The Masters Of Suspicion: The Wisdom Of Supreme Masters

John C. Simon¹ & Nitis P. Harsono²

¹ STT Intim Makassar

Email: tajaksebakal@gmail.com

² STT Intim Makassar

Email: nitis.harsono@yahoo.com

Artikel info

Artikel history:

Received; 13-03-2020

Revised; 25-03-2020

Accepted; 29-03-2020

Abstract: *Three masters of suspicion, i.e. Marx, Freud and Nietzsche, each spoke of a critical task in the realm of human action. Marx suspected that economic motives were often not to support life but instead to suppress it. Nietzsche suspected that religion only produced decadent and timid humans so they never became their true selves, hypocrites and like to scare others. Freud was suspicious of human subconscious motivation so that it must be seriously criticized in order to an action was truly born of compassionate political and social morality. These three masters present important pedagogic values to be developed today, namely education for social change, education for empowerment and education to build a compassionate social and political morality.*

Abstrak: Tiga guru kecurigaan (the masters of suspicion), 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 dekadent 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 pedagogik yang penting dikembangkan hari ini, yakni pendidikan untuk perubahan sosial, pendidikan untuk kemerdekaan dan pendidikan untuk membangun moralitas sosial dan politik belarasa.

Keywords:

Teachers of suspicion; pedagogic; social change.

Corresponden author:

artikel dengan akses terbuka dibawah lisensi CC BY -4.0

Introduction

"Three teachers of suspicion", that's how Marx, Nietzsche and Freud are called. All three used analytical knives in their respective fields to suspect each motive of economic action (Marx), the destructive aspects of religion (Nietzsche) and political-moral motives (Freud). Economics, politics and religion are not three areas of human action that are immune to the impulse towards the illusion of the subject in the form of exploitative, dominative and oppressive false consciousness. Therefore all of it need to be exposed to insistent criticism with the intention to ensure fairly economic practices, empowering religions and humane moral and politics.

This paper is based on a thesis that these three teachers of suspicion speak of wisdom of being critical of the reality around us for the sake of the realization of an economic, religious and political just, independent and glorifying mankind. The question to be answered in this paper is what is important about their views in constructing pedagogical values for today's life? To answer it, the sequence of discussion in this paper is as follows. *First*, a hermeneutical research methodology will be described as a means to examine the thoughts of those three masters of suspicion. *Second*, the results of the research on their thoughts will be explained. *Third*, the results of the discussion will be explained in the form of pedagogic values that can be extracted from it that is relevant for tasks of today. *Fourth*, as a conclusion, some contextual notions will be deduced.

Research Methodology

The three figures of the school of suspicion, namely Marx, Nietzsche and Freud, occupy an important position in the project towards the "transformation of subjectivity" through undermining the illusion of the subject which is absolute, exploitative and dominative. The criticism of Descartes's cogito hermeneutic and its derivative, "School of Descartes", is that it is non-emancipative because it directly establishes the knowledge of the self. Whereas according to the teachers suspicion: "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 way (long detour) that passes or is mediated by various symbols of humanity and returns to a new, different and better concept of the self, namely the emancipated self-image along with the living context.

In order to lead to the emancipation of the subject that open to others, emancipatory hermeneutics received input from sources of critical thought (Ricoeur, 1970: 32; Ricoeur, 1982: 6; Kearney, 1986: 109-126; Stewart, 1989: 296-307), namely: Marx's economic-political criticism (which had previously been a criticism of Kant and Hegel's idealism that which is considered as asocial because it was not based on historical consciousness); Freud's psychoanalysis (which undermines pseudo morality); and Nietzsche's genealogy (which examines the deepest aspects of religion). On these three perspectives, Ricoeur said: "Nietzschean genealogy, Freudian psychoanalysis, the Marxist critique of ideology, that is, the weapons of the hermeneutics of suspicion" (Ricoeur, 2003: 337).

Results

Chronologically, the thought struggle of the three masters of suspicions will be presented, that is respectively are Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche and Sigmund Freud. The philosophy of Karl Marx (1818-1883) must be understood as a criticism of the philosophy of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831). While Hegel's philosophy is difficult to understand

without understanding the philosophy of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) (Ricoeur, 1986: 135, 302; Ricoeur, 1982: 235; Anderson, 1993). Kant's criticism faces a deadlock because he limits ratio autonomy to merely subjective. Indeed he calls the aspect of the activity of human knowledge, but it stagnates because the subject's reason cannot be objective by touching things outside of itself (Ricoeur, tt, 57-71; Ricoeur, 1967: 51-53). Furthermore, the deadlock occurs because the knowledge possessed by the subject does not depart from historical consciousness. Subjects who think are separate and distant subjects from the context in which they live. This is why Ricoeur called Kant's philosophy created "anthropological illusion" (Ricoeur, 1974: 416) apart from human concerns. As a result, when historical awareness as a context is ignored, knowledge is in an empty space without content and concern (Ricoeur, 1986: 31). And it is tantamount to losing its critical power and then turning into a pro status quo.

Marx's philosophy was also a criticism of Hegel's philosophy (Ricoeur, 1986: 135, 302). Unwilling trapped in the pendulum theory or contemplation, he wanted to build a praxis philosophy that could change reality, which at that time was characterized by capitalist society and exploitation. The philosophy which Hegel previously considered contemplation or "consciousness" turned out to have no effect on, and could not change, reality (Ricoeur, 1986: xii), and to Marx, in fact, it is a "false consciousness" because it preserves the inequality in social reality.

Here Marx offers an emancipatory perspective by taking the path of suspicion while being critical of false consciousness (Ricoeur, 1986: 75). "Marx [...] as we said, begin with *suspicions* about the illusions of consciousness", Ricoeur said (Ricoeur, 1974: 150). That is why Kearney said that: "Marx who developed a hermeneutics of 'false consciousness'" (Kearney, 1986: 109). This path of suspicion is pursued in order to work on the hermeneutic function, which is to critically interpret the false consciousness. The aim is "Marx wants is to *liberate praxis* by the awareness of necessity", Ricoeur said (Ricoeur, 1986: 150). Hence philosophy must be a practical philosophy that drives change and social emancipation towards a just society without exploitation.

The problem is that Marx still uses the dialectical method of Hegel, which is read in the perspective of historical materialism. The core view of historical materialism is that the development of society is determined by developments in the economic or material aspects. True human consciousness should be controlled by human needs in economics or matterial aspects— "man is what he eats" (Ricoeur, 1986: 32; Ricoeur, 1974: 110). This is the most objective fact of human life, said Marx (Ricoeur, 1986: 38). Other than that it is a false consciousness that ideologically blinds humans in seeing what constitutes their basic rights as a human being. With this view, Marx invites everyone to discover what is fundamental in their lives, namely liberation and social change towards justice without exploitation.

Genealogical analysis of Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) was a suspicious analysis of every dogmatic statement. The genealogical analysis also intends to disarm universalist pretensions and claims on what is right or moral (Ricoeur, 1991: 216; Ricoeur, 1974: 12). Genealogical analysis is directed at suspicious critical interpretation (Ricoeur, 1974: 331; Ricoeur, 1992: 15) of someone by examining the type of person and moral behind his/her opinion and actions. Nietzsche's genealogical mechanism shows the existence of two typologies of morality, namely slave morality and master morality (Ricoeur, 1970: 181, 183; Clark, 1990: 68-69; Copleston, 1963: 401; Sindhunata, 2000: 7).

To find out which or what kind of person is willing to be a slave or master, Nietzsche tries to dismantle one's personality. This is a kind of psychological approach (Ricoeur, 1966: 117; Ricoeur, 1986: 119), namely philosophizing by using a more personal approach, so that

between stated ideas and the person who propose it, it's radically inseparable or indistinguishable.

Supported by the *ad hominem* strategy, that which is used to dismantle the fallacy, Nietzsche seeks to uncover many realities which are covered up in the name of theory, religious beliefs and philosophical views. He also investigated what was behind the action. This suspicion can be understood as a kind of diagnosis, namely diagnosing various forms of reference values and revealing what actually encourages people to comply or implement these values (Ricoeur, 2003: 331; Haryatmoko, 2000: 37). Hence, genealogy can be said to be the art of interpretation and Nietzsche's method of research on the origin of moral pre-assessment or what is also called the value of values. The aim is to open the masks (even masks in the name of the divine) that lie behind an action. Charity activities, for example, are it based on sincere intentions to help or are there something else behind it? Nietzsche's analysis reveals the motives of action which are often based on hypocrisy.

The target of Nietzsche's criticism is morality based on a value system that denies self-achievement (self transcendence), justice and truth. In short, it is critical against anti-life morality. This kind of morality is called "slave morality" (Ricoeur, 1970: 181, 183; Sindhunata, 2000: 10-14). This low morality is not an idea or a theory, but something objective. Nietzsche based this view on his theory of power. As Ricoeur said about him: "he tells us, aims not only at conservation, but also at expansion and domination" (Ricoeur, 1966: 116). The objective of this life is expansion and dominance. This understanding was then summarized in the theory of "will to power" (*Wille zur Macht*) which is not only individual but also extends to public life (Ricoeur, 1966: 118).

Furthermore, Nietzsche wants to reveal what is called human decadence (Ricoeur, 1974: 445-447). Decadent man is low, weak and do not know his duties. It's a man who wasted his nobility. He is a creature who is ashamed to be human. This decadence is actually a situation in which humans are alienated from themselves, deny their existence, lose their identity or existence, are not loyal to their lives, deceive the highest truth they know. In this decadence man becomes a great liar to his existence.

Then, that causes humans to be decadent or hindered to become human beings who are actually God. For Nietzsche, God, as understood by Christianity (which has been institutionalized and capitalist), is a giant barrier that blocks humans from becoming human (Ricoeur, 1974: 445; Sindhunata, 2000: 13; Sudiarja, 2000: 25). Therefore, God must be abolished. Why does God have to die (*Gott ist tot, God is dead*)? The answer is clear: because He is a barrier for humans to become human. Because, for Nietzsche, there is no God who regulates and directs human life. Each individual is responsible to himself. Humans must be God for themselves and not depend on anyone. God who introduced by religion as the God of punishment, the protector capitalists and the creator of timid and cowardly humans, should be removed. In addition, Nietzsche have intention in order that religion be a force liberating humans. God is also the Liberating Actor.

The place of Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) in the hermeneutic of suspicion must be connected with the inadequacy of Marx's critical analysis through a scientific approach to explain why monopolistic capitalism systems and instrumentalist ratio can manipulate up to the personal lives of individuals. Marx's criticism is insufficient and analysis is needed which can explain why individuals can be psychologically influenced and dictated by their social context. This is where Freud got his place, namely "Freud helps us to reread Marx", Ricoeur said (Ricoeur, 1986: 244). The place is that "capitalism can be explained and criticized on strictly moral-political grounds" (Ricoeur, 1986: 221; Kaplan, 2003: 180). Criticism of political-morals is

Freud's explanation of things that which Marx didn't considered. Marxism requires psychoanalysis, because it can sharpen Marx's ideological criticism.

The question is how to explain the relationship between material reality and human consciousness? Or, how is the superstructure in the form of an inner atmosphere, ideas and various historical events caused by the below structure in the form of economic action? This is where psychoanalysis has a role. Freud's psychoanalysis provided an important foundation in the form of awareness of mental distortions and ways of thinking. Ricoeur calls it a criticism of "moral consciousness" (Ricoeur, 1974: 135, 152). Psychoanalysis is obliged to explain and interpret occurring distortions, that often systematically organized in human communication texts. These distortions are subject's misunderstanding of himself as if he were the center of everything (Ricoeur, 1982: 260).

Another role of psychoanalysis is as an intermediary concept to explain how and why people believe and agree on ideological distortions (Ricoeur, 1986: 137). "Freud [...] as we said, begin with suspicions about the illusions of consciousness", Ricoeur said, for that psychoanalysis is needed to do the task as "hermeneutics of unconscious desire" (Ricoeur, 1974: 150; Kearney, 1986: 109). Its task is to uncover the individual and society's unconsciousness over its historical condition. Ricoeur then agreed that psychoanalysis could be grouped into critical social sciences directed at the interests of emancipation to rediscover the power of self reflection (Ricoeur, 1982: 261; Ricoeur, 1974: 237-238). Stiver sharpens that point by saying, "Freud represent the demise of a philosophy of consciousness or immediacy, as opposed to what Ricoeur calls a 'philosophy of reflection'" (Stiver, 2001: 143). This unconsciousness is partly contributed by religion with its role as a "supplement of belief" (Ricoeur, 1970: 232-234; Ricoeur, 1986: 230-231; Stewart, 1989: 301-303) which is often expressed in the form of "primitive" and *childhood* which actually promotes forms of injustice. This is the role of religion as a social illusion.

For Ricoeur, Freud is important in showing that psychoanalysis limits and "falsifies" the egological or solipsistic *cogito* (Ricoeur, 1974: 149, 161). It means, "Ricoeur's work on Freud and psychoanalysis convinced him that consciousness is first of all false consciousness" (Vanhoozer, 1990: 29). So that through criticism of the illusion of the subject or super ego, ideological critics find the most convincing momentum to undermine all dominative and unconscious tendencies of the ego and dominating others. An action should be built on the foundation of social moral and political compassion on others

Consciousness —from Descartes, Kant— in relation to reason or closed ratio (*cogito*), is understood to be neutral and purely from interests. This ratio then turns into a system of thought that is intended to maintain the dominance of the ruling class over the controlled ones. From here a theory is drawn up whose purpose is to defend and justify reality. This was the beginning of the emergence of the ideology referred to by Marx, that created a motivational framework so that people took for granted the authority of the ruling class (Ricoeur, 1986: 183, 229). In practice, ideology is often hidden in sublime ideas of community that have the role of forcing its members to obey that is claimed to be noble rule or idea.

Marx then shifted from work activities to material conditions in which humans lived, studied and worked. Marx hereby comes into contact with certain historical conditions that shape reality, which reveal that ideology is born not from human consciousness but from its material needs. That is why, "Marx stresses that consciousness (*Bewusstsein*) is conscious

existence (bewusstes Sein). Once more, consciousness is not autonomous but is instead connected with human beings 'actual life process'" (Ricoeur, 1986: 78). With this Marx proclaims that what humans need today is social change. Efforts towards that direction are carried out by exceeding pure and value-free ratios, towards those that are full of interests. The social change in question is built on the foundation of a value or interest to live a noble, equal and fair life. The educational perspective fought for is education as a praxis for social change towards civilization and justice.

From Nietzsche we get the energy to be suspicious and dismantle the destructive aspects of religion that often hide behind great moral values, but tend to be exclusive, justify violence and isolate followers of other religions in the name of God, which Nietzsche strongly opposes. The educational perspective obtained is education as an independent praxis. The expected results are those students who are free from moral decadence, fear and able to become authentic individuals. Noble man according to Nietzsche is a human who comes to an understanding of self through the path of suffering. There are no shortcuts and there are no instant roads. Learning is also a way of suffering that requires hard work, patience and sacrifice.

Psychoanalysis is a hermeneutic detour that helps to find new humanity, namely the second naïvete (Ricoeur, 1970: 496), which remains fragile and will never be absolute, but has been transformed through its encounter with signs, symbols, metaphors and narrative texts. This is exactly Ricoeur's own words, "an opaque subjectivity which expresses itself through the *detour* of countless mediations –signs, symbols, texts and human praxis itself" (Kearney, 1984: 32). Thus it becomes clear that humanitarian problems are often blinded by "false consciousness," which is feeling capable by themselves and suppressing others. The consciousness, or precisely, the emancipation of the subject means liberating the subject from the false consciousness.

By proposing moral-political criticism, in addition to dismantling false consciousness, Freud also offered a new perspective that showed that social construction was not only material or rational (rational subject) as understood by Marx, but also a system of values that departed from a certain morality framework. It was here that Freud opened the eyes of the hermeneutic proponents of suspicion to the subconscious layer or to a noble system of values (morality) which turned out to hide oppressive ideological interests. Emancipation of the subject and social emancipation is needed to get out of this oppressive framework of morality.

However, Freud's emancipatory perspective used to underlie ideological criticism may not work if psychoanalysis still dwells on the basis of its value-free thinking. In his criticism, Ricoeur noted three things that allowed Freud's psychoanalysis to experience deadlock (Ricoeur, 1986: 247-249). However, the solution he offered was still an educational perspective from Freud's thought insight.

First and foremost, Ricoeur said, "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: 249). Value-free gestures actually show the strong influence of Cartesian thought, while not being able to escape psychoanalysis from the context of the rise of positivism which is also value-free. Cartesianism and positivism, among others, are fond of neutrality, anti-social to a-moral. In fact, the education perspective is not possible to carry a value-free, anti-social and a-moral perspective because education itself is full of interests, namely the interest so that ethical values and morality are well embedded.

Second, ideological criticism is difficult to parallelize with psychoanalysis if the subject or object that is made as a patient is considered to be transparent or self-evident. In addition to this showing "immediate seeing", psychoanalysis also cannot use the concept of neurosis as a

tool to criticize the patient so that the patient can carry out self-reflection and be awakened. Direct recognition does not allow for spacing so that ideological criticism does not work. In fact, in other literature, Ricoeur reminded, "the critique of ideology is the necessary *detour* which self-understanding must take" (Ricoeur, 1982: 144). Criticism itself never appears directly but takes a detour, among others, through others (neurosis patients) who cannot be immediately recognized, let alone to be embraced, mastered. Patients or anyone who is approached is a mysterious subject. Its mysteriousness is a symbol of acceptance of diversity (otherness). Liberating education —as echoed by Paulo Freire— is education that carries the praxis of recognition of mystery and deviation. Students are not really *tabularasa* (blank paper), who can only learn something if they are under pressure, control and intimidation. Education is an acknowledgment of the mysterious dimension of anyone who can receive learning from anywhere and anyone, as well as acceptance of diversity, that everyone is unique and different, so it does not need to be directed to be similar.

Third, because criticism of consciousness itself is not possible, we are also difficult to expect the realization of social transformation. Moreover, the fact that the existing intellectuals are from the bourgeoisie, then psychoanalysts —like Marxist intellectuals— are actually maintainers of the configuration of the society aka the pro status quo. But the educational perspective of Freud's insight is not from bourgeois intellectuals. Why? Because the power of Freud's moral-political criticism which was not value-free restored historical awareness of suffering. History is not first of all the history of masters, heroes and winners, but the history of slaves, losers and oppressed people. As a result, education first became a call to serve the poor, the destitute and suffering, not serve the masters and the winners. The goal is the establishment of socially moral and politically educated students as a call to compassion for those who suffer.

Conclusion

The technology discussed here is technology that is developing in the era of Revolution 4.0 when data is interconnected and uses artificial intelligence. Society 5.0 is the concept of utilizing already developed technology to overcome the problems that arise as a result of Revolution 4.0, namely alienation of social relations, digital inequalities that result in socio-economic disparities, fragmented use of technology in a framework of common welfare (health, work participation and city management). If it handled inadvertently, Society 5.0 can cause a trap in the form of an anti-justice capitalist economic practice (according to Marx's critical task), a religion which only creates decadent humans, who are afraid, isolated from one another and slave mentality (according to Nietzsche's critical task), and political praxis that loses the spirit and morality of civilization (according to Freud's critical task).

Life in the present hardly allows people to be free from consumerism, hedonism and post-truth. Many people are strongly influenced by self-interest, materialistic oriented, greedy and opportunist, unreliable and misusing trust, do not have a commitment to socio-political morality, spread horror, false news and are always unwilling to sacrifice for the benefit of others, instead multiply victimization. Even religion is used as a political vehicle to achieve deviating goals that far from its noble mission. It is here, the tasks of education for social change (Marx), to create free human beings (Nietzsche) and for compassionate socio-political morality (Freud), can no longer be delayed.

Finally, "masters of suspicion", they give us intelligent inspiration so that we can introspect and criticize ourselves to avoid the negative tendencies of the society they have accused. The world of education must be a noble place that plays a role in shaping a noble society. It is not a place to form and prepare a human who is ready to compete for selfish

purposes, but strives for the common good for social change. Organizers in the world of education must always criticize teaching weights and pay attention to graduates' expectations so that the portion of teaching not only prioritizes cognitive but also affective and psychomotor aspects in a balanced manner. Teaching in the world of education must be sensitive to the context of society that has not received sufficient attention by the organizers of education. The context in question is the suffering of the poor and oppressed, who seek justice, happiness and a solution to the ecological crisis. The reality of these problems, must be shown creatively and intelligently at all levels of education and various socio-economic downturn problems in society, methodologically, used as a starting point for theological reflection oriented to the defense and liberation of the poor and oppressed (Budi, 2003: 85). In the context of diversity of religions and beliefs, we assume that liberation from poverty, oppression, alienation or marginalization and the preservation of creation is a mission that the cross-faith community must fight for. Hopefully this mission will in turn become a joint mission point that is rich in works and noble.

Refference

- Anderson, Pamela Sue. 1993. *Ricoeur and Kant: Philosophy of The Will*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Budi, Hartono. 2003. *Teologi, Pendidikan, dan Pembebasan*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Clark, S.H. 1990. *Paul Ricoeur*. London dan New York: Routledge.
- Copleston, Frederich. 1963. *A History of Philosophy*. Vol. VII. London: Search Press.
- Ganie-Rochman, Meuthia. 2019. "Society 5.0 untuk Indonesia" (Society 5.0 for Indonesia). *Kompas*. (23 Maret): 6.
- Haryatmoko. 2000. "Pembongkaran Agama dan Aspek Destruktifnya (The Dismantling of Religion and Its Destructive Aspects)". *Basis*. No. 11-12, Th. Ke-49, (November-December): 33-38.
- Kaplan, David M. 2003. *Ricoeur's Critical Theory*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Kearney, Richard. 1986. "Religion and Ideology: Paul Ricoeur's Hermeneutic Conflict". *Irish Theological Quarterly*. Vol. 52, Nus. 1 and 2: 109-126.
- _____. 1984. *Dialogues with Contemporary Continental Thinkers*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1967. *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 2003. *The Rule of Metaphor*. Trans. Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin and John Costello. London and New York: Routledge Classics.
- _____. 1992. *Oneself as Another*. Trans. Kathleen Blamey. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1991. *A Ricoeur Reader: Reflection and Imagination*. Ed. Mario J. Valdes. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.
- _____. 1986. *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*. Ed. George H. Taylor. New York: Columbia University Press.
- _____. 1982. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*. Ed. John B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1974. *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*. Ed. Don Ihde. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- _____. 1970. *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*. Trans. Denis Savage. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- _____. 1967. *Husserl: An Analysis of His Phenomenology*. Trans. Edward G. Ballard and Lester E. Embree. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

- _____. 1966. *Freedom and Nature: The Voluntary and the Involuntary*. Trans. Erazim V. Kohak. Evanston Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- _____. tt. *Fallible Man: Philosophy of The Will*. Trans. Charles Kelbley. Chicago, Illinois: Henry Regnery Company.
- Sindhunata. 2000. "Nietzsche Si Pembunuh Tuhan (Nietzsche The Killer of God)". *Basis*. No. 11-12, Th. Ke-49, (November-December).
- Stewart, David. 1989. "The Hermeneutics of Suspicion". *Literature & Theology*. Vol. 3, Nu. 3, (November): 296-307.
- Stiver, Dan R. 2001. *Theology after Ricoeur: New Directions in Hermeneutical Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Sudiarja, A. 2000. "Nietzsche Muda Suka Bikin Perkara" (The Young Nietzsche Fond of Fuss). *Basis*. No. 11-12, Th. Ke-49, (November-Desember): 18-25.
- Sulistio, Tito. 2018. "Konsumtivisme, Feodalisme, Hedonisme, Peran Negara" (Consumtivism, Feodalism, Hedonism, the Function of State). *Kompas*. (30 November): 6.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. 1990. *Biblical Narrative in the Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur: A Study in Hermeneutics and Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.