

Title: Freedom in Education

There are different school of thought that offers their insight on educational freedom. Where the first school argues that children should be given liberty no problem if they are bad. The second says that the children should be bound no matter if they are good. The third school emphasize that they should not only be free but also good. However, the third school's point of view is not logical true. It is just a relic of Rousseauism to think that freedom will bring moral perfection. People with this insight consider education as tool for sudden development. The success of the intellectuals who support freedom ^{entirely} depend upon their benevolence, self control and trained intelligence. Thus, education has not only to be positive, but also a tool that provide mental growth to the children.

Words: 120

On the question of freedom in education there are at present three main schools of thought, deriving partly from differences as to ends and partly from differences in psychological theory. There are those who say that children should be completely free, however bad they may be; there are those who say they should be completely subject to authority, however good they may be; and there are those who say they should be free, but in spite of freedom they should be always good. This last party is larger than it has any logical right to be; children, like adults, will not all be virtuous if they are all free. The belief that liberty will ensure moral perfection is a relic of Rousseauism, and would not survive a study of animals and babies. Those who hold this belief think that education should have no positive purpose, but should merely offer an environment suitable for spontaneous development. I cannot agree with this school, which seems to me too individualistic, and unduly indifferent to the importance of knowledge. We live in communities which require co-operation, and it would be utopian to expect all the necessary co-operation to result from spontaneous impulse. The existence of a large population on a limited area is only possible owing to science and technique; education must, therefore, hand on the necessary minimum of these. The educators who allow most freedom are men whose success depends upon a degree of benevolence, self-control, and trained intelligence which can hardly be generated where every impulse is left unchecked; their merits, therefore, are not likely to be perpetuated if their methods are undiluted. Education, viewed from a social standpoint, must be something more positive than a mere opportunity for growth. It must, of course, provide this, but it must also provide a mental and moral equipment which children cannot acquire entirely for themselves.