

DOI: 10.15372/PHE20170408

УДК 372.016:1+13+17

**НЕДОГМАТИЧЕСКОЕ ПРЕПОДАВАНИЕ ФИЛОСОФИИ:  
ТЕМЫ ДИСКУССИИ ДЛЯ ПРАКТИКИ ОБУЧЕНИЯ**  
**Самуэль Мендонса, Ана Элиса Спаолонци Кейруш Ассис**  
(Кампинас, Бразилия)

**Аннотация.** В этой статье синтетически представлены три важные темы для преподавания философии: философия, этика и знание как стратегии этого преподавания в контексте различий, рассматриваемых с точки зрения концепции «Воля к власти» Фридриха Ницше. С учетом того что бразильский закон № 11.864 от 2008 г. устанавливает преподавание философии в средней школе на всей территории Бразилии возникает вопрос: каковы риски того, что это преподавание станет проводиться в догматическом формате и, следовательно, будет антифилософским? Мы утверждаем, что «Воля к власти» может стать важной основой образовательной концепции для учителей, следовательно, может стать основой недогматического обучения. Проблемный вопрос данной статьи таков: может ли преподавание философии противостоять формулированию непреложных истин? Вывод состоит в том, что преподавание философии должно отличаться двумя характеристиками: (i) необходимостью использования философского метода, и, как следствие, стремлением к знаниям как объединяющей оси обучения; (ii) необходимостью адаптации текстов классической философии к жизни учащихся. Поскольку ученики живут в мире, философия постоянно находится под влиянием технологий, учитель философии должен изучить вопросы использования технологических ресурсов. Таким образом, шансы на успех будут всегда выше. И, наконец, несмотря на парадоксально «стандартное» построение философских классов, учитывая дидактику различий, в конечном итоге, мы должны пытаться обрести философский опыт или, если это необходимо, некоторые репетиции, которые обеспечивают непрерывное развитие других живых конструкций. Воля к власти – это ключ к обеспечению недогматического образования.

**Ключевые слова:** философия, этика, знание.

---

© Самуэль Мендонса, Ана Элиса Спаолонци Кейруш Ассис, 2017

**Самуэль Мендонса** – доктор философии, исследователь в области образования и права в PUC Campinas.

**Ана Элиса Спаолонци Кейруш Ассис** – доктор философии, исследователь в области образования в UNICAMP.

**Samuel Mendonça** – Ph.D, Research Productivity Scholarship – CNPq Researcher in the areas of Education and Law at PUC Campinas.

**Ana Elisa Spaolonzi Queiroz Assis** – Ph.D, Researcher in the area of Education at UNICAMP.

**NON-DOGMATIC PHILOSOPHY TEACHING:  
THEMES IN DEBATE FOR CLASSROOM PRACTICE**

**Samuel Mendonça, Ana Elisa Spaolonzi Queiroz Assis (Campinas, Brazil)**

**Abstract.** *This paper presents, synthetically, three dear themes to the teaching of Philosophy: philosophy, ethics and knowledge as strategies for this teaching in the context of differences, considered from the perspective of the concept of «Will to Power» (Der Wille zur Macht), from Friedrich Nietzsche. If the Brazilian Law n.º 11.864 of 2008, determines the teaching of Philosophy in high school throughout Brazil, what are the risks that this teaching establish itself in a dogmatic format and therefore anti-philosophical? We argue that the «Will to Power» (Der Wille zur Macht) may constitute an important educational concept background to the teachers, consequently, as a hypothesis for a non-dogmatic teaching. The problem of the manuscript is: Can Philosophy teaching resist the formulation of consummate truths? The conclusion is that two characteristics should mark the Philosophy teaching: (i) the need to use the philosophical method and therefore the pursuit of knowledge should be the unifying axis of teaching and (ii) the need for adaptation of classical philosophy texts to the students' lives. If the students live in a world constantly influenced by technology, then the Philosophy teacher should explore the use of technological resources. Thus, the chances of success are always higher. Lastly, despite a paradoxically «regular» construction of philosophy classes, considering the didactics for the differences, what is sought, ultimately, is the philosophical experience or, if so desired, the rehearsal that provides other living constructions continuously. The Will to Power is a key to ensuring a non-dogmatic education.*

**Keywords:** *Philosophy; Ethics; Knowledge.*

### **Introduction**

Philosophy teaching has become mandatory in Brazil since Law No. 11.864 of 2008. Gallo (2012), presenting the Philosophy Teaching (*Ensino de Filosofia*) dossier, from the Philosophy and Education (*Filosofia e Educação*) journal of the State University of Campinas (UNICAMP), contextualizes in a brief and precise way the backstage that preceded the conquest of this important Law for Brazilian society.

Since the end of the 1990s we have witnessed various meetings and congresses focused on the theme. Among other things, I would like to point out the organization of the Brazilian Congress of Philosophy Teachers in the Methodist University of Piracicaba in 2000 and, since 2001, the South-Brazilian Symposiums on Philosophy

Teaching, for the importance that they had and have had. (GALLO, 2012, p. 2) (free translation)<sup>1</sup>.

The significant increase in the production of theses and dissertations in several post-graduate programs in Brazil, in the same way that the different events and publications of articles and specific dossiers on Philosophy teaching, justify the structuring of a field of studies. Gallo (2012) states that:

With this, we think it is possible to say that a field of studies and research on Philosophy teaching was established in the country, which has been consolidating over the last decade. Today, we have already had a very significant production in the area, which has recently received a major boost with the creation of PIBID (Institutional Scholarship Initiative Program), to which many Philosophy courses have joined, with relevant results. (GALLO, 2012, p. 3) (free translation)<sup>2</sup>.

Philosophy teachers from all over the country have faced different challenges for the applicability of this Law, whether concerning to content or method of teaching. Horn (2012) presents a great challenge to Philosophy teachers in the context of the achievement of the Law:

[...] how to legitimate the presence of Philosophy not only as curricular discipline alongside others, but as a knowledge that intends to contribute to the formation of adolescents and young people who attend school banks (HORN, 2012, p. 15) (free translation)<sup>3</sup>

It is not, therefore, a question of reproducing philosophical knowledge; it is necessary to think about the role of Philosophy in the formation of young Bra-

---

<sup>1</sup> Original text: Desde o final da década de 1990 temos assistido a diversos encontros e congressos focados no tema. Destaco, dentre outros, a realização, na Universidade Metodista de Piracicaba, em 2000, do Congresso Brasileiro de Professores de Filosofia e, a partir de 2001, a realização dos Simpósios Sul-Brasileiros sobre Ensino de Filosofia, pela importância que tiveram e têm tido. (GALLO, 2012, p. 2).

<sup>2</sup> Original text: Com isso, pensamos ser possível dizer que foi se constituindo no país um campo de estudos e pesquisas sobre ensino de Filosofia, que foi se consolidando ao longo da última década. Hoje, contamos já com uma produção bastante significativa na área, que mais recentemente recebeu um reforço importante com a criação do PIBID (Programa Institucional de Bolsas de Iniciação à Docência), ao qual muitos cursos de Filosofia têm aderido, com relevantes resultados. (GALLO, 2012, p. 3).

<sup>3</sup> Original text: [...] como tornar legítima a presença da Filosofia não apenas como mais uma disciplina curricular ao lado de outras, mas como um saber que pretende contribuir para a formação de adolescentes e dos jovens que frequentam os bancos escolares (HORN, 2012, p. 15).

zilians, and for this very reason, this article presents to the Philosophy professor three themes that can be explored in different ways.

On June 24, 2013, the Pontifical Catholic University of Campinas (PUC-Campinas) held the International Didactic Encounter for Differences with the following objectives:

[...] to discuss the possibilities of didactics for differences in the context of the foundations of education. From the affirmation of difference as an immanent condition to human being: (n-1) (Deleuze); Faciality (Guattari); Body without organs (Deleuze; Guattari); every being is normal in its own norm (Canguilhem); Constitution of active subjectivities (Foucault); The being encloses in itself its own power - *Der Wille zur Macht* (Nietzsche). (PUC CAMPINAS, 2014) (free translation)<sup>4</sup>

Although the Philosophy teaching was not the object of the encounter, considering the different dimensions of the foundations of education, there was also reference to it. The exhibitions of the researchers, such as Hubert Vincent, of the University of Rouen, France and the Brazilian Artur José Renda Vitorino, from the Post-Graduation Program in Education of PUC Campinas, mediated by Alexandre Filordi de Carvalho of the Federal University of São Paulo – also organizer of the event –, were remarkable about the question: «are there possible didactics for the differences?» (PUC-CAMPINAS, 2014). The questioning about the possibility or not of didactics for the differences seems to indicate the need to think strategies also for the Philosophy teaching; after all, it is through didactics that one sought the consolidation of teaching.

The dossier Philosophy Teaching and Citizenship of *Pro-posições* journal, v. 21, 2010, brought important contributions to the theme, especially the «Presentation» by René Trentin Silveira (2010, p. 15) who carefully synthesized the legal contexts of Philosophy teaching since the Jesuits, but mainly emphasized that the Law aforementioned refers to «[...] a major achievement for the construction of an education more committed to the humanistic and critical formation of Brazilian youth, but also presenting enormous challenges for educators» (SILVEIRA, 2010, p. 17) (free translation)<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> Original text: [...] discutir as possibilidades de didáticas para as diferenças no contexto dos fundamentos da educação. A partir da afirmação da diferença como condição imanente ao ser: (n-1) (Deleuze); rostidade assignificada (Guattari); corpo sem-orgãos (Deleuze; Guattari); todo ser é normal em sua própria norma (Canguilhem); constituição de subjetividades ativas (Foucault); o ser encerra em si a sua própria potência – *Der Wille zur Macht* (Nietzsche). (PUC CAMPINAS, 2014).

<sup>5</sup> Original text: [...] uma conquista da maior importância para a construção de uma educação mais comprometida com a formação humanística e crítica dos jovens brasileiros, mas que também traz enormes desafios para os educadores (SILVEIRA, 2010, p 17).

In this context, this text presents three dear themes to Philosophy teaching: philosophy, ethics and knowledge, considered from the «Will to Power» (*Der Wille zur Macht*), referring to Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900), precisely in his second productive period<sup>6</sup>, as strategies for philosophy teaching in the context of differences. If the Brazilian Law n.º 11.864 of 2008 determines the teaching of Philosophy in high school throughout Brazil, what are the risks that this teaching establish itself in a dogmatic format and therefore anti-philosophical? If legal determination indicates formality, same content role, method, and evaluation as to Philosophy teaching, we may risking a standardization that is not "philosophical" and, in this sense, we argue that the Will to Power (*Der Wille zur Macht*) may constitute an important educational concept background to the teachers, consequently, as a hypothesis for a non-dogmatic teaching. Therefore, problem of the manuscript is: can Philosophy teaching resist the formulation of consummate truths?

### Strategies for the Philosophy Teaching

There are many productions about didactics and, certainly, the article by Villani and Pacca (1997) is a good reference that describes the meaning and characteristics of this form of teaching present in all knowledge areas. Didactics refers to a certain field of knowledge, and in the case of Philosophy, this is no different. To think the Philosophy teaching presupposes didactics, *i.e.*, forms of teaching that are consequent to learning.

It is important to emphasize that there are authors who criticize the emphasis on learning in the educational field (BIESTA, 2012, 2006). Likewise, guarantee learning is not a directed consequence of an educational structure. Beyond learning or teaching, the comprehension about school as an environment seems to stand out (SIMONS; MASSCHELEIN, 2012). Is there a proper way of teaching Philosophy? This question refers to a number of other questions that concern to a concept of Philosophy and, above all, the purpose of the Philosophy teaching; after all, what is Philosophy taught for, and more specifically, in what consists the supposed philosophy that can be taught, considering

---

<sup>6</sup> There are three periods in Friedrich Nietzsche's work. Almeida (2007) argues that the first period bears the mark of tragedy, naming it as the stage of "tragic writings". In a sense, what is at stake in this period is the opposition of construction forces on the one hand, and degeneration on the other. The symbols refer to Apollo and Dionysus. The second period concerns to the criticism of the German philosopher to science, to English men, precisely, his consideration of ultimate knowledge, of truth (*die Wahrheit*). However, it is from Aurora that this author starts to develop especially the theme of the Will to Power. A theme that enables the grounding of the question about difference, precisely as there are forces of construction and destruction in the constant search for accumulation. In a word, there is no truth, but interpretation.

this possibility? Gallo and Aspis (2010, p.89) affirm that the Philosophy teaching consists in «stand for resistance» to society, «[...] tracing lines of scape» (free translation)<sup>7</sup>. It is in this sense that the didactics for differences finds support, precisely in the sense of not assuming a form of teaching that is hegemonic, regular and predictable, but a form that is dynamic, built in the flow of oppositions of interests, desires and thoughts.

Aspis's article (2004), a result from the master's dissertation «Philosophy Teaching for Young People as a Philosophical Experience», defended at UNICAMP/Brazil, emphatically says that the philosophy teacher must be a philosopher. Therefore, the didactics presented here were thought for philosophers, meaning those that graduated in Philosophy but, moreover, to the one who searches for himself permanently. Thus, at the same time that we agree with the meaning of Aspis (2004), we deepen the definition of philosopher as one who seeks to overcome himself. In addition to the technical training, which is essential, the Philosophy teacher must seek to self-criticize as a basis for the critique of knowledge (MENDONÇA & VITORINO, 2013; MENDONÇA, 2011). Through this performance, we understand that the formation of the Philosophy teacher must be continually rethought, and reconstructed by himself, through his self-improvement.

If by didactic we mean a set of alternatives that a certain subject can cause to work some content with the public, when it comes to Philosophy, there are, at least, two initial problems. The first concerns to the nature of Philosophy that is embodied in the reconstruction of concepts and the search for oneself. Therefore, Philosophy cannot be transmitted as unhesitating and finished knowledge, but, fundamentally, it requires the interlocution with the students who, from their own Philosophy, also reconstructs their way of thinking and creating the world. Second, in a complementary addition to the first problem, the Philosophy teacher has the task of construct Philosophy with his students. Therefore, he is also unable to transmit any content, having the need to listen and let the students being construction agents of this knowledge.

These propaedeutic considerations indicate the dimension of differences as basis of a knowledge that is not, in this text, thought in a sectarian way, with prompt and determined contents; on the contrary, it is precisely through the opening to erect knowledge that seems possible to build Philosophy in a way that does not consolidate universal and necessary education. Philosophy is here as aporetic and paradoxical. knowledge.

The two reasons seem sufficient for thinking strategies for the Philosophy teaching in the context of the differences trying not to insert it in the list

---

<sup>7</sup> Original texts: [...] em opor resistências [...] traçando linhas de fuga” (GALLO & ASPIS, 2010, p. 89)

of predetermined knowledge, questioning, in the last analysis, the concept of education that supports philosophical teaching.

From these considerations, we explore the subject Philosophy as a conceptual content to High School. Here is a presentation and discussion of a strategy that is far from becoming universal and necessary, but, precisely, it serves to rethink didactics in the Philosophy teaching field. We highlight again that this didactic form cannot be thought as a model for teachers, but as a basis for the reflection on the classes and the concept of Philosophy, that underpins the discipline plans with the Political Pedagogical Project of the school institution.

### **1.1. Didactic to the Philosophy teaching**

How to work the Philosophy as a theme with high school students circumscribed in *Wille zur Macht?* By Will to Power one must understand the search for self-surpassing, the set of internal and external forces, negative and positive, of construction and deconstruction that inhabit the organic and the inorganic world (NIETZSCHE, 1968). To think about the teaching of philosophical themes in this context means to assume the aporias and paradoxes in constructing a knowledge made in contradiction, as one thinks with the interlocutor. Thus, the Will to Power claims a type of man that Nietzsche calls the *Übermensch* (overman), *i.e.*, that protagonist capable of continually overcoming, living what exists bluntly. In a posthumous fragment, Nietzsche (1968, WP 1067) asserts: «This world is the will to power—and nothing besides! And you yourselves are also this will to power – and nothing besides!».

When it comes to philosophy teaching, the starting point seems to be the need to expose the birth of Philosophy in ancient Greece highlighting the importance of using *λόγος* (*logos*) in order to offer conditions so that the students are awake. Beyond a given content, what is at issue is the way students can relate to Philosophy. The assumption of the use of reason in the Greek sense would demand a more accurate analysis in the consideration of Nietzsche's thought, either by the criticism he undertook to Socrates (NIETZSCHE, 1968), or paradoxically elevating the thought of Heraclitus and other pre-Socratics. In the consideration of the Will to Power, the understanding of Philosophy does not seem possible through axioms, and even searching for a definition of knowledge, in the dimension of didactics for differences, it seems fundamental to preserve the different forms of knowledge search.

That is what justify the Philosophy theme as absolutely necessary and, certainly, it concerns the axis that can inaugurate a course of Philosophy at high school level. It is necessary to take into account the material conditions for carrying out this work. On average, in Brazil, there are only one hour per week for Philosophy topics. Therefore, it is not possible to think of Philosophy

teaching as a reproduction of what we have in undergraduate courses. Perhaps the Philosophy teacher can relativize the use of philosophical language at first, with the purpose of dialoguing with the students from what is typical and fit of their conviviality, considering their differences and their different ways of apprehend reality. Not seeking the unification of thought through language means considering differences as conditions for thinking.

The didactics for the differences part from the language used to seek the interlocution with those involved in the process of knowledge construction. What does that mean? At once, that in the relations of Philosophy teaching, it seems necessary to recognize the interlocutors, their condition of thinking and formulating judgments, and this is done through dialogue, exchange and formulation of problems.

The first recommendation to the Philosophy teacher, from the didactics for differences point of view, is to avoid the rationalization of Philosophy, *i.e.*, to avoid presenting or discussing the subject of philosophy abstruse, in an abstract way, without offering a point of interaction with the students' reality. We recommend Hume (1999) as a source for the materialization of the strategy, for the second moment, since in the first section of his text the Scottish philosopher discusses the different kinds of Philosophy and emphasizes: «Be a philosopher; but, amidst all your philosophy, be still a man» (HUME, 1999, p. 90).

For a philosophy class to be effective, it seems fundamental that the teacher proposes philosophical questions appropriate to students' realities, considering the differences in their lives (*i.e.* social, economic, religious, among others), using philosophical approaches with them. To consider the forces of construction and deconstruction is surely a way of conceiving the Will to Power in the teaching process.

In this sense, some questions may open the lesson, and must, necessarily, point to the reality of the students, *e.g.*: 'Do you consider yourself rational?'; or 'Are human beings rational?'; or 'Is there rationality in human actions?'. From questions of this nature, the teacher can orchestrate the debate, which hardly will find consensus, and precisely for this reason, the different positions must be highlighted and pointing out concrete examples of situations that are polemics, and in general, confuse students in relation to rationality and its 'good in itself' character. Situations involving preconception, violence or cases of child sexual abuse are, paradoxically, situations involving rationality; After all, those are human actions, produced by rational beings. Therefore, to clarify that rationality also encompasses the dimension of deconstruction can be a strategy to deal with the Philosophy theme; After all, what is Philosophy? The discussion can generate elements for students to see themselves as agents of thought or as agents of Philosophy. *Der Wille zur Macht* is present in philo-



sophical reflection exactly when the teacher is able to avoid a particular position, whatever it may be, as last.

The consideration of didactics for differences means exactly the escape from the formalization of Philosophy teaching and the attempt to think the reflection of thought through the consideration of the different, the external, the other, the foreigner, the traveler (KOHAN, 2013). This does not mean that any thoughts are considered philosophical, or open to relativism, but the value that rest in the formulation of the philosophical attitude.

It is recommended that the teacher take care of the students' positioning in order to value them, but at the same time, offer elements so that the students are not restricted to what they think so they can listening and understand how their colleagues think. The didactics for differences, in this case, points to the diversity of positions in the classroom, a fundamental task of the philosophical exercise. Therefore, it is important that students leave this first class with the questions they have asked and, in this sense, it is not prudent for the teacher to 'correct' the students' statements in order to moralize<sup>8</sup> their positioning, but let them think about what they formulated during class. This sense of belonging of thought is essential for the student to feel as an interlocutor in the classroom.

In a second class, as a continuity, the teacher can take an excerpt from Hume's text (1999), especially the section *I* entitled «Of the different species of Philosophy». The room can be divided into teams so that the reading is done during the class, in a maximum of twenty minutes, in groups of three people. The group can elect a rapporteur and a representative, in order to systematize the discussions and give the professor the result of this debate. It may be suggested that students describe the species of Philosophy, *i.e.*, to explain the easy Philosophy and abstruse Philosophy. It is also reasonable to suggest that they interpret the sense of intermediate Philosophy (Hume's Philosophy), a result from the easy and abstruse Philosophies, but without the metaphysical character of the abstruse Philosophy, preserving logic and, above all, considering the human action as essential for philosophizing.

Three groups can be drawn to present the conclusions of the reading and discussion. In this case, the teacher can resume the content of the previous class with the purpose of showing that: (i) Philosophy does not concern nebulous constructions, but, it concerns to men's life; and (ii) Philosophy is not restricted to prejudices, but refers to the search for knowledge and the interpretation of truth. Thus, the teacher can ask a question at the end of the lesson that relates to the theme

---

<sup>8</sup> In the article «*Moralization and the teaching of Philosophy*» (MENDONÇA, S; VITORINO, A. J. R., 2013), it is discussed the risks that the formulation of final answers for students have in the context of the Philosophy teaching.

of the two classes and tell the students to research, with the use of technology<sup>9</sup>, in order to elaborate a synthesis of what they mean by Philosophy.

This form of teaching, which places the student at the center of philosophical reflection, as author of the construction of thought, differs from what has been consolidated as Philosophy teaching, once the reproduction of the Philosophy history is done in an expositive form. There is no criticism here regarding the expositive lectures, once they represent one way of building knowledge, however, for high school and the social reality of students, it seems fundamental the use of didactics for differences avoiding the construction of an abstruse and meaningless Philosophy for the students life.

The second example of philosophy teaching is about ethics. It should be remembered that these examples do not mean finished forms of didactic experience on the Philosophy teaching, but drafts, essays<sup>10</sup>, starting points, strategies that can motivate philosophical reflection.

## 1.2. Ethics teaching hypothesis

Considering the complexity of the ethics subject, it is not possible to deal with something so dense in a simplified way. So, we need to think a significant number of classes for the possibility of dialogue on this topic. Depending on the pedagogical political project of the school, eventually, the ethics as a theme may be the basis of the high school Philosophy course and there is sufficient justification for this selection. For example, if the presence of philosophy has any meaning at the high school level and there is an emphasis on the conquering of citizenship, then ethics can be the backdrop to such a construction as it deals with the base of values (axiology) of society.

In another context, if human relations do not seem to preserve traditional values such as respect, friendship and temperance, Aristotle's (1999) study can provide elements about these and other fundamental virtues for human coexistence. In any case, doing philosophical teaching through the appreciation of the student's thinking, demands care with the formulation of a thought that does not begin rigorously, but absolutely linked to the social experience of each one and, precisely in this perspective, as a fundamental brand of teaching.

---

<sup>9</sup> It is possible to recommend that students use networks such as Facebook, Google+, and others to conduct the research during the week. The background of this recommendation is the realization that many students use the networks, so when building a 'community' with the theme of the class or the name of the discipline, this virtual environment could mean the continuity of studies of Philosophy. By this means, the teacher can also suggest other complementary texts and even the use of direct communication (online chat and forums) for the suggested research.

<sup>10</sup> In this respect, we recommend the work of Kohan (2013) on the life of Simón Rodrigues. The master inventor stimulates thinking school, and, of course, Philosophy does not shy away from such a daring, irreverent and aporetic project.

A strategy for the discussion of ethics consists of presenting questions that are related to the students' experience and take them to the limit of human coexistence. Concrete positions that highlight the extent of men's rights, such as corruption in their various spheres or violence, *e.g.*, trigger situations that refer to ethics. It should be clarified that ethics cannot be reduced to the casuism of a murder or diversion of public money. Provisions of this nature may even be an object of ethics, once the discussion is philosophical and based on principles and foundations of a branch of ethics. We mean by this that, in the case of ethics, it is necessary to define what meaning is in question. There is no con-sense about the various schools of ethics constructed throughout the history of Philosophy, and for that very reason, it is not possible to say that a situation is or is not ethical in itself. There is no ethical situation in itself, but depending on ethical acceptability, then situations may even have a certain classification.

We recommend, again, groups of up to three people to discuss five issues, in one class. In the next class, considering that each group should elect a rapporteur and a representative, the same way as the other activity, a forum for the presentation of what each group discussed can be stimulated. Here are five possible questions: (i) what do the components of the group mean by ethics?; (ii) present the principle (s) of the ethical concept defined in the previous item; (iii) is it ethical to disrespect the other (iv) is it ethical to disrespect oneself? (v) does the ethics that the group defined in the first item allow selfish actions?. The discussion of the questions is based on two guidelines: (i) whenever possible, seek to provide examples, but, simultaneously, one should not confuse example with argument and (ii) all members of the group should say what they think or, if there is any impediment, must present in writing what they think about the issues. To consider the Will to Power as a basis for the didactics for differences means to be open to the various meanings about the ethics that the students will be willing to present. To direct the discussion to an understanding of ethics means to silence the Will to Power or, in other words, means not to allow oneself to be tried, to be rehearsed, to live the dynamism of thought.

In the third class, the teacher can indicate a collective reading, but with the same groups as the second class, of book V of the work of Aristotle (1985). This text is important and there should be guidance for the groups to read common excerpts, distributed according to the number of students and the time available for discussion.

The reading of book V of «Nicomachean Ethics», which deals with justice, will suffice to: (i) define justice as virtue that inserts man in the life of the *polis* and (ii) evidence the importance of the *mean justice* (ARISTOTLE, 1999 p.73) or, if best, of balance, as the goal of the ethical life. Simultaneously with the

construction of universal values from the Stagirite, in the consideration of didactics for differences, these values must be questioned and, in a way, stimulate students to the constant critique of knowledge.

Although Aristotle's discussion occurs in an absolutely different context of modern times, yet, given the importance of harmonious coexistence in society, in considering differences, this text may provide sufficient positions for students' convincing about the importance of rational human virtues development. It is evident that in the context of the Will to Power one cannot claim harmony in the sense of absence of conflict, but, be it with Nietzsche or Heraclitus, consider that «Everything is done by contrasts: from the struggle of opposites the most beautiful harmony is born» (BORNHEIM, 1991, p.36)<sup>11</sup>.

We turn to the third strategy, which deals with knowledge, and it is necessary to emphasize that each strategy presented here has its origin in the experience of teaching Philosophy in public schools in the Metropolitan Region of Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil in the 1990s and it is far from setting up a teaching Philosophy model. In seeking consistency with the proposition of this text, what stands out in the last instance, is the possibility of philosophical teaching through the individual and genuine construction of each teacher and not from the universalization of content or even method.

The responsibility of Philosophy teaching is given to the teacher, and even considering the guidelines of the public branch of some states in the Brazilian federal union, in relation to the standardization of philosophical contents, it is necessary to bet on the difference of proposition that considers the concrete reality of the students, or the Philosophy teaching will be aimed at failure.

### **1.3. The possibility of teaching the knowledge issue**

The correlations between knowledge and Philosophy are diverse and both themes refer to the philosophical attitude. If we ask how it is possible to know something, it is from the search for knowledge that we do it. How to discuss dense and fundamental questions, such as those concerning epistemology, with high school students in the consideration of differences? In Nietzsche's (1999) perspective there is no true knowledge, so since the Will to Power refers to the combination of internal and external forces that are in the organic and inorganic world, the thematic of knowledge can mean an excellent strategy to overcoming dogmatism. Here is the need to establish the third theme for the philosophy teaching. Students who are already accustomed to philosophical thinking, to the need to listen the position of the colleague, and mainly to

---

<sup>11</sup> Original text: Tudo se faz por contrastes; da luta dos contrários nasce a mais bela harmonia (BORNHEIM, 1991, p. 36).

seek theoretical subsidies that ground their positions, have the conditions for the involvement with the knowledge issue.

Dalbosco (2011) offers an accurate contribution to Kant's understanding and its relation to education, so his text can be used as a source for this subject, together with the already explored text in the first strategy from Hume (1999).

We recommend that the teacher ask at least seven students about their identity, as follows: (i) who are you? and (ii) are you your name? These two questions favor the discussion about the anthropological dimension. So, coordinating the debate, suggesting that the students may have different names and questioning if they would be, for that reason, other people, generates a usual intense debate. The knowledge theme can, therefore, start from the dimension of the knowledge of the identity of each one; After all, who is the human being? If the question were directed to 'what' is the human being, then the answer would be more direct. «Who is the man» is a question typically of philosophical anthropology and, in itself, refers to the need to think about the various correlations of men and knowledge. Mondin (1982) and Vaz (1993) deepen the philosophical anthropology issue and, therefore, can be sources for teachers. As we have already said, for Nietzsche (1968, WP 1067): «This world is the will to power – and nothing besides!» and the men are part of this world, resulting in Will to Power, that is, the set of internal and external forces of construction and deconstruction, life and death. If on the one hand the If, on the one hand, students can affirm that man is something in itself, a substance, *e.g.*, in the consideration of the Will to Power we must ask if man is something fixed, ultimate.

In the second class about knowledge, we recommend examining the second section of Hume's text (1999), entitled «Of the Origin of Ideas». This text, emblematic of empiricism, highlights the need for experience the construction of knowledge. Then, through reading in small groups, the teacher may suggest that students stand out: (i) the two arguments that underlie the theory of the origin of ideas and (ii) the contradictory phenomenon. During the debate, organized from representatives of at least three groups, the teacher can explore elements of a structural reading, specifically as to the contradictory phenomenon.

If Hume (1999) contradicts itself, then the students must show how the supposed contradiction occurs. With this exercise, students will be able to learn about the writing style of philosophers, specifically when it comes to irony or strategy to strengthen a particular argument. The knowledge issue, discussed by different theoretical schools, can be deepened considering other authors such as René Descartes (1998), Boaventura de Souza Santos (2002) and Nietzsche (1968). To deal with the scientific method and the need to organize knowledge in order to succeed in the content studied, can be an interesting strategy for high school students in the organization of their school life.

If *Wille zur Macht* is the axis for the reflection of the themes presented here, the example of Hume is intriguing, given that he questions the hypothesis of truth and, for this reason only, he already deserves credit. Nevertheless, in the last instance, there is the confirmation, in the text, that the contradictory phenomenon, more than does not contradict his theory, confirms it, which allows to conclude that there is a truth.

The authors suggested here are from different philosophical schools and, precisely because of this, in the consideration of differences, can and should be used in the context of philosophy teaching.

When one argues about themes for the Philosophy teaching in the context of differences from the question: can philosophical teaching resist the formulation of consummate truths?, it seems reasonable to suppose that the one graduate in Philosophy has, at least potentially, conditions to overcome the truths established in school scope constructing, with the students, philosophical conceptions that have the mark in the opening to the knowledge and not in its possession.

### Final Considerations

We note throughout these reflections that the themes «philosophy», «ethics» and «knowledge» relate to potential content for the intervention of the Philosophy teacher in the classroom and, thus, objectively in relation to the question formulated in the introduction: Can Philosophy teaching resist the formulation of consummate truths?, it seems possible to affirm that yes, the hypothesis of resistance of the philosophical teaching exists. However, when it comes to the themes developed, we return to what is common to all of them: (i) the problematization carried out in the social context of the students, (ii) the teacher's mediation with questions and a philosophical text, and (iii) discussion presenting a summary of the content read with the students' problematization. In the perspective of the Will to Power (*Der Wille zur Macht*), each of the themes in the context of philosophical teaching is understood as openness, as becoming, as possibility. Thus, there is no ultimate definition of philosophy, ethics, or even knowledge. Quite the contrary, in the context of differences, what we have is the challenge of the absence of unity, the escape from universalization and, therefore, resistance to the ultimate formulation of knowledge.

The three themes were addressed in the consideration of the Will to Power, that is, the hypothesis of a construction that does not end, i.e., metaphilosophically par excellence. Thus, the strategies presented here should not be taken as models for Philosophy classes, but as a basis for dialogue, so that Philosophy teachers can rethink their teaching considering the different

regions of Brazil (or any other country) and the need for spaces for that young people can dialogue and have the chance to build their own lives, through the Will to Power. Ultimately, we seek to consolidate a non-dogmatic education.

If it is difficult to establish a standard model for the Philosophy teaching, and this is related to the nature of Philosophy, which is dynamic, this does not mean that one can not seek a minimal basis for Brazilian (or any other) education in Philosophy. This minimal basis underlies the reflections of this text and points to a way of Philosophy teaching beyond the dimension of content. Therefore, the minimum base refers to the strategies that should vary in each case. However, it seems fundamental that the Philosophy teacher should continually seek the philosophical method as the basis for Philosophy classes. Although apparently innocuous, this observation is justified because of the problem of Philosophy being taught, in many cases in Brazil, by those who have no training in the area.

Therefore, two characteristics should mark the philosophy teaching: (i) the need to use the philosophical method and therefore the pursuit of knowledge should be the unifying axis of teaching and (ii) the need for adaptation of classical philosophy texts to the students' lives. If the students live in a world constantly influenced by technology, then the Philosophy teacher should explore the use of technological resources. Thus, the chances of success are always higher. Lastly, despite a paradoxically "regular" construction of philosophy classes, considering the didactics for the differences, what is sought, ultimately, is the philosophical experience or, if so desired, the rehearsal that provides other living constructions continuously. The Will to Power is a key to ensuring a non-dogmatic education.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Almeida, R. M.** de. *Eros e Tântatos: a vida, a morte, o desejo*. São Paulo: Loyola, 2007.
- Aristotle.** *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by W. D. Ross. Kitchener, 1999.
- Aspis, R. P. L.** O professor de filosofia: ensino de filosofia no ensino médio como experiência filosófica. In: *Cad. Cedes*. Campinas. vol. 24, no. 64, set./dez, 2004.
- Biesta, Gert.** *Beyond Learning: Democratic Education for a Human Future*. Colorado: Paradigm Publishers, 2006.
- Giving** teaching back to education: responding to the disappearance of the teacher. *Phenomenology & Practice*, Vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 35–49, 2012.
- Bornheim, G.** *Os filósofos pré-socráticos*. São Paulo: Cultrix, 1991.
- Brasil.** *Lei 11.684*. Ministério da Educação. D.O.U. 03/06/2008. Available in: [https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/\\_ato2007-2010/2008/lei/111684.htm](https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2008/lei/111684.htm).
- Dalbosco, C.** Kant & a Educação. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2011.
- Descartes, R.** *Discourse on Method*. The Harvard Classics: Bibliographic Record. 1998.
- Gallo, S.** Ensino de Filosofia: tendências e desafios. *Filosofia e Educação*, vol. 4, no 1, pp. 1–9, abril-setembro de 2012.
- Gallo, S., Aspis, R. L.** Ensino de filosofia e cidadania nas "sociedades de controle": resistência e linhas de fuga. *Pro-Posições*, Campinas, vol. 21, no. 1, abr. 2010.

- Horn, G. B.** Apresentação. Dossiê – Filosofia e ensino. *Educar em Revista*, no. 46, 2012.
- Hume, David.** *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*. New York: Oxford, 1999.
- Kohan, W. O.** *O mestre inventor*. Relato de um viajante educador. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2013.
- Mendonça, S.** Proposta de filosofia para o Estado de São Paulo: a autonomia do educador problematizada a partir de *Was ist Aufklärung*, de Kant. *Cadernos de Educação*. Pelotas: FaE/PPGE/UFPel, vol. 39, pp. 135–152, maio/agosto, 2011.
- Mendonça, Samuel, Vitorino, Artur José Renda.** (2013). Moralização e o ensino de filosofia. *Cadernos de Pesquisa: Pensamento Educacional*, no. 8(19), pp. 42–58, 2013.
- Mondin, B.** *O Homem, quem é ele?* Elementos de antropologia filosófica. 2 ed. São Paulo: Paulinas, 1982.
- Nietzsche, F.** *The Will to Power*. Trad. Walter Kaufmann e R. J. Hollingdale. New York: Vintage Books, 1968.
- Puc Campinas.** Encontro Internacional: didáticas para as diferenças. Available in: <https://www.puc-campinas.edu.br/eventos/encontro-internacional-didaticas-para-as-diferencas/>.
- Santos, B. De S.** *Um discurso sobre as ciências*. Porto : Afrontamento, 2002.
- Silveira, R. T.** Apresentação. Dossiê Ensino de Filosofia. *Pro-Posições*, Campinas, vol. 21, no. 1(61), pp. 15–30, jan./abr. 2010.
- Simons, M., Masschelein, J.** School. A matter of form. In GIELEN P.; BRUYNE P. *Teaching Art in the Neoliberal Realm*. Realism versus Cynicism. Amsterdam : Valiz, 2012.
- Vaz, H. C. De L.** *Antropologia Filosófica I*. São Paulo: Loyola, 1993.
- Villani, A., Pacca, J. L. De A.** Construtivismo, conhecimento científico e habilidade didática no ensino de ciências. *Rev. Fac. Educ.*, São Paulo, vol. 23, no. 1–2, Jan. 1997.

Принята редакцией: 15.09.2017