remembered for The Social Contract. We know that every thinker or philosopher is more or less influenced by the events and ideas that develop and flourish around him and Rousseau is not an exception. Though Geneva was his birth place he travelled France and lived there several years. So we can easily say that he was a piquant observer of various events and especially political ones that grew around him. France was the heaven of autocracy and the autocratic rule of French rulers created an intolerable situation in French society. The irresponsible activities of the autocratic ruler drained huge amount of money from the state treasury and, in order to replenish it, the ruler levied taxes upon the masses of men. Autocracy was the system of the day when Rousseau started his political and other writings. The absence of democracy and the shortening condition of liberty created a tremendous impact upon the mind of Jean Jacques Rousseau. From the very childhood Rousseau was a great worshipper of liberty. Immediately after his birth his mother died. His father was not fully normal. He lived few years under the guardianship of an educated and aristocrat lady. But this guardianship was intolerable to him. It is quite natural that such a man would be the lover of liberty. But the physical environment around him was not favourable for liberty and democracy. This disturbed his mind and thought considerably. Many critics are of opinion that there were favourable conditions of industrialisation in various parts of Europe. In this situation Rousseau observed that there was generation of wealth and accumulation of property in society. Particularly in agriculture and commercial sectors there was large amount of wealth and property. But it was not properly distributed among various sections of the population. Because of this, inequality came to be the main feature of society. This inequality not only drew his attention, it disturbed his mind considerably. It means that Rousseau was quite conscious of the inequality with which he was confronted. Again, this book has another title. All these are proofs of the fact that he seriously thought about inequality and it is also true that he did not approve of this inequality. The fact is that the second half of the eighteenth century was characterized by the unequal distribution of wealth. Rousseau thought that the unequal distribution of wealth was also the cause of political discontent. He thought that this inequality was one of the causes of unrest. In France and several other countries there were religious conflicts among various religious communities. He could not tolerate this. He also saw that the church and other religious organisations were eager to establish their own identity and to control the behaviour of the general public. Rousseau could not accept it as normal. Rather, he raised his voice. He was the great worshipper of liberty and its loss or curtailment was a source of great anxiety to him. The general condition of Britain was not acceptable to him. He vehemently criticized the British form of parliamentary democracy. Even he did not hesitate to say that the British people were free only at the time of election. Jean Jacques Rousseau saw that

the British politics and economy were fully controlled by aristocrats, capitalists and feudal landlords. General public was far away from the real platform of democracy. In some parts of Europe the impact of Enlightenment was perceptible and he strongly felt the influence of Enlightenment. But because of the domination of propertied class and influential politicians they could not get their due share. There is an interesting similarity between Plato and Rousseau. The thought of these two philosophers was enormously influenced by contemporary events. The downward movement of democracy, morality, ethics etc. Jean Jacques Rousseau was also influenced by Plato. He observed that morality, dignity of man, liberty and several other eternal values are at stake and the advancement of sciences and arts was primarily responsible for this. Wealthy and luxurious Rome failed to achieve that. Political Ideas of Jean Jacques Rousseau: Jean Jacques Rousseau viewed and analysed the contemporary society in his own way and his way was a different one. He wanted the revival of freedom and simplicity that prevailed in the state of nature. He squarely blamed the progress of arts and sciences for the loss of morality freedom etc. Again, for the loss of freedom and morality the development of reason is responsible. He revolted against intelligence, the growth of knowledge and progress of science. In his judgment all these are responsible for the general deterioration of society. Naturally men should not be moved or guided by reason. Rather, they should act in accordance with emotion, feelings and instincts. The cultivation of all these will give man real joy and satisfaction. He believes that there is no place of reason in all these things. He believes that science cannot give man proper satisfaction in life. The development of trade, commerce and the general economic condition drastically changed the physical condition of society and, at the same time, gave birth to a new and wealthy class which may be called bourgeois. In the observation of Sabine we find the following remark " In a Discourse on the Arts and Sciences Rousseau has openly denounced the negativeness of the progress of arts and sciences. In this book he has said that the progress of arts and science has not been able to contribute anything to the augmentation of human happiness. The simplicity of mind and action as well as thought is lost and in the opinion of Rousseau, this is a great loss. Man is actually helpless in the rapid. In order to save and revive the honesty, simplicity and virtue of man the best way is to stop the progress of science and arts. Rousseau has said those whom nature intended for her disciples have not needed masters- Bacon, Descartes and Newton, those teachers of mankind, had themselves no teachers. Jean Jacques Rousseau could not accept the progress of arts and science on the ground that these made man reasonable and a reasonable man is corrupt and complex-minded. So it is obvious that morality, ethics, reverence and faith were much more important than the progress of arts and science. Somehow Rousseau arrived at the conclusion that morality and reverence had the power to make man perfect and honest. Hence reason is abandoned. State of Nature and Social Contract: When Rousseau was the Secretary to the French Ambassador in he planned to write a comprehensive book on various aspects of body politic. But the adverse circumstances forced him to abandon the project. But the prize awarded to him by the Academy of Dijon inflamed his thought of writing a book and he started the implementation of the idea.

*Life and Time of Jean Jacques Rousseau: The Everyman's edition of The Social Contract notes the following short life history of J. J. Rousseau (henceforth only Rousseau); "Jean Jacques Rousseau, born at Geneva in , the son of a watchmaker.*

To be free in this sense, said Rousseau, was to be happy. The originality of the novel won it harsh reviews, but its sexual nature made it immensely popular with the public. It remained a best seller until the French Revolution in , a massive uprising calling for political and social change throughout France. Even today the ideas set forth in these works are revolutionary. Both of the books were burned by the authorities in Geneva, Switzerland. Exile and death Forced to flee from France, Rousseau sought refuge at Yverdon in the territory of Bern. There he was kicked out by the Bernese authorities and would spend the next few years seeking a safe place to live. But Rousseau, falsely believing Hume to be in league with his Parisian and Genevan enemies, not only refused the pension but also openly broke with the philosopher. Rousseau returned to France in June under the protection of the Prince de Conti. Wandering from place to place, he at last settled in in Paris. There he made a living, as he often had in the past, by copying music. By December the Confessions, upon which he had been working since , was completed, and he gave readings from this work at various private homes. For More Information Cranston, Maurice. University of Chicago Press, Jean-Jacques Rousseau in Exile and Adversity. Rousseau in 90 Minutes. She remained with him for the rest of his life”as mistress, housekeeper, mother of his children, and finally, in , as his wife. Apparently he regarded them as his own even though he assigned them to a hospital for abandoned children. Rousseau had no means to educate them, and he reasoned that they would be better raised as workers and peasants by the state. Comment about this article, ask questions, or add new information about this topic: