

**SINJIE: Salam International Journal of Islamic Education**  
Vol. 1, No. 1 April/2022  
Homepage: <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/sinjie>  
Email: [sinjie.jurnalppspai@umm.ac.id](mailto:sinjie.jurnalppspai@umm.ac.id)

Received: 1 February  
Revised: 12 February  
Accepted: 20 March  
Published: 22 April

## Moral Education in View of Al-Ghazali and Emile Durkheim

Dian Indriyani<sup>1\*</sup>, Ishomuddin<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>STKIP Muhammadiyah Manokwari, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia

---

\*Corresponding author(s).

E-mail address: [dindriyani413@gmail.com](mailto:dindriyani413@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** Modern society is familiar with capitalism and the rationalization of social relations. Today, they face a complicated problem related to social identity. Atomistic, impersonal and competitive society in the market and capitalism cause society does not find their individual identity in social identity. This study aimed to determine the views of Al-Ghazali and Emile Durkheim about the differences and similarities of moral education as well as the relevance of the two figures' thoughts. This study used the Library Research type. The data collection used primary and secondary sources. Data are analyzed using historical, descriptive, analytical and comparative methods. The results indicate that moral education based on Al-Ghazali's view is to configure humans who are saintly to get closer to God. The sources of al-Ghazali's moral education are revelation and strict guidance from the sheikh so it does not optimize the function of reason. Meanwhile, moral education of Emile Durkheim is a social means to realize social goals. The purpose of moral education is the creation of social solidarity and social equilibrium in society.

**Keywords:** Moral Education; Modern Society

## INTRODUCTION

Globalization is moving fast process and penetrating all aspects of life, such as economics, politics, socio-culture and education. The main symptom of the globalization process is advances science, information-communication technology and transportation technology. Technological advances strongly influence economic, political, socio-cultural and educational structures, so globalization becomes an unavoidable and challenging reality. However, globalization as a process is ambivalent (A. Sudiarja, 1992; Dewanta, 2003). Globalization exposes great opportunities for human development due to the rapid development of science and technology. However, modern civilization dominated by a culture of science and technology seems increasingly out of control and ethical considerations.

(Daniel Lerner, 1968) argues that modernization is a new term for a long process – a process of social change – where less developed societies acquire common characteristics

for more developed societies. Many experts have discussed various opinions on modernization from different points of view. As stated by M. Rusli Karim, Light and killer, modernization is change in values, institutions and views that move traditional societies towards industrialization and urbanization. In addition, Zanden asserts that modernization is the process of a society shifting from traditional or pre-industrial social and economic arrangements to an industrial society (Karim, 1994).

It is based on the fact that human progress in the science and technology due to globalization is not always comparable to the enhancement of the moral field (Asdi, 1995). On the other hand, advances science and technology make it easy for humans to solve life's problems. However, both of them have a negative impact when science and technology do not function as human liberators, but both shackle and dominate humans.

The globalization tide has succeeded in penetrating the traditional moral, namely the noble customs and human ancestors habits (William Chang, 1999). Moral values, such as respect other human, responsibility, honesty, harmony and solidarity are shifted by human autonomy that prioritizes freedom. In addition, the view of freedom towards ourself so other parties cannot regulate. This freedom often conditions 'homo homini lupus', that is, humans do not admit the boundaries of rights and authority in social life.

The shift in the moral norms role occurred during the French Revolution which became a symbol of freedom. In this new humanism, modern humans are increasingly abandoning standard values. They make themselves as rules and discharge from normative attachments that are considered outdated. Humans think that they are autonomous in controlling themselves. It is reflected in the attitude of controlling the universe for personal gain.

A view of life that prioritizes personal freedom will encourage people to prioritize personal interests and forget the others rights. This attitude often causes conflicts with other parties in social life. The exaltation of freedom seems to be outside the social entity and others. As a result, moral values are ignored in this view of life.

Conceptualization of the moral education system is philosophically needed in Islamic education. It is based on the lack of clarity in philosophical thinking, concepts or theories of Islamic education related to the development of human civilization, namely a rapid shift in values along with the development of science and technology in society (Ma'arif, 1997). Islam is invited to provide solutions and alternative thoughts as well as self-correction for the weaknesses of their thought. Therefore, a study of the thoughts of educational figures is required, both Islamic and non-Islamic, regarding moral education to improve weaknesses. In addition, it can be a material for consideration in taking appropriate moral education concepts for the present and the future. It provides new innovations that are suitable and useful for Islamic education.

One of the leading Muslim thinkers who studies moral, mental and educational issues is Abu Hamid Muhammad bin Muhammad al-Ghazali, otherwise known as al-Ghazali. In the history of Islamic thought, al-Ghazali is an expert and practitioner of education, religion, Islamic law, and has extensive knowledge of philosophy, Sufism, psychology, morals (morals) and Islamic spirituality (Yahya Jaya, 1994).

Thus, al-Ghazali's thoughts on moral education are similar with his religious and Sufistic philosophy. Amin Abdullah, in the Philosophy of Islamic Ethics, stated that between al-Ghazali and Kant had a similar mystical conception of ethics (morals). The source of morality is revelation and al-Ghazali refuses reason as a guiding principle in human ethical actions. In this case, the role of the ratio is not required optimally, merely

peripheral. Al-Ghazali prefers revelation and emphasizes the importance of moral guidance (Murshid) as the main guide for the selected people in achieving mystical virtues (Abdullah, 2002; Sulaiman, 1990).

In contrast to al-Ghazali, Emile Durkheim, an expert and practitioner of education, moral philosopher, chose society as the owner of moral authority to develop and realize human nature in thinking about moral education. It refers to the sociological spiritualism approach, which is a belief about the unequal nature and importance of the whole and each individual in building the whole (Peristiany, 1989). Even though society is a combination of individual elements, they are still different and establish new phenomena that are *sui generis* (unique).

Durkheim applies sociological spirituality through an attempt to understand society as an independent organic reality that has its own development laws and existence. Beliefs regarding the nature and importance of each individual are not the same. Thus, society remains different and establishes a new phenomenon that is *sui generis* (unique).

From the explanation above, the researchers examined moral education related to those two figures because they have different styles of thinking and each figure represents western and eastern figures in revealing the concept of moral education. However, the similarity of those figures is the method of moral education. Al-Ghazali and Emile Durkheim have the same paradigmatic tendencies in the practical application of education. They emphasize that moral education is an effort to establish a moral person. In addition, they emphasize that the central role of the teacher or moral adviser is the teacher centered concept in the learning method.

Based on the explanation above, al-Ghazali and Emile Durkheim are *discursus* and have an influence on each culture and thought. Therefore, the researchers examined the system of thought of the two figures critically and comparatively in moral education as a study goal.

## || METHOD

### 1. The approach and type of research

This study is based on a literature review. Therefore, the research characteristic is library research. The data are collected and analyzed from literature and other documentation materials, such as journals articles and other relevant media.

### 2. Data Collection

There are two types of data in this study, namely primary data and secondary data. Primary data are data related to the thoughts of al-Ghazali and Emile Durkheim about moral education in various opuses. Al-Ghazali's opuses include: "Ihya 'Ulumuddin", "Fatihat al-Ulum", "Mizan al-'Amal", "Mi'raj al-Salikin", and "Ayyuha al-Walad". The opuses of Durkheim include: "Moral Education; A Study of Theory and Application of Educational Sociology", Sociology and Philosophy. While secondary data is data related to moral education from other scientists. Secondary data is applied as supporting material and complementary analysis.

### 3. Data Analysis Method

#### a. Historical Method

The historical method aims to uncover, explore, examine and analyze the problems that become the object of study based on history so researchers obtain

objective conclusions. It is because the method is based on an objective background analysis of phenomenon (Shidiqi, 1983).

#### **b. Descriptive Method**

Descriptive method is steps to represent objectively about the reality that exists in the research problem.

#### **c. Analysis Method**

The analytical method is used to examine the thoughts of al-Ghazali and Emil Durkheim moral education after being explained through descriptive method. The way is content analysis, which is to analyze the thoughts concepts of various opuses related to moral education, especially by al-Ghazali and Emil Durkheim.

#### **d. Comparative Method**

The comparative method uses comparison logic. The comparison is a comparison between replicative facts. This method compares al-Ghazali and Emil Durkheim thoughts on moral education as the research focus.

## **|| RESULT & DISCUSSION**

### **1. Al-Ghazali and His Moral Thought**

#### **a) Biography of Al-Ghazali**

Al-Ghazali is known as a Muslim theologian, educator, and Sufi in the middle ages. He was born in 1058 AD/450 AH in the Ghazalah village, Thus (now near Meshed), a city in Persia. Al-Ghazali replaced his teacher as the leader of the madrasa founded by Imam al-Haramain in Nisabur because of his skills and intelligence (Umaruddin, 1996; Abu Hamid Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Muhammad al-Ghazali, n.d.; Smith, n.d.).

After al-Juwaini died, al-Ghazali visited the residence of a vizier (minister) during the reign of Sultan 'Adud ad-Daulah Alp Arselan (455 H/1063M-465 H/1072 AD) and Jalal ad-Daulah Malik Shah (465 H /1072 AD-485 AH/1092 AD) of the Salajiqah Dynasty in al-'Askar, a city in Persia. The vizier was Nizam al-Mulk. The vizier was amazed by al-Ghazali's views so he asked al-Ghazali to teach al-Shafi'iyah Fiqh at his college, in Baghdad, which is known as Madrasah Nizhamiyah. Al-Ghazali taught in 484 AH/1091 AD. When he was 34 years old, al-Ghazali had obtained various degrees in the Islamic world and reached the pinnacle of his career (Ali, 1980; Hasan, 1967; Hilmi, 1975; Muhammad Khudri Beik, 1970; Nakosteen, 1996).

#### **b) Al-Ghazali's Moral Thought**

Al-Ghazali's view of morals can be investigated from the concept of khulq. Al-Ghazali defines the word khulq (moral) as a condition or soul that is the source of simple actions without thought and effort.

Al-Ghazali applies four terms regarding the definition of the soul, namely *al-qalb*, *al-nafs*, *al-ruh* and *al-aql*. The four terms have similarities and differences in meaning. The most important difference is the physical aspect, namely *al-qalb* means physical heart, *al-ruh* means physical spirit and *latif*, *al-nafs* means *lust* and *al-aql* means knowledge. Meanwhile, the similarity based on a spiritual point of view is the human soul which has a *rabbinic* character. It is the essence, self and human substance. Therefore, human based on the physical is not returning to God, but in a spiritual sense is returning to God (Hossein Nasr dan Oliver Leaman, n.d.; Johnson, 1994; M.M. Sharif, 1961).

Thus, Al-Ghazali defines the soul based on the physical which is related to the physical life force and the soul is related to the nature, self and human substance which

is rabbinic (Jaya, 1994). Based on the analysis of the essence of the soul, the potential and function, al-Ghazali argues that morals and human nature are based on the type of soul. For example, the ruling soul is vegetal and animal, so the moral and character of person resembles vegetal and animal. However, if the ruling soul is *insaniyyah*, the person is as though Camille man.

However, the soul in al-Ghazali's concept does not ignore the human physical. Al-Ghazali also considers the physical element important because the spiritual really needs the physical in conducting its obligations as caliph. A healthy physical life is the path to a good spiritual life. The world is a place for the afterlife, so humans should maintain, foster, prepare and fulfil physical needs so as not to perish.

Al-Ghazali argues that morality is not an outward act that appears, but it is a mental condition that is the source of natural and easy actions without consideration and thought (Madjidi, 1997).

Thus, a well or poor judgment of a moral act should be seen from the physical and psychological elements. Therefore, the physical should be seen from the reason and purpose.

## **2. Emile Durkheim and His Thoughts**

### **a) Biografi Emile Durkheim**

Emile Durkheim was born on April 15, 1858 in Epinal, a small Jewish village in eastern France. He lived with a devout Jewish family. His father and grandfather were rabbis or Jewish priests (Johnson, 1994). His mother was a simple woman, an embroiderer. Durkheim should have become a rabbi if he followed the traditional customs.

However, Durkheim deviated due to a mystical experience. In addition, he is Catholic because he was influenced by a Catholic female teacher. In the end, he became an agnostic, suspending the existence of God. Durkheim was an active and patriotic man. He used his energy to inflame the patriotism to defend the country during the war. His son, Andre died in the war. After losing his son and suffering from a heart attack, he died at 60 years old in 1917 in Fontaineblau.

### **b) Emile Durkheim's Moral Thought**

Emile Durkheim argues that educational thinking should be oriented towards morality. Durkheim said that education is a continuous effort to fill the child soul with the way of seeing, feeling and acting, where the child accepts and achieves these efforts spontaneously but directed. Babies are trained (forced) to eat, drink and sleep related to the time. On the other hand, babies are also trained to be calm, clean and obedient. When growing up, their habits are not enough to be forced but they should be guided and nurtured to think about others, realize the environment, respect customs, and feel the importance of a work (Djuretna A. Imam Muhni, 1994).

Emile Durkheim argues that moral education is not a material that should be included in a particular curriculum or teaching. However, it is a hidden curriculum. Every teacher should present a good example for students such as, behavior, attitudes, knowledge, or mutual respect. Schools shape children morals through teaching, not intra-curricular activities.

Furthermore, the hidden curriculum assists teachers to have an open and firm view or attitude about right or wrong, and it assists teachers to familiarize students with prosocial behaviour in the school environment. In addition, socialization should also be

disseminated to the society to show their prosocial moral character and social behaviour through free experience (Snarey, n.d.).

The moral education problem has a major role in Durkheim system of thought. It is evident from his various views on social philosophy, epistemology and sociology. Durkheim argues that learning is a process of learners who can grow related to the position, intellectual level, and moral conditions of the surrounding environment. Humans can become knowledgeable and moral because of their society. Teachers are agents of society. It is a very important connection in cultural transition. The teacher job is to create a moral social.

The teacher as a central role in the task and power should be useful. However, Durkheim argues that teachers should have basic qualities to be effective and efficient. The first quality is moral authority.

Teachers of moral subjects should be symbols and examples for students, namely the symbol of idols and the fulfilment of daily tasks to realize regularity and efficiency. Therefore, the teacher should have moral authority. Moral authority assists teachers to teach or develop the moral character of students.

The second main quality is the totality of trying. Teaching is transmitting isolated facts or small stories and organic activity as well as synthesis. Durkheim argues that teachers need to observe the totality of students' personalities during teaching process. The views of al-Ghazali and Emile Durkheim regarding moral education include the concept and nature of moral education, the objectives of moral education, sources of moral education, moral education materials, methods of moral education, and the roles as well as requirements of moral educators.

### **3. The Differences and Similarities of al-Ghazali dan Emile Durkheim's Thought on Moral Education**

Al-Ghazali and Emile Durkheim emphasized the urgency of morals in human life and the importance of transmitting morals through education. However, an analysis of the views of al-Ghazali and Emile Durkheim on moral education revealed that there are many similarities and differences.

Al-Ghazali's moral education focused on the psychological students. It was evident from his view of the moral concept. Moral is a state or configuration of the soul that is the source of simple actions without thought and effort. It will lead to moral education developed by a personality, where education leads to the establishment of pious, good personality, purity of soul from the moral elements of wisdom, *syaja'ah*, *iffah*, and *'aadalah* to get closer to Allah.

Emile Durkheim states that morality is a social fact that the existence is apart from subjective eagerness. Moral facts are considered as a social phenomenon containing rules for acting which are recognized from certain characteristics such as discipline or attachment to groups and autonomy.

Thus, Durkheim argues that moral education leads to the spirit of society, where education is in charge to develop individuals related to their nature, open hidden abilities and social means in achieving social goals where a society ensures its survival.

The difference between al-Ghazali and Emile Durkheim was the starting point and the socio-political conditions of society. Al-Ghazali, as a Sufi and philosopher, orients humans to conscience and *al-dzauq*, so moral education is based on psychology and oneself. Moral education is also a mystical guide for the soul to seek the afterlife. Meanwhile, Emile Durkheim is a sociologist who investigates the moral problems of his

nation. He grew up when French society experienced the failure of the French revolution. Its failure affected the moral values of society. People experience anomie (a state without moral reference). Moral values to defend the nation and social goals are fading. Therefore, Durkheim argues that moral education should create a positive contribution to society and the nation.

## CONCLUSIONS

### 1. Al-Ghazali's view of moral education

Al-Ghazali argues that moral education is individual and religious. The purpose of moral education is to establish a pure soul to get closer to God. The source of moral education is revelation and guidance from the sheikh, so the reason function is not optimal. Moral education material is science and charity. Al-Ghazali's educational methods are the habituation method, the exemplary method and the *tazkiyah an-nafs* method (purification of the soul) through *takhliyah al-nafs* and *tahliyah al-nafs*. *Takhliyah al-nafs* is an effort to adapt through self-emptying of despicable traits. While *tahliyah al-nafs* is self-decoration with morals and commendable nature. The role and requirements of educators are *warastatul anbiya'* with the teacher centered concept.

### 2. Emile Durkheim's views on moral education

Emile Durkheim's view of moral education is social, rational and secular. Moral education is a social means to realize social goals. The purpose of moral education is the creation of social solidarity and social equilibrium in society. The moral-making authority is society by replacing the role of religion. Moral education material contains a hidden curriculum. Emile Durkheim emphasizes discipline, habituation, the use of school as a group attachment and exemplary methods. Durkheim applies the concept of teacher centered where the role and position of the teacher as a connection and moral agent of society.

## REFERENCES

- 'Umaruddin, M. (1996). M. 'Umaruddin, *The Ethical Philosophy of al-Ghazali*. Delhi: Publisher & Distributors.
- A. Sudiarja, S. (1992). "Pendahuluan" Dalam Budi Susanto, Et Al. , *Nilai-Nilai Etis Dan Kekuasaan Utopis : Panorama Praksis Etika Indonesia Modern (Yogyakarta : Kanisius, 1992*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Abdullah, M. A. (2002). *Antara Al- Ghazali Dan Kant: Filsafat Etika Islam*, Penerj. Hamzah. Bandung: Mizan.
- Abu Hamid Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Muhammad al-Ghazali. (n.d.). *al-Munqiz min ad-Dlalal*. Beirut: al-Maktabah al-Sya'biyyah.
- Ali, K. (1980). *A Study of Islamic History*. Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli.
- Asdi, E. D. (1995). Imperatif Kategoris Dalam Filsafat Moral Immanuel Kant. *Jurnal Filsafat*, 1(2).
- Daniel Lerner. (1968). Daniel Lerner dalam International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, Vol. 9 dan 10. In *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*. The Macmillan Company and The Free Press.
- Dewanta, I. A. (2003). Upaya Merumuskan Etika Ekologi Global. *Basis*, 01(02).
- Djuretna A. Imam Muhni. (1994). *Moral Dan Religi Menurut Durkheim dan Henry Bergson*,. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

- Hasan, H. I. (1967). *Tarikh al-Islami as-Siyasi wa ad-Dini wa as-S#aqafi wa al-Ijtima'i*, cet. 1. Kairo: Maktabah al-Nahdah al-Misriyah.
- Hilmi, A. K. (1975). *As-Salajiqah fi at-Tarikh wa al-Hadarah*, cet. 1 (Kuwait: Dar-al-Buh{us al-'Ilmiyyah, 1975. Kuwait: Dar-al-Buh{us al-'Ilmiyyah.
- Hossein Nasr dan Oliver Leaman. (n.d.). *Routledge History of World Philosophies: History of Islamic Philosophy Part I*, cet. 1. London dan New York: Rotledge.
- Jaya, Y. (1994). *Spiritualisasi Islam Dalam Menumbuhkembangkan Kepribadian Dan kesehatan Mental*. Jakarta: CV. Ruhama.
- Johnson, D. P. (1994). *Teori Sosiologi klasik dan modern I*, terj. Robert MZ Lawang. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Karim, M. R. (1994). *Agama, Modernisasi & Sekularisasi*. Yogyakarta: PT. Tiara Wacana.
- M.M. Sharif, A. (1961). *History of Muslim Philosophy*. Delhi: Low Price Publications.
- Ma'arif, A. S. (1997). "Masalah Pembaruan Pendidikan Islam", Dalam Ahmad Busyairi Dan Azharuddin Sahil, *Tantangan Pendidikan Islam (Yogyakarta: LPM UII, 1997)*. Yogyakarta: LPM UII.
- Madjidi, B. (1997). *Konsep Pendidikan Para Filsuf Muslim*. Yogyakarta: al-AminPress.
- Muh{ammad Khudri Beik. (1970). *Muh{ad}arah Tarikh al-Umam al-Islamiyyah*. Mesir: Maktabah al-Tijariyyah al-Kubra.
- Nakosteen, M. (1996). *Kontribusi Islam atas Dunia Intelektual Barat: Deskripsi Analisis Abad Keemasan Islam*, alih bahasa Joko S Kahhar dan Supriyanto Abdullah, cet. 1. Surabaya: Risalah Gusti.
- Peristiany, J. (1989). "Pengantar" Dalam Emil Durkheim, *Sosiologi Dan Filsafat*, Terj. Soedjono Dirdjosisworo. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Shidiqi, N. (1983). *Pengantar Sejarah Muslim*. Yogyakarta: Nur Cahaya.
- Smith, M. (n.d.). *al-Ghazali The Mystic*. Lahore: Kazi Publication.
- Snarey, J. (n.d.). Moral Education Emile Durkheim Dan Moral Sozialisation Dalam Marvin C, Alkind (Ed). In *Encyclopedi Of Educational Research*. Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Sulaiman, F. H. (1990). *Konsep Pendidikn Akhlak Al-Ghazali Terj. Ahmad Hakim dan Imam Aziz*. Jakarta: P3M.
- William Chang. (1999). Pendidikan Nilai-Nilai Moral. *Kompas*.
- Yahya Jaya. (1994). *Spiritualisasi Islam Dalam Menumbuhkembangkan Kepribadian Dan Kesehatan Mental (Jakarta:CV Ruhama,1994)*. Jakarta: CV Ruhama.