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1. INTRODUCTION

The early nineteen nineties are marked by the collapse of communism. This changes the picture of the world. Before the collapse, there were two world systems, which most Third World countries looked up to and directed themselves toward; namely the democratic capitalism of the West and the totalitarian communism of the East. Now the question is, "Does the collapse of communism prove that the democratic capitalism of the West is the only and the best choice?" If there were only two choices originally, the answer could be "yes." But, the fact is that the survival of democratic capitalism in the West does not prove that it is the best.

The collapse of communism and the growth of democratic movement in some communist countries indicate that more and more people believe that communism is not a viable choice for freedom and prosperity. The collapse of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe shows that people choose democracy over totalitarianism. Even in the last largest communist country, the People's Republic of China, some intellectuals and well-educated people fight for democracy. Democracy has become a symbol of the political freedom that is lacking in communism. Besides political freedom, people in these former communist countries also fight for prosperity. Russia, one of the Republics of the former Soviet Union, tries to achieve
prosperity through a free market economic system. Although the change in economic system in Russia creates confusion among its people, the free market system of capitalism still seems to become the most popular choice among former communist countries. So, for most former communist countries democratic capitalism becomes the choice for their economic and political system.

The next question is, "Is the democratic capitalism of the West really a good choice for former communist and the Third World countries?" To answer this question it is worth seeing what happens in a democratic capitalist country, such as the United States.

The United States, the defender and champion of democratic capitalism is in social crisis. The people have freedom, but it leads to individualism. For example, Robert N. Bellah, in his book Habits of the Heart, argues that American society has become very individualistic. In this society people lose their sense of community and become alienated. Besides the problem of individualism, the equality among American people also seems to be in doubt. The riot in Los Angeles, for example, could be seen as an indication of the lack of equality between black and white. In the economic arena, the United States is the greatest debtor of the world, although in general Americans do not live beneath the poverty line. This picture could make people in the former communist and the Third World countries doubt that democratic capitalism, as it is practised in the United States, is the best and the only choice after all.
The collapse of totalitarian communism in the Eastern block and the social crisis in democratic capitalism of the United States show that these systems are in crisis. Because of the crisis our question should not be "Which one of these two systems should we choose?," but rather "Is there another choice?" Iran, for example, chooses Islam as its ideology. Although many doubt this ideology, the point is that there could be another choice besides communism and capitalism. Third World countries could potentially choose a model which fits their own sociocultural conditions.

Peter L. Berger, the well-known American sociologist, suggests another choice for the Third World, instead of communism or the American capitalism. In his early* work he suggested that the Third World should not duplicate either capitalism or socialism/communism, but rather should seek an open, non-doctrinaire approach. In his later work, Berger forsakes this approach and suggests another choice, namely democratic capitalism. But, the democratic capitalism which Berger suggests for the Third World is not the democratic capitalism of the West or the United States, but democratic capitalism a la Japan and East Asia. Japan and the so-called Four Little Dragons (South Korea, Taiwan, Hongkong, and Singapore) are another kind of democratic capitalism, which Berger calls a "Second Case" capitalism. Berger believes that the "Second Case" capitalism is a better choice for the Third

* The notion of Berger's "early" and "later" thought only refer to his thought on the Third World, not to his sociology of knowledge. There is no change in his sociology of knowledge and his belief on value-freeness of sociology.
Berger comes to this suggestion because he believes that people in Third World countries should have political freedom and equality, and get rid of poverty. Democracy is simply a political system where freedom is guaranteed and governmental power is limited, while capitalism is a means which could improve economic standards. For "Second Case" capitalism these characteristics (freedom and prosperity) are not enough, but should be added to a spirit of communality. This last characteristic differentiates "Second Case" capitalism from the individualistic democratic capitalism of the United States.

Indonesia, a Third World country, is moving toward this "Second Case" capitalism. Japan has become the model for Indonesian development. Berger himself also sees a possibility of Indonesia becoming a new little dragon of Southeast Asia, following Singapore. In this thesis I will examine critically how far Berger's capitalist model could help Indonesia. To do so, I will first outline Berger's basic sociological theory and his development model for the Third World. I will use Indonesia as an empirical example of the capitalist development model (which matches Berger's criteria for a successful Third World country pursuing development) in examining how far this model could help Third World countries.

There are two main reasons why I examine Berger's view. First, his later model of Third World development, as we shall see, matches the development model adopted in Indonesia. Second, Berger
has a solid theoretical ground. This ground gives a good framework to understand and evaluate his own view.

Berger grounds his thought in his sociology of knowledge, so I will begin with exploring this sociology (chapter 2). In this chapter I will discuss Berger's notion of value free sociology and three processes in the sociology of knowledge, namely: institutionalization, legitimation and internalization. Chapter 3 is an exploration of Berger's thinking on the Third World. I will attempt to describe critically his early and later thought. In chapter 4 I will outline Indonesian society. The picture of Indonesia in this chapter will not be a complete picture, since it is just an overview. The emphasis will be on Indonesian society and culture. I will open this chapter by describing the general features of Indonesia, and then I will discuss three cultural layers which form Indonesian culture. Western intervention in Indonesian culture, and the main characteristic of Indonesian society, i.e. its agrarian nature. I will close this chapter by describing the development of Indonesia in the post-colonial era where the main emphasis has been on economic growth. The last chapter will be an analytical one where I attempt to examine

* Berger's ideas are not purely his own, rather they are grounded on the thought of Max Weber and Alfred Schutz. Annette Ahern, in her article "Towards an Academic Praxis in Religious Studies: Berger's Dual-citizenship Approach" (Studies in Religion (Journal), Vol. 20, No. 3, 1991, p 335) points out Weber and Schutz's contributions to Berger's thought. A better explanation of this matter can be found in Robert Wuthnow et. al., Cultural Analysis; The Work of Peter L. Berger, Mary Douglas, Michel Foucault, and Jurgen Habermas (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984) chapter 2. In this thesis I will not discuss Weber and Schutz's views, although they are employed by Berger.
Berger’s thought critically both from his own theoretical framework and from my Christian perspective. First, I will examine, from "empirical evidence," whether capitalism is a better solution for the Third World. I will present the Indonesian experience of pursuing development as empirical evidence. I hope this section will answer the question of how far Berger’s capitalism model could help Indonesia. Second, I will examine how far Berger’s view on value-freeness and on the Third World fit his framework of sociology of knowledge. In other words, I will examine Berger’s view by using his own criteria. Third, I will examine Berger’s sociology of knowledge from a Christian perspective. To do so, I will use some Christian criteria to try to evaluate Berger’s view. I will close this thesis with a conclusion where I will highlight my agreement and disagreement with Berger.

Notes:

2. BERGER'S SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE

Peter Berger is closely associated with the sociology of knowledge. He developed his views in the book he and Thomas Luckmann published in 1966, entitled The Social Construction of Reality. The main thesis of this book is, as the title suggests, that reality is socially constructed. Human beings in their social lives construct the reality around them so that reality is bound to a particular human society. What is real for a particular society in a particular place is not necessarily real for others elsewhere. Consequently, a variety of societies construct a variety of realities.

Berger understands reality from a sociological point of view. Reality for Berger is "a quality appertaining to phenomena that we recognize as having a being independent of our own volition." This kind of definition, Berger believes, is true both for the man on the street, who takes for granted the world he experiences as reality, and for the philosopher, who always asks ultimate questions about reality. For Berger, a sociological understanding of reality "falls somewhere in the middle between that of man in the street and that of the philosopher." Berger's understanding of reality is not at a philosophical level, because sociology cannot achieve this since a sociologist only deals with empirical phenomena, nor can it be at the level of the man in the street, because the reality that this man takes for granted is different
from one society to another. However, Berger's understanding of reality is, in fact, close to the ordinary man in the street. He takes everyday reality as a reality, but with an awareness that this kind of reality is different from one society to another. Berger's sociological understanding of reality deals only with "what is there," without asking "what is beyond there." A sociologist, Berger says, "is forced by the very logic of his discipline to ask,..., whether the difference between the two 'realities' may not be understood in relation to various differences between the two societies."

Human society is an open world. There is no fixed relationship with other human beings in their environment. Human society is different from an animal's world. Berger compares the man-world with the dog-world or the horse-world: "Despite an area of individual learning and accumulation," Berger says, "the individual dog or the individual horse has a largely fixed relationship to its environment, which it shares with all other members of its respective species." For non-human beings there is a biologically fixed character to their relationships even if geographical variation is introduced. "In this sense, all non-human animals, as species and as individuals, live in closed worlds whose structures are predetermined by the biological equipment of the several animal species." "Unlike the other higher mammals, who are born with an essentially completed organism," Berger says in another book, "man is curiously 'unfinished' at birth." Put differently, the human world is not biologically determined. That
is why the human's world is characterized by an openness.

Berger's understanding of human society is dialectical. On the one hand, society is a human product, yet on the other hand, human beings are the product of their societies. These two statements are not contradictory, rather they "reflect the inherently dialectic character of the social phenomenon."* Berger explains this dialectical understanding through three processes, which happen universally in society: institutionalization, legitimation, and internalization.

In this chapter I will outline these three processes, using *The Social Construction of Reality*, as my main source. Before I do so, I will discuss Berger's notion of sociology as a value-free science. This concept is important because it is on this belief that Berger judges social reality.

2.1. Sociology as a Value-Free Science

Berger has employed the concept of value freeness since his earliest work. He believes that value-freeness is very important for a sociologist, because through this approach a sociologist could see "what is there." Through value free research one could eliminate bias from one's work. In other words, value-freeness is the principal character of sociology as a science.

First of all, Berger doesn't say that sociologists have no values. Berger says: "Certainly the statement [sociology is value-free] does not mean that the sociologist has or should have no values."10 As human beings sociologists have their own values.
"In any case," Berger says, "it is just about impossible for a human being to exist without any values at all, though, of course, there can be tremendous variation in the values one may hold." Even, "the sociologist who (after all) is also a living human being, must *not* become value-free. The moment he does, he betrays his humanity and ... transform himself into a ghostly embodiment of abstract science." As human beings sociologists have many values such as the values of their religious groups, the values of their ethnic groups or nations, the values of individual persons etc. "Clearly," says Berger, "in many cases these values will provide the motives by which a sociologist became interested in a particular phenomenon to begin with." The value-freeness has to do with controlling or "bracketing" the values from the society in the work of sociologists.

The only value that sociologists should hold is scientific integrity. Berger believes that all other values -such as religious, ethnic, individual, etc- have to be bracketed. Once sociologists embark on their scientific inquiry, "they must 'bracket' these values as much as possible --not, needless to say, in the sense of giving them up or trying to forget them, but in the sense of controlling the way in which these values might distort the sociological vision." "The bracketing of one's own values implies a systematic openness to the values of others as they are relevant to the situation being studied--even if these values are quite repugnant to oneself...." The failure of bracketing these values means the collapse of scientific enterprise. The work
of a sociologist who fails to bracket these values become "a mirror image of his own hopes and fears, wishes, resentment or other psychic needs." In other words, the scientific enterprise requires value-freeness.

Basically value-freeness is a way of seeing what is there. To clarify this theory Berger uses an analogy of the work of a spy.

In any political or military conflict it is of advantage to capture the information used by the intelligence organs of the opposing side. But this is so only because good intelligence consists of information free of bias. If a spy does his reporting in term of the ideology and ambitions of his superiors, his reports are useless not only to the enemy, if the later should capture them, but also to the spy own side. It has been claimed that one of the weaknesses of the espionage apparatus of totalitarian states is that spies report not what they find but what their superiors want to hear. This, quite evidently, is bad espionage. The good spy reports what is there. Others decide what should be done as a result of his information. The sociologist is a spy in very much the same way. His job is to report as accurately as he can about a certain social terrain.

Good sociologists should be good spies who report what exactly is there, regardless of whether they or others like it. Because of this value-freeness, sociology, Berger says, is "a systematic attempt to see the social world as clearly as possible, to understand it without being swayed by one's own hopes and fears."

The value-freeness of sociology, and of social sciences in general, is important in order to achieve the same objectivity as the natural sciences. The bottom line of this issue is objectivity. Berger believes that the scientific objectivity of sociology depends on its value-freeness. The question here is, "If 'what is there' is socially constructed, so that a human being is
a product of society, how is a value-freeness possible?" Is there any part of a human being that is not a product of society so it could be used as a tool to determine the value-freeness?

Berger doesn't give an explicit answer to this question. There are a couple of indications which could help us to find the answer, however. First, as I mentioned above, value-freeness refers to a freeness from one's "hopes and fears, wishes, resentments or other psychic needs," and it should also be freedom from pleasing one's superior. Second, when Berger summarises his discussion on value-freeness he says: "we agree with the positivists that there is such a thing as scientific objectivity (even if in practice it is often difficult to achieve)."²⁰ In discussions concerning scientific objectivity, which is grounded in the "relevance structures" (the structures that serve as the motives in scientific investigation), Berger refers to the work of the human mind.²¹ Based on these two indications, that value-freeness means free from psychic needs, and it refers to the work of the human mind which is the most important in the positivistic notion of objectivity, I believe that, for Berger, human reason determines the value-freeness. In other words, something is value free if it is free from psychological, social, ideological or any other values, except the value of human reason.

Although Berger acknowledges that the work of human reason is socially constructed, he gives the highest credit to reason in the scientific enterprise. As a scientist, the only value integral to sociological research is reason; but as a human being the
sociologist also has social values. The question here is: "Does a
scientist stop being a human being, who has more than just reason,
while he is doing his scientific work?" In his analogy, Berger
compares a good sociologist with a good spy who reports what is
there, not what his superiors want to hear, but now a sociologist
also seems to have a superior who is to be satisfied and pleased,
namely reason. If the human reason is the superior, it is not
value-free.

I think there is no such value-freeness. A sociologist, in
his dual citizenship*, always carries a particular value; either
the value the "republic of scholars" or the values of his society.
In the "republic of scholars" the three processes of constructing
reality, which I will describe in the next sections, also happen.
Thomas Kuhn23, for example, demonstrates that there are three
steps, which are very similar to Berger's three processes, in
scientific revolution.

According to Kuhn, scientific revolution appears when science
is in a crisis. Clarence Joldersma summarizes: "A crisis, in
Kuhn's scheme, is the rise of the scientist's conviction that the
theory he is working with is defective and is causing him to be
unsuccessful in his problem solving."23 Because of the crisis,
scientists have to abandon the old theory and search for a new

* Berger believes that a sociologist has a peculiar status of
dual citizenship. As a member of society he internalizes the
values from his society, so that the society becomes his "reference
group," while as a social scientist he is a member of a scientific
community, what he calls the "republic of scholars," where the
value of this group becomes his reference.
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theory. Revolutionary science is "the active search by scientists for a new 'current theory'." This is the first step in the revolution, namely the abandonment of the old malfunctioning theory and the search for a new one. If a new one has been found, the second step is that it has to be shared with other scientists. During this time not all scientists agree that the new theory is the proper one; some still hold the old one. But, Kuhn says, "Revolutions close with a total victory for one of the two opposing camps." One of these two theories has to achieve a victory, either the new or the old one. When the victor has been determined the third step is to make it part of scientists' daily lives so the new theory becomes the way in scientific problem solving. These three steps are very similar to Berger's three processes in society. The first step is similar to externalization. This process is like the process of discovering a ten step of constructing matchsticks canoes, which I will discuss in the next section. The second step is similar to objectivation where a subjective reality is institutionalized and legitimated, and then it becomes an objective reality. The third step is similar to internalization where an objective reality becomes a part of individuals consciousness. In the three steps of scientific revolution, as Kuhn describes, science is a social construction of the society of scientists.

2.2. Institutionalization

Since the human world is an open world, not perfectly
programmed and directed, human beings have to produce their own world. Different from animals, the human instinctual structure at birth is unspecialized and undirected toward a species-specific environment. There is no fixed relation between human beings and their environment. Because of this openness Berger says: "Not only has man succeeded in establishing himself over the greater part of the earth's surface, his relationship to the surrounding environment is everywhere very imperfectly structured by his own biological constitution." Consequently, "Man must make a world for himself. The world-building activity of man, therefore, is not a biologically extraneous phenomenon, but the direct consequence of man's biological constitution." Man's biological development happens in a relationship with his environment.

The environment is an important part of human development. Both the natural and human environments give shape to human beings. During the first years of human life an individual is grossly underdeveloped; then the individual develops himself to be a human in an interrelationship with his outside world. "The human organism," says Berger, "is thus still developing biologically while already standing in a relationship to its environment. In other words, the process of becoming man takes place in an interrelationship with an environment." Not only does the natural environment play a role in human development, so does human cultural and social order. Berger argues that "the developing human being not only interrelates with a particular natural environment, but with a specific cultural and social order, which
is mediated to him by the significant others who have charge of him." To put it differently: human organismic and self development is both socially and naturally determined.

In this development human beings also form their world. While a man is developing himself he is also expressing himself through his activities. The process where a man expresses himself into the world is called externalization. Berger defines externalization as "the ongoing outpouring of human being into the world, both in the physical and the mental activity of men." Put differently, externalization is human physical and mental expressions. Through this process human beings form themselves and their society. "As man externalizes himself, he constructs the world into which he externalizes himself." In other words, through externalization a man produces himself and society.

The process of producing himself and society always happens in togetherness, not in solitariness. Berger says:

"Man's self production is always, and of necessity, a social enterprise. Men together produce a human environment, with the totality of its socio-cultural and psychological formations. ... Just as it is impossible for man to develop as man in isolation, so it is impossible for man in isolation to produce a human environment. Solitary human being is being on the animal level (which, of course, man shares with other animals). As soon as one observes phenomena that are specifically human, one enters the realm of the social. Man's specific humanity and his sociality are inextricably intertwined. Homo sapiens is always, and in the same measure, homo socius."

On the one hand, a man becomes himself in his togetherness and in a relation to his environment, on the other hand, a society becomes a society because men live and externalize themselves in their togetherness and in their environment.
An externalization that is repeated frequently in a particular pattern is called habitualization. "All human activity," Berger says, "is subject to habitualization." Habitualization could be repeated again in the future in the same manner. It happens to every person. Someone who constructs a canoe out of matchsticks, say, in ten steps and then repeats it frequently is habitualising his activity. The ten steps of constructing a matchstick canoe becomes a pattern that can be repeated in the future. This pattern becomes his general stock of knowledge which is taken for granted by him as the pattern of constructing matchstick canoes. With this pattern at hand he has narrowed down the way of constructing matchstick canoes from hundreds of possible ways to one. Berger says: "Habitualization provides the direction and the specialization of activity that is lacking in man's biological equipment, thus relieving the accumulation of tensions that result from undirected drives." Habitualization provides a ready-to-use activity.

Habitualization precedes institutionalization, but not all habitualization can be institutionalized. The habitualization of a solitary individual, for example, can not become an institution. Only the habitualized actions that are available to all members of a particular social group could be institutionalized.

Institutionalization is a process where habitualization becomes an institution. It is a process in which routine patterned actions becomes a rule which is taken for granted and shared by a particular social group and then this knowledge is passed to next
generations. Institutionalization requires a reciprocity of actions and the actors. Berger says:

Institutionalization occurs whenever there is a reciprocal typification of habitualized actions by types of actors. Put differently, any such typification is an institution. What must be stressed is the reciprocity of institutional typifications and the typicality of not only the action but also the actors in institutions. The typifications of habitualized actions that constitute institutions are always shared ones. They are available to all members of the particular social group in question, and the institution itself typifies individual actors as well as individual actions. The institution posits that action of type X will be performed by actors of type X. For example, the institution of the law posits that heads shall be chopped off in specific ways under specific circumstances, and that specific types of individuals shall do the chopping (executioners, say, or member of an impure caste, or virgins under a certain age, or those who have been designated by an oracle).33

A habitualized action which has been institutionalized perfectly becomes a rule. As Berger describes it, this is a process from "There we go again" to "This is how these things are done."36 This is so especially if it has been passed to the next generation. Take the matchstick canoe as an example. Imagine B joins A in making matchstick canoes in the ten steps pattern. Every morning both A and B wake up and resume their attempts to construct the canoe. Every time they start on step one of resuming the procedure they may mumble: "There we go again." Time passes by and they have children. The children get the knowledge of the ten steps of constructing matchstick canoes from their parents. The ten steps for the children become the way the canoe is done. Here the institutionalization has historical and control aspects. The historical aspect is that the knowledge is accepted from their
parents, A and B; so, in order to understand the knowledge of this matchstick canoe we should trace it back to A and B, of which it is produced. The control aspect is that the ten steps method becomes the proper way of constructing the canoe; they control the activity in constructing the canoe. For this reason Berger says that institutions imply historicity and control.37

Social reality comes to human beings through institutions. Our externalization is, in one way or another, a duplication of what has been done by older generations. In other words, we inherit the institutional world from the older generation and experience it as an objective reality. To the children, in our example, the ten steps of constructing matchstick canoes is taken as an objective reality. For the children this institution had been there before they were born and it will be there after their death. The institution is a historic reality which is external to them. Since the institutional world exists as an external reality to human beings, it requires legitimation by which it can be explained and justified.

2.3. Legitimation

Legitimation is the way by which the institutional world can be justified and explained. Legitimation informs individuals what things are and what to do and not to do. Legitimation is best described, as Berger says, as a "second-order" objectivation of meaning. It "produces new meanings that serve to integrate the meanings already attached to disparate institutional
In the first phase of institutionalization, legitimation is not necessarily needed. This is so, because the institution is simply a fact that does not need any further support; it is a self-evident. A and B in our example, do not need any explanation and justification of the why and how of the ten steps of constructing matchstick canoes. For A and B the ten step method is simply the way to construct such canoes. The children have to learn about the matchstick canoes and the history behind it. In this phase legitimation is needed. Berger says: "The problem of legitimation inevitably arises when the objectivations of the (now historic) institutional order are to be transmitted to a new generation." For the next generation the unity of history and biography is broken. Legitimation is needed when "the self-evident character of the institutions can no longer be maintained by means of the individual's own recollection and habitualization." Since nothing is self-evident there must be explanations and justifications. Legitimation is the process of explaining and justifying the institutional world.

Legitimation explains the institutional world by ascribing its cognitive validity and justifies it by giving it normative value. "Legitimation 'explains' the institutional order by ascribing cognitive validity to its objectivated meanings. Legitimation justifies the institutional order by giving a normative dignity to its practical imperatives." Legitimation implies both values and knowledge. Berger takes kinship structure as an example:
For example, a kinship structure is not legitimated merely by the ethics of its particular incest taboos. There must first be 'knowledge' of the roles that define both 'right' and 'wrong' actions within the structure. The individual, say, may not marry within his clan. But he must first 'know' himself as a member of this clan. This 'knowledge' comes to him through a tradition that 'explains' what clans are in general and what his clan is in particular. In the legitimation of institutions, knowledge precedes values so that individuals know "why things are what they are" and why he should perform a particular action.

In the process of legitimation, knowledge and values come to individuals at pre-theoretical and theoretical levels. In the first level legitimation explains simple things such as "What things are" or "This is how things are done." In the kinship structure, for example, a child learns that a particular child is his cousin whom he should not marry. This kind of legitimation even comes through vocabulary. The word "cousin" legitimates kinship structure. In this level legitimation is a pre-theoretical one. To a higher level this kind of legitimation is not enough, because when a child grows he will ask the "Why" questions, such as "Why things are what they are?" or "Why this thing should be done in this way?" Higher levels of legitimation answer this kind of question with a "theoretical" legitimation. The second level is a legitimation that contains theoretical propositions in a rudimentary form. Here the legitimation provides pragmatic

" Berger employs the word "theoretical" here to refer to the abstract answers which involve some arguments. The arguments could be found in proverbs, folk tales, etc. This kind of answer is needed when people need more explanations concerning "why things are what they are."
explanations which are directly related to concrete actions. This legitimation takes forms such as proverbs, moral maxims, wise sayings, legends and folk tales. The third level is the legitimation that "contains explicit theories by which an institutional sector is legitimated in term of a differentiated body of knowledge."\textsuperscript{13} In this stage legitimation provides a comprehensive and complex frame of reference for the institutionalized actions. Because of its complexity and specificity it is frequently transmitted through specialized personnel who transmit a specific aspect of it. In our example of the cousin in the kinship structure, there may be someone who elaborates the economic theory of "cousinhood," its rights, obligations etc. The theory of "cousinhood" does not necessarily have pragmatic applications. Here the legitimation "begins to go beyond pragmatic application and to become 'pure theory'."\textsuperscript{44} The fourth level is the legitimation which takes place by means of a symbolic totality that maybe cannot be experienced in everyday life. This legitimation refers to realities outside everyday experience, to the divine world. The incest to marry someone from his clan, for instance, "will attain its ultimate negative sanction as an offence against the divine order of the cosmos and against the divinely established nature of man."\textsuperscript{45} The institutional order, now, is justified by divine order. In this level legitimation reaches an integration between the pragmatic world and the totality of meaning of the universe.

All of these levels of legitimation overlap in our daily
lives. It is possible to distinguish them analytically, but not empirically. The social world becomes an objective reality because human externalization is institutionalized and legitimated. Institutionalization and legitimation are also called objectivation.

2.4. **Internalization**

Internalization is one of what Berger calls the three moments of the ongoing dialectical process of society. We have discussed the other two moments, namely externalization and objectivation (through institutionalization and legitimation). Through externalization and objectivation, on the one hand, human beings produce their social reality. The concept of cousin, for instance, is produced by human beings. On the other hand, through internalization the society produces human beings. Because of these two sides of the process these three moments are in dialectical relation. These three moments are also in ongoing process. They happen at the same time simultaneously.

Internalization is a process whereby objective reality becomes subjective reality. Internalization is a process in which society forms or gives shapes to individual human beings. "Internalization is the appropriation by men of the same reality, transforming it once again from structures of the objective world into structure of subjective consciousness."\(^\text{46}\) In internalization, society acts back to human beings, so that members of society take their social reality to be a part of themselves; part of their consciousness.
Society nurtures its members so that the members become part of the society. In this step objective social reality becomes subjective in human consciousness. In this sense, through internalization, society produces human beings.

An individual is not born as a programmed and directed being in a society. He is born with "a predisposition towards society, and he becomes a member of society. ... The beginning point of this process is internalization: the immediate apprehension or interpretation of an objective event as expressing meaning, that is, as manifestation of another's subjective processes which thereby becomes subjectively meaningful to myself."47 In other word, he learns from significant others to understand his fellowmen and apprehends the world as a meaningful and social reality. The apprehension begins with the individual "taking over" the world in which others already live.

In internalization the individual member of society learns about others and the world. He learns to understand the way others live and the world they live in, so that that world becomes his own. He and they share life and time in their togetherness, not only to share each other, but also to define each other reciprocally. This is an ongoing process where mutual identification happens between him and them. He and they live in the same world and participate in each other's being. In other words, the individual member not only learns or takes over from others, but also shares and gives his own to others.

In this degree the individual has become a member of his
society. In this stage the individual not only internalizes the objective world into himself, but also shares what he has achieved from others with other members of society in the process called socialization.

Berger defines socialization as "the comprehensive and consistent induction of an individual into the objective world of society or a sector of it." In simple words we could say that socialization is a process wherein an individual member of society shares his life with others. This process begins with birth and continues through all of life. The earliest socialization overlaps with internalization, or the socialization happens through internalization. A child who learns from others about the objective world to become a member of society at the same time socializes his being. When the child has grown up and has already become a socialized individual, he enrols into the objective world, or maybe a particular sector, of his society.

The processes of externalization, socialization and internalization happen simultaneously. While an individual externalizes himself he is also involved in the process of socialization and internalization. Through these three processes the individual becomes a member of society, where he is a part of his community. Objectivation happens in the process of socialization.

Because of these processes Berger argues that reality is socially constructed. This construction happens through the processes of externalization, objectivation, and internalization.
In externalization and objectivation human beings construct their reality, so that it becomes an objective reality, while in internalization human beings bring the objective reality into themselves, so that it becomes a subjective reality. Knowledge in society also goes through these three processes. Knowledge concerning a particular thing is discovered in one's externalization and objectified through the processes of institutionalization and legitimation, and then passed on to next generation. These three processes form a circle.

I think Maarten Vrieze is right that these three processes form a closed circle. The problem here is that Berger doesn't deal with the knowledge which comes from outside (a particular) society. There is no room for the knowledge from God, for instance. In this closed circle we could talk about knowledge of God or divine order, but it functions as a justification in the highest level of the process of legitimation. There is no God's norm for society because every society creates its own norms.

In this closed circle, a particular social reality is constructed by a particular society in a particular place and time, and human beings are formed by their society. In this model we cannot suggest that a particular socially constructed reality is a better one than another, because there is no norm to determine which social reality is a better one. For example, what is the norm to say that democratic society is better than an authoritarian one, if there is no norm. This kind of problem exists in Berger's later development model for Third World, as I will discuss shortly.
His early model was a better application of this sociology of knowledge. It was more consistent with this closed circle framework.

Notes:


42. *Ibid*, p. 111.

43. *Ibid*, p. 112.

44. *Ibid*, p. 113.


3. BERGER ON THE THIRD WORLD

Berger is also known as a scholar with concerns about the Third World. His first book which discussed Third World issues was *Pyramids of Sacrifice*, published in 1974. In this book Berger suggested that the Third World, ideologically, should not become capitalist nor socialist. Later, in 1977, he changed his mind. Since then he has argued that democratic capitalism would be a better model for the Third World.

In this chapter I want to explore Berger's early and later thought on the Third World. First, I will discuss his recent thought and then in section two I will attempt to describe the shift of his thought. In the last section I will highlight his concept of democratic capitalism, which he now believes to be a better solution to the problems of the Third World.

3.1. Berger's Understanding of the Third World

The phrase "Third World" has a double meaning. On the one hand the phrase "Third World" refers to a quite different style of politics from either the "American-style capitalism" or (ex) "Soviet-style Communism." But, on the other hand, the phrase

* Although the Soviet Union and its communist system have collapsed I still want to employ it as a model of communism. Also Berger's thought on the Third World dated from before the collapse, so that he compares these two ideologies. The collapse of the Soviet Union and its communism doesn't make any difference in our
"Third World" also refers to a negative image of poor non-Western and non Eastern bloc countries. Berger is aware of these two meanings, and he uses both of them. The early Berger agrees mostly with the first meaning, but later he uses this phrase to refer to poor countries.

In his small book, *Speaking to the Third World*, Berger discusses the phrase "Third World." Although Berger isn't happy with the phrase, he also doesn't want to employ the alternative terms used within the United Nations. He explains his disagreement with the alternatives as follows:

There are alternative terms. Within the United Nations, parlance has shifted from "underdeveloped countries" to "developing" to "less developed," each creating difficulties of its own. There is also the currently fashionable term "South," as in the "North/South dialogue" or "North/South global negotiations" urgently propagated by the Brandt Report and other voices for reform of the international system. This terminology, if nothing else, suffers from geographical absurdity. India is "South" and Australia "North," while the industrial societies of the Soviet bloc are in a never-never land left out of the "dialogue" altogether.

Because of this difficulty Berger doesn't use the terms "underdeveloped, developing and less developed," nor "North-South" division. He is stuck with the phrase "Third World," which he accepts as a political description, rather than scientific language. As a political description this phrase has positive and negative images. Berger says: "The very phrase by now evokes a multitude of images, positive as well as negative."

Originally the phrase "Third World" referred to "a 'third way' discussion about the Third World because some the Third World countries still have a similar leftist articulation.
of development, different from the allegedly flawed models of American-style capitalism and Soviet-style Communism. The use of the phrase has its origin in the early 1950s. In 1955 Sukarno of Indonesia, Nehru of India, and Tito of Yugoslavia sponsored a conference in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia. The conference is known as the "Bandung Conference," (in Indonesia it is known as the "Asia-Africa Conference.") It proclaimed that these new independent countries gathered in Bandung had the right to be independent of the two superpower blocks, namely the United States and the Soviet Union. Berger pictures those countries as "more socialist than the American model and more democratic than the Soviet one--some sort of social democracy, yet not simply a copy of Western models, rather an indigenous construction doing justice to the cultural traditions of the countries first gathered at Bandung."

In its original and positive sense, the phrase "Third World" refers to a new ideology. The new ideology is neither the American nor the Soviet model. For Berger, it is more accurate to call it a "Third World ideology," for there have been two powerful ideologies of the world, namely capitalism and communism. But, until now we don't really know what this new ideology exactly means. We cannot find a precise definition of the "Third World ideology" because the Bandung Conference didn't produce a clear definition, and the Third World countries are diverse among themselves. "If one speaks of a Third World ideology," Berger says, "then one is referring to an 'ideal type'."
This phrase also has a negative image, especially for people in the First World. For Americans, for instance, the "Third World" means poor nations. Berger says: "...when Americans speak to the poorer nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America..., they are indeed addressing the Third World." Another picture of the Third World is "an image of hopelessly corrupt, incompetent, and oppressive regimes, opposed to American purposes and ideals." The Third World is also associated with overcrowded slummy cities in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, such as Calcutta, Lagos, or Mexico City. Economic problems dominate the negative images of the Third World. But the economic was not the main issue in the original concept of the Third World, rather it was ideology; namely that their ideology was different from both American capitalism and Soviet communism.

The Third World countries claim that they want to be independent from both America and the Soviets, but Berger believes that in general the Third World is leftist. He doesn't say that all Third World countries are the same. "Not that the Third World is an ideological monolith. Just as it is diverse in its economic, social, and political realities, so it is diverse ideologically." Some Third World countries are explicitly Marxist states, and some of them explicitly anti-Marxist, especially the states that profess to be religious states and emphatically secular states (such as some countries in the Middle East, or Pakistan, Malaysia, Brunei Darussalam, and Indonesia in Asia). "But one interesting and unifying aspect should be noted: the construction that one may call
the Third World ideology is, broadly speaking, leftist—indeed, in important intellectual respects it depends on elements of Marxist theory—and it is given lip service by states that are anything but leftist in their domestic arrangements. I think Berger is right that broadly speaking the Third World ideology is leftist, especially those of the South and Central America, but it is not so in Asia. The reason why the Third World sounds leftist was because most of the Third World's spokesmen were from the countries where the leftist elements are very strong.

Berger points out a series of propositions as, what he calls, "the common core" of the Third World ideology, as follows:

[1] Development is not just a matter of economic growth. Rather, one can only regard as development those processes of change in which the dynamism of economic growth is harnessed to transcendent social purposes—to the progressive rescue from degrading poverty of masses of people and to a more equitable distribution of benefits of growth.

[2] The causes of Third World poverty must be sought primarily outside the Third World itself—historically in the depredations of colonialism and imperialism, today in the consequences of an unjust international economic system which is heavily weighted in favor of the rich countries of the West (or "North") against the poor countries of the Third World (or "South").

[3] The West owes "compensation" or "reparations" to the Third World for the past act of exploitation. Also the West owes the Third World a redress of the unjust international economic system through a variety of juridical, political, and economic measures. This, in the long run, will be of benefit to all countries, as it will result in a more stable world order.

[4] The establishment of a just international system is a prerequisite for all aspects of development, not only economic but political and human as well. For that reason economic and social rights within the general conception of human rights espoused by the international community.¹⁰

These propositions, Berger argues, are based on "a set of
presuppositions about the nature of the world and they also put
this view of the world into a moral context, a view of what the
world ought to be.\textsuperscript{11} Using Berger's sociology of knowledge, I
would say that these propositions, according to Berger, are rooted
in a certain social construction of reality. This ideology, Berger
believes, is a political instrument, used to legitimate specific
objectives by Third World governments within the United Nations.
The objectives are to secure favorable treatment for Third World
countries in terms of trade and aid, and to enshrine some of the
features of Third World ideology in international law.

In responding these propositions, Berger agrees to that
development is more than just economic growth and the importance of
the protection of human rights. He says:

To the proposition that development is not the same as
economic growth, we can indeed assent. Demurring from the
overemphasis on equality, we can also assent to a definition
of development that includes greater access to a decent life
and institutions for the protection of the human rights of
everyone in society.\textsuperscript{12}

In other words, Berger responds positively only to the first
proposition, but disagrees with the rest because of the fundamental
idea of economic relations.

Berger strongly disagrees with the Third World's model of
economic relations because it is based on what he calls a "zero-sum
game," where the gain of one is necessarily the loss of another
(the second proposition). The Third World claims that the poverty
in the Third World is caused by the West, because the West stole
from the Third World. The claim suggests that the gain in the West
caused the loss in the Third World. Berger says, that "this
exploitation 'model' does not fit the relations between the Third World and the advanced societies of the West either in the past or today."

Berger argues that the thesis that the poverty of the Third World is caused by the colonialism and imperialism of Western countries is questionable. "There is no way in which the affluence of a long list of Western countries, including the United States, can be causally explained by colonial exploitation," says Berger. He believes that the countries that were colonized, such as by Britain and France for instance, got more than the colonial countries. Berger also questions whether the contemporary international economic system is exploitative of Third World countries. Without saying how independent is the Third world from the First World in global economic system, he believes that "the economies of the 'North' are quite independent from the 'South'." The idea of "compensation" or "reparation," (the third proposition) historically, juridically, and morally is spurious and absurd. Moreover Berger does not believe that the gap between the rich and the poor nations is growing, especially between the rich and OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries), and some ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations), countries. Here Berger believes that the poverty of the Third World is not caused by an unjust international system (which is assumed by the fourth proposition). Berger believes that the bias in the Third World statements about development derives from "the fact that many Third World regimes follow some variety of
socialism both in theory and practice, while many others, if not socialist, are heavily statist in their economic system.\(^1\) In other words, Berger believes the claims that the problems in the Third World derive from the West are not true. The truth is, according to Berger, that their problems come from their own political and economic systems.

What Berger wants in economic relations is the equality, in the sense that the West doesn't owe anything to the Third World. In the "compensation" or "reparations" model the relations will not be equal, because the West has to pay what it owes from the past.

My problem with Berger's response is that he doesn't acknowledge how exploitative colonialism and imperialism were. To put it differently, Berger, at least, doesn't prove that colonialism and imperialism do not cause the poverty of Third World countries. In Indonesia, for instance, Indonesians paid for the debt of the Dutch government during World War II through, so called, "cultuur-steisel." (I will discuss this further more in the next chapter) Although I believe that colonialism and imperialism have caused poverty and suffering, I agree with Berger that economic relations cannot be based on the "exploitative" model, in the sense that the West has to pay what it owes during colonial time. The West doesn't have to pay what it received during colonial time.

Berger suggests a model which is better than what the Third World proposition suggests. For Berger the most important thing in a political and economic system is the protection of liberty and
human rights. The protection of liberty and human rights must be the goal for development and be embodied in political and economic institutions. To achieve this goal, a better choice is democratic capitalism, which is the heart of the American ideology. In other words, democratic capitalism should become the model of the Third World.

Democracy and capitalism always come together. Berger claims that there is an empirical correlation between these two elements. There will be no democracy in a non-capitalist system. Berger says:

We do not, at this point, possess a comprehensive theory of capitalism, but one thing we know is the empirical correlation between capitalism and political liberty (as well as the correlation between political liberty and the whole gamut of human rights). That correlation can be stated with great precision: every democracy in the contemporary world has a capitalist economy; no society with a socialist economy is democratic. The fact that a sizable number of countries, all now in the Third World, are capitalist and non-democratic does not negate the correlation between democracy and capitalism, which can be theoretically explicated in terms of the brakes on state power that a private sector tends to produce.17

Berger believes that "the only real revolution going on in the world today is that of democratic capitalism."18

Berger doesn't give any further explanation of the reason why "The fact that a sizable number of countries, ..., are capitalist and non-democratic does not negate the correlation between democracy and capitalism." As I will argue in chapter 5, from the Indonesian "empirical" experience, capitalist economic systems can even lead to authoritarianism.

Why does Berger believe that democratic capitalism is the only
real revolution? The answer is because this system "can credibly promise economic development, political liberty, and respect for the dignity of human beings in their infinite variety." In this point Berger believes that economic development is guaranteed by the capitalist system, and political liberty and respect for the dignity of human beings are guaranteed by democracy. In other words, Berger puts his ultimate trust in the capitalist system for economic development, and in democracy for political liberty and respect for the dignity of human beings.

3.2. The Shift of Berger's Thought on the Third World

What Berger presently says concerning the Third World is very different from the position he developed in his 1974 book *Pyramids of Sacrifice*. He shifts from his *neither capitalism nor socialism* approach to espousing democratic capitalism. He explains the shift briefly in his article "Underdevelopment Revisited."

In his book *Pyramids of Sacrifice* Berger identified two powerful myths of development, which the Third World should avoid. He said: "Two powerful myths affect thought and action on the problem of development--the myth of growth and the myth of revolution." The myth of growth is the heart of the capitalist myth in which the increase of the GNP (Gross National Product) is the condition to overcome the poverty. Berger believed that the myth of growth was even treated as a new "gospel" by the Western tradition. Berger said: "Whoever speaks of economic growth in the Third World today is not just engaging in economics, but is rousing
a whole array of redemptive aspirations, the ultimate content of which is mythic."\textsuperscript{22} The myth of revolution is a simple contradiction of the myth of growth and belongs to the socialist. This myth is predominantly progressive in the Marxist sense, wherein the fulfilment of the liberation of man from his alienation lies in the future, when class struggles have been overcome. The myth of growth involves faith in rationalism, which idealizes choice and control. The standard-bearers of the myth of growth are entrepreneurs and engineers. This myth idealizes rationality, while the myth of revolution represents a quest for redemptive community. Berger commented on these two myths:

\textit{It is possible to conclude, on nonmythological grounds, that capitalism has the better arguments and that what is needed, therefore, is a debunking of the socialist myths in theory as well as in political practice. On the other hand, one might conclude that there are very good reasons, rational as well as moral, for opting for a socialist model of development—in which case its mythic associations can simply be welcomed as a tactical advantage.}\textsuperscript{23}

In other words, each of these myths has its own weakness. That's why Berger wanted to demythologize this mythological approach to development with a pragmatic, non-doctrinaire approach. The Third World countries, in their economic policies, should be independent from the rich countries.\textsuperscript{24} "In other words," Berger said, "the presupposition of development is political sovereignty in the formulation and execution of economic policy."\textsuperscript{25} Further more he said: "I believe that Third World governments will be better off, the more their decisions in this area are determined by pragmatic rather than ideological considerations..."\textsuperscript{26} Berger himself
later summarized his thought concerning this book as follows: "In the service of demythologizing these ideas, the book [Pyramids of Sacrifice] advocated an open, non-doctrinaire approach; neither capitalism nor socialism, it argued, offered a panacea. Each country would have to think through, in pragmatic terms, what its most promising development strategy should be."2 He presented Brazil and China as the clearest examples of these two myths. Brazil represents capitalism, while China represents socialism. He rejected either of these as a model for the development of the Third World. The reason why he rejected both models was because both models, in order to achieve their goals, were willing to sacrifice at least one generation of human beings. Berger said: "Both sets of sacrifice are justified by theories. The theories are delusional and the sacrifices are indefensible. Rejection of both the Brazilian and the Chinese models is the starting point for any morally acceptable development policy."29 Because of this moral criterion Berger proposed neither a capitalist nor socialist approach in order to avoid human sacrifice and the destroying of the values of Third World people.

Berger himself realized that he had changed from his early view. In Speaking to the Third World he gives two reasons why he changed his mind, namely change in the world and change in his own perspective due to his personal experience. He says: "Obviously, Pyramids of Sacrifice is today obsolete, because of the changes that have taken place in the world. But looking back on it now, I am struck as well by the changes that have occurred in my own
perspective."²⁹ The changes bring Berger to a pro-capitalist position.

Berger doesn't give much attention to change in the world as the reason why he changed his mind. Only in Speaking to the Third World does he mention that change in the world as one of the reasons why he changed his mind. In other books he does not mention it at all.³⁰ One reason he does mention is that he did not have any knowledge of East Asian countries. It seems that his knowledge concerning East Asia is the main reason he has changed his mind. This knowledge brought him to the conclusion that "capitalism is the morally safer bet"³¹ as a Third World development model.

When Berger was writing Pyramids of Sacrifice he didn't have much experience with the Third World. "In 1974," he says, "except for one foray into Africa, my acquaintance with the Third World was limited to Latin America; inevitably, this made for a very specific bias."³² But he had become interested in the problems of the Third World back in 1968 when he was serving as a consultant to the steering committee of Clergy and laymen Concerned about Vietnam. The result of this position was that he became interested in American policies in Latin America, "which then looked as a plausible site for future Vietnam-like interventions."³³ Then he travelled in the Caribbean, Venezuela, and Mexico in 1969. In 1969 he taught a course in Mexico, at the Centro Intercultural de Documentacion in Cuernavaca. Based on this experience he wrote Pyramids of Sacrifice.
The experience which contributed to the change in Berger's thought is his experience with East Asia. Berger's first experience with this area was in 1977, and he then turned his attention to it. Berger sees it as a "success story" of capitalism. If he talks about East Asia he refers to Japan, the so-called Four Little Dragons (South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore) and, increasingly, at least some of the countries of ASEAN (besides Singapore)—Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand. Because of his experience with East Asia Berger says: "The experience of East Asia makes it difficult to remain evenhanded as between capitalist and socialist development models." Berger believes that the economic success of these countries are success stories of capitalism which should become a model for Third World development.

The capitalism of East Asia is not exactly the same as capitalism in Western countries. Although capitalism has a close tie to Western countries this doesn't mean that capitalism has only one single pattern. In Third World countries capitalism takes different forms from Western capitalism. That is why Berger believes that in discussion concerning modern capitalism we cannot exclude Third World capitalism. Berger says that Third World countries "constitute a gigantic laboratory, in which different 'models' of capitalist and non-capitalist development have been engineered ever since the breakup of the old colonial empires in the wake of World War II." Berger calls East Asian capitalism "A Second Case" capitalism.
When Berger talks about capitalism he does not talk about capitalism as a theory or ideal type. He argues that his propositions concerning capitalism are grounded in empirical evidence. He says:

..., it is plausible to think of existing economies as located on a continuum between two extreme poles*, which as such do not empirically exist at all. One pole... represents a pure market economy, in which all decisions of production and distribution are determined by market forces. ... The other pole ... represents an economy in which all decisions are determined by political allocation. Neither of these poles exist today.... They are theoretical constructs.

Based on this view if Berger compares two countries he doesn't see that one is capitalist and another is socialist, but one is more capitalist, or more socialist, than another. For Berger the United States is more capitalist than the Soviet Union, North Korea is more socialist than South Korea, Switzerland is more capitalist than Sweden.

Berger defines capitalism as a particular economic system which presents itself empirically in aggregation with other social phenomena. "Empirically," Berger says, "both today and in the past, the capitalist phenomenon appears in aggregation with a multitude of other phenomena." Modern capitalism is linked to technology, new stratification systems, new political systems, and new cultures. Berger says: "All of these elements are intertwined within the economic culture of capitalism, experienced by ordinary

* Berger uses the word "pole" to refer to "ideal type" in Weber's sense. (Berger, The Capitalist Revolution, p. 225)
people as a totality or unity, and often conceptualized as such both by advocates and by critics of capitalism.\textsuperscript{43} This kind of definition brings Berger to the conclusion that East Asian countries are more capitalist than any other Third World countries, although Berger describes East Asian capitalism as "a second case capitalism."

The reason why Berger calls East Asia "second case capitalism" is while their economic systems are capitalistic the state still has a very active role in shaping their development process. Berger says: "They have developed fully modernized industrial economies of a capitalist type."\textsuperscript{42} To achieve this development the state plays a very strong role in directing the development process.

There are three criteria which characterize the East Asian economies as successful Third World societies in pursuing development.\textsuperscript{44} First, they have sustained high economic growth. "They have sustained high growth rates, even during periods of recession (as after the oil shock of the early 1970s)—between 1955 and 1975 from 7.8 percent to 9.5 percent growth in GNP and above 5 percent in per capita GNP."\textsuperscript{45} Second, as the result of high economic growth they have succeeded in eliminating the type of poverty associated with the Third World. The success in eliminating poverty is the result of a good distribution of economic growth. Third, "these societies have developed economies heavily geared toward manufacturing exports."\textsuperscript{46} These three criteria should become the criteria for the development of other
Third World countries.

For Berger, development is a matter of economic growth, a move from economic poverty to a rich and industrialized society. Here he is not consistent with his claim, when he responds to the Third World's propositions, that "To the proposition development is not the same as economic growth, we can indeed assent." Berger emphasizes the material aspect of the term development. He says for ordinary people "Development is the process by which people in the poorer countries are to reach the levels of material life achieved in the countries of advanced industrial capitalism." As a theoretical definition Berger defines it as "a process of ongoing economic growth by which large masses of people are moved from poverty onto an improved material standard of life." Berger uses material standards of living as standards to measure the development. Based on these standards, Berger believes that the better way toward development is capitalism.

He believes that capitalism is not only the better way toward development, but it is also an impetus toward democracy. He argues that socialism cannot lead to democracy, but rather produces a pervasive bureaucratization of the economy and economic inefficiency. Berger's hypothesis is: "If capitalist development is successful in reaching economic growth from which a sizable proportion of the population benefits, pressures toward democracy are likely to appear." Berger believes that in capitalism

* Berger uses the term democracy in a broad sense, namely as a procedure by which governmental power is limited by means of popular participation.
there is a room for people to participate in social and political lives.

3.3. **Democratic Capitalism as a Solution**

It is clear that Berger has changed his mind as to what is better for the Third World. The early Berger suggested neither the capitalist nor the socialist model, but now he explicitly advocates democratic capitalist model. Anton Zijderveid says that Berger suggested his early position because of his religious commitment. With his later position Berger likely wants to shift to a focus on social science. His present work "is emphatically a social-scientific, and not a theological or ethical, enterprise." Here Berger refers to his sociological approach as a value-free science, which, he believes, can be separated from ethical enterprise.

Berger does realize that there is a negative side to Western capitalism. He points out that Western capitalism is closely related to individualism. He doesn't want the Third World to form individualistic societies, like American society. The bourgeois culture of the West produced a type of person marked by individual autonomy. This kind of culture should not be adopted by the Third World. But, some components of the bourgeois culture are still needed, such as "activism, rational innovativeness, and self-discipline." The capitalism Berger wants is a capitalism with the spirit of communality.

In Berger's view capitalism is simply a non state economy
where individuals are free to play in a market system. Capitalism is a system which provides a market situation of opportunities. "Individuals are given relatively free rein to play this market and to reap the benefits of their success." Berger doesn't see an individual's freedom in an economic market as a threat to communality. He is impressed that Chinese young people in Singapore, although in a capitalist society, still take care of the elderly and most people pay serious attention to their community activity. Here Berger points out a capitalism which includes Chinese tradition as a model of capitalism with the spirit of communality. The development of this kind of capitalism should generate economic growth where most of the population benefit. In order to generate growth, the state is allowed to intervene in the economy, but the intervention should not lead to a state monopoly economy. In other words, state intervention is in order to generate opportunities.

Capitalism, Berger believes, could bring pressure toward democracy. Democracy is also meant in a broad sense, namely as a political system where governmental power is limited by means of popular participation, and human rights are respected. Politically, all members of society have equal rights to political liberty. Governmental power will not lead to a tyranny, so that individuals and groups receive protection from acts of tyranny, such as massive terror, arbitrary executions, torture, mass deportations, and forced separation of families. In other words, democracy deals with political power and human rights.
The democratic capitalism that Berger advocates is a capitalist economic system plus a particular kind of society. The *Four Little Dragons* (South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore), that he points out, have a similar cultural root. Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore (where 60% of the population are Chinese) are Chinese societies, while Korea and Japan are related to ancient Chinese culture. Berger is right that these countries are successful in increasing their economic growth through capitalist economic systems. What he doesn't show is whether a capitalist economic system strengthens the communal character of Chinese culture or threatens it, or neither. To put it differently, Berger doesn't show how the mixture of these two socially constructed realities could result in democratic capitalism. A more theoretical question here is, if we mix two or more socially constructed realities which norm should determine good and bad in the society?

Using Berger's definition of democracy as "a procedure by which governmental power is limited by means of popular participation," I doubt that South Korea, where military regime is very strong, and Hong Kong, which is colonized by Britain, fit to this definition. And what will be the result if capitalist economic system meets a non-Chinese culture? In the next chapter I will discuss the capitalist economic system as it meets Indonesian society and culture, one which is not dominated by Chinese culture.
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Indonesia is a big country, in terms of population and area, and it also has rich natural resources and cultural heritage. People have lived in this area since years before Christ. But, as a state, named the Republic of Indonesia, it doesn't have a long historical background. Indonesia got its freedom from Dutch colonialism after World War II.

Since its independence Indonesia has declared that the republic is a united state. Politically, it is a united state: in the sense that it has one constitution, one government, one economic system, one education system, etc. Even before the independence, in 1928, Indonesian independent movement activists declared a pledge to the unification of Indonesia, namely one country, one nation, and one language. This pledge presupposes a plurality of Indonesia, where there were many kingdoms and languages needed to be unified.

Indonesia is a newly united state that consists of a plurality of old societies. It consists of many different ethnic groups* which have their own culture. Every ethnic group forms its own society with its own values system and institution. Often, each

---

* The event is known as *Sumpah Pemuda* (Youth Pledge) in 28 October 1928.

** I am using the word "ethnic" in the sense of a group of people who live in one community with their own language, value system and culture. I prefer to use "ethnic" to "tribe" because the word "tribe" is mostly associated with primitive and uncivilized people.
ethnic group is very different from one another, yet in some cases there are similarities among them. In terms of culture, Indonesia is a pluralistic society.

This unity and diversity forms Indonesian society. The Indonesian national motto, "Bhinneka Tunggal Ika" (Unity in Diversity), reflects and represents Indonesian society. Yet the diversity is far more obvious than the unity, because the diversity is deeply rooted in the long history of every ethnic group, while the unity has been emphasized just since the independence day. Therefore, in order to understand Indonesia, one should understand these two dimensions. In the case of Indonesia, the diversity enriches the society on the one hand, but on the other hand it creates some problems.

In this chapter I will discuss Indonesian society and culture in general. The first part is a description to give a broad picture of Indonesia. I will follow Indonesian scholars who divide Indonesian culture into three layers, the indigenous, Indic/Hindu and Islamic. I will focus not on detail, but on the basic element, i.e. belief. Besides these three layers there is also Western influence, but this has not yet formed another cultural layer. I will close with a discussion of the agrarian character of Indonesian society and its development in post-colonial era.

---

"In this thesis I will use the phrase "Indonesian society" instead of "Indonesian societies" to refer to all ethnics that live in Indonesia and they are united under one state. In other words, Indonesian society is not really one society in the sense that it has one culture, rather a society that contains many societies and cultures."
4.1. Society and Culture

Indonesia, which was known as the Netherlands East Indies before World War II lies south of Malaysia and the Philippines, east of Papua New Guinea, and north of Australia. More exactly, it extends across the equator from 92 degree to 141 degree east longitude, and from longitude 6 degree north to 11 degree south. It is an archipelago, the largest in Southeast Asia. Leslie Palmier says it "forms part of the world's largest archipelago." Indonesia consists of 13,667 big and small islands. About 6,000 of them are inhabited. Among them there are five very large islands; namely Kalimantan (formerly Borneo; one fourth of it -the northern part- belongs to Malaysia and Brunei Darussalam), Sumatra, Irian Jaya (west part of Guinea Island), Sulawesi (also known as Celebes), and Java. The islands stretch from Sabang island, north of Sumatra, to Irian Jaya for a total distance of 3,400 miles. James L. Peacock says: "In Europe the island chain would reach from west of Ireland to east of the Caspian Sea; in the United States, from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific." Its total land and sea area is nearly four million square miles, since the land area covers about 735,000 square miles (about the size of Alaska). "Indeed, the land area of Indonesia is exceeded in all of Asia only by India and Communist China." Indonesia is a big country.

Indonesia is also large in terms of population. It is the fifth most populous country in the world, exceeded only by China, (former) USSR, India and the United States. The population of Indonesia is about 180 millions, and is very unevenly distributed.
Over 50% live in Java, whose area is less than 7% of the total land area. Java is the center of the government, the largest employer in the country, and the center of business activity. While Java is over populated, other islands such as Kalimantan and Irian Jaya, are left empty.

Java is the place where people from all over Indonesia meet each other. But, wherever an Indonesian goes he has a close tie with his home village, the place of his ethnic group and culture. In this case Palmier is right, saying: "Depending on to whom he is speaking, an Indonesian will identify himself usually first by his village, then his ethnic group, and lastly, when meeting a foreigner, his country." The question "Where are you from?" is very common (maybe like the question "What do you do for living?" in North America), so we could treat him properly according to his etiquette and values. For example, you should talk gently to a Javanese, especially if he is from Surakarta or Yogyakarta, but you could speak bluntly to a Bataknese. Everyone identifies himself and is identified with his particular ethnic community. Even in the big cities of Java, everyone is aware of his own ethnic background, the ethnic group where he belongs to.

There are more than 300 ethnic groups, differing considerably in size. Some of them are: Batak and Acehnese in North Sumatra, Minangkabau in Central Sumatra, Javanese in central and East Java, Sundanese in West Java, Maduranese in Madura island, Dayak and Coastal Malays in Kalimantan, Makasarese and Buginese in Sulawesi,
Balinese in Bali, Ambonese in Maluku, Irianese in Irian Jaya, etc." Every ethnic group could be divided into sub-groups (I prefer to call the sub-group although in many cases each of them has its own language, culture and even indigenous religion). For example, Batak (ethnic group) could be divided into Batak Toba, Batak Karo, Batak Simalungun and so on; or Dayak could be divided into Dayak Maanyan, Dayak Ngaju, Dayak Kendayan, Dayak Iban and so on.

Physically, Indonesian people display Mongoloid and Negroid traits. People from Northern Sumatra down to Bali display, so-called Malay racial traits. Their skin color varies from light to dark brown with Mongoloid type of face without the nasal flatness and eye fold. People who live east of Bali (in the Lesser Sunda islands and Maluku islands) display Negroid traits. Their skin color is dark to black with frizzy-haired, suggesting connections with peoples of New Guinea and Melanesia. Historical studies suggest that the Mongoloid traits were probably inherited from the southern Chinese and Indochinese, while the Negroid traits are inherited from Australoid people, who immigrated to Indonesia far before Christ's time.

Each ethnic group has its own language. No one knows exactly
how many languages are spoken in Indonesia." According to Hildred Geertz "Most of the languages belong to a single linguistic family, the Malayo-Polynesian, that is, they share many close cognate words and have highly similar grammatical structure." Although they belong to a single linguistic family, people from different ethnic groups cannot communicate one another with their own languages. For example, not only can the Batakese not communicate with the Javanese in either language, but also the Dayak Maanyan cannot communicate with Dayak Kendayan in either Maanyan or Kendayan language even though they belong to the same ethnic group. After independence, Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian language, which is based on the Malay language spoken in Riau, West Kalimantan and Sumatra) was chosen as the official language of communication in all Indonesia.

The diversity of ethnic groups forms the heterogeneity of Indonesian society. In many cases the diversity is quite extreme. Sometimes people from different ethnic groups cannot get along together. This happens not only because of the diversity of cultures, but also because of different historical backgrounds. The Sundanese (the native of West Java), for example cannot get along very well with the Javanese (the native of Central and East Java). These two ethnic groups have different cultures and values, and belonged to different kingdoms. Once the Javanese king conquered

* Some suggest there are more than 50 languages, while Hildred Geertz puts them into 3 language families with more than two hundred and fifty distinct languages (See: McVey (ed), Indonesia, pp. 24, 28-29)
the Sundanese king and West Java became a conquered territory. This experience continues to hurt the Sundanese, while on the other hand it gives a superior feeling to the Javanese. It is not acceptable for the Sundanese to be led by a Javanese boss: they would rather to have people from other ethnic groups. My point here is that in some cases the different between one ethnic group to another is very strong.

Although all Indonesians have been living together in one country for almost a half of a century they do not mix very well. An Indonesian proverb says: "Lain ladang, lain belalang; lain lubuk, lain ikannya" (Other fields, other locusts; other pools, other fishes). This proverb is a kind of justification of Indonesian cultural diversity, namely they accept the diversity as something usual, but in the diversity they don't want to mix one another. In other words, if you are a locust from another field you could live according to the values of your own field while I'll live according to mine. Every ethnic group tries to preserve its own tradition as long as possible, because betraying one's tradition means betraying his own identity. A Javanese who doesn't live and act according to Javanese tradition is not a Javanese anymore; a Batakinese who doesn't live and act according to Batak culture is not a Batakinese. In many ethnic groups if one does not live according to his tradition it means he doesn't live as a human being, but as an animal, since an animal doesn't have any tradition. A Javanese who doesn't live according to Javanese tradition is called a buffalo, a Dayakinese who doesn't live
according to Dayak tradition is called a dog (for Dayak Kendayan) or a monkey (for Dayak Ngaju and Maanyan). For these societies not only man-world is different from animal-world, as Berger says\textsuperscript{11}, but also a man who doesn't internalize and live according to the culture he belongs to is an animal. This kind of belief, namely that one's humanity is determined by his ethnic culture, makes Indonesians resistant to mixing their own ethnic cultures with others.

The Indonesian government realizes that this diversity could break up Indonesian unity. In order to overcome the possibility of the breaking up of the national unity, the government emphasizes the concept of "national unity" and "national stability." Under the concept of national unity, the Indonesian government promotes the concept of a national culture, where all cultures should be mixed together then form a new culture, called "national culture" (this is a kind of 'melting pot' like the United States). All Indonesians should live under one and the same way of life; even all political parties should have the same ideology. Under the concept of national stability, every difference which could lead to separation should vanish. The motto for national unity is "Menempatkan kepentingan nasional di atas kepentingan pribadi dan golongan" (To put the national interests above individual and group's interests). There are four issues, as the Indonesian government formulates them, that could disturb unity and stability, namely SARA (abbreviation for: Suku, Agama, Ras dan Antar golongan = Ethnicity, Religion, Race, and social group). The issues in the
differences of ethnicity, religion, race and social group cannot be discussed publicly because, according to the Indonesian government, any discussion concerning these differences could easily lead to dissension.

It is true that unity is important, but to emphasize unity over diversity is both unrealistic and dangerous. On the one hand, as Hildred Geertz says, Indonesians "have lived with ethnic diversity for thousands of years."¹² It is not realistic to leave behind one's traditions that has been socialized from generation to generation, while the idea of unity has just come a half of century ago. Also over-emphasizing unity could create an authoritarian government. The government gets the right to oppress any kind of difference for the sake of "unity." In the case of Indonesia, unity means to be one under the government policy. The government becomes a mega-structure which defines the unity.

Most Indonesian scholars divide Indonesian cultures into three cultural layers, namely the indigenous, the Indic or Hindu, and the Islamic.¹³ These three layers co-exist and influence one another throughout Indonesian society. In the case of Indonesia we cannot talk about an indigenous Indonesian culture without admitting the influence of the Indic and Islam culture, nor can we talk about Hindu or Islam without acknowledging the influence of Indonesian indigenous culture.

On top of these three layers came Western intervention, especially from the Dutch. This influence brought Indonesia into
contact with modern culture. In modern Indonesia the three layers and the Western culture influence one another and mix together. The nature of the intervention varies from one place to another.

a. The Indigenous

Indigenous Indonesian culture is a culture rooted in animistic religion. E. B. Taylor defines animism as "a belief in a plurality of spirits and ghosts." Indigenous Indonesian culture believes that spirits live in every creature, animate and inanimate, and give them a "life energy." In this belief, not only human beings have lives, but other creatures as well. Trees, rocks, mountains, rivers, etc have lives. These spirits live among human beings. Consequently, the community of living consists of human beings, animals, inanimate and spiritual beings.

The sense of community is very important in this culture. Human beings live together in mutual relationships with their fellow human beings. In the relation with other fellow human beings, one's business is not exclusively his own business, but it involves the whole community. Alisjahbana says: "Marriage, birth and death were not events which merely concerned individuals. The whole community was deeply involved, and such events were therefore inevitably closely regulated by social conventions." There is no single event where an individual is apart from his fellow men.

One of the manifestations of this community is gotong royong. Gotong royong basically means helping each other voluntarily and spontaneously without expecting anything in return. The main idea
here is that everyone is a part of his community, so the community has the responsibility to support his needs. Since the member of the community is a part of the community, the community should help its members.

The idea of communality is also present in the Indonesian indigenous leadership. The leader of the community is a council of elders: the people who are believed to have wisdom and knowledge from the spirits. Alisjahbana calls this kind of community a "miniature democratic republic." "Their headmen were elected from the descendants of the older branch of the tribe." Alisjahbana says, "and they saw to the needs and interests of the community, assisted by a council of elders. Really important decisions were taken by collective deliberation." The council of elders indicates that the leadership is neither totalitarian nor authoritarian. Decision making processes involve not only the members of the council, but also the people. Darmaputera says: "Musyawarah or consultation is universally practiced in the archipelago almost to every matter. Every member of the meeting is allowed to speak and had the right to be listened to." Furthermore, he says that the role of the leader is "to formulate a compromise in such a way that nobody will feel a winner or a loser."

The involvement of people in the decision making process is important in the indigenous leadership, but the most important thing is a knowledge of the supernatural. Every decision should be based on supernatural knowledge, because this knowledge is "the highest form of knowledge." Supernatural knowledge is a
knowledge from, and of, spirits and cosmic order. All human interests have to be judged by, and submitted to, the supernatural law. This kind of knowledge is possessed by some particular persons, viz, the persons who have wahyu (godly spirit). Due to the fact that the most important thing is supernatural knowledge, the indigenous democracy was not based on a majority, but rather on the judgement of the spirits and the people who possess the godly spirit. Alisjahbana and Darmaputera are right in saying that democracy was part of the indigenous culture only in the sense that all members of the community were involved in decision making process, but people's interest is not the highest concern, because the highest concern is to do the supernatural will. Perhaps it is better to name this "theocratic democracy."

The supernatural beings and other creatures are also a part of the human community. Spirits are very much involved in human life. "Thought and action," Alisjahbana says, are "centred around the question of how to get help from the good spirits and how to avert the influence of those that were mischievous or obstructive." But, the relation between human beings and the spirits is more than just how to use the good spirits and how to avert the bad spirits. The spirits are treated like human beings: they are invited in every community gathering, they are involved in the public decision making process, they get help if they need, etc. The rest of the creation also gets respect from human beings, because they have lives and are part of the whole community. Harming animals and trees means breaking the totality of cosmic harmony. The idea of
community in this culture includes not only human beings, but also other creatures and spirits.

Another characteristic of indigenous Indonesian society is that it was a close society with a stress on kinship. People lived in small scale community, where all members have blood ties to one another. Each community lived independently and was isolated from other communities. The community consisted mostly of people from one ethnic group. The idea that one community consisting of a diversity of cultures was foreign to the indigenous culture. In some community other ethnic groups were seen as enemies. The war among Dayak ethnic groups, for example, ended just in the twentieth century. In Central Kalimantan it was ended in the 1930s, sponsored by the Dayak Evangelical Church; in West Kalimantan all Dayak ethnic groups were united by the Partai Dayak (Dayak Party) just before Indonesia's first General Election in 1955.

To conclude this part I would say that the indigenous culture of Indonesia is a culture where human beings live in a totality, and in mutual relations with fellow human beings, spirits, and other creatures. Although the concept of community is wider than the community among human beings, the concept of fellow human beings was not wide enough. People from other ethnic groups were not included in their concept of fellow human beings, because they lived different culture so they were not human beings. The concept of fellow human being in this culture is bounded by locality.
b. The Indic/Hindu

The coming of Indic culture to Indonesia cannot be separated from Hindu religion. It is hard to say whether the Indic culture came to Indonesia through Hindu religion or *vice versa*. Indic civilization and Hinduism came to Indonesia together.* It was brought by merchants and priests from southern India and influenced Indonesian culture deeply.

Hinduism came to Indonesia in the third century. Darmaputera says that the coming of Hinduism was not as a colonial power which defeated Indonesian culture.

Historians have not come to an agreement on the manner in which the first contact between the Hindus and Indonesian culture was brought about—whether through conquest or peaceful penetration with either commerce or religion as intermediary. What is certain is that there was no Hindu colonization as a result of that encounter.²⁰

At the time of the coming of Indic culture, Indonesian culture was not inferior, so that the contact of these two cultures was not as between inferior and superior. Hinduism was accepted in many parts of Indonesia. Probably it was first accepted by upper class people. It infiltrated Indonesian culture and established itself through ruling elites. There were some great Hindu kingdoms established after the fifth century in Java, Sumatra and Kalimantan. The last and greatest Hindu kingdom was Majapahit which ruled over all the Indonesian archipelago, Malaysia and up to the Philippine.

Through Indic culture Indonesians had contact with the

* I will use the phrase "Indic culture" and "Hindu culture" synonymously.
sanskrit language. Ruling elites spoke their own language and sanskrit. Many sanskrit words can still be found in Indonesian language, especially in Javanese language.

Hinduism also brought the concept of god into Indonesian culture. In the indigenous culture people believe in spirits; good spirits, bad spirits and ancestor spirits, but there was no god. (In Hinduism there are three main gods, namely Brahma, Shiva and Vishnu). It is not clear how the Hindu concept of god influenced the indigenous religion, because contemporary indigenous religion does have the concept of god, or else the ancestor's spirits function as god.

Although Hinduism has never been a popular religion in Indonesia, except in the island of Bali and during the past century in Java, it has influenced Indonesian society. There are two more main influences, namely a dualistic view of life, and social stratification.

In Hinduism human life is divided into two lives, namely life in this world and life after death in Nirvana (heaven). This view derives from a dualistic view of human being; body and soul. Body is lower than soul. Life in this world is not of great worth because it is a bodily life. Life in this world is like, as the Javanese say it, "numpang ngombe" (a stop for having a drink for a moment and then leaving again). In this kind of life a man should unite his soul with the Source of Life (manunggaling gusti), through meditation or asceticism and other spiritual activities. Physical activities do not contribute anything to the unification
of the soul, and in fact physical life, including physical work, is valued less than spiritual life. Through spiritual activities one frees his soul from the prison of his body.

Someone who does physical work is not well respected in society. Peasants, who work with their hands, for example, don't have the same status as other people. This view brought social stratification in Indonesian society, but it is different from the caste system known in Indian Hinduism.

Hinduism in Indonesia has no a strict caste system. In Java, the main distinction is between noble (priyayi) and ordinary people. In Bali there is another class, namely Brahmin, but it refers mostly to one's function in a Hindu temple as a priest. In Central Kalimantan (among Dayak Ngaju), and in Sulawesi (among Torajanese) there was a slave class, but nobody has shown that it has any relation with Hinduism. The influence of Hinduism in social stratification is that it created two classes in society, namely noble and ordinary people. This division happened, I would suggest, not because of Hindu teaching, but because of the establishment of the Hindu kingdoms in Indonesia.

At the time of the coming of Hinduism a king of political reform was needed. Darmaputera says:

The Indonesian local leaders at that time were attempting to build a larger and more stable community beyond the village level, not only to satisfy their natural thirst of power but primarily because their sawah (wet rice field) based society needs continually more wide-spread irrigation network systems, which in turn require stronger and more centralized authority. The Brahmins, with their magic and ritual prestige, were best suited to this task of reform. Under their influenced, kingship was glorified and became a magic, ritual institution. The state became the mundane reflection of the cosmic realm,
and Shiva the guardian and guarantor of that realm. In short, Hinduism was thus accepted partly because it was needed as a cultural vehicle for legitimation of the new form of authority.²²

The reform was from the indigenous "theocratic democracy" to a monarchical system.

The monarchical system places the king as a different person in society. He was identified with the deity and had almost unlimited power. The Keraton (palace) was viewed as the center of the cosmos. The king, along with his families and relatives, became different from any other people. They are different because they are blessed and given the power to rule over other people. They are priyayi, who are the opposite of common people who are characterized as wong cilik (the little and powerless people). This system created a hierarchical society where the priyayi lies on the top of wong cilik.

In this hierarchical society the king controls the society. The king, with the help of his administrators, is in charge in politics, religion, economy, justice system etc. During the era of the Hindu kingdoms in Indonesia the "theocratic democracy" was replaced by an authoritarianism.

This was a great change for Indonesian society, but it did not change the whole society. Hinduism did not swallow the indigenous culture, and never really became a part of popular culture; rather it became a part of elite culture. It is different from Islam, which, as we shall see, was quickly absorbed by the mass.
c. The Islamic

Islam is the most popular religion in Indonesia. Almost all the major world religions are represented in Indonesia, except Judaism, but Islam is the majority. According to the 1980 national census, 88.2 % of the total population were Moslem, while 5.8 % were Protestant, 3% Roman Catholic, 2% Hindu and 1% Buddhist.* Unlike Hinduism, Islam is spread widely all over Indonesia. It spreads from the eastern half of Sumatra, the coast and river valley of Kalimantan, the islands between Sumatra and Kalimantan, south Sulawesi, Gorontalo in North Sulawesi, Ternate, Tidore, Java, Madura, Sumbawa, small pockets on other Nusa Tenggara (Lesser Sunda) islands, and up to Irian Jaya (West Guinea). Islam penetrates all levels of society. It is not just a "religion," in a narrow sense, but a culture, which is known as the Pesisir (coastal) culture.

While the indigenous culture was associated with peasantry, and Indic culture with the elite, Islamic culture is identified with coastal people, because it spread first around the coastal area. The other features of this culture is that it is associated with trading activity and was viewed as opposed to Western colonialism.

Islam came to Indonesia at the beginning of the twelfth century. Like Hinduism, Islam was also brought to Indonesia by

* Since everyone legally has to have either one of these five religions, it could happen that someone who says that he is a Christian never goes to church or a Moslem never goes to the mosque.
Indian traders, especially traders from Gujarat (west coast of the Indian sub-continent) who learned Islam from Persian merchants. The first infiltration of Islam into Indonesian culture was not via Islamization by Moslem priests, but rather through a cultural exchange between the traders and people on the coastal area, where the Indonesian international spice trade activity was. The coastal people who were active in commerce interchanged with Islamic culture around their market activity. In that time Islam was mainly a religion of the merchants. Later, in the nineteenth century, when there was a direct contact with Mecca, Islamic influence increased and it spread deeper into the interior area and touched the peasantry and the nobility.

The Islam which first came to Indonesia had the strong mystical elements of the Sufi sect. Darmaputra says: "Because of these mystical elements, Islam was easily accepted by the Indonesian population, even to the point of being embedded into Javanese syncretism." In the late nineteenth century, under the influence of the Moslem Reformation movement from Egypt (a movement which attempted to purify Islam), there was a movement which attempted to cleanse Islam from its syncretistic and mystical elements, and to educate Moslems in a purer Islamic teaching and practice. One of the manifestation of this movement was the establishment of pesantren (Moslem boarding schools that teach the Qur'an and Moslem doctrine).

Islamic culture is centred around belief in a supernatural being, i.e. god, but this god is different from the supernatural
powers of the indigenous or the Hindu culture. In Islam the separation between god and creatures is very strong. Alisjahbana explains the difference as follow:

One characteristic of Islam that clearly distinguishes it from Hindu is its uncompromising monotheism. In contrast also with Hinduism and the indigenous Indonesian religions, in which animals, human beings and supernatural powers were not sharply separated and could easily be changed into one another, Islam gives Man a special position above the animal and vegetable world. By virtue of his separation from both Allah* and the animal and vegetable worlds, Man is given an opportunity to build his own world guided by his own intelligence. Islam also differs from indigenous Indonesian and Hindu cultures in that it offers an opening for the growth of a body of secular knowledge, autonomous of religious influence, permitting freedom of thought and enquiry. This tendency was fostered by the fact that Islam flourished mainly in the Mediterranean basin and came into an early contact with certain aspects of Greek culture.24

Human beings are different from god, animals and vegetables, but all human beings are the same in front of god.

Since all human beings are the same before god, Islam opposes any caste system and human division that is based on race or social status. This kind of view made Islam a symbol of anti-colonialism during Dutch colonial period in Indonesia.

During Dutch colonialism the native Indonesian people were seen as inferior people. There were three classes in society. The first and highest class was the Dutch and other white European people. They had all the advantages and luxuries of the country,

* Name of God. In North America Allah is always associated with the Moslem's god, but in Indonesia both Moslem and Christian use the same word - Allah. Allah for Moslem is the god who known through the Qur'an and the prophet Muhammad, while for Christians Allah is the God who is known through Jesus Christ and the Bible. In this thesis, except in quotation, I will use "god" to refer to the god of both Moslems and Christians.
and ruled over it. The second class was Chinese. The Chinese were a kind of bridge between the Dutch and native Indonesians. In commerce, for example, the Indonesian were not allowed to have direct contact with the Dutch, but through the Chinese; so Indonesians sold commercial materials to the Chinese and then the Chinese sold them to the Dutch. The native Indonesians were the third and lowest class in society. As the lowest class they had no rights in politics, and they were not even the same before the law.

Islam, which is theoretically against this kind of class structure, attracted native Indonesians in their fight for freedom and equality. The influence of Islam created an Indonesian spirit of nationalism which opposed the Dutch authority. As the result of this spirit there were some religious-based wars against the Dutch, such as the Diponegoro war in Java in 1825, the Padri War in west Sumatra in the 1820s and 1830s, and the Aceh War at the end of the nineteenth century. In the twentieth century Islam formed the basis of the first mass organization of the nationalist movement, named Sarekat Islam. Islam during this time was not only viewed as a religion, but also as a political movement which gave a hope of freedom from Dutch colonialism.

d. Western Intervention

Western intervention in Indonesian society through Dutch colonialism lasted for more than three and a half centuries. Although the intervention was not for a short period, its influence was not strong enough to form a cultural layer, such as the Hindu
and Islam. The reason why it did not penetrate deeply enough in the heart of Indonesian culture was because it came as a colonial power that saw the native people as inferior. Since the Westerners were different, they lived in their own community without real and intensive contact with the Indonesians, so that there was little cultural exchange. Nevertheless there are some influences of Western cultural elements on Indonesian society.

The first contact with Western European people was with the Portuguese in the late fifteenth century. They came to Indonesia for two purposes, namely, to trade and to find a new land for Catholicism. The Portuguese who came to Indonesia were traders, priests and soldiers. They landed on the eastern part of Indonesia, such as Maluku, Ambon, Timor, Ternate and Tidore, which were known as the islands of spices. This Portuguese intervention did not last for a long time, except in East Timor which was colonized by Portugal until 1975, so there is almost no influence left, only some small pockets of Catholicism.

In the sixteenth century the Dutch came. The first Dutch who came to Indonesia, in 1596, were traders. As traders they were not interested in Christianization or spreading the Western culture, because their sole concern was in profitable trade.²² The presence of the Portuguese was seen as a rival by the Dutch. What the Dutch wanted was a monopoly of trade over Indonesia, which they achieved in 1680s. This monopoly then brought the Dutch to the next step; colonialism, where they took over authority in trade, politics and society.
Colonialism was begun through a Dutch trading company. In 1602 under the Dutch parliament's charter the trading company, Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC = the United East India Company) was formed. It was a unique institution because it combined military and political powers with commercial functions. Due to these powers, VOC was not only "responsible for conducting profitable trade in the East, but it could also wage war, build fortresses, administer justice and conclude treaties with Asian rulers in order to achieve this end." In other words, in order to achieve commercial profit VOC could use military and political powers. Seekins gives a small picture about how VOC used its powers to achieve the end. "When the people of the small Banda archipelago south of the Malukus continued to sell nutmeg and mace to British merchants, " Seekins says, "Virtually the entire original population was killed or deported. The islands were repopulated with VOC servants who worked the nutmeg groves with slave labor."

Since the main concern of the Dutch was commercial profit, there were not too many Dutch influences in Indonesian culture. From the first time the Dutch entered Indonesia until the end of the nineteenth century there was no real cultural contacts. Dutch soldiers, traders and administrators lived all over Indonesia, but they lived in their own world. Darmaputra says that during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries "the development of Indonesian culture was practically unaffected by the presence of the Dutch traders." The main concern was not changed when VOC went
bankrupt in 1796 and Indonesia became the "property" of the Dutch government.

In the nineteenth century the presence of the Dutch began to penetrate Indonesian society. The first influence was through the Cultivation System (*cultuur-stelsel*), which was introduced by the General Governor Johannes van den Bosch in 1830. The second influence was through education. The first one only affected the economic sphere, while the second affected through the upper class of society. Education influenced Indonesian society greatly.

Basically the Cultivation System was a system which tried to change Indonesian farming, especially in Java and later in Sumatra, from traditional subsistence to commercial export oriented farming. Seekins says: "It was, in essence, a system in which peasants would be directed to set aside a certain portion of village land for the cultivation of cash crops; the government would decide what these crops would be and would buy them at a fixed price." Instead of planting rice and other fruits and vegetables they needed, the framers were forced to grow the most profitable crops: sugar, coffee, indigo (from which dyes were manufactured), tea, cinnamon, pepper, tobacco, cinchona and cotton. Because of the force of the Dutch (that's why this system is called the "Forced Cultivation System" by Indonesians) much more land and labor were devoted to the growing of these cash crops than for growing rice, which is the main staple for Indonesian people.

The result of this system was very successful for the Dutch, but exploitative for Indonesians. Palmier says:
From the Dutch point of view, it was a roaring success. Between 1831 and 1877 funds from the Indies, as the Dutch called their colony, paid the debts of the Netherlands, the expenses of the war with Belgium, as well as the cost of railways and public works. On average, the Indies contributed nearly half the Dutch annual budget. Perhaps the only benefit it (Java) gained was the introduction of new plants: tea, tobacco, cinnamon, palm-oil, and cinchona (for quinine).30

In other words, as Seekins puts it: "The result was the creation of a genuinely exploitative colonial system in which the wealth of Java was diverted to the Netherlands to support the metropolitan country's own finances and economic development."31 The system exploited Indonesian labor intensive farming for the profit of the Dutch, without significantly increasing Indonesian economic life.

The system also didn't change Indonesian culture. It was a system, as Clifford Geertz sees it, "to keep the natives native and yet get them to produce for world markets."32 The peasants worked in their farms according to their traditional way but they were forced to produce export oriented products. It was a system "in which the holders of capital, the Dutch, regulated selling prices and wages, controlled output, and even dictated the processes of production."33 Culturally, the system did not change Indonesian peasant culture, except it brought suffering, but it helped the Dutch economy. The reason why this system didn't change Indonesian culture was because the Indonesians didn't accept it. For Indonesians it was an exploitative system which had to be avoided.

I think Palmier and Seekins are right that Indonesia did not gain any direct benefit from the system. But, the introduction of
the new plants, as Palmier points out, was not just a matter of introduction of new kinds of plants, rather it was an introduction of a new purpose in farming, namely commercial farming. It was the first time the farmers worked in their rice field for a commercial purpose. This way of farming was not common at that time, since rice fields were just for rice, and rice was not a commercial plant. However this new purpose in farming did not spread rapidly because Indonesians were not accustomed to it and it always reminded them of the Dutch exploitation of human beings.

A deeper influence of Western culture slowly affected Indonesian culture through education. It was the Dutch who for the first time introduced Western education* at the end of the nineteenth century. During the indigenous and Hindu periods there were no formal educational institution. Perhaps pesantren, which was established by Islam, was the first non-Western formal educational institution in Indonesia, but it was limited. Pesantren is only for Moslems and it teaches only religious subject**, i.e. Islam, while Western education teaches liberal knowledge and is open to students in any religion. Western education, which was brought by the Dutch, introduced a new educational system and a new concept of knowledge and brought a change among Indonesians, although its penetration was limited.

The late nineteenth century was the time that some young

---

* Education here refers to its narrow sense, namely schooling.

** Because of the influence of western education, nowadays pesantren teaches its students "non-religious" subjects, such as the latin alphabet, mathematics, etc.
Indonesians had direct contact with Western culture through education. The Dutch government established some schools for non-Europeans. The main purpose of these schools was to train some non-Europeans to become officials of the colonial government or to hold positions in European enterprises, so that they could serve in the civil service or in private economic organizations. Thus, since the very beginning schooling was merely a means to a good job and a high social position in the colonial system. But these schools were not opened to all children of all classes. They were "intended only for the children of Indonesian notables and high officials in the colonial government." Only the children of Indonesian princes and local leaders could get in the schools. The number of these schools was limited. They were situated in larger towns and mostly in Java. Because of these limits, only a very small number of Indonesian tasted Western education. In 1904 only 24 Indonesians were in Secondary Education, and in 1927 the number was up to 6,488. Yet this number was very small compared to the Indonesian population at that time, which was almost a hundred million people.

Although only a very small number of Indonesians had a chance

---

* Before this period there were some Dutch schools, but they were only for Europeans. At the very end of the nineteenth century the Dutch government established some schools for non-European. There were two kinds of non-European schools, one was for Chinese and other far-easterners and the other was for native Indonesians. Academically speaking, the European school was the highest in standard, followed by the school for Chinese and then for the native Indonesian. For example, one who graduated from Medical School for the native called "Dokter Jawa" or Javanese Doctor, was not a real doctor but a vaccinator.
to taste Western education, it had a major influence. First
Indonesians who had graduated from the Dutch government school
established their own school. As a result, a series of schools
organized by the Indonesians themselves began to spring up like
mushrooms alongside of the government schools. The
establishment of Indonesian schools gave more chances for
Indonesians to get an education. Second, the most important
influence of Western education was that it changed the Indonesian
way of life. Education was a gate to enter a new world and a new
way of thinking.

Alisjahbana, one of the first Indonesians who received Western
education, says that Western education brought conflicts and
antagonism, not only between two generations but also between two
ways of life and religions. He tells his own experience as
follows:

These conflicts and antagonism were not confined only to
matters that directly affected the relationships between
children and their parents, or between the individual and the
community; the lines dividing the two generations were carried
over and felt in every aspect of life: ideas of hygiene,
methods of agriculture, theories and practices of bringing up
children, table-manners, household management, indeed any part
of everyday life you care to mention. The conflicts are, of
course, most important and strongest where they touch the
ultimate meaning of life as the sphere of religion. I still
remember how as a very conceited young man, enthralled by the
new knowledge I had just acquired in school -- which in any
case I had not properly assimilated -- I wounded my father
very deeply by not understanding the possible consequences of
my words in such a strained atmosphere. One day, when I was
about twenty-three, I found myself talking to him quite freely
about the theories of the nineteenth century philosophers on
such topics as evolution and the rise and fall of great
religions. My words cut my father to the heart: he understood
that he would never now be able to eradicate these ideas from
his son's mind, and with tears pouring down his face, he said:
"Ah, my son, we are not only divided in this world, but we
shall never meet again in the next. Our Gods are different, and our worlds hereafter will be different.\textsuperscript{37} Indeed, education not only influenced the external way of living but also how Indonesians viewed the world, their lives, and knowledge. Education touches the ultimate meaning of life, the worldview.\textsuperscript{38} For Alisjahbana's father his son is now living in a different social construction, because he has different worldview. Education here creates worldview conflict for the father, but it introduces a new world for Alisjahbana. Because of this influence Raden Ajenq Kartini, for example, began the Indonesian women's emancipation movement. These kinds of influences were viewed as being in conflict with Indonesian society because they brought new values, which were different from what Indonesians had from generation to generation.

4.2. Indonesia as an Agrarian Society

Indonesia is an agrarian society. Before the coming of Hinduism, Islam and Western culture, and up to now, most Indonesians are farmers. Nowadays, more than 60\% of the population are farmers and live in small villages. The coming of the Western culture during the colonial period did not change many Indonesian farming patterns, although the farming pattern which was introduced through \textit{cultuur stelsel} was very different from Indonesian pattern. A radical change from the traditional to a modern farming in Indonesia, is that modern farming is commercially oriented while the traditional one is a subsistence farming. This commercially oriented farming comes to Indonesia latter on in the
post colonial period through Indonesian capitalist economic system.

Most Indonesians are peasants. Basically, farming was not for commercial purpose, but for subsistence. Since farming is to support the family's daily needs, they grew rice (the main staple), vegetables and fruits. All of these were carried out on a small scale, just enough to support the family. In general, the farmers cultivated their own land for their own needs. Some of them now sell a part of the products, but for personal livelihood alone.

Rice was the main plant, so it was planted in a special rice field, and took most parts of the field, while vegetables and fruits were grown around the house. Rice and rice field have a special meaning to most of Indonesian people. In most parts of Indonesia people were not allowed to sell rice, because: first, rice is a special gift from god which people have to take a good care of it, second there is a belief that rice has a spirit (in Java it is named Dewi Sri). A rice field is a place where people show how they take care of god's gift (rice). Someone who doesn't have a rice field is a poor because he doesn't have a place to take care of god's gift and cannot support his family needs. In Indonesian traditional society agriculture is always associated with rice farming.

Geertz divides Indonesian agriculture (rice farming) into two groups, namely wet rice agriculture and swidden agriculture. The first is well irrigated with good water control and yearly cultivated agriculture. The latter is "slash and burn" farming, "in which fields are cleared, farmed for one or more years and then
allowed to return to bush for fallowing, usually eventually to be
recultivated."

The wet rice agriculture, known as sawah, requires good irrigation and terraces, while the swidden agriculture, known as ladang, depends on rain fall and doesn't need a complicated agricultural technique, except the axe. Sawah could be found in northwest, central, and east Java, south Bali, and west Lombok, while ladang could be found in southwest Java and the rest of the islands.

Although these two kinds of farming are in contrast to one another, there is one thing that remains the same, namely the spirit of communality or qotonq royong. Farmers, who live in small villages live and work close to each other. They form their own organization, which is different from one place to another, so they can share the water, do ritual celebrations together, work together and help each other. This spirit ties the farmers together closely with a strong solidarity.

Communality is a major characteristic of Indonesian society, since Indonesian society is basically an agrarian society. The influence of foreign cultures does not totally eliminate this characteristic, but it begins threatening this spirit. In commercial farming, for example, there is no more qotonq royong, where people help each other voluntarily and spontaneously without expecting anything in return. In commercial farming the relationship of people with the owner is a relationship between employer and employees.

Indonesia is a living society, it has changed and is changing
through time. It has been changed by Hinduism, Islam and Western cultures, yet it maintains its indigenity. None of them could totally uproot the indigenous layer. Indeed, in some places the indigenous is relatively untouched. This makes Indonesia a society consisting of a variety of cultures. It ranges from the stone-age culture of the Asmat in Irian Jaya, the nomad of Kubu in interior Sumatra, Hindu in Bali and some parts of Java, Islam in coastal areas, Christian in North Sumatra, Ambon and North Sulawesi, up to the westernized culture of Jakarta and other big cities. Indonesia is a place where old and new meet each other. But, generally speaking, small villages are more indigenous than the bigger ones. Since more than 60% of the population are farmers and live in small villages the peasant character of the society still remains.

Indonesian society and culture in general still remains, but in the post-colonial era a new spirit is blowing in this society, namely capitalism. The state economic policy in this era expresses capitalism. Although this spirit is relatively new, it begins to change the picture of this society.

4.3. Indonesia in the Post-Colonial Era; A New Little Dragon?

The picture of Indonesian society and culture above demonstrates that, while Indonesia is not a democratic capitalist

*I take 1967, when Soeharto was elected as Indonesia's President as the beginning of capitalism era in the post-colonial Indonesia. Concerning the end of colonialism in Indonesia, there are two versions. According to Indonesians the end of colonialism was 1945, when Indonesians proclaimed Indonesian independence, but according to the Dutch the end was 1950 when the Dutch government acknowledged Indonesian independence.
society, in the sense of Berger's model for the Third World, but it is moving toward such a model. At present Indonesia is a capitalistic country with very strong government involvement in every aspect of human life, and a government that also owns the main capital in the country (but now the government has begun to privatize this capital). The Indonesian government and some Indonesian scholars don't want to categorize it as either one, but rather neither one; it has its own ideology, namely Pancasila. I will argue that it is a capitalistic country, in Berger's sense, where economic growth is the main goal for development, and the government is allowed to intervene in economic life, but it is not a democratic one. Compared with Singapore and Japan, for instance, Indonesia is not quite the same, because the role of government is very strong, so that it becomes an authoritarian one. But, it is like Singapore and Japan in their early development; it is a new little dragon.

Becoming a dragon in Indonesian society requires a change. The change is deeper than just economic and political levels. Basically, the change is a change of social reality; a change from one social construction of reality to another. It is a change from a peasant society (which is an objective reality for Indonesians) to another reality which has not yet become an objective reality.

*Pancasila* (pronounced *pancha-sila*; literally means, the five principles) is Indonesian national ideology which is based on the five principles: 1) The profession of religious beliefs; 2) Compassion and respect for human dignity; 3) national unity; 4) Representative government; and 5) Social justice for all citizens. (The translation of Pancasila is quoted from Mubyarto, *Pancasila Economic System ...*, p. 1).
for Indonesians. Using Alisjahbana's father's words, it is a change of world and god. This is a change from a social construction of reality where material things are needed just enough to live our lives to another social construction of reality, where economic growth is the main yardstick to measure development.

Berger says that the *Four Little Dragons* are capitalistic countries, and now Indonesia as a new little dragon is moving toward such capitalism. In order to become a capitalistic country Indonesia uses economic growth as the yardstick for its development.

Originally Indonesian society was not a capitalistic society. The idea of capitalism is something new. It is not inherited as an objective reality by Indonesians, neither it is constructed by Indonesian society. The three cultural layers do not suggest anything about the capitalistic character of this society. The Islamic layer did not bring Indonesia to a capitalistic society, although the Islamic layer is closely associated with trade. Neither did the western influence through the Dutch colonialism bring Indonesia to capitalism. While it is true that the Netherlands itself is a capitalist country and so was its colonial system in Indonesia, Richard Robison is right when he says: "One of the most persistent themes developed by economic historians of Dutch colonialism in Indonesia has been that the penetration of capitalism failed to generate an indigenous capitalist economy or indigenous bourgeoisie." He goes on to say that because of the
"relative weakness of Dutch capitalism itself, the process of capitalist revolution in colonial Indonesia was limited."\(^4\)3 Almost nothing from the past could be related to capitalism.

Besides capitalism being foreign to Indonesian society, there was also a phase when capitalism was seen as something negative. At the end of Sukarno's\(^\ast\) era (from the late fifties to 1965) Indonesia had very close relations with two major communist powers (the Soviet Union and China) and other eastern block countries, such as (former) Yugoslavia. In 1962 the Indonesian Communist Party was the largest communist party outside the Soviet Union and China.\(^4\)4 This condition brought Indonesia to a position against the Western block, which was associated with capitalism and colonialism. Sukarno indoctrinated Indonesians to hate capitalism, and especially America's capitalism. In this phase the Indonesian political system created a negative image about capitalism.

While some Indonesians have been indoctrinated by Sukarno to believe that capitalism was bad, there is also an important cultural aspect of Indonesian society which makes Indonesia deny that it is (or at least is moving toward) a capitalistic country. A basic activity in a capitalist system is to gain profit. Max Weber defines capitalistic economic action as "one which rests on

\(^\ast\) Sukarno was Indonesia's first President. He was elected to this position since Indonesia proclaimed its independence in 1945, and then became a life long President. In September 30, 1965, the Indonesia Communist Party attempted to take over and changed Indonesia to a communist country through a coup, but it was failed by military under the leadership of Soeharto. Sukarno was believed to be behind the coup, so he was "forced" to step down from his position and he gave Soeharto an authority to take his position.
the expectation of profit by the utilization of opportunities for exchange, that is on (formally) peaceful changes of profit."46 Furthermore he explains that "the action is adapted to a systematic utilization of goods or personal services as means of acquisition in such a way that, at the close of business period, the balance of the enterprise in money assets ... exceeds the capital, i.e. the estimated value of the material means of production used for acquisition in exchange."46 A centrally important goal of capitalism is to gain profit in terms of money. In Indonesian culture, however, money and material things are not important. They should even be avoided as far as possible. Material things always conflict with spiritual things, which are the most important. The material things needed are just enough to live our lives, therefore there is no incentive to accumulation. From this point of view we should understand the reason why Indonesian traditional farming, for instance, was not commercial. Farmers cultivated their own land for their own needs, not for selling. Farming and any other human activities were not for the sake of material things, they were not to gain profit.

Indonesia also attempts to preserve the communal peasant character of Indonesian society. In this kind of society the economic aspect of human life is placed in the context of social/communal life. In order to preserve this idea, paragraph 33 of the Indonesian Constitution states that the Indonesian economy is to be organized as a collective effort based on the principle of family co-operation.47 This is based on gotong royong principle
where self-centredness should be avoided and tolerance is important. In Mubyarto’s words, this is a system where “the distribution of resources is far more important than resource allocation.” But this co-operative economic system was in practice never seriously pursued by the Indonesian government. The fact is, in Soeharto’s era Indonesia has moved toward a capitalistic system.

When Soeharto was installed as president, the Indonesian economy was in chaos. Inflation was up to 600% a year, and relations with Western countries were not good. In this situation Soeharto gave priority to economic development, and built new relations with Western countries. With the help of a powerful group of American-educated economists, nicknamed the Berkeley Mafia (because most had been trained at the University of California at Berkeley), Soeharto established a new economic order based on modern capitalist economic theory. By the early 1970s the capitalist revolution has become the dominating social and economic force in Indonesia. Soeharto was successful in overcoming the economic chaos.

The major emphasis in Soeharto’s concept of development is economic growth. Since he became the president until now this emphasis has not changed. In the campaign in the Indonesian General Election in June 1992, the ruling party, Golkar, promised the same thing, namely to increase, or at least to sustain, economic growth. In term of economic growth, Indonesia is one of the success stories of capitalism.
Since the late 1960s the Indonesian economy has grown rapidly. Most economic experts on Indonesia suggest that 1967 was the time when the Indonesian economic income rose significantly. Using Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth Stephen B. Wickman says:

From 1960 through 1967 the real rate of growth of the gross domestic product... averaged less than 2 percent per year; in only one year did it top 5 percent. ... It was not until 1968 that the economy recovered, finally responding to stabilization measures implemented by the new Soeharto government. The GDP growth rate was over 11 percent that year and, as of late 1982, had not dropped below 5 percent.

In terms of the GDP growth Indonesia develops rapidly. Also in terms of GNP (Gross National Product) growth Indonesia grows rapidly. In 1971 Indonesia was a very poor country with US $ 80 per capita income; just above Bangladesh with US $ 70. In a seven year period, by 1977, Indonesia rose almost four times its per capita GNP to US $ 300. The most recent data suggests that Indonesian per capita income in 1991 is US $ 570, with 6.6% economic growth during 1991. Compared to the Sukarno era, which was socialistic, the Soeharto era is more successful. Wickman comments on these two era as follow:

Compared with the Sukarno era, when the emphasis was on revolutionary strategies to eradicate the vestiges of colonialism and to transform the economy into one reflecting the goal of Indonesian socialism, the government [Soeharto's government] has concentrated on pragmatic approaches to increase production and income. ... There has been more willingness to accept private foreign investment and to rely on private, as well as public, enterprise. With each year's budget and every new development plan, the yardstick for government policy has been economic achievement.

Using GDP and GNP as indicators of economic growth, no doubt Indonesian economy has grown rapidly since Soeharto's government
emphasized economic growth as the main goal in development.

In order to achieve this economic growth Indonesia needs capital. In the early years of Soeharto era, especially in the 1970s until the early 1980s when oil price increased, Indonesian income was mostly from oil. In this period about 70% of income was from oil, even in 1982 Indonesia received 82% of its foreign income from the export of oil. Since the oil bonanza is over and Indonesian oil production is less than before, Indonesia can no longer depend on oil. In 1992 the figures went down to 31%. In this situation Indonesia has to find other sources because it still needs capital.

At the present time there are two main sources besides oil. The first source, which is not very popular, is from taxes. The percentage of income from taxes is very small. In 1992, for instance, income from taxes is anticipated to be 15.2% of GDP. I will not discuss this source further more because it has little significance. The second source is private investments.

One of the major sources of private investment in Indonesia is domestic investment. Based on ownership, domestic capital, in general, could be divided into three groups, i.e. the state, Indonesian Chinese, and native Indonesian (pri{	ext{b}}um{	ext{i}}). It is very common in Third World countries that the state is involved in economic life. In Indonesia the state owns and monopolizes most of the important industries, such as oil and other mining. The government, besides running the government administration, also runs business companies, such as oil company, hotels, telephone
Besides the state, the Indonesian Chinese are the second largest domestic investment in Indonesia. The Chinese have had a powerful role in Indonesian economy since Dutch colonialism because they were the economic bridge between the colonists and native Indonesians. Any significant involvement of native Indonesians (*pribumi*) in Indonesian economic life began just in the Soeharto era. But the involvement of native Indonesians tends to be limited to the government leaders' families. Soeharto's family is now the largest native capital holder in the country: his sons, daughters, half-brother, cousin and brother-in-law own a huge number of business enterprises. They have become the native economic elite who control the economy. Adam Schwarz says: "You cannot get involved in an important deal any more if you don't bring in at least one of the [Soeharto's] children."

Domestic investors are encouraged to enter the international market with export-oriented products. On the one hand, in the international market they could sell their products with high prices but produce them with cheap domestic labor. On the other hand, Indonesia has to find another international source of income to replace the income from oil. With a population of 180 million Indonesia is not a small market, but the purchasing power is low. For domestic investors producing exported goods is the main interest. In this export oriented interest, farming, for instance, cannot be rice farming, but rather must be cash crops (like the *cultuur-stelsel*). Or, in the production sector Reebok shoes are manufactured and sold in North American Zellers or Woolco.
Department stores. The main concern in this kind of system is the international market.

In Ungaran, a small town in Central Java about 30 kilometres from my university, there is a garment factory. This factory produces clothing for the North American market. One day my Australian friend went to the factory and bought some shirts for the price of US $2 each. Because the quality and the price are good I asked my friend whether I could buy some, but he told me I couldn't because I am an Indonesian. Because everything produced in the factory is for the North American market, Indonesians are not allowed to buy any of its products. If I were an American or Australian I could buy some, but I am an Indonesian. Even if I were able to buy one I could not wear it, because it's hard to find an Indonesian size shirt. Or if I still wanted to buy one (or a pair of "Made in Indonesia" Reebok shoes) I need to go to Zellers, Woolco, or Woolworth in Canada or the United States, but the price is 5 or 6 times higher than the Ungaran price.

Another source for private investment is foreign investment. This includes joint ventures and government loans. Indonesia is not very attractive for foreign investors because of so many conditions, strict government controls, complicated bureaucracy, and lack of facilities. In the last 25 years, for instance, Indonesia has received US $40.4 billion through joint ventures. Compared to China, which just opened the province of Guangdong

* This price is very cheap for Australians and Americans. But a lower class Indonesian laborer who works in the factory has to work two full days to pay for one of these shirts.
years ago as the centre for foreign investment, Indonesia is
nothing. In order to compete with other Third World countries
and the Eastern block in attracting foreign investment, the
Indonesian government allows for 100% foreign investment since
April 1992, but this is only in some places. The main foreign
source of income is foreign government loans. In 1992, for
instance, almost 45% of development projects are funded from loans.

All of these investments have helped Indonesia to increase its
economic growth. The Indonesian development concept which
emphasises economic growth as the main goal has increased
Indonesian GNP and GDP. If we use the United Nations poverty line
as a yardstick Indonesia is one of the most successful Third World
countries. Schlossstein says: "The percentage of people living
below the poverty line dropped markedly, from 57 percent in 1970 to
less than 40 percent in 1980." Indonesia which was a poor
country during colonial period until the Sukarno era has become a
new little dragon.

The picture of post-colonial Indonesia match Berger's three
criteria which characterize a successful Third World society in
pursuing development. Indonesia has sustained high economic
growth, succeeded in eliminating the type of poverty associated
with the Third World, and developed an economy heavily geared
toward manufacturing exports. In other words, Indonesia is
another success story of capitalism in the East Asia. My question
now is: "How much does it cost the Indonesian people?"
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60. *Tempo*, No. 25, p. 29.

62. See quote no 44 - 46 in chapter 3.
5. WHERE DOES THE DRAGON GO?

In the previous chapters I described Berger's view and Indonesian social reality. I have described Berger's value-free approach to sociology, the three processes of sociology of the knowledge, and his earlier and later view of the Third World. In chapter 4 I described Indonesian society and culture, its agrarian character, and its post-colonial economic development. In this chapter I will attempt pull these strands together.

I will divide my analysis into three main parts. First, I want to test Berger's model of democratic capitalism for the Third World in terms of the Indonesian experience. Berger's earlier view (Pyramids of Sacrifice) advocated an open and non-doctrinaire approach in order to avoid the human costs of both the capitalist and socialist models. My question to his later view is: "Doesn't capitalism cost human sacrifice", as he used to believe?" In discussing this question I will take the Indonesian experience as an empirical example. Second, I will attempt to analyze both Berger's value-free approach and his democratic capitalist model in terms of his sociology of knowledge perspective. In other words, I want to test whether the idea of value-freeness and the model of democratic capitalism are consistent with his sociology of

* Berger employed the term "human sacrifice" in Pyramids of Sacrifice.
knowledge framework. I will use Berger's sociology of knowledge as a tool to analyze his own view, since he claims that his view is grounded on this sociology. Third, I will attempt to criticize Berger's sociology of knowledge by considering a Christian perspective on sociology of knowledge. In this third section I will deal with the question of norms in social reality. I think these three issues are interrelated.

5.1. How Much Does a New Dragon Cost?

At the end of the previous chapter I argued that the post-colonial Indonesia very much matches Berger's three criteria which characterize a successful Third World society pursuing development. I am not saying that Indonesia is the same as Japan. What I am saying is that —using Berger's three criteria— Indonesia, since economic growth is the main emphasis in its development, has become a new little dragon. My question here is "Does this model cost human sacrifice?"

If one tries to count the cost of economic growth in the Third World, there is some truth in the Evangelical left's conclusion that capitalism is an oppressive system.¹ I will argue that in Indonesia it costs the justification of an authoritarian political system with military domination. Economic growth has become an idol under which human sacrifice is justified.

In order to increase, or at least sustain, economic growth Indonesia needs more capital. Indonesia needs to protect the sources of capital that it already has and to attract new
investments, especially foreign investments. This protection and attraction are needed at both the economic and political levels. Before we discuss how economic growth costs people I will discuss what has happened in Indonesian society in the last 25 years development.

Selo Soemardjan, a well-known Indonesian sociologist, sees the result of Indonesian development is imbalance. According to Soemardjan this imbalance is ideological, structural, and geographic. The ideology which emphasizes economic growth leaves other aspects of human life behind. There is no balance between the economic and other aspects. Moreover, other aspects of human life are not only left behind and sacrificed, but they are also put solely in the service of the economic aspect. Soemardjan compares the political and economic aspects saying: "The imbalance between political and economic development, or between the ideals of justice and prosperity, became so serious and the gap between the two sectors so wide that the integration of the entire social system was threatened." What Soemardjan means by structural imbalance is that not all economic sectors are seriously developed. Only the sectors which could earn foreign exchange are seriously developed. When Soemardjan wrote his article the emphasis was tourism, and now it is on non-oil exports. Geographically the last 25 years of Indonesian development is also imbalanced. The development is centred in Java and some parts of Sumatra, while the rest of the country are left behind. Most Indonesian oil (which was the main income source in early development) and the forest
industry, for instance, are from Kalimantan, but Java receives the benefits from the development. These imbalances are the result of a non comprehensive development concept in which the economic aspect rules.

What happens in this kind of society is that people who own capital become an elite class where social power is concentrated. First, they become richer and richer while others stay poor. Just to give a picture of how rich the rich is, an Indonesian student, whose father has a 55% share of a local bank in East Java (which is not the richest one), recently received a Cdn $ 145,000 BMW car from his father. The reason he got the car was because he wanted to quit his school in Toronto and move to the United States, but the father disapproved. So, the car was a kind of bribe. $ 145,000 is a sum which an Indonesian university lecturer cannot dream of it even if he saved for the rest of his life. This picture will become sadder if we compare this family with the people in Lombok in the lesser Sunda island where per capita income is US $ 80 a year. Second, the business elite has social power. The business elite determines what kind of crops should be planted by farmers. Even the school curriculum is adjusted to business needs. This elite wants to change the farmers' way of farming from subsistence farming to commercial farming. The way this class achieves its advantage can be explained by looking at facilities and protection.

In order to create a favorable environment for economic growth some business facilities are needed. Physical facilities, for
example, include such items as office and industrial buildings, communication systems, and electricity. Providing such buildings cost the loss of farm land. It is common knowledge in Indonesia now (especially in Java and some big cities) that Indonesians plant buildings in their rice fields, instead of rice. The farmers are forced to sell their lands for a very cheap price and asked to move to somewhere in the jungle of Kalimantan or Irian and open a new farm. The issue of the Indonesian government and business companies taking over people's lands is a very sensitive issue and became a major topic in the recent Indonesian General Election campaign. To provide a good communication systems Indonesia has acquired an American technology communication satellite, worth billions of dollars, using foreign loans. The satellite is being used by Indonesians for the one channel state-owned television and for telephones which are owned by less than 10% of population. For electricity, Indonesia built dams (which, again, costs the loss of productive farming land), and nuclear power (which increases Indonesian debt). In providing these facilities the government creates unemployment and poverty. The number of landless farmers increases every year. The farmers who traditionally fed their families from their lands have no land anymore and cannot depend on their income from farming.7 Unemployment also increases*, even though the birth rate is the lowest in Indonesian history. Concerning the problems of unemployment and poverty, Wickman puts it as follows:

Indonesia's unemployment and poverty problems have remained enormous. Despite the obvious signs of economic development,
much of the population continued to live at the bare subsistence level, especially in rural Java. Employment prospects for these often landless farmers depended upon a vast array of programs and projects. Although sizable public works programs have helped alleviate some problems, aspect of industrial policy that favored capital-intensive industry did little to help the poor.  

These physical facilities can be linked to problems of unemployment and poverty, but the problems become worse because Indonesia has also to provide political stability in order to protect business interests.

Political stability is an important condition in increasing economic growth. It is important not only to protect business activities, but also to attract foreign investments. In Indonesia, and most Third World countries, achieving stability is a large problem.

There are two reasons why political stability is a big problem in Indonesia. First, Indonesia consists of so many different ethnic groups and cultures, while the idea of plurality is not very popular. Second, Indonesian development is imbalanced so that it creates gaps, such as the gaps between the rich and the poor, urban and rural, Java and outer islands, native Indonesian and Chinese Indonesian (who own most of the private capital). These gaps result in social jealousy. This jealousy has not created civil war, but it has created rioting several times. It is possible that these two reasons could bring Indonesia into civil war and tear the country apart. One way to achieve political stability in this kind of society is through military power, but this creates another problem, namely authoritarianism.
In the Soeharto era Indonesia has become a militarized country. Most, if not all, (especially non-Indonesian) experts in Indonesian politics agree that the Soeharto government is a military regime. Andrew MacIntyre, for instance, says: "The New Order [another name for the Soeharto era], then has been a military-based regime with a developmentalist orientation that has been characterised by a high level of state control over politics and policy."\(^8\) The reason for the militarization is to secure economic growth, because, as Schlossstein puts it, it is "a necessary (but insufficient) condition for economic takeoff."\(^9\)

In Indonesia, the military not only engages in military tasks, but also in political and social activities. The military functions beyond military tasks, because its mission is defined as "ensuring internal security and political stability so that political and economic development could proceed uninterrupted."\(^10\) This concept is known as "\textit{dwi fungsi}" (dual function).

With this dual function, military personnel could become leaders everywhere in the country. As a political power, the military has representatives in parliament and gets many high political positions, such as ministers, governors etc. Soeharto himself is a general and his successor will be a military person as well. Besides these political positions the military is also involved in social life. It is very common that a state university president or the president director of a state-owned bank or state business enterprise is a general. For the Indonesian government
the military has become a main lever to achieve economic growth.

With support from the military, state power is very strong. The state interests are seen as the national interests. In the state's interests the military and business sectors are the main concerns. According to Benedict Anderson's analysis "Policy is a reflection of the state's interests, rather than of those of any extra-state class or group, with the partial exception of foreign capital." Extra-state participation is very little, and participation is allowed only insofar as it supports the state policy. In this sense the state has become authoritarian.

The present situation is not, in Berger's sense, a democratic one, and I doubt that it will lead to a democratic political system in near future. MacIntyre says:

There are several basic reasons for doubting that Indonesia will move towards democracy in a conventional sense of the word; that is, involving as minimal conditions a regularised system providing for election of an alternative political leadership on the basis of free and competitive elections."

MacIntyre gives three basic reasons: 1) the military appears to be actively seeking to preserve its position and ensure that it is not gradually eased from the centre of power. 2) Indonesia is not far from a de facto one-party political system where the two other parties (besides Golkar, the ruling party) are presently incapable of providing an alternative. 3) There is currently no coalition of "opposition" civilian groups which carries great weight. These three elements, I would argue, are intertwined with one another and are a result of an authoritarian system. The military-based government established the Golkar party whose traditional members
are civil servants (which is the largest organization in the country) and their families. *Golkar*, just with its traditional members, is the largest party; imagine what kind of coalition could defeat the coalition of *Golkar* and military representatives in the parliament? This is not to mention that "opposition" is not allowed in this country. I think this kind of picture doesn't fit to Berger's theory that capitalism will bring democracy. What happens here is that capitalism tends to require authoritarian regime to maintain political stability which is an important condition for economic growth.

Theoretically Indonesia has the institutions which are required in a democratic country. It has a parliament, general elections, labor unions, political parties, and courts of justice, but they do not function as they function in Western countries. They function principally as indicators to international society that Indonesia is a "democratic" country. The reason for this is that Indonesia needs foreign aid from the West and Japan, and the main condition for the aid is that the receiver is "democratic." Recently aid comes with additional conditions, such as respect for human rights and environment care. What the donor countries do not know is whether recipient countries have ideas of democracy, human rights or environmental care; or, if they do, their views about these ideas are different from those donor countries. Democracy in traditional Indonesian society, for instance, is different from democracy in the liberal tradition where individual rights are the most important thing. Forcing the liberal concept of democracy on
Indonesian society would change Indonesian values and societal structures.

Now, how much does a new dragon cost? It costs traditional values, (such as: gotong royong, peasant values and theocratic democracy), and human sacrifice (where people have to give up their lives in order to provide business facilities and political stability). The reason why this cost is so high is because the ideology of capitalism is not an objective reality for Indonesians, it is not inherited from the three cultural layers, neither is from its peasant culture. This situation is like someone who used to construct matchstick canoes with the ten step pattern and then wants to change it into, say, a five step pattern. In order to do so, first he has to leave his knowledge and skills about the ten step behind, and then he has to begin to habitualize the five step pattern. This change of pattern of constructing matchstick canoes means sacrificing traditional knowledge and skills, and beginning to objectivize a new reality. This cost was exactly what Berger tried to avoid in his early thinking in Pyramids, where he believed that "Capitalist development imposes severe human costs." The economic growth approach doesn't bring Indonesia to a democracy, rather it introduces another social reality. The Indonesian capitalist economic system has cost human sacrifice (as what Berger used to believe), development imbalance, and an authoritarian government.
5.2. Development from the Perspective of the Sociology of Knowledge

From the Indonesian experience, capitalist economic system, which Berger believes to be a better solution for the Third World, doesn't seem to work in liberating people from authoritarian system and respecting human rights to live in a meaningful world. The Indonesian capitalist approach is only successful in increasing GNP. Although the later Berger's model doesn't work fully, yet his concern for economic development, political liberty and respect for human dignity is very important when we deal with the development of the Third world. I agree with him that economic growth is one of the most important aspects in the development of the Third World, because poverty and hunger are real phenomena which are faced there. Economic growth should overcome poverty and hunger because these are not signs of God's good creation. But, if we take economic growth as the most important aspect of development, it becomes an idol. If we separate economic growth from other aspects of human life it will turn human beings into economic animals. In our approach, as the early Berger said, we should not only say "No to children living in garbage, no to exploitation and hunger, no to terror and totalitarianism," but also "no to anomie and the mindless destruction of human meanings." In other words, we cannot overcome the poverty and hunger by throwing people into meaningless lives where they are alienated from their constructed reality. The early Berger realized that the capitalist approach could not say no to all of these terrible situations, but why did he change his mind, and which approach is more consistent
to his sociology of knowledge theory?

As a sociologist, Berger interprets social reality. He deals with what is in society, so that empirical evidence is very important. Wuthnow et al. describe Berger's approach as phenomenological. From this perspective, it's understandable why Berger abandoned his early view. There was no empirical evidence for what he suggested in *Pyramids*. The economic and political system which he suggested in *Pyramids* did not exist.

For Berger, the systems which exist are capitalism and socialism. If a society is not capitalist it must be socialist, or one is more capitalist than another. This way of thinking also brings Berger to the judgement that massive terror, arbitrary executions, torture, mass deportations, and forced separation of families belong to socialism because capitalism gives limits to governmental power. Theoretically, it could be true, but in fact some of these actions happen in Indonesia not because of socialism, but because of economic growth. The government, under the name of development, is allowed to do many things which are outside of the limits of governmental power, such as terrorize the farmers who don't want to give up their farm lands for building dams for electricity or any other business facilities. But, because these brutal actions theoretically could be justified by socialism, it is socialism that is blamed. I think this brutal action could exist in any system. To say that it only happens in socialist systems is not true. The reason why Berger blames socialism is because he believes there are only two systems exist; so if brutal actions, which theoretically
could not be justified by capitalism, happen it must be caused by socialism, because there is no more other choice. This kind of approach makes it difficult for a sociologist to deal with something outside of empirical reality.

There is no room for an eschatological perspective or dreaming in an empirical approach. Consequently, we cannot transform a society toward a model that has not yet existed or been objectivized. What we could do is simply duplicate another social reality. Because the Kingdom of God doesn't empirically exist, we cannot transform human society toward it. But because the Bible tells us to live according to the norms of the Kingdom then we tend to identify it with one of the systems that empirically exists. For example, one of the characteristic of the Kingdom is justice. To implement justice in our society we choose a more just societal system that has been constructed and then identify the Kingdom with this system. This is the weakness of an empirical approach, namely it sticks with what is "out there," not beyond. In other words, we choose one among social realities that have been constructed by a particular society, not try to construct a new one.

With this empirical approach Berger wants to be faithful to the idea of value-free sociology, but he is not. First, his suggestion of democratic capitalism is not value-free because the yardstick for successful development is economic growth. The assumption here is that richer is better, the successful career is the career that makes much money. Second, in Berger's sociology of knowledge framework it is impossible to have a value-free approach.
In Berger's sociology of knowledge there are three dialectical processes, namely externalization, objectivation (through institutionalization and legitimation), and internalization. On the one hand, human beings collectively produce society, but, on the other hand, they are the products of their society. As products of a particular society they have a particular knowledge of what reality is and how to understand it. From this perspective it is impossible to have a value-free approach. Let me employ Berger's metaphor of the "good spy who reports what is there" to clarify my point.

Suppose the spy goes to a small village in Asia far away from a big city. There he enters a farmer's house and sees there is no chair, no table, because people there sit on the floor. In the center of the living room stands something that is shaped exactly like a "bedpan." After this visit, I wonder how the spy will report the farmer's living room. As a "good spy who reports what is there" he will write his report by saying that he sees a farmer's living room with the size so and so, without a chair and table, and a bedpan in the center of the room. It seems like a value-free report, but it is not. The "bedpan" is not a bedpan, but it is a drinking-water-pot which is used for serving guests. For the spy, as a viewer, that kind of thing is a "bedpan" and is used as a bedpan; but the farmer doesn't have any idea about a bedpan or he maybe doesn't even have the idea of a washroom because his washroom is the bush outside his house. I wonder whether the spy would be willing to drink some water if the farmer served him
from the "bedpan." Here the spy sees the reality out there from his own perspective which he gets from his own society. My point here is that "what is there" is socially constructed by a particular society in a particular time and space, therefore value-freeness is impossible. Put it differently, value-freeness is, as any other reality, socially constructed.

As well as value-freeness, norms are also socially constructed. As social constructions they are bound to particular societies. There is no definite and universal norm. But why does Berger suggest democratic capitalism as the norm for development, political liberty with limits on state power, and respect for human dignity? To put it differently, if every society constructs its own social reality what makes Berger believe that every society will construct democratic capitalism? The answer to this question is because the later Berger assumes that democratic capitalism is a "common ideological heritage of mankind," which is an objective reality for every society. The problem is that this ideology of democratic capitalism is not an objective reality for non-Western societies, because they do not inherit it from their older generations and they do not internalize this kind of reality. Most non-Western societies do not share this kind of reality. This scenario doesn't fit Berger's sociology of knowledge framework, because if social reality is socially constructed, it follows that every society should construct its own reality. This approach matches exactly with Berger's early view in *Pyramids*, namely, an open, non-doctrinaire approach; neither capitalism nor socialism.
Suppose Berger was right that democratic capitalism is a better model, then comes the question of norms. What kind of norm should determine the respect for human dignity and the limit of governmental power, for instance?

Respect for human dignity, which is tied closely to human rights and the limit of governmental power, does not come from nowhere. I will take human rights as an example to clarify my point.21

There are numerous concepts of human rights. Paul Marshall points out two of them, namely, "justice out of rights" and "rights out of justice."22 The first one views "human rights as the basis of a political order, out of which we elaborate our understanding of justice," while the second views "human rights as those protections and resources which are justly due to people in a particular political order."23 Marshall criticizes the first view because it "tends to be self-contradictory, to lead to tensions between rights and justice, and to undercut several of the substantive protections which its proponents wish to support."24 From a Christian (especially Reformed) perspective --which is based on the concepts of creation, fall and redemption-- Marshall argues that "rights should be understood as (inter alia) a consequence of justice and not vice versa."25 But this kind of concept is open-ended, because rights are not themselves the norm. Marshall says: "Rights will then depend on (proper) actual political and juridical activity. Rights are subject to actual government decision and so should be historically sensitive: they may be specified for
particular times and places." Although rights may be different according to times and places that doesn't imply that there are no political norms for what rights there should be. These two concepts of human rights derive from particular norms, the latter is from Christianity while the former is from liberalism."

Berger doesn't answer the question of what kind of norm should be used to measure respect for human dignity and the limits of governmental power. Following his sociology of knowledge framework he would argue that every society constructs its own norms. This kind of answer matches his early view. But his later view answers this question from a capitalistic ideology which emphasize economic growth and individual rights. Since Berger always seeks to ground his view on his sociology of knowledge, then his early view is more consistent and it has a greater respect for the indigenous values of a culture. I think the early Berger was right in arguing that the development of the Third World should not depend on either capitalism or socialism. What is important in development is that it should improve human standards of living and give respect to human dignity without destroying traditional values and sacrificing human beings. But, the question remains of what norms should be used to determine what standards of living, respect for human dignity and good traditional values are. Norms are also needed to

"Marshall employs George Grant's definition of liberal as "a set of beliefs which proceed from the central assumption that man's essence is his freedom and therefore that what chiefly concerns man in this life is to shape the world as we want it." George Grant, Technology and Empire (Toronto: Anansi, 1969), p. 114. In liberal position human rights are based on individual rights."
judge traditional values, because not every traditional value is good and acceptable. Cannibalism in a particular society, or sati (the burning of a man's widow with his body on the funeral pyre) in India, for example, are not good features in a traditional culture. Here norms are needed to judge whether particular traditional values have to be preserved or not. The early Berger left this open ended, while the later advocates democratic capitalism.

The later Berger is not necessarily too far away from what he wanted in Pyramids. Both the early and later positions express a high concern for human beings, but in the later position it seems to me that economic growth has becomes an idol. An idol, as Marshall defines it, is "a thing which humans create or find and which they then put their trust in." What Marshall means here is if we put our ultimate trust to something it will become an idol. Berger concerns are still the same, but the later believes that economic growth can overcome the problem of poverty and hunger, and lead to a democratic society without destroying traditional values and sacrificing human beings. This is not true. The economic growth approach does not (automatically) lead to democracy, rather it can become an idol. The only way to avoid idolatry is to put our trust in the true God. But Berger excludes God from his sociology of knowledge.

In the three processes of Berger's sociology of knowledge human beings only respond to other human beings (significant others) and their environment. In this picture there is no God. The only way God could be included is in the highest level of
legitimation, namely as a Legitimator. As a Legitimator, God is not a norm giver, because norms are socially constructed, rather he legitimates humanly constructed norms. But in the Christian view God is not a Legitimator, but the Creator who gives laws and norms to the created world.

5.3. Toward a Christian Perspective on Sociology of Knowledge

A Christian perspective in the sociology of knowledge would not be a "value-free" approach. I think there is no such value-freeness, not even in Berger's sociology of knowledge framework. A Christian perspective of sociology of knowledge would be an approach based on Christian belief. The basic difference between this approach and Berger's is that a Christian perspective acknowledges that there are God's laws and norms in the created world, so that in the process of constructing social reality human beings do not only respond to significant others and their environment, as Berger suggests, but also to God and his laws and norms. From a Christian perspective we could say that there are limits to governmental power, because God has established particular norms for the state. In Berger's sociology of knowledge we cannot say that there is a normative limit to governmental power, because every society should, and has the rights to, define the limits based on human desires. In a Christian perspective, the limits are shaped by society but they are based on the norms that God has created.

The Bible says that "In the beginning God created the heavens
and the earth." In the act of creation "God has created the world
good, and the very way this world is made speaks to us of its
Creator."28 Human beings and the whole universe are God's
creatures. Walsh and Middleton say: "Creatures are, by definition,
totally dependent. We exist only because God's wise word sustains
and preserves our being."29 But at the same time God also gave
a specific task to human being, the so called cultural mandate,
namely to rule over the earth (Gen. 1: 28). In the activity of
ruling over the earth human beings produce their reality.

Albert Wolters sees God's activity in creating the heavens and
the earth in the beginning, his acts in the subsequent six days of
creation, and human activity in constructing culture as God's
activity in creating the world.30 In the first two activities
God created the world directly without mediation, while in the last
one he creates social reality indirectly, namely through the
involvement of human responsibility.

These three activities could be distinguished into three
phases of creation. The first proclamation of the Bible is "In the
beginning God created the heavens and the earth." (Gen. 1:1) These
words, Wolters says, "refer to a creatio ex nihilo, a creation out
of nothing."31 The creatio ex nihilo, which Wolters also calls
the creatio prima, is distinct from the six days of creation, which
Wolters calls the creatio secunda. The six days of creation
presuppose "an already created 'earth,' unformed, empty, and dark,
and that the subsequent sovereign 'Let there be's' of the Creator
establish a variety of creational distinctions (light/dark,
above/below the firmament, sea/dry land, etc.) within that already created but initially unfinished earthly realm." The creatio secunda is not a creation out of nothing, rather an elaborating and furnishing the unformed earthly reality into a beautiful cosmos. God created everything in the creatio secunda by his word. Wolters says: "By his word of command God 'works up' the unformed earth into a masterpiece of the craftsman's art." The third phase, the so-called creatio tertia, is creation where God's norms govern the earth as developed by God indirectly, through people. The creatio tertia has to do with the cultural mandate. These three phases point to the same God, the Creator, and his word.

In the creatio secunda God not only created earthly realities, but also norms for social reality. God not only created physical things, such as the sun, stars, plants, animals, the structure of atom, the movement of the solar system, the building instinct of a beaver etc, but also norms for the structures of society. Wolters says: "God's ordinances also extend to the structures of society, to the world of art, to business and commerce. Human civilization is normed throughout. Everywhere we discover limits and proprieties, standards and criteria: in every field of human affairs there are right and wrong ways of doing things." The scope of the creation in the creatio secunda includes physical things, the laws of nature, and norms for human society.

Although both the laws of nature and norms reflect word of God in creation Wolters distinguishes them. Both of them are God's laws, but Wolters employs "laws" to refer to the laws of nature
that govern the nonhuman realm and "norms" to refer to the laws of
culture and society that govern the human realm. With laws God
rules the nonhuman realm directly, but he uses human beings as
mediators in ruling the human realm. Wolters says: "He [God] put
the planets in their orbits, makes the seasons come and go at the
proper time, makes seeds grow and animals reproduce, but entrusts
to mankind the tasks of making tools, doing justice, producing art,
and pursuing scholarship." Wolters is right when he says
that the nonhuman realm is a fixed world where the relations are
fixed. There is no other choice for a horse, for instance, except
to obey its laws. But, the human world is characterized by an
openness where mankind is called to positivize the norms, to apply
them to specific situations in our lives. There are norms for
justice, but human beings have to positivize these norms into their
political systems, their economic systems, and so forth. The
process of positivizing God's norms happens in the creatio tertia
where human beings are given a cultural mandate, namely to
construct their social reality.

The creatio secunda was not the end of God creational
activity. "Although God has withdrawn from the work of creation,"
Wolters says, "he has put an image of himself on the earth with a
mandate to continue." Mankind is the only creature given the
image of God, and the mandate to subdue the earth by filling and
forming it. "From now on the development of the created earth will
be societal and cultural in nature," says Wolters. Human
activity in developing the created earth based on God's norms is
called the *creatio tertia*.

God did not tell Adam and Eve how to subdue the earth. Here, Berger is right saying that the human world is an open world in which there is no fixed relationship with other human beings, their environment, and, I must add, the Creator. God only gave norms, which have to be positivized by mankind. Human beings have to construct their world. But in the process of producing social reality (externalization and objectivation) human beings not only respond to creatures, but to God and his norms as well. From this point of view, externalization is not only an "ongoing outpouring of human being into the world," as Berger defines it, but also an ongoing responding to the Creator and his norms as the realization of his cultural mandate. Consequently, objectivation is a process by which the human product (including the response to the Creator) becomes an objective reality. In this process God's norms are institutionalized into particular institutions, depending on times and places. Consequently, what Marshall says about the possibility that rights may be different according to times and places is very true. There is God's norm for human rights, but the rights may be institutionalized differently according to times and places because human beings respond to the norm differently according to their situation. In the process of internalization human beings internalize the product of human beings, a product where God's norms have been objectivized.

Externalization and objectivation should become ways wherein mankind fulfils the cultural mandate. Through these two processes
human beings develop the created earth and unfold and open up God's hidden norms. In this way externalization and objectivation, the processes of producing social reality, become the creatio tertia.

In Berger's sociology of knowledge, the acknowledgement of God and his norms is missing. Berger doesn't see that social activity in producing social reality as a continuation of the creatio prima and secunda, rather it is a totally separated activity. In Berger's sociological view, there are no particular norms to be unfolded, but human beings have to create their own norms. If it is so, Berger has no right to say that governmental power should be limited, because in his view there is no norm which gives the norm to governmental power. In other words, if a particular society agrees to give all power to the state, let it be. If we want to talk about the limits of governmental power, it will be better to talk from a Christian perspective, because in a Christian perspective we believe that there are norms for the state, family, church and other societal structures. These norms give the normative limits for societal structures. These norms are not only for a Christian family, a "Christian state" and other Christian social structures, but for all societal structures; because the Christian God is not only for Christians, but the God for the whole universe, who created and governs the universe.

In Third World development God's norm should also become the norm. But this norm should be positivized according to their own social reality. They don't have to be the same as Western, or Japan, or Singapore society. It should be an open-ended and non-
idolized approach. Human rights, for instance, should not be the same everywhere. From a Christian approach, as Marshall says: "Rights will then depend on (proper) actual political and juridical activity. Rights are subject to actual government decision and so should be historically sensitive: they may be specified for particular times and places." The norm justice should determine rights.

5.4. Conclusion

From the Indonesian experience capitalist economic system helps Indonesia in increasing GNP and GDP, but it doesn't lead to a democratic system. It is also threatening Indonesian communal peasant character and has created imbalance in Indonesian development. This picture matches to Berger's earlier model where he believed that capitalism, which mythologized economic growth, cost human sacrifice. I think Berger's earlier model is a better model, although it does not yet exist. In this thesis I propose an open-ended approach, as the early Berger, but I suggest to take God's norm as the principle in societal development.

I agree with Berger that in Third World development it is very important to overcome poverty, respect to human dignity and political liberty. But the way to achieve them cannot just duplicate Japan or Singapore, because their social realities are not the same. It could be so, only if Third World social realities were exactly the same as Japan or Singapore.
Notes:
1. I will employ Craig M. Gay's notion of the "Evangelical left, right and center in his book *With Liberty and Justice for Whom? The Recent Evangelical Debate over Capitalism* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991). The Evangelical left views capitalism as oppressive, by definition; while the Evangelical right sees capitalism as a system which provides economic liberation and "the foundation for political and cultural liberation of modern societies." (p. 64) The Evangelical center, which falls in between these two groups, sees the necessity of state involvement.


7. See, for example, Piet Rietveld, "Basic Choices in Economic Research: The Case of Non-agricultural Activities in Rural Indonesia" in Sander Griffioen & Jan Verhooft (eds.), *Norm & Context in the Social Sciences* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1990). Based on research conducted in a rural village in Central Java Rietveld and other research staff discovered that villagers, who are mostly farmers, cannot depend on their farming activity.


19. Anton C. Zijderveld believes that the early Berger advocated the so-called "welfare state" which has been tried out in North-West Europe (see: James D. Hunter and Stephen C. Ainlay (eds.), *Making Sense of Modern Times; Peter L. Berger and the Vision of Interpretive Sociology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986), p. 71.), but Berger denies it (ibid, p. 226).

20. I am using Brian J. Walsh's term in his book *Subversive Christianity; Imaging God in a Dangerous Time* (Bristol, England: Regius, 1992) p. 62. Here Walsh criticizes Fukuyama's "The End of History." One of Walsh's criticism is that Fukuyama's assumption that Western liberal democracy is a common ideological heritage of mankind is arrogant, narrowly ethnocentric, and an ideological form of genocide (p. 60). I think Berger also falls into the same trap when he suggests democratic capitalism for the Third World.


27. Ibid, p. 131.


34. Ibid, p. 36.

35. Ibid, p. 22.


37. Ibid, p. 36.

38. Ibid, p. 36.
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