Spring 2016

The Art of Well-Regulated Freedom: Rousseau and Cortázar

Braden M. Goveia
Central Washington University, bradengoveia@gmail.com

Central Washington University

The Art of Well-Regulated Freedom: Rousseau and Cortázar

A Thesis Submitted for Consideration by the
Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies
for Confirmation of the Bachelor of Arts Degree

Philosophy 497 Senior Thesis
Dr. Cynthia Coe

By
BRADEN GOVEIA

Ellensburg, Washington
June, 2016

Abstract

Jean-Jacques Rousseau was one of the most influential philosophers of eighteenth-century Europe. In 1762 Rousseau published his treatise on education titled *Emile*. In *Emile*, Rousseau argues that people require an education that returns them to themselves. He demonstrates how he could take on an ordinary boy (Emile) as his pupil and experiment with the possibility of raising him into an autonomous adult, both morally and intellectually. In 1963, Julio Cortázar published *Hopscotch* in its original Spanish title *Rayuela*. Cortázar wrote *Hopscotch* in a way that allows the reader to decide what role, if any, the last ninety-eight chapter sections have in the reading. Many of these sections seem irrelevant to the underlying story. Both Rousseau and Cortázar emphasize the importance of autonomy and curiosity in what deals with one's education. In this research, I analyze ways that Rousseau creates an environment in which Emile feels he must rely on his own abilities, and how Emile depends on his autonomy and curiosity to solve problems. At the same time, I demonstrate how Cortázar puts in practice many of the same techniques to encourage his readers to acknowledge their autonomy and curiosity in their reading of *Hopscotch*. Although Rousseau and Cortázar raise important ideas about individual autonomy, they reveal the counterintuitive nature of well-regulated freedom.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In March 2014, Jess Watters from Fox News interviewed a number of college students on the beach during their spring break (Watters). Watters asks the students about specific historical figures and dates. The reason why these interviews attract attention on television and online is because news commentators and viewers at home mock the college students for their inability to answer the questions accurately. People who complain that the vacationers were unable to answer the questions favorably also mention that the issues presented in the interview deal with things that they had to know when they were in school. However, to believe that knowledge of historical facts is indicative of an educated person is to believe in a form of education that Jean-Jacques Rousseau rejects. The questions in the random interviews required no need to think critically or creatively. For example, Watters asked students to state the current US unemployment rate. In another case, he asked the students to cite the current US debt amount. As if the assertion that that one's nation's debt is $18 trillion when in truth it is $19 trillion were any indication of the quality of a person's education, Fox News was interested in questions that measured the obedience of their memory and the measure of their conformity to what facts a person beyond them found important.

A student might know that President Reagan spoke about X topic on June 8th, 1986 in Nashville, TN, or to know that President Obama spoke on X topic on December 14th, 2011 in Los Angeles. A Republican might argue that a student who knows facts about President Reagan demonstrates a better college education. The difference between the first and the second example in terms of the type of education received by a student is nonexistent. The two examples demonstrate the same education. According to Rousseau in the eighteenth century, this is an example of a poor education, in general. Rousseau would argue that a randomly televised

interview on the beach would measure one's education more accurately if the questions required skill based creative problem solving.

From the before the time Rousseau's *Emile* was published and until today, the notion that the number of facts in one's memory is a measure of one's education apparently lingers still. Rousseau's book *Emile* traces the education of an imaginary boy named Emile, from infancy to adulthood. The book, published in 1762, is a response to the notion of education that troubled Rousseau. Therefore, Emile's upbringing depends on a tutor who works to cultivate Emile's critical thinking abilities, creative thinking abilities, his curiosity, and most importantly, his autonomy, all without subjecting Emile to data memorization.

There is value in intellectual autonomy. Therefore, no period is better than another to analyze Rousseau's treatise on education. The author of this paper will not present an argument from urgency, or claim that "now it is more important than ever to teach critical thinking." It is appropriate to analyze a treatise on autonomy, curiosity, and critical thinking at any time.

In 1963, two hundred years following the publication of *Emile*, the Argentine author Julio Cortázar published the novel *Rayuela* (*Hopscotch* in English). In a case very similar to that of Rousseau, Cortázar's novel is a response to what he perceived as a need to bring one's creativity and autonomy into greater involvement with their reading of a novel. In his book titled *In The Mainstream*, Luis Harss describes Cortázar's novel as "a therapeutic book, intended as a complete course of treatment" against overly rational traditions in the West, and also as a "revolt against literary language" (211-212). The novel is considered therapeutic because it can serve as treatment for the reader who, perhaps unknowingly, wishes to regain a level of autonomy. Cortázar's novel is a revolt against literary language in the sense that it awakens the reader by presenting an approach to reading a novel that challenges the traditional

language of communicating a novel to the reader. *Hopscotch* became one of the most famous novels from Latin America during the 1960s for how it embraces the autonomy of the individual reader and for how it invites the reader to disrupt the author-reader line of authority.[1] The themes within *Hopscotch's* design reverberated in the atmosphere of the 1960s notions of rebellion and freedom.

Like Rousseau, Cortázar attempts to balance his reader's freedom with some restraint. *Hopscotch* is not a book of empty pages designed so that a reader can imagine or "write" his or her own story. That would be an example of the stagnation that results in an environment where there is insufficient guidance. Both Cortázar and Emile's tutor demonstrate a fine balance of well-regulated freedom.

In situations where the fine balance between autonomy and restraint shifts too far towards either extreme, the imbalance can seem difficult to bear. The *New York Times* article "No Script? No Roles? It's Really No Problem" from 2016 describes an unscripted play with six actors called "Stolen House (Love). They know nothing about a plot, story, or characters. The six actors must create a uniquely improvised show. The skit provides the actors with the opposite extreme. They have much more autonomy than what Rousseau and Cortázar would believe is beneficial for a student or a reader to possess.

Therefore, Rousseau and Cortázar create their own "set" that allows for "well-regulated" freedom. The concept of well-regulated freedom seems counterintuitive. It seems something can ultimately be either free or unfree, but never both. Overall, both Rousseau and Cortázar play on the idea that there is a value in operating as a human somewhere between the two extremes of restraint and autonomy. Each of their respective work draws on the idea of the

[1] An editorial article in the *Revista de la Universidad de México* states that Cortázar's goal was to combat the passivity in reading novels and short stories and a tendency to prefer "preassembled products" (3).

existence of a delicate balance between the two concepts. Also, this thesis outlines two examples for why the works of Rousseau and Cortázar pose significant differences in their use of well-regulated freedom.

I Exposition of *Emile*

Emile consists of five chapters, or books. Books I, II, and III deal with Emile's education and upbringing. In Books IV and V Rousseau discusses how Emile should be brought into society as a fully capable autonomous individual. The author of this paper intends to ignore Book V for the purpose of the current analysis. Book V deals with the education of a girl named Sophie, with whom Emile is intended to marry. The tutor, Rousseau's alter ego, educates Emile until he is of adult age.

Rousseau's purpose in *Emile* is to describe what he believes is a good education.[2] He laments that the literature and learning surrounding him during the eighteenth century produces more destruction than edification (33). His goal is to present a remedy. If his ideas were not a remedy for the education of his time, he would be content, at least, to know that his ideas lead others to think of better ones (33).

Emile, then, is a treatise on how to ground education on what Rousseau believes is human nature. Rousseau claims that it is by human nature that we desire to modify our surroundings (37). He writes that a person wants nothing to remain as nature has intended it to be (37). He fears that the natural, good, and pure form of 'human' can be destroyed by the wrong education. It should be noted that for Rousseau 'natural' refers to what stands untouched by human hands, even though this leads to a contradiction according to some. Professor John Charvet demonstrates the problem of Rousseau's definition of 'natural' in *The Social Problem*

[2] That is, what he believes a good education for boys should be. Rousseau would never argue that girls should have the same education. For this reason the author will use masculine pronouns when referring specifically to the tutor's student Emile.

in Rousseau's Philosophy, where he writes, "The good society, for Rousseau, must both denature man and yet be founded upon man's nature" (3). A destructive education according to Rousseau is one that fails to liberate a person from becoming dependent on others. For Rousseau, being free from others emotionally is a topic of morality. Nicholas Dent's reading of Rousseau indicates that "what passes for morality and moral education" in Rousseau's mind "is little more than coercion and bullying" (Dent 6).

In Books I through II, Emile's tutor concern is to allow Emile to exercise his curiosity and autonomy to prevent him from becoming dependent on other humans. Rousseau writes that life creates needs (56). Emile is an infant in Book I. Rousseau believes everything that deals with caring for Emile at this stage in his life forms part of his education. This is why he claims that "education begins at birth" (62). Therefore, Emile's ability to move about, his hygiene, how he is nursed, and his diet are all issues that deal with his early education.

Emile's tutor opposes the idea of swaddling him (43). He asks, "could not so cruel a constraint have an influence on their disposition as well as their constitution?" (43). Rousseau laments that young animals get to exercise their strength and use their limbs from very early in life, while babies are restricted by clothing from birth (45). Because of this, Rousseau believes swaddling impedes the development of Emile's strength and autonomy (43). It is necessary that Emile exercise his body and experiment with its movements. He could not learn through personal experience how to use his arms and legs with vigor if belts, sleeves, and tight diapers continually bind him.

As with swaddling, Rousseau wants to limit Emile as little as possible in terms of Emile's experiences. Rousseau discusses with certain admiration how Thetis made her son Achilles invulnerable by plunging him into the river Styx (47). This image in ancient mythology appeals

to Rousseau because he is certain that children become more susceptible to suffering in adulthood in proportion to how much they have been kept from any harm in infancy and childhood (47). The idea of plunging an infant into a river is more than troublesome, but Rousseau insists that Thetis strengthened Achilles as a result. The fable in which Achilles is plunged into the Styx by his mother is what Rousseau calls "a lovely one", because despite the fact that it is harmful to submerge an infant in water, the act, in the end, had a strengthening effect on Achilles (47). This analogy serves as a platform for why Emile is exposed to problems and difficulties that his tutor can prevent, but refuses to do so out of concern for Emile's future. If Emile proves to be less vulnerable to seek help in various unsettling situations, then he may prove less likely to accept other forms of mental or physical refuge hastily later in life that can jeopardize his ability to think through the matter. Shielding Emile from frightful experiences also means Emile must be left in the dark so it no longer causes suffering (63). He writes, "I want him habituated to seeing new objects, ugly, disgusting, peculiar animals, but little by little, from afar, until he is accustomed to them, by dint of seeing them handled by others, he finally handles them himself" (63).

Rousseau uses another example from an ancient story to explain how Emile should be educated as an infant. In this example, he recalls how Hector of Troy saw how frightened his young son Astyanax was at the sight of the feather moving about on his helmet. Instead of hiding the helmet from his son to prevent him from feeling frightened, he does the opposite. Hector has his son play with the helmet (65). The story Rousseau tells of Hector and Astyanax illustrates the role that curiosity and personal experience, and not shelters, will be a key factor in Emile's education and upbringing.

The first book Emile reads is Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe.* He reads the book long before he is old enough to read another book. *Robinson Crusoe* teaches Emile how to be an independent human. In the novel, Crusoe survives a shipwreck and subsists alone for 28 years on an island before he is rescued. Crusoe must abandon (unwillingly) society to enter nature. The tutor prescribes the book to Emile with such prominence because Crusoe teaches him to see the importance of gaining useful skills and for being able to survive without depending on others to know what is best for him. In a statement that encompasses why he wants Emile to read *Robinson Crusoe*, Rousseau writes, "The surest means of raising above prejudices and ordering one's judgment about the true relations of things is to put oneself in the place of an isolated man and to judge everything as this man himself ought to judge of it with respect to his own utility" (185). *Robinson Crusoe* is meant to be Emile's entertainment and instruction (185). However, Emile will not suspect that the book is for his instruction. Dependence is weakness according to Rousseau, and to be strong is to be independent and autonomous. Therefore, a weak person is someone who depends on another to live or who needs to be instructed on what they ought to do to live well. Rousseau puts emphasis on education because it is the relationship and dependence between tutor and student that can produce an autonomous individual. Rousseau's concern is not to leave Emile to educate himself in the wild. On the other hand, any dependence that fails to produce an autonomous individual is problematic for Rousseau. Just any tutor/student relationship will not suffice. The relationship between the two people required to produce the autonomous individual Rousseau desires is delicate.[3]

If Emile is to avoid dependence on others, then the tutor must prevent Emile from relying on fact memorization. The tutor decides not to teach him geographical or astronomical facts. Memorization is the opposite of learning for Rousseau:

[3] See section IV

> No, if nature gives the child's brain the suppleness that fits it to receive all sorts of impressions, it is not in order to engrave on this brain the names of kings, dates, terms of heraldry, globes, and geography, and all those word without any sense for the child's age, and devoid of utility for any age whatsoever… (112)

Even if his student were successful in memorizing facts, the tutor believes Emile would then stumble on his application of the facts in practice. If the tutor would have explained in detail the coordinates to where he intended to lead Emile, he claims he would have "made a true pedant's display of which he will have understood not a single idea," and Emile still would be ignorant as to what it feels like to be without direction (180). A student never feels he or she is without bearing while they depend on constant accounts from their instructor (180).[4] It is difficult to inspire curiosity in a learning environment when a student has only to engage at a minimal level. For Emile to comprehend something, it is required that he does more than simply memorize his tutor's instruction. The tutor writes,

> Apparent facility at learning is the cause of children's ruin. It is not seen that this very facility is the proof they learn nothing. Their brain, smooth and polished, returns, like a mirror, the objects presented to it. But nothing remains; nothing penetrates. The child retains the words… (107)

While it is possible that a student feels indifferent towards learning, it is much harder for him or her to be curious about learning while they are expected to be passive learners. Being a passive learner is facilitated when one the memorization of terms becomes more important that the understanding of the ideas that the words represent (74). What Rousseau dislikes is that a student might accept, or memorize, things and ideas about the world as

[4] When discussing *Hopscotch* and the general themes contained within this essay, the author will use gender-inclusive pronouns.

portrayed by an instructor that fail to reflect the student's experience in the world. For example, that student has specifically memorized the US debt fails to reflect his or her experience in the world.

Emile and his tutor become hungry, thirsty, and tire as a result of wandering in all directions during their walk in the wilderness. The tutor allows Emile to cry over the unfortunate situation in which they find themselves. The two begin to deliberate where they are in relation to the surrounding mountains, the forest, and in relation to the sun's position in the sky. Emile succeeds in deriving their general location from the dialogue he and the tutor have.

Emile learns a great deal from the attitude of his tutor when Emile leads them through areas on unknown dangers (77). For example, if Emile notices that his tutor panics as a result of where Emile has taken them, then Emile would surely feel lost. If on the other hand his tutor appears relaxed and faithful to Emile's path, then Emile would maintain his confidence and learn significantly more (77).

The tutor must allow Emile's curiosity to be the engine behind his learning, without permitting him to lose the opportunity to learn the lesson intended. It is not solely by chance that Emile sits to cry in that particular area in the forest, because that is exactly the general area where he wanted to lead Emile, to the south of the city Montmorency (181). But the tutor had no control over where and when Emile cries, or even over the fact that he cried. To a certain degree, the tutor has to macromanage the general learning process, while delegating to Emile the micromanagable aspects of his own learning experience.

The extent in which Emile exercises his free will during his upbringing matters greatly to his tutor (66). As long as Emile encounters resistance "only in things and never in wills, they will become neither rebellious nor irascible" (66). A case where Emile finds resistance in a

thing rather than in his might be if he constantly needed or willed to lift eleven pounds but only has the strength to lift ten. In this example, Emile encounters resistance in a thing and not in his will or any one else's will. Emile should find experience only the resistance that nature gives him. For example, natural consequences do not include lies, withheld valuable information, or dogmas, because their effectiveness demonstrates a corruptive dependence on another person. The resistance that Emile experiences, in nature, serve as opportunities for him to overcome his problems alone. If Emile adheres fully to a dogma or a lie, his actions would be restricted from inquiring into the topic any further.

Rousseau would argue that it is a sign of a truly autonomous individual for him or her to recognize self-improvement without the need for external recognition. Emile is to have strong self-esteem by the time he reaches maturity. If Emile's happiness is dependent on the recognition that others show him, then he would be far from fully autonomous according to Rousseau's criteria. The same is true if Emile were to become accustomed to draw a sense of security from outperforming a peer in standardized tests. Unlike an autonomous individual, his security would derive from comparing himself to others. Emile's tutor would want to educate Emile to gain satisfaction from his own improvements. Therefore, Emile's maturity and happiness are impossible unless his well-being is detached from other people.

The tutor recognizes that Emile, like any young student, succeeds at learning in unique ways. For example, if Emile has a tutor who rushed him, then he might not comprehend what he is intended to learn (73). Such students are unlikely to understand the material presented them. The tutor insists that Emile ought to proceed at his own pace (73). Curiosity is a phenomenon of the individual. To respect one's own curiosity is to respect one's individuality.

Having confidence in his curiosity is key to Emile's education. His imagination helps "extend the measure of the possible" (81). "Oh man," he later writes, "draw your existence up within yourself, and you will no longer be miserable" (83). For this reason, the tutor desires that Emile remain oblivious to the control he has over him. It is the tutor's role to provide room for Emile to improve his skills without realizing he is gaining instruction. "To draw your existence up within yourself" means to respect the queries that one's curiosity presents. Overall, discovering the means to protect the queries that one's curiosity can present is central to Emile's education.

II Exposition of *Hopscotch*

While *Emile* is more a treatise on education than a book on how to raise a young boy, *Hopscotch*'s plot is less significant than the structure of how it is read. Compared to the structure of the novel, the plot in *Hopscotch* is relatively simple. Horacio Oliveira and La Maga form a romantic relationship while living in Paris. La Maga is free-spirited and curious, while Oliveira is strictly methodical in his mannerism. For example, Oliveira laments that "La Maga doesn't know who Spinoza is. La Maga reads tedious Russian and German novels and Pérez Galdós and forgets immediately after what she has read" (90). Their time together fills the first section of the book under the title "From The Other Side", and concludes in Chapter 36 after the death of La Maga's young son and her resulting disappearance (169). Long sections of "From The Other Side" consist of conversations that Oliveira and La Maga have with friends and strangers they encounter in Paris together. "From The Other Side" refers to Paris, while "From This Side" contains the story of Oliveira after he returns to Argentina (219).

In "From The Other Side" chapters, Oliveira finds work at a circus (262). When the owner of the circus sells the business to purchase a psychiatric ward, Oliveira agrees to

accompany his boss in the new job (307). Thus, Oliveira employs himself in places associated with abnormality. Throughout these later chapters, Oliveira suffers from La Maga's absence and begins to "see" her in the women he meets and begins to call them by her name (324). The chapters in the second section of *Hopscotch* conclude when Oliveira loses his mind and leaps from the top floor of the psychiatric ward (349). This is one of the many ways that *Hopscotch* can be read, from Chapter One and until Chapter Fifty-Six.

Instead of a Table of Contents, Cortázar provides the reader a Table of Instructions immediately following the page containing copyright information. This is the first thing a reader will encounter upon beginning the book. It reads, "In its own way, this book consists of many books, but two books above all" (v). The Table of Instructions at the start of the novel indicates to the readers that they will have to decide which version of *Hopscotch* they will read. The first of the two "books" that Cortázar refers to in the Table of Instruction is the story that a reader will experience if he or she reads the novel in the traditional manner; that is, from front to back chronologically until where Oliveira jumps from the building. There is nothing abnormal in this reading of the text. This reading of *Hopscotch* in the traditional manner begins from Chapter One and ends after Chapter Fifty-Six, where a person can decide to end the book with what Cortázar calls "a clean conscience" while ignoring the remaining pages in the book (v). The decision to ignore the remaining section requires an act of the reader's responsibility. The second reading is Cortázar's suggested reading of the novel, which follows a distorted order of chapters. The order of chapters provided by Cortázar shows that Chapters One to Fifty-Six appear in their respective order, but with Chapters Fifty-Seven to 155 (not included in the traditional reading) placed non-chronologically among the initial fifty-six chapters.

The autonomy that Cortázar allows in *Hopscotch* exists because, as he states, the "full" version of his text is only one of the numerous readings that someone can have. A person is able to disregard Cortázar's suggested order of the extended version and create his or her own reading. Although a person's reading of any text depends on his or her autonomous faculties, Cortázar cultivates his reader's faculties by placing chapters in *Hopscotch* that are unconnected to the plot. The reader can determine whether a seemingly unrelated chapter can relate to the plot or to one of its themes or not. The more unrelated a chapter seems, the more a reader may work to conjure a connection. Someone forms a personal reading of *Hopscotch* by exercising his or her judgment during the reading process. This allows readers to exert their individuality by placing them in a position that requires them to make sense of their interpretation of the "Expendable Chapters" provided them with which to work. Professor of Latin American Studies Saúl Yurkiévich writes in "Julio Cortázar: al calor de su sombra" that Cortázar succeeded in his ability to establish situations for his reader and accept the end result after the reader carried some of the story forward (10). A person takes into account his or her desires for what they are, or are not, interested in reading. The book becomes individualized. This creative process requires that the reader take a conscious hold of what parts of the text are superfluous to their reading and those that contribute to it.

Someone who has decided to read *Hopscotch* in the manner that books traditionally are read will begin reading Chapter One on page three. He or she might not notice the quote in French that precedes Chapter One by two pages. The quote lies under the title "From The Other Side" and can easily be passed over without notice. It is part of a letter that Jacques Vaché

wrote to the anti-fascist and anarchist, André Breton. It reads, "Rien ne vous tue un homme comme d'être oblige de représenter un pays" (1).[5]

Two details are worth noticing with regard to this quote. Firstly, it is worth mentioning that the quote remains in French in the book's original Spanish publication as well as in the English translation. Secondly, it is interesting that it is located just prior to where only those who begin reading the book in a traditional manner would begin reading. To discover the meaning, the reader would first have to notice the quote, act out of curiosity about it, and search for a translation.

The fact that the quote is left untranslated into Spanish or English makes one wonder what significance it has. It seems as if the author wanted to hint to the reader that obligating him or her to receive *his* text as it is presented to them is not how he would prefer they read it. To compel someone to carry out an act that allows for no individuality on their own behalf does, in essence, kill them. A death occurs when they appear less as an individual and more as a subject upon which the author acts. Cortázar decides not to include the text in the language in which the text is published, but rather to place the quote in a way that requires the reader to investigate on their own, if he or she *decides* to. What a quote such as this means requires an act of interpretation. Cortázar leaves the quote in French at the start of Chapter One for the readers who decide to forfeit a level of individuality and simply absorb the text. This act of finding a translation of the quote interestingly represents a level of interaction with the text that counters the reading of the text in a traditional manner. Had Cortázar included the text in the language of his readers, he would have prevented the engagement of the reader that he demands of them all along. Those who read *Hopscotch* in the non-traditional manner avoid the quote

[5] "Nothing kills a man like obligating him to represent a country"

from André Breton. They start the reading at Chapter Seventy-Three, and then follow the instruction to Chapter One on page 3, thus avoiding the quote on page 1.

Departing from the remark that to obligate someone to die metaphorically is to forfeit one's individuality in a textual sense, as in the quote that precedes the traditional reading of *Hopscotch*, the reading of text concludes with the death of the protagonist, Horacio Oliveira, in Chapter Fifty-Six when he jumps from a building. In contrast, Oliveira does not die in the non-traditional reading of the text. Eight chapters continue after Chapter Fifty-Six. The chapter following Chapter Fifty-Six is Chapter 135 in which Oliveira lays bandaged in a hospital bed.

Chapter Sixty contains a narrative about a Morelli, a fictional writer who believes in the liberation of the reader in literature. Morelli is easily understood to be Cortázar's alter ego in *Hopscotch*. Some chapters contain entire notes from Morelli in the first-person that his admirers discovered where he had lived. Although a common theme from Morelli's personal notes include discussions of his desire for an engaged reader, in other notes he simply talks of literature in more abstract ways. In Chapter Seventy-Nine, Morelli writes,

> Situation of the reader. In general every novelist hopes his reader will understand him, by participating in his own experience, or that he will pick up a determined message and incorporate it. The romantic novelist wants to be understood for his own sake or for that of his heroes; the classical novelist wants to teach, leave his trace on the past of history.
>
> A third possibility: that of making an accomplice of the reader, a traveling companion. Simultaneanize him, provided that the reading will abolish reader's time and substitute author's time. Thus the reader would be able to become a coparticipant and cosufferer of the experience through which the novelist is passing… (397)

Similarly, Emile's tutor is a coparticipant and cosufferer throughout Emile's upbringing. Emile's state matches the same paradoxical notion of "autonomous participation" that reflects the situation of Cortázar's readers.

Other chapters within the section of "Expendable Chapters" contain anonymous first person monologues about varying topics such as in Chapters Seventy-Three, Eighty-Three, and Eighty-Four. Chapter Eighty-One consists of a short paragraph from book *Tratados en La Habana* written by the Cuban author and poet José Lezama Lima, one of the most influential Latin American writes of the 20th century. Chapter Eighty-Seven contains a brief passage regarding the jazz musician Duke Ellington and his song *Baby When You Ain't There.* Interestingly, the title of the song by Ellington conveys feelings of a strong emotional dependence towards another person, as if the person is not happiest alone. Cortázar seems to indicate there is a great deal that people can learn when they remove their dependence on others, even if it causes great difficulty. As in *Emile*, there is a reference to *Robinson Crusoe* in *Hopscotch*. Morelli writes that his ideal reader is someone who would be a great Robinson Crusoe on the island (387).[6]

A few chapters contain excerpts from newspapers that Cortázar read while writing *Hopscotch*. Chapter 119 is from *The Observer* newspaper in London and it describes that an inspector entered someone's home and discovered that the owner's bird was locked in a cage in which it hardly had room to move, let alone spread its wings. The article states that the owner of the bird was fined by the city. Chapters 114, 115, and 116 deal with the death penalty. Chapter 114 is an excerpt from an article published by the Associated Press that describes the cruel proceeding of an inmate's execution within a gas chamber in California.

[6] See page 28 for further discussion on *Robinson Crusoe* within *Emile* and *Hopscotch*.

The reader who decides to traverse the "Expendable Chapters" encounters the task of measuring the value of each of these chapters that a first glance may have nothing to do with the protagonists in Paris and in Buenos Aires. For example, if the reader decides that Chapter 104 of the "Expendable Chapters" is irrelevant to the story, then removing that chapter from their story has no effect on the readability of the chapters he or she decides to retain. In other words, no single chapter in *Hopscotch* discarded from the rest can render the novel, as a whole, incomprehensible. The reader has the ability to incorporate the expendable chapters in their reading of *Hopscotch* however they wish. It takes judgment to understand what chapters might contribute to their reading of *Hopscotch*. Beyond deciding what chapters to incorporate into the reading, the reader also has the responsibility to determine in what way a chapter contributes to the reading. This way, the retained chapters exist in the reading in a non-arbitrary manner. If a reader finds a purpose for Chapter 119 (the short chapter with the captive bird) in his or her reading of *Hopscotch,* then the reader authored it, not Cortázar.

III Analysis of *Hopscotch* and *Emile*

Well-Regulated Freedom in Action

Initially, one might think the works by Rousseau and Cortázar have very little in common. However, a close analysis of both works should expose that the two writers play extensively on the importance of questioning what kind of balance ought to exist between restraint and autonomy in various environments.

Rousseau and Cortázar seem to impose very little constraint on their subjects. Rousseau writes that the "first of all goods is not authority but freedom" (84). He refers to both physical restraint and mental restraint as impediments to Emile's upbringing. Freedom from physical restraints and from mental restraints both imply a negative action—that is, the absence or lack

of something else. Cortázar is more concerned with the problems of mental constraints than with physical constraints. Rousseau is concerned with two kids of freedom in *Emile*, both physical and mental, but only because he believes both ultimately relate to mental restraints. For example, Emile's tutor is adamant that swaddling makes Emile weak (44). Both authors agree on the importance of freeing their subjects from mental restraints.

Mental freedom is the absence of mental restraint imposed directly or indirectly onto one's self. Freedom, then, is a necessary condition, and not merely a sufficient condition for autonomy. At the end of Book IV, Rousseau begins a long discussion against dogmatic obedience.[7] In order to prevent Emile from depending on the mental restraints he could receive from others, his tutor intends to place Emile in a state of ignorance, also understood as a state of darkness of understanding (167). Both Rousseau and Cortázar seem to enjoy placing their subjects in this state.

In *Emile*, this is observed when Rousseau is content that his pupil is confused. It does not bother Rousseau that Emile is mentally "left in the dark". This is how Emile senses the absence of Rousseau's mental guidance. In *Hopscotch*, Cortázar's desire is to impose less restraint on his readers throughout the novel. As in *Emile*, Cortázar's readers are "left in the dark." Their reading of *Hopscotch* can lack much of the restraint from the *author*itative figure. As the word indicates, there is a link between 'author' and 'authority' that Cortázar wants his readers to acknowledge so they recognize modes of control in literature they may not have fully noticed. An authority figure must author something.

The tutor wants Emile to become "habituated to darkness" (63). In this passage, the tutor refers neither to the lack of physical restraint nor mental restraint. He describes the darkness that exists where there is no light. This is the third type of ignorance described in *Emile*. When

[7] See page 26 for section on dogmatic obedience

Rousseau writes that Emile should be accustomed to being surrounded by the dark, he refers to the same underlying concept that links physical constraint and mental constraint. The underlying concept that concerns both Rousseau and Cortázar is exemplified perhaps best in the example of leaving Emile in the dark without his sight until he is comfortable in that state. That is, to understand better than before that he *is*—to focus less on what is presented to him in order for him to notice his means for comfort. Emile must understand he is an individual if he is to later exercise autonomy while experiencing an absence of clarity from other sources.

Rousseau and Cortázar understand that there is an area between complete abandonment and micromanagement. They believe such dependence on someone else can hardly produce a liberated thinker. Rousseau argues that micromanaging Emile increases his weaknesses (47). Likewise, he claims that pupils who have been restricted to the "bosom of his family and friends" as the sole object of their attention will feel lost once they count on their own individual company (228). Coming to face one's ignorance, alone, is the first step where Emile and Cortázar's readers begin to strengthen their autonomy.

Now that Emile and Cortázar's reader sense the lack of restraint that they might expect or want, they have to come to terms with their ignorance and freedom. At this point, Emile and Cortázar's readers are in the dark, ignorant, and free from restraint. The key for both writers is to ensure that this state of freedom can be used as an educational tool. The sense of freedom and darkness that Emile and Cortázar's readers experience must be felt powerfully in order to be pedagogically useful. For example, to read about an experience differs greatly from experience with it. Any true experience with a phenomenon must be a raw encounter.

It is the sense of ignorance and helplessness that *reminds* Emile that he is alone, yet with himself. Rousseau writes that this stage is where the moral life of Emile commences (78). He

claims that it is now when Emile "gains consciousness of himself … he becomes truly one, the same, and consequently already capable of happiness or unhappiness" (78). Emile, like Cortázar's readers, has to become accustomed to consulting *himself*. He gains a stronger sense of his knowledge, ignorance, abilities, and individuality.

Rousseau and Cortázar argue that they want their subjects to think for themselves in order to be less susceptible to deception from others. Rousseau claims, "the only means of avoiding error is ignorance" (204). In order for ignorance to be constructive as in *Emile* and *Hopscotch*, a person must know how to recognize when he or she is unable to provide an honest and justified response. If a person becomes habituated to depending on the knowledge of others, or if this person grows accustomed to holding unjustified beliefs from the support of others around him or her, then according to Rousseau this individual will jeopardize the strength of his or her reason (118). For Rousseau, thoughtless obedience also leads to the loss of reason.

In Chapter Sixty-Two of *Hopscotch* Cortázar laments that words are used without knowledge of their meaning, such as the word *sapien,* which means 'wise'. Here Cortázar refers to the word *sapien* in the following manner: "another tired old word, one of those that one must scrub clean before attempting to use it with any sort of meaning" (363). Coming to terms with one's ignorance towards things that become muddled in habit is key within Cortázar's work. Cortázar's readers sense the distance between their reading of the novel and the author. Before reading *Hopscotch*, readers may not have acknowledged that the author is close to their reading. Cortázar distances himself from his readers to make his readers sense his absence. He or she may realize how immediate to them authors traditionally exist within other novels. The absence of the author's direction helps the reader know that he or she relied on constant impulses. For example, "John floated the rapids" is a true statement whether he was

alone or whether he paid a tour guide to direct the tube, or whether he and his friend Mike were each in charge of one side of the craft. Cortázar wants to control only one side of the "craft". In the Table of Instructions, Cortázar reminds his readers that they may forfeit the opportunity to read the text with less assistance from his part. He agrees to control the impulses from both sides, like the tour guide, if he must.

Once an individual realizes he or she lacks knowledge, it becomes possible for this person to know him- or herself. In *Hopscotch*, Cortázar imagines a situation similar to the darkness in which Emile finds himself at time in his upbringing. Through the novel's characters, Cortázar describes a novel he would like to write that is a description of *Hopscotch* itself. He describes that in this book, "everything would be a kind of disquiet, a continuous uprooting, a territory where psychological causality would yield disconcertedly" (363). A disconcerted situation of a continuous uprooting described by Cortázar depicts what Cortázar believes a person should experience to rid him- or herself from habit and ignorance. Doing so would bring a person closer to knowing him- or herself, in a manner that is analogous with what the tutor wants Emile to experience in his education. It is an example of how ignorance imposed on a pupil can be used as an educational instrument. Cortázar claims, "man only is in that he searches to be, plans to be, thumbing through words and modes of behavior" (363).

Whether they are in fact alone or not is debatable, but Emile and Cortázar's readers have had to accept their ignorance, loneliness, and freedom. Now is when they employ their own autonomy and curiosity to find a sense of security. Emile is left "in the dark" so he can learn how to be ignorant (313). Being ignorant is not the same as knowing how to be ignorant. To be ignorant implies a negative action. It places emphasis on an absence. To be ignorant says nothing about what *is*. To know how to be ignorant implies action. This is the kind of ignorance

that the tutor raises Emile to have. It is also the ignorance Cortázar that wants his readers to experience in *Hopscotch*.

When Emile and Cortázar's readers sense no other aid besides their own, they engage their autonomous faculties. Rousseau writes,

> impenetrable mysteries surround us on all sides; they are above the region accessible to the senses. We believe we possess intelligence for piercing these mysteries, but all we have is imagination. Through this imaginary world each blazes a trail he believes to be good. (268)

Emile's innate desire for his well-being is what engages his autonomous faculties (167). Earlier in *Emile*, Rousseau writes that it is important that Emile's tutor must "busy himself for his own well-being" (120). For Rousseau, to busy one's self for one's well-being is to engage one's mind and body out of concern for one's situation. To do otherwise is to forfeit mind and body to better one's self through someone else. In order for Emile to engage his mind and body, he had to acknowledge the absence of restraint from Rousseau. That is why it is important that his freedom be experienced unequivocally in the previous step. If a person reads *Hopscotch* in the non-traditional manner, then what directs his or her reading is an individual desire for the well-being of their reading of it, and less of a desire for Cortázar's micromanagement.

Rousseau writes that when Emile is forced to learn by himself, he uses his reason and not another's; for to give nothing to opinion, one must give nothing to authority, and most of our errors come to us far less from ourselves than from others. From this constant exercise there ought to result a vigor of mind… (207). It is easier for a person to memorize what others expect to see him or her do than it is to think about what is right to do. It is true that knowledge of the

current US unemployment rate and debt amount can require some vigor of mind. Nonetheless, the tutor would be more interested in knowing that Emile is capable of discerning the moment when a highly esteemed and charismatic figure in his life commits a logical fallacy while talking to him or what significance a given battle in history bears on his life. To engage with the information requires a greater level of vigor.

Instead of claiming that his novel can build a vigorous mind for his readers, Cortázar puts considerable emphasis on the importance of what an individual reader contributes with his or her mind. He describes a novel that could be written that, if written, would undeniably resemble *Hopscotch*. He writes,

> the book would have to be something like those sketches proposed by Gestalt psychologists, and therefore certain lines would induce the observer to trace imaginatively the ones that would complete the figure. But sometimes the missing lines were the most important ones, the only ones that really counted. (469)

'Gestalt' in German translates into 'form' or 'shape' in English. Gestalt psychology investigates how human senses can perceive an unorganized or incoherent idea or image and portray it within the mind as an organized or coherent concept. The process of authoring order out of disorder is precisely the process Cortázar wants his readers to carry out in *Hopscotch.* This is also the process that the tutor wants Emile carry out when he is faced with moments of uncertainty and confusion in life. He admits that the most important segments of *Hopscotch* are not those that he publishes, but rather those constructed in the mind of each reader in an effort to find coherence in it. What they contribute to the reading would fill the places of "darkness." That is, there are moments in the novel where they unequivocally sense the absence of the swaddling that exists

when the narrators lead the reader to each scene. Here, each person "reads" what his or her imagination constructs.

Emile's tutor wants him to engage his own autonomous faculties to learn how to teach himself when he is unable to depend on others. He writes that his goal "is not that he know exactly the topography of the region, but that he know the means of learning about it" (171). Rousseau writes that to teach Emile to think autonomously is the tutor's "didactic craze" (78). To learn to think critically, for Rousseau, is to learn to live happily. He believes Emile will grow to be happier depending on his ability to teach himself things (85). Emile would be happier because he would use strength from nature in place of dependence on someone else (68).

Critique of Dogmatic Obedience

It has been demonstrated that Emile and Cortázar construct an education and a novel that invite the students or readers to ignite their own curiosity and autonomy. Now it is necessary to reveal how similarly both works critique the idea that people could impose dogmatic restraints upon themselves. In Book IV, Rousseau pauses his discussion of Emile's upbringing to write against dogmatism because he believes blind and habituated obedience greatly impedes Emile's autonomy. Prior to this section in Book IV, Rousseau mentions that Emile ought to concede nothing to authority. To concede nothing to authority means to assert nothing where the claim's validity rests solely on another person's position. Rousseau also advises that Emile should act only when he, and not a superior (such as his tutor), understands that the act is necessary.

Nicholas Dent argues in *Rousseau* that Rousseau's ideas regarding dogmatic tendencies in human thinking is relevant today. He writes, "The propensity of individuals and

governments to use moral appeals to provide a basis for measures that are increasingly repressive – and by this produce exactly the 'delinquent' behavior Rousseau predicts – seems unstoppable" (94). Part of Emile's education, as Dent noted, is to prepare him to avoid the repression that people often undergo in exchange for a sense of well-being. The tutor understands that it is wrong for someone to bind Emile with obedience and retain his sense of well-being as blackmail.

Both Rousseau portrayed as Emile's tutor and Cortázar portrayed as Morelli express criticism towards behaviors that represent a surrender of one's autonomy. In *Hopscotch* the characters admire Morelli's writing for its nonconformist approach to traditional literature. For example, Oliveira and his friends discuss on one occasion how "Morelli is an artist who has a special kind of art" (443). His art consists of breaking habits. The protagonists in *Hopscotch* discover manuscripts and notes written by Morelli that suggest the nature of his novel. It becomes apparent during the protagonists' conversations that the book Morelli attempts to develop a novel with the same structure of *Hopscotch* itself. A number of the Expendable Chapters consist of Morelli's personal notes that discuss the book he wants to write and demonstrate a discontent towards a mental dependence on tradition at the expense of critical thinking, in a manner that reflects Rousseau's critique of dogmatism found in Book IV of *Emile*.

Chapter Seventy-Four contains a note written by Morelli clipped to a laundry bill. Morelli writes, "On the level of day-to-day acts, the attitude of my nonconformist is translated into his refusal of everything that smells like an accepted idea, tradition, a gregarious structure based on fear and falsely reciprocal advantages. It would not be hard for him to be Robinson Crusoe" (387). In a way that reflects Crusoe's state, Emile's tutor leads him away from society and into

the wilderness in order for him to depend on himself. The nonconformist is a character that Morelli imagines will be the protagonist in a novel he considers writing. For example, it is unclear why Morelli takes notes on small scraps of paper instead of generic paper for note taking. However, the fact that Morelli takes notes in this manner speaks to his nonconformist nature. He realizes that if he must record a thought for a later time that day, then a common notepad designed and advertised for notes serves no function that the back of a receipt cannot also fulfill. The "refusal of everything that smells like an accepted idea" is a theme that appears throughout *Emile*, and especially in Book IV. Furthermore, the fact that Morelli links the imaginary protagonist to Robinson Crusoe is very indicative that Rousseau and Cortázar hold coinciding ideas of autonomy. Both authors used Crusoe as an ideal example for the protagonists in each of their novels.

Robinson Crusoe contains many passages in which Crusoe spends time alone thinking and planning. Because he is solitary, his thoughts come from no one else. This is significant because Rousseau warns against the belief that a claim or doctrine can be true because God said so (296). Such an assertion contains none of the critical and autonomous thinking that the tutor wants to impart on Emile. For example, in Book II the tutor advises that "one ought to demand nothing of children through obedience, it follows that they can learn nothing of which they do not feel the real and present advantage in either pleasure or utility" (116). Nature, then, directs what Emile ought to learn and why. In Book IV, Rousseau writes, "let us grant nothing to the right of birth and the authority of fathers and pastors, but let us recall for the examination of the conscience and reason all that they have taught us from our youth" (297). Moral beliefs, just as religious beliefs, are not to be imposed onto another person. For Rousseau, this is particularly important that children come to hold moral claims through their own experience in the world

and not by obedience to the moral assertions of an authority figure. Emile must learn that lying is wrong not because his tutor claims it is wrong, but because of the natural consequences it causes in nature. The tutor states,

> Thus you will not declaim against lying; you will not precisely punish them for having lied, but you will arrange it so that all the bad effects of lying – such as not being believed when one tells the truth, of being accused of the evil that one did not do although one denies it – come in league against them when they have lied. (101)

In the above example, Rousseau presents a paradoxical aspect of Emile's education. It is important that Emile be independent of others in the construction of his moral outlook. Yet, (1) his tutor teaches Emile to avoid lying and (2) his tutor makes use of peer pressure to teach it to Emile. The use of peer pressure to teach Emile to become independent of others emotionally and mentally is a clear example of the paradoxical nature of well-regulated freedom.

Likewise, in *Hopscotch*, another note discovered from Morelli states that his tentative novel would be an opportunity to "cut the roots of all systematic construction of characters and situations. Method: irony, ceaseless self-criticism, incongruity, imagination in the service of no one" (396). The only dogmas the tutor sees fit for Emile are those that are obvious and clear (300). However, a claim that is obvious and clear is rather undogmatic. A dogma is something that must be taken as true. Something that is obvious and clear cannot be a dogma. What Emile accepts as truth will be apparent in nature. For example, the precept "we have to love ourselves to preserve ourselves" may be an undeniable precept that Emile's tutor wants him to know, but he will know it from undeniable experience in nature (213).

Rousseau describes in Book IV that a good use of his faculties produces all the theology he can acquire from his own assessment of the universe (297). Rousseau then anticipates the reaction people would have towards his claim —"They may very well cry out, 'Subject your reason.' He who deceives me can say as much. I need reasons for subjecting my reason" (297). He reminds Emile that we are one species, and therefore no person can know naturally what he cannot know. No person can claim to possess tools to learn of God that are out of Emile's reach. His religion would be the product of his own imagination and creativity. He will owe blind service to no other. Such a religion would be built on more questions than solutions. A religion based on more questions than answers would please Rousseau because assertions made by other people builds towards a surrender of one's critical thinking much faster than questions left unanswered. A novel constructed to convey the same experience is precisely the novel Morelli wants to write for his readers. Morelli is less interested in attracting a reader who looks to avoid problems in exchange for packaged solutions, that in turn allow him or her to "suffer comfortably seated in his chair, without compromising himself in the drama that should also be his" (439).

To break away from dogmatic thinking is to break away from habits. Oliveira states that the novel Morelli considers writing serves as "an urge to get out of the rut" (446). Morelli is looking to break the reader's mental habits just as the tutor is looking to prevent Emile from acquiring mental habits. The protagonist in *Hopscotch* describes him as an artist "who has a special idea of art, consisting more than anything in knocking over the usual forms, something every good artist has in common" (443). They also claim, "the Chinese-scroll novel makes him explode. The book is read from beginning to end like a good child" (443). Here, a good child is one that responds to habituated pressure. 'To do good' is synonymous with 'to obey'.

The tutor never states that Emile ought to trust the Bible as a source of authority over him. This would contradict the natural and personal religion Emile is to develop for himself and could silence his curiosity regarding questions of nature around him. Morelli laments that "the novel is content in a closed order," hinting that novels internalized passively are read dogmatically (396). Rousseau is aware of the "closed order" of dogmatic mental habits that could occur in Emile's mind if he acquires the habit of blindly accepting claims that a book, such as the Bible, makes.

Dogmatism mistakes habit and memorization with understanding. Both Rousseau and Cortázar recognize that knowledge is distinct from understanding. For example, the tutor never encourages Emile to memorize information. In *Hopscotch*, Cortázar indicates a similar theme. After La Maga disappears at the end of the first half of *Hopscotch*, Oliveira and his friends recall her unique personality. La Maga felt unintelligent and underestimated herself because she felt unable to participate in the discussions that Oliveira and their friends have throughout the novel. She was curious and became occupied by simple things around her while the remaining characters engaged in "interesting conversations." La Maga felt pressured to read more books in order to participate in the conversations better. Nonetheless, it was all in vain. After her disappearance, Oliveira and the others recall that La Maga "thought that by studying, her famous studying, she could get to be intelligent. She confused knowledge with understanding. The poor girl had a good understanding of so many things that we don't sense because we know so much about them" (536).

Emile is to avoid books because they can give him a false sense of understanding. Rousseau knows that as with dogmatic mental habits, it is an error to believe one has acquired an understanding from an exposure to factual claims. Cortázar portrays La Maga's

understanding as the kind that the tutor encourages Emile to acquire—that is, one based on curiosity and self-dependence.

Chapter 145 of *Hopscotch* consists of a single paragraph taken from *Ferdydurke* written by the Polish author Witold Gombrowicz. The novel deals with themes present throughout *Hopscotch* and *Emile*. In *Ferdydurke*, the author addresses the concepts of identity, originality, and human interaction. The paragraph Cortázar includes in *Hopscotch* is from Chapter IV of *Ferdydurke* in which Gombrowicz writes,

> If someone were to make this sort of objection to me: this partial conception of mine is not, in truth, any conception at all, but a mockery, joke, raillery, and trick, and that I, instead of subjecting myself to the severe rules and canons of Art, am trying to make fun of them by means of irresponsible jests, romps, and leers, I would answer yes, that it's true, that my aims are precisely that…I do not hesitate to confess it – I want to turn away a little, gentlemen, from your Art, just as from you yourselves, because I cannot stand alongside of that Art, with your conceptions, your artistic attitude, and all of your artistic milieu! (544)

Cortázar finds this passage relevant to his novel because he looks to break free from a rut in literature. If there is an art that the tutor wishes that Emile avoids, it would be the art of dogmatic indoctrination of any form. Gombrowicz demonstrates how acting the opposite of serious can have a very serious and radical nature. La Maga is portrayed as the least serious of the group of characters, yet she had a better understanding of the world because she never lost touch with her curiosity. She has no difficulty in rejecting habits and dogmatism.

Artistic authority and tradition, like religious authority and tradition, can be dogmatic. Art can hold parameters too. In art, improvisation is one method used to escape from an

organized structure of habit. In an interview with Omar Cisneros, Cortázar claimed that he enjoyed the sensation of creativity that exists in all forms of improvised art (52). Like Cortázar and his reader, Emile's tutor must exercise a small amount of improvisation as he allows Emile to wield more autonomy in order to direct Emile without knowing what Emile's next action may be.

Artistic and religious conventions lead a person away from his or her genuine internal impulses. Often attention is given to the artist, writer, scientist, or academic who responds to (and performs within) the parameters in which his or her peers operate. How does one be creative within a parameter? Although this sounds like the basis for Emile's education, it is different. The tutor's parameter exists to make Emile immune to all parameters except those found in nature and those founded on his own reason and moral intuition. The key is for his tutor to construct initial parameters to guide him on his way. Emile's creativity during moments of his upbringing are to appear as unrestricted as can be in nature itself.

The effort to resist conformity can breed conformity too. There are parameters to find oneself outside of parameters, correctly. For example, people can argue that there is a right way and a wrong way to be a hippie. There can be a right way and a wrong way to be an "emo." Emile and Cortázar's readers are supposed to experience a wider parameter that allows them to stretch their creativity and imagination in a way that oversteps the parameters others place in their way.

Well-Regulated Freedom: Paradox

Clearly, *Emile* and *Hopscotch* contain comparable critiques of dogmatic obedience to the restraints that people unconsciously accept from outside sources. It is appropriate now to outline the paradoxical nature of 'well-regulated freedom' that exists overall. Rousseau

candidly acknowledges that Emile is only slightly free. A motto for *Emile* might be what he writes in Book II: "Let him believe he is the master" (120). He recommends that Emile only should govern as long as "he uses what you exact from him" (120). In Book II he refers to this idea as a "well-regulated freedom" (92). He writes, "one not ought to get involved with raising a child if one does not know how to guide him where he wants" (92). This creates a paradox regarding the nature of freedom of Emile's freedom. Rousseau repeats a similar statement at the beginning of Book III when Emile is an adolescent, but he employs the term 'curiosity" rather than 'freedom'. He writes, "At first children are only restless; then they are curious; and that curiosity, well directed, is the motive of the age we have now reached" (167). If Emile's freedom as a child is well directed and his curiosity as an adolescent is well directed, then it is difficult for Rousseau to claim that Emile learns by himself.

Nonetheless, in Book II Rousseau writes that Emile does in fact learn by himself (192). Emile learns by himself while his tutor causes all objects that are important for him to know "pass before him" (192). Emile is free to learn what he may from objects and ideas that are imposed on him from his tutor. This is how Emile is "guided a little" (171). It is paradoxical that someone, like Emile, could be made free by being guided to freedom. Rousseau and Cortázar insist that autonomy requires more than freedom. That is, autonomy requires certain parameters. For example, Cortázar includes a Table of Instructions where the Table of Contents is usually located in novels (v). This is significant because Cortázar's instruction implies a parameter for his readers as part of his effort to give them less restraint and parameters.

It would be incorrect to claim that the tutor's control over Emile is invisible. It would be invisible if they had no effect on Emile's upbringing. To camouflage is not synonymous with to make invisible. The tutor's manipulation of Emile is camouflaged because it does in fact have

an effect on Emile, and because the consequences of his actions appear clothed in nature. It would be detrimental to Emile's education if he were to recognize the fact that his tutor's hand guided his freedom.

While both authors insist that autonomy requires certain parameters, they focus a great deal on the removal of other parameters. For example, both authors describe orderly disorder in a positive tone. In *Hopscotch*, Horacio Oliveira states that his relationship with La Maga causes him to view the disorder of his world differently. Similar to how Emile's feelings are both natural and orchestrated by his tutor, Oliveira notices a "precarious happiness" and a "false truce" around him when he is with La Maga (13). Nonetheless, he writes, "there was no disorder then. The world was still something petrified and established, swinging on its hinges, a skein of streets and trees and names and months. There was no disorder to open escape-hatches…" (13). Oliveira notes that some amount of disorder serves as an escape toward well-regulated freedom. Both *Emile* and *Hopscotch* portray disorder as something natural and good, as something liberating, even though it requires restraint. For example, Oliveira writes, "I had come to accept La Maga's disorder as the natural condition of every moment…" (12). In the same chapter, Oliveira describes a freedom that resembles that of Emile for its counterintuitive nature of an artificial freedom and its utility. He writes,

> It was idiotic to revolt against the Maga world and the Rocamodour [her infant] world, when everything told me that as soon as I got my freedom back I would stop feeling free. A hypocrite like few others, it bothered me to spy on my own skin…my attempts at being a parrot in a cage reading Kierkegaard through the bars, and I think that what bothered me most was that La Maga had no idea at all that she was my witness, and on the contrary, was convinced that I was eminently master of my fate. But no, what really

> exasperated me was knowing that I would never again be so close to my freedom as in those days in which I felt myself hemmed in by the Maga world, and that my anxiety to escape was an admission of defeat. (14)

Similar to how Oliveira loses his freedom the moment he ceases to be " hemmed in by the Maga world", Rousseau believes the time in Crusoe's life where he is the freest is when he lives restricted on the island. Crusoe's control over his environment is limited to within a given confinement. In Crusoe's case, it is a literal island. Crusoe's only limitations arise from nature: daylight hours, nightfall, rain, the variety of plants and animals, and the size of the island. The island in which Emile and Cortázar's readers wield control is formed by Rousseau and Cortázar. They construct the basic groundwork for autonomy. Crusoe's island serves as a good example for what *Hopscotch* is to its reader. It is an island where Cortázar's reader roams and feels that he or she is autonomous. *Hopscotch* is the physical island. Emile's island is the invisible and abstract cage in which Emile is raised under the manipulation of the tutor. The question arises, in what way can freedom be anything except total freedom? Also, in what way is freedom useful if it is unrestrained?

Emile and *Hopscotch* demonstrate a freedom and autonomy that are restricted and artificial. In order to conceal the order that lies beneath the surface, it seems both texts elevate the concept of disorder as an approximation to a natural order and as an opposition to methodical reasoning, even though Emile's tutor has to methodically orchestrate the occurrences in Emile's upbringing.

Importance of Play

Whether the concept of 'well-regulated freedom' is coherent or not may be debated further. However, the works by Rousseau and Cortázar place significant emphasis on an

important and often covert relationship between autonomy, curiosity, playfulness, and freedom. Both *Emile* and *Hopscotch* portray playfulness in a positive and healthy manner. The cover of *Emile* displays an image of Emile playing with a top. On the other hand, *Hopscotch* is the name of a game children play. When discussing Emile's games, Rousseau writes that "his games are his business" (161). He also claims that "all of childhood is or ought to be only games and frolicsome play" (153). As with La Maga in *Hopscotch*, Rousseau shows that playfulness and curiosity should be respected. He writes, "respect childhood, and do not hurry to judge it" (107). Later in Book IV, Rousseau writes about Emile in the past tense to explain how Emile learned to think as a result of his labors and games (316). This is not the first instance where Rousseau mentions that playfulness serves a purpose in education. "Love childhood, he advises, and "promote its games…its amiable instinct" (79). In Book I he recalls the story when Astyanax is frightened at the sight of his father Hector (63). This scene also serves to show that playfulness and games are part of human nature, which is why Rousseau believes playfulness and games ought to be included in an education. In Book II, Rousseau writes that Emile will overcome any future fear of the dark if he learns to play in darkness outside from a very young age (137).

Rousseau laments that humans stop playing games as they age. He writes, "Why do you want to deprive these little innocents of the enjoyment of a time so short which escapes them and of a good so precious which they do not know how to abuse…As soon as they can sense the pleasure of being arrange it so that they can enjoy it…" (79).

Playfulness and the serious nature that games have for the children who play them is also apparent in *Hopscotch*. Morelli scribbles in his notepad that "the happy building of a kite and its raising for the joy of children is not a lowly occupation" (387). According to Oliveira,

"our passions are the principal instruments of our preservation" (212). After the disappearance of La Maga, the individuals who remember her admire her silly nature. "Blessed be the silly", claims Étienne, "her silliness used to irritate me. Horacio insisted it was just a lack of information, but he was wrong. There's a well-known difference between ignorance and silly" (536). Being free to act silly has nothing to do with a lack of knowledge in either text. In fact, in *Emile* and *Hopscotch,* the character who plays and acts curiously is the same individual in each text who is portrayed in the most favorable light.

An adult who appears silly demonstrates that he or she is unresponsive towards some form of authority. Habit is an authoritative figure. An adult who acts silly demonstrates that he or she is unresponsive towards an established boundary. Oliveira mentions, "Only by living absurdly is it possible to break out of this infinite absurdity" (101). Here, he refers a glass cage that each person in society must fit into.

Aside from La Maga, there is another character in *Hopscotch* who portrays favorably what it is to be outside of traditional boundaries of behavior. Oliveira discovers a piano concert nearby that he decides to attend where a woman named Madame Berthe Trépat will play her original music on the piano. Before Oliveia could see her face well, "her shoes had stopped him in his tracks, men's shoes, incapable of disguise by any skirt" (104). When she began to play, her music sounded horrific to the audience. After the first song, Oliveira had "some trouble in dividing his attention between the extraordinary stew that Bertha Trépat was boiling up at full steam and the furtive or forthright way in which young and old were leaving the concert" (105). After two songs, Bertha Trépat looks up to see all had left the concert except eight or nine people. Oliveira wanted to leave, but during the concert there "had been an atmosphere which had fascinated Oliveira" (106). Oliveira approaches Bertha Trépat at the show's end and tells

her, “Deep down, I know that you were playing for yourself” (108). Emile’s tutor would be content seeing him play in way that is unintelligible to others. The way an infant plays with toys demonstrates an example of pure curiosity. This occurs at the same time in a person’s life where he or she is the most dependent on others. However, their curiosity is at the pinnacle of its freedom. As a child grows, he or she gains autonomy over their physical needs in tandem with the surrender of the autonomy of their curiosity. As they learn to depend on fewer people to live, parameters form around the art in their mind. Bertha Trépat understands that to please an audience, she must anticipate what it is that the audience anticipates, and employ her artistic faculties within that parameter in order to gain recognition.

Trépat’s music was too unintelligible to the audience. Oliveira deeply enjoyed her desire for raw expression. Trépat knew how to play the piano, yet her own music resembled that of someone who is ignorant of music theory. Her music was natural in the sense that Emile’s religion ought to be natural, that is, genuine and in response to no other authority beside his own.

IV Contrasts

While in previous sections where the similarities between the two books are analyzed, there are two elements in *Emile* and *Hopscotch* that demonstrate a contrast between the two books. In one book, the reason why autonomy is important serves as a mean to an end, while in the other book the means and the end are reversed. The other contrast deals with the likelihood of failure in one author’s endeavor, compared to how assured the other author feels that nearly any outcome in the reader’s case will be a success.

The end and the means to the end in *Emile* are inverted in *Hopscotch*. For example, in *Emile*, Emile must obey his tutor to a certain extent so that he can become an autonomous

adult. Emile is to feel that he concedes nothing to pure authority. In order to be formed in such a way, Emile must unknowingly respond to his tutor. He ought to sense that he is merely a companion of his tutor until they depart from each other when he can live autonomously. Although Emile has a level of autonomy in his upbringing, the relationship between him and Rousseau is crucial to acquire the opposite end when he is older. Therefore, Emile's autonomy rests on his dependence on his tutor. The relationship of dependence is the means to Emile's future autonomy, the end. On the other hand, the reader of *Hopscotch* senses he or she is alone compared to when they read traditional novels, so that they become Cortázar's companion and coauthor in the end. The reader of *Hopscotch* is autonomous, and his or her autonomy is not the end, as in Emile. In this case, autonomy is means to an end. In *Hopscotch*, the reader's temporary autonomy is means to bring the reader and the author closer.

In Chapter 137 Morelli writes that the book he imagines writing will consist of an "implacable *subtraction*" between him and the reader (526). The reader is meant to be alone and autonomous from the beginning of his or her reading. Nonetheless, the goal of the book is to create a "traveling companion" out of the reader (397). It is important to Cortázar that his readers cohabit the role of authorship in his story, which would make the story more *their* story.

The reader's autonomy is a necessary element to make a companion out of the reader in the end. A traveling companion is less of a "companion" when one is subject to the authority figure of the other. Therefore, the end in *Hopscotch* is to bring the author and reader together using autonomy as its means, while on the other hand the end in *Emile* is to produce an autonomous individual by means of a close relationship.

Now, it is much more difficult for Rousseau to construct Emile into the end product he wants out to make than it is for Cortázar to achieve his end goal. Emile's final autonomy is

natural, but it does not occur naturally. The tutor in *Emile* is confronted with the constant task of accounting for variables in Emile's upbringing. Any miscalculation or unpredicted occurrence can prevent Emile from becoming the kind of autonomous individual he wants to make. In the first paragraph of Book I, the tutor explains that the process he is about to commence with Emile is analogous to breaking in a horse (37). There is considerable effort in breaking in a horse, and it may go wrong. The task of Emile's tutor is more difficult than that of a horse trainer. The tutor is attempting to train someone to be free from others, while the horse trainer must form the horse to become obedient to another.

On the other hand, how Cortázar interacts with his readers is unlike the process of breaking in a horse. He experiences none of the stress Rousseau suffers in worrying that the end goal could be missed. This is because the end for Cortázar is that his readers participate in the reading. Even if a reader decides to read *Hopscotch* in exactly the traditional manner that books are read, the end for Cortázar is still achieved because *the reader* consciously chose that reading over his or her other options. The relation Cortázar has with his reader is a horizontal relation. He desired to be a companion. Emile's tutor occupies a position of authority over Emile in a vertical manner. There is no reason for Cortázar to fear that his readers discover his role as an author. Unlike in the case of the tutor in *Emile*, there is no reason for Cortázar to hide behind a veil.

Emile's tutor begins Emile's upbringing with a "blank slate." That is, Emile does not have to dismantle a preexisting notion or habit in Emile's mind prior to teaching him how to be autonomous. The tutor must maintain an illusion from behind a veil so Emile senses he is free from human restraint, especially that of this tutor. Cortázar would ask for a transparent veil. He wants his readers to witness the control authors have over their reading of a novel by pointing

himself out in a sort of whistle-blowing tactic. He wants readers to know that they are freer than has been indicated to them. Cortázar wants them to witness the diminishing of their dependence, unlike in Emile's case.

Conclusion

Initially, the works *Emile* by Rousseau and *Hopscotch* by Cortázar seem to have very little in common. One text recommends how to raise a young boy to adulthood. The other is a novel about a romantic relationship and separation of two people in Paris. Also, the books were published two centuries apart. The likelihood that a person would find these works alike is implausible. Nonetheless, a close analysis of both works uncover the paradoxical aspect of well-regulated freedom. *Emile* and *Hopscotch* illustrate the need for parameters and restraints in autonomy.

While both texts show the authors struggle with the same questions, each author demonstrates a different area within human experience where these questions can be asked. Rousseau desires to know what the balance should be between a child's freedom and restraint during their upbringing in order for him or her to grow into an adult who thinks autonomously. His question arises from his concern that children are raised with too much physical and mental restraint to become fully autonomous humans in adulthood. On the other hand, Cortázar's desire is to experiment with the balance between restraint and autonomy in the reading of a novel. This arises from his concern that people may be unaware of their own autonomous faculties while engaged in reading.

One may ask what would Rousseau and Cortázar would say about social norms in the twenty-first century. In what way do we accept, without introspection, restraints in the form of other peoples' moral claims? There are cases where someone representing an organized belief

system tells a member of the organization that the moral controls imposed on him or her resemble the sting of a kite, and not the cage around a bird. What could a child do to recognize from a young age whether an authoritative figure conceals manipulation with the appearance of something honorable?

One might ask if social platforms such as Facebook.com also present a false image of autonomy and individuality. For example, an individualized Facebook or Instagram account allows a user to express to countless people, with comment posts and photos, how he or she is different and unique within the masses of the world. However, people selectively post images taken during exciting moments. A person, suddenly, experiences a torrent of continual instances with which to drastically compare his or her life. This type of exposure resembles nothing of Robinson Crusoe on his island, where according to Rousseau he was freest. How can a person learn to operate social media platforms like Berta Trépat plays the piano, while maintaining the autonomy over his or well-being like Crusoe? Further, if advertisers promote their products by appealing to a person's natural desire for individuality, then what can a society do to educate the youth to recognize false portrayals of autonomy?

Questions relating to restraint and autonomy are relevant in more areas than two. One may ask what level of restraint is harmful to a student's upbringing in elementary grades. For example, in what way does recess allow for a better balance between restraint and autonomy? What books should be part of school curriculum? What homework allows students to exercise his or her curiosity while maintaining the restraint needed to channel the students towards a desired end? Queries of this sort ought to be asked continually and incorporated into other areas of life.

The questions may be more important than the answers. It is a very good sign that these questions are *asked*. When questions such as these are given a firm answer, people may fall back into the dogmatic obedience that both authors warn against. That is, when someone feels that an answer exists for such questions on hand, then that ease of mind may translate into a lack of creative, critical, or autonomous wonder.

Works Cited

Charvet, John. *The Social Problem in Rousseau's Philosophy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974. Print.

Cisneros, Omar. *El cómplice, el perseguidor: arte y poética en Julio Cortázar*. Zacatecas: Taberna Libraria Editores, 2012. Print.

Cortázar, Julio. *Hopscotch*. New York: Pantheon, 1986. Print.

Dent, Nicholas. *Rousseau*. New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.

Editorial. "Revista de la Universidad de México". UNAM, Aug. 2013. Print.

Harss, Luis and Barbara Dohmann. *Into the Mainstream*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967. Print.

Love, Matthew. "No Script? No Roles? It's Really No Problem." New York Times 5 May 2016: C1. Print.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Emile: Or, On Education*. New York: Basic, 1979. Print

"Watters' World: Best of Spring Break." Fox News, 27 March 2014. http://video.foxnews.com/v/3401092103001/watters-world-best-of-spring-break/.

Yurkiévich, Saúl. "Julio Cortázar: al calor de su sombra". *Coloquio internacional: lo lúcido y lo fantástico en la obra de Cortázar*. Ed. Centre de Recherches Latinoamericanos Université de Poitiers. Madrid: Editorial Fundamentos, 1986. Print.