

A Study into Philosophical Anthropology of the Teaching of Philosophy in Turkey

Mehmet Ali Dombayci

Gazi Faculty of Education, Gazi University, Ankara, 06500, Turkey
E-mail: dombayci@gazi.edu.tr

KEYWORDS Philosophical Anthropology, Teaching of Philosophy, Philosophy Curriculum, Conditions of Existence

ABSTRACT The aim of this study is to analyse the philosophy course which is taught in secondary education in Turkey from the perspective of philosophical anthropology. The emergence of philosophical anthropology in the context of the question “What is man?” as a philosophical discipline is a remarkable process. Besides the importance of the establishment of philosophical anthropology as a discipline by Scheler, it is also required to analyse other views in anthropology in an interactive manner. In this study, different views on anthropology in the history of philosophical anthropology are put forward. Takiyettin Mengusoglu’s anthropology is introduced as a philosophical anthropology based on ontological grounds within its own systematic, in line with a critical view on these different opinions. There are also some conclusions about the historical process, development, and content of philosophy courses taught in Turkey. In terms of an analysis of this course, this last philosophical anthropology was preferred as it has a holistic view about man. Some recommendations are presented from the perspective of a philosophical anthropology, first for education and for the philosophy course for high schools.

INTRODUCTION

The adventure of man is to exist, to know that he exists and to try to bring into existence. Philosophy turned to human with Protagoras’ saying “Man is the measure for all”. This tendency became more apparent and effective with Socrates. The motto of this adventure, “Know Thyself!” is transformed into a question, and it could also be expressed as “What’s man?” Questions with “What?” are fundamental to philosophy. The distinctive quality of philosophical questions is the fact that the philosopher asks these to himself. So, in a way when a philosopher asks the question “What is man?” to himself, he makes himself the problematic, the object of research and scrutiny.

The human problem has been dealt with by a great many different disciplines. The common characteristic of these disciplines is an effort of human being to perceive himself and has varied throughout history. In ancient Hindu thinking, man perceived himself together with the all other living things. In ancient Greece, however, we see that

man distinguished himself from other beings in terms of his thoughts and emotions and is considered superior to other living things with its unique possession of logos, in a way having a special bond to Divinity. During Renaissance and with the re-exploration of man, rather than the religious and God-centred perception of man during the Middle Ages, man was perceived as immanent. Along with Descartes, researches focused on the conscience of man rather than man himself, and as a result, the essence of man was linked with logos. This perspective made it possible to turn to man, to the subject (Akdemir 2010). The idea of pantheism, starting from Avicenna to Spinoza and to Hegel, emphasised that human spirit identifies with the divine spirit. Leibniz goes one step further and says that man, himself, is a sort of minor god (Cilingir 2014). Later on, together with the original thoughts of philosopher such as Kant, Nietzsche, Scheler, Camus, Cassirer, Heidegger, and Mengusoglu, philosophical anthropology became transformed into an independent field.

The most significant and distinctive act of man, whom philosophical anthropology analyses from a holistic and ontological perspective, it “to think”. The basic notion of philosophy education is the thinking-based attempt to know oneself. Man can learn how to think only when he pays full attention to what needs to be thought about (Heidegger 2009). Learning how to think is only

Address for correspondence:
Dr. Mehmet Ali Dombayci
Assist. Prof.
Gazi Faculty of Education
Philosophy and Related Sciences
Education Department, Gazi University
Ankara, 06500, Turkey
Telephone: +905323430580
E-mail: dombayci@gazi.edu.tr

possible through reflection which means the thinking process bends over itself, contemplating about itself. We can see the link between reflection and the reflexive quality of philosophical knowledge in the etymological analysis of both concepts. Both the concept of *flexible* and the concept of *flection* are the past participle form of the concept *flectere* (Harper 2014). The fact that the act of thinking questions itself means that own conditions of existence of the thinking being are questioned. Philosophical anthropology looks into all these by making analyses and definitions. Dealing with philosophy teaching from a perspective of philosophical anthropology means exploring ways of knowing oneself – questioning oneself – thinking about oneself. In the current study, methodology was given as a priority, and then the emergence of philosophical anthropology with the views of thinkers giving their contribution to this discipline was introduced. Besides the views of these thinkers, the philosophical anthropology of Takiyyettin Mengusoglu coming to the fore with his original ideas was given. Following that the philosophy course taught at high schools was introduced. Within the philosophical anthropology context of Mengusoglu, the evaluation of the philosophy course taught in secondary education in Turkey was realized and the results were shared. Some recommendations were given depending on the evaluations.

METHODOLOGY

This study is a research which uses descriptive survey model in order to develop a suggestion from philosophy teaching based on philosophical anthropology. Document analysis was used as a tool for data collection. Document analysis includes the analysis of written material that brings in information about the phenomenon or phenomena subject to research (Yildirim and Simsek 2006). In order to resolve the main problem of this research, data based on literature were gathered. As the main purpose of the study is to present a suggestion for philosophy teaching in the secondary level in Turkey, works of Mengusoglu, who established an original thinking of philosophical anthropology as a Turkish thinker, as well as reviews of his work constitute the basis of this work. On the other hand, other philosophical anthropology views in literature are also dealt with in a comparative way. In the analysis of

the data, the relevant data gathered from documents were noted down in the first place, and these notes were analysed carefully and categorised to cover all aspects of philosophical anthropology in terms of their relationship. The data analysed and commented within the framework of the purpose of this study were synthesised in line with the problem of this research and suggestions to be made.

Philosophical Anthropology

It is likely to encounter a number of anthropological theories throughout the history of philosophical anthropology. These could be listed as follows; the theory of developmental psychology, the Geist theory established by Max Scheler, the biological theory and cultural anthropology which is derived from culture and its related concepts.

The first one is the theory of developmental psychology. This theory maintains that there should only be a difference of degree between man and other living things rather than a difference of form and quality. It tries to show that the uninterruptedness of biological development also exists in the psychic realm. W. Kohler, an important figure in the frame of this theory, claims that there is a concrete parallelism between the phenomena of soul and body and this should be underlined in psychology (Ang 2006).

The second theory was put forward by Scheler. Scheler (1988) argues that taking the historical process into consideration, when we ask the question “What is man?”, we could get three different responses pointing at three completely disagreeing opinions. The first one is the opinion world of the Jewish-Christian tradition, in other words Adam and Eve and their expulsion from Heaven; the second one is the Ancient Greek thought of human which considers man as a being with logos, phronesis, ratio, etc.; and the third one is the human thought of modern natural sciences and psychology which believes that man is the last stage of development and evolution on earth. As projections of these three different understandings of man, traditions theological, philosophical and natural scientific anthropology emerged. However, these three anthropologies do not have any commonality among one another and neither do they take each other into consideration. Scheler, therefore, claims that no answer has been found to the question “What is

man?" and emphasizes the need for a new philosophical anthropology. According to the anthropology he presents, there is a difference in form between man and other living things rather than a difference in degree. It is emphasised that this difference in form should not be searched for in the bio-psychic structure of man and man is divided into the two spheres of psycho-vital and Geist. It is further underlined that there is only a one degree difference between man and other living things in the psycho-vital sphere, while the main distinction lies in the sphere of Geist. This sphere emerges as a realm in which biology and psychology cannot intervene as it does not need a soul, nor a body. Geist is a principle contrary to life which is the consolidation of psycho-vital sphere signifying the unity of body and soul. It also holds the concept of logos and has a certain act of perception. Hence, Geist appears as a pattern of acts. These acts do not take place by themselves and they require an actualiser. Scheler calls this actualiser "person". Opposite to the person is "the world". And opposite to the psycho-vital sphere is "the environment". Man, as a being with Geist, becomes free by releasing himself from the dependence and pressure of everything that is psychic and organic. Such a being does not live in an environment, but in the world. These ideas of Scheler imply that he divides man into two categories in a covert manner. Still the originality of his work and his being the first in this field are enough to consider him as the guru of philosophical anthropology (Ang 2006).

Biological anthropology stands out as another theory. In the scope of this theory, Arnold Gehlen compared the biology of human beings and animals morphologically in order to set the grounds for the place of man in this world. This comparison shows that man is a being of deficiencies. He claims that the reason why man cannot adapt to his environment is the fact that his organs are not specialised for specific tasks. Man overcomes these lacking qualities with his intelligence, making it possible for him to live anywhere in the world. Hence, according to Gehlen, even human culture is a biological concept. It depends on his biology since it is a product of biology. In this respect, it could be said that Gehlen's biological theory does not hang in the air, but is based on some real phenomena (Mengusoglu 1988).

Cultural anthropology, the last theory, is represented by Erich Rothacker and Ernst Cassirer.

Both thinkers take culture as the centre of their views on anthropology. Although their starting point is different from one another, it could be said that they analysed the same thing. While development of culture is important for Rothacker, for Cassirer it is crucial that cultures are turned to symbolic forms. According to Rothacker, cultural life is a form of existence that gives life a content and a form. The laws on which this existence is based are the *polar* laws that keep the development of cultures alive. Cultural anthropology can reach these laws by remaining in the frame of historical life style, mutual relationship among cultures and understanding the links between the branches of culture. Art, religion, philosophy, poetry, namely all branches of culture depend on these laws. Cassirer, on the other hand, answers the question "What is man?" not by defining man not as an *animal rationale*, which has been the accepted definition so far, but as an *animal symbolicum*. Man does not live in a world of realities, but in a world of symbols. This world is composed of myths, religion, language, history, art and science because man can only found the cosmos of symbolic forms in these. This cosmos enables man to interpret and understand his experience and his life and to make links to the world of ideas (Mengusoglu, 1988). The most important feature that makes man a man is his ability to attach a single meaning to what exists, objects, and phenomena. Man is freed from single meaning through symbolic forms. He can only express himself with the help of these symbols. Symbolic form is the condition of both semantics and the human expression of meaning (Cotuksoken 1997).

These theories of anthropology derive from a psychological, metaphysical, or biological concept. Kant, however, does not base his ideas on any concept, but he deals with caring, education, the idea of the purpose, learning, transferring accomplishments from one generation to the other, working, founding states and actions. Therefore, Mengusoglu (1988) considers Kant's view on man as the fifth theory.

With Kant, the question "What is man?" was for the first time dealt with differently when compared with his predecessors. The difference is mainly the result of Kant's view on man which considers man as a moral being and the bearer of freedom. Almost like for any other philosopher, for Kant also, opinions on existence and knowledge form the basis for the opinions on

ethics, metaphysics, history and others. Kant classifies the world of existence into two as “appearance” and “thing-in-itself”. He also categorizes knowledge as a priori and a posteriori, while dividing the moral realm into the elements of freedom, personality and moral law. These elements point out to a dual understanding of man in which Kant divides his ideas on man into two; natural and reasonable being (Mengusoglu 1949). However, the duality here, unlike that of Descartes and Scheler, does not divide man into two categories ontologically. Hence his ontic view is gnoseologic and is referred to for knowledge. On the other hand, Kant was the first philosopher to show that man is an autonomous being. Yet, the autonomous side of man is only his reason. Man is a natural being with his other aspect. Like all other natural things that exist in time and space, man is also subject to the laws of nature. Being subject to the laws of reason, on the other hand, means being human, free and autonomous, as well as making law by oneself. The autonomous sphere makes both Kant’s philosophical anthropology and his ethics possible. In this way, man can be divided into two heterogeneous spheres; autonomous and heteronomous (Mengusoglu 1988). Kant’s adding one more question to the already existing three ancient questions of philosophy shows that he prioritizes anthropological problems. These questions are: What can we know? What should be do? What can we expect? and the fourth one What is man? While metaphysics deal with the first question, morality takes the second, religion attempts to answer the third and anthropology tries to tackle with the fourth. The first three questions pave the way for the fourth one. Takiyyettin Mengusoglu deals with the fourth question in detail.

Philosophical Anthropology of Takiyyettin Mengusoglu

Mengusoglu criticises the major philosophical anthropologies that have been established in our century in order to acquire correct knowledge about the existence of man and to set the ground for his own philosophical anthropology. The anthropologies he criticises are the theory of developmental psychology, Scheler’s Geist theory, biological theory and cultural anthropology that takes culture and its concepts as the starting point.

The developmental psychology view which is mostly based on biological data has shown that there cannot be any difference or distinction between a man and an animal in terms of existence, but there could only be a difference of degree. This idea does not correspond to philosophical anthropology’s need to find solutions to the problems arising in the man’s world and its desire to reach a correct understanding of man. This new discipline trying to identify the difference of existence tries to overcome this unproductive state presented by the “developmental” understanding with the help of Scheler’s view. This view identified a sphere of existence which is in the authority of neither psychology nor biology as a field of research for man. Finding Scheler’s view insufficient as well, Mengusoglu criticised the division of existence into two heterogeneous spheres which are irrelevant ontologically. Scheler’s view fragmented its being and left Geist, which cannot be associated with body and soul, vulnerable and hanging in the air. As a way out was sought, Gehlen, in his view based on biological grounds, drew attention to the fact that man is a being of deficiencies with primitive organs. He was also criticised by Mengusoglu as he reached metaphysical conclusions based on the fact that man is a defenseless being in terms of his natural equipment and tried to explain all human actions on biological grounds. This point of view fails to explain the values governing human acts. It is not possible either to compensate for the negativity of man’s being deficient by using concepts of ethicising and rationalising. Another view that falls insufficient is cultural anthropology. Cultural anthropology may rather identify the characteristics of nations. Philosophical anthropology is not interested in identifying the various characteristics that emerge in nations (Iyi 2006). Thus, cultural anthropology also divides man which is the field of study of philosophical anthropology (Mengusoglu 1988).

Kant’s anthropology is the closest view to the philosophical anthropology established by Mengusoglu and is based on ontological grounds, and it is, at the same time, a transition. Still, although Kant defines man as a free being who wants and ideates, the fact that he divided natural and spiritual aspects of man with thick lines caused him to fall in a duality. Mengusoglu’s anthropology does not divide man neither ontologically nor gnoseologically, while it does not abandon autonomy. Ontology is not necessary for reason,

but it is needed for the wholeness of man. Hence, in the coherent anthropology of Mengusoglu there is no duality.

Mengusoglu presents an anthropology, in his own words an anthropology based on ontology, against these views he criticizes. Leaving Kant's theory aside, when the starting point is concepts like development, Geist, deficient being, culture, etc. in anthropological problems, the ontological basis is lost. This would be a forced speculation (Mengusoglu 1988). The main objective of Mengusoglu, who carefully sets the starting point of this new anthropology is to understand man as what he really is. Hence, he takes an unbiased and plain view as a basis without referring to any presuppositions. He deals with the phenomena which are found in the concrete human existence, concrete integrity, concrete acts and the resulting accomplishments. The phenomena and accomplishments of human integrity are the following: man as a being who knows, acts, feels values, adopts attitudes, foresees and predetermines, wants, ideates, commits himself to something, works, educates and can be educated, founds states, believes, speaks and who is free, historical, the creator of art and techniques, and biopsychic. Mengusoglu calls these accomplishments and phenomena the "conditions of existence" of man, which is a term uttered by Nietzsche (Mengusoglu 1959).

Mengusoglu's original anthropology has three main philosophical sources. It derives from Kant the idea that man is an autonomous being and has opportunities that could further be improved. He attaches importance to the idea that how accomplishments specific to man and man-made works emerge from his very existence should be shown explicitly, which is an idea that Scheler put forward as a principle when defining the task of philosophical anthropology. It does not adhere to any assumption or acceptance other than the ontological integrity of man. Its idea of ontic integrity lies in the phenomenology and ontology views of Nicolai Hartmann. Hartmann, in his "new ontology" talks about four levels of existence. These are respectively: inorganic, organic, psychic and spiritual levels. These levels come together in the concrete integrity of man. In other words, man is a being which brings together all levels of existence in himself. Destroying human integrity means locking his being in a single concept or a system. Rather, as long as man exists,

he should be considered together with the existing and changeable human characteristics (Ornek 1997).

Such kind of a philosophical anthropology considers the opportunities of man as a species, as well as the characteristics of man, presenting a starting point to deal with problems in other fields. Kucuradi (1997) explains that this starting point enables her to make a distinction which Mengusoglu does not do, and that it constitutes a reference point to approach problems in other fields. In her work regarding human rights, she distinguishes between human characteristics and human possibilities based on philosophical anthropology. Conditions of existence preceded the idea of human possibilities, just like this idea led the way to the ideas concerning the possibility to know, to do and act, to present values, etc. With the actualisation of these possibilities, knowledge, philosophy, sciences, technique, moral, culture and other human accomplishments emerge. In other words, these themselves are also possibilities. These accomplishments are the actualisation of man's possibilities. These accomplishments produce their products in an interdependent way and they are among the main elements of man's world as supra-person values (Ozcan 2006).

Mengusoglu considers all his work in the scope of new ontology. This has been criticised by philosophers in Turkey in terms of philosophy education. It is possible to link this criticism with the fact that philosophy in Turkey still does not take shape as a part of the culture. In an environment where institutionalisation of philosophy remains incomplete, it seems rather risky to show, process, and evaluate the concepts and problems of philosophy through the eyes of a certain type of philosophy. Making the other types of philosophy the point of criticism over and over again by this certain type of philosophy has also been criticised since it may lead to the spread of a single-perspective philosophy culture. Although this is quite understandable in terms of philosophy education, it does not prevent us from considering Mengusoglu as the first system philosopher of Turkish philosophy. Mengusoglu dealt with almost all subjects and problems of philosophy within its systemic integrity. He made important detections and evaluations considering not only the general subjects of philosophy, but also the historical and up-to-date problems of Turkish society (Ozlem 1997). From this point

onwards philosophical anthropology shall mean Mengusoglu's philosophical anthropology.

Teaching of Philosophy in Secondary Education in Turkey

In the History of Turkish Education, philosophy has been taught in high schools and Universities for many years. Teaching of Philosophy which was introduced to our secondary education along with the II. Mesrutiyet period has been one of the courses which were subject to a lot of changes both in terms of curriculum and practise during the Republic period. Seven different curricula have been implemented so far in high schools in the Republican Era. These are the curricula of 1924, 1935, 1950, 1976, 1985, 1993 and the currently implemented 2009 curriculum respectively. The most comprehensive and most appropriate one in terms of curriculum development technique is the 2009 curriculum which is being taught at the moment.

As this study deals with the 2009 Philosophy Curriculum, which is still officially taught, it would be useful to mention the overall aims: it is a curriculum in which the units and content of the 1993 Curriculum were partly maintained, but which was developed in line with the constructivist approach. It comprises eight units. These are, in a given order: introduction to philosophy, philosophy of knowledge, philosophy of existence, philosophy of morality, philosophy of art, philosophy of religion, philosophy of politics, and philosophy of science. Unlike other curricula, activities are included. The curriculum, in which some units are shifted, show signs of the 2005 reform. The overall aims of the curriculum could be listed as follows (MEB 2010);

1. Students acquire information about the field and fundamental problems of philosophy,
2. Students understand what philosophy is and develop the skills to carry out philosophical inquiry,
3. Students adopt a philosophical perspective and develop the habit of using this perspective in their daily lives,
4. Students develop systematically thinking skills,
5. Students develop the skill to inquire existence as a whole,
6. Students realise the meaning of values for man, and develop an attitude to judge both ethical and aesthetic values from a national and universal point of view,
7. Students develop an attitude of inquiry to understand themselves and the universe,
8. Students develop an attitude to have a multi-perspective look into topics,
9. Students develop a discussion culture, and the attitude to be able to use concepts accurately and neatly when expressing their ideas.
10. Students develop the skill to judge basic problems of knowledge and science
11. Students establish the relationship between life and philosophy

When the above mentioned overall aims are analysed, the fifth, the sixth, and the seventh aims are noteworthy in terms of philosophical anthropology; however, they are not reflected in the attainments of the curriculum.

OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION

In Turkey philosophy has been taught in secondary education since the establishment of the Republic, and this makes Turkey one of the countries which teach philosophy at secondary level. It is possible to say that this brings about both advantages and disadvantages in different ways. The fact that education is a science and philosophy is a supra-science field sometimes makes it difficult to carry them out together. The difficulty here is that a supra-science field is dealt with in the scope of teaching activities and an education system that function in accordance with scientific principles and procedures. Still, it is a great advantage that students come across with philosophy and its content in secondary education.

Teaching of philosophy should make man both the subject and object of education. Integrity of man can take place in two ways; one is by being a being with self-consciousness, the second is by being a being who can find himself and others in others (Akdeniz 1996). What is important here is to deal with this structure of integrity without destroying it. As an indicator of this structure of integrity, a philosophical anthropology point of view to philosophy teaching requires going beyond the philosophy course and the school in which this subject is taught (Kaynardag 1997).

In this section, philosophy course will be evaluated in the light of the latest curriculum (MEB 2010) which has been taught since 2009, and in the context of the conditions of existence of philosophical anthropology (Mengusoglu

1988). This intervention is considered not concerning its relation to the phenomena themselves, but in terms of its influence on the success of these phenomena regarding education.

Man as a Being Who Knows: The knowledge about man who has a tendency to know and who knows should be evaluated in the context of its bond with life. Hence, rather than how knowledge is formed and what elements it comprises, the question of what is the accomplishment of knowledge for human life is important. There is a parallelism between Mengusoglu's association of the knowledge phenomenon with the sphere of values and historicism, and Cotuksoken's utterances about the link between knowledge and the outer world, thinking, and language (Ozer 2011). There nine attainments in total about the philosophy of knowledge in the philosophy curriculum. The last one establishes a relationship between knowledge and life, while the others analyse how knowledge is formed and what elements it comprises. No linkage is mentioned between the world, thinking, and language. On the other hand, as the curriculum deals with the acts of knowledge it establishes the relationship between knowledge and existence as a whole (Mengusoglu 1955).

Man as a Being Who Acts: The bond between the phenomenon of acting emerges as the practical sphere of man but it is not limited to this only. This phenomenon can only turn into an accomplishment by being active, and being action oriented. When the philosophy curriculum is analysed, it is clear that not all actions of man, as a whole being, are dealt with. These is an inquiry about the purpose of moral action and answers are sought from the perspective of the history of philosophy.

Man as a Being Who Senses Values: What regulates the acts of man is the sense of value in man. The sense of value should be considered as a criterion in decision making. The relationship between the acts and values is uninterrupted. Mengusoglu categorizes values as high values such as love, knowledge, honesty, justice, etc., material values such as benefit, interest, doubt, etc. as means values, and behavioural values that are derived from the social structure of the society, traditions, and customs. Although there is a statement in the curriculum which says that the aim is to ensure that students realise the meaning of values for man, and develop an attitude to evaluate both ethical and aesthetic values from a national and universal perspective, there is no

clarity as to which topic this aim is linked with and to what extent it will be actualised (MEB 2010).

Man as a Being who Adopts an Attitude: There is a correlation between man's adopting an attitude towards the conditions of life and the phenomena of knowledge, acting, and value. The activeness of man is due to the fact that he possesses knowledge. Values define the direction of this activeness. These values display man's attitude towards life. There are situations in which man can remain indifferent towards the conditions in life. The reason might be his lack of knowledge, value blindness, the fact that these situations do not fall in the life sphere of man, or they may be due to a pathological reason. Except for the last one, we cannot talk about indifference or not taking an attitude. Philosophy education should establish links with these, apart from this last one. However, no such relationships have been established. This kind of relationship can only be possible when affective aims are also included in the curriculum (MEB 2010), but this curriculum is mainly composed of cognitive ones.

Man as a Being who Foresees, and Predetermines: Foresight is about the intentions, aims, plans and related activeness of man. Sense of value, which gives direction to the acts of man also determines his attitudes. This determination makes it possible to accomplish the phenomena of foresight and predetermination. Since values and acts are not sufficiently dealt with as human acts in the curriculum, it is not possible to consider man as a being who foresees and predetermines. Though there is an attainment which says that students question existence and their own existence, it is not enough.

Man as a Being who Wants: Human acts are actualised when the sense of value and the phenomena of taking an attitude and foreseeing-predetermining are combined with want. Unlimited form of want, on the other hand, is desire and it cannot stand being able to do, or being actualised, so it is indeed being a dreamer. In the curriculum, there is no perspective which would make it possible to consider man who wants in a way to establish the links mentioned above.

Man as a Free Being: Man needs to take initiative to organize and sequence his own acts. The opportunity needed to take this initiative is freedom. When the acts of man are governed by means values, freedom either disappears or is left with little space. In such cases, interests become influential. Hence, man's acts should be governed

by high values so that freedom is possible. The curriculum limits the concept of freedom to moral acts; however, it does not make a link with values (MEB 2010).

Man as a Historical Being: History includes information about human acts, the resulting accomplishments, and events that take place between communities of man (Ang 2006). Man's acts, as well as his accomplishments constitute the sphere of historical existence. In this way, man sees what is historical as a whole and can be based on an anthropological ground deriving from the integrity of historical sphere. The curriculum is not sufficient in dealing with man and his from a spatial and temporal perspective. Information about accomplishments and events are presented in a disconnected way.

Man as a Being Who Ideates: Giving meaning and ideating are related to the sphere of human life and sphere of human action. Each act is governed by the values that need to be actualised. The existence of the phenomenon of ideating in man is the precondition of historicity, and hence, of attaching meaning to experience. The curriculum (MEB 2010) is incomplete in terms of giving meaning to philosophical topics and problems and in terms of conceptualising them. This incompleteness lead to a limited act of thinking with regard to questioning the content.

Man as a Being Who Commits Himself to Something: In the act of man, in addition to the sense of value and desiring something, having a purpose and committing oneself to this purpose is also influential. Man's committing himself to a certain thing shows that his actions are meaningful to him and he values his them. The relationship between values and the phenomenon of committing oneself to something affects man's freedom as well. As the content of the curriculum mostly focuses on introducing -isms and philosophers, it does not leave any room to the student to question with an aim to commit himself to a certain something.

Man as a Working Being: This could be considered in the scope of explaining the link between governing the phenomenon of work in terms of its aims and the sphere of values. Meaningful work is governed by high values. Meaningful work makes the actualiser of the work happy and becomes his style of existence. When man gets out of this style of existence he feels deficient. Meaningless work is a way of work governed by means values and place the

accomplishment of a task in the centre. The curriculum does not have sufficient content to make an assesment of man's committing himself to meaningful work or thing.

Man as a Being Who Can Educate and be Educated: The bio-psychic cores that are found in man constitute the basis for phenomena. Phenomena such as knowing, acting, sensing values, being active, foreseeing-predetermining, being free, etc. are not granted to man readily by nature. In order for these to actualise, the phenomena of education and being able to be educated are needed. Education of man needs him to be considered as a whole. His "plasticity" which distinguishes him from other living things is the possi-bility for him to bend and to gain a new form. Even though the curriculum accepts that it could only aim to educate the student in terms of philosophical inquiry at this level, it lacks the structure to make it possible.

Man as a Founder of State: Man's acts are categorised according to their purposes, and they are given meaning and ideated in the historical process. The uninterruptedness of the human actions which ideate actions by the sense of values is actualised by the phenomenon of work. Man owes these to his ability to form a social unity and found a state. State, on one hand depends on the conditions of existence of the society, and on the other hand it is the developing, governing, and protecting factor of other conditions of existence. State is a precondition of sustaining man's conditions of existence. Although there is an attainment such as "the student recognizes how and why states emerged" in the unit dealing with political philosophy in the curriculum (MEB 2010), this attainment is considered in the scope of ideas concerning the source of power, which requires philosophical knowledge.

Man as a Faithful Being: The phenomenon of believing is closely related to the realm of values, but it is also a tool to design the future. Hence it is closely linked to the phenomenon of foreseeing-predetermining so that men and communities can exist and survive. Man's ability to exist in life depends on his actions, his sense of values that gives direction to his actions, his love of work and his belief. The act of believing gives direction to his actions. In the curriculum, the concept of belief is listed among the basic concepts of religion philosophy; however, it is not dealt with in the context of philosophical anthropology.

Man as the Creator of Art: Art is an accomplishment as a product of human actions. Art is the field in which man explicitly shows his desires, ideas, belief, values and his relationship with the nature. Its pursuit is the sphere of man's existence and everything related to it. Art is one of the phenomena that ensures the continuity of human existence. Art shows the meaningful side of the invisible things in daily life. The curriculum leaves some room to philosophy of art, but he content focuses on art, artist, common aesthetic judgements, problem of beauty, qualities of a work of art, etc. There is no mentioning of the fact that art is an act of man and a form of existence, neither is there a sign of a link between art and other fields.

Man as a Talking Being: Language phenomenon is at the centre of human phenomena. Though these phenomena are not in a hierarchical order, language positions itself by being historical and with the accomplishments of man, it is indeed the carrier of these accomplishments. Language, itself, is a realm of existence with its specific questions and problems. At the same time, language is the way in which philosophy comes to exist. It is the means of making sense and ideation. Transition of language from the realm of condition of existence to the realm of reality is only possible through philosophy teaching. In that respect, its relation to thinking is very strong. In the curriculum, the importance of language in terms of philosophy is analysed. In this context, the importance of language and its role in building a network of concepts are emphasised and the relationship between language, meaning and understanding is analysed.

Man as a Bio-psyhic Being: Man's bio-psyhic existence means that he has an ontic and concrete integrity together with all the phenomena. The curriculum destroys this integrity rather than supporting it.

Man as a Disharmonic Being: Disharmony is the bipolar state of man which hosts opposites in one place. Man, due to the nature of his existence, is equipped with qualities such as good and bad, right and wrong, just and unjust. He is freed from this bipolarity with his sense of values.

CONCLUSION

Although not enough links are established between the conditions of existence of philosophical anthropology and philosophy curriculum, the fact that philosophy is taught on

the secondary level in Turkey should be considered as chance. Two centuries ago Kant said "A man can only become a man through education", which may sound reductive, but it should not be a problem to rephrase it as "A man can only become a man through philosophy education." because the only field which can deal with man and his conditions of existence without destroying its integrity to answer the question "What is human?" is philosophy.

In this context, when we look at the philosophy course being taught in Turkey, we cannot say that it is a type of philosophy education foreseen by philosophical anthropology starting from the sequencing of units to the content and the methods used. The course starts with introduction to philosophy, followed by philosophy of knowledge and finally philosophy of existence. This sequencing is one of the main reasons why philosophical anthropology based on ontological grounds cannot flourish. In addition, the fact that parts concerning existence, knowledge and axiology are dealt with separately and in a disconnected way, which is another problem.

Man is on one hand a cognitive and on the other hand an affective being. Similarly he is convergent and at the same time he has a divergent side. This also indicates his disharmonic nature. However, the existing course only considers the cognitive and convergent side of man. This cognitive side the course takes into consideration puts philosopher, movement and concept in the centre of the course and foresees a knowledge-based philosophy teaching, keeping it distant from being human-centred. In a similar way it overlooks the values related to the affective side and prevents phenomena such as believing, idealising, adopting attitudes, foreseeing, acting, committing oneself to something, etc. from happening.

Although they are not topic of question in this study, "Value Dimensioning Approach" and "Quadruple Thinking" developed by Dombayci and Bacanlı present points of view that are open for development to provide solutions to the obstacles listed here.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Philosophy lessons should not be delivered as introduction to the history of philosophy or certain philosophical disciplines, they should seek achievements in questioning, independent thinking, establishing a personality, eliminating fanaticism,

adopting an attitude, etc. The basic condition to achieving such accomplishments is to take into consideration the conditions of human existence. Throughout philosophy teaching, it is expected that the students know themselves with the help of conditions of existence, can answer the question "What is man?" at least to some extent, and to actualise the principle "Know thyself!."

When philosophy turns to human existence, it should be able to see his education through its own perspective. Philosophy which is home to cognitive actions should take man as the centre in order to understand what education means for man. Human-oriented education and the need for man to question himself as a being can only be accomplished this way. Through this questioning, man will discover the relationship among his own conditions of existence. Conditions of human existence should be the determining factor for all actions that lead to or result from it. Hence the philosophical anthropological view in philosophy teaching is quite significant in contributing to the accomplishments of man.

Philosophical anthropology cannot provide content, but form to philosophy. Philosophical anthropology is tool to bring together the concepts, topics and issues and human integrity, as a perspective for philosophy teaching. Unfortunately, in the existing philosophy curriculum in Turkey, this integrity is not so apparent. In a historical sense, although it could be said that we are approaching this integrity, the progress is so slow.

REFERENCES

- Akdemir E 2010. *Insan Felsefesi - Epiktetos ve Marcus Aurelius Ornegi*. Istanbul: Birey Yayıncılık.
- Akdeniz H 1996. *Felsefi Antropoloji Acısından Eğitim Problemi*. Ma. Thesis (Unpublished). Bursa: Uludag Üniversitesi.
- Ang T 2006. *Felsefe, Eğitim, Tarih ve İnsan Üzerine Düşünceler*. Istanbul: Toroslu Kitaplığı.
- Cilingir O 2014. *Insan Nedir?* From <<http://www.historicalsense.com/Archive/Fener67.htm>> (Retrieved on 28 April 2014).
- Cotuksoken B 1997. Ennst Cassier'de İnsan. In: I Kucuradi (Ed.): *Yuzyilimizda İnsan Felsefesi - Takiyettin Mengusoglu'nun Anisina*. Ankara: Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu Yayınları, pp. 169-178
- Harper D 2014. Online Etymology Dictionary- Flection From: <<http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=reflection>> (Retrieved on 29 April 2014).
- Heiddeger M 2009. *Düşünmek Ne Demektir?* (R. Senturk, Trans.) Istanbul: Paradigma Yayıncılık.
- Iyi S 2006. *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Aydınlanma ve İnsan Felsefesi Çalışmaları*. Istanbul: Toroslu Kitaplığı.
- Kaynardag A 1997. Takiyettin Mengusoglu'nun Düşünce Dünyasında Eğitim Kavramı ve Eğitim Sorunları. In: I Kucuradi (Ed.): *Yuzyilimizda İnsan Felsefesi - Takiyettin Mengusoglu Anisina*. Ankara: Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu Yayınları, pp. 49-66
- Kucuradi I. 1997. 20. Yuzyil Felsefi Antropolojisinde Takiyettin Mengusoglu'nun Yeri. In: I Kucuradi (Ed.): *Yuzyilimizda İnsan Felsefesi*. Ankara: Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu Yayınları, pp. 75-85
- MEB. 2010. Felsefe Dersi Öğretim Programı. *Tebliğler Dergisi*, 73(2629): 124-138.
- Mengusoglu T 1949. *Kant ve Scheler'de İnsan Problemi -Felsefi Antropoloji İçin Tenkidî Bir Hazırlık*. Istanbul: Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Mengusoglu T 1955. Bilgi Fenomeninin Felsefi Antropoloji Bakımından Tahlili. *Felsefe Arkivi*, 3(2): 53-75.
- Mengusoglu T 1959. Ontolojik Esaslara Dayanan Felsefi Antropoloji Hakkında Düşünceler. *Felsefe Arkivi*, 4(2): 1-8.
- Mengusoglu T 1988. *İnsan Felsefesi*. Istanbul: Remzi Kitapevi.
- Ornek Y 1997. Felsefede Antropoloji Gelenegine Takiyettin Mengusoglu. In: I Kucuradi (Ed.): *Yuzyilimizda İnsan Felsefesi-Takiyettin Mengusoglu'nun Anisina*. Ankara: Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu Yayınları, pp. 67-73.
- Ozcan M 2006. *İnsan Felsefesi: İnsanın Neligi Üstüne Bir Soruşturma*. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Ozer G 2011. *Takiyettin Mengusoglu'nun Eğitim Anlayışı*. Ma. Thesis, Unpublished. Istanbul: Maltepe Üniversitesi.
- Ozlem D 1997. Takiyettin Mengusoglu'nda İnsan Kavramı. In: I Kucuradi (Ed.): *Yuzyilimizda İnsan Felsefesi-Takiyettin Mengusoglu Anisina*. Ankara: Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu Yayınları, pp. 11-22
- Scheler M 1988. *İnsanın Kosmostaki Yeri*. (T. Mengusoglu, Trans.) Istanbul: Yaprak Kitap Yay. Paz.
- Yildirim A, Simsek H 2006. *Sosyal Bilimler de Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seckin Yayınları.