Industrial Education: A Philosophical Evaluation of the Background of the Evolving Situation from the Education of Morality to the Morality of Education *

AHMET KESGİN
Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University

Abstract: The main problem of this text is as follows: While identifying the status of education systems related to moral education with the title of industrial education, the situation is identified through the problems of the morality of education or moral education. Then, a proposal on the education of morality is made through the system evaluation. This point is for the purpose of the text. These problems are dealt with by using an in-depth and holistic evaluation method together with description and identification. The text primarily focuses on the founding meaning through which time manifests. Because education is both built by this meaning and fulfills a task that perpetuates it. As a part of an entirety/ground reflecting the spirit of the time, education carries/overflows its nuclei and aims. The expression "industrial education" is crucial in that it expresses both its

---

* The "morals of education" in the title is an identification of the de facto situation. Industrial education is the definition of this identification. "Education of morals", on the other hand, is a proposal. It is a proposal of something different from industrial education. This is an environment-building offer of societies with different contexts. In addition, industrial education refers to the process of a "transformation" and "change" from the education of morality to the morality of education. Although there is no detail on this subject in the text, this is the meaning of the title.

AHMET KESGİN ✉
Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Philosophy
Esenboğa Merkez Külliyesi, Çubuk, Ankara, 06760, TR [akesgin@gmail.com]

roots, the entirety to which it belongs, and the network of values it has. Here, the term industrial refers to the ground in question, and industrial education refers to the educational understanding of that ground. It is unthinkable that the network of values (morality is one of them) it possesses is contrary to the whole in question. In the text, the identification of this situation is described through the "ethics of education". This process that humanity has experienced is new. Therefore, industrial education should be interpreted with its conceptual network. Thus, concepts such as "environment", "context", "transformation", "change" have been redefined. This is essential to make sense of the situation. It identifies that the final solutions sought can be possible not with the "morals of education" but with the "education of morals". This means proposing a reinstallation of the system/environment.

Keywords: Industrial education, morals of education, education of morals, capitalism, transformation, change, environment, context.

Introduction

In this text, I have made an effort to define, describe and evaluate the phenomenon of industrial education. I showed this through the relationship between education and morality. In this way, while describing a new situation in the text, I benefited from the oldest issues of humanity, so that the difference in the course of the relationship between them could be seen. Both the education-ethics relationship and their position in the systems help to understand this issue.

All the historical experience in education shows us that morality, as a philosophical, political, and social issue, has been an important issue of education and training. Morality has existed in this network of relations, sometimes as a founding (purpose) and sometimes as a secondary issue (instrument). The ground on which the mentioned issue develops has certain spirit and carrier

elements. In other words, what determines the quality and direction of this relationship today is this ground that carries the spirit of the time, and all other partners (politics, education, law, science, etc.) appear as carriers and reflections of this ground.

The emphasis on "industrial" used in the expression of industrial education has been preferred because it essentially defines this system/entirety/ground. Every country in the world has its education system, but they are all different aspects of the same *system. Instead of education systems, there is the educational understanding of the system or the education of the system.* The ground/system proposes education as a program and plan that will achieve its goals and objectives. In other words, although there are different philosophical views on education, almost all of them reinforce and perpetuate that basic ground today. In this respect, they are also the carriers of the ideologies developed on the ground.[1]

So, what is this ground/entirety and how should it be portrayed? In line with this question, first, the ground on which the relationship between education and morality develops is considered, and the problem is dealt with in the context of the means-end. The meaning of making education and morality a means or an end to each other has been sought in the "entirety/ground", which is assumed to be a "part" of education itself, rather than educational philosophies and its aims. In this case, the relationship between education and morality has to be formed within a (systemic) whole, of which education is also a part. The main/constitutive element of this entirety is the economy today, and this text is formed by placing it in the context of the carrier and manifestation of its values.

Eventually, education, together with being a carrier partner

---

[1] For ideological dimensions and philosophies, see Gerald L. Gutek, *Eğitime Felsefi ve İdeolojik Yaklaşımlar*, trans. Nesrin Kale (Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi, 2001); Kemal Bakır, *Eğitim Felsefesi* (Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık, 2019); Mustafa Cihan and Zafer Yılmaz, eds., *Eğitim Felsefesi* (Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık, 2021).

of the entirety that provides its formation in the modern era, still lives with the moral(s) inherent in this entirety. As such, it already dominates the world widely. The carrier and constructing elements of the dominant understanding of education do not go independently of the basic values that make it up while moving to communities and societies with other "contexts" other than places where they were born and raised. The text reveals both the quality of this education, the entirety/ground (system) in which education is formed, and the formation of morality, which is one of the partners of education, in what is being formed in this relationship. In other words, the text reveals the mandatory conditions of what is desired and applied, what is targeted, and what is acquired.

However, in the text, the situation in which education can be made a tool for morality is not ignored, and although a direct proposal is not made on this subject, because it is the subject of another study due to the limitation of the subject, the current situation has been assessed. The meaning attributed to education determines its purpose. Therefore, in the text, while it is questioned how much education can serve to establish the desired morality by making it a mediator, the morality of the status quo is also revealed. On the other hand, as the main finding in the text, it is claimed that the moral understandings of the hole/system/ground in which education is formed are already acquired by the students in an inherent way to the education processes. If there is another type of morality proposed, this morality has to either take the risk of conflict with the moral types inherent in the aforementioned entirety/system/ground, that is, education or it has to adapt to them. In the text, these basic claims are discussed. It is hoped that new horizons will be opened by creating a new discussion ground on the ground/entirety/system on which the actual situation is formed and manifested through various means (philosophies, values, goals, institutions, etc.).

What is the Problem?

The main question is: On this ground, is education a tool for

morality or is morality a tool for education? What is sought or what is the actual situation?

The answers to these two questions are different. Accordingly, besides the philosophy on which education is based, it has distant-general-specific aims. Additionally, there is an actual situation. Should morality serve these basic purposes of education (of course, gaining moral behavior is also mentioned there)? If so, different types of morality have to be harmonized with these aims of education in this context. From this point of view, the problem has to be identified differently.

On the other hand, if morality is the main axis in this process, primarily, an understanding of morality should be established, and education should be transformed into a carrier with its philosophy, plan-programs, and objectives at all stages. Moreover, the whole education system -together with the other partners of the entirety of which it is a part- should be designed as a system in which morality is sought, questioned, experienced, organized, and therefore the predicted or accepted morality is accepted as the axis. If the moral types sought and desired to be established -which are mentioned in the text- are not responsibility ethics but others, they already exist and are made visible to the partners of the schooling process as a partner of the system, and they are acquired through various methods and tools. The relationship between education and morality should first be discussed on this ground.

Framework

Theoretical Framework

First, the education system in Turkey is evaluated. However, this system has serious similarities and targets with other systems in the world. It is not difficult to find these similarities, from its "theoria" and philosophy to its epistemological formation, from its main purpose to its specific goals. However, education today has two different visibilities, theoretically and practically, although it is less in the West and more common in non-Western countries.

This is primarily the visibility on the surface. Because beyond these, there is a basic ground on which education is based. The difference in appearance is primarily because non-Western societies consist of a rupture, not a continuity of the relationship between their *context*s and *environment*s. The situation that determines the relationship between morality and education is primarily and especially the ground on which education rests, and this foundation is a founding and decisive ground everywhere.[2] In this respect, current education systems both grow on this ground and fulfill a task that perpetuates this ground. These efforts in education, which are constantly reviewed theoretically and practically and renewed from time to time, should be seen as an effort to keep up with the aforementioned basic ground. Nevertheless, a fundamental problem arises concerning education, pointing to this background: What is education and its purpose? It seems that while education has a meaning that we define and experience while answering this question, it also has a meaning that is known to the whole in which it is included. The substantive definition and purpose should be sought together with this last one. Otherwise, while theoretical evaluations on education and morality, requests and proposals for implementation, and even the situation in practice did not work in determining the situation, the applicability of the proposals to be made at the same time often creates conflicting situations.

What then is the position of morality concerning this situation? This question is important because the connection and coherence of education with the ground that I have pointed out can be read through the answers to this question or its traces can be followed. Is purpose sought or desired through morality compatible with the actual situation? If there is an incompatibility in general, what could be the reasons? Do the moral attitudes that are compatible with the basic ground on which education is granted, that is, "really" intended, manifest in people through education?

---

[2]   The Big Picture is the same everywhere. Dennis Littky and Samantha Garabelle, *The Big Picture: Education Is Everyone's Business* (Virginia: ASCD Press, 2004).

Contrary to the moral attitudes, stances, and behaviors that are intended to be built through education, the results give clues about the position of morality in this relationship. In this case, we identify which type of morality emerges in this relationship and turns it into a behavior. Now let us create the conceptual framework that will complete this theoretical framework.

Conceptual Framework

Current political systems in the modern era are commonly in the form of nation-states. Although the forms of government differ, these political structures shape all the elements that make up their systems according to this basic form. In that context, it is possible to say that different societies around the world have built their national education. Nevertheless, there is a groundwork that brings them closer to each other and prepares an environment for them to compete with similar scales and measurements. Educational philosophies and systems are formed under the influence of this ground. Today, there are widespread education systems in the world. They are systems that are consistent within themselves at a certain level, have a clear purpose and objectives, and propose and implement them in line with certain programs and plans. It is possible to describe the situation, as it is commonly known, in this way. However, the matter does not end here. The education system, which is depicted as a system with its partners, is a part and carrier of a larger system in which it is a part. He arbitrates it. For this reason, there is the education of the system rather than education systems. In other words, it is more correct to say that there is a system/entirety/ground first and its education system. If we call the system an entirety/a whole, the parts that make it up must carry and reflect both the theory of the system, such as philosophy and purpose, as well as individual manifestations of this philosophy and purpose in all its applications. In this respect, the parts both carry the entirety and give it continuity. Education cannot be free from this, and its very existence depends on it.

Education lives by fulfilling many functions, primarily scien-

tific-technical, as a lever that facilitates the employment of individual people, for the whole system and then for its partners. It has such an image all over the world today. In this state, it cannot be spread around the world only thanks to the philosophies it possesses. The texts dealing with education, which we can cite as the founder -and even these are manifestations of the aforementioned basic ground- point to an agent who builds and carries them. For there can be no existence of an act without an agent. The epistemological ground surrounding and constructing education is primarily under the influence of this agent. For this reason, some concepts are needed to describe the situation. These are the concepts that make our issue more coherent and understandable. They are "environment", "context", "transformation" and "change". Of course, there are others such as "individual", "ground", while it is possible to make sense of them in their context, the previous ones contribute significantly to the understanding of the claim in the text.

Environment refers to the spirit and manifestations of the present time lived in. Even though they have different backgrounds and experiences, I call the environment the situation that allows both communities and societies to live in the same period and resemble each other. The existence of such a situation indicates a situation that societies are exposed to, and this exposure has an effect that makes them similar to each other. *Context* refers to historical streaming that flows from the past to the future, encompassing people and societies with a common past and story. *Context* surrounds the *environment*. If the *environment* is the present tense, *context* defines a situation from the past to the future, including the present. Accordingly, the *context* expresses the streaming in which all the meaning from the past, especially the mental structures, customs and traditions, identities, and personalities, is carried from the past to the future. A person is born in that meaning and acquires his personality. The expression "man is born in an environment" means that he was born in a meaning. To be human means to already be a (historical) context being. It

has a meaning in this context. We can compare it to the following: Let us take a river as an example. A river rises and flows in a particular geographical setting. If it is a very long river, it passes through different climatic zones and topographies. It has to pass through earth conditions with different soil structures. The river is an earth partner with these qualities. However, any place and time of the river denote its presence. The events that took place there and at that time are both the presence of that part of the river and the present of other elements flowing in the river. Along with these, the presence of that part of the river has a past. Water, everything that flows with water, has a past. They flow with the past. While the situation that appears in any part of the river creates the *environment* of that river, the past from which everything flows from the bed that the *environment* flows through to what it carries, the present where the *environment* is located, and the future where it will go constitute the *context*.

Man is just like this river. He is both the river itself and the being that flows in it. He is the river itself, for it is man himself who flows through time. He is human as a species. He flows in it because each person is in the meaning that was built in the time before him. Therefore, a person is born in a certain *environment*. He finds the environment ready and continues, consumes, or changes it by contributing to it over time. All *environments*, however, flow through a particular *context*.

Environments are all states in which people are born. However, not every *environment* is set up by its *context*. Sometimes, some environments may be *environments* created by *contexts* completely different from theirs. History provides many examples of this. Today, almost every *environment* in the world is more or less under the influence of a western-centered imagination and action. Although some intellectuals such as Toulmin have evaluated that the political and intellectual superiority of the West has come to an end,[3] the influence of nearly 250 years of experience

---

[3]   Stephen Toulmin, *Kozmopolis: Modernite'nin Gizli Gündemi*, trans. Hüsamettin Arslan (İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları, 2002).

can't disappear completely. A dominant environment brings soci-eties, whose *contexts* are very different from each other, into a habit of contemplation and action that homogenizes on many is-sues. It is possible to state that non-Western societies either di-rectly[4] or indirectly, under this influence, lined up their environ-ments to keep up with it. That is why today's *environment* also means something that is formed in this dominant *environment* ra-ther than an *environment* built on the context of each society. Com-munities and societies with very different *contexts* breathe the air of the same *environment*. In this respect, it is necessary to state that today, a unique experience has been experienced in terms of its prevalence and depth compared to its counterparts in history.[5] To create the meaning of the mobility that emerges as a result of these two basic situations, it is necessary to draw attention to two other concepts. These are *transformation* and *change*.

Before explaining these, it is important to establish a frame-work for the concepts of *community* and *society*: People live in communities. In other words, living in a community is a necessity of life. Being a society is a matter of definition, and as a result, they establish political unions with and on these definitions. To become a community, it is necessary to be subject to certain natural pro-cesses and to have certain meanings formed on them. It is possible to see that the meanings that can form a unity with one or all of the issues such as ancestry, belief, geography, history, etc. are es-tablished. It is also possible for people to become a society after they become a community. Becoming a society indicates being built almost entirely around a meaning. Society is a union of com-munities defined politically. In that case, while the community is a natural state that develops in the historical flow, society is an artificial, constructed meaning. While tribes and clans can be given as examples to communities, broader meanings such as

4   Serge Latouche, *Dünyanın Batılılaşması*, trans. Temel Keşoğlu (İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları, 1993); Philip G. Altbach and Gail P. Kelly, *Sömürgecilik ve Eğitim*, trans. İbrahim Kalın (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1991).
5   Ahmet Kesgin, *Endüstriyel Siyaset ve Ahlâk* (Ankara: Maarif Mektepleri, 2019).

French, Chinese and Arab can be given to societies. This meaning, especially the modern period state and society thought, can exist even more widely and distinctly together with ideologies. Both communities and societies are the unity of many elements that make up them. These elements are also partners that bring communities or societies together. In addition to these, societies manifest with various aspects such as political, economic, moral and social, etc. Their visibility in history is through them. There are such manifestations of the contexts in which societies flow. These sometimes come to the fore as the main visible feature of societies. While its basic "character" remains the same, the prominent element may differ. Society is a phenomenon that manifests itself as the unity of different issues and elements. The concepts of *transformation* and *change* can become meaningful after this point. Because while communities have more distant histories, almost hereditary relationships, societies are not. The society is built, and when one of the communities establishes a more prominent dominance in terms of ideas and de facto, the said community is sometimes formed to include other elements as a society. In time, with the emergence of another community, the conception and description of society can undergo transformation or change.

Accordingly, *transformation* is the process of differentiation that occurs when the main element that becomes evident in the manifestation of society, in other words, the influence of the carrier element that shapes its appearance, is replaced by another element that creates that society. The fact that a quality that makes up a society and stays behind comes to the fore over time, which means that it becomes more prominent as a more recognized and defined quality, is the differentiation experienced by societies. There is no fundamental difference here. While the base remains the same, one of the pillars formed on that base leaves its place to another one standing behind it and makes its visibility possible with a new element.

Change, on the other hand, refers to the differentiation, even the metamorphosis, experienced when one of the societies with

different *contexts* seriously influences the other. In this respect, the founding agent of the *environment* we live in today is the modern West, especially Western Europe. Societies with different contexts in the world are under the influence of this environment either directly or indirectly. This experience is new and while the West has built it with its historical dynamics, it has an important superiority and influence on the earth today with another partner (economy) embedded in the characteristics of those societies. For this reason, I express the situation he lived in as per his historical experience as a *transformation*. I use the concept of *change* to express the situation experienced by non-Western societies. Because they mostly live the time/environment with new experiences that they are unfamiliar within their context. Education has to be embodied with this new process and at the same time, it is the carrier of it. The text is constructed with this theoretical and conceptual framework. Let us now consider the issue by placing it in the education-ethics context in Turkey.

What is the Purpose of Education? How Can Morality Be Compatible with This Purpose?

First, let us start with a basic question that relates to the actual situation in education and especially concerns parents: When children are sent to schools, are they basically expected to mature as "better" people or to have "a career in which they can be successful throughout their lives"? Although there are many interlocutors of this question who are undoubtedly partners of the system, let us look for the answer through parents. Focusing on the main tendencies and actions of the parents, it can be asked which of their children's school-related acts are they more interested in? Are the main issues they focus on the situation and outcomes related to the mental development and actions of children? In which situations do situations to improve behavior motivate families? For example, how much are they interested in the course grades in the primary school report cards, especially the behavior grades on the right? The answers to these questions, as can be expected, show that the main question is focused on "having a profession

that can be successful". The situation of other partners in education does not present a different situation. When the main question above is made specific to them, the answers that can be given are equivalent to the answers given here both for the actual situation and with the theoretical background.

So, the main issue here lies in the reality of the existence purpose of education. Beyond the aims of the Turkish National Education organizational law, education as a system today is a part of a system larger than itself and has to be compatible with it. The truth of this entirety gives it its philosophy, social base, goals, intentions, demands, and proposals. While education is primarily created by this system of which it is a part, then it fulfills the task of ensuring the continuity of the said entirety (system). Morality or any other element is a part of this system and must carry it. The system must have a morality compatible with it, if a new proposal is to be made, it must first be compatible with the entire system. Otherwise, it has to stay out or have adaptation problems. In that case, it can be said that today the education system, that is, the understanding of the education of the system, has both a moral code and an idea, and it is already taught to students. Because in this case, if education is to carry the system that built it and perpetuate it, it will have to exclude any partner who is not in harmony with it, or it will have to give it only as an acculturation/information tool.

The conceptualization of *industrial education* is proposed to describe exactly this problem. Let us further concretize this concept with some of its salient elements in order to present here a partial framework for a more detailed study on this subject.

This conceptualization was created primarily in terms of referring to the whole of which the current educations in the world are a part. Today, education contributes to the basic purpose and movement as a part of that system/whole/entirety with almost all of its elements, from its philosophical foundations, its conceptual networks to the purpose it performs and the social and institutional structures and forms it is organized in. On the other hand,

by being a part of the education system, people seem to both de-mand this basic purpose and already acquire the qualities and be-haviors that come with it. This situation is gained to students in an institutionalized manner with educational processes and condi-tions. Morality does not mean anything more than being a carrier part of this process, even if it is not the founder. I define this new education system as *industrial education. Industrial education* is also the name of a system of values and is a type of education that has values inherent in our time. It carries and reflects the values of the whole to which it belongs. Therefore, it can be said that it is the education of the system rather than the education system. The education system exists as a result and part of the system that sur-rounds it, and it is an organ that perpetuates it.

If the aims of the training(s) cannot be independent of the en-tirety in question, what is the fundamental/actual purpose of the existence of industrial training? Because the laws, principles, and values inherent in that existence are the cores of education and it enables every person who is subject to it to acquire them in the process. Whatever content proposal is made -it may be against the spirit of the system- those contents have to come into harmony with this basic trajectory eventually. Otherwise, it is not easy for industrial education to evolve in a direction contrary to *'the ground'* in which it formed. So, what does this mean now?

No educational system in the world today can exist inde-pendently of the *environment* of the time in which it is. Although societies with different *contexts* live in the world, today's *environ-ment* has a very widespread and comprehensive effect, very dif-ferent from its counterparts in history. Today, the color and the set of habits (values) of a western-origin acquis can be seen in al-most all dimensions of life, from the theory of knowledge to the habits occurring in the street. When the founding agent of the *en-vironment* in the western experience, it is possible to determine that people carry out their existence with these values in almost every field, from those who struggle to survive in the environment to the very few people who 85% of the world's gross product. This

environment started to become more visible in the 19th century when the rural population in the west fell behind the urban population, and it evolved into a more widespread harmony in non-western societies, for example in Turkey, from the last quarter of the 20th century. Because this situation was primarily the manifestation of the new urban structure and habits, which attracted large world populations to the city. In this new situation, the element that started to come to the fore as the main founding feature in the relations between people is "homo-economicus". The new economic man, as the core of the emergence of the market economy society, has taken its place in all layers of life more prominently than in all times in the 20th century. In that case, it has been started to produce values that will keep up with the new and founding elements of the time, from education to law, from science to art, from politics to agriculture and animal husbandry, as a part of production processes. At this point, it should be noted that symbols, values and ideas based on new economic aspects, and habits visibly find, for example, partners in morality.

The economy has taken its place as the central founding element and value of this new process. In this respect, economic relations have become an important element that carries time through new people by getting rid of their past habits. The "economy", which developed with the intellectual acquis and scientific identity, and then the abstractions reduced to the developing mathematical formulas, is actually carried by many tools. In fact, while economic activity was an ordinary partner or part of social relations in the past, the economy stands out as the axis source of activity and values in the new process. It should also be noted that this is represented by the concept of economics, which I would like to draw attention to as the subject of another study, rather than the concept of economy. In other words, while the economy, as it was common in the past, stood out as the economy of subsistence and need, it can be defined as the economy of appetite in the new situation. It sits on an "absolutely insatiable human ground". The thing that provides the basic rhythm of the appetite economy is

that the masses settled in the cities have to live individually with the fear of hunger. However, in the past, "hunger" was not an individual problem, but rather a problem of social life units as "scarcity". Because communities, not people, suffered from hunger.[6] The *community* does not leave a single person to starvation. Or such a notion is alien to communities. This fundamental mental and vital *change* and *transformation* has a high impact on today's people. The theoretical and actual situation is based on this. So today, economic activity and "values" have a serious impact on the world. All other values either take positions according to this new axis and main value system, or social realities with different contexts take over the situation preemptively (with crises or depressions). In this new world, the system that creates a brand new value system according to its acquis and rhythm and spreads over the ideas and values about the economy is called capitalism.[7] According to the new situation that emerged with it, all other ancient virtues were either ensured to comply with its basic values or remained in the past. Education systems and their partners have not been formed independently of this but have been structured in line with its institutionalization and needs. Of course, it has to carry its basic values and introduce them to its followers. So, what are these core values?

If the world in which humanity exists today has a carrier meaning, it can be said that the economy (in its actual and theoretical form) primarily has the most important indicators pointing to this meaning. Therefore, the above question must first and foremost be interpreted concerning the economy.

The most fundamental value of economic activity is "interest".

---

[6]   Karl Polanyi, *Büyük Dönüşüm: Çağımızın Siyasal ve Ekonomik Kökenleri*, trans. Ayşe Buğra (İstanbul: Alan Yayıncılık, 1986).

[7]   For details, see Peter L. Berger, *The Capitalist Revolution: Fifty Propositions About Prosperity, Equality and Liberty* (New York: Basic Books, 1986); Claude Jessua, *Kapitalizm*, trans. Işık Ergüden (Ankara: Dost Kitabevi, 2005); Jack Goody, *Kapitalizm ve Modernlik*, trans. İhsan Durdu (İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2008); Immanuel Wallerstein, *Tarihsel Kapitalizm ve Kapitalist Uygarlık*, trans. Necmiye Alpay (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2006); Max Weber, *Protestan Ahlâkı ve Kapitalizmin Ruhu*, trans. Zeynep Gürata (İstanbul: Ayraç Yayınları, 1999).

After the interest becomes the central value, the surrounding values that can accompany it in almost every field begin to form. According to this, while environmental values such as utility in morality, egocentric in social relations, opportunistic in competition, jealousy in the education process, insecure in the management process depending on the situation, therefore in distrust of each other and tend to evolve into oppression, psychological and philosophical depths about them can be the source of legitimacy.[8] For example, it is sufficient to focus on utility, which is a moral value.

The phenomenon of benefit and harm is primarily an economic phenomenon. It can be seen as a moral consequence for a person to do things that will benefit or harm himself and others. In other words, as a result of any moral attitude or behavior, a person can be harmed or benefited. However, morality mostly includes virtues that mature by thinking about good and bad. People can benefit or harm because of their good and bad behaviors. This is a result and the result is evaluated economically about morality. In this case, the subject of benefit-utility becomes a form of morality by being articulated with economic activity. It is seen that when it comes to the interest, the facts of benefit/benefit-harm turn into moral forms. The socialization of this transformation or change is with the new economic and political individual.

For the *new (secular) individual*[9] who has been detached from their *context*(s) and *transformed/changed* into a citizen by the modern state and built by deepening philosophically. The new (secular) individual, who was detached from his/her context and transformed/changed into a citizen by the modern state and built by deepening philosophically, has already opened up space for himself and started to carry the process as the most valuable carrier value of the process by creating new ties. The process in which

---

8   For details, see Ahmet Kesgin, "Modern Dünyanın Eğitimi: Erdemden Değere," *III. Uluslararası Değerler Eğitimi Kongresi*, ed. Hasan Meydan (Zonguldak: Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2018), 3-20.

9   Ahmet Kesgin, "Felsefî, Siyasî/Politik ve İktisadî/Ekonomik Bir Kurgunun Gerçekliğe Dönüşüm Serencamı: Birey," *2. Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler ve Eğitim Araştırmaları Sempozyumu* (Konya: Palet Yayınları, 2018), 318-29.

success is sought and rewarded in the educational process and as a result does not offer and does nothing but build the individual by tearing them apart from the environment. For this reason, the main output that comes to the fore by deepening with the new individual cannot be anything other than value and interest. All over the world, the new urban life, employment opportunities, career acquisition processes, fear of starvation, manufactured goods and their economic values remaining online among very few people further deepen the injustice that already exists worldwide in the exercise of the possibilities and power of the new financial capitalism. These values are deepened by forcing the masses to reach the top of the pyramid continuously. Although self-actualization is at the top of the pyramid, at the core of the matter are the evolved basic values formed in line with the needs and appetites of the new individual.[10] Industrial education is responsible for bringing the values inherent in the process to individuals, as well as being a legitimate carrier of this process. As with everything else, the integration of education into the economy in this new system makes it a conduit to it. In this case, education is a tool that gives students (new individuals) the values of the (new) economy. In addition to industrial education, this is another element that makes education a part of the system to which it belongs.

Along with all these, the "belief and idea of progress" determines the direction of the movement.[11] This belief and opinion is another distinctive feature of industrial education. This movement manifests itself in all areas of life. Going forward is now a morally fundamental aspect, as it is in all respects. It is almost believed to move forward in a good way. It is possible to compare this belief in progress to flying an airplane or riding a bicycle. They must constantly move forward to stay standing up. When

---

[10] Abraham Maslow, "A Theory of Human Motivation," *Psychological Review* 50, no. 4 (1943): 370-96.

[11] For the idea of progress, seeJohn Andrew Bernstein, "Adam Ferguson and the Idea of Progress," *Studies in Burke and His Time* 19, no. 2 (1978): 99-118; Robert Nisbet, *History of the Idea of Progress* (New York: Basic Books, 1980).

stopped, they either fall or need a strut. For this reason, it is necessary to constantly move forward. After all, this situation also shows itself in industrial education. Education, with its new content, is essentially a "lever" that enables "individuals" to acquire it in the new time. So, more important than the question of how moral education -in this case, which moral question is also important- is taught in industrial education? how does education make students, who are one of its most important partners, acquire these values as the carrier and producer of this new situation? In this context, rather than what is taught, what is acquired should be revealed.

In this case, the following identification is appropriate: In this new process, industrial education is already making people acquire it with the moral types inherent in it. The moral types inherent in this new situation are hedonism, utilitarianism, or duty morality, which has taken pleasure, utility, or duty as the main issue. In addition, this issue is not an achievement built by education alone.

In this new process, which has become more widespread since the industrialization period, it is more important to answer the question of which morality it fulfills, which is compatible with the aforementioned whole, rather than what morality is intended to be given through industrial education. This is what is aimed to be done here. This also makes it easier to focus on the processes of what moral type is acquired, not on which type of morality is taught. So what is the fundamental meaning of this new process, and what does industrial education do in conveying and constructing this fundamental meaning? Following these questions, the following answer can be given to the basic question posed at the beginning of the text:

The process in today's world is not an experience manifested by the "education of moral", but a process that embodies the "ethics of education". In fact, this second statement should now be arranged as follows: There is a process that includes the "ethics of

industrial education". Accordingly, industrial education has a purpose of existence and a meaning formed in this way. This meaning reflects the whole, including this type of education. Here, the playmaker is not morality, but the purpose and meaning of the whole in question, which industrial education also carries. It also takes its basic meaning from the new economy. Morality itself and its education are used as tools for this new situation.

Societies living in different "contexts" are trying to keep up with this new process through education. They will either harmonize their unique qualities such as morality, which causes these differences to become clear, with this new "environment" (the meaning about the entirety), or make the "values" inherent in the whole system, which comes with education and which consists of the carrier values of the "environment", their "character" as well. Otherwise, the bike will stall or the plane will crash.

If "education of morals" is to be searched for, first of all, an agreement must be reached on which morality this morality is, and then a new "environment" should be built with a brand new philosophy, purpose, and a pattern of proposals in which that morality can be acquired. As can be seen, this situation becomes evident as a brand new offer for education. Is it possible? If every society had experienced its transformation by remaining loyal to its context, not a single *environment* like today, but many different *environments* could have emerged. However, from its epistemological ground to values, the world today lives in the same environment built under the hegemony of a single agent. This is one of the main reasons for the rhythmic crises experienced by those with different contexts.

Conclusion

The time we live in undoubtedly manifests itself through various means. Education is one of these tools. In addition to the philosophies on which education is based, its specific-general-distant goals, its actual situation can also indicate many things. Moral education is one of the important problems of the education pool.

Along with its philosophy and education, morality is one of the oldest issues of humanity. While the founding element, that is, the structuring of education, is sometimes arranged to acquire morality in its relationship with education, today it has been reduced to an instrumental partners' status.

This new situation is directly related to the position of education. Even when focusing on education alone, much can be said about the *entirety/ground* behind this position. Education about the core values of the time we live in and what their carrier elements provide serious visibility. Here, moral education has a place in the field as long as it can serve the *entirety/ground* that provides this position to education.

However, there are various types of morality, and some of them have already taken their place as part of the system as a whole. This place sometimes comes in line with the tools and goals used by education, and sometimes it opens up areas for itself with other partners of the system - philosophy, sciences, law, economy, etc. However, the situation is slightly different for moral types that cannot be directly compatible with the "environment" that the system builds and because they have different "contexts". Either it is harmonized with the moral types inherent in the system, various virtues can be mediated for this, or it has to be excluded.

In this case, morality itself, as an independent matter, can become the key to the system, where education is made a means for it, all other partners are reduced to a secondary position. To propose such a position to morality means to reconstruct and build the "environment". However, what this means is the restructuring of education from head to toe and enabling each of the partners in the system to be instrumental in this issue. This is not the same thing as morality in the current school situation involving all play partners, or even creating moral issues about every subject. The main issue meant here is to propose a new system. It means placing morality at the center of the system. It can be said that humanity has made incredible progress in many areas in the last two centuries, but it has also seen the bloodiest and most widespread wars

in history. Today, people are rapidly moving towards a world where the environment in which they live is left breathless. These and similar situations show that human civilization is experiencing a serious moral crisis. For this reason, it seems essential from all times to establish an environment of relations in which morality can become a constituent element.

References

Altbach, Philip G., and Gail P. Kelly. *Sömürgecilik ve Eğitim*. Translated by İbrahim Kalın. İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1991.

Bakır, Kemal. *Eğitim Felsefesi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık, 2019.

Berger, Peter L. *The Capitalist Revolution: Fifty Propositions About Prosperity, Equality and Liberty*. New York: Basic Books, 1986.

Bernstein, John Andrew. "Adam Ferguson and the Idea of Progress." *Studies in Burke and His Time* 19, no. 2 (1978): 99–118.

Cihan, Mustafa, and Zafer Yılmaz, eds. *Eğitim Felsefesi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık, 2021.

Goody, Jack. *Kapitalizm ve Modernlik*. Translated by İhsan Durdu. İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2008.

Gutek, Gerald L. *Eğitime Felsefi ve İdeolojik Yaklaşımlar*. Translated by Nesrin Kale. Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi, 2001.

Jessua, Claude. *Kapitalizm*. Translated by Işık Ergüden. Ankara: Dost Kitabevi, 2005.

Kesgin, Ahmet. *Endüstriyel Siyaset ve Ahlâk*. Ankara: Maarif Mektepleri, 2019.

Kesgin, Ahmet. "Felsefî, Siyasî/Politik ve İktisadî/Ekonomik Bir Kurgunun Gerçekliğe Dönüşüm Serencamı: Birey." In *2. Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler ve Eğitim Araştırmaları Sempozyumu*, 318–29. Konya: Palet Yayınları, 2018.

Kesgin, Ahmet. "Modern Dünyanın Eğitimi: Erdemden Değere." In *III. Uluslararası Değerler Eğitimi Kongresi*, edited by Hasan Meydan, 3–20. Zonguldak: Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2018.

Latouche, Serge. *Dünyanın Batılılaşması*. Translated by Temel Keşoğlu. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları, 1993.

Littky, Dennis, and Samantha Garabelle. *The Big Picture: Education Is Everyone's Business*. Virginia: ASCD Press, 2004.

Maslow, Abraham. "A Theory of Human Motivation." *Psychological Review* 50, no. 4 (1943): 370–96.

Nisbet, Robert. *History of the Idea of Progress*. New York: Basic Books, 1980.

Polanyi, Karl. *Büyük Dönüşüm: Çağımızın Siyasal ve Ekonomik Kökenleri*. Translated by Ayşe Buğra. İstanbul: Alan Yayıncılık, 1986.

Toulmin, Stephen. *Kozmopolis: Modernite'nin Gizli Gündemi*. Translated by Hüsamettin Arslan. İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları, 2002.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *Tarihsel Kapitalizm ve Kapitalist Uygarlık*. Translated by Necmiye Alpay. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2006.

Weber, Max. *Protestan Ahlâkı ve Kapitalizmin Ruhu*. Translated by Zeynep Gürata. İstanbul: Ayraç Yayınları, 1999.

Entelekya Logico-Metaphyscal Review