Educational Philosophy and Christian Pedagogy

Educational Philosophy and Christian Pedagogy

By

Gregory Mellema

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Educational Philosophy and Christian Pedagogy

By Gregory Mellema

This book first published 2024

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-0364-0924-1
ISBN (Ebook): 978-1-0364-0925-8

This book is dedicated to my siblings:
Joel Mellema
Kathy Hoekstra
Heidi Pengra

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Portions of Chapter Six appeared in *Philosophical Research Archives* 13 (1988), 439-462.

Portions of Chapter Seven appeared in *Christian Scholars Review* 19 (1989), 123-148.

Portions of Chapter Ten appeared in *The New Scholasticism* 57 (1983), 362-374, and *Christian Educators Journal* 23 (1984), 14-15.

Portions of Chapter Eleven appeared in *The Journal of Thought* 21 (1986), 54-63.

I wish to thank the editors of these journals for permission to include all of this material.

INTRODUCTION

This book is divided into two sections. The first section traces developments in the philosophy of education from Rousseau through the twentieth century. The second deals with the topic of Christian philosophy of education. Jacques Maritain represents the Catholic perspective, while Nicholas Wolterstorff represents the Protestant perspective. In addition, there will be chapters dealing with educational aims, learning, and special education, each approached by way of a Christian perspective.

Naturally the question arises why the historical material begins with Rousseau. In what follows I will provide an explanation. The short answer is that Rousseau was the first philosopher of education to articulate a progressive approach to educational thought.

To understand what constitutes a progressive approach it is necessary to understand the traditional approach that characterized educational thought prior to Rousseau. In his book, *Philosophy of Education in Historical Perspective* Adrian Dupuis provides a characterization of the traditional approach. In actuality it is more of a caricature, but I believe it is helpful in providing a backdrop to the material in the first section of this volume. What follows is a paraphrase of Dupuis' account.

Due primarily to the influence of Greek thought, human persons are seen as consisting of a physical body and a non-physical mind or spirit. The non-physical component has in some sense a status of superiority. For this reason the so-called academic subjects have a greater claim than courses in manual skills on inclusion in the

curriculum since they involve activities of the mind. The body is seen as our lower nature.

In addition, since all humans are imperfect by nature, there should be strict codes of behavior. Children do not know what is best for them, and adults must decide until such time as they have been taught to control their bodily passions through the use of reason.

Knowledge acquired through pure reason is superior to that acquired through sense experience (which involves the body). The student begins with a large number of facts and masters them, largely through memorization. Then the student proceeds to abstract general truths through the use of reason.

Truth consists in certain eternal, changeless principles. They have an intrinsic value, and knowing them is necessary for the perfection of the mind. For this reason they must be taught, regardless of any practical utility. Values are also eternal and changeless and must also be taught.

The aim of education is intellectual in nature, the acquisition of knowledge in a rational, systematic fashion. If physical education is included, it is in order to assist the mind, which can function better in a strong body. The curriculum consists of academic courses. Athletics, drama, band, choir, shop courses, and the like, are considered extra-curricular. Foreign languages, especially classical languages, are important in contributing to the perfection of the mind. Electives, if any, are few in number. The courses are ordinarily taken in a prescribed sequence.

The lecture is the time-honored method of teaching. The students take notes and read textbooks. They must then acquire the knowledge that the teachers and textbooks contain. Throughout the process of learning the teacher is the active agent and the pupil is the passive agent. Students are evaluated on the basis of their ability to reproduce

the facts presented to them and their ability to draw generalized conclusions from these facts.

Strict discipline is a necessity since the evil tendencies in students must be dealt with. They must not be given the freedom to follow their evil tendencies. Obedience, silence, and order are the hallmarks of a well-run classroom. Nevertheless, schools should develop in students moral qualities; outward signs of obedience alone are insufficient.

This concludes the characterization by Adrian Dupuis of the traditionalist approach to educational thought. Dupuis is well aware that it is nothing more than a generalization of what transpired across a great expanse of time. Nevertheless, he is correct in thinking that it can provide illumination in coming to understand the radical nature of Rousseau's perspective and the progressive philosophers of education that followed.

Following a brief chapter summarizing Rousseau's educational philosophy, Chapter Two will present the views of Kant, Pestalozzi, Froebel, Herbart, and Spencer. These five philosophers reject the traditionalist approach in varying ways and form a type of bridge from Rousseau, the first progressive, to John Dewey, the culmination of the trend toward progressivism. Dewey's philosophy of education is complex, spans a number of his writings, and forms the subject matter of Chapter Three.

It should come as no surprise that various philosophers of education reacted against Dewey's proposals in an effort to re-establish traditionalist ideas. The neo-traditionalists, as they are referred to in Chapter Four, include Robert Hutchins, Mortimer Adler, Hyman Rickover, and Allan Bloom.

Alfred North Whitehead's philosophy of education appeared in his book, *The Aims of Education*, originally published in 1929. Whitehead,

who sides neither with traditionalism nor progressivism, established himself as an influential figure in the field of education. His views are summarized in Chapter Five.

In 1956 Benjamin Bloom and associates published a taxonomy of cognitive educational objectives, and in 1964 they published a taxonomy of affective educational objectives. It is difficult to describe the enormous impact these taxonomies have made upon educational thought and practice. Chapter Six provides a detailed description of both taxonomies.

Lawrence Kohlberg's cognitive theory of moral development, initially unveiled in the 1950s, likewise had an enormous impact upon educational thought and practice. Chapter Seven contains a description of his six-stage theory of moral development together with the process that led to its discovery.

The final five chapters center around Christian perspectives regarding educational philosophy. Jacques Maritain represents the catholic perspective (Chapter Eight), while Nicholas Wolterstorff represents the protestant perspective (Chapter Nine). Chapter Ten takes up the topic of educational aims, Chapter Eleven addresses philosophical issues concerning learning, and Chapter Twelve presents a Christian approach to the philosophy of special education based upon the work of David Anderson.

CHAPTER ONE

JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU

The rise of a progressive philosophy of education in the western world begins with Jean Jacques Rousseau. Naturally, it is possible to find writers prior to this calling for certain changes in educational procedure, writers such as John Amos Comenius (1592-1670). Moreover, it is possible to find certain suggestive fragments of a new approach to education in the writings of thinkers such as Francis Bacon (1561-1626). But the 18th century was truly the century when a progressive philosophy was first openly proclaimed and first put into practice.

There is no question that Rousseau is the first writer to openly proclaim that the traditional style of education was fundamentally in error, and he is also the first writer to set forth a new approach. It is difficult to find influences which led Rousseau to his ideas about education, as innovative as they are.

Rousseau was born in 1712 in Geneva. He had little formal education, and this is perhaps a point of significance. At the age of 16 he left home to seek his fortune, and from this time until the age of 28 he led a restless and unsettled life. He became a private tutor for a brief time, and this experience created a life-long interest in education.

His chief work on education, *Emile*, was published in 1762 when he was 50. The same year the work was condemned by the French parliament, and Rousseau moved to Prussia where he began to write in defense of his book. In 1765 he accepted an invitation by the great

British philosopher David Hume to settle in England. Then he began to experience mental and emotional problems and after a violent quarrel with Hume he returned to the continent in 1767. He moved from place to place, oppressed by the thought of universal persecution, and died in 1778.

One striking fact about his life is his restlessness. He never found a niche in society, particularly French society. He was somehow always an outsider, and this explains to some extent his repeated attacks on the political and educational practices of the 18th century, particularly in France. It is easier to understand his displeasure with the whole system of education in the 18th century when one sees how all of French culture repelled him and how he always stood at some distance from it.

Before turning to Rousseau's book *Emile*, it will prove helpful to examine some portions of his *First Discourse.* Over and against the artificiality of society we find Rousseau's respect for the original nature of persons. Western thought had for so long been dominated by the view that our nature is essentially imperfect or evil. Now Rousseau comes forward with precisely the opposite view. We are by nature good and also happy. What follows is Rousseau's account of the development of civilization from the very beginning.

The life of the savage is a happy one. He spends his time providing for his natural needs, and he has only two natural needs, food and sex. Without much difficulty he provides for these needs, unburdened by the anxiety over the anxiety over death and disease experienced by modern individuals. People have a natural feeling of pity for one another, and this prevents them from bringing undue suffering upon others.

The first step toward civilization came with the first rudimentary social communities: Families. This was not unfortunate in any way

and gave rise to two new sentiments previously unknown, conjugal love and parental love. Rousseau calls this stage the golden age of humanity.

People soon began to discover, with the development of various tools and weapons, something new: Leisure. He calls this the first yoke people imposed upon themselves without realizing it. Leisure pursuits turned into needs; people were unhappy to lose them. In other words, these were artificial needs.

People began to gather during their idle hours, and public esteem began to be valued. Four new sentiments, previously unknown, grew out of these activities: Vanity, contempt, shame, and envy.

Soon people began to engage in tasks that require the cooperation of several hands, and they became dependent upon the help of one another. Equality began to disappear when some people began to labor for others. Then the concept of property was introduced, and with property arose the first rules of justice.

Since people did not possess equal talents, the distribution of goods became unequal. The stronger did more work. The cleverer found ways to shorten their labor and increase their possessions at the same time. Soon there were those who were rich and those who were poor. These differences led to further inequality. The poor became dependent upon the rich, and the rich used old slaves to subdue new ones.

Then the rich began to suggest contractual arrangements whereby, for the sake of protection, people would voluntarily swear allegiance to their “monarch.” Rousseau believed that this arrangement was another in a long line of disastrous developments. The weaker were tricked into giving up their natural freedom. The whole human race, with the exception of a few, was subjected to work, servitude, and misery.

In this way Rousseau describes the disastrous development of society as we know it. In the state of primitive nature people were happy, good and equal. With the development of civilization everything changed. Clearly these were not changes that benefitted society at large.

Rousseau believed that there is an innate sense of right and wrong implanted in the human heart, and people have a natural sense of pity toward one another. His denial of the doctrine of original sin led to the burning of the first edition of *Emile*.

He believed that our natural passions are small but have been swollen by a hundred tributaries as the result of civilization. The closer we remain to nature, the less difference there is between what we desire and what we are capable of obtaining. And the closer we remain to nature, the closer we come to happiness. Freedom can be attained only when we desire no more than what we are capable of obtaining; Rousseau calls this his fundamental maxim.

Rousseau stressed the importance of realizing that a child has only knowledge of particulars and has virtually no power of developing abstract notions. The child gains knowledge through sense experience, and this should be the focus of education. Children should be given a good deal of opportunity to have experiences. He stresses the desirability of taking children outside into the open air for a first-hand experience of nature's beauty. All of their instruction should be contained in particulars. Education does not have as its foremost concern the development of reason, the perfection of the mind, or the perfection of the soul. Instruction should not consist in teaching truth.

He identified goodness with the state of nature and evil with the corrupting influences that spoil the state of nature. The child is born wholly good, and vice begins to take root as time progresses. Moral

instruction should take place through experience. Teaching virtue does not make sense because children have an innate sense of right and wrong.

The intellectual capacities of the child are not the only capacities that should be developed. Rousseau emphasizes the necessity for the child's physical development. Physical needs are natural needs, and for this reason they are important. He believed that the great secret of education is to make mental and bodily exercise serve as a relaxation to each other. The emotional development of the child is also important for Rousseau.

From the ages of 5 until 12 physical activity is stressed more than anything else. The other subjects should be tied directly to sense experience. Rousseau believed that a student should be encouraged to read, but only in subtle ways. A student who receives a written invitation for a party with ice cream will be motivated to learn to read if the student has not already learned. Rousseau also boasts that he relieves children of their greatest misery: Books.

From the ages of 12 to 15 the student becomes more sophisticated in areas such as geography and natural sciences, again with the emphasis upon observation and first-hand experience. The student should ideally be taken on many trips. Vocational training should also begin at this time. Students need to learn how to earn a living.

After age fifteen sex education and preparation for family living is encouraged. This is consistent with the development of a person's natural self. A study of comparative religion is desirable. Rousseau is highly critical of traditional religious education. He complains that preposterous images of God are usually traced upon children's minds in the school, and these images tend to remain indelible all of their life.

The traditional teaching of history he calls a ridiculous error. What can be learned by studying facts in this way? The study of languages he calls useless, unless the student plans to live in a locale where a particular language is spoken.

Children's interests should be stimulated. They reason best about what concerns their present interests. By now it should be clear that for Rousseau the focus of teaching should be child centered. The child should be an active participant in the learning process. The child learns by doing. Above all, the natural patterns of growth in the child should be respected.

Rousseau was concerned to evaluate the child in all the various aspects of his or her development. There are no regular examinations of any kind. He does not favor pointing out to children their mistakes. The teacher should wait until the child is in a position to discover mistakes and correct them. The lessons learned on the playground are more valuable than those learned in class.

He believed that a child should never be taught the concept of being at fault, for this would be a departure from the state of nature. Even if children break a vase, they should not be punished. One should constantly make efforts never to leave breakable objects in their environment. Never command a student to do anything, and teachers should not give the students the impression that they have authority over them. Rather, teachers should display virtue and let their examples be seen by students. Do not force upon students the customs and standards of adult society. Let the students see for themselves that actions such as breaking windows bring about bad consequences.

Rousseau believed that women should be educated, but men and women should not receive the same education. He believed that a woman's education should consist primarily in the domestic arts.

It is beyond obvious that Rousseau's philosophy of education is a radical departure from traditional approaches, and it is not difficult to understand why *Emile* was condemned by the French parliament. At the same time one can see important connections between Rousseau's educational views and his views concerning the effects of civilization upon humanity.

Although his educational views met with widespread hostility, some were enlightened enough to discern proposals concerning education that represented improvements upon traditional practices. The next chapter examines five philosophers of education who were in various ways inspired by Rousseau's work to design progressive philosophies of their own.

CHAPTER TWO

KANT, PESTALOZZI, FROEBEL, HERBART, AND SPENCER

One of Rousseau's contemporaries, Johann Bernhard Basedow (1724-1790), articulated some progressive educational views independently of Rousseau, but the major figures following him who produced progressive philosophies of education were Kant, Pestalozzi, Froebel, Herbart, and Spencer. These philosophers of education comprise the subject matter of this chapter. They can be viewed as forming a type of bridge from Rousseau to John Dewey, the greatest of the progressive philosophers of education.

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), one of the most highly revered philosophers of all time, authored a book titled *Education*. It is an unfinished volume that is seldom cited in works about Kant's philosophy, but it played an important role in educational developments in Germany.

Kant was convinced that what Rousseau had to say about education was for the most part true. He repeatedly quotes Rousseau in his book. Kant distinguished between practical and theoretical philosophy and believed that his work on education falls into the former category.

The aim of education, according to Kant, is the perfection of the student, both moral and non-moral. Kant always emphasized treating a person as an end, never as a means to an end, and this emphasis influenced his ideas on education.

Basically Kant is in agreement with Rousseau's views on nature, but he believed that our natural condition requires certain restraints. He stresses self-help, doing, initiative, and freedom on the part of the student. But he puts more emphasis on compulsion, discipline, and obedience than Rousseau. He believes that undisciplined students are apt to follow every caprice. Kant specifically attacks the suggestion that everything ought to learned as if in play; he thinks this to be preposterous. He also thinks there is good reason in cultivating one's memory (but not for its own sake).

In the first period of childhood the student must learn submission and positive obedience. Educators must prevent children from becoming too effeminate. A hard bed is healthier than a soft bed. There is nothing worse than perpetually caressing a child. Children who have been accustomed to cry to get what they want become veritable despots. In some cases putting everything before children so that they do it from inclination is very well, but there is much more besides that we must place before them as duty.

Kant's beliefs summarized in the previous paragraph show that he is not quite as progressive as Rousseau, but in most respects his views align with Rousseau's. He felt that discipline should not be slavish; a child should always be conscious of his freedom. A student's knowledge should always be related to application and practice. We must always seek to unite knowledge with the carrying out of that knowledge in practice. Children must learn to think for themselves and not become mere passive recipients of what they are told in the classroom. Education should not be solely concerned with the development of a student's mental faculties. It should provide training to prepare the student to live happily in society.

Kant believed that a child is by nature neither morally good nor morally bad. In this way Kant occupies a middle position between the older traditions and the views of Rousseau. He stresses developing

the student's natural gifts. The more artificial contrivances we use, the more we become dependent upon instruments; these contrivances run counter to nature.

He scorned mere learning of facts. Mental skills ought to be developed instead of an accumulation of facts. Finally, education for Kant does not include women.

Johann Pestalozzi (1746-1827) was born in Zurich, Switzerland. After graduating from secondary school he acquired a farm and set out to combine agriculture with the education of the children of a nearby school, the idea being to combine elementary education with practical work. The enterprise was a failure, but it provided him with a number of valuable insights into education.

He went on to found several schools: in 1790 a school in Stans, in 1799 a school in Burgdorf, in 1804 a school in Munchnbuchsee, and in 1805 a school in Yverdun. The school in Yverdun won European recognition, and he remained there until 1825.

Pestalozzi was familiar with the writings of Comenius, but he was influenced primarily by Rousseau. Throughout his writings we hear about the natural person. But, unlike Rousseau, he went out and established schools, continually trying out his ideas.

Pestalozzi was motivated in large part by his observation that most people seem to lead lives devoid of human dignity. He believed that their shiftlessness and want of purpose could be cured by a properly devised system of education. He was also concerned with the problem of illegitimate children and the infanticide which was often the result.

He won fame as a schoolmaster through his book, *How Gertrude Teaches Her Children*. Both Froebel and Herbart visited Pestalozzi's school at Burgdorf, and both acknowledged their indebtedness to

him. As will be seen in what follows, both also saw fit to suggest certain changes.

Pestalozzi had a true compassion for the poor and the lower classes. He was certainly a man of the people. He liked to do his thinking as he roamed the fields in fair weather and foul. Frequently he was mistaken by authorities for a tramp.

Like Kant, he did not share Rousseau's view that everything works out best in a state of nature pure and adulterated. We should not leave everything to the uncontrolled action of blind nature. However, he did share the view that traditional education destroys the natural self. He calls schools devices for destroying the fruits which Nature has produced in the child. He also believed that natural relationships should be the criteria for organizing our ideas.

The child in his view possesses considerable abilities even at the age of three, and this is due to Nature herself. Instruction must always accord with the natural development of the child. When it is done right instruction consists in harmonizing the teachers' message and the demands they make upon the child with the child's powers at the moment. Childrens' powers at the moment, of course, depend directly upon their stage of natural development.

Pestalozzi felt strongly that the educator should try to imitate the mother's own untutored methods. Her untutored manner makes her teaching a joy to the child; nature is doing great things through her. Traditionally education has given rise to the sudden removal of the child from this warm atmosphere of natural development when he or she is five years old. God has made children resistant to these destroying forces, but to no avail.

Tremendous emphasis is placed by Pestalozzi upon grounding all instruction in sense experience. Sense experience is the foundation of all instruction. All intellectual training should be based upon an

alphabet of sense experience, suggesting that the child's sensations may be used as building blocks for the ideas he or she forms. The education of the mind, he says, advances from sensory experience to definite ideas. The ultimate end of instruction is the formation of definite ideas, but these ideas must begin with sense experience. Already while the child is in the cradle the teaching of sounds should take place. Pestalozzi argued that there was a need for "observation books" for small children. No doubt traditional views on education resulted in there not being an overabundance of picture books.

The teaching of specific subjects should be in accord with the need to begin with sense experience. For example, the beginning of arithmetic ought to be taught with real objects, or at least dots representing them. Science should be taught in direct contact with nature. The principles of speech should be taught in the same slow order that Nature has followed as it developed in the history of the human race.

The teaching of grammar was not part of Pestalozzi's program. Books that presuppose a knowledge of grammar have no place in elementary education and should be discarded. We find, then, the same type of anti-bookish spirit as in Rousseau. There is no evidence, however, of a dislike of reading instruction. He remarked that definitions become mere words unless connected to sense experience.

Even though Pestalozzi believed that Nature has endowed children with great powers, he is skeptical of innate knowledge. He does not believe that one can sit down and draw knowledge from a child. People have been deluded into thinking that intelligence can be drawn from a child through the Socratic method.

He stresses the fact that education should be directed toward the whole person, education of the heart, the hand, and the mind. He stressed the importance of a personal relation to God, but he does not

have much to say by way of suggestion about how this should be developed. The need for practical skills is very much of concern to Pestalozzi, and the training of practical skills is based upon the same laws as the teaching of the intellect.

In general, education should always be guided by Nature, because Nature will lead us uncorrupted toward truth and wisdom. Knowledge consists of an organic oneness, and this should constantly be the direction of instruction. The interests of the child should always be taken into account, and the child should be given a feeling of confidence in his or her abilities. Finally, Pestalozzi championed the education of people from all classes, and he expressed a desire to set fire to the barriers that shut out some from the right to be educated.

Froebel (1782-1852) studied at the University of Jena, the University of Gottingen, and the University of Berlin. In 1816 he established a school in Griesheim and in 1837 a school in Thuringia. The school in Thuringia included a kindergarten, and Froebel is credited with being the founding father of the kindergarten movement. The kindergarten spread rapidly throughout Europe and later throughout the United States.

Pestalozzi definitely influenced Froebel, a fact that is not surprising since Pestalozzi was the most challenging educator of his time. From 1808 until 1810 Froebel taught at Pestalozzi's Yverdon Institute and was also influenced by Pestalozzi's writings.

Nevertheless, Froebel was critical of Pestalozzi. He accused the latter of being preoccupied with the child's social development. He felt that there is an inner spiritual element of the child which Pestalozzi ignored. He did not see the Pestalozzian method as a living force; there was, he believed, no organic connection between the subjects of the curriculum. He also felt that Pestalozzi was too crudely empirical with an over-emphasis on the role of sense experience.

The starting point of Froebel's philosophy is God. He thinks of God as an eternal law that pervades and rules all things. He is expressed in the world of Nature, in the internal world of mind and spirit, and in life where the two are united. Froebel found an ultimate oneness in life, nature, and spirit. He stresses the importance of viewing the whole world as a unity. For him man's spiritual nature is essentially and innately spiritual. Education ought to help students reach full awareness of their essential nature. It should also guide them to be at peace with Nature and to be united with God.

All of this might sound a bit obscure, but it should suggest that Froebel was much more committed than Rousseau or Pestalozzi to a philosophy of education that proceeded from a full-blown, systematic philosophy. In this respect Froebel much more resembles Kant. In fact, Froebel was much influenced by Johann Gottlieb Fichte, the great German Idealist, who was in turn influenced by Kant. There is a tradition here which laid great emphasis upon developing full-blown metaphysical ideas regarding the self, God, and nature. The greatest of all the Idealists, G.W.F. Hegel, is the culmination of this tradition.

Froebel believed that persons consist of a dual nature of body and mind and that we are perceptive and rational beings. The attainment of wisdom is our highest aim.

He did not subscribe to the view that the child is the passive recipient of knowledge. He believed that true education must originate in activity. The eternal principle (which he sometimes identifies with God) demands spontaneity and self-determination. He believed that children have an innate desire for activity. They also have an innate desire for creative work. These desires should be left unchecked by adult folly.

There is little doubt that Froebel is in favor of a child-centered philosophy of education. A teacher ought to encourage the child's natural impulse to activity, investigation, and creative work. The emphasis upon developing the natural self does not appear as great in Froebel as in Rousseau or Pestalozzi, but it is not entirely absent. He says that our development has followed Nature's course, and that is a fact of importance for the educator.

Froebel, like Rousseau, seemed to regard people in their natural state as being good. This follows from his belief that the eternal principle pervades human beings. Divine action, he felt, cannot be other than good if left undisturbed. He also states that if we regard people in their natural state and at the same time take account of this divine action, it can be seen that all teaching which prescribes must impede, destroy, and annihilate. Thus, because our natural impulses are good (due to this divine action) morality should not be prescribed from without.

In other ways Froebel falls into the newer, progressive view of education. He states that from earliest childhood students must be trained in productive activity, and the lessons learned from daily work are by far the most productive. He regards play as most valuable. The child should be allowed to use his energy freely. And discipline ought to be permissive since the child is pervaded by God's presence. Education, he says, should neither direct nor interfere; it should be permissive.

The aim of education for Froebel is to cultivate students' divine nature. This pretty well sums up his philosophy of education. Education should not be an imposition from without but should develop the child according to the natural unfolding of his or her abilities.

Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841) was born in Oldenburg and studied at home with a private tutor through the age of twelve. He had a remarkable memory and could repeat a sermon word for word. He studied at the University of Jena, and in 1797 he went to Switzerland to take a post as a tutor. He was there three years, and during this time he worked out many of his views on education.

In 1802 he received his doctorate in Gottingen and taught Philosophy there for the next seven years. In 1809 he moved to Konigsburg to occupy Kant's former chair in Philosophy. He remained there until 1833. While there he concentrated upon Psychology (then a specialized area within Philosophy).

Herbart's application of the principles of Psychology to the formulation of a philosophy of education secure him a place of honor. He wished to construct a systematic, scientific philosophy of education based upon the latest findings in Psychology. Some call him the father of the science of education. The experimental sciences, he believed, were of great importance for establishing instructional procedures. He complained that philosophers neglected the findings of science.

Herbart felt the natural person was receiving too much emphasis in the philosophy of education. He accuses Rousseau of placing too much confidence in crude impulse, and he felt that it was mere folly to leave a person's training to Nature.

He did not agree with Rousseau that the child is good by nature. The child, he writes, enters the world with a wild impetuosity, a principle of disorder, and this must be subdued. Germs of this impulsiveness remain with the child throughout his or her development, and we must always be ready to restrain these.

Because of this discipline has much to do. However, Herbart certainly did not promote a system of strict discipline. Gentle feeling