PHILOSOPHY OF EMANCIPATORY EDUCATION THROUGH THE MASTERS OF SUSPICION

John Christianto Simon
Sekolah Tinggi Theologia Intim Makassar
Email: tajaksebakal@gmail.com

I Gusti Nyoman Arnawa
Sekolah Tinggi Theologia Intim Makassar

Abstrak

> *Tulisan ini akan menjawab apa tuturan tiga guru kecurigaan bagi konstruksi filsafat pendidikan yang relevan di hari ini. Tulisan ini merupakan penelitian kualitatif yang bermaksud mengonstruksi makna melalui penelusuran kepustakaan atas sumber-sumber bacaan terpilih. Perspektif hermeneutik yang dipakai dalam tulisan ini berarti upaya menempatkan teks, yaitu pemikiran ketiga guru kecurigaan ini, dalam konteks masa kini guna mengonstruksi makna bagi filsafat pendidikan yang relevan. Tiga guru kecurigaan, Marx, Freud dan Nietzsche, masing-masing bersabda tentang tugas kritis di wilayah tindakan manusia. Marx mencurigai bahwa motif ekonomi sering kali tidak murni untuk kehidupan, sebaliknya untuk menindas. Nietzsche mencurigai agama yang hanya menciptakan manusia-manusia dekaden yang takut sehingga tidak menjadi diri sendiri, munafik dan sukanya menakut-nakuti orang lain. Freud mencurigai bahwa motivasi bawah sadar manusia harus dikritisi secara sungguh-sungguh agar sebuah tindakan benar-benar lahir dari moralitas sosial dan politik belarasa. Ketiga maha guru ini menghadirkan nilai-nilai pendidikan yang penting dikembangkan hari ini, yakni pendidikan untuk perubahan sosial, pendidikan untuk pemerdekaan dan pendidikan untuk membangun moralitas sosial dan politik belarasa.*

Kata kunci: *Guru-Guru Kecurigaan, Perubahan Sosial, Manusia Merdeka, Moral-Politik*

Abstract

This paper will answer what the masters of suspicion say about the construction of today's relevant philosophy of education. This paper is a qualitative research intended to construct meaning through a literature search on selected reading sources. The hermeneutic perspective used in this paper means an attempt to put the text, namely the thoughts of these masters of suspicion, in the present context to construct a meaning for the relevant philosophy of education. Three masters of suspicion, i.e. Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche, spoke respectively of a critical task in the realm of human action. Marx suspected that economic motives are often not to support life but to suppress it instead. Nietzsche suspected that religion only produced decadent and timid humans so they never became their true selves, hypocrite, and like to scare others. Freud was suspicious of human subconscious motivation so it must be seriously criticized in order to bring out an action that is truly born of compassionate political and social morality. These three masters present important education values to be developed today, namely education for social change, empowerment, and building compassionate social and political morality.

Keywords: *Emancipatory Education, Masters of Suspicion, Social Change, Free People, Political Morality.*

_____

INTRODUCTION

Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud are known as "the three masters of suspicion". All three teach about the importance of being critical with suspicious of everything that is seen, read, and analyzed so we do not take something for granted. In hermeneutic philosophy, the knife of suspicion becomes one of the hermeneutic wings to understanding social reality laden with various ideologies hiding oppressive interests and non-emancipatory false consciousness. Alison Scott-Baumann discusses the significance of these three teachers of suspicion, that "Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud gave us three significant phenomena of which the first provided reasons to be suspicious of ourselves and of others" (Scott-Baumann, 2009: 60). The three of them used analytical tools in their respective areas to

suspect every motive for economic action (Marx), destructive aspects of religion (Nietzsche), and moral-political motives (Freud). Economy, religion, and politics are three areas of human action that are not immune from being pushed to the subject's illusion in the form of exploitative, dominating, and oppressive false consciousness. Due to their unimmunity, all of them need to be placed under a barrage of criticism. Scott-Baumann called it,

> "Suspicion is thus personal, challenging Kant, looking beneath people's surface behavior and words to find concealed and therefore, according to the masters of suspicion, bad things [...] the hermeneutics of suspicion has been used often to refer to a world in which we can no longer be proud of our own motives, trust others and believe in God or Good" (Scott-Baumann, 2009: 184).

The purpose of the philosophy of suspicion is to ensure the emancipatory or liberating praxis of life and to guard the validity of just economic practices, liberating religion, and humane-moral politics.

This paper holds a thesis—as well as the author's position on the object of the research study—that these three teachers of suspicion speak about the wisdom in forming a critical attitude toward social realities in the realm of economics religion and politics, in order to achieve the equitable economic human praxis, the liberating religious practices, and the moral-political practices glorifying humans. This paper tries to answer what are the important legacies of the three teachers relevance to the construction of contemporary educational philosophy.

This paper is qualitative research aimed to analyze, interpret, and construct meaning through a literature search of selected reading sources in the form of the thoughts of three figures called the "three masters of suspicion." An upward slice into the field of education is found by using a hermeneutic perspective, which distinguishes between reading and interpreting activities, "exegesis" (*placing text in the context of the past*) and "hermeneutic"

(*placing text in the present context*) (Ricoeur, 1982: 43, Simon, 2018: 5, 12; Simon, 2019b: 103). Rather than exegesis, the hermeneutic perspective used in this paper means an attempt to place the text, namely the thoughts of the three teachers mentioned above, in the present context in order to construct a meaning that relevant to contemporary educational philosophy.

This research on three philosophical figures to find an emancipatory educational perspective is relatively new and has never been done before. Some journal publications only photograph each character about certain educational issues. About Marx, Eureka Mokibelo wrote the article entitled "Language-in-education policy issues and Karl Marx's views on education" (Mokibelo, 2018: 292-298). This paper concludes that capitalist education has imposed its ideology through the Language-in-Education Policy (LiEP) and presents inequality among students in the classroom and beyond. Meanwhile, Sonia Omer and Sadia Jabeen wrote the article entitled "Exploring Karl Marx Conflict Theory in Education: Are Pakistani Private Schools Maintaining Status Quo" (Omer & Jabeen, 2016: 195-202). This study presents a true picture of the educational inequality that exists in Pakistan and Marx's thinking helps restart the debate for policymakers to address educational inequality in Pakistan's education system.

About Nietzsche, Ansgar Allen wrote the article entitled "Awaiting Education: Friedrich Nietzsche on the Future of Our Educational Institutions" (Allen, 2017: 197-210). In this paper, Allen argues that Nietzsche's thinking fosters a critical attitude towards teachers and the teachings they convey, which often hide certain interests. Later, Douglas W. Yacek wrote the article entitled "Going to School with Friedrich Nietzsche: The Self in Service of Noble Culture" (Yacek, 2014: 391-411). Yacek offers the democratic nature of Nietzsche's self-critical pedagogy in order to grow the role of students as agents of cultural transformation.

About Freud, William Badenhorst (2022) wrote the article entitled "Freud and Medical Student Education: Introducing an Elective Course". This article explains that health education

students are challenged to have innovations in recognizing psychiatric problems from patients in an effort to provide holistic health recovery. Furthermore, M. Nasir Budiman, Saifullah Idris, and Masbur (2018) wrote the article entitled "Between Religion and Education in Freud's Perspective". The results of the research show that Freud applied his ideas to family and social life. The idea also offers a guide to explain myths, tales, and history and interpret drama, literature, and art. He is always looking for new dimensions and broader application of ideas, namely the unconscious, the Oedipus complex, mental disorders (neurosis), and the three basic frameworks of human personality. Towards the end of his life, he thought about the themes of death, human limitations, and the limits of civilization.

Through the study of these three figures, I try to correct the view that ignores the contribution of these three figures in order to develop an emancipatory educational perspective. These three figures the "school of suspicion" (Simon, 2019a: 132-133, 223), namely Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud, occupy an important position in the framework of the project of stepping on "the transformation of subjectivity" by *breaking down the illusion of an absolute subject*, that exploitative and dominative in nature. The illusion of a subject feeling alone and does not need other people (*solipsistic*), and that everything is self-centered (*egological*) is a legacy of Descartes's philosophical thought. His *cogito* hermeneutic model and its derivatives in the non-emancipatory "school of Descartes" (Simon, 2019a: 6, 11, 35, 44), are philosophical ideas in which self-knowledge (self-understanding) obtained directly without going through *mediation*, that also means rejecting the presence of other people. The teachers of suspicion, on the other hand, say, "hermeneutics holds that we understand ourselves only by taking *a long detour* through the signs, texts, and other repositories of humanity found in cultural works" (Ricoeur, 1982: 143; Kaplan, 2003: 10). This is the idea of hermeneutics as *a long detour* openly passing through or mediated by various symbols of humanity, including the presence of other people, and returning to a new self-concept, which is different and

better, namely self-image that is emancipated together living context including accepting the presence of others.

Towards the emancipation of a subject that is open to others, emancipatory hermeneutics first receives input from Marx's political-economic critique. Marx's political-economic critique is a fundamental criticism against the a-social idealism of Kant and Hegel that is based not on historical awareness. Then it received input from Nietzsche's genealogy, intending to examine the deepest aspects of religion which are free of interests, free value and serve oppressive powers. Finally, it receives input from Freud's psychoanalysis, intending to undermine the apparent morality of pretending to be good and carrying the false interests of injustice.

All three masters are sources of critical thinking: "Three masters, seemingly mutually exclusive, dominate the school of suspicion: Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud" (Ricoeur, 1970: 32; Felski, 2011; Akrivoulis, 2017: 245). These three perspectives transform into powerful "weapons" targeting the arrogance of discourse and the practice of various oppressive behaviors, as Ricoeur says, "Nietzschean genealogy, Freudian psychoanalysis, the Marxist critique of ideology, that is, the weapons of the hermeneutics of suspicion" (Ricoeur, 2003: 337). The base of the three teachers is critical philosophy which is not directly related to issues surrounding education. However, all three figures consistently offer critical educational perspectives according to the context of each thinker. As explained above, through the perspective of hermeneutics philosophy, efforts to find relevant meanings from the thoughts of these three suspicious teachers in the field of education become a critical task regarding emancipatory educational values

DISCUSSION: THE THOUGHT OF KARL MARX, FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE AND SIGMUND FREUD

1. Karl Marx

The philosophy of Karl Marx (1818-1883) must be understood as a criticism of the philosophy of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831). Meanwhile, Hegel's philosophy is difficult to

understand without understanding the philosophy of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) (Piercey, 2021: 563; Ricoeur, 1986: 135, 302; Ricoeur, 1982: 235; Anderson, 1993). The main problem that arises is that Kant's criticism has *stalled* because Kant limited the autonomy of ratios to be purely subjective. He did mention the active aspect of human knowledge, but it is stagnant because it is impossible for the subject's mind to become objective by touching things outside himself (Ricoeur, undated: 57-71; Ricoeur, 1967: 51-53). Furthermore, Kant's thought bottleneck occurs because the knowledge possessed by the subject doesn't depart from historical awareness. A thinking subject is created, but it is a subject that is separate and distant from the context in which it lives. This is why Ricoeur calls Kant's philosophy creating "the anthropological illusion" (Ricoeur, 1974: 416) separating from human concerns. As a result, if historical awareness as a context is ignored, knowledge will only exist in an empty space without content, without concern, and without ethical calling (Ricoeur, 1986: 31). And that is tantamount to losing critical power on the problematic context and transforming into a *pro-status quo*, namely justifying the fact of social inequality that occurs.

Marx's philosophy is a criticism of Hegel's philosophy (Marx, 1982; Marx and Engels, 2016; Ricoeur, 1986: 135, 302). As part of an effort to avoid getting caught up in theoretical tensions or contemplation, Marx intended to build a praxis philosophy that could change reality, which at that time was characterized by capitalist society and the exploitation of the rich over the weak. Philosophy that previously was understood by Hegel as contemplation or "awareness" in fact did not bring impact and change to reality. This is Ricoeur's assessment that "the real source of human activity is praxis and not consciousness" (Ricoeur, 1986: xii). By taking the opposite path, then, according to Marx, contemplation without action only creates a "false consciousness" by maintaining an unequal social reality, until there is only one option left, namely philosophy to become a practical science with the ultimate goal of social transformation.

Here Marx offers an emancipatory perspective by taking the path of suspicion on false consciousness through the school of suspicion (Marx, 1982; Ricoeur, 1986: 75). "Marx [...] as we said, begin with suspicions about the illusions of consciousness", says Ricoeur (Ricoeur, 1974: 150). This is in the view of Richard Kearney: "Marx who developed a hermeneutics of false consciousness" (Kearney, 1986: 109). This path of suspicion is taken in order to perform a hermeneutic function, namely to critically interpret this false consciousness. The goal is "Marx wants is to liberate praxis by the awareness of necessity", said Ricoeur (Ricoeur, 1974: 150). For Marx, philosophy must become a practical philosophy that drives change and social emancipation regarding a just society without exploitation.

Marx still uses Hegel's dialectical method, which is read from the perspective of historical materialism, and it is just the obstacle as well as criticism. The essence of the view of historical materialism is that the development of a society is determined by developments in the economic or material field. What is a human need in the economic or material field—"man is what he eats" (Ricoeur, 1986: 32; Ricoeur, 1974: 110)—is what should control human consciousness. This is the most objective fact of human life, said Marx (Ricoeur, 1986: 38). Beyond that, such as social, cultural, and even religious needs are false awareness that ideologically blind humans in seeing what is their basic right as humans. Hence, it is not strange that Marx was later very anti-religious and considered religion as the opium of the people. However, even though his footing is materialism, Marx got enough sympathy by inviting everyone to find what is fundamental in his life, namely liberation and social change toward justice without exploitation. Later, but it will not be discussed here, this side which Marx did not see was developed by the critical theory philosopher, Jürgen Habermas (Sunarko, 2019: 32-34; Simon, 2018: 6-11), through the concept of a post-secular society that is open to the role of religion as a set of values that brings about social change precisely because religion encourages its adherents to take critical action.

2. Friedrich Nietzsche

Friedrich Nietzsche's genealogical analysis (1844-1900) is an analysis that is suspicious of every dogmatic statement stemming from those who are called guardians of morality, including religious people. Nietzsche's genealogical analysis also intends to strip away universalist pretensions and likes to claim to be right or moral (Nietzsche, 1974; Ricoeur, 1991: 216; Damgaard, 2018: 200). The truth claim in the form of a certain system of moral values is realized, among other things, by the emergence of a single interpretation. Ricoeur said this: "In Nietzsche, values must be interpreted because they are expressions of the strength and the weakness of the will to power. Moreover, in Nietzsche, life itself is the interpretation of interpretations" (Ricoeur, 1974: 12). Because there will never be one interpretation, the presumption of a single morality or universal morality is automatically invalidated. This is in line with Nietzsche's understanding of plural interpretation which celebrates various moral guides stemming from various local contexts. "Nietzsche was *the first* to make a connection between suspicion and interpretation", said Ricoeur (Ricoeur, 1974: 331; Ricoeur, 1992: 15). It is through the path of suspicion and interpretation celebrating various meanings that the oppressive standards of universal morality are brought to an end.

Genealogical analysis is directed at a critical distrustful interpretation of a person's thought by examining what type of person and what kind of morals lie behind his/her opinions and actions. As a result, Nietzsche's genealogical mechanism shows that there are two typologies of morality (Nietzsche, 1974; Ricoeur, 1970: 181, 183; Clark, 1990: 68-69; Copleston, 1963: 401; Sindhunata, 2000: 7), namely master-morality and slave-morality. In order to find out which person or what kind of person is willing to be a slave or a master, Nietzsche tries to dismantle one's personality. The morality of slaves and masters is Nietzsche's attempt to borrow and clarify Freud's views on this theme. This is a kind of psychological approach (Ricoeur, 1966: 117; Ricoeur, 1986: 119), namely philosophizing by using a more personal approach, so that between

raised ideas and who raised them, between what was said and what was done, inseparable or diametrically distinguished. Obviously, Nietzsche wants to ensure that what is said and what is done are inseparable. The personality of the slave or master can be seen in both words and actions.

With the support of an *ad hominem* strategy, namely investigating fallacies in thinking, Nietzsche tries to reveal many realities that are covered up in the name of theory, religious beliefs, and moral philosophical views. Nietzsche investigates what lies behind an action. This suspicion can be referred to as a kind of diagnosis, namely diagnosing various forms of reference values and revealing what actually drives people to adhere to or carry out certain values. Ricoeur said: "a *'genealogical'* manner of questioning philosophers has emerged, thanks principally to Nietzsche, which does not limit itself to collecting declared intentions but holds them in suspicion and seeks the motives and self-interests behind their reasons" (Ricoeur, 2003: 331; Haryatmoko, 2000: 37). Genealogical analysis is Nietzsche's art of interpretation and research method on the origin of moral pre-judgment or what is also called the value of values. The purpose of examining the origins of a value is to uncover the masks behind words and actions, including the mask in the name of God. Through charitable activities, for example, one investigates and examines whether the benevolence comes from a pure intention to help or is there something else. Nietzsche's genealogical analysis suspects the other "something" and uncovers and exposes motives for action which are often based on false interests and hypocrisy.

The target of Nietzsche's criticism is morality based on a value system that denies self-transcendence in the form of justice and truth. His aim is to be critical of the low morality which is anti-life. Such morality is referred to as "slave morality" (Nietzsche, 1974; Ricoeur, 1970: 181, 183; Sindhunata, 2000: 10-14). This lowly morality is not just an idea or theory, but something objective, that is, people who are sweet in words and behave hypocritically, are vindictive and spread death everywhere. This view of objective

morality was developed by Nietzsche from his theory of power. As Ricoeur said about Nietzsche, "he tells us, aims not only at conservation but also at expansion and domination" (Ricoeur, 1966: 116). For Nietzsche, the objective of life is expansion and domination. This understanding he then summarizes in the theory of the "will to power" (Deutsch: *Wille zur Macht*), which is not only individual in nature but also penetrates into everyday public life (Ricoeur, 1966: 118). Those whose lives only pursue power, speak intimidating and easily spill blood, only exposing humans who are slaves and have lowly morals.

Furthermore, Nietzsche wants to reveal what is called human decadence (Nietzsche, 1974; Ricoeur, 1974: 445-447; Burston, 2020: 118). Decadent humans are lowly, weak, and do not know their duties. That's a human being who wastes his nobility as a human being who has a noble and honorable morality. With servile morals, he is a creature ashamed to be human. This decadent human is actually a situation where humans are alienated from themselves, deny their existence, lose their identity or existence, are disloyal to their lives, deceive the highest truth they know, namely humans with master morality, and act fairly. In this decadence, humans become big liars about their existence.

Then, what causes humans to be decadent or hindered from becoming real human beings is God. Nietzsche's point is of course the image of God in his time, namely the gods of the bourgeoisie who act as anti-life by oppressing others. For Nietzsche, God, as understood by Christianity, which in his time had been institutionalized and became part of the tools of capitalism, was a gigantic barrier that prevented humans from becoming independent humans. So, this image of God who enslaves like this must be eliminated. Why must God die (Deutsch: *Gott ist tot, God is dead*)? The answer is clear: because He is a barrier for humans to become free humans (Burston, 2020: 116, 123; Ricoeur, 1974: 445; Sudiarja, 2000: 25). It's because, according to Nietzsche, there is no God who regulates and directs human life. Each individual is responsible for himself. Man must be God for himself and not be

dependent on anyone. The God introduced by religion as the God who punishes the poor, the God who protects the capitalists and the creator of cowardly humans should be removed. Behind his controversial efforts in the history of Christianity, Nietzsche actually contained noble intentions, namely for religion to become a force that liberates humans, as opposed to oppressive religion; and God is also the Liberating Actor, as opposed to God who is used by oppressors to oppress others.

3. Sigmund Freud

The place of Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) in the hermeneutics of suspicion certainly related to the inadequacy of Marx's critical analysis through a scientific approach that was unable to explain how the system of monopoly capitalism and instrumentalist ratios can manipulate individuals' personal lives. Marx's criticism is considered insufficient and an analysis that can explain why psychologically individuals can be influenced and dictated by their social context such as the power of capitalism is needed. It is here Freud get a place, namely "Freud helps us to reread Marx", said Ricoeur (Ricoeur, 1986: 244). Freud's point is that "capitalism can be explained and criticized on strictly moral-political grounds" (Ricoeur, 1986: 221; Kaplan, 2003: 180). Criticism of moral-politics is his explanation of what Marx did not touch. Thus, Marxism requires psychoanalysis, because psychoanalysis can sharpen Marx's ideological criticism.

The question is how to explain the relationship between material reality and human consciousness. Or, how the upper structure in the form of moods, ideas, and various historical events is caused by the lower structure in the form of economic action? This is where psychoanalysis comes into play. Freud's psychoanalysis provides an important foundation in the form of awareness of mental distortions and ways of thinking. Ricoeur calls it a critique of "moral consciousness" (Ricoeur, 1974: 135, 152). Psychoanalysis is obliged to explain and interpret the existing distortions, which are often systematically organized in texts of human communication.

These distortions are the subject's misunderstanding of himself (Freud, 1975; Ricoeur, 1982: 260; Burston, 2020: 33-34), as if the self is the center of everything as if by mastering capital, the self reaches the peak of actualization as a human being. This reduction of self raises a moral awareness that humans are not only instruments of action (instrumental action) in the field of economic production but go beyond it to be free from all mental illnesses and ways of thinking that imprison their entire lives.

Another role of psychoanalysis is as an "intermediary concept" to explain why and how society believes and accepts ideological distortions (Ricoeur, 1986: 137). "Freud [...] as we said, begin with suspicions about the illusions of consciousness", said Ricoeur, hence psychoanalysis is needed to carry out the task as "hermeneutics of unconscious desire" (Ricoeur, 1974: 150; Kearney, 1986: 109). The task of "hermeneutics of unconscious desires", is to dismantle the unconscious of individuals and society in their historical conditions. Ricoeur later agreed that psychoanalysis can be classified into a group of critical social sciences directed by emancipatory interests to rediscover the power of self-reflection (Ricoeur, 1982: 261; Ricoeur, 1974: 237-238). Dan Stiver said that "Freud represents the demise of a philosophy of consciousness or immediacy, as opposed to what Ricoeur calls a 'philosophy of reflection'" (Stiver, 2001: 143). Philosophy of reflection or also called "the hermeneutic of unconscious desires" includes targeting a set of religion-backed beliefs with its role as a "supplement of belief" (Ricoeur, 1970: 232-234; Ricoeur, 1986: 230-231; Gschwandtner, 2021: 16) that often have "primitive" and childish expressions that actually practicing forms of injustice. This is the role of religion as a social illusion, anti-social, and hiding violent libido.

Ricoeur sees, it's important for Freud to show the psychoanalysis limits and "falsifies" the egological or solipsistic cogito (Ricoeur, 1974: 149, 161). Egology means self-centered. Solipsistic means feeling alone without needing other people. Egology and solipsism are two things that are both false consciousness. For Kevin J. Vanhoozer, "Ricoeur's work on Freud

and psychoanalysis convinced him that consciousness, first of all, is a false consciousness" (Vanhoozer, 1990: 29). Thus, through critiquing the illusion of the egotistical or solipsistic subject, ideological criticism finds the most convincing momentum to overthrow all false unconscious tendencies of the ego and domination of others. The result is that a true human action is built on a moral, social, and political foundation of compassion for others.

IMPLICATIONS: PHILOSOPHY OF EMANCIPATORY EDUCATION

From the results of the discussion in the previous section, there are implications in the form of educational philosophy values, in which suspicion masters contribute respectively to education for social change (Marx), education for free humans (Nietzsche), and moral-political education (Freud).

1. Karl Marx: Philosophy of Education for Social Change

Marx emphasized that it is not human consciousness that determines their condition, but on the contrary social conditions determine human consciousness (Ricoeur, 1986: 80; Ricoeur, 1970: 34-35; Clark, 1990: 62). Furthermore, to him, what determines society is not aware as Hegel means, but reality, "that the real source of human activity is praxis and not consciousness" (Ricoeur, 1986: xii). Consciousness depends on circumstances. Why? Because "Real individuals and material conditions are conjoined" (Ricoeur, 1986: xii). This is actually the way of life for everyone who basically thinks concretely, namely men whose way of thinking is controlled by economic motives.

Starting from this concrete awareness, Marx criticized the ideas or ideology that became the basis for education, which believed in the power of ideas or awareness to change the course of history. In contrast to the great ideology, Marx concluded, as Ricoeur said that: "Marx concluded that the only critique which can change reality is a critique not by means of words and ideas, such as the critique made by the left Hegelians, who remain speculative thinkers, but a critique involving concrete praxis" (Marx, 1982;

Ricoeur, 1986: 26). That is, a criticism that not limited in a form of discourse or rhetoric but a set of concrete actions.

Ideology-based education or ideas placing awareness –since Descartes, Kant—is understood in relation to reason or closed ratio (*cogito*), neutral and pure from the interests of social transformation. It is then shifted into an education system intended to maintain the domination of the ruling class over the ruled. From here, educational theories are composed aiming to defend and justifyng the reality of inequality. This was the beginning of the emergence of non-emancipatory educational ideology, that Marx sees as creating a "motivational framework" driving people simply accept authority from those in power, by which education becomes a pro status quo of power (Ricoeur, 1986: 183, 229). In practice, this ideology is often hidden in ideas about a noble society whose role is to force people to comply with a rule or a noble idea. As a result, people then forget that they are actually oppressed.

Marx then shifted from work activity to the material conditions in which humans live, learn (education) and work. This shift made Marx touches certain historical conditions shaping reality, revealing that the ideology of education was born not from human consciousness but from human material needs. That is why, "Marx stresses that consciousness (Deutsch: *Bewusstsein*) is a conscious *existence* (Deutsch: *bewusstes Sein*). Once more, consciousness is not an autonomous but connected with human beings 'actual life process'" instead (Ricoeur, 1986: 78). With this, Marx proclaimed that what humans need today is education for social change. Efforts in this direction are going beyond pure, neutral and value-free ratios, to become educational praxis that are not neutral, not value-free but carrying the interests of social transformation. The social change is built on the foundation of a value or educational interest for a noble, equal, and just life. The promoted educational perspective is an education as a praxis for social change toward civilization and justice.

2. Friedrich Nietzsche: Philosophy of Free People Education

In Nietzsche's eyes, religion (especially Christianity) has created history from human beings who are afraid and not free to develop themselves. This fear exists because the focus of life and religious teachings is on the afterlife (heaven there), not the world here and now. In Ricoeur's assessment of Nietzsche's criticism, Christianity presents a closed theology (onto-theology), and tramples and breaks human efforts to seek goodness today. Ricoeur said, "onto-theology which culminates in the idea of a moral god" (Ricoeur, 1974: 447). As a result, Christianity becomes fantasy and illusion anesthetizing and intoxicating people from their duties to become authentic and quality human beings today by diverting their orientation only to heaven.

Humans must become human again through education. Nietzsche said, "I teach you the Superman" (Nietzsche, 1967: 67; Ricoeur, 1974: 446). Education in the struggle to become human again is indeed painful, said Nietzsche, like the pain of a woman who is in labor pain. Becoming a new person is described as "understanding comes through suffering" (Greece: to pathei mathos) (Ricoeur, 1974: 159). Achieving an understanding as a superhuman is a process full of suffering and that is the ideal of Nietzsche's education for humanity, namely humans with high morality. Education for the new humanity is an effort to create human beings who are not barbaric and do not fight reason, as has been shown by religion in various wars, killings, and terror (Ricoeur, 1974: 446; Stewart, 1989: 300-301). From an educational perspective, Nietzsche introduced the term "eternal return", which according to Nietzsche also applies to superhumans (Deutsch: Ubermensch, Superman), namely new humans or mighty humans. Superhuman is a conscious human figure, who no longer submits himself to slavery, including by oppressive religious dogmatic statements. Education realizes that it is fate that humans are decadent, but they do not want to be oppressed by decadence.

Through Nietzsche we get the energy to be suspicious and dismantle the destructive aspects of religion which often hide

behind great moral values, even though they tend to be exclusive, justify violence and isolate followers of other religions in the name of God (Nietzsche, 1974). It is something that Nietzsche strongly opposed, namely the arrogance of spiritual values. The recommended educational perspective is education as a praxis of liberation. The result is students are free from moral decadence, and fear and are able to become authentic individuals. According to Nietzsche, a nobleman is a man who comes to understand himself through the path of suffering, full of struggle. There are no shortcuts and no instant roads. Learning is also a way of suffering that requires hard work, patience, and sacrifice.

3.   Sigmund Freud: Philosophy of Moral-Political Education

Psychoanalysis is a hermeneutic detour that helps find a new humanity, namely the *second naïvete* (Freud, 1975; Ricoeur, 1970: 496), which remains fragile and will never be absolute, but is transformed through its encounter with signs, symbols, metaphors and narrative texts (stories or tales that are reflective). This is exactly what Ricoeur said, "an opaque subjectivity which expresses itself through the *detour* of countless mediations–signs, symbols, texts and human praxis itself" (Kearney, 1984: 32). In this way it becomes clear that human problems are often blinded by "false awareness", feeling capable but actually not, and creating self-defense mechanisms by muzzling others. Consciousness or rather emancipation of the subject means freeing the subject from this false consciousness.

Through moral-political criticism, besides dismantling false consciousness, Freud offers a new perspective on education that social construction is not only material or rational (a rational subject) as Marx understands, but also by a value system that departs from a certain framework of morality. Here Freud opens the eyes of educational activists about the need for a hermeneutic suspicion on the subconscious layer or on the noble value system (morality) which in fact hides oppressive ideological interests. It is this oppressive framework of morality that drives the need for subject emancipation and social emancipation.

What needs to be looked at closely and at the same time be criticized, is that Freud's emancipatory perspective, which is used to critique ideology, may not work or get stuck if psychoanalysis still survives on its *value-free* basis of thought. In his critique, Ricoeur noted three things that allowed Freud's psychoanalysis to break down. The solution Ricoeur offers at once is an educational perspective through the insight of Freud's thought.

First and *foremost*, Ricoeur's words are "In a way, the psychoanalyst in the analytic situation may be a *value-free thinker* because he or she is the object of transference" (Ricoeur, 1986: 247-249). The value-free gesture actually shows the strong influence of Cartesian thought, as well as the inseparable psychoanalysis from the context of the rise of positivism which is also value-free. Cartesianism and positivism, among others, are passionate about being neutral, and anti-social to a-moral. An emancipatory educational perspective cannot possibly be controlled by this value-free, anti-social, and a-moral perspective. Because education itself is full of interests, namely the interest that ethical values and noble morality are well instilled in the hearts of students.

Second, education based on ideological criticism is difficult to parallel with psychoanalysis if the subject or object that is the patient is considered to be transparent or completely clear. Besides this showing the gesture of "immediate seeing" inherited from phenomenology (Simon, 2019a: 5, 54-68), psychoanalysis cannot use the concept of neurosis as a tool to criticize the patient so that the patient can self-reflect and awaken. Direct recognition makes distance become impossible so that ideological criticism of the subject doesn't work. In fact, in other literature, Ricoeur warns, "the critique of ideology is the necessary *detour* which self-understanding must take" (Ricoeur, 1982: 144). Criticism itself never appears directly but instead takes a detour, including through another self (the patient with the neurosis) who cannot be immediately recognized as a case in his life, let alone to be embraced, controlled, or forced to follow problem-solving from the counselor. The patient or whoever is approached is a subject full of

mysteries. Acknowledgment of mystery is a symbol of acceptance of otherness. The liberating education is one carrying the praxis of acknowledging the mysteries and otherness of human beings. The students are like patients, no longer those who are truly *tabula rasa* (white paper), who, when under pressure, control, and intimidation, can only learn something. Education is an acknowledgment of the mysterious dimension of everyone who can receive learning from anywhere and anyone, as well as acceptance of diversity, that everyone is unique and different, so there is no need to be directed to be similar. During this pandemic, the relevance of Freud's educational praxis seems to be reciprocating with the independent learning-free campus paradigm through the implementation of online learning, which gives students the freedom to learn from any source and grow as unique individuals, and be directed according to their developmental potential.

Third, because criticism of one's own consciousness is not possible, it will be difficult for education to expect social transformation to emerge. And it is complicated by bourgeois intellectuals, and psychoanalysts—like the Marxist intellectuals—who actually maintain the configuration of society, aka the *pro-status quo* (Simon, 2019a: 125). The educational perspective from Freud's *insight* is the education of the oppressed not the intellectual bourgeois. Why? Because of the non-value-free power of Freud's moral-political critique, it means a call to serve the restoration of historical awareness of suffering. History is not first of all the history of masters, heroes, and victors, but the history of slaves who are the defeated and oppressed people. The result is that education first becomes a vocation to serve the poor, destitute, and suffering, not to serve masters and victors. The bottom line is the awakening of socially and politically moral students as a call to compassion for those who are suffering.

The three big ideas above can be systematized into the following matrix of emancipatory educational philosophy.

Table. 1. Matrix Philosophy of Emancipatory Education
Source: Author's Scheme

Karl Marx	Friedrich Nietzsche	Sigmund Freud
Designation: Philosophy of Education for Social Change	Designation: Philosophy of Free People Education	Designation: Philosophy of Moral-Political Education
Context of thought: Ideologies that give rise to a closed mind (cogito), neutral, and pure from the interests of social transformation	Context of thought: Religion (especially Christianity) has created a history of humans who are afraid and not free to develop themselves	Context of thought: Freud offers a new perspective on education that social construction is not only material or rational (a rational subject) as understood by Marx, but also by a value system that departs from a certain framework of morality
Educational models: Educational praxis that is not neutral, not value-free, and carries the interests of social transformation. Social change is built on the foundation of a value or educational interest for a noble, equal, and just life. The educational perspective that is promoted is education as a praxis for social change towards civilization and justice	Educational models: Nietzsche's educational ideals for humanity, namely humans with high morality, not barbaric, and not against reason, as has been shown by religion in various wars, killings, and terror	Educational models: The educational perspective from Freud's insight is the education of the oppressed not the intellectual bourgeois education. The result is that education first becomes a vocation to serve the poor, destitute, and suffering, not to serve masters and victors. The bottom line is the awakening of socially and politically moral students as a call to compassion for those who are suffering

CONCLUSION

Living in today's world, almost no one can be free from the spirit of consumerism, hedonism, and post-truth. We and many people are heavily influenced by self-interest, materialism, greed, opportunism, and untrustworthiness; abusing trust; and neglecting social morality, horror-spreading politics, fake news, and always the unwillingness to sacrifice for the good of society. Even there are parties multiplying sacrifices everywhere. Even religion is used as a political vehicle to achieve misguided goals deviating from its noble mission. A description of the context as above requires a starting point for a liberating philosophy of education. Through Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud, we want to answer what their perspective on education is relevant today. Here are the tasks of educational philosophy for social change (Marx), for creating free noble human beings (Nietzsche), and for forming social morality and compassionate politics (Freud) are no longer inevitable. These three values can be incorporated into the emancipatory philosophy of educational praxis.

The "three masters of suspicion" provide us with intelligent inspiration that us to become introspective and self-critical of the tendencies of society that, as they accuse, thrive in humans who are not aware of the need for liberation, decadent humans who pretend power and immoral compassion. The world of education is a strategic place that plays a role in shaping humans and society with an emancipatory life. The goal of an emancipatory educational philosophy is not to form and prepare a human being who is ready to compete for self-interested goals and maintain social egoism, but rather to fight for the common interest of social change.

The organizers of the world of education always criticize the quality of teaching and the expected graduates' wishes, so that the portion is not only on the cognitive side but there is an adequate balance with affective and psychomotor. Teaching in the world of education must be sensitive to the context of society and bring students back to society, something that until now has not been completed as a reference for the implementation of education. The

context referred to is the suffering of the poor and oppressed, who are struggling to seek justice and seeking happiness in the midst of a crisis due to the Covid-19 pandemic and an increasingly massive ecological crisis. In the context of the diversity of religions and beliefs, we assume that emancipatory education for liberation from poverty, oppression, alienation, or marginalization and the preservation of creation is an obliged mission for interfaith and cultural communities. We hope the mission of emancipatory education be transformative, liberating, and civilizing political-moral in public spaces, so that, in turn, it will become a common force to change reality to be better and humane.

REFERENCES

Akrivoulis, D. E. (2017). Beyond the hermeneutics of suspicion in the critique of humanitarian intervention. *Review of International Studies* 43(2) April, 240-259, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210516000383.

Allen, A. (2017). Awaiting Education: Friedrich Nietzsche on the Future of our Education Institutions. *Journal Philosophical Inquiry in Education* 24(3), 197-210, https://doi.org/10.7202/1070606ar.

Anderson, P. S. (1993). *Ricoeur and Kant: Philosophy of The Will*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

Badenhorst, W. (2022). Freud and Medical Student Education: Introducing an Elective Course. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 69(6), February, https://doi.org/10.1177/00030651211066553.

Budiman, M. N., Idris, S., & Masbur. (2018). Between Religion and Education in Freud Perspective." *Advanced Science Letters* 24(10), 7090-7094, https://doi.org/10.1166/asl.2018.12415.

Burston, D. (2020). *Psychoanalysis, Politics and the Postmodern University*. Pittsburgh, PA, USA: Palgrape.

Clark, S. H. (1990). *Paul Ricoeur*. London dan New York: Routledge.

Copleston, F. (1963). *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. VII. London: Search Press.

Damgaard, I. (2018). Through hermeneutics of suspicion to a rediscovery of faith."*Studia Theologica–Nordic Journal of Theology* 72(2), 198-216, https://doi.org/10.1080/0039338X.2018.1451774.

Felski, R. (2011). Critique and the Hermeneutics of Suspicion. *M/C Journal* 15(1), https://doi.org/10.5204/mcj.431.

Freud, S. (1975). *Five Lecture on Psycho-Analysis Leonardo da Vinci and Other Works*. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Gschwandtner, C. M. (2021). Faith, Religion, and Spirituality: A Phenomenological and Hermeneutic Contribution to Parsing the Distinctions. *Religions* 12(476), 1-23, https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12070476.

Haryatmoko. (2000). Pembongkaran Agama dan Aspek Destruktifnya."*Basis* 11-12, Th. Ke-49, (November-Desember): 33-38.

Kaplan, D. M. (2003). *Ricoeur's Critical Theory*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Kearney, R. (1986). Religion and Ideology: Paul Ricoeur's Hermeneutic Conflict. *Irish Theological Quarterly* 52(1 & 2), 109-126.

_____(1984). *Dialogues with Contemporary Continental Thinkers*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Marx, K. (1982). *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2016). *The German Ideology*. New York: Routledge.

Mokibelo, E. (2018). Language-in-education policy issues and Karl Marx's views on education. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management* 6(4), 292-298, https://10.18535/ijsrm/v6i4.el11.

Nietzsche, F. (1974). *Twilight of the Idols and The Anti-Christ*. Great Britain: Penguin Books.

_____(1967). *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Omer, S., & Jabeen, S. (2016). Exploring Karl Marx Conflict Theory in Education: Are Pakistani Private Schools Maintaining Status Quo. *Bulletin of Education and Research* 3(2), 195-202, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1210318.

Piercey, R. (2021). Too Many Hegels? Ricoeur's Relation to German Idealism Reconsidered. *The Palgrave Handbook of German Idealism and Phenomenology*, editor C.D. Coe, 547-565. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66857-0_25.

Ricoeur, P.(1966). *Freedom and Nature: The Voluntary and the Involuntary*. Trans. by Erazim V. Kohak. Evanston Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

_____(1967). *Husserl: An Analysis of His Phenomenology*. Trans. by Edward G. Ballard dan Lester E. Embree. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

_____(1970). *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*. Trans. by Denis Savage. New Haven: Yale University Press.

_____(1974). *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*. Edited by Don Ihde. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

_____(1982). *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*. Edited by John B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____(1986). *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*. Edited by George H. Taylor. New York: Columbia University Press.

_____(1991). *A Ricoeur Reader: Reflection and Imagination*. Edited by Mario J. Valdes. Toronto dan Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

_____(1992). *Oneself as Another*. Trans. by Kathleen Blamey. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

_____(2003) *The Rule of Metaphor*. Trans. by Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin dan John Costello. London and New York: Routledge Classics.

_____(n.d.). *Fallible Man: Philosophy of The Will*. Trans. by Charles Kelbley. Chicago, Illinois: Henry Regnery Company.

Scott-Baumann, A.(2009). *Ricoeur and the Hermeneutics of Suspicion*. London & New York: Continuum.

Simon, J. C. (2018). Sumbangan Paul Ricoeur dalam Proses Berteologi. *Gema Teologika* 3(1), 1-18, https://doi.org/10.21460/gema.2018.31.338.

_____(2019a). *Hermeneutik Paul Ricoeur dan Tugas Emansipasi: Kemiskinan, Ketidakadilan, dan Radikalisme di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta & Makassar: PT. Kanisius & STT Intim Makassar.

_____(2019b). Metode Penelitian Teologi Lintas Ilmu: Sebuah Catatan Reflektif. *Jurnal Baji Dakka* 3(1), 81-114.

Sindhunata. (2000). Nietzsche Si Pembunuh Tuhan. *Basis* 11-12, Th. Ke-49, (November-Desember): 4-17.

Stewart, D. (1989). The Hermeneutics of Suspicion. *Literature & Theology* 3(3), 296-307.

Stiver, D. R. (2001). *Theology after Ricoeur: New Directions in Hermeneutical Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Sunarko, A. (2019). *Agama dalam Masyarakat Post-Sekular: Refleksi Teologis*. Jakarta: Penerbit Obor.

Sudiarja, A. (2000). Nietzsche Muda Suka Bikin Perkara. *Basis* 11-12, Th. Ke-49, (November-Desember): 18-25.

Vanhoozer, K J. (1990). *Biblical Narrative in the Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur: A Study in Hermeneutics and Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yacek, D. W. (2014). Going to School with Friedrich Nietzsche: The Self in Service of Noble Culture. *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 33(July), 391-411, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-013-9394-z.