

LEARNING TO PHILOSOPHIZE AS A NECESSARY CONDITION FOR CHANGE IN THE WORLD

ANDREJ ADAM

Ravne na Koroškem School Center, Gimnazija Ravne, Ravne na Koroškem, Slovenia
andrej.adam@guest.arnes.si

In this paper, we start from Marx's eleventh thesis on Feuerbach: "Philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it." We argue that the pursuit of philosophy for such change has become necessary: philosophizing is an essential part of such change because it implies opposition to constant adaptation to the circumstances required by economics. In this light, the work of Rudi Kotnik is part of the effort to bring about such a change. We rank him among the Slovenian pioneers who strived for the teaching of philosophy, where the teaching of philosophizing is at the forefront. However, for this to succeed, we need a more radical change in social and economic circumstances. Without it, philosophizing turns into an interesting didactic game, and the changes in consciousness and behaviour that this game brings are merely fleeting and mostly disappear in time.

DOI

[https://doi.org/
10.18690/um.ff.11.2025.2](https://doi.org/10.18690/um.ff.11.2025.2)

ISBN

978-961-299-082-4

Keywords:

philosophy of education,
didactics of philosophy,
critical thinking,
practice,
goals of philosophizing



University of Maribor Press

DOI
[https://doi.org/
10.18690/um.ff.11.2025.2](https://doi.org/10.18690/um.ff.11.2025.2)

ISBN
978-961-299-082-4

Ključne besede:
filozofija vzgoje,
didaktika filozofije,
kritično mišljenje,
praksa,
cilji filozofiranja

UČENJE FILOZOFIRANJA KOT NUJEN POGOJ SPREMINJANJA SVETA

ANDREJ ADAM

Šolski center Ravne na Koroškem, Gimnazija Ravne, Ravne na Koroškem, Slovenija
andrej.adam@guest.arnes.si

V prispevku izhajamo iz Marxove enajste teze o Feuerbachu: »Filozofi so svet samo različno *interpretirali*; gre pa za to, da ga *spremenimo*.« Trdimo, da je prizadevanje filozofije za takšno spremembo nujno, da je filozofiranje pomemben del takšne spremembe, ker implicira nasprotovanje nenehnega prilagajanja okoliščinam, ki jih zahteva ekonomija. V tej luči je delo Rudija Kotnika del prizadevanja za takšno spremembo. Prav njega uvrščamo med pionirje, ki so si v Sloveniji prizadevali za pouk filozofije, kjer je v ospredju poučevanje filozofiranja. V tem že lahko zaznamo praktični moment, o katerem govori enajsta teza o Feuerbachu. Toda brez korenitejše spremembe družbenih in ekonomskih okoliščin prizadevanje za spremembo učenja filozofije v filozofiranje ne more uspeti. Brez širših sprememb se filozofiranje spremeni v zanimivo didaktično igro, spremembe zavesti in ravnanja, ki jih ta igra prinese, pa so zgolj bežne in vpričo zahtev, ki jih prinaša življenje v danem sistemu, večinoma izginejo.



Univerzitetna založba
Univerze v Mariboru

1 Introduction

This paper will rely on Marx's eleventh thesis to Feuerbach: "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it." We will show that pursuing philosophy for such a change has become necessary. Moreover, we will show that philosophizing is an essential part of such change, for a world in which people do not philosophize but always only adapt to the circumstances brought before by economics can only be a world of barbarism. In this light, the work of Rudi Kotnik – to whom we pay tribute with this paper, is already part of the effort for change that the Enlightenment tradition had in mind. Furthermore, we should classify him among the pioneers who strived for the teaching of philosophy in the Republic of Slovenia under the idea that teaching how to philosophize should be at the forefront instead of merely teaching and studying philosophy.

But if we can already perceive in this the practical moment of which the eleventh thesis to Feuerbach speaks, it must also be said in the same breath that these efforts have remained halfway efforts. Without a broader change, i.e., changes in more general social and economic circumstances, the attempt to change the teaching of philosophy into philosophizing cannot succeed. Without more comprehensive changes, philosophizing just turns into an interesting didactic game – the changes in consciousness and behaviour that this game brings are merely fleeting: in the face of the demands life that in a given system brings, they necessarily disappear.

The system we live in is, of course, capitalist. With the help of Annie Leonard and her *Story of Stuff Project*, we can say that this is a linear system of reproduction of everyday life. The consequence of this system is not only the increasing destruction of the environment and its resources but also that the people themselves are changing into resources and are exposed to destruction. The change of the world thus refers to the evolution of the linear system into sustainably oriented local circuits of the economy and other forms of everyday life. Such an organisation of daily economic life, however, requires people who can organise these circuits, who can cooperate with each other, discuss, and, usually on the grounds of free decisions, integrate into the life of the community. Such people can participate in the life of the community in more direct ways than is customary today. They can take back our government. However, they are only capable of this if they do not learn only philosophy but how to philosophize in schools. In this respect, philosophizing has a fundamental, vital meaning. Nowadays, it appears not only as a possibility but as a

necessity. Moreover, it does not appear as a competence but as a human right and a fundamental condition for the democratic formation of consciousness, i.e., the consciousness of a member of some self-governing circuit or socio-economic cycle.

2 The Allegory of the Cave

Let's start with Plato's allegory of the cave. The essence of this famous allegory is the separation of the educated and uneducated persons. Uneducated persons are presented as prisoners with ties on their necks and legs. Their view (point of view) is limited to the cave's back wall, where they see only the shadows created by the puppeteers behind their backs. Therefore, uneducated people see shadows and believe in shadows (one could also say phantasms, illusions, conjectures, appearances, prejudices, dreams, false news, etc.). It is also said that an uneducated person is unwise, not only because he confuses appearance and reality due to his limitations, but because he gives real power to imitations (appearances, illusions) through his way of life and thinking so that reality itself becomes limited and unwise. It becomes an assumed reality.

What does that mean? In the second book of Plato's *Republic* (Plato, 1997), the literary characters Glaucon and Adeimantus remind Socrates of what the majority thinks about justice (morality). Whoever wants to be happy (thrive) must – according to the majority – create an appearance (i.e., shadows, illusions) of justice (or reputation for justice) while secretly, if he is wise, act unjustly (immorally). When most adopt such behaviour, it is very difficult to act differently. First, most people no longer think of a different course of action. Hypocrisy becomes a form of socialisation. Insofar as we say one thing (we create a false appearance) and do another, we create and always recreate (reproduce) such social conditions in which hypocritical people arise and prosper. Second, when unjust people appropriate the results of our work and undeservedly overtake us, justice becomes exhausting and naive. Adeimantus puts it this way:

“But they tell me that an unjust person, who has secured for himself a reputation for justice, lives the life of god. Since, then, ‘opinion forcibly overcomes truth’ and ‘controls happiness’ as the wise men say, I must surely turn entirely to it. I should create a facade of illusory virtue around me to deceive those who come near, but keep behind it the greedy and crafty fox of the wise Archilochus” (Plato 1997, 365b–c).

Therefore, appearance compels reality, forces even the truth and rules over happiness. From today's point of view, the point of Plato's Allegory of the Cave is perhaps that appearance "forces" social reality – in other words – that it has real effects, reflected in the ever-new production of hypocritical people, people acting solely on presumptions. The fundamental problem of hypocrisy is contradiction, which is structural. Someone who says one thing and does another is in constant conflict with himself. When there are many such people, when they predominate, shadows (assumptions, appearance, illusions, etc.) become the rule and settle into all the subsystems of social life. In what follows, we will address the question of the extent to which philosophy as philosophizing can oppose the dominance and expansion of this appearance with real effects in social life. However, since the appearance itself is real, this confrontation is nothing more than an attempt to change the world.

3 Forcing the truth – an example

To make it easier to understand the logic of forcing the truth, let us mention an example of such forcing, i.e., adapting school systems to the needs of the economy. It manifests itself in many different ways, but here, we only mention the requirement that the number of advertised enrolment places for students should correspond to the future economic needs of society. This logic is utterly self-evident in the minds of decision-makers and also in the minds of most people. Few people think that this is an illusion (bare assumption), which, because it is real and therefore determines the decisions and characters of people, violates the right of future generations to choose their own future.

Therefore, the essence of this illusion or assumption is nothing but the forcing of the truth (reality) and domination over happiness. This perception forces young people to adapt to the competition for advertised study places, but not only to the competition, but to the reality that organises this competition and is almost exclusively regulated by employment opportunities, economic growth, and other economic indicators. In other words, it is self-evident to this logic that people's lives and thinking are dominated by the materialism of petty worries. In this way, students enter the school system as uneducated and leave it as such.

The materialism of petty worries is by no means foreign to Slovenians. In the history of the culture of the Slovenian people, a struggle has been fought since Prešeren's time, which some call a cultural struggle, even though it is a struggle of the issue of petty materialism. Yet we are not reminded of this only by Prešeren, Cankar, Kosovel and other great names of Slovenian culture; this is an ancient, fundamental question of the human spirit. Thus, Christ already said the following famous words in the Gospel of Matthew (6:34): "Therefore do not worry about tomorrow, for tomorrow will worry about itself."

These are the words we can use to connect the phenomenon of petty materialism with the question of spirit and the question of trust. Trust manifests itself as trust in a fellow human being and in the community. If people are connected, if they care for each other, if they live in a well-ordered community, by trusting their fellow human beings, they will trust in society and in the future. They will not be afraid to fail or that they will be left without means of subsistence, because they can be sure that others will not leave them to an unfortunate fate. Petty materialism will not obsess them to the point of allowing it to influence their consciousness.

Trust thus manifests itself not only as a social relationship but also as a psychological characteristic of people, of well-formed, cultured, educated people, those who are no longer prisoners in a cave. Slovenian poet Kosovel would say that it is a characteristic of people who, in themselves, feel the power and superiority of the soul. Their opposites, according to him, are people who are shackled and numb before matter. So they are the prisoners in a cave. So, when Kosovel talks about trust and materialism, he has in mind exactly what Christ had in mind when he said, "Therefore I tell you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat or drink; or about your body, what you will wear. Is not life more than food, and the body more than clothes?" (Matthew, 6:25).

Kosovel's discourse on trust and materialism has always been a critique of enslavement to petty materialism, which he says is "just a feeding trough of slops in which illegal traffickers and speculators /.../ seek food." They are, in fact frightened beings who do not trust other people and the society in which they live. Because they are frightened of scarcity, they manically accumulate material goods, they compete and strive for resources, and so on. The consequence of this is the desire for power and dominance over others, which is also related to the means of subsistence (to deciding on their distribution) and to the distrust of others and fear

of them. Such frightened people, petty materialists, are always worried about tomorrow. Kosovel would say that they are an evacuation of the spirit (as the title of his poem reads): they betray the spirit and kneel helplessly before matter. When they come to positions that require them to manage public funds, they always take care of themselves and their own. This means that they act exactly as educated people should not. The spirit, as a common will or a social bond, is not something sacred to them, it is not a holy or enlightened spirit, it is not a spirit to which we should surrender and thus internally free ourselves from petty worries and selfishness, but a spirit of limited, particular interests that are determined only by petty, materialistic concerns.

In what follows, we will show that petty materialistic concerns and particular interests are a necessary and accompanying (i.e., systemic) phenomenon of capitalism. We could say that if we remember Marx, sociability (the social nature of people) in capitalism manifests itself in a form that opposes sociality itself – it manifests itself in the form of private, particular interests, as a private initiative in the name of profit, and so on.

4 Linear or capitalist system of reproduction and consumption

In one of the videos in her project, *The Story of Stuff*, Annie Leonard describes the capitalist socio-economic order as a linear system. She divides it into five phases: extraction of raw materials, material production, exchange, consumption and waste management. Because Annie Leonard is primarily an ecologist, her linearity is synonymous with (ecological) wastefulness, although she also mentions the equally wasteful exploitation of people. The wasteful treatment of the environment within the framework of the capitalist social order has become a great problem from the point of view of the survival of mankind and, thus, the external frontier of capitalist production. But, if the essence of capitalism is production, economic growth because of profit, then the socio-economic trends that provide profit – cheaper production and greater consumption – are necessary.

Annie Leonard quotes the American analyst Victor Lebovin in her video:

“Our enormously productive economy demands that we make consumption our way of life, that we convert the buying and use of goods into rituals, that we seek our spiritual satisfaction, our ego satisfaction in consumption. /.../ We need things consumed, burned, replaced and discarded at an ever-accelerating rate.”

On this basis, Annie Leonard concludes that consumption and transformation of citizens into consumers are at the heart of a linear (capitalist) system of production. She concludes that we have become a nation of consumers. That this is our primary identity. We measure and demonstrate our values with how much we spend, how much goods we buy and consume.

A similar story to Leonard's is told by Adam Curtis in the first part of the four-part documentary cycle, *Century of Self*, titled "Happiness Machines." He attributes a key role in turning citizens into consumers to Freud's nephew from the US, Edward Bernays. Let's take a look at some highlights from this documentary movie.

Curtis mentions the danger of overproduction. The development of the capitalist economy had an unpleasant consequence, which is the result of competition in the so-called free market: the powerful capitalist machine actually began to produce mountains of consumer goods. At this point, Curtis says:

"America's corporations /.../ had come out of the war rich and powerful, but they had a growing worry. The system of mass production had flourished during the war and now millions of goods were pouring off production lines, that they were frightened of was the danger of overproduction, that there would come a point when people had enough goods and would simply stop buying. Up until that point, the majority of products were still sold to the masses on the basis of need. While the rich had long been used to luxury goods, for the millions of working class Americans most products were still advertised as necessities. Goods like shoes, stockings, even cars were promoted in functional terms, for their durability. The aim of the advertisements was simply to show people the products practical virtues, nothing more. What the corporations realized they had to do was transform the way the majority of Americans thought about products."

Like Leonard, who cites V. Lebov, Curtis cites a representative of the interests of capital:

"One leading Wall Street banker, Paul Mazer of Lehman Brothers, was clear about what was necessary. We must shift America, he wrote, from needs to a desires culture. People must be trained to desire, to want new things even before the old had been entirely consumed. We must shape a new mentality in America. Man's desires must overshadow his needs. Prior to that time there was no American

consumer, there was the American worker. And there was the American owner. And they manufactured, and they saved and they ate what they had to and the people shopped for what they needed. And while the very rich may have bought things they didn't need, most people did not. And Mazer envisioned a break with that, where you would have things that you didn't actually need, but you wanted, as opposed to needed. And the man who would be at the center of changing that mentality for the corporations, was Edward Bernays."

Circumstances related to market competition and innovation have thus produced the phenomenon of consumerism. Even though the possibility of this change was systemically given and may not have been necessary for citizens to start to turn into consumers, the force that would have stopped such a trend at the time was either absent or too weak.

"Bernays' actions fascinated American corporations. /.../ In 1927 an American journalist wrote: A change has come over our democracy, it is called consumptionism. The American citizens first importance to his country is now no longer that of citizen, but that of consumer."

Then, in 1928, a president who agreed with Bernays came to power. President Hoover was the first politician to articulate the idea that consumerism would become the central motor of American life. After he was elected, he told a group of advertisers and public relations men: "You Have taken over the job of creating desire and have transformed people into constantly moving happiness machines. Machines which have become the key to economic progress." What was beginning to emerge in the 1920s was a new idea of how to run mass democracy. At its heart was the consuming self, which not only made the economy work but was also happy and docile and so created a stable society. Bernays had to create a new type of customer.

This side of the negative consequences of capitalism was excellently articulated a generation before Annie Leonard and Adam Curtis by Herbert Marcuse, in his famous book *One Dimensional Man*.

According to Marcuse, as written by Thomas F. Wall in his book *Thinking Critically About Philosophical Problems*, capitalism actually succeeds in always creating new needs, desires, and ways of enjoyment. So, a capitalist consumer society does transform

citizens into consumers. Let us quote an excerpt from Wall's book concerning Marcuse:

"In consumer society, people make and buy things that they really do not need, thus fuelling the economy to create more and more such goods. New technology has allowed for the dramatically increased production of ever new and enticing products. Cars, electrical appliances, computers, fancy clothes, travel, and so on are readily accessible to the masses because they can be cheaply and efficiently produced. In the midst of this plenty, workers no longer feel exploited by capitalism. Instead, they have become a willing part of the system itself. /.../

The trouble with this, for Marcuse, is that workers have come to identify themselves with the products that meet only one dimension of their nature. The materialism that results from the success of capitalism may supply workers with food and clothing, toys and entertainment, /.../ but it leaves the worker's truly essential needs unmet" (Wall, 2001, p. 481–2).

So we are back to the materialism of petty worries. According to Marcuse, the success of capitalist production and consumerism has the consequence that the worker does not decide what is produced. Deciding on crucial issues is still in the possession of the capitalist class:

"What is produced is determined by others – the capitalists. The workers are brainwashed by the media to believe that they really need such items to be happy, all the while putting more and more money into the hands of those who own the means of production. Once again, workers are exploited by the system; only now they don't even know it. Once again, the evils of capitalism have robbed the workers of their very soul; only now they do not even recognize its absence" (Wall, 2001, p. 482).

5 Capitalism and democracy

We may have come to the point where it is worth noting the contradiction to which employees in the capitalist production system are exposed. On the one hand, the compulsion of competition between capitalists leads to innovation and, at the same time, to the accompanying desire of capitalists for the workers they employ to behave ascetically in the workplace and at home. However, because innovation in the capitalist system cannot be curbed (because of the demand for increasing surplus

value and economic growth), this leads to unforeseen but necessary consequences: massive overproduction. This triggers a new wave of worker conditioning: the creation of consumers. The unexpected consequence of this creation is the changing of people's consciousness, the transformation of citizens into consumers, into one-dimensional beings.

The key characteristic for this change, if we return to the allegory of the cave, is the growth of a new subjectivity, which we have said is only a form of unexplored life, a form of sheepishly following the majority, agreeing to contradictory beliefs and contradictory ways of life, living in the name of collective hallucinations, satisfaction with the materialism of petty worries and so on. To this list, we can now add agreeing to change citizens into consumers, the (involuntary) acceptance of transformation into moving machines of happiness, into one-dimensional beings, misidentification of social needs with consumer desires, and above all, passive, lazy, indifferent, and reckless agreement to the very trends of changing consciousness, which is further reflected in the acceptance of uncertainty of everyday life, in the acceptance of guilt for economic failure or for unsuccessful participation in consumption.

The consumer who is acting as a necessary condition for the functioning of capitalism is therefore limited and alienated from what he might be in a better-ordered society. As such, he is exposed to conscious manipulation that deters him from making decisions about his own life, which ruins the will to make such decisions. Such conscious manipulation is precisely Bernays's, who, as Curtis says,

“/.../ by stimulating people's inner desires and then satiating them with consumer products was creating a new way to manage the irrational force of the masses. He called it ‘The engineering of consent’. (For Bernays) Democracy /.../ was a wonderful concept, but /.../ he (did not) felt that all those publics out there had reliable judgment, and that they very easily might vote for the wrong man or want the wrong thing; so that they had to be guided from above. It's enlightened despotism in a sense. You appeal to their desires and unrecognized longings, that sort of thing. That you can tap into their deepest desires or their deepest fears and use that to your own purposes.”

Curtis then continues that in the 1920s, a new idea of running a mass democracy began to emerge. At the very core of this democracy was the consumer self, which not only propelled the economy but was happy and reassured and thus formed a stable society:

“/.../ Bernays /.../ concept of managing the masses takes the idea of democracy and turns it into a palliative, it turns it into giving people some kind of feel good medication that will respond to an immediate pain or immediate yearning, but will not alter the objective circumstances one iota. The idea of democracy at its heart was about changing the relations of power that had governed the world for so long; and Bernays’ concept of democracy was one of maintaining the relations of power, even if it meant that one needed to stimulate the psychological lives of the public. And in fact, in his mind that is what was necessary. That if you can keep stimulating the irrational self then leadership can go on doing what it wants to do.”

All these trends, which form a contradictory context of everyday life that “forces” reality into contradictions, remain unexplored from the point of view of the masses. This also leaves the lives of individuals who, as they grow up, enter into contradictory contexts and accept their blind dictation unexplored. This is mainly due to the lack of social status of critical thinking or because critical thinking is changing into its appearance – we can remind ourselves only of the many school and extracurricular projects that take place in the name of critical thinking, understood as a tool for creating a flexible workforce or tool for adapting to the reality created and determined by economic goals.

Flexibility, for example, is just another name for accepting reality, which is blindly and rapidly changing under the pressure of innovation. But do we have to accept such a reality for granted? Is it self-evident that we want to be flexible? A young person, if he did not receive a quality education, most often simply adopts such and similar notions from his environment: he listens to parents, peers, the media, teachers, and non-governmental organisations. But parents, peers, the media, teachers and non-governmental organisations themselves live in the same contradictory context, of which they are most often unaware of and lack the imagination and will to step out of that context. This shows that the contradictory trends of social reality are already given, and because they are given, they are unconscious. Why are they unconscious? Because the assumptions on which they are based and their consequences remain ill-considered. Namely, trends create

notions (I will attend a critical literacy course so that one day I will be liked by the managers and that I will be a happy, flexible being) that mimic reasonable and conscious reasoning. But would a reasonable worker want to become flexible if it benefits business owners, yet means an uncertain life full of worries about the future for him? Agreeing to flexibility is therefore the result of blindness, the result of limited vision; it is an act characteristic of a prisoner in the cave. Above, we have attributed this blindness precisely to the effects of a contradictory context or contradictory social structure that affects the consciousness of individuals. By turning citizens into consumers (or by creating a lazy consciousness, insofar as laziness manifests itself as unwillingness to analyse contradictory trends), the possibility that we will remain blind to these assumptions is significantly increased. Thus, we get stuck in the life that is given to us: we live happily, except our own lives remain unexplored.

In this way, the circle is closed. People with a new subjectivity do not actually see the truth, do not see the trends and necessities within which goods are produced in the capitalist mode of production, nor do they see how their own consciousnesses (expectations, needs, desires) are produced at the same time. In particular, they do not see the contradictions of the conditioning to which they are exposed; they do not see that reality itself is contradictory because of the necessities of the capitalist system. They do not see this because they are blinded, because they are fighting – like Plato said – for shadows. They don't see this because they live in a world of appearances and believe in those appearances. Namely, the capitalist system itself constantly produces a virtual reality, which as such is shown to people, and at the same time obscures the functioning of the structure (or “grammar”) of the system beyond appearances, which – as we have seen – constantly comes into various contradictions; contradictions of the structure itself.

6 Conclusion: Capitalism, school, and philosophy

According to what was written above, the task of the school and the task of philosophy is to educate people or to change uneducated people into educated ones. Such upbringing has several aspects.

With the vocabulary of authors from the field of critical thinking, the path to shaping educated people is teaching insofar as this differs from instilling beliefs (through indoctrination). Namely, teaching the manner of performing this activity is essential,

and is based on the assumption that students are potentially reasonable persons and that they will accept beliefs on the basis of reasonable reasons. Teaching is, therefore a rational enterprise and, as such, a condition for freedom of spirit.

Harvey Siegel, for example, argues that the goal of teaching (shaping educated people) is to develop critical thinking, defined as an interweaving of skills and aspirations. Such a definition

“/.../ goes far beyond the skills for evaluating claims and basically contains certain dispositions, habits of mind, and character traits. Disposition to think critically – that is, to use appropriate criteria to evaluate claims and actions and also to respect beliefs and actions driven by reason – is perhaps the most important component of critical thinking” (Siegel, 1988, p. 7).

In Siegel’s conceptualisation of critical thinking, this component is characterised by the term “critical spirit,” which refers to a complex of dispositions, attitudes, habits of mind, and character traits. It therefore includes dispositions (e.g., a tendency to seek reasons and evidence in passing judgments or a tendency to careful appraisal of these reasons); attitudes (e.g., respect for truth and respect for the importance of reasoned judgement, but also rejection of bias, arbitrariness, excuses, illusions and everything else that hinders the proper use of reasonable judgement); habits of mind that agree with these dispositions and attitudes (for example, search for reasons, mature reflection on the principles of reasonable assessment, critical investigation of the proposed reasons, and impartial and unselfish assessment of these reasons); and character traits that are consistent with all of that (Siegel, 1997, p. 35–6).

When it comes to educating people, when it comes to turning prisoners from the cave into free citizens, Siegel’s reflection is important. Equally important, in fact, and very similar at key points, is the reflection of the Slovene pioneers (therefore also Rudi Kotnik) on the didactic change from learning philosophy to philosophizing. But at the same time, it is insufficient. It lacks a step that refers to the production of dispositions, attitudes, habits of mind and character traits. Namely, all these will develop not only through individual exercises in critical thinking but also through simultaneous social practice (changing the world) in appropriate collectives. Why do we claim this?

The reason is, as we have seen, simple. Mere exercises in critical thinking or in Socratic discussion can otherwise contribute to an open-hearted search for the best solutions to a given issue. In this, they differ from, if we remember Plato, the sophistic desire to win the debate, the use of arguments to turn citizens into consumers, and so on. But young people, who have shown themselves best in Socratic discussion (critical thinking) during their schooling, who have learned to listen to different points of view and give them priority over their own, if they have proved to be better argued, must sooner or later enter the reality as it is, to the labour market with all the contradictions, some of which we have presented above. Because, as we have seen, that reality (which is contradictory) has the power to force (shape) consciousness, young people, left to their own devices, can hardly resist and maintain the critical spirit acquired in school. Such a spirit can be nurtured only in a context that actually allows that, in a context that actually allows everyone to decide on the rules of living together in society. Such a context presupposes some form of direct democracy and also the possibility of deciding about our economic life. That means that such a context must ensure a reasonable discussion of needs, desires, consumption, and citizenship. If someone else changes our needs into desires, transforms us into consumers or machines of happiness, we have no power over ourselves, and we are not free in the true sense of the word. That is why the public debate on needs and desires should restore freedom in the true sense. The responsibility for training for such public debate must be the goal of public education, which must educate individuals who are able to be free in the true sense of the word. Such individuals are actually able to choose the way of life in a community and to a community (within the limits of previously considered social needs and not artificially created desires).

References

- Curtis, A. (2002). *The Century of Self. Happiness Machines*, ep. 1. [Video]. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DnPmg0R1M04> (2 June 2021)
- Leonard, A. *Story of Stuff Project*. [Video] (2 June 2021) Retrieved: <https://www.storyofstuff.org/>
- Siegel, H. (1988). *Educating Reason: Rationality, Critical Thinking, and Education*. Routledge.
- Siegel, H. (1997). *Rationality Redeemed? Further Dialogues on an Educational Ideal*. Routledge.
- Plato (1997). *Complete Works*. J. Cooper & D. S. Hutchinson (Eds.). Hackett Publishing Company.
- Wall, T. F. (2001). *Thinking Critically about Philosophical Problems*. Wadsworth – Thomas Learning.

