Definisi: Jurnal Agama dan Sosial Humaniora
eISSN: 2828-7878 Vol 4, No 3, 2025, pp 183-200
https://doi.org/10.15575/djash.v4i3.55133

God, Morality, and Modern Man: A Comparative Study of Freud and Nietzsche in the Critique of Religion

Noneng Dena Nurjannah
UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
nonengdenan@gmail.com

Neng Hannah
UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
nenghannah@gmail.com

Suggested Citation:

Nurjannah, Noneng Dena; Hannah, Neng. (2025). God, Morality, and Modern Man: A Comparative Study of Freud and Nietzsche in the Critique of Religion. *Definisi: Jurnal Agama dan Sosial Humaniora*, Volume 4, Number 3: 183–200. https://doi.org/10.15575/djash.v4i3.55133

Article's History:

Received April 2026; *Revised* November 2026; *Accepted* November 2026.
2025. journal.uinsgd.ac.id ©. All rights reserved.

Abstract:

The debate over the existence of God has been a central theme in the traditions of modern philosophy and psychology. This article aims to compare Sigmund Freud and Friedrich Nietzsche's critiques of religion as theistic and moral foundations of human life. Freud interpreted God as a psychological illusion arising from the human need for protection and a father figure, while Nietzsche radically declared that "God is dead" as a critique of the decadence of religious values and the dominance of Christian morality. Through a qualitative approach and hermeneutic analysis, this study finds that both figures not only reject the existence of God metaphysically but also deconstruct the social, psychological, and cultural structures that support religious belief. Freud's and Nietzsche's critiques are highly relevant in the context of modern society facing a crisis of meaning and morality in the post-secular era. This article offers a conceptual framework for understanding human responses to the loss of absolute values and opens up discussions about the possibility of a new spirituality formation in the modern era.

Keywords: Bale Zakat; charity; da'wah; empowerment of the Ummah.

INTRODUCTION

The debate over the existence of God is one of the oldest and most profound discourses in the history of human thought. In philosophical and theological traditions, God is often understood as the source of ultimate values, the guarantor of morality, and the foundation of

existential meaning. Furthermore, in line with Zubair's opinion (Hawasi, 2021), belief in God, religion, and morality, which are included in religious beliefs, is believed to provide greater impetus for righteous actions and to offer additional inspiration and optimism in every action guided by moral and ethical values. However, since the late 19th century, criticism of theistic ideas has grown stronger with the development of science, psychoanalysis, and existential philosophy. Two major thinkers who made significant contributions to the critique of the existence of God are Sigmund Freud and Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche.

Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis, stated that religion is nothing but an illusion stemming from the human psychological need for security and an authoritative figure (Freud, 1961). In his work, The Future of an Illusion, Freud describes God as a representation of the ideal father, a figure who provides protection in the face of life's uncertainties, suffering, and death. This view indicates that religion does not originate from divine revelation, but rather from the inner dynamics of humans, particularly from the mechanisms of projection and unresolved psychological childhood fears (Jr., 1992).

Sigmund Freud, within the framework of his psychoanalytic theory, placed religion in close relation to the structure of human personality, particularly the dynamics among the id, ego, and superego. In this perspective, the concept of God is understood as a manifestation of the internalized superego, namely the result of internalization into the individual's consciousness in the form of norms, prohibitions, and authorities that have more power or are considered superior to the individual (Aditya & Nupusiah, 2023; Fatih, 2019; Fikri & Kusuma, 2025; Suntoro et al., 2024). If so, then the understanding of God and Religion is only the fruit of personal or individual experience and perspective obtained from the subjective, relative, and changeable social and cultural dynamics of society, not from revelation that is certain, fixed, and unchanging.

Meanwhile, Friedrich Nietzsche emerged as a revolutionary figure in modern philosophy through the concept of "God is dead" (Gott ist tot), which he put forward in The Gay Science (Nietzsche, 1974). This statement is not a simple declaration of atheism, but rather a deeper cultural and moral critique. Nietzsche saw that Christian morality had lost its vitality and turned into a form of denial of life. In his view, religion is no longer a source of moral strength, but rather a manifestation of weak will and the dominance of slave values that suppress human potential to be themselves (W. A. Kaufmann, 1950). The death of God, according to Nietzsche, is an opportunity for humans to create new values autonomously, as reflected in the concept of the Übermensch.

Nietzsche's philosophical perspective is informed by the narratives of modernity and postmodernity, which abandon dependence on metaphysical dimensions and direct the gaze toward secular values that prioritize immanence over transcendence. Furthermore, this perspective is not immune to the emergence of the nihilism paradigm or crisis of meaning, so that individuals are forced to form their own values in a landscape that has nothing to do with Divine intervention (Chabbert, 2018; Harris, 2021). Thus, Nietzsche's thinking not only marks the collapse of metaphysical authority in modern human life, but also forces humans to be conscious and responsible creators of meaning in a world that has lost its transcendent foundation. Thus, the freedom offered by nihilism also becomes an ontological burden that demands courage, creativity, and affirmation of life itself.

Freud and Nietzsche not only rejected the existence of God as a metaphysical entity but also dismantled the psychological, social, and cultural structures that underpin belief in God. Their critique of religion goes beyond mere rational rejection; both offer a diagnosis of the

crisis of meaning in modern Western culture. In this context, religion is seen as a form of escape from reality or as a moral system that restricts human freedom. Therefore, their thinking is highly relevant in understanding the reality of modern humans living amidst the process of secularization and a crisis of values.

The process of secularization, as explained by Vahanian (1961), not only means a decline in the authority of religious institutions, but also a profound change in the experience of religion (Vahanian, 1961). Modern societies increasingly move away from transcendental narratives and face a value vacuum that has not been adequately filled. Geertz (1973) points out that religion as a symbolic system persists, but often loses its ability to address the existential anxieties of modern humans (Geertz, 1973).

Secularism, the foundation of Freud and Nietzsche's concept of God or Religion, leads to a paradigm of standards and values that are not absolute. Furthermore, secularism influences the structure and function of religion in society, so that religious values that belong to the Divine order become less important for individuals and society (Hawasi, 2021; Santiago & Asnawi, 2024; Yusak & Salurante, 2025; Zaluchu, 2018). This thinking, rooted in secularization and secularism, has given rise to a society with a paradigm regarding God and Religion that is limited to the private or individual realm and separates it from the public realm. According to Salombe, Prasetyo, and Aulu (Legi et al., 2025) this phenomenon indicates the loss of the spiritual dimension from society's social and cultural life, meaning that the metaphysical realm is not holistically integrated into human life.

Therefore, this study is important to see how Freud and Nietzsche's critiques can help reflect on the direction of contemporary human spirituality and morality, by combining psychoanalytic and existential approaches. This article seeks to develop a theoretical framework to understand how humans navigate the transition from traditional religious structures to more autonomous and reflective constructions of meaning.

Several previous studies have examined in depth the views of Sigmund Freud and Friedrich Nietzsche on religion and the existence of God. Freud, in The Future of an Illusion (1961), positioned religion as a product of psychological illusion stemming from the human need for a protective father figure (Freud, 1961). This view was expanded upon by Hood Jr. (1992), who in his article stated that Freud distinguished between ontogenetic (individual development) and phylogenetic (cultural development) dimensions in religious structure, emphasizing that religion arises from the inability of individuals and societies to face existential reality independently (Jr., 1992). Another study by Malony and North (1979) reconstructed a dialogue between Freud and the priest Oskar Pfister, showing how Freud rejected religion as a form of hope for the future and instead saw it as a psychological obstacle to moral maturity (Malony & North, 1979). In the Indonesian context, Susanto and Idris (2017) strengthen Freud's thesis that religion can be understood as a "collective neurosis" rooted in human affective needs for symbolic protection and order (Susanto & Idris, 2017).

Meanwhile, Nietzsche's thoughts on the death of God have become the subject of critical reflection in various studies of modern philosophy and theology. In The Gay Science, Nietzsche declared that "God is dead," a radical metaphor that signified the destruction of absolute values and the dominance of Christian morality in the modern world (Nietzsche, 1974). Kaufmann (1950) emphasized that this statement was not a simple form of atheism, but rather an attempt to free humans from external value systems that stifled their existential creativity (W. A. Kaufmann, 1950). In the context of contemporary theology, Vahanian (1961) developed the idea of "death-of-God theology," arguing that while God may still be alive

metaphysically, He is culturally dead: society no longer relies on religion as the primary source of meaning in life (Vahanian, 1961). Furthermore, a study from the journal Religions (2024) confirms that Nietzsche's statement about the death of God is actually the starting point for exploring a new form of religiosity, a post-theistic spirituality that no longer relies on traditional metaphysical structures (David, 2024).

However, previous studies have tended to discuss the thoughts of Freud and Nietzsche separately. This research positions itself in a different analytical space, namely by directly comparing two critical approaches to religion: one from the psychoanalytic realm, and the other from existential philosophy. The aim is not only to explore their respective metaphysical arguments, but also to examine the relevance and reflective potential of their thinking to the crisis of values, morality, and spirituality of modern humanity in today's secular and pluralistic era.

Based on the background and urgency of this study, this research aims to examine in depth the critiques of Sigmund Freud and Friedrich Nietzsche on the concepts of God and religion, particularly in the context of the transition of modern thought that is critical of traditional religious authority. This research also seeks to explain the implications of the thoughts of these two figures for morality and the existence of modern humans who are faced with a crisis of meaning amidst the wave of secularization and value relativism.

Furthermore, this study aims to develop a systematic comparative framework between Freud's and Nietzsche's approaches, highlighting the similarities and differences in their methodologies, philosophical backgrounds, and critiques of religion. This analysis is expected to yield contemporary reflections on the possibility of a new form of spirituality—one that no longer relies on conventional theistic structures but remains capable of providing meaningful and valuable orientation in modern human life.

Freud's Critique of Religion as a Psychological Illusion

Sigmund Freud was a key figure in modern psychology who viewed religion as a psychic construct stemming from the human need for protection and emotional comfort. In The Future of an Illusion (1961), Freud stated that the concept of God is a projection of an ideal father figure, who serves as a protector against the fears and uncertainties of life. Religion, he argued, is a form of collective neurosis, a system of beliefs passed down from generation to generation that helps humans cope with existential anxiety (Freud, 1961). This statement emphasizes that religion and God are merely products of human thought and imagery, born of a human psychological system that constantly craves an existence perceived as superior to itself.

Hood Jr. (1992), in the journal The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, expanded Freud's argument by distinguishing between individual (ontogenetic) and socio-cultural (phylogenetic) development in religious structures. He stated that for Freud, religion is not merely a rational error, but a reflection of the inner human need for a stable symbolic structure (Jr., 1992). It can be said that religion is only one of the psychological mechanisms that exist within humans themselves to overcome existential anxiety and the uncertainty of life, by itself when rationality develops steadily and human psychology is at the peak of perfect evolution then dependence on religion will decrease and religion will no longer be relevant to humans (Annur & Jannah, 2025).

Freud also emphasized that religion is a form of human expression of disappointment and escape, born of anxiety, conflict, depression, and other feelings. Therefore, religious expression is merely a way of escape created by humans, functioning as a way to avoid danger and create

a sense of security and peace for themselves (Ramdaina & Hambali, 2023). Furthermore, Malony and North (1979) highlight the historical debate between Freud and the priest Oskar Pfister, which shows how Freud firmly maintained that religion is a form of escape from reality that hinders psychological maturity. This perspective is deeply rooted in modern psychoanalysis and has become a major foundation in the study of the psychology of religion (Malony & North, 1979).

Nietzsche and the Death of God: A Critique of Traditional Morality

Friedrich Nietzsche presented a different and more radical approach than Freud. In The Gay Science and Thus Spoke Zarathustra, Nietzsche declared that "God is dead" (Gott ist tot) as a metaphor for the loss of credibility of the absolute values formerly upheld by Christianity. He called Christian morality a form of "slave morality," which constrains the human will to live through values of suffering, denial, and weakness (Nietzsche, 1974).

Belief in God is considered to erase human dynamics. In addition, the emergence of this idea is motivated by the hegemony of religion within Western Christianity, because religion is considered a barrier to progress in the cultural order of Western society (Roswantoro, 2005). According to Kaufmann (1950), Nietzsche's statement is not merely an atheistic declaration, but rather an invitation to go beyond old values and form a new ethical system rooted in the will to power. The concept of the Übermensch or superior man was initiated as a response to nihilism, namely the emptiness of values that emerged after the "death of God" (W. A. Kaufmann, 1950).

A contemporary study by Vahanian (1961) in The Death of God shows that Nietzsche's concept is relevant to the conditions of modern Western culture experiencing spiritual alienation and the search for new values. Within this framework, the "death of God" is not the end of meaning, but a challenge to reformulate morality without a transcendental foundation. Furthermore, along with advances in technology, science, and the development of knowledge, approaches to understanding God, especially in the West, tend to be empirically positivistic, which has implications for theological reflection on the concept of God between personal and non-personal, God is all-good, just, but still allows evil in the world (Abidin, 2022; Siswadi, 2024).

Post-Theistic Spirituality and Modern Secularization

The thoughts of Freud and Nietzsche have become the foundation for the emergence of a new discourse on post-theistic spirituality in modern society. The process of secularization has weakened the role of religion as a provider of universal meaning, but the search for existential meaning continues. In a study published in the journal Religions (2024), the death of God is interpreted as the starting point for the exploration of a new religiosity—not in the form of dogmatic belief, but in the search for reflective and humanistic values (Sagi, 2024). This thinking also became the birthplace of the idea of existentialism in the West, which assumes that humans have a tendency to change and are constantly creating something new, ultimately leading to a point where what is considered true today cannot be said or considered true at another time (Bayu & Amalih, 2021)

One of Philipp's (2024) articles, titled "The Death of God as a Turn to Radical Theology," explains that Nietzsche's nihilism encouraged theological thinkers to formulate a non-dogmatic spirituality that maintains ethical and existential sensibilities. This marked a shift from institutional religion to a more personal religiosity open to a plurality of values (David,

2024). This paradigm contributed to the birth of paradigms and concepts of God, such as the concept of God born from the cognitive structure and human mind, which is indeed an instinct and system for knowing God, known as neo-rationalism. However, in addition, the concept also emerged that says God is only a shadow of humanity born from human inferiority in facing life's problems and conflicts (Bayu & Amalih, 2021; Situmorang & Ay, 2026).

Another implication that occurred in western society that was born from the ideas of Freud and Nietzsche encouraged the secularization movement in behavioral patterns and societal structures, such as the birth of the genealogy of secularism, which includes secularism that includes the rejection of the absolute power of religious institutions, the non-integration between religion and state, and the freedom of non-religious groups to justify the problems that exist in the two points or genealogy of secularism before, meaning that everyone is free to determine what is good and right for themselves. (Azmi & Rifqi, 2025; Suryajaya, 2022).

METHOD

This research uses a qualitative approach with philosophical hermeneutic methods and comparative textual analysis (sugiono, 2018). The hermeneutic approach is used to interpret the deeper meaning of Freud and Nietzsche's main texts, which discuss the themes of divinity, religion, and morality. Meanwhile, the comparative approach is used to identify the similarities and differences in the views of the two figures, especially regarding criticism of the concept of God and its impact on modern human existence. This method is commonly used in the study of the philosophy of religion, religious psychology, and humanities because it is able to capture the depth of ideas as well as the historical and cultural context of the thoughts studied (Gadamer, 2004).

The primary data in this study comes from the primary works of these two great figures. For Freud, the primary sources are The Future of an Illusion (1927) and Civilization and Its Discontents (1930), which contain important ideas about religion as a psychological projection and a form of collective neurosis (Freud, 1961). For Nietzsche, the works The Gay Science (1974) and Thus Spoke Zarathustra (1883) are used, which contain sharp criticisms of Christian moral values and the radical concept of "God is dead" (Nietzsche, 1974). These two sources were chosen because they are representative works that explicitly discuss religion, God, and the crisis of meaning in modern society (Nietzsche, 1883).

In addition, this research also relies on secondary sources in the form of academic books and scientific journal articles. For example, Hood Jr. (1992) in The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion examines how Freud differentiates religious development at the individual (ontogenetic) and social (phylogenetic) levels, and sees religion as a system that maintains the psychological order of society (Jr., 1992). In his study of Nietzsche, Kaufmann (1950) explains that the declaration of the “death of God” is not a simplistic rejection of religion, but rather a cultural diagnosis that reveals the crisis of values in Western civilization (W. A. Kaufmann, 1950). Meanwhile, Vahanian (1961) in The Death of God discusses how the death of God in culture becomes a starting point for theological reflection and the reformulation of post-theistic spirituality (Vahanian, 1961).

Data collection techniques were conducted through library research, exploring primary and secondary sources obtained from various academic databases such as journals, dissertations, theses, and books. Literature selection was conducted rigorously, taking into account scientific authority, topic relevance, and methodological clarity.

Data analysis was conducted in three stages. First, a hermeneutic interpretation of the text was conducted to understand the philosophical meaning of key concepts such as God, morality, nihilism, and modern religiosity. Second, a comparative analysis was conducted, examining the differences in approach between Freud as a psychoanalyst and Nietzsche as an existentialist philosopher, particularly in terms of the conception of religion and its impact on human life. Third, contextualization was conducted, linking the thoughts of both figures to the conditions of modern society, which is experiencing a wave of secularization, value pluralism, and non-dogmatic spirituality.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Freud and Nietzsche, though coming from different disciplines and backgrounds, offered two complementary frameworks for understanding the dynamics of religion and spirituality in modern humans. Freud described religion as a psychological mechanism that arises from the human need for protection, especially during childhood. Within his psychoanalytic framework, religion becomes a kind of collective illusion that functions to reduce existential anxiety and provide a sense of security through symbolic figures such as God (Freud, 1961). Despite its illusory nature, Freud also acknowledged that religion plays a role as a social structure that supports moral order and cultural cohesion (Jr., 1992).

Freud's psychoanalytic framework allows for a deeper understanding of religion's latent function as an instrument of psychological and social regulation in human life. Through concepts such as wish fulfillment and self-defense mechanisms, religion can be understood as a projection of emotional needs that were not fully resolved in the early stages of an individual's development, which are then institutionalized in the form of collective beliefs. In this context, religion not only operates in the individual realm as a means of alleviating anxiety but also has a structural dimension that contributes to the formation of norms, the legitimacy of authority, and social stability. Therefore, although Freud positioned religion as an illusion, his view does not necessarily negate its functional significance in human life, but rather emphasizes the complexity of the relationship between psychological needs, symbolic constructions, and social order in shaping religious experiences.

Meanwhile, Nietzsche carried out a radical dismantling of religion, which he considered a form of slave morality, namely a value system that restrains human vitality and will to live. Religion, for Nietzsche, rejects authentic life and replaces it with values of self-denial, submission, and hope for a transcendental world (Nietzsche, 1974). As an alternative, Nietzsche called for the independence of values through the creation of a new, autonomous and affirmative morality, embodied in the concept of the Übermensch and the transvaluation of values (W. A. Kaufmann, 1950).

Within the framework of philosophical analysis, Nietzsche's critique of religion can be viewed as a disconstructive effort that is not merely destructive, but also opens up new horizons for the reconstruction of values in modern human life. His rejection of slave morality emphasizes the urgency of individual liberation from repressive value structures that hinder self-actualization. Thus, the idea of the Übermensch and the transvaluation of values can be interpreted as an emancipatory project that encourages humans to actively create, negotiate, and affirm their own values autonomously. In this context, Nietzsche's thought has significant relevance as a response to the crisis of moral authority and the void of values in modern

society, as well as a conceptual foundation for the emergence of new forms of ethics that are more dynamic, contextual, and oriented towards strengthening human existential potential.

These two schools of thought, though different in approach and emphasis, both provide an important theoretical foundation for the development of non-theistic spirituality in the modern era. In the context of a secular society increasingly moving away from traditional religious structures, the thoughts of Freud and Nietzsche help explain the crisis of values and morality, while simultaneously opening up new possibilities for a spirituality that is reflective, autonomous, and no longer dependent on religious dogma. This combination of perspectives is crucial in formulating intellectual and practical responses to the existential challenges of modern humans in an increasingly pluralistic and post-religious world.

Thus, it can be emphasized that the integration of Freud's and Nietzsche's thoughts serves not only as a framework for criticizing the establishment of traditional religiosity, but also as a constructive foundation for formulating alternative forms of spirituality relevant to the context of modernity. The synthesis of the two shows that the crisis of values emerging in secular society is not merely a symptom of decadence, but also a momentum for transformation toward a more autonomous and reflective existential awareness. Therefore, this approach has both theoretical significance and practical implications in developing a non-theistic spiritual paradigm capable of addressing the needs for meaning, ethics, and orientation in modern human life amidst the dynamics of a pluralistic and post-religious world.

Sigmund Freud's Views on God and Religion

Sigmund Freud viewed religion as a form of psychological illusion that serves as a defense mechanism against existential anxieties, particularly fears of death, suffering, and the mysteries of the universe. In The Future of an Illusion (1961), Freud stated that religion is the fruit of wish-fulfillment, a manifestation of the human need for a protective father figure and a source of emotional comfort amidst the uncertainties of life (Freud, 1961).

Freud carefully distinguished between illusion and delusion. Illusions are considered natural because, although subjective, they are based on a connection to external reality, such as religion, which fulfills an individual's psychic needs, particularly feelings of insecurity and the desire for protection. However, because these illusions stem from childhood psychological conditions, they remain neurotic, irrational, and can hinder a person's mental and moral maturity (Freud, 1961). In *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930), Freud introduced the concept of "oceanic feeling," a sense of connectedness without ego boundaries, as a reason why humans seek spiritual comfort. For him, this mystical feeling represents a regression to childhood, when individuals felt secure in the relief of paternal protection. Thus, religion becomes a compensatory mechanism when the realities of the world are too frightening to face rationally (Freud, 1930).

Within this framework, Freud's views can be understood as a critical attempt to place religious experience within a more rational and measurable psychological horizon. His argument suggests that the need for religion is not entirely rooted in metaphysical truth, but rather in affective dynamics formed during an individual's early development. Thus, the concept of oceanic feeling and the distinction between illusion and delusion reinforce the thesis that religion functions as both an adaptive and defensive mechanism in the face of existential uncertainty. However, the reduction of religion to a neurotic framework also carries normative implications, namely the need for transformation toward psychic

maturity, characterized by the ability to face reality without relying on illusory constructs. Therefore, Freud's thinking is not only descriptive but also prescriptive, encouraging modern humans to develop a more autonomous, rational, and emotionally mature self-awareness in response to their spiritual needs.

A study by Hood Jr. (1992) confirms Freud's analysis by distinguishing two important pathways for the formation of religion: ontogenetic (individual development) and phylogenetic (cultural development). Hood suggests that religion is not only an individual strategy for coping with uncertainty but also a social structure developed to maintain collective order and solidarity (Jr., 1992). Ontogenetic repression refers to the form of repression that occurs within an individual as a result of the interaction between psychic structures, namely the id, ego, and superego. Meanwhile, phylogenetic repression relates to repression that develops at the collective level of society, rooted in the initial human condition within primal groups. At both levels, the pleasure principle—oriented toward satisfying drives and desires—tends to be subordinated to the reality principle, namely the drive to adapt for survival in the social world (Anthonio, 2020).

Furthermore, Malony and North (1979) recorded a dialogue between Freud and Oskar Pfister, a cleric who believed that religion could provide hope and moral maturity, because Freud actually viewed religion as a mass neurosis that hindered individual psychological and moral development. This relationship demonstrates Freud's position as a thinker who was quite vocal in rejecting religion as a spiritual path, as evident in his perspective on the function of religion in society (Malony & North, 1979). Freud's explanation underpins the contemporary field of religious psychology. For example, Verywell Mind (2007) explains that Freud saw religion as an attempt to control the external world through internal creation, namely an inner human need to return to the safety zone of father figures and organized society (Cherry, 2023).

Freud's position that viewed religion as a mass neurosis demonstrates a tendency toward psychological reductionism, which attempts to explain religious phenomena solely as a product of individual intrapsychic dynamics. While this approach makes an important contribution to uncovering the latent dimensions of religious experience, it risks ignoring the complexity of religion as a multidimensional phenomenon encompassing existential, cultural, and transformative aspects. Freud's dialogue with Oskar Pfister, in fact, demonstrates the epistemological tension between psychological and theological approaches, where religion can be understood not only as a defense mechanism but also as a source of meaning and constructive moral orientation.

Friedrich Nietzsche's Views on God and Morality

Friedrich Nietzsche emphatically declared "Gott ist tod" (God is dead) in The Gay Science (1974), declaring the death of God not merely as the loss of a metaphysical entity, but as a profound crisis in the structure of Western values and morals (Nietzsche, 1974). In a popular example, the 'madman' declares that humanity has 'killed' God, and with it, the entire order previously relied upon has collapsed. Nietzsche saw this as a transformative moment that ushered in an era of nihilism (emptiness of values) if humanity fails to create a new system of meaning.

Walter Kaufmann (1950) emphasized that this declaration was not merely a rejection of religion, but rather a call to break free from what he called "slave morality": an ethical system that glorifies denial, meekness, and lowing submission, and replace it with a morality that respects the life force and potential of the individual (will to power) (W. A. Kaufmann, 1950). Nietzsche believed that after the collapse of old values, humans must take on the role of

creators of new values, embodied in the figure of the Übermensch who is able to create his own life ethics and implement the "transvaluation of values."

Brian Leiter (2019) provides a contemporary analysis of the relationship between the death of God and the collapse of Western egalitarian morality. He argues that without a religious foundation, the moral foundation (deontology or utilitarianism) becomes fragile, and so far no non-theistic justification has been able to support egalitarian morality with the same strength (Leiter, 2019). The implication is profound: Nietzsche not only proclaimed the death of God but also highlighted the formidable challenge of creating a new, post-theistic ethical system. Thus, the human perspective, previously based on God and religion, becomes based on humans and life, effectively eliminating God and religion from the very fabric of human life itself (Arif et al., 2025)

Furthermore, Nietzsche's theory of the will to power posits that the essential human drive is not goodness or truth, but rather the actualization and expression of power, creativity, and individual growth (Nietzsche, 1974). This concept radically breaks with Christian morality, which emphasizes humility and self-sacrifice. Furthermore, Nietzsche introduced the idea of Eternal Recurrence as a method of testing values: imagine life being repeated over and over again; are the values we create worthy of immortality? This is a way to test human engagement with life and ethical courage in a world without God (Nietzsche, 1974).

Nietzsche repeatedly criticized the morality that developed during his time as contradictory to life and basic human instincts. He saw that this morality had been distorted to the point of denying the will to power. In the name of values such as purity, goodness, and eternal life, moral thinkers and theologians constructed a value system that ultimately weakened human vitality and fighting spirit. Within this framework, the concept of will to power emerged as a response to nihilistic tendencies that reject the values of life, with the aim of restoring affirmation to the strength, creativity, and zest for individual life. Furthermore, Nietzsche introduced the concept that humans have the ability to create a new order and morality, transcending previous notions of morality, thus enabling them to create their own values based on the will to power, a concept he called Ubermensch (Gerindem et al., 2025; Hendrawan et al., 2026; Ihsanotaki et al., 2024; Novianto, 2023)

Within a philosophical framework, Nietzsche's ideas of will to power and eternal recurrence can be understood as a radical attempt to reorient the foundation of human ethics from dependence on external authority to a fully personal, existential responsibility. Furthermore, by placing power, creativity, and growth as fundamental drives, Nietzsche not only critiques ascetic morality but also encourages the birth of subjects who dare to affirm life as a whole, including in the face of suffering and uncertainty. Furthermore, the concept of eternal recurrence functions as a reflective tool that tests the consistency and authenticity of an individual's values, so that every life choice is no longer temporary or instrumental, but has a sustainable existential weight. In this context, Nietzsche's thinking reinforces the urgency of establishing an autonomous and affirmative ethics, which not only frees humans from traditional moral determinations but also demands the courage to create and account for values in a world that has lost its metaphysical foundation.

Overall, Nietzsche's views on the death of God and morality highlight four important points: first, the deconstruction of old values, the recognition that the old morality built on religion is now crumbling (Gott ist tod). Second, the crisis of nihilism, the emptiness of values demands the conscious creation of a new moral system. Third, the construction of affirmative values, through the concept of Übermensch and the will to power, Nietzsche provides

direction for an autonomous and creative life. Fourth, the existential test, Eternal Recurrence demands full acceptance of every value and action of life. Studies such as those conducted by Philipp (2024) confirm that Nietzsche's thoughts pave the way for radical theology and post-theistic spirituality—people who acknowledge the uselessness of God, but are still able to build a meaningful life that is humanistic and reflective (David, 2024).

Comparison of Freud and Nietzsche's Criticism of Religion

Freud and Nietzsche firmly stated that the concepts of God and religion are not absolute metaphysical realities but rather human constructs, formed through psychological and cultural processes. However, their critical approaches differ fundamentally. Freud (1961) examined religion through a psychodynamic lens, viewing it as a product of wish-fulfillment and a psychological defense against existential anxiety. According to him, religion provides a protective father narrative that fulfills basic human needs for comfort and security, while also offering a symbolic structure against an uncontrollable world (Freud, 1961). Freud's critique focuses on the assumption that God is merely a perception born of the human psychic urge to find comfort, support, and protection in something perceived as having greater power than humans themselves.

Sudiarja explains in (Asroni, 2020) that Freud interpreted religion as a form of psychotic obsession, namely, repetitive activities carried out continuously due to the urge of an internal need that is difficult to avoid. Within this framework, religious practice is understood as a repetitive liturgical ritual. Furthermore, Freud emphasized that human behavior is fundamentally driven by libido, or sexual urges that dominate psychic life. Because these urges are seen as dangerous and cannot always be expressed directly, religion then functions as a form of sublimation of these desires. The concept of God, in this view, is a projection of a father figure who simultaneously limits and grants permission, as well as serves as a symbol of the fulfillment of unfulfilled human desires. Thus, religion is positioned as an illusion that masks the true reality of human consciousness.

Hood distinguishes two main pathways in the formation of religion (Jr., 1992): first, ontogenetic: religion grows out of the psychic dynamics of individuals; second, phylogenetic: religion develops as a collective psychological response to social conditions. Freud described religion as a form of collective neurosis, a psychological mechanism that is not entirely healthy but serves as a moral support for society. Although he believed that religion can hinder mental maturity because it relies on illusions, Freud still saw its value in maintaining moral stability (Malony & North, 1979).

Meanwhile, Nietzsche took the approach that humans are superior beings and must free themselves from the cage of inferiority. Therefore, humans must kill God within themselves, because when God is considered to exist by humans, it shows that humans are not yet fully free and find it difficult to develop in line with modernity and find it difficult to recognize themselves. This background gave rise to the ideas of nihilism and superhumans (ubermanch), which initiated human independence in determining values, morals and norms that resulted in relative and uncertain truths, and freed humans from unnecessary metaphysical limitations (AALOUI, 2024; Fatha & Rahmat, 2024; Putawa, 2022; Rahman, 2023)

Unlike Freud, Nietzsche viewed religion from the perspective of cultural philosophy and morality. For Nietzsche, Christianity is a form of slave morality, whose values emphasize weakness, self-denial, and submission to transcendental authority, suppressing the potential for human life and creativity (Nietzsche, 1974). The pronouncement of "God is dead" signifies

the collapse of old moral foundations and the emergence of nihilism, where humans lose their grip on values and face a void of meaning (Leiter, 2019). Nietzsche rejected religion completely; he did not consider it a phase of human development that could be abandoned, but rather a barrier to human spiritual and cultural evolution. The concepts of the Übermensch, the will to power, and the transvaluation of values emerged as normative alternatives to traditional religion-driven ethics (Nietzsche, 1974).

The point of convergence between these two figures can be seen in the social constructs of Freud and Nietzsche, which agree that God and religion were not created by revelation, but rather shaped by society and the human mind. They both share a critique of religious values, viewing religion as an obstacle to self-actualization—Freud from a psychological perspective, Nietzsche from the perspective of values and creativity. Thus, the similarity in epistemological positions between Freud and Nietzsche indicates a paradigm shift in understanding religion, from what was initially viewed as a transcendent truth to an immanent and anthropological construct. This perspective emphasizes that religious experience cannot be separated from the ever-evolving psychological and cultural dynamics of humankind. Furthermore, their critiques of religion do not merely aim to negate its existence, but rather to open up space for critical reflection on its function and relevance in modern life. In this context, religion can be reconsidered not as an absolute, limiting authority, but as a phenomenon that needs to be interpreted contextually so as not to hinder the potential for human creativity, freedom, and self-actualization.

The difference between the thoughts of these two figures can be seen from the following elements: first, psychological vs. cultural-philosophical, Freud focused on individual psychodynamics, while Nietzsche focused on culture and social morals. Second, the role of religion, Freud considered religion as a neurosis that still has a role in maintaining collective morality, while Nietzsche rejected religion completely, seeing it as a restraint. Third, the scale of transformation, Freud emphasized psychological healing, while Nietzsche called for a revolution in values and culture. Therefore, researchers such as Vahanian (1961) and contemporary studies by Philipp (2024) describe how Freud and Nietzsche's thoughts open a new path towards post-theistic spirituality, a condition where meaning and morals are built on self-awareness, creativity, and reflection, rather than adherence to dogma (Vahanian, 1961) (David, 2024).

Relevance of Thought to Modern Man

The thoughts of Sigmund Freud and Friedrich Nietzsche continue to offer a critical lens for the condition of modern humans living in a post-religious era, marked by secularization, a moral crisis, and a more personal and reflective search for the meaning of life. Both explored the deepest aspects of human experience, Freud through the psychological dimension, and Nietzsche through the moral and existential dimensions, which continue to have a significant influence on the study of theology, psychology, philosophy, and modern clinical therapy.

Freud viewed religion as a psychological symbolic system that evolved to soothe human existential fears. In The Future of an Illusion (1961), he explained that religion provides an illusory sense of security, as a form of regression to childhood when individuals were highly dependent on father figures (Freud, 1961). In a modern world increasingly moving away from formal religious institutions, the role of these symbolic structures remains, but in alternative forms of spirituality or psychological support. Pargament (2001), in The Psychology of Religion and Coping, shows that religion and spirituality continue to function as strategies for coping with suffering and crisis, even in secular societies (Pargament, 2001).

"Spiritual resources help people cope with life stressors even when traditional religiosity declines." (Pargament, 2001).

Various psychotherapeutic approaches such as Viktor Frankl's logotherapy (1985) and Pargament's spiritually integrated psychotherapy (2007) emphasize the importance of integrating psychological needs and the search for meaning (Frankl, 1985) (Pargament, 2001). Although Freud explicitly rejected the theological role of religion, his theory paved the way for existential psychotherapy approaches, which address death anxiety, meaninglessness, and responsibility for life (Yalom, 1980).

Nietzsche saw the modern crisis of values as a result of the "death of God"—not in the biological sense, but in the sense of the collapse of transcendent authority as the basis of morality. This loss of value grip gave rise to nihilism, namely the awareness that old values are no longer valid but have not yet been replaced by new ones (Nietzsche, 1974). The concept of the "death of God" in Nietzsche's thought does not simply signal the collapse of religious belief, but indicates a fundamental crisis in the structure of meaning and moral legitimacy of modern humans. The nihilism that emerges is not only a condition of value emptiness, but also a transitional phase that opens up the possibility for the reconstruction of a more autonomous and affirmative value system. Within this framework, Nietzsche does not stop at diagnosing the crisis, but rather encourages the birth of humans capable of creating new values in response to the loss of transcendent foundations. Therefore, the modern crisis of values can be understood simultaneously as a challenge and an opportunity, a reflective moment that demands intellectual and existential courage to reformulate the orientation of life independently in a world no longer supported by metaphysical authority.

Nietzsche offered an alternative through the idea of the Übermensch (superior man), who is able to consciously create his own values through the will to power (will to power) and the reassessment of values (Umwertung aller Werte) (W. A. Kaufmann, 1950). In the modern context, this idea inspired the emergence of a reflective spirituality that no longer relies on religious institutions, but relies on moral independence and existential creativity. Zinnbauer & Pargament (2005) call it "spirituality without religion," namely a form of search for meaning and value that does not refer to dogma, but rather on the creation of personal values rooted in life experiences (Zinnbauer et al., 2005).

"The death of God theology opens the possibility of constructing a reflective spirituality that affirms human autonomy and moral imagination." (David, 2024).

Studies by Vahanian (1961) and more recently by Philipp (2024) also suggest that the "death of God" could be the starting point for the birth of radical theology, namely a theology based on immanent humanism and individual moral responsibility, rather than submission to external divine authority (Vahanian, 1961) (David, 2024). Both of these ideas stem from a fiscal-centric perspective, which consistently focuses on empirical evidence. Therefore, humans are considered capable of resolving all conflicts and life's affairs through rational reason, setting aside spiritual aspects or the divine dimension (Amir & Rahman, 2026).

Although the idea of the "death of God" developed in radical theology offers a framework of immanent humanism that emphasizes individual autonomy and moral responsibility, this approach is not free from a number of epistemological and existential problems. Reducing the religious dimension to a rational-empirical framework tends to ignore the complexities of human experience that cannot be fully explained through empirical verification alone, such as spiritual experiences, transcendent meaning, and the need for metaphysical orientation. Furthermore, the assumption that human rationality is sufficient to resolve all of life's

problems has the potential to give rise to a new form of reductionism, one that ignores the inherent limitations of human reason itself. In this context, neglecting the spiritual dimension does not always result in authentic freedom but can also trigger a deeper crisis of meaning, especially when humans are confronted with existential realities that transcend the reach of instrumental rationality. Therefore, a more integrative approach is needed, one that not only recognizes the role of reason but also makes room for the spiritual dimension as an essential part of human existence.

However, Freud and Nietzsche's thinking can be read as two complementary poles in understanding the human response to the loss of religious value structures. Freud explains why humans need symbols, while Nietzsche encourages humans to create values without external symbols. In the practice of psychotherapy and cultural studies, this approach encourages the development of a spiritual framework that: first, does not depend on revelation or formal religious institutions; second, remains able to address existential needs such as anxiety, suffering, and the search for meaning; and third, encourages moral reflection and autonomous value creation.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that both Sigmund Freud and Friedrich Nietzsche fundamentally criticized religion and the concept of God as human constructs, but from different approaches and backgrounds. Freud viewed religion as a psychological illusion rooted in the human need for emotional security and authoritative figures, especially in the face of existential anxiety. Religion, for Freud, was an understandable defense mechanism but also considered a form of collective neurosis that inhibited psychic maturity. In contrast, Nietzsche Nietzsche views religion as a moral system that suppresses human existential potential. With his declaration that "God is dead," Nietzsche not only metaphysically rejected God's existence but also highlighted the collapse of the foundations of traditional values previously supported by religion. He encouraged the birth of new values derived from human consciousness and will through the concepts of the Übermensch and the will to power. Both of these ideas have high relevance in the increasingly secular and pluralistic modern world. Freud offered a psychological explanation for the human need for a structure of meaning, while Nietzsche encouraged humans to create an autonomous morality rooted in existential courage. Together, the two provide an important foundation for an understanding of contemporary spirituality that is no longer based on theistic doctrine, but on reflection, responsibility, and the creation of personal meaning in the face of nihilism and moral confusion in the modern era. The philosophy and psychology of religion, particularly through the integration of psychoanalytic and existentialist approaches, can be used to understand the dynamics of modern human spirituality more comprehensively. In the practical realm, the thoughts of Freud and Nietzsche can be used as a foundation for the development of psychotherapy and spiritual counseling that accommodates symbolic needs while encouraging the creation of personal values, especially in facing the crisis of meaning in the post-religious era. Further research should be directed at exploring contemporary societal responses to non-theistic spirituality, including within local or non-Western cultural contexts. In education, these two perspectives can serve as a source of reflection in designing ethics and spirituality curricula that are more adaptive to the plurality of values and existential experiences of the younger generation.

REFERENCES

AALOUI, N. (2024). Entre métaphysique et nihilisme, être et apparaître, dans le Zarathoustra de Nietzsche et l'herméneutique de Heidegger. *Revue Internationale Du Chercheur*, *5*(4).

Abidin, A. K. (2022). Filsafat Ketuhanan: Argumen Logis Tentang Tuhan Perspektif Filosof-Filosof Barat. *TAJDID: Jurnal Ilmu Ushuluddin*, *21*(2), 454–477. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.30631/tjd.v21i2.196

Aditya, R., & Nupusiah, U. (2023). Paradigma psikoanalisis dalam perspektif sigmund freud. *Journal Education and Government Wiyata*, *1*(3), 171–177. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.71128/e-gov.v1i3.16

Amir, A. N., & Rahman, T. A. (2026). *Kritik Al-Attas Terhadap Kristian-Barat : Suatu Tinjauan Sejarah-Falsafah Al- Attas ' S Critique Of The Christian -West : A Historical-Philosophical Outlook*. *10*(1), 84–95.

Annur, A. S., & Jannah, M. (2025). Agama Sebagai Konstruksi Sosial dan Wahyu Ilahi: Analisis Komparatif Perspektif Barat dan Islam. *Jurnal Ilmiah Guru Madrasah*, *4*(2), 407–418. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.69548/jigm.v4i2.77

Anthonio, A. (2020). *Work Sucks , I Know : Herbert Marcuse Mengenai Pekerjaan Sebagai Represi Manusia*. 1–17. //repo.driyarkara.ac.id/id/eprint/685

Arif, S., Annada, F. T., & Rezkyanta, H. (2025). Pengaruh Sekularisasi dalam Diskursus Worldview Barat: The Influence of Secularization in the Discourse of the Western Worldview. *Journal of Islamic and Occidental Studies*, *3*(2), 142–154. https://doi.org//doi.org/10.21111/jios.v3i2.71

Asroni, A. (2020). Resolusi Konflik Agama: Perspektif Filsafat Perenial. *Religi: Jurnal Studi Agama-Agama*, *16*(1), 64–78. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.14421/rejusta.2020.1601-04

Azmi, W., & Rifqi, R. (2025). Sekularisme: Analisis Konseptual, Genealogi Historis, dan Kritik dalam Perspektif Islam. *Al-Wajih: The Journal of Islamic Studies*, *2*(2), 169–177. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.54213/jg0t2s95

Bayu, I., & Amalih, I. (2021a). *Eksistensialisme Religius Dalam Wacana Keislaman Kontemporer (Study Atas Pemikiran Ali Syari'ati)*. *3*(1), 73–88.

Bayu, I., & Amalih, I. (2021b). Eksistensialisme Religius Dalam Wacana Keislaman Kontemporer (Study Atas Pemikiran Ali Syari'ati). *Muallim Jurnal Pendidikan*, *3*(1), 73–88.

Chabbert, M. (2018). On becoming secular: Gilles Deleuze and the death of God. *MHRA Working Papers in the Humanities*, 50–59. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.59860/wph.a166222

Cherry, K. (2023). *Sigmund Freud on Religion The perspective of a Jewish atheist scientist*. Verywellmind.

David, P. (2024). The Death of God as a Turn to Radical Theology: Then and Now. *Religions*, *15*(8), 918. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15080918

Fatha, H., & Rahmat, S. (2024). Nihilisme Normatif Kontemporer: Studi Kritis terhadap Anti Otoritas dalam Memahami Teks Islam: Contemporary Normative Nihilism: A Critical Study on Anti-Authority in Understanding Islamic Text (Nash). *Journal of Islamic and Occidental Studies*, *2*(2), 198–218. https://doi.org/10.21111/jios.v2i2.43

Fatih, M. K. (2019). Epistemologi Psikoanalisa: Menggali Kepribadian Sosial dalam Perspektif Sigmund Freud. *Madinah: Jurnal Studi Islam*, *6*(1), 20–31. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.58518/madinah.v6i1.1287

Fikri, M. D., & Kusuma, A. R. (2025). *Kepribadian Menurut Sigmund Freud (Respon Kritis Perspektif Worldview)*.

Frankl, V. E. (1985). *Man's Search for Meaning*. Washington Square Press.

Freud, S. (1930). *Civilization and Its Discontents*. W.W. Norton & Company .Inc.

Freud, S. (1961). *The Future of an Illusion* (J. Strachey (ed.)). W.W. Norton & Company .Inc.

Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method* (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall (eds.); 2nd ed.). Continuum.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays.* Basic Books.

Gerindem, D. C. A., Tanuwidjaja, S., & Wibowo, D. F. (2025). Perbandingan Kesia-siaan dalam Nihilisme dengan Pengkhotbah 1: 2serta Relevansinya terhadap Moralitas Hidup Kristen. *Sola Scriptura: Jurnal Teologi*, *6*(1), 21–42.

Harris, M. E. (2021). Nietzsche's' Death of God,'Modernism and Postmodernism in the Twentieth Century: Insights from Altizer and Vattimo. *Global Journal of Cultural Studies*, *62*(1), 10–20. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.6000/2817-2310.2022.01.02

Hawasi, H. (2021). Tindakan Moral Sebagai Dasar Etika Eksistensialisme Religius Muhammad Iqbal. *DAWUH: Islamic Communication Journal*, *2*(3), 104–116.

Hendrawan, F., Remawa, A. A. G. R., & Sariada, I. K. (2026). Exploring Nietzsche's Philosophical Idea on Nihilism:"The Question of the Essence of Morality in Humanizing Humans": Menelisik pemikiran filsafat Nihilisme Nietzsche:"Persoalan Hakikat Moralitas Memanusiakan Manusia". *Santhet (Jurnal Sejarah Pendidikan Dan Humaniora)*, *10*(1), 77–86. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.36526/santhet.v10i1.6798

Ihsanotaki, M. A. S., Ghiffari, A., & Zaeri, R. (2024). Ubermensch Dan Kritik Nietzhsche Terhadap Hukum Moral Tradisional. *Praxis: Jurnal Filsafat Terapan*, *2*(01).

Jr., R. W. H. (1992). Mysticism, reality, illusion and the Freudian critique of religion. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, *2*(3), 141–159. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327582ijpr0203_1

Kaufmann, W. A. (1950). *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*. Princeton University Press.

Legi, R. E., Tolego, Y. B., Lumantow, A. I. S., & Rumetor, J. J. (2025). Pendidikan Agama Kristen Dewasa: Tantangan, Strategi, dan Implikasi bagi Pengembangan Spiritualitas dalam Konteks Sosial-Budaya Modern. *Jurnal Teologi Injili*, *5*(1), 38–56. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.55626/jti.v5i1.165

Leiter, B. (2019). The Death of God and the Death of Morality. *PhilPapers*, *102*(3), 386–402.

Malony, H. N., & North, G. (1979). The future of an illusion – the illusion of the future: A historical dialogue on the value of religion between Oskar Pfister and Sigmund Freud. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, *15*(2), 177–186. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6696(197904)15:2<177::AID-JHBS2300150209>3.0.CO;2-6

Nietzsche, F. W. (1883). *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (R. J. Hollingdale (ed.)). Penguin Books.

Nietzsche, F. W. (1974). *The Gay Science* (W. Kaufmann (ed.); Original w). Vintage Books.

Novianto, F. A. (2023). Etika Filsafat Dalam Meyikapi Over Religiusitas Pada Masyarakat Modern (Pendeketan Teori "Egoisme" Nietzsche). *Journal of Religion and Social Transformation*, *1*(2), 1–14. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.24235/yv8qjh54

Pargament, K. I. (2001). *The Psychology of Religion and Coping: Theory, Research, Practice*. Guilford Press.

Putawa, R. A. (2022). Makna filosofis ketiadaan dan relevansinya dengan tipe data undefined pada javascript. *Jurnal Filsafat Indonesia*, *5*(1), 80–86. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.23887/jfi.v5i1.41775

Rahman, M. I. (2023). Pandangan Nihilisme Terhadap Ontologi (Studi Deskriptif Pemikiran Nietzsche). *Journal Khafi Of Islamic Studies*, *1*(2), 19–36.

Ramdaina, F. N., & Hambali, R. Y. A. (2023). Agama dan kepribadian dalam perspektif psikoanalisis Sigmund Freud. *Gunung Djati Conference Series*, *19*, 427–435. //conferences.uinsgd.ac.id/gdcs

Roswantoro, A. (2005). Kritik terhadap Eksistensialisme Ateistik tentang Penolakan Eksistensi Tuhan. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *43*(1), 207–239. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2005.431.207-239

Sagi, A. (2024). Between Religion and Religiosity: Between the Death and Resurrection of God. *Religions*, *15*(11), 1297. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15111297

Santiago, D. F., & Asnawi, N. (2024). Tinjauan Filosofis Pragmatisme John Dewey Terhadap Persoalan Sekularisasi Agama: John Dewey's Philosophical Review of Pragmatism on the Problem of the Secularization of Religion. *Jurnal Filsafat Indonesia*, *7*(3), 388–397. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.23887/jfi.v7i3.74847

Siswadi, G. A. (2024). Konsep Tuhan Dalam Tradisi Barat Serta Kritik Terhadap Pandangan Tentang Tuhan Personal Dan Non-Personal. *Tampung Penyang*, *22*(1), 19–35. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.33363/tampung-penyang.v22i1.1191

Situmorang, A., & Ay, E. L. (2026). Ontologi Teosentris Dan Rasionalitas Otonom: Analisa Komparatif-Sistematis Filsafat Kristen Dan Rasionalisme. *Voice of HAMI: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Agama Kristen*, *8*(2), 108–120. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.59830/voh.v8i2.140

sugiono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. *Bandung: A*.

Suntoro, A. F., Amala, S. K., & Muhyidin, L. (2024). Implementasi Gagasan Islamisasi Ilmu Pengetahuan Kontemporer SMN Al-Attas terhadap Teori Psikoanalisis Sigund Freud Implementation of SMN Al-Attas' Concept of Islamization of Contemporary Science on Sigmund Freud's Psychoanalysis Theory. *Journal of Islamic and Occidental Studies (JIOS)*, *2*(2), 151–175. https://doi.org/10.21111/jios.v2i2.47

Suryajaya, M. (2022). Asal-Usul Pemikiran Tentang Sekularisme. *Jurnal Filsafat*, *32*(1), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.22146/jf.73767

Susanto, S., & Idris, S. (2017). Religion: Sigmund Freud's infantile illusions and collective neurosis perspective. *Ar-Raniry International Journal of Islamic Studies*, *4*(1), 55–70. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22373/jar.v4i1.7518

Vahanian, G. (1961). *The Death of God: The Culture of Our Post-Christian Era*. George Braziller.

Yalom, I. D. (1980). *Existential Psychotherapy. New York: Basic Books*. Basic Books.

Yusak, Y. K. G., & Salurante, T. (2025). Membangun Integritas Keimanan Dalam Pendidikan Agama Kristen Di Era Pluralistis Dan Sekularisme:: Studi Strategi Berbasis Alkitab. *Didache: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristen*, *6*(2), 165–184. https://doi.org/10.55076/didache.v6i2.393

Zaluchu, S. E. (2018). Mengkritisi Teologi Sekularisasi. *Kurios*, *4*(1), 26–38. https://doi.org///doi.org/10.30995/kur.v4i1.31

Zinnbauer, B. J., Pargament, K. I., Cole, B., Rye, M. S., Butter, E. M., Belavich, T. G., Hipp, K. M., Scott, A. B., & Kadar, J. L. (2005). Religiousn and spirituality: Unfuzzying the fuzzy. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *36*(4), 549–564.

© 2025 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/).